Usenet Newsgroup Archive: rec.radio.amateur.policy

2003-08 - 2003-09

These Usenet messages were preserved as a plain-text archive. This PDF was generated by Digital Library of Amateur Radio & Communications from the source text file in 2026.

Date span: 2003-08-01 through 2003-09-30

Source text: rec.radio.amateur.policy.txt

Source item: https://archive.org/details/usenet-rec

Messages included in this PDF: 6,161

Message records with no readable body available in the source text: 5

Messages are presented chronologically by archived date.

Binary or encoded payloads are not printed as blocks of encoded text; a placeholder appears where such material was detected. The original source text is unchanged.

1. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 00:24:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030731202448.12501.00001272@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 73416

In article <bgbtgk$m98$0@208.206.142.96>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" wrote:

>> > California became the most populated state in the USA many years
>> > ago. Many, many, many folks moved here because THEY liked it.
>>
>> And now it's one of the most highly taxed, crime ridden places in
>> the United States.
>
>They face a $35BILLION budget shortfall for *this year* and they're not
>finished counting yet. All those
>"feel good" deals, and Putzie's vaunted emergency services bills coming due.
>Wonder what will be left when
>it all settles out?
>Quick and dirty math, that's at least $1000 for each citizen, man-woman-child
>residing there. One has to wonder when the big exodus will begin. So they're
>about to fire their Governor,
>not that he could have done much to avoid it all.

And what will his replacement do to fix it?
>
From all I've read and heard, the reason for all these California crises
(remember the electric energy emrgency?) comes from a fundamental failure of
the system and the voters there to connect rights with responsibilities. IOW,
services are not connected to taxes.

They vote in all sorts of mandates but not the taxes to fund them.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2. Re: BAD IDEA for ham radio in general (was Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them t

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 00:27:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0307311627.8201057@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73417

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3F28664E.8010402@adelphia.net>...
>
> Uhh Brian, let's look at just how much credibility the PCTA's have in
> this newsgroup. Nada, zilch, nothing.

Mike, I see it the other way. In any case, everyone posting here has
been tainted by the stench of a rotting horse. But we continue to
beat it anyway.

> About the only thing we could do is to ask someone like Carl to tell us
> what to do.

If you must.

> What I would say is to keep the code test in the future, and to
> maintain a high level of proficiency in the writtens. That is what I
> believe the ARS should do. I can and will file my comments, but it isn't
> going to mean a thing.

Why not?

> What the NCTA's appear to want is an open acceptance of what they have
> brought to bear on the Amateur community. Sorry, ain't going to happen.
> I'll welcome and encourage new hams, but I won't change my mind about
> how I think the ARS should be structured.

You know, some people think that the NCTA have been ineffective at
changing anything. They think the FCC was going that way anyhow.

So I'll chalk you up as one who thinks NCI is a highly effective
organization. Yep, better ask Carl how you should respond to and
NOI/NPRM.

> Personally, I think the NCTA's haven't quite figured out that THEY have
> become the mainstream in Amateur radio. YOU WON! NOw you have to start
> running the show.

Kewl!

> People who agitate for change very often have a hard time adjusting to
> their new position after achieving it, so don't feel too bad.

Kind of like the Republican Party after 70 years of Democrat rule.

FWIW, they're doing just fine. So will we.

> This whole concept is why I chastise Carl and Bill for not being more
> prepared to ease the transition after their victory. The PCTA's, such as
> Larry, Dick, Dave, Jim, Dan, and myself and others, are a diverse group.

Steve, Larry, Dick, Kelly, Dave, Dan, Bruce, Dan Finn, and a heap of
others who have fallen on their swords are certainly diverse.

Jim seems to be friendly enough, considering the hell he's been
through over the years.

> We have in common the belief that the code test is a good thing for
> Amateur radio, but beyond that we have opinions that run all over the place.

Oh, yeh.

> This is why I say Carl Has to get his people in line. You are one of
> his people, All the rabble rousing CB'ers are his people, All the people
> who oppose Morse Code testing are his people. You are now the status quo.

Except for the CB part, thank you. CB is regulated by Part 95, not
Carl.

I'm ready to start singing like Sidney Portier, "He's Got the Whole
World in His Hands."

> You have to deal with it. That is exactly how it is. Amateur radio's
> future now hinges on you. And there is nothing a PCTA could do about it
> even if they wanted to.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike, don't sweat it. The ARS is in good hands.

73, Brian

3. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 00:37:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0307311637.531200bc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73418

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030731062104.09580.00001803@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> In article <1059622545.396048@newshost03.voicenet.com>, "Chic N Pox"
> <oafowemes300@yahoo.com> writes:

> >So Dick, please remember that keeping Code WILL NOT
> >keep the fruitcakes out of the hobby, nor will it bring more stations
> >into the same.
>
> It won't keep 'em all out, that's for sure.

So its much more important to keep out some or a lot of ordinary law
abiding citizens who otherwise could be enjoying the ARS?

You never did get it, did you?

I said it before the last restructuring and I guess its necessary that
I say it again, "What I fear most about restructuring the ARS is a
lack of enforcement, and what I fear most about maintaining the Status
Quo is a lack of enforcement. The Morse Exam is no substitute for
enforcement."

Brian

4. Re: Hey CBers Help Get rid of Morse Code Test and Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 00:45:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F29B84F.1040500@adelphia.net>
Source record: 73419
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Keith wrote:
> On Fri, 25 Jul 2003 02:09:36 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
>
>
>>Even though the FCC does not maintain the info in their database, you will
>>certainly have to be able to provide proof via the appropriate documentation
>>that you do have the privileges should you ever receive an NAL from the FCC.
>
>
> The FCC does not have the man power or personal to police 200,000 techs that
> have the ability to access 28.300-28.500 MHz voice.
> Face it the game is over, No code techs pick up your microphones and talk.

Atta boy Keith. The new age of Hams arrivith!

- Mike KB3EIA -

5. QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 00:49:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F29B941.3060802@adelphia.net>
Source record: 73420

Just practicing one of the the new Q signals....

- Mike KB3EIA -

6. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 00:55:46 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hiwsnnx.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73421

On 31 Jul 2003 17:37:02 -0700, Brian wrote:

>I said it before the last restructuring and I guess its necessary that
>I say it again, "What I fear most about restructuring the ARS is a
>lack of enforcement, and what I fear most about maintaining the Status
>Quo is a lack of enforcement. The Morse Exam is no substitute for
>enforcement."

For once we agree.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

7. Re: Some comments on the NCVEC petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 01:01:47 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgce5r$vo9$0@208.206.142.87>
Source record: 73422

"D. Stussy" wrote:

>
> Apparently, you've never been to Southern California. There were times where
> one could count the violations on our "animal farm" repeater - and sometimes
> the number of violations per minute would exceed the number of seconds in a
> minute. Most of those misfits are still licensed. Watch out HF - here they
> come!

Yep, just as they came to VHF/UHF ham radio from the never-never
land of 27 mhz via a no-code (and virtualy no-test) ham radio license.
Seems like the FCC just doesn't care, or they'd never allow it.

8. Re: Hey CBers Help Get rid of Morse Code Test and Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 01:08:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hiwthcz.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73423

Keith wrote:

> The FCC does not have the man power or personal to police 200,000
> techs that have the ability to access 28.300-28.500 MHz voice. Face
> it the game is over, No code techs pick up your microphones and talk.

The Oregon State Police does not have the "man power or personal"
(sic) to police the 200,000 or more drivers who have the ability to
access I-5 northbound in the southbound lane. Drivers, jump into
your cars and DRIVE.....

What a jerk.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

9. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 01:30:32 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgcfro$4t0$0@208.206.142.73>
Source record: 73424

Phil Kane wrote:

> On 31 Jul 2003 17:37:02 -0700, Brian wrote:
>
> >I said it before the last restructuring and I guess its necessary that
> >I say it again, "What I fear most about restructuring the ARS is a
> >lack of enforcement, and what I fear most about maintaining the Status
> >Quo is a lack of enforcement. The Morse Exam is no substitute for
> >enforcement."
>
> For once we agree.
>

Not me. Not at all
. You know as well as anyone, better than most, that almost the only
"enforcement" we've had on the ARS for many years
prior to Riley's appointment WAS the code test.

Now, a 'difficult' (for that type of individual) test which discourages,
yea, FILTERS him from active, open participation is a poor
excuse for monitor vans and well trained and equipped crews.
But it's what we had.

Now we have Riley and a 5wpm code test. Soon only Riley. When he goes, I
for one believe the ARS will follow his exit, not far behind. By that time
there
will be far more than adequate evidence that the ARS is no longer a viable
self-
policing entity, staffed with conscientious people willing and able to
conduct
themselves in a manner commensurate with the priveleges granted,
most of which will shortly be summarily withdrawn.

I just don't believe the public OR the government would tolerate CB on the

same level as ham radio has long existed. And that's exactly where it's
headed,
and has been for too many years.

10. Re: Hey CBers Help Get rid of Morse Code Test and Requirement

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 01:33:30 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgcg1a$4t0$1@208.206.142.73>
Source record: 73425

Phil Kane wrote:

> Keith wrote:
>
> > The FCC does not have the man power or personal to police 200,000
> > techs that have the ability to access 28.300-28.500 MHz voice. Face
> > it the game is over, No code techs pick up your microphones and talk.
>
> The Oregon State Police does not have the "man power or personal"
> (sic) to police the 200,000 or more drivers who have the ability to
> access I-5 northbound in the southbound lane. Drivers, jump into
> your cars and DRIVE.....
>
> What a jerk.

We just can't wait for a few thousand like him- it wouldn't take all that many, you know, to really cause some super problems- to show up on HF running
full power.....

11. Re: Good bye CODE!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 01:56:55 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93C9DF2F6D3Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 73426

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
news:bgbspdkbv1@208.206.142.96:

>
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> Alun Palmer wrote:
>>
>> > Do you realise if it does take two years, the US will be just about
>> > the only country with code testing, except maybe Russia!
>>
>> Which would mean?
>
> Simple, Mike - instant gratification foiled again!
>
>

Well, given that I already have an Extra Class licence, how would that be
relevant?

12. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 02:04:17 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgchr1$a7r$0@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 73427

N2EY wrote:

> In article <bgbtgk$m98$0@208.206.142.96>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" wrote:
>
> >> > California became the most populated state in the USA many years
> >> > ago. Many, many, many folks moved here because THEY liked it.
> >>
> >> And now it's one of the most highly taxed, crime ridden places in
> >> the United States.
> >
> >They face a $35BILLION budget shortfall for *this year* and they're not
> >finished counting yet. All those
> >"feel good" deals, and Putzie's vaunted emergency services bills coming due.
> >Wonder what will be left when
> >it all settles out?
> >Quick and dirty math, that's at least $1000 for each citizen, man-woman-child
> >residing there. One has to wonder when the big exodus will begin. So they're
> >about to fire their Governor,
> >not that he could have done much to avoid it all.
>
> And what will his replacement do to fix it?
> >
> From all I've read and heard, the reason for all these California crises
> (remember the electric energy emrgency?) comes from a fundamental failure of
> the system and the voters there to connect rights with responsibilities. IOW,
> services are not connected to taxes.
>
> They vote in all sorts of mandates but not the taxes to fund them.
>

And wouild you like to guess who's voting all that into being?

Hint: It's not the conservatives!

Seems like Liberalism is about to devout itself in the Sunshine State.

13. Re: Good bye CODE!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 02:07:27 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgci0v$a7r$1@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 73428

Alun Palmer wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in
> news:bgbspdkbv1@208.206.142.96:
>
> >
> >
> > Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> >> Alun Palmer wrote:
> >>
> >> > Do you realise if it does take two years, the US will be just about
> >> > the only country with code testing, except maybe Russia!
> >>
> >> Which would mean?
> >
> > Simple, Mike - instant gratification foiled again!
> >
> >
>
> Well, given that I already have an Extra Class licence, how would that be
> relevant?

You really missed it, didn't you??

Instant upgrade of license isn't the only gratification involved.

14. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 02:13:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F29CCE4.5090409@adelphia.net>
Source record: 73429

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
>
>>On 31 Jul 2003 17:37:02 -0700, Brian wrote:
>>
>>
>>>I said it before the last restructuring and I guess its necessary that
>>>I say it again, "What I fear most about restructuring the ARS is a
>>>lack of enforcement, and what I fear most about maintaining the Status
>>>Quo is a lack of enforcement. The Morse Exam is no substitute for
>>>enforcement."
>>
>> For once we agree.
>>
>
>
> Not me. Not at all
> . You know as well as anyone, better than most, that almost the only
> "enforcement" we've had on the ARS for many years
> prior to Riley's appointment WAS the code test.
>
> Now, a 'difficult' (for that type of individual) test which discourages,
> yea, FILTERS him from active, open participation is a poor
> excuse for monitor vans and well trained and equipped crews.
> But it's what we had.
>
> Now we have Riley and a 5wpm code test. Soon only Riley. When he goes, I
> for one believe the ARS will follow his exit, not far behind. By that time
> there
> will be far more than adequate evidence that the ARS is no longer a viable
> self- policing entity, staffed with conscientious people willing and able to
> conduct themselves in a manner commensurate with the priveleges granted,
> most of which will shortly be summarily withdrawn.

Dick, these thoughts have been buzzing around the drafty recesses of my
head:

"I don't have time to learn Morse code....."

"I'm never going to use Morse code, I'm not going to learn it....."

"I think band plans are stupid, it's an obsolete idea for an obsolete
mode. They really aren't law anyhow...."

"There are a lot more people running SSB, why shouldn't they have the bandwidth....."

"I don't feel like self policing, that's just interfereing with my RIGHTS. Besides, there isn't enough enforcement personnel to catch me....."

At that point it is a dire situation indeed!

And it's already all been heard in this group.

- Mike KB3EIA -

15. Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 02:19:05 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93C9E2F10E649elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 73430

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:3F290C63.3070405@psu.edu:

> Alun Palmer wrote:
>> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:3F2813F3.7070808@psu.edu:
>>
>>
>>>
>>>Alun Palmer wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>You don't get it, do you? Nobody has ever implied it says OR, and it
>>>>certainly never mentions Element 1.
>>>>
>>>>What it does say is:
>>>>
>>>>"who has recieved credit for proficiency in telegraphy
>>>>_in_accordance_with_international_requirements_"
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> You are taking what is an aside, and basing your whole argument
>>> on it.
>>>Won't work.
>>>
>>> This argument doesn't work on enough levels that it is surprising
>>> that
>>>anyone would use it.
>>>
>>>1. My first remark about the very secondary nature of the "in
>>>accordance with....."
>>>
>>
>>
>> That is the strongest argument against it, i.e. is it a condition? It
>> may not be, but this is the first post to attack that point
>>
>>
>>>2. The reworded Article 25.5 now says, "Administrations shall
>>>determine whether or not a person seeking a license to operate an
>>>amateur station shall demonstrate the ability to send and receive
>>>texts in Morse code signals."
>>>
>>> Do you agree that this is the reworded article 25.5?
>>>

>>
>>
>> Yes
>>
>>
>>> The administration has determined that the persons seeking a
>>> license must pass a 5 wpm Morse code test.
>>
>>
>> Not so fast. Where does it say that in respect of the Novice
>> frequencies?
>>
>>
>>>Until it changes it's requirements, it will continue.
>>>
>>>
>>>3. There is nothing in the rules that we are out of compliance with.
>>>
>>
>>
>> Who said there was? Maybe D Stussy, but his line of argument is truly
>> wierd
>
> Yeah, reading his argument makes me dizzy.
>
>>
>>>4. Morse code testing is not abolished. Individual administrations now
>>>make that call- to test, or not to test.
>>>
>>
>>
>> Yes, but have they actually made it in respect of those particular
>> frequencies? I'm not sure that they have.
>>
>
> Since many contries have individual bending of the rules, (US
> technician, Japanese Low power HF as examples, there is already
> evidence of some modification of the rules. This of course complicaes
> matters.
>
> So we are left with starting from the premise that we or whatever
> country is in initial compliance. That initial compliance is dated from
> the day before the rule change.
>
> This to me says that the present state is in compliance, even
> though
> the requirement for the Morse test has been modified.
>
> I certainly understand your argument.

Yes, I beleive you do now. I think we are at least 'on the same page'.

> But when situations like
> this
> crop up, and one rule interferes with another, those who would be
> called on to make a ruling have to make it with the concept of the
> spirit of the rule, plus they have to make rulings that do not throw
> the institution into chaos.
>
>

Others have pointed out that rule 301(e) was written that way to avoid creating any new 'Tech+' licencees, but it looks as if invoking the international rules created a sunset clause, whether intentionally or otherwise.

I don't really see how that throws anything into chaos. Right now no-coders who operate on the Novice/Tech HF allocations can't readily be detected for lack of any central records to prove that they are actually no-coders. If the changes to s25.5 affect 97.301(e) so as to make it permissible, then from the FCC perspective it makes an enforcement problem go away!

>
>
>>>Using the argument that Morse code testing has been abolished is quite
>>>simply *wrong*.
>>
>>
>> No-one is saying it has been abolished for the General or the Extra
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
73 de Alun, N3KIP

16. Re: Some comments on the NCVEC petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 02:26:02 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93C9E41F5307Belektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 73431

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:h1hWa.15081$Vx2.7449274@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0307311259.2080b9e7@posting.google.com...
>> Do you really think that the very best we can do for entry-level HF
>> privileges for new hams in a nocodetest 21st century future is to give
>> them tiny slices of CW on four bands and SSB on one band, and at the
>> same time give them all of amateur VHF/UHF? Is that really what's best
>> for the ARS?
>>
>
> No reason to give the Techs any more than what the current coded Techs
> get. If they want more, they can take the General written. It's only
> slightly harder than the Tech test.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

Well, we agree on something, then

17. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 02:51:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030731225152.23406.00001167@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 73432

In article <3F29B941.3060802@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Just practicing one of the the new Q signals....

QR10-4, QGB! I'm QPM, so QBD me!

(Translation: "Ten-Fawhar, Good Buddie! I'll be putting the pedal to the
metal now, so watch my back door!)

73 de Larry, K3LT

18. Re: BAD IDEA for ham radio in general (was Re: Contact the FCC and

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 02:51:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030731225153.23406.00001168@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 73433

In article <bg9tmk$s69$1@208.206.142.78>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>
> Not to worry though, Larry. With the NCTA in charge ham radio won't be dead.
>Just
>brain dead.
>

Dick:

Perhaps. I could be wrong about all this, but I don't have that kind of luck!
And if ham radio does end up "brain dead," how long do you think the
inert, comatose corpse will be kept breathing before someone trips over
the respirator's power cord?

73 de Larry, K3LT

19. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 02:52:19 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgckl3$j64$0@208.207.71.139>
Source record: 73434

Brian wrote:

> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030731062104.09580.00001803@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> > In article <1059622545.396048@newshost03.voicenet.com>, "Chic N Pox"
> > <oafowemes300@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> > >So Dick, please remember that keeping Code WILL NOT
> > >keep the fruitcakes out of the hobby, nor will it bring more stations
> > >into the same.
> >
> > It won't keep 'em all out, that's for sure.
>
> So its much more important to keep out some or a lot of ordinary law
> abiding citizens who otherwise could be enjoying the ARS?

> You never did get it, did you?
>

YOU never did get it. No one has any intent to keep anyone out who wants to
follow the rules and refrain from becoming a problem. You never could see that
a code test never kept otu anyone who wanted in,. just a few who were too mildly interested
to
bother. Like you.

>
> I said it before the last restructuring and I guess its necessary that
> I say it again, "What I fear most about restructuring the ARS is a
> lack of enforcement, and what I fear most about maintaining the Status
> Quo is a lack of enforcement. The Morse Exam is no substitute for
> enforcement."

That's all you know about it. For years the code test was the ONLY factor that restricted
troublemakers from freely roaming the ham bands, FCC having been relegated by lack of
funding
to more or less toothless-watchdog status.
Of course that doesn't nean a thing to you, but what that shows id your lack of
perception.

So when a few thousand refugees from way up there descend onto the HF bands
-as some have very recently indicated their intent right here on rrap- and lonely Riley is
left
to sweep up,. just how much enforcement you think there'll be?
But press on- it's "kill the code" even if it kills us.

20. Re: BAD IDEA for ham radio in general (was Re: Contact the FCC and

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 03:32:00 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgcmvgnmg0@208.207.71.150>
Source record: 73435

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <bg9tmk$s69$1@208.206.142.78>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> > Not to worry though, Larry. With the NCTA in charge ham radio won't be dead.
> >Just
> >brain dead.
> >
>
> Dick:
>
> Perhaps. I could be wrong about all this, but I don't have that kind of luck!
> And if ham radio does end up "brain dead," how long do you think the
> inert, comatose corpse will be kept breathing before someone trips over
> the respirator's power cord?

That induhvidual is already standing on the ozygen hose!

21. ON before DL - that will make 4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 04:09:15 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93CA17AD3BE7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 73436

Belgium is abolishing the code test on the 4th, two days before Germany,
pushing the Germans into fourth place. The official announcements are out.

Four down - how many to go?

22. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 04:51:48 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bgg5nv$no0ns$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 73515
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Yep, As I was aware of that. And I never expected them to change for me at the last minute. BUT, I do believe that with enough warning ahead of time it should be considered more than fair for a VE team to make an adjustment. It should be no problem for a VEC to be able to send via code practice oscillator!!!!!! Wouldn't that be a shame if the VEC's have become so lazy they can't even send a code test via a key because they are relying on the code CD's and tapes.

Where the hell did you think I expected to walk into a test session in the past, and at the last possible moment expect a major change?

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> Arrangements for a different tone have to be made in advance so that they
> have time to obtain a CD or tape of the needed pitch from the VEC. You
> can't just drop into a test session and expect them to have anything
> different than the commonly used tone.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

23. Re: BAD IDEA for ham radio in general (was Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them t

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 04:53:11 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bgg5o0$no0ns$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 73516

Thanks Jim.

Ryan KC8PMX

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030731182105.15462.00001980@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <bgb8ni$mjfjb$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Really??? Considering that I would sign up for that!!!!!! What
company???
> >
>
> "Neighborhood HiSpeed", which claims to have been "built by MCI". Might be
a
> local thing. Limited time offer, includes unlimited local calls, unlimited
long
> distance, call waiting, caller ID, 3 way calling, unlimited DSL, free
modem.
>
> See www.mci.com/hs3
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

24. Code goodby,maybe something else.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 06:31:42 UTC
From: kc5cqa@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <3f2d0354.3892183@news.devtex.net>
Source record: 73437

I think I have noticed something, I think, tell me what you think.
I am a 'tech', and glad to have 'this' ticket, and have worked 'on the
code' off and on. But my point is, I use/listen on two meters and 440
locally. In the last several years, I 'hear' pagers of all kinds in
the ham bands. Keep that thought in mind. Also a few years back I
recall reading about different ""Companies '" wanting/trying to use
the 440/two meter band for sat freq, and business in general. I know
I don't have that 'info' detailed and with footnotes, but I am sure
you recall what I am talking about. There is JUST so much spectrum,
and lot of
business looking to use it. All (90%) of the hams I know are pretty
old, you go to a ham fest , convention, and there are very few young
people. I have had the ''''idea'''' that if ham radio is left to it
own wishes, what is the likely hood that some "Service" will eat the
old, dying , and the dead. I don't advocate the 'ham bands' turning
into 11 meters, but I don't "think" we should refuse to see the
"writhing on the wall',,,, I would just hate to see something like,,,,
ten years from now , almost everyone in the US, walking around with a
cell phone in there pocket, all using the """Ham bands"". Just my 2
cents......What do you "think"? cl 73

25. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 08:03:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB4F970D.1FCA4%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 73438

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> What are those "realistic needs and goals", Dwight?

Please, don't waste my time with silly questions like that, Mike. Every ham knows, or should know, that the goals of Amateur Radio are specified in 97.1 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The needs are that necessary to meet those goals.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

26. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 08:26:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB4F9C59.1FCA6%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 73439

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> There seems to be a bigger picture that the
> NCTA's are having trouble grasping.
>
> After their victory, their people - in this
> case, *all* those who oppose Morse code
> testing are coming out of the woodwork. And
> they seem to be having problems recognizing
> their new resposibility. Dwight and I are
> not too different on the requirements to
> become a Ham. The problem is that a lot of
> other people in his camp have some drastically
> different ideas of what is realistic or
> reasonable.
>
> Those are the people who need to be reigned in.
>
> Question is, are the NCTA's up to the task?

Mike, since I'm not an advocate, I'm not in the NCTA camp. You seem to think anyone who disagrees with you is. Instead, I've simply acknowledged, during a discussion with you about the written tests, that code testing no longer offers any real benefit to ham radio. An acknowledgement of reality doesn't necessarily advocate anything.

In my opinion, the code testing issue is pretty much dead in this country. It's only a matter of time before code testing goes away. So, instead, I was responding to your comments about the written tests, with code testing, first mentioned by you, on the peripheral of that discussion.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

27. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 08:51:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB4FA25C.1FCA8%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 73440

"Mike Coslo" wrote:

> How was I excluded from the ARS by the Morse
> code test?

In the past, you were not excluded (code testing served a need). However, if code testing remains solely as a means to exclude "those people," others in the future will be. "Those people" include anyone you set out to exclude.

You want stiffer written tests (or code testing) to exclude "dumbed down" people. I don't agree with that. Show me something that individual has done wrong and I'll support your efforts to get rid of that person. However, I'm not willing to exclude groups of people simply because some don't like them or a few in that group have done things some don't like.

Many don't like CB'ers and want stiffer written exams (or code testing) to keep "those people" out. I don't agree with that. Again, if you want to throw someone out because that person has broken the rules, I'm all for that. However, I'm not willing to exclude someone from even getting into ham radio simply because they once owned a CB radio and we don't like what some did with those radios.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

28. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 09:14:40 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB4FA7BF.1FCAA%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 73441

"Mike Coslo" wrote:

> And then after a couple years, that nasty test
> will be what is keeping people out of the ARS.

Yet, you and Dick are the only two in this thread who have even suggested anything like that. Not a single person opposed to code testing has made any such comments in this thread. And I certainly haven't made any comments about reducing or eliminating the written tests.

Most people are realistic. I support keeping the written tests because those tests serve a purpose which benefits me and the entire ham radio community. Code testing, which a few of you can't seem to get past, doesn't today.

My comments about "keeping people out," or excluding people, only had to do with test requirements designed to exclude instead of serving a need for ham radio. Code testing once served a need, so did not exclude at that time. If it remains today solely as a barrier to keep others out, it does exclude. Brian's idea of stiffer written exams don't exclude if it serves a purpose or need. However, if done solely to keep others out, it also does exclude.

Again, once we start down the path of excluding others, when does it stop and who else do we exclude? Am I next in the list? Are you?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

29. Re: Sign in the petition against the abuse of the Band Plan forward this message to your buddies)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 10:11:55 UTC
From: g8aso@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <3d538e03.0308010211.7f2e6525@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73442
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy,pt.rec.radio.amadorismo,nl.radio.amateur

Greetings,

Abuse of the Bandplan, what bandplan?

That is something that was invented by a magazine publishing company,
The Radio Society Of Great Britain Limited. The licensing authority
recognises NO "bandplan", please read the BR68, learn how to spell
'FREQUENCY', and try not to make such a display of cuntishness in
future.

Brian G8ASO

dxresource@yahoo.es (Ignacio) wrote in message
news:<3d2e2fa.0307311316.4e339502@posting.google.com>...
> Fill in the petition:
>
>
> it9ryh.bravehost.com
>
> Against the abuse some OM make over the DX-Windows's fequenecy frame
>
>
> 73s
>
> Ignacio

30. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 10:21:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030801062111.23307.00001906@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 73443

In article <bgchr1$a7r$0@208.207.71.169>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> In article <bgbtgk$m98$0@208.206.142.96>, "Dick Carroll;"
><dixie@townsqr.com>
>> writes:
>>
>> >"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" wrote:
>>
>> >> > California became the most populated state in the USA many years
>> >> > ago. Many, many, many folks moved here because THEY liked it.
>> >>
>> >> And now it's one of the most highly taxed, crime ridden places in
>> >> the United States.
>> >
>> >They face a $35BILLION budget shortfall for *this year* and they're not
>> >finished counting yet. All those
>> >"feel good" deals, and Putzie's vaunted emergency services bills coming
>due.
>> >Wonder what will be left when
>> >it all settles out?
>> >Quick and dirty math, that's at least $1000 for each citizen,
>man-woman-child
>> >residing there. One has to wonder when the big exodus will begin. So
>they're
>> >about to fire their Governor,
>> >not that he could have done much to avoid it all.
>>
>> And what will his replacement do to fix it?
>> >
>> From all I've read and heard, the reason for all these California crises
>> (remember the electric energy emrgency?) comes from a fundamental failure
>of
>> the system and the voters there to connect rights with responsibilities.
>IOW,
>> services are not connected to taxes.
>>
>> They vote in all sorts of mandates but not the taxes to fund them.
>
>And wouild you like to guess who's voting all that into being?

The voters
>

>Hint: It's not the conservatives!
>
>Seems like Liberalism is about to devout itself in the Sunshine State.
>
Actually, it's both. The "liberals" vote in the mandates. The "conservatives" block the taxes. Both sides disconnect rights from responsibilities. You get the worst of both worlds.

Look at their electric "deregulation" of a few years back. The retail prices were regulated (classic big government utility/monopoly idea) but the wholesale prices weren't (classic laissez-faire trickle-down supply-side free-market-capitalism).

Coupled with that was the desire for high tech jobs and investment (Silicon Valley) but not the responsibility to build the infrastructure to run it (power lines, generating stations).

End result: Lotta people's lights went out.

73 de Jim, N2EY

31. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 10:41:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308010241.6b2cc971@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73444

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bgckl3$j64$0@208.207.71.139>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030731062104.09580.00001803@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> > > In article <1059622545.396048@newshost03.voicenet.com>, "Chic N Pox"
> > > <oafowemes300@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> > > >So Dick, please remember that keeping Code WILL NOT
> > > >keep the fruitcakes out of the hobby, nor will it bring more stations
> > > >into the same.
> > >
> > > It won't keep 'em all out, that's for sure.
> >
> > So its much more important to keep out some or a lot of ordinary law
> > abiding citizens who otherwise could be enjoying the ARS?
>
> > You never did get it, did you?
> >
>
> YOU never did get it. No one has any intent to keep anyone out who wants to
> follow the rules and refrain from becoming a problem.

But keeping out people was the net effect of your code exam.

You never could see that
> a code test never kept otu anyone who wanted in,. just a few who were too mildly
interested to
> bother. Like you.

I got in with a code exam.

> > I said it before the last restructuring and I guess its necessary that
> > I say it again, "What I fear most about restructuring the ARS is a
> > lack of enforcement, and what I fear most about maintaining the Status
> > Quo is a lack of enforcement. The Morse Exam is no substitute for
> > enforcement."
>
> That's all you know about it.

It is true.

For years the code test was the ONLY factor that restricted
> troublemakers from freely roaming the ham bands, FCC having been relegated by lack of
funding
> to more or less toothless-watchdog status.

> Of course that doesn't nean a thing to you, but what that shows id your lack of
> perception.

It shows that someone wasn't doing their job.

> So when a few thousand refugees from way up there descend onto the HF bands
> -as some have very recently indicated their intent right here on rrap- and lonely Riley
is left
> to sweep up,. just how much enforcement you think there'll be?
> But press on- it's "kill the code" even if it kills us.

Dick, coded people can be idiots, too. Have you heard Kelly challenge
other to "Meet me on HF, any band, any mode, any time..."

Was that so he could sweet talk them?

32. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 10:46:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308010246.16ca3007@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73445

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bgcfro$4t0$0@208.206.142.73>...

> I just don't believe the public OR the government would tolerate CB on the
>
> same level as ham radio has long existed. And that's exactly where it's
> headed,
> and has been for too many years.

Thats kind of nonsense wording, but I gather that the Code Exam "as a
barrier to idiots" doesn't work?

33. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 10:49:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308010249.313b156a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73446

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3F29CCE4.5090409@adelphia.net>...
> Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> >
> > >>On 31 Jul 2003 17:37:02 -0700, Brian wrote:
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>>>I said it before the last restructuring and I guess its necessary that
> > >>>>I say it again, "What I fear most about restructuring the ARS is a
> > >>>>lack of enforcement, and what I fear most about maintaining the Status
> > >>>>Quo is a lack of enforcement. The Morse Exam is no substitute for
> > >>>>enforcement."
> > >>
> > >> For once we agree.
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> > > Not me. Not at all
> > > . You know as well as anyone, better than most, that almost the only
> > > "enforcement" we've had on the ARS for many years
> > > prior to Riley's appointment WAS the code test.
> > >
> > > Now, a 'difficult' (for that type of individual) test which discourages,
> > > yea, FILTERS him from active, open participation is a poor
> > > excuse for monitor vans and well trained and equipped crews.
> > > But it's what we had.
> > >
> > > Now we have Riley and a 5wpm code test. Soon only Riley. When he goes, I
> > > for one believe the ARS will follow his exit, not far behind. By that time
> > > there
> > > will be far more than adequate evidence that the ARS is no longer a viable
> > > self- policing entity, staffed with conscientious people willing and able to
> > > conduct themselves in a manner commensurate with the priveleges granted,
> > > most of which will shortly be summarily withdrawn.
> >
> > Dick, these thoughts have been buzzing around the drafty recesses of my
> > head:
> >
> > "I don't have time to learn Morse code....."
> >
> > "I'm never going to use Morse code, I'm not going to learn it....."
> >

> "I think band plans are stupid, it's an obsolete idea for an obsolete
> mode. They really aren't law anyhow...."
>
> "There are a lot more people running SSB, why shouldn't they have the
> bandwidth......"
>
> "I don't feel like self policing, that's just interfereing with my
> RIGHTS. Besides, there isn't enough enforcement personnel to catch me....."
>
> At that point it is a dire situation indeed!
>
> And it's already all been heard in this group.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick, Larry,
Dan, Bruce...

34. Re: Good bye CODE!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 10:59:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308010259.4d5b8d0e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73447

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bgbu56$nn4$0@208.206.142.96>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bg9ts2$s69$2@208.206.142.78>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030729223106.20198.00001064@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> > > > > In article <bg7489dps1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > > > > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > >Hi troll idiot....hope ur not in a hurry. The PCTAs are gonna put you on
> > > > > >hold for another decade at least.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > Dan:
> > > > > >
> > > > > Good point. And the PCTA's may not need to lift a finger. After all,
> > > > > the FCC just went to a great deal of time and expense to restructure
> > > > > the U.S. amateur radio licensing system,
> > > > >
> > > > A recurring review was and is required. Do you know how often they
> > > > must review the regs?
> > > > >
> > > > and may not be all that
> > > > > motivated to go through that process again in such short order.
> > > > >
> > > > They don't have a choice. It's called a mandate.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > Really, Brain? Would you care to cite exactly the source and contents of that
mandate?
> > >
> > Do you think the FCC reviewed Part 97 last time because they thought
> > it was a neat thing to do?
>
> Well I see that you complied and stated the source and contents of the mandate,
> Just like you validated your Somalia (alleged) operation.
>
> As has been noted here many times, all the FCC has to do is state "We visited the code
test issue less than three

> years ago, and revisited it as the result of a
> petition for reconsideration. We find no reason to revisit it again.
>
> End of story

So did you ever figure out why the FCC evaluated it last time, and why they have to review it again in the future?

35. Re: With CW gone, can the CW allocations be far behind?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 11:10:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308010310.7edab335@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73448

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0307311517.474d1626@posting.google.com>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2965B6.38D7F121@earthlink.net>...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> > > Do you have multiple personalities? Or is your psychosis a mild one
> > > of simple hatred for anyone pointing out that you never did any
> > > glorious government radio pioneering in the 1980s.
> >
> > You've called a number of people crazy over the past week or so. You
> > know what they say about one who believes that a number of others are
> > insane?
>
> Like "laughing" at 10 or 15 lines of posts? He HAS gone over
> the edge. Poor pogue still trying to figure out how he got here and
> why hasn't President Nixon got us out of Viet Nam yet.....
>
> That's OK, though...I am sure he's happy, where ever his mind
> is...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

He's just walking a mile in your shoes, Steve.

36. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 11:30:51 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgdj16$1guu$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73449

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BB4FA25C.1FCA8%stewart@say.net...
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> > How was I excluded from the ARS by the Morse
> > code test?
>
>
> In the past, you were not excluded (code testing served a need).
However,
> if code testing remains solely as a means to exclude "those people,"
others
> in the future will be. "Those people" include anyone you set out to
exclude.
>
> You want stiffer written tests (or code testing) to exclude "dumbed
down"
> people. I don't agree with that. Show me something that individual has
done
> wrong and I'll support your efforts to get rid of that person. However,
I'm
> not willing to exclude groups of people simply because some don't like
them
> or a few in that group have done things some don't like.
>

Excellent point, Dwight. It is only recently that I have heard more and
more alignment with the philosophy [paraphrasing] that it's OK to filter out
bad people from the ARS by having CW as an element for testing. If it is
believed that taking that element away will "dumb down" the ARS; then it is
logical to make the assumption that many support CW as a filtering tool for
the ARS--which is disgusting.

>
> Many don't like CB'ers and want stiffer written exams (or code testing)
to
> keep "those people" out. I don't agree with that. Again, if you want to
> throw someone out because that person has broken the rules, I'm all for
> that. However, I'm not willing to exclude someone from even getting into
ham
> radio simply because they once owned a CB radio and we don't like what
some
> did with those radios.
>

It has become popular now, to label others as "those people." In ham radio,
in everyday life. If CW is serving as a "filtering tool" in the eyes of a
majority in ham radio--I say abolish it. But, I've a feeling the attitude
that it is a filtering tool is not prevalent. Thank goodness!!

>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

37. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 11:35:08 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgdj98$1hk7$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73450

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bgckl3$j64$0@208.207.71.139...
>
>
> Brian wrote:
>
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030731062104.09580.00001803@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> > > In article <1059622545.396048@newshost03.voicenet.com>, "Chic N Pox"
> > > <oafowemes300@yahoo.com> writes:
> > >
> > > >So Dick, please remember that keeping Code WILL NOT
> > > >keep the fruitcakes out of the hobby, nor will it bring more stations
> > > >into the same.
> > >
> > > It won't keep 'em all out, that's for sure.
> >
> > So its much more important to keep out some or a lot of ordinary law
> > abiding citizens who otherwise could be enjoying the ARS?
>
> > You never did get it, did you?
> >
>
> YOU never did get it. No one has any intent to keep anyone out who wants
to
> follow the rules and refrain from becoming a problem. You never could see
that
> a code test never kept otu anyone who wanted in,. just a few who were too
mildly interested to
> bother. Like you.
>
> >
> > I said it before the last restructuring and I guess its necessary that
> > I say it again, "What I fear most about restructuring the ARS is a
> > lack of enforcement, and what I fear most about maintaining the Status
> > Quo is a lack of enforcement. The Morse Exam is no substitute for
> > enforcement."
>
> That's all you know about it. For years the code test was the ONLY factor
that restricted
> troublemakers from freely roaming the ham bands, FCC having been relegated
by lack of funding
> to more or less toothless-watchdog status.
> Of course that doesn't nean a thing to you, but what that shows id your

lack of
> perception.
>
> So when a few thousand refugees from way up there descend onto the HF
bands
> -as some have very recently indicated their intent right here on rrap- and
lonely Riley is left
> to sweep up,. just how much enforcement you think there'll be?
> But press on- it's "kill the code" even if it kills us.
>
>

I remember a long time ago in this newsgroup, accusing some of using the CW test as a filtering tool. I was nearly lambasted to Timbuktu. Now, it's popular and OK to just make the declaration!

If CW is used as a "filter" to keep anyone of the ARS; then it's plain wrong.

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

38. Re: Here We Go Again..Sir Putzalot Is Back In His Stride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 12:37:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308010437.67e04d46@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73451

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0307311135.4e787c76@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0307310513.16383b4@posting.google.com>...
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030729170206.23406.00001120@mb-m27.aol.com>...

> > > BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
> > > AHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!
> >
> > Lennie's gone over the edge. I warned him.
>
> Looks like he's walking a mile in your shoes.

He shudda tried a pair that hadn't been worn out and thrown away.

Steve, K4YZ

39. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 13:49:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F2A7003.9030002@adelphia.net>
Source record: 73452

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>
>>How was I excluded from the ARS by the Morse
>>code test?
>
>
>
> In the past, you were not excluded (code testing served a need). However,
> if code testing remains solely as a means to exclude "those people," others
> in the future will be. "Those people" include anyone you set out to exclude.
>
> You want stiffer written tests (or code testing) to exclude "dumbed down"
> people. I don't agree with that. Show me something that individual has done
> wrong and I'll support your efforts to get rid of that person. However, I'm
> not willing to exclude groups of people simply because some don't like them
> or a few in that group have done things some don't like.

First off, I don't think I've ever said "dumbed down". If you know I
have, post the reference.

Now to the subject at hand.

I do not consider the Morse Code to be *any test of intelligence or
desirability whatsoever.

What I do consider it is a method of ensuring that the person actually
wants to be in the service. It is a measure of inclusivity, not
exclusivity. Kind of like learning to parallel park or do a three point
turn.

> Many don't like CB'ers and want stiffer written exams (or code testing) to
> keep "those people" out. I don't agree with that. Again, if you want to
> throw someone out because that person has broken the rules, I'm all for
> that. However, I'm not willing to exclude someone from even getting into ham
> radio simply because they once owned a CB radio and we don't like what some
> did with those radios.

You"re way off base with me Dwight. I own a CB radio - use it for
traveling. It's saved my tookus on a few occasions. I even had a
license, (my parents did to be precise, many years ago) KBM-8780.

We can be whatever we want to be. There is no argument that no license
testing is at all necessary at all in order to put up a station and
start transmitting as soon as the Morse code requirement is gone.

So we choose. We do already have indications of what the spectrum of behaviors are. Right now, those who favor less knowledge have the upper hand.

- Mike KB3EIA -

40. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 14:00:01 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308010600.7555d642@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73453

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030801062111.23307.00001906@mb-m29.aol.com>...

> >
> >Hint: It's not the conservatives!
> >
> >Seems like Liberalism is about to devout itself in the Sunshine State.
> >
> Actually, it's both. The "liberals" vote in the mandates. The "conservatives"
> block the taxes. Both sides disconnect rights from responsibilities. You get
> the worst of both worlds.
>
> Look at their electric "deregulation" of a few years back. The retail prices
> were regulated (classic big government utility/monopoly idea) but the wholesale
> prices weren't (classic laissez-faire trickle-down supply-side
> free-market-capitalism).
>
> Coupled with that was the desire for high tech jobs and investment (Silicon
> Valley) but not the responsibility to build the infrastructure to run it
> (power lines, generating stations).
>
> End result: Lotta people's lights went out.

Then they come up with notions like putting chunks of mind-bending
intellectual and political expertise like Arnold to work on leading
'em out of the swamp . .

Burlesque v.2003.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

41. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 14:13:53 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgdsj1$fs9$0@208.207.71.145>
Source record: 73454

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bgcfro$4t0$0@208.206.142.73>...
>
> > I just don't believe the public OR the government would tolerate CB on the
> >
> > same level as ham radio has long existed. And that's exactly where it's
> > headed,
> > and has been for too many years.
>
> Thats kind of nonsense wording, but I gather that the Code Exam "as a
> barrier to idiots" doesn't work?

It's certainly no surprise that you'd view it that way .

42. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 14:15:40 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgdsmc$fs9$1@208.207.71.145>
Source record: 73455

Brian wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3F29CCE4.5090409@adelphia.net>...
> > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > >
> > > Phil Kane wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > >>On 31 Jul 2003 17:37:02 -0700, Brian wrote:
> > > >>
> > > >>
> > > >>>I said it before the last restructuring and I guess its necessary that
> > > >>>I say it again, "What I fear most about restructuring the ARS is a
> > > >>>lack of enforcement, and what I fear most about maintaining the Status
> > > >>>Quo is a lack of enforcement. The Morse Exam is no substitute for
> > > >>>enforcement."
> > > >>
> > > >> For once we agree.
> > > >>
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Not me. Not at all
> > > > . You know as well as anyone, better than most, that almost the only
> > > > "enforcement" we've had on the ARS for many years
> > > > prior to Riley's appointment WAS the code test.
> > > >
> > > > Now, a 'difficult' (for that type of individual) test which discourages,
> > > > yea, FILTERS him from active, open participation is a poor
> > > > excuse for monitor vans and well trained and equipped crews.
> > > > But it's what we had.
> > > >
> > > > Now we have Riley and a 5wpm code test. Soon only Riley. When he goes, I
> > > > for one believe the ARS will follow his exit, not far behind. By that time
> > > > there
> > > > will be far more than adequate evidence that the ARS is no longer a viable
> > > > self- policing entity, staffed with conscientious people willing and able to
> > > > conduct themselves in a manner commensurate with the priveleges granted,
> > > > most of which will shortly be summarily withdrawn.
> > >
> > > Dick, these thoughts have been buzzing around the drafty recesses of my
> > > head:
> > >
> > > "I don't have time to learn Morse code....."

> >
> > "I'm never going to use Morse code, I'm not going to learn it....."
> >
> > "I think band plans are stupid, it's an obsolete idea for an obsolete
> > mode. They really aren't law anyhow...."
> >
> > "There are a lot more people running SSB, why shouldn't they have the
> > bandwidth......"
> >
> > "I don't feel like self policing, that's just interfereing with my
> > RIGHTS. Besides, there isn't enough enforcement personnel to catch me....."
> >
> > At that point it is a dire situation indeed!
> >
> > And it's already all been heard in this group.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
> way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick, Larry,
> Dan, Bruce...

Citations please, to use your favorite phrase. NOWHERE has any of the above said any such thing and you know it... no, actually you probably don't. You don't seem to know much of anything.

43. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 14:34:57 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgdtqh$j38$0@208.207.71.176>
Source record: 73456

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" wrote:
> >
> >
> >>How was I excluded from the ARS by the Morse
> >>code test?
> >
> >
> >
> > In the past, you were not excluded (code testing served a need). However,
> > if code testing remains solely as a means to exclude "those people," others
> > in the future will be. "Those people" include anyone you set out to exclude.
> >
> > You want stiffer written tests (or code testing) to exclude "dumbed down"
> > people. I don't agree with that. Show me something that individual has done
> > wrong and I'll support your efforts to get rid of that person. However, I'm
> > not willing to exclude groups of people simply because some don't like them
> > or a few in that group have done things some don't like.
>
> First off, I don't think I've ever said "dumbed down". If you know I
> have, post the reference.
>
> Now to the subject at hand.
>
> I do not consider the Morse Code to be *any test of intelligence or
> desirability whatsoever.
>
> What I do consider it is a method of ensuring that the person actually
> wants to be in the service. It is a measure of inclusivity, not
> exclusivity. Kind of like learning to parallel park or do a three point
> turn.
>
> > Many don't like CB'ers and want stiffer written exams (or code testing) to
> > keep "those people" out. I don't agree with that. Again, if you want to
> > throw someone out because that person has broken the rules, I'm all for
> > that. However, I'm not willing to exclude someone from even getting into ham
> > radio simply because they once owned a CB radio and we don't like what some
> > did with those radios.
>
> You"re way off base with me Dwight. I own a CB radio - use it for
> traveling. It's saved my tookus on a few occasions. I even had a
> license, (my parents did to be precise, many years ago) KBM-8780.

It's another strawman, Mike. Most hams in my town had CB licenses 30 years ago and thought we'd enjoy conversing with others who weren't hams, and probably some of them would wind up getting into ham radio. A few did, and one couple a man and wife even worked up to Extra -tested at the Chicage FCC office.

But it wasn't long until the vulgarity from truckers passing through ruined it for most everyone who didn't join them. Then came the Freebanders, another story entirely. CB as a common communications mode faded pretty fast.

I was there to observe the beginning of the nonsense on 27 mnhz, if fact my tenure as a ham goes back to the time when the CB band was a very-little-used ham band. I knew no ham who lamented it being converted to a medium for the people. Sure was a shame the FCC had to place it on a frequency so subject to abuse. A' local' CB band would never have turned into such a trash pit. The anonymity offered by "shooting skip" wouldn't have been available on local-only transmissions and that culture would never have developed.
And the rules said it was to be used locally only. But we soon saw how well a significant percentage of those who have nothing to lose obey the rules, didn't we? Why should anyone believe they change when they get a ham license when it's being made so easy? I'll say it again-the only thing preventing wholsale change in ham radio toward the exact same thing that happened to CB is the code test. When that's gone, ham radio is on a steeper part of the slippery slope.

BTW I held CB callsign KIQ8934, c. 1970.

44. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 14:42:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F2A7C60.5080702@adelphia.net>
Source record: 73457

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>
>>And then after a couple years, that nasty test
>>will be what is keeping people out of the ARS.
>
>
>
> Yet, you and Dick are the only two in this thread who have even suggested
> anything like that. Not a single person opposed to code testing has made any
> such comments in this thread. And I certainly haven't made any comments
> about reducing or eliminating the written tests.

It is simple crystal ball gazing, Dwight. I just look at a situation, and work it out into the future. There are many people with many views, people like you who support testing as it is now, and people who support lessening the tests. BTW, I believe it was Bill Sohl who proposed that sort of thing (yes, I know - not as an official NCI position). At any rate, people being what they are, and now encouraged by the recent changes, those who want less or no testing will feel encouraged to speak up and see if they can get their wishes granted.

Nothing stays in one place. Liberals tend to get more liberal, and conservatives get more conservative as they have success, until they start getting out of touch with the mainstream. Some of you are just not looking past the ends of your noses. The inability of people to set still on something means that there will be calls to further "simplify" or "make more inclusive" the requirements to be a Ham. Those of us who think it should mean something will just be considered cranks.

As you no doubt consider us cranks, eh?

> Most people are realistic.

Very true. Who among us, no matter what their opinion, doesn't think they are being realistic? 8^)

>I support keeping the written tests because
> those tests serve a purpose which benefits me and the entire ham radio
> community. Code testing, which a few of you can't seem to get past, doesn't
> today.
>
> My comments about "keeping people out," or excluding people, only had to
> do with test requirements designed to exclude instead of serving a need for
> ham radio. Code testing once served a need, so did not exclude at that time.

> If it remains today solely as a barrier to keep others out, it does exclude.

As does any test whatsoever! Testing in any form is a matter of your definition exclusion, With even as hard a time as I had learning Morse code, it is not harder than the rest of the testing regimen.

> Brian's idea of stiffer written exams don't exclude if it serves a purpose
> or need. However, if done solely to keep others out, it also does exclude.

How many CB'ers (who are not Hams already) have been tested for access to their band? Many are running serious power, and they can put up antennas and put rigs together. And operate just fine.

There is just no NEED for any testing whatsoever in order to do the physical act of getting on the air. No need at all!

Unless of course, you would like to have the ARS mean a bit more than Citizen's band radio.

We have to as hams decide just how adroit we want the new ham to be. As the new lords of the hood, you NCTA's have to make sure of that.

> Again, once we start down the path of excluding others, when does it stop
> and who else do we exclude? Am I next in the list? Are you?

I wasn't going to say this, but I'm weary of the "exclusive" sthick going on. I know a young lady who is a General class ham. She works mostly CW. She's a pretty darn good Operator too. I'm not going to give out her name or callsign to protect her privacy

She is also a person who attended special education classes for her education. A dear woman, but not as smart as the average person.

And yet, somehow, some way, she learned Morse code, studied for and passed the General test, and is now on the air as an active ham.

When I see the whining about exclusivity, and all the other complaining about how unfair the Morse code test, I often think of her.

Then I think of the complainers and compare them, who think it is just too hard, and her, she who took the trouble to learn, even though she has not been blessed with the same gifts as most of us. She's a brother/sister ham, and I'm happy and proud to INCLUDE her in the service.

Wanna guess who I respect more?

- Mike KB3EIA -

45. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 14:45:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F2A7D17.2010501@adelphia.net>
Source record: 73458

```
Brian wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3F29CCE4.5090409@adelphia.net>...
>
>>Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>
>>>Phil Kane wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>On 31 Jul 2003 17:37:02 -0700, Brian wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>I said it before the last restructuring and I guess its necessary that
>>>>>I say it again, "What I fear most about restructuring the ARS is a
>>>>>lack of enforcement, and what I fear most about maintaining the Status
>>>>>Quo is a lack of enforcement. The Morse Exam is no substitute for
>>>>>enforcement."
>>>>
>>>> For once we agree.
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Not me. Not at all
>>>. You know as well as anyone, better than most, that almost the only
>>>"enforcement" we've had on the ARS for many years
>>>prior to Riley's appointment WAS the code test.
>>>
>>> Now, a 'difficult' (for that type of individual) test which discourages,
>>>yea, FILTERS him from active, open participation is a poor
>>>excuse for monitor vans and well trained and equipped crews.
>>>But it's what we had.
>>>
>>> Now we have Riley and a 5wpm code test. Soon only Riley. When he goes, I
>>>for one believe the ARS will follow his exit, not far behind. By that time
>>>there
>>>will be far more than adequate evidence that the ARS is no longer a viable
>>>self- policing entity, staffed with conscientious people willing and able to
>>>conduct themselves in a manner commensurate with the priveleges granted,
>>>most of which will shortly be summarily withdrawn.
>>
>> Dick, these thoughts have been buzzing around the drafty recesses of my
>>head:
```

>>
>> "I don't have time to learn Morse code....."
>>
>> "I'm never going to use Morse code, I'm not going to learn it....."
>>
>> "I think band plans are stupid, it's an obsolete idea for an obsolete
>>mode. They really aren't law anyhow...."
>>
>> "There are a lot more people running SSB, why shouldn't they have the
>>bandwidth......"
>>
>> "I don't feel like self policing, that's just interfereing with my
>>RIGHTS. Besides, there isn't enough enforcement personnel to catch me....."
>>
>> At that point it is a dire situation indeed!
>>
>> And it's already all been heard in this group.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
> way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick, Larry,
> Dan, Bruce...

Well, I don't intend to. Heck, I'll probably do lot's of "self policing".

- Mike KB3EIA -

46. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 14:46:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F2A7D68.80207@adelphia.net>
Source record: 73459

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>
> I remember a long time ago in this newsgroup, accusing some of using the CW
> test as a filtering tool. I was nearly lambasted to Timbuktu.

Ouch, that sounds painful! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

47. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 14:50:40 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgduo0kne0@208.207.71.145>
Source record: 73460

Brian Kelly wrote:

> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030801062111.23307.00001906@mb-m29.aol.com>...
>
> > >
> > >Hint: It's not the conservatives!
> > >
> > >Seems like Liberalism is about to devout itself in the Sunshine State.
> > >
> > Actually, it's both. The "liberals" vote in the mandates. The "conservatives"
> > block the taxes.

I dunno, Jim, that's the most heavily taxed place I've been, in every category. They just
can't
seem to understand that all the desirable public programs come at a high cost. Somebody
gotta
pay for it all. They just can't afford all they've voted themselves.

> Both sides disconnect rights from responsibilities. You get
> > the worst of both worlds.

I wouldn't argue against that.

>
> >
> > Look at their electric "deregulation" of a few years back. The retail prices
> > were regulated (classic big government utility/monopoly idea) but the wholesale
> > prices weren't (classic laissez-faire trickle-down supply-side
> > free-market-capitalism).
> >

That scheme had to have been set up by Dumb and Dumber. Where were
their heads? Buy high and sell low and not go broke? How?

> > Coupled with that was the desire for high tech jobs and investment (Silicon
> > Valley) but not the responsibility to build the infrastructure to run it
> > (power lines, generating stations).
> >
> > End result: Lotta people's lights went out.

The old NIMBY sindrome at work. Everyone wants a cellphone but no one wants the tower in
their
neighborhood.

Everybody wants hams to be available for emergency comms when the ship hits sht sand. But
no

one wants that ugly ham radio tower in the neighborhood, not even an outside antenna in the new
subdivision.

>
>
> Then they come up with notions like putting chunks of mind-bending
> intellectual and political expertise like Arnold to work on leading
> 'em out of the swamp . .
>
> Burlesque v.2003.

To his credit The Terminator woke up and 'terminated' himself from that
nasty scenario. I imagine he took a close look and realized it was Mission Impossible. Actually
he probably could have done better than most of the
politocos have. Like Ronald Reagen. He had no big load of baggage
in the form of longterm obligations to carry to the job, and called it like he saw it.

48. ARRL on real world BPL tests - devastating effect on the HF bands

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 15:03:48 UTC
From: robkemp90210@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <6114e4af.0308010703.a9d23b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73461

From;
http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/07/30/4/?nc=1

Extract below;

In the meantime, ARRL Lab Manager Ed Hare, W1RFI, is continuing his efforts to assess and quantify the effects of BPL on HF amateur allocations. Just back from a more than 1300-mile trip to evaluate the effects of BPL systems now in the testing stages, Hare described the interference he monitored on the HF bands as "devastating." ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, and members of the ARRL Technical Relations Office staff have been working to build the Amateur Radio case against BPL in Washington.

"The threat is real," Hobart said, "and the work it will take to defeat this potential threat will be significant." She said the ARRL is counting on every ham--whether or not an ARRL member--to support the League's efforts to represent Amateur Radio in this fight.

In a recent solicitation focusing on the BPL issue, ARRL CEO David Sumner, K1ZZ, said no threat prior to BPL has posed a challenge more serious than the one amateurs face today. "The threat is as close as the power lines right in your neighborhood," Sumner said in issuing a call to action to all amateurs. "Only by joining forces financially will we be able to educate government officials quickly and effectively on the impact of this new threat to Amateur Radio spectrum."

Sumner notes that BPL technology already has been deployed in some European countries, and amateurs there have experienced interference from the systems. Responding in part to concerns expressed by its amateur community, Japan last year decided not to adopt the technology because of its interference potential.

49. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 15:34:20 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308010734.6f5909ea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73462
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bgb8nf$mjfjb$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> Definitely a problem if you do not have a HF reciever at all. And those Rat
> Shack ones suck for that too.

Amen, don't even think about one of those turkeys. One advantage I/we
had back then was a profusion of quite inexpensive but usable HF rcvrs
which are not available today. Mostly military surplus gear and some
commercial cheapies like the Hallicrafters S-38. In this respect maybe
we had it much easier than the newbies today have.

> There used to be publication of VHF
> rebroadcasts of the w1aw transmissions, but I have yet to hear any around
> here in Michigan. Where the hell is the so-called field organization they
> are so proud of on this one? Even if it is a members-only thing, still you
> would think that the local (state-wise) field organizations would think that
> was important enough to rebroadcast.........

Too much work. Plus once VHF comes into play CW becomes a no-interest
thing. We've had sporadic attempts around here to get 2M code practice
sessions going but they didn't last very long.

> Ryan, KC8PMX

w3rv

50. Re: Sign in the petition against the abuse of the Band Plan forward this message to your buddies)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 16:18:39 UTC
From: g3cwi@tesco.net
Message-ID: <b8480e86.0308010818.5e784899@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73463
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy,pt.rec.radio.amadorismo,nl.radio.amateur

g8aso@hotmail.com (G8ASO oï¿½o ï¿½) wrote in message
news:<3d538e03.0308010211.7f2e6525@posting.google.com>...
> That is something that was invented by a magazine publishing company,
> The Radio Society Of Great Britain Limited. The licensing authority
> recognises NO "bandplan", please read the BR68.

Misguided though he undoubtedly is, I notice that Ignatio is from
Italy. Thus if he has a bandplan to enforce, maybe it is an Italian
invention? It is also not entirely true that the licencing authority
in the UK recognises no band plan since BR68 list band plans - perhaps
you have never read BR68?

The use of some bands is done by gentlemens agreement but perhaps you
would exclude yourself from any conventional definition of a
gentleman?

73

Richard
G3CWI

51. Re: Fight the BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 16:39:58 UTC
From: donrm@soco.agilent.com
Message-ID: <1059755998.121094@cswreg.cos.agilent.com>
Source record: 73464
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In rec.radio.amateur.equipment JC <w9jcm@nospamsbcglobal.net> wrote:
> I will not contriube crap the the arrl. NOT A CENT. The have there OWN
> agenda and not the general ham public. I was a member for 6 years and just
> quit them. I will never go back.

Sorry you feel that way. We owe our ham radio to the ARRL -
they're all we have, all we ever have had, or will have.
Do you think the local CB club is going to look out for our
interests?

The ARRL has to cater to a lot of concerns, whether your operation
is with PSK31 or CW and link coupling.

A little OT, but I worry because we're losing the young interests
to the internet. If you're old enough to recall hearing the novice
bands come alive after 3PM when school let out, you'll know what I mean.

73 Don K6LTS

52. Re: Here We Go Again..Sir Putzalot Is Back In His Stride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 17:07:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308010907.2830acf6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73465

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308010437.67e04d46@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0307311135.4e787c76@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0307310513.16383b4@posting.google.com>...
> > > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030729170206.23406.00001120@mb-m27.aol.com>...
>
> > > > BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
> > > > AHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!
> > >
> > > Lennie's gone over the edge. I warned him.
> >
> > Looks like he's walking a mile in your shoes.
>
> He shudda tried a pair that hadn't been worn out and thrown away.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, if you want to read more maniacal laughing postings, send him a fresh pair.

Brian

53. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 19:12:21 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <t7elivk6ou7t6nh03bb3gqlohhu2qmobb6@4ax.com>
Source record: 73466

On 1 Aug 2003 02:52:19 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>For years the code test was the ONLY factor that restricted
>troublemakers from freely roaming the ham bands, FCC having been relegated by lack of funding
>to more or less toothless-watchdog status.

Only problem I have with that statement is the FACT (stated by Riley himself as quoted in QST, CQ, Popular Communications, Monitoring Times, Worldradio, and possibly others I didn't read) that the two frequencies FCC received the most complaints about (14.303 and, I believe, 3.950) were frequencies where the operators had to pass code tests in order to obtain privileges to operate there.

In a way, I guess we're lucky - if the Liberty Net hadn't attracted all the jammers (and counter-jammers) to the one frequency they'd have been...well...freely roaming the bands.

>So when a few thousand refugees from way up there descend onto the HF bands
>-as some have very recently indicated their intent right here on rrap- and lonely Riley is left
>to sweep up,. just how much enforcement you think there'll be?
>But press on- it's "kill the code" even if it kills us.

Dick, the code isn't stopping those few thousand refugees from descending into the HF bands now, and it wouldn't stop them from doing so in the future even if we continued to have a code test for the next 267 years...any more than it has stopped them from inhabiting the so-called "freeband" which is another place they don't have any privileges or licenses to operate.

The *only* thing keeping unlicensed operators off the ham bands in droves is the well-known determination of licensed hams to keep them off of here, even if it means going out at 3:00 AM in the middle of an ice storm to do some DF'ing and tape recording. That's it, period. The code test is not now, never has been, and never will be a deterrent to anyone contemplating an act of gross stupidity on the bands...and that applies to hams and non-hams alike.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

54. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 19:40:13 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <7dfliv4n5tild30d19s7lneg3kpt67v69r@4ax.com>
Source record: 73467

On 01 Aug 2003 02:51:52 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <3F29B941.3060802@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>writes:
>
>>Just practicing one of the the new Q signals....
>
>QR10-4, QGB! I'm QPM, so QBD me!
>
>(Translation: "Ten-Fawhar, Good Buddie! I'll be putting the pedal to the
>metal now, so watch my back door!)
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

You seem to toss that CB jargon around pretty well, Larry. Don't tell
me...no, it couldn't be...could it?

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

55. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 19:40:14 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <cuflivkf5eh6endfss1oa9om3k6ec1dnbo@4ax.com>
Source record: 73468

On Fri, 1 Aug 2003 06:35:08 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
wrote:

>I remember a long time ago in this newsgroup, accusing some of using the CW
>test as a filtering tool. I was nearly lambasted to Timbuktu.

Too bad you fell short, I need Timbuktu. :-)

>Now, it's popular and OK to just make the declaration!

Popular? Perhaps, in some circles. Popularity doesn't prove
correctness, though.

I'd point out that Hitler was pretty popular in Germany once upon a
time, but N2EY might call up the Godwin's Law police and have them
lock me up, so how about...burning witches at the stake used to be
pretty popular once upon a time.

>If CW is used as a "filter" to keep anyone of the ARS; then it's plain
>wrong.

Doesn't keep anybody out of the ARS anyway. Just keeps them from
getting a license that grants HF privileges, forcing them to either
find a control operator who's passed a code test, or work VHF/UHF.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

56. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 19:57:26 UTC
From: Mike Ro Farad <MRF@muffled.com>
Message-ID: <HCzWa.19205$ff.8465@fed1read01>
Source record: 73469

Ask 100 Hams if they have ever been on CB --- 50% will fess up -- and the
other 50% are just not telling the truth ---

Mike Ro Farad is 10-99

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> wrote in message
news:7dfliv4n5tild30d19s7lneg3kpt67v69r@4ax.com...
> On 01 Aug 2003 02:51:52 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >In article <3F29B941.3060802@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> >writes:
> >
> >>Just practicing one of the the new Q signals....
> >
> >QR10-4, QGB! I'm QPM, so QBD me!
> >
> >(Translation: "Ten-Fawhar, Good Buddie! I'll be putting the pedal to
the
> >metal now, so watch my back door!)
> >
> >73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> You seem to toss that CB jargon around pretty well, Larry. Don't tell
> me...no, it couldn't be...could it?
>
> 73 DE John, KC2HMZ
>

57. IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 20:05:34 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <iKzWa.2315$lL.372712@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73470

Today the Ed Thomas, Chief of the FCC's Office of Engineering
and Technology, issued an order extending the Reply Comment
period in ET Docket No. 03-104 (BPL) until August 20, 2003.

Remember, paper filed comments are due at the correct address
by COB on the deadline day, electronic comments via the ECFS
have until midnight at the end of the deadline day.

FOLKS ... if you are going to comment, PLEASE don't "flame"
the FCC or the proponents of BPL ... just cite facts (the ARRL's
comments and the excellent technical analysis done by Ed Hare
are full of them ...).

Flaming will hurt us more than it will help us.

Keep it calm, rational, and polite, please, for all of our sakes.

73,
Carl - wk3c

58. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 20:08:30 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308011208.3d5adf8e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73471

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bgduo0kne0@208.207.71.145>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:

>
> Everybody wants hams to be available for emergency comms when the ship hits sht sand. But no
> one wants that ugly ham radio tower in the neighborhood, not even an outside antenna in the new
> subdivision.
>
>
> >
> >
> > Then they come up with notions like putting chunks of mind-bending
> > intellectual and political expertise like Arnold to work on leading
> > 'em out of the swamp . .
> >
> > Burlesque v.2003.

This just in . . Larry Flint, publisher of Hustler: "California is the
most progressive state in the union," said Flynt, 61. "I don't think
anyone here will have a problem with a smut peddler as governor."

> To his credit The Terminator woke up and 'terminated' himself from that
> nasty scenario. I imagine he took a close look and realized it was Mission
> Impossible.

The rumor mill is saying his wife wears the pants and yanked him out
of the race "Yes Dear, I'll be right home" . . . PWed.

> Actually
> he probably could have done better than most of the
> politocos have.

Prolly wouldn't do any worse.

> Like Ronald Reagen. He had no big load of baggage
> in the form of longterm obligations to carry to the job, and called it like
> he saw it.

He wuz another breed of cat altogehter.

59. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 20:26:39 UTC
From: Mike Ro Farad <MRF@muffled.com>
Message-ID: <i3AWa.19213$ff.18880@fed1read01>
Source record: 73472

> Keep it calm, rational, and polite, please, for all of our sakes.

Great advice Carl, also good advice for this news group --
Let's exhibit a quality image of Amateur Radio
10-67 10-67 10-67 10-67 10-67 10-67 10-4?

Millie Am Pair for OM Mike Ro Farad

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:iKzWa.2315$lL.372712@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> Today the Ed Thomas, Chief of the FCC's Office of Engineering
> and Technology, issued an order extending the Reply Comment
> period in ET Docket No. 03-104 (BPL) until August 20, 2003.
>
> Remember, paper filed comments are due at the correct address
> by COB on the deadline day, electronic comments via the ECFS
> have until midnight at the end of the deadline day.
>
> FOLKS ... if you are going to comment, PLEASE don't "flame"
> the FCC or the proponents of BPL ... just cite facts (the ARRL's
> comments and the excellent technical analysis done by Ed Hare
> are full of them ...).
>
> Flaming will hurt us more than it will help us.
>
> Keep it calm, rational, and polite, please, for all of our sakes.
>
> 73,
> Carl - wk3c
>

60. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 21:06:47 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308011306.40697ac3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73473
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bg8pbfilg0@208.206.142.88>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > When I studied for my earliest tests there were no consumer-level
> > recording methods let alone computers. My only options for practicing
> > Morse were having somebody hand-send it or copying it off the air.
> > Which, as a practical matter, meant copying it with a rcvr or forget
> > it.
>
> Exactly, and with my old ARC 5 receiver you NEVER heard only one signal, the thing was wide open and you
> had to pick out which signal you wanted to copy and learn to ignor ethe rest. Sure was good training, I
> developed a very
> good 'internal filter' at the outset and still retain that skill.

Yessir. Ya had to learn operating skills along with learning just the
code. Whether ya wanted to or not. There was no "pause" button on W1AW
and ya couldn't replay it either.

I saw some *really* off-the-wall Novice rcvrs. One buddy of mine
comandeered an old wooden case Philco BC/SW rcvr which didn't have a
BFO. Musta had a 15 Khz "bandwidth". So he copied the thumps the
speaker cranked out. Some time later he managed to pick up a
half-working grid-dipper and tuned the dipper just off the sides of
the incoming signals and viola, hetrodynes he could copy. As long as
he had his mitts on both tuning knobs. I came along and had a
brainfart. I fished an insulated wire down inside the last IF can and
wound the other end loosely around the GDO coil and tuned the GDO to
455 kHz. Instant BFO. He took it one step further yet and added a
gawdawful narrow passive surplus audio filter and cruised all over
40M with that lashup. The homebrewed TX was another Rube Golberg gem,
some xtal oscillator tube driving a 6146, all of it in a cigar box.

Imagine any nocode even considering jumping thru those hoops just to
get on the air.

> The upside was that the Novice bands were absolutely packed with slowspeed code and finding lots of
> practice was no problem. You also learned to copy the many and varied 'fists', it was all hand sent, no
> one had a keyer, though some used bugs. That provided another experience which developed lifetime
> skills that no one today gets. I still enjoy copying hand sent or bug sent code, unless

it's *really*
> butchered.

Absolutely correct. It goes farther than that though.

As much as a pain in the butt as those days were in a number of
respects that regime had a number of huge advantages over what is
available today to newbies. The Novice bands were actually a very
successful "support group", we had no options but to clump together
and work with each other toward the same objectives. We climbed all
over each other trying to get our speeds up and beat the one-year
clock on our drop-dead tickets.

Boy there was the incentive licensing move from Hell! But it worked
and the only bitching I ever heard was from a few of the OFs who
turned their noses up at the mere thought of allowing newbies to get
on the HF bands with a lousy 5wpm code test. Turned out to be a
non-sequeter for them 'cause the FCC tossed us into our isolated
playpens 'way up the 80 & 40M bands where they didn't have to put up
with us. We *had* to work each other. Clever arrangement in
retrospect.

And in many if not most cases getting a Novice station took a bunch of
self-taught knowledge and work just to get on the air. All of which
were more learning experiences. One did not use a rubber-duckie or any
otjer catalog antennas on 80 . . autotuners . . as if . . digital
nothing . .

No doubt a dumb-down proponent or two will scan this diatribe and get
some giggles out of the ramblings of another stuck-in-the-past grouchy
OF. But in the end who will be the **real** losers?

Yeah, there's a "cultural gap", fuggem all, I hope they get just
exactly they want.

> > I'm still a very strong supporter of learning Morse via the W1AW
> > code practice sessions.
>
> It's probaby the best training resource around if one owns a receiver, especially after
one has learned
> basic Morse.

Yup. Lotta newbies have used zero-cost borrowed rcvrs. I'd loan one of
my "spares" to anybody who was genuinely interested in copying W1AW.
I "loaned" my old HQ-120 to the kid accross the street, he then loaned
it some other kid . . . I have no idea wher it finally landed.

> > Today they transmit computer-generated code
> > and back then I believe they used tape-generated code so it has always
> > been quite precise. I'll concede that I'm only around 150 miles from
> > the station so they boom here on 80M and QRM wasn't/isn't a problem.
> > Might be more difficult from the west coasts but I don't know.
>
> I've heard them one one band or another everywhere in the USA

> that I've listened for them including out on the west coast.

Good. Then they do have big coverage.

w3rv

61. Re: Fight the BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 21:10:38 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308011310.138371bc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73474
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.swap,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy

donrm@soco.agilent.com wrote in message news:<1059755998.121094@cswreg.cos.agilent.com>...
> In rec.radio.amateur.equipment JC <w9jcm@nospamsbcglobal.net> wrote:
> > I will not contriube crap the the arrl. NOT A CENT. The have there OWN
> > agenda and not the general ham public. I was a member for 6 years and just
> > quit them. I will never go back.
>
> Sorry you feel that way. We owe our ham radio to the ARRL -
> they're all we have, all we ever have had, or will have.
> Do you think the local CB club is going to look out for our
> interests?
>
> The ARRL has to cater to a lot of concerns, whether your operation
> is with PSK31 or CW and link coupling.
>
> A little OT, but I worry because we're losing the young interests
> to the internet. If you're old enough to recall hearing the novice
> bands come alive after 3PM when school let out, you'll know what I mean.

They weren't there, they'll never in this world get it.

>
> 73 Don K6LTS

w3rv

62. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 22:03:49 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308011403.e58b6b6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73475

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030730202125.15462.00001953@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0307300011.5df7f89b@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >When I studied for my earliest tests there were no consumer-level
> >recording methods let alone computers. My only options for practicing
> >Morse were having somebody hand-send it or copying it off the air.
> >Which, as a practical matter, meant copying it with a rcvr or forget
> >it.
>
> Same here. Except I had to build the receiver, learn to use it, then find hams
> to listen to.

I sure built my share of rcvrs. At least in my case finding the ham
bands didn't seem to be much of an issue and there wasn't much to
learn about how to use 'em. Under any conditions I'd rather try to
find 40 with one of those than I would the first time I sit down in
front of any of the current riceboxes. Heh.

> Did not know W1AW existed when I was studying for Novice so I
> listened to other hams.

I probably "got around" more than you did and I did a lot of "radio"
before I finally went for my Novice ticket. Early tinkering & tuning
led me to working on my Boy Scout Merit Badge. Which was basically an
ARRL publication and everything a newbie needed to know about W1AW
code practice sessions was in the Radio Merit Badge booklet. I still
remember buying it from the Boy Scout department in the Lit Brothers
store at the bottom of the Hill. They special-ordered it for me.

I was also all over the Red Arrow, PTC and PRR commuter lines at a
tender age. The newsstand in the PTC waiting room in 69th Street
Terminal stocked 73 and CQ and occasionally QST. I always scarfed one
of 'em up if I had enough pocket change. I picked up a lotta info from
those long before I got my ticket. Then there were my ham buddies in
UDHS. By the time I actually got on the air I was pretty well primed.

> >I'm still a very strong supporter of learning Morse via the W1AW
> >code practice sessions. Today they transmit computer-generated code
> >and back then I believe they used tape-generated code so it has always
> >been quite precise. I'll concede that I'm only around 150 miles from
> >the station so they boom here on 80M and QRM wasn't/isn't a problem.
> >Might be more difficult from the west coasts but I don't know.
>
> W6OWP used to do west-coast runs but I think that has ended. The antenna farm

> used for code practice and bulletins at W1AW is designed to blanket the USA on
> all bands. Full legal limit into long Yagis aimed at the West Coast on all
> bands where a Yagi is practical.

Dick sez they have good coverage of the west coast.

> >I still recommend W1AW over any of the "canned" aids. Two downsides of
> >course are that W1AW does not send Farnsworth and one needs a
> >half-decent HF rcvr.
>
> W1AW DOES send Farnsworth at the slower speeds! And they've done so since
> before I ever heard of them - 35+ years. I think they transition at 13 or 15
> wpm.

They definitely did not use Fransworth back when I was getting
started. I wish they had. Once I got my General it was goodbye W1AW
code practice for years until I went back to clock myself at 25-30wpm
for the Extra in the same timeframe in which you were getting started.

> Bulletins are sent at 18 wpm so there's even more practice.
>
> One drawback/advantage of W1AW is that it is sent on a fixed schedule. If you
> simply cannot be at the rx at the appointed time, you're outa luck. OTOH,
> having a fixed preset practice time tends to help some folks actually DO IT
> rather than talk about it.

W1AW has plenty of sessions per week, I dunno, I seldom had any
particular trouble making myself available for the evening sessions.

> Another trick I've done for years: Have the rx on and tuned to a CW station
> whenever possible. I used to do homework with the cans on and tuned to a CW
> station - any station - as background. After a while it became like listening
> to somebody talk.

No way. I can't obsess in two directions at the same time . . !

> >http://www.arrl.org/w1aw.html#w1awsked
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

63. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 22:11:22 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87fzkldo51.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73476

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>being made so easy? I'll say it again-the only thing preventing wholsale change
>in ham radio toward the exact same thing that happened to CB is the code test.
>When that's gone, ham radio is on a steeper part of the slippery slope.
>
>BTW I held CB callsign KIQ8934, c. 1970.

Well ain't that just sweet. And you are the twit that accuses
others of coming from 27 MHz. You're little more than a
flaming hypocrite of the first order. A CB retreated loser.

And regardless of how silly all of your other arguments are,
such as your statement that you knew of no hams that lamented
the loss of 11 meters, your claim that the difference between CB
and Amateur Radio is the *code test*, is utterly absurd.

The difference is having an *appropriate* *technical* *test*
that pertains to what the Amateur Radio Service is today. In
1960 when I was first licensed a code test was most certainly a
valid part of such an appropriate test, but it hasn't been now
for 20 years at least.

All you are is a narrow minded bigot that wants a play pen that
elevates you to king of the sand box and keeps other who might
challenge you out.

I held a commercial telegraph license, and worked for a company
that actually paid (other) people to operate CW, but the last
commercial CW operation was *decades* ago now. And that is
exactly when the code requirement for the Amateur Radio Service
should have been removed.

Now, why don't you just slide back under the 27 MHz rock that
you slithered out from, dick.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

64. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 22:15:30 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <6EBWa.15209$Vx2.7635819@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 73477

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BB4FA25C.1FCA8%stewart@say.net...
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> > How was I excluded from the ARS by the Morse
> > code test?
>
>
> In the past, you were not excluded (code testing served a need).
However,
> if code testing remains solely as a means to exclude "those people,"
others
> in the future will be. "Those people" include anyone you set out to
exclude.
>
> You want stiffer written tests (or code testing) to exclude "dumbed
down"
> people. I don't agree with that. Show me something that individual has
done
> wrong and I'll support your efforts to get rid of that person. However,
I'm
> not willing to exclude groups of people simply because some don't like
them
> or a few in that group have done things some don't like.
>
> Many don't like CB'ers and want stiffer written exams (or code testing)
to
> keep "those people" out. I don't agree with that. Again, if you want to
> throw someone out because that person has broken the rules, I'm all for
> that. However, I'm not willing to exclude someone from even getting into
ham
> radio simply because they once owned a CB radio and we don't like what
some
> did with those radios.

No it's not to keep them out but to insure that they KNOW the rules and regulations and good operating practices when they do make the transition to ham radio. Given some of the questions that licensed hams have asked about the rules and regs that they should already know since they have passed the tests, I'm inclined to think that stiffer exams are necessary to insure that ham radio doesn't turn into a mess due to ignorance on the part of otherwise well intentioned new operators.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

65. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 22:21:40 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bgep4v$v7d$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 73478
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308010734.6f5909ea@posting.google.com...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bgb8nf$mjfjb$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > Definitely a problem if you do not have a HF reciever at all. And those
Rat
> > Shack ones suck for that too.
>
> Amen, don't even think about one of those turkeys. One advantage I/we
> had back then was a profusion of quite inexpensive but usable HF rcvrs
> which are not available today. Mostly military surplus gear and some
> commercial cheapies like the Hallicrafters S-38. In this respect maybe
> we had it much easier than the newbies today have.
>
> > There used to be publication of VHF
> > rebroadcasts of the w1aw transmissions, but I have yet to hear any
around
> > here in Michigan. Where the hell is the so-called field organization
they
> > are so proud of on this one? Even if it is a members-only thing, still
you
> > would think that the local (state-wise) field organizations would think
that
> > was important enough to rebroadcast.........
>
> Too much work. Plus once VHF comes into play CW becomes a no-interest
> thing. We've had sporadic attempts around here to get 2M code practice
> sessions going but they didn't last very long.
>
>
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
>
> w3rv

Since were on a trip down memory lane. This is how I received my FIRST HAM
SIGNAL.

I had a 6 transistor jap radio. I started 'tweeking' the coils and heard
this booming CQ CQ CQ this is W*xx.....He was down the street on the next
block.

Its been downhill eversince

Dan/W4NTI

66. Re: Some comments on the NCVEC petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 22:22:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030801182234.14837.00001908@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 73479

In article <Pine.LNX.4.56.0307312141100.9994@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>> "Many places"? Try "everywhere". CW has no exclusive subbands except
>> for those two on the bottom of 6 and 2. CW has to share every bit of
>> non-phone HF/MF space with data modes. In a nocodetest future, that
>> should change.
>
>I said "many places" because it is NOT true for 6m and 2m. "Everywhere" is
>wrong. I chose my words carefully here, and your carelessness has introduced
>error.

The discussion was about HF/MF. Sorry if I confused anybody.

Main point is that there is NO exclusive CW space anywhere on the <30 MHz ham
bands. And the percentage of HF/MF bandspace available to 'phone-image is
already way above 50%.
>
>> The petition talks about technically knowledgeable people and new
>> modes and technologies. On HF, that stuff is almost exclusively
>> happening in the CW/data subbands. Unless you count "single wideband"
>> as a progressive new mode....
>>
>> >PS: I haven't significantly used code since I passed it on the exam for
>my
>> >license, nor do I plan to.
>>
>> That's fine. There's a bunch of modes I had to learn about for the
>> tests that I haven't used significantly, if at all, since I passed the
>> test. Nor do I plan to.
>>
>> A lot of hams, including me, use Morse very significantly. The NCVEC
>> petition talks as if we code-using hams don't exist.
>>
>> >(If you look me up, you'll know that I have at
>> >least 13wpm because I held an Advanced as my prior license class from
>> 10
>> >years ago.)
>>
>> How do I know you didn't get the Advanced via medical waiver? ;-) (Not
>> that there's anything wrong with that!) Waivers have been available
>> for over 13 years.
>
>Because if I had used the medical waiver procedure, I would have been an
>Extra

>back then.....

Hopw would I know that?

>I passed all the written elements in 1992 (3 in one session),
>but didn't get 20wpm within a year (but got 13, and element 4B expired). The
>ease of element 4B back then should have clued you in....

I passed all of the written and code elements between 1967 and 1970. No CSCEs.
No Bash books.No Q&A pools. All long gone.....
>
>> >> There is no requirement that any radio amateur actually use Morse
>> code. Radio
>> >> amateurs use it by choice.
>>
>> >Justification for it NOT to be a requirement.
>>
>> Perhaps. Yet NCVEC did not pursue that line of reasoning, which could
>> be a very powerful argument. Instead, they wrote as if they want code
>> USE by hams to go away.
>>
>> But the petition claims that hams ONLY use it because of the test
>> requirement. That's just not true.
>
>Their involvement is with testing, not operating....

Then why talk about how much a mode is used and why?
>
>> >> (Do we all know what requirement means? :-))
>>
>> The whole world wonders.
>>
>> >> Written tests are a burden to the applicants, too.
>>
>> >Are you advocating no license testing at all?
>>
>> Nope. Just the opposite.
>>
>> > How about no licenses?
>>
>> Nope, just the opposite.
>>
>> > Having to fill out the paperwork is a burden too!
>>
>> Exactly. And it turns away some people.
>>
>> >(I am not advocating dropping the license requirement; just showing
>> that his
>> >argument can be taken ad absurdium.)
>>
>> Reductio ad absurdum is a valid technique of showing the validity of a

>> hypothesis. If a hypothesis can be shown to logically lead to a
>> contradiction or absurdity, the hypothesis must be false.
>
>...But only if it's clear that's what you're doing.

Sorry if it wasn't clear.

> There are some on this
>group for which such is beyond their comprehension.
>
That is truly sad.

>> >> However, it should be noted that most of the Commission's
>> enforcement actions
>> >> for poor and illegal operating practices such as jamming,
>> obscenity/profanity,
>> >> failure to identify, operation outside of license privileges and
>> failure to
>> >> heed bandplans are against amateurs using voice modes, not Morse
>> code or
>> >> digital modes.
>>
>> >Profanity, by itself, is illegal? The FCC has never said that.
>> There may be
>> >limits and conditions where it's inappropriate, but there have been
>> findings
>> >that in some very limited contexts that profanity by itself does NOT
>> cause a
>> >violation to have occurred.
>>
>> Doesn't change the basic fact of what I was pointing out: Phone
>> operation generates far more enforcement actions than CW/data
>> operations. Some of these enforcement actions are for behavior that is
>> truly awful, and very embarrassing to the ARS.
>>
>> When I first started out, I recall there was a common philosophy that
>> 'phone operators had to set the highest possible standards of
>> courtesy, respect and operating skill while on the air because anyone
>> and everyone could be listening. That philosphy seems to have become
>> inverted over the years.
>
>Apparently, you've never been to Southern California.

I have.

>There were times where
>one could count the violations on our "animal farm" repeater - and sometimes
>the number of violations per minute would exceed the number of seconds in a
>minute. Most of those misfits are still licensed. Watch out HF - here they
>come!

And what mode were they using? It wasn't CW/Morse!
>
>> >> Following this logic, the written exams should be stripped of
>> anything a
>> >> licensee does not have an interest in.
>>
>> >Does that include having to answer ANY question? :-)
>>
>> Any question the examinee doesn't think is relevant. For example, why
>> should someone who never, ever intends to use voice modes, or who may
>> be physically unable to use them, have to learn about them? Isn't that
>> a burden on them? Why should they have to learn something they'll
>> never, ever use?
>
>So, if I don't think any question is relevant, I can dispose of the entire
>test? :-)

That's the ad absurdum that the NECVEC argument leads to.
>
>> The NCVEC petition says it's a burden to require a code test to
>> operate voice modes. If that's valid, why isn't it a burden to require
>> questions on voice modes in order to operate CW or data modes? Look at
>> all the written testing a ham has to go through just to operate a
>> manufactured CW rig on 7005 kHz. Why?
>
>They had to offer some justification.

Such as?
>
>> Some might say "because it supports the basis and purposes of the
>> ARS". The obvious response is "How?" Also, there is no requirement
>> that each amateur support the basis and purposes of the ARS in any way
>> other than following the rules.
>>
>> What it all boils down to is that except for some very basic rules,
>> regulations and safety considerations, most of the test requirements
>> for an amateur license come down to somebody's opinion about what
>> should be tested. Opinion and nothing more.
>
>And if the FCC didn't like that, then they'd take testing back and do it
>themselves.

Nope. FCC is chronically short of $$ and there's no way they'll take that job
back unless there were radical changes both internal and external.

Think about the total number of hours donated by every VE and then figure what
that would cost FCC to do themselves. VE fees cover the cost of providing the
materials but NOT the labor..
>
>> >> This proposal simply drops Element 1 without making any other
>> changes. Oddly
>> >> enough, if it were adopted, Technicians would gain a bit of 10

>> meter SSB. Most
>> >> of the privileges Technicians would gain would be slices of 80, 40,
>> 15 and 10
>> >> meter CW.
>>
>> >I don't see a problem with that. What's your problem with it?
>>
>> It's incomplete. It looks like the NCVEC had blinders on.
>
>I disagree. They aren't looking to refarm the service; just take "one bite
>from the apple." (It may be the first bite, but not the last.)

Then it's sloppy. Or dishonest.

>Perhaps they
>believe in taking SMALL steps and seeing what happens.

Perhaps they figure that if they put their entire agenda out there at once,
there would be a storm of opposition.

Or maybe they just don;t think very far ahead.

>Alternatively, since
>their involvement is with testing, perhaps that's all they felt they could
>justify.

Shortsighted.

>> Do you really think that the very best we can do for entry-level HF
>> privileges for new hams in a nocodetest 21st century future is to give
>> them tiny slices of CW on four bands and SSB on one band, and at the
>> same time give them all of amateur VHF/UHF? Is that really what's best
>> for the ARS?
>
>I don't pretend to speak for what is best for the entire service.

Anyone who has an opinion on testing is speaking about what is best for the
service.

> I've
>posted
>my thoughts about licensing elsewhere.
>
>> >This petition is meant to address the change in international
>> agreement
>> >dropping the code requirement as a license prerequisite and NOTHING
>> MORE.
>> >They're not out to overhaul the entire service; just this one part.
>>
>> Which means FCC may do the whole NPRM cycle again for just that. Why
>> not do something a little more comprehensive? Will the FCC be flooded
>> with followup petitions? Probably. Carl, WK3C, has said here that's
>> not the way to go. I agree with him. Are we both wrong?

>>
>> >At least they're doing it in a way that has no impact on the rest of
>> it.
>>
>> >If you want to mess with the mandated bandplans, file your own
>> petition.
>>
>> Bandplans are voluntary. Subbands are part of the rules. I say the
>> subbands could use some work. Let's see....3500-3575, CW only.
>> 3575-3675, data and CW. 3675-3725, Data modes including digital
>> voice, and CW. 3725-4000, phone....
>
>Actually, bandplans aren't voluntary if someone can be cited for not
>following
>them (and that has happened). If they were clearly voluntary, then such a
>citation would be defeated (at least, defeatable) in an agency hearing.

Enforcement of bandplans lags far behind enforcement of subbands.

73 de Jim, N2EY

67. Belgium cancels last CW exam!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 22:44:57 UTC
From: Rene <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bgeqha$o5ekb$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 73480

Not only can Belgian CEPT-2 amateurs use the HF bands starting August 4, 2003, but the Belgian authority (BIPT) also moved to strike the last planned CW exam (October 22nd)!

Read about it on www.uba.be

Rene

68. Re: Ham Radio Domain Name

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 22:49:57 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <UmSdnaXeyMsLc7eiXTWJjQ@crocker.com>
Source record: 73481

"Fred Atkinson" <fatkinson@mishmash.com> wrote in message
news:lujliv0hhuh87c7jssc05ohlupippf5grc@4ax.com...
> If you're interested in setting up a ham radio site (under your
> call sign domain), read the article I've put up. It's a [very] budget
> was to have your ham radio page at http://www.yourcall.com and your
> email at rick@yourcall.com.
>
> The article is at http://www.mishmash.com/hamdomain.
>
> If you like it, let me know. If you do it, let me know, too.
>
> Thanks,
>

sounds like a lot of work. if you want full service web hosting with email
to yourcall@yourcall.com try calling your isp and see if they offer that
service. many local isp's will handle all the registration and redirection
to your own domain name for a very reasonable monthly charge... and its
one-stop shopping with built in tech-support. the next level down from that
is to use the free web space that many isp's give you with your dialup or
cable account and use someone like register.com to register your domain name
and then redirect it to your page on your isp's server.

David Robbins K1TTT

e-mail: mailto:k1ttt@arrl.net

web: http://www.k1ttt.net

AR-Cluster node: 145.69MHz or telnet://dxc.k1ttt.net

69. Re: Belgium also moves to strike last CW exam!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 22:59:44 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93CAC124FF208elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 73482
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Rene" <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net> wrote in
news:bgeqfe$o40d4$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de:

> Not only can Belgian CEPT-2 amateurs use the HF bands starting August
> 4, 2003, but the Belgian authority (BIPT) also moved to strike the last
> planned CW exam (October 22nd)!
>
> Read about it on www.uba.be
>
> Rene
>
>
>
>

Here's the French version of the Belgian announcements:

IL N'Y A PLUS D'EXAMEN DE TELEGRAPHIE ...

Nous avons �galement appris que l' IBPT n'organisera plus d'examen de t�l�graphie. L'examen qui avait �t� annonc� pour le 22 octobre 2003 est donc supprim�.

Les examens B et C (ON1 et ON2) pr�vus pour le 3 septembre 2003 auront lieu comme pr�vus, avec la m�me mati�re � conna�trer, et avec les m�mes degr�s de difficult�s qu'auparavent. La seule diff�rence est que ceux qui r�ussiront l'examen B (anciennement l' ON1) recevront maintenant automatiquement un indicatif ON4-5-6-7 et ils auront directement acc�s aux bandes d�cam�triques.

DE BONNES NOUVELLES POUR NOS AMIS ON1

Nous venons de recevoir le communiqu� suivant de l'IBPT concernant les radioamateurs.

Suite aux r�sultats de la CMR-03 relatifs � l'obligation pour les radioamateurs de passer un examen de morse pour acc�der aux bandes de fr�quences en dessous de 30 MHz, l'IBPT a d�cid�, � l'instar d'autres pays de la CEPT, d'appliquer cette d�cision d�s � pr�sent.

De ce fait, tout radioamateur titulaire d'une licence "B" peut demander une licence "A" � partir du 4 ao�t 2003.

Pour ce faire, il doit envoyer � l'Institut un courrier reprenant toutes ses coordonn�es accompagn� d'un timbre fiscal � 5 € non annul� par licence demand�e.

Un indicatif ON4 � 5 � 6 �7 lui sera attribu� en tenant compte de ses d�sid�ratas �ventuels et il recevra sa nouvelle licence ainsi que la facture y aff�rent par retour du courrier.

Le conseil souhaite de bonnes transmissions dans les bandes HF aux nouveaux titulaires d'une licence A.

Ph Appeldoorn
Ir Conseiller

70. code freedom day???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 23:02:24 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <C92dnUyn2uM1bLeiU-KYgw@crocker.com>
Source record: 73483

I'm sorry, did I miss it??? 10m seems awfully quiet tonight.

71. Re: Code goodby,maybe something else.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-01 23:30:10 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <6KCWa.4355$Tv5.1675@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 73484

Those pagers may not be in the ham band. If they are close by, you may be suffering from intermod.

While I truly don't care about the code/no code issue, I do worry about watering down tests too much. If we gave licenses away and managed to keep it from becoming another 11 meters, who (once all of those old guys you talk about die off) is going to put up repeaters, much less maintain them? If the folks that want to learn something about amateur radio get into the game, there won't be a problem; if it turns into nothing but a hobby band with no one technically competent, your HTs (and a lot of the 440 stuff will turn into nothing more than high-end FRS units. You can expect perhaps 5 to 6 miles maximum between 5 watt HTs with gain antennas. Perhaps 10 miles between mobiles with 50 watts. Putting up an hf antenna may become too much for some folks (sure, buy a commercial antenna and mount it on a tower. Not good for 80 meters.). What you would lose is good, reliable, 20 to 300 mile communications. The repeaters can supply 20 to 100 mile range; 75 and 40 meters can supply good range (depending upon local time) from local to hundreds (or thousands) of miles out. You don't need to contact England. Neither do you need a station 1000 miles away. Usually, you need stations anywhere from 50 miles out to perhaps 300 miles if you have a wide spread disaster (such as the ice storm perhaps 5 years ago in the North Eastern U.S. and Canada). Without repeaters and/or HF mobile hams (you think 11 meter antennas can drive you crazy, wait until you try to get any kind of efficiency on a 75 meter mobile antenna). Of course, if the ham bands go, you'll have folks trying to drive their cars with two cell phones (one for each ear) trying to carry on two conversations at once whilst attempting to drive their vehicle (cell phones, pagers, satellite tv, satellite radio, wireless digital, video, cameras - these are what the commercial interests need the bandwidth for). Yeah, I hear about the internet too. My ISP at the time was down in Rochester for a couple of weeks due to the attack on the twin towers in NYC - over 300 miles away! You'd only need a small earthquake to kill the cellular telephones (10,000 people pick up two cell phones each and call 911 - "did we just have an earthquake?" - or - "we just had an earthquake!"). There is a considerable movement now to exclude amateurs who have not had training and recent field experience from getting involved in emergencies (unless no one else is available) since this can cause more problems than it solves. We don't need less training and knowledge; of that I am certain.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).

Version: 6.0.505 / Virus Database: 302 - Release Date: 7/30/03

72. Re: code freedom day???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 00:10:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bgevhj$1dh$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 73485

Thats because all the usual inhabitants are back on CB telling all their
'Good Buddies' that its almost like stealing to be a ham now.

Dan/W4NTI

"David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:C92dnUyn2uM1bLeiU-KYgw@crocker.com...
> I'm sorry, did I miss it??? 10m seems awfully quiet tonight.
>
>

73. Re: Good bye CODE!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 00:48:47 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hiylrn6.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73486

On 1 Aug 2003 03:59:08 -0700, Brian wrote:

>> As has been noted here many times, all the FCC has to do is state "We visited the code test issue less than three
>> years ago, and revisited it as the result of a
>> petition for reconsideration. We find no reason to revisit it again.
>>
>> End of story
>
>So did you ever figure out why the FCC evaluated it last time, and why
>they have to review it again in the future?

Because The Congress said "no rules review, no appropriation".

Of course, the scholars and wonders at the FCC didn't read between the lines and figure out that The Congress was aiming at broadcast and cable and telephone competition rules, so they could kiss off things like personal radio services.....

Those are the areas that The Congress want to control, so they have no concept that the others exist and care less. For the average amateur, the reverse is true.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

74. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 00:48:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hiymbv7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73487

On 1 Aug 2003 07:00:01 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>Then they come up with notions like putting chunks of mind-bending
>intellectual and political expertise like Arnold to work on leading
>'em out of the swamp . .

Was Ronnie the Ray-Gun any better ??

Hey, was Jerry "Moonbeam" Brown, the professional politician, Yale
law school graduate, any better?

BTW - Arnold declined to run.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

75. Re: Code goodby,maybe something else.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 00:48:53 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hiylhe5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73488

On Fri, 01 Aug 2003 06:31:42 GMT, kc5cqa wrote:

>All (90%) of the hams I know are pretty
>old, you go to a ham fest , convention, and there are very few young
>people.

Consider that the typical three-day-weekend hamfest/convention costs about $300 excluding transportation if one is not lucky enough to live in the immediate area. Add to that transportation (for me usually about $150 when I go to Pacificon, quite a bit less when I go to Seapac) and it gets to be "real money".

OK, so I'm 66 years old and have been a ham for 52 years. When I started out as a hugh school student, all the hams I knew were my age (high school and college friends) and none of us could afford going to a ham convention. Some of us would go to the Institute of Radio Engineers convention exhibit in New York (local to us) on the last day to see if we could scarf up samples of components (capacitors, resistors, tube sockets, etc) which the exhibitors would give to young hams just as the exhibit was closing. Those days are gone (sob).

Our local ham club - the largest in the state - has quite a number of young hams as members and we encourage programs to interest young people in becoming active in ham radio. Some of our regular 2-m net weekly checkins are folks less than 16 years old.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
Oregon Tualatin Valley Amateur Radio Club

76. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 01:17:06 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgf3ec$2pgs$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73489

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> wrote in message
news:cuflivkf5eh6endfss1oa9om3k6ec1dnbo@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 1 Aug 2003 06:35:08 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> wrote:
>
>
> >I remember a long time ago in this newsgroup, accusing some of using the
CW
> >test as a filtering tool. I was nearly lambasted to Timbuktu.
>
> Too bad you fell short, I need Timbuktu. :-)
>
> >Now, it's popular and OK to just make the declaration!
>
> Popular? Perhaps, in some circles. Popularity doesn't prove
> correctness, though.
>
> I'd point out that Hitler was pretty popular in Germany once upon a
> time, but N2EY might call up the Godwin's Law police and have them
> lock me up, so how about...burning witches at the stake used to be
> pretty popular once upon a time.
>
> >If CW is used as a "filter" to keep anyone of the ARS; then it's plain
> >wrong.
>
> Doesn't keep anybody out of the ARS anyway. Just keeps them from
> getting a license that grants HF privileges, forcing them to either
> find a control operator who's passed a code test, or work VHF/UHF.
>
> 73 DE John, KC2HMZ
>

Ya know...I got to looking at my statement and it probably should have said,
"If CW is supported as a method to keep people "out" of the ARS..."

Of course its primary purpose for being a test requirement is to prove one
can use it. ;)

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

77. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 01:31:18 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgf496$2ek$0@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 73490

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> > And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
> > way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick, Larry,
> > Dan, Bruce...
>
> Well, I don't intend to. Heck, I'll probably do lot's of "self policing".

Mike, it's some more of his lying. What was said was that FCC might as well just shut down the
ARS as to turn it over to the outlaws. And he twists it to mean what he wants it to mean.

78. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 01:48:45 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgf59t$4r9$0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 73491

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ wrote:

> On 1 Aug 2003 02:52:19 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> >For years the code test was the ONLY factor that restricted
> >troublemakers from freely roaming the ham bands, FCC having been relegated by lack of funding
> >to more or less toothless-watchdog status.
>
> Only problem I have with that statement is the FACT (stated by Riley
> himself as quoted in QST, CQ, Popular Communications, Monitoring
> Times, Worldradio, and possibly others I didn't read) that the two
> frequencies FCC received the most complaints about (14.303 and, I
> believe, 3.950) were frequencies where the operators had to pass code
> tests in order to obtain privileges to operate there.
>

Of course! All three dozen of them, out of over half a million hams! Actually that's not a bad
percentage at all, even a couple thousand yo-yos out of that many licensees is a strikingly small
ratio of bozos to real folk.

> In a way, I guess we're lucky - if the Liberty Net hadn't attracted
> all the jammers (and counter-jammers) to the one frequency they'd have
> been...well...freely roaming the bands.
>

Yep, they seem to flock, don't they? So what happens when their numbers grow
exponentuially by the "inclusion" of all the neanderthals who so far just couldn't hack it? Wanna
see Liberty Nets wall to wall on 75??? It's in the wings.

> >So when a few thousand refugees from way up there descend onto the HF bands
> >-as some have very recently indicated their intent right here on rrap- and lonely Riley is left
> >to sweep up,. just how much enforcement you think there'll be?
> >But press on- it's "kill the code" even if it kills us.
>
> Dick, the code isn't stopping those few thousand refugees from
> descending into the HF bands now, and it wouldn't stop them from doing
> so in the future even if we continued to have a code test for the next
> 267 years...any more than it has stopped them from inhabiting the
> so-called "freeband" which is another place they don't have any
> privileges or licenses to operate.
>

Come on, wake up John. The ham bands are no where near anything like 27 mhz and you know it, But
they ARE a whole lot more like it than they were 20 years ago, speaking from experience. Try as you
will, you just can't refute the facts and what I laid out is fact.

>
> The *only* thing keeping unlicensed operators off the ham bands in
> droves is the well-known determination of licensed hams to keep them
> off of here, even if it means going out at 3:00 AM in the middle of an
> ice storm to do some DF'ing and tape recording. That's it, period.

THAT is correct. Working unlicensed hams is just not acceptable, and no
selfrespecting ham will willingly do so. Since few bootleggers, as far as we are able to determine,
are adept at carrying on a real life amateur radio contact-tho there has been some pretty slick
Slims in the past- few if the people under discussion will even bother to try. So what happens then
when ham radio licenses become so easy to get- with the code 'barier' gone- that the lack of a
license is no longer
the stopper? Chew on that one a bit.

> The
> code test is not now, never has been, and never will be a deterrent to
> anyone contemplating an act of gross stupidity on the bands...and that
> applies to hams and non-hams alike.

That statement simply confirms that you don't know the facts.

79. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 01:49:40 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgf5bk$4r9$1@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 73492

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ wrote:

> On 01 Aug 2003 02:51:52 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >In article <3F29B941.3060802@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> >writes:
> >
> >>Just practicing one of the the new Q signals....
> >
> >QR10-4, QGB! I'm QPM, so QBD me!
> >
> >(Translation: "Ten-Fawhar, Good Buddie! I'll be putting the pedal to the
> >metal now, so watch my back door!)
> >
> >73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> You seem to toss that CB jargon around pretty well, Larry. Don't tell
> me...no, it couldn't be...could it?

You don't think that Larry saw "Convoy"?

80. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 02:26:13 UTC
From: j999w@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030801222613.09823.00001235@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 73493

> this dinosaur technology

Dinosaurs are extinct ... CW is NOT.

Long live the code.

jw
wb9uai

81. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 02:41:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB509D30.1FCF0%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 73494

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> First off, I don't think I've ever said "dumbed
> down". If you know I have, post the reference.

You've agreed with Brian and 'dumbed down" were his words.

> I do not consider the Morse Code to be *any
> test of intelligence or desirability whatsoever.
>
> What I do consider it is a method of ensuring
> that the person actually wants to be in the
> service. It is a measure of inclusivity, not
> exclusivity. Kind of like learning to parallel
> park or do a three point turn.

That ridiculous, Mike. Surely you must be joking. That premise is absurd at its very core. It's basically saying nearly half the Hams today, those without code skills, didn't actually want to be involved in Ham Radio - that all their money invested in radio equipment and efforts invested in activities were done because they didn't really want any of this. And that, in the end, only a code test will prove they actually did want it. If I didn't think you were serious, I'd be laughing at this point.

> (snip) We do already have indications of what
> the spectrum of behaviors are. Right now, those
> who favor less knowledge have the upper hand.

Okay, now I'm laughing. Where are all those people who have the upper hand (the ones who favor less knowledge)? There must be many thousands of them if they have the upper hand. I've been involved with Ham Radio for a number of years now and I have yet to hear all those people advocating less knowledge about Ham Radio. I haven't seen any web sites stating that goal. I've never talked to a person on the radio who has stated that goal. If these people actually exist, they must be the most secret group in America.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

82. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 03:20:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308011920.126e6217@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73495

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bgdsj1$fs9$0@208.207.71.145>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bgcfro$4t0$0@208.206.142.73>...
> >
> > > I just don't believe the public OR the government would tolerate CB on the
> > >
> > > same level as ham radio has long existed. And that's exactly where it's
> > > headed,
> > > and has been for too many years.
> >
> > Thats kind of nonsense wording, but I gather that the Code Exam "as a
> > barrier to idiots" doesn't work?
>
> It's certainly no surprise that you'd view it that way .

I didn't.

83. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 03:21:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308011921.2d261ab7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73496

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bgdsmc$fs9$1@208.207.71.145>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3F29CCE4.5090409@adelphia.net>...
> > > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Phil Kane wrote:
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >>On 31 Jul 2003 17:37:02 -0700, Brian wrote:
> > > >>
> > > >>
> > > >>>I said it before the last restructuring and I guess its necessary that
> > > >>>I say it again, "What I fear most about restructuring the ARS is a
> > > >>>lack of enforcement, and what I fear most about maintaining the Status
> > > >>>Quo is a lack of enforcement. The Morse Exam is no substitute for
> > > >>>enforcement."
> > > >>
> > > >> For once we agree.
> > > >>
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Not me. Not at all
> > > > . You know as well as anyone, better than most, that almost the only
> > > > "enforcement" we've had on the ARS for many years
> > > > prior to Riley's appointment WAS the code test.
> > > >
> > > > Now, a 'difficult' (for that type of individual) test which discourages,
> > > > yea, FILTERS him from active, open participation is a poor
> > > > excuse for monitor vans and well trained and equipped crews.
> > > > But it's what we had.
> > > >
> > > > Now we have Riley and a 5wpm code test. Soon only Riley. When he goes, I
> > > > for one believe the ARS will follow his exit, not far behind. By that time
> > > > there
> > > > will be far more than adequate evidence that the ARS is no longer a viable
> > > > self- policing entity, staffed with conscientious people willing and able to
> > > > conduct themselves in a manner commensurate with the priveleges granted,
> > > > most of which will shortly be summarily withdrawn.
> > >
> > > Dick, these thoughts have been buzzing around the drafty recesses of my
> > > head:
> > >
```

> > > "I don't have time to learn Morse code....."
> > >
> > > "I'm never going to use Morse code, I'm not going to learn it....."
> > >
> > > "I think band plans are stupid, it's an obsolete idea for an obsolete
> > > mode. They really aren't law anyhow...."
> > >
> > > "There are a lot more people running SSB, why shouldn't they have the
> > > bandwidth......"
> > >
> > > "I don't feel like self policing, that's just interfereing with my
> > > RIGHTS. Besides, there isn't enough enforcement personnel to catch me....."
> > >
> > > At that point it is a dire situation indeed!
> > >
> > > And it's already all been heard in this group.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> > And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
> > way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick, Larry,
> > Dan, Bruce...
>
> Citations please, to use your favorite phrase. NOWHERE has any of the above said any such
> thing and you know it... no, actually you probably don't. You don't seem to know much of
> anything.

Now you're lying.

84. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 03:26:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308011926.41cdde39@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73497

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3F2A7D17.2010501@adelphia.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
> > way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick, Larry,
> > Dan, Bruce...
>
> Well, I don't intend to. Heck, I'll probably do lot's of "self policing".
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I don't think they really meant it. They're just blowhards that want
to take their ball and go home, and probably couldn't think of
anything rational to say.

85. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 03:27:58 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308011927.9e0b560@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73498

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bgdj98$1hk7$1@adenine.netfront.net>...

>
> I remember a long time ago in this newsgroup, accusing some of using the CW
> test as a filtering tool. I was nearly lambasted to Timbuktu. Now, it's
> popular and OK to just make the declaration!
>
> If CW is used as a "filter" to keep anyone of the ARS; then it's plain
> wrong.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Aaron Jones was keeping the "Morse Myths" list. That one was probably
in the top ten.

86. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 03:32:49 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgfbd1$g37$0@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 73499

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >being made so easy? I'll say it again-the only thing preventing wholsale change
> >in ham radio toward the exact same thing that happened to CB is the code test.
> >When that's gone, ham radio is on a steeper part of the slippery slope.
> >
> >BTW I held CB callsign KIQ8934, c. 1970.
>
> Well ain't that just sweet. And you are the twit that accuses
> _others_ of coming from 27 MHz. You're little more than a
> flaming hypocrite of the first order. A CB retreated loser.
>

Hey, it's Frozen Floyd!!! How's things up there north of the North pole, Gud Buddie??? Shootin' lots of skip on the upper side these days? Sure must be awful, having to slither through all that permafrost getting NO sleep in all the wall tyo wall daylight! Life's a bitch and then you die!

Yep, Gud Buddie, I was there at the very beginning, even before the beginning, when 11 meters was a fullfledged ham band. But it sure wasn't used much and - like I said- I knew no ham who lamented it's reassignment, in fact most hams I knew thought it a neat idea. We liked radio and knew some ordianry folds who used CB would get to liking it too, and become hams, especially if us hams got on CB-with licnses, of course- and talked them into it. And that was the way it worked, for a time. Then the scabs came and ran out the normal folk....

An would you believe there's more? In the winter of 1958, as a student I and the gentleman I worked part time for *built* a pair of CB sets to use in his business. Yes, BUILT them, from an article in Popular Electronics. He (a ham also) ordered the parts and we put them together like kits. All very legal and above board at that time. There were NO commercial CB sets yet on the market.

But hey, you missed all this! You weren't even licensed as a ham 'til 1960, and from your postings, you never were active enough to know what went on. even then.
So I suppose we'll just have to POOF! blow you off like the rest of the lightweights. All talk and no walk, that's our snakey friend from the frozen north. Must be a real pain slithering you way across the frozen tundra. But carry on! You can do it!

>
> And regardless of how silly all of your other arguments are,
> such as your statement that you knew of no hams that lamented
> the loss of 11 meters, your claim that the difference between CB
> and Amateur Radio is the *code test*, is utterly absurd.
>
> The difference is having an *appropriate* *technical* *test*

> that pertains to what the Amateur Radio Service is today.

So you think there's a technical test involved in ham radio licensing today?
Really? Have you even seen a test lately? The question pools which not only
give all the questions with their exact answers, till recently they even listed the
answers in the same order in the pool that they appeared in the tests. Some technical
test! No surprise that so many new hams today are not literate at all on the material
ton which they were just tested. No one ever said the tests, especially the entry
levels need be difficult nor cover that much technical material, but what we have
today is simply a sham. And you should know it, but clearly do not.

> In
> 1960 when I was first licensed a code test was most certainly a
> valid part of such an appropriate test, but it hasn't been now
> for 20 years at least.
>

Opinions are like noses, everyone has one. Yoiurs doesn't smell any better than that
of anyone else.

>
> All you are is a narrow minded bigot that wants a play pen that
> elevates you to king of the sand box and keeps other who might
> challenge you out.
>

Dare I note that you're an ignoramous of the first magnitude? Yes I dare, in fact I
'll state it unambiguously and most forcefully. It's rare that you'll ever encounte
another ham who has been personally responsible for so many hams becoming licensed.
of ALL classes, including many codeless techs. Not only did I do this willingly, I
did it voluntarily and for the most part eagerly. On Tuesday night after our test
session I always stayed up until all the paperwork was finalized and ready to drop
into the post office first thing next morning on my way to work at 6.
Need I say I never got more than a very few hours sleep on those workweek nights?
Have you done any of that Frosty Floyd?

So now you're working to get a "remote licensing" system for the Alaska outback.
Wunnerful! That'll never be compromised, I'm sure!

>
> I held a commercial telegraph license, and worked for a company
> that actually paid (other) people to operate CW, but the last
> commercial CW operation was *decades* ago now. And that is
> exactly when the code requirement for the Amateur Radio Service
> should have been removed.

Floyd, you really need to move down to the lower 48 where you can try to stay in
contact with realty. The US Coast Guard dropped the Maritime 500khz wartch four years
ago. There is still commercial CW in many places in the world, not that it matters to
us hams. If you really think that CW in ham radio is dead, well you should try
turning on a HF receiver at once in your lifetime and tune it down to the lowe end of
any HF band, assuming you can find one. Surprise, surprise!

>
>
> Now, why don't you just slide back under the 27 MHz rock that
> you slithered out from, dick.
>

Well Frosty, I was there and watched the rock form.

Get back to us when you learn something.

87. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 03:33:36 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgfbeg$g6k$0@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 73500

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >being made so easy? I'll say it again-the only thing preventing wholsale change
> >in ham radio toward the exact same thing that happened to CB is the code test.
> >When that's gone, ham radio is on a steeper part of the slippery slope.
> >
> >BTW I held CB callsign KIQ8934, c. 1970.
>
> Well ain't that just sweet. And you are the twit that accuses
> _others_ of coming from 27 MHz. You're little more than a
> flaming hypocrite of the first order. A CB retreated loser.
>

Hey, it's Frozen Floyd!!! How's things up there north of the North pole, Gud Buddie??? Shootin' lots of skip on the upper side these days? Sure must be awful, having to slither through all that permafrost getting NO sleep in all the wall tyo wall daylight! Life's a bitch and then you die!

Yep, Gud Buddie, I was there at the very beginning, even before the beginning, when 11 meters was a fullfledged ham band. But it sure wasn't used much and - like I said- I knew no ham who lamented it's reassignment, in fact most hams I knew thought it a neat idea. We liked radio and knew some ordianry folds who used CB would get to liking it too, and become hams, especially if us hams got on CB-with licnses, of course- and talked them into it. And that was the way it worked, for a time. Then the scabs came and ran out the normal folk....

An would you believe there's more? In the winter of 1958, as a student I and the gentleman I worked part time for *built* a pair of CB sets to use in his business. Yes, BUILT them, from an article in Popular Electronics. He (a ham also) ordered the parts and we put them together like kits. All very legal and above board at that time. There were NO commercial CB sets yet on the market.

But hey, you missed all this! You weren't even licensed as a ham 'til 1960, and from your postings, you never were active enough to know what went on. even then.
So I suppose we'll just have to POOF! blow you off like the rest of the lightweights. All talk and no walk, that's our snakey friend from the frozen north. Must be a real pain slithering you way across the frozen tundra. But carry on! You can do it!

>
> And regardless of how silly all of your other arguments are,
> such as your statement that you knew of no hams that lamented
> the loss of 11 meters, your claim that the difference between CB
> and Amateur Radio is the *code test*, is utterly absurd.
>
> The difference is having an *appropriate* *technical* *test*

> that pertains to what the Amateur Radio Service is today.

So you think there's a technical test involved in ham radio licensing today? Really? Have you even seen a test lately? The question pools which not only give all the questions with their exact answers, till recently they even listed the answers in the same order in the pool that they appeared in the tests. Some technical test! No surprise that so many new hams today are not literate at all on the material ton which they were just tested. No one ever said the tests, especially the entry levels need be difficult nor cover that much technical material, but what we have today is simply a sham. And you should know it, but clearly do not.

> In
> 1960 when I was first licensed a code test was most certainly a
> valid part of such an appropriate test, but it hasn't been now
> for 20 years at least.

Opinions are like noses, everyone has one. Yoiurs doesn't smell any better than that of anyone else.

>
> All you are is a narrow minded bigot that wants a play pen that
> elevates you to king of the sand box and keeps other who might
> challenge you out.

Dare I note that you're an ignoramous of the first magnitude? Yes I dare, in fact I 'll state it unambiguously and most forcefully. It's rare that you'll ever encounte another ham who has been personally responsible for so many hams becoming licensed. of ALL classes, including many codeless techs. Not only did I do this willingly, I did it voluntarily and for the most part eagerly. On Tuesday night after our test session I always stayed up until all the paperwork was finalized and ready to drop into the post office first thing next morning on my way to work at 6.
Need I say I never got more than a very few hours sleep on those workweek nights? Have you done any of that Frosty Floyd?

So now you're working to get a "remote licensing" system for the Alaska outback. Wunnerful! That'll never be compromised, I'm sure!

>
> I held a commercial telegraph license, and worked for a company
> that actually paid (other) people to operate CW, but the last
> commercial CW operation was *decades* ago now. And that is
> exactly when the code requirement for the Amateur Radio Service
> should have been removed.

Floyd, you really need to move down to the lower 48 where you can try to stay in contact with realty. The US Coast Guard dropped the Maritime 500khz wartch four years ago. There is still commercial CW in many places in the world, not that it matters to us hams. If you really think that CW in ham radio is dead, well you should try turning on a HF receiver at once in your lifetime and tune it down to the lowe end of any HF band, assuming you can find one. Surprise, surprise!

>
>

> Now, why don't you just slide back under the 27 MHz rock that
> you slithered out from, dick.
>

Well Frosty, I was there and watched the rock form. AND turn to slime.

Get back to us when you learn something.

88. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 03:35:47 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgfbij$g6k$1@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 73501

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bgdsmc$fs9$1@208.207.71.145>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3F29CCE4.5090409@adelphia.net>...
> > > > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Phil Kane wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > >On 31 Jul 2003 17:37:02 -0700, Brian wrote:
> > > > >>
> > > > >> >>I said it before the last restructuring and I guess its necessary that
> > > > >> >>I say it again, "What I fear most about restructuring the ARS is a
> > > > >> >>lack of enforcement, and what I fear most about maintaining the Status
> > > > >> >>Quo is a lack of enforcement. The Morse Exam is no substitute for
> > > > >> >>enforcement."
> > > > >>
> > > > >> For once we agree.
> > > > >>
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Not me. Not at all
> > > > > . You know as well as anyone, better than most, that almost the only
> > > > > "enforcement" we've had on the ARS for many years
> > > > > prior to Riley's appointment WAS the code test.
> > > > >
> > > > > Now, a 'difficult' (for that type of individual) test which discourages,
> > > > > yea, FILTERS him from active, open participation is a poor
> > > > > excuse for monitor vans and well trained and equipped crews.
> > > > > But it's what we had.
> > > > >
> > > > > Now we have Riley and a 5wpm code test. Soon only Riley. When he goes, I
> > > > > for one believe the ARS will follow his exit, not far behind. By that time
> > > > > there
> > > > > will be far more than adequate evidence that the ARS is no longer a viable
> > > > > self- policing entity, staffed with conscientious people willing and able to
> > > > > conduct themselves in a manner commensurate with the priveleges granted,
> > > > > most of which will shortly be summarily withdrawn.
> > > >

> > > > Dick, these thoughts have been buzzing around the drafty recesses of my
> > > > head:
> > > >
> > > > "I don't have time to learn Morse code....."
> > > >
> > > > "I'm never going to use Morse code, I'm not going to learn it....."
> > > >
> > > > "I think band plans are stupid, it's an obsolete idea for an obsolete
> > > > mode. They really aren't law anyhow...."
> > > >
> > > > "There are a lot more people running SSB, why shouldn't they have the
> > > > bandwidth......"
> > > >
> > > > "I don't feel like self policing, that's just interfereing with my
> > > > RIGHTS. Besides, there isn't enough enforcement personnel to catch me....."
> > > >
> > > > At that point it is a dire situation indeed!
> > > >
> > > > And it's already all been heard in this group.
> > > >
> > > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >
> > > And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
> > > way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick, Larry,
> > > Dan, Bruce...
> >
> > Citations please, to use your favorite phrase. NOWHERE has any of the above said any
such
> > thing and you know it... no, actually you probably don't. You don't seem to know much
of
> > anything.
>
> Now you're lying.

So you can prove it, right? Get it on!

89. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 03:44:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB50ABC6.1FCF3%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 73502

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> (my comments here snipped)
>
> As you no doubt consider us cranks, eh?

No, I don't consider you anything. However, I am a bit frustrated that my comments are being twisted to apply to arguments I never made. Throughout this discussion, my comments have focused solely on Brian's argument for stiffer written tests. Since then, my words have been twisted to apply to the current tests and to some potential future tests that don't even exist yet (and will very likely never exist). Likewise, code testing has been added to the discussion - a subject I've tried hard to avoid over the last two to three years and tried to minimize in this discussion. I'm not here to debate the code tests.

>> Brian's idea of stiffer written exams don't
>> exclude if it serves a purpose or need.
>> However, if done solely to keep others out,
>> it also does exclude. (snip)
>
>> (snip) Again, once we start down the path
>> of excluding others, when does it stop and
>> who else do we exclude? Am I next in the
>> list? Are you?
>
> (snip) And yet, somehow, some way, she learned
> Morse code, studied for and passed the General
> test, and is now on the air as an active ham.
>
> When I see the whining about exclusivity, and all
> the other complaining about how unfair the Morse
> code test, I often think of her.
>
> Then I think of the complainers and compare them,
> who think it is just too hard, and her, she who
> took the trouble to learn, even though she has
> not been blessed with the same gifts as most of
> us. She's a brother/sister ham, and I'm happy
> and proud to INCLUDE her in the service.
>
> Wanna guess who I respect more?

See what I mean? I made a comment about "Brian's idea of stiffer written exams" and you responded with comments about code testing.

Lets try to get pass this issue once and for all. I've never complained about the code tests being too hard, nor have I ever said they were unfair. I don't care about code testing. In my opinion, with the recent ITU changes, this issue will soon be dead anyway.

Further, to clarify another issue, my comments about excluding people applied only to the idea of using license requirements solely in an effort to exclude - I didn't introduce that premise, those specifically advocating the exclusion of others did. If you're one of those people, and those are your ideals, I don't really care to know who you're proud of or respect.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

90. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 04:31:20 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgfeqo$n1d$0@208.206.142.111>
Source record: 73503

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:

> Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> > >being made so easy? I'll say it again-the only thing preventing wholsale change
> > >in ham radio toward the exact same thing that happened to CB is the code test.
> > >When that's gone, ham radio is on a steeper part of the slippery slope.
> > >
> > >BTW I held CB callsign KIQ8934, c. 1970.
> >
> > Well ain't that just sweet. And you are the twit that accuses
> > _others_ of coming from 27 MHz. You're little more than a
> > flaming hypocrite of the first order. A CB retreated loser.
> >
>
> Hey, it's Frozen Floyd!!!

One thing more, you flaming nincompoop- the ONLY reason I hang out here is to counter the misinformation dished out by phoney dingalings like you. For sure there are more fun ways to spend my retirement, but I will not allow the likes of you to by the only resource for the new and future hams reading here. They deserve better- MUCH better.

91. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 04:37:53 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgff71nqf0@208.206.142.111>
Source record: 73504

Dwight Stewart wrote:

>
> Further, to clarify another issue, my comments about excluding people
> applied only to the idea of using license requirements solely in an effort
> to exclude - I didn't introduce that premise, those specifically advocating
> the exclusion of others did.

Right you are, Dwight. The FCC did - way back about 1912
(actually their predecessors)

ALL licenses exclude those who don't meet the qualifications, and include those
who do. Why else would they exist?

92. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 04:45:38 UTC
From: robkemp90210@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <6114e4af.0308012045.b54018e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73505

Quote from the American Public Power Association; "the burden should
be imposed on challengers to BPL to demonstrate interference in a
fact-based, empirical proof. Further, to the extent that interference
is demonstrated, there should be an attempt to accommodate BPL, even
if it means that existing communications providers may have to share
or transfer bandwidth."
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287496

Critical everyone submits a reply comment ASAP.

To file, go here;
http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi
"Proceeding" field, enter "03-104"
"Document Type" select "Reply to comments"

Links for the key filings (pro BPL and anti BPL) are here;
http://www.arrl.org/~ehare/rfi/plc/BPL_NOI_hyperlinks.html

Good reply examples are below;
Notes
You can cut paste - key is the comments you submit represent your
thoughts.
You can also reply to support comments i.e. the ARRL comments have
your support.

Andrew Leeds - response to UPLC
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514288117

Lee McVey - response to Amperion
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287923

Nickolaus E. Leggett - response to NA Shortwave Association
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287539

Cortland Richmond - response to PowerWan
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287407

Lee McVey - response to UPLC
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287392

Cortland Richmond - response to Florida Light and Power
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287386

Arthur Guy - response to ARRL
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287323

Good general comments
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287303

Ashley Lane - response to Ameren
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287129

Nickolaus E. Leggett - response to ARRL
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287007

Cortland Richmond - response to Southern Linc
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514286932

Nickolaus E. Leggett - response to National Academy of Science
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514286161

Nickolaus E. Leggett - response to Amateur Radio Research and
Development Corp.
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514286102

Lawrence Macioski - response to ARRL
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514083272

Robert Read - response to ARRL
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514082900

"Mike Ro Farad" <MRF@muffled.com> wrote in message
news:<i3AWa.19213$ff.18880@fed1read01>...
> > Keep it calm, rational, and polite, please, for all of our sakes.
>
> Great advice Carl, also good advice for this news group --
> Let's exhibit a quality image of Amateur Radio
> 10-67 10-67 10-67 10-67 10-67 10-67 10-4?
>
> Millie Am Pair for OM Mike Ro Farad
>
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:iKzWa.2315$lL.372712@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > Today the Ed Thomas, Chief of the FCC's Office of Engineering
> > and Technology, issued an order extending the Reply Comment
> > period in ET Docket No. 03-104 (BPL) until August 20, 2003.
> >
> > Remember, paper filed comments are due at the correct address
> > by COB on the deadline day, electronic comments via the ECFS
> > have until midnight at the end of the deadline day.
> >
> > FOLKS ... if you are going to comment, PLEASE don't "flame"
> > the FCC or the proponents of BPL ... just cite facts (the ARRL's
> > comments and the excellent technical analysis done by Ed Hare
> > are full of them ...).
> >
> > Flaming will hurt us more than it will help us.
> >
> > Keep it calm, rational, and polite, please, for all of our sakes.
> >

> > 73,
> > Carl - wk3c
> >

93. Re: code freedom day???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 05:02:50 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308012102.1d6d871e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73506

"David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<C92dnUyn2uM1bLeiU-KYgw@crocker.com>...
> I'm sorry, did I miss it??? 10m seems awfully quiet tonight.

Izzat a surprise?

All show. No go. The usual.

94. Re: Some comments on the NCVEC petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 05:20:59 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0308020515300.190@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 73507

On Thu, 31 Jul 2003, Phil Kane wrote:
> On Thu, 31 Jul 2003 21:58:16 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
> >> What it all boils down to is that except for some very basic rules,
> >> regulations and safety considerations, most of the test requirements
> >> for an amateur license come down to somebody's opinion about what
> >> should be tested. Opinion and nothing more.
> >
> >And if the FCC didn't like that, then they'd take testing back and do it
> >themselves.
>
> Thus substituting the judgment of the Chief,. Licensing and
> Rxamination Branch (the guy - yes, one individual - who used to make
> up the tests) for the judgment of the Question Pool Committee.

That may be true. I never said it was a good idea. I only said that it's the government's option, good or bad.

95. Re: Some comments on the NCVEC petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 05:22:08 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0308020516480.190@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 73508

On Fri, 1 Aug 2003, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> "D. Stussy" wrote:
> > Apparently, you've never been to Southern California. There were times where
> > one could count the violations on our "animal farm" repeater - and sometimes
> > the number of violations per minute would exceed the number of seconds in a
> > minute. Most of those misfits are still licensed. Watch out HF - here they
> > come!
>
> Yep, just as they came to VHF/UHF ham radio from the never-never
> land of 27 mhz via a no-code (and virtualy no-test) ham radio license.
> Seems like the FCC just doesn't care, or they'd never allow it.

There's one and ONLY one reason why the So CA amateur community allows it - it keeps them off the rest of the repeaters! :-)

96. Re: Some comments on the NCVEC petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 05:29:28 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0308020519070.190@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 73509

On Fri, 1 Aug 2003, N2EY wrote:
> ....
> >> >> There is no requirement that any radio amateur actually use Morse code. Radio
> >> >> amateurs use it by choice.
> >> >Justification for it NOT to be a requirement.
> >>
> >> Perhaps. Yet NCVEC did not pursue that line of reasoning, which could
> >> be a very powerful argument. Instead, they wrote as if they want code
> >> USE by hams to go away.
> >>
> >> But the petition claims that hams ONLY use it because of the test
> >> requirement. That's just not true.
> >
> >Their involvement is with testing, not operating....
>
> Then why talk about how much a mode is used and why?

So they can at least APPEAR to justify their position.

> > ...
> >So, if I don't think any question is relevant, I can dispose of the entire
> >test? :-)
>
> That's the ad absurdum that the NECVEC argument leads to.

But they didn't say that, nor does it necessarily lead all readers to that
conclusion....

> >> It's incomplete. It looks like the NCVEC had blinders on.
> >
> >I disagree. They aren't looking to refarm the service; just take "one bite
> >from the apple." (It may be the first bite, but not the last.)
>
> Then it's sloppy. Or dishonest.

I disagree - neither sloppy nor dishonest. It's all that their function could
justify - and perhaps all that they really care about. Changing the bandplans
or anything else to have to do with morse code they simply leave for others,
because it's outside their little world.

97. Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 05:40:08 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0308020525560.190@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 73510

On Fri, 1 Aug 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
>...
> Others have pointed out that rule 301(e) was written that way to avoid
> creating any new 'Tech+' licencees, but it looks as if invoking the
> international rules created a sunset clause, whether intentionally or
> otherwise.

AH! Someone who is now on the verge of understanding what that "wierd" thing I said was. IT was a "sunset clause" and the change to S25.5 was the "sunset."

> I don't really see how that throws anything into chaos. Right now no-
> coders who operate on the Novice/Tech HF allocations can't readily be
> detected for lack of any central records to prove that they are actually
> no-coders. If the changes to s25.5 affect 97.301(e) so as to make it
> permissible, then from the FCC perspective it makes an enforcement problem
> go away!

It doesn't make it permissible. What it did is REVOKE the authority for those Novices/Techs to operate on HF at all. The problem STILL GOES AWAY because NO ONE has the privilege. The FCC doesn't have to worry about who's has a Technician Plus legacy license, a renewed Technician (with code credit), or a Technician with code credit in hand (that they don't know about) - it doesn't matter; Technicians (and Novices) don't have any HF privileges anymore. "The sun has set."

[This also explains why Tech Plussers received Technician licenses upon renewal. The license class, and now its privilege, has been disposed of in a very seripticious, systemic manner.]

> >>>Using the argument that Morse code testing has been abolished is quite
> >>>simply *wrong*.
> >>
> >> No-one is saying it has been abolished for the General or the Extra

98. Re: Some comments on the NCVEC petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 06:28:25 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgflm9$3ml$0@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 73511

"D. Stussy" wrote:

> On Fri, 1 Aug 2003, Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > "D. Stussy" wrote:
> > > Apparently, you've never been to Southern California. There were times where
> > > one could count the violations on our "animal farm" repeater - and sometimes
> > > the number of violations per minute would exceed the number of seconds in a
> > > minute. Most of those misfits are still licensed. Watch out HF - here they
> > > come!
> >
> > Yep, just as they came to VHF/UHF ham radio from the never-never
> > land of 27 mhz via a no-code (and virtualy no-test) ham radio license.
> > Seems like the FCC just doesn't care, or they'd never allow it.
>
> There's one and ONLY one reason why the So CA amateur community allows it - it
> keeps them off the rest of the repeaters! :-)

Whatever works best !

99. Re: Here We Go Again..Sir Putzalot Is Back In His Stride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 07:30:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308012330.4a7e333e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73512

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308010907.2830acf6@posting.google.com>...

> Steve, if you want to read more maniacal laughing postings, send him a fresh pair.

I doubt it...Lennie would never be able to wear my shoes even if
we did wear the same size.

Nor could you, I bet...

Steve, K4YZ

100. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 09:18:32 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <8765lgct93.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73513

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
>> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>> >being made so easy? I'll say it again-the only thing preventing wholsale change
>> >in ham radio toward the exact same thing that happened to CB is the code test.
>> >When that's gone, ham radio is on a steeper part of the slippery slope.
>> >
>> >BTW I held CB callsign KIQ8934, c. 1970.
>>
>> Well ain't that just sweet. And you are the twit that accuses
>> _others_ of coming from 27 MHz. You're little more than a
>> flaming hypocrite of the first order. A CB retreated loser.
>>
>
>Hey, it's Frozen Floyd!!! How's things up there north of the North pole, Gud
>Buddie??? Shootin' lots of skip on the upper side these days? Sure must be
>awful, having to slither through all that permafrost getting NO sleep in all the wall
>tyo wall daylight! Life's a bitch and then you die!

Well gee DICK, no as a matter of fact I'm not much aware of CB and all
the required vocabulary.

You see, unlike you, I never did use CB.

Now, tell me why anyone would want to pay any attention to what another
CB'er like you has to say about the ARS?

Hey hypocrite, shouldn't we cross post this to a CB group so you'll be
at home?

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

101. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 09:19:28 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <871xw4ct7j.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73514

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
>> Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>
>> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>> > >being made so easy? I'll say it again-the only thing preventing wholsale change
>> > >in ham radio toward the exact same thing that happened to CB is the code test.
>> > >When that's gone, ham radio is on a steeper part of the slippery slope.
>> > >
>> > >BTW I held CB callsign KIQ8934, c. 1970.
>> >
>> > Well ain't that just sweet. And you are the twit that accuses
>> > _others_ of coming from 27 MHz. You're little more than a
>> > flaming hypocrite of the first order. A CB retreated loser.
>> >
>>
>> Hey, it's Frozen Floyd!!!
>
>One thing more, you flaming nincompoop- the ONLY reason I hang out here is to
>counter the misinformation dished out by phoney dingalings like you. For sure there are
>more fun ways to spend my retirement, but I will not allow the likes of you to by the
>only resource for the new and future hams reading here. They deserve better- MUCH better.

You hang out here because you're a hypocrite.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

102. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 11:19:08 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <M6NWa.15268$Vx2.7735038@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 73517
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bgg5nv$no0ns$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Yep, As I was aware of that. And I never expected them to change for me
at
> the last minute. BUT, I do believe that with enough warning ahead of time
> it should be considered more than fair for a VE team to make an
adjustment.
> It should be no problem for a VEC to be able to send via code practice
> oscillator!!!!!! Wouldn't that be a shame if the VEC's have become so
lazy
> they can't even send a code test via a key because they are relying on the
> code CD's and tapes.
>
> Where the hell did you think I expected to walk into a test session in the
> past, and at the last possible moment expect a major change?

They are supposed to make those provisions. If they did not, they were in the wrong. However, I would not favor them using hand sent code with an oscillator for two reasons. 1) Oscillators are often not adjustable in pitch. 2) Some people who copy quite well have absolutely lousy fists and do not send good clean code. It takes a pretty good op to copy some of the people out there.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

103. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 11:26:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB51180E.1FD46%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 73518

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:

> (snip) ALL licenses exclude those who don't
> meet the qualifications, and include those
> who do. Why else would they exist?

There is a huge difference in requirements necessary to meet a certain goal or purpose and requirements designed to exclude those we doesn't like, Dick. I'm sure you know that. And I'm equally sure you know this discussion is about the latter.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

104. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 11:31:13 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308020331.7b7e6b9f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73519

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hiymbv7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 1 Aug 2003 07:00:01 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >Then they come up with notions like putting chunks of mind-bending
> >intellectual and political expertise like Arnold to work on leading
> >'em out of the swamp . .
>
> Was Ronnie the Ray-Gun any better ??

Hey I kinda liked his Shiny Pebbles thingies . .

> Hey, was Jerry "Moonbeam" Brown, the professional politician, Yale
> law school graduate,

YALE? Well, there ya have it . .

> any better?
>
> BTW - Arnold declined to run.

Supposedly his XYL put the nix on it because she doesn't want to be
anywhere near the BS.

105. Re: code freedom day???

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 11:55:02 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <tEqdnR4D5KgIO7aiXTWJjA@crocker.com>
Source record: 73520

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308012102.1d6d871e@posting.google.com...
> "David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<C92dnUyn2uM1bLeiU-KYgw@crocker.com>...
> > I'm sorry, did I miss it??? 10m seems awfully quiet tonight.
>
> Izzat a surprise?
>
> All show. No go. The usual.

it is nice to know that the fcc is still in the enforcement business and has gotten at least one 11m trucker off the 10m band! as reported in the latest ARRL Letter:
<quote>
==>FCC WARNS TRUCKING FIRMS ABOUT ALLEGED UNLICENSED 10-METER OPERATION

The FCC Enforcement Bureau has sent Warning Notice letters to three highway transportation firms asserting that drivers of some of their vehicles may have transmitted without a license on 10 meters. The notices allege the unlicensed operations took place July 8 on Interstate highways in South Carolina.

Letters went out July 14 from FCC Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth to Jolly Roger Capital Ltd of Columbia, South Carolina, Tidewater Transit Company of Kinston, North Carolina, and Shuford Lumber of Marion, North Carolina. He warned all three firms that operation of radio transmitting equipment without a license could lead to fines of up to $10,000, equipment seizure and even imprisonment.

Hollingsworth asked all three firms to get in touch with him to discuss the allegations. He told ARRL that one of the companies already had responded and required its driver to remove all radio gear from his truck.

<unquote>

So they do have some resources to go after unlicensed 10m operation!

106. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 12:27:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030802082707.04207.00001975@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 73522

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of July 31, 2003:

Novice - 33,409 (decrease of 15,920)
Technician - 257,791 (increase of 52,397)
Technician Plus - 66,704 (decrease of 62,156)
General - 141,381 (increase of 28,704)
Advanced - 83,141 (decrease of 16,641)
Extra - 104,453 (increase of 25,703)
Total - 686,879 (increase of 12,087)

73 de Jim, N2EY

107. Re: Ham Radio In The Post-Code Testing Era

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 12:27:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030802082707.04207.00001974@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 73524

In article <3F203500.1080106@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> You would be hard pressed to find a rational person, at any time or in
>> any culture, who finds that activity anything other than disgusting.
>> Also, taste and smell are closely related, and it's very rare that
>> something will smell bad but taste good.
>
>Have you heard of that coffee in which the beans are passed through the
>digestive tract of a monkey?

Yes. That story surfaces every so often. Supposed to be a Vietnamese delicacy
or something.

>It seems to be real (although it now passes
>through a critter called a Palm Toddy (Civet) Cat. Read:
>
>http://www.geocities.com/unasoda42/portfolio/monkey-featurette.html
>
>and:
>
>http://home.earthlink.net/~stewartallen/india.html
>
>and
>
>http://www.truthorfiction.com/rumors/kopiluwak.htm
>
>I won't say this isn't some kind of joke, but we can always hope....

Check

http://www.snopes.com

for urban legend confirmation/debunking

>Let's go into Starbucks and ask for a cup of crappuchino....

Ever hear Utah Phillips story about the moose pie?

73 de Jim "It's good though!" N2EY

108. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 12:27:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030802082708.04207.00001977@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 73521

In article <HCzWa.19205$ff.8465@fed1read01>, "Mike Ro Farad" <MRF@muffled.com>
writes:

>Ask 100 Hams if they have ever been on CB --- 50% will fess up -- and the
>other 50% are just not telling the truth ---

I've never been on cb. I've listened there, but never transmitted.

109. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 12:27:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030802082708.04207.00001976@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 73525

In article <iKzWa.2315$lL.372712@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>Today the Ed Thomas, Chief of the FCC's Office of Engineering
>and Technology, issued an order extending the Reply Comment
>period in ET Docket No. 03-104 (BPL) until August 20, 2003.
>
>Remember, paper filed comments are due at the correct address
>by COB on the deadline day, electronic comments via the ECFS
>have until midnight at the end of the deadline day.
>
>FOLKS ... if you are going to comment, PLEASE don't "flame"
>the FCC or the proponents of BPL ... just cite facts (the ARRL's
>comments and the excellent technical analysis done by Ed Hare
>are full of them ...).
>
>Flaming will hurt us more than it will help us.
>
>Keep it calm, rational, and polite, please, for all of our sakes.
>

Good advice.

73 de Jim, N2EY

110. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 12:27:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030802082709.04207.00001978@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 73523

In article <cuflivkf5eh6endfss1oa9om3k6ec1dnbo@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
<kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> writes:

>I'd point out that Hitler was pretty popular in Germany once upon a
>time, but N2EY might call up the Godwin's Law police and have them
>lock me up, so how about...burning witches at the stake used to be
>pretty popular once upon a time.

I just mentioned Godwin's Law. I wasn't expecting the Spanish Inquisition.
>
>>If CW is used as a "filter" to keep anyone of the ARS; then it's plain
>>wrong.
>
>Doesn't keep anybody out of the ARS anyway. Just keeps them from
>getting a license that grants HF privileges, forcing them to either
>find a control operator who's passed a code test, or work VHF/UHF.

Or they can just pass the test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

111. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 12:27:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030802082710.04207.00001979@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 73526

In article <t7elivk6ou7t6nh03bb3gqlohhu2qmobb6@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
<kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> writes:

>On 1 Aug 2003 02:52:19 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
>>For years the code test was the ONLY factor that restricted
>>troublemakers from freely roaming the ham bands, FCC having been relegated
>by lack of funding
>>to more or less toothless-watchdog status.
>
>Only problem I have with that statement is the FACT (stated by Riley
>himself as quoted in QST, CQ, Popular Communications, Monitoring
>Times, Worldradio, and possibly others I didn't read) that the two
>frequencies FCC received the most complaints about (14.303 and, I
>believe, 3.950) were frequencies where the operators had to pass code
>tests in order to obtain privileges to operate there.

Yup. That's true.

They also had to pass at least two written tests to operate there. The written
tests are largely about the rules and regulations of the ARS. Obviously those
written tests didn't keep those ops out of the ARS, nor cause them to behave
correctly. Should we just dump those written tests because they did not work
perfectly?

Also - what mode were those folks using on 14.313 and 3.950?
>
>In a way, I guess we're lucky - if the Liberty Net hadn't attracted
>all the jammers (and counter-jammers) to the one frequency they'd have
>been...well...freely roaming the bands.
>
>>So when a few thousand refugees from way up there descend onto the HF bands
>>-as some have very recently indicated their intent right here on rrap- and
>lonely Riley is left
>>to sweep up,. just how much enforcement you think there'll be?
>>But press on- it's "kill the code" even if it kills us.
>
>Dick, the code isn't stopping those few thousand refugees from
>descending into the HF bands now, and it wouldn't stop them from doing
>so in the future even if we continued to have a code test for the next
>267 years...any more than it has stopped them from inhabiting the
>so-called "freeband" which is another place they don't have any
>privileges or licenses to operate.

See above about written exam...
>
>The *only* thing keeping unlicensed operators off the ham bands in
>droves is the well-known determination of licensed hams to keep them
>off of here, even if it means going out at 3:00 AM in the middle of an
>ice storm to do some DF'ing and tape recording. That's it, period.

No, there's another part: the fact that there may be some enforcement action as a result of that determination. Didja see where FCC cited a couple of trucking companies because of truckers' illegal use of 10 meters?

>The
>code test is not now, never has been, and never will be a deterrent to
>anyone contemplating an act of gross stupidity on the bands...and that
>applies to hams and non-hams alike.

Then please explain why there are so many NALs for violations committed using voice modes, and so few for violations using Morse code or data modes. Maybe it's not the TEST but the MODE that has an effect?

73 de Jim, N2EY

112. Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 12:33:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <wcOWa.2375$lL.382710@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73527

> > > > > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > > > > . You know as well as anyone, better than most, that almost the
only
> > > > > > "enforcement" we've had on the ARS for many years
> > > > > > prior to Riley's appointment WAS the code test.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Now, a 'difficult' (for that type of individual) test which
discourages,
> > > > > > yea, FILTERS him from active, open participation is a poor
> > > > > > excuse for monitor vans and well trained and equipped crews.
> > > > > > But it's what we had.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Now we have Riley and a 5wpm code test. Soon only Riley. When
he goes, I
> > > > > > for one believe the ARS will follow his exit, not far behind. By
that time
> > > > > > there
> > > > > > will be far more than adequate evidence that the ARS is no
longer a viable
> > > > > > self- policing entity, staffed with conscientious people willing
and able to
> > > > > > conduct themselves in a manner commensurate with the priveleges
granted,
> > > > > > most of which will shortly be summarily withdrawn.

Dick,

EVERY time there has been change of any real sort in ham radio, there
have been cranky olde fartz like you preaching "end of the world" doom
and gloom ... and every time it has not come to pass ...

Witness:

conversion from spark to CW;
conversion from AM to SSB;
introduction of packet radio and other "new-fangled @^#%$ computer
thingies";
the introduction of the no-code Tech license;
restructuring 3 years ago;

and many others I'm sure I've omitted.

The point is, the world (and ham radio) is NOT going to end ... despite
your rants that it is.

Actually, on the contrary, if these changes hadn't happened and we were still stuck in the spark era (i.e., if cranky olde fartz like you had stopped
the progress of ham radio over the years), we WOULD be in danger.

If you want to see what presents the biggest danger to the future of ham radio LOOK IN THE MIRROR ... the enemy you fear is yourself, with your backward thinking, unwillingness to accept progress, and lack of tolerance for newcomers (unless, of course, they've suffered through the same fraternity hazing rituals that you had to endure, lo those many years ago and think in exactly the backward, narrowminded ways that you do).

When you're done looking in the mirror, you can look a your cronies, Larry, Dave Heil, and the whole list of like-thinkers... they are also part of the enemy you fear ... for they think and act essentially the same way as you do.

THERE is where the REAL danger to the future of ham radio lies ... in people who are so married to/stuck in its past that they despise any thought of change, progress, and the newcomers that it will bring (unless the newcomers are acceptable "clones" cast in your own image).

However, those newcomers are the future of ham radio ... for us older guys will surely die, and if there aren't younger folks to replace us ham radio will die with us. It's up to us to WELCOME and ENCOURAGE them ... their ways will not be the ways of the past ... things change and nobody can freeze time. But insulting, berating, demeaning them, and trying to keep them out is not the way ...

Think about these things long and hard before you look yourself in the mirror again ... without some reflection, reconsideration, and change in your ways, you may not like what you see ... the enemy that is YOU.

(Try to be *completely* like Scrooge ... go through the change, don't stay stuck in the first part ...)

Carl - wk3c

113. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 12:40:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F2BB14D.8080503@adelphia.net>
Source record: 73528

N2EY wrote:
> In article <cuflivkf5eh6endfss1oa9om3k6ec1dnbo@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
> <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> writes:
>
>
>>I'd point out that Hitler was pretty popular in Germany once upon a
>>time, but N2EY might call up the Godwin's Law police and have them
>>lock me up, so how about...burning witches at the stake used to be
>>pretty popular once upon a time.
>
>
> I just mentioned Godwin's Law. I wasn't expecting the Spanish Inquisition.

NO one expects the Spanish Inquisition!

>>>If CW is used as a "filter" to keep anyone of the ARS; then it's plain
>>>wrong.
>>
>>Doesn't keep anybody out of the ARS anyway. Just keeps them from
>>getting a license that grants HF privileges, forcing them to either
>>find a control operator who's passed a code test, or work VHF/UHF.
>
>
> Or they can just pass the test.

Too hard, too hard!

- Mike KB3EIA -

114. Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 12:46:08 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <koOWa.2376$lL.382886@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73529

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308020525560.190@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Fri, 1 Aug 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
> >...
> > Others have pointed out that rule 301(e) was written that way to avoid
> > creating any new 'Tech+' licencees, but it looks as if invoking the
> > international rules created a sunset clause, whether intentionally or
> > otherwise.
>
> AH! Someone who is now on the verge of understanding what that "wierd"
thing I
> said was. IT was a "sunset clause" and the change to S25.5 was the
"sunset."

It is NOT a sunset clause ... NCI specifically asked for a sunset clause
so code testing would "automagically" go away when S25.5 was suppressed
or changed so that code testing was no longer required by the ITU Radio
Regs.

The FCC SPECIFICALLY declined to enact such a sunset clause, and the
text of 301 does NOT contain one, no matter how you try to twist it.

>
> > I don't really see how that throws anything into chaos. Right now no-
> > coders who operate on the Novice/Tech HF allocations can't readily be
> > detected for lack of any central records to prove that they are actually
> > no-coders. If the changes to s25.5 affect 97.301(e) so as to make it
> > permissible, then from the FCC perspective it makes an enforcement
problem
> > go away!
>

Again (and again ... you people must not be able to read, only write) ...
the FCC *DOES* have records of which Techs have 5 wpm credit and
which don't ... this idea that "there are no records, so you can get away
with it is 1) false, and 2) borders on inducement to violate the rules.

If someone follows your (VERY BAD) advice and gets cited for it,
I hope they explain that "(fill in the names from usenet) told me it was
OK" and the FCC comes knocking on your doors with citations for
#2 above ...

[remainder of totally incorrect psuedo/quasi-regulatry crap deleted in
the interest of not further perpetuating/propagating misinformation ...]

Carl - wk3c

115. Re: Some comments on the NCVEC petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 13:03:09 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bggd0spmq1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 73531

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030730222105.24390.00001460@mb-m19.aol.com...
> >PETITION FOR RULE MAKING
>
> >The National Conference of Volunteer Examiner Coordinators (NCVEC) is
> >the umbrella organization comprised of the fourteen organizations
> >charged since 1984, under Section 97.519(a) of the rules of the Federal
> >Communications Commission, 47 CFR 97.519(a) to develop and administer
> >all Amateur Radio operator license testing and to electronically file
> >all successful license applications with the FCC. In total, the VECs
> >and their more than 30,000 VE teams have collectively administered
> >nearly two million examinations during the past twenty years and have
> >notified the FCC to issue approximately a million new and upgraded
> >Amateur Radio licenses.
>
> The NCVEC is not, however, an organization where the VECs are elected, or
where
> individual VE opinions were gathered or solicited.

So? Your point? Is that something that should call into question
the NCVEC as being invalid, illegal, or fattening?

> >Once a year, the various Volunteer Examiner Coordinator organizations
> >meet at their annual conference to discuss the various issues that
> >impact Amateur Radio operator testing. At their July 25, 2003, meeting
> >held with the FCC in Gettysburg, PA, the VECs overwhelmingly agreed
> >that Morse code testing should be immediately ended since it was now
> >possible to do so. It was also noted that countries have already begun
> >discontinuing Morse examinations. As a result the VECs voted to file
> >this Petition asking that the FCC take expedited action to allow them
> >to discontinue administering Element 1, the 5 words-per-minute
> >telegraphy examination as soon as possible.
>
> No surprise there.
>
> >Pursuant to Section 1.405 of the Commission's procedural rules (47
> >C.F.R. 1.405), the NCVEC hereby respectfully requests that the
> >Commission issue a Notice of Proposed Rule Making at an early date
> >looking toward amendment of the rules governing the Amateur Radio
> >Service, 47 C.F.R. 97.1 et seq., as set forth herein and in the
> >attached Appendix.
>
> No imagination, either.

When dis imagination or, for that matter, creativity have to be part
of the filling/process?

> >The rule changes requested herein would terminate the telegraphy
> >examination requirement and permit existing Technician Class operators
> >to access HF spectrum as provided in 47 C.F.R. 97.301(e) without the
> >necessity of passing a Morse code examination. This request to
> >eliminate the Morse code (Element 1) examination does not necessarily
> >have the support of the ARRL Board since they have yet to develop a
> >position on the matter. In support of its petition, NCVEC states as
> >follows:
>
> >I. Introduction and Background
> >
> > Since the turn of the century, the Morse code, invented by American
> > Samuel Morse and first used in 1844, has been the foundation of early
> > distress and safety communications. Although Morse code (or CW, as it
> > is commonly called) was the primary mode of communications from the
> > late 19th Century through the early 20th Century, it has all but become
> > obsolete in practically all other contemporary communication systems.
> > Due to the emergence of satellite and digital communications, manual
> > telegraphy is no longer used or required in any radio service other
> > than in the Amateur Service.
>
> Amateur radio operators, however, use it extensively. On the HF/MF amateur
> bands, it is the second most popular mode of communications, only slightly
> behind SSB in popularity.

So? Hams also use differnent languages (Engish, Spanish, Chineese, etc.)
yet no one is mandated to use or be tested in any language other than
that of their "home" country.

> The Amateur Radio Service is unlike other radio services in its needs and
> resources.

So are you sying amateur radio "needs" morse code testing? If so,
the burden of proof hasn't been met as per FCC R&O for 98-143.

> > Radiotelegraphy in the maritime service has been phased out in favor of
> > modern technology. The last vestige of manual telegraphy began being
> > phased out in the maritime service in 1988 when the International
> > Maritime Organization adopted the Global Maritime Distress and Safety
> > System (GMDSS).
> >
> > In the 1990's, countries around the world began closing down their
> > distress 500 kHz calling frequency watch which had been in use since
> > 1912. The final 500 kHz message sent by the U.S. Coast Guard took
> > place from station NMN (Chesapeake Virginia) on April 1, 1995, and they
> > no longer monitor the frequency.
>
> Most radio amateurs are not on ships.

So the validity of having a trained morse pool even 20 years ago
wasn't or shouldn't have been because other services used morse.
Interesting, did you make that comment when no-code was first proposed?

> > Even though the commercial world eliminated Morse code as a
> > communications medium many years ago, it has continued on the Amateur
> > bands because manual Morse proficiency was an international Amateur
> > Service requirement when operating on spectrum under 30 MHz.
>
> There is no requirement that any radio amateur actually use Morse code.
Radio
> amateurs use it by choice.

The statement isn't one of USE, it is based on a prior
international requirement...now gone, dead, caput, finito, over.

> Other services are constrained by considerations of cost, particularly
labor
> cost. They consider elimination of the need for a skilled radio operator
to be
> progress. Amateurs do not.

You speak for "all" amateurs? Perhaps you should have said "some"
amateurs. In any case, learning morse does have a cost to each
and every amateur that does so. I see no reason to "mandate"
that cost upfront for access to amateur radio.

> To most other radio services, radio is but a means to an end, not an end
in
> itself. Amateur radio, by contrast, is radio for its own sake.

So?

> > II. Telegraphy requirement in the Amateur Service
> >
> > There are many communications modes and emissions available to the
> > radio amateur and manual CW is just another one that certainly deserves
> > no special priority. The amateur radio operator examination process
> > does not require a practical demonstration in the ability to use any
> > other mode - even though more than a thousand modes and emissions are
> > available to the Amateur Service.
>
> Except for single sideband radiotelphony, none of those other modes
approaches
> Morse code in popularity on the amateur bands below 30 MHz.

The point still comes back to the fact that NO other mode
requires any skill test. It is that simple.

> > The international law previously required unspecified proficiency in
> > the International Morse code when the operation takes place in the
> > medium or high frequency bands. Because of technological advances,
> > this regulation has become inconsistent with the goals of the Amateur
> > Service since it provides a barrier to otherwise qualified individuals

> > who wish to experiment and communicate below 30 MHz. There can be no
> > doubt that the Morse code proficiency requirements have constituted an
> > unnecessary and artificial impediment to fuller use of the Amateur
> > Radio Service for many potential and existing amateurs.
>
> The removal of the code test requirement for amateur licenses above 30 MHz
has
> not resulted in a technological revolution in amateur radio on those
> frequencies. There is no reason to expect one below 30 MHz.

I never bought any great significance to that argument either.

> > It appears that the reason that many (no-code) Technician amateurs are
> > not upgrading to license classes that require telegraphy suggests that
> > the Morse code requirement may be a significant barrier.
>
> > III. Morse code testing is a burden to the applicant
> >
> > It should be noted that while today's personal computers can easily
> > send and receive telegraphy, the international Morse code "sent by hand
> > and received by ear" requirement continued as a worldwide fundamental
> > requirement for an amateur operator license until the recent actions by
> > the International Telecommunications Union.
> >
> > The taking of the telegraphy examination is an unnecessary burden upon
> > the applicant. Experience has shown that it is more often than not a
> > very stressful experience for the examinee. With the elimination of
> > the international requirement for skill in manual telegraphy, there is
> > no longer any reasonable justification for requiring an applicant to
> > demonstrate this antiquated skill.
> >
> > It is one that must be acquired through rote memorization of the
> > character meanings of some 43 combinations of audible dots and dashes:
> > 26 letters of the alphabet, numerals 0 through 9, four punctuation
> > marks and three characters unique to CW. This must be followed by
> > numerous practice sessions until the necessary skill is achieved. Most
> > applicants, once they pass the code exam, never use the mode on the
> > amateur airwaves. And many, perhaps most, could not pass it again if
> > required to do so.
>
> Written tests are a burden to the applicants, too.

Are YOU proposing an end to written tests?

> Most radio amateurs do not construct or repair their own equipment, yet
they
> are required to know something about how it works.

Because they "can" if they wanted to. If a non-coded ham gets
on the air to learn using morse with another ham...what's the probably
harm to others and or anyone compared to constructing or repairing
equipment themselves?

> > While it continues to serve some amateur operators well, as it did in
> > the early days of radio, it is now but one of many modes available to
> > amateur operators. The lack of interest in CW has turned many
> > prospective amateur operators away from the Amateur Service. IV.
> > Morse proficiency is not an indication of a quality operator
> >
> > Some amateurs believe that the effort and sacrifice needed to learn
> > Morse code indicates a more dedicated and, therefore, a better
> > candidate for Amateur Radio. No evidence exists, however, that
> > supports a relationship between manual telegraphy proficiency and the
> > quality, desirability or motivation of the operator.
>
> However, it should be noted that most of the Commission's enforcement
actions
> for poor and illegal operating practices such as jamming,
obscenity/profanity,
> failure to identify, operation outside of license privileges and failure
to
> heed bandplans are against amateurs using voice modes, not Morse code or
> digital modes.

More because saying "FU" via code isn't likly to be listened to by
any non-coded ham or non-ham.

> > What the Morse code licensing requirement does do, however, is to
> > greatly reduce the number of applicants operating in the medium and
> > high frequencies. Many people question why an individual with vast
> > knowledge in the electronics field should be excluded from operating on
> > HF spectrum due to a personal disinterest in the Morse code.
> >
> > Continuing the use of Morse code proficiency as a means with which to
> > gauge "quality" or to limit the number of amateur radio operators
> > accessing public spectrum is certainly at odds with the FCC's mandate
> > to promote the wider use of radio and its commitment to the use of
> > emerging technologies.
> >
> > V. Morse proficiency should not be required to operate in the voice
mode
> >
> > It appears that most amateurs want to communicate in the voice mode.
> > It makes no sense from a regulatory perspective to require radio
> > amateurs to be Morse proficient when the greater majority of radio
> > amateurs do not desire to use that mode and there is no regulatory
> > reason for them to do so.
>
> Since most amateurs do not desire to build their own equipment.....

Are you proposing not allowing hams to build their own?

> > The future of Amateur Radio encompasses many modes undreamed of just a
> > few years ago. Although manual telegraphy is a noble part of the
> > Amateur Radio's past, it is no longer the prime emission mode.

> >
> > In short, the Commission should ensure that the amateur examination
> > elements are appropriate for the types of operation that will be
> > performed by the licensee.
>
> Following this logic, the written exams should be stripped of anything a
> licensee does not have an interest in.

ZIP - false, since any one subject CAN be ingnored and the test
applicant can still pass. Not so with the separate morse
test element.

> > VI. An unnecessary burden upon the VEC system
> >
> > The administration of a CW examination imposes an unnecessary burden
> > upon the VE teams who must prepare and administer the CW examinations.
> > It requires extensive preparation and special equipment to prepare and
> > administer properly. It is often disruptive and unsettling to those
> > other examinees who are taking one of the written examinations within
> > the same room.
> >
> > Under 97.507(d), the VEs must prepare and record a series of messages
> > sufficient to preclude any one message from becoming known to the
> > examinees. Each message must contain every one of the 43 telegraphy
> > characters at least once during period of at least 5 minutes. At the
> > prescribed speed of 5 words per minute, and at the prescribed 5
> > characters per word, the message is little more than 25 words in
> > length. In practice, it is a difficult task to compose a realistic
> > message under these limitations. It is also an unnecessary burden upon
> > the coordinating VECs since most of them also prepare telegraphy
> > examinations for their VE teams.
> >
> > VII. An unnecessary burden upon the amateur service community
> >
> > The amateur service community suffers from the loss to its ranks of a
> > large number of potentially excellent operators who are turned away
> > because of the CW requirement. Either because of lack of the requisite
> > aptitude for sending and receiving CW or because of an unwillingness to
> > spend the time acquiring a skill for which they find of no value to
> > them, they forego becoming amateur operators.
>
> Yet the growth in amateur radio from 1990 to 2000, when there were both
medical
> waivers and a nocodetest license, was almost identical to that from 1980
to
> 1990, when all amateur licenses required code tests and there were no
waivers..

Again, I don't care about or argue the growth side of it.

> > VIII. An unnecessary burden upon the FCC
> >
> > Now that the international (treaty) Morse code requirement is optional,
> > the FCC can expect to receive numerous requests for waivers of the
> > Morse code examination due to applicant hearing and other medical
> > conditions in order to be compliant with the Americans with
> > Disabilities Act (ADA).
>
> Yet it was not compliance with the ADA that resulted in medical waivers
for the
> 13 and 20 wpm code tests.

If it hadn't happened otherwise, the ADA would have entered the
picture by now.

> > When there were multiple code tests, the FCC cited the international
> > (treaty) requirement, as the reason that the five word-per-minute code
> > test could not be waived. This case no longer applies and the FCC will
> > have to develop procedures to guide both themselves and the VECs/VEs in
> > handling requests for code exam waivers that are certain to come.
> >
> > Dealing with requests for a waiver of the code exam could create an
> > unnecessary burden on the FCC and VECs/VEs and consume an excessive
> > amount of time and resources. It seems illogical to require all
> > amateur examinees to pass a requirement that could be waived by the
> > actions of a physician. History has shown that physician-initiated
> > waiver requests have been very controversial in the Amateur Service.
>
> By this logic, the written tests will also be a target of waiver actions.
For
> example, profoundly deaf people are currently required to study for exams
which
> include numerous questions on SSB and other voice modes even though there
is
> little chance they will ever use those modes.

Pure speculation and, IMHO, not likly to ever happen.

> > IX. World Administrative Radio Conference 2003
> >
> > The only changes made to the international Amateur Service regulations
> > over the last 75 years concern the frequency above which amateurs may
> > operate without Morse testing. At their Washington, DC conference in
> > 1927, the ITU (then called the International Telegraph Union) allocated
> > frequency bands to the various radio services and established operating
> > guidelines and operator qualifications. It was deemed important that
> > Amateurs prove an ability to transmit and receive communications in
> > Morse signals since, at the time, radiotelegraphy was the primary means
> > of long range communication.
> >
> > Since then, the administrations comprising International
> > Telecommunication Union have reviewed and voted to relax the Amateur

> > Service's mandatory Morse proficiency requirement at every
> > international conference capable of doing so.
> >
> > In 1947 (Atlantic City), the ITU agreed that Morse proficiency should
> > only be required when the operation took place on frequencies below
> > 1000 MHz (1 GHz.) At WARC-59, the 1959 World Administrative Radio
> > Conference, this level dropped to 144 MHz. A further reduction was
> > made at WARC-79 to 30 MHz. Consequently, up until recently, Article
> > S25.5 3 read: 25.5 3. 1) Any person seeking a license to
> > operate the apparatus of an amateur station shall prove that he is able
> > to send correctly by hand and to receive correctly by ear, texts in
> > Morse code signals. The administrations concerned may, however, waive
> > this requirement in the case of stations making use exclusively of
> > frequencies above 30 MHz.
> >
> > At WRC-2003, the international Radio Regulation Article S25.5 3 was
> > revised to make the Morse code testing requirement a matter for each
> > licensing administration to decide for itself. Effective July 5, 2003,
> > Article S25.5 3 reads: 25.5 3. 1) Administrations shall
> > determine whether or not a person seeking a license to operate an
> > amateur station shall demonstrate the ability to send and receive texts
> > in Morse code signals.
> >
> > X. Summary of NCVEC proposal to end Morse testing
> >
> > The attached appendix contains a list of the rules that must be amended
> > if Morse code examinations are to be discontinued. These amendments
> > propose merely to end the manual telegraphy examination and to permit
> > Technician Class operators the same frequency privileges as those
> > enjoyed by Technician Class operators who have passed a code exam.
> >
> > Therefore, the foregoing considered, NCVEC, the National Conference of
> > Volunteer Examiner Coordinators, respectfully requests that the
> > Commission issue a Notice of Proposed Rule Making at any early date,
> > proposing the rule changes set forth herein, and in the appendix
> > attached hereto.
> >
> > Respectfully submitted,
> >
> > NCVEC, National Conference of VECs
> > P.O. Box 565101, Dallas, Texas 75356
>
> This proposal simply drops Element 1 without making any other changes.
Oddly
> enough, if it were adopted, Technicians would gain a bit of 10 meter SSB.
Most
> of the privileges Technicians would gain would be slices of 80, 40, 15 and
10
> meter CW.

Start simple...then, if it makes sense, look at the overall licensing levels, etc. Makes sense to me.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

116. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 13:04:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F2BB6FF.3010501@adelphia.net>
Source record: 73530
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Yep, As I was aware of that. And I never expected them to change for me at
> the last minute. BUT, I do believe that with enough warning ahead of time
> it should be considered more than fair for a VE team to make an adjustment.
> It should be no problem for a VEC to be able to send via code practice
> oscillator!!!!!! Wouldn't that be a shame if the VEC's have become so lazy
> they can't even send a code test via a key because they are relying on the
> code CD's and tapes.

It's certainly possible, but in this day and age, I could see prospective amateur one complaining that the custom test was too easy or too hard, or complaining that he or she wanted to take the test from a CD instead of a real person, or some other such.

Almost all of us can handle the standard test methods.

The rest can be accomodated for.

Over the course of my testing, I took tests at 4 different places: Williamsport PA, Butler PA, State College PA, and Lock Haven PA. ALL the VE teams were extremely helpful and accomodating. Those who knew of my hearing problem when I took Element 1 (twice, cuz I flunked the first time) were just great. The first time I took the test, they were more bothered by my failing it than I was, and the second time, I spoke to one of the VE's beforehand, and he outlined the different methods I might use, and explained the lengths they were capable of going to to accomodate my needs.

I just want to point this out, because the tone of you letter sounds like you think that VE's are some sort of ossified "my way or the highway" people. They aren't.

- Mike KB3EIA -

117. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 13:07:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2BB70E.1E4BD7ED@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73532

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >After all
> >those changes, where are the "fresh new ideas?" What are we doing now
>
> Simple, the old-timers are not interested in new ideas.

Your statement is not substantiated by fact.

> One example would be holding on to Morse code and pressuring new Hams > to learn Morse code and excluding those that don't want to learn Morse > code.

The first part of your statement is not "an example" at all. Morse code has demonstrated its usefulness and is still widely used in amateur radio. Someone might "hold on" to morse code and be very active with newer modes or might be involved in electronic circuit design.

The second part of your statement, the one about pressuring new Hams to learn morse code is unsubstantiated by fact. Some new hams don't want to learn morse code and don't. Some new hams find the world of HF radio exciting and want to participate. They learn morse code. Some new hams find HF interesting and have decided to "wait it out" in hopes that there'll be no morse testing in the future.

The third part of your statement, dealing with the exclusion of those who don't want to learn morse code, is unsubstantiated by fact. What evidence can you present to support your claim? From what would these folks be excluded? You've participated in meetings. You've been part of operating events. How have you been excluded?

> Another example is most
> old timers want to just make random contacts and are not interested in > the technical aspects of the hobby.

How do you know what "most old timers" do and what they are not interested in? I know old timers who are very technically inclined and I know others who participate in nets and who keep weekly or daily skeds. Those are not "random contacts".

> I have proposed new ideas, projects, etc. I didn't say I just want > others to do those projects for me. I would help with those projects - > if there were interest. I have asked to volunteer for those types of > activities on several occasions. The old-timers in the club are NOT > interested in those types of activities.

Nothing precludes you from tackling projects which interest you. "Old timers" might not be interested in the particular projects you've proposed. They might not be interested in such as group activities. A third alternative is that your personality grates on them.

> However, they will put extra effort into teaching code classes to
> get people to operate Morse code.

Operate or learn? All of them, en masse put in extra effort or just some of them put in extra effort? Why do you object if someone desires to do something which is different than what you desire?

> Don't blame the newcomers - its the old-timers that want to keep
> things as they are.

First you'll have to come to an understanding of what it is which "old timers" want before you begin to lecture us or them from your rather shallow pool of knowledge on the subject.

Dave K8MN

118. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 13:10:18 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bggd7jmcm1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73533

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BB509D30.1FCF0%stewart@say.net...
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
> >
> > First off, I don't think I've ever said "dumbed
> > down". If you know I have, post the reference.
>
>
> You've agreed with Brian and 'dumbed down" were his words.
>
>
> > I do not consider the Morse Code to be *any
> > test of intelligence or desirability whatsoever.
> >
> > What I do consider it is a method of ensuring
> > that the person actually wants to be in the
> > service. It is a measure of inclusivity, not
> > exclusivity. Kind of like learning to parallel
> > park or do a three point turn.
>
>
> That ridiculous, Mike. Surely you must be joking. That premise is absurd
> at its very core. It's basically saying nearly half the Hams today, those
> without code skills, didn't actually want to be involved in Ham Radio -
that
> all their money invested in radio equipment and efforts invested in
> activities were done because they didn't really want any of this. And
that,
> in the end, only a code test will prove they actually did want it. If I
> didn't think you were serious, I'd be laughing at this point.
>
>
> > (snip) We do already have indications of what
> > the spectrum of behaviors are. Right now, those
> > who favor less knowledge have the upper hand.
>
>
> Okay, now I'm laughing. Where are all those people who have the upper
hand
> (the ones who favor less knowledge)? There must be many thousands of them
if
> they have the upper hand. I've been involved with Ham Radio for a number
of
> years now and I have yet to hear all those people advocating less

knowledge
> about Ham Radio. I haven't seen any web sites stating that goal. I've
never
> talked to a person on the radio who has stated that goal. If these people
> actually exist, they must be the most secret group in America.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

That's because you won't hear it anywhere but here--as whining, Dwight.
With the exception of a few on this newsgroup, the participants in this
newsgroup are very out of touch with ham radio...

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

119. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 13:11:55 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bggdalmdu1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73534

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308011927.9e0b560@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bgdj98$1hk7$1@adenine.netfront.net>...
>
> >
> > I remember a long time ago in this newsgroup, accusing some of using the
CW
> > test as a filtering tool. I was nearly lambasted to Timbuktu. Now,
it's
> > popular and OK to just make the declaration!
> >
> > If CW is used as a "filter" to keep anyone of the ARS; then it's plain
> > wrong.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Aaron Jones was keeping the "Morse Myths" list. That one was probably
> in the top ten.
>

I wouldn't give the character "Aaron Jones" an ounce or less of
credibility...

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

120. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 13:14:21 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bggdf6mgc1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73535

Hey, Floyd!!! Wow, you got Dickie going!! LOL

Kim W5TIT

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bgfbd1$g37$0@208.206.142.103...
>
>
> Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> > >being made so easy? I'll say it again-the only thing preventing
wholsale change
> > >in ham radio toward the exact same thing that happened to CB is the
code test.
> > >When that's gone, ham radio is on a steeper part of the slippery slope.
> > >
> > >BTW I held CB callsign KIQ8934, c. 1970.
> >
> > Well ain't that just sweet. And you are the twit that accuses
> > _others_ of coming from 27 MHz. You're little more than a
> > flaming hypocrite of the first order. A CB retreated loser.
> >
>
> Hey, it's Frozen Floyd!!! How's things up there north of the North pole,
Gud
> Buddie??? Shootin' lots of skip on the upper side these days? Sure must
be
> awful, having to slither through all that permafrost getting NO sleep in
all the wall
> tyo wall daylight! Life's a bitch and then you die!
>
> Yep, Gud Buddie, I was there at the very beginning, even before the
beginning, when
> 11 meters was a fullfledged ham band. But it sure wasn't used much and -
> like I said- I knew no ham who lamented it's reassignment, in fact most
hams I knew
> thought it a neat idea. We liked radio and knew some ordianry folds
> who used CB would get to liking it too, and become hams, especially if us
hams got on
> CB-with licnses, of course- and talked them into it. And that was the way
it worked,
> for a time. Then the scabs came and ran out the normal folk....
>
> An would you believe there's more? In the winter of 1958, as a student I

and the
> gentleman I worked part time for *built* a pair of CB sets to use in his
business.
> Yes, BUILT them, from an article in Popular Electronics. He (a ham also)
ordered the
> parts and we put them together like kits. All very legal and above board
at that
> time. There were NO commercial CB sets yet on the market.
>
> But hey, you missed all this! You weren't even licensed as a ham 'til
1960, and from
> your postings, you never were active enough to know what went on. even
then.
> So I suppose we'll just have to POOF! blow you off like the rest of the
lightweights.
> All talk and no walk, that's our snakey friend from the frozen north. Must
be a real
> pain slithering you way across the frozen tundra. But carry on! You can do
it!
>
>
>
> >
> > And regardless of how silly all of your other arguments are,
> > such as your statement that you knew of no hams that lamented
> > the loss of 11 meters, your claim that the difference between CB
> > and Amateur Radio is the *code test*, is utterly absurd.
> >
> > The difference is having an *appropriate* *technical* *test*
> > that pertains to what the Amateur Radio Service is today.
>
> So you think there's a technical test involved in ham radio licensing
today?
> Really? Have you even seen a test lately? The question pools which not
only
> give all the questions with their exact answers, till recently they even
listed the
> answers in the same order in the pool that they appeared in the tests.
Some technical
> test! No surprise that so many new hams today are not literate at all on
the material
> ton which they were just tested. No one ever said the tests, especially
the entry
> levels need be difficult nor cover that much technical material, but what
we have
> today is simply a sham. And you should know it, but clearly do not.
>
>
>
> > In

> > 1960 when I was first licensed a code test was most certainly a
> > valid part of such an appropriate test, but it hasn't been now
> > for 20 years at least.
> >
>
> Opinions are like noses, everyone has one. Yoiurs doesn't smell any better
than that
> of anyone else.
>
>
>
> >
> > All you are is a narrow minded bigot that wants a play pen that
> > elevates you to king of the sand box and keeps other who might
> > challenge you out.
> >
>
> Dare I note that you're an ignoramous of the first magnitude? Yes I dare,
in fact I
> 'll state it unambiguously and most forcefully. It's rare that you'll ever
encounte
> another ham who has been personally responsible for so many hams becoming
licensed.
> of ALL classes, including many codeless techs. Not only did I do this
willingly, I
> did it voluntarily and for the most part eagerly. On Tuesday night after
our test
> session I always stayed up until all the paperwork was finalized and
ready to drop
> into the post office first thing next morning on my way to work at 6.
> Need I say I never got more than a very few hours sleep on those workweek
nights?
> Have you done any of that Frosty Floyd?
>
> So now you're working to get a "remote licensing" system for the Alaska
outback.
> Wunnerful! That'll never be compromised, I'm sure!
>
>
>
>
> >
> > I held a commercial telegraph license, and worked for a company
> > that actually paid (other) people to operate CW, but the last
> > commercial CW operation was *decades* ago now. And that is
> > exactly when the code requirement for the Amateur Radio Service
> > should have been removed.
>
> Floyd, you really need to move down to the lower 48 where you can try to
stay in

> contact with realty. The US Coast Guard dropped the Maritime 500khz wartch
four years
> ago. There is still commercial CW in many places in the world, not that it
matters to
> us hams. If you really think that CW in ham radio is dead, well you should
try
> turning on a HF receiver at once in your lifetime and tune it down to the
lowe end of
> any HF band, assuming you can find one. Surprise, surprise!
>
>
>
> >
> >
> > Now, why don't you just slide back under the 27 MHz rock that
> > you slithered out from, dick.
> >
>
> Well Frosty, I was there and watched the rock form.
>
> Get back to us when you learn something.
>

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

121. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 13:16:38 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bggdjgmjf1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73536

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BB50ABC6.1FCF3%stewart@say.net...
>
> Further, to clarify another issue, my comments about excluding people
> applied only to the idea of using license requirements solely in an effort
> to exclude - I didn't introduce that premise, those specifically
advocating
> the exclusion of others did. If you're one of those people, and those are
> your ideals, I don't really care to know who you're proud of or respect.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

HOOWAHH, Dwight. Yessirreee, that is *exactly* on target!

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

122. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 13:17:34 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bggdl7mor1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73537

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bgfeqo$n1d$0@208.206.142.111...
>
>
> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> > Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> > > >being made so easy? I'll say it again-the only thing preventing
wholsale change
> > > >in ham radio toward the exact same thing that happened to CB is the
code test.
> > > >When that's gone, ham radio is on a steeper part of the slippery
slope.
> > > >
> > > >BTW I held CB callsign KIQ8934, c. 1970.
> > >
> > > Well ain't that just sweet. And you are the twit that accuses
> > > _others_ of coming from 27 MHz. You're little more than a
> > > flaming hypocrite of the first order. A CB retreated loser.
> > >
> >
> > Hey, it's Frozen Floyd!!!
>
> One thing more, you flaming nincompoop- the ONLY reason I hang out here is
to
> counter the misinformation dished out by phoney dingalings like you. For
sure there are
> more fun ways to spend my retirement, but I will not allow the likes of
you to by the
> only resource for the new and future hams reading here. They deserve
better- MUCH better.
>

Imagine that. Dick Carroll out to "save the world."
BWAHHAHHHAHHAAAHAHAHAAA

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

123. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 13:21:01 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bggdro$ms3$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73538

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bgff71nqf0@208.206.142.111...
>
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> >
> > Further, to clarify another issue, my comments about excluding people
> > applied only to the idea of using license requirements solely in an
effort
> > to exclude - I didn't introduce that premise, those specifically
advocating
> > the exclusion of others did.
>
> Right you are, Dwight. The FCC did - way back about 1912
> (actually their predecessors)
>
> ALL licenses exclude those who don't meet the qualifications, and include
those
> who do. Why else would they exist?
>

You can't purr like a kitten in one thread, Dick, then turn around and lose control in another. The premise being discouraged here is that the CW test would be seen by some as a way to keep *unwanted* people out of ham radio--not just people in general.

I would suspect that there are many nitwits in this newsgroup who support the idea of CW testing being a good way to keep someone, like me for example, out of the ARS. Their idea is a waste of time, of course because a) I am a coded ham, and b) CW testing does nothing to keep creeps out of the ARS. I won't mention to you how I know that.

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

124. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 13:30:28 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bggedonal1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73539

"Rob Kemp" <robkemp90210@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:6114e4af.0308012045.b54018e@posting.google.com...
> Quote from the American Public Power Association; "the burden should
> be imposed on challengers to BPL to demonstrate interference in a
> fact-based, empirical proof. Further, to the extent that interference
> is demonstrated, there should be an attempt to accommodate BPL, even
> if it means that existing communications providers may have to share
> or transfer bandwidth."
>
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287496
>

Well, in the worst case scenario, APP is exactly right. We *will* have to
make adjustments. Here's my thought: this is going to happen time and time
again. Frequencies are prime real estate right now and will get even moreso
in the future. This is not going to go away.

>
> Critical everyone submits a reply comment ASAP.
>

I guess you're making the assumption that everyone who is a ham would be
against this? Or, are you really being that generous where it's a "everyone
should have their voice thing?"

>
> To file, go here;
> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi
> "Proceeding" field, enter "03-104"
> "Document Type" select "Reply to comments"
>
> Links for the key filings (pro BPL and anti BPL) are here;
> http://www.arrl.org/~ehare/rfi/plc/BPL_NOI_hyperlinks.html
>
> Good reply examples are below;
> Notes
> You can cut paste - key is the comments you submit represent your
> thoughts.
> You can also reply to support comments i.e. the ARRL comments have
> your support.
>

Good idea. Make everyone think uniformly...yeah, that's the ticket! On the
other hand, those who have no idea what BPL may be about, what impacts it
has, etc., will be "following" something they have no idea about. Maybe BPL
is a bad thing for ham radio, but maybe it's a good thing for us as a whole.

Do I want to accommodate ham radio, or the rest of my fellow citizens and what this may do for them? What alternatives would the commercial interests have to BPL technology, and how much would that cost us?

Gosh, those are just a few questions people may encounter, and I am probably now going to be lambasted for thinking about the majority...LOL what a concept.

Kim W5TIT

>
> Andrew Leeds - response to UPLC
>
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514288117
>
> Lee McVey - response to Amperion
>
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287923
>
> Nickolaus E. Leggett - response to NA Shortwave Association
>
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287539
>
> Cortland Richmond - response to PowerWan
>
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287407
>
> Lee McVey - response to UPLC
>
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287392
>
> Cortland Richmond - response to Florida Light and Power
>
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287386
>
> Arthur Guy - response to ARRL
>
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287323
>
> Good general comments
>
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287303
>
> Ashley Lane - response to Ameren
>
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287129
>
> Nickolaus E. Leggett - response to ARRL
>
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287007
>

> Cortland Richmond - response to Southern Linc
>
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514286932
>
> Nickolaus E. Leggett - response to National Academy of Science
>
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514286161
>
> Nickolaus E. Leggett - response to Amateur Radio Research and
> Development Corp.
>
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514286102
>
> Lawrence Macioski - response to ARRL
>
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514083272
>
> Robert Read - response to ARRL
>
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514082900
>
> "Mike Ro Farad" <MRF@muffled.com> wrote in message
news:<i3AWa.19213$ff.18880@fed1read01>...
> > > Keep it calm, rational, and polite, please, for all of our sakes.
> >
> > Great advice Carl, also good advice for this news group --
> > Let's exhibit a quality image of Amateur Radio
> > 10-67 10-67 10-67 10-67 10-67 10-67 10-4?
> >
> > Millie Am Pair for OM Mike Ro Farad
> >
> >
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > news:iKzWa.2315$lL.372712@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > > Today the Ed Thomas, Chief of the FCC's Office of Engineering
> > > and Technology, issued an order extending the Reply Comment
> > > period in ET Docket No. 03-104 (BPL) until August 20, 2003.
> > >
> > > Remember, paper filed comments are due at the correct address
> > > by COB on the deadline day, electronic comments via the ECFS
> > > have until midnight at the end of the deadline day.
> > >
> > > FOLKS ... if you are going to comment, PLEASE don't "flame"
> > > the FCC or the proponents of BPL ... just cite facts (the ARRL's
> > > comments and the excellent technical analysis done by Ed Hare
> > > are full of them ...).
> > >
> > > Flaming will hurt us more than it will help us.
> > >

> > > Keep it calm, rational, and polite, please, for all of our sakes.
> > >
> > > 73,
> > > Carl - wk3c
> > >

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

125. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 13:38:15 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2BBE55.E45133EA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73540

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > > > > > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > > > > > > . You know as well as anyone, better than most, that almost the
> only
> > > > > > > > "enforcement" we've had on the ARS for many years
> > > > > > > > prior to Riley's appointment WAS the code test.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Now, a 'difficult' (for that type of individual) test which
> discourages,
> > > > > > > > yea, FILTERS him from active, open participation is a poor
> > > > > > > > excuse for monitor vans and well trained and equipped crews.
> > > > > > > > But it's what we had.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Now we have Riley and a 5wpm code test. Soon only Riley. When
> he goes, I
> > > > > > > > for one believe the ARS will follow his exit, not far behind. By
> that time
> > > > > > > > there
> > > > > > > > will be far more than adequate evidence that the ARS is no
> longer a viable
> > > > > > > > self- policing entity, staffed with conscientious people willing
> and able to
> > > > > > > > conduct themselves in a manner commensurate with the priveleges
> granted,
> > > > > > > > most of which will shortly be summarily withdrawn.
>
> Dick,
>
> EVERY time there has been change of any real sort in ham radio, there
> have been cranky olde fartz like you preaching "end of the world" doom
> and gloom ... and every time it has not come to pass ...
>
> Witness:
>
> conversion from spark to CW;
> conversion from AM to SSB;
> introduction of packet radio and other "new-fangled @^#%$ computer
> thingies";
> the introduction of the no-code Tech license;
> restructuring 3 years ago;
>
> and many others I'm sure I've omitted.

The conversion of Saint Carl?

> The point is, the world (and ham radio) is NOT going to end ... despite
> your rants that it is.
>
> Actually, on the contrary, if these changes hadn't happened and we were
> still stuck in the spark era (i.e., if cranky olde fartz like you had
> stopped
> the progress of ham radio over the years), we WOULD be in danger.

You aren't much younger than I am, Carl. You just haven't been involved in amateur radio as long. Further, you remained a tech for a couple of decades until the morse testing speed was dropped. Since that time, you've become an HF SSB op. This latest rant shows you to be as cranky as anyone else here.

> If you want to see what presents the biggest danger to the future of
> ham radio LOOK IN THE MIRROR ... the enemy you fear is yourself,
> with your backward thinking, unwillingness to accept progress, and lack
> of tolerance for newcomers (unless, of course, they've suffered through
> the same fraternity hazing rituals that you had to endure, lo those many
> years ago and think in exactly the backward, narrowminded ways that
> you do).
>
> When you're done looking in the mirror, you can look a your cronies,
> Larry, Dave Heil, and the whole list of like-thinkers... they are also
> part of the enemy you fear ... for they think and act essentially the
> same way as you do.

I note that you've reverted to your original "Big Mouth Carl" persona, Squiggy. The leopard does not change his spots, even if they fade and his coat begins to look a little worn and thin in places. Your tirade includes some tired and quite familiar terms like "fraternity hazing rituals", "suffered" and "endure", "backward" and "narrowminded".

> THERE is where the REAL danger to the future of ham radio lies ...
> in people who are so married to/stuck in its past that they despise
> any thought of change, progress, and the newcomers that it will
> bring (unless the newcomers are acceptable "clones" cast in your
> own image).

I submit that you don't really know where the "REAL" danger to the future of ham radio lies. Simply lowering requirements and standards is not "progress" in anyone's book. Newcomers have always been welcomed if they're good ops. A lid is a lid and we already have enough of them.

> However, those newcomers are the future of ham radio ... for us older
> guys will surely die, and if there aren't younger folks to replace us ham
> radio will die with us.

There have always been newcomers in amateur radio. Old timers always die and newcomers always arrive. Newcomers may be the future (a great many newcomers have gray hair) but we're the present, not the past. The future has not yet arrived. Even you don't know what the future holds,

as much as you'd like to see yourself as a visionary.

> It's up to us to WELCOME and ENCOURAGE
> them ... their ways will not be the ways of the past ... things change and
> nobody can freeze time.

I welcome and encourage them. Some of them will become good ops. Some
won't.

> But insulting, berating, demeaning them, and trying
> to keep them out is not the way ...

I'm not insulting, berating or demeaning them. I might insult, berate
and demean you but not them. Newcomers aren't required to take
responsibility for you.

> Think about these things long and hard before you look yourself in
> the mirror again ... without some reflection, reconsideration, and change
> in your ways, you may not like what you see ... the enemy that is YOU.

I'll take your sermon to heart about the time you begin telling us of
your own soul searching, reflection and reconsideration of opinions
which are unlike your own. Let us know if you like what you see.

> (Try to be *completely* like Scrooge ... go through the change, don't > stay stuck in the
first part ...)

Quit rattling your chains and moaning.

Dave K8MN

126. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 13:43:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F2BC015.5010506@adelphia.net>
Source record: 73541

Hey Kim, I didn't get his post for some reason

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> news:BB509D30.1FCF0%stewart@say.net...
>
>>"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>>
>>>First off, I don't think I've ever said "dumbed
>>>down". If you know I have, post the reference.
>>
>>
>> You've agreed with Brian and 'dumbed down" were his words.

Not my words! Come on, Dwight. We can discuss these things, but don't
put words in my mouth! Or my fingers or keyboard or whatever.

>>> I do not consider the Morse Code to be *any
>>>test of intelligence or desirability whatsoever.
>>>
>>>What I do consider it is a method of ensuring
>>>that the person actually wants to be in the
>>>service. It is a measure of inclusivity, not
>>>exclusivity. Kind of like learning to parallel
>>>park or do a three point turn.
>>
>>
>> That ridiculous, Mike. Surely you must be joking. That premise is absurd
>>at its very core. It's basically saying nearly half the Hams today, those
>>without code skills, didn't actually want to be involved in Ham Radio -
>> that all their money invested in radio equipment and efforts invested in
>>activities were done because they didn't really want any of this. And
>> that,in the end, only a code test will prove they actually did want it. If I
>>didn't think you were serious, I'd be laughing at this point.

Gee Dwight, I can see that you are pretty good at extrapolating all
kinds of stuff. All those technicians are working at a level that they
are comfortable with. They have passed the tests they need to pass.

>>>(snip) We do already have indications of what
>>>the spectrum of behaviors are. Right now, those
>>>who favor less knowledge have the upper hand.
>>
>>
>> Okay, now I'm laughing. Where are all those people who have the upper
>> hand(the ones who favor less knowledge)? There must be many thousands of them.

There are. They are NCI and the people who want the code test eradicated. And it appears they have been successful. And please don't try to differentiate between Morse Code as a skill and Morse code as knowledge. No one sounds smart trying to make that argument.

- Mike KB3EIA -

127. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 13:48:22 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bggffa$o9p$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73542

"Rob Kemp" <robkemp90210@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:6114e4af.0308012045.b54018e@posting.google.com...
>
> Good reply examples are below;
> Notes
> You can cut paste - key is the comments you submit represent your
> thoughts.
> You can also reply to support comments i.e. the ARRL comments have
> your support.
>

I looked through the first several. Of those, this is the one I like the
best:

>
> Nickolaus E. Leggett - response to NA Shortwave Association
>
http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287539
>

It leaves some things open for debate, as any will. But, out of this comes
my opinion that BPL is probably a risky idea due to the politics of
it--meaning that the power grid for the United States probably should not
become a transmission source for other companies (which would likely be a
step in the future: power companies "renting" their transmission lines for
BPL technology). Sounds like too much regulatory soup to me...

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

128. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 13:48:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F2BC150.20100@adelphia.net>
Source record: 73543

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> news:BB509D30.1FCF0%stewart@say.net...
>
>>"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>>
>>>First off, I don't think I've ever said "dumbed
>>>down". If you know I have, post the reference.
>>
>>
>> You've agreed with Brian and 'dumbed down" were his words.
>>
>>
>>
>>> I do not consider the Morse Code to be *any
>>>test of intelligence or desirability whatsoever.
>>>
>>>What I do consider it is a method of ensuring
>>>that the person actually wants to be in the
>>>service. It is a measure of inclusivity, not
>>>exclusivity. Kind of like learning to parallel
>>>park or do a three point turn.
>>
>>
>> That ridiculous, Mike. Surely you must be joking. That premise is absurd
>>at its very core. It's basically saying nearly half the Hams today, those
>>without code skills, didn't actually want to be involved in Ham Radio -
>
> that
>
>>all their money invested in radio equipment and efforts invested in
>>activities were done because they didn't really want any of this. And
>
> that,
>
>>in the end, only a code test will prove they actually did want it. If I
>>didn't think you were serious, I'd be laughing at this point.
>>
>>
>>
>>>(snip) We do already have indications of what
>>>the spectrum of behaviors are. Right now, those
>>>who favor less knowledge have the upper hand.
>>

>>
>> Okay, now I'm laughing. Where are all those people who have the upper
>
> hand
>
>>(the ones who favor less knowledge)? There must be many thousands of them
>
> if
>
>>they have the upper hand. I've been involved with Ham Radio for a number
>
> of
>
>>years now and I have yet to hear all those people advocating less
>
> knowledge
>
>>about Ham Radio. I haven't seen any web sites stating that goal. I've
>
> never
>
>>talked to a person on the radio who has stated that goal. If these people
>>actually exist, they must be the most secret group in America.
>>
>>
>>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>>
>
>
> That's because you won't hear it anywhere but here--as whining, Dwight.
> With the exception of a few on this newsgroup, the participants in this
> newsgroup are very out of touch with ham radio...

I know many hams who are bothered by this, Kim. They don't participate
in this newsgroup, but they still are concerned. And it really is pretty
hard to argue that complete removal of a test element is not a reduction
in the amount of knowledge needed to pass a test.

- Mike KB3EIA -

129. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 13:52:42 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bggfqioel1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73544

"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
news:871xw4ct7j.fld@barrow.com...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
> >
> >> Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >>
> >> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >> > >being made so easy? I'll say it again-the only thing preventing
wholsale change
> >> > >in ham radio toward the exact same thing that happened to CB is the
code test.
> >> > >When that's gone, ham radio is on a steeper part of the slippery
slope.
> >> > >
> >> > >BTW I held CB callsign KIQ8934, c. 1970.
> >> >
> >> > Well ain't that just sweet. And you are the twit that accuses
> >> > _others_ of coming from 27 MHz. You're little more than a
> >> > flaming hypocrite of the first order. A CB retreated loser.
> >> >
> >>
> >> Hey, it's Frozen Floyd!!!
> >
> >One thing more, you flaming nincompoop- the ONLY reason I hang out here
is to
> >counter the misinformation dished out by phoney dingalings like you. For
sure there are
> >more fun ways to spend my retirement, but I will not allow the likes of
you to by the
> >only resource for the new and future hams reading here. They deserve
better- MUCH better.
>
> You hang out here because you're a hypocrite.
>
> --
> Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
> Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com
>

Well, Floyd, it sounds like you may know Dick personally. I don't know that
for a fact, but it sounds that way. Regardless, I do agree with your
comment that he's a hypocrite.

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

130. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 13:54:10 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgghkn$pu7$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73549

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:M6NWa.15268$Vx2.7735038@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:bgg5nv$no0ns$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > Yep, As I was aware of that. And I never expected them to change for me
> at
> > the last minute. BUT, I do believe that with enough warning ahead of
time
> > it should be considered more than fair for a VE team to make an
> adjustment.
> > It should be no problem for a VEC to be able to send via code practice
> > oscillator!!!!!! Wouldn't that be a shame if the VEC's have become so
> lazy
> > they can't even send a code test via a key because they are relying on
the
> > code CD's and tapes.
> >
> > Where the hell did you think I expected to walk into a test session in
the
> > past, and at the last possible moment expect a major change?
>
> They are supposed to make those provisions. If they did not, they were in
> the wrong. However, I would not favor them using hand sent code with an
> oscillator for two reasons. 1) Oscillators are often not adjustable in
> pitch. 2) Some people who copy quite well have absolutely lousy fists and
> do not send good clean code. It takes a pretty good op to copy some of
the
> people out there.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

And the fluctuation in CW skills is yet another reason to question its
validity as a testing element.

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

131. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 14:04:31 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgggdfrqj0@208.207.71.132>
Source record: 73545

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >
> >> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >> >being made so easy? I'll say it again-the only thing preventing wholsale change
> >> >in ham radio toward the exact same thing that happened to CB is the code test.
> >> >When that's gone, ham radio is on a steeper part of the slippery slope.
> >> >
> >> >BTW I held CB callsign KIQ8934, c. 1970.
> >>
> >> Well ain't that just sweet. And you are the twit that accuses
> >> _others_ of coming from 27 MHz. You're little more than a
> >> flaming hypocrite of the first order. A CB retreated loser.
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Hey, it's Frozen Floyd!!! How's things up there north of the North pole, Gud
> >Buddie??? Shootin' lots of skip on the upper side these days? Sure must be
> >awful, having to slither through all that permafrost getting NO sleep in all the wall
> >tyo wall daylight! Life's a bitch and then you die!
>
> Well gee DICK, no as a matter of fact I'm not much aware of CB and all
> the required vocabulary.
>
> You see, unlike you, I never did use CB.

Yeah, so you say. You say lots of things. Of course you only claim
expertise inlkots of areas where you clearly are a novice. We'e learned to
expect it of you.

>
>
> Now, tell me why anyone would want to pay any attention to what another
> CB'er like you has to say about the ARS?

No surprise you're confused, Frosty. Yes, I know a LOT about CB. I was there
when it started and watched it turn into a cesspool, remember? Yeah we know,
you're the sort who slants everything to suit the agenda of the moment. Slither on.

>
>
> Hey hypocrite, shouldn't we cross post this to a CB group so you'll be
> at home?
>

That simpleton remark says it all. Why should anyone pay any attention to an idiot like you who can't understand simple facts?

132. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 14:05:52 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgggg0rqj1@208.207.71.132>
Source record: 73546

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
> >
> >> Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >>
> >> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >> > >being made so easy? I'll say it again-the only thing preventing wholsale change
> >> > >in ham radio toward the exact same thing that happened to CB is the code test.
> >> > >When that's gone, ham radio is on a steeper part of the slippery slope.
> >> > >
> >> > >BTW I held CB callsign KIQ8934, c. 1970.
> >> >
> >> > Well ain't that just sweet. And you are the twit that accuses
> >> > _others_ of coming from 27 MHz. You're little more than a
> >> > flaming hypocrite of the first order. A CB retreated loser.
> >> >
> >>
> >> Hey, it's Frozen Floyd!!!
> >
> >One thing more, you flaming nincompoop- the ONLY reason I hang out here is to
> >counter the misinformation dished out by phoney dingalings like you. For sure there are
> >more fun ways to spend my retirement, but I will not allow the likes of you to by the
> >only resource for the new and future hams reading here. They deserve better- MUCH
better.
>
> You hang out here because you're a hypocrite.

If that were true- and we'll let the readers decide for themselves-
I wouldn't trade places with an idiot the likes of you.

133. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 14:07:49 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgggjlrqj2@208.207.71.132>
Source record: 73547

Brian Kelly wrote:

> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hiymbv7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> > On 1 Aug 2003 07:00:01 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > >Then they come up with notions like putting chunks of mind-bending
> > >intellectual and political expertise like Arnold to work on leading
> > >'em out of the swamp . .
> >
> > Was Ronnie the Ray-Gun any better ??
>
> Hey I kinda liked his Shiny Pebbles thingies . .
>
> > Hey, was Jerry "Moonbeam" Brown, the professional politician, Yale
> > law school graduate,
>
> YALE? Well, there ya have it . .
>
> > any better?
> >
> > BTW - Arnold declined to run.
>
> Supposedly his XYL put the nix on it because she doesn't want to be
> anywhere near the BS.

Not only that, she's a member of the vaunted Kennedy clan and that would clash here her personal politics.

134. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 14:15:49 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bggh2l$t8l$0@208.207.71.132>
Source record: 73548

N2EY wrote:

> In article <HCzWa.19205$ff.8465@fed1read01>, "Mike Ro Farad" <MRF@muffled.com>
> writes:
>
> >Ask 100 Hams if they have ever been on CB --- 50% will fess up -- and the
> >other 50% are just not telling the truth ---
>
> I've never been on cb. I've listened there, but never transmitted.

The Troll you responded to is obviously just that- a troll.

Most hams today weren't around for the beginning of CB and few have any real knowledge of how things evolved there. Of course many hams *came* from CB, and I know that from multiple sources: for one my many years as a VE. From the early 70's MOST people who wound up as hams first learned of personal communications radio via CB. There's nothing whatever wrong with that, and most of them soon learned about ham radio and quickly saw the attraction, put themselves into learnintg mode and made the switch
. It isn't the hams who started in CB that is the problem, it's the many outlaws who also came from it.
Of course you already know this, but some professed oldtimers posting here clearly do not.

135. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 14:23:43 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bggi7g$pu7$2@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73550

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F2BBE55.E45133EA@earthlink.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
>
> > The point is, the world (and ham radio) is NOT going to end ... despite
> > your rants that it is.
> >
> > Actually, on the contrary, if these changes hadn't happened and we were
> > still stuck in the spark era (i.e., if cranky olde fartz like you had
> > stopped
> > the progress of ham radio over the years), we WOULD be in danger.
>
> You aren't much younger than I am, Carl. You just haven't been involved
> in amateur radio as long. Further, you remained a tech for a couple of
> decades until the morse testing speed was dropped. Since that time,
> you've become an HF SSB op. This latest rant shows you to be as cranky
> as anyone else here.
>

And your notes of Carl's history with ham radio seem at most, perfuntory.
They have nothing to do with the fact that Carl posted his comments to this
thread. Unless you believe that Carl must be exactly equal with you before
you consider any importance to his comments. Does one have to be in ham
radio exactly as long as you, be as old as you, have been on HF SSB and CW
as much as you, before you think they're "worthy?"

> >
> > If you want to see what presents the biggest danger to the future of
> > ham radio LOOK IN THE MIRROR ... the enemy you fear is yourself,
> > with your backward thinking, unwillingness to accept progress, and lack
> > of tolerance for newcomers (unless, of course, they've suffered through
> > the same fraternity hazing rituals that you had to endure, lo those many
> > years ago and think in exactly the backward, narrowminded ways that
> > you do).
> >
> > When you're done looking in the mirror, you can look a your cronies,
> > Larry, Dave Heil, and the whole list of like-thinkers... they are also
> > part of the enemy you fear ... for they think and act essentially the
> > same way as you do.
>
> I note that you've reverted to your original "Big Mouth Carl" persona,
> Squiggy. The leopard does not change his spots, even if they fade and
> his coat begins to look a little worn and thin in places. Your tirade
> includes some tired and quite familiar terms like "fraternity hazing

> rituals", "suffered" and "endure", "backward" and "narrowminded".
>

Those terms are quite appropriately used. Perhaps you like your terms,
better. It's always interesting to note how you quickly change to
name-calling ("Squiggy", "Big Mouth Carl") when you see things you don't
like. Is this another chapter in your book? Go to your library and get a
book on communication--somewhere in there you'll see part where it says that
resorting to name-calling doesn't provide substantiation nor clarification
for thoughts, only provides that the person has nothing more important to do
but resort to infantile pouting.

> >
> > THERE is where the REAL danger to the future of ham radio lies ...
> > in people who are so married to/stuck in its past that they despise
> > any thought of change, progress, and the newcomers that it will
> > bring (unless the newcomers are acceptable "clones" cast in your
> > own image).
>
> I submit that you don't really know where the "REAL" danger to the
> future of ham radio lies. Simply lowering requirements and standards is
> not "progress" in anyone's book. Newcomers have always been welcomed if
> they're good ops. A lid is a lid and we already have enough of them.
>

The requirements have been adjusted (lowered if you like) to accommodate
current trends and shift focus from older technology to newer. The
standards have not been lowered at all.

> >
> > However, those newcomers are the future of ham radio ... for us older
> > guys will surely die, and if there aren't younger folks to replace us
ham
> > radio will die with us.
>
> There have always been newcomers in amateur radio. Old timers always
> die and newcomers always arrive. Newcomers may be the future (a great
> many newcomers have gray hair) but we're the present, not the past. The
> future has not yet arrived. Even you don't know what the future holds,
> as much as you'd like to see yourself as a visionary.
>

In your stumbling around, above, your forgot to leave a point.

>
> > It's up to us to WELCOME and ENCOURAGE
> > them ... their ways will not be the ways of the past ... things change
and
> > nobody can freeze time.
>
> I welcome and encourage them. Some of them will become good ops. Some
> won't.

>

There's a difference between encouraging only those with whom you agree, and encouraging *everyone*. When you say that "standards" have been lowered, you send a message you may not be meaning to send.

> >
> > But insulting, berating, demeaning them, and trying
> > to keep them out is not the way ...
>
> I'm not insulting, berating or demeaning them. I might insult, berate
> and demean you but not them. Newcomers aren't required to take
> responsibility for you.
>

Your messages come across as attempts to insult, berate, and demean, Dave. You are very political in your approach with people here. If someone does not act and think just as you, you assert superiority.

> >
> > Think about these things long and hard before you look yourself in
> > the mirror again ... without some reflection, reconsideration, and
change
> > in your ways, you may not like what you see ... the enemy that is YOU.
>
> I'll take your sermon to heart about the time you begin telling us of
> your own soul searching, reflection and reconsideration of opinions
> which are unlike your own. Let us know if you like what you see.
>
> > (Try to be *completely* like Scrooge ... go through the change, don't >
stay stuck in the first part ...)
>
> Quit rattling your chains and moaning.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

You are quite dislikable, whether you realize it or not. And you do seem to approach life from the comfort zone...

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

136. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 14:40:40 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bggih8eq0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 73551

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> > > > > > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > > > > > . You know as well as anyone, better than most, that almost the
> only
> > > > > > > "enforcement" we've had on the ARS for many years
> > > > > > > prior to Riley's appointment WAS the code test.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Now, a 'difficult' (for that type of individual) test which
> discourages,
> > > > > > > yea, FILTERS him from active, open participation is a poor
> > > > > > > excuse for monitor vans and well trained and equipped crews.
> > > > > > > But it's what we had.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Now we have Riley and a 5wpm code test. Soon only Riley. When
> he goes, I
> > > > > > > for one believe the ARS will follow his exit, not far behind. By
> that time
> > > > > > > there
> > > > > > > will be far more than adequate evidence that the ARS is no
> longer a viable
> > > > > > > self- policing entity, staffed with conscientious people willing
> and able to
> > > > > > > conduct themselves in a manner commensurate with the priveleges
> granted,
> > > > > > > most of which will shortly be summarily withdrawn.
>
> Dick,
>
> EVERY time there has been change of any real sort in ham radio, there
> have been cranky olde fartz like you preaching "end of the world" doom
> and gloom ... and every time it has not come to pass ...
>

Well there goes Kandid Karl on his modernize-or-die rant, build 36.

Why can't you just respond to what was written for once instead of twisting what was said to suit your own Agenda? If you don't believe that hams causing serious

enforcement problems in sufficient quantities WILL cause severe deterioration to the ARS you haven't been paying attention. And that doesn't mean paying attention to ME either. YOu haven't beenopaying attention to Riley, ARRL and a host of other heavy duty sources. But that's simply typical of you, Carl. You see what you want to see and ascribe your reasons to all of it.

>
> Witness:
>
> conversion from spark to CW;
> conversion from AM to SSB;
> introduction of packet radio and other "new-fangled @^#%$ computer
> thingies";
> the introduction of the no-code Tech license;
> restructuring 3 years ago;
>
> and many others I'm sure I've omitted.
>
> The point is, the world (and ham radio) is NOT going to end ... despite
> your rants that it is.
>
> Actually, on the contrary, if these changes hadn't happened and we were
> still stuck in the spark era (i.e., if cranky olde fartz like you had
> stopped
> the progress of ham radio over the years), we WOULD be in danger.
>

Carl, the temptation to label you as a dumbshit is almost overwhelming. DO you really believe no one but you has benefited from nor been deeply involved in any of the many technical advances in communications, jsut because some of us believe there should remain a code test qualification for licensing? If you're really that stupid you're to be pityed on the level of one who is mentally handicapped.In facxt it seems your hatred for morse code has caused you some serious REAL mental difficulties, or you surely wouldn't go off on such idiotic rants.

>
> If you want to see what presents the biggest danger to the future of
> ham radio LOOK IN THE MIRROR ... the enemy you fear is yourself,
> with your backward thinking, unwillingness to accept progress, and lack
> of tolerance for newcomers (unless, of course, they've suffered through
> the same fraternity hazing rituals that you had to endure, lo those many
> years ago and think in exactly the backward, narrowminded ways that
> you do).

That says t all, Carl. You have no real facts with which to counter my arguments so you stoop, yet again, to the level of the gutter for support. How so very typical of you!

>
>
> When you're done looking in the mirror, you can look a your cronies,
> Larry, Dave Heil, and the whole list of like-thinkers... they are also
> part of the enemy you fear ... for they think and act essentially the
> same way as you do.
>

Well, there you have it, folks, Carl at his finest.

>
> THERE is where the REAL danger to the future of ham radio lies ...
> in people who are so married to/stuck in its past that they despise
> any thought of change, progress, and the newcomers that it will
> bring (unless the newcomers are acceptable "clones" cast in your
> own image).
>

Ah! So you welcome all the thousands from never-never land who have clearly and repeatedly demonstrated their disdain for anything that even smells like rules and order, right into the ARS as "saviors" of your high tech world! Yeah, we see where you're coming from!

>
> However, those newcomers are the future of ham radio

The REAL future of ham radio isn't in bringing into the service every warm body who ever had a twitch of interest in ham radio. If you believe that- and clearly you do- it just shows the breadth of your ignorance.

> ... for us older
> guys will surely die, and if there aren't younger folks to replace us ham
> radio will die with us. It's up to us to WELCOME and ENCOURAGE
> them ... their ways will not be the ways of the past ... things change and
> nobody can freeze time. But insulting, berating, demeaning them, and trying
> to keep them out is not the way ...
>

So you'd advocate bringing in any and everyone regardless, and "teaching" one and all. You'll be the role model, of course. And all the outlaws from on high will be eager and willing students.
Right, it's sure to fly. Upside down, maybe.

>
> Think about these things long and hard before you look yourself in
> the mirror again ... without some reflection, reconsideration, and change
> in your ways, you may not like what you see ... the enemy that is YOU.
>
> (Try to be *completely* like Scrooge ... go through the change, don't stay
> stuck in the first part ...)
>

If you and those like you are the future of the ARS, it's bleak indeed.

137. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 14:45:01 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <N7QWa.41650$Wd5.8967440@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 73552

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BB51180E.1FD46%stewart@say.net...
> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> > (snip) ALL licenses exclude those who don't
> > meet the qualifications, and include those
> > who do. Why else would they exist?
>
> There is a huge difference in requirements necessary to meet a certain
> goal or purpose and requirements designed to exclude those we doesn't
like,
> Dick. I'm sure you know that. And I'm equally sure you know this
discussion
> is about the latter.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Exactly my point. The 5-wpm test does NOT exclude anyone who puts forth a
minimal effort, the 20-wpm does.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

138. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 14:53:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <HfQWa.15307$Vx2.7774739@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 73553

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bgghkn$pu7$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:M6NWa.15268$Vx2.7735038@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:bgg5nv$no0ns$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > > Yep, As I was aware of that. And I never expected them to change for
me
> > at
> > > the last minute. BUT, I do believe that with enough warning ahead of
> time
> > > it should be considered more than fair for a VE team to make an
> > adjustment.
> > > It should be no problem for a VEC to be able to send via code practice
> > > oscillator!!!!!! Wouldn't that be a shame if the VEC's have become so
> > lazy
> > > they can't even send a code test via a key because they are relying on
> the
> > > code CD's and tapes.
> > >
> > > Where the hell did you think I expected to walk into a test session in
> the
> > > past, and at the last possible moment expect a major change?
> >
> > They are supposed to make those provisions. If they did not, they were
in
> > the wrong. However, I would not favor them using hand sent code with an
> > oscillator for two reasons. 1) Oscillators are often not adjustable in
> > pitch. 2) Some people who copy quite well have absolutely lousy fists
and
> > do not send good clean code. It takes a pretty good op to copy some of
> the
> > people out there.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> And the fluctuation in CW skills is yet another reason to question its
> validity as a testing element.
>
> Kim W5TIT

That's false logic. One could apply the same to the variation in all other ham radio knowledge.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

139. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 15:02:05 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <NnQWa.41777$Wd5.9022641@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 73554

Wow Carl,

All that below to equate those who support the retention of Element 1 with "the enemy." I repeat, are you sure we're talking about the 5-wpm exam? Sure doesn't sound like it.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message news:wcOWa.2375$lL.382710@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > > > > > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > > > > > . You know as well as anyone, better than most, that almost the
> only
> > > > > > > "enforcement" we've had on the ARS for many years
> > > > > > > prior to Riley's appointment WAS the code test.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Now, a 'difficult' (for that type of individual) test which
> discourages,
> > > > > > > yea, FILTERS him from active, open participation is a poor
> > > > > > > excuse for monitor vans and well trained and equipped crews.
> > > > > > > But it's what we had.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Now we have Riley and a 5wpm code test. Soon only Riley. When
> he goes, I
> > > > > > > for one believe the ARS will follow his exit, not far behind. By
> that time
> > > > > > > there
> > > > > > > will be far more than adequate evidence that the ARS is no
> longer a viable
> > > > > > > self- policing entity, staffed with conscientious people willing
> and able to
> > > > > > > conduct themselves in a manner commensurate with the priveleges
> granted,
> > > > > > > most of which will shortly be summarily withdrawn.
>
> Dick,
>
> EVERY time there has been change of any real sort in ham radio, there

> have been cranky olde fartz like you preaching "end of the world" doom
> and gloom ... and every time it has not come to pass ...
>
> Witness:
>
> conversion from spark to CW;
> conversion from AM to SSB;
> introduction of packet radio and other "new-fangled @^#%$ computer
> thingies";
> the introduction of the no-code Tech license;
> restructuring 3 years ago;
>
> and many others I'm sure I've omitted.
>
> The point is, the world (and ham radio) is NOT going to end ... despite
> your rants that it is.
>
> Actually, on the contrary, if these changes hadn't happened and we were
> still stuck in the spark era (i.e., if cranky olde fartz like you had
> stopped
> the progress of ham radio over the years), we WOULD be in danger.
>
> If you want to see what presents the biggest danger to the future of
> ham radio LOOK IN THE MIRROR ... the enemy you fear is yourself,
> with your backward thinking, unwillingness to accept progress, and lack
> of tolerance for newcomers (unless, of course, they've suffered through
> the same fraternity hazing rituals that you had to endure, lo those many
> years ago and think in exactly the backward, narrowminded ways that
> you do).
>
> When you're done looking in the mirror, you can look a your cronies,
> Larry, Dave Heil, and the whole list of like-thinkers... they are also
> part of the enemy you fear ... for they think and act essentially the
> same way as you do.
>
> THERE is where the REAL danger to the future of ham radio lies ...
> in people who are so married to/stuck in its past that they despise
> any thought of change, progress, and the newcomers that it will
> bring (unless the newcomers are acceptable "clones" cast in your
> own image).
>
> However, those newcomers are the future of ham radio ... for us older
> guys will surely die, and if there aren't younger folks to replace us ham
> radio will die with us. It's up to us to WELCOME and ENCOURAGE
> them ... their ways will not be the ways of the past ... things change and
> nobody can freeze time. But insulting, berating, demeaning them, and
trying
> to keep them out is not the way ...
>
> Think about these things long and hard before you look yourself in

> the mirror again ... without some reflection, reconsideration, and change
> in your ways, you may not like what you see ... the enemy that is YOU.
>
> (Try to be *completely* like Scrooge ... go through the change, don't stay
> stuck in the first part ...)
>
> Carl - wk3c
>
>
>

140. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 15:14:36 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bggkgs$4i4$0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 73555

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" writ
> >
> > And the fluctuation in CW skills is yet another reason to question its
> > validity as a testing element.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> That's false logic. One could apply the same to the variation in all other
> ham radio knowledge.

Careful Dee, you'll hurt her fragile feelings. Logic has never been her long
suit.

141. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 15:14:38 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bggkf2$5ph@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 73556

```
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:HfQWa.15307$Vx2.7774739@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:bgghkn$pu7$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:M6NWa.15268$Vx2.7735038@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > > news:bgg5nv$no0ns$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > > > Yep, As I was aware of that. And I never expected them to change
for
> me
> > > at
> > > > the last minute. BUT, I do believe that with enough warning ahead
of
> > time
> > > > it should be considered more than fair for a VE team to make an
> > > adjustment.
> > > > It should be no problem for a VEC to be able to send via code
practice
> > > > oscillator!!!!!! Wouldn't that be a shame if the VEC's have become
so
> > > lazy
> > > > they can't even send a code test via a key because they are relying
on
> > the
> > > > code CD's and tapes.
> > > >
> > > > Where the hell did you think I expected to walk into a test session
in
> > the
> > > > past, and at the last possible moment expect a major change?
> > >
> > > They are supposed to make those provisions. If they did not, they
were
> in
> > > the wrong. However, I would not favor them using hand sent code with
an
> > > oscillator for two reasons. 1) Oscillators are often not adjustable
in
> > > pitch. 2) Some people who copy quite well have absolutely lousy fists
> and
> > > do not send good clean code. It takes a pretty good op to copy some
```

of
> > the
> > > people out there.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> >
> > And the fluctuation in CW skills is yet another reason to question its
> > validity as a testing element.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> That's false logic. One could apply the same to the variation in all
other
> ham radio knowledge.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Exactly. Except that the written tests, by virtue of their being only one right answer that has already been chosen to be the right one, is much more stable. Yes, sometimes the right answer isn't so right. BUT, by virtue of agreeing to take the test you have studied for, you are agreeing that the right answers are right.

By your observation above, the CW test is dependent on tone quality, morse style, etc. It is not a very stable test environment.

Kim W5TIT

142. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 15:16:15 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bggkiu$m1f@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 73557

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bggih8eq0@208.207.71.142...
>
>
> If you're really that stupid you're to be pityed on the level of one who
is mentally
> handicapped.In facxt it seems your hatred for morse code has caused you
some
> serious REAL mental difficulties, or you surely wouldn't go off on such
idiotic
> rants.
>

Ditto for your zeal for it, Dick.

Kim W5TIT

143. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 15:33:51 UTC
From: Mike Ro Farad <MRF@muffled.com>
Message-ID: <zRQWa.22271$ff.5438@fed1read01>
Source record: 73558

We have met the enemy and they are us -- From "Pogo" by Walt Kelly --
1960's

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:wcOWa.2375$lL.382710@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> Think about these things long and hard before you look yourself in
> the mirror again ... without some reflection, reconsideration, and change
> in your ways, you may not like what you see ... the enemy that is YOU.
>
> (Try to be *completely* like Scrooge ... go through the change, don't stay
> stuck in the first part ...)
>
> Carl - wk3c
>
>
>

144. Re: Sign in the petition against the abuse of the Band Plan forward this message to your buddies)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 16:22:39 UTC
From: class_a_pkearn_12wpml@class_a.eircom.12wpm.co.uk.net
Message-ID: <3f2be50d.3873377@news1.eircom.net>
Source record: 73559
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy,pt.rec.radio.amadorismo,nl.radio.amateur

On 1 Aug 2003 09:18:39 -0700, g3cwi@tesco.net (Richard) wrote:

>The use of some bands is done by gentlemens agreement but perhaps

the assumption is that there is a presence of 'gentlemen'

nowadays..the term cb'ers agreement might be more suitable
(or is that STABLE)

145. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 17:09:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308020909.cf11070@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73560

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bggi7g$pu7$2@adenine.netfront.net>...
>
> You are quite dislikable, whether you realize it or not. And you do seem to
> approach life from the comfort zone...
>
> Kim W5TIT

Probably from a lifetime of work and play in a radio shack. He needs
to get out more often.

Brian

146. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 17:23:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308020923.2c4f8678@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73561

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bggih8eq0@208.207.71.142>...

> Well there goes Kandid Karl on his modernize-or-die rant, build 36.

VS DICK on his Stagnate-or-Die rant, ver 1.0 (i.e., never changing)?

What was the last regulatory change to the ARS did you promote?

147. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 17:31:48 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308020931.33e4019c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73562

```
"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bggdal$mdu$1@adenine.netfront.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0308011927.9e0b560@posting.google.com...
> > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:<bgdj98$1hk7$1@adenine.netfront.net>...
> >
> > >
> > > I remember a long time ago in this newsgroup, accusing some of using the
> CW
> > > test as a filtering tool. I was nearly lambasted to Timbuktu. Now,
> it's
> > > popular and OK to just make the declaration!
> > >
> > > If CW is used as a "filter" to keep anyone of the ARS; then it's plain
> > > wrong.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Aaron Jones was keeping the "Morse Myths" list. That one was probably
> > in the top ten.
> >
>
> I wouldn't give the character "Aaron Jones" an ounce or less of
> credibility...
>
> Kim W5TIT

Because he was anonymous?

He/she was probably an FCC or high-up ARRL figure just trying to keep
his job separate from personal opinion. If that is possible, which
Phil Kane has shown cannot. Too many anecdotal stories of how one ham
in the FCC can cause havok for the entire ARS.
```

148. Re: Ham Radio In The Post-Code Testing Era

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 17:35:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308020935.3270c0be@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73563

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030802082707.04207.00001974@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> In article <3F203500.1080106@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >
> >> You would be hard pressed to find a rational person, at any time or in
> >> any culture, who finds that activity anything other than disgusting.
> >> Also, taste and smell are closely related, and it's very rare that
> >> something will smell bad but taste good.
> >
> >Have you heard of that coffee in which the beans are passed through the
> >digestive tract of a monkey?
>
> Yes. That story surfaces every so often. Supposed to be a Vietnamese delicacy
> or something.

Is this to be the new hazing ritual that substitutes for the Farnsworth Exam?

149. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 17:37:24 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0308020937.54f97ddd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73564

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> Just practicing one of the the new Q signals....
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a 1.4.

The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!

It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious. It was poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly lame as to lack the true drawing power of a really masterful troll. Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense stupidity of the premise, but a 9.8? Never! The Armenian judges tear their hair out, throw their balalaikas down in dismay, and perform the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant! They demand a recount!

73, de Hans, K0HB
--

Reality does not care what you believe. -K0HB

150. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 17:37:48 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <MFSWa.15338$Vx2.7814979@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 73565

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bggkf2$5ph@library1.airnews.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:HfQWa.15307$Vx2.7774739@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > news:bgghkn$pu7$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > > news:M6NWa.15268$Vx2.7735038@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > > >
> > > > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:bgg5nv$no0ns$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > > > > Yep, As I was aware of that. And I never expected them to change
> for
> > me
> > > > at
> > > > > the last minute. BUT, I do believe that with enough warning ahead
> of
> > > time
> > > > > it should be considered more than fair for a VE team to make an
> > > > adjustment.
> > > > > It should be no problem for a VEC to be able to send via code
> practice
> > > > > oscillator!!!!!! Wouldn't that be a shame if the VEC's have
become
> so
> > > > lazy
> > > > > they can't even send a code test via a key because they are
relying
> on
> > > the
> > > > > code CD's and tapes.
> > > > >
> > > > > Where the hell did you think I expected to walk into a test
session
> in
> > > the
> > > > > past, and at the last possible moment expect a major change?
> > > >
> > > > They are supposed to make those provisions. If they did not, they
> were
> > in
> > > > the wrong. However, I would not favor them using hand sent code
with

> an
> > > > oscillator for two reasons. 1) Oscillators are often not
adjustable
> in
> > > > pitch. 2) Some people who copy quite well have absolutely lousy
fists
> > and
> > > > do not send good clean code. It takes a pretty good op to copy some
> of
> > > the
> > > > people out there.
> > > >
> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > > >
> > >
> > > And the fluctuation in CW skills is yet another reason to question its
> > > validity as a testing element.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > That's false logic. One could apply the same to the variation in all
> other
> > ham radio knowledge.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> Exactly. Except that the written tests, by virtue of their being only one
> right answer that has already been chosen to be the right one, is much
more
> stable. Yes, sometimes the right answer isn't so right. BUT, by virtue
of
> agreeing to take the test you have studied for, you are agreeing that the
> right answers are right.
>
> By your observation above, the CW test is dependent on tone quality, morse
> style, etc. It is not a very stable test environment.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Again your logic is faulty. The code test administration environment is stable. The pitch is predefined. The speed is predefined. The tapes or CDs are made using computer generated code, thus all the spacing is correct and stable. In other words, at the test, one is listening to perfect code and then there is only one right answer. It is even more perfect than the written tests since some of those answers are a bit if you've actually studied and learned the theory rather than memorizing questions and answers.

In both instances, code and written, the person is to pass the test and then improve their abilities in the real world.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

151. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 17:49:06 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0308020949.1a461d6b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73566

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

>
> EVERY time there has been change of any real sort in ham radio, there
> have been cranky olde fartz like you preaching "end of the world" doom
> and gloom ... and every time it has not come to pass ...
>

Carl,

With all due respect, the above and similar jeremiads from you, Dick, (and whoever) qualify as finalists in the rrap IPOTD (Irrelevant Post Of The Decade) competition.

Look, you have a valid FCC license. Dick has a valid FCC license. I have a valid FCC license. That makes us all members of a group comprising about one quarter of one per cent of the U.S. population. We have strong common interests as a result of that shared status. Let's focus on that.

The whole argument about Morse code reminds me of sail-boaters and power-boaters arguing among themselves about which technology is "most efficient", or "gets through rough water", or whatever, while in the meantime a commercial interest is petitioning to drain the water out of our lake and converting the whole damned place to an industrial park.

Friends, our "lake" of spectrum is in danger of being drained away -- spend your energy and intellect trying to solve that problem which MEANS SOMETHING to everyone of us, instead of arguing over the merits/demerits of Morse testing.

Without spectrum, there is no Amateur Radio.

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
The dust will not settle in our time. And when it does some great roaring machine will come and whirl it all skyhigh again.

152. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 18:12:21 UTC
From: Mike Ro Farad <MRF@muffled.com>
Message-ID: <alTWa.22315$ff.13718@fed1read01>
Source record: 73568

Not intended as a troll really -- but tongue in cheek (:-)

> > >Ask 100 Hams if they have ever been on CB --- 50% will fess up -- and
the
> > >other 50% are just not telling the truth ---

In the 70's there were a lot of CBers who got tired of the nonsense and got
an Amateur Radio License.

However I have talked with a lot of new hams here and a surprising number
come from the CB ranks -- some still operate both ---
many are into REACT and GMRS

In Calif -- a CHP air patrol used to talk with the CBers below - herding
traffic -- yep you guessed it he/she was "Air Bear"
Colorful colorful CB patter -- Hark the Modulator, Pink Peterbilt, and
Moseying Mama. City Kitty, Dry Box, Bedbuggers, Chicken Lights, County
Mountie, Granny Lane, et al. Fun stuff
See URL: http://listen.to/welfarewally

CB was/is great Americana -- great numbers of folks jumped on the $30 CB
rigs (E.F Johnson even made em)
Hey they even made movies about it !

Nope I have never bad mouthed CB -- just another radio "service" although
with problems as any license free radio would be (will be). CB, FRS, etc.

In the 70's -- I went to a combined Ham/CB store to get xtals for my CB
rigs (three cars caravanning across country), an old grizzly ham jumped on
me as I looked at CB stuff. You blankety blank CBers blah blah -0 %*#@ - the
drill - blah blah. I answered him in Morse code as I was a radio op in the
US Navy -- my CW answer was not too polite (his buddies were howling with
laughter as they dragged him away).

This ought to stir up a hornets nest.

73 -- Mike Ro Farad (with a ham ticket - extra heavy) and KEV9505 CB license
(expired I guess (:-) grin)

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bggh2l$t8l$0@208.207.71.132...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <HCzWa.19205$ff.8465@fed1read01>, "Mike Ro Farad"

<MRF@muffled.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Ask 100 Hams if they have ever been on CB --- 50% will fess up -- and
the
> > >other 50% are just not telling the truth ---
> >
> > I've never been on cb. I've listened there, but never transmitted.
>
> The Troll you responded to is obviously just that- a troll.
>
> Most hams today weren't around for the beginning of CB and few have any
real
> knowledge of how things evolved there. Of course many hams *came* from CB,
and I
> know that from multiple sources: for one my many years as a VE. From the
early
> 70's MOST people who wound up as hams first learned of personal
communications
> radio via CB. There's nothing whatever wrong with that, and most of them
soon
> learned about ham radio and quickly saw the attraction, put themselves
into
> learnintg mode and made the switch
> . It isn't the hams who started in CB that is the problem, it's the many
outlaws
> who also came from it.
> Of course you already know this, but some professed oldtimers posting
here
> clearly do not.
>

153. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 18:21:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030802142104.14837.00001940@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 73567

In article <bggedonal1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>"Rob Kemp" <robkemp90210@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>news:6114e4af.0308012045.b54018e@posting.google.com...
>> Quote from the American Public Power Association; "the burden should
>> be imposed on challengers to BPL to demonstrate interference in a
>> fact-based, empirical proof. Further, to the extent that interference
>> is demonstrated, there should be an attempt to accommodate BPL, even
>> if it means that existing communications providers may have to share
>> or transfer bandwidth."

>Well, in the worst case scenario, APP is exactly right. We *will* have to
>make adjustments. Here's my thought: this is going to happen time and time
>again. Frequencies are prime real estate right now and will get even moreso
>in the future. This is not going to go away.

Kim:

I think you're missing a basic point of radio regulation here.

The radio spectrum is a limited, shared resource, which is why we have
different services, licenses, etc. And of course there must be a balance
between the needs of various services, such as broadcasting vs. hams vs.
maritime users, etc.

But BPL isn't a *user* of the radio spectrum, just a *polluter*. And a basic
principle of regulation has been that polluters must not interfere with
licensed users. APP's comment turns that on its head, saying the licensed users
must not only accomodate the polluters, but that the burden of proof is on the
licensed users, not the polluters. HUH?

Imagine a river that is used for many purposes - transportation, recreation,
energy production, food production, etc. Different parts of the river are
reserved for different purposes and all benefit from the river. The different
users of the river all pay for licenses and support preservation and
intelligent use of the river.

Then along comes a company that wants to use the river as a dump for its
industrial waste, without paying any fees and without regard for other users of
the river, who are NOT allowed to dump anything into the river at all! The
company says they should be allowed to dump their waste into the river wherever
and whenever they want, and if the other river users don't like it, too bad.

On top of all this, other companies in the same business do not dump waste into
anybody's river. Instead, they invest heavily in new technology so that they
don't generate much waste in the first place, and also invest in treatment,

containment and disposal technology so that what little waste they do generate is handled safelyt. Those other companies are in direct competiton with the new company, but they don't get the exception the new company is asking for.

Some folks think BPL is only an HF problem, but the systems proposed go as high as 80 MHz, which includes 6 meters. And if there are any harmonics produced, watch out 2 meters and above.

>> Critical everyone submits a reply comment ASAP.

>I guess you're making the assumption that everyone who is a ham would be
>against this? Or, are you really being that generous where it's a "everyone
>should have their voice thing?"

Do you think BPL is a good thing, Kim?

>Good idea. Make everyone think uniformly...yeah, that's the ticket!

What is YOUR thinking on BPL, KIm?

>On the
>other hand, those who have no idea what BPL may be about, what impacts it
>has, etc., will be "following" something they have no idea about. Maybe BPL
>is a bad thing for ham radio, but maybe it's a good thing for us as a whole.

How could it be a good thing for us as a whole? Most of us have a choice of dialup, DSL or cable. Do we really need another choice, particularly one that pollutes the radio spectrum to a level much higher than the others?

Perhaps where you live DSL and cable are not available, or are expensive. : Access BPL won't solve your problem, because it is basically a short-range "last mile" technology, and the target markets are high density suburban areas, not rural.

>Do I want to accommodate ham radio, or the rest of my fellow citizens and
>what this may do for them? What alternatives would the commercial interests
>have to BPL technology, and how much would that cost us?

It's not just about ham radio, but about all users of the spectrum, and setting a precedent. And if it's somehow OK to trash 2-80 MHz, why not 80-500 MHz?

Do the people supporting BPL care what they do to the radio spectrum?

>Gosh, those are just a few questions people may encounter, and I am probably
>now going to be lambasted for thinking about the majority...LOL what a
>concept.

"The majority" already have access to DSL, cable modems, dialup, and a wide range of other systems. Will BPL be cheaper? More reliable? I don't see how. Show me.

btw, BPL will be just as vulnerable to disruption from physical damage as cable, dialup or DSL because the wires are on the same poles or in the same trenches. In fact it will be more vulnerable because the lines are not shielded.

73 de Jim, N2EY

154. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 18:34:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F2C0443.9060301@adelphia.net>
Source record: 73569

Kim is having some trouble with her newsreader, so I'm forwarding this
reply post with her permission.

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F2BC150.20100@adelphia.net...
>> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>> > > "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
>> > news:BB509D30.1FCF0%stewart@say.net...
>> >
>> >
>> > > Okay, now I'm laughing. Where are all those people who have the upper
>> > > hand (the ones who favor less knowledge)? There must be many thousands
> of them
>> > > if they have the upper hand. I've been involved with Ham Radio for a
> number
>> > > of years now and I have yet to hear all those people advocating less
>> > > knowledge about Ham Radio. I haven't seen any web sites stating that
> goal. I've
>> > > never talked to a person on the radio who has stated that goal. If
> these people
>> > > actually exist, they must be the most secret group in America.
>> > >
>> > >
>> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>> > >
>> > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> > That's because you won't hear it anywhere but here--as whining, Dwight.
>> > With the exception of a few on this newsgroup, the participants in this
>> > newsgroup are very out of touch with ham radio...
>>
>> I know many hams who are bothered by this, Kim. They don't participate
>> in this newsgroup, but they still are concerned. And it really is pretty
>> hard to argue that complete removal of a test element is not a reduction
>> in the amount of knowledge needed to pass a test.
>>
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
> Put it that way, Mike, yes. It is hard to argue that removing *any* part of
> a test is not a reduction in the amount of knowledge needed to pass a test.

> But, that is simply a word game and nothing else.
>
> The point is, what does passing a CW test prove in the way of
> knowledge--other than that one can pass a CW test? What does passing the
> written tests prove in the way of knowledge--other than that one can pass a
> written test? If you see the parody in both of those questions, then I go
> one step further and say: What does passing a CW test have to with anything
> related to overall knowledge of ham radio?!!!!!???? In my mind, *NOTHING*
> It's bad enough that the written tests don't prove a whole lot, without the
> added argument of CW in the mix. To continue to support CW as some form of
> proof that people know more about ham radio, know more about communication,
> know more about the standards and technology of ham radio, et al, is to
> continue to do nothing but whine about a tradition--which is really all CW
> really is: A TRADITION that no one wants to see fade away.
>
> Passing CW is nothing. And it proves nothing to anyone else, except that
> they studied CW and passed it in a test. I've seen idiots on every side of
> ham radio, so it does nothing to prove quality or *interest* as everyone
> seems to like to argue. If CW was that kind of instrument, then we'd have
> no jerks on ham radio and, believe me, I've heard them.
>
> Using CW as a test to prove "diligence" to the desire of wanting to be a ham
> radio operator is pure crap in my not-so-humble opinion. It is wrong to
> even attempt to measure someone's desire and interest. If I have an Extra
> license and I have no equipment or haven't even been on the radio in years,
> then what did passing CW prove, in terms of proven interest? Nothing. And
> it never will.
>
> Yes, CW is a useful communication skill. Hell, *ANY* type of communication
> skill is useful. If we place such importance on CW, then why not RTTY,
> phone, ATV, etc. You know what I'm saying. And, if CW proves a higher
> plane of dedication and knowledge, then why are there extremely skilled CW
> operators out there, who are real jerks?! And you know there are. So, how
> can someone, *anyone* then turn around and say that CW proves *anything*?
> It proves nothing but that the person studied for and passed the CW
> requirement.
>
> Damn, I hate getting into this. It's absurd to me, to think that there are
> people who think CW proves a thing. It's a damn tradition and nothing more.
> Now, it *used* to be a needed skill, and it *used* to keep up with current
> trends in communication. It does neither anymore.
>
> I appreciate and respect the tradition of CW as a part of ham radio. I
> appreciate and respect most (excluding some here in this newsgroup only) CW
> operators and operation. I can't tell you how many times I've felt quite
> privileged to watch a CW operator at Field Day. I will defend to the end of
> ham radio that CW is wonderful, a skill that only few will learn and use,
> and that it has a rich tradition and history in ham radio. But I will not
> defend saying that having it as a testing requirement proves a dawgoned
> thing, because it just plain doesn't.

>
> Kim W5TIT

155. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 18:39:11 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308021039.5a140de2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73570

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bggih8eq0@208.207.71.142>...

> >
> > Think about these things long and hard before you look yourself in
> > the mirror again ... without some reflection, reconsideration, and change
> > in your ways, you may not like what you see ... the enemy that is YOU.
> >
> > (Try to be *completely* like Scrooge ... go through the change, don't stay
> > stuck in the first part ...)

"Changes" like SS on 20 and cw contest "simulators"?

>
> If you and those like you are the future of the ARS, it's bleak indeed.

Ah poo, it's another slow weekend in Allentown, lotta slow weekends in
Allentown, the bands are munged up so he tossed out another goofy
troll.

Hey Carl, got yer towers up yet? Thought not. Why don't you go do
something actually useful?

156. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 18:42:07 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030802144207.13162.00001144@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 73571

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> Simple, the old-timers are not interested in new ideas.
>
>Your statement is not substantiated by fact.

It is a broad generalization, which, unless there is a logical influence, cannot support itself. However, I did not say 100% old-timer are not interested in new ideas, just that there is a tendency for that in Ham radio. Thats my, and other's, experience, so is not substantiated by fact.

>The first part of your statement is not "an example" at all. Morse code
>has demonstrated its usefulness and is still widely used in amateur
>radio. Someone might "hold on" to morse code and be very active with
>newer modes or might be involved in electronic circuit design.

In my local club newsletter. The club states that a new HF setup is keeping with the goal of advancement of the radio art. However, the do little else towards that effect, despite having alot of resourses which can be utilized for technical activities. Also, few club members are interested in homebrewing, despite claiming interest by posing for a photograph showing club members doing a group project. So, the "advancement of the radio art" is just a justification for more HF/CW activities.

>The second part of your statement, the one about pressuring new Hams to
>learn morse code is unsubstantiated by fact.

At various antenna setups, the other Hams try to persuade me to learn Morse code. This has happened several times.

>Some new hams don't want
>to learn morse code and don't.

>The third part of your statement, dealing with the exclusion of those
>who don't want to learn morse code, is unsubstantiated by fact.

The ones that do become popular with the other club members. The ones that don't want to learn Morse code become excluded.

>How do you know what "most old timers" do and what they are not
>interested in? I know old timers who are very technically inclined

All I can say is what I have found in my area and in several other states. There have been exceptions of course, but it is too rare to be worth the effort. I cannot search out the contradiction.

157. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 18:47:22 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030802144722.13162.00001145@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 73573

From (Larry Roll K3LT):

>If that is the case in your club, then simply work around the old timers
>that you find so offensive, and get your fellow newcomers involved in your
>projects. What is so difficult about that?

The newcomers seem to be of the same mode also. The ones that are interested in the technical stuff probably would have left within one or two meetings. Probably same would be true about the social aspect of newcomers. Thats why the demographics seem to stay as they are when new people join.

The other alternative is to start my own club. I tried it, but that was not too successful.

158. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 18:47:59 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308021047.5638e89f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73572
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bgep4v$v7d$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...

>
> Since were on a trip down memory lane. This is how I received my FIRST HAM
> SIGNAL.
>
> I had a 6 transistor jap radio. I started 'tweeking' the coils and heard
> this booming CQ CQ CQ this is W*xx.....He was down the street on the next
> block.

There ya go! How many variations on that theme do ya wanna guess have
been played out?

I got my first dose by landing on 75M with one of the old
floor-mounted living room multiband wooden console radios owned by a
couple of old maid aunts. Was around the time of the broadcast of the
atom bomb tests on Bikini atoll.

> Its been downhill eversince

As if!

> Dan/W4NTI

w3rv

159. Re: Ham Radio In The Post-Code Testing Era

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 18:51:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F2C0852.3000608@adelphia.net>
Source record: 73574

Brian wrote:
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030802082707.04207.00001974@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>
>>In article <3F203500.1080106@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>>
>>
>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>You would be hard pressed to find a rational person, at any time or in
>>>>any culture, who finds that activity anything other than disgusting.
>>>>Also, taste and smell are closely related, and it's very rare that
>>>>something will smell bad but taste good.
>>>
>>>Have you heard of that coffee in which the beans are passed through the
>>>digestive tract of a monkey?
>>
>>Yes. That story surfaces every so often. Supposed to be a Vietnamese delicacy
>>or something.
>
>
> Is this to be the new hazing ritual that substitutes for the Farnsworth Exam?

Little pellets are a dih, and the big ones are a dah........

Some monkeys "send" at 16 wpm. Anything above that and it all runs
together and sounds like S**t.

- Mike KB3EIA -

160. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 19:07:24 UTC
From: Mike Ro Farad <MRF@muffled.com>
Message-ID: <LZTWa.22323$ff.7299@fed1read01>
Source record: 73575

There are technical CLUBS, general CLUBS, DX CLUBS, contest CLUBS, repeater (users) CLUBS, microwave CLUBS, et al

Do we have to CLUB you over the head to get you to go to the right one ???

> The other alternative is to start my own club. I tried it, but that was not too
> successful.

Wonder Why ????

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030802144722.13162.00001145@mb-m10.aol.com...
> From (Larry Roll K3LT):
>
> >If that is the case in your club, then simply work around the old timers
> >that you find so offensive, and get your fellow newcomers involved in your
> >projects. What is so difficult about that?
>
> The newcomers seem to be of the same mode also. The ones that are interested in
> the technical stuff probably would have left within one or two meetings.
> Probably same would be true about the social aspect of newcomers. Thats why the
> demographics seem to stay as they are when new people join.
>
>
>

161. Re: now on 6.290 khz shortwave

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 19:27:43 UTC
From: East SWL <spixinc@spixincelec.org>
Message-ID: <bgh3ac$8rd$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73576
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

There is a pirate station operating from the U.S. East
Coast nightly on 6273 kHz. Excellent reception here
in Norfolk VA. Sounds like he has a political agenda.
Seems to have some hot inside information about the
FCC which he gets from a disgruntled FCC employee
who is unhappy with their present assignment.

SWL/Harry

"John Smith" <isresi1@freemail.nl> wrote in message
news:3f2be128$0$31059$e4fe514c@dreader4.news.xs4all.nl...
> Hi guys,
>
> I receive a pirate station (European) on 6.290. Can you guys here it too?
>
> I transmit by Internet my reception (as long as the station is on) you can
> here it here:
>
> http://213.84.76.227:8080
>
>
> Hope to hear your reports. I use a Kenwoord R-5000 and my aerial is a 1.10
> meters active antenne.
>
>
> Smasr.
>
>
>

162. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 20:21:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030802162111.25815.00001906@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 73577

In article <bggkf2$5ph@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:

>Exactly. Except that the written tests, by virtue of their being only one
>right answer that has already been chosen to be the right one, is much more
>stable. Yes, sometimes the right answer isn't so right. BUT, by virtue of
>agreeing to take the test you have studied for, you are agreeing that the
>right answers are right.
>
>By your observation above, the CW test is dependent on tone quality, morse
>style, etc. It is not a very stable test environment.
>
Not at all!

The accomodations available in the code test are similar to accomodations available in the written test. For example, if someone has limited vision, the written might be printed in large plain easy-to-read text like 48 point Arial rather than 10 point Times New Roman. Blind people might take the test in Braille or aurally. People with limited mobility might use various devices to fill out the answer sheet, or verbalize their answers rather than writing them.

Because the written tests are not timed, a written test can take anywhere from a few minutes to hours.

73 de Jim, N2EY

163. Re: now on 6.290 khz shortwave

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 20:26:23 UTC
From: John Smith <isresi1@freemail.nl>
Message-ID: <3f2c1e0a$0$76461$e4fe514c@dreader8.news.xs4all.nl>
Source record: 73578
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"East SWL" <spixinc@spixincelec.org> wrote in message
news:bgh3ac$8rd$0@pita.alt.net...
> There is a pirate station operating from the U.S. East
> Coast nightly on 6273 kHz. Excellent reception here
> in Norfolk VA. Sounds like he has a political agenda.
> Seems to have some hot inside information about the
> FCC which he gets from a disgruntled FCC employee
> who is unhappy with their present assignment.
>
>
> SWL/Harry
>
> "John Smith" <isresi1@freemail.nl> wrote in message
> news:3f2be128$0$31059$e4fe514c@dreader4.news.xs4all.nl...
> > Hi guys,
> >
> > I receive a pirate station (European) on 6.290. Can you guys here it
too?
> >
> > I transmit by Internet my reception (as long as the station is on) you
can
> > here it here:
> >
> > http://213.84.76.227:8080
> >
> >
> > Hope to hear your reports. I use a Kenwoord R-5000 and my aerial is a
1.10
> > meters active antenne.
> >
> >
> > Smasr.
> >
> >
> >
>
>
It turned out to be a dutch station radio spaceman.

From the UK i now receive radio Galaxy (pirate) at 6.305 signal 7 - 9 on my
1.10 meters long aerial. Aearial performs
better then i thought it would do.

164. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 20:51:54 UTC
From: Spamhater <nospam@nospam.com>
Message-ID: <QvVWa.760$603.38999@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 73579
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bgg5nv$no0ns$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Yep, As I was aware of that. And I never expected them to change for me
at
> the last minute. BUT, I do believe that with enough warning ahead of time
> it should be considered more than fair for a VE team to make an
adjustment.
> It should be no problem for a VEC to be able to send via code practice
> oscillator!!!!!! Wouldn't that be a shame if the VEC's have become so
lazy
> they can't even send a code test via a key because they are relying on the
> code CD's and tapes.
>
> Where the hell did you think I expected to walk into a test session in the
> past, and at the last possible moment expect a major change?
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >
> > Arrangements for a different tone have to be made in advance so that
they
> > have time to obtain a CD or tape of the needed pitch from the VEC. You
> > can't just drop into a test session and expect them to have anything
> > different than the commonly used tone.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
>

Not sure if a "code key/Oscillator" applies here, but if a person needs to
have special testing done, the rules I"ve seen written state that the
examinee is the one who must furnaish the equipment to the VEs in which to
use to accomidate that persons handicap. Perhaps the VEs didn't have one.
Not every one does.
JMS

165. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 20:56:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308021256.64db56db@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73580
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308021047.5638e89f@posting.google.com>...

> I got my first dose by landing on 75M with one of the old
> floor-mounted living room multiband wooden console radios owned by a
> couple of old maid aunts. Was around the time of the broadcast of the
> atom bomb tests on Bikini atoll.

My dad was at Eniwetok, and at several Nevada tests as well. He is
what is now called an "atomic veteran."

He has real military experience.

166. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 21:01:16 UTC
From: Spamhater <nospam@nospam.com>
Message-ID: <BEVWa.761$603.39117@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 73581
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F2BB6FF.3010501@adelphia.net...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > Yep, As I was aware of that. And I never expected them to change for me
at
> > the last minute. BUT, I do believe that with enough warning ahead of
time
> > it should be considered more than fair for a VE team to make an
adjustment.
> > It should be no problem for a VEC to be able to send via code practice
> > oscillator!!!!!! Wouldn't that be a shame if the VEC's have become so
lazy
> > they can't even send a code test via a key because they are relying on
the
> > code CD's and tapes.
>
> It's certainly possible, but in this day and age, I could see
> prospective amateur one complaining that the custom test was too easy or
> too hard, or complaining that he or she wanted to take the test from a
> CD instead of a real person, or some other such.
>
> Almost all of us can handle the standard test methods.
>
>
> The rest can be accomodated for.
>
> Over the course of my testing, I took tests at 4 different places:
> Williamsport PA, Butler PA, State College PA, and Lock Haven PA. ALL the
> VE teams were extremely helpful and accomodating. Those who knew of my
> hearing problem when I took Element 1 (twice, cuz I flunked the first
> time) were just great. The first time I took the test, they were more
> bothered by my failing it than I was, and the second time, I spoke to
> one of the VE's beforehand, and he outlined the different methods I
> might use, and explained the lengths they were capable of going to to
> accomodate my needs.
>
> I just want to point this out, because the tone of you letter sounds
> like you think that VE's are some sort of ossified "my way or the
> highway" people. They aren't.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

I can say this.. I HAVE seen some VEs who were real bastards. Not wanting to help anyone. But I've seen those too, who helped all as much as they could. However, my former comment still stands, according to the rules I've read, if an applicant is handicapped and requires special equipment to use in testing, it is THEIR responsibility to provide it for the VEs to use. It is NOT the VEs place to provide it. There is a comment though I'd like to make about the My way or the Highway when it comes to testing. It is "supposed" to be required of the VEs to afford the candidates the best possible conditions in which to examine. IF someone in the waiting or even an applicant his/herself starts making it miserable for the others OR even before hand if the applicant fails to provide all required documentation, the VEs have a right to evict them from the area. JMS

167. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 21:35:00 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <88WWa.2408$IL.389043@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73582

"K0HB" <k0hb@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:e79dbd9b.0308020949.1a461d6b@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
> >
> > EVERY time there has been change of any real sort in ham radio, there
> > have been cranky olde fartz like you preaching "end of the world" doom
> > and gloom ... and every time it has not come to pass ...
> >
>
> Carl,
>
> With all due respect, the above and similar jeremiads from you, Dick,
> (and whoever) qualify as finalists in the rrap IPOTD (Irrelevant Post
> Of The Decade) competition.
>
> Look, you have a valid FCC license. Dick has a valid FCC license. I
> have a valid FCC license. That makes us all members of a group
> comprising about one quarter of one per cent of the U.S. population.
> We have strong common interests as a result of that shared status.

We may have some common interests, but I don't share Dick's obvious
interest in keeping as many people out of ham radio as possible.

> Let's focus on that.
>
> The whole argument about Morse code reminds me of sail-boaters and
> power-boaters arguing among themselves about which technology is "most
> efficient", or "gets through rough water", or whatever, while in the
> meantime a commercial interest is petitioning to drain the water out
> of our lake and converting the whole damned place to an industrial
> park.
>
> Friends, our "lake" of spectrum is in danger of being drained away --
> spend your energy and intellect trying to solve that problem which
> MEANS SOMETHING to everyone of us, instead of arguing over the
> merits/demerits of Morse testing.

My comments weren't actually directed so much towards Dick's
desire to keep Morse testing (we could agree to disagree on that),
but rather on his *stated reasons* ... their fallacy, and their bad-
spiritedness.

>
> Without spectrum, there is no Amateur Radio.

On that we agree ... but without growth, the spectrum will be increasingly at risk as other uses keep demanding more access to spectrum.

A body of hams whose main goal seems to be to insult, bad-mouth, berate, and do every other thing they can to discourage as many people as possible from becoming hams does NOT help our cause.

73,
Carl - wk3c

168. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 21:55:43 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87u18zbu74.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73583

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote:
>"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@barrow.com> wrote
>>
>> You hang out here because you're a hypocrite.
...

>Well, Floyd, it sounds like you may know Dick personally. I don't know that
>for a fact, but it sounds that way. Regardless, I do agree with your
>comment that he's a hypocrite.

All I know about him is the garbage that he posts to Usenet.

Anyone who responds with posts filled with gratuitous, fantasy
filled insults rather than discussion, is a jerk. On top of
that, it turns out he's a two faced dick.

He is a primary proponent here of retaining a code test solely
for the purpose of preventing people access to the ARS, claiming
that those it deters are all somehow less honorable and less
deserving that he is. Yet we see that he is void of honor and
deserves nothing.

He's also one of the most fun people to poke with a stick, just to
see what he can imagine next.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

169. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 22:04:50 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87ptjnbtrx.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73584

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote:
>Hey, Floyd!!! Wow, you got Dickie going!! LOL
>
>Kim W5TIT

Three responses to one poke. Guess that stick hit the right
sore spot, eh?

Of course, he is a dick. I guess we couldn't expect much else.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

170. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 23:24:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308021524.1c9bfdc9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73585

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bgfbij$g6k$1@208.206.142.103>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bgdsmc$fs9$1@208.207.71.145>...
> > > Brian wrote:

> > > > And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
> > > > way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick, Larry,
> > > > Dan, Bruce...
> > >
> > > Citations please, to use your favorite phrase. NOWHERE has any of the above said any
such
> > > thing and you know it... no, actually you probably don't. You don't seem to know much
of
> > > anything.
> >
> > Now you're lying.
>
> So you can prove it, right? Get it on!

DICK, you remember what you said, or don't you?

171. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 23:32:06 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93CBC6A1646A4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 73586

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
news:NnQWa.41777$Wd5.9022641@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:

> Wow Carl,
>
> All that below to equate those who support the retention of Element 1
> with "the enemy." I repeat, are you sure we're talking about the 5-wpm
> exam? Sure doesn't sound like it.
>

The continued existence of a CW test does actually threaten the future of the hobby, i.e. it is a 'deal killer' for recruitment. Unfortunately, a lot of damage has already been done, as it has been allowed to persist long past it's 'sell by' date.

Sure, 5 wpm is easy (higher speeds were not, but that's moot now). However, the CW test manages to be too slow to impart any genuinely useful level of CW ability, whilst at the same time putting off prospective hams. In other words, it's more counter-productive than useful.

Sure. there is a lot of CW use by hams on HF, but there are precious few prospective hams who want to use it. Put in all the written questions you like on CW, though, as that won't cause the same kind of problem.

I think it's true that those who want to keep a code test would likely have wanted to keep spark if they had been around back then. If they really could stop the wheel of progress, the hobby likely would die with their generation, but luckily that won't happen.

Keeping out all those who aren't interested in CW may keep a few 'breakers' out, but it keeps out most people, period. That may suit a few people here, but it isn't the way forward. Ultimately, keeping the code test would do far more to destroy the hobby than letting in a few CBers (and I do mean a few, as most of them are not smart enough to pass the written tests). If we keep a code test, the hobby will fail for lack of interest. Luckily, I don't expect that to happen.

172. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 23:50:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bghinm$hp6$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 73587

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308021524.1c9bfdc9@posting.google.com...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bgfbij$g6k$1@208.206.142.103>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bgdsmc$fs9$1@208.207.71.145>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get
their
> > > > > way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick,
Larry,
> > > > > Dan, Bruce...
> > > >
> > > > Citations please, to use your favorite phrase. NOWHERE has any of
the above said any such
> > > > thing and you know it... no, actually you probably don't. You don't
seem to know much of
> > > > anything.
> > >
> > > Now you're lying.
> >
> > So you can prove it, right? Get it on!
>
> DICK, you remember what you said, or don't you?

Brian is a liar, a bs artist, and just a general troublemaker. No one said
a thing about destroying the ARS. I for one said I would fight against
those THAT WANT TO DESTROY THE ARS. Which obviously includes Brian the
braindead.

Dan/W4NTI

173. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-02 23:54:20 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bghivc$2t0$0@208.207.71.163>
Source record: 73588

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "K0HB" <k0hb@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:e79dbd9b.0308020949.1a461d6b@posting.google.com...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > EVERY time there has been change of any real sort in ham radio, there
> > > have been cranky olde fartz like you preaching "end of the world" doom
> > > and gloom ... and every time it has not come to pass ...
> > >
> >
> > Carl,
> >
> > With all due respect, the above and similar jeremiads from you, Dick,
> > (and whoever) qualify as finalists in the rrap IPOTD (Irrelevant Post
> > Of The Decade) competition.
> >
> > Look, you have a valid FCC license. Dick has a valid FCC license. I
> > have a valid FCC license. That makes us all members of a group
> > comprising about one quarter of one per cent of the U.S. population.
> > We have strong common interests as a result of that shared status.
>
> We may have some common interests, but I don't share Dick's obvious
> interest in keeping as many people out of ham radio as possible.
>

And I don't share your obvious interest in welcoming ever raving idiot out of
never-never land who is incapable of passing a code test into ham radio.
We know, you weren't mucj om CW and there you're not alone, we know.
But to accuse me of trying to keep out as many peopel as possible just flies
in th fact of the facts . But we're used to that from you. Nothing changes.

>
> > Let's focus on that.
> >
> > The whole argument about Morse code reminds me of sail-boaters and
> > power-boaters arguing among themselves about which technology is "most
> > efficient", or "gets through rough water", or whatever, while in the
> > meantime a commercial interest is petitioning to drain the water out
> > of our lake and converting the whole damned place to an industrial
> > park.
> >
> > Friends, our "lake" of spectrum is in danger of being drained away --
> > spend your energy and intellect trying to solve that problem which

> > MEANS SOMETHING to everyone of us, instead of arguing over the
> > merits/demerits of Morse testing.
>
> My comments weren't actually directed so much towards Dick's
> desire to keep Morse testing (we could agree to disagree on that),
> but rather on his *stated reasons* ... their fallacy, and their bad-
> spiritedness.
>

Yep, you would. It's not the least politically correct to deny anyone the
right to cause us all the trouble they want. We'vve seen a LOT of that
already. All you can focus on is the fact that a miniscule percentage of hams
who have passed a code test happen to be the few troublemakers on 3950 and
14313. So jus t weait untill all their cohorts who *couldn't* pass one show up

Carl, you just aren't too bright.

> >
> > Without spectrum, there is no Amateur Radio.
>
> On that we agree ... but without growth, the spectrum will be
> increasingly at risk as other uses keep demanding more access
> to spectrum.
>
> A body of hams whose main goal seems to be to insult, bad-mouth,
> berate, and do every other thing they can to discourage as many
> people as possible from becoming hams does NOT help our cause.

That would be YOU, pal. You've done that consistantly with no end in sight.
My opposition to allowing the neaderthals from north of 27 mhz free licensing
access to HF ham radio isn't off base at all. If it was you'd have some
rational
response instead of just another replay of your pre-canned bile saturated
rants.

The fact is there for all to see- the code test has for years been the ONLY
factor hindering those very induhvidiuals from HF ham radio access en masse.
With the code test gone, here they come!

174. Re: CORRECTION!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 00:34:53 UTC
From: averyfine@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030802203453.09680.00000826@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 73589

>Subject: Re: CORRECTION!!!
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 7/31/03 3:34 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0307311134.4e87c9c6@posting.google.com>
>
>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0307310521.151ae9a7@posting.google.com>...
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0307291516.319b327@posting.google.com>...
>> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0307290749.e3cd378@posting.google.com>...
>> >
>> > > And the "garbage" that get's thrown in here was dumped by someone
>> > > other than me...I just pick up the pieces and make a fool of the guy
>> > > who did it.
>> > >
>> > > Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> > Oh geez. You vomit last night's booze on here on an almost daily
>> > basis and make a fool of only yourself.
>>
>> Whew. That was poignant, Brain. Come up with that one one your own?
>>
>> And a sincere THANK-YOU for making my point with your graphic "wit".
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>Well, you do. Then you say you pick thru the chunks and make fools of other
>people.
>
>You fool only yourself.
>
Maybe Brian should get one of those monkeys for a pet :-) :-) :-) :-)

Bottoms up! :-) :-) :-) :-)

175. Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 01:04:06 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030802210406.21580.00000808@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 73590

Do Hams get 11 Meters Back, as soon as all the CBers upgrade to there Free Handout Ham Licenses?

176. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 01:14:04 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bghnks$1q9$0@208.207.71.155>
Source record: 73591

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bgfbij$g6k$1@208.206.142.103>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bgdsmc$fs9$1@208.207.71.145>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
> > > > > way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick, Larry,
> > > > > Dan, Bruce...
> > > >
> > > > Citations please, to use your favorite phrase. NOWHERE has any of the above said
any such
> > > > thing and you know it... no, actually you probably don't. You don't seem to know
much of
> > > > anything.
> > >
> > > Now you're lying.
> >
> > So you can prove it, right? Get it on!
>
> DICK, you remember what you said, or don't you?

PRICK, so you CAN'T prove it becasuse it never happened!

177. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 01:56:23 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <aZZWa.17768$t86.15573@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 73592

Not likely. What fee handout licenses? There still are a couple of written exams (not that they are overly difficult, mind you).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030802210406.21580.00000808@mb-m07.aol.com...
> Do Hams get 11 Meters Back, as soon as all the CBers upgrade to there Free
> Handout Ham Licenses?

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.506 / Virus Database: 303 - Release Date: 8/1/03

178. Later, folks!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 02:00:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F2C6D1A.3020704@adelphia.net>
Source record: 73593

Well, I'm off on a vacation to the soggy Northeast, so I'll be off line
this week.

Everyone have a good week, and don't get too mad at each other!! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

179. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 02:13:16 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <4804dcc1188b33b471d7d3e183a02859.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 73594

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote
>
> Gosh, those are just a few questions people may encounter, and I am probably
> now going to be lambasted for thinking about the majority.

No, I think you will be lambasted for not doing your homework and
understanding the issue.

"BPL" is an unlicensed service which proposes that it be allowed to
inject RF (radio signals) into the AC distribution grid. This RF will
extend across the MF/HF spectrum, and up into the lower VHF spectrum,
and the power lines will act not as a transmission line, but as an
antenna. The interference will potentially affect EVERY RADIO
COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE (not just hams) who use the affected spectrum.

In fact, BPL is a single unlicensed service which would presume to
pollute the spectrum used by the "majority" (your word, not mine) of all
long distance radio communications services.

Kim, you seem to be a person concerned with social issues. That's a
great quality. Go to your local library and research the term "tragedy
of the commons".

Good luck on this one now.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

180. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 02:25:32 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308021825.1918f024@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73595
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308021256.64db56db@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308021047.5638e89f@posting.google.com>...
>
> > I got my first dose by landing on 75M with one of the old
> > floor-mounted living room multiband wooden console radios owned by a
> > couple of old maid aunts. Was around the time of the broadcast of the
> > atom bomb tests on Bikini atoll.
>
> My dad was at Eniwetok, and at several Nevada tests as well. He is
> what is now called an "atomic veteran."

NOW we know why you turned out like you did. Sue the sumbitches.

> He has real military experience.

181. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 02:36:40 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030802223640.14766.00000906@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 73596

>There still are a couple of written
>exams

Is that what there called?

182. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 02:37:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F2C75C9.7030805@adelphia.net>
Source record: 73597

K0HB wrote:
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote
>
>>Gosh, those are just a few questions people may encounter, and I am probably
>>now going to be lambasted for thinking about the majority.
>
>
> No, I think you will be lambasted for not doing your homework and
> understanding the issue.
>
> "BPL" is an unlicensed service which proposes that it be allowed to
> inject RF (radio signals) into the AC distribution grid. This RF will
> extend across the MF/HF spectrum, and up into the lower VHF spectrum,
> and the power lines will act not as a transmission line, but as an
> antenna. The interference will potentially affect EVERY RADIO
> COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE (not just hams) who use the affected spectrum.

That includes Homeland defense, defense, broadcasting, lots of people
besides hams.

> In fact, BPL is a single unlicensed service which would presume to
> pollute the spectrum used by the "majority" (your word, not mine) of all
> long distance radio communications services.

BPL seems like one of those diminished performance systems that have
been foisted on the public more and more. If a person is tempted to
disagree, I'd ask how many of us would accept the performance on our
home telephones that we accept on cellular- "can you hear me now?"

People seem to forget that the power lines make a recieving antenna as
well as a transmitting antenna. My suspicion is that with the error
checking that will have to take place a lot on any BPL system, we will
be lucky to get to 56K modem speeds.

Anyone care to take bets on how BPL performs to say cable modems? DSL?

- Mike KB3EIA -

183. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 02:48:54 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <qK_Wa.2427$lL.391902@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73598

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bghivc$2t0$0@208.207.71.163...
>
> The fact is there for all to see- the code test has for years been the
ONLY
> factor hindering those very induhvidiuals from HF ham radio access en
masse.
> With the code test gone, here they come!
>

The sky is falling! The sky is falling! (sayeth Dick ...)

That's my point ... every change in the history of ham radio
has had folks like Dick ranting and raving that "This will be
the end of ham radio!"

(Not!)

What WILL be the end of ham radio is a lack of significant
growth ... as Alun has said, the Morse test is a "no sell" for
many folks who would otherwise make fine hams.

The "hordes of CBers" argument doesn't hold water ...
if they're "freebanding" (illegally and without licenses)
around 27 MHz, why would any rational person think
the lack of a license would keep them from the ham
bands TODAY (if they wanted to be here) ...

The doom and gloom, end of the world scenario that Dick
keeps trying to peddle smells of sour grapes ...

Carl - wk3c

184. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 03:02:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030802230218.25052.00001540@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 73600

In article <7dfliv4n5tild30d19s7lneg3kpt67v69r@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
<kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> writes:

>>QR10-4, QGB! I'm QPM, so QBD me!
>>
>>(Translation: "Ten-Fawhar, Good Buddie! I'll be putting the pedal to the
>>metal now, so watch my back door!)
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>You seem to toss that CB jargon around pretty well, Larry. Don't tell
>me...no, it couldn't be...could it?
>
>73 DE John, KC2HMZ

John:

Yep, it is true! I was once a CB'er, for a whole six months! I was the
Asst. Mgr. of the Radio Shack store in Depew, NY at the time, and I gave
myself a 30% discount on a Realistic TRC-23 CB transceiver -- the top-of-
the-line AM CB rig at the time in the era just before 40 channels. I
installed it in my 1972 Dodge Colt with a 102" whip antenna, and actually
got a lot of use out of it when travelling between the area R/S stores on
stock transfer missions and going to/from the repair shop in Buffalo.
When I quit the job at Radio Shack and joined the Air Force, that was
the end of my brilliant career as a CB'er!

73 de Larry, K3LT
Ex: KHM-7772 (Handle: "Sky King")

185. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 03:02:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030802230219.25052.00001541@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 73599

In article <f45722ac.0308010249.313b156a@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
>way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick, Larry,
>Dan, Bruce...
>

Brian:

Is that what I said? Prove it. Keep in mind, if you can't or won't prove it,
then YOU are a liar, and have completely and forever trashed your
credibility in this newsgroup.

As usual, a simple apology to Dick, Dan, Bruce, and myself will get you
off the hook. I will be happy to accept my own via private E-mail, to save
you any further embarrassment.

73 de Larry, K3LT

186. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 03:02:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030802230221.25052.00001542@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 73601

In article <3F2A7D17.2010501@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>> And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
>> way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick, Larry,
>> Dan, Bruce...

Hmmm. Curious. I don't recall who originally posted this, but I would
certainly be interested in seeing a quote where I said that I intended to
"destroy the amateur radio service" once code testing had been abolished.
To be sure, it would hardly be necessary for me to lift a finger to "destroy
the ARS" since our so-called "newcomers" will be doing their level best
to accomplish that on their own!

> Well, I don't intend to. Heck, I'll probably do lot's of "self
policing".

Any attempts at "self policing" will, for the most part, be wasted breath,
once all the eager new HF phone operators are finally liberated from 11 meters
and join their "fellow amateurs" on our HF phone bands. About the only
thing that could possibly work would be some sort of "super Elmering" at
the local club levels -- meaning, put the Codeless General/Extra-class
"newcomers" on a very short leash, and keeping them on it more or less
permanently. However, since I believe that 99.999999999018 percent of
the problems in amateur radio originate on the phone bands, we'd be asking
the inmates to guard the jailhouse.

Looking at it from the bright side, the antics of the present and future
phone operators may be the best "incentive" yet for people to learn the
Morse code! However, as usual, they'll probably just give up entirely,
rather than make the effort to learn a useful communications skill. After
all, the code went away because of laziness.

73 de Larry, K3LT

187. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 03:59:20 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgi1ap$1lkc$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73602

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308020931.33e4019c@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bggdalmdu1@adenine.netfront.net>...
> >
> > I wouldn't give the character "Aaron Jones" an ounce or less of
> > credibility...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Because he was anonymous?
>
> He/she was probably an FCC or high-up ARRL figure just trying to keep
> his job separate from personal opinion. If that is possible, which
> Phil Kane has shown cannot. Too many anecdotal stories of how one ham
> in the FCC can cause havok for the entire ARS.
>

Oh, heck no. I don't really care about anonymity in the newsgroup. No, I
just didn't like him and got a few emails about his character that didn't
sound so up and up (his character, not the emails...LOL)

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

188. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 04:03:05 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgi1hq$1lne$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73603

```
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:MFSWa.15338$Vx2.7814979@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:bggkf2$5ph@library1.airnews.net...
> >
> > By your observation above, the CW test is dependent on tone quality,
morse
> > style, etc. It is not a very stable test environment.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> Again your logic is faulty. The code test administration environment is
> stable. The pitch is predefined. The speed is predefined. The tapes or
> CDs are made using computer generated code, thus all the spacing is
correct
> and stable. In other words, at the test, one is listening to perfect code
> and then there is only one right answer. It is even more perfect than the
> written tests since some of those answers are a bit if you've actually
> studied and learned the theory rather than memorizing questions and
answers.
>
> In both instances, code and written, the person is to pass the test and
then
> improve their abilities in the real world.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

I've sat for more than a few CW tests. And, I've known people who have the
same experience as I. It's been different every time. It depends upon the
VE team and how they like to administer the test. I don't know what logic
has to do with it; but whatever.

Kim W5TIT

---
Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net
```

189. Re: Code goodby,maybe something else.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 04:07:15 UTC
From: kc5cqa@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <3f308216.2607146@news.devtex.net>
Source record: 73604

On Sat, 02 Aug 2003 00:48:53 GMT, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:

>On Fri, 01 Aug 2003 06:31:42 GMT, kc5cqa wrote:
>
>>All (90%) of the hams I know are pretty
>>old, you go to a ham fest , convention, and there are very few young
>>people.

I 'think' I understand what you are saying, I am 58, by way of
slight arm twisting' my wife and daughter got there tech tickets, just
a little while after I got mine,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, my
daughter is 24, and when I reminded her she would need to 'reup' at
the end of the year,,, she was only mildly concerned,,, she is working
full time, and married,,,, busy, just like you were talking about....
sooooo what is the difference NOW, as related to 'way back when',,,,
ham radio ,THEN,,, was not COMPETING with the internet, nor was it
in a life and death struggle with """"Big Business""""", this IS a
democratic , Capitalistic country ,,,,,,,,, if the ''settlers crossing
the Great Plains "circled the wagons",,, maybe Hams should take on
a defense posture,,,, and what do "they" always say,,, the best
defense is an offence. I think that is all I am trying to say.
As far as '''travel expense'' I was talking ALSO about the local
hamfest, San Antonio Tx, within thirty miles of the city there are
three 'small town hamfest', at least three times a year.,,,, and again
I repeat most of the attendees are old,,,, like myself ,,, retired.
Like I said I don't advocate a 11 meters ''mess'', I am not sure, but
what do you think? Do you believe the 11 meter members/users
would want to join a ''''structured organization'. I for one don't
see it,,,, I think part of "their enjoyment is the fact they can '''be
out of bounds'''. I don't know just my thought.
Maybe I am not "seeing IT all",,,, but the percentage of 'young
people' in OUR midst is,,,,,,,,,,,,,, ??how much 4 or 5%??? I have not
made a search,,, I am only going by what I see. just some thoughts.
cl 73
>
> Consider that the typical three-day-weekend hamfest/convention costs
> about $300 excluding transportation if one is not lucky enough to
> live in the immediate area. Add to that transportation (for me
> usually about $150 when I go to Pacificon, quite a bit less when I
> go to Seapac) and it gets to be "real money".
>
> OK, so I'm 66 years old and have been a ham for 52 years. When I
> started out as a hugh school student, all the hams I knew were my
> age (high school and college friends) and none of us could afford

> going to a ham convention. Some of us would go to the Institute of
> Radio Engineers convention exhibit in New York (local to us) on the
> last day to see if we could scarf up samples of components
> (capacitors, resistors, tube sockets, etc) which the exhibitors
> would give to young hams just as the exhibit was closing. Those
> days are gone (sob).
>
> Our local ham club - the largest in the state - has quite a number
> of young hams as members and we encourage programs to interest young
> people in becoming active in ham radio. Some of our regular 2-m net
> weekly checkins are folks less than 16 years old.

190. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 04:16:55 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgi2bp$1m8b$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73605

Thanks for your explanation, Jim.

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030802142104.14837.00001940@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <bggedonal1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Critical everyone submits a reply comment ASAP.
>
> >I guess you're making the assumption that everyone who is a ham would be
> >against this? Or, are you really being that generous where it's a
"everyone
> >should have their voice thing?"
>
> Do you think BPL is a good thing, Kim?
>

Whether I think it's a good thing or not wasn't the point of my comments.
The point was that I wonder if a "blanket invitation" for comments would
extend to those who may think it is a good idea.

> >
> >Good idea. Make everyone think uniformly...yeah, that's the ticket!
>
> What is YOUR thinking on BPL, KIm?
>

Well, I don't think I have a position on it, Jim. So, I would personally
refrain from commenting. I would not automatically think it was a bad idea
just because I am a ham radio operator, though. My point with the comments
was that uniformity can sometimes be seen as ignorance--and the FCC is
probably in a position to determine if they are getting canned messages or
not. It always a good idea, if one is participating in a mass effort to at
least come up with something truly original--even better to come up with
something that directly impacts them.

>
> btw, BPL will be just as vulnerable to disruption from physical damage as
> cable, dialup or DSL because the wires are on the same poles or in the
same
> trenches. In fact it will be more vulnerable because the lines are not
> shielded.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Maybe they'll ditch the whole thing...

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

191. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 04:24:54 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgi2qo$1mrb$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73606

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bghnks$1q9$0@208.207.71.155...
>
> PRICK, so you CAN'T prove it becasuse it never happened!
>

Uh, the signature should come *after* the post has ended, not at the
beginning... :o

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

192. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 04:25:55 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgi2sl$1msv$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73607

"K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:4804dcc1188b33b471d7d3e183a02859.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote
> >
> > Gosh, those are just a few questions people may encounter, and I am
probably
> > now going to be lambasted for thinking about the majority.
>
> No, I think you will be lambasted for not doing your homework and
> understanding the issue.
>
> "BPL" is an unlicensed service which proposes that it be allowed to
> inject RF (radio signals) into the AC distribution grid. This RF will
> extend across the MF/HF spectrum, and up into the lower VHF spectrum,
> and the power lines will act not as a transmission line, but as an
> antenna. The interference will potentially affect EVERY RADIO
> COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE (not just hams) who use the affected spectrum.
>
> In fact, BPL is a single unlicensed service which would presume to
> pollute the spectrum used by the "majority" (your word, not mine) of all
> long distance radio communications services.
>
> Kim, you seem to be a person concerned with social issues. That's a
> great quality. Go to your local library and research the term "tragedy
> of the commons".
>
> Good luck on this one now.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>

Aw, Hans...and just when the sand was drying from your britches...

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

193. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 04:28:27 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgi31e$1n3m$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73608

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F2C75C9.7030805@adelphia.net...
> K0HB wrote:
> > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote
> >
> >>Gosh, those are just a few questions people may encounter, and I am
probably
> >>now going to be lambasted for thinking about the majority.
> >
> >
> > No, I think you will be lambasted for not doing your homework and
> > understanding the issue.
> >
> > "BPL" is an unlicensed service which proposes that it be allowed to
> > inject RF (radio signals) into the AC distribution grid. This RF will
> > extend across the MF/HF spectrum, and up into the lower VHF spectrum,
> > and the power lines will act not as a transmission line, but as an
> > antenna. The interference will potentially affect EVERY RADIO
> > COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE (not just hams) who use the affected spectrum.
>
> That includes Homeland defense, defense, broadcasting, lots of people
> besides hams.
>

Well then, if it's *that* bad, I'm sure it'll be defeated, eh?

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

194. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 04:31:28 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgj5pv$2eia$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73644

Is that the music to the Twilight Zone I hear?

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030802230221.25052.00001542@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <3F2A7D17.2010501@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
> >> And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
> >> way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick, Larry,
> >> Dan, Bruce...
>
> Hmmm. Curious. I don't recall who originally posted this, but I would
> certainly be interested in seeing a quote where I said that I intended to
> "destroy the amateur radio service" once code testing had been abolished.
> To be sure, it would hardly be necessary for me to lift a finger to
"destroy
> the ARS" since our so-called "newcomers" will be doing their level best
> to accomplish that on their own!
>
> > Well, I don't intend to. Heck, I'll probably do lot's of "self
> policing".
>
> Any attempts at "self policing" will, for the most part, be wasted breath,
> once all the eager new HF phone operators are finally liberated from 11
meters
> and join their "fellow amateurs" on our HF phone bands. About the only
> thing that could possibly work would be some sort of "super Elmering" at
> the local club levels -- meaning, put the Codeless General/Extra-class
> "newcomers" on a very short leash, and keeping them on it more or less
> permanently. However, since I believe that 99.999999999018 percent of
> the problems in amateur radio originate on the phone bands, we'd be asking
> the inmates to guard the jailhouse.
>
> Looking at it from the bright side, the antics of the present and future
> phone operators may be the best "incentive" yet for people to learn the
> Morse code! However, as usual, they'll probably just give up entirely,
> rather than make the effort to learn a useful communications skill. After
> all, the code went away because of laziness.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Yes, yes it is...

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

195. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 04:39:21 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2C915D.728BDD78@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73609

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3F2BBE55.E45133EA@earthlink.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > >
> >
> > > The point is, the world (and ham radio) is NOT going to end ... despite
> > > your rants that it is.
> > >
> > > Actually, on the contrary, if these changes hadn't happened and we were
> > > still stuck in the spark era (i.e., if cranky olde fartz like you had
> > > stopped
> > > the progress of ham radio over the years), we WOULD be in danger.
> >
> > You aren't much younger than I am, Carl. You just haven't been involved
> > in amateur radio as long. Further, you remained a tech for a couple of
> > decades until the morse testing speed was dropped. Since that time,
> > you've become an HF SSB op. This latest rant shows you to be as cranky
> > as anyone else here.
> >
>
> And your notes of Carl's history with ham radio seem at most, perfuntory.
> They have nothing to do with the fact that Carl posted his comments to this
> thread. Unless you believe that Carl must be exactly equal with you before
> you consider any importance to his comments.

As you are, so is Carl in my age group. Carl sat on a Tech ticket for
2 1/2 decades until the requirements were lowered. Carl crowed about
the large numbers of highly technical people being kept out of ham radio
by "high speed" morse tests. Extra Class Carl spends his time chasing
DX on HF SSB with a commercial rig. Carl is as cranky as anyone here.
He's just cranky with a view opposite mine. I offer his sermon as
proof.

> Does one have to be in ham
> radio exactly as long as you, be as old as you, have been on HF SSB and CW
> as much as you, before you think they're "worthy?"

Why no, Kim. Then again, I didn't write anything like that. Perhaps you
just had a feeling...

> > >
> > > If you want to see what presents the biggest danger to the future of
> > > ham radio LOOK IN THE MIRROR ... the enemy you fear is yourself,

> > > with your backward thinking, unwillingness to accept progress, and lack
> > > of tolerance for newcomers (unless, of course, they've suffered through
> > > the same fraternity hazing rituals that you had to endure, lo those many
> > > years ago and think in exactly the backward, narrowminded ways that
> > > you do).
> > >
> > > When you're done looking in the mirror, you can look a your cronies,
> > > Larry, Dave Heil, and the whole list of like-thinkers... they are also
> > > part of the enemy you fear ... for they think and act essentially the
> > > same way as you do.
> >
> > I note that you've reverted to your original "Big Mouth Carl" persona,
> > Squiggy. The leopard does not change his spots, even if they fade and
> > his coat begins to look a little worn and thin in places. Your tirade
> > includes some tired and quite familiar terms like "fraternity hazing
> > rituals", "suffered" and "endure", "backward" and "narrowminded".
> >
>
> Those terms are quite appropriately used.

I'm sure you mean what you've written even if it isn't borne out by
fact.

> Perhaps you like your terms,
> better. It's always interesting to note how you quickly change to
> name-calling ("Squiggy", "Big Mouth Carl") when you see things you don't
> like.

Did you bother to read what Carl wrote about me?

> Is this another chapter in your book?

No chapter in my book is devoted to Carl. If you'd like a copy, I can
sell you one at a pre-publication discount.

> Go to your library and get a
> book on communication--somewhere in there you'll see part where it says that
> resorting to name-calling doesn't provide substantiation nor clarification
> for thoughts, only provides that the person has nothing more important to do
> but resort to infantile pouting.

Thanks for saving me the trouble of going to the library. I'll attempt
to filter out your additions and paraphrasing.

> > >
> > > THERE is where the REAL danger to the future of ham radio lies ...
> > > in people who are so married to/stuck in its past that they despise
> > > any thought of change, progress, and the newcomers that it will
> > > bring (unless the newcomers are acceptable "clones" cast in your
> > > own image).
> >
> > I submit that you don't really know where the "REAL" danger to the
> > future of ham radio lies. Simply lowering requirements and standards is

> > not "progress" in anyone's book. Newcomers have always been welcomed if
> > they're good ops. A lid is a lid and we already have enough of them.
> >
>
> The requirements have been adjusted (lowered if you like) to accommodate
> current trends and shift focus from older technology to newer.

"Adjusted" is so cute and newspeak. We're still using the older
technology in question, you might recall.

> The standards have not been lowered at all.

So the requirements have been lowered but the standards haven't?

> > >
> > > However, those newcomers are the future of ham radio ... for us older
> > > guys will surely die, and if there aren't younger folks to replace us
> ham
> > > radio will die with us.
> >
> > There have always been newcomers in amateur radio. Old timers always
> > die and newcomers always arrive. Newcomers may be the future (a great
> > many newcomers have gray hair) but we're the present, not the past. The
> > future has not yet arrived. Even you don't know what the future holds,
> > as much as you'd like to see yourself as a visionary.
> >
>
> In your stumbling around, above, your forgot to leave a point.

Not at all, Kim. You just neglected to digest it. Most new hams aren't
new people. They aren't young. Many are quite old. A great many "old
timers" have decades left in them. They aren't going away. They are
not only the past, but the present of amateur radio.

> >
> > > It's up to us to WELCOME and ENCOURAGE
> > > them ... their ways will not be the ways of the past ... things change
> and
> > > nobody can freeze time.
> >
> > I welcome and encourage them. Some of them will become good ops. Some
> > won't.
> >
>
> There's a difference between encouraging only those with whom you > agree, and
encouraging *everyone*. When you say that "standards" have > been lowered, you send a
message you may not be meaning to send.

I wrote that standards were lowered because that is, in fact what took
place (again). I did not place blame on newcomers. They didn't lower
the standard. I did not place a qualifier on the welcoming of
newcomers. Do you ever read the words I've written before replying to

them?

> > >
> > > But insulting, berating, demeaning them, and trying
> > > to keep them out is not the way ...
> >
> > I'm not insulting, berating or demeaning them. I might insult, berate
> > and demean you but not them. Newcomers aren't required to take
> > responsibility for you.
> >
>
> Your messages come across as attempts to insult, berate, and demean, Dave.

Good. I intended to insult, berate and demean Carl. I wrote no such
thing about newcomers. You didn't read what I wrote or you could not
have come to such a conclusion.

> You are very political in your approach with people here.

No kidding. Clue us in as to what you do here.

> If someone does
> not act and think just as you, you assert superiority.

What are you attempting to achieve in writing the sentence above? Are
you attempting to assert superiority?

> > > Think about these things long and hard before you look yourself in
> > > the mirror again ... without some reflection, reconsideration, and
> change
> > > in your ways, you may not like what you see ... the enemy that is YOU.
> >
> > I'll take your sermon to heart about the time you begin telling us of
> > your own soul searching, reflection and reconsideration of opinions
> > which are unlike your own. Let us know if you like what you see.
> >
> > > (Try to be *completely* like Scrooge ... go through the change, don't >
> stay stuck in the first part ...)
> >
> > Quit rattling your chains and moaning.

> You are quite dislikable, whether you realize it or not.

I'm sure that it appears that way to someone like you, Kim. In your
view, Carl can tell others to engage in reflection and tell them to
change their ways. If similar words are directed to Carl, you find the
person "dislikable". Go hug a tree, Kim. Take a whale to lunch.

> And you do seem to approach life from the comfort zone...

...whatever that means.

Dave K8MN

196. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 04:40:44 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2C91B4.3568C4C2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73610

Brian wrote:
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bggi7g$pu7$2@adenine.netfront.net>...
> >
> > You are quite dislikable, whether you realize it or not. And you do seem to
> > approach life from the comfort zone...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Probably from a lifetime of work and play in a radio shack. He needs
> to get out more often.

I get out very well on any number of bands.

Dave K8MN

197. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 04:42:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj0jjng.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73611

On 02 Aug 2003 20:21:11 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>People with limited mobility might use various devices to
>fill out the answer sheet, or verbalize their answers rather
>than writing them.

Do you mean "oral"? "Verbal" includes both "written" and "oral".
The opposite of "verbal" is "graphic".

We get that trick question in the first hour, first day of Law
School Contracts I regarding what's not worth the paper it's not
written on (which is not true - except in specific instances where
the law requires that a contract be in writing, an oral contract can
be as enforceable as a written contract).

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

198. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 04:42:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj0ml7i.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73612

On 02 Aug 2003 12:27:10 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Then please explain why there are so many NALs for violations
>committed using voice modes, and so few for violations using Morse
>code or data modes. Maybe it's not the TEST but the MODE that has an
>effect?

The days when the monitoring stations would catch ham operators 2
or 3 kHz outside the band edge (especially in contests) are gone
forever. "Cruising" is no longer a daily activity.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

199. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 04:42:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj0mc5h.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73613

On 02 Aug 2003 12:27:09 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>I just mentioned Godwin's Law. I wasn't expecting the Spanish Inquisition.

Mike Godwin, with whom I met and debated in several seminars on
Computer Freedom and Privacy in the 90s, tossed out "Godwin's Law"
in a moment of sarcasm.....

Is it now "holy writ" ?? <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

200. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 04:42:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj0n1pj.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73614

On 2 Aug 2003 04:31:13 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>> BTW - Arnold declined to run.
>
>Supposedly his XYL put the nix on it because she doesn't want to be
>anywhere near the BS.

Isn't he married to Maria Shriver, marriage-related to the Kennedys?

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

201. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 04:51:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2C943A.389193CB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73616

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> Simple, the old-timers are not interested in new ideas.
> > >
> > >Your statement is not substantiated by fact.
> >
> > It is a broad generalization, which, unless there is a logical > influence, cannot support itself.

It certainly is broad and it certainly doesn't support itself.

> However, I did not say 100% old-timer are not interested
> in new ideas, just that there is a tendency for that in Ham radio.

Actually, that is not what you said at all. What you said is:
"Simple, the old-timers are not interested in new ideas."

> Thats my,
> and other's, experience, so is not substantiated by fact.

No "other's" have confirmed your claim.

> >The first part of your statement is not "an example" at all. Morse code
> > >has demonstrated its usefulness and is still widely used in amateur
> > >radio. Someone might "hold on" to morse code and be very active with
> > >newer modes or might be involved in electronic circuit design.
> >
> > In my local club newsletter. The club states that a new HF setup is keeping
> > with the goal of advancement of the radio art. However, the do little else
> > towards that effect, despite having alot of resourses which can be utilized for
> > technical activities.

They're probably doing all that when you aren't around.

> Also, few club members are interested in homebrewing,
> despite claiming interest by posing for a photograph showing club > members doing a group project.

Well, they do have photographic proof. We're stuck with just your
claim.

> So, the "advancement of the radio art" is just a justification
> for more HF/CW activities.

So you're back to telling them where their interests should lie.

> >The second part of your statement, the one about pressuring new Hams to
> >learn morse code is unsubstantiated by fact.
>
> At various antenna setups, the other Hams try to persuade me to learn > Morse code. This has happened several times.

And it was "pressure", not "encouragement"? Did it dawn on you that
they might be going easier on others and that they save the high
pressure tactics for you?

> >Some new hams don't want
> >to learn morse code and don't.
>
> >The third part of your statement, dealing with the exclusion of those
> >who don't want to learn morse code, is unsubstantiated by fact.
>
> The ones that do become popular with the other club members. The ones that
> don't want to learn Morse code become excluded.

Ahhh! So it is just you and it is now about popularity.

> >How do you know what "most old timers" do and what they are not
> >interested in? I know old timers who are very technically inclined
>
> All I can say is what I have found in my area and in several other states.

I'll wager that most "old timers" aren't even involved with a radio
club. You'll have to use the callsign database and begin making phone
calls or knocking on doors to come up with a scientific sampling, Vipul.
I'd like to be able to feel sorry for you but my experience tells me
that you don't really have a handle on reality.

> There have been exceptions of course, but it is too rare to be worth > the effort. I cannot search out the contradiction.

That's right. You've begun with an outcome and you're trying to make
the statistics fit that outcome. Good luck.

Dave K8MN

202. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 04:52:52 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgi4f4$qp5$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 73617

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bghivc$2t0$0@208.207.71.163...
> >
> > The fact is there for all to see- the code test has for years been the
> ONLY
> > factor hindering those very induhvidiuals from HF ham radio access en
> masse.
> > With the code test gone, here they come!
> >
>
> The sky is falling! The sky is falling! (sayeth Dick ...)

Nope. Sayeth Kandid Karl. I'm just describing the facts.

>
>
> That's my point ... every change in the history of ham radio
> has had folks like Dick ranting and raving that "This will be
> the end of ham radio!"
>

Oh *that* won't end ham radio, just make it unrecognizable. Maybe to the point where FCC or other authority would strongly consider action to seriously curtail the service.When enough hams cease to behave well enough you can be sure closer scrutiny will result. The enforcement problems today represent a quite small percentage of hams, but it won't take much of a raise in that percentage for the ship to go aground. Believe it, it didn't originate with me. If you've missed
authorities remarks to that effect, shame on you.

>
> (Not!)
>
> What WILL be the end of ham radio is a lack of significant
> growth ..

BS, Pal. There are now six times the number of US hams that existed when I was first licensed, and the US population has NOT grown anywhere that much.

When commercials want our spectrum badly enough they'll get some of it, as they have in the past. Of course yoiu already know that. Maybe you're not sharp enough to know that the more troublemakers and scofflaws we accrue the more likely we're to be viewed as no longer willing and able to self-police the ARS.

Without the vast majority of hams keeping themselves in line the ARS *WILL*
cease to exist, or don't you pay attention to Riley and other authorities?

> . as Alun has said, the Morse test is a "no sell" for
> many folks who would otherwise make fine hams.
>

Unhuh, we've heard that for decades and still no beef. Any individual too
hung up
on himself to bother to learn a measly 5wpm VERY basic morse code is simply
too mildly interested for it to matter what the requirements are. He's just
not interested *enough*. If he was, the code would be no barrier at all, as
proven many thousands of times over. Barrier Schmarrier! It's your Agenda
strawman!

>
> The "hordes of CBers" argument doesn't hold water ...
> if they're "freebanding" (illegally and without licenses)
> around 27 MHz, why would any rational person think
> the lack of a license would keep them from the ham
> bands TODAY (if they wanted to be here) ...
>

You really uninformed, aren't you? Yyou been too busy rachetjawing on 20
meter SSB to notice what's going on on 10 meters? Read the latest enforcement
logs.
That's where they talk to* each other*. They don't need to, they have all
that mostly uninhabited spectrum between CB and 28 mhz but instead they land
in the 10 meter band by CHOICE. Wonder why they do that? Couldn't be for the
very reason I've stated-that they just want to cause trouble for, and thumb
their noses at hams, could it? Why shouldn't they get easy ham radio licenses
and REALLY do it right?

It's not surprising you missed out on the reported cases where numbers of
those very people have been overheard discussing what they intend to do after
they get their no-code licenses and get on HF. If a few are heard making such
plans, you can be sure many plan it that don't talk about it overtly.

>
> The doom and gloom, end of the world scenario that Dick
> keeps trying to peddle smells of sour grapes ...
>

You can sanitize it any way you want, but the situation smells and it isn't
going away with the end of code testing, to the contrary, It'll only get
worse.

203. Re: Using ham bands for educational / research project

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 04:54:02 UTC
From: Bill Frovik n0mnb <n0mnb@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <w9-dnUZjZosRCbGiXTWJkQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 73615
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

```
go for it. as long as u share your info and results with the ham
community..and it wouldn't hurt to get ur ticket..
73's de n0mnb
"Leo Szumel" <please_use_my_last_name@ieee.org> wrote in message
news:bdvgma$88l$1@woodrow.ucdavis.edu...
> Hi,
>
> What we'd like to do is use amateur radio for some university research
> projects. Specifically, we would like to use AR equipment in sensor
> network research. Sensor networks are basically like APRS without people
> at the transmit nodes, and more than just position information is
> reported (maybe temperature, etc). Also, multi-hop relay may be employed.
>
> I've examined Part 97 rules and tried to read as many applicable threads
> as possible. My interpretation is that:
>
> (a) automated transmissions are OK (with caveats)
> (b) AR can be used for educational (non-commercial) purposes
> (c) AR can be used for data transmissions, using encrypted
> authentication, provided the data payload is unencrypted
>
> Part (b) is the most shaky becaues it seems to dependon "reasonable use"
> and other gray terms. Certainly my proposed use is not "hobby" but it
> seems to me to fall into the category of "experimentation" and
> (hopefully) "advancing the field."
>
> What do you think of using AR bands for relaying sensor information for
> research purposes? Would an FCC Special Temporary Authority be
> appropriate/required?
>
> Sincerely,
>
> --
> Leo Szumel | ECE Graduate Student, UC Davis
> Email: my_last_name@ieee.org
>
```

204. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 05:01:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2C9682.FFEC97A8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73618

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From (Larry Roll K3LT):
>
> >If that is the case in your club, then simply work around the old timers
> >that you find so offensive, and get your fellow newcomers involved in your
> >projects. What is so difficult about that?
>
> The newcomers seem to be of the same mode also.

Your tales always end with you being the odd man out.

> The ones that are interested in
> the technical stuff probably would have left within one or two meetings.

Your job is to seek them out and meld a new club based around your
unique definition of what an amateur radio club should be.

> Probably same would be true about the social aspect of newcomers. Thats why the
> demographics seem to stay as they are when new people join.

So the club stays full of those who are interested in talking about
amateur radio and who set up operating events and then waste that time
by actually operating rather than touring the beach, eating salads and
chatting up the "preety fems".

I'm involved in a county group which is part of ARES. Most of the hams
involved are not interested in contesting or DXing. Many operate VHF FM
only. I don't know any who've designed and built a linear amplifier.
Only one other is interested in collecting and restoring vintage gear.
I continue to attend. We interact based on our common interests rather
than the things which divide us.

Dave K8MN

> The other alternative is to start my own club. I tried it, but that was not too
> successful.

205. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 05:25:47 UTC
From: leaky fawecettes <dumdadeedum4@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1059888434.286818@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 73619

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F29B941.3060802@adelphia.net...
> Just practicing one of the the new Q signals....
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Another guy in here thinks the end of CW spells
the complete end of ham radio.....how utterly
pathetic...

206. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 06:37:50 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <252Xa.19658$A52.17243@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 73620

Multiple guess.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030802223640.14766.00000906@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >There still are a couple of written
> >exams
>
> Is that what there called?

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.506 / Virus Database: 303 - Release Date: 8/1/03

207. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 07:46:47 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <873cgjb2u0.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73621

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
>
>>I just mentioned Godwin's Law. I wasn't expecting the Spanish Inquisition.
>
> Mike Godwin, with whom I met and debated in several seminars on
> Computer Freedom and Privacy in the 90s, tossed out "Godwin's Law"
> in a moment of sarcasm.....
>
> Is it now "holy writ" ?? <ggg>

It was not sarcasm. It was a very *intentional* experiment in
social engineering on the net, and it was clearly very
successful too!

And yes, it is now a "holy writ", and probably the 2nd most
famous one. The most famous being "Thou shalt not top post".

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

208. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 08:37:30 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB524209.1FF2B%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 73622

"WA8ULX" wrote:

> (snip) ...to there Free... (snip)

Try "...to their free..." instead. The rest deserves no real response.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

209. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 08:38:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB52424F.1FF2C%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 73623

"WA8ULX" wrote:
>
> Is that what there called?

Try "...what they're called..." instead. The rest deserves no real
response.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

210. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 08:53:49 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB5245DC.1FF2E%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 73624

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> That's because you won't hear it anywhere but
> here--as whining, Dwight. With the exception
> of a few on this newsgroup, the participants
> in this newsgroup are very out of touch with
> ham radio...

You right about that, Kim. If all those outside these newsgroups were like those here, everyone would have probably killed each other by now.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

211. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 09:04:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB52486D.1FF30%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 73625

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
> Kim is having some trouble with her newsreader, so
> I'm forwarding this reply post with her permission.
>>
>> (snip)
>>
>> I appreciate and respect the tradition of CW as a
>> part of ham radio. I appreciate and respect most
>> (excluding some here in this newsgroup only) CW
>> operators and operation. I can't tell you how many
>> times I've felt quite privileged to watch a CW
>> operator at Field Day. I will defend to the end of
>> ham radio that CW is wonderful, a skill that only
>> few will learn and use, and that it has a rich
>> tradition and history in ham radio. But I will not
>> defend saying that having it as a testing
>> requirement proves a dawgoned thing, because it
>> just plain doesn't.

Well-written comments, Kim. So well written, there is nothing else to add. So I'll wait to see how the responses fall. And thanks for posting Kim's message, Mike.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

212. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 09:36:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308030136.739cf065@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73626

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hj0n1pj.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 2 Aug 2003 04:31:13 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >> BTW - Arnold declined to run.
> > >
> > >Supposedly his XYL put the nix on it because she doesn't want to be
> > >anywhere near the BS.
> >
> > Isn't he married to Maria Shriver, marriage-related to the Kennedys?

I think she's blood, one of Robert K's daughters, niece of the
President of the Chapaquiddick Diving Team.

213. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 09:43:38 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308030143.66ff5dee@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73627

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93CBC6A1646A4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> news:NnQWa.41777$Wd5.9022641@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>
> > Wow Carl,
> >
> > All that below to equate those who support the retention of Element 1
> > with "the enemy." I repeat, are you sure we're talking about the 5-wpm
> > exam? Sure doesn't sound like it.
> >
>
> The continued existence of a CW test does actually threaten the future of
> the hobby, i.e. it is a 'deal killer' for recruitment. Unfortunately, a
> lot of damage has already been done, as it has been allowed to persist
> long past it's 'sell by' date.
>
> Sure, 5 wpm is easy (higher speeds were not, but that's moot now).
> However, the CW test manages to be too slow to impart any genuinely useful
> level of CW ability, whilst at the same time putting off prospective hams.
> In other words, it's more counter-productive than useful.
>
> Sure. there is a lot of CW use by hams on HF, but there are precious few
> prospective hams who want to use it. Put in all the written questions you
> like on CW, though, as that won't cause the same kind of problem.
>
> I think it's true that those who want to keep a code test would likely
> have wanted to keep spark if they had been around back then. If they
> really could stop the wheel of progress, the hobby likely would die with
> their generation, but luckily that won't happen.
>
> Keeping out all those who aren't interested in CW may keep a few
> 'breakers' out, but it keeps out most people, period. That may suit a few
> people here, but it isn't the way forward. Ultimately, keeping the code
> test would do far more to destroy the hobby than letting in a few CBers
> (and I do mean a few, as most of them are not smart enough to pass the
> written tests). If we keep a code test, the hobby will fail for lack of
> interest. Luckily, I don't expect that to happen.

When does your Green Card expire?

214. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 09:47:36 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87ptjn9io7.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73628

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:
>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hj0n1pj.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
>> On 2 Aug 2003 04:31:13 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>> >> BTW - Arnold declined to run.
>> >
>> >Supposedly his XYL put the nix on it because she doesn't want to be
>> >anywhere near the BS.
>>
>> Isn't he married to Maria Shriver, marriage-related to the Kennedys?
>
>I think she's blood, one of Robert K's daughters, niece of the
>President of the Chapaquiddick Diving Team.

Actually she is the daughter of Eunice Kennedy Shriver and
Sargent Shriver. That makes her the niece of former President
of the United States John F. Kennedy.

Incidentally, if anyone has any doubt about Arnold having some
smarts, a quick review of his choice of mates should indicate
he's no dummy.

The claimed nix mentioned above regarding the BS seems like
clear proof of it too. Sharp lady...

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

215. Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 10:13:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308030213.2da209b9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73629

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<koOWa.2376$lL.382886@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308020525560.190@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > On Fri, 1 Aug 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
> > >...
> > > Others have pointed out that rule 301(e) was written that way to avoid
> > > creating any new 'Tech+' licencees, but it looks as if invoking the
> > > international rules created a sunset clause, whether intentionally or
> > > otherwise.
> >
> > AH! Someone who is now on the verge of understanding what that "wierd"
> thing I
> > said was. IT was a "sunset clause" and the change to S25.5 was the
> "sunset."
>
> It is NOT a sunset clause ... NCI specifically asked for a sunset clause
> so code testing would "automagically" go away when S25.5 was suppressed
> or changed so that code testing was no longer required by the ITU Radio
> Regs.
>
> The FCC SPECIFICALLY declined to enact such a sunset clause, and the
> text of 301 does NOT contain one, no matter how you try to twist it.
>
> >
> > > I don't really see how that throws anything into chaos. Right now no-
> > > coders who operate on the Novice/Tech HF allocations can't readily be
> > > detected for lack of any central records to prove that they are actually
> > > no-coders. If the changes to s25.5 affect 97.301(e) so as to make it
> > > permissible, then from the FCC perspective it makes an enforcement
> problem
> > > go away!
> >
>
> Again (and again ... you people must not be able to read, only write) ...
> the FCC *DOES* have records of which Techs have 5 wpm credit and
> which don't ... this idea that "there are no records, so you can get away
> with it is 1) false, and 2) borders on inducement to violate the rules.
>
> If someone follows your (VERY BAD) advice and gets cited for it,
> I hope they explain that "(fill in the names from usenet) told me it was
> OK" and the FCC comes knocking on your doors with citations for
> #2 above ...
>

> [remainder of totally incorrect psuedo/quasi-regulatry crap deleted in
> the interest of not further perpetuating/propagating misinformation ...]
>
> Carl - wk3c

AMEN. That oughta cork it.

216. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 12:06:28 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <8V6Xa.45902$ib2.12932146@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 73630

No, CB'ers are getting the Ham Bands.

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030802210406.21580.00000808@mb-m07.aol.com...
> Do Hams get 11 Meters Back, as soon as all the CBers upgrade to there Free
> Handout Ham Licenses?

217. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 12:09:39 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <7Y6Xa.45903$ib2.12933664@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 73631

Why bother, Ham Radio as it was know is dead anyway.

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:iKzWa.2315$lL.372712@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> Today the Ed Thomas, Chief of the FCC's Office of Engineering
> and Technology, issued an order extending the Reply Comment
> period in ET Docket No. 03-104 (BPL) until August 20, 2003.
>
> Remember, paper filed comments are due at the correct address
> by COB on the deadline day, electronic comments via the ECFS
> have until midnight at the end of the deadline day.
>
> FOLKS ... if you are going to comment, PLEASE don't "flame"
> the FCC or the proponents of BPL ... just cite facts (the ARRL's
> comments and the excellent technical analysis done by Ed Hare
> are full of them ...).
>
> Flaming will hurt us more than it will help us.
>
> Keep it calm, rational, and polite, please, for all of our sakes.
>
> 73,
> Carl - wk3c
>

218. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 12:11:45 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93CC53475F12Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 73632

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0308030143.66ff5dee@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns93CBC6A1646A4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
>> news:NnQWa.41777$Wd5.9022641@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>>
>> > Wow Carl,
>> >
>> > All that below to equate those who support the retention of Element
>> > 1 with "the enemy." I repeat, are you sure we're talking about the
>> > 5-wpm exam? Sure doesn't sound like it.
>> >
>>
>> The continued existence of a CW test does actually threaten the future
>> of the hobby, i.e. it is a 'deal killer' for recruitment.
>> Unfortunately, a lot of damage has already been done, as it has been
>> allowed to persist long past it's 'sell by' date.
>>
>> Sure, 5 wpm is easy (higher speeds were not, but that's moot now).
>> However, the CW test manages to be too slow to impart any genuinely
>> useful level of CW ability, whilst at the same time putting off
>> prospective hams. In other words, it's more counter-productive than
>> useful.
>>
>> Sure. there is a lot of CW use by hams on HF, but there are precious
>> few prospective hams who want to use it. Put in all the written
>> questions you like on CW, though, as that won't cause the same kind of
>> problem.
>>
>> I think it's true that those who want to keep a code test would likely
>> have wanted to keep spark if they had been around back then. If they
>> really could stop the wheel of progress, the hobby likely would die
>> with their generation, but luckily that won't happen.
>>
>> Keeping out all those who aren't interested in CW may keep a few
>> 'breakers' out, but it keeps out most people, period. That may suit a
>> few people here, but it isn't the way forward. Ultimately, keeping the
>> code test would do far more to destroy the hobby than letting in a few
>> CBers (and I do mean a few, as most of them are not smart enough to
>> pass the written tests). If we keep a code test, the hobby will fail
>> for lack of interest. Luckily, I don't expect that to happen.
>

> When does your Green Card expire?
>

January 3, 2011. That's a bit like asking someone when their driver's licence expires. The two renewal processes are much the same, except that Immigration don't test my eyesight!

This debate extends to much more than just the US, anyway.

219. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 12:23:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308030423.74389c2c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73633

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hj0n1pj.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 2 Aug 2003 04:31:13 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >> BTW - Arnold declined to run.
> > >
> > >Supposedly his XYL put the nix on it because she doesn't want to be
> > >anywhere near the BS.

Do they live in California?

>
> Isn't he married to Maria Shriver, marriage-related to the Kennedys?

Don't know. I don't watch Access Hollywood or Entertainment or any of that "stuff."

220. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 12:30:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308030430.75e2f33d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73634

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bghinm$hp6$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0308021524.1c9bfdc9@posting.google.com...
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:<bgfbij$g6k$1@208.206.142.103>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:<bgdsmc$fs9$1@208.207.71.145>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get
> their
> > > > > > way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick,
> Larry,
> > > > > > Dan, Bruce...
> > > > >
> > > > > Citations please, to use your favorite phrase. NOWHERE has any of
> the above said any such
> > > > > thing and you know it... no, actually you probably don't. You don't
> seem to know much of
> > > > > anything.
> > > >
> > > > Now you're lying.
> > >
> > > So you can prove it, right? Get it on!
> >
> > DICK, you remember what you said, or don't you?
>
> Brian is a liar, a bs artist, and just a general troublemaker. No one said
> a thing about destroying the ARS. I for one said I would fight against
> those THAT WANT TO DESTROY THE ARS. Which obviously includes Brian the
> braindead.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Ah, Buddy of Bruce. You're another one who denies (or can't remember)
what he said.

In any case, I'll accept your conversion to "protector of the ARS."

Brian

221. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 12:37:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308030437.7d8ed774@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73635

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bgi2qo$1mrb$1@adenine.netfront.net>...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bghnks$1q9$0@208.207.71.155...
> >
> > PRICK, so you CAN'T prove it becasuse it never happened!
>
> Uh, the signature should come *after* the post has ended, not at the
> beginning... :o
>
> Kim W5TIT

That's what happens when he gets upset. Misspells words, too.

222. Re: Later, folks!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 12:43:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308030443.2b7d0c07@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73636

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3F2C6D1A.3020704@adelphia.net>...
> Well, I'm off on a vacation to the soggy Northeast, so I'll be off line
> this week.
>
> Everyone have a good week, and don't get too mad at each other!! 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike, have a great time and watch out for the black flies.

Brian

223. Re: CORRECTION!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 12:44:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308030444.26307f9c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73637

```
averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030802203453.09680.00000826@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: CORRECTION!!!
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 7/31/03 3:34 PM Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0307311134.4e87c9c6@posting.google.com>
> >
> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> >news:<5c01b95b.0307310521.151ae9a7@posting.google.com>...
> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
> news:<f45722ac.0307291516.319b327@posting.google.com>...
> >> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
> news:<5c01b95b.0307290749.e3cd378@posting.google.com>...
> >> >
> >> > > And the "garbage" that get's thrown in here was dumped by someone
> >> > > other than me...I just pick up the pieces and make a fool of the guy
> >> > > who did it.
> >> > >
> >> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >> >
> >> > Oh geez. You vomit last night's booze on here on an almost daily
> >> > basis and make a fool of only yourself.
> >>
> >> Whew. That was poignant, Brain. Come up with that one one your own?
> >>
> >> And a sincere THANK-YOU for making my point with your graphic "wit".
> >>
> >> Steve, K4YZ
> >
> >Well, you do. Then you say you pick thru the chunks and make fools of other
> >people.
> >
> >You fool only yourself.
> >
> Maybe Brian should get one of those monkeys for a pet :-) :-) :-) :-)
>
> Bottoms up! :-) :-) :-) :-)

What monkeys? and why are you impersonating Len?
```

224. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 13:12:22 UTC
From: N22X <N22X@sherzfordzent.com>
Message-ID: <bgj1ml$nt4$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73638
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"yazoo63" <bankstonb@cox.net> wrote in message
news:581Xa.3888$qf.399@lakeread06...
> Hearing a station playing old-time country (or gospel) music mixed in with
> what sounds like a male announcer
> preaching a sermon.
>
> Receiving this fairly weak (S-5) with a lot of QRM into northern Virginia.
> (thank god for notch filters !!!)
>
> Anyone have any info on this station ?
>
> Barry
> N4IJN
> Fredericksburg, VA
>
>
Since the FCC closed all their monitoring stations seven
years ago, the number of pirates and unlicensed activity
on HF has jumped by quantum leaps. We are observing
pirates in the 6600 khz range, which is reserved for
aero ops, something which was unheard of in the days of
active FCC enforcement.

N22X
Terra Haute, IN

225. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 13:15:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030803091558.21428.00001484@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 73639

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hj0jjng.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 02 Aug 2003 20:21:11 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>People with limited mobility might use various devices to
>>fill out the answer sheet, or verbalize their answers rather
>>than writing them.
>
> Do you mean "oral"?

DOH!!!!

> "Verbal" includes both "written" and "oral".
> The opposite of "verbal" is "graphic".
>
> We get that trick question in the first hour, first day of Law
> School Contracts I regarding what's not worth the paper it's not
> written on (which is not true - except in specific instances where
> the law requires that a contract be in writing, an oral contract can
> be as enforceable as a written contract).

HAW! My bad!

Perfect example of why legal stuff is written the way it is, rather than in 'plain English regular people can understand'. Of course the fact that 'regular people' can understand the same 'plain English' sentence several different conflicting ways is conveniently forgotten.

Point is, there are plenty of accomodations possible for both the written and code tests.

--

Phil has probably seen this many times, but for the rest of us:

From the book "Disorder in the Court":

Last one is the corker

73 de Jim, N2EY

Q: What is your date of birth?
A: July fifteenth.
Q: What year?
A: Every year

Q: What gear were you in at moment of the impact?

A: Gucci sweats and Reeboks.

Q: This myasthenia gravis, does it affect your memory at all?
A: Yes.
Q: And in what ways does it affect your memory?
A: I forget.
Q: You forget. Can you give us an example of something you've forgotten?

Q: How old is your son, the one living with you.
A: Thirty-eight or thirty-five, I can't remember which.
Q: How long has he lived with you?
A: Forty-five years.

Q: What was the first thing your husband said to you when he woke up that morning?
A: He said, "Where am I, Cathy?"
Q: And why did that upset you?
A: My name is Susan.

Q: And where was the location of the accident?
A: Approximately milepost 499.
Q: And where is milepost 499?
A: Probably between milepost 498 and 500.

Q: Sir, what is your IQ?
A: Well, I can see pretty well, I think.

Q: Did you blow your horn or anything?
A: After the accident?
Q: Before the accident.
A: Sure, I played for 10 years. I even went to school for it.

Q: Trooper, when you -stopped the defendant, were your red and blue lights flashing?
A: Yes.
Q: Did the defendant say anything when she got out of her car?
A: Yes, sir.
Q: What did she say?
A: "What disco am I at?"

Q: Now doctor, isn't it true that when a person dies in his sleep, he doesn't know about it until the next morning?

Q: The youngest son, the 20-year old, how old is he?

Q: Were you present when your picture was taken?

Q: So the date of conception of (the baby) was August 8th?
A: Yes.
Q: And what were you doing at that time?

Q: She had three children, right?
A: Yes.
Q: How many were boys?
A: None.
Q: Were there any girls?

Q: You say the stairs went down to the basement?
A: Yes.
Q: And these stairs, did they go up also?

Q: How was your first marriage terminated?
A: By death.
Q: And by whose death was it terminated?

Q: Can you describe the individual?
A: He was about medium height and had a beard.
Q: Was this a male or a female?

Q: Is your appearance here this morning pursuant to a deposition notice that I sent to your attorney?
A: No, this is how I dress when I go to work.

Q: Doctor, how many autopsies have you performed on dead people?
A: All my autopsies are performed on dead people.

Q: All your responses must be oral, OK?
What school did you go to?
A: Oral.

---

226. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 13:18:25 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <BY7Xa.15583$Vx2.8054756@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 73640

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bgi31e$1n3m$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F2C75C9.7030805@adelphia.net...
> > That includes Homeland defense, defense, broadcasting, lots of people
> > besides hams.
> >
>
> Well then, if it's *that* bad, I'm sure it'll be defeated, eh?
>
> Kim W5TIT

And that is the most naive statement about the workings of government that I
have ever seen.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

227. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 13:20:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030803092050.23869.00000931@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 73641

> Try "...to their free..." instead.

No I like" there" better, besides it Pisses you Knuckle draggers off.

228. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 13:22:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030803092219.23869.00000932@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 73642

>No, CB'ers are getting the Ham Bands.

Yes your right, what I meant to say was CBplussers.

229. Re: Using ham bands for educational / research project

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 14:02:36 UTC
From: "WB3FUP (Mike Hall)" <wb3fup@msn.com>
Message-ID: <bgj4lu$p4gko$1@ID-134747.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 73643
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc

I believe that you have to have a properly licensed control operator, at a control point, for any transmission made on amateur radio except in the case of emergency. Emergency is further defined as threat to life and property.

I have, on various boy scout camporees, place a two meter, rock controlled radio, set on 52, in the disaster sight. The boys were on there own, but there was always someone with a stronger radio, close at hand, to monitor, w/o the boys realizing it. Never had a problem, and did some sole searching about definition of control point. Decided that the stretch, if any was worth it, and I was willing to defend my decision if necessary.

--
73 es cul

wb3fup
a Salty Bear

"Bill Frovik n0mnb" <n0mnb@comcast.net> wrote in message news:w9-dnUZjZosRCbGiXTWJkQ@comcast.com...
> go for it. as long as u share your info and results with the ham
> community..and it wouldn't hurt to get ur ticket..
> 73's de n0mnb
> "Leo Szumel" <please_use_my_last_name@ieee.org> wrote in message
> news:bdvgma$88l$1@woodrow.ucdavis.edu...
> > Hi,
> >
> > What we'd like to do is use amateur radio for some university research
> > projects. Specifically, we would like to use AR equipment in sensor
> > network research. Sensor networks are basically like APRS without people
> > at the transmit nodes, and more than just position information is
> > reported (maybe temperature, etc). Also, multi-hop relay may be employed.

> >
> > I've examined Part 97 rules and tried to read
as many applicable threads
> > as possible. My interpretation is that:
> >
> > (a) automated transmissions are OK (with
caveats)
> > (b) AR can be used for educational
(non-commercial) purposes
> > (c) AR can be used for data transmissions,
using encrypted
> > authentication, provided the data payload is
unencrypted
> >
> > Part (b) is the most shaky becaues it seems to
dependon "reasonable use"
> > and other gray terms. Certainly my proposed
use is not "hobby" but it
> > seems to me to fall into the category of
"experimentation" and
> > (hopefully) "advancing the field."
> >
> > What do you think of using AR bands for
relaying sensor information for
> > research purposes? Would an FCC Special
Temporary Authority be
> > appropriate/required?
> >
> > Sincerely,
> >
> > --
> > Leo Szumel | ECE Graduate Student, UC Davis
> > Email: my_last_name@ieee.org
> >
>
>

230. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 14:35:33 UTC
From: JMBCV <nobody@mail.jmbcv.net>
Message-ID: <4d97bf651f9acb3c4418ccd59091a0ec@mail.jmbcv.net>
Source record: 73645

In article <3F2C9682.FFEC97A8@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>
> Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> > From (Larry Roll K3LT):
> >
> > >If that is the case in your club, then simply work around the old timers
> > >that you find so offensive, and get your fellow newcomers involved in your
> > >projects. What is so difficult about that?
> >
> > The newcomers seem to be of the same mode also.
>
> Your tales always end with you being the odd man out.
>
> > The ones that are interested in
> > the technical stuff probably would have left within one or two meetings.
>
> Your job is to seek them out and meld a new club based around your
> unique definition of what an amateur radio club should be.
>
> > Probably same would be true about the social aspect of newcomers. Thats why the
> > demographics seem to stay as they are when new people join.
>
> So the club stays full of those who are interested in talking about
> amateur radio and who set up operating events and then waste that time
> by actually operating rather than touring the beach, eating salads and
> chatting up the "preety fems".
>
> I'm involved in a county group which is part of ARES.

Feh. You've attended only one meeting..and just to harass and stalk another ham, ASSHOLE.

> Most of the hams
> involved are not interested in contesting or DXing. Many operate VHF FM
> only. I don't know any who've designed and built a linear amplifier.
> Only one other is interested in collecting and restoring vintage gear.

Yep, they are a clique of losers.....

> I continue to attend. We interact

Except the fact you fail to bathe regularly, you mean.......fuckstick.

>based on our common interests rather than the things which divide us.

Yeah, those common interests being not helping newer hams......

>
> > The other alternative is to start my own club. I tried it, but that was not too
> > successful.

btw, fuck off, High-el.

231. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 14:43:08 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgj71t$2ffe$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73646

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F2C915D.728BDD78@earthlink.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > And your notes of Carl's history with ham radio seem at most,
perfuntory.
> > They have nothing to do with the fact that Carl posted his comments to
this
> > thread. Unless you believe that Carl must be exactly equal with you
before
> > you consider any importance to his comments.
>
> As you are, so is Carl in my age group. Carl sat on a Tech ticket for
> 2 1/2 decades until the requirements were lowered.
>

So?

>
> Carl crowed about
> the large numbers of highly technical people being kept out of ham radio
> by "high speed" morse tests. Extra Class Carl spends his time chasing
> DX on HF SSB with a commercial rig. Carl is as cranky as anyone here.
> He's just cranky with a view opposite mine. I offer his sermon as
> proof.
>

You mounted your view on the allegation that Carl has not been licensed in
the same manner as you (re: your whining about his being a Tech for so long
and his alledged comments about CW).

>
> > Does one have to be in ham
> > radio exactly as long as you, be as old as you, have been on HF SSB and
CW
> > as much as you, before you think they're "worthy?"
>
> Why no, Kim. Then again, I didn't write anything like that. Perhaps you
> just had a feeling...
>

Then, why the opening remarks then and now, with this post, about how long
Carl was a Tech and his alledged comments on CW? Why enter that into your
remarks at all, Dave, if not to cast attention to that? If you are casting
attention to that, then why?

>
> > Perhaps you like your terms,
> > better. It's always interesting to note how you quickly change to
> > name-calling ("Squiggy", "Big Mouth Carl") when you see things you don't
> > like.
>
> Did you bother to read what Carl wrote about me?
>

And, I think many times here you have poked at me for defending something I've said because of what or how someone else said it. Which makes you a hypocrite for now defending your actions because of the actions of someone else.

> >
> > Is this another chapter in your book?
>
> No chapter in my book is devoted to Carl. If you'd like a copy, I can
> sell you one at a pre-publication discount.
>

I've read the book, seen the movie. Both were unworthy of my partaking in your offer.

> >
> > Go to your library and get a
> > book on communication--somewhere in there you'll see part where it says
that
> > resorting to name-calling doesn't provide substantiation nor
clarification
> > for thoughts, only provides that the person has nothing more important
to do
> > but resort to infantile pouting.
>
> Thanks for saving me the trouble of going to the library. I'll attempt
> to filter out your additions and paraphrasing.
>

Glad to see you got my point, no matter how you may resent it.

> >
> > The requirements have been adjusted (lowered if you like) to accommodate
> > current trends and shift focus from older technology to newer.
>
> "Adjusted" is so cute and newspeak. We're still using the older
> technology in question, you might recall.
>

Then, changed if you like that better. Dave, the "requirements" for living have changed since the pioneer days. Things change constantly, if they intend to keep up. The requirements for ham radio have changed here in the United States and now, indeed, the world. What about that is so difficult for you to grasp.

I note your folding my remarks up into your neat little package of, "if one does argues against CW testing in any way, they must certainly be against the use of CW." Use your claimed intelligence. Find a damned post where I have ever said anything against its use. I am only and simply against it being a testing element.

>
> > The standards have not been lowered at all.
>
> So the requirements have been lowered but the standards haven't?
>

No, Dave. We all still have to abide by the same R&R as we always have. Those standards have not been lowered at all. What standards do you do ham radio by? You cannot be using your book for that, because someone else definitely supercedes you on that.

Dave Heil said:
> > > There have always been newcomers in amateur radio. Old timers always
> > > die and newcomers always arrive. Newcomers may be the future (a great
> > > many newcomers have gray hair) but we're the present, not the past.
The
> > > future has not yet arrived. Even you don't know what the future
holds,
> > > as much as you'd like to see yourself as a visionary.
> > >
> >
> > In your stumbling around, above, your forgot to leave a point.
>
> Not at all, Kim. You just neglected to digest it. Most new hams aren't
> new people. They aren't young. Many are quite old. A great many "old
> timers" have decades left in them. They aren't going away. They are
> not only the past, but the present of amateur radio.
>

I think you just stumbled again.
> >
> > There's a difference between encouraging only those with whom you
> > agree, and encouraging *everyone*. When you say that "standards" have
> > been lowered, you send a message you may not be meaning to send.
>
> I wrote that standards were lowered because that is, in fact what took
> place (again). I did not place blame on newcomers. They didn't lower
> the standard. I did not place a qualifier on the welcoming of
> newcomers. Do you ever read the words I've written before replying to
> them?
>

I don't think the standards have been lowered at all. Your attempt to defend the "lowered standards" statement has fallen on deaf ears IMHO.

> >
> > Your messages come across as attempts to insult, berate, and demean,

Dave.
>
> Good. I intended to insult, berate and demean Carl. I wrote no such
> thing about newcomers. You didn't read what I wrote or you could not
> have come to such a conclusion.
>
> > You are very political in your approach with people here.
>
> No kidding. Clue us in as to what you do here.
>

I have agreed with and offended both sides of the fence here, Dave, and in
my life. I don't let politics of something determine how I will be affected
by them.

> >
> > If someone does
> > not act and think just as you, you assert superiority.
>
> What are you attempting to achieve in writing the sentence above? Are
> you attempting to assert superiority?
>

No, and sorry you took it that way. I am pointing out to you how others
perceive your nature. And, no, it's not just me.

> >
> > You are quite dislikable, whether you realize it or not.
>
> I'm sure that it appears that way to someone like you, Kim. In your
> view, Carl can tell others to engage in reflection and tell them to
> change their ways. If similar words are directed to Carl, you find the
> person "dislikable". Go hug a tree, Kim. Take a whale to lunch.
>
> > And you do seem to approach life from the comfort zone...
>
> ...whatever that means.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

I think you know what it means, Dave.

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

232. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 14:44:33 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgj74i$2fhb$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73647

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F2C91B4.3568C4C2@earthlink.net...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bggi7g$pu7$2@adenine.netfront.net>...
> > >
> > > You are quite dislikable, whether you realize it or not. And you do
seem to
> > > approach life from the comfort zone...
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Probably from a lifetime of work and play in a radio shack. He needs
> > to get out more often.
>
> I get out very well on any number of bands.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Ham radio is a pretend zone of life, Dave. They all pretend to be friendly,
gregarious individuals. Most hams I've met in real life? I won't
mention...

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

233. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 14:45:41 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgj76l$2fis$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73648

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj0ml7i.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 02 Aug 2003 12:27:10 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >Then please explain why there are so many NALs for violations
> >committed using voice modes, and so few for violations using Morse
> >code or data modes. Maybe it's not the TEST but the MODE that has an
> >effect?
>
> The days when the monitoring stations would catch ham operators 2
> or 3 kHz outside the band edge (especially in contests) are gone
> forever. "Cruising" is no longer a daily activity.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>

Heh heh, and maybe CW is not so commonly understood by those at the FCC?
Phil?

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

234. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 14:49:20 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgj7dg$2fmb$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73649

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BB5245DC.1FF2E%stewart@say.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > That's because you won't hear it anywhere but
> > here--as whining, Dwight. With the exception
> > of a few on this newsgroup, the participants
> > in this newsgroup are very out of touch with
> > ham radio...
>
>
> You right about that, Kim. If all those outside these newsgroups were
like
> those here, everyone would have probably killed each other by now.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Well, there would definitely be no ham radio to worry about...

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

235. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 14:55:35 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgj7p9$2g0r$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73652

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:BY7Xa.15583$Vx2.8054756@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:bgi31e$1n3m$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F2C75C9.7030805@adelphia.net...
> > > That includes Homeland defense, defense, broadcasting, lots of people
> > > besides hams.
> > >
> >
> > Well then, if it's *that* bad, I'm sure it'll be defeated, eh?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> And that is the most naive statement about the workings of government that
I
> have ever seen.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

heh heh heh...all my comments on the BPL issue have been to rattle chains
and nothing else. But, I am even having a hard time doing that; couldn't
you tell I was getting desperate?

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

236. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 14:56:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Ao9Xa.2454$IL.398727@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73650

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bgi4f4$qp5$0@208.206.142.91...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bghivc$2t0$0@208.207.71.163...
> > >
> > > The fact is there for all to see- the code test has for years been
the
> > ONLY
> > > factor hindering those very induhvidiuals from HF ham radio access en
> > masse.
> > > With the code test gone, here they come!
> > >
> >
> > The sky is falling! The sky is falling! (sayeth Dick ...)
>
> Nope. Sayeth Kandid Karl. I'm just describing the facts.
>
> >
> >
> > That's my point ... every change in the history of ham radio
> > has had folks like Dick ranting and raving that "This will be
> > the end of ham radio!"
> >
>
> Oh *that* won't end ham radio, just make it unrecognizable. Maybe to the
> point where FCC or other authority would strongly consider action to
> seriously curtail the service.When enough hams cease to behave well enough
> you can be sure closer scrutiny will result. The enforcement problems
today
> represent a quite small percentage of hams, but it won't take much of a
raise
> in that percentage for the ship to go aground. Believe it, it didn't
> originate with me. If you've missed
> authorities remarks to that effect, shame on you.

Dick, you ASSume that a large percentage of new hams will "behave
badly," solely on the basis that Morse testing will no longer be required.

As I said before, if the (unlicensed) law-breakers aroung 27 MHz
really WANTED to be amongst us, they'd be here now ... lack of
a license doesn't stop them at 27 MHz ... why would it stop them here?

The problem I have with you is that your views and rhetoric are so
steeped in disdain for anyone who doesn't share your views WRT
keeping code testing that you are out of touch with reality.

> > The "hordes of CBers" argument doesn't hold water ...
> > if they're "freebanding" (illegally and without licenses)
> > around 27 MHz, why would any rational person think
> > the lack of a license would keep them from the ham
> > bands TODAY (if they wanted to be here) ...
> >
>
> You really uninformed, aren't you? Yyou been too busy rachetjawing on 20
> meter SSB to notice what's going on on 10 meters? Read the latest
enforcement
> logs.
> That's where they talk to* each other*. They don't need to, they have all
> that mostly uninhabited spectrum between CB and 28 mhz but instead they
land
> in the 10 meter band by CHOICE. Wonder why they do that? Couldn't be for
the
> very reason I've stated-that they just want to cause trouble for, and
thumb
> their noses at hams, could it? Why shouldn't they get easy ham radio
licenses
> and REALLY do it right?

We're talking about some truckers looking for a clear, "private" channel ...

Since a lot of 10m is essentially an unoccupied wasteland (and I do operate
on 10m ...), with virtually all the activity concentrated in the 28.3-28.5
segment (except for the minority of folks who deliberately want to shun
the Tech+ and Novice ops), wouldn't it be better to OCCUPY that spectrum
by allowing Novice/Tech/Tech+ access there?
(remember the "use it of lose it" saying ...)

> It's not surprising you missed out on the reported cases where numbers of
> those very people have been overheard discussing what they intend to do
after
> they get their no-code licenses and get on HF. If a few are heard making
such
> plans, you can be sure many plan it that don't talk about it overtly.

While this anecdotal "evidence" has not been documented/proved AFAIK,
you can also be pretty sure that, if such conversations HAVE actually taken
place, there's a big "hot air" factor ... look at how such folks bluster and
posture here (and I expect also in the CB groups ... though I don't monitor
those ...)

> > The doom and gloom, end of the world scenario that Dick
> > keeps trying to peddle smells of sour grapes ...
> >
> You can sanitize it any way you want, but the situation smells and it
isn't

> going away with the end of code testing, to the contrary, It'll only get
> worse.

Forever the "Things are going to change somewhat and that will be the end
of civilization." FUD ...

Sorry Dick, it just doesn't hold water, based on all of the historical
evidence
of the same sort of dire predictions in every case of change in the past,
and
the fact that NONE of them panned out.

Learn from history, or be doomed to repeat it ...

Carl - wk3c

237. Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 14:59:15 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <7r9Xa.2455$lL.398459@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73651

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030802230218.25052.00001540@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <7dfliv4n5tild30d19s7lneg3kpt67v69r@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur
KC2HMZ
> <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> writes:
>
> >>QR10-4, QGB! I'm QPM, so QBD me!
> >>
> >>(Translation: "Ten-Fawhar, Good Buddie! I'll be putting the pedal to
the
> >>metal now, so watch my back door!)
> >>
> >>73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >You seem to toss that CB jargon around pretty well, Larry. Don't tell
> >me...no, it couldn't be...could it?
> >
> >73 DE John, KC2HMZ
>
> John:
>
> Yep, it is true! I was once a CB'er, for a whole six months! I was the
> Asst. Mgr. of the Radio Shack store in Depew, NY at the time,

We should have known ... "Radio Shack, you've got questions, we're
clueless,"
I'm sure Larry fit in quite well.

Carl - wk3c

238. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 15:02:33 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgj86k$2gbl$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73654

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BB52486D.1FF30%stewart@say.net...
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
> > Kim is having some trouble with her newsreader, so
> > I'm forwarding this reply post with her permission.
> >>
> >> (snip)
> >>
> >> I appreciate and respect the tradition of CW as a
> >> part of ham radio. I appreciate and respect most
> >> (excluding some here in this newsgroup only) CW
> >> operators and operation. I can't tell you how many
> >> times I've felt quite privileged to watch a CW
> >> operator at Field Day. I will defend to the end of
> >> ham radio that CW is wonderful, a skill that only
> >> few will learn and use, and that it has a rich
> >> tradition and history in ham radio. But I will not
> >> defend saying that having it as a testing
> >> requirement proves a dawgoned thing, because it
> >> just plain doesn't.
>
>
> Well-written comments, Kim. So well written, there is nothing else to
add.
> So I'll wait to see how the responses fall. And thanks for posting Kim's
> message, Mike.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Thank you, Dwight. There will be none, save yours. The naysayers totally
ignore poignant statements and seem to like more, getting involved with the
idiocy...

For example:
Dave Heil still hasn't told me if he has ever, in any way, broken the law.
Dick Carroll still has not described the items he would need to set up a CW
station in a disaster situation.

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

239. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 15:03:00 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Eu9Xa.2457$IL.398959@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73653

> In article <f45722ac.0308010249.313b156a@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
> >way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick, Larry,
> >Dan, Bruce...

Wait a minute ... don't tar all of us Extras with the same brush that Dick, Larry, et al deserve ...

For example the vast majority of the Directors of NCI are Extras (or their national equivalent thereof).

Additionally, there are a significant number of Extras amongst our membership ... at least in proportion to the % of Extras to other license classes.

So, it's not "the Extras" ... it's the PCTAs ...

Please don't lump all Extras in with that crowd ... it just 'aint so.

Carl - wk3c

240. Re: Code goodby,maybe something else.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 15:04:15 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <Pv9Xa.19698$Tr5.893@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 73655

In my ARES group of qty 40 hams, one is a college age teen, no one in age group 20's or 30's, about 15 in their 40's, 2 age 80, 5 in their 70's, the rest in their 50's and 60's. The older ones are always willing to elmer the younger ones. We all learn from each other. One 80 year old gentleman, a former WWII fighter plane mechanic, is the most dedicated guy I have, always available and willing to work to the best of his ability.

Steve

241. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 15:06:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj1kl2l.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73657

On 03 Aug 2003 13:15:58 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Phil has probably seen this many times, but for the rest of us:
>
>From the book "Disorder in the Court":
>
>Last one is the corker

Love it..... <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

242. Re: Using ham bands for educational / research project

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 15:06:31 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj1ljhn.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73658
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 2 Aug 2003 23:54:02 -0500, Bill Frovik n0mnb wrote:

> go for it. as long as u share your info and results with the ham
>community..and it wouldn't hurt to get ur ticket..
>73's de n0mnb

Leo and I kicked this around in private e-mail, and because of lots
of facts that you don't know, the use of amateur radio for this
project is NOT proper.

Gotta' know the whole story before you dispense quasi-legal
advice.....especially when said advice is incorrect.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
Principal Attorney
Communications Law Center
San Francisco, CA

243. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 15:06:31 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj1kzym.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73659

On 02 Aug 2003 23:46:47 -0800, Floyd Davidson wrote:

>> Mike Godwin, with whom I met and debated in several seminars on
>> Computer Freedom and Privacy in the 90s, tossed out "Godwin's Law"
>> in a moment of sarcasm.....
>>
>It was not sarcasm. It was a very *intentional* experiment in
>social engineering on the net, and it was clearly very
>successful too!

Knowing Mike, it had to have a lot of "let's see who salutes it"
irony in it. He's a neat guy - we once debated the perceived role
of the FCC in content regulation while we were in the men's room
during a session break (I was still with the agency at the time).....
<ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

244. Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 15:13:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <vE9Xa.2460$lL.399198@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73660

```
"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308030213.2da209b9@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<koOWa.2376$lL.382886@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> > news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308020525560.190@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > > On Fri, 1 Aug 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
> > > >...
> > > > Others have pointed out that rule 301(e) was written that way to
avoid
> > > > creating any new 'Tech+' licencees, but it looks as if invoking the
> > > > international rules created a sunset clause, whether intentionally
or
> > > > otherwise.
> > > >
> > > AH! Someone who is now on the verge of understanding what that
"wierd"
> > thing I
> > > said was. IT was a "sunset clause" and the change to S25.5 was the
> > "sunset."
> >
> > It is NOT a sunset clause ... NCI specifically asked for a sunset clause
> > so code testing would "automagically" go away when S25.5 was suppressed
> > or changed so that code testing was no longer required by the ITU Radio
> > Regs.
> >
> > The FCC SPECIFICALLY declined to enact such a sunset clause, and the
> > text of 301 does NOT contain one, no matter how you try to twist it.
> >
> > >
> > > > I don't really see how that throws anything into chaos. Right now
no-
> > > > coders who operate on the Novice/Tech HF allocations can't readily
be
> > > > detected for lack of any central records to prove that they are
actually
> > > > no-coders. If the changes to s25.5 affect 97.301(e) so as to make it
> > > > permissible, then from the FCC perspective it makes an enforcement
> > problem
> > > > go away!
> > > >
> > >
> > Again (and again ... you people must not be able to read, only write)
```

...
> > the FCC *DOES* have records of which Techs have 5 wpm credit and
> > which don't ... this idea that "there are no records, so you can get
away
> > with it is 1) false, and 2) borders on inducement to violate the rules.
> >
> > If someone follows your (VERY BAD) advice and gets cited for it,
> > I hope they explain that "(fill in the names from usenet) told me it was
> > OK" and the FCC comes knocking on your doors with citations for
> > #2 above ...
> >
> > [remainder of totally incorrect psuedo/quasi-regulatry crap deleted in
> > the interest of not further perpetuating/propagating misinformation ...]
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
>
> AMEN. That oughta cork it.

I *certainly* hope so!

Hams are supposed to share good advice and learn from "Elmers."

Phil Kane is clearly in a position to provide a VERY authoratative
"read" on this issue.
I make my living doing radio regulatory for my company, for standards
bodies, etc. While I am not, as is Phil, a lawyer, I *am* well-versed
in this field and how regulatory language should be read ... it's not
"plain English" ... and it varies somewhat between FCC, ITU, etc.

While I certainly want to see the last vestiges of Morse testing eliminated,
I do *not* want to see a bunch of people misinformed and then have them
go out and unwittingly commit violations that could put their licenses at
risk, subject them to heavy fines, and give all of ham radio a bad name.

BOTTOM LINE: *Until the FCC changes its rules* no-code Techs
have NO HF privs ... sorry, folks, but that's the way it is.

Carl - wk3c

245. Re: N8WWM, rain reported again.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 15:25:06 UTC
From: Keith Hosman <logdshr-remove-@bnnorth.net>
Message-ID: <Sw9Xa.7797$Ly2.1253747@cletus.bright.net>
Source record: 73656
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030729220819.335$7t_-_@newsreader.com...
| Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
| > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
| > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
| > > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
| > > > > avoobner2002@yahoo.com (Aaron H. Voobner) wrote:
| > > > > Riley H. has a good track record of
| > > > > > following up on such complaints, check the Rain Report if you
| > > > > > wish confirmation of this.
| > > > > >
| > > > > Is that the same rain report n8wwm was busted out on?
| > > > >
| > > > Did you leave again, Aaron?
| > > >
| > > I see you're still here,Aaron. What's your opinion of doug adair
| > > n8wwm getting ratted out on the rain report?
| > >
| >
| I know you're jumping up and down about no CW, jackass.
|
| --
| GO# 40

What did Doug do this time? I missed the rain report.

--
--
KC8TCQ
Tune in next week when Ohio floats away.
```

246. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 16:01:33 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgjbkt$g21$0@208.206.142.66>
Source record: 73661

Brian Kelly wrote:

> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hj0n1pj.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> > On 2 Aug 2003 04:31:13 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > >> BTW - Arnold declined to run.
> > >
> > >Supposedly his XYL put the nix on it because she doesn't want to be
> > >anywhere near the BS.
> >
> > Isn't he married to Maria Shriver, marriage-related to the Kennedys?
>
> I think she's blood, one of Robert K's daughters, niece of the
> President of the Chapaquiddick Diving Team.

She's the daughter of Sargent Shriver, who married a sister to JFK.

247. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 16:01:35 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <877k5uafxc.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73662

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
>On 02 Aug 2003 23:46:47 -0800, Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
>>> Mike Godwin, with whom I met and debated in several seminars on
>>> Computer Freedom and Privacy in the 90s, tossed out "Godwin's Law"
>>> in a moment of sarcasm.....
>>>
>>It was not sarcasm. It was a very *intentional* experiment in
>>social engineering on the net, and it was clearly very
>>successful too!
>
> Knowing Mike, it had to have a lot of "let's see who salutes it"
> irony in it.

Oh, it was *loaded* with that!

Here's an interview where he explained how it started, and what
he was thinking of.

<http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/2.10/godwin.if.html>

> He's a neat guy - we once debated the perceived role
> of the FCC in content regulation while we were in the men's room
> during a session break (I was still with the agency at the time).....
> <ggg>

He was very active on Usenet back when it was a small community,
and certainly added productively to the discussions that he
engaged in.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

248. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 16:14:32 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgjcd8$i9k$0@208.206.142.66>
Source record: 73663

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:bgi31e$1n3m$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F2C75C9.7030805@adelphia.net...
> > > That includes Homeland defense, defense, broadcasting, lots of people
> > > besides hams.
> > >
> >
> > Well then, if it's *that* bad, I'm sure it'll be defeated, eh?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> And that is the most naive statement about the workings of government that I
> have ever seen.

Typical of Kim, I'm afraid

249. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 16:20:09 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <873cgiaf2e.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73664

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>>
>> Yep, it is true! I was once a CB'er, for a whole six months! I was the
>> Asst. Mgr. of the Radio Shack store in Depew, NY at the time,
>
>We should have known ... "Radio Shack, you've got questions, we're
>clueless,"
>I'm sure Larry fit in quite well.

Ain't this just tooooo precious. Both DICK Carrol and Larry ROLL
turn out to be refugees from the CB channels.

Of course, they *act* like it too.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

250. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 16:21:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030803122121.27503.00001415@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 73665

In article <Xns93CBC6A1646A4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>The continued existence of a CW test does actually threaten the future of
>the hobby, i.e. it is a 'deal killer' for recruitment.

WHOA, hold on a second, there!

Folks, here's a claim that the code test must go because it allegedly holds
back growth in the ARS.

>Unfortunately, a
>lot of damage has already been done, as it has been allowed to persist
>long past it's 'sell by' date.

Sounds like you're hedging your bets, Alun.
>
>Sure, 5 wpm is easy (higher speeds were not, but that's moot now).
>However, the CW test manages to be too slow to impart any genuinely useful
>level of CW ability, whilst at the same time putting off prospective hams.
>In other words, it's more counter-productive than useful.
>
>Sure. there is a lot of CW use by hams on HF, but there are precious few
>prospective hams who want to use it.

How do you know they don't want to use it? At the past several Field Days, the
CW ops generated the most interest.

>Put in all the written questions you
>like on CW, though, as that won't cause the same kind of problem.
>
>I think it's true that those who want to keep a code test would likely
>have wanted to keep spark if they had been around back then.

Different thing entirely. Spark for hams wasn't outlawed in the USA until 1927
- long after hams had stopped using it. By choice.

>If they
>really could stop the wheel of progress, the hobby likely would die with
>their generation, but luckily that won't happen.

Do you want code USE by hams to continue or not, Alun?
>
>Keeping out all those who aren't interested in CW may keep a few
>'breakers' out, but it keeps out most people, period. That may suit a few
>people here, but it isn't the way forward. Ultimately, keeping the code
>test would do far more to destroy the hobby than letting in a few CBers

>(and I do mean a few, as most of them are not smart enough to pass the
>written tests). If we keep a code test, the hobby will fail for lack of
>interest. Luckily, I don't expect that to happen.

OK, let's look at some facts:

- Growth in the ARS in the USA from 1980 to 1990 (when there were no waivers and all hams had to pass at least 5 wpm) was almost exactly the same as from 1990 to 2000 (when both waivers and codetestless licenses were available)

- Overall, the ARS in the USA has kept on growing for the past 35 years. In fact, since the end of WW1, the only periods of non-growth were WW2 and most of the 1960s.

And now a challenge to all this stuff about disincentives. Soon the code test will probably be gone. There will probably be a surge of new licenses and upgrades, then back to growth rates near to what they were before. If we don't see more long-term growth without code tests, will you admit you were wrong and help get code tests reinstated?

73 de Jim, N2EY

251. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 16:21:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030803122123.27503.00001416@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 73666

In article <3F2C0443.9060301@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>> Put it that way, Mike, yes. It is hard to argue that removing *any* part
>> of
>> a test is not a reduction in the amount of knowledge needed to pass a test.
>> But, that is simply a word game and nothing else.

It's more than a word game. Encouraging radio knowledge of all types is one of
the most basic reasons to have the ARS exist at all. The tests are there to
insure a minimum knowledge level. ("Knowledge" including skills, concepts,
facts, etc.)
>>
>> The point is, what does passing a CW test prove in the way of
>> knowledge--other than that one can pass a CW test?

It proves that:

1) The person has learned a useful radio skill at a very basic level.
2) The person was willing and able to devote the time and effort necessary to
learn that skill.
3) The person has been exposed to a useful, widely-used-by-hams radio
communications mode other than voice or data.

>>What does passing the
>> written tests prove in the way of knowledge--other than that one can pass a
>> written test?

It proves that:

1) The person has learned some useful radio knowledge at a very basic level.
2) The person was willing and able to devote the time and effort necessary to
learn that knowledge.
3) The person has been exposed to several aspects of the amateur radio service
(regulations, operating practices, technology).

>> If you see the parody in both of those questions, then I go
>> one step further and say: What does passing a CW test have to with anything
>> related to overall knowledge of ham radio?!!!!!???? In my mind, *NOTHING*

Then your knowledge of amateur radio is very lacking. Like it or not, CW/Morse
is a very big part of amateur radio today. Of course, that by itself doesn't
prove we must have a code test.

>> It's bad enough that the written tests don't prove a whole lot, without the
>> added argument of CW in the mix. To continue to support CW as some form >>
of

>> proof that people know more about ham radio, know more about >>
communication,
>> know more about the standards and technology of ham radio, et al, is to
>> continue to do nothing but whine about a tradition--which is really all CW
>> really is: A TRADITION that no one wants to see fade away.

You are mistaken on several counts there, Kim.

1) The written tests are what they are. They are in a continuing state of development.

2) ALL ELSE BEING EQUAL, a ham who has Morse skills knows more about amateur radio than one with no Morse skills.

3) Morse/CW has certain advantages to hams beyond being "just another mode".
4) Morse/CW is more than "just a tradition". It's a useful mode of radio communication enjoyed by hundreds of thousands of hams.

5) There do exist folks who want Morse/CW USE (not just the TEST) by hams to simply go away. They are a very small minority, but they do exist. Or at least there are people whose rhetoric indicates they want Morse use by hams to end.

Of course, whether all of that "proves" we must have a code test is simply a matter of opinion.

>> Passing CW is nothing.

Maybe not to you. To others, it's a big deal.

>> And it proves nothing to anyone else, except that
>> they studied CW and passed it in a test. I've seen idiots on every side of
>> ham radio, so it does nothing to prove quality or *interest* as everyone
>> seems to like to argue. If CW was that kind of instrument, then we'd have
>> no jerks on ham radio and, believe me, I've heard them.

That's simply illogical. No test, no matter how contrived, will filter out every single "jerk" from the ranks of amateur radio. Or anything else, for that matter.

Look at how much it takes just to become a physician. The training and testing required is phenomenal, and designed to weed out the incapable. The hard work and dedication required just to get into medical school are extraordinary, and yet that's just the beginning. I could go on and on, but you get the picture.

And yet there are some physicians who are jerks, pure and simple. Not many, but some. And they make life hell for the rest, through things like high malpractice insurance premiums and over-regulation.
>>
>> Using CW as a test to prove "diligence" to the desire of wanting to be a
>>ham
>> radio operator is pure crap in my not-so-humble opinion.

OK, fine. At least you note that it's your opinion.

>> It is wrong to
>> even attempt to measure someone's desire and interest.

Why? I'd rather have an ARS consisting of a few hundred thousand interested, active, dedicated, skilled, knowledgeable hams than one of a few million inactive, apathetic, unskilled, ignorant ones who could not care less. Code test or no code test.

>> If I have an Extra
>> license and I have no equipment or haven't even been on the radio in years,
>> then what did passing CW prove, in terms of proven interest? Nothing. And
>> it never will.

Incorrect. It proved that at one time the person had the interest.

>> Yes, CW is a useful communication skill. Hell, *ANY* type of communication
>> skill is useful. If we place such importance on CW, then why not RTTY,
>> phone, ATV, etc.

Because those modes don't require the acquisition of new skills for their use.

>> You know what I'm saying.

Not really.

>> And, if CW proves a higher
>> plane of dedication and knowledge, then why are there extremely skilled CW
>> operators out there, who are real jerks?! And you know there are.

No, I don't. Name some. If your only reference is how a few folks behave in this newsgroup, it should be remembered that lots of folks on both sides of the code test fence have behaved like real jerks in their posts here.

>> So, how
>> can someone, *anyone* then turn around and say that CW proves *anything*?
>> It proves nothing but that the person studied for and passed the CW
>> requirement.

Seems to me that you want the Morse code test to be a perfect "jerk" filter. And of course no test can do that.

But note this plain, simple fact: Almost all of the FCC enforcement actions for "jerk-like" on-air behavior (obscenity, jamming, failure to ID, exceeeding license privileges, etc., etc.) are against hams using PHONE modes, not CW/Morse or data modes. ALL of us have taken written tests detailing what we should and should not do on the air, but it seems like violations are much more prevalent among the talkers than the brasspounders or keyboarders. Why?

73 de Jim, N2EY

252. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 16:26:29 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgjd3l$je6$0@208.206.142.66>
Source record: 73667

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> We should have known ... "Radio Shack, you've got questions, we're
> clueless,"

Don't gloat too much. I know a young fellow who has a Radio Shack franchise
who repairs almost anything, and is a walking electronic encyclopedia

253. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 16:53:37 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgjemhnrv0@208.206.142.107>
Source record: 73668

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>
> Dick, you ASSume that a large percentage of new hams will "behave
> badly," solely on the basis that Morse testing will no longer be required.
>

Still troubled by selective reading comprehension problems, Carl? I said that
the
percentages of troublemakers today is small, bjut it wouldn't have to grow that
much to put our bands in real jeopardy. So today we have a few frequencies
inhabited by that small percentage of (gasp) codetested hams causing us a black

eye. So how much of an increase in their ranks would it take to place a
"3950" at each and every 10 kHz point across 75 and 20 meter SSB (note that you
don't EVER hear of any such nonsense on the digital segments).

Actually it wouldn't requore that many more If ther are as many as a dozen on
each "3950", a couple thousand would do it, hands down.
There's sure to be lot more than that show up for the handout license-once that
dastardly Morris code is out of the picture..

. And HISTORY, which you attempt to quote but characteristically alter to fit
your Agenda, says there WILL be
a significant percentage of those very troublemakers scarf up essentially free
and for sure easy ham radio licenses once the code test disappears. End of
story.

> As I said before, if the (unlicensed) law-breakers aroung 27 MHz
> really WANTED to be amongst us, they'd be here now ... lack of
> a license doesn't stop them at 27 MHz ... why would it stop them here?
>
> The problem I have with you is that your views and rhetoric are so
> steeped in disdain for anyone who doesn't share your views WRT
> keeping code testing that you are out of touch with reality.
>

Hey Pot, meet Kettle!!!!!

>
> > > The "hordes of CBers" argument doesn't hold water ...
> > > if they're "freebanding" (illegally and without licenses)
> > > around 27 MHz, why would any rational person think
> > > the lack of a license would keep them from the ham
> > > bands TODAY (if they wanted to be here) ...
> > >
> >

> > You really uninformed, aren't you? Yyou been too busy rachetjawing on 20
> > meter SSB to notice what's going on on 10 meters? Read the latest
> enforcement
> > logs.
> > That's where they talk to* each other*. They don't need to, they have all
> > that mostly uninhabited spectrum between CB and 28 mhz but instead they
> land
> > in the 10 meter band by CHOICE. Wonder why they do that? Couldn't be for
> the
> > very reason I've stated-that they just want to cause trouble for, and
> thumb
> > their noses at hams, could it? Why shouldn't they get easy ham radio
> licenses
> > and REALLY do it right?
>
> We're talking about some truckers looking for a clear, "private" channel ...
>

Yep, thats's ONE case. You really believe there aren't many others out there?

>
> Since a lot of 10m is essentially an unoccupied wasteland

Yep, just like the space between 27 mhz CB band and 28 mhz. So why do they need to jump up into our ten meter band then if not to cause us trouble and agitate? Answer is "they don't", they just choose to do so. "Aw, those nasty hams aren't using it so we might as well, who cares about them anyway? Just wait till that dastardly Morris code test is gone, then WE"LL be there legally, too"!

> wouldn't it be better to OCCUPY that spectrum
> by allowing Novice/Tech/Tech+ access there?
> (remember the "use it of lose it" saying ...)
>

Surely you haven't interpreted my remarks to read that I oppose any such use of 10 meters. Stop insisting that your Agenda do the interpretation of others writing, please. Let what's written stand for itself.

> > It's not surprising you missed out on the reported cases where numbers of
> > those very people have been overheard discussing what they intend to do
> after
> > they get their no-code licenses and get on HF. If a few are heard making
> such
> > plans, you can be sure many plan it that don't talk about it overtly.
>
> While this anecdotal "evidence" has not been documented/proved

Ah, so we should just wait till the actually DO it all, then ask FCC to run them off. Sorry, it won't happen, never has. Once they're here, they're here WITH LEGAL LICENSES to stay, to our longterm detriment, as you well know. "One step closer to extinction".....

>
> > > The doom and gloom, end of the world scenario that Dick
> > > keeps trying to peddle smells of sour grapes ...
> >
> > You can sanitize it any way you want, but the situation smells and it
> isn't
> > going away with the end of code testing, to the contrary, It'll only get
> > worse.
>
> Forever the "Things are going to change somewhat and that will be the end
> of civilization." FUD ...
>
> Sorry Dick, it just doesn't hold water, based on all of the historical
> evidence
> of the same sort of dire predictions in every case of change in the past,
> and
> the fact that NONE of them panned out.
>

So you equate all of history with the vast drop in licensing requirements
brought on by NCI and others far more interested in getting the code test gone
and
the license numbers up, to a few mode changes and other far more minor
changes in the past. How so very convenient for your Agenda!

>
> Learn from history, or be doomed to repeat it ...

Good advice. You should TAKE it.

254. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 16:54:45 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgjeolnrv1@208.206.142.107>
Source record: 73669

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> Please don't lump all Extras in with that crowd ... it just 'aint so.

You sure have THAT right!

255. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 17:00:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030803130004.09955.00001084@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 73670

In article <20030802144722.13162.00001145@mb-m10.aol.com>, vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) writes:

>From (Larry Roll K3LT):
>
>>If that is the case in your club, then simply work around the old timers
>>that you find so offensive, and get your fellow newcomers involved in your
>>projects. What is so difficult about that?
>
>The newcomers seem to be of the same mode also. The ones that are interested
>in
>the technical stuff probably would have left within one or two meetings.

Vipul:

"Would have?" Did they or didn't they? It's gotta be one or the other!

>Probably same would be true about the social aspect of newcomers. Thats why
>the demographics seem to stay as they are when new people join.

"Would be?" "Would have?" What's going on here? I thought you were relating actual experiences, not hypothetical situations. If you aren't speaking from a standpoint of actual situations you've observed at your local club meetings, then you may want to just leave out the speculation, since it only damages your already non-existent credibility.

>The other alternative is to start my own club. I tried it, but that was not
>too successful.

Not "too" successful? More vague, unconvincing language. Have you been taking lessons from Kim on Usenet sophistry?

73 de Larry, K3LT

256. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 17:05:28 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <e48a9fc3066780f33d010eaa9ad9b9e2.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 73671

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote

>
> Aw, Hans...and just when the sand was drying from your britches...
>

Britches?????

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

257. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 17:26:03 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030803132603.08385.00001211@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 73672

From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)

>>The newcomers seem to be of the same mode also. The ones that are interested
>>in
>>the technical stuff probably would have left within one or two meetings.
>
>Vipul:
>
>"Would have?" Did they or didn't they? It's gotta be one or the other!

I am not a demographer. I don't track newcomers like that. On that statement,
I'm just theorizing. That's why I used the word "probably".

>>Probably same would be true about the social aspect of newcomers. Thats why
>>the demographics seem to stay as they are when new people join.

I am not a demographer. I don't track newcomers like that. On that statement,
I'm just theorizing. That's why I used the word "probably".

Its 95%+ males, mostly older males. The idea of putting up antennas and
contesting for hours is boring. Not surprisingly, there are few females in the
hobby.

Most of the young people are of the anti-social nerdy type that others would
not like to be with. Therefore, other young people don't join.

>>The other alternative is to start my own club. I tried it, but that was not
>>too successful.
>
>Not "too" successful?

Two other people showed up. One person was a typical Ham type and believed that
I could get more members by appealing to current Hams. If I could find current
Hams with those interests, I would not have to start this type of club.

The other person, although not an EE, was sincerely interested in technical
projects.

Due to certain factors such as the lack of a meeting place, getting enough
members, and lack of funds, and other factors, the club could not get started.

258. Re: Code goodby,maybe something else.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 17:39:09 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <1NbXa.15762$Vx2.8117037@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 73673

"Steve Stone" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in message
news:Pv9Xa.19698$Tr5.893@news02.roc.ny...
> In my ARES group of qty 40 hams, one is a college age teen, no one in age
> group 20's or 30's, about 15 in their 40's, 2 age 80, 5 in their 70's, the
> rest in their 50's and 60's. The older ones are always willing to elmer
the
> younger ones. We all learn from each other. One 80 year old gentleman, a
> former WWII fighter plane mechanic, is the most dedicated guy I have,
always
> available and willing to work to the best of his ability.
>
> Steve
>
>

I've often thought we really need to get more people in their 40s or so into the hobby and resurrect the interest of current hams in their 40s. Why? Well people in their 40s are established and have many productive years ahead of them. They are the ones who have the time and money to be significant participants in elmering, recruiting, operating, political involvement, etc. Yes we will also need young people but their participation is, of necessity, limited by the fact that they are just getting started in life and thus don't have as much discretionary time and money since they must focus on starting their careers and families.

And as the comment above shows, hams of any age are an asset to the hobby if they choose to be.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

259. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 17:46:22 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030803134622.08385.00001212@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 73674

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> Also, few club members are interested in homebrewing,
>> despite claiming interest by posing for a photograph showing club > members
>doing a group project.
>
>Well, they do have photographic proof. We're stuck with just your
>claim.

No, they only posed for the photograph. It does not mean that they actually did that activity. I can ask people in that photograph if they are interested in homebrewing and that person will say he is not interested in homebrewing.

Therefore, the photograph is just hype and does not represent what the club is really interested in.

>> So, the "advancement of the radio art" is just a justification
>> for more HF/CW activities.
>
>So you're back to telling them where their interests should lie.

I didn't say they were interested in homebrewing - the photograph did. It takes a prominant place in the club publicity. Except, the photograph is a mis-representation of what the club members are truly interested in.

>I'll wager that most "old timers" aren't even involved with a radio
>club.

They don't go to club meetings. And they don't go to Hamfests. Nor are they on 2m. I get it - they don't exist.

>You'll have to use the callsign database and begin making phone
>calls or knocking on doors to come up with a scientific sampling

A scientific sampling is not needed by me, nor any potential new recruit to Ham radio. If that person's experiences are of anti-social, mostly male, mostly older, non-technical (if they are interested in that), Hams, then thats all they need to know. It won't do much good to show them the other aspect that "could" exist, but does not exist for them.

>> There have been exceptions of course, but it is too rare to be worth > the
>effort. I cannot search out the contradiction.
>
>That's right. You've begun with an outcome and you're trying to make
>the statistics fit that outcome.

I'm not making any statistics fit. I'm saying that if something is 95%* and it takes you a certain amount of time to come across the other 5%, then its not

worth the effort.

---

*The 95% number is given for example purposes only. It is not meant to represent a specific percentage.

260. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 17:51:20 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <sYbXa.15769$Vx2.8120481@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 73675

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:Ao9Xa.2454$lL.398727@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
>
> We're talking about some truckers looking for a clear, "private" channel
...
>

And it is aggravated by the fact that you can find 10m ham radios in truck stops next to the CBs. Although labeled as requiring a license, that is totally ignored.

> Since a lot of 10m is essentially an unoccupied wasteland (and I do
operate
> on 10m ...), with virtually all the activity concentrated in the 28.3-28.5
> segment (except for the minority of folks who deliberately want to shun
> the Tech+ and Novice ops), wouldn't it be better to OCCUPY that spectrum
> by allowing Novice/Tech/Tech+ access there?
> (remember the "use it of lose it" saying ...)
>

The 10-10 club was formed to help keep the 10 meter band active. Unfortunately, the propagation is so dependent on the sunspot cycle that for 2/3s of the cycle (roughly 7 years out of every 11) that the 10 meter band is generally only good for local communications except for occasional openings caused by sporadic E. No matter how many people we allow on 10 meters, there's going to be a lot of dead air except during the peaks of the sunspot cycle. Just check the beacon stations and you'll realize that for yourself.

For whatever reason, I have found that not many Novice/Tech+/Tech with HF privileges are taking advantage of 10 meters. If all those licensed for it used it, I'd certainly be hearing something as I'm in a major metropolitan area. Yet it's quiet. I suspect that those interested in HF have already upgraded to General and the rest aren't on the air because they fall in the class of inactive hams.

Inactivity of existing hams is more of a problem than any test requirements, etc. If every US ham already licensed for HF made one QSO per day, it would be wall to wall signals.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

261. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 17:52:50 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgji5i$10a$0@208.207.71.148>
Source record: 73676

Floyd Davidson wrote:

>
> Ain't this just tooooo precious. Both DICK Carrol and Larry ROLL
> turn out to be refugees from the CB channels.
>
> Of course, they *act* like it too.
>

Why, Frozen Floyd! Did you finally get your brain thawed out enough to
compose another trash post? Yoiu said you didn't know anything about CB.
That couldn't have been a bald faced lie could it?

I know a LOT about CB, and of course it isn't CB that was ever the problem in
the first place. But you already know that. Maybe. On the other hand you appear

to actually know very little. You're a hot air expert.

262. Re: CORRECTION!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 17:54:01 UTC
From: averyfine@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030803135401.03007.00001019@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 73677

```
>Subject: Re: CORRECTION!!!
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 8/3/03 8:44 AM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0308030444.26307f9c@posting.google.com>
>
>averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
>news:<20030802203453.09680.00000826@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: CORRECTION!!!
>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >Date: 7/31/03 3:34 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0307311134.4e87c9c6@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> >news:<5c01b95b.0307310521.151ae9a7@posting.google.com>...
>> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>> news:<f45722ac.0307291516.319b327@posting.google.com>...
>> >> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>> news:<5c01b95b.0307290749.e3cd378@posting.google.com>...
>> >> >
>> >> > > And the "garbage" that get's thrown in here was dumped by
>someone
>> >> > > other than me...I just pick up the pieces and make a fool of the guy
>> >> > > who did it.
>> >> > >
>> >> > > Steve, K4YZ
>> >> >
>> >> > Oh geez. You vomit last night's booze on here on an almost daily
>> >> > basis and make a fool of only yourself.
>> >>
>> >> Whew. That was poignant, Brain. Come up with that one one your
>own?
>> >>
>> >> And a sincere THANK-YOU for making my point with your graphic "wit".
>> >>
>> >> Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> >Well, you do. Then you say you pick thru the chunks and make fools of
>other
>> >people.
>> >
>> >You fool only yourself.
>> >
>> Maybe Brian should get one of those monkeys for a pet :-) :-) :-) :-)
>>
```

>> Bottoms up! :-) :-) :-) :-)
>
>What monkeys?

The ones who eat the coffee beans. :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-)

> and why are you impersonating Len?
>
Len who?

I am not impersonating anyone. I am simply myself.

263. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 17:59:51 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgjiin$10a$1@208.207.71.148>
Source record: 73678

Jim Hampton wrote:

> Multiple guess.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030802223640.14766.00000906@mb-m04.aol.com...
> > >There still are a couple of written
> > >exams
> >
> > Is that what there called?

Jim I sure wish that was all there was to it. Instead we have all the questions with the exact answers, and many methods to do practice tests so as to condition your memory until you can remember enough of those answers and their paired questions, until you just can't miss! No knowledge required!

Neat! If one was to set out to dumb down a technical organization, how better to go about it than to devise such a scheme?

264. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 18:00:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030803140030.09955.00001087@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 73682

In article <vE9Xa.2460$lL.399198@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>
>BOTTOM LINE: *Until the FCC changes its rules* no-code Techs
>have NO HF privs ... sorry, folks, but that's the way it is.
>
>Carl - wk3c

That's right, Carl -- but what I want to know is, why are you "sorry"
about it?

73 de Larry, K3LT

265. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 18:00:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030803140031.09955.00001088@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 73684

In article <bgj86k$2gbl$1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:

>
>Thank you, Dwight. There will be none, save yours. The naysayers totally
>ignore poignant statements and seem to like more, getting involved with the
>idiocy...
>
>For example:
>Dave Heil still hasn't told me if he has ever, in any way, broken the law.

Why should he, Kim?

>Dick Carroll still has not described the items he would need to set up a CW
>station in a disaster situation.

Why should he, Kim?

Dave and Dick have nothing to prove to you, little Kimmie dear. They are
grown up, mature, adults, and you are (or act like) a little child screaming
for attention any way you can get some. Nobody in this NG is going to
lift a finger to prove a damn thing to the likes of YOU, Kim, so just forget
that, and start showing proper respect for your moral and intellectual
superiors -- you know, people like Dave, Dick, and myself!

73 de Larry, K3LT

266. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 18:00:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030803140032.09955.00001089@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 73680

In article <BB52486D.1FF30%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>
>"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>> Kim is having some trouble with her newsreader, so
>> I'm forwarding this reply post with her permission.
>>>
>>> (snip)
>>>
>>> I appreciate and respect the tradition of CW as a
>>> part of ham radio. I appreciate and respect most
>>> (excluding some here in this newsgroup only) CW
>>> operators and operation. I can't tell you how many
>>> times I've felt quite privileged to watch a CW
>>> operator at Field Day. I will defend to the end of
>>> ham radio that CW is wonderful, a skill that only
>>> few will learn and use, and that it has a rich
>>> tradition and history in ham radio. But I will not
>>> defend saying that having it as a testing
>>> requirement proves a dawgoned thing, because it
>>> just plain doesn't.
>
>
> Well-written comments, Kim. So well written, there is nothing else to add.
>So I'll wait to see how the responses fall. And thanks for posting Kim's
>message, Mike.

Dwight:

And they say ***I*** have a "thing" for Kim! Sheez! Why don't you just
go ahead and propose to her right here on the newsgroup! (Keep in mind,
her OM may object!) I've never seen such sucking-up since I saw a flight
of a half-dozen or so Canada Geese devoured by a C-5B engine!

I know this may come as a shock to Kim, but Code testing isn't there to
"prove" anything at all. It is there to ensure that prospective hams have
a basic understanding of this useful radiocommunications skill. Poor
Kim -- will she ever get ANYTHING right?

73 de Larry, K3LT

267. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 18:00:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030803140033.09955.00001090@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 73679

In article <7r9Xa.2455$lL.398459@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>> John:
>>
>> Yep, it is true! I was once a CB'er, for a whole six months! I was the
>> Asst. Mgr. of the Radio Shack store in Depew, NY at the time,
>
>We should have known ... "Radio Shack, you've got questions, we're
>clueless," I'm sure Larry fit in quite well.

Carl:

Actually, I did fit into Radio Shack very well. I had a great time working
there,
was actually able to meet my sales quotas and make some real money, and
I had a lot of customers who would come into the store and ask for me by
name since I had a reputation for knowing what I was talking about and I was
willing to provide some actual customer service beyond taking money and
handing out receipts. I helped many customers with auto stereo and CB
installations, I did minor repairs in-store, and I'd drive all over Buffalo
doing
stock transfers in order to get customers things that my store didn't have
on hand at the time. I would have ultimately been a store manager if I had
not joined the Air Force at the urging of my best friend Fran, N2HMG.

Radio shack was a great place for a young person interested in electronics
to work in the early '70's. Today's R/S employees are nothing like us "old
timers" used to be. Today, I go into a R/S store and ask them about a
pay-as-you-go cell phone plan that they have mentioned on their own
store displays, and they don't know anything about it! Nothing technical,
just a matter of knowing the specifics of the plan! Sheez! My brother Tom
told me one of the best stories about current R/S cluelessness: He
went in to his local store and asked for a particular Operational Amplifier.
The salesfreak indignantly replied, "All of our amplifiers work, Sir!"

73 de Larry, K3LT

268. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 18:00:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030803140034.09955.00001091@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 73681

In article <873cgiaf2e.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
writes:

>>> Yep, it is true! I was once a CB'er, for a whole six months! I was the
>>> Asst. Mgr. of the Radio Shack store in Depew, NY at the time,
>>
>>We should have known ... "Radio Shack, you've got questions, we're
>>clueless,"
>>I'm sure Larry fit in quite well.

Floyd:

I had quite a reputation in the WNY District of Radio Shack. I would actually
take broken stuff my customers brought in for service and fix it in the store!

It kept a lot of customers coming back, and I usually had no problem meeting
my sales quotas!

>Ain't this just tooooo precious. Both DICK Carrol and Larry ROLL
>turn out to be refugees from the CB channels.

Yes, I freely admit to being a "refugee" from CB.

>Of course, they *act* like it too.

Naturally, we act like CB refugees. We certainly wouldn't want to act like
actual CB'ers! After all, we're "refugees" for a reason!

73 de Larry, K3LT

269. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 18:00:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030803140034.09955.00001092@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 73683

In article <bgj5pv$2eia$1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:

>Is that the music to the Twilight Zone I hear?

>Yes, yes it is...

Believe it or not, folks, this is one of Kim's more reasonably intelligent
posts!

73 de Larry, K3LT

270. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 18:00:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030803140035.09955.00001093@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 73685

In article <Eu9Xa.2457$lL.398959@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>
>> In article <f45722ac.0308010249.313b156a@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
>> >way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick, Larry,
>> >Dan, Bruce...
>
>
>Wait a minute ... don't tar all of us Extras with the same brush that
>Dick, Larry, et al deserve ...
>
>For example the vast majority of the Directors of NCI are Extras (or
>their national equivalent thereof).
>
>Additionally, there are a significant number of Extras amongst our
>membership ... at least in proportion to the % of Extras to other
>license classes.
>
>So, it's not "the Extras" ... it's the PCTAs ...
>
>Please don't lump all Extras in with that crowd ... it just 'aint so.
>
>Carl - wk3c

Carl:

Brian made the statement that "Extras" such as Dick, Dan, Bruce, and
myself wish to "destroy the amateur radio service." Obviously, he thinks
we want to do this because we *are* PCTA's, and see the value of retaining
code testing (what's left of it) in the ARS. In other words, because we
don't agree with him and the NCTA's, we want to "destroy" the ARS.
Do you think this is accurate? Do YOU think that us PCTA's want to
"destroy" the ARS?

AFAIC, when the FCC finally gives us a No-Code Test ARS licensing
system, the "destruction" of our hobby/service is self-assured. About
the best we can hope for is for the NCTA's to continue with their traditional
apathy and laziness, and somehow not flock to the ARS in any great
numbers. We would also require the assistance of the ARRL and the
FCC to resist the urge to expand HF phone spectrum, but I don't see that
as something the ARRL would do, so the FCC will be happy to oblige

when the petitions start coming in. In any case, the future of the ARS looks bleak, and it will be the non-code tested "newcomers" who will be administering the coup de gras.

BTW, Carl -- the only reason you're an "Extra" is because you waited until the code test was dumbed down to a maximum of 5 WPM. That's not being a Real Extra(tm) in the opinion of any of the traditional PCTA's. You're just a wannabe Extra Pretender who got in on an Affirmative Action program.

73 de Larry, K3LT
Amateur Extra since 1983

271. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 18:00:53 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgjikl$10a$2@208.207.71.148>
Source record: 73686

Aw, Hans, surely you -too- learned long ago not to expect anything intelligent of Kim.

K0HB wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote
> >
> > Gosh, those are just a few questions people may encounter, and I am probably
> > now going to be lambasted for thinking about the majority.
>
> No, I think you will be lambasted for not doing your homework and
> understanding the issue.
>
> "BPL" is an unlicensed service which proposes that it be allowed to
> inject RF (radio signals) into the AC distribution grid. This RF will
> extend across the MF/HF spectrum, and up into the lower VHF spectrum,
> and the power lines will act not as a transmission line, but as an
> antenna. The interference will potentially affect EVERY RADIO
> COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE (not just hams) who use the affected spectrum.
>
> In fact, BPL is a single unlicensed service which would presume to
> pollute the spectrum used by the "majority" (your word, not mine) of all
> long distance radio communications services.
>
> Kim, you seem to be a person concerned with social issues. That's a
> great quality. Go to your local library and research the term "tragedy
> of the commons".
>
> Good luck on this one now.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
> --
> Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

272. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 18:20:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030803142057.23307.00001931@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 73687

In article <bgi2bp$1m8b$1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>Thanks for your explanation, Jim.

You're welcome.
>
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030802142104.14837.00001940@mb-m03.aol.com...
>> In article <bggedonal1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim"
><fahgedit@nomail.net>
>> writes:

>> >> Critical everyone submits a reply comment ASAP.

>> >I guess you're making the assumption that everyone who is a ham would be
>> >against this? Or, are you really being that generous where it's a
>"everyone
>> >should have their voice thing?"
>>
>> Do you think BPL is a good thing, Kim?
>
>Whether I think it's a good thing or not wasn't the point of my comments.

I know. That's why I asked the question.

>The point was that I wonder if a "blanket invitation" for comments would
>extend to those who may think it is a good idea.

The original poster wrote:

"Critical everyone submits a reply comment ASAP."

Looks pretty blanket to me.

>> >Good idea. Make everyone think uniformly...yeah, that's the ticket!
>>
>> What is YOUR thinking on BPL, KIm?

>Well, I don't think I have a position on it, Jim. So, I would personally
>refrain from commenting.

Well, there you have it.

> I would not automatically think it was a bad idea
>just because I am a ham radio operator, though.

Nor would I.

However, after looking at the engineering analyses of what it would mean to hams and other licensed users of the radio spectrum, I think it is a very bad idea.

>My point with the comments
>was that uniformity can sometimes be seen as ignorance--and the FCC is
>probably in a position to determine if they are getting canned messages or
>not.

Sure. Uniformity can also be seen as strength. If millions of people vote for Candidate X next year, does that mean ignorance?

Lack of comments can be, and probably will be, interpreted as lack of concern.

>It always a good idea, if one is participating in a mass effort to at
>least come up with something truly original--even better to come up with
>something that directly impacts them.

Exactly. But all that is for naught if no comments are filed.

It is also a good idea to mention relevant background information, such as amateur and professional radio and engineering experience and education. Even though we may think that an argument should be judged on its merits alone, regardless of who authors it, FCC does look at that stuff.

And even if there is no BPL where I live, it will have an impact if I won't be able to work hams in a BPL area.

>> btw, BPL will be just as vulnerable to disruption from physical damage as
>> cable, dialup or DSL because the wires are on the same poles or in the
>> same
>> trenches. In fact it will be more vulnerable because the lines are not
>> shielded.

>Maybe they'll ditch the whole thing...

Hopefully. Japan did, after finding out how bad it really is. But I'm not willing to trust in a "let George do it" attitude. My comments are already on file, reply comments are in development.

73 de Jim, N2EY

273. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 19:07:07 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <u3dXa.15787$Vx2.8139004@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 73688

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030803132603.08385.00001211@mb-m20.aol.com...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> Most of the young people are of the anti-social nerdy type that others
would
> not like to be with. Therefore, other young people don't join.
>

Well got news for you. It's the anti-social nerdy types in our society that make the majority of technical and business advances. They are focused on their goals rather than looking for social clubs. All of our computer technology has come from the "geeks" and some of those boys have gotten wealty (Bill Gates comes to mind here).

> >>The other alternative is to start my own club. I tried it, but that was
not
> >>too successful.
> >
> >Not "too" successful?
>
> Two other people showed up. One person was a typical Ham type and believed
that
> I could get more members by appealing to current Hams. If I could find
current
> Hams with those interests, I would not have to start this type of club.
>
> The other person, although not an EE, was sincerely interested in
technical
> projects.
>
> Due to certain factors such as the lack of a meeting place, getting enough
> members, and lack of funds, and other factors, the club could not get
started.

EVERY club had that problem in the beginning. However each of the successful clubs had a leader who was willing to WORK to overcome all these factors. It certainly looks like your expectations of what it takes to get a club going were very unrealistic.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

274. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 19:20:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308031120.63988d29@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73689
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308021825.1918f024@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308021256.64db56db@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308021047.5638e89f@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > I got my first dose by landing on 75M with one of the old
> > > floor-mounted living room multiband wooden console radios owned by a
> > > couple of old maid aunts. Was around the time of the broadcast of the
> > > atom bomb tests on Bikini atoll.
> >
> > My dad was at Eniwetok, and at several Nevada tests as well. He is
> > what is now called an "atomic veteran."
>
> NOW we know why you turned out like you did. Sue the sumbitches.

I turned out great. A couple of extra teeth is all. I even passed my
entrance physical, and served honorably for 20+ years.

Anyway, that's what I like about you; you get all of your exercise
dodging the draft and jumping to conclusions.

275. Re: Here We Go Again..Sir Putzalot Is Back In His Stride

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 19:31:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308031131.de6734e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73690

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308012330.4a7e333e@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308010907.2830acf6@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Steve, if you want to read more maniacal laughing postings, send him a fresh pair.
>
> I doubt it...Lennie would never be able to wear my shoes even if
> we did wear the same size.
>
> Nor could you, I bet...
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Maybe if they were first dipped in a fungicide? But even if I were to
wear your shoes, I would deal with my problems constructively instead
of lashing out at other people.

276. Ed Hare (W1RFI) of the ARRL on BPL replies to comments

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 19:51:08 UTC
From: robkemp90210@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <6114e4af.0308031151.57914794@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73691

From Ed Hare (W1RFI) of the ARRL on BPL replies to comments;
(repost from QRZ)

What I believe to be most important at this point is that the FCC get a wide range of input that is not all "ARRL" material. Analyzing ARRL's material is fine, but it really does need to appear as an individual contribution, not just a "me-too." That is why ARRL hasn't put out a "form letter" to be used, because especially in the NOI stages, this is not a vote. I have seen a number of excellent posts here outlining things I hadn't thought of.

Over this evening and into early next week, I intend to start reading the various company and organizational filings in detail. Naturally, I will put together a technical recommendation to the DC guys, who will use them to develop ARRL's "political" position and to write the ARRL filings. Because this is a rulemaking process, all the major players tend to keep their "stuff" close until the last day, to give those with different positions less ammunition. So, unfortunately, I am not sharing what I have learned with even the amateur community, except in the most general terms.

I can say that I just got back from a 1300-mile drive to several of the test areas, and the ARRL article used a description I considered carefully before being quoted -- the interference to HF that I observed was devastating. The APPA folks demanded that any claims of interference be proven. I believe we can give them exactly what they wanted and do just that. It is not just amateur radio that is at risk here, but any use of HF that operates near BPL installations operating on their frequencies at the limit of the present FCC rules cannot help but hear the BPL signals loud and clear. I had done calculations of what to expect, and the system that operate at the present limits did just what I knew they would.

The real issue is interference. The BPL industry is claiming that there is no interference problem, but where are THEIR calculations? Where are their interference studies? They have offered no information about the frequencies their systems use, no information about what field strength they measured in their Part 15 verification tests. The only basis on which they make that claim is that they have "no reports of interference" and by pretending all the overseas amateur studies don't exist, and claiming that there has been no interference worldwide.

Some did provide some power levels, of -50 dBm/Hz. This power level results in a conducted signal level of 48 dB higher than the present limits for conducted emissions for most other devices, upsetting the

present order by a factor of 70,000. How can this not have an effect. They want to add 10 dB, so their conducted signals would be almost a million times more powerful than the present conducted emissions limits. Ever hear a neighbor's computer system? Want to multiply that by a lot?

277. Re: Some comments on the NCVEC petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 20:21:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030803162107.15462.00002043@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 73692

In article <bggd0spmq1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030730222105.24390.00001460@mb-m19.aol.com...
>> >PETITION FOR RULE MAKING
>>
>> >The National Conference of Volunteer Examiner Coordinators (NCVEC) is
>> >the umbrella organization comprised of the fourteen organizations
>> >charged since 1984, under Section 97.519(a) of the rules of the Federal
>> >Communications Commission, 47 CFR 97.519(a) to develop and administer
>> >all Amateur Radio operator license testing and to electronically file
>> >all successful license applications with the FCC. In total, the VECs
>> >and their more than 30,000 VE teams have collectively administered
>> >nearly two million examinations during the past twenty years and have
>> >notified the FCC to issue approximately a million new and upgraded
>> >Amateur Radio licenses.
>>
>> The NCVEC is not, however, an organization where the VECs are elected, or
>>where
>> individual VE opinions were gathered or solicited.
>
>So? Your point? Is that something that should call into question
>the NCVEC as being invalid, illegal, or fattening?

The point is that the petition is NOT necessarily the opinion of the majority
of VEs or VECs. It was cooked up by a few of the top guys, who were not
elected.

>> >Once a year, the various Volunteer Examiner Coordinator organizations
>> >meet at their annual conference to discuss the various issues that
>> >impact Amateur Radio operator testing. At their July 25, 2003, meeting
>> >held with the FCC in Gettysburg, PA, the VECs overwhelmingly agreed
>> >that Morse code testing should be immediately ended since it was now
>> >possible to do so. It was also noted that countries have already begun
>> >discontinuing Morse examinations. As a result the VECs voted to file
>> >this Petition asking that the FCC take expedited action to allow them
>> >to discontinue administering Element 1, the 5 words-per-minute
>> >telegraphy examination as soon as possible.
>>
>> No surprise there.
>>
>> >Pursuant to Section 1.405 of the Commission's procedural rules (47
>> >C.F.R. 1.405), the NCVEC hereby respectfully requests that the
>> >Commission issue a Notice of Proposed Rule Making at an early date

>> >looking toward amendment of the rules governing the Amateur Radio
>> >Service, 47 C.F.R. 97.1 et seq., as set forth herein and in the
>> >attached Appendix.
>>
>> No imagination, either.
>
>When dis imagination or, for that matter, creativity have to be part
>of the filling/process?

When someone truly has the interests of the ARS in mind, they will look at the complete picture rather than take a narrow view. This is particularly important in dealing with FCC because we have seen how long it takes them to do an amateur service NPRM cycle.

>
>> >The rule changes requested herein would terminate the telegraphy
>> >examination requirement and permit existing Technician Class operators
>> >to access HF spectrum as provided in 47 C.F.R. 97.301(e) without the
>> >necessity of passing a Morse code examination. This request to
>> >eliminate the Morse code (Element 1) examination does not necessarily
>> >have the support of the ARRL Board since they have yet to develop a
>> >position on the matter. In support of its petition, NCVEC states as
>> >follows:
>>
>> >I. Introduction and Background
>> >
>> > Since the turn of the century, the Morse code, invented by American
>> > Samuel Morse and first used in 1844, has been the foundation of early
>> > distress and safety communications. Although Morse code (or CW, as it
>> > is commonly called) was the primary mode of communications from the
>> > late 19th Century through the early 20th Century, it has all but become
>> > obsolete in practically all other contemporary communication systems.
>> > Due to the emergence of satellite and digital communications, manual
>> > telegraphy is no longer used or required in any radio service other
>> > than in the Amateur Service.
>>
>> Amateur radio operators, however, use it extensively. On the HF/MF amateur
>> bands, it is the second most popular mode of communications, only slightly
>> behind SSB in popularity.
>
>So?

So it makes sense that the things that should be tested for an amateur radio license should be derived from what hams actually do, rather than what other services do. Would you support questions on multiplex stereo FM on the ham test? That mode is widely used in the broadcast service.

>Hams also use differnent languages (Engish, Spanish, Chineese, etc.)
>yet no one is mandated to use or be tested in any language other than
>that of their "home" country.

How many US hams regularly use a language other than English on the ham bands?
Betcha it's far, far below the number using Morse/CW.
>
>> The Amateur Radio Service is unlike other radio services in its needs and
>> resources.
>
>So are you sying amateur radio "needs" morse code testing? If so,
>the burden of proof hasn't been met as per FCC R&O for 98-143.

All I'm saying is that comparisons with other services are meaningless because
the ARS is completely different.

>> > Radiotelegraphy in the maritime service has been phased out in favor of
>> > modern technology. The last vestige of manual telegraphy began being
>> > phased out in the maritime service in 1988 when the International
>> > Maritime Organization adopted the Global Maritime Distress and Safety
>> > System (GMDSS).
>> >
>> > In the 1990's, countries around the world began closing down their
>> > distress 500 kHz calling frequency watch which had been in use since
>> > 1912. The final 500 kHz message sent by the U.S. Coast Guard took
>> > place from station NMN (Chesapeake Virginia) on April 1, 1995, and they
>> > no longer monitor the frequency.
>>
>> Most radio amateurs are not on ships.
>
>So the validity of having a trained morse pool even 20 years ago
>wasn't or shouldn't have been because other services used morse.

The validity of the "trained pool" argument depends on what you mean by
"trained". There's a lot more to it than a 5 wpm code test.

>Interesting, did you make that comment when no-code was first proposed?

When was that? 1975?
>
>> > Even though the commercial world eliminated Morse code as a
>> > communications medium many years ago, it has continued on the Amateur
>> > bands because manual Morse proficiency was an international Amateur
>> > Service requirement when operating on spectrum under 30 MHz.
>>
>> There is no requirement that any radio amateur actually use Morse code.
>> Radio amateurs use it by choice.
>
>The statement isn't one of USE, it is based on a prior
>international requirement...now gone, dead, caput, finito, over.

The NCVEC statement does indeed say that the USE of Morse has continued because
of the TEST. It gives no other reason.

Here's the statement again:

"Even though the commercial world eliminated Morse code as a communications
medium many years ago, it has continued on the Amateur bands because manual

Morse proficiency was an international Amateur Service requirement when
operating on spectrum under 30 MHz."

The word "it" refers to "Morse code as a communications medium" in the above
sentence. NCVEC is saying that hams continue to USE Morse because of the TEST.

That's just plain not true.

>> Other services are constrained by considerations of cost, particularly
>> labor cost. They consider elimination of the need for a skilled radio
operator
>> to be progress. Amateurs do not.
>
>You speak for "all" amateurs?

Yes. Do you think hams want to be eliminated?

>Perhaps you should have said "some"
>amateurs.

Perhaps there are a few who want to be eliminated, but not many.

The point is that for other services radio is a means to an end. To hams it's
an end in itself.

>In any case, learning morse does have a cost to each
>and every amateur that does so. I see no reason to "mandate"
>that cost upfront for access to amateur radio.
>
Your opinion, very reasonably stated and noted.

>> To most other radio services, radio is but a means to an end, not an end
>> in
>> itself. Amateur radio, by contrast, is radio for its own sake.
>
>So?

So amateur radio should not be judged nor structured the way other services
are.
>
>> > II. Telegraphy requirement in the Amateur Service
>> >
>> > There are many communications modes and emissions available to the
>> > radio amateur and manual CW is just another one that certainly deserves
>> > no special priority. The amateur radio operator examination process
>> > does not require a practical demonstration in the ability to use any
>> > other mode - even though more than a thousand modes and emissions are
>> > available to the Amateur Service.
>>
>> Except for single sideband radiotelphony, none of those other modes
>> approaches
>> Morse code in popularity on the amateur bands below 30 MHz.
>

>The point still comes back to the fact that NO other mode
>requires any skill test. It is that simple.

No other mode requires the acquisition of skills the average person is not
likely to have in order to use it.
>
>> > The international law previously required unspecified proficiency in
>> > the International Morse code when the operation takes place in the
>> > medium or high frequency bands. Because of technological advances,
>> > this regulation has become inconsistent with the goals of the Amateur
>> > Service since it provides a barrier to otherwise qualified individuals
>> > who wish to experiment and communicate below 30 MHz. There can be no
>> > doubt that the Morse code proficiency requirements have constituted an
>> > unnecessary and artificial impediment to fuller use of the Amateur
>> > Radio Service for many potential and existing amateurs.
>>
>> The removal of the code test requirement for amateur licenses above 30 MHz
>>has
>> not resulted in a technological revolution in amateur radio on those
>> frequencies. There is no reason to expect one below 30 MHz.
>
>I never bought any great significance to that argument either.
>
Yet it has been made repeatedly in the past, and is made several times in the
NCVEC petition. What does it matter if someone is a Ph.D in EE, has a bunch of
patents, etc., etc., if all they're going to do as a ham is work SSB DX with a
manufactured transceiver and antenna?

>> > It appears that the reason that many (no-code) Technician amateurs are
>> > not upgrading to license classes that require telegraphy suggests that
>> > the Morse code requirement may be a significant barrier.
>>
>> > III. Morse code testing is a burden to the applicant
>> >
>> > It should be noted that while today's personal computers can easily
>> > send and receive telegraphy, the international Morse code "sent by hand
>> > and received by ear" requirement continued as a worldwide fundamental
>> > requirement for an amateur operator license until the recent actions by
>> > the International Telecommunications Union.
>> >
>> > The taking of the telegraphy examination is an unnecessary burden upon
>> > the applicant. Experience has shown that it is more often than not a
>> > very stressful experience for the examinee. With the elimination of
>> > the international requirement for skill in manual telegraphy, there is
>> > no longer any reasonable justification for requiring an applicant to
>> > demonstrate this antiquated skill.
>> >
>> > It is one that must be acquired through rote memorization of the
>> > character meanings of some 43 combinations of audible dots and dashes:
>> > 26 letters of the alphabet, numerals 0 through 9, four punctuation
>> > marks and three characters unique to CW. This must be followed by

>> > numerous practice sessions until the necessary skill is achieved. Most
>> > applicants, once they pass the code exam, never use the mode on the
>> > amateur airwaves. And many, perhaps most, could not pass it again if
>> > required to do so.
>>
>> Written tests are a burden to the applicants, too.
>
>Are YOU proposing an end to written tests?

Nope. Just the opposite.
>
>> Most radio amateurs do not construct or repair their own equipment, yet
>> they
>> are required to know something about how it works.
>
>Because they "can" if they wanted to.

BINGO!

So since a ham can operate Morse if he/she wants to, why is it unreasonable to have a basic Morse test? There are probably far more US hams using Morse today (by choice) than there are US hams today using homebrew stations (by choice).

Of course there are some like me who use Morse with a homebrew station...

>If a non-coded ham gets
>on the air to learn using morse with another ham...what's the probably
>harm to others and or anyone compared to constructing or repairing
>equipment themselves?

Depends on the situation. I can tell you, however, that the knoweldge required to pass all of the writtens is only a small subset of that needed to homebrew even a simple amateur station.

>> > While it continues to serve some amateur operators well, as it did in
>> > the early days of radio, it is now but one of many modes available to
>> > amateur operators. The lack of interest in CW has turned many
>> > prospective amateur operators away from the Amateur Service. IV.
>> > Morse proficiency is not an indication of a quality operator
>> >
>> > Some amateurs believe that the effort and sacrifice needed to learn
>> > Morse code indicates a more dedicated and, therefore, a better
>> > candidate for Amateur Radio. No evidence exists, however, that
>> > supports a relationship between manual telegraphy proficiency and the
>> > quality, desirability or motivation of the operator.
>>
>> However, it should be noted that most of the Commission's enforcement
>> actions
>> for poor and illegal operating practices such as jamming,
>> obscenity/profanity,
>> failure to identify, operation outside of license privileges and failure
>> to

>> heed bandplans are against amateurs using voice modes, not Morse code or
>> digital modes.
>
>More because saying "FU" via code isn't likly to be listened to by
>any non-coded ham or non-ham.

In 35+ years of mostly-CW amateur radio operation I have NEVER heard anything
like that. Have you?
>
>> > What the Morse code licensing requirement does do, however, is to
>> > greatly reduce the number of applicants operating in the medium and
>> > high frequencies. Many people question why an individual with vast
>> > knowledge in the electronics field should be excluded from operating on
>> > HF spectrum due to a personal disinterest in the Morse code.
>> >
>> > Continuing the use of Morse code proficiency as a means with which to
>> > gauge "quality" or to limit the number of amateur radio operators
>> > accessing public spectrum is certainly at odds with the FCC's mandate
>> > to promote the wider use of radio and its commitment to the use of
>> > emerging technologies.
>> >
>> > V. Morse proficiency should not be required to operate in the voice
>mode
>> >
>> > It appears that most amateurs want to communicate in the voice mode.
>> > It makes no sense from a regulatory perspective to require radio
>> > amateurs to be Morse proficient when the greater majority of radio
>> > amateurs do not desire to use that mode and there is no regulatory
>> > reason for them to do so.
>>
>> Since most amateurs do not desire to build their own equipment.....
>
>Are you proposing not allowing hams to build their own?

No - just the opposite.

But note that NCVEC doesn't see a problem in requiring theory in the writtens
because *some* hams *might choose* to homebrew....
>
>> > The future of Amateur Radio encompasses many modes undreamed of just a
>> > few years ago. Although manual telegraphy is a noble part of the
>> > Amateur Radio's past, it is no longer the prime emission mode.
>> >
>> > In short, the Commission should ensure that the amateur examination
>> > elements are appropriate for the types of operation that will be
>> > performed by the licensee.
>>
>> Following this logic, the written exams should be stripped of anything a
>> licensee does not have an interest in.
>
>ZIP - false, since any one subject CAN be ingnored and the test

>applicant can still pass. Not so with the separate morse
>test element.

That depends on what you mean by a "subject". If you define a "subject"
narrowly, that's true. But not if you define it as, say, "theory".
>
>> > VI. An unnecessary burden upon the VEC system
>> >
>> > The administration of a CW examination imposes an unnecessary burden
>> > upon the VE teams who must prepare and administer the CW examinations.
>> > It requires extensive preparation and special equipment to prepare and
>> > administer properly. It is often disruptive and unsettling to those
>> > other examinees who are taking one of the written examinations within
>> > the same room.
>> >
>> > Under 97.507(d), the VEs must prepare and record a series of messages
>> > sufficient to preclude any one message from becoming known to the
>> > examinees. Each message must contain every one of the 43 telegraphy
>> > characters at least once during period of at least 5 minutes. At the
>> > prescribed speed of 5 words per minute, and at the prescribed 5
>> > characters per word, the message is little more than 25 words in
>> > length. In practice, it is a difficult task to compose a realistic
>> > message under these limitations. It is also an unnecessary burden upon
>> > the coordinating VECs since most of them also prepare telegraphy
>> > examinations for their VE teams.
>> >
>> > VII. An unnecessary burden upon the amateur service community
>> >
>> > The amateur service community suffers from the loss to its ranks of a
>> > large number of potentially excellent operators who are turned away
>> > because of the CW requirement. Either because of lack of the requisite
>> > aptitude for sending and receiving CW or because of an unwillingness to
>> > spend the time acquiring a skill for which they find of no value to
>> > them, they forego becoming amateur operators.
>>
>> Yet the growth in amateur radio from 1990 to 2000, when there were both
>> medical
>> waivers and a nocodetest license, was almost identical to that from 1980
>> to
>> 1990, when all amateur licenses required code tests and there were no
>> waivers..
>
>Again, I don't care about or argue the growth side of it.

If we drop the code test and don't get lots more new hams, then Element 1
wasn't really a barrier or burden. QED
>
>> > VIII. An unnecessary burden upon the FCC
>> >
>> > Now that the international (treaty) Morse code requirement is optional,
>> > the FCC can expect to receive numerous requests for waivers of the

>> > Morse code examination due to applicant hearing and other medical
>> > conditions in order to be compliant with the Americans with
>> > Disabilities Act (ADA).
>>
>> Yet it was not compliance with the ADA that resulted in medical waivers
>> for the
>> 13 and 20 wpm code tests.
>
>If it hadn't happened otherwise, the ADA would have entered the
>picture by now.

I disagree. But we can't dig up a dead King and ask him.

>> > When there were multiple code tests, the FCC cited the international
>> > (treaty) requirement, as the reason that the five word-per-minute code
>> > test could not be waived. This case no longer applies and the FCC will
>> > have to develop procedures to guide both themselves and the VECs/VEs in
>> > handling requests for code exam waivers that are certain to come.
>> >
>> > Dealing with requests for a waiver of the code exam could create an
>> > unnecessary burden on the FCC and VECs/VEs and consume an excessive
>> > amount of time and resources. It seems illogical to require all
>> > amateur examinees to pass a requirement that could be waived by the
>> > actions of a physician. History has shown that physician-initiated
>> > waiver requests have been very controversial in the Amateur Service.
>>
>> By this logic, the written tests will also be a target of waiver actions.
>>For
>> example, profoundly deaf people are currently required to study for exams
>>which
>> include numerous questions on SSB and other voice modes even though there
>>is
>> little chance they will ever use those modes.
>
>Pure speculation and, IMHO, not likly to ever happen.

But it logically proceeds from the argument that people shouldn't have to learn
stuff they won't use.
>
>> > IX. World Administrative Radio Conference 2003
>> >
>> > The only changes made to the international Amateur Service regulations
>> > over the last 75 years concern the frequency above which amateurs may
>> > operate without Morse testing. At their Washington, DC conference in
>> > 1927, the ITU (then called the International Telegraph Union) allocated
>> > frequency bands to the various radio services and established operating
>> > guidelines and operator qualifications. It was deemed important that
>> > Amateurs prove an ability to transmit and receive communications in
>> > Morse signals since, at the time, radiotelegraphy was the primary means
>> > of long range communication.
>> >

>> > Since then, the administrations comprising International
>> > Telecommunication Union have reviewed and voted to relax the Amateur
>> > Service's mandatory Morse proficiency requirement at every
>> > international conference capable of doing so.
>> >
>> > In 1947 (Atlantic City), the ITU agreed that Morse proficiency should
>> > only be required when the operation took place on frequencies below
>> > 1000 MHz (1 GHz.) At WARC-59, the 1959 World Administrative Radio
>> > Conference, this level dropped to 144 MHz. A further reduction was
>> > made at WARC-79 to 30 MHz. Consequently, up until recently, Article
>> > S25.5 3 read: 25.5 3. 1) Any person seeking a license to
>> > operate the apparatus of an amateur station shall prove that he is able
>> > to send correctly by hand and to receive correctly by ear, texts in
>> > Morse code signals. The administrations concerned may, however, waive
>> > this requirement in the case of stations making use exclusively of
>> > frequencies above 30 MHz.
>> >
>> > At WRC-2003, the international Radio Regulation Article S25.5 3 was
>> > revised to make the Morse code testing requirement a matter for each
>> > licensing administration to decide for itself. Effective July 5, 2003,
>> > Article S25.5 3 reads: 25.5 3. 1) Administrations shall
>> > determine whether or not a person seeking a license to operate an
>> > amateur station shall demonstrate the ability to send and receive texts
>> > in Morse code signals.
>> >
>> > X. Summary of NCVEC proposal to end Morse testing
>> >
>> > The attached appendix contains a list of the rules that must be amended
>> > if Morse code examinations are to be discontinued. These amendments
>> > propose merely to end the manual telegraphy examination and to permit
>> > Technician Class operators the same frequency privileges as those
>> > enjoyed by Technician Class operators who have passed a code exam.
>> >
>> > Therefore, the foregoing considered, NCVEC, the National Conference of
>> > Volunteer Examiner Coordinators, respectfully requests that the
>> > Commission issue a Notice of Proposed Rule Making at any early date,
>> > proposing the rule changes set forth herein, and in the appendix
>> > attached hereto.
>> >
>> > Respectfully submitted,
>> >
>> > NCVEC, National Conference of VECs
>> > P.O. Box 565101, Dallas, Texas 75356
>>
>> This proposal simply drops Element 1 without making any other changes.
>>Oddly
>> enough, if it were adopted, Technicians would gain a bit of 10 meter SSB.
>>Most
>> of the privileges Technicians would gain would be slices of 80, 40, 15 and
>>10

>> meter CW.
>
>Start simple...then, if it makes sense, look at the overall licensing
>levels, etc. Makes sense to me.

At that rate and the typical FCC NPRM cycle, a couple decades should do it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

278. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 20:24:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bgjr1c$pa9$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 73693

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F2C75C9.7030805@adelphia.net...

>
> Anyone care to take bets on how BPL performs to say cable modems? DSL?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

>
I can GUARANTEE they wont make a connect anytime Im in my shack.

Dan/W4NTI

279. Re: Code a Deterrent to a Ham Ticket ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 20:28:52 UTC
From: robertosmith1@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <e78146ce.0308031228.6783ced4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73694

Larry,

What is your chosen occupation? Sounds like you've found your niche.
I'm still looking for mine.

-Robert

280. Re: Changing Subjects (Was Code a Deterrent to a Ham Ticket)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 20:49:21 UTC
From: El Asesor <EA@juliet.com>
Message-ID: <RLeXa.24680$ff.6219@fed1read01>
Source record: 73695

Gee I looked at the subject, then the contents and I am totally baffled.

Come on guys/gals -- if your post is for one person only or you change subject matter --- please change the subject title.

Don't make a hundred (thousand?) readers open up something totally unrelated to the subject.

Yeah I know -- who made me a net-police person? But dog gone I get tired of opening up these posts that have nothing to do with the subject.

Yeah I know --- then don't open em up. But there is some good stuff here --- don't want to miss them.

<robertosmith1@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:e78146ce.0308031228.6783ced4@posting.google.com...
> Larry,
>
> What is your chosen occupation? Sounds like you've found your niche.
> I'm still looking for mine.
>
> -Robert

281. Re: N8WWM, rain reported again.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 21:10:57 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0308031310.11b3aa29@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73696
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Duh" <MyDixieWrecked@uranus.com> wrote in message
news:<jtGVa.119311$hV.8630047@twister.austin.rr.com>...
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20030729220819.335$7t_-_@newsreader.com...
> > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > > > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > > > > > avoobner2002@yahoo.com (Aaron H. Voobner) wrote:
> > > > > > Riley H. has a good track record of
> > > > > > following up on such complaints, check the Rain Report if you
> > > > > > wish confirmation of this.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Is that the same rain report n8wwm was busted out on?
> > > > > >
> > > > > Did you leave again, Aaron?
> > > > >
> > > > I see you're still here,Aaron. What's your opinion of doug adair
> > > > n8wwm getting ratted out on the rain report?
> > > >
> > >
> > I know you're jumping up and down about no CW, jackass.
> >
> > --
> > GO# 40
>
> Well, we all knew Doug would return with his usual demented rants, but who
> knew he'd stoop so low again?

well dougie is a product of his environment.....the hamsters
thought it would be a good idea to relax the entry requirements into
ham radio and then this type of twit is what they get.....case
closed.....the hamsters now need to get used the fact that they
will soon further increase the reality tv watcher population in their
ranks, when they eliminate the code requirements....and as that event
happens, little jerry and the rest of the do-gooders will have their
hands full policing these morons .....instead of whining an a cb
newsgroup about qrp good buddies talking on 10.....

282. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 21:29:30 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <_8fXa.72573$Wd5.14250995@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 73697

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030802210406.21580.00000808@mb-m07.aol.com...
> Do Hams get 11 Meters Back, as soon as all the CBers upgrade to there Free
> Handout Ham Licenses?

This is actually not such a bad idea. I've always supported dropping the
155.3 mi. limit on CB and the idea of allowing hams to reduce their power
and elmer CBers on channels 36 through 40 USB on the finer point of DXing. I
think it'd be a great recruitment tool, just MHO.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

283. French pirates on the 45m aircraft band

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 21:33:15 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <b703f35e62495a988164f7319fdf55a9@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 73698

You probably can hear them too, some
are using also quite every night the frequency 146150 KHz in FM, sometimes in duplex with the 45m band. They live near
Paris, so the US embassy in Paris could hear them easily every night between
midnight and 2 A.M .
One of these well known pirates is named
Jacky, he lives in the town of IVRY
(near Paris) and was previously the
president of the radio-club of this town
some years ago. He was born in 1955, his family name begins with a "B", and he is using an ICOM IC-706 for piracy.
He is a CBer, not a ham-radio operator.
Another pirate is using the call "Mayran" is also well known on 45m, 11m and 146150 KHz (military frequency in
France, the 2m amateur band stops at 146 MHz).
Keep that in records for the FBI !

284. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 21:47:49 UTC
From: unidyne <unidyne@lvcm.com>
Message-ID: <hpfXa.888$2g.60@fed1read05>
Source record: 73699
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"N22X" <N22X@sherzfordzent.com> wrote in message
news:bgj1ml$nt4$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "yazoo63" <bankstonb@cox.net> wrote in message
> news:581Xa.3888$qf.399@lakeread06...
> > Hearing a station playing old-time country (or gospel) music mixed in
with
> > what sounds like a male announcer
> > preaching a sermon.
> >
> > Receiving this fairly weak (S-5) with a lot of QRM into northern
Virginia.
> > (thank god for notch filters !!!)
> >
> > Anyone have any info on this station ?
> >
> > Barry
> > N4IJN
> > Fredericksburg, VA
> >
> >
> Since the FCC closed all their monitoring stations seven
> years ago, the number of pirates and unlicensed activity
> on HF has jumped by quantum leaps.

No shit! I hadn't heard about that!

We are observing
> pirates in the 6600 khz range, which is reserved for
> aero ops, something which was unheard of in the days of
> active FCC enforcement.

Way cool!
Guys & gals, if you're reading this, don't get caught!

285. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 21:50:10 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93CCB5577DA7Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 73700

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030803122121.27503.00001415@mb-m24.aol.com:

> In article <Xns93CBC6A1646A4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>The continued existence of a CW test does actually threaten the future
>>of the hobby, i.e. it is a 'deal killer' for recruitment.
>
> WHOA, hold on a second, there!
>
> Folks, here's a claim that the code test must go because it allegedly
> holds back growth in the ARS.
>
>>Unfortunately, a
>>lot of damage has already been done, as it has been allowed to persist
>>long past it's 'sell by' date.
>
> Sounds like you're hedging your bets, Alun.

Not atall. Since about 1995 there has been a paradigm shift caused by this medium we're using right now (the Internet). If code testing had been abolished significantly before that it would have boosted our numbers far more than it ever can now. All I'm really saying is that that opportunity is lost.

>>
>>Sure, 5 wpm is easy (higher speeds were not, but that's moot now).
>>However, the CW test manages to be too slow to impart any genuinely
>>useful level of CW ability, whilst at the same time putting off
>>prospective hams. In other words, it's more counter-productive than
>>useful.
>>
>>Sure. there is a lot of CW use by hams on HF, but there are precious
>>few prospective hams who want to use it.
>
> How do you know they don't want to use it? At the past several Field
> Days, the CW ops generated the most interest.

As a sideshow it generates interest. Think of it as being like a demonstration of some obscure craft in a living museum. Sure, people find it interesting watching a blacksmith shoe a horse (and that's not a dead art either), but it doesn't mean they are going to learn to do it.

>
>>Put in all the written questions you

>>like on CW, though, as that won't cause the same kind of problem.
>>
>>I think it's true that those who want to keep a code test would likely
>>have wanted to keep spark if they had been around back then.
>
> Different thing entirely. Spark for hams wasn't outlawed in the USA
> until 1927 - long after hams had stopped using it. By choice.
>
>>If they
>>really could stop the wheel of progress, the hobby likely would die
>>with their generation, but luckily that won't happen.
>
> Do you want code USE by hams to continue or not, Alun?

Honestly? I don't care if it does or not. For the record I think it will continue. It does have some advantages (but then, so do a lot of other modes).

>>
>>Keeping out all those who aren't interested in CW may keep a few
>>'breakers' out, but it keeps out most people, period. That may suit a
>>few people here, but it isn't the way forward. Ultimately, keeping the
>>code test would do far more to destroy the hobby than letting in a few
>>CBers (and I do mean a few, as most of them are not smart enough to
>>pass the written tests). If we keep a code test, the hobby will fail
>>for lack of interest. Luckily, I don't expect that to happen.
>
> OK, let's look at some facts:
>
> - Growth in the ARS in the USA from 1980 to 1990 (when there were no
> waivers and all hams had to pass at least 5 wpm) was almost exactly the
> same as from 1990 to 2000 (when both waivers and codetestless licenses
> were available)
>
> - Overall, the ARS in the USA has kept on growing for the past 35
> years. In fact, since the end of WW1, the only periods of non-growth
> were WW2 and most of the 1960s.
>
> And now a challenge to all this stuff about disincentives. Soon the
> code test will probably be gone. There will probably be a surge of new
> licenses and upgrades, then back to growth rates near to what they were
> before. If we don't see more long-term growth without code tests, will
> you admit you were wrong and help get code tests reinstated?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

You know I won't (a wise man only asks questions to which he knows the answers, and you're no fool). I have always disagreed with a skill test in Morse being a condition for HF phone. I have never heard an argument for that that makes logical sense.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

286. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 21:56:59 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <LyfXa.72928$Wd5.14335216@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 73701

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns93CBC6A1646A4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in
> news:NnQWa.41777$Wd5.9022641@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net:
>
> > Wow Carl,
> >
> > All that below to equate those who support the retention of Element 1
> > with "the enemy." I repeat, are you sure we're talking about the 5-wpm
> > exam? Sure doesn't sound like it.
> >
>
> The continued existence of a CW test does actually threaten the future of
> the hobby, i.e. it is a 'deal killer' for recruitment.

Sorry Alun, I'm represent the exact demographic the disproves the above statement. I'm a newbie AND a CBer and Element 1 offers absolutely NO deterent to those interested in AR HF ops. Now to those who do not even want to put forth any effort...?

> Sure, 5 wpm is easy (higher speeds were not, but that's moot now).

The just do it. (Not you personally, figuratively, that is.)

> However, the CW test manages to be too slow to impart any genuinely useful
> level of CW ability,

That's because it not supposed to. It "forces" the newbie to get a taste of CW. Then it's up to the individual to either take him/herself further or drop it entirely. Many will never know if CW truly interested them because they will not have been made to even try.

> whilst at the same time putting off prospective hams.

INACCURATE STATEMENT! It puts off lazy prospective hams.

> Sure. there is a lot of CW use by hams on HF, but there are precious few
> prospective hams who want to use it.

Sorry, here I am again...Exhibit A and proof to the contrary.

> Put in all the written questions you
> like on CW, though, as that won't cause the same kind of problem.

Er, as long as the answers are published...hmm?

> Keeping out all those who aren't interested in CW may keep a few
> 'breakers' out, but it keeps out most people, period.

"Breakers?" If you mean CBers, again...Exhibit A. Like I've said before, I'm nowhere even NEAR Morse proficient...but after 20 min. twice a day for three weeks I can dust Element 1 any day of the week and twice on Sundays. (...and likely at 100% copy.)

> If we keep a code test, the hobby will fail for lack of
> interest. Luckily, I don't expect that to happen.

Neither do I.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

287. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 22:04:07 UTC
From: Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc>
Message-ID: <3F2D86D7.26E186E1@yahoo.moc>
Source record: 73702

> This is actually not such a bad idea. I've always supported dropping the
> 155.3 mi. limit on CB and the idea of allowing hams to reduce their power
> and elmer CBers on channels 36 through 40 USB on the finer point of DXing. I
> think it'd be a great recruitment tool, just MHO.

I once tried to "school" a guy on DXing. He's a little too slow
for help. I have even made DX contacts and passed 'em on to him.

288. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 22:11:26 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <iMfXa.15838$Vx2.8180666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 73703

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:LyfXa.72928$Wd5.14335216@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> That's because it not supposed to. It "forces" the newbie to get a taste
of
> CW. Then it's up to the individual to either take him/herself further or
> drop it entirely. Many will never know if CW truly interested them because
> they will not have been made to even try.
>

Exactly. It's nice to see it so neatly. It's the same reason that students
are required to study a number of items which they may or may not pursue in
the future.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

289. Re: Logical Reason For Morse Testing (Was Ham radio's REAL ememy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 22:39:24 UTC
From: El Asesor <EA@juliet.com>
Message-ID: <MfgXa.24734$ff.16574@fed1read01>
Source record: 73704

Much cut out but for this one:
>I have always disagreed with a skill test in
> Morse being a condition for HF phone. I have never heard an argument for
> that that makes logical sense.
>
The FCC Charter Part 97 sez:
97.1 Basis and purpose.
The rules and regulations in this Part are designed to provide an amateur radio service having a fundamental purpose as expressed in the following principles:

Only (d) is quoted as follows

(d) Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur radio service of trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts.

So until the military abandoned Morse Code (recently), having a trained pool of operators proficient in Morse was a national asset. Certainly was true during WWII and the Korean war (in which I sent and received volumes of Military CW traffic), even into the cold war this was true. Sounds logical to me, how about you. Remember we are not arguing about who is right, but what is right -- OVER

It had an additional attraction to those Hams entering the military -- a Ham proficient at morse could get a cushy chair at a radio (sometimes). Or more often --- a not so cushy job in a rain-filled fox hole!

Now days - having "trained operators, technicians, and electronics experts" can be a great national asset when the Big Kahuna hits -- ala 9/11 but big time. And Lord forbid we ever have to mobilize a "Citizen Army" again, but if we do -- you can bet ye olde bottom dollar, hams who can operate, maintain, and repair electronics will be in high demand.

Things have changed, so I would now agree that CW skill is no longer necessary (as a test), but we need to test so that we know those entering the Amateur Radio Service know the International and FCC rules and regs, enough technical knowledge to competently operate transmitters, and quite a bit more so we don't end up with a free for all on the Amateur Bands which for the most part has been up to now -- characterized by courteous, skilled, and knowledgeable operators. We need to ensure this proud tradition continues. We don't want a CB band or FRS band on the Ham Spectrums.

Don't bother to tell me that the Ham Renegades (0.01%) are representative of the community as a whole.

290. Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 23:15:52 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0308032303150.503@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 73705

On Sat, 2 Aug 2003, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308020525560.190@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > On Fri, 1 Aug 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
> > >...
> > > Others have pointed out that rule 301(e) was written that way to avoid
> > > creating any new 'Tech+' licencees, but it looks as if invoking the
> > > international rules created a sunset clause, whether intentionally or
> > > otherwise.
> >
> > AH! Someone who is now on the verge of understanding what that "wierd"
> thing I
> > said was. IT was a "sunset clause" and the change to S25.5 was the
> "sunset."
>
> It is NOT a sunset clause ... NCI specifically asked for a sunset clause
> so code testing would "automagically" go away when S25.5 was suppressed
> or changed so that code testing was no longer required by the ITU Radio
> Regs.
>
> The FCC SPECIFICALLY declined to enact such a sunset clause, and the
> text of 301 does NOT contain one, no matter how you try to twist it.

That is true - the FCC didn't enact a sunset clause to eliminate code testing
for HF as NCI requested. I never said that's what they did.

The FCC DID enact a sunset clause that TERMINATES HF operation by licenses of
lesser privilege than General class. That's what I've been saying that they
did.

> > > I don't really see how that throws anything into chaos. Right now no-
> > > coders who operate on the Novice/Tech HF allocations can't readily be
> > > detected for lack of any central records to prove that they are actually
> > > no-coders. If the changes to s25.5 affect 97.301(e) so as to make it
> > > permissible, then from the FCC perspective it makes an enforcement problem
> > > go away!
> >
>
> Again (and again ... you people must not be able to read, only write) ...
> the FCC *DOES* have records of which Techs have 5 wpm credit and
> which don't ... this idea that "there are no records, so you can get away
> with it is 1) false, and 2) borders on inducement to violate the rules.

[Count your levels of quotation; you attribute this to me but I didn't say it.]

No, they don't. They have records of which techs PRIOR to April 15, 2000 that have the credit. They do NOT have records after April 14, 2000 because those are held by the VECs and never forwarded to the FCC.

> If someone follows your (VERY BAD) advice and gets cited for it,
> I hope they explain that "(fill in the names from usenet) told me it was
> OK" and the FCC comes knocking on your doors with citations for
> #2 above ...

I never said that it was OK for a no-code Technician to operate on HF.

I have said that it is NOT OK for a coded Technician to operate on HF because his authority to do so has been rescinded.

You are confusing my argument with that of someone else. I agree with you that the originator of this thread is incorrect - but I went further by saying that due to the language used in 47 CFR 97.301(e), Technicians and Novices have LOST their HF privileges.

291. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 23:18:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj1m5eo.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73706

On Sun, 3 Aug 2003 09:45:41 -0500, Kim W5TIT wrote:

>> The days when the monitoring stations would catch ham operators 2
>> or 3 kHz outside the band edge (especially in contests) are gone
>> forever. "Cruising" is no longer a daily activity.

>Heh heh, and maybe CW is not so commonly understood by those at the FCC?
>Phil?

Nope - I am told that the requirement still is 16 wpm for field
office enforcement agents and 20 wpm for monitoring techs - yes,
there still are those, just not as many because the mon stas are
all remoted to a central point now, where each can be brought up as
necessary by a single tech. Several of the field office agents are
ex-monitoring techs as well.

As long as Morse is permitted in any radio service for any purpose,
such as IDs in the land mobile services or "permissive" Morse in the
maritime services, or "permissive" Morse in the ARS, that job
requirement will stay.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

292. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-03 23:27:11 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0308032322180.503@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 73707

On Sun, 3 Aug 2003, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> BOTTOM LINE: *Until the FCC changes its rules* no-code Techs
> have NO HF privs ... sorry, folks, but that's the way it is.

Neither do Novices nor the "coded" Techs. They lost their HF privileges
effective July 5, 2003.

293. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 00:10:43 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgk8a3$114$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73708

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bgjcd8$i9k$0@208.206.142.66...
>
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > news:bgi31e$1n3m$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> > > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3F2C75C9.7030805@adelphia.net...
> > > > That includes Homeland defense, defense, broadcasting, lots of
people
> > > > besides hams.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Well then, if it's *that* bad, I'm sure it'll be defeated, eh?
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> >
> > And that is the most naive statement about the workings of government
that I
> > have ever seen.
>
> Typical of Kim, I'm afraid
>

Yeah, and I guess what's typical of you, Dick, is that you can't face an
honest question. I've already said I was trying to rattle chains with the
BPL topic.

Hell, you don't even have the hutzpah to comment directly to something from
me.

Kim W5TIT

---
Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net
```

294. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 00:11:33 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgk8bl$11q$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73709

"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
news:873cgiaf2e.fld@barrow.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
> >>
> >> Yep, it is true! I was once a CB'er, for a whole six months! I was
the
> >> Asst. Mgr. of the Radio Shack store in Depew, NY at the time,
> >
> >We should have known ... "Radio Shack, you've got questions, we're
> >clueless,"
> >I'm sure Larry fit in quite well.
>
> Ain't this just tooooo precious. Both DICK Carrol and Larry ROLL
> turn out to be refugees from the CB channels.
>
> Of course, they *act* like it too.
>
> --
> Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
> Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com
>

The things that upset us most are often things we see as qualities in our
ownselves.

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

295. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 00:33:09 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgk9k5$1u3$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73710

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030803122123.27503.00001416@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <3F2C0443.9060301@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Put it that way, Mike, yes. It is hard to argue that removing *any*
part
> >> of
> >> a test is not a reduction in the amount of knowledge needed to pass a
test.
> >> But, that is simply a word game and nothing else.
>
> It's more than a word game. Encouraging radio knowledge of all types is
one of
> the most basic reasons to have the ARS exist at all. The tests are there
to
> insure a minimum knowledge level. ("Knowledge" including skills, concepts,
> facts, etc.)
> >>
> >> The point is, what does passing a CW test prove in the way of
> >> knowledge--other than that one can pass a CW test?
>
> It proves that:
>
> 1) The person has learned a useful radio skill at a very basic level.
>

Then, why not have a "net operation" test? Net operation is fairly
standard. That's as basic a level as you can get: everyone understands the
English Language (at least those who are testing for a US amateur radio
license).

>
> 2) The person was willing and able to devote the time and effort necessary
to
> learn that skill.
>

That has nothing to do with their participation in ham radio.

>
> 3) The person has been exposed to a useful, widely-used-by-hams radio
> communications mode other than voice or data.
>

Like I said, then test on voice. It's the widest-used-by-hams radio communication. Why not test the most used mode?

> >>
> >> What does passing the
> >> written tests prove in the way of knowledge--other than that one can pass a
> >> written test?
>
> It proves that:
>
[Skip 1 and 2, we already went over those]
> 3) The person has been exposed to several aspects of the amateur radio service
> (regulations, operating practices, technology).
>

Agreed.

>
> >> If you see the parody in both of those questions, then I go
> >> one step further and say: What does passing a CW test have to with anything
> >> related to overall knowledge of ham radio?!!!!!???? In my mind, *NOTHING*
>
> Then your knowledge of amateur radio is very lacking. Like it or not, CW/Morse
> is a very big part of amateur radio today. Of course, that by itself doesn't
> prove we must have a code test.
>

Thank you. And, was that you acquiescing? Yes, CW is incredibly important and a big part of amateur radio. But, no, it does not prove that we must have a code test.

> >>
> >> It's bad enough that the written tests don't prove a whole lot, without the
> >> added argument of CW in the mix. To continue to support CW as some form >>
> of
> >> proof that people know more about ham radio, know more about >>
> communication,
> >> know more about the standards and technology of ham radio, et al, is to
> >> continue to do nothing but whine about a tradition--which is really all CW
> >> really is: A TRADITION that no one wants to see fade away.
>
> You are mistaken on several counts there, Kim.
>
> 1) The written tests are what they are. They are in a continuing state of

> development.
>
> 2) ALL ELSE BEING EQUAL, a ham who has Morse skills knows more about
amateur
> radio than one with no Morse skills.
>

I disagree. A ham who has CW skills knows more about CW than one with no CW
skills.

>
> 3) Morse/CW has certain advantages to hams beyond being "just another
mode".
>

That does not merit a CW test.

>
> 4) Morse/CW is more than "just a tradition". It's a useful mode of radio
> communication enjoyed by hundreds of thousands of hams.
>

That does not merit a CW test.

>
> 5) There do exist folks who want Morse/CW USE (not just the TEST) by hams
to
> simply go away. They are a very small minority, but they do exist. Or at
least
> there are people whose rhetoric indicates they want Morse use by hams to
end.
>

That's their problem, not mine. I don't believe CW will ever exit from the
ham radio scene.

>
> Of course, whether all of that "proves" we must have a code test is simply
a
> matter of opinion.
>
> >> Passing CW is nothing.
>
> Maybe not to you. To others, it's a big deal.
>

Well, I worded that wrong. Passing CW is a big deal, but it does nothing
for the benefit of ham radio, save that that particular operator may use
CW--but that particular operator would probably have used CW anyway, then.

> >>
> >> And it proves nothing to anyone else, except that
> >> they studied CW and passed it in a test. I've seen idiots on every

side of
> >> ham radio, so it does nothing to prove quality or *interest* as
everyone
> >> seems to like to argue. If CW was that kind of instrument, then we'd
have
> >> no jerks on ham radio and, believe me, I've heard them.
>
> That's simply illogical. No test, no matter how contrived, will filter out
> every single "jerk" from the ranks of amateur radio. Or anything else, for
that
> matter.
>

I know that, and you know that. But others here either don't know that or
don't want to let go of that part of the argument.

>
> Look at how much it takes just to become a physician. The training and
testing
> required is phenomenal, and designed to weed out the incapable. The hard
work
> and dedication required just to get into medical school are extraordinary,
and
> yet that's just the beginning. I could go on and on, but you get the
picture.
>

I will not argue the merit of CW testing against the measure of training and
testing for a professional field. There is no reason to put someone through
the same stressful training and testing that a physician goes through, for
an amateur radio license.

> >>
> >> Using CW as a test to prove "diligence" to the desire of wanting to be
a
> >>ham
> >> radio operator is pure crap in my not-so-humble opinion.
>
> OK, fine. At least you note that it's your opinion.
>

One would hope, Jim, that everyone realizes we post our opinions.

> >>
> >> It is wrong to
> >> even attempt to measure someone's desire and interest.
>
> Why? I'd rather have an ARS consisting of a few hundred thousand
interested,
> active, dedicated, skilled, knowledgeable hams than one of a few million
> inactive, apathetic, unskilled, ignorant ones who could not care less.
Code

> test or no code test.
>

And, I'd rather have *everyone.*

> >>
> >> If I have an Extra
> >> license and I have no equipment or haven't even been on the radio in
years,
> >> then what did passing CW prove, in terms of proven interest? Nothing.
And
> >> it never will.
>
> Incorrect. It proved that at one time the person had the interest.
>

Oh, wow...

> >>
> >> Yes, CW is a useful communication skill. Hell, *ANY* type of
communication
> >> skill is useful. If we place such importance on CW, then why not RTTY,
> >> phone, ATV, etc.
>
> Because those modes don't require the acquisition of new skills for their
use.
>

Uh, 'scuse me? They require being able to establish communication between
devices, have the signal within a certain bandwidth, etc.

> >>
> >> You know what I'm saying.
>
> Not really.
>
> >> And, if CW proves a higher
> >> plane of dedication and knowledge, then why are there extremely skilled
CW
> >> operators out there, who are real jerks?! And you know there are.
>
> No, I don't. Name some. If your only reference is how a few folks behave
in
> this newsgroup, it should be remembered that lots of folks on both sides
of the
> code test fence have behaved like real jerks in their posts here.
>

No, it would not be only by a few folks in this newsgroup. And, I won't
name them because they are from my local area. Suffice it to say their
interference for the use of spelling curse words in CW was frequent and
sufficient enough to end a years long tradition of hams getting together

every night at 10:00PM for a phone net on 10M.

> >>
> >> So, how
> >> can someone, *anyone* then turn around and say that CW proves
anything?
> >> It proves nothing but that the person studied for and passed the CW
> >> requirement.
>
> Seems to me that you want the Morse code test to be a perfect "jerk"
filter.
> And of course no test can do that.
>

Not at all. Others already think it does.

>
> But note this plain, simple fact: Almost all of the FCC enforcement
actions for
> "jerk-like" on-air behavior (obscenity, jamming, failure to ID, exceeeding
> license privileges, etc., etc.) are against hams using PHONE modes, not
> CW/Morse or data modes. ALL of us have taken written tests detailing what
we
> should and should not do on the air, but it seems like violations are much
more
> prevalent among the talkers than the brasspounders or keyboarders. Why?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I've already said that there are probably more reasons for that than it being because a CW operator is a finer person than others who are not. And, talking is much easier and quicker to let things roll off that we shouldn't. CW is mostly callsign/whereabouts/weather/TNX and that's it. If an actual conversation ensues, I'm sure no one (except the jerks I know of) would waste their time getting carpal tunnel with cursing in CW.

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

296. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 00:34:34 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgk9mq$1v5$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73711

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bgjd3l$je6$0@208.206.142.66...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
>
> > We should have known ... "Radio Shack, you've got questions, we're
> > clueless,"
>
> Don't gloat too much. I know a young fellow who has a Radio Shack
franchise
> who repairs almost anything, and is a walking electronic encyclopedia
>

You're always stocked to the gills with whatever you need, Dick. Could you
please describe the equipment necessary for the setup of a disaster station
for CW operation? Are you that stocked?

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

297. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 00:35:40 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <878yqa8dk3.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73712

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote:
>> Ain't this just tooooo precious. Both DICK Carrol and Larry ROLL
>> turn out to be refugees from the CB channels.
>>
>> Of course, they *act* like it too.
>>
>
>The things that upset us most are often things we see as qualities in our
>ownselves.

That is true, and it is often reflected in the things people say when they try to insult others. Both of them have a pretty stock set of insults, which clearly are based on what they understand about themselves, but are gratuitously thrown at anyone who disagrees with them.

One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

298. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 00:37:42 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgk9sm$25k$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73713

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030803140031.09955.00001088@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <bgj86k$2gbl$1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
> <fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:
>
> >
> >Thank you, Dwight. There will be none, save yours. The naysayers
totally
> >ignore poignant statements and seem to like more, getting involved with
the
> >idiocy...
> >
> >For example:
> >Dave Heil still hasn't told me if he has ever, in any way, broken the
law.
>
> Why should he, Kim?
>
> >Dick Carroll still has not described the items he would need to set up a
CW
> >station in a disaster situation.
>
> Why should he, Kim?
>
> Dave and Dick have nothing to prove to you, little Kimmie dear. They are
> grown up, mature, adults, and you are (or act like) a little child
screaming
> for attention any way you can get some. Nobody in this NG is going to
> lift a finger to prove a damn thing to the likes of YOU, Kim, so just
forget
> that, and start showing proper respect for your moral and intellectual
> superiors -- you know, people like Dave, Dick, and myself!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I'm showing you guys you're number one right now... _ _ | _ _

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

299. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 00:46:55 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgkae0$2md$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73714

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:iMfXa.15838$Vx2.8180666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:LyfXa.72928$Wd5.14335216@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > That's because it not supposed to. It "forces" the newbie to get a taste
> of
> > CW. Then it's up to the individual to either take him/herself further or
> > drop it entirely. Many will never know if CW truly interested them
because
> > they will not have been made to even try.
> >
>
> Exactly. It's nice to see it so neatly. It's the same reason that
students
> are required to study a number of items which they may or may not pursue
in
> the future.
>
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Then I say we test on every mode there is. If you support that for CW, then surely you support it for other modes.

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

300. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 00:48:11 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgkagn$2nk$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73715

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj1m5eo.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sun, 3 Aug 2003 09:45:41 -0500, Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> >> The days when the monitoring stations would catch ham operators 2
> >> or 3 kHz outside the band edge (especially in contests) are gone
> >> forever. "Cruising" is no longer a daily activity.
>
> >Heh heh, and maybe CW is not so commonly understood by those at the FCC?
> >Phil?
>
> Nope - I am told that the requirement still is 16 wpm for field
> office enforcement agents and 20 wpm for monitoring techs - yes,
> there still are those, just not as many because the mon stas are
> all remoted to a central point now, where each can be brought up as
> necessary by a single tech. Several of the field office agents are
> ex-monitoring techs as well.
>
> As long as Morse is permitted in any radio service for any purpose,
> such as IDs in the land mobile services or "permissive" Morse in the
> maritime services, or "permissive" Morse in the ARS, that job
> requirement will stay.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Wow, Phil! I had no idea. And, I am glad to hear it.

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

301. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 00:50:16 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgkak8$ri3$0@208.206.142.71>
Source record: 73716
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Brian wrote:

> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308021825.1918f024@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308021256.64db56db@posting.google.com>...
> > > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308021047.5638e89f@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > > I got my first dose by landing on 75M with one of the old
> > > > floor-mounted living room multiband wooden console radios owned by a
> > > > couple of old maid aunts. Was around the time of the broadcast of the
> > > > atom bomb tests on Bikini atoll.
> > >
> > > My dad was at Eniwetok, and at several Nevada tests as well. He is
> > > what is now called an "atomic veteran."
> >
> > NOW we know why you turned out like you did. Sue the sumbitches.
>
> I turned out great. A couple of extra teeth is all. I even passed my
> entrance physical, and served honorably for 20+ years.
>
> Anyway, that's what I like about you; you get all of your exercise
> dodging the draft and jumping to conclusions.

The draft is between your ears.

302. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 00:51:15 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgkb08$pqf@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 73720

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj1m5eo.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sun, 3 Aug 2003 09:45:41 -0500, Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> >> The days when the monitoring stations would catch ham operators 2
> >> or 3 kHz outside the band edge (especially in contests) are gone
> >> forever. "Cruising" is no longer a daily activity.
>
> >Heh heh, and maybe CW is not so commonly understood by those at the FCC?
> >Phil?
>
> Nope - I am told that the requirement still is 16 wpm for field
> office enforcement agents and 20 wpm for monitoring techs - yes,
> there still are those, just not as many because the mon stas are
> all remoted to a central point now, where each can be brought up as
> necessary by a single tech. Several of the field office agents are
> ex-monitoring techs as well.
>
> As long as Morse is permitted in any radio service for any purpose,
> such as IDs in the land mobile services or "permissive" Morse in the
> maritime services, or "permissive" Morse in the ARS, that job
> requirement will stay.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Wow, Phil! I had no idea. And, I am glad to hear it.

Kim W5TIT

303. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 00:52:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj2a01q.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73718

On Sun, 03 Aug 2003 21:29:30 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:

>This is actually not such a bad idea. I've always supported dropping the
>155.3 mi. limit on CB and the idea of allowing hams to reduce their power
>and elmer CBers on channels 36 through 40 USB on the finer point of DXing. I
>think it'd be a great recruitment tool, just MHO.

If you espouse the above, it is evidence that you have no
understanding about what CB is supposed to be for and you cannot
keep ham radio and CB separate as they should be.

What you are describing is hamming, not proper (some call it "legal") CB
operating.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

304. Re: Some comments on the NCVEC petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 00:52:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj2cd7r.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73717

On 03 Aug 2003 20:21:07 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>When someone truly has the interests of the ARS in mind, they will
>look at the complete picture rather than take a narrow view. This is
>particularly important in dealing with FCC because we have seen how
>long it takes them to do an amateur service NPRM cycle.

And, unfortunately, the ARS got shot in the a** again by the same
people who will be deciding the BPL issue, the Office of Engineering
Technology within the FCC.

Last week, the ARRL was denied reconsideration of an FCC/OET ruling
that increased the power/emission limits of non-licensed Part 15
devices operating in the 24 GHz band (yes, that's 24 GHz - lots of
amateur satellite telemetry and control takes place there) by a
factor of 10. The potential for interference was great.

The ARRL held that the FCC exceeded its authority by allowing
blanket Part 15 operation of devices that knowingly could cause
interference to the ARS - a licensed primary service - rather than
requiring individual FCC licenses for such devices with attendant
frequency coordination.

The Communications Act gives the FCC authority to issue "blanket
authorizations" for stations operating above the Part 15
non-licensed power levels in the Citizens (CB, MURS, FRS, R/C),
Maritime (Domestic VHF Ship) and Aviation (Domestic VHF Aircraft)
Services, but not the devices in question.

The FCC asserted its authority to do just what it did, and denied
reconsideration. The action on the request for reconsideration took
9 months.

I felt strongly about that issue because although my name did not
appear in the FCC filings, I did contribute some info and direction
and served as a sounding board while the filing was being drafted by
the ARRL General Counsel.

I just hope that it is not a whiff of the BPL future.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

305. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 00:52:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <f7iXa.15968$Vx2.8217426@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 73719

```
"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bgkae0$2md$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:iMfXa.15838$Vx2.8180666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:LyfXa.72928$Wd5.14335216@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > That's because it not supposed to. It "forces" the newbie to get a
taste
> > of
> > > CW. Then it's up to the individual to either take him/herself further
or
> > > drop it entirely. Many will never know if CW truly interested them
> because
> > > they will not have been made to even try.
> > >
> >
> > Exactly. It's nice to see it so neatly. It's the same reason that
> students
> > are required to study a number of items which they may or may not pursue
> in
> > the future.
> >
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> Then I say we test on every mode there is. If you support that for CW,
then
> surely you support it for other modes.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>

No problem. I'm ready. Are you?

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
```

306. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 00:57:32 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <0ciXa.15969$Vx2.8220036@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 73721

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bgk9k5$1u3$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> CW is mostly callsign/whereabouts/weather/TNX and that's it. If an actual
> conversation ensues, I'm sure no one (except the jerks I know of) would
> waste their time getting carpal tunnel with cursing in CW.
>

There you are wrong. There are many extensive conversations on CW. They converse about the same things voice operators do. I've heard them talking about their careers, families, computers, buying and selling on ebay and a myriad of other topics.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

307. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 01:01:14 UTC
From: "Robert M. Bratcher Jr" <bratcher@pdq.net>
Message-ID: <9vbrivgfht6qgh1baovksnkslaj3n3g4m@4ax.com>
Source record: 73722
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 3 Aug 2003 09:12:22 -0400, "N22X" <N22X@sherzfordzent.com>
wrote:

>
>"yazoo63" <bankstonb@cox.net> wrote in message
>news:581Xa.3888$qf.399@lakeread06...
>> Hearing a station playing old-time country (or gospel) music mixed in with
>> what sounds like a male announcer
>> preaching a sermon.
>>
>> Receiving this fairly weak (S-5) with a lot of QRM into northern Virginia.
>> (thank god for notch filters !!!)
>>
>> Anyone have any info on this station ?
>>
>> Barry
>> N4IJN
>> Fredericksburg, VA
>>
>>
> Since the FCC closed all their monitoring stations seven
>years ago, the number of pirates and unlicensed activity
>on HF has jumped by quantum leaps. We are observing
>pirates in the 6600 khz range, which is reserved for
>aero ops, something which was unheard of in the days of
>active FCC enforcement.
>
>N22X
>Terra Haute, IN

I'd guess the number of FM pirates has risen too? I haven't heard any
in my city in quite awhile but we have "resident agents" so maybe
thats why....

308. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 01:01:31 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgn52drde1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73770

```
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:f7iXa.15968$Vx2.8217426@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:bgkae0$2md$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:iMfXa.15838$Vx2.8180666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > > news:LyfXa.72928$Wd5.14335216@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > > That's because it not supposed to. It "forces" the newbie to get a
> taste
> > > of
> > > > CW. Then it's up to the individual to either take him/herself
further
> or
> > > > drop it entirely. Many will never know if CW truly interested them
> > because
> > > > they will not have been made to even try.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Exactly. It's nice to see it so neatly. It's the same reason that
> > students
> > > are required to study a number of items which they may or may not
pursue
> > in
> > > the future.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> >
> > Then I say we test on every mode there is. If you support that for CW,
> then
> > surely you support it for other modes.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> No problem. I'm ready. Are you?
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
```

Yep, but the testing in all areas of the mode will never happen. So, do you still support it just for CW?

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

309. Re: Ed Hare (W1RFI) of the ARRL on BPL replies to comments

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 01:05:29 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgkbgpudf0@208.207.71.165>
Source record: 73723

Rob Kemp wrote:

> It is not just amateur radio that is at risk
> here, but any use of HF that operates near BPL installations

As well as any other radio system operating over a wide area up to the 80 MHz
limit planned. Public safety comes immediately to mind since I worked in that fielf. I know that a number of states presently still use low band VHF for state police communications using direct car to base systems as well as many crossband repeaters with receivers covering considerable areas operating on frequencies between 40 and 50 MHz.
I worked as a field engineer in such a system and RF noise was an ongoing problem. And with the FM systems in use, often the noise will simply keep the squelch closed and the recever won't be aware that the transmitting station is attempting a call.
I recall one such particularly troublesome repeater where that would occur and by the time I could drive to the repeater site the "phantom" problem was gone. After several unproductive tries, I finally found the source of the noise- a welder in a shop about a half mile from the repeater site which welded only ocassionally, and those times just happened to coincide with the repeater desense problems. We wound up relocating that repeater because of it.

If that sort of situation can virtually shut down a single low band repeater I can only simagine the sort of wide area problems could be caused by BPL.

Dick

310. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 01:09:52 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <874r0y8bz3.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73724

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
>On Sun, 03 Aug 2003 21:29:30 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:
>
>>This is actually not such a bad idea. I've always supported dropping the
>>155.3 mi. limit on CB and the idea of allowing hams to reduce their power
>>and elmer CBers on channels 36 through 40 USB on the finer point of DXing. I
>>think it'd be a great recruitment tool, just MHO.
>
> If you espouse the above, it is evidence that you have no
> understanding about what CB is supposed to be for and you cannot
> keep ham radio and CB separate as they should be.
>
> What you are describing is hamming, not proper (some call it "legal") CB
> operating.

One of the odd things about the animosity between CB and ARS users, is that here in Alaska CB was a *very* beneficial service used pretty much as intended in most Alaskan locations.

Because I worked in the (long distance) telecom business, the places where I've lived were always communications centers, and CB was never popular in those areas. But I also spent a lot of years traveling to nearly half of the villages in Alaska... and in many villages for many years CB was the way people kept in touch with their neighbors until roughly 1980 or so, by which time telephones had been installed in almost all villages. But even after that happened CB remained very popular in many coastal areas with perhaps the single exception of here in Barrow (larger boats, mostly used for whaling, were and still are commonly equipped with VHF marine radios here).

During years of higher sunspot activity the skip that was experienced on CB was a general nuisense to most Alaskan users because it generated an unnecessary racket where the radio was, and interfered with monitoring for significant (perhaps emergency) traffic from neighbors.

Between cell phones and VHF radios, I don't think anyone on Alaska much cares anymore what they do with CB regulations.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

311. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 01:18:25 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308031718.23b2c842@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73725

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030802210406.21580.00000808@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> Do Hams get 11 Meters Back, as soon as all the CBers upgrade to there Free
> Handout Ham Licenses?

We didn't "lose" 11M, we just had use CB reddios instead of our ham
gear to run on 11.

w3rv

312. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 01:41:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308031741.11bb8ad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73726

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030803134622.08385.00001212@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> Also, few club members are interested in homebrewing,
> >> despite claiming interest by posing for a photograph showing club > members
> >doing a group project.
> >
> >Well, they do have photographic proof. We're stuck with just your
> >claim.
>
> No, they only posed for the photograph. It does not mean that they actually did
> that activity. I can ask people in that photograph if they are interested in
> homebrewing and that person will say he is not interested in homebrewing.
>
> Therefore, the photograph is just hype and does not represent what the club is
> really interested in.

So far all we "have" is your word, which is, at best, dubious,
that this really occured. You won't ID the club, any of the members,
a web page with the news letter on it, etc etc etc.

> >> So, the "advancement of the radio art" is just a justification
> >> for more HF/CW activities.
> >
> >So you're back to telling them where their interests should lie.
>
> I didn't say they were interested in homebrewing - the photograph did. It takes
> a prominant place in the club publicity. Except, the photograph is a
> mis-representation of what the club members are truly interested in.

PAY ATTENTION WO WHAT WAS SAID, VIPUL!

(What's with all the allegedly college educated "engineer types".

What was said was >>YOU<< are back to telling "them" where thier
interests should lay. And you do. You constantly barrage this NG
with YOUR interpretation of what Amatuer Radio should be and how
"wrong" other Amateurs are for not following THAT doctrine.

> >I'll wager that most "old timers" aren't even involved with a radio
> >club.
>
> They don't go to club meetings. And they don't go to Hamfests. Nor are they on
> 2m. I get it - they don't exist.
>

> >You'll have to use the callsign database and begin making phone
> >calls or knocking on doors to come up with a scientific sampling
>
> A scientific sampling is not needed by me, nor any potential new recruit to Ham
> radio. If that person's experiences are of anti-social, mostly male, mostly
> older, non-technical (if they are interested in that), Hams, then thats all
> they need to know. It won't do much good to show them the other aspect that
> "could" exist, but does not exist for them.

Your creepiness is getting worse.

> >> There have been exceptions of course, but it is too rare to be worth > the
> >effort. I cannot search out the contradiction.
> >
> >That's right. You've begun with an outcome and you're trying to make
> >the statistics fit that outcome.
>
> I'm not making any statistics fit. I'm saying that if something is 95%* and it
> takes you a certain amount of time to come across the other 5%, then its not
> worth the effort.

Depends on what the "5%" is, Vippy, and whether or not you've got
the perseverence to find it or not. If the "95%" is clay, and the
"5%" is gold, then isn't it worth it to you to get your blue jeans a
bit dirty...???

> ---
> *The 95% number is given for example purposes only. It is not meant to
> represent a specific percentage.

"95%" >>IS<< a specific percentage. YOU quantified it, Vipster.

Steve, K4YZ

313. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 01:44:25 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgkdpp$108$0@208.207.71.135>
Source record: 73727

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:bgk9k5$1u3$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> > CW is mostly callsign/whereabouts/weather/TNX and that's it. If an actual
> > conversation ensues, I'm sure no one (except the jerks I know of) would
> > waste their time getting carpal tunnel with cursing in CW.
> >
>
> There you are wrong. There are many extensive conversations on CW. They
> converse about the same things voice operators do. I've heard them talking
> about their careers, families, computers, buying and selling on ebay and a
> myriad of other topics.

Dee, don't waste your time trying to convince Kim with facts. Her mind, such as it is, is already made up.

314. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 02:13:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2DC086.A0898140@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73728

JMBCV wrote:
>
> In article <3F2C9682.FFEC97A8@earthlink.net>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> >
> >
> > Vshah101 wrote:
> > >
> > > From (Larry Roll K3LT):

> >
> > I'm involved in a county group which is part of ARES.
>
> Feh. You've attended only one meeting..and just to harass and stalk another ham, ASSHOLE.

Why, Roger Wiseman! Fancy you slithering from beneath your bed to make
yet another anonymous post. I've attended a number of meetings and
functions, Roger. I'm told that you only came to the one meeting.

By the way, I'd go very carefully on that stalking stuff, Rog. You've
frequently harrassed me here and in direct e-mails. You have an arrest
record and you've been booted from a couple of ISP's. You've been
cautioned for malicious QRMing on 20 meters and have been forced to
retest.

> > Most of the hams
> > involved are not interested in contesting or DXing. Many operate VHF FM
> > only. I don't know any who've designed and built a linear amplifier.
> > Only one other is interested in collecting and restoring vintage gear.
>
> Yep, they are a clique of losers.....

Oh yes, I neglected to mention that we have one dysfunctional individual
who exhibits sociopathic behavior on several levels. He frequently
haunts the rec.radio.amateur.misc and rec.radio.amateur.policy
newsgroups and posts irrelevant stream-of-consciousness filth (usually
unrelated to the thread topic. His over exhuberance has led him to the
malicious interference incidents on 20m.

Actually, Roger, the only real loser is you. You're hardly a clique.

> > I continue to attend. We interact
>
> Except the fact you fail to bathe regularly, you mean.......fuckstick.

It looks like your still battling that rare form of Tourette's Syndrome.

> >based on our common interests rather than the things which divide us.
>
> Yeah, those common interests being not helping newer hams......

How could you come to that conclusion? You haven't been attending
meetings.

> > > The other alternative is to start my own club. I tried it, but that was not too
> > > successful.
>
> btw, fuck off, High-el.

BTW, forwarded your stuff to Chief Stenger in Glen Dale. It is about
the only way to make a case against someone who has no interpersonal
skills.

Ta-Ta for now.

Dave K8MN

315. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 02:37:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2DC5F3.D3D53968@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73729

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3F2C915D.728BDD78@earthlink.net...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > And your notes of Carl's history with ham radio seem at most,
> perfuntory.
> > > They have nothing to do with the fact that Carl posted his comments to
> this
> > > thread. Unless you believe that Carl must be exactly equal with you
> before
> > > you consider any importance to his comments.
> >
> > As you are, so is Carl in my age group. Carl sat on a Tech ticket for
> > 2 1/2 decades until the requirements were lowered.

> So?

So that's a statement of fact which deals with Carl's level of
experience and Carl's motivation.

> > Carl crowed about
> > the large numbers of highly technical people being kept out of ham radio
> > by "high speed" morse tests. Extra Class Carl spends his time chasing
> > DX on HF SSB with a commercial rig. Carl is as cranky as anyone here.
> > He's just cranky with a view opposite mine. I offer his sermon as
> > proof.
> >
>
> You mounted your view on the allegation that Carl has not been licensed in
> the same manner as you (re: your whining about his being a Tech for so long
> and his alledged comments about CW).

You seem to have it fouled up. Carl did the whining. His comments
aren't alleged. His comments are archived and on the record.

> > > Does one have to be in ham
> > > radio exactly as long as you, be as old as you, have been on HF SSB and
> CW
> > > as much as you, before you think they're "worthy?"
> >
> > Why no, Kim. Then again, I didn't write anything like that. Perhaps you
> > just had a feeling...
> >
>

> Then, why the opening remarks then and now, with this post, about how long
> Carl was a Tech and his alledged comments on CW? Why enter that into your
> remarks at all, Dave, if not to cast attention to that? If you are casting
> attention to that, then why?

Cast attention? As much as you'd like to make this about me, I'd have
likely sat quietly until Carl saw fit to include my name in his sermon.
This is about Carl having the gall to preach to others that they are the
enemies of amateur radio.

> > > Perhaps you like your terms,
> > > better. It's always interesting to note how you quickly change to
> > > name-calling ("Squiggy", "Big Mouth Carl") when you see things you don't
> > > like.
> >
> > Did you bother to read what Carl wrote about me?
> >
>
> And, I think many times here you have poked at me for defending something
> I've said because of what or how someone else said it. Which makes you a
> hypocrite for now defending your actions because of the actions of someone
> else.

Look, Kim. Carl wrote something and included my name. He did it in the
clumsy and loutish style that we've come to know over a period of years
before your appearance here. The "New Carl" with pancake makeup and
carefully scripted comments wasn't fooling anyone who had earlier
dealings with him. His latest stuff is pure "Old Carl".

> > > Is this another chapter in your book?

> > No chapter in my book is devoted to Carl. If you'd like a copy, I can
> > sell you one at a pre-publication discount.

> I've read the book,...

The book isn't out yet.

>...seen the movie.

There isn't any movie.

> Both were unworthy of my partaking in
> your offer.

And you make this judgement on the book which is not yet out and the
movie which doesn't exist? Wowser!

> > > Go to your library and get a
> > > book on communication--somewhere in there you'll see part where it says
> that
> > > resorting to name-calling doesn't provide substantiation nor
> clarification
> > > for thoughts, only provides that the person has nothing more important

> to do
> > > but resort to infantile pouting.
> >
> > Thanks for saving me the trouble of going to the library. I'll attempt
> > to filter out your additions and paraphrasing.

> Glad to see you got my point, no matter how you may resent it.

Ease up, Kim. I didn't say I agree with you.

> > > The requirements have been adjusted (lowered if you like) to accommodate
> > > current trends and shift focus from older technology to newer.
> >
> > "Adjusted" is so cute and newspeak. We're still using the older
> > technology in question, you might recall.
> >
>
> Then, changed if you like that better. Dave, the "requirements" for living
> have changed since the pioneer days.

So it is no longer "food and water in, waste out, keep breathing"?

> Things change constantly, if they
> intend to keep up.

Things have intentions?

> The requirements for ham radio have changed here in the
> United States and now, indeed, the world. What about that is so difficult
> for you to grasp.

I grasp the concept of change quite fully. Standards can be raised.
Standards can be lowered. We've seen standards lowered.

> I note your folding my remarks up into your neat little package of, "if one
> does argues against CW testing in any way, they must certainly be against
> the use of CW." Use your claimed intelligence. Find a damned post where I
> have ever said anything against its use. I am only and simply against it
> being a testing element.

Nice rant but I did not address any comments to your view on morse
testing or the use of CW.

> > > The standards have not been lowered at all.
> >
> > So the requirements have been lowered but the standards haven't?
> >
>
> No, Dave.

Yes, Kim. You just told us so.

> We all still have to abide by the same R&R as we always have.

That statement is incorrect.

> Those standards have not been lowered at all.

They most certainly have and on a number of occasions.

> What standards do you do ham
> radio by? You cannot be using your book for that, because someone > else definitely supercedes you on that.

You're babbling.

> Dave Heil said:
> > > > There have always been newcomers in amateur radio. Old timers always
> > > > die and newcomers always arrive. Newcomers may be the future (a great
> > > > many newcomers have gray hair) but we're the present, not the past.
> The
> > > > future has not yet arrived. Even you don't know what the future
> holds,
> > > > as much as you'd like to see yourself as a visionary.
> > > >
> > >
> > > In your stumbling around, above, your forgot to leave a point.
> >
> > Not at all, Kim. You just neglected to digest it. Most new hams aren't
> > new people. They aren't young. Many are quite old. A great many "old
> > timers" have decades left in them. They aren't going away. They are
> > not only the past, but the present of amateur radio.
> >
>
> I think you just stumbled again.

Nope. You still have that digestion problem.

> > > There's a difference between encouraging only those with whom you
> > > agree, and encouraging *everyone*. When you say that "standards" have
> > > been lowered, you send a message you may not be meaning to send.
> >
> > I wrote that standards were lowered because that is, in fact what took
> > place (again). I did not place blame on newcomers. They didn't lower
> > the standard. I did not place a qualifier on the welcoming of
> > newcomers. Do you ever read the words I've written before replying to
> > them?
> >
>
> I don't think the standards have been lowered at all.

I know you don't but that is incorrect.

> Your attempt to
> defend the "lowered standards" statement has fallen on deaf ears IMHO.

If you mean your particular ears, I'd say you're right.

> > > Your messages come across as attempts to insult, berate, and demean,
> Dave.

> >
> > Good. I intended to insult, berate and demean Carl. I wrote no such
> > thing about newcomers. You didn't read what I wrote or you could not
> > have come to such a conclusion.
> >
> > > You are very political in your approach with people here.
> >
> > No kidding. Clue us in as to what you do here.

> I have agreed with and offended both sides of the fence here, Dave, > and in my life.

You most certainly have, Kim.

> I don't let politics of something determine how I will be affected
> by them.

You don't even let facts determine that...

> > > If someone does
> > > not act and think just as you, you assert superiority.
> >
> > What are you attempting to achieve in writing the sentence above? Are
> > you attempting to assert superiority?
> >
>
> No, and sorry you took it that way. I am pointing out to you how others
> perceive your nature. And, no, it's not just me.

Gee, Kim. I wasn't either. Sorry you took it that way.

> > > You are quite dislikable, whether you realize it or not.
> >
> > I'm sure that it appears that way to someone like you, Kim. In your
> > view, Carl can tell others to engage in reflection and tell them to
> > change their ways. If similar words are directed to Carl, you find the
> > person "dislikable". Go hug a tree, Kim. Take a whale to lunch.
> >
> > > And you do seem to approach life from the comfort zone...
> >
> > ...whatever that means.

> I think you know what it means, Dave.

No. Really. It doesn't make any sense.

Dave K8MN

316. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 02:39:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2DC67E.2A7EE8E5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73730

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3F2C91B4.3568C4C2@earthlink.net...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:<bggi7g$pu7$2@adenine.netfront.net>...
> > > >
> > > > You are quite dislikable, whether you realize it or not. And you do
> seem to
> > > > approach life from the comfort zone...
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > > Probably from a lifetime of work and play in a radio shack. He needs
> > > to get out more often.
> >
> > I get out very well on any number of bands.

> Ham radio is a pretend zone of life, Dave.

No, Kim. It isn't.

> They all pretend to be friendly, gregarious individuals.

Who? The folks in Wichita? Presbyterian Church elders?

> Most hams I've met in real life? I won't mention...

It's probably a lucky thing for them. Maybe you've been pretending to
be gregarious and friendly.

Dave K8MN

317. Re: Code a Deterrent to a Ham Ticket ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 02:41:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030803224124.01315.00001293@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 73732

In article <e78146ce.0308031228.6783ced4@posting.google.com>,
robertosmith1@yahoo.com writes:

>
>Larry,
>
>What is your chosen occupation? Sounds like you've found your niche.
>I'm still looking for mine.
>
>-Robert

Robert:

I don't know if my present occupation is as much "chosen" as "found."
I am a Paratransit Operator, which means I'm a specialized bus driver who
operates a bus equipped with a wheelchair lift and securement locations
for up to four wheelchairs, and adaptable seating for ambulatory passengers.
I transport elderly and disabled passengers who qualify for our service
under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). I provide door-to-door
service throughout my county. The job is quite a challenge, and the people
I deal with are, for the most part, very nice and appreciative. There are,
exceptions, of course, and some people are more of a challenge to work
with than others, but that's part of the overall challenge of the job. It's a
job
that requires good people skills, and the ability to adapt to constant
change. I don't know how long I'll be doing this, but for now, it suits me.

73 de Larry, K3LT

318. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 02:41:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030803224124.01315.00001294@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 73733

In article <bgk9sm$25k$1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:

>> >Dick Carroll still has not described the items he would need to set up a
>CW
>> >station in a disaster situation.
>>
>> Why should he, Kim?
>>
>> Dave and Dick have nothing to prove to you, little Kimmie dear. They are
>> grown up, mature, adults, and you are (or act like) a little child
>screaming
>> for attention any way you can get some. Nobody in this NG is going to
>> lift a finger to prove a damn thing to the likes of YOU, Kim, so just
>forget
>> that, and start showing proper respect for your moral and intellectual
>> superiors -- you know, people like Dave, Dick, and myself!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>I'm showing you guys you're number one right now... _ _ | _ _

Kimmie:

You see, sweetheart, this is just the kind of thing I'm talking about. It
is quite juvenile to be making insulting hand gestures on Usenet! Only
a petulant little girl like yourself would do that. Not a mature, grown up,
adult woman. So please go to your room now, and don't ever do that
again!

73 de Larry (that's MISTER Roll to you), K3LT

319. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 02:41:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030803224125.01315.00001295@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 73731

In article <bgji5i$10a$0@208.207.71.148>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>
>I know a LOT about CB, and of course it isn't CB that was ever the problem in
>the first place. But you already know that. Maybe. On the other hand you
>appear
>
>to actually know very little. You're a hot air expert.

Dick:

Hey, don't knock it. A "hot air expert" could be a handy thing in KL7-land!

73 de Larry, K3LT

320. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 02:56:50 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgki1i$da1$0@208.207.71.171>
Source record: 73734

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <bgk9sm$25k$1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
> <fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:
>
> >> >Dick Carroll still has not described the items he would need to set up a
> >CW
> >> >station in a disaster situation.
> >>
> >> Why should he, Kim?
> >>
> >> Dave and Dick have nothing to prove to you, little Kimmie dear. They are
> >> grown up, mature, adults, and you are (or act like) a little child
> >screaming
> >> for attention any way you can get some. Nobody in this NG is going to
> >> lift a finger to prove a damn thing to the likes of YOU, Kim, so just
> >forget
> >> that, and start showing proper respect for your moral and intellectual
> >> superiors -- you know, people like Dave, Dick, and myself!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >I'm showing you guys you're number one right now... _ _ | _ _
>
> Kimmie:
>
> You see, sweetheart, this is just the kind of thing I'm talking about. It
> is quite juvenile to be making insulting hand gestures on Usenet!

Naw, Larry, she's mooning you !

321. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 02:58:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308031858.1ced5160@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73735

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<iKzWa.2315$lL.372712@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> Today the Ed Thomas, Chief of the FCC's Office of Engineering
> and Technology, issued an order extending the Reply Comment
> period in ET Docket No. 03-104 (BPL) until August 20, 2003.
>
> Remember, paper filed comments are due at the correct address
> by COB on the deadline day, electronic comments via the ECFS
> have until midnight at the end of the deadline day.
>
> FOLKS ... if you are going to comment, PLEASE don't "flame"
> the FCC or the proponents of BPL ... just cite facts (the ARRL's
> comments and the excellent technical analysis done by Ed Hare
> are full of them ...).
>
> Flaming will hurt us more than it will help us.
>
> Keep it calm, rational, and polite, please, for all of our sakes.
>
> 73,
> Carl - wk3c

Well done Carl. Time to cut the usual RRAP crap and get series here,
screw the unending code test flames, we have a REAL policy problem
this time.

Do you think it is likely that the FCC will pay much if any attention
to the rather offhand electronically filed comments by individual
hams?

We asked for access to 60M. Looked like a done deal until the NTIA
jumped in late in the game and for all practical purposes NTIA pared
our access back considerably from what we expected. Reason: The events
of 9/11/01 caused a top-to-bottom review of all government comms
assets and the gummint itself decided to limit ham interference
potential on 60M for it's own "rediscovered" critical HF comms, etc.,
etc., you don't need the rest. So now we have a potential interference
source for those comms which makes any ham comms on 60M look like
peanuts in comparison, etc., etc. again. Where the hell is NTIA on
THIS one??!

Where are the HF aeronautical users? How 'bout all the emergency
services ops in the 30-50 Mhz range? BPL will not degrade their comms
because the FM they use "rejects noise"? Not hardly. How many
additional non-recreational HF users will be seriously affected by BPL

and where are their "comments"?

The Japanese goverment disallowed BPL because of the obvious threats it poses to the HF/low vhf spectrum in Japan. How do hams, civilly, strive to make sure the FCC becomes aware of (tongue in cheek) and factors in that precedent? Are there any English language sources available for copies of the Japanese telecomms authorities rationales for rejecting BPL? Might be useful . .

I'm not a fatalist by nature but unfortunately I think this one is 100% out of our hands. But I think we still have to put up the good fight.

w3rv

322. Re: Some comments on the NCVEC petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 03:45:58 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308031945.fc1f3fc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73736

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030803162107.15462.00002043@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <bggd0spmq1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030730222105.24390.00001460@mb-m19.aol.com...
> >> >PETITION FOR RULE MAKING
>
> >> >The National Conference of Volunteer Examiner Coordinators (NCVEC) is
> >> >the umbrella organization comprised of the fourteen organizations
> >> >charged since 1984, under Section 97.519(a) of the rules of the Federal
> >> >Communications Commission, 47 CFR 97.519(a) to develop and administer
> >> >all Amateur Radio operator license testing and to electronically file
> >> >all successful license applications with the FCC. In total, the VECs
> >> >and their more than 30,000 VE teams have collectively administered
> >> >nearly two million examinations during the past twenty years and have
> >> >notified the FCC to issue approximately a million new and upgraded
> >> >Amateur Radio licenses.
> >>
> >> The NCVEC is not, however, an organization where the VECs are elected, or
> >>where
> >> individual VE opinions were gathered or solicited.
> >
> >So? Your point? Is that something that should call into question
> >the NCVEC as being invalid, illegal, or fattening?
>
> The point is that the petition is NOT necessarily the opinion of the majority
> of VEs or VECs. It was cooked up by a few of the top guys, who were not
> elected.

Oh Geez. Not the same unelected, non-FCC guys that unilaterally
decided to jettison the 5wpm Morse Exam for the 13-15wpm Farnsworth
Exam, and deny HF access to otherwise qualified people who just can't
beep fast?

Come to think of it, I'm trying to remember the last time I voted for
the top few guys at the ARRL.

bb

323. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 03:52:35 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgkla3klj0@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 73737

Brian Kelly wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<iKzWa.2315$lL.372712@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > Today the Ed Thomas, Chief of the FCC's Office of Engineering
> > and Technology, issued an order extending the Reply Comment
> > period in ET Docket No. 03-104 (BPL) until August 20, 2003.
> >
> > Remember, paper filed comments are due at the correct address
> > by COB on the deadline day, electronic comments via the ECFS
> > have until midnight at the end of the deadline day.
> >
> > FOLKS ... if you are going to comment, PLEASE don't "flame"
> > the FCC or the proponents of BPL ... just cite facts (the ARRL's
> > comments and the excellent technical analysis done by Ed Hare
> > are full of them ...).
> >
> > Flaming will hurt us more than it will help us.
> >
> > Keep it calm, rational, and polite, please, for all of our sakes.
> >
> > 73,
> > Carl - wk3c
>
> Well done Carl. Time to cut the usual RRAP crap and get series here,
> screw the unending code test flames, we have a REAL policy problem
> this time.
>
> Do you think it is likely that the FCC will pay much if any attention
> to the rather offhand electronically filed comments by individual
> hams?
>
> We asked for access to 60M. Looked like a done deal until the NTIA
> jumped in late in the game and for all practical purposes NTIA pared
> our access back considerably from what we expected. Reason: The events
> of 9/11/01 caused a top-to-bottom review of all government comms
> assets and the gummint itself decided to limit ham interference
> potential on 60M for it's own "rediscovered" critical HF comms, etc.,
> etc., you don't need the rest. So now we have a potential interference
> source for those comms which makes any ham comms on 60M look like
> peanuts in comparison, etc., etc. again. Where the hell is NTIA on
> THIS one??!
>
> Where are the HF aeronautical users? How 'bout all the emergency

> services ops in the 30-50 Mhz range? BPL will not degrade their comms
> because the FM they use "rejects noise"? Not hardly. How many
> additional non-recreational HF users will be seriously affected by BPL
> and where are their "comments"?
>
> The Japanese goverment disallowed BPL because of the obvious threats
> it poses to the HF/low vhf spectrum in Japan. How do hams, civilly,
> strive to make sure the FCC becomes aware of (tongue in cheek) and
> factors in that precedent? Are there any English language sources
> available for copies of the Japanese telecomms authorities rationales
> for rejecting BPL? Might be useful . .
>
> I'm not a fatalist by nature but unfortunately I think this one is
> 100% out of our hands. But I think we still have to put up the good
> fight.

The companies pushing BPL are clearly doing a massive snow job or they have no techincal copmetence,
and that isn't at all likely. They know what this stuff will cause, assuming they do have competent
people and aren't squelching them for the good of the "cause".

We don't know who, at what level of competence at FCC is listening to whom, and *who will decide*, and
on what basis. If "the fix is in" the fight
obviously becomes much, much tougher, and may require court action after the
R&O, and if that's the way it plays out, it HAS to be contested. This simply won't fly in the real
world. I spent a career working with a statewide Public Safety
communications system that simply could not co-exist with BPL. I can't imagine those people jsut sitting
on their hands and letting BPL become fact.

I haven't spent the hours and hours it would require due to the plodding dialup I use, to read
extensively in the posted comments at FCC website, but I sure wonder if any of the Pub Safety people
are paying attention. I know most of them would love to move up to some U/SHF trunked system but the $$$
involved is prohibitive today, and they WON'T be doing that any time soon, so they'd sure better fight
this off.

Dick

324. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 04:00:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308032000.2d19eaf1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73738

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030803140035.09955.00001093@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> In article <Eu9Xa.2457$lL.398959@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >
> >> In article <f45722ac.0308010249.313b156a@posting.google.com>,
> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >>
> >> >And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
> >> >way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick, Larry,
> >> >Dan, Bruce...
> >
> >
> >Wait a minute ... don't tar all of us Extras with the same brush that
> >Dick, Larry, et al deserve ...
> >
> >For example the vast majority of the Directors of NCI are Extras (or
> >their national equivalent thereof).
> >
> >Additionally, there are a significant number of Extras amongst our
> >membership ... at least in proportion to the % of Extras to other
> >license classes.
> >
> >So, it's not "the Extras" ... it's the PCTAs ...
> >
> >Please don't lump all Extras in with that crowd ... it just 'aint so.
> >
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> Carl:
>
> Brian made the statement that "Extras" such as Dick, Dan, Bruce, and
> myself wish to "destroy the amateur radio service." Obviously, he thinks
> we want to do this because we *are* PCTA's, and see the value of retaining
> code testing (what's left of it) in the ARS. In other words, because we
> don't agree with him and the NCTA's, we want to "destroy" the ARS.

No, no, no, no, no. It has nothing to do with your disagreements with
me.

Larry, right after you told that guy not to let the door hit him in
the ass on his way out of the ARS, you said that the FCC ought to take
all the VHF and up amateur bands and sell them to the highest bidder.
Or was that after you said who was your favorite black on the bus? Or

was it after you said something about the knuckle dragging 4-lander with the southern accent? Maybe it was after you talked about the welfare mother of color with her hand out?

In any case, you wanted to destroy the ARS for the no-code Technicians, and it had nothing to do with me.

325. Re: CORRECTION!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 04:07:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308032007.143c4f56@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73739

averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030803135401.03007.00001019@mb-m01.aol.com>...

> >What monkeys?
>
> The ones who eat the coffee beans. :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-)

I don't drink coffee. I have no use or need for coffee beans or
coffee bean eating monkeys.

> > and why are you impersonating Len?
> >
> Len who?

Len Anderson

> I am not impersonating anyone. I am simply myself.

And who or what is that?

326. Re: Survey? Was: Re: With CW gone, can the CW allocations be far behind?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 04:25:21 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <viro4b4v8cnb7f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 73740

Good point Jon. As I said when I tabulated the WT Docket 98-143 comments, the amateur radio community is more or less divide on the Morse code exam issue. The issue can not be decide consensus or polls. Commission will dispose of this issue in due course. There is no good reason for the ARRL to waste any more funds on the Morse code matter. At WRC 2003 not one radio administration spoke in favor of retaining the mandatory international Morse code requirement.

The ARRL did a lot of good work in getting a an agreement of the realigment of 40 meters. I though it would be impossible.
But look what can be accomplished when ARRL spents it resource to solve a problem that makes sense even to SW broadcasters. Kind of like a bandplan for hams and broadcasters.

Larry

"Jon Bloom" <jbloom@arrl.org> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.07.24.00.47.39.443612.14546@arrl.org...

> People's minds are well made up on this issue, and nothing anyone does is
> going to change that. Those who support Morse testing will be angry with
> the ARRL if it comes out for elimination of the test no matter how that
> decision was made. Those who favor elimination will be equally angry if
> the ARRL supports continuation of testing. And those of us who think far
> too much energy has already been wasted on this subject will groan yet
> again if ARRL spends any more substantial resources on it.
>
> In my opinion, because it's a waste of resources -- time and money -- that
> would be better devoted to tackling the problems Amateur Radio faces that
> are important -- a list that does not, in my mind, include anything to do
> with Morse testing.
>
> Jon

327. Re: Some comments on the NCVEC petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 04:36:39 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgknsn$q3l$0@208.206.142.97>
Source record: 73741

Brian wrote:

> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030803162107.15462.00002043@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > In article <bggd0spmq1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20030730222105.24390.00001460@mb-m19.aol.com...
> > >> >PETITION FOR RULE MAKING
> >
> > >> >The National Conference of Volunteer Examiner Coordinators (NCVEC) is
> > >> >the umbrella organization comprised of the fourteen organizations
> > >> >charged since 1984, under Section 97.519(a) of the rules of the Federal
> > >> >Communications Commission, 47 CFR 97.519(a) to develop and administer
> > >> >all Amateur Radio operator license testing and to electronically file
> > >> >all successful license applications with the FCC. In total, the VECs
> > >> >and their more than 30,000 VE teams have collectively administered
> > >> >nearly two million examinations during the past twenty years and have
> > >> >notified the FCC to issue approximately a million new and upgraded
> > >> >Amateur Radio licenses.
> > >>
> > >> The NCVEC is not, however, an organization where the VECs are elected, or
> > >>where
> > >> individual VE opinions were gathered or solicited.
> > >
> > >So? Your point? Is that something that should call into question
> > >the NCVEC as being invalid, illegal, or fattening?
> >
> > The point is that the petition is NOT necessarily the opinion of the majority
> > of VEs or VECs. It was cooked up by a few of the top guys, who were not
> > elected.
>
> Oh Geez. Not the same unelected, non-FCC guys that unilaterally
> decided to jettison the 5wpm Morse Exam for the 13-15wpm Farnsworth
> Exam, and deny HF access to otherwise qualified people who just can't
> beep fast?
>
> Come to think of it, I'm trying to remember the last time I voted for
> the top few guys at the ARRL.

B-rian, you may not beep fast but you sure do chirp like hell!

328. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 04:48:45 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87r8426n9u.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73742

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>In article <bgk9sm$25k$1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
><fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:
>>
>>I'm showing you guys you're number one right now... _ _ | _ _
>
>Kimmie:
>
>You see, sweetheart, this is just the kind of thing I'm talking about. It
>is quite juvenile to be making insulting hand gestures on Usenet! Only
>a petulant little girl like yourself would do that. Not a mature, grown up,
>adult woman. So please go to your room now, and don't ever do that
>again!
>
>73 de Larry (that's MISTER Roll to you), K3LT

Two faced hypocrite.

If she makes one insulting gester and that means she is
"petulant", what do the dozens and dozens that you post make
you?

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

329. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 07:20:32 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308032320.6a3f5545@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73743

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030803132603.08385.00001211@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> From: yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
>
> >>The newcomers seem to be of the same mode also. The ones that are interested
> >>in
> >>the technical stuff probably would have left within one or two meetings.
> >
> >Vipul:
> >
> >"Would have?" Did they or didn't they? It's gotta be one or the other!
>
> I am not a demographer. I don't track newcomers like that. On that statement,
> I'm just theorizing. That's why I used the word "probably".

I love how you give us "numbers" about how "unbalanced" you find
Amatuer Radio, then when called on your numbers you throw some excues
out about how you're NOT qualified in the first plce to MAKE that
assertion.

> >>Probably same would be true about the social aspect of newcomers. Thats why
> >>the demographics seem to stay as they are when new people join.
>
> I am not a demographer. I don't track newcomers like that. On that statement,
> I'm just theorizing. That's why I used the word "probably".
>
> Its 95%+ males, mostly older males. The idea of putting up antennas and
> contesting for hours is boring. Not surprisingly, there are few females in the
> hobby.

You have been offered countless exmaples of OTHER things you can
do in Amateur radio, but you keep harping back to two or three things
you DON'T like and presenting them as the "only" thing there are to
do.

What an idiot, Vipul.

> Most of the young people are of the anti-social nerdy type that others would
> not like to be with. Therefore, other young people don't join.

Double idiot.

> >>The other alternative is to start my own club. I tried it, but that was not
> >>too successful.
> >

> >Not "too" successful?
>
> Two other people showed up. One person was a typical Ham type and believed that
> I could get more members by appealing to current Hams. If I could find current
> Hams with those interests, I would not have to start this type of club.

Sure you would. Almost every "specialty" club (DXing, contesting,
ARES, etc) starts as a sub-group of some other organization.

> The other person, although not an EE, was sincerely interested in technical
> projects.
>
> Due to certain factors such as the lack of a meeting place, getting enough
> members, and lack of funds, and other factors, the club could not get started.

The club could not get started because YOU did not possess the
organizational skills to make it happen. You only had 2 or three
people interested? Then meet in your living room for now! Have your
"meeting" over coffee or drinks at a night club.

People usually do NOT like joinging something that doesn't have
form and function, so it takes a few like minded individuals to get
the program rolling.

Unless you are going to try and "out-do" the ARRL on day one, it
does NOT take a lot of money to get a new club started.

So far, the only reason for NOT getting your club started is
wimpy excuses and a lack of determination on YOUR part.

Period.

Steve, K4YZ

330. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 09:03:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB5399A8.1FFBF%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 73744
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"N22X" wrote:
>
> Since the FCC closed all their monitoring stations
> seven years ago, the number of pirates and
> unlicensed activity on HF has jumped by quantum
> leaps. (snip)

If the FCC has closed all their fixed monitoring stations, it was probably in favor of better and cheaper technology. In other words, I strongly suspect monitoring capability is still there - it just needs an employee interested enough to do something with it (or perhaps enough employees to do something effective with it).

On the other hand, I haven't seen an increase in unlicensed activity. The only two pirates I've heard in this area have recently closed down their operations, though not as a result of FCC enforcement activities. Instead, since fewer people today scan around through available frequencies for something to listen to (scanning instead through the stations they've previously programmed into memories), many pirates are simply finding it more difficult to gain an audience today. Of those people still scanning around through available frequencies, fewer seem interested in pirate stations.

Those things, perhaps more than anything else, may eventually spell the end of pirate broadcasting.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

331. Re: CORRECTION!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 09:11:44 UTC
From: averyfine@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030804051144.10282.00000944@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 73745

>Subject: Re: CORRECTION!!!
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 8/4/03 12:07 AM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0308032007.143c4f56@posting.google.com>
>
>averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
>news:<20030803135401.03007.00001019@mb-m01.aol.com>...

>> >What monkeys?

>> The ones who eat the coffee beans. :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-)

>I don't drink coffee.

After reading about the monkeys, I am surprised that anyone drinks coffee.

>I have no use or need for coffee beans or coffee bean eating
>monkeys.

It is not all about you, Brian. :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-)

>> > and why are you impersonating Len?

>> Len who?

>Len Anderson

Who or what is a Len Anderson?

Can he not speak for himself?

Are you his acolyte?

>> I am not impersonating anyone. I am simply myself.

>And who or what is that?

Why do you want to know?

332. Re: Changing Subjects (Was Code a Deterrent to a Ham Ticket)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 09:17:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB539CD8.1FFC1%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 73746

"El Asesor" wrote:
>
> Gee I looked at the subject, then the contents and I
> am totally baffled.
>
> Come on guys/gals -- if your post is for one person
> only or you change subject matter --- please change
> the subject title.
>
> Don't make a hundred (thousand?) readers open up
> something totally unrelated to the subject.
>
> Yeah I know -- who made me a net-police person? But
> dog gone I get tired of opening up these posts that
> have nothing to do with the subject.
>
> Yeah I know --- then don't open em up. But there is
> some good stuff here --- don't want to miss them.

I agree. If someone is going to change the subject of a discussion, please change the subject line and take it out of the tread. By doing so, you reduce the distraction for those not interested in the new subject, but also better attract those who are interested in that new subject (it's no longer buried in a thread they may not be interested in).

Of course, this can't be done in every case or every time a person has a quick out-of-context comment, but it should at least be tried when it looks like the new subject is developing into a major discussion in itself.

And this is not an attempt to be a newsgroup policeman - it's simply a polite plea from a fellow newsgroup participant.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

333. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 10:44:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB53B168.1FFC3%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 73747

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:

> And they say ***I*** have a "thing" for Kim! Sheez!
> Why don't you just go ahead and propose to her right
> here on the newsgroup! (Keep in mind, her OM may
> object!) I've never seen such sucking-up since I
> saw a flight of a half-dozen or so Canada Geese
> devoured by a C-5B engine! (snip)

As you well know, Larry, I've talked with Kim over a period of several years in this newsgroup. I'm also one of those now having problems accessing her messages. In this case, I happen to agree with most of her comments - which has certainly not always been the case. Therefore, a rare, but firm, "well-done" was richly deserved here.

But that is very different from your almost endless obsession with Kim. Wherever and whenever she posts, you're almost always one of the first to respond. And those responses almost always display a tinge of emotionalism, perhaps even jealousy. Your comments above are an example of that. Are you jealous because I've complimented "your girl?"

Don't worry, Larry. Her opinion of you isn't likely to go down simply because somebody else complimented her. I don't think Kim's (at least stated) opinion of you could go down much further.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

334. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 11:24:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308040324.4da0a2d2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73749

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<f7iXa.15968$Vx2.8217426@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:bgkae0$2md$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:iMfXa.15838$Vx2.8180666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > > news:LyfXa.72928$Wd5.14335216@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > > That's because it not supposed to. It "forces" the newbie to get a
> taste
> of
> > > > CW. Then it's up to the individual to either take him/herself further
> or
> > > > drop it entirely. Many will never know if CW truly interested them
> because
> > > > they will not have been made to even try.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Exactly. It's nice to see it so neatly. It's the same reason that
> students
> > > are required to study a number of items which they may or may not pursue
> in
> > > the future.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> >
> > Then I say we test on every mode there is. If you support that for CW,
> then
> > surely you support it for other modes.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> No problem. I'm ready. Are you?

SPANK! Yee-haw!

>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

335. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 11:28:58 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <_rrXa.2515$lL.412652@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73748

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030803140035.09955.00001093@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <Eu9Xa.2457$lL.398959@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >
> >> In article <f45722ac.0308010249.313b156a@posting.google.com>,
> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >>
> >> >And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
> >> >way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick, Larry,
> >> >Dan, Bruce...
> >
> >
> >Wait a minute ... don't tar all of us Extras with the same brush that
> >Dick, Larry, et al deserve ...
> >
> >For example the vast majority of the Directors of NCI are Extras (or
> >their national equivalent thereof).
> >
> >Additionally, there are a significant number of Extras amongst our
> >membership ... at least in proportion to the % of Extras to other
> >license classes.
> >
> >So, it's not "the Extras" ... it's the PCTAs ...
> >
> >Please don't lump all Extras in with that crowd ... it just 'aint so.
> >
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> Carl:
>
> Brian made the statement that "Extras" such as Dick, Dan, Bruce, and
> myself wish to "destroy the amateur radio service." Obviously, he thinks
> we want to do this because we *are* PCTA's, and see the value of retaining
> code testing (what's left of it) in the ARS. In other words, because we
> don't agree with him and the NCTA's, we want to "destroy" the ARS.
> Do you think this is accurate? Do YOU think that us PCTA's want to
> "destroy" the ARS?

I've seen quite a bit of the "If I don't get my way, I'll take my ball and
go
home." attitude ... you, Larry, for one have said in the past something
to the effect that "If code testing is eliminated, they might as well just

auction our bands off to the commercial folks." (perhaps not an exact quote, but pretty darned close and certainly conveying the meaning of what you've said ...)

> AFAIC, when the FCC finally gives us a No-Code Test ARS licensing
> system, the "destruction" of our hobby/service is self-assured. About
> the best we can hope for is for the NCTA's to continue with their traditional
> apathy and laziness, and somehow not flock to the ARS in any great
> numbers. We would also require the assistance of the ARRL and the
> FCC to resist the urge to expand HF phone spectrum, but I don't see that
> as something the ARRL would do, so the FCC will be happy to oblige
> when the petitions start coming in. In any case, the future of the ARS
> looks bleak, and it will be the non-code tested "newcomers" who will
> be administering the coup de gras.
>
> BTW, Carl -- the only reason you're an "Extra" is because you waited until
> the code test was dumbed down to a maximum of 5 WPM. That's not being
> a Real Extra(tm) in the opinion of any of the traditional PCTA's. You're
> just a wannabe Extra Pretender who got in on an Affirmative Action
> program.

Over 32 years as an RF Engineer, recognized in my profession, and I'm "not good enough" for the likes of you and Dick? Not sure whether to ROTFLMAO or gag/puke ...

Carl - wk3c

336. Re: Survey? Was: Re: With CW gone, can the CW allocations be far behind?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 11:29:46 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bglgd9$q2g$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 73851

"lk" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
news:viro4b4v8cnb7f@corp.supernews.com...
> Good point Jon. As I said when I tabulated the WT Docket 98-143 comments,
> the amateur radio community is more or less divide on the Morse code exam
> issue.

Of course that was 5 years ago. Convential wisdom has it that, if anything,
the shift over time would result in less support for code testing today than
then.

> The issue can not be decide consensus or polls.

The FCC was pretty clear in their assessment as stated in
the R&O. No reason for code testing other than the
former treaty.

> Commission will
> dispose of this issue in due course. There is no good reason for the ARRL
> to waste any more funds on the Morse code matter. At WRC 2003 not one
radio
> administration spoke in favor of retaining the mandatory international
Morse
> code requirement.

Agreed.

> The ARRL did a lot of good work in getting a an agreement of the
realigment
> of 40 meters.

Agree also.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

337. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 11:31:03 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <XtrXa.2516$IL.412622@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73750

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030803140034.09955.00001092@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <bgj5pv$2eia$1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
> <fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:
>
> >Is that the music to the Twilight Zone I hear?
>
> >Yes, yes it is...
>
> Believe it or not, folks, this is one of Kim's more reasonably intelligent
> posts!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Yes, Larry, it is an appropriate and astute question that Kim asked.

You PCTAs are so freaking out of touch with reality that it makes it
so ...

Carl - wk3c

338. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 11:41:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
Message-ID: <BB53BE8F.1FFC7%stewart@say.net>
Source record: 73853

"N2EY" wrote:

> (snip) But note this plain, simple fact: Almost all of
> the FCC enforcement actions for "jerk-like" on-air
> behavior (obscenity, jamming, failure to ID, exceeeding
> license privileges, etc., etc.) are against hams using
> PHONE modes, not CW/Morse or data modes. ALL of us have
> taken written tests detailing what we should and should
> not do on the air, but it seems like violations are much
> more prevalent among the talkers than the brasspounders
> or keyboarders. Why?

Very simple answer, Jim. The FCC has limited personnel today. The few they have simply don't have the time to sit around listening, as code users pound out their incredibly slow conversations, to catch violations. ;)

Actually, the differences in violations between the various modes isn't that hard to understand. The phone modes dominate ham radio usage, therefore it should be obvious more violations will occur in those modes. In addition, phone users exchange information at a greater rate when compared to CW users and conversations occur more often when compared to data users. Both of these lead to greater opportunities for violations to occur. If all these differences were factored in, I suspect the differences in violations would be far less.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

339. !Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 11:42:51 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <%ErXa.2517$lL.412629@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73852

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030803140033.09955.00001090@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <7r9Xa.2455$lL.398459@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >> John:
> >>
> >> Yep, it is true! I was once a CB'er, for a whole six months! I was
the
> >> Asst. Mgr. of the Radio Shack store in Depew, NY at the time,
> >
> >We should have known ... "Radio Shack, you've got questions, we're
> >clueless," I'm sure Larry fit in quite well.
>
> Carl:
>
> Actually, I did fit into Radio Shack very well. I had a great time
working
> there,
>
Figures ...
[snipped some of the bragging about what a great employee Larry was]
>
> Radio shack was a great place for a young person interested in electronics
> to work in the early '70's. Today's R/S employees are nothing like us
"old
> timers" used to be.

Baloney ... I've (tried to) buy parts from time to time at R/S ... the folks
20 or more years ago were just as clueless as today from my experience.

>Today, I go into a R/S store and ask them about a
> pay-as-you-go cell phone plan that they have mentioned on their own
> store displays, and they don't know anything about it! Nothing technical,
> just a matter of knowing the specifics of the plan! Sheez! My brother
Tom
> told me one of the best stories about current R/S cluelessness: He
> went in to his local store and asked for a particular Operational
Amplifier.
> The salesfreak indignantly replied, "All of our amplifiers work, Sir!"
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I knew that sooner or later this thread vis a vis Larry's history as
a CBer/radio shack employee would draw out the "But things
were different in the good old days and we were/are better than
the newbies today! ego trip ... :-)

Carl - wk3c

340. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 11:50:53 UTC
From: Rich <RW@preecelinc.org>
Message-ID: <bglh9q$ik0$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73854
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BB5399A8.1FFBF%stewart@say.net...
>
> If the FCC has //drivel snipped//

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

If you know so much, how come you are still just
a Technician Class?

Rich

341. Re: Some comments on the NCVEC petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 12:12:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bgliqq$fu4$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 73855

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030803162107.15462.00002043@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <bggd0spmq1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>, "Bill Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030730222105.24390.00001460@mb-m19.aol.com...
> >> >PETITION FOR RULE MAKING
> >>
> >> >The National Conference of Volunteer Examiner Coordinators (NCVEC) is
> >> >the umbrella organization comprised of the fourteen organizations
> >> >charged since 1984, under Section 97.519(a) of the rules of the
Federal
> >> >Communications Commission, 47 CFR 97.519(a) to develop and administer
> >> >all Amateur Radio operator license testing and to electronically file
> >> >all successful license applications with the FCC. In total, the VECs
> >> >and their more than 30,000 VE teams have collectively administered
> >> >nearly two million examinations during the past twenty years and have
> >> >notified the FCC to issue approximately a million new and upgraded
> >> >Amateur Radio licenses.
> >>
> >> The NCVEC is not, however, an organization where the VECs are elected,
or
> >>where
> >> individual VE opinions were gathered or solicited.
> >
> >So? Your point? Is that something that should call into question
> >the NCVEC as being invalid, illegal, or fattening?
>
> The point is that the petition is NOT necessarily the opinion of the
majority
> of VEs or VECs. It was cooked up by a few of the top guys, who were not
> elected.

"cooked up" sure smacks of a negative spin. Regardless,
I don't recall the petition claiming to represent a majority opinion
based on any elections, survey, etc. More to the issue, those
that do gather at the annual NCVEC session DO represent
a significant participation and commitment to amateur radio...
of which, I suspect, the FCC is fully aware of.

> >> >Once a year, the various Volunteer Examiner Coordinator organizations
> >> >meet at their annual conference to discuss the various issues that
> >> >impact Amateur Radio operator testing. At their July 25, 2003,
meeting

> >> >held with the FCC in Gettysburg, PA, the VECs overwhelmingly agreed
> >> >that Morse code testing should be immediately ended since it was now
> >> >possible to do so. It was also noted that countries have already
begun
> >> >discontinuing Morse examinations. As a result the VECs voted to file
> >> >this Petition asking that the FCC take expedited action to allow them
> >> >to discontinue administering Element 1, the 5 words-per-minute
> >> >telegraphy examination as soon as possible.
> >>
> >> No surprise there.
> >>
> >> >Pursuant to Section 1.405 of the Commission's procedural rules (47
> >> >C.F.R. 1.405), the NCVEC hereby respectfully requests that the
> >> >Commission issue a Notice of Proposed Rule Making at an early date
> >> >looking toward amendment of the rules governing the Amateur Radio
> >> >Service, 47 C.F.R. 97.1 et seq., as set forth herein and in the
> >> >attached Appendix.
> >>
> >> No imagination, either.
> >
> >When does imagination or, for that matter, creativity have to be part
> >of the filling/process?
>
> When someone truly has the interests of the ARS in mind, they will look at
the
> complete picture rather than take a narrow view. This is particularly
important
> in dealing with FCC because we have seen how long it takes them to do an
> amateur service NPRM cycle.

The NCVEC filing seems to be right on target with regard to dropping
morse testing now that the treaty has ended any mandatory need for same.
Great Britain, Belgium, Germany, Switzerland have already taken the same
route.

> >> >The rule changes requested herein would terminate the telegraphy
> >> >examination requirement and permit existing Technician Class operators
> >> >to access HF spectrum as provided in 47 C.F.R. 97.301(e) without the
> >> >necessity of passing a Morse code examination. This request to
> >> >eliminate the Morse code (Element 1) examination does not necessarily
> >> >have the support of the ARRL Board since they have yet to develop a
> >> >position on the matter. In support of its petition, NCVEC states as
> >> >follows:
> >>
> >> >I. Introduction and Background
> >> >
> >> > Since the turn of the century, the Morse code, invented by American
> >> > Samuel Morse and first used in 1844, has been the foundation of early
> >> > distress and safety communications. Although Morse code (or CW, as
it
> >> > is commonly called) was the primary mode of communications from the

> >> > late 19th Century through the early 20th Century, it has all but
become
> >> > obsolete in practically all other contemporary communication systems.
> >> > Due to the emergence of satellite and digital communications, manual
> >> > telegraphy is no longer used or required in any radio service other
> >> > than in the Amateur Service.
> >>
> >> Amateur radio operators, however, use it extensively. On the HF/MF
amateur
> >> bands, it is the second most popular mode of communications, only
slightly
> >> behind SSB in popularity.
> >
> >So?
>
> So it makes sense that the things that should be tested for an amateur
radio
> license should be derived from what hams actually do, rather than what
other
> services do. Would you support questions on multiplex stereo FM on the ham
> test? That mode is widely used in the broadcast service.

I support "questions" about morse on the tests. That is not, however,
the same as supporting a mandated "skill" test for character recognition
ability.

> >Hams also use differnent languages (Engish, Spanish, Chineese, etc.)
> >yet no one is mandated to use or be tested in any language other than
> >that of their "home" country.
>
> How many US hams regularly use a language other than English on the ham
bands?
> Betcha it's far, far below the number using Morse/CW.

The point is that morse is a character set, and the test is a skill
test based on speed of ability, not simple knowledge on a par
with written test questions.

> >> The Amateur Radio Service is unlike other radio services in its needs
and
> >> resources.
> >
> >So are you sying amateur radio "needs" morse code testing? If so,
> >the burden of proof hasn't been met as per FCC R&O for 98-143.
>
> All I'm saying is that comparisons with other services are meaningless
> because the ARS is completely different.

Yet comparing it to the other service's need for a pool of
trained morse users was appropriate when it served the
purpose of arguing for morse testing. How convenient :-)

> >> > Radiotelegraphy in the maritime service has been phased out in favor
of
> >> > modern technology. The last vestige of manual telegraphy began being
> >> > phased out in the maritime service in 1988 when the International
> >> > Maritime Organization adopted the Global Maritime Distress and Safety
> >> > System (GMDSS).
> >> >
> >> > In the 1990's, countries around the world began closing down their
> >> > distress 500 kHz calling frequency watch which had been in use since
> >> > 1912. The final 500 kHz message sent by the U.S. Coast Guard took
> >> > place from station NMN (Chesapeake Virginia) on April 1, 1995, and
they
> >> > no longer monitor the frequency.
> >>
> >> Most radio amateurs are not on ships.
> >
> >So the validity of having a trained morse pool even 20 years ago
> >wasn't or shouldn't have been because other services used morse.
>
> The validity of the "trained pool" argument depends on what you mean by
> "trained". There's a lot more to it than a 5 wpm code test.

As above, how convenient :-) :-)

> >Interesting, did you make that comment when no-code was first proposed?
>
> When was that? 1975?

I don't recall. I defer to your historic knowledge on that :-)

> >> > Even though the commercial world eliminated Morse code as a
> >> > communications medium many years ago, it has continued on the Amateur
> >> > bands because manual Morse proficiency was an international Amateur
> >> > Service requirement when operating on spectrum under 30 MHz.
> >>
> >> There is no requirement that any radio amateur actually use Morse code.
> >> Radio amateurs use it by choice.
> >
> >The statement isn't one of USE, it is based on a prior
> >international requirement...now gone, dead, caput, finito, over.
>
> The NCVEC statement does indeed say that the USE of Morse has continued
because
> of the TEST. It gives no other reason.
>
> Here's the statement again:
>
> "Even though the commercial world eliminated Morse code as a
communications
> medium many years ago, it has continued on the Amateur bands because
manual
> Morse proficiency was an international Amateur Service requirement when

> operating on spectrum under 30 MHz."
>
> The word "it" refers to "Morse code as a communications medium" in the
above
> sentence. NCVEC is saying that hams continue to USE Morse because of the
TEST.
>
> That's just plain not true.

Fair enough..but I doubt the NCVEC intended to rule out ALL other reasons
that morse continues to be used by hams other than the test.

> >> Other services are constrained by considerations of cost, particularly
> >> labor cost. They consider elimination of the need for a skilled radio
> >> operator to be progress. Amateurs do not.
> >
> >You speak for "all" amateurs?
>
> Yes. Do you think hams want to be eliminated?

I didn't see that as your point.

> >Perhaps you should have said "some"
> >amateurs.
>
> Perhaps there are a few who want to be eliminated, but not many.
>
> The point is that for other services radio is a means to an end. To hams
> it's an end in itself.

Yet hams will be free to USE morse even if there's no test.

> >In any case, learning morse does have a cost to each
> >and every amateur that does so. I see no reason to "mandate"
> >that cost upfront for access to amateur radio.
> >
> Your opinion, very reasonably stated and noted.

Thanks.

> >> To most other radio services, radio is but a means to an end, not an
end
> >> in itself. Amateur radio, by contrast, is radio for its own sake.
> >
> >So?
>
> So amateur radio should not be judged nor structured the way other
> services are.

Fair enough, although doing so doesn't (IMHO) add or detract
from the need for code testing.

> >> > II. Telegraphy requirement in the Amateur Service
> >> >
> >> > There are many communications modes and emissions available to the
> >> > radio amateur and manual CW is just another one that certainly
deserves
> >> > no special priority. The amateur radio operator examination process
> >> > does not require a practical demonstration in the ability to use any
> >> > other mode - even though more than a thousand modes and emissions are
> >> > available to the Amateur Service.
> >>
> >> Except for single sideband radiotelphony, none of those other modes
> >> approaches
> >> Morse code in popularity on the amateur bands below 30 MHz.
> >
> >The point still comes back to the fact that NO other mode
> >requires any skill test. It is that simple.
>
> No other mode requires the acquisition of skills the average person is not
> likely to have in order to use it.

So? In a nocode license world, those that want to use
morse will learn it. Are you worried about new hams operating
at 2 or 3 wpm on the air? Or would you encourage those
to get on the air and learn morse?

> >> > The international law previously required unspecified proficiency in
> >> > the International Morse code when the operation takes place in the
> >> > medium or high frequency bands. Because of technological advances,
> >> > this regulation has become inconsistent with the goals of the Amateur
> >> > Service since it provides a barrier to otherwise qualified
individuals
> >> > who wish to experiment and communicate below 30 MHz. There can be no
> >> > doubt that the Morse code proficiency requirements have constituted
an
> >> > unnecessary and artificial impediment to fuller use of the Amateur
> >> > Radio Service for many potential and existing amateurs.
> >>
> >> The removal of the code test requirement for amateur licenses above 30
MHz
> >> has not resulted in a technological revolution in amateur radio on
those
> >> frequencies. There is no reason to expect one below 30 MHz.
> >
> >I never bought any great significance to that argument either.
> >
> Yet it has been made repeatedly in the past, and is made several times in
the
> NCVEC petition. What does it matter if someone is a Ph.D in EE, has a
bunch of
> patents, etc., etc., if all they're going to do as a ham is work SSB DX
with a
> manufactured transceiver and antenna?

I repeat: I never bought that argument.

> >> > It appears that the reason that many (no-code) Technician amateurs
are
> >> > not upgrading to license classes that require telegraphy suggests
that
> >> > the Morse code requirement may be a significant barrier.
> >>
> >> > III. Morse code testing is a burden to the applicant
> >> >
> >> > It should be noted that while today's personal computers can easily
> >> > send and receive telegraphy, the international Morse code "sent by
hand
> >> > and received by ear" requirement continued as a worldwide fundamental
> >> > requirement for an amateur operator license until the recent actions
by
> >> > the International Telecommunications Union.
> >> >
> >> > The taking of the telegraphy examination is an unnecessary burden
upon
> >> > the applicant. Experience has shown that it is more often than not a
> >> > very stressful experience for the examinee. With the elimination of
> >> > the international requirement for skill in manual telegraphy, there
is
> >> > no longer any reasonable justification for requiring an applicant to
> >> > demonstrate this antiquated skill.
> >> >
> >> > It is one that must be acquired through rote memorization of the
> >> > character meanings of some 43 combinations of audible dots and
dashes:
> >> > 26 letters of the alphabet, numerals 0 through 9, four punctuation
> >> > marks and three characters unique to CW. This must be followed by
> >> > numerous practice sessions until the necessary skill is achieved.
Most
> >> > applicants, once they pass the code exam, never use the mode on the
> >> > amateur airwaves. And many, perhaps most, could not pass it again if
> >> > required to do so.
> >>
> >> Written tests are a burden to the applicants, too.
> >
> >Are YOU proposing an end to written tests?
>
> Nope. Just the opposite.

Good, wouldn't want some people to get the wrong idea.

> >> Most radio amateurs do not construct or repair their own equipment, yet
> >> they
> >> are required to know something about how it works.
> >
> >Because they "can" if they wanted to.
>

> BINGO!
>
> So since a ham can operate Morse if he/she wants to,
> why is it unreasonable to have a basic Morse test?

Because it isn't needed for regulatory purposes.

> There are probably far more US hams using Morse today
> (by choice) than there are US hams today using
> homebrew stations (by choice).

Because not having a test won't lead to any problems
if hams start out "learnin' on the air" using morse at
speeds we/you miht think of as painfully slow.
Even the ITU never spec'd a minimum speed.

> Of course there are some like me who
> use Morse with a homebrew station...

Personal choice, works for me.

> >If a non-coded ham gets
> >on the air to learn using morse with another ham...what's the probably
> >harm to others and or anyone compared to constructing or repairing
> >equipment themselves?
>
> Depends on the situation. I can tell you, however, that the knoweldge
required
> to pass all of the writtens is only a small subset of that needed to
homebrew
> even a simple amateur station.

Agreed.

> >> > While it continues to serve some amateur operators well, as it did in
> >> > the early days of radio, it is now but one of many modes available to
> >> > amateur operators. The lack of interest in CW has turned many
> >> > prospective amateur operators away from the Amateur Service. IV.
> >> > Morse proficiency is not an indication of a quality operator
> >> >
> >> > Some amateurs believe that the effort and sacrifice needed to learn
> >> > Morse code indicates a more dedicated and, therefore, a better
> >> > candidate for Amateur Radio. No evidence exists, however, that
> >> > supports a relationship between manual telegraphy proficiency and the
> >> > quality, desirability or motivation of the operator.
> >>
> >> However, it should be noted that most of the Commission's enforcement
> >> actions
> >> for poor and illegal operating practices such as jamming,
> >> obscenity/profanity,
> >> failure to identify, operation outside of license privileges and
failure
> >> to

> >> heed bandplans are against amateurs using voice modes, not Morse code
or
> >> digital modes.
> >
> >More because saying "FU" via code isn't likly to be listened to by
> >any non-coded ham or non-ham.
>
> In 35+ years of mostly-CW amateur radio operation I have NEVER heard
anything
> like that. Have you?

Nope...and that's my point. Morse as a mode doesn't
lend itself naturally to verbal abuse...whereas phone does
allow for easy oral abuse recognized by anyone listening...both
ham and non-ham.

> >> > What the Morse code licensing requirement does do, however, is to
> >> > greatly reduce the number of applicants operating in the medium and
> >> > high frequencies. Many people question why an individual with vast
> >> > knowledge in the electronics field should be excluded from operating
on
> >> > HF spectrum due to a personal disinterest in the Morse code.
> >> >
> >> > Continuing the use of Morse code proficiency as a means with which to
> >> > gauge "quality" or to limit the number of amateur radio operators
> >> > accessing public spectrum is certainly at odds with the FCC's mandate
> >> > to promote the wider use of radio and its commitment to the use of
> >> > emerging technologies.
> >> >
> >> > V. Morse proficiency should not be required to operate in the voice
> >mode
> >> >
> >> > It appears that most amateurs want to communicate in the voice mode.
> >> > It makes no sense from a regulatory perspective to require radio
> >> > amateurs to be Morse proficient when the greater majority of radio
> >> > amateurs do not desire to use that mode and there is no regulatory
> >> > reason for them to do so.
> >>
> >> Since most amateurs do not desire to build their own equipment.....
> >
> >Are you proposing not allowing hams to build their own?
>
> No - just the opposite.
>
> But note that NCVEC doesn't see a problem in requiring theory in the
writtens
> because *some* hams *might choose* to homebrew....

Nor do you and I from what we have been saying.

> >> > The future of Amateur Radio encompasses many modes undreamed of just
a
> >> > few years ago. Although manual telegraphy is a noble part of the
> >> > Amateur Radio's past, it is no longer the prime emission mode.
> >> >
> >> > In short, the Commission should ensure that the amateur examination
> >> > elements are appropriate for the types of operation that will be
> >> > performed by the licensee.
> >>
> >> Following this logic, the written exams should be stripped of anything
a
> >> licensee does not have an interest in.
> >
> >ZIP - false, since any one subject CAN be ingnored and the test
> >applicant can still pass. Not so with the separate morse
> >test element.
>
> That depends on what you mean by a "subject". If you define a "subject"
> narrowly, that's true. But not if you define it as, say, "theory".

True.

> >> > VI. An unnecessary burden upon the VEC system
> >> >
> >> > The administration of a CW examination imposes an unnecessary burden
> >> > upon the VE teams who must prepare and administer the CW
examinations.
> >> > It requires extensive preparation and special equipment to prepare
and
> >> > administer properly. It is often disruptive and unsettling to those
> >> > other examinees who are taking one of the written examinations within
> >> > the same room.
> >> >
> >> > Under 97.507(d), the VEs must prepare and record a series of
messages
> >> > sufficient to preclude any one message from becoming known to the
> >> > examinees. Each message must contain every one of the 43 telegraphy
> >> > characters at least once during period of at least 5 minutes. At the
> >> > prescribed speed of 5 words per minute, and at the prescribed 5
> >> > characters per word, the message is little more than 25 words in
> >> > length. In practice, it is a difficult task to compose a realistic
> >> > message under these limitations. It is also an unnecessary burden
upon
> >> > the coordinating VECs since most of them also prepare telegraphy
> >> > examinations for their VE teams.
> >> >
> >> > VII. An unnecessary burden upon the amateur service community
> >> >
> >> > The amateur service community suffers from the loss to its ranks of a
> >> > large number of potentially excellent operators who are turned away
> >> > because of the CW requirement. Either because of lack of the
requisite

> >> > aptitude for sending and receiving CW or because of an unwillingness
to
> >> > spend the time acquiring a skill for which they find of no value to
> >> > them, they forego becoming amateur operators.
> >>
> >> Yet the growth in amateur radio from 1990 to 2000, when there were both
> >> medical
> >> waivers and a nocodetest license, was almost identical to that from
1980
> >> to
> >> 1990, when all amateur licenses required code tests and there were no
> >> waivers..
> >
> >Again, I don't care about or argue the growth side of it.
>
> If we drop the code test and don't get lots more new hams, then Element 1
> wasn't really a barrier or burden. QED

Agree...but I have never made that argument anyway.

> >> > VIII. An unnecessary burden upon the FCC
> >> >
> >> > Now that the international (treaty) Morse code requirement is
optional,
> >> > the FCC can expect to receive numerous requests for waivers of the
> >> > Morse code examination due to applicant hearing and other medical
> >> > conditions in order to be compliant with the Americans with
> >> > Disabilities Act (ADA).
> >>
> >> Yet it was not compliance with the ADA that resulted in medical waivers
> >> for the
> >> 13 and 20 wpm code tests.
> >
> >If it hadn't happened otherwise, the ADA would have entered the
> >picture by now.
>
> I disagree. But we can't dig up a dead King and ask him.

Do you seriously doubt that if the J1 king hadn't helped push
for the waivers of 13/20 that someone wouldn't have invoked
the ADA to gain the same result? We'll never know, but it
seems likly to me as the argument has been raised even
against the 5 wpm test.

> >> > When there were multiple code tests, the FCC cited the international
> >> > (treaty) requirement, as the reason that the five word-per-minute
code
> >> > test could not be waived. This case no longer applies and the FCC
will
> >> > have to develop procedures to guide both themselves and the VECs/VEs
in

> >> > handling requests for code exam waivers that are certain to come.
> >> >
> >> > Dealing with requests for a waiver of the code exam could create an
> >> > unnecessary burden on the FCC and VECs/VEs and consume an excessive
> >> > amount of time and resources. It seems illogical to require all
> >> > amateur examinees to pass a requirement that could be waived by the
> >> > actions of a physician. History has shown that physician-initiated
> >> > waiver requests have been very controversial in the Amateur Service.
> >>
> >> By this logic, the written tests will also be a target of waiver
actions.
> >>For
> >> example, profoundly deaf people are currently required to study for
exams
> >>which
> >> include numerous questions on SSB and other voice modes even though
there
> >>is
> >> little chance they will ever use those modes.
> >
> >Pure speculation and, IMHO, not likly to ever happen.
>
> But it logically proceeds from the argument that people shouldn't have to
learn
> stuff they won't use.

I don't see the same relationship between the logic
of a "skill" test vs a knowledge test.

> >> > IX. World Administrative Radio Conference 2003
> >> >
> >> > The only changes made to the international Amateur Service
regulations
> >> > over the last 75 years concern the frequency above which amateurs may
> >> > operate without Morse testing. At their Washington, DC conference in
> >> > 1927, the ITU (then called the International Telegraph Union)
allocated
> >> > frequency bands to the various radio services and established
operating
> >> > guidelines and operator qualifications. It was deemed important that
> >> > Amateurs prove an ability to transmit and receive communications in
> >> > Morse signals since, at the time, radiotelegraphy was the primary
means
> >> > of long range communication.
> >> >
> >> > Since then, the administrations comprising International
> >> > Telecommunication Union have reviewed and voted to relax the Amateur
> >> > Service's mandatory Morse proficiency requirement at every
> >> > international conference capable of doing so.
> >> >
> >> > In 1947 (Atlantic City), the ITU agreed that Morse proficiency should

> >> > only be required when the operation took place on frequencies below
> >> > 1000 MHz (1 GHz.) At WARC-59, the 1959 World Administrative Radio
> >> > Conference, this level dropped to 144 MHz. A further reduction was
> >> > made at WARC-79 to 30 MHz. Consequently, up until recently, Article
> >> > S25.5 3 read: 25.5 3. 1) Any person seeking a license to
> >> > operate the apparatus of an amateur station shall prove that he is
able
> >> > to send correctly by hand and to receive correctly by ear, texts in
> >> > Morse code signals. The administrations concerned may, however, waive
> >> > this requirement in the case of stations making use exclusively of
> >> > frequencies above 30 MHz.
> >> >
> >> > At WRC-2003, the international Radio Regulation Article S25.5 3 was
> >> > revised to make the Morse code testing requirement a matter for each
> >> > licensing administration to decide for itself. Effective July 5,
2003,
> >> > Article S25.5 3 reads: 25.5 3. 1) Administrations shall
> >> > determine whether or not a person seeking a license to operate an
> >> > amateur station shall demonstrate the ability to send and receive
texts
> >> > in Morse code signals.
> >> >
> >> > X. Summary of NCVEC proposal to end Morse testing
> >> >
> >> > The attached appendix contains a list of the rules that must be
amended
> >> > if Morse code examinations are to be discontinued. These amendments
> >> > propose merely to end the manual telegraphy examination and to permit
> >> > Technician Class operators the same frequency privileges as those
> >> > enjoyed by Technician Class operators who have passed a code exam.
> >> >
> >> > Therefore, the foregoing considered, NCVEC, the National Conference
of
> >> > Volunteer Examiner Coordinators, respectfully requests that the
> >> > Commission issue a Notice of Proposed Rule Making at any early date,
> >> > proposing the rule changes set forth herein, and in the appendix
> >> > attached hereto.
> >> >
> >> > Respectfully submitted,
> >> >
> >> > NCVEC, National Conference of VECs
> >> > P.O. Box 565101, Dallas, Texas 75356
> >>
> >> This proposal simply drops Element 1 without making any other changes.
> >>Oddly
> >> enough, if it were adopted, Technicians would gain a bit of 10 meter
SSB.
> >>Most
> >> of the privileges Technicians would gain would be slices of 80, 40, 15
and

> >>10
> >> meter CW.
> >
> >Start simple...then, if it makes sense, look at the overall licensing
> >levels, etc. Makes sense to me.
>
> At that rate and the typical FCC NPRM cycle, a couple decades should do
it.

Maybe so :-(:-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

342. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 12:21:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030804082114.27503.00001423@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 73857

In article <bgk9k5$1u3$1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030803122123.27503.00001416@mb-m24.aol.com...
>> In article <3F2C0443.9060301@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>> writes:

>> >> Put it that way, Mike, yes. It is hard to argue that removing *any*
>> >> part of
>> >> a test is not a reduction in the amount of knowledge needed to pass a
>> >> test. But, that is simply a word game and nothing else.

>> It's more than a word game. Encouraging radio knowledge of all types is
>> one of
>> the most basic reasons to have the ARS exist at all. The tests are there
>> to
>> insure a minimum knowledge level. ("Knowledge" including skills, concepts,
>> facts, etc.)

>> >> The point is, what does passing a CW test prove in the way of
>> >> knowledge--other than that one can pass a CW test?

>> It proves that:

>> 1) The person has learned a useful radio skill at a very basic level.

>Then, why not have a "net operation" test? Net operation is fairly
>standard. That's as basic a level as you can get: everyone understands the
>English Language (at least those who are testing for a US amateur radio
>license).

Actually, based on some postings here, understanding of English should not be
taken for granted!

Net operation test? Good idea! In fact, I have posted suggestions here about a
similar (but simpler) test. Basic idea was that the person taking the test
would demonstrate the ability to send and receive simple messages in standard
form using either CW/Morse, voice, or a data mode. I can google up the details
if you want.

However, when I proposed such a test as a replacement for the code test, there
was universal opposition from nocodetest folks. That's when I realized that for
some of the loudest complainers here it wasn't really about the code at all,
but about the idea of operating skills and standard procedures.

>> 2) The person was willing and able to devote the time and effort necessary
>> to learn that skill.

>That has nothing to do with their participation in ham radio.

So? There's no requirement that any licensee actually participate. There used
to be, btw.

>> 3) The person has been exposed to a useful, widely-used-by-hams radio
>> communications mode other than voice or data.

>Like I said, then test on voice. It's the widest-used-by-hams radio
>communication. Why not test the most used mode?

Why test what almost everyone can do?

My proposed message-skills test would have left the choice of mode up to the
person being tested. What could be fairer?

>> >> What does passing the
>> >> written tests prove in the way of knowledge--other than that one can
>> >> pass a written test?

>> It proves that:

>[Skip 1 and 2, we already went over those]
>> 3) The person has been exposed to several aspects of the amateur radio
>> service (regulations, operating practices, technology).

>Agreed.

Well, there you have it.

>> >> If you see the parody in both of those questions, then I go
>> >> one step further and say: What does passing a CW test have to with
>> >> anything
>> >> related to overall knowledge of ham radio?!!!!!???? In my mind,
>> >> *NOTHING*

>> Then your knowledge of amateur radio is very lacking. Like it or not,
>> CW/Morse
>> is a very big part of amateur radio today. Of course, that by itself
>> doesn't prove we must have a code test.

>Thank you.

You're welcome.

> And, was that you acquiescing?

Nope.

When you boil down all the arguments, almost everything on any ARS license test
(real or proposed) comes down to somebody's opinion on what's important and
what isn't. Proof just doesn't exist, one way or the other. Take Ohm's Law -
why MUST it be tested? Some hams do perfectly well with little or no knowledge
of it, and yet it's on the tests because somebody thinks it's important enough

to force it down everyone's throats.

>Yes, CW is incredibly important
>and a big part of amateur radio. But, no, it does not prove that we must
>have a code test.

Exactly. Just like Ohm's Law.

>> >> It's bad enough that the written tests don't prove a whole lot, without
>> >> the added argument of CW in the mix. To continue to support CW as
>> >> some form of
>> >> proof that people know more about ham radio, know more about >>
>> >> communication,
>> >> know more about the standards and technology of ham radio, et al, is to
>> >> continue to do nothing but whine about a tradition--which is really all
>> >> CW really is: A TRADITION that no one wants to see fade away.

>> You are mistaken on several counts there, Kim.

>> 1) The written tests are what they are. They are in a continuing state of
>> development.

>> 2) ALL ELSE BEING EQUAL, a ham who has Morse skills knows more about
>> amateur radio than one with no Morse skills.

>I disagree. A ham who has CW skills knows more about CW than one with no >CW
skills.

And since CW/Morse is a big important part of amateur radio, a ham who has CW
skills knows more about amateur radio than one with no CW skills.

You cannot escape that conclusion. Of course, that conclusion does not prove
that CW must have its own test, just that "ALL ELSE BEING EQUAL, a ham who has
Morse skills knows more about amateur radio than one with no Morse skills."

>> 3) Morse/CW has certain advantages to hams beyond being "just another
>> mode".

>That does not merit a CW test.

In your opinion. In others' opinions, it does.

>> 4) Morse/CW is more than "just a tradition". It's a useful mode of radio
>> communication enjoyed by hundreds of thousands of hams.

>That does not merit a CW test.

In your opinion. In others' opinions, it does.

>> 5) There do exist folks who want Morse/CW USE (not just the TEST) by hams
>> to simply go away. They are a very small minority, but they do exist. Or at
>> least
>> there are people whose rhetoric indicates they want Morse use by hams to
>> end.

>That's their problem, not mine. I don't believe CW will ever exit from the
>ham radio scene.

I hope you are right about that.

>> Of course, whether all of that "proves" we must have a code test is simply
>> a matter of opinion.

>> >> Passing CW is nothing.

>> Maybe not to you. To others, it's a big deal.

>Well, I worded that wrong. Passing CW is a big deal, but it does nothing
>for the benefit of ham radio, save that that particular operator may use
>CW--but that particular operator would probably have used CW anyway, then.

If it does nothing, why all the fuss?.

>> >> And it proves nothing to anyone else, except that
>> >> they studied CW and passed it in a test. I've seen idiots on every
>> >> side of ham radio, so it does nothing to prove quality or *interest* as
>> >> everyone
>> >> seems to like to argue. If CW was that kind of instrument, then we'd
>> >> have
>> >> no jerks on ham radio and, believe me, I've heard them.

>> That's simply illogical. No test, no matter how contrived, will filter out
>> every single "jerk" from the ranks of amateur radio. Or anything else, for
>> that matter.

>I know that, and you know that. But others here either don't know that or
>don't want to let go of that part of the argument.

I've never seen anyone argue that a code test is a perfect "jerk filter". I
have seen people argue that it is not a "jerk filter" at all. I've also seen
arguments that since it's not a perfect "jerk filter", it has no effect at all
on "jerks".

>> Look at how much it takes just to become a physician. The training and
>> testing
>> required is phenomenal, and designed to weed out the incapable. The hard
>> work
>> and dedication required just to get into medical school are extraordinary,
>> and
>> yet that's just the beginning. I could go on and on, but you get the
>> picture.

>I will not argue the merit of CW testing against the measure of training and
>testing for a professional field. There is no reason to put someone through
>the same stressful training and testing that a physician goes through, for
>an amateur radio license.

Apparently you did not get the picture at all.

The point is simply that NO test or training is a perfect "jerk filter", not
even at the level of what doctors go through.

>
>> >> Using CW as a test to prove "diligence" to the desire of wanting to be
>> >> a ham radio operator is pure crap in my not-so-humble opinion.

>> OK, fine. At least you note that it's your opinion.

>One would hope, Jim, that everyone realizes we post our opinions.

We post both opinions and objective facts. The problem is that some folks try
to pass off their opinions as objective facts.

>> >> It is wrong to even attempt to measure someone's desire and interest.

>> Why? I'd rather have an ARS consisting of a few hundred thousand
>> interested,
>> active, dedicated, skilled, knowledgeable hams than one of a few million
>> inactive, apathetic, unskilled, ignorant ones who could not care less.
>> Code test or no code test.

>And, I'd rather have *everyone.*

That means there should be no tests and no qualifications at all. We've seen
what happens to a radio service that takes that route. No thanks.

>> >> If I have an Extra
>> >> license and I have no equipment or haven't even been on the radio in
>> >> years,
>> >> then what did passing CW prove, in terms of proven interest? Nothing.
>> >> And it never will.

>> Incorrect. It proved that at one time the person had the interest.

>Oh, wow...

When's the last time YOU were on the ham bands, Kim?

>> >> Yes, CW is a useful communication skill. Hell, *ANY* type of
>> >> communication
>> >> skill is useful. If we place such importance on CW, then why not RTTY,
>> >> phone, ATV, etc.

>> Because those modes don't require the acquisition of new skills for their
>> use.
>
>Uh, 'scuse me? They require being able to establish communication between
>devices, have the signal within a certain bandwidth, etc.

Plug 'n' play, Kim. No test for that. Does it really take a lot of skill to use
an HT?

>> >> You know what I'm saying.

>> Not really.

>> >> And, if CW proves a higher
>> >> plane of dedication and knowledge, then why are there extremely skilled

>> >> CW operators out there, who are real jerks?! And you know there are.

>> No, I don't. Name some. If your only reference is how a few folks behave
>> in this newsgroup, it should be remembered that lots of folks on both sides
>> of the code test fence have behaved like real jerks in their posts here.

>No, it would not be only by a few folks in this newsgroup. And, I won't
>name them because they are from my local area. Suffice it to say their
>interference for the use of spelling curse words in CW was frequent and
>sufficient enough to end a years long tradition of hams getting together
>every night at 10:00PM for a phone net on 10M.

Never heard of such a thing around here. How do you know who these folks
are/were? What was their problem with a local 10 meter 'phone net?

Doesn't take any real skill to program a keyer, computer or keyboard to send
cuss words.

>> >> So, how
>> >> can someone, *anyone* then turn around and say that CW proves
>> >> *anything*?
>> >> It proves nothing but that the person studied for and passed the CW
>> >> requirement.

>> Seems to me that you want the Morse code test to be a perfect "jerk"
>> filter. And of course no test can do that.

>Not at all. Others already think it does.

Who?

>> But note this plain, simple fact: Almost all of the FCC enforcement
>> actions for
>> "jerk-like" on-air behavior (obscenity, jamming, failure to ID, exceeeding
>> license privileges, etc., etc.) are against hams using PHONE modes, not
>> CW/Morse or data modes. ALL of us have taken written tests detailing what
>> we
>> should and should not do on the air, but it seems like violations are much
>> more
>> prevalent among the talkers than the brasspounders or keyboarders. Why?

>I've already said that there are probably more reasons for that than it
>being because a CW operator is a finer person than others who are not.

" a CW operator is a finer person than others who are not. " Has a nice ring to
it...

>And,
>talking is much easier and quicker to let things roll off that we shouldn't.

All the more reason to promote CW as a mode and downplay voice.

>CW is mostly callsign/whereabouts/weather/TNX and that's it.

Not at all, Kim.

I'm on HF CW several times a week, mostly ragchewing on 80 and 40. Typicla QSO is at least a half hour, usually more. Call/QTH/wx/rig/name/age/ham experience is all done withing 5-10 minutes max at the speeds normally enocuntered. Wonderful QSOs with many wonderful people. No cussing, no jamming, no nastiness. Lots of politeness and good manners. If one or both ops have QSK, conversation flows naturally.

>If an actual
>conversation ensues, I'm sure no one (except the jerks I know of) would
>waste their time getting carpal tunnel with cursing in CW.

Carpal tunnel? Not a problem - the side-to-side motion of a bug or paddles avoids CTS, while the up-and-down motion of keyboards promotes it. Just another advantage of CW...

73 de Jim, N2EY

343. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 12:21:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030804082115.27503.00001424@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 73856

In article <vE9Xa.2460$lL.399198@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
>news:d22b54c3.0308030213.2da209b9@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<koOWa.2376$lL.382886@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
>> > news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308020525560.190@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
>> > > On Fri, 1 Aug 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
>> > > >...
>> > > > Others have pointed out that rule 301(e) was written that way to
>avoid
>> > > > creating any new 'Tech+' licencees, but it looks as if invoking the
>> > > > international rules created a sunset clause, whether intentionally
>or
>> > > > otherwise.
>> > >
>> > > AH! Someone who is now on the verge of understanding what that
>"wierd"
>> > thing I
>> > > said was. IT was a "sunset clause" and the change to S25.5 was the
>> > "sunset."
>> >
>> > It is NOT a sunset clause ... NCI specifically asked for a sunset clause
>> > so code testing would "automagically" go away when S25.5 was suppressed
>> > or changed so that code testing was no longer required by the ITU Radio
>> > Regs.
>> >
>> > The FCC SPECIFICALLY declined to enact such a sunset clause, and the
>> > text of 301 does NOT contain one, no matter how you try to twist it.
>> >
>> > >
>> > > > I don't really see how that throws anything into chaos. Right now
>no-
>> > > > coders who operate on the Novice/Tech HF allocations can't readily
>be
>> > > > detected for lack of any central records to prove that they are
>actually
>> > > > no-coders. If the changes to s25.5 affect 97.301(e) so as to make it
>> > > > permissible, then from the FCC perspective it makes an enforcement
>> > problem
>> > > > go away!
>> > >

>> >
>> > Again (and again ... you people must not be able to read, only write)
>...
>> > the FCC *DOES* have records of which Techs have 5 wpm credit and
>> > which don't ... this idea that "there are no records, so you can get
>away
>> > with it is 1) false, and 2) borders on inducement to violate the rules.
>> >
>> > If someone follows your (VERY BAD) advice and gets cited for it,
>> > I hope they explain that "(fill in the names from usenet) told me it was
>> > OK" and the FCC comes knocking on your doors with citations for
>> > #2 above ...
>> >
>> > [remainder of totally incorrect psuedo/quasi-regulatry crap deleted in
>> > the interest of not further perpetuating/propagating misinformation ...]
>> >
>> > Carl - wk3c
>>
>> AMEN. That oughta cork it.
>
>I *certainly* hope so!

So do I. But I doubt it will.
>
>Hams are supposed to share good advice and learn from "Elmers."

That's a traditional value of amateur radio. Trouble is, some newcomers take the attitude that the would-be Elmers are simply cranky olde fartz who want to keep things the same way forever, don;t know what they're talking about, yada yada yada.
>
>Phil Kane is clearly in a position to provide a VERY authoratative
>"read" on this issue.
>I make my living doing radio regulatory for my company, for standards
>bodies, etc. While I am not, as is Phil, a lawyer, I *am* well-versed
>in this field and how regulatory language should be read ... it's not
>"plain English" ... and it varies somewhat between FCC, ITU, etc.

Yet there are those who give you and Phil a hard time and will not accept your Elmering no matter your qualifications, logic or how you phrase it.
>
>While I certainly want to see the last vestiges of Morse testing eliminated,
>I do *not* want to see a bunch of people misinformed and then have them
>go out and unwittingly commit violations that could put their licenses at
>risk, subject them to heavy fines, and give all of ham radio a bad name.

Agreed! But will they listen to you?
>
>BOTTOM LINE: *Until the FCC changes its rules* no-code Techs
>have NO HF privs ...

All of which is quite obviousl from even a basic understanding of the rules.

>sorry, folks, but that's the way it is.
>
What's even sorrier is that there is such misunderstanding about such basic rules. Obviously the written tests need serious work.

73 de Jim, N2EY

344. Re: N8WWM, rain reported again.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 13:08:16 UTC
From: Hambone the Magnificent <taildoggie4@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1060002639.965375@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 73861
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"gw" <gw@webhideout.com> wrote in message
news:235a74db.0308031310.11b3aa29@posting.google.com...
> "Duh" <MyDixieWrecked@uranus.com> wrote in message
news:<jtGVa.119311$hV.8630047@twister.austin.rr.com>...
> > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030729220819.335$7t_-_@newsreader.com...
> > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > > > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > > > > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > > > > > > avoobner2002@yahoo.com (Aaron H. Voobner) wrote:
> > > > > > > Riley H. has a good track record of
> > > > > > > following up on such complaints, check the Rain Report if
you
> > > > > > > wish confirmation of this.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Is that the same rain report n8wwm was busted out on?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Did you leave again, Aaron?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I see you're still here,Aaron. What's your opinion of doug adair
> > > > > > n8wwm getting ratted out on the rain report?
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > I know you're jumping up and down about no CW, jackass.
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > > GO# 40
> > >
> > > Well, we all knew Doug would return with his usual demented rants, but
who
> > > knew he'd stoop so low again?
> >
> >
> > well dougie is a product of his environment.........the hamsters
> > thought it would be a good idea to relax the entry requirements into
> > ham radio and then this type of twit is what they get.........case
> > closed.........the hamsters now need to get used the fact that they
> > will soon further increase the reality tv watcher population in their
> > ranks, when they eliminate the code requirements....and as that event
> > happens, little jerry and the rest of the do-gooders will have their
> > hands full policing these morons .......instead of whining an a cb
> > newsgroup about qrp good buddies talking on 10.............
```

Yeah, but if they all goto 2 Meters who gives a crap?
The 2 Meter band has long been called "ham CB drive time channel" for
years...

345. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 13:10:20 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <0XsXa.2527$IL.413876@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73858

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030803122123.27503.00001416@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <3F2C0443.9060301@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Put it that way, Mike, yes. It is hard to argue that removing *any*
part
> >> of
> >> a test is not a reduction in the amount of knowledge needed to pass a
test.
> >> But, that is simply a word game and nothing else.
>
> It's more than a word game. Encouraging radio knowledge of all types is
one of
> the most basic reasons to have the ARS exist at all. The tests are there
to
> insure a minimum knowledge level. ("Knowledge" including skills, concepts,
> facts, etc.)
> >>
> >> The point is, what does passing a CW test prove in the way of
> >> knowledge--other than that one can pass a CW test?
>
> It proves that:
>
> 1) The person has learned a useful radio skill at a very basic level.

But what about Morse is so important that it is "equal to all else" in terms
of a "pass or don't get an HF license" ???

> 2) The person was willing and able to devote the time and effort necessary
to
> learn that skill.

This goes to "work ethic" and "quality of operator" arguments that have
already been rejected by the FCC ... let's not keep beating that horse.

> 3) The person has been exposed to a useful, widely-used-by-hams radio
> communications mode other than voice or data.

So???

> You are mistaken on several counts there, Kim.
>
> 1) The written tests are what they are. They are in a continuing state of
> development.

>
> 2) ALL ELSE BEING EQUAL, a ham who has Morse skills knows more about
amateur
> radio than one with no Morse skills.

Correction ... a ham who has Morse skills is able to operate better Morse
than one with no Morse skills. PERIOD.

> 3) Morse/CW has certain advantages to hams beyond being "just another
mode".
> 4) Morse/CW is more than "just a tradition". It's a useful mode of radio
> communication enjoyed by hundreds of thousands of hams.

So? That is no reason to make it a requirement, when the majority of hams
and would-be hams have no desire to use Morse.

>> Look at how much it takes just to become a physician. The training and
testing
> required is phenomenal, and designed to weed out the incapable. The hard
work
> and dedication required just to get into medical school are extraordinary,
and
> yet that's just the beginning. I could go on and on, but you get the
picture.

Apples vs. oranges ... providing medical treatment is often a life and death
thing ... being able to operate/or not operate Morse is not.

As far as the "character filter" thing goes ... the FCC has already ruled
on that ... it doesn't fly.

> Why? I'd rather have an ARS consisting of a few hundred thousand
interested,
> active, dedicated, skilled, knowledgeable hams than one of a few million
> inactive, apathetic, unskilled, ignorant ones who could not care less.
Code
> test or no code test.

You seem to leap to the conclusion that folks who are not interested in
Morse fall into the "inactive, apathetic, unskilled, ignorant" category.
False assumption, not based in any factual reality.;

Carl - wk3c

346. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code ...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 13:11:55 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <vYsXa.2528$lL.413503@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73859

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030803140030.09955.00001087@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <vE9Xa.2460$lL.399198@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >
> >BOTTOM LINE: *Until the FCC changes its rules* no-code Techs
> >have NO HF privs ... sorry, folks, but that's the way it is.
> >
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> That's right, Carl -- but what I want to know is, why are you "sorry"
> about it?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Because it's a silly requirement and not necessary now that the ITU
Radio Regs have been changed ... however, it will take a rules change
by the FCC to fix it.

Carl - wk3c

347. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 13:12:23 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <XYsXa.2529$IL.412603@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73860

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308032322180.503@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Sun, 3 Aug 2003, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > BOTTOM LINE: *Until the FCC changes its rules* no-code Techs
> > have NO HF privs ... sorry, folks, but that's the way it is.
>
> Neither do Novices nor the "coded" Techs. They lost their HF privileges
> effective July 5, 2003.

False ... please stop preaching this nonsense.

Carl - wk3c

348. Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 13:24:06 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <W7tXa.2530$IL.413076@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73862

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308032303150.503@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Sat, 2 Aug 2003, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> > news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308020525560.190@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > > On Fri, 1 Aug 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
> > > >...
> > > > Others have pointed out that rule 301(e) was written that way to
avoid
> > > > creating any new 'Tech+' licencees, but it looks as if invoking the
> > > > international rules created a sunset clause, whether intentionally
or
> > > > otherwise.
> > >
> > > AH! Someone who is now on the verge of understanding what that
"wierd"
> > thing I
> > > said was. IT was a "sunset clause" and the change to S25.5 was the
> > "sunset."
> >
> > It is NOT a sunset clause ... NCI specifically asked for a sunset clause
> > so code testing would "automagically" go away when S25.5 was suppressed
> > or changed so that code testing was no longer required by the ITU Radio
> > Regs.
> >
> > The FCC SPECIFICALLY declined to enact such a sunset clause, and the
> > text of 301 does NOT contain one, no matter how you try to twist it.
>
> That is true - the FCC didn't enact a sunset clause to eliminate code
testing
> for HF as NCI requested. I never said that's what they did.
>
> The FCC DID enact a sunset clause that TERMINATES HF operation by licenses
of
> lesser privilege than General class. That's what I've been saying that
they
> did.

THEY DID NO SUCH THING. You are WRONG and your continued
repetition of incorrect information is not doing anyone a service.

> > Again (and again ... you people must not be able to read, only write)
...
> > the FCC *DOES* have records of which Techs have 5 wpm credit and
> > which don't ... this idea that "there are no records, so you can get

away
> > with it is 1) false, and 2) borders on inducement to violate the rules.
>
> [Count your levels of quotation; you attribute this to me but I didn't say
it.]

Sorry ... but my responses are still correct.

Carl - wk3c

349. Re: Survey? Was: Re: With CW gone, can the CW allocations be far behind?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 13:28:44 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <visnv63u7fvsb7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 73863

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bglgd9$q2g$1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "lk" <lklose@net-link.net> wrote in message
> news:viro4b4v8cnb7f@corp.supernews.com...
> > Good point Jon. As I said when I tabulated the WT Docket 98-143
comments,
> > the amateur radio community is more or less divide on the Morse code
exam
> > issue.
>
> Of course that was 5 years ago. Convential wisdom has it that, if
anything,
> the shift over time would result in less support for code testing today
than
> then.

IARU changed their position, and maybe ARRL will change their position.

At least they should stop wasting members funds trying to save a rule that
no
radio administration supported at WRC 2003.

Larry

350. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 13:45:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2E6280.D0D2A0FB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73864

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>
> Thank you, Dwight. There will be none, save yours. The naysayers totally
> ignore poignant statements and seem to like more, getting involved with the
> idiocy...
>
> For example:
> Dave Heil still hasn't told me if he has ever, in any way, broken the law.

I've posted responses to your sillyness on at least two occasions. That
you have problems with your news service does not equate to a
non-response on my part. Your query to me is not relevant to your
self-admission to being a radio scofflaw.

> Dick Carroll still has not described the items he would need to set up a CW
> station in a disaster situation.

So? What response do you believe he owes you?

Dave K8MN

351. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 14:02:13 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bglp15$7bl$0@208.206.142.74>
Source record: 73865

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> I've seen quite a bit of the "If I don't get my way, I'll take my ball and
> go home." attitude ...

By gollies you sure have that right! You've seen a LOT of that, up
close and personal! In fact you lived it for a couple decades until the
FCC did you a huge favor and invented the Extra Lite!

352. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 14:04:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2E6711.7F1E4CE5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73866

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > In article <f45722ac.0308010249.313b156a@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
> > >way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick, Larry,
> > >Dan, Bruce...
>
> Wait a minute ... don't tar all of us Extras with the same brush that
> Dick, Larry, et al deserve ...

"Us Extras"? Whooo, that's rich, Carl!

> For example the vast majority of the Directors of NCI are Extras (or
> their national equivalent thereof).

What differentiates a majority from a vast majority? In a country with only two license classes, the higher class license is equivalent to the U.S. Extra?

> Additionally, there are a significant number of Extras amongst our
> membership ... at least in proportion to the % of Extras to other
> license classes.

What constitutes a "significant number" of Extas when compared to the percentage of your membership holding a license for which no code test is required?

> So, it's not "the Extras" ... it's the PCTAs ...

...and I gather that you don't have many members who support code testing :-)

Dave K8MN

353. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 14:06:04 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2E675E.16905547@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73867

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030802230218.25052.00001540@mb-m11.aol.com...
> > In article <7dfliv4n5tild30d19s7lneg3kpt67v69r@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur
> KC2HMZ
> > <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> writes:
> >
> > >>QR10-4, QGB! I'm QPM, so QBD me!
> > >>
> > >>(Translation: "Ten-Fawhar, Good Buddie! I'll be putting the pedal to
> the
> > >>metal now, so watch my back door!)
> > >>
> > >>73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> > >You seem to toss that CB jargon around pretty well, Larry. Don't tell
> > >me...no, it couldn't be...could it?
> > >
> > >73 DE John, KC2HMZ
> >
> > John:
> >
> > Yep, it is true! I was once a CB'er, for a whole six months! I was the
> > Asst. Mgr. of the Radio Shack store in Depew, NY at the time,
>
> We should have known ... "Radio Shack, you've got questions, we're
> clueless,"
> I'm sure Larry fit in quite well.

So where is Kim? Shouldn't she be jumping on Carl over irrelevant
comments directed at Larry?

Dave K8MN

354. Re: !Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 14:07:58 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bglpbu$83p$0@208.206.142.74>
Source record: 73868

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030803140033.09955.00001090@mb-m21.aol.com...
> > In article <7r9Xa.2455$lL.398459@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >
> > >> John:
> > >>
> > >> Yep, it is true! I was once a CB'er, for a whole six months! I was
> the
> > >> Asst. Mgr. of the Radio Shack store in Depew, NY at the time,
> > >
> > >We should have known ... "Radio Shack, you've got questions, we're
> > >clueless," I'm sure Larry fit in quite well.
> >
> > Carl:
> >
> > Actually, I did fit into Radio Shack very well. I had a great time
> working
> > there,
> >
> Figures ...
> [snipped some of the bragging about what a great employee Larry was]
> >
> > Radio shack was a great place for a young person interested in electronics
> > to work in the early '70's. Today's R/S employees are nothing like us
> "old
> > timers" used to be.
>
> Baloney ... I've (tried to) buy parts from time to time at R/S ... the folks
> 20 or more years ago were just as clueless as today from my experience.
>
> >Today, I go into a R/S store and ask them about a
> > pay-as-you-go cell phone plan that they have mentioned on their own
> > store displays, and they don't know anything about it! Nothing technical,
> > just a matter of knowing the specifics of the plan! Sheez! My brother
> Tom
> > told me one of the best stories about current R/S cluelessness: He
> > went in to his local store and asked for a particular Operational
> Amplifier.
> > The salesfreak indignantly replied, "All of our amplifiers work, Sir!"
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT

> >
>
> I knew that sooner or later this thread vis a vis Larry's history as
> a CBer/radio shack employee would draw out the "But things
> were different in the good old days and we were/are better than
> the newbies today! ego trip ... :-)

So you can dodge reality here just as easily as any other area where it suits yoiu and your Agenda. No surprise whatevver. If you don't think that the majority of Rado Shack stores carried a much better line of parts and that the employes knew much more about them 20 years ago, you're as clueless here as you've clearly demonstrated yourself to be elsewhere.

355. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 14:08:43 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bglpdb$83p$1@208.206.142.74>
Source record: 73869
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Rich wrote:

> "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> news:BB5399A8.1FFBF%stewart@say.net...
> >
> > If the FCC has //drivel snipped//
>
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
>
> If you know so much, how come you are still just
> a Technician Class?

SURPRISE! It's that dastardly Morris code!

356. Re: Some comments on the NCVEC petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 14:12:59 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bglplb$8n5$0@208.206.142.74>
Source record: 73870

Bill Sohl wrote:

>
> The point is that morse is a character set, and the test is a skill
> test based on speed of ability, not simple knowledge on a par
> with written test questions.

Yes, thast *is* the point, indeed. As you well know being able to recognize Morse characters written on paper has nothing whatever to do with copying in off a radio. It exhibits so little knowledge as to be of no value.
No one can copy by ear or any other way with no more than that.

Which shows yojust how flawed and clueless the entire No Code Agenda has always been.

357. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 14:23:37 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2E6B78.777DC932@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73871

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> Also, few club members are interested in homebrewing,
> >> despite claiming interest by posing for a photograph showing club > members
> >doing a group project.
> >
> >Well, they do have photographic proof. We're stuck with just your
> >claim.
>
> No, they only posed for the photograph. It does not mean that they
> actually did that activity.

So the activity in the photograph never really took place?

> I can ask people in that photograph if they are interested in
> homebrewing and that person will say he is not interested in homebrewing.

"Will say" or "has said"? If you haven't asked, you don't know.

> Therefore, the photograph is just hype and does not represent what the > club is really interested in.

You've based your "therefore" on an illogical assumption.

> >> So, the "advancement of the radio art" is just a justification
> >> for more HF/CW activities.
> >
> >So you're back to telling them where their interests should lie.
>
> I didn't say they were interested in homebrewing - the photograph did.

Your response isn't directed to my statement. You don't approve of what
other club members do and you want them to do what you want. When they
don't, you complain bitterly.

> It takes
> a prominant place in the club publicity. Except, the photograph is a
> mis-representation of what the club members are truly interested in.

Make up your mind. Are you interested in charging them with
misrepresentation or do you want the members to do what you want, rather
than what *they* want?

> >I'll wager that most "old timers" aren't even involved with a radio
> >club.

>
> They don't go to club meetings.

Some go to club meetings. Many do not. A "local" club meeting for me
is a minimum of 26 miles and a maximum of 37 miles.

> And they don't go to Hamfests.

A number attend hamfests. A larger number does not. A number of new
licensees attends hamfests. A larger number does not.

> Nor are they on 2m.

A number are on 2m. A number are not. That band is but one band among
many allocated to the ARS.

> I get it - they don't exist.

No, you don't get it.

> >You'll have to use the callsign database and begin making phone
> >calls or knocking on doors to come up with a scientific sampling
>
> A scientific sampling is not needed by me, nor any potential new > recruit to Ham radio.

It is needed if you want anyone to believe your blanket generalizations.

> If that person's experiences are of anti-social, mostly male, mostly
> older, non-technical (if they are interested in that), Hams, then > thats all they need
to know.

Most hams are male. That is a fact.
The median age for hams is in the late forties. That is a fact.
Most hams are anti-social. That is not a fact.
Most hams are non-technical. That is not a fact.

> It won't do much good to show them the other aspect that
> "could" exist, but does not exist for them.

If you are the individual doing the showing, those folks could have a
gut full of misinformation in no time.

> >> There have been exceptions of course, but it is too rare to be worth > the
> >effort. I cannot search out the contradiction.
> >
> >That's right. You've begun with an outcome and you're trying to make
> >the statistics fit that outcome.

> I'm not making any statistics fit.

Certainly you are. You begin with false assumptions and attempt to
prove them to be true. That isn't ever going to work.

> I'm saying that if something is 95%* and it
> takes you a certain amount of time to come across the other 5%, then > its not worth the
effort.

Something is 95% what? Maybe we're dealing with your frequent assumptions about those involved in amateur radio. My guess would be that your statements are 95% falsehood and 5% truth. I guess it isn't worth the effort to sniff out that elusive 5%.

Dave K8MN

358. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 14:26:07 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bglqdvago0@208.206.142.67>
Source record: 73872

N2EY wrote:

> In article <bgk9k5$1u3$1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:

>Huge smippage..<.

Thanks, Jim., and also thanks goes to Kim for helpin, make so many vital points.
Nope CW isn't a perfecrt "jerk filter" but it sure is partially effective!

359. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 14:34:12 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bglqt4bhd0@208.206.142.67>
Source record: 73873

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> N2EY Wrote
> > 2) ALL ELSE BEING EQUAL, a ham who has Morse skills knows more about
> amateur
> > radio than one with no Morse skills.
>
> Correction ... a ham who has Morse skills is able to operate better Morse
> than one with no Morse skills. PERIOD.
>

And in your flawed view that means that ham isn't any more capable of carrying on communications than one who knows not a character of Morse. Sez it all.

> > 3) Morse/CW has certain advantages to hams beyond being "just another
> mode".
> > 4) Morse/CW is more than "just a tradition". It's a useful mode of radio
> > communication enjoyed by hundreds of thousands of hams.
>
> So? That is no reason to make it a requirement, when the majority of hams
> and would-be hams have no desire to use Morse.
>

Well *there* a straw character for ya! Care to toss out some citations on that one?

>
> >> Look at how much it takes just to become a physician. The training and
> testing
> > required is phenomenal, and designed to weed out the incapable. The hard
> work
> > and dedication required just to get into medical school are extraordinary,
> and
> > yet that's just the beginning. I could go on and on, but you get the
> picture.
>
> Apples vs. oranges ... providing medical treatment is often a life and death
> thing ... being able to operate/or not operate Morse is not.
>

And the point flew right over the head of yet another codehater!

>
> As far as the "character filter" thing goes ... the FCC has already ruled
> on that ... it doesn't fly.
>

The FCC rules on character" Don't think so! It has a few of its own!

> > Why? I'd rather have an ARS consisting of a few hundred thousand
> interested,
> > active, dedicated, skilled, knowledgeable hams than one of a few million
> > inactive, apathetic, unskilled, ignorant ones who could not care less.
> Code
> > test or no code test.
>
> You seem to leap to the conclusion that folks who are not interested in
> Morse fall into the "inactive, apathetic, unskilled, ignorant" category.
> False assumption, not based in any factual reality.;

Proven by your decades of waiting for the rules to be degraded to where you can pass them without having to jump through your own personal hoops....

360. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 14:38:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308040638.5023c99d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73874
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"N22X" <N22X@sherzfordzent.com> wrote in message news:<bgj1ml$nt4$0@pita.alt.net>...

> Since the FCC closed all their monitoring stations seven
> years ago,

The FCC did *not* close all their monitoring stations.

> the number of pirates and unlicensed activity
> on HF has jumped by quantum leaps. We are observing
> pirates in the 6600 khz range, which is reserved for
> aero ops, something which was unheard of in the days of
> active FCC enforcement.
>
> N22X
> Terra Haute, IN

w3rv

361. PTTI (Pro-Talk-Test-International) Chapter Formed

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 14:42:54 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0308040642.1d453f19@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73875

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote

>
> But note this plain, simple fact: Almost all of the FCC enforcement actions for
> "jerk-like" on-air behavior (obscenity, jamming, failure to ID, exceeeding
> license privileges, etc., etc.) are against hams using PHONE modes, not
> CW/Morse or data modes. ALL of us have taken written tests detailing what we
> should and should not do on the air, but it seems like violations are much more
> prevalent among the talkers than the brasspounders or keyboarders. Why?

Well, it's certainly clear that if the CW test reduces jerks on CW,
then a talking test would reduce jerks who talk on their radios?

PTTI! Damn, Jim, what a concept!

Or maybe your whole jeremiad about FCC enforcement means that FCC
monitors are no-coders who wouldn't recognize those infractions when
done in Morse.

Or maybe attributing a lower "jerk quotient" to Morse operators is the
lamest excuse EVER for keeping a Morse examination.

Sunuvagun!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

362. Comment On This News Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 15:15:55 UTC
From: The Moderator <TM@foxtrot.com>
Message-ID: <MMuXa.26296$ff.14911@fed1read01>
Source record: 73876

Comment On This News Group

There is a lot of good stuff here, but also an incredible amount of junk.

Another place to reasonably discuss Amateur Radio is at the Yahoo Groups.

http://groups.yahoo.com/

Search for "Amateur Radio" get over 1200 places to discuss your interests, mostly without flames, insults, off-topics, false information, and the stupidity that is prevalent here. Some are moderated, some public.

Lots of Elmers have left here and are now on Yahoo Groups.

Just FYI

363. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 15:36:31 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308040736.15977093@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73877

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bgkla3klj0@208.206.142.103>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> The companies pushing BPL are clearly doing a massive snow job or they have no techincal copmetence,
> and that isn't at all likely. They know what this stuff will cause, assuming they do have competent
> people and aren't squelching them for the good of the "cause".

Gets down to who is snowing who. I doubt that the power companies have much in the way of inhouse expertise in the field. It appears that those who have the big interest in BPL are the firms who have the expertise, such as it might be, and want to sell their wares to the power companies. Might be that the power companies were the first layer to get snowed and now they're at the same game with the FCC. Looks to me like these outfits are small startups looking for a reason to exist, none of 'em ring any bells as proven Internet heavyweights.

> We don't know who, at what level of competence at FCC is listening
> to whom, and *who will decide*, and *on what basis*.

Opaque as hell, so much for "open government". Particularly with the current administration. But we already knew that.

> If "the fix is in" the fight
> obviously becomes much, much tougher, and may require court action after the
> R&O, and if that's the way it plays out, it HAS to be contested.

Something is going on within the FCC, why did the OET extend the reply comment period?? I think that's a pretty unusual maneuver. And it was done by an FCC technical office. I doubt the FCC high-level no-clues would have let that happen if a real fix was in. Something is up.

> This simply won't fly in the real
> world. I spent a career working with a statewide Public Safety
> communications system that simply could not co-exist with BPL. I can't
> imagine those people jsut sitting
> on their hands and letting BPL become fact.

Isn't there some sort of national organization for emergency services techs & engineers?

> I haven't spent the hours and hours it would require due to the plodding dialup I use, to read
> extensively in the posted comments at FCC website, but I sure wonder if any of the Pub Safety people

> are paying attention. I know most of them would love to move up to some U/SHF trunked system but the $$$
> involved is prohibitive today, and they WON'T be doing that any time soon, so they'd sure better fight
> this off.

My knee-jerk reaction to this was "where are the heavy-hitters like Motorola" who have a vested interest in lo-band VHF ops?" Silly me, Motorola would love to have the lo-band trashed in order to move *everybody" up the spectrum whether the taxpayers can afford it or not.

Or do the pros already know BPL is going nowhere and can't be bothered with getting into it??

This bull has more horns than I can count.

Time to ship Carl back to Washington to do something actually useful this time.

>
> Dick

w3rv

364. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 15:51:29 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308040751.46c79c3c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73878

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hj1kl2l.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 03 Aug 2003 13:15:58 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
> >Phil has probably seen this many times, but for the rest of us:
> >
> >From the book "Disorder in the Court":
> >
> >Last one is the corker
>
> Love it..... <ggg>

http://www.geocities.com/CollegePark/6174/tranquip.htm

73 de Jim, N2EY

365. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 16:03:04 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <YsvXa.7059$mZ6.2697@nwrdny02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 73879

```
"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bgkae0$2md$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:iMfXa.15838$Vx2.8180666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:LyfXa.72928$Wd5.14335216@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > That's because it not supposed to. It "forces" the newbie to get a
taste
> > of
> > > CW. Then it's up to the individual to either take him/herself further
or
> > > drop it entirely. Many will never know if CW truly interested them
> because
> > > they will not have been made to even try.
> > >
> >
> > Exactly. It's nice to see it so neatly. It's the same reason that
> students
> > are required to study a number of items which they may or may not pursue
> in
> > the future.
> >
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> Then I say we test on every mode there is. If you support that for CW,
then
> surely you support it for other modes.
>
> Kim W5TIT

I'm with that! Good call, Kim.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI
```

366. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 16:06:52 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F2E849C.40509@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 73812

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> Hmmm. How interesting. We're not just "out of touch with reality," we're
> "freaking out of touch with reality." That sounds a bit severe! Just what,
> may I axe, makes us PCTA's so "freaking" out of touch with reality? Is it
> because we believe in the usefulness of the Morse code, and the need to
> have code testing so prospective hams get the opportunity to be exposed
> to it? Or is it just that we disagree with the NCTA and NCI, and are able
> to express our opinions with clarity and conviction? It's gotta be something
> along those lines!

Following your line of thinking, why doesn't the test include
listening and transmitting on AM so prospective hams get the
opportunity to be exposed to it? Also FM, and all the other modes?

367. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 16:09:58 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308040809.62f03763@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73880

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93CCB5577DA7Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20030803122121.27503.00001415@mb-m24.aol.com:
>
> > In article <Xns93CBC6A1646A4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >
> >>The continued existence of a CW test does actually threaten the future
> >>of the hobby, i.e. it is a 'deal killer' for recruitment.
> >
> > WHOA, hold on a second, there!
> >
> > Folks, here's a claim that the code test must go because it allegedly
> > holds back growth in the ARS.
> >
> >>Unfortunately, a
> >>lot of damage has already been done, as it has been allowed to persist
> >>long past it's 'sell by' date.
> >
> > Sounds like you're hedging your bets, Alun.
>
> Not atall. Since about 1995 there has been a paradigm shift caused by this
> medium we're using right now (the Internet). If code testing had been
> abolished significantly before that it would have boosted our numbers far
> more than it ever can now. All I'm really saying is that that opportunity
> is lost.

Still, you're saying that increasing growth was and is a reason to get
rid of Element 1.

As for the internet, I say it is only one piece of a much bigger
puzzle. The plain simple fact is that the survival of amateur radio is
dependent on meeting needs/desires that cannot be met by the internet,
cell phones, email, cheap long distance 'phones, etc.

Those needs and desires are everchanging, btw. Not so long ago it was
common for a ham's family members to get licenses for "honeydew"
purposes. Some of those family members developed more interest, some
didn't. Today, cell phones and FRS/MURS meet most of the "honeydew"
needs so that recruiting tool is gone.

> >>Sure, 5 wpm is easy (higher speeds were not, but that's moot now).
> >>However, the CW test manages to be too slow to impart any genuinely
> >>useful level of CW ability, whilst at the same time putting off

> >>prospective hams. In other words, it's more counter-productive than
> >>useful.
> >>
> >>Sure. there is a lot of CW use by hams on HF, but there are precious
> >>few prospective hams who want to use it.
> >
> > How do you know they don't want to use it? At the past several Field
> > Days, the CW ops generated the most interest.
>
> As a sideshow it generates interest. Think of it as being like a
> demonstration of some obscure craft in a living museum. Sure, people find
> it interesting watching a blacksmith shoe a horse (and that's not a dead
> art either), but it doesn't mean they are going to learn to do it.

I disagree. Look at the interest in participation sports like running
and cycling. Or in crafts. Or in learning to play musical instruments.

Of course a lot depends on the presentation. If all anyone ever sees
is somebody pounding out 5 wpm on a straight key, combined with horror
stories of how "difficult" it supposedly is, they are less likely to
be interested than if they see a fast effortless operation between
skilled ops and an attitude of "almost anybody can learn to do this
with some practice".

There was a time in my life when, if somebody had told me that I could
run a regulation marathon, I'd have told them they were nuts. Yet a
few years later I had run two of them. The difference was seeing it
done by others I could identify with, developing an interest, learning
what was necessary, and then doing it.

> >>Put in all the written questions you
> >>like on CW, though, as that won't cause the same kind of problem.
> >>
> >>I think it's true that those who want to keep a code test would likely
> >>have wanted to keep spark if they had been around back then.
> >
> > Different thing entirely. Spark for hams wasn't outlawed in the USA
> > until 1927 - long after hams had stopped using it. By choice.
> >
> >>If they
> >>really could stop the wheel of progress, the hobby likely would die
> >>with their generation, but luckily that won't happen.
> >
> > Do you want code USE by hams to continue or not, Alun?
>
> Honestly? I don't care if it does or not.

Your answer avoids the question.

> For the record I think it will
> continue. It does have some advantages (but then, so do a lot of other
> modes).

>
> >>Keeping out all those who aren't interested in CW may keep a few
> >>'breakers' out, but it keeps out most people, period. That may suit a
> >>few people here, but it isn't the way forward. Ultimately, keeping the
> >>code test would do far more to destroy the hobby than letting in a few
> >>CBers (and I do mean a few, as most of them are not smart enough to
> >>pass the written tests). If we keep a code test, the hobby will fail
> >>for lack of interest. Luckily, I don't expect that to happen.
> >
> > OK, let's look at some facts:
> >
> > - Growth in the ARS in the USA from 1980 to 1990 (when there were no
> > waivers and all hams had to pass at least 5 wpm) was almost exactly the
> > same as from 1990 to 2000 (when both waivers and codetestless licenses
> > were available)
> >
> > - Overall, the ARS in the USA has kept on growing for the past 35
> > years. In fact, since the end of WW1, the only periods of non-growth
> > were WW2 and most of the 1960s.
> >
> > And now a challenge to all this stuff about disincentives. Soon the
> > code test will probably be gone. There will probably be a surge of new
> > licenses and upgrades, then back to growth rates near to what they were
> > before. If we don't see more long-term growth without code tests, will
> > you admit you were wrong and help get code tests reinstated?
>
> You know I won't (a wise man only asks questions to which he knows the
> answers, and you're no fool).

If I know the answer, what's the point of asking the question?

> I have always disagreed with a skill test in
> Morse being a condition for HF phone. I have never heard an argument for
> that that makes logical sense.

Here's one: 'phone takes up much more spectrum.

And if we say there should not be a skill test in one mode in order to
be allowed to use another, it's equally valid to say there should not
be a test on theory in order to use manufactured, no-tune radios
either.

73 de Jim, N2EY

368. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 16:21:58 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F2E8825.7070907@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 73881

Rob Kemp wrote:

>Quote from the American Public Power Association; "the burden should
>be imposed on challengers to BPL to demonstrate interference in a
>fact-based, empirical proof. Further, to the extent that interference
>is demonstrated, there should be an attempt to accommodate BPL, even
>if it means that existing communications providers may have to share
>or transfer bandwidth."
>http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=651428749
6
>
>
BPL is not a system that needs to radiate RF signals to do its job, it
would be an
unintentional radiator. It's a system going point to point via wires,
not a system
that uses isolated boxes (radios) that communicate via RF "over the
air". Thus there
is no reason why we would need to share spectrum with BPL.

>Critical everyone submits a reply comment ASAP.
>
>To file, go here;
>http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi
>"Proceeding" field, enter "03-104"
>"Document Type" select "Reply to comments"
>
>
>

369. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 16:36:31 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F2E8B8E.6020002@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 73882

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>Well then, if it's *that* bad, I'm sure it'll be defeated, eh?
>
>Kim W5TIT
>
>
>
If the FCC commissioners and rule makers actually understand radio physics and not just lawyers, then it would be a good bet that it would be defeated. But even on matters that any politician would understand, the FCC screwed up. That new rule on how many broadcast stations one company can own, for example. I want multiple sources of broadcast news, and the only real way to get that is to have several separate companies owning the various stations in my town.

370. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 16:38:02 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F2E8BEA.5030508@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 73883

```
>
>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Well then, if it's *that* bad, I'm sure it'll be defeated, eh?
>>>
>>>Kim W5TIT
>>>
>>>
>>And that is the most naive statement about the workings of government that I
>>have ever seen.
>>
>>
>
>Typical of Kim, I'm afraid
>
>
>
Kim was using sarcasm..... Wasn't that obvious? :-(
```

371. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 16:44:46 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F2E8D7E.2080000@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 73818

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> JJ wrote:
>
>
>>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Hmmm. How interesting. We're not just "out of touch with reality," we're
>>>"freaking out of touch with reality." That sounds a bit severe! Just what,
>>>may I axe, makes us PCTA's so "freaking" out of touch with reality? Is it
>>>because we believe in the usefulness of the Morse code, and the need to
>>>have code testing so prospective hams get the opportunity to be exposed
>>>to it? Or is it just that we disagree with the NCTA and NCI, and are able
>>>to express our opinions with clarity and conviction? It's gotta be something
>>>along those lines!
>>
>>Following your line of thinking, why doesn't the test include
>>listening and transmitting on AM so prospective hams get the
>>opportunity to be exposed to it? Also FM, and all the other modes?
>
>
>
>
> Isn't everyone "exposed" to voice and voice modes well before entering ham radio?
> How many people ever are exposed to radiotelgraphy?

What about all those digital modes? It makes just as much sense
to make sure new hams can operate those modes as it does CW.

>

372. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 17:16:30 UTC
From: Rich <RW@preecelinc.org>
Message-ID: <bgm4cf$vm4$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73884
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308040638.5023c99d@posting.google.com...
> "N22X" <N22X@sherzfordzent.com> wrote in message
news:<bgj1ml$nt4$0@pita.alt.net>...
>
> > Since the FCC closed all their monitoring stations seven
> > years ago,
>
> The FCC did *not* close all their monitoring stations.
>
> > the number of pirates and unlicensed activity
> > on HF has jumped by quantum leaps. We are observing
> > pirates in the 6600 khz range, which is reserved for
> > aero ops, something which was unheard of in the days of
> > active FCC enforcement.
> >
> > N22X
> > Terra Haute, IN
>
> w3rv

So says you, but according to www.fcc.gov
they ARE all closed.
Geeeeeze, another no-code tech shoots his
mouth off!

Rich

373. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 17:24:44 UTC
From: "Lo Power FM Assn." <x41x@powerfmaarea.com>
Message-ID: <bgm4rt$12u$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73885
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message:
// FLUSHED //

Look, nobody here is interested in your ongoing
petty ham radio disputes. Take it to r.r.a.p. or
go shoot your mouth on 14313 like you hams do.
Give us a break!

x44x
Low Power FM
No Licensed Required

374. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 17:40:16 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgm5q0$2qp$0@208.207.71.154>
Source record: 73886

Robert Casey wrote:

> Rob Kemp wrote:
>
> >Quote from the American Public Power Association; "the burden should
> >be imposed on challengers to BPL to demonstrate interference in a
> >fact-based, empirical proof. Further, to the extent that interference
> >is demonstrated, there should be an attempt to accommodate BPL, even
> >if it means that existing communications providers may have to share
> >or transfer bandwidth."
> >http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514287
496
> >
> >
> BPL is not a system that needs to radiate RF signals to do its job, it
> would be an
> unintentional radiator. It's a system going point to point via wires,
> not a system
> that uses isolated boxes (radios) that communicate via RF "over the
> air". Thus there
> is no reason why we would need to share spectrum with BPL.

Do you work for one of the companies promoting BPL ?

Surely you're aware that unintentional radiators are just as capable of causing destructive interference as the intentional when the receiving system being interefered with is in close
enough proximity for sufficient signal to radiate into it. Why else would all part 15 devices
be labeled as they are, "Must accept interference from other sources and must not cause interference etc ". Not the exact wording but the meaning is unambiguous.
These folks even want to change Part 15 rules to make it OK for unintentional radiators to interfere with licensed (protected) services, even to force the licensed services to prevent
interfering with the part 15 devices!

Wanta rethink your statement?

375. Re: Some comments on the NCVEC petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 18:42:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308041042.aec2d50@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73887

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bgknsn$q3l$0@208.206.142.97>...
> Brian wrote:

> > Oh Geez. Not the same unelected, non-FCC guys that unilaterally
> > decided to jettison the 5wpm Morse Exam for the 13-15wpm Farnsworth
> > Exam, and deny HF access to otherwise qualified people who just can't
> > beep fast?
> >
> > Come to think of it, I'm trying to remember the last time I voted for
> > the top few guys at the ARRL.
>
> B-rian, you may not beep fast but you sure do chirp like hell!

I guess I need a little more bias.

376. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 19:00:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308041100.318665a2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73888

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<f7iXa.15968$Vx2.8217426@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:bgkae0$2md$1@adenine.netfront.net...

> > Then I say we test on every mode there is. If you support that for CW,
> then
> > surely you support it for other modes.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> No problem. I'm ready. Are you?
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

As soon as I see the R&O from the FCC (or a declaration from the
unelected at the NCVEC that they have a copy of an "unwritten" policy
letter from the FCC, such as that which permits Farnsworth exams).

377. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 19:08:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308041108.279d336d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73889

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bgj71t$2ffe$1@adenine.netfront.net>...

> Then, why the opening remarks then and now, with this post, about how long
> Carl was a Tech and his alledged comments on CW? Why enter that into your
> remarks at all, Dave, if not to cast attention to that? If you are casting
> attention to that, then why?

Dave has a problem with the old Techs, the Tech Plusses, and
presumably the Techs with Code. They aren't 13wpm hams. They aren't
worthy to share his band space.

Now that Carl can share Dave's band space...

378. Re: CORRECTION!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 19:23:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308041123.4939b6aa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73890

averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030804051144.10282.00000944@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: CORRECTION!!!
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 8/4/03 12:07 AM Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0308032007.143c4f56@posting.google.com>
> >
> >averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
> >news:<20030803135401.03007.00001019@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>
> >> >What monkeys?
>
> >> The ones who eat the coffee beans. :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-)
>
> >I don't drink coffee.
>
> After reading about the monkeys, I am surprised that anyone drinks coffee.

I'm suprised that anyone drinks it, without even considering the
monkeys.

> >I have no use or need for coffee beans or coffee bean eating
> >monkeys.
>
> It is not all about you, Brian. :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-)

That changes nothing.

> >> > and why are you impersonating Len?
>
> >> Len who?
>
> >Len Anderson
>
> Who or what is a Len Anderson?

Odd that you ask. He's a guy who frequents rrap.

> Can he not speak for himself?

Not today. He has larangytus.

> Are you his acolyte?

Odd that you bring it up.

I don't believe that Len is of the Catholic faith, nor is he of the Church of Morseodists. And I haven't been an Altar boy in many, many years.

> >> I am not impersonating anyone. I am simply myself.
>
> >And who or what is that?
>
> Why do you want to know?

Curiosity. Obviously you are not yourself when you post as Avery Fine.

379. Re: N8WWM, rain reported again.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 19:42:13 UTC
From: Keith Hosman <logdshr@bnnorth.net>
Message-ID: <AFyXa.7865$Ly2.1272784@cletus.bright.net>
Source record: 73891
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030803115602.817$Fq@newsreader.com...
> "Keith Hosman" <logdshr-remove-@bnnorth.net> wrote:
> > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030729220819.335$7t_-_@newsreader.com...
> > | Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > | > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > | > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > | > > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > | > > > > avoobner2002@yahoo.com (Aaron H. Voobner) wrote:
> > | > > > > Riley H. has a good track record of
> > | > > > > following up on such complaints, check the Rain Report if
you
> > | > > > > wish confirmation of this.
> > | > > > > >
> > | > > > > Is that the same rain report n8wwm was busted out on?
> > | > > > >
> > | > > > Did you leave again, Aaron?
> > | > > >
> > | > > I see you're still here,Aaron. What's your opinion of doug adair
> > | > > n8wwm getting ratted out on the rain report?
> > | > >
> > | >
> > | I know you're jumping up and down about no CW, jackass.
> > |
> > | --
> > | GO# 40
> >
> > What did Doug do this time? I missed the rain report.
> >
> He got caught jamming repeaters.
>
> --
> GO# 40

Huh, I've been too busy with work to even fire up any of the radios other
than sometimes the ARES traffic nets and SKYWARN. The SKYWARN net takes
place on one of his old haunts the .375 machine which is the one mentioned
the last time he was on the RAIN report.

73 de Keith

p.s. I see that you had some flooding out your way hope your place made it
ok. We had a tornado touch down here this afternoon plus 3 other sightings

which did not touch down. Going to be a busy evening :/
--
--
KC8TCQ

"No matter where you go, There you are"

380. Re: N8WWM, rain reported again.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 19:54:20 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0308041154.747cafc0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73892
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Hambone the Magnificent" <taildoggie4@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<1060002639.965375@newshost03.voicenet.com>...
> "gw" <gw@webhideout.com> wrote in message
> news:235a74db.0308031310.11b3aa29@posting.google.com...
> > "Duh" <MyDixieWrecked@uranus.com> wrote in message
> news:<jtGVa.119311$hV.8630047@twister.austin.rr.com>...
> > > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20030729220819.335$7t_-_@newsreader.com...
> > > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > > > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > > > > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > > > > > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > > > > > > > avoobner2002@yahoo.com (Aaron H. Voobner) wrote:
> > > > > > > > > Riley H. has a good track record of
> > > > > > > > > following up on such complaints, check the Rain Report if
> you
> > > > > > > > > wish confirmation of this.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Is that the same rain report n8wwm was busted out on?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Did you leave again, Aaron?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I see you're still here,Aaron. What's your opinion of doug adair
> > > > > > > > n8wwm getting ratted out on the rain report?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > I know you're jumping up and down about no CW, jackass.
> > > > > >
> > > > > --
> > > > GO# 40
> > >
> > Well, we all knew Doug would return with his usual demented rants, but
> who
> > knew he'd stoop so low again?
> >
> >
> well dougie is a product of his environment.....the hamsters
> > thought it would be a good idea to relax the entry requirements into
> > ham radio and then this type of twit is what they get.....case
> > closed.....the hamsters now need to get used the fact that they
> > will soon further increase the reality tv watcher population in their
> > ranks, when they eliminate the code requirements....and as that event
> > happens, little jerry and the rest of the do-gooders will have their

> > hands full policing these morons ....instead of whining an a cb
> > newsgroup about qrp good buddies talking on 10.............
>
> Yeah, but if they all goto 2 Meters who gives a crap?
> The 2 Meter band has long been called "ham CB drive time channel" for
> years...

well the point is , is that if this continues to go the way it is.......the hamsters are going to be faced with a large segment of cb types who behave like cb types on the ham bands.........and to a large extent this is already going on.....but they have only themselves to blame.............and to think , they thought by lowering the threshold of admittance, they would swell the ranks of the ham bands with law abiding, rule abiding hamsters, made in their own images, but they did not sit down and calculate jut who it is that would come to the party.....................ham radio is becoming nothing more than glorified cb radio..........and dat's da twut.............

381. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 20:01:22 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <mYyXa.8863$W%3.2111@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 73893

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj2a01q.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sun, 03 Aug 2003 21:29:30 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >This is actually not such a bad idea. I've always supported dropping the
> >155.3 mi. limit on CB and the idea of allowing hams to reduce their power
> >and elmer CBers on channels 36 through 40 USB on the finer point of
DXing. I
> >think it'd be a great recruitment tool, just MHO.
>
> If you espouse the above,

I do, I do!

> it is evidence that you have no
> understanding about what CB is supposed to be for

I have an understanding of what CB WAS supposed to be for as well as what it
HAS evolved into. (...and I don't mean the out-of-band lids with the illegal
amplifiers either.)

> and you cannot
> keep ham radio and CB separate as they should be.

Speak for yourself, Phil. I certainly CAN. I have witnessed the shift in
what the "citizens" (Remember that word?) want from *their* Citizen's Band.
I personally have no want to bang my fist down on the table and proclaim
that "that's not what it was originally meant for." That's what it's become,
plain and simple. Don't like it? Then get your fmr. comrades to kick it up a
notch or two wrt enforcement and stop it...or admit their boo-boo (CB on HF
and they can't respond to a natuarally occuring phenomenon, hihi.) and try
to take a little advantage of the situation. It reallly could've been a
win-win situation back in 2000, Phil, but false pride got in the way.

> What you are describing is hamming, not proper (some call it "legal") CB
> operating.

Easy councellor, I'm proposing not "describing" so no crime's been commited.
(Re. my proposal only.) Please reread what I wrote. I find it pretty
interesting that you equate working DX on five channels within a 440 KHz
slice of the HF spectrum with "hamming." I personally think a whole lot more
of ham radio with literally dozens of modes and much much more spectrum at
our disposal. Yes, Phil, I think it's a GREAT idea to whet some CBer's
appetite with the words "If you like what you can do with 12 Watts on CB,
lemme show you what you with just a tad more effort and some studying on
20." Nope, no cutting off my nose to spite my face here, nosiree.

BTW, please notice that I mentioned NOTHING about dropping the code
requirement, (I support its retention) additional 11-meter frequency
allocation, or any increase in the allowed power output.

> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

382. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 20:08:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2EBC38.1917F426@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73894

Brian wrote:
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bgj71t$2ffe$1@adenine.netfront.net>...
>
> > Then, why the opening remarks then and now, with this post, about how long
> > Carl was a Tech and his alledged comments on CW? Why enter that into your
> > remarks at all, Dave, if not to cast attention to that? If you are casting
> > attention to that, then why?
>
> Dave has a problem with the old Techs, the Tech Plusses, and
> presumably the Techs with Code.

I didn't address those you mention. I addressed Carl.

> They aren't 13wpm hams. They aren't
> worthy to share his band space.

No, they haven't been tested at 13 wpm or at 20 wpm. I didn't address
that issue.

> Now that Carl can share Dave's band space...

Carl may share some space with me. There are plenty of areas on a
number of bands where I doubt I'll run into Carl. Come to think of it,
I doubt I'll run into you in those spots.

Dave K8MN

383. Re: Ed Hare (W1RFI) of the ARRL on BPL replies to comments

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 20:57:32 UTC
From: "Richard L. Tannehill" <w7rtrick@firstinter.net>
Message-ID: <3F2EC8BC.D6092F69@firstinter.net>
Source record: 73895

Dick, fortunately, most public safety entities in the past
20 years have vacated VHF Low for VHF High, UHF, T-Band, and
800 MHz, with 700 MHz just around the corner. A major
exception is the California Highway Patrol. They still use
LB statewide, and their system will no doubt be destroyed if
BPL is allowed to happen. When the State of Arizona still
had low band systems for the State Land/Forestry Dept and
MVD, we ran some tests and found that in the Phoenix metro
area, desense of up to 20 dB due to traffic signal
computers, power lines, street lighting, etc was very
common. They had great rural coverage, but couldn't talk in
town. The effect is even noticable on VHF HB (150-174 MHz),
but not to anywhere the same level. We need to raise the
issue of "homeland security" though with BPL. That's the
hot button at the FCC right now that we can press.

Rick Tannehill, P.E. - W7RT
Former Comm. Engineering Manager
Ariz Dept of Public Safety (Retired)

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> Rob Kemp wrote:
>
> > It is not just amateur radio that is at risk
> > here, but any use of HF that operates near BPL installations
>
> As well as any other radio system operating over a wide area up to the 80
> MHz
> limit planned. Public safety comes immediately to mind since I worked in
> that fielf. I know that a number of states presently still use low band
> VHF for state police communications using direct car to base systems as
> well as many crossband repeaters with receivers covering considerable
> areas operating on frequencies between 40 and 50 MHz.
> I worked as a field engineer in such a system and RF noise was an
> ongoing problem. And with the FM systems in use, often the noise will
> simply keep the squelch closed and the recever won't be aware that the
> transmitting station is attempting a call.
> I recall one such particularly troublesome repeater where that would
> occur and by the time I could drive to the repeater site the "phantom"
> problem was gone. After several unproductive tries, I finally found the
> source of the noise- a welder in a shop about a half mile from the
> repeater site which welded only ocassionally, and those times just
> happened to coincide with the repeater desense problems. We wound up
> relocating that repeater because of it.

>
> If that sort of situation can virtually shut down a single low band
> repeater I can only simagine the sort of wide area problems could be
> caused by BPL.
>
> Dick

384. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 21:31:45 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bgmjb7$d4n$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 73896

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bgkla3klj0@208.206.142.103...
>

> I haven't spent the hours and hours it would require due to the plodding
dialup I use, to read
> extensively in the posted comments at FCC website, but I sure wonder if
any of the Pub Safety people
> are paying attention. I know most of them would love to move up to some
U/SHF trunked system but the $$$
> involved is prohibitive today, and they WON'T be doing that any time soon,
so they'd sure better fight
> this off.
>
> Dick
>

Dick,

Perhaps they are just sitting by waiting to be run off their present
allocations..In order to FORCE a move to the higher bands....eh?

Dan/W4NTI

385. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 21:41:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308041341.296b4488@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73897
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bgkak8$ri3$0@208.206.142.71>...

> The draft is between your ears.

Since I started kegging, the draft is in my beer.

386. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 21:46:12 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F2ED422.2000409@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 73898

Dick Carroll; wrote:

>
>
> Robert Casey wrote:
>
>> Rob Kemp wrote:
>>
>> >Quote from the American Public Power Association; "the burden should
>> >be imposed on challengers to BPL to demonstrate interference in a
>> >fact-based, empirical proof. Further, to the extent that interference
>> >is demonstrated, there should be an attempt to accommodate BPL, even
>> >if it means that existing communications providers may have to share
>> >or transfer bandwidth."
>> >http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=651428
7496
>> <http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=651428
7496>
>>
>> >
>> >
>> BPL is not a system that needs to radiate RF signals to do its job, it
>> would be an
>> unintentional radiator. It's a system going point to point via wires,
>> not a system
>> that uses isolated boxes (radios) that communicate via RF "over the
>> air". Thus there
>> is no reason why we would need to share spectrum with BPL.
>>
> Do you work for one of the companies promoting BPL ?
>
> Surely you're aware that unintentional radiators are just as capable
> of causing destructive interference as the intentional when the
> receiving system being interefered with is in close enough proximity
> for sufficient signal to radiate into it. Why else would all part 15
> devices be labeled as they are, "Must accept interference from other
> sources and must not cause interference etc ". Not the exact wording
> but the meaning is unambiguous.
> These folks even want to change Part 15 rules to make it OK for
> unintentional radiators to interfere with licensed (protected)
> services, even to force the licensed services to prevent interfering
> with the part 15 devices!
>
> Wanta rethink your statement?

>
Maybe I wasn't clear. When I said that BPL is an unintended radiator,
I meant that there is no
reason why hams should tolerate the interference it causes. BPL is
supposed to be a concept
where two nodes of it communicate to each other over power wires, and if
those power wires
were shielded (like coax) then it would still work without trashing HF.
But I know full well
that power wires are not shielded with respect to RF, and that the trash
WILL get out and
ruin HF. And that there is no reason why hams, NTIA, and other HF users
should be
forced to live with this trash. There's other ways of getting on the
Internet. So BPL should
not be allowed to happen.

387. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 21:58:58 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F2ED720.4000509@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 73899

>
>
>This is actually not such a bad idea. I've always supported dropping the
>155.3 mi. limit on CB and the idea of allowing hams to reduce their power
>and elmer CBers on channels 36 through 40 USB on the finer point of DXing. I
>think it'd be a great recruitment tool, just MHO.
>
>
>
We could do that now, *IF* we use type accepted (or whatever they call
it nowadays) CB radios
instead of our ham transcievers, and not exceed the distance limit. But
I think the CBers
might see us as invaders on their turf, like we see them when invading
10m. It might be better
to be low key, maybe have the ARRL buy ads in CB magizines that say
something like "if
you get a general or extra ham license, you can DX on many different
bands using more
power (legally) even when the sunspots are out of season. 'You already
love radio, see
how much more fun you can have with a ham license'." Of course one
would have to
wordsmith it right to attract serious and disiplined operators and not
the kids and "lids".
Without making ham radio look condensending or putting CBers down. I'm
not that
good a writer, but I think that it could be done well.

388. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 22:16:48 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <kXAXa.92552$Wd5.18542286@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 73900

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308031718.23b2c842@posting.google.com...
> wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030802210406.21580.00000808@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> > Do Hams get 11 Meters Back, as soon as all the CBers upgrade to there
Free
> > Handout Ham Licenses?
>
>
> We didn't "lose" 11M, we just had use CB reddios <radios> instead of our
ham
> gear to run on 11.
>
> w3rv

Quite correct. (...and too often overlooked.)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

389. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 22:22:57 UTC
From: K&#65533;HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <20b48da5f8f0d4d919c1c2c61d8f7c66.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 73751

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> Aw, Hans, surely you -too- learned long ago not to expect anything intelligent of
> Kim.

I thought it was hilarious how she tried to distance herself from her
initial ill-prepared comments with "Oh, I was just trying to rattle some
chains." How transparent can you get? Then she starts showing an
interest in the staus of my britches. Fat chance --- I've seen a
picture!!!!

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

390. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 22:32:56 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <BB54583C.2111F%stewartx@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73752
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Rich" wrote:
>
> If you know so much, how come you are still just
> a Technician Class?

What does my ham radio license class have to do with pirate radio?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

391. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 22:38:36 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <MfBXa.16442$Vx2.8524886@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 73753

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030804082114.27503.00001423@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <bgk9k5$1u3$1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >If an actual
> >conversation ensues, I'm sure no one (except the jerks I know of) would
> >waste their time getting carpal tunnel with cursing in CW.
>
> Carpal tunnel? Not a problem - the side-to-side motion of a bug or paddles
> avoids CTS, while the up-and-down motion of keyboards promotes it. Just
another
> advantage of CW...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Quite true. The several books available on Morse code discuss the history of the key, bug, and paddles and the latter two were developed specifically to prevent carpal tunnel syndrome, although at that time it was not called by that name. Nothing has yet been developed to prevent carpal tunnel syndrome among those who constantly use the keyboard. The best that they have been able to come up with is to teach people to use the least stressful hand/wrist/finger position but CTS still occurs.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

392. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 22:50:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <BB545C3F.21121%stewartx@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73754

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> (snip) It has become popular now, to label
> others as "those people." In ham radio,
> in everyday life. If CW is serving as a
> "filtering tool" in the eyes of a majority
> in ham radio--I say abolish it. But, I've
> a feeling the attitude that it is a
> filtering tool is not prevalent. Thank
> goodness!!

Actually, I think that attitude has become very commonplace. I've heard it off and on for the last several years and it's also something I've heard outside these newsgroups on the radio.

By the way, I can now view your messages just fine. My old news provider was the source of the problem. As you can see, I've switched internet service providers and the problem appears to be gone. I was even able to go back and read those older messages that generated the error message before.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

393. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 22:55:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2EE319.3FA91B69@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73755

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
> Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
> breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
> that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
> just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.

Izzat Len's function here, Floyd? I was always of the opinion that Leonard H. was MY cheap form of entertainment. Of all the posters here, I can't think of one invidual less relevant to amateur radio's past, present or future--not that much of anything he sez is great or exactly correct.

Dave K8MN

394. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 23:03:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2EE512.405B432E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73756

"Kï¿½HB" wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> > Aw, Hans, surely you -too- learned long ago not to expect anything intelligent of
> > Kim.
>
> I thought it was hilarious how she tried to distance herself from her
> initial ill-prepared comments with "Oh, I was just trying to rattle some
> chains." How transparent can you get?

Kim's shuffle and slide has only been topped by the occasions when
Len-Anderson-As-Avery-Fineman sends six or eight posts consisting of
nothing but quotes from another with no input from Len. These have been
identified as "a carefully laid trap". Pure Black Adder and Baldrick
stuff.

> Then she starts showing an
> interest in the staus of my britches. Fat chance --- I've seen a
> picture!!!!

Why, that isn't very politically correct of you, Hans. I'm sure she is
a warm human being and has a lovely personality....Oh, never mind.

Dave K8MN

395. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 00:20:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030804202055.04207.00002054@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 73757

In article <0XsXa.2527$lL.413876@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030803122123.27503.00001416@mb-m24.aol.com...
>> In article <3F2C0443.9060301@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >> Put it that way, Mike, yes. It is hard to argue that removing *any*
>> >> part of
>> >> a test is not a reduction in the amount of knowledge needed to pass a
>> >> test. But, that is simply a word game and nothing else.

>> It's more than a word game. Encouraging radio knowledge of all types is
>> one of
>> the most basic reasons to have the ARS exist at all. The tests are there
>> to
>> insure a minimum knowledge level. ("Knowledge" including skills, concepts,
>> facts, etc.)

>> >> The point is, what does passing a CW test prove in the way of
>> >> knowledge--other than that one can pass a CW test?
>>
>> It proves that:
>>
>> 1) The person has learned a useful radio skill at a very basic level.
>
>But what about Morse is so important that it is "equal to all else" in terms
>of a "pass or don't get an HF license" ???

Actually, I think the written test should be broken down into subelements that
each require a passing grade. Safety, Regs, and Theory would be one possible
split.
>
>> 2) The person was willing and able to devote the time and effort necessary
>> to learn that skill.
>
>This goes to "work ethic" and "quality of operator" arguments that have
>already been rejected by the FCC ... let's not keep beating that horse.

I'm simply pointing out what passing the test proves. Doesn't prove the test
must exist.
>
>> 3) The person has been exposed to a useful, widely-used-by-hams radio
>> communications mode other than voice or data.

>So???

That exposure is a good thing. Doesn't mean it must exist, though.

>> You are mistaken on several counts there, Kim.
>>
>> 1) The written tests are what they are. They are in a continuing state of
>> development.
>>
>> 2) ALL ELSE BEING EQUAL, a ham who has Morse skills knows more about
>> amateur radio than one with no Morse skills.
>
>Correction ... a ham who has Morse skills is able to operate better Morse
>than one with no Morse skills. PERIOD.

No, that's not correct, Carl.

Since Morse code is a big part of amateur radio, the person with Morse skills knows more about amateur radio than the person without those skills IF ALL ELSE IS EQUAL. The same can be said for, say, the ham who understands and can use Ohm's Law as opposed to the ham who cannot. Or the ham who can use the standard phonetics skillfully, as opposed to the person who can't.
>
>> 3) Morse/CW has certain advantages to hams beyond being "just another
>> mode".
>> 4) Morse/CW is more than "just a tradition". It's a useful mode of radio
>> communication enjoyed by hundreds of thousands of hams.
>
>So?

So it makes sense to promote things that are useful to hams.

> That is no reason to make it a requirement,

Sure it is. But it's just one reason.

> when the majority of hams
>and would-be hams have no desire to use Morse.

How do you know they don't want to use Morse, Carl?
>
>>> Look at how much it takes just to become a physician. The training and
>>> testing required is phenomenal, and designed to weed out the incapable. The
hard
>>> work and dedication required just to get into medical school are
extraordinary,
>>> and yet that's just the beginning. I could go on and on, but you get the
>>> picture.
>
>Apples vs. oranges ... providing medical treatment is often a life and death
>thing ... being able to operate/or not operate Morse is not.
>
You missed the point completely, Carl.

The bit about doctors was simply to point out that no test is a perfect "jerk filter". Not even the rigorous training physicians go through results in a completely "jerk free" profession. No amount of testing that is reasonable could result in a "jerk free" ARS.

>As far as the "character filter" thing goes ... the FCC has already ruled
>on that ... it doesn't fly.

You miss the point: No test is a perfect filter. The 5 wpm code test certainly isn't.
>
>> Why? I'd rather have an ARS consisting of a few hundred thousand
>> interested,
>> active, dedicated, skilled, knowledgeable hams than one of a few million
>> inactive, apathetic, unskilled, ignorant ones who could not care less.
>> Code test or no code test.
>
>You seem to leap to the conclusion that folks who are not interested in
>Morse fall into the "inactive, apathetic, unskilled, ignorant" category.

WHERE do you get THAT?

Look again at what I wrote - I'm saying I prefer quality over quantity.

Note the last line: "CODE TEST OR NO CODE TEST"

>False assumption, not based in any factual reality.;

Would you rather have lots of hams who are inactive, apathetic, unskilled and ignorant, or fewer hams that are the opposite, Carl?

73 de Jim, N2EY

396. Re: CORRECTION!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 00:47:12 UTC
From: averyfine@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030804204712.03115.00001762@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 73758

>Subject: Re: CORRECTION!!!
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 8/4/03 3:23 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0308041123.4939b6aa@posting.google.com>
>
>averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
>news:<20030804051144.10282.00000944@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: CORRECTION!!!
>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >Date: 8/4/03 12:07 AM Eastern Daylight Time
>> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0308032007.143c4f56@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
>> >news:<20030803135401.03007.00001019@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>>
>> >> >What monkeys?
>>
>> >> The ones who eat the coffee beans. :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-)
>>
>> >I don't drink coffee.
>>
>> After reading about the monkeys, I am surprised that anyone drinks coffee.
>
>I'm suprised that anyone drinks it, without even considering the
>monkeys.
>
Why? Many people enjoy it.
>
>> >I have no use or need for coffee beans or coffee bean eating
>> >monkeys.
>
>> It is not all about you, Brian. :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-) :-)
>
>That changes nothing.
>
Some would say it changes everything.
>
>> >> > and why are you impersonating Len?
>>
>> >> Len who?
>>
>> >Len Anderson
>>
>> Who or what is a Len Anderson?

>
>Odd that you ask.

Why is it odd?

> He's a guy who frequents rrap.

Where are his postings, then?

I do not see anything written by him in this newsgroup.
>
>> Can he not speak for himself?
>
>Not today. He has larangytus.
>
What is " larangytus"?

>> Are you his acolyte?
>
>Odd that you bring it up.
>
Why is it odd?

>I don't believe that Len is of the Catholic faith, nor is he of the
>Church of Morseodists.

Acolyte is a not just a term applied to Catholics. It is a general term
referring to one who is an aide to a leader of a belief system. Often
it means one who is in training. The term "acolyte" is used by Jean
M. Auel in her most recent book in the "Earth's Children" series,
"The Shelters Of Stone". That story takes place long before the
Roman Catholic church, or Morse code, came to be.

Are you in training with Len Anderson?

Are you his acolyte?

I do not know of any "Church of Morseodists".

> And I haven't been an Altar boy in many, many
>years.

But you were once one?
>
>> >> I am not impersonating anyone. I am simply myself.
>>
>> >And who or what is that?
>>
>> Why do you want to know?
>
>Curiosity. Obviously you are not yourself when you post as Avery
>Fine.

How do you know I am not?

Do you know for a fact that no person named Avery Fine exists?

397. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 00:55:24 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <0gDXa.2601$IL.423205@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73759

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F2E6711.7F1E4CE5@earthlink.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > > In article <f45722ac.0308010249.313b156a@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
> > > >way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick,
Larry,
> > > >Dan, Bruce...
> > >
> > Wait a minute ... don't tar all of us Extras with the same brush that
> > Dick, Larry, et al deserve ...
> >
> "Us Extras"? Whooo, that's rich, Carl!

Yes, Dave, "Us Extras" ... much as it may eat at you, I'm an Extra, too.
(FCC said so ... and it's up to them, not you ... :-P

> > For example the vast majority of the Directors of NCI are Extras (or
> > their national equivalent thereof).
> >
> What differentiates a majority from a vast majority? In a country with
> only two license classes, the higher class license is equivalent to the
> U.S. Extra?

When I said "or their national equivalent thereof," I was refering to our
Director from New Zealand ... a long-time, coded ham of their highest
class.

> > Additionally, there are a significant number of Extras amongst our
> > membership ... at least in proportion to the % of Extras to other
> > license classes.
> >
> What constitutes a "significant number" of Extas when compared to the
> percentage of your membership holding a license for which no code test
> is required?

I haven't calculated the exact percentage, but we have a LOT of members
who hold an Extra class license ... and that's not just since folks were
able
to upgrade with "only 5 wpm."

> > So, it's not "the Extras" ... it's the PCTAs ...
> >

> ...and I gather that you don't have many members who support code
> testing :-)

That's right ... one of the requirements for membership is supporting
the elimination of Morse testing.

Carl - wk3c

398. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 00:58:38 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <2jDXa.2602$lL.423121@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73760

```
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F2E675E.16905547@earthlink.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20030802230218.25052.00001540@mb-m11.aol.com...
> > > In article <7dfliv4n5tild30d19s7lneg3kpt67v69r@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur
> > KC2HMZ
> > > > <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> writes:
> > > >
> > > > >>QR10-4, QGB! I'm QPM, so QBD me!
> > > > >>
> > > > >>(Translation: "Ten-Fawhar, Good Buddie! I'll be putting the pedal
to
> > the
> > > > >>metal now, so watch my back door!)
> > > > >>
> > > > >>73 de Larry, K3LT
> > > > >
> > > > >You seem to toss that CB jargon around pretty well, Larry. Don't tell
> > > > >me...no, it couldn't be...could it?
> > > > >
> > > > >73 DE John, KC2HMZ
> > > >
> > > > John:
> > > >
> > > > Yep, it is true! I was once a CB'er, for a whole six months! I was
the
> > > > Asst. Mgr. of the Radio Shack store in Depew, NY at the time,
> > >
> > > We should have known ... "Radio Shack, you've got questions, we're
> > > clueless,"
> > > I'm sure Larry fit in quite well.
> >
> > So where is Kim? Shouldn't she be jumping on Carl over irrelevant
> > comments directed at Larry?

Dave ... it's not irrelevant ... Larry has always spoken quite freely of his
disdain for CBers and other "lower forms of life" (knuckle-draggers, etc.)

The fact that Larry was a CBer, yet talks down to folks with such a
superior attitude, shows what a hypocrite he is ...

Carl - wk3c
```

399. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:08:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj3o16v.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73761
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Mon, 4 Aug 2003 13:16:30 -0400, Rich wrote:

> So says you, but according to www.fcc.gov they ARE all closed.

Read it again....they are UNMANNED and therefore closed to the
public. They are all operated by remote control from Laurel/Columbia, MD.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

400. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:08:12 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj3nw0u.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73764
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 4 Aug 2003 07:38:22 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>"N22X" <N22X@sherzfordzent.com> wrote in message news:<bgj1ml$nt4$0@pita.alt.net>...
>
>> Since the FCC closed all their monitoring stations seven
>> years ago,
>
>The FCC did *not* close all their monitoring stations.

In fact when the monitoring stations were remoted, an additional
one was added. The station at Canandaigua, NY was brought back on
line after being closed for a number of years (it was used as the
test bed for developing the remote control system).

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

401. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:08:13 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj3oljw.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73763

On 4 Aug 2003 08:36:31 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>My knee-jerk reaction to this was "where are the heavy-hitters like
>Motorola" who have a vested interest in lo-band VHF ops?" Silly me,
>Motorola would love to have the lo-band trashed in order to move
>*everybody" up the spectrum whether the taxpayers can afford it or
>not.

The Big Emm stopped making low-band radios and replacement parts almost ten years ago, and RCA and GE have been out of that business for a lot more. That's why several of my clients have gone to UHF and 800 MHz trunked systems. A biggie user in the Low-Band is the California Highway Patrol (5000 or so mobiles and lots of base stations) who has been mouthing about going to 800 MHz for at least twelve years that I am aware of. I'll see it when it happens.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

402. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:08:14 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj4351y.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73762

On Mon, 04 Aug 2003 07:41:03 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:

> Very simple answer, Jim. The FCC has limited personnel today. The few they
>have simply don't have the time to sit around listening, as code users pound
>out their incredibly slow conversations, to catch violations. ;)

For reasons that I disagreed with then and I disagree with now, (but
that's another story) the FCC' s enforcement response is driven by
complaints, not by "Patrolling the Ether" (tm) as in days of yore.

How many complaints of amateur CW violations do you think "Riley"
gets? (Somebody pounding out "FU" in Morse on a Touch-Tone (tm) pad
on a repeater input does not count as CW....)

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

403. Re: Ed Hare (W1RFI) of the ARRL on BPL replies to comments

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:09:56 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgn3lk$s0t$0@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 73765

"Richard L. Tannehill" wrote:

> Dick, fortunately, most public safety entities in the past
> 20 years have vacated VHF Low for VHF High, UHF, T-Band, and
> 800 MHz, with 700 MHz just around the corner.

Yes, I'm aware of that movement, but there (or were last I knew, I've been out of the loop for a few years) still at least a half dozen states with low VHF statewide public safety systems. California is one of the several, but I assumed that by now they had bought a trunked system with all that money they spent that they didn't have!

> A major
> exception is the California Highway Patrol. They still use
> LB statewide, and their system will no doubt be destroyed if
> BPL is allowed to happen. When the State of Arizona still
> had low band systems for the State Land/Forestry Dept and
> MVD, we ran some tests and found that in the Phoenix metro
> area, desense of up to 20 dB due to traffic signal
> computers, power lines, street lighting, etc was very
> common.

Yep, been there and observed it first hand. *Wide* variations in the noise level which is transparent to the end user. His squelch just doesn't open when he is called and the noise is present!

> They had great rural coverage, but couldn't talk in
> town. The effect is even noticable on VHF HB (150-174 MHz),
> but not to anywhere the same level. We need to raise the
> issue of "homeland security" though with BPL. That's the
> hot button at the FCC right now that we can press.

Agreed! Now how to orient the issue such that the proponants don't win that battle. Looks like the viability of the remaining public safety systems woiuld predominate, esecially with California in that group. But that point sure isn't obvious in what I've read so far. California should be a BIG stopper to BPL. For certain they won't be upgrading anytinme soon with their money troubles. It's very expensive for a small state, and small sure doesn't fit there! When I first visited a CHP district HQ in 1980 I was told the CHP had 5,000 patrolmen then . No telling how much they've grown since. It'll be interesting to watch this evolve, our ham radio involvement aside.

Dick W0EX

>
>
> Rick Tannehill, P.E. - W7RT
> Former Comm. Engineering Manager
> Ariz Dept of Public Safety (Retired)

>
> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
> >
> > Rob Kemp wrote:
> >
> > > It is not just amateur radio that is at risk
> > > here, but any use of HF that operates near BPL installations
> >
> > As well as any other radio system operating over a wide area up to the 80
> > MHz
> > limit planned. Public safety comes immediately to mind since I worked in
> > that fielf. I know that a number of states presently still use low band
> > VHF for state police communications using direct car to base systems as
> > well as many crossband repeaters with receivers covering considerable
> > areas operating on frequencies between 40 and 50 MHz.
> > I worked as a field engineer in such a system and RF noise was an
> > ongoing problem. And with the FM systems in use, often the noise will
> > simply keep the squelch closed and the recever won't be aware that the
> > transmitting station is attempting a call.
> > I recall one such particularly troublesome repeater where that would
> > occur and by the time I could drive to the repeater site the "phantom"
> > problem was gone. After several unproductive tries, I finally found the
> > source of the noise- a welder in a shop about a half mile from the
> > repeater site which welded only ocassionally, and those times just
> > happened to coincide with the repeater desense problems. We wound up
> > relocating that repeater because of it.
> >
> > If that sort of situation can virtually shut down a single low band
> > repeater I can only simagine the sort of wide area problems could be
> > caused by BPL.
> >
> > Dick

404. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:10:49 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgn3n9$s0t$1@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 73766

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bgkla3klj0@208.206.142.103...
> >
>
> > I haven't spent the hours and hours it would require due to the plodding
> dialup I use, to read
> > extensively in the posted comments at FCC website, but I sure wonder if
> any of the Pub Safety people
> > are paying attention. I know most of them would love to move up to some
> U/SHF trunked system but the $$$
> > involved is prohibitive today, and they WON'T be doing that any time soon,
> so they'd sure better fight
> > this off.
> >
> > Dick
> >
>
> Dick,
>
> Perhaps they are just sitting by waiting to be run off their present
> allocations..In order to FORCE a move to the higher bands....eh?

Dan I'm surprised by very little these days.

405. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:11:16 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgn3o4$s0t$2@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 73767
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bgkak8$ri3$0@208.206.142.71>...
>
> > The draft is between your ears.
>
> Since I started kegging, the draft is in my beer.

Smart move!

406. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:12:37 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgn3ql$s0t$3@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 73768

Robert Casey wrote:

> Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > Robert Casey wrote:
> >
> >> Rob Kemp wrote:
> >>
> >> >Quote from the American Public Power Association; "the burden should
> >> >be imposed on challengers to BPL to demonstrate interference in a
> >> >fact-based, empirical proof. Further, to the extent that interference
> >> >is demonstrated, there should be an attempt to accommodate BPL, even
> >> >if it means that existing communications providers may have to share
> >> >or transfer bandwidth."
> >> >http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514
287496
> >> <http://svartifoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514
287496>
> >>
> >> >
> >> >
> >> BPL is not a system that needs to radiate RF signals to do its job, it
> >> would be an
> >> unintentional radiator. It's a system going point to point via wires,
> >> not a system
> >> that uses isolated boxes (radios) that communicate via RF "over the
> >> air". Thus there
> >> is no reason why we would need to share spectrum with BPL.
> >>
> > Do you work for one of the companies promoting BPL ?
> >
> > Surely you're aware that unintentional radiators are just as capable
> > of causing destructive interference as the intentional when the
> > receiving system being interefered with is in close enough proximity
> > for sufficient signal to radiate into it. Why else would all part 15
> > devices be labeled as they are, "Must accept interference from other
> > sources and must not cause interference etc ". Not the exact wording
> > but the meaning is unambiguous.
> > These folks even want to change Part 15 rules to make it OK for
> > unintentional radiators to interfere with licensed (protected)
> > services, even to force the licensed services to prevent interfering
> > with the part 15 devices!

> >
> > Wanta rethink your statement?
> >
> Maybe I wasn't clear. When I said that BPL is an unintended radiator,
> I meant that there is no
> reason why hams should tolerate the interference it causes. BPL is
> supposed to be a concept
> where two nodes of it communicate to each other over power wires, and if
> those power wires
> were shielded (like coax) then it would still work without trashing HF.
> But I know full well
> that power wires are not shielded with respect to RF, and that the trash
> *WILL* get out and
> ruin HF. And that there is no reason why hams, NTIA, and other HF users
> should be
> forced to live with this trash. There's other ways of getting on the
> Internet. So BPL should
> not be allowed to happen.

My apolgies for misunderstanding. I agree completely.

407. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:21:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030804222107.25815.00001937@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 73769

In article <qK_Wa.2427$lL.391902@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>What WILL be the end of ham radio is a lack of significant
>growth ...

Let's get it straight - is dropping Element 1 going to give us lots more growth or not?

For a historical context, here are some numbers on the growth of US amateur radio in the past 30 years or so. All numbers are rounded off but are accurate to within 2%. Sources are various Callbooks and US census data.:

US Hams:

1970: 270,000
1980: 350,000
1990: 514,000
2000: 680,000

Growth Rate:

1970 to 1980: 29.6% (120,000 net growth)
1980 to 1990: 46.8% (164,000 net growth)
1990 to 2000: 32.2% (166,000 net growth)

Oddly enough, percentage growth slowed down after the introduction of code test waivers and the Tech lost its code test. The total net growth in the '90s was almost exactly the same as in the '80s, even though the US population was larger.

As a percentage of the total US population:

Year - US population/annual growth - US hams - % hams
1970: 203 million 270,000 0.133%
1980: 227 million 350,000 0.154%
1990: 249 million 514,000 0.206%
2000: 281 million 680,000 0.242%

US hams as a percentage of population increased 0.021% in the '70s, 0.052% in the '80s and 0.036% in the '90s. So the growth slowed down after the introduction of code test waivers and the Tech lost its code test.

It stands to reason that if code testing were an 'unnecessary, arbitrary, and distasteful (to many) barrier to entry', those who were interested, but dissuaded by those unnecessary barriers would "jump in." when the 'barriers' were eliminated. Except that's not what happened, in either absolute number of hams or percentage growth. Growth in total hams was almost exactly the same

during the '90s, compared to the '80s, and the percentage growth actually dropped.

Current number of US hams is about 687,000. Current US population is left as an exercise for the reader.

> as Alun has said, the Morse test is a "no sell" for
>many folks who would otherwise make fine hams.

I think the salesperson can have a lot to do with whether a sale is made or not...;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

408. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:39:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308041839.62aabe55@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73771

Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message news:<878yqa8dk3.fld@barrow.com>...

> One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
> Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
> breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
> that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
> just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.

Sad, but true. But they don't see it that way.

One David Heil demands licensed participation in the ARS. But when confronted with mere Technician participation in the ARS that rivals his Extraness, he digs in and destroys. Or at least he tries to. Then there is Extra DICK. Probably Extra in every way except the dick department. Then there's Jim "DeSoda" who keeps rewriting "200 Meters and Up." No need to mention INSANE Clown Posse in a Nurse's dress or the civilian with "real" military experience.

409. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:43:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308041843.7a554040@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73772

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F2EE319.3FA91B69@earthlink.net>...
> Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
> > One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
> > Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
> > breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
> > that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
> > just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.
>
> Izzat Len's function here, Floyd? I was always of the opinion that
> Leonard H. was MY cheap form of entertainment.

Chalk it up to a lack of understanding.

Of all the posters here,
> I can't think of one invidual less relevant to amateur radio's past,
> present or future--not that much of anything he sez is great or exactly
> correct.
>
> Dave K8MN

Whatever he say is probably more relavent than working out of band
Frenchmen on 6M. Especially the part about Korean War teletype
operations.

410. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:44:29 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgn5mdrse1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73773

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:0ciXa.15969$Vx2.8220036@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:bgk9k5$1u3$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> > CW is mostly callsign/whereabouts/weather/TNX and that's it. If an
actual
> > conversation ensues, I'm sure no one (except the jerks I know of) would
> > waste their time getting carpal tunnel with cursing in CW.
> >
>
> There you are wrong. There are many extensive conversations on CW. They
> converse about the same things voice operators do. I've heard them
talking
> about their careers, families, computers, buying and selling on ebay and a
> myriad of other topics.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Wow, most of the CW operators I've known even state that all they "pretty much" do is exchange information. Most of them also only use it during a contest, though. Maybe that's the difference.

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

411. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:45:39 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgn5ojrte1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73774

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bgkdpp$108$0@208.207.71.135...
>
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > news:bgk9k5$1u3$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> > > CW is mostly callsign/whereabouts/weather/TNX and that's it. If an
actual
> > > conversation ensues, I'm sure no one (except the jerks I know of)
would
> > > waste their time getting carpal tunnel with cursing in CW.
> > >
> >
> > There you are wrong. There are many extensive conversations on CW.
They
> > converse about the same things voice operators do. I've heard them
talking
> > about their careers, families, computers, buying and selling on ebay and
a
> > myriad of other topics.
>
> Dee, don't waste your time trying to convince Kim with facts. Her mind,
such as
> it is, is already made up.
>

Still sniping, Dick? You sure are a chicken...

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

412. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:52:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308041852.189fdc9a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73775

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bgjbkt$g21$0@208.206.142.66>...

> She's the daughter of Sargent Shriver, who married a sister to JFK.

Now that's an important factoid. Speaking of coders and the
Kennedy's; do you think that if Ted had a knee-key...

413. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:52:33 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgn65i$s6s$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73776

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F2DC5F3.D3D53968@earthlink.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Does one have to be in ham
> > > > radio exactly as long as you, be as old as you, have been on HF SSB
and
> > CW
> > > > as much as you, before you think they're "worthy?"
> > >
> > > Why no, Kim. Then again, I didn't write anything like that. Perhaps
you
> > > just had a feeling...
> > >
> >

Yeah, all folks like you like to do is "imply" and then get all uppity and
persnickity when you're asked about your implication.

Let me ask it this way: WHY do you even mention the number of years of
licensure, or for how long certain classes of licensure may have been held,
or under what regulations that licensure was achieved? Why bring it up?

I've stopped here on your post, so if there's any *real* pertinent stuff,
I've missed it...

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

414. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:53:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2F1ADF.9E64A43D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73777

Brian wrote:
>
> Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message news:<878yqa8dk3.fld@barrow.com>...
>
> > One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
> > Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
> > breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
> > that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
> > just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.
>
> Sad, but true. But they don't see it that way.

Likely because it is a fairy tale. Leonard would need assistance to eat
mush for breakfast. You've been asked if you're his acolyte. I think
it would be more fitting if you were to be known as his electrolyte.

> One David Heil demands licensed participation in the ARS.

Maybe one of 'em demands such but it isn't this one.

> But when
> confronted with mere Technician participation in the ARS that rivals
> his Extraness, he digs in and destroys.

That claim is a non-starter as it is in conflict with what I've written
here very recently.

> Or at least he tries to.

Or at least you attempt to let on that he does.

> Then there is Extra DICK. Probably Extra in every way except the dick
> department. Then there's Jim "DeSoda" who keeps rewriting "200 Meters
> and Up." No need to mention INSANE Clown Posse in a Nurse's dress or
> the civilian with "real" military experience.

What's your claim to credibility?

Dave K8MN

415. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:57:13 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgn6easfr1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73778

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F2DC67E.2A7EE8E5@earthlink.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F2C91B4.3568C4C2@earthlink.net...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > news:<bggi7g$pu7$2@adenine.netfront.net>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You are quite dislikable, whether you realize it or not. And you
do
> > seem to
> > > > > > approach life from the comfort zone...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > >
> > > > > Probably from a lifetime of work and play in a radio shack. He
needs
> > > > > to get out more often.
> > > >
> > > > I get out very well on any number of bands.
> >
> > Ham radio is a pretend zone of life, Dave.
>
> No, Kim. It isn't.
>
>
> > They all pretend to be friendly, gregarious individuals.
>
> Who? The folks in Wichita? Presbyterian Church elders?
>
> > Most hams I've met in real life? I won't mention...
>
> It's probably a lucky thing for them. Maybe you've been pretending to
> be gregarious and friendly.
>
> Dave K8MN

You're a massive waste of time, Dave. Go play with Len...

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

416. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:57:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308041857.18ab5676@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73779

Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message news:<87u18zbu74.fld@barrow.com>...

> He's also one of the most fun people to poke with a stick, just to
> see what he can imagine next.

He's supposed to be a "Show Me" kind of guy. But we keep showing him
and showing him.

Maybe he's a "See No Evil" kind of guy, but he sees evil behind ever
corner.

Maybe he's just DICK.

417. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 02:59:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2F1C58.D8461F2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73780

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2EE319.3FA91B69@earthlink.net>...
> > Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >
> > > One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
> > > Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
> > > breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
> > > that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
> > > just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.
> >
> > Izzat Len's function here, Floyd? I was always of the opinion that
> > Leonard H. was MY cheap form of entertainment.
>
> Chalk it up to a lack of understanding.

I have: Floyd's. I can add you if you like.

> > Of all the posters here,
> > I can't think of one invidual less relevant to amateur radio's past,
> > present or future--not that much of anything he sez is great or exactly
> > correct.

>
> Whatever he say is probably more relavent than working out of band
> Frenchmen on 6M.

It may be "relavent" but it isn't relevant and more than your attempted
diversion.

> Especially the part about Korean War teletype
> operations.

Oh, yeah! That was loaded with useful information relating to amateur
radio. Len has admitted a decades-long interest in amateur radio. Len
has been posting here for over seven years. He hasn't acted on his
amateur radio fanstasy in those decades and he hasn't acted on it in
seven years. Len's avocation is posting to a usenet group devoted to
soemthing in which he is a non-participant. You're his little
electrolyte.

Dave K8MN

418. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:00:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308041900.5dac20b7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73781

Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message news:<87r8426n9u.fld@barrow.com>...
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:

> >73 de Larry (that's MISTER Roll to you), K3LT
>
> Two faced hypocrite.
>
> If she makes one insulting gester and that means she is
> "petulant", what do the dozens and dozens that you post make
> you?

Flatulent.

419. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:01:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308041901.69702450@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73782
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bglpdb$83p$1@208.206.142.74>...
> Rich wrote:
>
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
> > news:BB5399A8.1FFBF%stewart@say.net...
> > >
> > > If the FCC has //drivel snipped//
>
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> >
> > If you know so much, how come you are still just
> > a Technician Class?
>
>
>
> SURPRISE! It's that dastardly Morris code!

It must be dastardly if you're so willing to send it poorly.

420. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:02:10 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2F1CDE.15ACE6B8@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73783

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:0ciXa.15969$Vx2.8220036@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > news:bgk9k5$1u3$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> > > CW is mostly callsign/whereabouts/weather/TNX and that's it. If an
> actual
> > > conversation ensues, I'm sure no one (except the jerks I know of) would
> > > waste their time getting carpal tunnel with cursing in CW.
> > >
> >
> > There you are wrong. There are many extensive conversations on CW. They
> > converse about the same things voice operators do. I've heard them
> talking
> > about their careers, families, computers, buying and selling on ebay and a
> > myriad of other topics.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> Wow, most of the CW operators I've known even state that all they "pretty
> much" do is exchange information. Most of them also only use it during a
> contest, though. Maybe that's the difference.

Interesting data, Kim. Do you have evidence that your anecdotal tale is
indicative of national stats--or do you just have a feeling?

Dave K8MN

421. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:05:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2F1DA4.B76F9D30@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73784

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3F2DC5F3.D3D53968@earthlink.net...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > Does one have to be in ham
> > > > > radio exactly as long as you, be as old as you, have been on HF SSB
> and
> > > > CW
> > > > > as much as you, before you think they're "worthy?"
> > > > >
> > > > Why no, Kim. Then again, I didn't write anything like that. Perhaps
> you
> > > > just had a feeling...
> > > > >
> > > >
> >
> Yeah, all folks like you like to do is "imply" and then get all uppity and
> persnickity when you're asked about your implication.

Folks "like you" snipe at my comments directed toward Carl and not at
Carl for his comments to Larry. Don't get all uppity with me, Kim.

> Let me ask it this way: WHY do you even mention the number of years of
> licensure, or for how long certain classes of licensure may have been held,
> or under what regulations that licensure was achieved? Why bring it up?

Here's a two-parter for you, Kim.

a) Because I am free to do so.

b) I chose to do so.

> I've stopped here on your post, so if there's any *real* pertinent stuff,
> I've missed it...

Well, it won't be the first time.

Dave K8MN

422. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:08:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2F1E3B.710BEB1B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73785

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3F2DC67E.2A7EE8E5@earthlink.net...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3F2C91B4.3568C4C2@earthlink.net...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > > news:<bggi7g$pu7$2@adenine.netfront.net>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You are quite dislikable, whether you realize it or not. And you
> do
> > > seem to
> > > > > > approach life from the comfort zone...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > > >
> > > > > Probably from a lifetime of work and play in a radio shack. He
> needs
> > > > > to get out more often.
> > > > >
> > > > I get out very well on any number of bands.
> > >
> > > Ham radio is a pretend zone of life, Dave.
> >
> > No, Kim. It isn't.
> >
> >
> > > They all pretend to be friendly, gregarious individuals.
> >
> > Who? The folks in Wichita? Presbyterian Church elders?
> >
> > > Most hams I've met in real life? I won't mention...
> >
> > It's probably a lucky thing for them. Maybe you've been pretending to
> > be gregarious and friendly.

> You're a massive waste of time, Dave.

Run out of comments or did I just hit a nerve?

> Go play with Len...

He wasn't available but you stepped up to the plate.

Dave K8MN

423. Re: !Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:09:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030804230933.15462.00002066@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 73793

In article <%ErXa.2517$lL.412629@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>> Radio shack was a great place for a young person interested in electronics
>> to work in the early '70's. Today's R/S employees are nothing like us
>"old
>> timers" used to be.
>
>Baloney ... I've (tried to) buy parts from time to time at R/S ... the folks
>20 or more years ago were just as clueless as today from my experience.

Carl:

Nobody's going to deny that, especially not me! My own store manager
didn't know what the difference between a resistor and a capacitor was!
However, I'm willing to bet that in the early to mid-70's, there were a lot
more technically knowledgeable RS employees than there are now.

>>Today, I go into a R/S store and ask them about a
>> pay-as-you-go cell phone plan that they have mentioned on their own
>> store displays, and they don't know anything about it! Nothing technical,
>> just a matter of knowing the specifics of the plan! Sheez! My brother
>Tom
>> told me one of the best stories about current R/S cluelessness: He
>> went in to his local store and asked for a particular Operational
>Amplifier.
>> The salesfreak indignantly replied, "All of our amplifiers work, Sir!"
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>I knew that sooner or later this thread vis a vis Larry's history as
>a CBer/radio shack employee would draw out the "But things
>were different in the good old days and we were/are better than
>the newbies today! ego trip ... :-)

Well, Carl, that's just the reality of the situation. You do understand
the concept of reality, don't you?

73 de Larry, K3LT

424. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:09:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030804230934.15462.00002068@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 73787

In article <87r8426n9u.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
writes:

>
>Two faced hypocrite.
>
>If she makes one insulting gester and that means she is
>"petulant", what do the dozens and dozens that you post make
>you?

I dunno, Floyd. Let's look them over. Please repost AT LEAST one DOZEN
of my "insulting gestures" and we'll examine them, one by one. C'mon,
now, get busy with Google and post a dozen of my insulting gestures, or
you're the hypocrite!

73 de Larry, K3LT

425. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:09:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030804230934.15462.00002067@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 73794

In article <bgki1i$da1$0@208.207.71.171>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>> You see, sweetheart, this is just the kind of thing I'm talking about. It
>> is quite juvenile to be making insulting hand gestures on Usenet!
>
>Naw, Larry, she's mooning you !

Dick:

I don't think so. If she were mooning me, it would be more like this:

|
|
____________________|____________________

Her puny little __|__ would be more like J.Lo. mooning me! And nobody's
ever gonna mistake Kim's derriï¿½re for J.Lo's!!! Kim was clearly making a
hand gesture.

73 de Larry, K3LT

426. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:09:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030804230935.15462.00002070@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 73786

In article <3F2E675E.16905547@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> We should have known ... "Radio Shack, you've got questions, we're
>> clueless,"
>> I'm sure Larry fit in quite well.
>
>So where is Kim? Shouldn't she be jumping on Carl over irrelevant
>comments directed at Larry?

I don't think so, Dave. That wouldn't serve her agenda -- whatever
that is!

73 de Larry, K3LT

427. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:09:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030804230935.15462.00002069@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 73788

In article <BB53B168.1FFC3%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>
> Don't worry, Larry. Her opinion of you isn't likely to go down simply
>because somebody else complimented her. I don't think Kim's (at least
>stated) opinion of you could go down much further.

Dwight:

Whew! Thanks! I will sleep a lot better tonight knowing that Kim's
opinion of me is just as irrelevant to my life as it's always been!

73 de Larry, K3LT

428. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:09:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030804230936.15462.00002071@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 73789

In article <2jDXa.2602$lL.423121@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>
>Dave ... it's not irrelevant ... Larry has always spoken quite freely of his
>disdain for CBers and other "lower forms of life" (knuckle-draggers, etc.)
>
>The fact that Larry was a CBer, yet talks down to folks with such a
>superior attitude, shows what a hypocrite he is ...

Carl:

On the contrary. The fact that I'm an ex-CB'er just shows that I'm honest,
and that I'm qualified to talk about CB'ers. If I were a hypocrite, I'd have
denied that I ever was a CB'er.

73 de Larry, K3LT

429. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:09:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030804230937.15462.00002072@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 73792

In article <f45722ac.0308032000.2d19eaf1@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Carl:
>>
>> Brian made the statement that "Extras" such as Dick, Dan, Bruce, and
>> myself wish to "destroy the amateur radio service." Obviously, he thinks
>> we want to do this because we *are* PCTA's, and see the value of retaining
>> code testing (what's left of it) in the ARS. In other words, because we
>> don't agree with him and the NCTA's, we want to "destroy" the ARS.
>
>No, no, no, no, no. It has nothing to do with your disagreements with
>me.
>
>Larry, right after you told that guy not to let the door hit him in
>the ass on his way out of the ARS,

Brian:

Damn considerate of me, wasn't it?

>you said that the FCC ought to take
>all the VHF and up amateur bands and sell them to the highest bidder.

Believe me, they're think of doing just that!

>Or was that after you said who was your favorite black on the bus?

That would have been the driver (at the time).

>Or
>was it after you said something about the knuckle dragging 4-lander
>with the southern accent?

You mean the ones stinking up the 75-meter band? Yup, that's them,
all right!

>Maybe it was after you talked about the
>welfare mother of color with her hand out?

I just saw her at the Food Lion the other day. Only then, her hand was
full of USDA Food Coupons. It must have worked! Sure beats living
a moral lifestyle and working for a living, eh? But that's OK, you and I
will just keep working hard and paying our taxes, so when she sticks
her hand out again, there will be something to put in it! We can't let
all her Chillen With The Different Last Names go hungry now, can we?
I'm sure their fathers appreciate our efforts!

>In any case, you wanted to destroy the ARS for the no-code
>Technicians, and it had nothing to do with me.

No, Brian, the No-code Techs are doing a good enough job of that themselves, without my help! However, I will say one thing -- when I push buttons around here, they sure seem to stay pushed! Nice to know I'm not losing my touch!

73 de Larry, K3LT

430. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:09:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030804230939.15462.00002073@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 73791

In article <_rrXa.2515$lL.412652@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>
>I've seen quite a bit of the "If I don't get my way, I'll take my ball and
>go
>home." attitude ... you, Larry, for one have said in the past something
>to the effect that "If code testing is eliminated, they might as well just
>auction our bands off to the commercial folks." (perhaps not an exact
>quote, but pretty darned close and certainly conveying the meaning of
>what you've said ...)

Carl:

Yes, I did say that. And it still seems like a good idea to me, considering
what the future prospects for the ARS are looking like. After all, we're
hoarding literally billions of dollars worth of commercially-viable spectrum,
most of which isn't being used by us (hams) for a damn thing worth
talking about. I'm sure we'll always have most of our HF allocations, but
I expect we're gonna lose big time above 500 MHz or so. And that, in
reference to another post, is just my concept of "reality."

>> AFAIC, when the FCC finally gives us a No-Code Test ARS licensing
>> system, the "destruction" of our hobby/service is self-assured. About
>> the best we can hope for is for the NCTA's to continue with their
>traditional
>> apathy and laziness, and somehow not flock to the ARS in any great
>> numbers. We would also require the assistance of the ARRL and the
>> FCC to resist the urge to expand HF phone spectrum, but I don't see that
>> as something the ARRL would do, so the FCC will be happy to oblige
>> when the petitions start coming in. In any case, the future of the ARS
>> looks bleak, and it will be the non-code tested "newcomers" who will
>> be administering the coup de gras.
>>
>> BTW, Carl -- the only reason you're an "Extra" is because you waited until
>> the code test was dumbed down to a maximum of 5 WPM. That's not being
>> a Real Extra(tm) in the opinion of any of the traditional PCTA's. You're
>> just a wannabe Extra Pretender who got in on an Affirmative Action
>> program.
>
>Over 32 years as an RF Engineer, recognized in my profession, and I'm
>"not good enough" for the likes of you and Dick? Not sure whether to
>ROTFLMAO or gag/puke ...

What do 32 years of RF engineering experience have to do with ham radio,
Carl? I'll admit that it's handy to have guys like you around, but most of

the hams I know have no professional-level technical skills whatsoever. We are radio AMATEURS. Your professional credentials are recognized within your profession for good reason -- you deserve such recognition -- WITHIN YOUR PROFESSION. As a radio amateur, however, you're no better than any other dumbed-down Extra-Lite who waited for years to get around the requirement to learn and be tested for a useful communications skill. Sorry about that, my friend, but that's just the TRVTH.

73 de Larry, K3LT

431. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:09:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030804230940.15462.00002074@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 73790

In article <XtrXa.2516$lL.412622@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>
>Yes, Larry, it is an appropriate and astute question that Kim asked.
>
>You PCTAs are so freaking out of touch with reality that it makes it
>so ...
>
>Carl - wk3c

Carl:

Hmmm. How interesting. We're not just "out of touch with reality," we're "freaking out of touch with reality." That sounds a bit severe! Just what, may I axe, makes us PCTA's so "freaking" out of touch with reality? Is it because we believe in the usefulness of the Morse code, and the need to have code testing so prospective hams get the opportunity to be exposed to it? Or is it just that we disagree with the NCTA and NCI, and are able to express our opinions with clarity and conviction? It's gotta be something along those lines!

73 de Larry, K3LT

432. Re: Ed Hare (W1RFI) of the ARRL on BPL replies to comments

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:10:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308041910.4fc7c186@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73795

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bgkbgpudf0@208.207.71.165>...
> Rob Kemp wrote:
>
> > It is not just amateur radio that is at risk
> > here, but any use of HF that operates near BPL installations>
>
> As well as any other radio system operating over a wide area up to the 80
> MHz
> limit planned. Public safety comes immediately to mind since I worked in
> that fielf.

You worked in that filth?

I know that a number of states presently still use low band
> VHF for state police communications using direct car to base systems as
> well as many crossband repeaters with receivers covering considerable
> areas operating on frequencies between 40 and 50 MHz.

Since you are an Extra in that filth, you might want to suggest that they move.

> I worked as a field engineer in such a system and RF noise was an
> ongoing problem.

I'm sure Roosterpoop, MO is a hot rf environment.

And with the FM systems in use, often the noise will
> simply keep the squelch closed and the recever won't be aware that the
> transmitting station is attempting a call.

That's bad news.

> I recall one such particularly troublesome repeater where that would
> occur and by the time I could drive to the repeater site the "phantom"
> problem was gone. After several unproductive tries, I finally found the
> source of the noise- a welder in a shop about a half mile from the
> repeater site which welded only ocassionally, and those times just
> happened to coincide with the repeater desense problems.

I thought all spark transmitters had to be registered.

We wound up
> relocating that repeater because of it.

We?

> If that sort of situation can virtually shut down a single low band
> repeater I can only simagine the sort of wide area problems could be
> caused by BPL.

>
> Dick

Just simagine it.

433. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:20:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308041920.341aecae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73796

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F2EBC38.1917F426@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bgj71t$2ffe$1@adenine.netfront.net>...
> >
> > > Then, why the opening remarks then and now, with this post, about how long
> > > Carl was a Tech and his alledged comments on CW? Why enter that into your
> > > remarks at all, Dave, if not to cast attention to that? If you are casting
> > > attention to that, then why?
> >
> > Dave has a problem with the old Techs, the Tech Plusses, and
> > presumably the Techs with Code.
>
> I didn't address those you mention. I addressed Carl.

Exactly. You continued to address Carl as if he were a Tech. Which
he is not.

> > They aren't 13wpm hams. They aren't
> > worthy to share his band space.
>
> No, they haven't been tested at 13 wpm or at 20 wpm. I didn't address
> that issue.

Oh, my. Oh, dear. You merely addressed Carl's tenure on the
Technician band space.

> > Now that Carl can share Dave's band space...

> Carl may share some space with me.

Carl can share any space with you that he wishes. That is what the
FCC mean's by issuing him an Extra license. Get used to it. Naw,
nevermind.

There are plenty of areas on a
> number of bands where I doubt I'll run into Carl. Come to think of it,
> I doubt I'll run into you in those spots.

Duh! I don't have Extra priv's, Oh Master of Amateur Radio!!!

Go work some Frenchmen on 6M. I've heard they've got all kinds of
priveleges!!!

Hi, hi (maniacal laughing in Morse with or without Steve's shoes).

Sebentee Tree, Brian

434. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:23:41 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030804232341.20076.00000977@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 73798

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)

> You won't ID the club, any of the members,
I have more respect than that.

>What was said was >>YOU<< are back to telling "them" where thier
>interests should lay.

And neither should they tell me what my interests should be. Like, telling people at club meetings that they should learn Morse code. Or, suggesting I should learn Morse code when I participate in antenna setups or at Ham gatherings.

>You constantly barrage this NG
>with YOUR interpretation of what Amatuer Radio should be and how
>"wrong" other Amateurs are for not following THAT doctrine.

Like the current group of Hams do in their groups?

> If the "95%" is clay,
Okay, makes sense.

>and the
>"5%" is gold, then isn't it worth it to you to get your blue jeans a
>bit dirty...???

That 5% is gold at the end of a rainbow (it doesn't exist).

435. Re: Some comments on the NCVEC petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:23:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308041923.7241309b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73797

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bglplb$8n5$0@208.206.142.74>...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >
> > The point is that morse is a character set, and the test is a skill
> > test based on speed of ability, not simple knowledge on a par
> > with written test questions.
>
> Yes, thast *is* the point, indeed. As you well know being able to recognize Morse
> characters written on paper has nothing whatever to do with copying in off a radio. It
> exhibits so little knowledge as to be of no value.
> No one can copy by ear or any other way with no more than that.
>
> Which shows yojust how flawed and clueless the entire No Code Agenda has always been.

DICK, rewrite that in Engrish 100 times. On the blackboard. With chalk.

436. Re: Comment On This News Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:25:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308041925.161d4eeb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73799

"The Moderator" <TM@foxtrot.com> wrote in message
news:<MMuXa.26296$ff.14911@fed1read01>...
> Comment On This News Group
>
> There is a lot of good stuff here

I don't think so. That's why I leave it so often.

I like the people on yahoo NVIS. They're not all screwed up with the code.

437. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:36:57 UTC
From: Uri <slip@sparphoneyorg.net>
Message-ID: <bgn8nk$9oc$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73800
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj3o16v.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Mon, 4 Aug 2003 13:16:30 -0400, Rich wrote:
>
> > So says you, but according to www.fcc.gov they ARE all closed.
>
> Read it again....they are UNMANNED and therefore closed to the
> public. They are all operated by remote control from Laurel/Columbia,
MD.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
Hey stupid ass, I did read it. THEY ARE ALL
CLOSED, KAPUT, DISMANTLED!!!!!!!!!!!!!
Do you comprehend the standard English that the web
is written in ?????????????? Remote Control?
Geeeee, does the remote control use a standard 9 volt
battery??? Take your petty ham disputes to 14313.

Uri

438. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:40:49 UTC
From: Uri <slip@sparphoneyorg.net>
Message-ID: <bgn8us$a99$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73801
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj3nw0u.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 4 Aug 2003 07:38:22 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >"N22X" <N22X@sherzfordzent.com> wrote in message
news:<bgj1ml$nt4$0@pita.alt.net>...
> >
> >> Since the FCC closed all their monitoring stations seven
> >> years ago,
> >
> >The FCC did *not* close all their monitoring stations.
>
> In fact when the monitoring stations were remoted, an additional
> one was added. The station at Canandaigua, NY was brought back on
> line after being closed for a number of years (it was used as the
> test bed for developing the remote control system).
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
Canadaigua is listed as having been
turned over to the FAA as an back-up air control site!!!!!
All the monitoring stations have been dismantled. Do you
understand standard English?????????????

Uri

439. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:41:17 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030804234117.20076.00000980@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 73802

From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

>So the activity in the photograph never really took place?

Its possible, that it was some kind of demo setup for a guest speaker and the club members just sat there. That could be one explanation.

>> I can ask people in that photograph if they are interested in
>> homebrewing and that person will say he is not interested in homebrewing.
>
>"Will say" or "has said"? If you haven't asked, you don't know.

This photo was taken before I joined the club. Many of the people in the photo are still in the club.

Just look at the majority of activities. Not one has been a homebrew activity since I joined the clubs. Yet, currently that photo is shown. This seems like some kind of misrepresentation.

I could ask a few people in the photo if they like homebrewing. Then, I could take one step further, and ask them why they posed for a homebrew photo if they do not like to homebrew. I would have to bring the photo with me, and track down specific people. That kind of questioning could get too weird.

>> It won't do much good to show them the other aspect that
>> "could" exist, but does not exist for them.
>
>If you are the individual doing the showing, those folks could have a
>gut full of misinformation in no time.

Thats a good challenge. Lets introduce a new person to a Hamfest and see what that person's impression of Ham radio is.

>You begin with false assumptions and attempt to
>prove them to be true.

I didn't begin with any assumptions. I noticed these things at Hamfests.

440. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:42:38 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgn93euac1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73803

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030804082114.27503.00001423@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <bgk9k5$1u3$1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:

[Preface: this message is rather confusing to try and keep attributes on, so
I hope I do a decent job of it]

>
> >> >> The point is, what does passing a CW test prove in the way of
> >> >> knowledge--other than that one can pass a CW test?
>
> >> It proves that:
>
> >> 1) The person has learned a useful radio skill at a very basic level.
>
> >Then, why not have a "net operation" test? Net operation is fairly
> >standard. That's as basic a level as you can get: everyone understands
the
> >English Language (at least those who are testing for a US amateur radio
> >license).
>
> Actually, based on some postings here, understanding of English should not
be
> taken for granted!
>
> Net operation test? Good idea! In fact, I have posted suggestions here
about a
> similar (but simpler) test. Basic idea was that the person taking the
test
> would demonstrate the ability to send and receive simple messages in
standard
> form using either CW/Morse, voice, or a data mode. I can google up the
details
> if you want.
>

Well. No, you don't have to do that. I believe you ;) I think it's a
great idea to have some such thing like that.

>
> However, when I proposed such a test as a replacement for the code test,
there
> was universal opposition from nocodetest folks. That's when I realized

that for
> some of the loudest complainers here it wasn't really about the code at
all,
> but about the idea of operating skills and standard procedures.
>

They had a problem with the way you say you proposed it: as a choice of
either CW/Morse, voice, or a data mode?! Geeze, that is whining! Because I
don't have a problem with that at all. In fact, even if the CW test hangs
around, I think the presentation of it ought to be in net format. The
questions could be something like, "who was the net control station," etc.

> >>
> >> 2) The person was willing and able to devote the time and effort
necessary
> >> to learn that skill.
>
> >That has nothing to do with their participation in ham radio.
>
> So? There's no requirement that any licensee actually participate. There
used
> to be, btw.
>

I understand that. I also understand there used to be requirement for
upgrading with a certain amount of time. I know that is why there is such a
population of folks who think it's an all-out sin to stay as a Novice, Tech,
etc.

BUT, the current requirements do not mandate that a licensee participate; so
why have that as part of a scope for an amateur radio license? If the
requirement for participation hours comes back, *then* include testing
parameters that will measure a person's willingness, devotion...

> >>
> >> 3) The person has been exposed to a useful, widely-used-by-hams radio
> >> communications mode other than voice or data.
>
> >Like I said, then test on voice. It's the widest-used-by-hams radio
> >communication. Why not test the most used mode?
>
> Why test what almost everyone can do?
>

I think your proposal is similar to the idea of "testing voice." Use a test
that measures the capability of one to conform to net standards. While nets
all have different *styles* the standards are pretty much throughout.

>
> My proposed message-skills test would have left the choice of mode up to
the
> person being tested. What could be fairer?

>

Absolutely! I hope you don't think I'd have a problem with something like
that?

>
> >> Then your knowledge of amateur radio is very lacking. Like it or not,
> >> CW/Morse
> >> is a very big part of amateur radio today. Of course, that by itself
> >> doesn't prove we must have a code test.
>
> >Thank you.
>
> You're welcome.
>
> > And, was that you acquiescing?
>
> Nope.
>
> When you boil down all the arguments, almost everything on any ARS license
test
> (real or proposed) comes down to somebody's opinion on what's important
and
> what isn't. Proof just doesn't exist, one way or the other. Take Ohm's
Law -
> why MUST it be tested? Some hams do perfectly well with little or no
knowledge
> of it, and yet it's on the tests because somebody thinks it's important
enough
> to force it down everyone's throats.
>

True, but you reasoned that the parts of the testing process I have a
problem with were for measure of devotion, and such. We are not discussing,
really, what is important in ham radio for--truly--the only real important
thing for ham radio is that one comprehend, be familiar with, and employ the
Rules and Regulations from the FCC; and become familiar with the "ways" of
ham radio (gentelmen's agreements, standard communication protocols, etc.)

While unpopular for ham radio, if someone doesn't take the time to "be
careful" in building equipment, putting up and antenna, building
this-or-that, it is generally them that is going to get hurt. Advertisement
of a few tragedies and people are going to get the idea that they need some
independent study to be safe in what they do with ham radio. No net
control, RACES or ARES Coordinator is going to turn loose an inexperienced,
rough rider of a ham onto the general public. So, IMHO, the only true
measure for ham licensing should be through a written test that measures
knowledge of the FCC R&R, the Communications Act, etc.

HOWEVER; I concede and certainly will agree to keep CW testing, because I do
believe in *some* of the traditions of ham radio; and CW is one of them. I
also like your idea and would support something like that.

>
> >> >> It's bad enough that the written tests don't prove a whole lot,
without
> >> >> the added argument of CW in the mix. To continue to support CW as
> >> >> some form of
> >> >> proof that people know more about ham radio, know more about >>
> >> >> communication,
> >> >> know more about the standards and technology of ham radio, et al, is
to
> >> >> continue to do nothing but whine about a tradition--which is really
all
> >> >> CW really is: A TRADITION that no one wants to see fade away.
>
> >> You are mistaken on several counts there, Kim.
>
> >> 1) The written tests are what they are. They are in a continuing state
of
> >> development.
>
> >> 2) ALL ELSE BEING EQUAL, a ham who has Morse skills knows more about
> >> amateur radio than one with no Morse skills.
>
> >I disagree. A ham who has CW skills knows more about CW than one with no
>CW
> skills.
>
> And since CW/Morse is a big important part of amateur radio, a ham who has
CW
> skills knows more about amateur radio than one with no CW skills.
>

I think we are splitting hairs, here.

>
> You cannot escape that conclusion. Of course, that conclusion does not
prove
> that CW must have its own test, just that "ALL ELSE BEING EQUAL, a ham who
has
> Morse skills knows more about amateur radio than one with no Morse
skills."
>

We will have to agree to disagree on this one.

> >>
> >> 3) Morse/CW has certain advantages to hams beyond being "just another
> >> mode".
>
> >That does not merit a CW test.
>
> In your opinion. In others' opinions, it does.
>

Well, certainly. I'm puzzled here. I always deal in opinions.

> >>
> >> 4) Morse/CW is more than "just a tradition". It's a useful mode of
radio
> >> communication enjoyed by hundreds of thousands of hams.
>
> >That does not merit a CW test.
>
> In your opinion. In others' opinions, it does.
>

(see above)

> >>
> >> 5) There do exist folks who want Morse/CW USE (not just the TEST) by
hams
> >> to simply go away. They are a very small minority, but they do exist.
Or at
> >> least
> >> there are people whose rhetoric indicates they want Morse use by hams
to
> >> end.
>
> >That's their problem, not mine. I don't believe CW will ever exit from
the
> >ham radio scene.
>
> I hope you are right about that.
>
> >> Of course, whether all of that "proves" we must have a code test is
simply
> >> a matter of opinion.
>
> >> >> Passing CW is nothing.
>
> >> Maybe not to you. To others, it's a big deal.
>
> >Well, I worded that wrong. Passing CW is a big deal, but it does nothing
> >for the benefit of ham radio, save that that particular operator may use
> >CW--but that particular operator would probably have used CW anyway,
then.
>
> If it does nothing, why all the fuss?.
>

ABSOLUTELY!!!!!!!! Why, Jim? A cursory explanation from me would be: 1)
that CW is such a tradition that any attempt to alter its state is seen as
an assault on a very beloved part of ham radio, 2) that, to many, change is
very difficult; mostly to reason seekers, i.e., if any change is made to CW
is must mean _____ and that CW will fade from the ARS, 3) there is
some degree of....well, jealousy would be a lousy term...but some degree of

bad feeling for others not having to be "raked through the coals" to get their license, and 4) the longheld belief that CW study to pass a test proves what you and I are debating here.

But, the root of your question: "why all the fuss" gets a whole ABSOLUTELY from me. Why all the fuss?

[Snipped, but hopefully illuminated below:]
> >>
> >> That's simply illogical. No test, no matter how contrived, will filter out
> >> every single "jerk" from the ranks of amateur radio. Or anything else, for
> >> that matter.
>
> >I know that, and you know that. But others here either don't know that or
> >don't want to let go of that part of the argument.
>
> I've never seen anyone argue that a code test is a perfect "jerk filter". I
> have seen people argue that it is not a "jerk filter" at all. I've also seen
> arguments that since it's not a perfect "jerk filter", it has no effect at all
> on "jerks".
>

The phrase "dumbing down" comes to mind. Most of us would agree that jerks are dumb. If CW testing is supported to the extent that to lose it is to "dumb down" the ARS, and bring the CBers in, and...well, you know all the comments; then isn't that an acknowledgement of the belief that, somehow, the CW test keeps all that from happening? Like I said, you and I know that it doesn't; but there are those who believe it does.

> >>
> >> Look at how much it takes just to become a physician. The training and
> >> testing
> >> required is phenomenal, and designed to weed out the incapable. The hard
> >> work
> >> and dedication required just to get into medical school are extraordinary,
> >> and
> >> yet that's just the beginning. I could go on and on, but you get the
> >> picture.
>
> >I will not argue the merit of CW testing against the measure of training and
> >testing for a professional field. There is no reason to put someone through

> >the same stressful training and testing that a physician goes through,
for
> >an amateur radio license.
>
> Apparently you did not get the picture at all.
>
> The point is simply that NO test or training is a perfect "jerk filter",
not
> even at the level of what doctors go through.
> >

I would not argue that, as noted above.

> >> >>
> >> >> Using CW as a test to prove "diligence" to the desire of wanting to
be
> >> >> a ham radio operator is pure crap in my not-so-humble opinion.
>
> >> OK, fine. At least you note that it's your opinion.
>

Jim, all my statements are my opinion. Can I ask you what in the world else
you think they would be?

> >
> >One would hope, Jim, that everyone realizes we post our opinions.
>
> We post both opinions and objective facts. The problem is that some folks
try
> to pass off their opinions as objective facts.
>

I hope I don't do that. If I do, it is not intentional.

> >> >>
> >> >> It is wrong to even attempt to measure someone's desire and
interest.
>
> >> Why? I'd rather have an ARS consisting of a few hundred thousand
> >> interested,
> >> active, dedicated, skilled, knowledgeable hams than one of a few
million
> >> inactive, apathetic, unskilled, ignorant ones who could not care less.
> >> Code test or no code test.
>
> >And, I'd rather have *everyone.*
>
> That means there should be no tests and no qualifications at all. We've
seen
> what happens to a radio service that takes that route. No thanks.
>

Well, then let me clarify that I mean I would have everyone who meets whatever requirements there is currently when they are "applying." Maybe it's only here, but I tell you I have seen more crappy people--those who would probably earn the title lid, cbplusser, etc.--get wiped off the air because of being ignored. Now, if the floodgates opened and there is not a testing structure of some kind, or a licensing structure of some kind, ham radio would certainly become a cesspool. Remember that CB radio used to be much better until the FCC relaxed regulations there; or, more to the point, quit enforcement opportunities there.

> >> >>
> >> >> If I have an Extra
> >> >> license and I have no equipment or haven't even been on the radio in
> >> >> years,
> >> >> then what did passing CW prove, in terms of proven interest?
Nothing.
> >> >> And it never will.
>
> >> Incorrect. It proved that at one time the person had the interest.
>
> >Oh, wow...
>
> When's the last time YOU were on the ham bands, Kim?
>

A looooong time ago; but I am still interested. And, m'darlin' is putting his radio back in his truck so I imagine we'll be full fledged again soon. By the way, I understand it is quite common for people to drop out, come back, drop out, come back, etc.

> >>
> >> Because those modes don't require the acquisition of new skills for
their
> >> use.
> >
> >Uh, 'scuse me? They require being able to establish communication
between
> >devices, have the signal within a certain bandwidth, etc.
>
> Plug 'n' play, Kim. No test for that. Does it really take a lot of skill
to use
> an HT?
>

Nope, but let's say it is a test requirement to put together an APRS station, under the guidelines and equipment that was available only up to about five years ago. It is NOT easy, and at that time everything had to wired yourself, or you could pay a much-higher-than-I-was-willing price--but for testing we'd leave out the order for the wiring harness. That is using a TNC, radio, GPS receiver, and we could even through in the computer for a full APRS station. Not easy. In fact, even with my much more technical husband on board, we still had to call to North Carolina and have a elmer

walk us through the way to do it! I'd have failed a ham test for
sure--wouldn't Dick and Larry and Dave just love that!

> >>
> >> But note this plain, simple fact: Almost all of the FCC enforcement
> >> actions for
> >> "jerk-like" on-air behavior (obscenity, jamming, failure to ID,
exceeeding
> >> license privileges, etc., etc.) are against hams using PHONE modes, not
> >> CW/Morse or data modes. ALL of us have taken written tests detailing
what
> >> we
> >> should and should not do on the air, but it seems like violations are
much
> >> more
> >> prevalent among the talkers than the brasspounders or keyboarders. Why?
>
> >I've already said that there are probably more reasons for that than it
> >being because a CW operator is a finer person than others who are not.
>
> " a CW operator is a finer person than others who are not. " Has a nice
ring to
> it...
>

heh heh, I knew you were going to like that.

Nothing could be finer than to handle my brass keyer in the mornin'
Nothing could be finer than to hear the longs n shorts in my speaker hornin
(poetic license there)

Anyway...

>
> Carpal tunnel? Not a problem - the side-to-side motion of a bug or paddles
> avoids CTS, while the up-and-down motion of keyboards promotes it. Just
another
> advantage of CW...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

441. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:45:22 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgn98j$ud0$1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73804

```
"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:YsvXa.7059$mZ6.2697@nwrdny02.gnilink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:bgkae0$2md$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:iMfXa.15838$Vx2.8180666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > > news:LyfXa.72928$Wd5.14335216@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > > That's because it not supposed to. It "forces" the newbie to get a
> taste
> > > of
> > > > CW. Then it's up to the individual to either take him/herself
further
> or
> > > > drop it entirely. Many will never know if CW truly interested them
> > because
> > > > they will not have been made to even try.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Exactly. It's nice to see it so neatly. It's the same reason that
> > students
> > > are required to study a number of items which they may or may not
pursue
> > in
> > > the future.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> >
> > Then I say we test on every mode there is. If you support that for CW,
> then
> > surely you support it for other modes.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> I'm with that! Good call, Kim.
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>
```

It's pretty darned logical to me...

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

442. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:49:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2F27DA.C63DE672@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73805

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2EBC38.1917F426@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bgj71t$2ffe$1@adenine.netfront.net>...
> > >
> > > > Then, why the opening remarks then and now, with this post, about how long
> > > > Carl was a Tech and his alledged comments on CW? Why enter that into your
> > > > remarks at all, Dave, if not to cast attention to that? If you are casting
> > > > attention to that, then why?
> > >
> > > Dave has a problem with the old Techs, the Tech Plusses, and
> > > presumably the Techs with Code.
> >
> > I didn't address those you mention. I addressed Carl.
>
> Exactly. You continued to address Carl as if he were a Tech. Which
> he is not.

No, I continued to address Carl as a churl, which he is.

> > > They aren't 13wpm hams. They aren't
> > > worthy to share his band space.
> >
> > No, they haven't been tested at 13 wpm or at 20 wpm. I didn't address
> > that issue.
>
> Oh, my. Oh, dear. You merely addressed Carl's tenure on the
> Technician band space.

I didn't address space at all. I addressed Carl's sitting on an old
Tech ticket for 2 1/2 decades until the requirements were lowered.

> > > Now that Carl can share Dave's band space...
>
> > Carl may share some space with me.
>
> Carl can share any space with you that he wishes. That is what the
> FCC mean's by issuing him an Extra license. Get used to it. Naw,
> nevermind.

Carl may share some space. While the FCC permits Carl the same access
as I hold, no amount of wishing on his part will make it likely that

Carl will share space with me in some areas of the bands. If such did
come to pass, he likely wouldn't recognize that fact.

> There are plenty of areas on a
> > number of bands where I doubt I'll run into Carl. Come to think of it,
> > I doubt I'll run into you in those spots.
>
> Duh! I don't have Extra priv's, Oh Master of Amateur Radio!!!

Duh, indeed! I don't operate only in Extra Class band segments but I do
use morse about 50% of the time. I'm banking on not running into you.

> Go work some Frenchmen on 6M. I've heard they've got all kinds of
> priveleges!!!

French hams fall under the jurisdiction of the French PTT. I don't tell
them where they can operate and neither does the FCC. They are
responsible for the operation of their stations and I am responsible
only for the operation of mine.

> Hi, hi (maniacal laughing in Morse with or without Steve's shoes).
>
> Sebentee Tree, Brian

Maybe you're not feeling well.

Dave K8MN

443. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 03:50:47 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgn9j3unh1@adenine.netfront.net>
Source record: 73806

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:BB545C3F.21121%stewartx@earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) It has become popular now, to label
> > others as "those people." In ham radio,
> > in everyday life. If CW is serving as a
> > "filtering tool" in the eyes of a majority
> > in ham radio--I say abolish it. But, I've
> > a feeling the attitude that it is a
> > filtering tool is not prevalent. Thank
> > goodness!!
>
>
> Actually, I think that attitude has become very commonplace. I've heard
it
> off and on for the last several years and it's also something I've heard
> outside these newsgroups on the radio.
>
> By the way, I can now view your messages just fine. My old news provider
> was the source of the problem. As you can see, I've switched internet
> service providers and the problem appears to be gone. I was even able to
go
> back and read those older messages that generated the error message
before.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Great, now you'll have to thoroughly read and catch up with all this really
intelligent stuff I've been posting! ;)

Kim W5TIT

Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
Complaints to news@netfront.net

444. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 04:00:53 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <mb4uivcd6g78b1n1ccd93u6a9m0vgqvl3n@4ax.com>
Source record: 73807

On 03 Aug 2003 18:00:34 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <bgj5pv$2eia$1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
><fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:
>
>>Is that the music to the Twilight Zone I hear?
>
>>Yes, yes it is...
>
>Believe it or not, folks, this is one of Kim's more reasonably intelligent
>posts!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

And now, Rod Serling steps out from behind the scroll bar on the left
side of our screens and says:

"Meet one Larry Roll, K2LT, a man with a chip on his shoulder the size
of the national debt..."

Beam us up, Scotty...there is definitely no intelligent life down
here.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Ruger: The original point and click interface.

445. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 04:00:54 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <8n4uiv0u2dukon46r2hehgsn5l2jquptiu@4ax.com>
Source record: 73808

On Mon, 04 Aug 2003 20:01:22 GMT, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
wrote:

>I have an understanding of what CB WAS supposed to be for as well as what it
>HAS evolved into. (...and I don't mean the out-of-band lids with the illegal
>amplifiers either.)

Well, then you must mean the IN-the-band lids with the illegal
amplifiers. Not to mention echo mikes, electronic noisemakers,
and...well, just listen down there and compile your own list.

>I personally have no want to bang my fist down on the table and proclaim
>that "that's not what it was originally meant for." That's what it's become,
>plain and simple. Don't like it? Then get your fmr. comrades to kick it up a
>notch or two wrt enforcement and stop it...

I wholeheartedly second the motion!

>or admit their boo-boo (CB on HF
>and they can't respond to a natuarally occuring phenomenon, hihi.)

I think they already have, and I think that's part of the reason why
MURS was created, thus putting no-license radio on VHF where it ought
to have been put in the first place.

>and try
>to take a little advantage of the situation.

On the other hand, there's no enforcement on the MURS frequencies
either. Around here (Buffalo, NY area) they already sound like the 11m
band, complete with illegal power levels and toilet-mouthed jerks,
many of whom can also be heard on 11m.

Then there's the marine VHF band...

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

446. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 04:00:55 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <306uivc3321t0951vl2ae9m51j6tfv0q43@4ax.com>
Source record: 73810

On 03 Aug 2003 18:00:32 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

> I've never seen such sucking-up since I saw a flight
>of a half-dozen or so Canada Geese devoured by a C-5B engine!

You shoulda been at KIAG three years ago when a GU-11 got eaten by an F-117. Two Nighthawks came in. The first one ate a seagull as soon as he touched ground. The second one landed hard and broke something. They were both supposed to fly in that weekend's air show, neither of them did. The broken one spent the weekend in the hanger. The one with a B1RD in the engine spent the weekend on the taxiway, roped off with guys standing around it holding M-16s and trying their darndest to look like Steven Segal.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

447. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 04:00:56 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <0k6uivkb68rtorse8bjbnkb1gcj63e8b7j@4ax.com>
Source record: 73809

On Sun, 3 Aug 2003 19:11:33 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
wrote:

>The things that upset us most are often things we see as qualities in our
>ownselves.

Careful, Kim. I almost asked if that's why Dick and Larry seem to
upset you so much.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
RadioScrap: You've Got Questions, We've Got Dumb Looks.

448. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 04:06:08 UTC
From: Urazaar Abdul <Abdul@arabsaleslandorg.com>
Message-ID: <bgnaebcuh0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73811
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The land that the monitoring stations sat on was
sold off by GAO shortly after the stations closed.
Strip malls and subdivisions now stand on land that
was once occupied by the monitoring stations.

Urazaar Abdul
United Arab Land Sales

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj3o16v.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Mon, 4 Aug 2003 13:16:30 -0400, Rich wrote:
>
> > So says you, but according to www.fcc.gov they ARE all closed.
>
> Read it again....they are UNMANNED and therefore closed to the
> public. They are all operated by remote control from Laurel/Columbia,
MD.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

449. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 04:11:11 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj4e980.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73813

On Mon, 04 Aug 2003 20:01:22 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:

>Speak for yourself, Phil. I certainly CAN. I have witnessed the shift in
>what the "citizens" (Remember that word?) want from *their* Citizen's Band.

I want a lot of things from "society" that there's no chance in hell
that I will get. Learning to operate by the rules is a large part of
radio operating maturity.

You want to get into a discussion about who is qualified to
determine what CB is all about - the inmates or the keepers?
Hope you have your asbestos-lined teflon raincoat handy.....

>I personally have no want to bang my fist down on the table and proclaim
>that "that's not what it was originally meant for." That's what it's become,
>plain and simple.

CB was not meant to be hobby radio, despite "what it has
become". What it has become is something akin to a free-for-all
where each one does what s/he wants.....

>Don't like it? Then get your fmr. comrades to kick it up a
>notch or two wrt enforcement and stop it...

I've been in favor of that for decades.....we used to have something
called Special Enforcement Teams in the early 70s - "SWAT" teams for
CB enforcement. When they came to town the grass was mowed real
well. They were getting too close to certain Very High VIPs'
interests and they were disbanded, allegedly for budgetary reasons.
I would just as soon resurrect them.

I'd rather not get into the history of the pissing contest between
two now-deceased Bureau Chiefs over enforcement philosophy.

>or admit their boo-boo (CB on HF
>and they can't respond to a natuarally occuring phenomenon, hihi.) and try
>to take a little advantage of the situation. It reallly could've been a
>win-win situation back in 2000, Phil, but false pride got in the way.

As I've always said - wanna' work skip and DX -- get a ham license.
Wanna' use local personal or business communication - that's what CB
is for.

It comes down to wheher one is going to follow the rules or not.
Plain and simple.

>> What you are describing is hamming, not proper (some call it "legal") CB
>> operating.

>
>Yes, Phil, I think it's a GREAT idea to whet some CBer's
>appetite with the words "If you like what you can do with 12 Watts on CB,
>lemme show you what you with just a tad more effort and some studying on
>20."

Try "If you want to do all those things, the only place to do it
is in ham radio." CB is *NOT* the minor leagues or a training ground
for ham radio.

It's that simple.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

450. Re: Ed Hare (W1RFI) of the ARRL on BPL replies to comments

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 04:11:11 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj4fl81.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73814

Hi Rick - Long Time No QSO.....

On Mon, 04 Aug 2003 13:57:32 -0700, Richard L. Tannehill wrote:

>Dick, fortunately, most public safety entities in the past
>20 years have vacated VHF Low for VHF High, UHF, T-Band, and
>800 MHz, with 700 MHz just around the corner. A major
>exception is the California Highway Patrol. They still use
>LB statewide, and their system will no doubt be destroyed if
>BPL is allowed to happen.

As I posted in another message, The Big Emm hasn't made Low-Band equipment for the last 10 years and except by cannibalization, replacement units are not available.

That's why we made the tests for Marin County about 5-6 years ago using T-Band trunking analog and digital on the interstitial channels - analog worked OK, digital (APCO 25) sucked big time for law enforcement needs. They still haven't gone to the new system because of NIMBY objections to site locations for both the transceivers and the microwave backbone (another project of mine that's going round and round in the courts). IIRC we did send a report in to APCO.

>We need to raise the
>issue of "homeland security" though with BPL. That's the
>hot button at the FCC right now that we can press.

I don't know -- the Commish just shot the ARRL in the a** over our objection to raising the Part 15 power level 10 db in the 24 GHz band (Amateur use - telecommand and data to/from amateur satellites. Commercial Part 15 use - wide-area wireless networking - more gadgets for the technical brain-dead).

Add to that OET's refusal to allow a 136 kHz amateur band "because it may interfere with Power Line Carrier data links".

Fortunately, the new Chief of the Homeland Security Division at the FCC is a good friend and protoge of mine, and although he is not a ham, he is a very well respected engineer/manager with his head on straight about national needs, so we may have a chance.

>Rick Tannehill, P.E. - W7RT
>Former Comm. Engineering Manager
>Ariz Dept of Public Safety (Retired)

Welcome to the land of the retired comm managers.... I have less "sitting around" time now that I'm retired then when I was "on the job" although I do a bit of both engineering and legal consulting from time to time just to keep current.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane (P.E. / Esq.)

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

451. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 04:24:12 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgnbhcfas0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 73815

JJ wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> >
> > Hmmm. How interesting. We're not just "out of touch with reality," we're
> > "freaking out of touch with reality." That sounds a bit severe! Just what,
> > may I axe, makes us PCTA's so "freaking" out of touch with reality? Is it
> > because we believe in the usefulness of the Morse code, and the need to
> > have code testing so prospective hams get the opportunity to be exposed
> > to it? Or is it just that we disagree with the NCTA and NCI, and are able
> > to express our opinions with clarity and conviction? It's gotta be something
> > along those lines!
>
> Following your line of thinking, why doesn't the test include
> listening and transmitting on AM so prospective hams get the
> opportunity to be exposed to it? Also FM, and all the other modes?

Isn't everyone "exposed" to voice and voice modes well before entering ham radio?
How many people ever are exposed to radiotelgraphy?

452. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 04:32:28 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgnc0s$g70$0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 73816

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message news:<878yqa8dk3.fld@barrow.com>...
> >
> > > One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
> > > Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
> > > breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
> > > that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
> > > just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.
> >
> > Sad, but true. But they don't see it that way.
>
> Likely because it is a fairy tale. Leonard would need assistance to eat
> mush for breakfast. You've been asked if you're his acolyte. I think
> it would be more fitting if you were to be known as his electrolyte.
>
> > One David Heil demands licensed participation in the ARS.
>
> Maybe one of 'em demands such but it isn't this one.
>
> > But when
> > confronted with mere Technician participation in the ARS that rivals
> > his Extraness, he digs in and destroys.
>
> That claim is a non-starter as it is in conflict with what I've written
> here very recently.
>
> > Or at least he tries to.
>
> Or at least you attempt to let on that he does.
>
> > Then there is Extra DICK. Probably Extra in every way except the dick
> > department. Then there's Jim "DeSoda" who keeps rewriting "200 Meters
> > and Up." No need to mention INSANE Clown Posse in a Nurse's dress or
> > the civilian with "real" military experience.
>
> What's your claim to credibility?

It's right there with his permission.

453. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 04:44:45 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <kdduiv4v7cuaau51tgf55bc9ijs6oqhnr0@4ax.com>
Source record: 73817

On 5 Aug 2003 04:24:12 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>Isn't everyone "exposed" to voice and voice modes well before entering ham radio?
>How many people ever are exposed to radiotelgraphy?

Which says a lot about the relevancy of code testing, even if you're
unable to look at it objectively enough to realize it.

As for people being exposed to voice modes, that must be why so many
phone ops sound like they have their microphone either at arm's length
or halfway down their throats, with no in between.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

454. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 05:02:17 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0308050457060.824@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 73819

```
On Mon, 4 Aug 2003, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308032322180.503@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > On Sun, 3 Aug 2003, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > > BOTTOM LINE: *Until the FCC changes its rules* no-code Techs
> > > have NO HF privs ... sorry, folks, but that's the way it is.
> >
> > Neither do Novices nor the "coded" Techs. They lost their HF privileges
> > effective July 5, 2003.
>
> False ... please stop preaching this nonsense.

If you think it's nonsense, then tell me how these licensees, under 47 CFR
97.301(e) are supposed to show that they have met an international requirement
that no longer exists in order to have the privileges listed in that
subsection?
```

455. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 05:05:11 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgndu7kgd0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 73820

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ wrote:

> On 5 Aug 2003 04:24:12 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> >Isn't everyone "exposed" to voice and voice modes well before entering ham radio?
> >How many people ever are exposed to radiotelgraphy?
>
> Which says a lot about the relevancy of code testing, even if you're
> unable to look at it objectively enough to realize it.

Seem s to be characteristic of you to get it exactly backwards, John. Morse code is a large part of ham radio, whatever your personal attitude toward it. As such it is a valid subject for proper learning and testing just as much as any part of the written test. Since it can only be learned by applied self study, and can't be said to be learned at all until a minimal level of skill is developed, thus the test is appropriate

456. Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 05:06:38 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0308050501590.824@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 73821

On Mon, 4 Aug 2003, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308032303150.503@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > On Sat, 2 Aug 2003, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> > > news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308020525560.190@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > > > On Fri, 1 Aug 2003, Alun Palmer wrote:
> > > > >...
> > > > > Others have pointed out that rule 301(e) was written that way to
> avoid
> > > > > creating any new 'Tech+' licencees, but it looks as if invoking the
> > > > > international rules created a sunset clause, whether intentionally
> or
> > > > > otherwise.
> > > >
> > > > AH! Someone who is now on the verge of understanding what that
> "wierd"
> > > thing I
> > > > said was. IT was a "sunset clause" and the change to S25.5 was the
> > > "sunset."
> > >
> > > It is NOT a sunset clause ... NCI specifically asked for a sunset clause
> > > so code testing would "automagically" go away when S25.5 was suppressed
> > > or changed so that code testing was no longer required by the ITU Radio
> > > Regs.
> > >
> > > The FCC SPECIFICALLY declined to enact such a sunset clause, and the
> > > text of 301 does NOT contain one, no matter how you try to twist it.
> >
> > That is true - the FCC didn't enact a sunset clause to eliminate code
> testing
> > for HF as NCI requested. I never said that's what they did.
> >
> > The FCC DID enact a sunset clause that TERMINATES HF operation by licenses
> of
> > lesser privilege than General class. That's what I've been saying that
> they
> > did.
>
> THEY DID NO SUCH THING. You are WRONG and your continued
> repetition of incorrect information is not doing anyone a service.

Then explain why .301(e) based HF operating privilege on something OTHER than
simply holding element 1 credit....

457. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 05:07:58 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgne3ekgd1@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 73822

JJ wrote:

> Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > JJ wrote:
> >
> >
> >>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Hmmm. How interesting. We're not just "out of touch with reality," we're
> >>>"freaking out of touch with reality." That sounds a bit severe! Just what,
> >>>may I axe, makes us PCTA's so "freaking" out of touch with reality? Is it
> >>>because we believe in the usefulness of the Morse code, and the need to
> >>>have code testing so prospective hams get the opportunity to be exposed
> >>>to it? Or is it just that we disagree with the NCTA and NCI, and are able
> >>>to express our opinions with clarity and conviction? It's gotta be something
> >>>along those lines!
> >>
> >>Following your line of thinking, why doesn't the test include
> >>listening and transmitting on AM so prospective hams get the
> >>opportunity to be exposed to it? Also FM, and all the other modes?
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > Isn't everyone "exposed" to voice and voice modes well before entering ham radio?
> > How many people ever are exposed to radiotelgraphy?
>
> What about all those digital modes? It makes just as much sense
> to make sure new hams can operate those modes as it does CW.

Not really. Anyone can learn PSK31 in a half hour of looking over the help file and playing iwth their keyboard. As you know if you've been listening to all the laments appearing here from the "excluded", no such possibliley exists for Morse code.

458. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 08:01:46 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87r8404jo5.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73824

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
>> One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
>> Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
>> breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
>> that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
>> just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.
>
>Izzat Len's function here, Floyd? I was always of the opinion that
>Leonard H. was MY cheap form of entertainment. Of all the posters here,
>I can't think of one invidual less relevant to amateur radio's past,
>present or future--not that much of anything he sez is great or exactly
>correct.
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave, did you hear a whistle just as you read that?

It was the point, that went right over your head...

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

459. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 08:08:05 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93CE29F7A1B7Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 73823

<snip>

>> >
>> > Do you want code USE by hams to continue or not, Alun?
>>
>> Honestly? I don't care if it does or not.
>
> Your answer avoids the question.
>

No. I gave you my honest answer. I have no hidden agenda to get rid of CW operation, but I have no interest in promoting it either,

>> For the record I think it will
>> continue. It does have some advantages (but then, so do a lot of other
>> modes).
>>
<snip>
>
>> I have always disagreed with a skill test in
>> Morse being a condition for HF phone. I have never heard an argument
>> for that that makes logical sense.
>
> Here's one: 'phone takes up much more spectrum.
>

That isn't a reason for testing phone ops in CW. It might be a reason for using CW if we were that short of spectrum, which IMHO we're not.

> And if we say there should not be a skill test in one mode in order to
> be allowed to use another, it's equally valid to say there should not
> be a test on theory in order to use manufactured, no-tune radios
> either.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Not a good analogy, or even really an analogy atall. That's like saying if you shouldn't have to learn basketball to play poker then you shouldn't have to learn to read to become a journalist.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

460. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 08:15:28 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93CE2B3777F09elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 73825

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
news:20030804230939.15462.00002073@mb-m06.aol.com:

> In article <_rrXa.2515$lL.412652@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>>
>>I've seen quite a bit of the "If I don't get my way, I'll take my ball
>>and go home." attitude ... you, Larry, for one have said in the past
>>something to the effect that "If code testing is eliminated, they might
>>as well just auction our bands off to the commercial folks." (perhaps
>>not an exact quote, but pretty darned close and certainly conveying the
>>meaning of what you've said ...)
>
> Carl:
>
> Yes, I did say that. And it still seems like a good idea to me,
> considering what the future prospects for the ARS are looking like.
> After all, we're hoarding literally billions of dollars worth of
> commercially-viable spectrum, most of which isn't being used by us
> (hams) for a damn thing worth talking about. I'm sure we'll always
> have most of our HF allocations, but I expect we're gonna lose big time
> above 500 MHz or so. And that, in reference to another post, is just
> my concept of "reality."
>
>>> AFAIC, when the FCC finally gives us a No-Code Test ARS licensing
>>> system, the "destruction" of our hobby/service is self-assured.
>>> About the best we can hope for is for the NCTA's to continue with
>>> their traditional apathy and laziness, and somehow not flock to the
>>> ARS in any great numbers. We would also require the assistance of
>>> the ARRL and the FCC to resist the urge to expand HF phone spectrum,
>>> but I don't see that as something the ARRL would do, so the FCC will
>>> be happy to oblige when the petitions start coming in. In any case,
>>> the future of the ARS looks bleak, and it will be the non-code tested
>>> "newcomers" who will be administering the coup de gras.
>>>
>>> BTW, Carl -- the only reason you're an "Extra" is because you waited
>>> until the code test was dumbed down to a maximum of 5 WPM. That's
>>> not being a Real Extra(tm) in the opinion of any of the traditional
>>> PCTA's. You're just a wannabe Extra Pretender who got in on an
>>> Affirmative Action program.
>>
>>Over 32 years as an RF Engineer, recognized in my profession, and I'm
>>"not good enough" for the likes of you and Dick? Not sure whether to

>>ROTFLMAO or gag/puke ...
>
> What do 32 years of RF engineering experience have to do with ham
> radio, Carl? I'll admit that it's handy to have guys like you around,
> but most of the hams I know have no professional-level technical skills
> whatsoever. We are radio AMATEURS. Your professional credentials are
> recognized within your profession for good reason -- you deserve such
> recognition -- WITHIN YOUR PROFESSION. As a radio amateur, however,
> you're no better than any other dumbed-down Extra-Lite who waited for
> years to get around the requirement to learn and be tested for a useful
> communications skill. Sorry about that, my friend, but that's just the
> TRVTH.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

It's not the truth, or even the TRVTH. RF is RF. I haven't noticed any
difference between amateur or professional RF energy.

461. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 08:22:13 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93CE2C5CA14F7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 73826

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj4351y.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:

> On Mon, 04 Aug 2003 07:41:03 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
>> Very simple answer, Jim. The FCC has limited personnel today. The few
>> they
>>have simply don't have the time to sit around listening, as code users
>>pound out their incredibly slow conversations, to catch violations. ;)
>
> For reasons that I disagreed with then and I disagree with now, (but
> that's another story) the FCC' s enforcement response is driven by
> complaints, not by "Patrolling the Ether" (tm) as in days of yore.
>
> How many complaints of amateur CW violations do you think "Riley"
> gets? (Somebody pounding out "FU" in Morse on a Touch-Tone (tm) pad
> on a repeater input does not count as CW....)
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>
>

So what do we call it then? I have certainly heard F-U-C-K sent in Morse
on a repeater.

462. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 10:42:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308050242.7d47fafa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73827

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F2F1ADF.9E64A43D@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message news:<878yqa8dk3.fld@barrow.com>...
> >
> > > One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
> > > Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
> > > breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
> > > that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
> > > just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.
> >
> > Sad, but true. But they don't see it that way.
>
> Likely because it is a fairy tale. Leonard would need assistance to eat
> mush for breakfast. You've been asked if you're his acolyte. I think
> it would be more fitting if you were to be known as his electrolyte.

At least I'm not his bunyon.

> > One David Heil demands licensed participation in the ARS.
>
> Maybe one of 'em demands such but it isn't this one.

You're one of them that incessantly points out his license status.

> > But when
> > confronted with mere Technician participation in the ARS that rivals
> > his Extraness, he digs in and destroys.
>
> That claim is a non-starter as it is in conflict with what I've written
> here very recently.

Bully for you.

> > Or at least he tries to.
>
> Or at least you attempt to let on that he does.
>
> > Then there is Extra DICK. Probably Extra in every way except the dick
> > department. Then there's Jim "DeSoda" who keeps rewriting "200 Meters
> > and Up." No need to mention INSANE Clown Posse in a Nurse's dress or
> > the civilian with "real" military experience.
>
> What's your claim to credibility?

I yam what I yam.

463. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 10:50:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308050250.19afda92@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73828

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F2F1C58.D8461F2@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2EE319.3FA91B69@earthlink.net>...
> > > Floyd Davidson wrote:
> > >
> > > > One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
> > > > Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
> > > > breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
> > > > that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
> > > > just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.
> > >
> > > Izzat Len's function here, Floyd? I was always of the opinion that
> > > Leonard H. was MY cheap form of entertainment.
> >
> > Chalk it up to a lack of understanding.
>
> I have: Floyd's. I can add you if you like.

See what I mean.

> > > Of all the posters here,
> > > I can't think of one invidual less relevant to amateur radio's past,
> > > present or future--not that much of anything he sez is great or exactly
> > > correct.
>
> >
> > Whatever he say is probably more relavent than working out of band
> > Frenchmen on 6M.
>
> It may be "relavent" but it isn't relevant and more than your attempted
> diversion.

Huh? Does not compute.

> > Especially the part about Korean War teletype
> > operations.
>
> Oh, yeah! That was loaded with useful information relating to amateur
> radio.

Sure. Lots of amateurs have hired a crane to drop a M28 in their
basement.

Len has admitted a decades-long interest in amateur radio. Len
> has been posting here for over seven years. He hasn't acted on his
> amateur radio fanstasy in those decades and he hasn't acted on it in
> seven years. Len's avocation is posting to a usenet group devoted to
> soemthing in which he is a non-participant. You're his little
> electrolyte.

That's so sweet. Its nice to know that one has to hold an amateur
license to be able to comment on amatuer radio. I can't decide who
points out that Len doesn't hold an amateur license more; you or
Steve.

464. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 11:09:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308050309.7f6b4a77@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73829

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F2F27DA.C63DE672@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2EBC38.1917F426@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bgj71t$2ffe$1@adenine.netfront.net>...
> > > >
> > > > > Then, why the opening remarks then and now, with this post, about how long
> > > > > Carl was a Tech and his alledged comments on CW? Why enter that into your
> > > > > remarks at all, Dave, if not to cast attention to that? If you are casting
> > > > > attention to that, then why?
> > > >
> > > > Dave has a problem with the old Techs, the Tech Plusses, and
> > > > presumably the Techs with Code.
> > >
> > > I didn't address those you mention. I addressed Carl.
> >
> > Exactly. You continued to address Carl as if he were a Tech. Which
> > he is not.
>
> No, I continued to address Carl as a churl, which he is.

Which is how you address Techs.

> > > > They aren't 13wpm hams. They aren't
> > > > worthy to share his band space.
> > >
> > > No, they haven't been tested at 13 wpm or at 20 wpm. I didn't address
> > > that issue.
> >
> > Oh, my. Oh, dear. You merely addressed Carl's tenure on the
> > Technician band space.
>
> I didn't address space at all. I addressed Carl's sitting on an old
> Tech ticket for 2 1/2 decades until the requirements were lowered.

Ding, ding, ding. The bell on my M28 rings each time you bring that up.

> > > > Now that Carl can share Dave's band space...
>
> > > Carl may share some space with me.
> >

> > Carl can share any space with you that he wishes. That is what the
> > FCC mean's by issuing him an Extra license. Get used to it. Naw,
> > nevermind.
>
> Carl may share some space.

May share all space.

While the FCC permits Carl the same access
> as I hold, no amount of wishing on his part will make it likely that
> Carl will share space with me in some areas of the bands. If such did
> come to pass, he likely wouldn't recognize that fact.

Nor would you. You treat him as if he were still a Tech.

> > There are plenty of areas on a
> > > number of bands where I doubt I'll run into Carl. Come to think of it,
> > > I doubt I'll run into you in those spots.
> >
> > Duh! I don't have Extra priv's, Oh Master of Amateur Radio!!!
>
> Duh, indeed! I don't operate only in Extra Class band segments but I do
> use morse about 50% of the time. I'm banking on not running into you.

I don't need West Virginia.

> > Go work some Frenchmen on 6M. I've heard they've got all kinds of
> > priveleges!!!
>
> French hams fall under the jurisdiction of the French PTT.

Indeed they do.

I don't tell
> them where they can operate and neither does the FCC.

Nor does the government of Tanzania.

They are
> responsible for the operation of their stations and I am responsible
> only for the operation of mine.

Smoke 'em if you got 'em.

465. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 11:47:47 UTC
From: Radio Truth <RadioTruth@radiowchica.org>
Message-ID: <bgo5fuabv0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73830
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The FCC office in Laurel, MD is where FCC
employees were caught in the act of running a child
pornography ring. FCC employees were using government
computers during official duty hours (while they were on the
public payroll) to run a cottage industry of child pornography.
It makes one wonder about the character of the persons the
FCC hires and how many more have yet to be caught.
Go here to read the FCC Inspector General's report, scroll
down to "Significant Investigations."
www.fcc.gov/bureaus/Inspector_General/Reports/sar398.txt

This is one item that was never the subject of a FCC press
releases.

Radio Truth
Bob Johnson
CEO

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj3o16v.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Mon, 4 Aug 2003 13:16:30 -0400, Rich wrote:
>
> > So says you, but according to www.fcc.gov they ARE all closed.
>
> Read it again....they are UNMANNED and therefore closed to the
> public. They are all operated by remote control from Laurel/Columbia,
MD.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

466. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 11:56:49 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <5YMXa.99153$Wd5.20928693@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 73831

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F2ED720.4000509@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >This is actually not such a bad idea. I've always supported dropping the
> >155.3 mi. limit on CB and the idea of allowing hams to reduce their power
> >and elmer CBers on channels 36 through 40 USB on the finer point of
DXing. I
> >think it'd be a great recruitment tool, just MHO.
> >
> >
> >
> We could do that now, *IF* we use type accepted (or whatever they call
> it nowadays) CB radios
> instead of our ham transcievers, and not exceed the distance limit.

'Zactly! I currently run a slightly older Uniden Grant XL, type certified
and 100% legal.

> But
> I think the CBers
> might see us as invaders on their turf, like we see them when invading
> 10m. It might be better
> to be low key,

I usually keep it subtle and have always had pretty good results. NOTE:
Those who bootleg on 10m (Or any other ham band.) are neither included in
this discussion nor welcomed on either band. I'll drop a dime on them in a
NY minute! (...and have done so in the past.)

> maybe have the ARRL buy ads in CB magizines that say

IMHO, the ARRL blew a golden opportunity for a win-win situation in 2000
when it comment against RM-9807. I don't think the ARRL's is very much
appreciated among CB circles, HOWEVER, true CB "hobbyists" (Sorry, Phil.) DO
respect ARO's and are usually quite receptive.

> something like "if
> you get a general or extra ham license, you can DX on many different
> bands using more
> power (legally) even when the sunspots are out of season. 'You already
> love radio, see
> how much more fun you can have with a ham license'." Of course one
> would have to
> wordsmith it right to attract serious and disiplined operators and not
> the kids and "lids".

> Without making ham radio look condensending or putting CBers down.

Funny story...well, kinda. I walked into the corner 7-Eleven and prepared to get my dailly fix of Java when a chap nodded in my direction and asked "you a ham?" It occured to me that he had seen my AR license plates and since we were the only two in the store, it was equally easy for me to notice the Wilson 1000 atop his vehicle. I nodded toward his car and asked him "what'cha runnin'?" Well, I could tell right away it wasn't kosher because you could cut the immediate cloud of nerousness with a knife. "Relax, I've been where you are and I can help you get to where you wanna be." Crash, down came the wall of apprehension. He was using one of those zillion channel Ranger rigs. I explained that if he'd let me, I could show him how to use that legally. Subtly massaged the enforcement angle into the conversation too. I lived three blocks away so I <permanently> lent him my Gordo Tech study guide and a copy of my ARRL code CD's. Told him the code test was nothing to sweat and if he any problems just give me a holler. Well, the next time he "hollered," he had two CSCE's in hand and a new Tech"+" was waiting for a call. Now that he's tasted more bandwidth, he doesn't want to risk losing those priviledges on any illegal 11-meter frequencies anymore. I personally don't care what his motivations are to fly straight are, I'm just glad that he is. Sure, I could've immediately beaten him up re. his rig or lectured him on what CB was originally intended for...but what would it have gained? CB gained a legal op, and he gained a whole new world of radio. For all I know, he might very well be an Extra by now. I do know it felt good. :-)

> I'm
> not that
> good a writer, but I think that it could be done well.

I think you just did a great job.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

467. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 12:29:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2FA19C.1FCA2977@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73832

Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> >Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >
> >> One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
> >> Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
> >> breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
> >> that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
> >> just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.
> >
> >Izzat Len's function here, Floyd? I was always of the opinion that
> >Leonard H. was MY cheap form of entertainment. Of all the posters here,
> >I can't think of one invidual less relevant to amateur radio's past,
> >present or future--not that much of anything he sez is great or exactly
> >correct.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Dave, did you hear a whistle just as you read that?
>
> It was the point, that went right over your head...

No, I heard no whistle. Must have been pointless.

Dave K8MN

468. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 12:39:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2FA40B.6CBD0E90@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73833

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2F1ADF.9E64A43D@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
news:<878yqa8dk3.fld@barrow.com>...
> > >
> > > > One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
> > > > Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
> > > > breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
> > > > that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
> > > > just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.
> > >
> > > Sad, but true. But they don't see it that way.
> >
> > Likely because it is a fairy tale. Leonard would need assistance to eat
> > mush for breakfast. You've been asked if you're his acolyte. I think
> > it would be more fitting if you were to be known as his electrolyte.
>
> At least I'm not his bunyon.

> > > One David Heil demands licensed participation in the ARS.

> > Maybe one of 'em demands such but it isn't this one.

> You're one of them that incessantly points out his license status.

Yes, I am. That isn't the same as what you claimed in your earlier
comment. Len isn't licensed in the amateur radio service and has no
experience in amateur radio.

> > > But when
> > > confronted with mere Technician participation in the ARS that rivals
> > > his Extraness, he digs in and destroys.
> >
> > That claim is a non-starter as it is in conflict with what I've written
> > here very recently.
>
> Bully for you.

...and shame on you for making yet another false accusation. That's two
so far in this exchange.

>
> > > Then there is Extra DICK. Probably Extra in every way except the dick
> > > department. Then there's Jim "DeSoda" who keeps rewriting "200 Meters
> > > and Up." No need to mention INSANE Clown Posse in a Nurse's dress or
> > > the civilian with "real" military experience.
> >
> > What's your claim to credibility?
>
> I yam what I yam.

Maybe you'll find a way to do something about it.

Dave K8MN

469. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 12:50:40 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2FA69A.45C19471@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73834

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F2F1C58.D8461F2@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2EE319.3FA91B69@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Floyd Davidson wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
> > > > > Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
> > > > > breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
> > > > > that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
> > > > > just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.
> > > >
> > > > Izzat Len's function here, Floyd? I was always of the opinion that
> > > > Leonard H. was MY cheap form of entertainment.
> > >
> > > Chalk it up to a lack of understanding.
> >
> > I have: Floyd's. I can add you if you like.
>
> See what I mean.

No, I don't.

> > > > Of all the posters here,
> > > > I can't think of one invidual less relevant to amateur radio's past,
> > > > present or future--not that much of anything he sez is great or exactly
> > > > correct.
> > >
> > >
> > > Whatever he say is probably more relavent than working out of band
> > > Frenchmen on 6M.
> >
> > It may be "relavent" but it isn't relevant and more than your attempted
> > diversion.
>
> Huh? Does not compute.

No, it doesn't. I have to stop posting when it is past my bedtime.

> > > Especially the part about Korean War teletype
> > > operations.
> >

> > Oh, yeah! That was loaded with useful information relating to amateur
> > radio.
>
> Sure. Lots of amateurs have hired a crane to drop a M28 in their
> basement.

Have they? The guys I've known who owned them just carted them in.
I don't know anyone who uses a Mod 28 now. Loads of people were giving
them away a decade or so back. I know one fellow who turned the cabinet
of his into a bar. His wife wasn't as fond of it as he was. Think
there's a Mod 28 in the Anderson home communications center?

> Len has admitted a decades-long interest in amateur radio. Len
> > has been posting here for over seven years. He hasn't acted on his
> > amateur radio fanstasy in those decades and he hasn't acted on it in
> > seven years. Len's avocation is posting to a usenet group devoted to
> > soemthing in which he is a non-participant. You're his little
> > electrolyte.
>
> That's so sweet. Its nice to know that one has to hold an amateur
> license to be able to comment on amatuer radio.

Nothing has prevented Len Anderson from commenting here. He has been
doing so for better than seven years. No one is required to agree with
him or to remain silent while a man with no experience in amateur radio
attempts to tell licensed hams how amateur radio should be shaped and
regulated. No one is forced to remain mum while he takes potshots at
the ARS, radio amateurs or the ARRL.

> I can't decide who
> points out that Len doesn't hold an amateur license more; you or
> Steve.

I'll let you work that out. It doesn't matter to me and I'm sure Steve
isn't in competition with me on the issue.

Dave K8MN

470. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 12:51:56 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgo99c$ju4$0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 73835

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> >Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >
> >> One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
> >> Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
> >> breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
> >> that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
> >> just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.
> >
> >Izzat Len's function here, Floyd? I was always of the opinion that
> >Leonard H. was MY cheap form of entertainment. Of all the posters here,
> >I can't think of one invidual less relevant to amateur radio's past,
> >present or future--not that much of anything he sez is great or exactly
> >correct.
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Dave, did you hear a whistle just as you read that?
>
> It was the point, that went right over your head...
>

Dave, you won't want to pay too much attention to Frozen Floyd, the permafrost has obviously made it to his brain.

471. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 12:57:45 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2FA842.281A9C16@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73836

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2F27DA.C63DE672@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2EBC38.1917F426@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bgj71t$2ffe$1@adenine.netfront.net>...
> > > > >
> > > > > > Then, why the opening remarks then and now, with this post, about how long
> > > > > > Carl was a Tech and his alledged comments on CW? Why enter that into your
> > > > > > remarks at all, Dave, if not to cast attention to that? If you are casting
> > > > > > attention to that, then why?
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave has a problem with the old Techs, the Tech Plusses, and
> > > > > presumably the Techs with Code.
> > > >
> > > > I didn't address those you mention. I addressed Carl.
> > >
> > > Exactly. You continued to address Carl as if he were a Tech. Which
> > > he is not.
> >
> > No, I continued to address Carl as a churl, which he is.
>
> Which is how you address Techs.

That's another incorrect claim you've made.

> > > > > They aren't 13wpm hams. They aren't
> > > > > worthy to share his band space.
> > > >
> > > > No, they haven't been tested at 13 wpm or at 20 wpm. I didn't address
> > > > that issue.
> > >
> > > Oh, my. Oh, dear. You merely addressed Carl's tenure on the
> > > Technician band space.
> >
> > I didn't address space at all. I addressed Carl's sitting on an old
> > Tech ticket for 2 1/2 decades until the requirements were lowered.
>
> Ding, ding, ding. The bell on my M28 rings each time you bring that up.

Then you need to check your wiring.

> > > > > Now that Carl can share Dave's band space...
> >
> > > > Carl may share some space with me.
> > >
> > > Carl can share any space with you that he wishes. That is what the
> > > FCC mean's by issuing him an Extra license. Get used to it. Naw,
> > > nevermind.
> >
> > Carl may share some space.
>
> May share all space.

He may and he may not.

> While the FCC permits Carl the same access
> > as I hold, no amount of wishing on his part will make it likely that
> > Carl will share space with me in some areas of the bands. If such did
> > come to pass, he likely wouldn't recognize that fact.
>
> Nor would you.

Sure I would, Brian.

> You treat him as if he were still a Tech.

No, I treat him as if he were still a churl.

> > > There are plenty of areas on a
> > > > number of bands where I doubt I'll run into Carl. Come to think of it,
> > > > I doubt I'll run into you in those spots.
> > >
> > > Duh! I don't have Extra priv's, Oh Master of Amateur Radio!!!
> >
> > Duh, indeed! I don't operate only in Extra Class band segments but I do
> > use morse about 50% of the time. I'm banking on not running into you.
>
> I don't need West Virginia.

So your reason for not using morse is that you don't need West Virginia?
That's some interesting logic.

> > > Go work some Frenchmen on 6M. I've heard they've got all kinds of
> > > priveleges!!!
> >
> > French hams fall under the jurisdiction of the French PTT.
>
> Indeed they do.

You understand that now? You seemed to have trouble with it in the
past.

> I don't tell
> > them where they can operate and neither does the FCC.

>
> Nor does the government of Tanzania.

Nor does the CEO of Nabisco. Has there been a problem in the past with
those pesky Tanzanians issuing notices to scofflaw French hams?

> They are
> > responsible for the operation of their stations and I am responsible
> > only for the operation of mine.
>
> Smoke 'em if you got 'em.

I gather from some of the things you've written that you've got 'em and
that you're smoking 'em.

Dave K8MN

472. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 13:00:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2FA8DB.83C47C8C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73837

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > >Floyd Davidson wrote:
> > >
> > >> One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
> > >> Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
> > >> breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
> > >> that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
> > >> just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.
> > >
> > >Izzat Len's function here, Floyd? I was always of the opinion that
> > >Leonard H. was MY cheap form of entertainment. Of all the posters here,
> > >I can't think of one invidual less relevant to amateur radio's past,
> > >present or future--not that much of anything he sez is great or exactly
> > >correct.
> > >
> > >Dave K8MN
> >
> > Dave, did you hear a whistle just as you read that?
> >
> > It was the point, that went right over your head...

> Dave, you won't want to pay too much attention to Frozen Floyd, the > permafrost has obviously made it to his brain.

It is a brave new world where Len Anderson, the old sharpie, is able to
use me as his plaything. That's the kind of world where Floyd is
sitting under a palm on the Alaskan Riviera.

Dave K8MN

473. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 13:06:03 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgoa3rloh0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 73838

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > I yam what I yam.
>
> Maybe you'll find a way to do something about it.

He's still breathing. There's hope.

474. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 13:13:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308050513.1ab303e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73839

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030804232341.20076.00000977@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>
> > You won't ID the club, any of the members,

> I have more respect than that.

Ohhh! I see! You can call THEM liars and you can accuse THEM of
misrepresnting the truth, but YOU have "too much respect"...?!?!

BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! !

Do you ever REMOTELY realize just how stupid you just amde
yuorself look, Vipul?

> >What was said was >>YOU<< are back to telling "them" where thier
> >interests should lay.
>
> And neither should they tell me what my interests should be. Like, telling
> people at club meetings that they should learn Morse code. Or, suggesting I
> should learn Morse code when I participate in antenna setups or at Ham
> gatherings.

And how many of these people held you down while another member
hit you with a rubber hose to "force" you to learn Morse Code?

> >You constantly barrage this NG
> >with YOUR interpretation of what Amatuer Radio should be and how
> >"wrong" other Amateurs are for not following THAT doctrine.
>
> Like the current group of Hams do in their groups?

Like WHAT, Vipul?

> > If the "95%" is clay,
> Okay, makes sense.
>
> >and the
> >"5%" is gold, then isn't it worth it to you to get your blue jeans a
> >bit dirty...???
>
> That 5% is gold at the end of a rainbow (it doesn't exist).

YOU will NEVER know if there's ANY gold anywhere, Vipul, because
you're too lazy and too timid to go find out if there is or not.

Steve, K4YZ

475. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 13:18:57 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F2FAD38.898EBA2F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73840

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >So the activity in the photograph never really took place?
>
> Its possible, that it was some kind of demo setup for a guest speaker and the
> club members just sat there. That could be one explanation.

Could be? Don't you know? If you don't, you're just blowing smoke.

> >> I can ask people in that photograph if they are interested in
> >> homebrewing and that person will say he is not interested in homebrewing.
> >
> >"Will say" or "has said"? If you haven't asked, you don't know.
>
> This photo was taken before I joined the club. Many of the people in the photo
> are still in the club.

So you don't know.

> Just look at the majority of activities. Not one has been a homebrew activity
> since I joined the clubs.

I note that it is now "clubs" rather than "club". How long have you
been involved? What interval do you consider acceptable between a
club's group homebrewing projects? Should there be a constant stream of
such projects or do you find it acceptable that such projects take place
from time to time?

> Yet, currently that photo is shown. This seems like
> some kind of misrepresentation.

I'm sure it seems that way to you. You're the guy who maintains that
hams aren't interested in things technical, don't homebrew, are all old
and all fat. From what you've posted here over the past few months,
amateur radio has been a bitter disappointment to you.

> I could ask a few people in the photo if they like homebrewing. Then, I could
> take one step further, and ask them why they posed for a homebrew photo if they
> do not like to homebrew. I would have to bring the photo with me, and track
> down specific people. That kind of questioning could get too weird.

It can't be any more strange than some of the stuff you post to this
group.

> >> It won't do much good to show them the other aspect that
> >> "could" exist, but does not exist for them.
> >
> >If you are the individual doing the showing, those folks could have a
> >gut full of misinformation in no time.
>
> Thats a good challenge. Lets introduce a new person to a Hamfest and see what
> that person's impression of Ham radio is.

Fine. Let another club member (not you) show them around so that the
non-ham has a fighting chance to comprehend just what amateur radio is
and what a hamfest is all about.

> >You begin with false assumptions and attempt to
> >prove them to be true.
>
> I didn't begin with any assumptions. I noticed these things at Hamfests.

Yes, you did. You've continued to hold those beliefs despite your
having been corrected on numerous occasions by those who have much more
experience than you. Quite often your stories end with you being
shocked by what passes for American culture, you being disappointed that
no one in a radio club wants to do what you want, you being dismayed
that hams set out for an operating activity and then waste that time by
operating or you being under the impression that your travel to a
domestic location was a "DXpedition". You seem to think that you are
just a normal guy in a sea or weirdness. Don't you find that peculiar?

Dave K8MN

476. FYI: QRZ Forum - NCVEC Petition & Comments

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 13:22:57 UTC
From: Old Dxer <OD@pretzil.com>
Message-ID: <RcOXa.26620$ff.15444@fed1read01>
Source record: 73841

At URL:
http://www.qrz.com/cgi-bin/ikonboard.cgi?act=ST&f=3&t=40746

Have At It Folks
Let Your Voice Be Known

477. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 13:23:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308050523.5de55973@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73842

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030804234117.20076.00000980@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>
> >So the activity in the photograph never really took place?
>
> Its possible, that it was some kind of demo setup for a guest speaker and the
> club members just sat there. That could be one explanation.

"..."could" be one explanation..." ?!?!

YOU said you saw it happen. You were there or you weren't.

Which lie is it today, Vipul?

> >> I can ask people in that photograph if they are interested in
> >> homebrewing and that person will say he is not interested in homebrewing.
> >
> >"Will say" or "has said"? If you haven't asked, you don't know.
>
> This photo was taken before I joined the club. Many of the people in the photo
> are still in the club.

Ahhhhhh....So now this happened BEFORE you were in the club...So
what you ahve been doing all these many months is whining about
something that SUPPOSEDLY happened before you were even there.

So what you have is NO FACTS and an uninformed OPIONION as to what
MIGHT have happened...?!?!

> Just look at the majority of activities. Not one has been a homebrew activity
> since I joined the clubs. Yet, currently that photo is shown. This seems like
> some kind of misrepresentation.

No worse than any misrepresentation YOU have made in THIS forum,
Vippy.

> I could ask a few people in the photo if they like homebrewing. Then, I could
> take one step further, and ask them why they posed for a homebrew photo if they
> do not like to homebrew. I would have to bring the photo with me, and track
> down specific people. That kind of questioning could get too weird.

YOU are "too weird", Vipul.

And without some form of identification of whom you are alleging
these acts against, all we have is your "word", and so far your word
and your "facts" have been less than adequate.

> >> It won't do much good to show them the other aspect that
> >> "could" exist, but does not exist for them.
> >
> >If you are the individual doing the showing, those folks could have a
> >gut full of misinformation in no time.
>
> Thats a good challenge. Lets introduce a new person to a Hamfest and see what
> that person's impression of Ham radio is.
>
> >You begin with false assumptions and attempt to
> >prove them to be true.
>
> I didn't begin with any assumptions. I noticed these things at Hamfests.

You began in THIS forum with a HUGE assumption, Vippy...You
assumed that you were smarter than anyone here and that your silly
assertions would be accepted just on your say-so.

I am proud to say you were wrong.

Steve, K4YZ

478. Re: Comment On This News Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 13:27:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308050527.54959947@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73843

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308041925.161d4eeb@posting.google.com>...
> "The Moderator" <TM@foxtrot.com> wrote in message
news:<MMuXa.26296$ff.14911@fed1read01>...
> > Comment On This News Group
> >
> > There is a lot of good stuff here
>
> I don't think so. That's why I leave it so often.

You leave so often because the context of the discussions exceeds
your ability to comprehend it.

> I like the people on yahoo NVIS. They're not all screwed up with the code.

As opposed to Brian Burke who's just all screwed up.

Steve, K4YZ

479. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 14:17:26 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB5534F9.2117E%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 73844
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Uri" wrote:

> Hey stupid ass, I did read it. THEY ARE ALL
> CLOSED, KAPUT, DISMANTLED!!!!!!!!!!!!!
> Do you comprehend the standard English that the web
> is written in ?????????????? Remote Control?
> Geeeee, does the remote control use a standard 9 volt
> battery??? Take your petty ham disputes to 14313.

Phil is correct. Dig around the FCC's web site and you'll find more on the subject if you look hard enough. The FCC/WTB is now using the National Automated Monitoring Network, central office in Laurel/Columbia Maryland. The Spectrum Enforcement Division in Maryland operates the new remote monitoring system, which replaced the old monitoring stations. The locations once used by those monitoring stations now appear to be used to house the new unmanned equipment.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

480. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 14:32:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB553896.21181%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 73845

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:

> Great, now you'll have to thoroughly read and
> catch up with all this really intelligent
> stuff I've been posting! ;)

Watch out. Too much activity in this newsgroup can lead to permanent brain damage. Since I have a lot to do around the house (it's computer maintenance day), I'll taking a break from this newsgroup until much later tonight.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

481. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 14:36:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB553972.21183%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 73846

"Phil Kane" wrote:

> For reasons that I disagreed with then and
> I disagree with now, (but that's another
> story) the FCC' s enforcement response is
> driven by complaints, not by "Patrolling
> the Ether" (tm) as in days of yore.

Actually, my comment was a joke, Phil. Notice the "wink face" after that paragraph. But, you're right - the FCC does depend mainly on complaints. In many cases (VHF, local issues, and so on), there isn't much else they can do.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

482. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 15:06:13 UTC
From: Paul <paulb6@lineone.net>
Message-ID: <bgoh69$tc4$1@newsg3.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 73847
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:BB54583C.2111F%stewartx@earthlink.net...

> What does my ham radio license class have to do with pirate radio?

Many pirates are radio amateurs - they have the knowledge and skill to put
together a station. :-)

483. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 15:10:06 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <4d97bf651f9acb3c4418ccd59091a0ec@dizum.com>
Source record: 73848

In article <3F2C9682.FFEC97A8@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>
> Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> > From (Larry Roll K3LT):
> >
> > >If that is the case in your club, then simply work around the old timers
> > >that you find so offensive, and get your fellow newcomers involved in your
> > >projects. What is so difficult about that?
> >
> > The newcomers seem to be of the same mode also.
>
> Your tales always end with you being the odd man out.
>
> > The ones that are interested in
> > the technical stuff probably would have left within one or two meetings.
>
> Your job is to seek them out and meld a new club based around your
> unique definition of what an amateur radio club should be.
>
> > Probably same would be true about the social aspect of newcomers. Thats why the
> > demographics seem to stay as they are when new people join.
>
> So the club stays full of those who are interested in talking about
> amateur radio and who set up operating events and then waste that time
> by actually operating rather than touring the beach, eating salads and
> chatting up the "preety fems".
>
> I'm involved in a county group which is part of ARES.

Feh. You've attended only one meeting..and just to harass and stalk another ham, ASSHOLE.

> Most of the hams
> involved are not interested in contesting or DXing. Many operate VHF FM
> only. I don't know any who've designed and built a linear amplifier.
> Only one other is interested in collecting and restoring vintage gear.

Yep, they are a clique of losers.....

> I continue to attend. We interact

Except the fact you fail to bathe regularly, you mean.......fuckstick.

>based on our common interests rather than the things which divide us.

Yeah, those common interests being not helping newer hams......

>
> > The other alternative is to start my own club. I tried it, but that was not too
> > successful.

btw, fuck off, High-el.

484. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 15:56:22 UTC
From: Radio Truth <RadioTruth@radiowchica.org>
Message-ID: <bgok22$7qh$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73849
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB5534F9.2117E%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "Uri" wrote:
>
> > Hey stupid ass, I did read it. THEY ARE ALL
> > CLOSED, KAPUT, DISMANTLED!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
> > Do you comprehend the standard English that the web
> > is written in ?????????????? Remote Control?
> > Geeeee, does the remote control use a standard 9 volt
> > battery??? Take your petty ham disputes to 14313.
>
>
> Phil is correct. Dig around the FCC's web site and you'll find more on
the
> subject if you look hard enough. The FCC/WTB is now using the National
> Automated Monitoring Network, central office in Laurel/Columbia Maryland.
> The Spectrum Enforcement Division in Maryland operates the new remote
> monitoring system, which replaced the old monitoring stations. The
locations
> once used by those monitoring stations now appear to be used to house the
> new unmanned equipment.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
Read my reply to the other stupid ass that has difficulty
comprehending standard English. There are NO MORE
MONITORING STATIONS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
The land was sold off by GAO to developers. What you
are confused about are the satellite systems run by other
agencies. It is explained very clearly on the FCC web page.
And when are you going to FINALLY upgrade from that
no code tech license you have?

K

485. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 16:09:18 UTC
From: Bob <box371@mailtownnews.net>
Message-ID: <bgokqa$932$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73850
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

If there is supposed to be so much official monitoring going
on, how do you account for the quantum leap of pirate & other
unlicensed broadcasters on HF freqs, especially in the
aeronautical bands? Also, truck drivers are all over the HF
freqs. now, including aero bands. A few years ago this was
unheard of! Plain truth is the FCC is out of the monitoring
& enforcement business! Permanently!

Bob

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj3nw0u.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 4 Aug 2003 07:38:22 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >"N22X" <N22X@sherzfordzent.com> wrote in message
news:<bgj1ml$nt4$0@pita.alt.net>...
> >
> >> Since the FCC closed all their monitoring stations seven
> >> years ago,
> >
> >The FCC did *not* close all their monitoring stations.
>
> In fact when the monitoring stations were remoted, an additional
> one was added. The station at Canandaigua, NY was brought back on
> line after being closed for a number of years (it was used as the
> test bed for developing the remote control system).
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

486. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 16:23:45 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308050823.53850b2a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73901

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93CE29F7A1B7Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...

> >> I have always disagreed with a skill test in
> >> Morse being a condition for HF phone. I have never heard an argument
> >> for that that makes logical sense.

> > Here's one: 'phone takes up much more spectrum.

> That isn't a reason for testing phone ops in CW.

Sure it is. Whether it's a sufficient reason is a matter of opinion.

> It might be a reason for
> using CW if we were that short of spectrum, which IMHO we're not.

Whether or not we're short of spectrum depends on a lot of things. In
the next few years, as the sunspot cycle continues to decline, we're
going to see many of the higher HF bands become essentially
line-of-sight for much of the time. Particularly winter evenings, when
many hams want to operate.
>
> > And if we say there should not be a skill test in one mode in order to
> > be allowed to use another, it's equally valid to say there should not
> > be a test on theory in order to use manufactured, no-tune radios
> > either.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> Not a good analogy, or even really an analogy atall.

Sure it is.

> That's like saying if
> you shouldn't have to learn basketball to play poker then you shouldn't
> have to learn to read to become a journalist.
>
That's not even an analogy! ;-)

The argument

"why test for code in order to use 'phone"

boils down to/is a subset of the larger argument

"why should I have to demonstrate that I know how to do A
in order to be allowed to do B,

when I already know how to do B,
and knowing how to do A has, at most,
only a very minor effect on how well I do B?"

Knowing how a modern, manufactured, very-few-if-any-adjustments ham rig works has, at most, only a very minor effect on how well someone operates that rig. Sure, many hams (including me) are very interested in what goes on behind the front panel, and a few of us (including me) actually design, build, repair and adjust our own rigs. But all of that is by choice, not requirement.

A ham needs to know where the bandedges are, and how wide his/her signal is, in order to stay inside them. That does not mean every ham must know, and be tested on, how a DDS synthesizer works (as just one example). Yet hams have to pass written tests full of stuff like that, which has little or nothing to do with operating a manufactured rig which may not even have a DDS synthesizer in it.

Doesn't mean we should dump or strip down the writtens. But we do need to realize that the above argument about "why should I have to do A..." can apply in all sorts of ways to the written tests.

73 de Jim, N2EY

487. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 16:30:46 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <WYQXa.10092$W%3.8287@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 73902

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj4e980.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Mon, 04 Aug 2003 20:01:22 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >Speak for yourself, Phil. I certainly CAN. I have witnessed the shift in
> >what the "citizens" (Remember that word?) want from *their* Citizen's
Band.
>
> I want a lot of things from "society" that there's no chance in hell
> that I will get.

Phil, what are we talking about here? By supporting the change of a rule via proper and legal protocol, am I really asking for something unreasonable? The Morse code requirement for HF AR is a recent hot issue. One of the most common statements I've read in support of its deletion is that "change is inevitable." I may not agree with the removal of Element 1, but I can't argue that all change is bad. I, for one, am not so afraid of change that I'll allow false pride override common sense.

> Learning to operate by the rules is a large part of
> radio operating maturity.

I agree. Is it your contention that changing, or attempting to change, a rule via the proper means is somehow a violation of sorts?

> You want to get into a discussion about who is qualified to
> determine what CB is all about - the inmates or the keepers?
> Hope you have your asbestos-lined teflon raincoat handy.....

"Inmates, keepers," Phil?! Are you kidding me? Let's stop and consider just what we're talking about here. This is what I'm in favor of.

1. The return of CB licensing. No test, but some accountability and enforcement. (...from said licensing proceeds.)
2. A written test with the 43 required Morse code characters in didah or .- format on one side and a random lettered listing of their written counterparts on the other. Ex.

1) -. ___ a. E
2) --- ___ b. Period
3) --.- ___ c. T
4) . ___ d. N
5) - ___ e. O
6) .-.-.- ___ f. Q

and so on...

Rote memorize the 43 characters, pass the test with a score of 70 (I'd prefer 85.) or better and receive and endorsement allowing you to work DX on channels 36 thorugh 40 USB at 12 Watts P.E.P. Yes, Phil...it IS that simple. Now if they'd just keep Element 1. :'-(

Further on the subject of "inmates" and "keepers," Phil. You're displaying a mentality that I've had the displeasure of witnessing over many years, having grown up in a law enforcement family...the us vs. them mentality. NOT "inmates," Phil...citizens. NOT "keepers," civil servants. It's easy to forget that when you worked for the FCC, you worked for "we the people." I don't believe I'm supporting anything harmful of subversive in what I've outlined above and the FCC admitted that they're aware that the majority of CBers support the removal of the 155.3 mi. limit. I personally don't think it'll ever happen and if the Morse code requirement is truly dropped in the USA, it'll likely become moot. That precious distinction you mentioned earlier may just become a little more blurred. The win-win opportunity was lost in 2000 and will likely not present itself again.

> >I personally have no want to bang my fist down on the table and proclaim
> >that "that's not what it was originally meant for." That's what it's become,
> >plain and simple.
>
> CB was not meant to be hobby radio, despite "what it has
> become". What it has become is something akin to a free-for-all
> where each one does what s/he wants.....

Enforcement! Where's the beef? Additionally, not ALL CBers are participants of said "free-for-all." I earned my GROL long before my ham tickets, but my exposure to CB is what picqued my interest in two-way communications and subsequently, AR.

> >Don't like it? Then get your fmr. comrades to kick it up a
> >notch or two wrt enforcement and stop it...
>
> I've been in favor of that for decades.....we used to have something
> called Special Enforcement Teams in the early 70s - "SWAT" teams for
> CB enforcement. When they came to town the grass was mowed real
> well. They were getting too close to certain Very High VIPs'
> interests and they were disbanded, allegedly for budgetary reasons.
> I would just as soon resurrect them.
>
> I'd rather not get into the history of the pissing contest between
> two now-deceased Bureau Chiefs over enforcement philosophy.

Don't let me get into my John Q. Taxpayer rant, hihi. ;-)

> >or admit their boo-boo (CB on HF
> >and they can't respond to a natuarally occuring phenomenon, hihi.) and try
> >to take a little advantage of the situation. It reallly could've been a
> >win-win situation back in 2000, Phil, but false pride got in the way.
>

> As I've always said - wanna' work skip and DX -- get a ham license.
> Wanna' use local personal or business communication - that's what CB
> is for.

Thats what CB was for and continues to serve as. There's no good reason why folks can't respond to a naturally occuring phenomenon when the band's open, especially when the majority of that "constituency" favors it. We're not talking about knockin' over convenience stores or driving 75 on city streets here, Phil. It's common sense.

> It comes down to wheher one is going to follow the rules or not.
> Plain and simple.

Rules can be changed, and quite frankly...it's the American way. It's called democracy. If I really believed it was harmful, (Other than to some false pride.) I surely wouldn't support it.

> >> What you are describing is hamming, not proper (some call it "legal")
CB
> >> operating.
> >
> >Yes, Phil, I think it's a GREAT idea to whet some CBer's
> >appetite with the words "If you like what you can do with 12 Watts on CB,
> >lemme show you what you with just a tad more effort and some studying on
> >20."
>
> Try "If you want to do all those things, the only place to do it
> is in ham radio."

It's been tried and it's not all that successful. Besides just what are "all those things" you're talking about? I'm only discussing one.

> CB is *NOT* the minor leagues or a training ground
> for ham radio.

I stand here as living proof to the contrary and I assure you, Phil...I'm nobody's lid. Not to blow my own horn, but I'm courteous OTA and in-person, convicted in my beliefs, concise in expressing those beliefs, quite open to changing my mind if shown wrong and admitting so, fairly well educated and am both a CBer and an ARO. I have nothing but respect for other's opinions and beliefs and I surely hope you understand that my disagreement with you re. this subject should not be construed as any lack of respect.

> It's that simple.

Stay tuned. (Pun intended) :-)

> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

488. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 16:40:13 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <N5RXa.10100$W%3.31@nwrdny01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 73903

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> wrote in message
news:8n4uiv0u2dukon46r2hehgsn5l2jquptiu@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 04 Aug 2003 20:01:22 GMT, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
> wrote:
>
> >I have an understanding of what CB WAS supposed to be for as well as what
it
> >HAS evolved into. (...and I don't mean the out-of-band lids with the
illegal
> >amplifiers either.)
>
> Well, then you must mean the IN-the-band lids with the illegal
> amplifiers. Not to mention echo mikes, electronic noisemakers,
> and...well, just listen down there and compile your own list.

You know, Ryan...I've been very very fortunate in that I've rarely
encountered the hordes of lids on the CB. I'm usually on ch. 38 LSB or ch.
40 USB and most folks I've had the pleasure of chatting with have been
pretty good ops. (By AR standards.)

> >I personally have no want to bang my fist down on the table and proclaim
> >that "that's not what it was originally meant for." That's what it's
become,
> >plain and simple. Don't like it? Then get your fmr. comrades to kick it
up a
> >notch or two wrt enforcement and stop it...
>
> I wholeheartedly second the motion!

After all, they do work for us.

> >or admit their boo-boo (CB on HF
> >and they can't respond to a natuarally occuring phenomenon, hihi.)
>
> I think they already have

Nah, you'll get all kinds of excuses wrt how unwieldy and expensive VHF gear
would've been back in 1958. But you know what...the manufacturers would've
worked that ou and historically ALWAYS have. That really wasn't the FCC's
job, it was, and still is, the job of the manufacturers.

> , and I think that's part of the reason why
> MURS was created, thus putting no-license radio on VHF where it ought
> to have been put in the first place.

Partly, yes.

> >and try
> >to take a little advantage of the situation.
>
> On the other hand, there's no enforcement on the MURS frequencies
> either. Around here (Buffalo, NY area) they already sound like the 11m
> band, complete with illegal power levels and toilet-mouthed jerks,
> many of whom can also be heard on 11m.

Enforcement? Where's the beef?! Oh, it went to pay for that $400 hammer or
that $1,200 barracks toilet bowl.

> Then there's the marine VHF band...

Ouch, low blow! ;-)

> 73 DE John, KC2HMZ

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

489. ARNewsline 1355 - Aug 1 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 16:45:28 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030805124528.14640.00001644@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 73904

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1355 – August 1 2003

A NOTE TO THOSE WHO ONLY “READ” AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE(tm)

For those of you who only know of the Amateur Radio Newsline (tm) as a text newsletter we would like to invite you to listen to the audio version. This Amateur Radio Newsline (tm) script is actually written for the “spoken word.” It is recorded each by professional broadcasters and is available for private listening or rebroadcast over your repeater. Two methods of delivery are available: FTP MP3 or dial-in telephone. Please visit our website at http://www.arnewsline.org for a list of telephone numbers (you have to pay your own long distance charges) and links to our voice newscast. On site free FTP Downloads are available at our site by clicking on the newscast number at the top of the page.

de
The Newsline Production Team

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1355 with a release date of Friday, August 1 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Amateur Radio helps solve a murder by tracking down one of its own. Get to know about the ham radio heroes involved in the hunt for a cop killer on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1355 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

ENFORCEMENT OF A DIFFERENT KIND: AMATEUR RADIO HELPS HUNT HAM WHO KILLED MICHIGAN COP

Hams in Michigan were called on to help track down a cop killer after what should have been a routine arrest became a grusome homicide scene. It happened on July 6th. Amateur Radio Newsline’s David Black, KB4KCH, is here with the rest of the story:

--

Never in Michigan's ham radio history has there been a case like Scott Woodring's. It began July 6th. That's when Woodring, KC8JNG, a member of the

Christian Identity movement and described as a survivalist, shot and killed a Michigan state police officer. It happened while Woodring was being arrested for solicitation of a minor.

A stand-off ensues and lasts nearly a day. During a law enforcement shift change, Woodring manages to escape, triggering an extensive manhunt throughout western lower Michigan. That's when ham radio operators became involved, since it was suspected that Woodring had been using amateur radio equipment to communicate with other members of his group.

James Wades, WB8SIW, is Michigan's RACES Officer and Section Emergency Coordinator:

--

Wades: “I directed the EC for Newago Co. to establish an intercept peratio in the area and monitor seldom used frequencies in and about he VHF 2 meter band. And, additionally, we sent out a broadcast nouncemnt to selected areas to selected area RACES members thrughout Michigan, essentially asking them to listen for conversations between Mr. Wodring and whomever else he might speak with.”

--

That paid off. A ham in Holton, Michigan reported monitoring Woodring and another operator talking on the air. The intercept was reported to state police they then asked government agencies including the FCC to provide direction finding assistance to find Woodring. But it was a Friday night and police couldn't get any response from the federal agencies. So Wades says investigators turned to radio amateurs for help:

--

Wades: “We deployed amateur radio teams from several counties in the area, and had pretty much a continuous radio direction finding occurring throughout the weekend, with teams from from Kent, Ottawa and Musquogen Counties. We also had teams on standby in Kalamazoo County as well as the Civil Air Patrol team – which weren’t utilized, but it was reassuring to know that they were there”

--

Hams and the police knew the general area where Woodring was believed to be hiding. Wades says it was an eyewitness who ultimately led to Woodring being found:

--

Wades: “Mr. Woodring was discovered through a tip from a citizen who saw him essentially taking shelter in a non working vehicle. When Michigan state police officers approached, he leveled an assault rifle at them and he was subsequently shot to death when he refused t comply with orders or lower the rifle.”

--

Wades says police were hesitant at first to work with radio amateurs. But he says the hams' efforts made a powerful and positive impact with law enforcement agencies.

--

Wades: “When all was said and done the feedback has been incredabally positive. Tremendously good comments about the professionalism and the skills of the radio amateurs involved. And basically I think that they were somewhat – almost shocked at the capabilities and the skill level of our ARES and RACES members in Michigan, which, of course was highly complimentary”

--

Around 40 radio amateurs took part in the effort to help find Woodring. Wades says the hams involved coordinated their work with police carefully, even establishing a dress code for hams reporting on scene with investigators. The professionalism Michigan hams showed has given law officers a new appreciation for the kind of help radio amateurs can provide when it's needed.

From Birmingham Alabama, I’m avid Black, KB4KCH, reporting for the Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

In all, RACES members provided 494 staff-hours to the man hunt. Most of this was contributed during the 36-hour period when radio direction finding activites to locate Woodring were being conducted. (ARNewsline(tm) from lead provided at www.qrz.com)

**

THE FIGHT FOR OUR SPECTRUM: HAM RADO VS. BPL

If you think that the term Broadband Over Powerlines and its acronym BPL will never afect you, guess again. BPL could effectively spell and end to ham radio as we know it. This, if it is ever approved by the FCC and popularized across our nation.

Just how real is the chalange to the survival of the Amateur Radio Service? ARRL Southwestern Division Director Art Goddard, W6XD, gave some graphic details at last weeks Fort Tuthill Hamfest in Arizona based on test data collected by Ed Hare, W1RFI, of the ARRL Lab:

--

Goddard: “If you are an engineer, anywhere from 33 to 63 decibels increase in the noise level thatr you will see at your reciever due to BPL run in the power lines in your neighborhod. If you are into S-Meter readings, thats somewhere between an S-6 and 10 over S-9.”

--

For those unaware, Broadband over Powerlines is a scheme to give consumers and businesses high speed Internet connections using the existing power distribution grid. This would put the power providers in the position of also being broadband internet providers as well. The problem is that powerlines are not shielded. They will act as much like giant antennas as they will a closed carrier of the broadband connection. In other words, whatever is on the power lines will be radiated and heard by your ham band reciever. And Art Goddard says that the Broadband Over Powerline signals will occupy the spectrum from 2 through 80 MHz, meaning every band from 75 meters through 6 meters will be affected.

According to Goddard, BPL has the backing of the White House which views the increased use of unlicensed devices as being good for the U-S economy. He also notes that the FCC – which is supposed to be neutral and regulating in the public interest, is – in this case -- actng like cheerleaders for the proposed service.

Goddard says that this is an issue that the ARRL is keeping a very close eye on. He also indicates that the League may soon be asking ham radio operators to lend their voice in opposition to BPL. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

RESTRUCTURING: NCVEC FILES TO END CW TESTING IN THE USA

The National Conference of Volunteer Examination Coordinators has filed a Petition for Rule Making before the FCC to end Morse testing in the United States. In its July 29th request, the NCVEC asks the FCC for an immediate end of CW testing of applicants.

The NCVEC request is based primarily on the action taken in Geneva at last months World Radiocommunications Conference. At that time, Morse testing as a world standard was abolished, leaving it to individual nations to decide whether or not to continue to administer CW exams.

The NCVEC petition concurs with the WRC findings. It notes an appearance that most of today’s radio amateurs want to communicate using voice. Because of this, the NCVEC says that it makes no sense from a regulatory standpoint to require hams to be Morse proficient when the greater majority of radio amateurs show no desire to use the mode. The petition also notes that the future of the hobby now encompasses many new modes that were undreamed of only a few short years ago. It adds that while manual telegraphy is a noble part of Amateur Radio’s past, it is no longer the services prime emission mode.

The NCVEC approach will still requires all applicants for an Amateur Service license or upgrade to pass the current written exams. Only Morse testing would be eliminated.

As we go to air no Rule Making designation has been assigned to this request by the FCC. The full text of the petition can be found on our website at www.arnewsline.org (ARNewsline(tm) from NCVEC release)

**

HAM RADIO TESTING: QPC RECALLS QUESTION

Also from the National Conference of Volunteer Examiners Coordinators word that its Question Pool Committee of has withdrawn question T5B04 from the Element 2 Question Pool. This, effective July 27th. This question is withdrawn due to the changes in Part 97 of the Amateur Service rules dealing with the new 60 Meter amateur allocation. (NCVEC)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the WR9ARC repeater of the Riverland Amateur Radio Club serving La Crosse, Wisconsin.

(5 sec pause here)

**

HAM SPECTRUM: ARRL & CQ PRESENTS A PRIMER ON 5 MHZ

And speaking about 60 meters, want to know just about everything there is to know about how to operate legally in this new 5 MHz spot frequencies? Walk, run or drive to your news stand and buy a copy of the August issues of both QST and CQ Magazines. Then go home, settle down and read the articles titled 60 Meters Frequently Asked Questions by Rick Lindquist N1RL and Ed Hare W1RFI in QST and Getting Ready For 60 by Gordon West, WB6NOA. Both are a wealth of information on how to approach this rather specialized allocation and handily compliment one another. We asked Gordo to explain what readers will find in his:

--

West: “One of the things that my CQ Magazine article talked about was the Amateur frequencies And tuning in. There was allot of confusion about what exact frequency one uses for upper sideband on the 60 meter band. As long as everybody remembers that 60 meters – 5 MHz – point 5 -- all of the upper sideband frequencies end with point 5.”

--

And why did her write the article?

--

West: “When I first heard about the band it immediately came to mind as channelized operation that many new hams are not used to. Well, growing up on 10 meter FM as well as 6 meter FM, I knew what channelized operation was all about. And the key word is “sharing.” There’s no QSY'ing – at least not easily on the 60 meter band beyond the 5 channels, so its going to be up to all hams to sort of take turns in using this exciting 60 meter – 5 MHz band.”

--

Where Gordon takes the story telling approach, Lindquist and Hare present their material in pure Question and Answer form. A style of writing that computer

enthusiasts call a FAQ. That's an acronym for the words "Frequently Asked Questions" and the answers that they provide is fact filled, precise and right to the point.

Taken together, "60 Meters Frequently Asked Questions" and "Getting Ready for 60" are the most complete operating guide for the 5 MHz band penned to date. Hams contemplating operation on the five channels that make up the 60 meter allocation would be well advised to read both before hitting the transmit switch.

For more information about subscribing to CQ, visit www.cq-amateur-radio on the world wide web. You can join the ARRL, support its work and begin receiving QST by signing up at www.arrl.org. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

THE WAR ON TERROR: TWO HAMS KILLED IN IRAQ

Two recent casualties of the war in Iraq were amateur radio operators, one American and one from Sri Lanka. The ARRL Letter reports that Specialist Jon Fettig, KCZ0HSQ, of Dickinson, North Dakota, was killed in an ambush on July 22nd.

The following day, Nadisha Yassari Ranmuthu, 4S7NR, an International Red Cross aid worker, was killed and his Iraqi driver was wounded after their vehicle, marked with the Red Cross emblem, came under fire south of Baghdad. Ranmuthu was 37 and well-known in the Sri Lankin ham radio community. (ARRL)

**

ENFORCEMENT: HAM TOLD HE MUST RESPOND TO FCC QUERRY

A California ham has been told that he had better respond to an earlier FCC letter to him regarding a pair of uncoordinated repeaters that he allegedly operates. Otherwise it could cost him his ham ticket. The agency's Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, explains:

--

Duckworth: "The Enforcement Bureau has sent a warning letter to WA6SEK, Thomas De Lasaux, of Stockton California, concerning uncoordinated repeaters on 224.660 Mhz and 441.275 Mhz. There has been no response to a letter of May 5th where he had 20 days to reply. He is being afforded an additional 20 days to respond."

--

According to Duckwoth, if there was no resolution by July 25th, the agency planned to initiate enforcement action against WA6SEK's Amateur Service license. Its now past that date and we are awaiting word from the FCC as to wheter or not De Lasaux has filed the required reply. (FCC, RAIN)

**

ENFORCEMENT: TRUCKING COMPANY WARNED ABOUT UNLICENSED 10 METER OPERATION

Also receiving a letter from the FCC is the Tidewater Transit Company, Inc. of Kinston, North Carolina. This one warns the company to stop using the 10 meter ham band for its communications or face some rather severe consequences.

In his letter to Tidewather, the FCC's Riley Hollingsworth notes that information before the Commission indicates that a 2002 Volvo truck belonging to Tidewater and bearing North Carolina license plate LK 4130, was the source of radio transmissions on the Ten Meter Amateur Radio band on July 8th. This while it was driving on Interstate 20 near the city of Lexington, South Carolina.

The Letter warned Tidewater that continued unlicensed operation could bring with it a fine of up to $10,000. The owners of Tidewater Transit were also instructed to contact Hollingsworth to discuss the matter with him. (FCC)

**

RESCUE RADIO: HAMS TO THE RESCUE AS CELL PHONES FAIL

Interlinked emergency repeaters played a key role in providing communications during the recent Arizona wildfires.

As learned at last weekends Ft. Tuthill Hamfest, radio amateurs in Navajo County set up repeater links to allow contact between the Red Cross communications center and a number of evacuation sites. This, after it was found that cellular telephone coverage across the area was inadaquite.

The hams stepped in when the walkie-talkie feature of the cellular telephones failed to operate as advertised. The reason appears to have been the small number of relay sites available in the isolated areas where the fires were burning.

The hastilly assembled Amateur Radio relay system along with existing high level Amateur service repeaters are reported to have performed flawlessly. This made possible an ongoing exchange of vital evacuation information. (ARNewsline (tm) from information gathered at Ft. Tuthill Hamfest)

**

RESCUE RADIO: E-911 KIND OF ON HOLD

A lack of funding from cash-strapped state and local governments appears to be slowing the rollout of enhanced 911 services. And in some areas it has put the new wireless emergency phone location service on what appears to be an indefinite hold.

--
Under FCC regulations, wireless companies were required to respond to 911 center requests within six months by providing technology that can locate any individual on a given wireless phone networks who is using a phone equipped to gather information from the global positioning satellite system. This technology lets emergency operators locate cell phone users in need of assistance, but only one in ten emergency call centers has access to it.

But John Melcher, who is the president of the National Emergency Number Association says that moneys earmarked for Enhanced 911 are being spent on other needs. In a recent press statement Melcher charged that some states have diverted millions of dollars
in Enhanced 911 funds collected from consumers and have used the money to subsidize budget shortfalls. This says Melcher puts the public in danger, adding that moneys earmarked on customer billing for Enhanced 911 services should be spent only on Enhanced 911 and nothing else.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

The FCC set specific deadlines for implementing this new service back in 1966. To date, many providers have yet to meet that implementation goal. (Published news reports)

**

RESCUE RADIO: THE INTERNATIONAL AREN NET

Still with rescue radio and emergency communications news, word that the Irish Amateur Radio Emergency Network takes to the air for its regularly scheduled drill session the first Tuesday of each month. The net is at 21:45 local Ireland time. Thats pretty close to UTC, with the net operating on 7 point 043 Mhz on SSB. (Q-News)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

EMERGING TECHNOLOGY: WI-FI SPEED INCREASED 4X

The most widely used wireless local area network protocol, IEEE Standard 802.11, also known as Wi-Fi, was extended last month to make it four times faster. The CGC Communicator reports that the new standard, IEEE 802.11g transmits data at up to 54 Megabits per second. Thats up from 11 megabytes per second as was called for in Wi-Fi standard 802.11b. (CGC Communicator)

(DO NOT READ: CGC)

**

INTERNATIONAL - ASIA: NON HAMS INVADING THE 7, 10 AND 14 MHz HANDS

The increasing use of more frequencies on various ham radio bands by the Indonesians and other South East Asian non amateurs for their personal or business traffic, is becoming a very serious problem. Q-News reports that the

Indonesians are using the lower 40 kHz of 40 meters, and frequencies around 14 point 100 MHz in the 20 Meter band most of the time.

Nor have they spared the 10 MHz allocation. There unlicensed oprators are regularly heard in the 10.0 to 10.1 MHz segment which primarily carries international air traffic control communications.

Q-News notes that this is a very serious situation. One which could endanger the lives and safety of air travelers in ITU Region 3 and a situation that needs to be to be dealt with quickly at the highest levels of international diplomacy. (Q-News)

**

INTERNATIONAL - UK: BBC HELPS THE BLIND

The British Broadcasting Company is playing a crucial role in developing new radio equipment that could help increase number of visually-impaired people working at the organization. Across the UK, BBC local radio stations are converrting from analog to digital equipment. The digital equipment is designed to make life easy for full-sighted broadcast journalists, using a visual touch-screen system, which is why it needs to be adapted for visually-impaired people.

Now comes word that Claire Jennings, who is the the BBC’s Disability Advisor for Technology, has been working alongside technology company Calrec. This, to design a digital radio broadcast mixing console that is user-friendly for visually-impaired radio producers

The BBC has spent the past few months working with Calrec to adapt the broadcast desk and with BBC Technology to extend the touch-screen control system so that it can convert text into speech and be controlled using a standard keyboard. As well as controlling sources to faders on the Calrec, the BBC system can control most other hardware in a similar manner.

The entire story may be found in cyberspace www.bbctechnology.com/newsarchive4.htm. (Media Network)

**

SPACE: NASA TEAMS WITH LOCAL LIBRARIES TO DELIVER -- SPACE

NASA and the American Library Association have partnered to create a one-of-a-kind interactive space research exhibit. This, as part of a new program called NASA @ your library.

The unique exhibit will tour 120 public libraries in five regions across the nation for the next two years. It will feature special presentations specifically created to expose people of all ages to NASA research in the areas of health, home and transportation, agriculture and environment, and commerce.

The program was recently launched at the Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore. NASA @ your library was created to inspire more participation at public libraries, raise awareness and encourage interest in science. (NASA)

**

CONTEST CALENDAR: FISTS C2C IN SEPTEMBER

Mark September 13th and 14th on your calendar for the third outing of the annual Fists Coast to Coast contest. This year the contest will run a full 24 hours beginning at 5 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time on September 13th and concluding at 5 P.M. on the 14th. That corresponds 0000 to 2400 UTC on September 14.

This year the rules are easier to understand and the sponsors say that there is the potential for higher scores due to the use of multipliers. The URL for rules and awards is complex and appears in the print edition of this report. If you have questions, please e-mail them to Paul Beringer NG7Z at fistsc2c@yahoo.com. On-line information is at www.tomochka.com/k7fff/fnw_c2c03.html. (FISTS)

**

DX

In D-X, word that two separate groups will be operating from Swaziland through the 3rd of August. K4SV and VA7DX will be active as 3DA0SV and 3DA0WC. Four South African operators will be on as 3DA0DX between the same dates. QSL each group as directed on the air. (GB2RS)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: ARNEWSLINE TAKES YOU TO A HAM RADIO BALLON LAUNCH

And finally this week, take a listen to this:

--
“15,790 feet. Course 44 degrees moving at 10 miles an hour.”
--

That’s the report of one of the controllers tracking a high altitude ham radio balloon launch that took place Saturday, July 26th at the Fort Tuthill Hamfest just outside of Flagstaff Arizona.

The launch was sponsored by hams belonging to Arizona Near Space Research. Brian Bingham is a Physics teacher from Deer Valley High School in Glendale, Arizona, who came out to take part in the launch. He says that many of those assisting are also educators who want to bring space a bit closer to their classrooms:

--
Bingham: “Most of the people you see out here helping are that group and a group of Arizona high school teachers that are going to be taking on some of the balloon launches. They will have teams from their schools do balloon launches through the NASA Arizona Space Grant.”

--

Bingham, who was a radio amateur many years ago described the system being readied to be sent aloft:

--

Bingham: “You can see a small package down here. It was built by one of the teams from a workshop and contains temperature sensors, humidity sensors, a small still camera, solar cells all in something just a little over a pound in weight. It has telemetry equipment with GPS position via satellite and transmits it back so that we an track it on the ground and recover the equipment.”

--

And how high will it all go?

--

Bingham: The balloon will go up to somewhere in the neighborhood of 100,000 feet. The balloon will also swell to somewhere about forty feet in diameter before it finally bursts. And then the parachute will bring it back down to Earth.

--

Brian Bingham says that his students will soon be choosing a project of their own to launch to the edge of space on a future balloon flight. It will be another educational experience made possible through the cooperative efforts of NASA, the educational community and ham radio. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, Amateur News Weekly, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Jeff Clark, K8JAC, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

490. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 17:16:02 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308050916.6ae3d533@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73905

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bgn93euac1@adenine.netfront.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030804082114.27503.00001423@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > In article <bgk9k5$1u3$1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim"
> <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> > writes:
>
> [Preface: this message is rather confusing to try and keep attributes on, so
> I hope I do a decent job of it]
>
> >
> > >> >> The point is, what does passing a CW test prove in the way of
> > >> >> knowledge--other than that one can pass a CW test?
>
> > >> It proves that:
>
> > >> 1) The person has learned a useful radio skill at a very basic level.
>
> > >Then, why not have a "net operation" test? Net operation is fairly
> > >standard. That's as basic a level as you can get: everyone understands
> the
> > >English Language (at least those who are testing for a US amateur radio
> > >license).
> >
> > Actually, based on some postings here, understanding of English should not
> be
> > taken for granted!
> >
> > Net operation test? Good idea! In fact, I have posted suggestions here
> about a
> > similar (but simpler) test. Basic idea was that the person taking the
> test
> > would demonstrate the ability to send and receive simple messages in
> standard
> > form using either CW/Morse, voice, or a data mode. I can google up the
> details
> > if you want.
> >
>
> Well. No, you don't have to do that. I believe you ;) I think it's a
> great idea to have some such thing like that.

Well, that makes two of us.
>
> > However, when I proposed such a test as a replacement for the code test,
> > there
> > was universal opposition from nocodetest folks. That's when I realized
> > that for
> > some of the loudest complainers here it wasn't really about the code at
> > all,
> > but about the idea of operating skills and standard procedures.
>
> They had a problem with the way you say you proposed it: as a choice of
> either CW/Morse, voice, or a data mode?!

Yep. And it wasn't even a net-based test, just a simple "pass a formal
message test", which is even simpler. (I like the net idea, btw).

> Geeze, that is whining! Because I
> don't have a problem with that at all. In fact, even if the CW test hangs
> around, I think the presentation of it ought to be in net format. The
> questions could be something like, "who was the net control station," etc.

Yup.

The idea can be expanded to multiple levels, too. Start out with a
simple, short message and a "net" composed of maybe the NCS and person
being tested, excellent conditions, etc. Higher levels involve
increased complexity.

And I'll tell ya, if ya really wanna see CW in action, follow a
traffic net where the ops have full hooks and know what they're doing.
I recall one Xmas-season session of EPA where I was NCS and the net
passed 42 messages in standard ARRL format. The session lasted 30
minutes.
>
> > >> 2) The person was willing and able to devote the time and effort
> > >> necessary
> > >> to learn that skill.
>
> > >That has nothing to do with their participation in ham radio.
> >
> > So? There's no requirement that any licensee actually participate. There
> > used
> > to be, btw.
> >
>
> I understand that.

Long time ago (40+ years) you had to certify you had been on the air
for a certain number of hours to renew your license.

> I also understand there used to be requirement for
> upgrading with a certain amount of time.

That only ever applied to the Novice. 1951-1967, one year, 1967-1974
two years.

Most hams today do not remember those times.

> I know that is why there is such a
> population of folks who think it's an all-out sin to stay as a Novice, Tech,
> etc.

I'm not one of those. I encourage folks to upgrade, but not doing so
doesn't mean they are bad hams.
>
> BUT, the current requirements do not mandate that a licensee participate; so
> why have that as part of a scope for an amateur radio license? If the
> requirement for participation hours comes back, *then* include testing
> parameters that will measure a person's willingness, devotion...

The problem is that, for the good of the ARS, we need to be
self-policing. I've heard things on the 'phone bands that, if recorded
and played back at a WRC or to a skeptical FCC, would make it really
tough to defend the need for the ARS to have use of the spectrum,
rather than some other service. Or even to exist.

> > >> 3) The person has been exposed to a useful, widely-used-by-hams radio
> > >> communications mode other than voice or data.
>
> > >Like I said, then test on voice. It's the widest-used-by-hams radio
> > >communication. Why not test the most used mode?
> >
> > Why test what almost everyone can do?
>
> I think your proposal is similar to the idea of "testing voice." Use a test
> that measures the capability of one to conform to net standards. While nets
> all have different *styles* the standards are pretty much throughout.

Some would argue that (not me).

Didja know amateur CW nets use special "QN" signals to speed up
operations? Like "QNC - all net stations copy", "QNA - answer in
prearranged order", "QNX - you are excused from the net", and many
more.

> > My proposed message-skills test would have left the choice of mode up to
> > the person being tested. What could be fairer?
>
> Absolutely! I hope you don't think I'd have a problem with something like
> that?

I met with so much opposition when it was posted that perhaps I
expected it...
>
> > >> Then your knowledge of amateur radio is very lacking. Like it or not,
> > >> CW/Morse
> > >> is a very big part of amateur radio today. Of course, that by itself

> > >> doesn't prove we must have a code test.
>
> > >Thank you.
> >
> > You're welcome.
> >
> > > And, was that you acquiescing?
> >
> > Nope.
> >
> > When you boil down all the arguments, almost everything on any ARS license
> > test
> > (real or proposed) comes down to somebody's opinion on what's important
> > and
> > what isn't. Proof just doesn't exist, one way or the other. Take Ohm's
> > Law -
> > why MUST it be tested? Some hams do perfectly well with little or no
> > knowledge
> > of it, and yet it's on the tests because somebody thinks it's important
> > enough
> > to force it down everyone's throats.
>
> True, but you reasoned that the parts of the testing process I have a
> problem with were for measure of devotion, and such. We are not discussing,
> really, what is important in ham radio for--truly--the only real important
> thing for ham radio is that one comprehend, be familiar with, and employ the
> Rules and Regulations from the FCC; and become familiar with the "ways" of
> ham radio (gentelmen's agreements, standard communication protocols, etc.)

That's a big part of what's important. I'd be really happy if all hams
did that much!

It's also important to actually get on the air and use the ham bands,
because no matter how many of us there are, or how advanced our
technology, if we don't use 'em, we lose 'em.

> While unpopular for ham radio, if someone doesn't take the time to "be
> careful" in building equipment, putting up and antenna, building
> this-or-that, it is generally them that is going to get hurt. Advertisement
> of a few tragedies and people are going to get the idea that they need some
> independent study to be safe in what they do with ham radio.

Yup. And in other areas of life, licensing generally exists to protect
innocent others from someone's ignorance, not to protect people from
themselves. Example: The reason we have building safety codes is not
to protect people from hurting themselves in their homes, but to
protect their neighbors and visitors.

> No net
> control, RACES or ARES Coordinator is going to turn loose an inexperienced,
> rough rider of a ham onto the general public. So, IMHO, the only true

> measure for ham licensing should be through a written test that measures
> knowledge of the FCC R&R, the Communications Act, etc.
>
> HOWEVER; I concede and certainly will agree to keep CW testing, because I do
> believe in *some* of the traditions of ham radio; and CW is one of them. I
> also like your idea and would support something like that.

Thanks - now tell FCC and ARRL!

> > >> >> It's bad enough that the written tests don't prove a whole lot,
> > >> >> without
> > >> >> the added argument of CW in the mix. To continue to support CW as
> > >> >> some form of
> > >> >> proof that people know more about ham radio, know more about >>
> > >> >> communication,
> > >> >> know more about the standards and technology of ham radio, et al, is
> to
> > >> >> continue to do nothing but whine about a tradition--which is really
> all
> > >> >> CW really is: A TRADITION that no one wants to see fade away.
>
> > >> You are mistaken on several counts there, Kim.
>
> > >> 1) The written tests are what they are. They are in a continuing state
> of
> > >> development.
>
> > >> 2) ALL ELSE BEING EQUAL, a ham who has Morse skills knows more about
> > >> amateur radio than one with no Morse skills.
>
> > >I disagree. A ham who has CW skills knows more about CW than one with no
> >CW
> > skills.
> >
> > And since CW/Morse is a big important part of amateur radio, a ham who has
> CW
> > skills knows more about amateur radio than one with no CW skills.
> >
>
> I think we are splitting hairs, here.

Perhaps. Or semantics.

> > You cannot escape that conclusion. Of course, that conclusion does not
> prove
> > that CW must have its own test, just that "ALL ELSE BEING EQUAL, a ham who
> has
> > Morse skills knows more about amateur radio than one with no Morse
> skills."
>
> We will have to agree to disagree on this one.

>
> > >>
> > >> 3) Morse/CW has certain advantages to hams beyond being "just another
> > >> mode".
>
> > >That does not merit a CW test.
> >
> > In your opinion. In others' opinions, it does.
>
> Well, certainly. I'm puzzled here. I always deal in opinions.

See below
>
> > >>
> > >> 4) Morse/CW is more than "just a tradition". It's a useful mode of
> radio
> > >> communication enjoyed by hundreds of thousands of hams.
>
> > >That does not merit a CW test.
> >
> > In your opinion. In others' opinions, it does.
> >
>
> (see above)
>
> > >>
> > >> 5) There do exist folks who want Morse/CW USE (not just the TEST) by
> hams
> > >> to simply go away. They are a very small minority, but they do exist.
> Or at
> > >> least
> > >> there are people whose rhetoric indicates they want Morse use by hams
> to
> > >> end.
>
> > >That's their problem, not mine. I don't believe CW will ever exit from
> the
> > >ham radio scene.
> >
> > I hope you are right about that.
> >
> > >> Of course, whether all of that "proves" we must have a code test is
> simply
> > >> a matter of opinion.
>
> > >> >> Passing CW is nothing.
>
> > >> Maybe not to you. To others, it's a big deal.
>
> > >Well, I worded that wrong. Passing CW is a big deal, but it does nothing

> > >for the benefit of ham radio, save that that particular operator may use
> > >CW--but that particular operator would probably have used CW anyway,
> then.
> >
> > If it does nothing, why all the fuss?.
> >
>
> ABSOLUTELY!!!!!!!! Why, Jim? A cursory explanation from me would be: 1)
> that CW is such a tradition that any attempt to alter its state is seen as
> an assault on a very beloved part of ham radio, 2) that, to many, change is
> very difficult; mostly to reason seekers, i.e., if any change is made to CW
> is must mean _____ and that CW will fade from the ARS, 3) there is
> some degree of....well, jealousy would be a lousy term...but some degree of
> bad feeling for others not having to be "raked through the coals" to get
> their license, and 4) the longheld belief that CW study to pass a test
> proves what you and I are debating here.
>
> But, the root of your question: "why all the fuss" gets a whole ABSOLUTELY
> from me. Why all the fuss?

The fuss is on both sides. You passed Element 1 - was it REALLY that
much of a problem?
>
> [Snipped, but hopefully illuminated below:]
> > >>
> > >> That's simply illogical. No test, no matter how contrived, will filter
> out
> > >> every single "jerk" from the ranks of amateur radio. Or anything else,
> for
> > >> that matter.
>
> > >I know that, and you know that. But others here either don't know that
> or
> > >don't want to let go of that part of the argument.
> >
> > I've never seen anyone argue that a code test is a perfect "jerk filter".
> I
> > have seen people argue that it is not a "jerk filter" at all. I've also
> seen
> > arguments that since it's not a perfect "jerk filter", it has no effect at
> all
> > on "jerks".
> >
>
> The phrase "dumbing down" comes to mind. Most of us would agree that jerks
> are dumb.

I don't. I've met some pretty smart jerks.

Or rather, there are all sorts of categories of "dumb" and "smart". We
both probably know people who can hardly construct a coherent sentence

(which some might call "dumb") but who can fix or build anything with
great skill (which some might call "smart") etc.

Or to put it bluntly, we probably know people with multiple Ph.D.s
(which some might call "smart") who don't have the horse sense to come
in out of the rain.

> If CW testing is supported to the extent that to lose it is to
> "dumb down" the ARS, and bring the CBers in, and...well, you know all the
> comments; then isn't that an acknowledgement of the belief that, somehow,
> the CW test keeps all that from happening? Like I said, you and I know that
> it doesn't; but there are those who believe it does.

Every test has some effects. Whether those effects justify the test is
really just an opinion.

We will probably see what the effects of no more CW testing will be in
a few years.
>
> > >>
> > >> Look at how much it takes just to become a physician. The training and
> > >> testing
> > >> required is phenomenal, and designed to weed out the incapable. The
> hard
> > >> work
> > >> and dedication required just to get into medical school are
> extraordinary,
> > >> and
> > >> yet that's just the beginning. I could go on and on, but you get the
> > >> picture.
>
> > >I will not argue the merit of CW testing against the measure of training
> and
> > >testing for a professional field. There is no reason to put someone
> through
> > >the same stressful training and testing that a physician goes through,
> for
> > >an amateur radio license.
> >
> > Apparently you did not get the picture at all.
> >
> > The point is simply that NO test or training is a perfect "jerk filter",
> not
> > even at the level of what doctors go through.
> > >
>
> I would not argue that, as noted above.

OK
>
> > >> >>
> > >> Using CW as a test to prove "diligence" to the desire of wanting to

> be
> > >> >> a ham radio operator is pure crap in my not-so-humble opinion.
>
> > >> OK, fine. At least you note that it's your opinion.
> >
>
> Jim, all my statements are my opinion. Can I ask you what in the world else
> you think they would be?

Some of them are facts - see below.

>
> > >
> > >One would hope, Jim, that everyone realizes we post our opinions.
> >
> > We post both opinions and objective facts. The problem is that some folks
> > try to pass off their opinions as objective facts.

> I hope I don't do that. If I do, it is not intentional.

The point is that we all deal in both opinions and facts, and it's
important to keep them straightened out. Example:

Your hubby exists - that's a plain, simple, objective fact. Not
debatable.

Your hubby is a darlin', lovin' wonderful guy - that's an opinion.

It's debatable.

Of course for somebody who isn't married to him to debate that opinion
is pretty dumb, huh? ;-)

> > >> >> It is wrong to even attempt to measure someone's desire and
> interest.
>
> > >> Why? I'd rather have an ARS consisting of a few hundred thousand
> > >> interested,
> > >> active, dedicated, skilled, knowledgeable hams than one of a few
> million
> > >> inactive, apathetic, unskilled, ignorant ones who could not care less.
> > >> Code test or no code test.
>
> > >And, I'd rather have *everyone.*
> >
> > That means there should be no tests and no qualifications at all. We've
> seen
> > what happens to a radio service that takes that route. No thanks.
> >
>
> Well, then let me clarify that I mean I would have everyone who meets
> whatever requirements there is currently when they are "applying."

That's part of it. I'd add:

"and who one comprehend, be familiar with, and employ the
Rules and Regulations from the FCC; and become familiar with the
"ways" of
ham radio (gentelmen's agreements, standard communication protocols,
etc.)"

(very useful quote, actually)

> Maybe
> it's only here, but I tell you I have seen more crappy people--those who
> would probably earn the title lid, cbplusser, etc.--get wiped off the air
> because of being ignored.

Self-policing at its best.

> Now, if the floodgates opened and there is not a
> testing structure of some kind, or a licensing structure of some kind, ham
> radio would certainly become a cesspool. Remember that CB radio used to be
> much better until the FCC relaxed regulations there; or, more to the point,
> quit enforcement opportunities there.

I don't know how far back your cb experience goes, but I have listened
there since the mid-'60s. Even back then, things were coming unglued.
The general cb culture (at least here in EPA/SNJ/DEL) by 1968 or so
was one of simply ignoring any rule or reg that the person didn't
like. Yes, there were some very nice people. I never got on cb because
of what I heard, and that culture.

> > >> >> If I have an Extra
> > >> >> license and I have no equipment or haven't even been on the radio in
> > >> >> years,
> > >> >> then what did passing CW prove, in terms of proven interest?
> Nothing.
> > >> >> And it never will.
>
> > >> Incorrect. It proved that at one time the person had the interest.
>
> > >Oh, wow...
> >
> > When's the last time YOU were on the ham bands, Kim?
> >
>
> A looooong time ago; but I am still interested. And, m'darlin' is putting
> his radio back in his truck so I imagine we'll be full fledged again soon.

(Montgomery Burns voice ON:)

Excellent!

(Montgomery Burns voice OFF)

> By the way, I understand it is quite common for people to drop out, come
> back, drop out, come back, etc.

Been that way since the beginning. Work, school, moving, you name it.
Even an active ham's involvement goes up and down. There were several
years when my entire operation was a 2 meter FM rig and Field Day.
Everything else was packed away.
>
> > >> Because those modes don't require the acquisition of new skills for
> their
> > >> use.
> > >
> > >Uh, 'scuse me? They require being able to establish communication
> between
> > >devices, have the signal within a certain bandwidth, etc.
> >
> > Plug 'n' play, Kim. No test for that. Does it really take a lot of skill
> to use
> > an HT?
>
> Nope, but let's say it is a test requirement to put together an APRS
> station, under the guidelines and equipment that was available only up to
> about five years ago.

Piece of cake.

> It is NOT easy, and at that time everything had to
> wired yourself, or you could pay a much-higher-than-I-was-willing price--but
> for testing we'd leave out the order for the wiring harness.

Where do I plug in the sodder arn?

> That is using
> a TNC, radio, GPS receiver, and we could even through in the computer for a
> full APRS station. Not easy. In fact, even with my much more technical
> husband on board, we still had to call to North Carolina and have a elmer
> walk us through the way to do it! I'd have failed a ham test for
> sure--wouldn't Dick and Larry and Dave just love that!

HAW!

In some countries, prospective hams had to scratch build a receiver of
a certain complexity level, get it to work, use it for a certain
amount of time, and gather QSL cards from stations heard. Then the
prospective ham had to demonstrate its operation and explain its
design to a panel of examiners. Only after those requirements were met
would the ham-to-be be allowed to even take the code and written
tests!

In the UK, today, getting a ham license requires that you attend a
certified training course. Doesn't matter what your experience outside
ham radio is, the course is part of the exam process. There are maybe
50,000 hams in the UK and 650 active clubs. I don't think the UK is
even as big as Texas.

Imagine such things in the USA.

> > >> But note this plain, simple fact: Almost all of the FCC enforcement
> > >> actions for
> > >> "jerk-like" on-air behavior (obscenity, jamming, failure to ID,
> exceeeding
> > >> license privileges, etc., etc.) are against hams using PHONE modes, not
> > >> CW/Morse or data modes. ALL of us have taken written tests detailing
> what
> > >> we
> > >> should and should not do on the air, but it seems like violations are
> much
> > >> more
> > >> prevalent among the talkers than the brasspounders or keyboarders. Why?
>
> > >I've already said that there are probably more reasons for that than it
> > >being because a CW operator is a finer person than others who are not.
> >
> > " a CW operator is a finer person than others who are not. " Has a nice
> ring to
> > it...
> >
>
> heh heh, I knew you were going to like that.

One cannot argue with the truth....;-)
>
> Nothing could be finer than to handle my brass keyer in the mornin'
> Nothing could be finer than to hear the longs n shorts in my speaker hornin
> (poetic license there)
>
> Anyway...
>
Nothin' could be finer
Than my keyer when I shine 'er
In the mooooorrnin'

Nothin' could be sweeter
Than DX on 20 meter
S In the mooooooornin'....

> > Carpal tunnel? Not a problem - the side-to-side motion of a bug or paddles
> > avoids CTS, while the up-and-down motion of keyboards promotes it. Just
> > another advantage of CW...

They called it "glass arm" or "telegrapher's arm" back then, but it
was CTS. A keyboard and mouse are even worse for giving you CTS.

73 de Jim, N2EY

491. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 18:59:13 UTC
From: Ray Neville <hoot@smiilexinc.org>
Message-ID: <bgoup1qtf0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73906
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bob" <box371@mailtownnews.net> wrote in message
news:bgokqa$932$0@pita.alt.net...
> If there is supposed to be so much official monitoring going
> on, how do you account for the quantum leap of pirate & other
> unlicensed broadcasters on HF freqs, especially in the
> aeronautical bands? Also, truck drivers are all over the HF
> freqs. now, including aero bands. A few years ago this was
> unheard of! Plain truth is the FCC is out of the monitoring
> & enforcement business! Permanently!
>
> Bob
>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj3nw0u.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> > On 4 Aug 2003 07:38:22 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > >"N22X" <N22X@sherzfordzent.com> wrote in message
> news:<bgj1ml$nt4$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > >
> > >> Since the FCC closed all their monitoring stations seven
> > >> years ago,
> > >
> > >The FCC did *not* close all their monitoring stations.
> >
> > In fact when the monitoring stations were remoted, an additional
> > one was added. The station at Canandaigua, NY was brought back on
> > line after being closed for a number of years (it was used as the
> > test bed for developing the remote control system).
> >
> > --
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
> >
>
>
The FCC closed down all monitoring stations in 1996,
and turned over the land they sat on to GAO for disposal.
The FCC no longer has any monitoring or locational
capability. Today's FCC is only a paper pushing
bureaucracy, without any technical expertise.
Sorry if you can't deal with the facts, but that is your
problem and doesn't change the truth.

Ray

492. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 19:04:58 UTC
From: Tarapia Tapioco <comesefosse@ntani.firenze.linux.it>
Message-ID: <42eccef647af07a25972ede82b2c3d9a@firenze.linux.it>
Source record: 73907

```
In article <3F2FA842.281A9C16@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2F27DA.C63DE672@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2EBC38.1917F426@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bgj71t$2ffe$1@adenine.netfront.net>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Then, why the opening remarks then and now, with this post, about how long
> > > > > > > Carl was a Tech and his alledged comments on CW? Why enter that into your
> > > > > > > remarks at all, Dave, if not to cast attention to that? If you are casting
> > > > > > > attention to that, then why?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave has a problem with the old Techs, the Tech Plusses, and
> > > > > > presumably the Techs with Code.
> > > > > >
> > > > > I didn't address those you mention. I addressed Carl.
> > > > >
> > > > Exactly. You continued to address Carl as if he were a Tech. Which
> > > > he is not.
> > > >
> > > No, I continued to address Carl as a churl, which he is.
> > >
> > Which is how you address Techs.
>
> That's another incorrect claim you've made.
>
> > > > > > They aren't 13wpm hams. They aren't
> > > > > > worthy to share his band space.
> > > > > >
> > > > > No, they haven't been tested at 13 wpm or at 20 wpm. I didn't address
> > > > > that issue.
> > > > >
> > > > Oh, my. Oh, dear. You merely addressed Carl's tenure on the
> > > > Technician band space.
```

> > >
> > > I didn't address space at all. I addressed Carl's sitting on an old
> > > Tech ticket for 2 1/2 decades until the requirements were lowered.
> > >
> > Ding, ding, ding. The bell on my M28 rings each time you bring that up.
> >
> Then you need to check your wiring.

PKB, pee wee.

> > > > > > Now that Carl can share Dave's band space...
> >
> > > > > > Carl may share some space with me.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Carl can share any space with you that he wishes. That is what the
> > > > > FCC mean's by issuing him an Extra license. Get used to it. Naw,
> > > > > nevermind.
> > > > >
> > > > Carl may share some space.
> > > >
> > > May share all space.
> > >
> > He may and he may not.

There's plenty of space between your dumbo ears, dumbass.

> > While the FCC permits Carl the same access
> > > as I hold, no amount of wishing on his part will make it likely that
> > > Carl will share space with me in some areas of the bands. If such did
> > > come to pass, he likely wouldn't recognize that fact.
> > >
> > Nor would you.
> >
> Sure I would, Brian.
> >
> > You treat him as if he were still a Tech.
> >
> No, I treat him as if he were still a churl.

Poor goatblowing high-el, treats others like he was treated...ridiculed because he looks like baby huey...

> > > > There are plenty of areas on a
> > > > > number of bands where I doubt I'll run into Carl. Come to think of it,
> > > > > I doubt I'll run into you in those spots.
> > > > >
> > > > Duh! I don't have Extra priv's, Oh Master of Amateur Radio!!!
> > > >
> > > Duh, indeed! I don't operate only in Extra Class band segments but I do
> > > use morse about 50% of the time. I'm banking on not running into you.
> > >
> > I don't need West Virginia.

>
> So your reason for not using morse is that you don't need West Virginia?
> That's some interesting logic.

He'd probably want any OTHER operator in WV but you, DUMBFUCK.

> > > > Go work some Frenchmen on 6M. I've heard they've got all kinds of
> > > > priveleges!!!
> > >
> > > French hams fall under the jurisdiction of the French PTT.
> >
> > Indeed they do.
>
> You understand that now? You seemed to have trouble with it in the
> past.

PKB, ASSHOLE.

> > I don't tell
> > > them where they can operate and neither does the FCC.
> >
> > Nor does the government of Tanzania.
>
> Nor does the CEO of Nabisco. Has there been a problem in the past with
> those pesky Tanzanians issuing notices to scofflaw French hams?

Well, aren't you the State Dept. "expert?" Oh, that's right you were only entrusted to being a messenger boy.

> > They are
> > > responsible for the operation of their stations and I am responsible
> > > only for the operation of mine.
> >
> > Smoke 'em if you got 'em.
>
> I gather from some of the things you've written that you've got 'em and
> that you're smoking 'em.

Smelly fatassed High-el likes to "smoke" little boy's dicks.......

493. Re: Comment On This News Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 19:48:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308051148.59cd8e60@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73908

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308050527.54959947@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308041925.161d4eeb@posting.google.com>...
> > "The Moderator" <TM@foxtrot.com> wrote in message
news:<MMuXa.26296$ff.14911@fed1read01>...
> > > Comment On This News Group
> > >
> > > There is a lot of good stuff here
> >
> > I don't think so. That's why I leave it so often.
>
> You leave so often because the context of the discussions exceeds
> your ability to comprehend it.

But never my ability to comment on it. ;^)

> > I like the people on yahoo NVIS. They're not all screwed up with the code.
>
> As opposed to Brian Burke who's just all screwed up.

Ah, tranference. Nice coping strategy.

494. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 20:08:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308051208.5037a6ed@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73909

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F2FA69A.45C19471@earthlink.net>...
to comment on amatuer radio.
>
> Nothing has prevented Len Anderson from commenting here. He has been
> doing so for better than seven years. No one is required to agree with
> him or to remain silent while a man with no experience in amateur radio
> attempts to tell licensed hams how amateur radio should be shaped and
> regulated. No one is forced to remain mum while he takes potshots at
> the ARS, radio amateurs or the ARRL.

Why do you classify them as "potshots?"

> > I can't decide who
> > points out that Len doesn't hold an amateur license more; you or
> > Steve.
>
> I'll let you work that out. It doesn't matter to me and I'm sure Steve
> isn't in competition with me on the issue.

Yet it really bugs you'se guys.

495. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 20:18:04 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308051218.78a6a36a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73910
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Uri" <slip@sparphoneyorg.net> wrote in message news:<bgn8nk$9oc$0@pita.alt.net>...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj3o16v.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> > On Mon, 4 Aug 2003 13:16:30 -0400, Rich wrote:
> >
> > > So says you, but according to www.fcc.gov they ARE all closed.
> >
> > Read it again....they are UNMANNED and therefore closed to the
> > public. They are all operated by remote control from Laurel/Columbia,
> MD.
> >
> > --
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
> >
> Hey stupid ass, I did read it. THEY ARE ALL
> CLOSED, KAPUT, DISMANTLED!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
> Do you comprehend the standard English that the web
> is written in ?????????????? Remote Control?
> Geeeee, does the remote control use a standard 9 volt
> battery??? Take your petty ham disputes to 14313.

Hey stupid ass, dial 202-418-1122 and ask if they have FCC monitoring
facilities up and running and tuning for pirates. Right now.

Toodles.

> Uri

w3rv

496. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 20:19:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308051219.4db85ce4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73911

```
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F2FA40B.6CBD0E90@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2F1ADF.9E64A43D@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
news:<878yqa8dk3.fld@barrow.com>...
> > > >
> > > > > One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
> > > > > Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
> > > > > breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
> > > > > that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
> > > > > just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.
> > > >
> > > > Sad, but true. But they don't see it that way.
> > >
> > > Likely because it is a fairy tale. Leonard would need assistance to eat
> > > mush for breakfast. You've been asked if you're his acolyte. I think
> > > it would be more fitting if you were to be known as his electrolyte.
> >
> > At least I'm not his bunyon.
>
> > > > One David Heil demands licensed participation in the ARS.
>
> > > Maybe one of 'em demands such but it isn't this one.
>
> > You're one of them that incessantly points out his license status.
>
> Yes, I am. That isn't the same as what you claimed in your earlier
> comment. Len isn't licensed in the amateur radio service and has no
> experience in amateur radio.

What purpose does that serve? The vast majority of the policy makers
at the FCC aren't licensed in the amateur radio service and have no
experience in amateur radio.

But I don't hear you complaining about that, yet they have the ability
to change what you do and how you do it.

> > > > But when
> > > > confronted with mere Technician participation in the ARS that rivals
> > > > his Extraness, he digs in and destroys.
> > >
```

> > > That claim is a non-starter as it is in conflict with what I've written
> > > here very recently.
> >
> > Bully for you.
>
> ...and shame on you for making yet another false accusation. That's two
> so far in this exchange.

Nothing false there.

> > > > Then there is Extra DICK. Probably Extra in every way except the dick
> > > > department. Then there's Jim "DeSoda" who keeps rewriting "200 Meters
> > > > and Up." No need to mention INSANE Clown Posse in a Nurse's dress or
> > > > the civilian with "real" military experience.
> > >
> > > What's your claim to credibility?
> >
> > I yam what I yam.
>
> Maybe you'll find a way to do something about it.

I'm satisfied with my accomplishments in the ARS.

497. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 20:30:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308051230.6231791e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73912

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F2FA842.281A9C16@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2F27DA.C63DE672@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2EBC38.1917F426@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bgj71t$2ffe$1@adenine.netfront.net>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Then, why the opening remarks then and now, with this post, about how long
> > > > > > > Carl was a Tech and his alledged comments on CW? Why enter that into your
> > > > > > > remarks at all, Dave, if not to cast attention to that? If you are casting
> > > > > > > attention to that, then why?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave has a problem with the old Techs, the Tech Plusses, and
> > > > > > presumably the Techs with Code.
> > > > >
> > > > > I didn't address those you mention. I addressed Carl.
> > > >
> > > > Exactly. You continued to address Carl as if he were a Tech. Which
> > > > he is not.
> > >
> > > No, I continued to address Carl as a churl, which he is.
> >
> > Which is how you address Techs.
>
> That's another incorrect claim you've made.

Prove it.

> > > > > > They aren't 13wpm hams. They aren't
> > > > > > worthy to share his band space.
> > > > >
> > > > > No, they haven't been tested at 13 wpm or at 20 wpm. I didn't address
> > > > > that issue.
> > > >
> > > > Oh, my. Oh, dear. You merely addressed Carl's tenure on the
> > > > Technician band space.
> > >
> > > I didn't address space at all. I addressed Carl's sitting on an old

> > > Tech ticket for 2 1/2 decades until the requirements were lowered.
> >
> > Ding, ding, ding. The bell on my M28 rings each time you bring that up.
>
> Then you need to check your wiring.

For what?

> > > > > > Now that Carl can share Dave's band space...
>
> > > > > Carl may share some space with me.
> > > > >
> > > > > Carl can share any space with you that he wishes. That is what the
> > > > > FCC mean's by issuing him an Extra license. Get used to it. Naw,
> > > > > nevermind.
> > > >
> > > > Carl may share some space.
> > >
> > > May share all space.
> >
> > He may and he may not.

Take it up with his hairdresser. The FCC says he may share all space,
and thats good enough for me.

> > While the FCC permits Carl the same access
> > > as I hold, no amount of wishing on his part will make it likely that
> > > Carl will share space with me in some areas of the bands. If such did
> > > come to pass, he likely wouldn't recognize that fact.
> > >
> > > Nor would you.
> >
> > Sure I would, Brian.

How is that?
>
> > You treat him as if he were still a Tech.
> >
> > No, I treat him as if he were still a churl.

A Tech.

> > > > There are plenty of areas on a
> > > > > number of bands where I doubt I'll run into Carl. Come to think of it,
> > > > > I doubt I'll run into you in those spots.
> > > > >
> > > > > Duh! I don't have Extra priv's, Oh Master of Amateur Radio!!!
> > > >
> > > > Duh, indeed! I don't operate only in Extra Class band segments but I do
> > > > use morse about 50% of the time. I'm banking on not running into you.
> > >
> > > I don't need West Virginia.

>
> So your reason for not using morse is that you don't need West Virginia?
> That's some interesting logic.

No, I'd prefer not to work you on any mode, including CW.

> > > > Go work some Frenchmen on 6M. I've heard they've got all kinds of
> > > > priveleges!!!
> > >
> > > French hams fall under the jurisdiction of the French PTT.
> >
> > Indeed they do.
>
> You understand that now? You seemed to have trouble with it in the
> past.

None whatsoever. But it takes two amateurs to make a circuit.

> > I don't tell
> > > them where they can operate and neither does the FCC.
> >
> > Nor does the government of Tanzania.
>
> Nor does the CEO of Nabisco. Has there been a problem in the past with
> those pesky Tanzanians issuing notices to scofflaw French hams?

Did Nabisco issue any?

And I never classified Tanzanian Officials as "pesky."

> > They are
> > > responsible for the operation of their stations and I am responsible
> > > only for the operation of mine.
> >
> > Smoke 'em if you got 'em.
>
> I gather from some of the things you've written that you've got 'em and
> that you're smoking 'em.

I'd have to be to intentionally work bootleggers.

498. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 21:05:49 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87r83zx1aq.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73913
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ray Neville" <hoot@smiilexinc.org> wrote:
>"Bob" <box371@mailtownnews.net> wrote:
>>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
>>>Brian Kelly wrote:
>>>>"N22X" <N22X@sherzfordzent.com> wrote:

>> unheard of! Plain truth is the FCC is out of the monitoring
>> & enforcement business! Permanently!

>> > >> Since the FCC closed all their monitoring stations seven
>> > >> years ago,
>> > >
>> > >The FCC did *not* close all their monitoring stations.
>> >
>> > In fact when the monitoring stations were remoted, an additional
>> > one was added. The station at Canandaigua, NY was brought back on
>> > line after being closed for a number of years (it was used as the
>> > test bed for developing the remote control system).

> The FCC closed down all monitoring stations in 1996,
>and turned over the land they sat on to GAO for disposal.
>The FCC no longer has any monitoring or locational
>capability. Today's FCC is only a paper pushing
>bureaucracy, without any technical expertise.
>Sorry if you can't deal with the facts, but that is your
>problem and doesn't change the truth.

Ray, can you explain to me why 47 CFR Part 0 Section 121 lists
14 locations for "protected" FCC field offices, including the
Canadaigua location mentioned above and the Laurel, Maryland
station mentioned in another post? The locations are protected
from RF emissions by licensed radio services *because* they are
FCC monitoring stations. Section 121 was updated in 1998, 1999, and
2002, so how can it be that these locations are still listed and
still protected if the monitoring functions there were discontinued
and the physical facilities disposed of in 1996?

Here is the list, coordinates included:

Allegan, Michigan
42[deg]36[min]20.1[sec] N. Latitude
85[deg]57[min]20.1[sec] W. Longitude

Anchorage, Alaska
61[deg]09[min]41.[sec] N. Latitude

150[deg]00[min]03.0[sec] W. Longitude

Belfast, Maine
44[deg]26[min]42.3[sec] N. Latitude
69[deg]04[min]56.1[sec] W. Longitude

Canandaigua, New York
42[deg]54[min]48.2[sec] N. Latitude
77[deg]15[min]57.9[sec] W. Longitude

Douglas, Arizona
31[deg]30[min]02.3[sec] N. Latitude
109[deg]39[min]14.3[sec] W. Longitude

Ferndale, Washington
48[deg]57[min]20.4[sec] N. Latitude
122[deg]33[min]17.6[sec] W. Longitude

Grand Island, Nebraska
40[deg]55[min]21.0[sec] N. Latitude
98[deg]25[min]43.2[sec] W. Longitude

Kingsville, Texas
27[deg]26[min]30.1[sec] N. Latitude
97[deg]53[min]01.0[sec] W. Longitude

Laurel, Maryland
39[deg]09[min]54.4[sec] N. Latitude
76[deg]49[min]15.9[sec] W. Longitude

Livermore, California
37[deg]43[min]29.7[sec] N. Latitude
121[deg]45[min]15.8[sec] W. Longitude

Powder Springs, Georgia
33[deg]51[min]44.4[sec] N. Latitude
84[deg]43[min]25.8[sec] W. Longitude

Santa Isabel, Puerto Rico
18[deg]00[min]18.9[sec] N. Latitude
66[deg]22[min]30.6[sec] W. Longitude

Vero Beach, Florida
27[deg]36[min]22.1[sec] N. Latitude
80[deg]38[min]05.2[sec] W. Longitude

Waipahu, Hawaii
21[deg]22[min]33.6[sec] N. Latitude
157[deg]59[min]44.1[sec] W. Longitude

Additionally, from

<http://www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Inspector_General/Reports/sar997.txt>

we have the following assessment (as of late 1997):

The reorganization entailed the closure of nine attended frequency monitoring stations and three additional monitoring sites located at FCC field offices. In place of these previously manned stations, a national automated monitoring network is now controlled from an existing facility in Columbia, Maryland. Nine of the 25 existing field offices as well as three of the six regional offices were closed. Two technical staff members continue to be assigned as Resident Agents in the nine locations in which field offices were closed.

So lets see, of 25 field offices 9 were close, leaving 14. And an automated monitoring network is in use, for which there are 14 protected locations. Does this add up to anything like

"out of the monitoring & enforcement business! Permanently!"

or

"the FCC closed all their monitoring stations seven years ago"

or

"The FCC closed down all monitoring stations in 1996"

or

"and turned over the land they sat on to GAO for disposal"

or

"The FCC no longer has any monitoring or locational capability"

or is there by any chance a large amount of disinformation being relayed here as if it were fact?

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

499. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 21:10:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F301B77.4B10C368@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73914

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2FA69A.45C19471@earthlink.net>...
> to comment on amatuer radio.
> >
> > Nothing has prevented Len Anderson from commenting here. He has been
> > doing so for better than seven years. No one is required to agree with
> > him or to remain silent while a man with no experience in amateur radio
> > attempts to tell licensed hams how amateur radio should be shaped and
> > regulated. No one is forced to remain mum while he takes potshots at
> > the ARS, radio amateurs or the ARRL.
>
> Why do you classify them as "potshots?"

I'm surprised that you find it necessary to ask.

> > > I can't decide who
> > > points out that Len doesn't hold an amateur license more; you or
> > > Steve.
> >
> > I'll let you work that out. It doesn't matter to me and I'm sure Steve
> > isn't in competition with me on the issue.
>
> Yet it really bugs you'se guys.

No, it really bugs Len. Good luck in making your decision as to who
brings it up more often.

Dave K8MN

500. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 21:17:11 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308051317.150ed8d9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73915

Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net> wrote in message news:<BB4FA25C.1FCA8%stewart@say.net>...
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> > How was I excluded from the ARS by the Morse
> > code test?
>
>
> In the past, you were not excluded (code testing served a need).

OK, I'll bite.

What need did code testing serve in the past that does not exist
today?

Before you say "other services used it", note that many if not most
hams had little chance of ever being part of those other services when
they used Morse. For example, people over a certain age, or with
certain physical conditions, would never be accepted in the military.

73 de Jim, N2EY

501. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 21:18:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F301D6D.D7A189F5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73916

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2FA40B.6CBD0E90@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2F1ADF.9E64A43D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:

> > > > > One David Heil demands licensed participation in the ARS.
> > >
> > > > Maybe one of 'em demands such but it isn't this one.
> > >
> > > You're one of them that incessantly points out his license status.
> > >
> > Yes, I am. That isn't the same as what you claimed in your earlier
> > comment. Len isn't licensed in the amateur radio service and has no
> > experience in amateur radio.
>
> What purpose does that serve?

It serves to point out Len's total lack of experience in the amateur
service.

> The vast majority of the policy makers
> at the FCC aren't licensed in the amateur radio service and have no
> experience in amateur radio.

The vast majority of policy makers at the FCC have nothing whatever to
do with amateur radio. Those that are involved in the regulation of the
ARS, are quite knowledgeable about the service. They are paid to know.
Additionally, there are radio amateurs on the FCC staff. That has
nothing to do with the issue of Len Anderson. He isn't a participant in
amateur nor is he a regulator of amateur radio. Len is totally
irrelevant to amateur radio.

> But I don't hear you complaining about that, yet they have the ability
> to change what you do and how you do it.

No, you won't hear me complaining often though there are times when the
Commission makes a decision which I don't like or which is just plain
wrong. Len makes no such decisions and is not involved in amateur
radio.

> > > > > But when
> > > > > confronted with mere Technician participation in the ARS that rivals
> > > > > his Extraness, he digs in and destroys.
> > > > >
> > > > > That claim is a non-starter as it is in conflict with what I've written
> > > > > here very recently.
> > > >
> > > > Bully for you.
> > >
> > ...and shame on you for making yet another false accusation. That's two
> > so far in this exchange.
>
> Nothing false there.

Just the ones beginning "But when confronted with mere Technician..."
and "One David Heil demands..." Are you going for three?

> > > > > Then there is Extra DICK. Probably Extra in every way except the dick
> > > > > department. Then there's Jim "DeSoda" who keeps rewriting "200 Meters
> > > > > and Up." No need to mention INSANE Clown Posse in a Nurse's dress or
> > > > > the civilian with "real" military experience.
> > > > >
> > > > > What's your claim to credibility?
> > > >
> > > > I yam what I yam.
> > >
> > > Maybe you'll find a way to do something about it.
>
> I'm satisfied with my accomplishments in the ARS.

That has been evident for some time.

Dave K8MN

502. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 21:29:18 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F301FE3.951681BE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 73917

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2FA842.281A9C16@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2F27DA.C63DE672@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2EBC38.1917F426@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bgj71t$2ffe$1@adenine.netfront.net>...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Then, why the opening remarks then and now, with this post, about how long
> > > > > > > > Carl was a Tech and his alledged comments on CW? Why enter that into your
> > > > > > > > remarks at all, Dave, if not to cast attention to that? If you are casting
> > > > > > > > attention to that, then why?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave has a problem with the old Techs, the Tech Plusses, and
> > > > > > > presumably the Techs with Code.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I didn't address those you mention. I addressed Carl.
> > > > >
> > > > > Exactly. You continued to address Carl as if he were a Tech. Which
> > > > > he is not.
> > > >
> > > > No, I continued to address Carl as a churl, which he is.
> > >
> > > Which is how you address Techs.
> >
> > That's another incorrect claim you've made.
>
> Prove it.

Au contraire, mon petit electrolyte, you need to prove that your claim
is correct.

> > > > > > > > They aren't 13wpm hams. They aren't
> > > > > > > > worthy to share his band space.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > No, they haven't been tested at 13 wpm or at 20 wpm. I didn't address

> > > > > > that issue.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Oh, my. Oh, dear. You merely addressed Carl's tenure on the
> > > > > > Technician band space.
> > > > > >
> > > > > I didn't address space at all. I addressed Carl's sitting on an old
> > > > > Tech ticket for 2 1/2 decades until the requirements were lowered.
> > > > >
> > > > Ding, ding, ding. The bell on my M28 rings each time you bring that up.
> > >
> > Then you need to check your wiring.
> >
> For what?

A faulty dinger.

> > > > > > > > Now that Carl can share Dave's band space...
> > >
> > > > > > > Carl may share some space with me.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > Carl can share any space with you that he wishes. That is what the
> > > > > > FCC mean's by issuing him an Extra license. Get used to it. Naw,
> > > > > > nevermind.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Carl may share some space.
> > > > >
> > > > May share all space.
> > >
> > He may and he may not.
> >
> Take it up with his hairdresser. The FCC says he may share all space,
> and thats good enough for me.

Please quote that "may share space" FCC document.
He's allocated the same frequencies. He may or may not share the same
space.

> > > While the FCC permits Carl the same access
> > > > as I hold, no amount of wishing on his part will make it likely that
> > > > Carl will share space with me in some areas of the bands. If such did
> > > > come to pass, he likely wouldn't recognize that fact.
> > > >
> > > Nor would you.
> > >
> > Sure I would, Brian.
> >
> How is that?

That is one for the little electrolyte to ponder. Go to it!

> > > You treat him as if he were still a Tech.
> > >

> > No, I treat him as if he were still a churl.
>
> A Tech.

No, I treat him as if he were still a churl.

> > > > > There are plenty of areas on a
> > > > > > number of bands where I doubt I'll run into Carl. Come to think of it,
> > > > > > I doubt I'll run into you in those spots.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Duh! I don't have Extra priv's, Oh Master of Amateur Radio!!!
> > > > >
> > > > > Duh, indeed! I don't operate only in Extra Class band segments but I do
> > > > > use morse about 50% of the time. I'm banking on not running into you.
> > > >
> > > > I don't need West Virginia.
> > >
> > So your reason for not using morse is that you don't need West Virginia?
> > That's some interesting logic.
>
> No, I'd prefer not to work you on any mode, including CW.

Why didn't you write that instead of leading us to believe that the
reason was that you don't "need" West Virginia?

> > > > > Go work some Frenchmen on 6M. I've heard they've got all kinds of
> > > > > priveleges!!!
> > > > >
> > > > > French hams fall under the jurisdiction of the French PTT.
> > > >
> > > > Indeed they do.
> > >
> > You understand that now? You seemed to have trouble with it in the
> > past.
>
> None whatsoever. But it takes two amateurs to make a circuit.

It certainly does. Two Frenchmen working each under fall under the
jurisdiction of the French PTT. A station in France working a station
in Tanzania is quite the different story. If the Frenchman breaks his
regs, it is up to the French authorities to discipline him. Maybe
they've contracted the job to some fellow in Ohio.

> > > I don't tell
> > > > them where they can operate and neither does the FCC.
> > >
> > > Nor does the government of Tanzania.
> >
> > Nor does the CEO of Nabisco. Has there been a problem in the past with
> > those pesky Tanzanians issuing notices to scofflaw French hams?
>
> Did Nabisco issue any?

Did Tanzania? Did France?

> And I never classified Tanzanian Officials as "pesky."

No, you didn't. I used that term in sarcastic response to your
misdirection.

> > > They are
> > > > responsible for the operation of their stations and I am responsible
> > > > only for the operation of mine.
> > >
> > > Smoke 'em if you got 'em.
> >
> > I gather from some of the things you've written that you've got 'em and
> > that you're smoking 'em.
>
> I'd have to be to intentionally work bootleggers.

Why are you intentionally working bootleggers?

Dave K8MN

503. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 21:56:25 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87he4vwyye.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73918

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>Brian wrote:
>>
>> Yet it really bugs you'se guys.
>
>No, it really bugs Len. Good luck in making your decision as to who
>brings it up more often.

It does? Is that why he's been using you for entertainment (and I
might add, providing others with great laughs) for how many years?

Seven??? And _you_ think it bugs him!

Dave gets out of bed every day and immediately hangs a target on
himself to help Len get a good aim...

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

504. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 22:03:25 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <NQVXa.17211$Vx2.8805529@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 73919

```
"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bgn52d$rde$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:f7iXa.15968$Vx2.8217426@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > news:bgkae0$2md$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > > news:iMfXa.15838$Vx2.8180666@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > > >
> > > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > > > news:LyfXa.72928$Wd5.14335216@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > > > That's because it not supposed to. It "forces" the newbie to get a
> > taste
> > > > of
> > > > > CW. Then it's up to the individual to either take him/herself
> further
> > or
> > > > > drop it entirely. Many will never know if CW truly interested them
> > > because
> > > > > they will not have been made to even try.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Exactly. It's nice to see it so neatly. It's the same reason that
> > > students
> > > > are required to study a number of items which they may or may not
> pursue
> > > in
> > > > the future.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > > >
> > >
> > > Then I say we test on every mode there is. If you support that for
CW,
> > then
> > > surely you support it for other modes.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> >
> > No problem. I'm ready. Are you?
> >
```

> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> Yep, but the testing in all areas of the mode will never happen. So, do
you
> still support it just for CW?
>
> Kim W5TIT

Yes.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

505. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 22:16:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <u1WXa.17267$Vx2.8809554@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 73920

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bgn5mdrse1@adenine.netfront.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:0ciXa.15969$Vx2.8220036@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > news:bgk9k5$1u3$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> > > CW is mostly callsign/whereabouts/weather/TNX and that's it. If an
> actual
> > > conversation ensues, I'm sure no one (except the jerks I know of)
would
> > > waste their time getting carpal tunnel with cursing in CW.
> > >
> >
> > There you are wrong. There are many extensive conversations on CW.
They
> > converse about the same things voice operators do. I've heard them
> talking
> > about their careers, families, computers, buying and selling on ebay and
a
> > myriad of other topics.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> Wow, most of the CW operators I've known even state that all they "pretty
> much" do is exchange information. Most of them also only use it during a
> contest, though. Maybe that's the difference.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Just cruise the bands at non-contest times and that is when you will find
the extended conversations.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

506. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 22:21:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <76WXa.17298$Vx2.8810860@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 73921

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns93CE2C5CA14F7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj4351y.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:
>
> > On Mon, 04 Aug 2003 07:41:03 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> >> Very simple answer, Jim. The FCC has limited personnel today. The few
> >> they
> >>have simply don't have the time to sit around listening, as code users
> >>pound out their incredibly slow conversations, to catch violations. ;)
> >
> > For reasons that I disagreed with then and I disagree with now, (but
> > that's another story) the FCC' s enforcement response is driven by
> > complaints, not by "Patrolling the Ether" (tm) as in days of yore.
> >
> > How many complaints of amateur CW violations do you think "Riley"
> > gets? (Somebody pounding out "FU" in Morse on a Touch-Tone (tm) pad
> > on a repeater input does not count as CW....)
> >
> > --
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
> > From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> > Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
> >
> >
> >
>
> So what do we call it then? I have certainly heard F-U-C-K sent in Morse
> on a repeater.

Anything from an unidentified transmission to interference to jamming for
starters depending on the exact events. It probably violates a number of
FCC rules.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

507. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 22:26:22 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <iaWXa.17306$Vx2.8811960@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 73922

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030804232341.20076.00000977@mb-m29.aol.com...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>
> > You won't ID the club, any of the members,
> I have more respect than that.
>
>
> >What was said was >>YOU<< are back to telling "them" where thier
> >interests should lay.
>
> And neither should they tell me what my interests should be. Like, telling
> people at club meetings that they should learn Morse code. Or, suggesting
I
> should learn Morse code when I participate in antenna setups or at Ham
> gatherings.
>

You are almost certainly misinterpreting their motives. They want to see people improve, upgrade, and otherwise develop their amateur radio skills and knowledge. It is in a benevolent spirit that they make these suggestions. For example, I have been through setting up digital modes on my system even though I don't care to use them. I've set them up and checked them out for the sole purpose of expanding my personal hands on knowledge. Once I had them working right, I was done using those modes.

> >You constantly barrage this NG
> >with YOUR interpretation of what Amatuer Radio should be and how
> >"wrong" other Amateurs are for not following THAT doctrine.
>
> Like the current group of Hams do in their groups?
>
> > If the "95%" is clay,
> Okay, makes sense.
>
> >and the
> >"5%" is gold, then isn't it worth it to you to get your blue jeans a
> >bit dirty...???
>
> That 5% is gold at the end of a rainbow (it doesn't exist).
>

Your personal expections of ham radio are simply unrealistic. Thus you will always be disappointed.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

508. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 22:36:37 UTC
From: averyfine@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030805183637.05187.00000072@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 73923

>Subject: Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 8/4/03 10:39 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0308041839.62aabe55@posting.google.com>
>
>Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
>news:<878yqa8dk3.fld@barrow.com>...
>
>> One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
>> Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
>> breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
>> that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
>> just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.
>
>Sad, but true. But they don't see it that way.

Is this Len Anderson person a cannibal?

Are you his acolyte or disciple?
>
>One David Heil demands licensed participation in the ARS. But when
>confronted with mere Technician participation in the ARS that rivals
>his Extraness, he digs in and destroys. Or at least he tries to.

How?

>Then there is Extra DICK. Probably Extra in every way except the dick
>department.

You seem to be very interested in a subject that is inappropriate for amateur
radio. Why is that?

> Then there's Jim "DeSoda" who keeps rewriting "200 Meters
>and Up."

Who are you referring to?
Where can I buy the book?

> No need to mention INSANE Clown Posse in a Nurse's dress or
>the civilian with "real" military experience.

Who are you referring to?
>
Brian Burke, your postings here are quite bizarre.

Is there a rational reason for your behavior?

509. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 22:39:30 UTC
From: averyfine@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030805183930.05187.00000073@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 73924

>Subject: Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)
>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@barrow.com
>Date: 8/5/03 5:56 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <87he4vwyye.fld@barrow.com>
>
>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>>Brian wrote:
>>>
>>> Yet it really bugs you'se guys.
>>
>>No, it really bugs Len. Good luck in making your decision as to who
>>brings it up more often.
>
>It does? Is that why he's been using you for entertainment (and I
>might add, providing others with great laughs) for how many years?

Floyd,

Are YOU Len Anderson's acolyte?

Or disciple?

510. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 22:46:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bgpc38iqp1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 73925

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F2ED720.4000509@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >This is actually not such a bad idea. I've always supported dropping the
> >155.3 mi. limit on CB and the idea of allowing hams to reduce their power
> >and elmer CBers on channels 36 through 40 USB on the finer point of
DXing. I
> >think it'd be a great recruitment tool, just MHO.
> >
> >
> >
> We could do that now, *IF* we use type accepted (or whatever they call
> it nowadays) CB radios
> instead of our ham transcievers, and not exceed the distance limit. But
> I think the CBers
> might see us as invaders on their turf, like we see them when invading
> 10m. It might be better
> to be low key, maybe have the ARRL buy ads in CB magizines that say
> something like "if
> you get a general or extra ham license, you can DX on many different
> bands using more
> power (legally) even when the sunspots are out of season. 'You already
> love radio, see
> how much more fun you can have with a ham license'." Of course one
> would have to
> wordsmith it right to attract serious and disiplined operators and not
> the kids and "lids".
> Without making ham radio look condensending or putting CBers down. I'm
> not that
> good a writer, but I think that it could be done well.
>

If all you CBers with a ham license want to go back and play in the pig pen.
Then go ahead. Don't even think anyone that is a real ham cares what goes
on there. Let alone wants to operate there.

If you don't like that. Tough...thats the fact jack.

Dan/W4NTI

511. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 22:48:37 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030805184837.29713.00000038@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 73927

From: Dave Heil k8mn

>> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>>
>> >So the activity in the photograph never really took place?

>Could be? Don't you know? If you don't, you're just blowing smoke.

I let my membership expire. Its not worth renewing. The way I could verify the info is to show up at individual events. I've done that and have trouble asking them the questions I want to ask. I could email a few in the photograph, but I only remember a few of their names.

I am pretty sure, that if I ask a few people from the photo if they are interested in a homebrewing project, they will either say they are not interested or too busy.

> Should there be a constant stream of
>such projects or do you find it acceptable that such projects take place
>from time to time?

If they are grouped in with other activites, that would be fine. These projects haven't been there at all.

>no one in a radio club wants to do what you want

Often true.

>you being dismayed
>that hams set out for an operating activity and then waste that time by
>operating or you being under the impression that your travel to a
>domestic location was a "DXpedition".

It was a vacation spot. I wanted to do some of the vacation activies. Yes, that the Hams did not do vacation activites (other than eating) did come as a surprise to me.

512. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 22:48:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bgpc7l$r9r$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 73926

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> wrote in message
news:8n4uiv0u2dukon46r2hehgsn5l2jquptiu@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 04 Aug 2003 20:01:22 GMT, "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
> wrote:
>
> >I have an understanding of what CB WAS supposed to be for as well as what
it
> >HAS evolved into. (...and I don't mean the out-of-band lids with the
illegal
> >amplifiers either.)
>
> Well, then you must mean the IN-the-band lids with the illegal
> amplifiers. Not to mention echo mikes, electronic noisemakers,
> and...well, just listen down there and compile your own list.
>
> >I personally have no want to bang my fist down on the table and proclaim
> >that "that's not what it was originally meant for." That's what it's
become,
> >plain and simple. Don't like it? Then get your fmr. comrades to kick it
up a
> >notch or two wrt enforcement and stop it...
>
> I wholeheartedly second the motion!
>
> >or admit their boo-boo (CB on HF
> >and they can't respond to a natuarally occuring phenomenon, hihi.)
>
> I think they already have, and I think that's part of the reason why
> MURS was created, thus putting no-license radio on VHF where it ought
> to have been put in the first place.
>
> >and try
> >to take a little advantage of the situation.
>
> On the other hand, there's no enforcement on the MURS frequencies
> either. Around here (Buffalo, NY area) they already sound like the 11m
> band, complete with illegal power levels and toilet-mouthed jerks,
> many of whom can also be heard on 11m.
>
> Then there's the marine VHF band...
>
> 73 DE John, KC2HMZ
>

Just like I figured would happen. And just what some of the no-codes are trying to make ham radio like.

Dan/W4NTI

513. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 22:51:47 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030805185147.29713.00000039@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 73928

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)

>So now this happened BEFORE you were in the club...So
>what you ahve been doing all these many months is whining about
>something that SUPPOSEDLY happened before you were even there.

The photo of the club members homebrewing was taken before I joined the club.
They have not done that activity since I have joined the club. That photo is
still on the club page, as if thats what the club members are interested in.

514. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 22:52:26 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bgpcf2pli1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 73929

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:N5RXa.10100$W%3.31@nwrdny01.gnilink.net...

> Nah, you'll get all kinds of excuses wrt how unwieldy and expensive VHF
gear
> would've been back in 1958. But you know what...the manufacturers would've
> worked that ou and historically ALWAYS have. That really wasn't the FCC's
> job, it was, and still is, the job of the manufacturers.

Your arguement dont hold water Bert. There was a CB band on UHF back then.
It was in the 400 mhz range FM and was called Class A.

Dan/W4NTI

515. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 23:02:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bgpd1lsat1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 73930

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:5YMXa.99153$Wd5.20928693@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3F2ED720.4000509@ix.netcom.com...
> > >
> > >
> > >This is actually not such a bad idea. I've always supported dropping
the
> > >155.3 mi. limit on CB and the idea of allowing hams to reduce their
power
> > >and elmer CBers on channels 36 through 40 USB on the finer point of
> DXing. I
> > >think it'd be a great recruitment tool, just MHO.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > We could do that now, *IF* we use type accepted (or whatever they call
> > it nowadays) CB radios
> > instead of our ham transcievers, and not exceed the distance limit.
>
> 'Zactly! I currently run a slightly older Uniden Grant XL, type certified
> and 100% legal.
>
> > But
> > I think the CBers
> > might see us as invaders on their turf, like we see them when invading
> > 10m. It might be better
> > to be low key,
>
> I usually keep it subtle and have always had pretty good results. NOTE:
> Those who bootleg on 10m (Or any other ham band.) are neither included in
> this discussion nor welcomed on either band. I'll drop a dime on them in a
> NY minute! (...and have done so in the past.)
>
> > maybe have the ARRL buy ads in CB magizines that say
>
> IMHO, the ARRL blew a golden opportunity for a win-win situation in 2000
> when it comment against RM-9807. I don't think the ARRL's is very much
> appreciated among CB circles, HOWEVER, true CB "hobbyists" (Sorry, Phil.)
DO
> respect ARO's and are usually quite receptive.
>
> > something like "if
> > you get a general or extra ham license, you can DX on many different

> > bands using more
> > power (legally) even when the sunspots are out of season. 'You already
> > love radio, see
> > how much more fun you can have with a ham license'." Of course one
> > would have to
> > wordsmith it right to attract serious and disiplined operators and not
> > the kids and "lids".
> > Without making ham radio look condensending or putting CBers down.
>
> Funny story...well, kinda. I walked into the corner 7-Eleven and prepared
to
> get my dailly fix of Java when a chap nodded in my direction and asked
"you
> a ham?" It occured to me that he had seen my AR license plates and since
we
> were the only two in the store, it was equally easy for me to notice the
> Wilson 1000 atop his vehicle. I nodded toward his car and asked him
> "what'cha runnin'?" Well, I could tell right away it wasn't kosher because
> you could cut the immediate cloud of nerousness with a knife. "Relax, I've
> been where you are and I can help you get to where you wanna be." Crash,
> down came the wall of apprehension. He was using one of those zillion
> channel Ranger rigs. I explained that if he'd let me, I could show him how
> to use that legally. Subtly massaged the enforcement angle into the
> conversation too. I lived three blocks away so I <permanently> lent him
my
> Gordo Tech study guide and a copy of my ARRL code CD's. Told him the code
> test was nothing to sweat and if he any problems just give me a holler.
> Well, the next time he "hollered," he had two CSCE's in hand and a new
> Tech"+" was waiting for a call. Now that he's tasted more bandwidth, he
> doesn't want to risk losing those priviledges on any illegal 11-meter
> frequencies anymore. I personally don't care what his motivations are to
fly
> straight are, I'm just glad that he is. Sure, I could've immediately
beaten
> him up re. his rig or lectured him on what CB was originally intended
> for...but what would it have gained? CB gained a legal op, and he gained a
> whole new world of radio. For all I know, he might very well be an Extra
by
> now. I do know it felt good. :-)
>
> > I'm
> > not that
> > good a writer, but I think that it could be done well.
>
> I think you just did a great job.
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>

>

I used to do the same thing with the customers I had in my CB shop a few years back. Got a LOT of converts that way.

But it was tough sometimes when they came in and asked me why the Swerrrrrrs were so high on their whup, when it was mounted with straps to the metal cab of the truck.

Dan/W4NTI

516. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 23:03:35 UTC
From: Ray Neville <hoot@smiilexinc.org>
Message-ID: <bgpd31$k12$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73931
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308051218.78a6a36a@posting.google.com...
> "Uri" <slip@sparphoneyorg.net> wrote in message
news:<bgn8nk$9oc$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj3o16v.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> > > On Mon, 4 Aug 2003 13:16:30 -0400, Rich wrote:
> > >
> > > > So says you, but according to www.fcc.gov they ARE all closed.
> > >
> > > Read it again....they are UNMANNED and therefore closed to the
> > > public. They are all operated by remote control from
Laurel/Columbia,
> > MD.
> > >
> > > --
> > > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> > >
> > >
> > Hey stupid ass, I did read it. THEY ARE ALL
> > CLOSED, KAPUT, DISMANTLED!!!!!!!!!!!!!
> > Do you comprehend the standard English that the web
> > is written in ?????????????? Remote Control?
> > Geeeee, does the remote control use a standard 9 volt
> > battery??? Take your petty ham disputes to 14313.
>
> Hey stupid ass, dial 202-418-1122 and ask if they have FCC monitoring
> facilities up and running and tuning for pirates. Right now.
>
> Toodles.
>
> > Uri
>
> w3rv

It's the number of a liquor store.

K

517. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 23:08:20 UTC
From: Ray Neville <hoot@smiilexinc.org>
Message-ID: <bgpdbukfs0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73933
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
news:87r83zx1aq.fld@barrow.com...
> "Ray Neville" <hoot@smiilexinc.org> wrote:
> >"Bob" <box371@mailtownnews.net> wrote:
> >>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
> >>>Brian Kelly wrote:
> >>>>"N22X" <N22X@sherzfordzent.com> wrote:
>
> >> unheard of! Plain truth is the FCC is out of the monitoring
> >> & enforcement business! Permanently!
>
> >> > >> Since the FCC closed all their monitoring stations seven
> >> > >> years ago,
> >> > >
> >> > >The FCC did *not* close all their monitoring stations.
> >> >
> >> > In fact when the monitoring stations were remoted, an additional
> >> > one was added. The station at Canandaigua, NY was brought back on
> >> > line after being closed for a number of years (it was used as the
> >> > test bed for developing the remote control system).
>
> > The FCC closed down all monitoring stations in 1996,
> >and turned over the land they sat on to GAO for disposal.
> >The FCC no longer has any monitoring or locational
> >capability. Today's FCC is only a paper pushing
> >bureaucracy, without any technical expertise.
> >Sorry if you can't deal with the facts, but that is your
> >problem and doesn't change the truth.
>
> Ray, can you explain to me why 47 CFR Part 0 Section 121 lists
> 14 locations for "protected" FCC field offices, including the
> Canadaigua location mentioned above and the Laurel, Maryland
> station mentioned in another post? The locations are protected
> from RF emissions by licensed radio services *because* they are
> FCC monitoring stations. Section 121 was updated in 1998, 1999, and
> 2002, so how can it be that these locations are still listed and
> still protected if the monitoring functions there were discontinued
> and the physical facilities disposed of in 1996?
>
> Here is the list, coordinates included:
>
> Allegan, Michigan
> 42[deg]36[min]20.1[sec] N. Latitude

> 85[deg]57[min]20.1[sec] W. Longitude
>
> Anchorage, Alaska
> 61[deg]09[min]41.[sec] N. Latitude
> 150[deg]00[min]03.0[sec] W. Longitude
>
> Belfast, Maine
> 44[deg]26[min]42.3[sec] N. Latitude
> 69[deg]04[min]56.1[sec] W. Longitude
>
> Canandaigua, New York
> 42[deg]54[min]48.2[sec] N. Latitude
> 77[deg]15[min]57.9[sec] W. Longitude
>
> Douglas, Arizona
> 31[deg]30[min]02.3[sec] N. Latitude
> 109[deg]39[min]14.3[sec] W. Longitude
>
> Ferndale, Washington
> 48[deg]57[min]20.4[sec] N. Latitude
> 122[deg]33[min]17.6[sec] W. Longitude
>
> Grand Island, Nebraska
> 40[deg]55[min]21.0[sec] N. Latitude
> 98[deg]25[min]43.2[sec] W. Longitude
>
> Kingsville, Texas
> 27[deg]26[min]30.1[sec] N. Latitude
> 97[deg]53[min]01.0[sec] W. Longitude
>
> Laurel, Maryland
> 39[deg]09[min]54.4[sec] N. Latitude
> 76[deg]49[min]15.9[sec] W. Longitude
>
> Livermore, California
> 37[deg]43[min]29.7[sec] N. Latitude
> 121[deg]45[min]15.8[sec] W. Longitude
>
> Powder Springs, Georgia
> 33[deg]51[min]44.4[sec] N. Latitude
> 84[deg]43[min]25.8[sec] W. Longitude
>
> Santa Isabel, Puerto Rico
> 18[deg]00[min]18.9[sec] N. Latitude
> 66[deg]22[min]30.6[sec] W. Longitude
>
> Vero Beach, Florida
> 27[deg]36[min]22.1[sec] N. Latitude
> 80[deg]38[min]05.2[sec] W. Longitude
>

> Waipahu, Hawaii
> 21[deg]22[min]33.6[sec] N. Latitude
> 157[deg]59[min]44.1[sec] W. Longitude
>
>
> Additionally, from
>
> <http://www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Inspector_General/Reports/sar997.txt>
>
> we have the following assessment (as of late 1997):
>
> The reorganization entailed the closure of nine attended
> frequency monitoring stations and three additional monitoring
> sites located at FCC field offices. In place of these
> previously manned stations, a national automated monitoring
> network is now controlled from an existing facility in
> Columbia, Maryland. Nine of the 25 existing field offices as
> well as three of the six regional offices were closed. Two
> technical staff members continue to be assigned as Resident
> Agents in the nine locations in which field offices were
> closed.
>
> So lets see, of 25 field offices 9 were close, leaving 14. And
> an automated monitoring network is in use, for which there are
> 14 protected locations. Does this add up to anything like
>
> "out of the monitoring & enforcement business! Permanently!"
>
> or
>
> "the FCC closed all their monitoring stations seven years ago"
>
> or
>
> "The FCC closed down all monitoring stations in 1996"
>
> or
>
> "and turned over the land they sat on to GAO for disposal"
>
> or
>
> "The FCC no longer has any monitoring or locational capability"
>
> or is there by any chance a large amount of disinformation being
> relayed here as if it were fact?
>
> --
> Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
> Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

Read this link. It tells how the land the monitoring stations sat on was disposed of by GAO and how FCC employees ran up millions of dollars in fraudulent cell phone bills while they were closing the monitoring stations and selling off the land.

www.fcc.gov/bureaus/inspector_general/sar996.txt

ken

518. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 23:17:09 UTC
From: gaffo <gaffo@usenet.net>
Message-ID: <vj0e2gn1n9o995@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 73932
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Radio Truth wrote:
> The FCC office in Laurel, MD is where FCC
> employees were caught in the act of running a child
> pornography ring. FCC employees were using government
> computers during official duty hours (while they were on the
> public payroll) to run a cottage industry of child pornography.
> It makes one wonder about the character of the persons the
> FCC hires and how many more have yet to be caught.
> Go here to read the FCC Inspector General's report, scroll
> down to "Significant Investigations."
> www.fcc.gov/bureaus/Inspector_General/Reports/sar398.txt
>
> This is one item that was never the subject of a FCC press
> releases.
>
> Radio Truth
> Bob Johnson
> CEO
>

you link is bad. Havfve another?

--
"I think all foreigners should stop interfering in the internal
affairs of Iraq," said Wolfowitz, who is touring the country to meet
U.S. troops and Iraqi officials.

519. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 23:19:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bgpe0cskv1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 73934

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bgn5mdrse1@adenine.netfront.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:0ciXa.15969$Vx2.8220036@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > news:bgk9k5$1u3$1@adenine.netfront.net...
> > > CW is mostly callsign/whereabouts/weather/TNX and that's it. If an
> actual
> > > conversation ensues, I'm sure no one (except the jerks I know of)
would
> > > waste their time getting carpal tunnel with cursing in CW.
> > >
> >
> > There you are wrong. There are many extensive conversations on CW.
They
> > converse about the same things voice operators do. I've heard them
> talking
> > about their careers, families, computers, buying and selling on ebay and
a
> > myriad of other topics.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> Wow, most of the CW operators I've known even state that all they "pretty
> much" do is exchange information. Most of them also only use it during a
> contest, though. Maybe that's the difference.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>
> ---
> Posted via news://freenews.netfront.net
> Complaints to news@netfront.net

Kim keeps referencing all her friends that do CW. And what they tell her.
Hey Kim....here is an eye opener for you. CW ops actually to 'communicate'
Yes there is the wx reports, rig here is etc. But real CW ops don't bother
with that boooooorings stuff. We talk about everything under the sun.

Get you 'CW OP BUDS' :) to get their speed up around 40 and check out 7030
or so. There are some 'real' conversations going on.

Dan/W4NTI

520. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-05 23:57:54 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308051557.561eebbc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73935
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Uri" <slip@sparphoneyorg.net> wrote in message news:<bgn8us$a99$0@pita.alt.net>...
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj3nw0u.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> > On 4 Aug 2003 07:38:22 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > >"N22X" <N22X@sherzfordzent.com> wrote in message
> news:<bgj1ml$nt4$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > >
> > >> Since the FCC closed all their monitoring stations seven
> > >> years ago,
> > >
> > >The FCC did *not* close all their monitoring stations.
> >
> > In fact when the monitoring stations were remoted, an additional
> > one was added. The station at Canandaigua, NY was brought back on
> > line after being closed for a number of years (it was used as the
> > test bed for developing the remote control system).
> >
> > --
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
> >
> Canadaigua is listed as having been
> turned over to the FAA as an back-up air control site!!!!!

Yeah, yeah, and some farmer raises corn on the New York Center site.

> All the monitoring stations have been dismantled.

No, no Sweetums, you don't know what you're talking about. Which
doesn't come as much of a shock. In most cases the station personnel
got "dismantled" when the stations were automated and placed under
remote control, that's all. Laurel is still staffed because it's the
biggest & baddest of the bunch. So yes indeedy Sweetums, the FCC is
definitely still listening, listening, listening . .

I can't urge you too strongly get a grip on the facts before you spout
off in USENET Sweetums else you make a complete ass of yourself again
like you just did.

> Do you
> understand standard English?????????????

Of course he can't. He's ONLY a multi-degreed EE/comms lawyer whod did
something like 30 with the FCC. Busted his share of pirates too by

golly.

>
> Uri

w3rv

521. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 00:05:30 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308051605.37855e26@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73936

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308041839.62aabe55@posting.google.com>...
> Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message news:<878yqa8dk3.fld@barrow.com>...
>
> > One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
> > Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
> > breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
> > that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
> > just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.
>
> Sad, but true. But they don't see it that way.
>
> One David Heil demands licensed participation in the ARS. But when
> confronted with mere Technician participation in the ARS that rivals
> his Extraness, he digs in and destroys. Or at least he tries to.
> Then there is Extra DICK. Probably Extra in every way except the dick
> department. Then there's Jim "DeSoda" who keeps rewriting "200 Meters
> and Up."

Ya still don't even get the relationship between wavelength and
frequency huh? It's 200 Meters and DOWN ya dim bulb.

> No need to mention INSANE Clown Posse in a Nurse's dress or
> the civilian with "real" military experience.

w3rv

522. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 00:08:59 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308051608.a214039@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73937

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<kXAXa.92552$Wd5.18542286@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0308031718.23b2c842@posting.google.com...
> > wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
> news:<20030802210406.21580.00000808@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> > > Do Hams get 11 Meters Back, as soon as all the CBers upgrade to there
> Free
> > > Handout Ham Licenses?
> >
> >
> > We didn't "lose" 11M, we just had use CB reddios <radios>

It's "reddios" on 11M and radios on 12M and elsewhere. "When in Rome
do as the Romans do."

> instead of our
> ham
> > gear to run on 11.
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Quite correct. (...and too often overlooked.)

w3rv

523. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 00:21:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030805202112.12631.00000024@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 73938

In article <bgn5mdrse1@adenine.netfront.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>Wow, most of the CW operators I've known even state that all they "pretty
>much" do is exchange information.

Not me.

>Most of them also only use it during a
>contest, though.

Not me.

>Maybe that's the difference.
>
Of course. The 'phone and data folks do the same - get the QSO and on to the
next, which is what contests are all about. DXing is similar.

CW ragchewing is a completely different game. Tremendous fun once you have the
skills and a decent rig.

And CW can offer a feature most other modes don't - full break-in, or QSK. The
receiving op can interrupt the sending op just by tapping the key. Great for
traffic handling, too.

73 de Jim, N2EY

524. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 00:21:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030805202113.12631.00000025@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 73939

In article <BB53BE8F.1FFC7%stewart@say.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>
>> (snip) But note this plain, simple fact: Almost all of
>> the FCC enforcement actions for "jerk-like" on-air
>> behavior (obscenity, jamming, failure to ID, exceeeding
>> license privileges, etc., etc.) are against hams using
>> PHONE modes, not CW/Morse or data modes. ALL of us have
>> taken written tests detailing what we should and should
>> not do on the air, but it seems like violations are much
>> more prevalent among the talkers than the brasspounders
>> or keyboarders. Why?
>
>
> Very simple answer, Jim. The FCC has limited personnel today. The few they
>have simply don't have the time to sit around listening, as code users pound
>out their incredibly slow conversations, to catch violations. ;)

HAW!
>
> Actually, the differences in violations between the various modes isn't
>that hard to understand. The phone modes dominate ham radio usage, therefore
>it should be obvious more violations will occur in those modes.

True to a point - but HF/MF usage isn't that much slanted towards 'phone. The
ratio of cited violations is far greater than the ratio of users.

And since enforcement is complaint-driven, FCC monitoring activity isn't a
factor.

>In addition,
>phone users exchange information at a greater rate when compared to CW >users

Some do. But in general, decent CW ops exchange info at a rate that is close to
that of people talking. Although the raw WPM is less, CW uses abbreviations and
prosigns, while 'phone tends to be full of pauses, redundancies and phonetics.

>and conversations occur more often when compared to data users. Both of
>these lead to greater opportunities for violations to occur. If all these
>differences were factored in, I suspect the differences in violations would
>be far less.

I don't think so. The worst I've ever heard on the CW bands was one ham calling
another a lid for tuning up and calling a DX station on the DX's freq after the
DX had clearly stated he was working split. The worst I've heard on the 'phone

bands I am too embarrassed to even describe.

It should be noted that the vast majority of hams behave very appropriately on the
bands, regardless of mode or license class. But it only takes a few bad apples to make all of us look bad.

73 de Jim, N2EY

525. How about PBL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 00:29:05 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0308051629.3cabf5a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73940

Here's an alternative to BPL from a local ham here in Minnesota.

http://home.comcast.net/~gbox/

73, de Hans, K0HB

526. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 00:59:19 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <HpYXa.27737$Sw4.9294@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 73941

Interesting. Of course, I never gave a hang for contests, but I recall the RPN (Rochester Peanut Whistle Net) that we had years ago. We met evenings on 15 CW. I'm trying to recall ... there was me (then WB2OSP), Tim WB2KAO (still has that call), Greg WB2GLK (now a 4 call and I'm not sure ... I'd have to look it up), Mike (WA2SEY now W2AV) and a couple of others. I can't imagine us getting on a bunch of evenings only to state rrr tnx fer call ur 5nn here in Rochester,, ny (heck, we were all from Rochester!). I enjoyed rag chewing, and preferred cw back then. When in the service, I usually split my operating around 1/3 ssb, 1/3 cw, 1/3 rtty. I used to talk via rtty with Norm, VK2NP, for hours on end. ssb and cw contacts were usually in the range of 15 minutes to half an hour. Even a cw contact for 15 minutes did consist of far more than simple weather, rig, etc exchanges as my cw contacts were fairly high speed cw (usually - although I did enjoy dropping into the novice 40 or 15 meter bands to give a few folks a chance to work something more than a couple of states away. Those were usually limited as you imply simply by the limitation of slow cw). The cw contacts close approached the limit of the rtty gear running a tape reader. rtty was 60 words per minute, too much for me, but at the time I had no problem putting 40 words per minute perfect copy on paper and 50 words per minute before I was struggling to copy it. Most of my contacts were between 30 and 50 words per minute cw. Come to think of it, a lot of voice contacts were just what you mentioned - signal, weather, rig, name, and - oh yes - *please* QSL.

Don't get me wrong; I don't care whether someone else want to learn code or not; I just don't care for a bunch of folks who want to blame it for their washing machines over-sudsing :) As far as carpel-tunnel, I never used a straight key (although I could send decent code to about 22 and shaky code to about 28 with one). A small amount of movement and the Hallicrafters HA1-TO keyer took care of the tough stuff :) A few hours of cw contacts never bithered me a bot.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bgn5mdrse1@adenine.netfront.net...
>
> Wow, most of the CW operators I've known even state that all they "pretty
> much" do is exchange information. Most of them also only use it during a
> contest, though. Maybe that's the difference.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03

527. Re: Comment On This News Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 01:44:44 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <g4ZXa.27743$W15.2356@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 73942

Very true. Flames don't last long there at all. On one group, we had an individual post (roughly approximated here) " Too much F****** e-mail. Stop the F*** the e-mail". I edited out the obscenity, approved the edited post, and explained how to change his profile; the group owner, however, decided to take the initiative and stop his e-mail for him. Permanently! :) The groups I'm a member of generally have a number of moderators. In the one group I mentioned, we have coverage from England, the U.S. Eastern time zone, Canada Pacific time zone, and Australia. Some even check in from work during lunch. The Yahoo Groups tend to be good and folks have a good time. Intentional flamers tend to disappear very quickly.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03

528. Re: Dear Norn: (Jim Beam warehouse burns in Ky)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 01:47:39 UTC
From: Wally Bigguns <kellogy7@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1060134546.863815@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 73943

Shhhhh....!

Dave, don't let the word get out to
some of the hams on 75 and 20 Meters
but today Jim Beam Co's seven-story
tall Bourbon warehouse BURNED TO THE
GROUND taking 19,000 barrels of
fine aging Kentucky Bourbon with it.

Rumor is that many 75 Meter nets are draping
their microphones in black ribbons.........

529. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 01:48:55 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <871xvzwo6w.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73944
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ray Neville" <hoot@smiilexinc.org> wrote:
>"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@barrow.com> wrote:
>> "Ray Neville" <hoot@smiilexinc.org> wrote:
>>
>> >The FCC no longer has any monitoring or locational capability.
^^
>>
>> Ray, can you explain to me why 47 CFR Part 0 Section 121 lists
>> 14 locations for "protected" FCC field offices, including the
...
>> Additionally, from
>>
>> <http://www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Inspector_General/Reports/sar997.txt>
>>
>> we have the following assessment (as of late 1997):
>>
>> The reorganization entailed the closure of nine attended
>> frequency monitoring stations and three additional monitoring
>> sites located at FCC field offices. In place of these
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
>> previously manned stations, a national automated monitoring
^^
>> network is now controlled from an existing facility in
^^
>> Columbia, Maryland.
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

> Read this link. It tells how the land the monitoring stations sat
>on was disposed of by GAO and how FCC employees ran up
>millions of dollars in fraudulent cell phone bills while they were
>closing the monitoring stations and selling off the land.
>
> www.fcc.gov/bureaus/inspector_general/sar996.txt

Learn something about

1) citing links in a manner that make the accessable
2) reading what you cite *before* you cite it
3) making your summary *accurate* if you do summarize

You've failed on all of the above. The actual link is,

http://www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Inspector_General/Reports/sar996.txt

It says *nothing* about land disposal by the the GAO, nor does it say a thing about cell phone usage related to the closing of monitoring stations.

What it does say contradicts your position and repeats *precisely* what I had said above:

... "the closure of nine attended frequency monitoring stations and three additional monitoring sites located at FCC field offices. This streamlining initiative has been implemented during this reporting period. In place of these previously manned stations, a national automated monitoring network has been established and will be controlled from an existing facility in Columbia, Maryland."

As you can see, claims that "The FCC no longer has any monitoring or locational capability" is absolutely refuted by the two cited references to FCC semi-annual reports. Both of them, the one I originally cited and the one you attempted to cite, say the exact same thing: The FCC now has a "national automated monitoring network" in place. They just as clearly have at least 14 locations, listed in the cite that I gave and deleted here as redundant, where these remotely operated monitoring stations exist.

The cite you attempted to make does say: "This report includes the major accomplishments and general activities of the OIG during the period April 1, 1996, through September 30, 1996...", where OIG is the Office of the Inspector General.

The OIG accomplishments and activities reported in that particular semi-annual review were one Special Review Report and three Audit Reports that were issued during the reporting period. The Special Review Report was related to support for frequency spectrum auctions. The Audit Reports were

1) Audit of Employee Use of American Express Government Credit Cards, issued August 14, 1996

2) Report on Cellular Telephone Utilization, issued August 15, 1996

3) Report on Audit of Proposal for Initial Pricing Under RFP No. 96-37, issued September 30, 1996.

Clearly you were not referring to items 1 and 3, which are not related to either monitoring stations, GAO sales or cell phones.

Item 2 is indeed related to cell phones, but has no particular connection to any GAO sales, as none are mentioned, and since it reports on cell phone usage between 1993 and 1995, it cannot be said to apply specifically to the deactivation of manned monitoring stations. In particular, it does not mention *any*

specific locations or activities or offices within the Commission as being singled out for either proper or inproper usage. It does say that proper managerial control was not in place and that abuses were found. However, none of the abuses found could possibly be related to the activities you claimed, because all were:

A sample of judgementally selected phone bills for FCC employees whose cellular phone bills consistently exceeded $100 per month over a six month period from January through July 1995, was reviewed by the auditors.

So, one just has to ask why you would post such a claim and then try to back it up with a cite that supports exactly the opposite of what you have said?

Did you even read it, or did you just expect that I wouldn't be able to find it?

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

530. Re: Dear Norn: (Jim Beam warehouse burns in Ky)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 01:54:28 UTC
From: Wally Bigguns <kellogy7@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1060134975.659072@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 73945

Link to the story with photos:

http://www.cnn.com/2003/US/South/08/04/ky.distillery.fire.ap/index.html

http://www.suntimes.com/output/news/cst-nws-bourbon05.html

Homepage of the Jim Beam Distillery

www.jimbeam.com

531. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 01:58:50 UTC
From: Ray Neville <hoot@smiilexinc.org>
Message-ID: <bgpnbm$4i7$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73946
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308051557.561eebbc@posting.google.com...
> "Uri" <slip@sparphoneyorg.net> wrote in message
news:<bgn8us$a99$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj3nw0u.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> > > On 4 Aug 2003 07:38:22 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
> > >
> > > >"N22X" <N22X@sherzfordzent.com> wrote in message
> > news:<bgj1ml$nt4$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > > >
> > > >> Since the FCC closed all their monitoring stations seven
> > > >> years ago,
> > > >
> > > >The FCC did *not* close all their monitoring stations.
> > >
> > > In fact when the monitoring stations were remoted, an additional
> > > one was added. The station at Canandaigua, NY was brought back on
> > > line after being closed for a number of years (it was used as the
> > > test bed for developing the remote control system).
> > >
> > > --
> > > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> > >
> > >
> > Canadaigua is listed as having been
> > turned over to the FAA as an back-up air control site!!!!!
>
> Yeah, yeah, and some farmer raises corn on the New York Center site.
>
> > All the monitoring stations have been dismantled.
>
> No, no Sweetums, you don't know what you're talking about. Which
> doesn't come as much of a shock. In most cases the station personnel
> got "dismantled" when the stations were automated and placed under
> remote control, that's all. Laurel is still staffed because it's the
> biggest & baddest of the bunch. So yes indeedy Sweetums, the FCC is
> definitely still listening, listening, listening . .
>
> I can't urge you too strongly get a grip on the facts before you spout
> off in USENET Sweetums else you make a complete ass of yourself again
> like you just did.
>

> > Do you
> > understand standard English?????????????
>
> Of course he can't. He's ONLY a multi-degreed EE/comms lawyer whod did
> something like 30 with the FCC. Busted his share of pirates too by
> golly.
>
> >
> > Uri
>
> w3rv

So despite all the facts to the contrary, you cling to this
fairy tale belief there are still mythical "monitoring" stations?
First of all you need to realize that as a no code tech, you
really have no idea what is going on. Do you have a
grip on reality? No, I did not think so. Now run along
and go back to your CB friends, or better yet take all your
ravings to 14313, like hams do. You are a very strange
lad indeed!

Ken

532. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 02:03:50 UTC
From: Ray Neville <hoot@smiilexinc.org>
Message-ID: <bgpnlk$525$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73947
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
news:871xvzwo6w.fld@barrow.com...
> "Ray Neville" <hoot@smiilexinc.org> wrote:
> >"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@barrow.com> wrote:
> >> "Ray Neville" <hoot@smiilexinc.org> wrote:
> >>
> >> >The FCC no longer has any monitoring or locational capability.
> ^^
> >>
> >> Ray, can you explain to me why 47 CFR Part 0 Section 121 lists
> >> 14 locations for "protected" FCC field offices, including the
> ...
> >> Additionally, from
> >>
> >> <http://www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Inspector_General/Reports/sar997.txt>
> >>
> >> we have the following assessment (as of late 1997):
> >>
> >> The reorganization entailed the closure of nine attended
> >> frequency monitoring stations and three additional monitoring
> >> sites located at FCC field offices. In place of these
> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
> >> previously manned stations, a national automated monitoring
> ^^
> >> network is now controlled from an existing facility in
> ^^
> >> Columbia, Maryland.
> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
>
>
> > Read this link. It tells how the land the monitoring stations sat
> >on was disposed of by GAO and how FCC employees ran up
> >millions of dollars in fraudulent cell phone bills while they were
> >closing the monitoring stations and selling off the land.
> >
> > www.fcc.gov/bureaus/inspector_general/sar996.txt
>
> Learn something about
>
> 1) citing links in a manner that make the accessable
> 2) reading what you cite *before* you cite it
> 3) making your summary *accurate* if you do summarize
>

> You've failed on all of the above. The actual link is,
>
> http://www.fcc.gov/Bureaus/Inspector_General/Reports/sar996.txt
>
> It says *nothing* about land disposal by the the GAO, nor does
> it say a thing about cell phone usage related to the closing of
> monitoring stations.
>
> What it does say contradicts your position and repeats *precisely*
> what I had said above:
>
> ... "the closure of nine attended frequency monitoring stations
> and three additional monitoring sites located at FCC field
> offices. This streamlining initiative has been implemented
> during this reporting period. In place of these previously
> manned stations, a national automated monitoring network
> has been established and will be controlled from an
> existing facility in Columbia, Maryland."
>
> As you can see, claims that "The FCC no longer has any
> monitoring or locational capability" is absolutely refuted by
> the two cited references to FCC semi-annual reports. Both of
> them, the one I originally cited and the one you attempted to
> cite, say the exact same thing: The FCC now has a "national
> automated monitoring network" in place. They just as clearly
> have at least 14 locations, listed in the cite that I gave and
> deleted here as redundant, where these remotely operated
> monitoring stations exist.
>
> The cite you attempted to make does say: "This report includes
> the major accomplishments and general activities of the OIG
> during the period April 1, 1996, through September 30, 1996...",
> where OIG is the Office of the Inspector General.
>
> The OIG accomplishments and activities reported in that
> particular semi-annual review were one Special Review Report and
> three Audit Reports that were issued during the reporting
> period. The Special Review Report was related to support for
> frequency spectrum auctions. The Audit Reports were
>
> 1) Audit of Employee Use of American Express Government
> Credit Cards, issued August 14, 1996
>
> 2) Report on Cellular Telephone Utilization, issued
> August 15, 1996
>
> 3) Report on Audit of Proposal for Initial Pricing
> Under RFP No. 96-37, issued September 30, 1996.
>
> Clearly you were not referring to items 1 and 3, which are

> not related to either monitoring stations, GAO sales or
> cell phones.
>
> Item 2 is indeed related to cell phones, but has no particular
> connection to any GAO sales, as none are mentioned, and since it
> reports on cell phone usage between 1993 and 1995, it cannot
> be said to apply specifically to the deactivation of manned
> monitoring stations. In particular, it does not mention *any*
> specific locations or activities or offices within the Commission
> as being singled out for either proper or inproper usage. It
> does say that proper managerial control was not in place and that
> abuses were found. However, none of the abuses found could
> possibly be related to the activities you claimed, because all
> were:
>
> A sample of judgementally selected phone bills for FCC
> employees whose cellular phone bills consistently exceeded
> $100 per month over a six month period from January through
> July 1995, was reviewed by the auditors.
>
> So, one just has to ask why you would post such a claim and then
> try to back it up with a cite that supports exactly the opposite
> of what you have said?
>
> Did you even read it, or did you just expect that I wouldn't be
> able to find it?
>
> --
> Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
> Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

A. If you claim to know so much, why do you post using
an incorrect path and headers?

B. You are confusing the issue with misquotes and half truths.

C. You really need to get a grip on reality!

D. Akabar Naazar Land Sales Conglomerate handled all
the land sales and disposal of the property which the
monitoring stations sat on. Did you not read his post?
No, I forgot, you cannot comprehend standard English.
Thanks for confirming my suspicions.

Kenny

533. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 02:13:40 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@netjammerqrm.org>
Message-ID: <bgpo7h$5vh$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73948
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Ray Neville" <hoot@smiilexinc.org> wrote in message
news:bgpnbm$4i7$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0308051557.561eebbc@posting.google.com...
> > "Uri" <slip@sparphoneyorg.net> wrote in message
> news:<bgn8us$a99$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > > news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj3nw0u.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> > > > On 4 Aug 2003 07:38:22 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >"N22X" <N22X@sherzfordzent.com> wrote in message
> > > news:<bgj1ml$nt4$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > > > >
> > > > >> Since the FCC closed all their monitoring stations seven
> > > > >> years ago,
> > > > >
> > > > >The FCC did *not* close all their monitoring stations.
> > > >
> > > > In fact when the monitoring stations were remoted, an additional
> > > > one was added. The station at Canandaigua, NY was brought back on
> > > > line after being closed for a number of years (it was used as the
> > > > test bed for developing the remote control system).
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Canadaigua is listed as having been
> > > turned over to the FAA as an back-up air control site!!!!!
> >
> > Yeah, yeah, and some farmer raises corn on the New York Center site.
> >
> > > All the monitoring stations have been dismantled.
> >
> > No, no Sweetums, you don't know what you're talking about. Which
> > doesn't come as much of a shock. In most cases the station personnel
> > got "dismantled" when the stations were automated and placed under
> > remote control, that's all. Laurel is still staffed because it's the
> > biggest & baddest of the bunch. So yes indeedy Sweetums, the FCC is
> > definitely still listening, listening, listening . .
> >
> > I can't urge you too strongly get a grip on the facts before you spout
```

> > off in USENET Sweetums else you make a complete ass of yourself again
> > like you just did.
> >
> > > Do you
> > > understand standard English?????????????
> >
> > Of course he can't. He's ONLY a multi-degreed EE/comms lawyer whod did
> > something like 30 with the FCC. Busted his share of pirates too by
> > golly.
> >
> > >
> > > Uri
> >
> > w3rv
>
> So despite all the facts to the contrary, you cling to this
> fairy tale belief there are still mythical "monitoring" stations?
> First of all you need to realize that as a no code tech, you
> really have no idea what is going on. Do you have a
> grip on reality? No, I did not think so. Now run along
> and go back to your CB friends, or better yet take all your
> ravings to 14313, like hams do. You are a very strange
> lad indeed!
>
> Ken
>
>

Mr Neville,

Hams have nothing better to do than jam each other on
14313. But 20 meters has been closed the last few days,
so these idiots are on here teasing and trolling. Don't fall
for their crap. Everyone knows it is an established fact
that all the FCC monitoring stations were closed and the
land sold over seven years ago. The FCC has long been
out of the monitoring & enforcement business, especially
now that they have nothing to monitor with. Tomorrow
20 meters will open back up and all these idiots will be
back on 14313 jamming each other. Too bad these trolls
can't get a life.

Herb

534. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 02:22:46 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87smofv821.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73949
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ray Neville" <hoot@smiilexinc.org> wrote:
>
> A. If you claim to know so much, why do you post using
>an incorrect path and headers?

What incorrect path and headers would those be?

> B. You are confusing the issue with misquotes and half truths.

Precise quotes and the full truth. If you think it was
otherwise, why don't you show where any quote I gave was wrong
in any way. And, show us a single quote from the cite you made
that in any way supported any claim you've made.

>C. You really need to get a grip on reality!

Such as that your posts are not credible.

>D. Akabar Naazar Land Sales Conglomerate handled all
>the land sales and disposal of the property which the
>monitoring stations sat on. Did you not read his post?
>No, I forgot, you cannot comprehend standard English.
>Thanks for confirming my suspicions.

If you can comprehend standard English, maybe you'll tell us why
the FCC continues to make semi annual reports that claim they
are operating a national network of monitoring stations?

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

535. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 02:29:54 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@netjammerqrm.org>
Message-ID: <bgpp5v$7e6$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73950
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
news:87smofv821.fld@barrow.com...
> "Ray Neville" <hoot@smiilexinc.org> wrote:
> >
> > A. If you claim to know so much, why do you post using
> >an incorrect path and headers?
>
> What incorrect path and headers would those be?
>
> > B. You are confusing the issue with misquotes and half truths.
>
> Precise quotes and the full truth. If you think it was
> otherwise, why don't you show where any quote I gave was wrong
> in any way. And, show us a single quote from the cite you made
> that in any way supported any claim you've made.
>
> >C. You really need to get a grip on reality!
>
> Such as that your posts are not credible.
>
> >D. Akabar Naazar Land Sales Conglomerate handled all
> >the land sales and disposal of the property which the
> >monitoring stations sat on. Did you not read his post?
> >No, I forgot, you cannot comprehend standard English.
> >Thanks for confirming my suspicions.
>
> If you can comprehend standard English, maybe you'll tell us why
> the FCC continues to make semi annual reports that claim they
> are operating a national network of monitoring stations?
>
> --
> Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
> Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

There there my boy. Hold out another 24 hours and you can
get back on 14313 and jam your buddies, talk about imaginary
"monitoring" stations, or anything else that you fruity hams
do. In the mean time, there is always CB. Yes, why don't
you get on channel 11 and make noises, such fun, as you well
know.

Herb

536. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 02:49:27 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F306ADA.F1F6A212@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74001

Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> >Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> Yet it really bugs you'se guys.
> >
> >No, it really bugs Len. Good luck in making your decision as to who
> >brings it up more often.
>
> It does? Is that why he's been using you for entertainment (and I
> might add, providing others with great laughs) for how many years?

I'd hate to hear you doing a play by play of a boxing match. You'd have
Len pummeling my gloves with his face.

> Seven??? And _you_ think it bugs him!

Seven, and I KNOW it bugs him.

> Dave gets out of bed every day and immediately hangs a target on
> himself to help Len get a good aim...

It's sheer agony being bested by those, "FIFTY YEARS AGO I was..." barbs
of Len's.

Dave K8MN

537. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 02:57:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F306C9E.F8FC9462@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74002

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: Dave Heil k8mn
>
> >> From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >>
> >> >So the activity in the photograph never really took place?
>
> >Could be? Don't you know? If you don't, you're just blowing smoke.
>
> I let my membership expire. Its not worth renewing. The way I could verify the
> info is to show up at individual events. I've done that and have trouble asking
> them the questions I want to ask. I could email a few in the photograph, but I
> only remember a few of their names.

You're tap dancing, Vipul.

> I am pretty sure, that if I ask a few people from the photo if they are
> interested in a homebrewing project, they will either say they are not
> interested or too busy.

Maybe they ARE too busy. Maybe they find you an irritant. We'll never
know.

> > Should there be a constant stream of
> >such projects or do you find it acceptable that such projects take place
> >from time to time?
>
> If they are grouped in with other activites, that would be fine. These projects
> haven't been there at all.

Nothing keeps you from homebrewing anything you like except for that
group activities fetish.

> >no one in a radio club wants to do what you want
>
> Often true.

I'll try to work up some sympathy.

> >you being dismayed
> >that hams set out for an operating activity and then waste that time by
> >operating or you being under the impression that your travel to a
> >domestic location was a "DXpedition".
>
> It was a vacation spot.

Did you go there with a radio club group intent on operating?

> I wanted to do some of the vacation activies.

Oh? Did the club plan vacation activities or did you just assume that
was part of the trip?

> Yes, that
> the Hams did not do vacation activites (other than eating) did come as > a surprise to
me.

Far be it from you to actually find out in advance what the group
planned to do. From my perspective, your time in amateur radio has been
one endless litany of complaints.

Dave K8MN

538. Re: How about PBL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 03:02:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F306DEA.A5811603@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74003

K0HB wrote:
>
> Here's an alternative to BPL from a local ham here in Minnesota.
>
> http://home.comcast.net/~gbox/
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Why isn't this man a Commissioner?

Dave K8MN

539. Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 03:06:56 UTC
From: Seagrams Seven <Seagrams@Seven.com>
Message-ID: <bgqrrv$n3t@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74028

Does this work?

540. Re: Comment On This News Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 03:19:27 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F3073BF.1070607@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 74004

The Moderator wrote:

>Comment On This News Group
>
>There is a lot of good stuff here, but also an incredible amount of junk.
>
>Another place to reasonably discuss Amateur Radio is at the Yahoo Groups.
>
>http://groups.yahoo.com/
>
>Search for "Amateur Radio" get over 1200 places to discuss your interests,
>mostly without flames, insults, off-topics, false information, and the
>stupidity that is prevalent here.
>
If you think this newsgroup is bad, take a look at some of the
soc.culture.* groups
sometime. Have heard that soc.culture.india is almost all flame wars.

>
>

541. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 03:24:17 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87llu7v57i.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74005
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Herb" <Herb@netjammerqrm.org> wrote:
>
> There there my boy. Hold out another 24 hours and you can
>get back on 14313 and jam your buddies, talk about imaginary
>"monitoring" stations, or anything else that you fruity hams
>do. In the mean time, there is always CB. Yes, why don't
>you get on channel 11 and make noises, such fun, as you well
>know.
>
>Herb

Are those the same "imaginary" monitoring stations that
Hollingsworth goes around the country talking about. He claimed
some three years ago that computer upgrades allowed them to do
about 1000 times as many Lines of Bearing samples as had been
previously done.

Of course, those _were_ imaginary back in 1995 when the ARRL
announced the soon to be built new remote monitoring system, and
quoted the FCC saying they would be an improvement,

The plan would close nine separate attended high
frequency monitoring stations, and three additional
monitoring sites within FCC field offices.
Technological advances permit the replacement of
these monitoring stations with a national automated
monitoring network by the summer of 1996, the FCC
said, and "overall, monitoring capacities will be
enhanced." One facility in Laurel/Columbia,
Maryland, will remain as the network central
station.
http://www.arrl.org/w1aw/1995-arlb096.html

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

542. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 03:26:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030805232629.25052.00001582@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 74010

In article <mb4uivcd6g78b1n1ccd93u6a9m0vgqvl3n@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
<kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> writes:

>
>And now, Rod Serling steps out from behind the scroll bar on the left
>side of our screens and says:
>
>"Meet one Larry Roll, K2LT, a man with a chip on his shoulder the size
>of the national debt..."

John:

Ooops. That's Larry Taft, not Larry Roll. I didn't know that Mr. Taft had
such a big chip on his shoulder!

>Beam us up, Scotty...there is definitely no intelligent life down
>here.

Apparently not. (Whirring sound, sparkley lights around the dematerializing
figures of Capt. Kirk and the landing party, then they disappear leaving the
scene full of sand, styrofoam rocks, and plastic foilage.)

Back aboard the Enterprise:

Scotty: So what'd you be seein' down there, Capt'n?

Kirk: The usual stuff, Scotty -- sand, styrofoam rocks, plastic foilage,
and KC2HMZ! Unfortunately, John was already brain dead, there was
nothing Bones could do for him.

Dr. McCoy: Damn it, Jim -- I'm a Doctor, not a miracle worker!

Kirk: Sorry, Bones. I know, he was beyond help!

73 de Larry, K3LT
Apologies to Star Trek screenplay writers everywhere!

543. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 03:26:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030805232630.25052.00001583@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 74006

In article <3F2E8D7E.2080000@mailcity.moc>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>
>What about all those digital modes? It makes just as much sense
>to make sure new hams can operate those modes as it does CW.
>

JJ:

No problem here! I'd be all for operational testing in the digital modes,
and I'll throw in a 40 WPM typing test to boot! Shall we co-author a
Petition for Rulemaking to the FCC? If so, send the first draft to my
E-mail address!

73 de Larry, K3LT

544. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 03:26:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030805232631.25052.00001584@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 74008

In article <bgne3ekgd1@208.206.142.92>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Not really. Anyone can learn PSK31 in a half hour of looking over the help
>file and playing iwth their keyboard.

Dick:

Yup. That's about what it took me to "learn" PSK-31. Of course, I had the
unfair advantage of having been a RTTY user for years prior to giving PSK31
a try.

>As you know if you've been listening to
>all the laments appearing here from the "excluded", no such possibliley exists

>for Morse code.

Yeah, that took about a week's worth of half-hour daily sessions to get me
up to the 5 WPM level. Then I got on-the-air, started making QSO's and
having a blast, and before I knew it, I had passed the 20 WPM code test!
That was after having spent half my life (up to that time) convinced that I
could never do it! Go figure…

73 de Larry, K3LT

545. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 03:26:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030805232631.25052.00001585@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 74009

In article <Xns93CE2B3777F09elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>It's not the truth, or even the TRVTH. RF is RF. I haven't noticed any >difference between amateur or professional RF energy.

Alun:

My point exactly. This is one of the reasons why the requirements to be licensed in the AMATEUR radio service do not require professional-level RF engineering skills. Nevertheless, Carl seems to hold on to the notion that his being an RF engineer somehow grants him exalted status as an AMATEUR radio operator. Why is that?

73 de Larry, K3LT

546. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 03:26:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030805232632.25052.00001586@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 74007

In article <f45722ac.0308041900.5dac20b7@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> >73 de Larry (that's MISTER Roll to you), K3LT
>>
>> Two faced hypocrite.
>>
>> If she makes one insulting gester and that means she is
>> "petulant", what do the dozens and dozens that you post make
>> you?
>
>Flatulent.

Brian:

I always thought you were a fart smeller!

73 de Larry, K3LT

547. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 03:27:28 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F3075A0.1040004@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 74011
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
>
>>
>>
>>
> Since the FCC closed all their monitoring stations seven
>years ago, the number of pirates and unlicensed activity
>on HF has jumped by quantum leaps. We are observing
>pirates in the 6600 khz range, which is reserved for
>aero ops, something which was unheard of in the days of
>active FCC enforcement.
>
>
>
I don't even understand the motivation of pirate broadcast radio. If
you have
a message or original music you want people to hear, you can reach a lot
more people
with a web site on the 'net than you ever could with radio. Either you
pirate on
SW, which few people are equipped to listen to, or FM, where your range
is quite limited, and few people will be able to hear you. And then
there is the
schedule limitation. The web site would be avaliable 24/7 for anyone so
inclined
to read or download from.

>
>

548. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 03:38:58 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F307851.6070808@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 74012
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
>
>Many pirates are radio amateurs - they have the knowledge and skill to put
>together a station. :-)
>
>
>
>
>
We did that back in college back in the 1970's. One of us bought a
homebrew transmitter,
did some repairs to clean it up some, threw together some turntables and
a crude mixer
board, used a mic from a cassette recorder, and went on the air Friday
night. We knew that
the nearest FCC office was about 150 miles away, and was closed for the
weekend.
We played records mostly. Some jocks from a local licensed station
found us, and
did a few shifts of our air time! (Guess they wanted the opportunity to
play their own
selections instead of a mandated playlist). I commented on our crude
equipment, and they
said that they had seen worse at licensed stations. We shut down Sunday
night and
dismantled the setup.

Later on someone else at our college did a pirate TV station! That made
the New York
Times! This was when the VCR was first comming out on the market. It was
said that someone built that transmitter out of an old guitar amp.
Sounds ludercutis,
but if it was a tube amp, could actually be done. Use the VCR's channel
modulator
as the exciter, and that feeds the "guitar" amp.

549. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 03:49:25 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F307AC4.50001@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 74013
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
>
>> it again....they are UNMANNED and therefore closed to the
>> public. They are all operated by remote control from Laurel/Columbia,
>>
>>
>MD.
>
>
>>
>>
> Hey stupid ass, I did read it. THEY ARE ALL
>CLOSED, KAPUT, DISMANTLED!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
>
>
Do you think it's any big deal to set up a remote controlled via phone
lines or
even a secure internet connection set of radio receivers and spectrum
analyzers
and antenna rotators at various listening sites? Though not every town
is so
equipped, but if a pirate pops up, the local licensed stations complain
and the
FCC sends the white vans to check it out. The FCC doesn't monitor every
station in every town; they respond to complaints. Did you get busted that
one time you transmitted with the wrong mode in a ham subband? Likely
not, if you only did it once by accident and then corrected it. You have to
constantly violate some rule in an annoying fashion before the FCC comes.

550. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 03:55:36 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0308051955.79831df4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74014

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bgpd1lsat1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:5YMXa.99153$Wd5.20928693@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > news:3F2ED720.4000509@ix.netcom.com...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > >This is actually not such a bad idea. I've always supported dropping
> the
> > > > >155.3 mi. limit on CB and the idea of allowing hams to reduce their
> power
> > > > >and elmer CBers on channels 36 through 40 USB on the finer point of
> DXing. I
> > > > >think it'd be a great recruitment tool, just MHO.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > We could do that now, *IF* we use type accepted (or whatever they call
> > > > it nowadays) CB radios
> > > > instead of our ham transcievers, and not exceed the distance limit.
> > >
> > > 'Zactly! I currently run a slightly older Uniden Grant XL, type certified
> > > and 100% legal.
> > >
> > > > But
> > > > I think the CBers
> > > > might see us as invaders on their turf, like we see them when invading
> > > > 10m. It might be better
> > > > to be low key,
> > >
> > > I usually keep it subtle and have always had pretty good results. NOTE:
> > > Those who bootleg on 10m (Or any other ham band.) are neither included in
> > > this discussion nor welcomed on either band. I'll drop a dime on them in a
> > > NY minute! (...and have done so in the past.)
> > >
> > > > maybe have the ARRL buy ads in CB magizines that say
> > >
> > > IMHO, the ARRL blew a golden opportunity for a win-win situation in 2000
> > > when it comment against RM-9807. I don't think the ARRL's is very much
> > > appreciated among CB circles, HOWEVER, true CB "hobbyists" (Sorry, Phil.)
> DO
> > > respect ARO's and are usually quite receptive.
> > >

> > > something like "if
> > > you get a general or extra ham license, you can DX on many different
> > > bands using more
> > > power (legally) even when the sunspots are out of season. 'You already
> > > love radio, see
> > > how much more fun you can have with a ham license'." Of course one
> > > would have to
> > > wordsmith it right to attract serious and disiplined operators and not
> > > the kids and "lids".
> > > Without making ham radio look condensending or putting CBers down.
> >
> > Funny story...well, kinda. I walked into the corner 7-Eleven and prepared
> to
> > get my dailly fix of Java when a chap nodded in my direction and asked
> "you
> > a ham?" It occured to me that he had seen my AR license plates and since
> we
> > were the only two in the store, it was equally easy for me to notice the
> > Wilson 1000 atop his vehicle. I nodded toward his car and asked him
> > "what'cha runnin'?" Well, I could tell right away it wasn't kosher because
> > you could cut the immediate cloud of nerousness with a knife. "Relax, I've
> > been where you are and I can help you get to where you wanna be." Crash,
> > down came the wall of apprehension. He was using one of those zillion
> > channel Ranger rigs. I explained that if he'd let me, I could show him how
> > to use that legally. Subtly massaged the enforcement angle into the
> > conversation too. I lived three blocks away so I <permanently> lent him
> my
> > Gordo Tech study guide and a copy of my ARRL code CD's. Told him the code
> > test was nothing to sweat and if he any problems just give me a holler.
> > Well, the next time he "hollered," he had two CSCE's in hand and a new
> > Tech"+" was waiting for a call. Now that he's tasted more bandwidth, he
> > doesn't want to risk losing those priviledges on any illegal 11-meter
> > frequencies anymore. I personally don't care what his motivations are to
> fly
> > straight are, I'm just glad that he is. Sure, I could've immediately
> beaten
> > him up re. his rig or lectured him on what CB was originally intended
> > for...but what would it have gained? CB gained a legal op, and he gained a
> > whole new world of radio. For all I know, he might very well be an Extra
> by
> > now. I do know it felt good. :-)
> >
> > > I'm
> > > not that
> > > good a writer, but I think that it could be done well.
> >
> > I think you just did a great job.
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Bert

> > WA2SI
> >
> >
>
> I used to do the same thing with the customers I had in my CB shop a few
> years back. Got a LOT of converts that way.

Kewl beans, it doesn't always work but when it does...it sure feels
good.

> But it was tough sometimes when they came in and asked me why the Swerrrrrrs
> were so high on their whup, when it was mounted with straps to the metal
> cab of the truck.

That wasn't the tough part for me. It's the ones with the really bad
attitudes who wear me out. At a certain point, you end up deciding who
is worth the effort and who to ditch.

> Dan/W4NTI

73 de Bert
WA2SI

551. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 04:03:18 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0308052003.74ae149d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74015

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bgpc38iqp1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3F2ED720.4000509@ix.netcom.com...
> > >
> > >
> > >This is actually not such a bad idea. I've always supported dropping the
> > >155.3 mi. limit on CB and the idea of allowing hams to reduce their power
> > >and elmer CBers on channels 36 through 40 USB on the finer point of
> DXing. I
> > >think it'd be a great recruitment tool, just MHO.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > We could do that now, *IF* we use type accepted (or whatever they call
> > it nowadays) CB radios
> > instead of our ham transcievers, and not exceed the distance limit. But
> > I think the CBers
> > might see us as invaders on their turf, like we see them when invading
> > 10m. It might be better
> > to be low key, maybe have the ARRL buy ads in CB magizines that say
> > something like "if
> > you get a general or extra ham license, you can DX on many different
> > bands using more
> > power (legally) even when the sunspots are out of season. 'You already
> > love radio, see
> > how much more fun you can have with a ham license'." Of course one
> > would have to
> > wordsmith it right to attract serious and disiplined operators and not
> > the kids and "lids".
> > Without making ham radio look condensending or putting CBers down. I'm
> > not that
> > good a writer, but I think that it could be done well.
> >
>
> If all you CBers with a ham license want to go back and play in the pig pen.
> Then go ahead.

No thanks, Dan. I avoid the pig pen, but I still do occasionally chit
chat on CB ch. 38 LSB and 40 USB...and no swine present. As a matter
of fact, I worked a guy on ch. 38 LSB earlier this evening who ended
up asking me to QSY to 28.440 MHz. I happily complied. ;-)

> Don't even think anyone that is a real ham cares what goes
> on there.

Very much false.

> Let alone wants to operate there.

See above.

> If you don't like that. Tough...thats the fact jack.

Doesn't bother me one iota as it's very far from factual.

> Dan/W4NTI

73 de Bert
WA2SI

552. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 04:09:24 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0308052009.31ac70a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74016

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bgpcf2pli1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:N5RXa.10100$W%3.31@nwrdny01.gnilink.net...
>
> > Nah, you'll get all kinds of excuses wrt how unwieldy and expensive VHF
> gear
> > would've been back in 1958. But you know what...the manufacturers would've
> > worked that ou and historically ALWAYS have. That really wasn't the FCC's
> > job, it was, and still is, the job of the manufacturers.
>
> Your arguement dont <doesn't> hold water Bert. There was a CB band on UHF back then.
> It was in the 400 mhz range FM and was called Class A.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

I remember it, Dan. Now dig a little further and research when that
band came into being and why it was subsequently reassigned. Then tell
me a little more about "my arguement." ;-)

73 de Bert
WA2SI

553. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 04:35:52 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93CF5FB731F0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 74017

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:76WXa.17298$Vx2.8810860@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns93CE2C5CA14F7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
>> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj4351y.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:
>>
>> > On Mon, 04 Aug 2003 07:41:03 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> >
>> >> Very simple answer, Jim. The FCC has limited personnel today. The
>> >> few they
>> >>have simply don't have the time to sit around listening, as code
>> >>users pound out their incredibly slow conversations, to catch
>> >>violations. ;)
>> >
>> > For reasons that I disagreed with then and I disagree with now,
>> > (but that's another story) the FCC' s enforcement response is
>> > driven by complaints, not by "Patrolling the Ether" (tm) as in
>> > days of yore.
>> >
>> > How many complaints of amateur CW violations do you think "Riley"
>> > gets? (Somebody pounding out "FU" in Morse on a Touch-Tone (tm)
>> > pad on a repeater input does not count as CW....)
>> >
>> > --
>> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>> >
>> > From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
>> > Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> So what do we call it then? I have certainly heard F-U-C-K sent in
>> Morse on a repeater.
>
> Anything from an unidentified transmission to interference to jamming
> for starters depending on the exact events. It probably violates a
> number of FCC rules.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

>

The point is that Phil is trying to say that jamming in MCW doesn't count as jamming in CW, which is like trying to say that there's a vital difference between using FM or SSB to jam.

554. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 04:38:10 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93CF65FEBD7Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 74018

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
news:20030805232631.25052.00001585@mb-m11.aol.com:

> In article <Xns93CE2B3777F09elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>It's not the truth, or even the TRVTH. RF is RF. I haven't noticed any
>>difference between amateur or professional RF energy.
>
> Alun:
>
> My point exactly. This is one of the reasons why the requirements to be
> licensed in the AMATEUR radio service do not require professional-level
> RF engineering skills. Nevertheless, Carl seems to hold on to the
notion
> that his being an RF engineer somehow grants him exalted status as an
> AMATEUR radio operator. Why is that?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Could it be because he knows a lot about radio?

555. Re: How about PBL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 07:20:34 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308052320.458e28a7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74019

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F306DEA.A5811603@earthlink.net>...
> K0HB wrote:
> >
> > Here's an alternative to BPL from a local ham here in Minnesota.
> >
> > http://home.comcast.net/~gbox/
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> Why isn't this man a Commissioner?

Because he wouldn't pass the IQ test, his is above the maximum allowable.

> Dave K8MN

w3rv

556. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 07:35:11 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308052335.641d0b27@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74020

averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030805183637.05187.00000072@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 8/4/03 10:39 PM Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0308041839.62aabe55@posting.google.com>
> >
> >Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
> >news:<878yqa8dk3.fld@barrow.com>...
> >
> >> One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
> >> Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
> >> breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
> >> that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
> >> just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.
> >
> >Sad, but true. But they don't see it that way.
>
> Is this Len Anderson person a cannibal?
>
> Are you his acolyte or disciple?

Apprentice. Same thing.

> >
> >One David Heil demands licensed participation in the ARS. But when
> >confronted with mere Technician participation in the ARS that rivals
> >his Extraness, he digs in and destroys. Or at least he tries to.
>
> How?
>
> >Then there is Extra DICK. Probably Extra in every way except the dick
> >department.
>
> You seem to be very interested in a subject that is inappropriate for amateur
> radio. Why is that?
>
> > Then there's Jim "DeSoda" who keeps rewriting "200 Meters
> >and Up."
>
> Who are you referring to?
> Where can I buy the book?
>
> > No need to mention INSANE Clown Posse in a Nurse's dress or
> >the civilian with "real" military experience.

>
> Who are you referring to?
> >
> Brian Burke, your postings here are quite bizarre.
>
> Is there a rational reason for your behavior?

Sort of. Unfortunately his father was involved in the atom bomb
experiments which were conducted just after WW2 . .

w3rv

557. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 09:27:21 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <877k5ruoee.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74021

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote:
>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>>
>> My point exactly. This is one of the reasons why the requirements to be
>> licensed in the AMATEUR radio service do not require professional-level
>> RF engineering skills. Nevertheless, Carl seems to hold on to the notion
>> that his being an RF engineer somehow grants him exalted status as an
>> AMATEUR radio operator. Why is that?

...

>Could it be because he knows a lot about radio?

Makes no difference to Larry. His measure of an Amateur is
simply how near to being identical to Larry Roll are they. If
it is not important to Larry, it isn't important to the ARS. If
it is important to Larry, then any ham that doesn't measure up,
somehow isn't a real ham.

It never occurred to him that many many hams are also
professionals, and if we measured him by the same standard, he'd
get laughed out of the club meeting. But in fact very few hams
who are pro's in the business think that hams are measured the
way Larry does. We do realize that it wouldn't be fair, and
that the ARS is afterall, a hobby and should remain that way.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

558. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 11:17:34 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgqo2j$um2@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74022

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030805232630.25052.00001583@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <3F2E8D7E.2080000@mailcity.moc>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
> writes:
>
> >
> >What about all those digital modes? It makes just as much sense
> >to make sure new hams can operate those modes as it does CW.
> >
>
> JJ:
>
> No problem here! I'd be all for operational testing in the digital modes,
> and I'll throw in a 40 WPM typing test to boot! Shall we co-author a
> Petition for Rulemaking to the FCC? If so, send the first draft to my
> E-mail address!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Yeah. Larry's never up for creating one himself.

Kim W5TIT

559. For Dwight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 11:30:34 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgqoqv$ihs@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74023

Hey, Dwight? Have you had any more problem with my news messages? I know at one point you said that you'd changed servers and didn't seem to be having any more. How's it been?

I think the problem is with the other server. I got rid of that account; I also think someone "whined" (heh heh) about how pertinent my posts are and that they just couldn't handle it any more. The error message I would get is: "you are not allowed to post to rec.radio.amateur.policy."

So, apparently someone can't handle the heat...

--
Kim W5TIT

560. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 11:32:35 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgqouo$got@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74024

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0308052003.74ae149d@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bgpc38iqp1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> >
> > If all you CBers with a ham license want to go back and play in the pig
pen.
> > Then go ahead.
>
> No thanks, Dan. I avoid the pig pen, but I still do occasionally chit
> chat on CB ch. 38 LSB and 40 USB...and no swine present. As a matter
> of fact, I worked a guy on ch. 38 LSB earlier this evening who ended
> up asking me to QSY to 28.440 MHz. I happily complied. ;-)
>
> > Don't even think anyone that is a real ham cares what goes
> > on there.
>
> Very much false.
>
> > Let alone wants to operate there.
>
> See above.
>
> > If you don't like that. Tough...thats the fact jack.
>
> Doesn't bother me one iota as it's very far from factual.
>
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>

I feel the same way about CB, Bert. There are ways to avoid the trash, and
that is on USB or LSB. Anyone who would forsake any communication venue
just doesn't have a clue for the value of that venue...

Kim W5TIT

561. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 11:38:50 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@netjammerqrm.org>
Message-ID: <bgqpb8$9o5$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 74025
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F307AC4.50001@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >> it again....they are UNMANNED and therefore closed to the
> >> public. They are all operated by remote control from Laurel/Columbia,
> >>
> >>
> >MD.
> >
> >
> >>
> >>
> > Hey stupid ass, I did read it. THEY ARE ALL
> >CLOSED, KAPUT, DISMANTLED!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
> >
> >
> Do you think it's any big deal to set up a remote controlled via phone
> lines or
> even a secure internet connection set of radio receivers and spectrum
> analyzers
> and antenna rotators at various listening sites? Though not every town
> is so
> equipped, but if a pirate pops up, the local licensed stations complain
> and the
> FCC sends the white vans to check it out. The FCC doesn't monitor every
> station in every town; they respond to complaints. Did you get busted
that
> one time you transmitted with the wrong mode in a ham subband? Likely
> not, if you only did it once by accident and then corrected it. You have
to
> constantly violate some rule in an annoying fashion before the FCC comes.
>

Your logic falls apart if there are no local stations to complain.
Your logic also does not apply to HF pirates and other unlicensed
ops such as the thousands of truck drivers and others now
operating illegally in the HF bands.

Herb

562. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 11:45:23 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@netjammerqrm.org>
Message-ID: <bgqpnhafq0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 74026
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
news:87llu7v57i.fld@barrow.com...
> "Herb" <Herb@netjammerqrm.org> wrote:
> >
> > There there my boy. Hold out another 24 hours and you can
> >get back on 14313 and jam your buddies, talk about imaginary
> >"monitoring" stations, or anything else that you fruity hams
> >do. In the mean time, there is always CB. Yes, why don't
> >you get on channel 11 and make noises, such fun, as you well
> >know.
> >
> >Herb
>
> Are those the same "imaginary" monitoring stations that
> Hollingsworth goes around the country talking about. He claimed
> some three years ago that computer upgrades allowed them to do
> about 1000 times as many Lines of Bearing samples as had been
> previously done.

He was talking about environmental monitoring and things that
the military was doing. Did you not listen? Oh, I forgot,
English is a second language for you. Also, the supply of
relative bearing grease became too expensive for the FCC to
afford anymore, so they could no longer take bearings.

>
> Of course, those _were_ imaginary back in 1995 when the ARRL
> announced the soon to be built new remote monitoring system, and
> quoted the FCC saying they would be an improvement,

Your confusing that with a FAA project. Check your
"sources" more closely. And how can you build anything on
land that the FCC no longer has? The FAA has constructed
remote air control facilities on some of the old FCC monitoring
station sites, and this is how you are getting so confused.
FAA is NOT FCC, now you get it?

Herb

>>
> --
> Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
> Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

563. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 12:17:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308060417.5eb2d38b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74027

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F301D6D.D7A189F5@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2FA40B.6CBD0E90@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2F1ADF.9E64A43D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > > One David Heil demands licensed participation in the ARS.
>
> > > > > Maybe one of 'em demands such but it isn't this one.
>
> > > > You're one of them that incessantly points out his license status.
> > > >
> > > Yes, I am. That isn't the same as what you claimed in your earlier
> > > comment. Len isn't licensed in the amateur radio service and has no
> > > experience in amateur radio.
> >
> > What purpose does that serve?
>
> It serves to point out Len's total lack of experience in the amateur
> service.

Yet he knows more about radio then you. How can that be if he has no experience?

> > The vast majority of the policy makers
> > at the FCC aren't licensed in the amateur radio service and have no
> > experience in amateur radio.
>
> The vast majority of policy makers at the FCC have nothing whatever to
> do with amateur radio. Those that are involved in the regulation of the
> ARS, are quite knowledgeable about the service.

They fooled me with the last restructuring NOI/NPRM.

> They are paid to know.

Wasted money.

> Additionally, there are radio amateurs on the FCC staff.

So every amateur on "staff" makes policy and rules?

That has
> nothing to do with the issue of Len Anderson. He isn't a participant in
> amateur nor is he a regulator of amateur radio. Len is totally
> irrelevant to amateur radio.

You are in the minority in thinking that.

> > But I don't hear you complaining about that, yet they have the ability
> > to change what you do and how you do it.
>
> No, you won't hear me complaining often though there are times when the
> Commission makes a decision which I don't like or which is just plain
> wrong. Len makes no such decisions and is not involved in amateur
> radio.

So why so do you give him so much attention?

> > > > > > But when
> > > > > > confronted with mere Technician participation in the ARS that rivals
> > > > > > his Extraness, he digs in and destroys.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That claim is a non-starter as it is in conflict with what I've written
> > > > > > here very recently.
> > > > >
> > > > > Bully for you.
> > >
> > > ...and shame on you for making yet another false accusation. That's two
> > > so far in this exchange.
> >
> > Nothing false there.
>
> Just the ones beginning "But when confronted with mere Technician..."
> and "One David Heil demands..." Are you going for three?

Sure. Why not?

> > > > > > Then there is Extra DICK. Probably Extra in every way except the dick
> > > > > > department. Then there's Jim "DeSoda" who keeps rewriting "200 Meters
> > > > > > and Up." No need to mention INSANE Clown Posse in a Nurse's dress or
> > > > > > the civilian with "real" military experience.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > What's your claim to credibility?
> > > > >
> > > > > I yam what I yam.
> > > >
> > > > Maybe you'll find a way to do something about it.
> >
> > I'm satisfied with my accomplishments in the ARS.
>
> That has been evident for some time.

And you are unsatisfied with yours?

Must you try to tear down Len at every opportunity to boost your stature?

564. Re: How about PBL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 12:27:43 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308060427.2c8b4249@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74029

k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB) wrote in message
news:<e79dbd9b.0308051629.3cabf5a@posting.google.com>...
> Here's an alternative to BPL from a local ham here in Minnesota.
>
> http://home.comcast.net/~gbox/
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Sure looks like a better idea to me.

Has he submitted comments to FCC on this? If so, we can reference them
in our Reply Comments.

73 de Jim, N2EY

565. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 12:29:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308060429.362b0b41@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74030

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F301FE3.951681BE@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2FA842.281A9C16@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2F27DA.C63DE672@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2EBC38.1917F426@earthlink.net>...

> > > > > > > > > Now that Carl can share Dave's band space...
> >
> > > > > > > > > Carl may share some space with me.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Carl can share any space with you that he wishes. That is what the
> > > > > > > FCC mean's by issuing him an Extra license. Get used to it. Naw,
> > > > > > > nevermind.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Carl may share some space.
> > > > >
> > > > > May share all space.
> > > >
> > > > He may and he may not.
> > >
> > > Take it up with his hairdresser. The FCC says he may share all space,
> > > and thats good enough for me.
> >
> > Please quote that "may share space" FCC document.

Please quote the "Farnsworth Exam at 13-15wpm is the same as the Morse
Exam at 5wpm" FCC document.

> He's allocated the same frequencies. He may or may not share the same
> space.

Which is it? May or May Not?

566. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 12:32:32 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Az6Ya.111882$Wd5.25129895@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 74031

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308051608.a214039@posting.google.com...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<kXAXa.92552$Wd5.18542286@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > news:d22b54c3.0308031718.23b2c842@posting.google.com...
> > > wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
> > news:<20030802210406.21580.00000808@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> > > > Do Hams get 11 Meters Back, as soon as all the CBers upgrade to
there
> > Free
> > > > Handout Ham Licenses?
> > >
> > >
> > > We didn't "lose" 11M, we just had use CB reddios <radios>
>
> It's "reddios" on 11M and radios on 12M and elsewhere. "When in Rome
> do as the Romans do."

Sorry, Brian. Within the circles that I operate, It's "radios." (On both 11m and the ham bands. YMMV.) FYI, folks here are QSX when they're monitoring the frequency. I rarely hear the annoying "I'm QRT and on the side" anymore, thank goodness. :-)

> w3rv

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

567. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 12:59:37 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308060459.65ddd357@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74032

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030805185147.29713.00000039@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)

> The photo of the club members homebrewing was taken before I joined the club.
> They have not done that activity since I have joined the club. That photo is
> still on the club page, as if thats what the club members are interested in.

And YOU think that just because no one had taken the picture off
the webpage that that's ALL they do???

You're a bigger idiot than had first presumed.

Steve, K4YZ

568. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 13:08:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308060508.1904f0a7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74033

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F2FAD38.898EBA2F@earthlink.net>...
> Vshah101 wrote:
> >
> > From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net

> > Thats a good challenge. Lets introduce a new person to a Hamfest and see what
> > that person's impression of Ham radio is.
>
> Fine. Let another club member (not you) show them around so that the
> non-ham has a fighting chance to comprehend just what amateur radio is
> and what a hamfest is all about.

What I am willing to bet is that if Vippy takes someone to a
Hamfest, the third party is likely to say "What the heck are you
talking about...these are just good people having fun", hence making
Vippy look even more foolish than what he does now.

> > >You begin with false assumptions and attempt to
> > >prove them to be true.
> >
> > I didn't begin with any assumptions. I noticed these things at Hamfests.
>
> Yes, you did. You've continued to hold those beliefs despite your
> having been corrected on numerous occasions by those who have much more
> experience than you. Quite often your stories end with you being
> shocked by what passes for American culture, you being disappointed that
> no one in a radio club wants to do what you want, you being dismayed
> that hams set out for an operating activity and then waste that time by
> operating or you being under the impression that your travel to a
> domestic location was a "DXpedition". You seem to think that you are
> just a normal guy in a sea or weirdness. Don't you find that peculiar?

He's got Third World-itis. Comes to America then wonders why
America isn't like the place he left.

Sheeesh.

Steve, K4YZ

569. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 13:19:56 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308060519.54ce7735@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74034

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<u3dXa.15787$Vx2.8139004@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...

> Well got news for you. It's the anti-social nerdy types in our society that
> make the majority of technical and business advances. They are focused on
> their goals rather than looking for social clubs. All of our computer
> technology has come from the "geeks" and some of those boys have gotten
> wealty (Bill Gates comes to mind here).

Dee...I can't help but imagine that there's some overweight
ex-prom queeen who's day revolves around 6 kids, a beer-bellied
ex-jock old man who won't get out of bed or stay sober,living in a
mobile home that's about to fall off the axles, all-the-while beating
herself up for having made fun of Mr. Gates for "daring" to ask her
out once ! ! !

=)

Steve, K4YZ

570. Re: Dear Norn: WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 13:38:19 UTC
From: Anonymous Sender <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com>
Message-ID: <f0f9a9baff20c2dea647aa794d2f7ebb@remailer.metacolo.com>
Source record: 74035
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.fuckwit.stagger-lee

From his monkey faced wife's yeast infected cunt in article
"Stupid Dude" <sdude@in.georgia> whined:
>
> On Tue, 5 Aug 2003 11:26:44 -0400, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > Dear Norm:
> >
> > WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

> Your pal and fellow stalker,
> Dimmy D.

More like Georgie Girl Arselicks ....how's that monkey faced wife Lucille, are you still having to have her cunt scraped out for the excess yeast so you can feed your half-breed kids?

571. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 13:45:39 UTC
From: "privacy.at Anonymous Remailer" <mixmaster@remailer.privacy.at>
Message-ID: <97a1ab5bcf0b81bb3369816e0a417832@remailer.privacy.at>
Source record: 74036

In article <3F2DC086.A0898140@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>
> JMBCV wrote:
> >
> > In article <3F2C9682.FFEC97A8@earthlink.net>
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > Vshah101 wrote:
> > > >
> > > > From (Larry Roll K3LT):
>
> > >
> > > I'm involved in a county group which is part of ARES.
> >
> > Feh. You've attended only one meeting..and just to harass and stalk another ham,
ASSHOLE.
>
> Why, Roger Wiseman! Fancy you slithering from beneath your bed to make

Why Dave High-el, imagine you stopping downloading kiddie porn to answer a post.....

> yet another anonymous post.

If this is anonymous, how do you know who sent it, dumbass?

> I've attended a number of meetings and
> functions, Roger.

Guess you had to suck off Bertie Garcia one way or another, eh, ASSHOLE?

> I'm told that you only came to the one meeting.

I'm told you shouldn't stalk other hams like you do, kiddie diddler.

> By the way, I'd go very carefully on that stalking stuff, Rog. You've
> frequently harrassed me here and in direct e-mails.

Awww, poor Dicksucking Davey.......you stalked Rog as well, because the only reason you
came to the ARES meeting to confront him, and let's not forget how you were going to break
the law by posting his "best newsgroup material" on telephone poles in Rog's neighborhood.

> You have an arrest

I do? Prove it.......

> record and you've been booted from a couple of ISP's.

Bwhahahahahahahaha....prove it, kiddie diddling Dave.

> You've been
> cautioned for malicious QRMing on 20 meters and have been forced to
> retest.

So some fake info was submitted and dumbfuck Riley believed it....... he still PASSED the "retest" it's doubtful you could as of today, ASSHOLE.

> > > Most of the hams
> > > involved are not interested in contesting or DXing. Many operate VHF FM
> > > only. I don't know any who've designed and built a linear amplifier.
> > > Only one other is interested in collecting and restoring vintage gear.
> >
> > Yep, they are a clique of losers.....
>
> Oh yes, I neglected to mention that we have one dysfunctional individual
> who exhibits sociopathic behavior on several levels. He frequently

I wonder if the WV Medical board is aware of you practicing psychology without a degree in it or a license?

> haunts the rec.radio.amateur.misc and rec.radio.amateur.policy
> newsgroups and posts irrelevant stream-of-consciousness filth (usually
> unrelated to the thread topic. His over exhuberance has led him to the
> malicious interference incidents on 20m.

Poor Davey......the Lackland press release boy, the flunky who couldn't get/or was so fucking stupid he couldn't get a real job then after a piss poor service record, had to take a flunky courier job with the State department, until he was terminated.

> Actually, Roger, the only real loser is you. You're hardly a clique.

IKYABWAI, dicksucking Davey.....

Actually, kiddiediddler High-el, how is it you had to get a mail order bride for yourself? Maybe it's you lack of personal cleanliness, as evidenced by the stench you had when you attened that meeting and your wrinkled clothes.

> > > I continue to attend. We interact
> >
> > Except the fact you fail to bathe regularly, you mean.......fuckstick.
>
> It looks like your still battling that rare form of Tourette's Syndrome.

Looks like you need to go to Hair Club For men and Jenny Craig. Dave has a bad comb-over and his fat belly makes him look like he's about 8 months pregnant. Given this along with his wrinkled clothes that he looks like he slept in for a week, he makes such a good impression...
With that small skull he really looks like Baby Huey.

> > >based on our common interests rather than the things which divide us.
> >
> > Yeah, those common interests being not helping newer hams......
>
> How could you come to that conclusion?

Unlike you, I don't pull my conclusions out of my ass, goat blower Davey.

> You haven't been attending
> meetings.

When some new hams needed help, they didn't get it, fuckstick.

> > > > The other alternative is to start my own club. I tried it, but that was not too
> > > > successful.
> >
> > btw, fuck off, High-el.
>
> BTW, forwarded your stuff to Chief Stenger in Glen Dale. It is about
> the only way to make a case against someone who has no interpersonal
> skills.

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHA..... you've said that ALL ALONG, DICKBREATH.... Maybe you need to give him another blowjob so he might pay attention to you next time..haven't heard a thing from him though.....some case, dickhead..... BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA...maybe it's because I don't live in Glen Dale, Davey, not everybody who posts anon is your obsession.

> Ta-Ta for now.

Your not-so-Closeted homosexuality, noted.

572. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 13:51:56 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgr15sqjp0@208.206.142.100>
Source record: 74037

Bert Craig wrote:

>
> > I used to do the same thing with the customers I had in my CB shop a few
> > years back. Got a LOT of converts that way.
>
> Kewl beans, it doesn't always work but when it does...it sure feels
> good.
>
> > But it was tough sometimes when they came in and asked me why the Swerrrrrrs
> > were so high on their whup, when it was mounted with straps to the metal
> > cab of the truck.
>
> That wasn't the tough part for me. It's the ones with the really bad
> attitudes who wear me out. At a certain point, you end up deciding who
> is worth the effort and who to ditch.

They 'll be getting the easy code-free HF- access tickets right along with the rest with the code test gone.

573. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 14:50:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB568EF3.211FB%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74039
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Radio Truth" wrote:

> Read my reply to the other stupid ass that
> has difficulty comprehending standard English.
> There are NO MORE MONITORING STATIONS!!!!!!!!

Okay, I get where you're going - there are no more monitoring stations in the classic sense. Satisfied now?

However, as several of us have stated, those stations have been replaced with a new automated monitoring system. In other words, the FCC is still monitoring.

> And when are you going to FINALLY upgrade from
> that no code tech license you have?

Since I happen to like my existing license, not anytime soon. Thanks for asking, though.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

574. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 14:55:53 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F3116F9.309@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 73960

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> Anyone who would forsake any communication venue
> just doesn't have a clue for the value of that venue...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>

Does that include CW?

575. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 14:56:23 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <rG8Ya.38$Kn.50476@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74038

```
"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308050457060.824@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> On Mon, 4 Aug 2003, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> > news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308032322180.503@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > > On Sun, 3 Aug 2003, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > > > BOTTOM LINE: *Until the FCC changes its rules* no-code Techs
> > > > have NO HF privs ... sorry, folks, but that's the way it is.
> > >
> > > Neither do Novices nor the "coded" Techs. They lost their HF
privileges
> > > effective July 5, 2003.
> >
> > False ... please stop preaching this nonsense.
>
> If you think it's nonsense, then tell me how these licensees, under 47 CFR
> 97.301(e) are supposed to show that they have met an international
requirement
> that no longer exists in order to have the privileges listed in that
> subsection?

I am not going to waste any more time arguing this ridiculous assertion of
yours ... it is false ... and other knowledgeable folks have told you so as
well.

I am inclined to think that you're just trolling for attention, and I don't
plan
to give you the satisfaction any more.

Carl - wk3c
```

576. Re: For Dwight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 15:09:48 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB569371.211FD%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74040

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:

> Hey, Dwight? Have you had any more problem with
> my news messages? I know at one point you said
> that you'd changed servers and didn't seem to be
> having any more. How's it been?

Your messages are showing up just fine now, Kim. As I said, I switched to a new ISP yesterday morning and that seems to have at least solved my problem. I was even able to go back and read your older messages that could not be read with the old ISP.

I'm also seeing replies to my messages (from other people) that I've not seen before. I didn't know these people had even replied to my messages. It appears my old ISP was also cutting out a lot of messages before I could even read them.

On a side note, I'm also getting much faster connection speeds with the new ISP. Earthlink is a little more expensive than some of the local ISP's, but it appears to be worth the extra expense (at least for me).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

577. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 15:21:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB56960F.211FF%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74041

"N2EY" wrote:

> OK, I'll bite.
>
> What need did code testing serve in the past
> that does not exist today?
>
> Before you say "other services used it", note
> that many if not most hams had little chance
> of ever being part of those other services when
> they used Morse. For example, people over a
> certain age, or with certain physical
> conditions, would never be accepted in the
> military.

It served a need from the ITU's and FCC's perspectives. And, yes, it did have to do with the fact that other services used it - the pool of trained operators concept in 97.1 of the CFR. Since the services we serve don't use code anymore, code simply no longer serves that need. That only leaves code use by ham operators for enjoyment. That doesn't warrant a unique license requirement (unique compared to the other modes).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

578. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 15:24:27 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308060724.8c72f39@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74042
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ray Neville" <hoot@smiilexinc.org> wrote in message news:<bgpd31$k12$0@pita.alt.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0308051218.78a6a36a@posting.google.com...
> > "Uri" <slip@sparphoneyorg.net> wrote in message
> news:<bgn8nk$9oc$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > > news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj3o16v.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> > > > On Mon, 4 Aug 2003 13:16:30 -0400, Rich wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > So says you, but according to www.fcc.gov they ARE all closed.
> > > >
> > > > Read it again....they are UNMANNED and therefore closed to the
> > > > public. They are all operated by remote control from
> Laurel/Columbia,
> MD.
> > > >
> > > > --
> > > > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Hey stupid ass, I did read it. THEY ARE ALL
> > > CLOSED, KAPUT, DISMANTLED!!!!!!!!!!!!!
> > > Do you comprehend the standard English that the web
> > > is written in ????????????? Remote Control?
> > > Geeeee, does the remote control use a standard 9 volt
> > > battery??? Take your petty ham disputes to 14313.
> >
> > Hey stupid ass, dial 202-418-1122 and ask if they have FCC monitoring
> > facilities up and running and tuning for pirates. Right now.
> >
> > Toodles.
> >
> > > Uri
> >
> > w3rv
>
> It's the number of a liquor store.

Bwaaaahaha! As if! YOU either still can't use a touchtone pad or ya
never dialed it or ya think ya can bullshit yer way outta this one.

It's an FCC number alrighty, it's the Crisis Management Center of the
Homeland Security Division of the FCC Enforcement Bureau. Had a nice
chat with the dude, he referred me to Riley for more info.

>
> K

w3rv

579. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 15:27:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB5697B2.21201%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74043

"N2EY" wrote:

> But it only takes a few bad apples to make all
> of us look bad.

And the FCC should go after those bad apples, whatever their license class. Ham operators should also informally ostracize the bad apples by not talking to them or inviting them to participate in other activities. Like the troublemakers in these newsgroups, these people are seeking an audience. Deprive them of that and they often change their ways fairly quickly.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

580. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 16:32:04 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308060832.44f9c66@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74044

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93CF5FB731F0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> news:76WXa.17298$Vx2.8810860@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

> > "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xns93CE2C5CA14F7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
> >> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj4351y.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:

> >> > On Mon, 04 Aug 2003 07:41:03 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:

> >> >> Very simple answer, Jim. The FCC has limited personnel today. The
> >> >> few they
> >> >>have simply don't have the time to sit around listening, as code
> >> >>users pound out their incredibly slow conversations, to catch
> >> >>violations. ;)
> >> >
> >> > For reasons that I disagreed with then and I disagree with now,
> >> > (but that's another story) the FCC' s enforcement response is
> >> > driven by complaints, not by "Patrolling the Ether" (tm) as in
> >> > days of yore.
> >> >
> >> > How many complaints of amateur CW violations do you think "Riley"
> >> > gets? (Somebody pounding out "FU" in Morse on a Touch-Tone (tm)
> >> > pad on a repeater input does not count as CW....)
> >> >
> >> > --
> >> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >> >
> >> > From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> >> > Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

> >> So what do we call it then? I have certainly heard

(expletive deleted)

> >> sent in
> >> Morse on a repeater.

That's awful. I haven't heard anything that bad on the CW/data
subbands, though. Have you?

> > Anything from an unidentified transmission to interference to jamming
> > for starters depending on the exact events. It probably violates a
> > number of FCC rules.

Let's see: Obscenity, failure to ID, jamming, unauthorized use of a repeater. For starters.

> The point is that Phil is trying to say that jamming in MCW doesn't count
> as jamming in CW, which is like trying to say that there's a vital
> difference between using FM or SSB to jam.

No, that's not the point at all.

The point is that hams actually using CW/Morse for communications don't gather anywhere near as many enforcement actions as hams using 'phone modes for communications. The difference is far more than can be accounted for by the greater popularity of 'phone modes.

Is there a CW equivalent of the W6NUT repeater, 14,313 or 3950?

73 de Jim, N2EY

581. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 16:36:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308060836.46813ae5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74045

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308051317.150ed8d9@posting.google.com>...

> What need did code testing serve in the past that does not exist
> today?
>
> Before you say "other services used it", note that many if not most
> hams had little chance of ever being part of those other services when
> they used Morse. For example, people over a certain age, or with
> certain physical conditions, would never be accepted in the military.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

So now you want an age waiver in addition to the disability waiver for code testing?

Just how old are you Jim?

582. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 17:46:05 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@netjammerqrm.org>
Message-ID: <bgrerultk0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 74046
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB568EF3.211FB%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "Radio Truth" wrote:
>
> > Read my reply to the other stupid ass that
> > has difficulty comprehending standard English.
> > There are NO MORE MONITORING STATIONS!!!!!!!!
>
>
> Okay, I get where you're going - there are no more monitoring stations
in
> the classic sense. Satisfied now?
>
> However, as several of us have stated, those stations have been replaced
> with a new automated monitoring system. In other words, the FCC is still
> monitoring.

Several of "you" can state whatever you want. Doesn't make
it true. The automated monitoring systems you refer to are in
place at a few of the old monitoring station sites B U T they are
not FCC equipment. They are remote controlled FAA air
control points. Get it now? FCC is totally out of the
picture!

>
>
> > And when are you going to FINALLY upgrade from
> > that no code tech license you have?
>
>
> Since I happen to like my existing license, not anytime soon. Thanks for
> asking, though.

Let the group here help you. Go to a Radio Shack. Buy the
General upgrade book. Memorize the questions & answers,
then go take the test this weekend. Report back here with the
results.

Herb

>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

>

583. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 17:49:31 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@netjammerqrm.org>
Message-ID: <bgrf2b$m8t$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 74047
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308060724.8c72f39@posting.google.com...
> "Ray Neville" <hoot@smiilexinc.org> wrote in message
news:<bgpd31$k12$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > news:d22b54c3.0308051218.78a6a36a@posting.google.com...
> > > "Uri" <slip@sparphoneyorg.net> wrote in message
> > news:<bgn8nk$9oc$0@pita.alt.net>...
> > > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > > > news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj3o16v.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> > > > > On Mon, 4 Aug 2003 13:16:30 -0400, Rich wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > So says you, but according to www.fcc.gov they ARE all
closed.
> > > > >
> > > > > > Read it again....they are UNMANNED and therefore closed to the
> > > > > > public. They are all operated by remote control from
> > Laurel/Columbia,
> > MD.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > --
> > > > > > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > Hey stupid ass, I did read it. THEY ARE ALL
> > > > CLOSED, KAPUT, DISMANTLED!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
> > > > Do you comprehend the standard English that the web
> > > > is written in ???????????????? Remote Control?
> > > > Geeeee, does the remote control use a standard 9 volt
> > > > battery??? Take your petty ham disputes to 14313.
> > >
> > > Hey stupid ass, dial 202-418-1122 and ask if they have FCC monitoring
> > > facilities up and running and tuning for pirates. Right now.
> > >
> > > Toodles.
> > >
> > > > Uri
> > >
> > > w3rv
> >
> > It's the number of a liquor store.
>
> Bwaaaahaha! As if! YOU either still can't use a touchtone pad or ya

> never dialed it or ya think ya can bullshit yer way outta this one.
>
> It's an FCC number alrighty, it's the Crisis Management Center of the
> Homeland Security Division of the FCC Enforcement Bureau. Had a nice
> chat with the dude, he referred me to Riley for more info.
>

It is? The guy was drunk when I called. Nevertheless, you need
to go back and study the FCC web site rather than making silly
phone calls and bothering people. Was that you jamming 14313
today?

Herb

> >
> > K
>
> w3rv

584. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 18:13:39 UTC
From: Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc>
Message-ID: <3F314553.960EED4B@yahoo.moc>
Source record: 74048

> I feel the same way about CB, Bert. There are ways to avoid the trash, and
> that is on USB or LSB. Anyone who would forsake any communication venue
> just doesn't have a clue for the value of that venue...

You would be outnumbered here by the number of dual-operators. I hear
CB'ers on ham and hams on CB every day of the week. And that's just
on sideband. I don't do AM anymore. Haven't for over 5 years.

Last night's net got overrun by noise, and we all went to the repeater.

585. FCC Monitoring Station

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 18:21:06 UTC
From: Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc>
Message-ID: <3F314712.C152739@yahoo.moc>
Source record: 74049
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The monitoring station in Columbia is still there on the map.

See ADC's Howard County, MD map, page 20, grid squares B1, C1,
B2, C2, D2 and C3 (upper left corner). Shown in gov't gray.

586. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 18:23:49 UTC
From: Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc>
Message-ID: <3F3147B5.72DC483B@yahoo.moc>
Source record: 74050
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> > Hey stupid ass, dial 202-418-1122 and ask if they have FCC monitoring
> > facilities up and running and tuning for pirates. Right now.

> It's the number of a liquor store.

Try these links from Google that came up when I searched that number:

http://www.fcc.gov/eb/sed/csle.html
http://www.fcc.gov/eb/sed/rfse.html

You must have misdialed.

587. FCC Monitoring Station

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 18:29:42 UTC
From: Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc>
Message-ID: <3F314916.9C554CDF@yahoo.moc>
Source record: 74051
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> Hams have nothing better to do than jam each other on
> 14313. But 20 meters has been closed the last few days,
> so these idiots are on here teasing and trolling. Don't fall
> for their crap. Everyone knows it is an established fact
> that all the FCC monitoring stations were closed and the
> land sold over seven years ago. The FCC has long been
> out of the monitoring & enforcement business, especially
> now that they have nothing to monitor with. Tomorrow
> 20 meters will open back up and all these idiots will be
> back on 14313 jamming each other. Too bad these trolls
> can't get a life.

Please drive to Farm House Lane in Howard County, MD and key up
a couple of K's. I'd love to read the resulting story in the paper.

588. Re: Comment On This News Group

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 18:51:12 UTC
From: Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc>
Message-ID: <3F314E20.C8419EC5@yahoo.moc>
Source record: 74052

> If you think this newsgroup is bad, take a look at some of the
> soc.culture.* groups
> sometime. Have heard that soc.culture.india is almost all flame wars.

Must be the curry.

589. Re: Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 18:58:48 UTC
From: Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc>
Message-ID: <3F314FE8.FD5E7080@yahoo.moc>
Source record: 74053

Seagrams Seven wrote:
>
> Does this work?

Would you like a frontal lobotomy or just a bottle in front of me?

590. Re: FCC Monitoring Station

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 19:22:20 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@netjammerqrm.org>
Message-ID: <bgrkgf$vo3$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 74054
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Scott Unit 69" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc> wrote in message
news:3F314712.C152739@yahoo.moc...
> The monitoring station in Columbia is still there on the map.
>
> See ADC's Howard County, MD map, page 20, grid squares B1, C1,
> B2, C2, D2 and C3 (upper left corner). Shown in gov't gray.

591. Re: FCC Monitoring Station

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 19:23:28 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@netjammerqrm.org>
Message-ID: <bgrkii$vr2$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 74055
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Scott Unit 69" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc> wrote in message
news:3F314712.C152739@yahoo.moc...
> The monitoring station in Columbia is still there on the map.
>
> See ADC's Howard County, MD map, page 20, grid squares B1, C1,
> B2, C2, D2 and C3 (upper left corner). Shown in gov't gray.

That's an outdated map, over 15 years old. The monitoring
stations were dismantled only seven years ago.

Herb

592. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 19:24:32 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@netjammerqrm.org>
Message-ID: <bgrkkivup0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 74056
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Scott Unit 69" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc> wrote in message
news:3F3147B5.72DC483B@yahoo.moc...
> > > Hey stupid ass, dial 202-418-1122 and ask if they have FCC monitoring
> > > facilities up and running and tuning for pirates. Right now.
>
> > It's the number of a liquor store.
>
> Try these links from Google that came up when I searched that number:
>
> http://www.fcc.gov/eb/sed/csle.html
> http://www.fcc.gov/eb/sed/rfse.html
>
> You must have misdialed.

Those links don't work.

Herb

593. Re: FCC Monitoring Station

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 19:25:39 UTC
From: Herb <Herb@netjammerqrm.org>
Message-ID: <bgrkmlbr0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 74057
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Scott Unit 69" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc> wrote in message
news:3F314916.9C554CDF@yahoo.moc...
> > Hams have nothing better to do than jam each other on
> > 14313. But 20 meters has been closed the last few days,
> > so these idiots are on here teasing and trolling. Don't fall
> > for their crap. Everyone knows it is an established fact
> > that all the FCC monitoring stations were closed and the
> > land sold over seven years ago. The FCC has long been
> > out of the monitoring & enforcement business, especially
> > now that they have nothing to monitor with. Tomorrow
> > 20 meters will open back up and all these idiots will be
> > back on 14313 jamming each other. Too bad these trolls
> > can't get a life.
>
>
> Please drive to Farm House Lane in Howard County, MD and key up
> a couple of K's. I'd love to read the resulting story in the paper.

Which paper?

Herb

594. Re: FCC Monitoring Station

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 19:55:44 UTC
From: Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc>
Message-ID: <3F315D40.F57C2691@yahoo.moc>
Source record: 74058
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> > The monitoring station in Columbia is still there on the map.
> >
> > See ADC's Howard County, MD map, page 20, grid squares B1, C1,
> > B2, C2, D2 and C3 (upper left corner). Shown in gov't gray.
>
> That's an outdated map, over 15 years old. The monitoring
> stations were dismantled only seven years ago.

Yes, my map is old. 2000 AD years old, in fact.

Since it is over my 2 year limit for ADC maps, I need to
buy a 2003 mapbook.

Stop trolling, and learn the facts, Jack.

This link takes you to the FCC. Oakland Mills Road has the only
entrance to Farm House Lane
http://yp.superpages.com/listings.phtml?WL=FCC&N=FCC&STYPE=S&T=&S=MD&PG=L&R=N&PS=15

My map has a year 2000 copyright on it if you can't understand my sarcasm.

595. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 19:59:13 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87oez2tv5a.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74059
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Herb" <Herb@netjammerqrm.org> wrote:
>FAA is NOT FCC, now you get it?
>
>Herb

Herbie, I understood right to begin with that you've gotten
off your meds again.

Why do so many of you folks get so excited about denying that
the FCC has a rather sophisticated national spectrum monitoring
system?

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

596. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 20:02:07 UTC
From: Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc>
Message-ID: <3F315EBF.93377C63@yahoo.moc>
Source record: 74060
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> > Try these links from Google that came up when I searched that number:
> >
> > http://www.fcc.gov/eb/sed/csle.html
> > http://www.fcc.gov/eb/sed/rfse.html
> >
> > You must have misdialed.
>
> Those links don't work.

They work here.

Your PC is f*cked and so is your phone.

You have just been vitually PLONKed, troll.

```
.:\:/:.
+-------------------+ .:\:\:/:/:.
| PLEASE DO NOT | :.:\:\:/:/:.:
| FEED THE TROLLS! | :=.' - - '.=:
| | '=(\ 9 9 /)='
| f*ck you, | ( (_) )
| rec.radio.* NG | /`-vvv-'\ <---Herb
+-------------------+ / TROLL \
| | @@@ / /|,,,,,|\ \
| | @@@ /_// /^\ \\_\
@x@@x@ | | |/ WW( ( ) )WW
\||||/ | | \| __\,,\ /,,/__
\||/ | | | (______Y______) jgs
/\/\/\/\/\/\/\//\\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\
```

597. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 20:03:32 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87k79qtuy3.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74061
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Herb" <Herb@netjammerqrm.org> wrote:
>"Scott Unit 69" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc> wrote in message
>news:3F3147B5.72DC483B@yahoo.moc...
>> > > Hey stupid ass, dial 202-418-1122 and ask if they have FCC monitoring
>> > > facilities up and running and tuning for pirates. Right now.
>>
>> > It's the number of a liquor store.
>>
>> Try these links from Google that came up when I searched that number:
>>
>> http://www.fcc.gov/eb/sed/csle.html
>> http://www.fcc.gov/eb/sed/rfse.html
>>
>> You must have misdialed.
>
> Those links don't work.

The links are fine, it's *you* that doesn't work

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

598. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 20:03:51 UTC
From: Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc>
Message-ID: <3F315F27.20096070@yahoo.moc>
Source record: 74062
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> Why do so many of you folks get so excited about denying that
> the FCC has a rather sophisticated national spectrum monitoring
> system?

When you're a netjammerqrm on 14313, you tend to get
a little worried about the vans in white.

599. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 20:32:17 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F3165D0.7070900@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 74063
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Herb wrote:

> Your confusing that with a FAA project. Check your
>"sources" more closely. And how can you build anything on
>land that the FCC no longer has? The FAA has constructed
>remote air control facilities on some of the old FCC monitoring
>station sites, and this is how you are getting so confused.
>FAA is NOT FCC, now you get it?
>
>
>
If true, it doesn't mean that the FAA doesn't let the FCC borrow their
equipment
from time to time.

600. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 21:51:19 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj7fov2.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74064

Cross-posting to alt.radio.pirate broken.

On Tue, 5 Aug 2003 11:56:22 -0400, Radio Truth wrote:

> Read my reply to the other stupid ass that has difficulty
>comprehending standard English. There are NO MORE
>MONITORING STATIONS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
>The land was sold off by GAO to developers. What you
>are confused about are the satellite systems run by other
>agencies. It is explained very clearly on the FCC web page.
>And when are you going to FINALLY upgrade from that
>no code tech license you have?

Dwight -- why do we waste time on these ignoramuses?

For the record - yesterday I had a good conversation with a former colleague of mine who is one of the folks at Columbia/Laurel.

The remote-controlled HF monitoring system is up and running and used on a daily basis for investigation of complaints, controlled from there or from Washington as need be. As has been the case for many decades, the vast majority of those are non-amateur service related.

Some of the property around each site (mostly the old rhombic fields) has been sold for uses that will not interfere with the accuracy of the newer log-periodic DF systems, but enough of each site is left to do the job properly. There is no need for the old buildings, many of which date to the WW-II era, and they have been dismantled.

Enough of this crap.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

601. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 21:51:19 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj7gha3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74065

(Cross-posting link to alt.radio.pirate dropped)

On 05 Aug 2003 19:24:17 -0800, Floyd Davidson wrote:

>Of course, those _were_ imaginary back in 1995 when the ARRL
>announced the soon to be built new remote monitoring system, and
>quoted the FCC saying they would be an improvement,
>
> The plan would close nine separate attended high
> frequency monitoring stations, and three additional
> monitoring sites within FCC field offices.

> http://www.arrl.org/w1aw/1995-arlb096.html

Actually the three field offices were moved from "downtown"
locations (Anchorage, Honolulu, and San Juan, PR) to the monitoring
stations several years before, but why quibble ??

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

602. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 21:51:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj7lux5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74066

On 5 Aug 2003 21:09:24 -0700, Bert Craig wrote:

>> Your arguement dont <doesn't> hold water Bert. There was a CB band on UHF back then.
>> It was in the 400 mhz range FM and was called Class A.

>I remember it, Dan. Now dig a little further and research when that
>band came into being and why it was subsequently reassigned. Then tell
>me a little more about "my arguement." ;-)

It still exists - it's called GMRS.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

603. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 21:51:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj7ic34.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74068

On Tue, 05 Aug 2003 16:40:13 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:

>Enforcement? Where's the beef?! Oh, it went to pay for that $400 hammer or
>that $1,200 barracks toilet bowl.

Well, it's time to drag out Project Accounting 101 again. As I
posted elsewhere (with apologies to the CPAs and EAs if I used
incorrect terminology as to the accountimne methods in the
example):

The scoffers fail to remember (or understand) that the "$500
hammer" came about by allocation of contract overhead by line
item rather than by proportional item cost....

Follow the bouncing ball for a machine and a hammer needed to
maintain it:

Machine catalog cost = $ 10,000.00
Hammer catalog cost = $ 10.00
Total cost of material = $ 10,010.00
10% Contract overhead = $ 1,001.00
Total contract cost = $ 11,011.00

By Proportional Item Cost allocation method, overhead is allocated
proportionally:

Machine cost = $ 10,000 + 10% = $ 11.000
Hammer cost = $ 10 + 10% = 11
Total cost = $ 11,011

By Line Item allocation method, the total overhead is divided by
the number of line items, in this case 2:

Machine cost = $ 10,000 + $ 500.50 = $ 10,500.50
Hammer cost = $ 10 + $ 500.50 = $ 510.50
Total cost = $ 11,011.00

Note the "$ 500 hammer" in the example above !!

Same hammer, same contract cost, no extra charge for the asinine
comments by The Congress and The Press and The Critics.

As to where the enforcement money went, the nickle-nursers in The
Congress never appropriated it, and even if they would have, the past
three agency chairmen - the folks who have the power to allot the
funds inside the agency - had neither regard for nor understanding of
the need for field enforcement.

And that takes care of that.......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

604. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 21:51:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj7njg7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74069

On Tue, 05 Aug 2003 14:36:33 GMT, Dwight Stewart wrote:

>Actually, my comment was a joke, Phil. Notice the "wink face" after that
>paragraph. But, you're right - the FCC does depend mainly on complaints. In
>many cases (VHF, local issues, and so on), there isn't much else they can
>do.

At one time the FCC was putting up a network of remote VHF/UHF
receivers in various cities for monitoring and single-bearing df
purposes. Access was dial-up with multiple passwords, and the
system piped audio and bearing info back down the line over
voice-over modems. The test installaton that we used the most was
in St. Louis, MO.

Boston, Washington, and Los Angeles/San Diego had integrated
networks of multiple receivers constituting a real df system for
what we today call "Homeland Security" purposes. The California
system was funded by the Coast Guard who was the primary client, and
it was used very heavily for marine safety and rescue purposes.

With the funding cuts (a.k.a. The Great Rape) of the mid-90s the
rest of the system never got built. I don't know if the CG kept
up the maintenance funding on the system as they were 'sposed to do.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

605. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 21:51:20 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj7mxu6.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74070

On 5 Aug 2003 08:22:13 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:

>So what do we call it then? I have certainly heard F-U-C-K sent in Morse
>on a repeater.

It is intentional and usually unidentified interference to voice communications (except if the repeater is running Packet or SSTV as several of our club and/or ARES/RACES repeaters do). It is NOT interference with CW/Morse communication or by a station in a legitimate QSO using CW/Morse.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

Oregon Tualatin Valley Amateur Radio Club

606. Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 21:51:21 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj7nx18.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74067

On Tue, 05 Aug 2003 05:06:38 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:

>Then explain why .301(e) based HF operating privilege on something OTHER than
>simply holding element 1 credit....

Because it was written very sloppily.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

607. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 21:53:14 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bgrtbehiu1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74071

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0308052009.31ac70a@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bgpcf2pli1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:N5RXa.10100$W%3.31@nwrdny01.gnilink.net...
> >
> > > Nah, you'll get all kinds of excuses wrt how unwieldy and expensive
VHF
> > gear
> > > would've been back in 1958. But you know what...the manufacturers
would've
> > > worked that ou and historically ALWAYS have. That really wasn't the
FCC's
> > > job, it was, and still is, the job of the manufacturers.
> >
> > Your arguement dont <doesn't> hold water Bert. There was a CB band on
UHF back then.
> > It was in the 400 mhz range FM and was called Class A.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> I remember it, Dan. Now dig a little further and research when that
> band came into being and why it was subsequently reassigned. Then tell
> me a little more about "my arguement." ;-)
>
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

As I remember, and Im not going to bother 'researching'. Class A CB was
available when Class D CB was initiated. That was the late 50s.

Dan/W4NTI

608. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 21:53:24 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0308061353.653bab47@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74072

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote

>
> If you think it's nonsense, then tell me how these licensees, under 47 CFR
> 97.301(e) are supposed to show that they have met an international requirement
> that no longer exists in order to have the privileges listed in that
> subsection?
>

Oh, this is so easy it almost makes me feel guilty ruining your lame
rant.

The "international requirement" is that each country decides whether
their licensees need Morse testing to operate on HF.

For right now, the FCC has decided that they do, and continues to
grant Novices and "Tech Plus" certain HF operating spectrum.

Sunuvagun!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--
"Reality doesn't care what you think." -- K0HB

609. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 21:58:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bgrtlc$tu7$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74073

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bgqouo$got@library1.airnews.net...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:b7d1465c.0308052003.74ae149d@posting.google.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<bgpc38iqp1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > >
> > > If all you CBers with a ham license want to go back and play in the
pig
> pen.
> > > Then go ahead.
> >
> > No thanks, Dan. I avoid the pig pen, but I still do occasionally chit
> > chat on CB ch. 38 LSB and 40 USB...and no swine present. As a matter
> > of fact, I worked a guy on ch. 38 LSB earlier this evening who ended
> > up asking me to QSY to 28.440 MHz. I happily complied. ;-)
> >
> > > Don't even think anyone that is a real ham cares what goes
> > > on there.
> >
> > Very much false.
> >
> > > Let alone wants to operate there.
> >
> > See above.
> >
> > > If you don't like that. Tough...thats the fact jack.
> >
> > Doesn't bother me one iota as it's very far from factual.
> >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
>
> I feel the same way about CB, Bert. There are ways to avoid the trash,
and
> that is on USB or LSB. Anyone who would forsake any communication venue
> just doesn't have a clue for the value of that venue...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

There is no value to CB. Whenever something good is tried the idiots trash it. Jam it, play music and tones all over it.

When I heard that while working on a CB radio, I just turned the RF gain down and went on.

Unfortunatly now I hear the exact same tactics on ham radio. Gee I wonder where that came from ???

Dan/W4NTI

610. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 22:07:34 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <G_eYa.17927$Vx2.9103077@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 74075

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0308060519.54ce7735@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<u3dXa.15787$Vx2.8139004@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>
> > Well got news for you. It's the anti-social nerdy types in our society
that
> > make the majority of technical and business advances. They are focused
on
> > their goals rather than looking for social clubs. All of our computer
> > technology has come from the "geeks" and some of those boys have gotten
> > wealty (Bill Gates comes to mind here).
>
> Dee...I can't help but imagine that there's some overweight
> ex-prom queeen who's day revolves around 6 kids, a beer-bellied
> ex-jock old man who won't get out of bed or stay sober,living in a
> mobile home that's about to fall off the axles, all-the-while beating
> herself up for having made fun of Mr. Gates for "daring" to ask her
> out once ! ! !

It wouldn't surprise me in the least.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

611. Request to Phil Kane

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 22:08:30 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <y%eYa.87$Kn.55157@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74074

Phil,

I posted a similar message once before.

Maybe you ignored me, maybe you never saw it ...

I would like to communicate with you via e-mail.
Please e-mail me a real e-mail address where I can
reach you.

Thanks and 73,
Carl - wk3c

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj7nx18.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Tue, 05 Aug 2003 05:06:38 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
>
> >Then explain why .301(e) based HF operating privilege on something OTHER
than
> >simply holding element 1 credit....
>
> Because it was written very sloppily.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

612. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 22:13:10 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308061413.42fde40f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74076

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308060832.44f9c66@posting.google.com>...
> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93CF5FB731F0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> > news:76WXa.17298$Vx2.8810860@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
> > > "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > > news:Xns93CE2C5CA14F7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> > >> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
> > >> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj4351y.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:
>
> > >> > On Mon, 04 Aug 2003 07:41:03 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > >> >> Very simple answer, Jim. The FCC has limited personnel today. The
> > >> >> few they
> > >> >>have simply don't have the time to sit around listening, as code
> > >> >>users pound out their incredibly slow conversations, to catch
> > >> >>violations. ;)
> > >> >
> > >> > For reasons that I disagreed with then and I disagree with now,
> > >> > (but that's another story) the FCC' s enforcement response is
> > >> > driven by complaints, not by "Patrolling the Ether" (tm) as in
> > >> > days of yore.
> > >> >
> > >> > How many complaints of amateur CW violations do you think "Riley"
> > >> > gets? (Somebody pounding out "FU" in Morse on a Touch-Tone (tm)
> > >> > pad on a repeater input does not count as CW....)
> > >> >
> > >> > --
> > >> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> > >> >
> > >> > From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> > >> > Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
> > >> So what do we call it then? I have certainly heard
>
> > (expletive deleted)
>
> > >> sent in
> > >> Morse on a repeater.
>
> That's awful. I haven't heard anything that bad on the CW/data
> subbands, though. Have you?

>
> > > Anything from an unidentified transmission to interference to jamming
> > > for starters depending on the exact events. It probably violates a
> > > number of FCC rules.
>
> Let's see: Obscenity, failure to ID, jamming, unauthorized use of a
> repeater. For starters.
>
> > The point is that Phil is trying to say that jamming in MCW doesn't count
> > as jamming in CW, which is like trying to say that there's a vital
> > difference between using FM or SSB to jam.
>
> No, that's not the point at all.
>
> The point is that hams actually using CW/Morse for communications
> don't gather anywhere near as many enforcement actions as hams using
> 'phone modes for communications. The difference is far more than can
> be accounted for by the greater popularity of 'phone modes.
>
> Is there a CW equivalent of the W6NUT repeater, 14,313 or 3950?

We're not quite above such things. You oughta been there the nite in
the early '70s when the Big Guns got together and decided to hammer
Radio Moscow off a freq around 7.030. You bet it worked, Moscow moved
up the band and didn't come back.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

613. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 22:21:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030806182148.15462.00002112@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 74077

In article <BB5697B2.21201%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>
>> But it only takes a few bad apples to make all
>> of us look bad.

> And the FCC should go after those bad apples, whatever their license
>class.

I agree 100%. But FCC's are very limited, thanks to the mandate to "get the government off your back" from 20+ years ago. And the general unpopularity of things like taxes.

>Ham operators should also informally ostracize the bad apples by not
>talking to them or inviting them to participate in other activities.

I agree 100%. And many of us do.

But there are those who don't accept our "old fashioned values" and traditions. Like not cussing or jamming on the air. Did ostracizing clean up 3950, 14313 or W6NUT?

>Like
>the troublemakers in these newsgroups, these people are seeking an audience.
>Deprive them of that and they often change their ways fairly quickly.
>
Sometimes. OTOH they sometimes cluster together and reinforce each other when that is done. We had an example of that a few years ago on a local repeater. Solution was to shut down the repeater when the bad apples showed up, which deprived everyone of its use.

Total dependence on enforcement and peer group rejection is not adequate if basic "social" values are not inculcated into people's thinking.

73 de Jim, N2EY

614. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 22:34:49 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308061434.396e74ff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74078

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bgne3ekgd1@208.206.142.92>...

> Not really. Anyone can learn PSK31 in a half hour of looking over the help file and
> playing iwth their keyboard. As you know if you've been listening to all the laments
> appearing here from the "excluded", no such possibliley exists for Morse code.

30 minutes, huh?

As I recall, you couldn't get it to work. Weeks of trying and posting here.

Under PSK31 testing, you would be excluded from the HF part of the ARS.

615. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 22:37:23 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj7q1za.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74079

On 6 Aug 2003 15:13:10 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>We're not quite above such things. You oughta been there the nite in
>the early '70s when the Big Guns got together and decided to hammer
>Radio Moscow off a freq around 7.030. You bet it worked, Moscow moved
>up the band and didn't come back.

Remember my story about "Radio Moscow does not operate on 16.xxx
MHz" ?? <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

616. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 22:37:23 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj7qdlb.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74080

On 06 Aug 2003 22:21:48 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>Sometimes. OTOH they sometimes cluster together and reinforce each
>other when that is done. We had an example of that a few years ago on
>a local repeater. Solution was to shut down the repeater when the bad
>apples showed up, which deprived everyone of its use.

We ran into this in the 70s and 80s in San Francisco. The problem
there was that the goal of the "bad apples" was to shut the repeater
down.

After we hauled one of the ringleaders into Federal court on the
complaint of the N. Cal. DX Club (it was pure coincidence that the
judge was a classmate of the chief complainant) the problem abated
somewhat and the yoyos gathered on one particular machine which
gets shut down from time to time. And this was nothing compared to
the NUT machine.

>Total dependence on enforcement and peer group rejection is not adequate if
>basic "social" values are not inculcated into people's thinking.

For sure.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

617. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 23:12:12 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030806191212.21977.00000067@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74081

>Whenever something good is tried the idiots trash
>it. Jam it, play music and tones all over it.

Expect that to be the Norm before long on Ham Radio. Cant wait till they all start crying for the FCC to do something

618. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 23:15:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030806191524.21977.00000068@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74082

>And the FCC should go after those bad apples, whatever their license
>class.

Dream on, cant wait till the CBplussers start filling up HF, and you all start crying to the FCC. I will be setting here laughing my ASS off

619. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 23:32:38 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87fzketl9l.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74083

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
>(Cross-posting link to alt.radio.pirate dropped)
>
>On 05 Aug 2003 19:24:17 -0800, Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
>>Of course, those _were_ imaginary back in 1995 when the ARRL
>>announced the soon to be built new remote monitoring system, and
>>quoted the FCC saying they would be an improvement,
>>
>> The plan would close nine separate attended high
>> frequency monitoring stations, and three additional
>> monitoring sites within FCC field offices.
>
>> http://www.arrl.org/w1aw/1995-arlb096.html
>
> Actually the three field offices were moved from "downtown"
> locations (Anchorage, Honolulu, and San Juan, PR) to the monitoring
> stations several years before, but why quibble ??

As you mentioned once before, the *wording* being used here is
what seems to allow the confusion that a number of people are
hanging on to. When they remoted a monitoring station and say
it was "closed" but mean "unmanned", it leaves those who can't
read well with a quote: "The station was closed."

They just ignore or don't see the next sentence that says the
functionality was transfered to a remotely controlled facility.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

620. Donated BPL Money at Work.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 23:46:27 UTC
From: BPL Investment Team <BPL_member@newsguy.com>
Message-ID: <bgs40j0mip@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 74089

The ARRL is spending the money you donated to pay for Internet bandwidth so you can see the future of ham radio on HF. There is no future for HF ham radio.

http://216.167.96.120/BPL_Trial-small.mpg

621. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 23:48:51 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <CtgYa.27909$pr5.23096@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74084

Thanks for some useful info, Phil. Amazing what one can do with proper accounting tools. I know a gentleman in the construction business. Some years ago whilst he was preparing a bid, one of his men pointed out an error in the proposal as written. The particular government in question was widening a road and had failed to account for the left turn lane traffic loops and appropriate lights. My friend therefore bid most of the job normally, but bit the poles AT COST while pumping up the price of the traffic control loops. There were a number of intersections and my friend got the winning bid (lowest bid). Ooops, they discovered the error later and since the lowest bidder was already awarded the contract, the extra loops were added at the price for the loops specified in the bid (how many hundred percent he padded on those numbers, I don't know. But he did make a nice profit margin on that contract). :)) He was happy enough to give the guy who pointed out the error $5,000.00.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03

622. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 23:53:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB570D90.21F26%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74085

"Phil Kane" wrote:

> Dwight -- why do we waste time on these
> ignoramuses? (snip)

It's very hard to tell the difference in a single message or two between the person who just doesn't have all the facts and the person who just doesn't want to hear the facts. I guess I should have known when I saw the cross-posted newsgroup.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

623. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 23:56:54 UTC
From: averyfine@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030806195654.27797.00001451@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 74086

>Subject: Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)
>From: kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly)
>Date: 8/6/03 3:35 AM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <d22b54c3.0308052335.641d0b27@posting.google.com>
>
>averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
>news:<20030805183637.05187.00000072@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> >Subject: Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)
>> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>> >Date: 8/4/03 10:39 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0308041839.62aabe55@posting.google.com>
>> >
>> >Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
>> >news:<878yqa8dk3.fld@barrow.com>...
>> >
>> >> One of the funniest parts of reading the newsgroups related to
>> >> Amateur Radio, is watching Len Anderson eat these jerks for
>> >> breakfast every morning as a form of cheap entertainment. Not
>> >> that everything he says is great and exactly correct, but he
>> >> just does it for fun, and he does run circles around them.
>> >
>> >Sad, but true. But they don't see it that way.
>>
>> Is this Len Anderson person a cannibal?
>>
>> Are you his acolyte or disciple?
>
>Apprentice. Same thing.

Thank you for the information.

Do you know if Len Anderson is a cannibal? Claims have been made that he eats
others for breakfast.
>
>> >
>> >One David Heil demands licensed participation in the ARS. But when
>> >confronted with mere Technician participation in the ARS that rivals
>> >his Extraness, he digs in and destroys. Or at least he tries to.
>>
>> How?
>>
>> >Then there is Extra DICK. Probably Extra in every way except the dick
>> >department.
>>
>> You seem to be very interested in a subject that is inappropriate for

>amateur
>> radio. Why is that?
>>
>> > Then there's Jim "DeSoda" who keeps rewriting "200 Meters
>> >and Up."
>>
>> Who are you referring to?
>> Where can I buy the book?
>>
>> > No need to mention INSANE Clown Posse in a Nurse's dress or
>> >the civilian with "real" military experience.
>>
>> Who are you referring to?
>> >
>> Brian Burke, your postings here are quite bizarre.
>>
>> Is there a rational reason for your behavior?
>
>Sort of. Unfortunately his father was involved in the atom bomb
>experiments which were conducted just after WW2 . .
>
So were a lot of other people.

Is there a scientific correlation?

Oddly enough, today is the 58th anniversary of the atomic attack on the Japanese city of Hiroshima. It is estimated that 150,000 people, mostly civilians, died as a direct result of that attack.

624. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-06 23:58:14 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <b5c5ed7b6c2b3526cacde7b8cc34c5ec.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 74087

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote .

> Anyone who would forsake any communication venue
> just doesn't have a clue for the value of that venue...
>
> Kim W5TIT

Does this mean the fact that you forsake the Morse code communications venue indicates that you "just don't have a clue for the value of that venue"? (Your words, not mine.)

Sunuvagun!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

625. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 00:00:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB570F34.21F28%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74088

"Phil Kane" wrote:
>
> (snip) The remote-controlled HF monitoring system
> is up and running and used on a daily basis for
> investigation of complaints, controlled from there
> or from Washington as need be. As has been the
> case for many decades, the vast majority of those
> are non-amateur service related.

Hey, Phil. Do they (the FCC) ever let anyone visit their monitoring facilities? I realize they probably don't want the extent of their capabilities to become public knowledge, and they certainly don't want to turn their facilities into a tourist attraction, but I would love an opportunity to see one of those places? If it is ever done, whom would I write to check into it? An email response is okay (remove the "NOSPAM" from my email address).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

626. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 00:09:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030806200930.10078.00001174@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 74090

In article <87he4vwyye.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>>Brian wrote:
>>>
>>> Yet it really bugs you'se guys.
>>
>>No, it really bugs Len. Good luck in making your decision as to who
>>brings it up more often.
>
>It does? Is that why he's been using you for entertainment (and I
>might add, providing others with great laughs) for how many years?

It's really Wry Amusement, Floyd. :-)

>Seven??? And _you_ think it bugs him!

Heh heh heh.

Doesn't bother me a bit. My interest has always been on removing the
code test for a radio license. That's begun happening internationally.
Quite satisfactory to me. More work to do on that for the US regulations
but this newsgroup is NOT the venue for any serious debate. :-)

>Dave gets out of bed every day and immediately hangs a target on
>himself to help Len get a good aim...

Dave is a walking target. He can't help himself.

"The flag is up, the flag is waving, the flag is down...you have 20
seconds."
Old, old command on the Army firing ranges for rapid fire exchange.

I'm over-qualified for that kind of "firing," Floyd. No sense wasting any
more "ammo" here. The "target" has been hit so many times he
doesn't know he's been hit. Like a zombie he parades around in his
ARS uniform as Oberst in the Amatur SchutzStaffel (A.S.S.) and the
shine on the jackboots is enough to get a good sight picture.

See you next week. Maybe.

LHA

627. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 00:09:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030806200934.10078.00001175@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 74091

In article <f45722ac.0308060417.5eb2d38b@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3F301D6D.D7A189F5@earthlink.net>...
>> Brian wrote:
>> >
>> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3F2FA40B.6CBD0E90@earthlink.net>...
>> > > Brian wrote:
>> > > >
>> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3F2F1ADF.9E64A43D@earthlink.net>...
>> > > > > Brian wrote:
>> >
>> > > > > > One David Heil demands licensed participation in the ARS.
>> >
>> > > > > Maybe one of 'em demands such but it isn't this one.
>> >
>> > > > You're one of them that incessantly points out his license status.
>> > > >
>> > > Yes, I am. That isn't the same as what you claimed in your earlier
>> > > comment. Len isn't licensed in the amateur radio service and has no
>> > > experience in amateur radio.
>> >
>> > What purpose does that serve?
>>
>> It serves to point out Len's total lack of experience in the amateur
>> service.
>
>Yet he knows more about radio then you. How can that be if he has no
>experience?

Poor Dave, still smarting over his alleged expertise in State Dept.
communications from the Cashew Nut Capital of Africa. :-)

He loves to put down others using "standards" of his own invention.
That saves him time and embare-assment of talking ON a subject.
It's so much easier for him to insult a communicator personally when
he doesn't have any valid argument on subjects.

That seems endemic to the members of the Gang of Four, PCTAs
all, drunk on sour whine after the rewrite of S25.5.

>
>> > The vast majority of the policy makers

>> > at the FCC aren't licensed in the amateur radio service and have no
>> > experience in amateur radio.
>>
>> The vast majority of policy makers at the FCC have nothing whatever to
>> do with amateur radio. Those that are involved in the regulation of the
>> ARS, are quite knowledgeable about the service.
>
>They fooled me with the last restructuring NOI/NPRM.
>
>> They are paid to know.
>
>Wasted money.
>
>> Additionally, there are radio amateurs on the FCC staff.
>
>So every amateur on "staff" makes policy and rules?

They must according to insider Dave.

All in the ARS are accountable to Dave and Dave's standards.

Probably in the same way that Arthur Andersen Co. was
"accountable" for Enron doings. :-)

> That has
>> nothing to do with the issue of Len Anderson. He isn't a participant in
>> amateur nor is he a regulator of amateur radio. Len is totally
>> irrelevant to amateur radio.
>
>You are in the minority in thinking that.

Probably not. There are a whole glob of old-timers who have been busy
brainwashing and being brainwashed into thinking that amateurs are the
supermen of radio. That allowed them to have superhuman status in
their own minds...adding stature to their self-images even though not
recognized by professionals.

Amateur radio is never been anything more than a hobby/recreation
activity in radio. That is an unwanted concept to the ARS lifestylers
whose whole being revolved around amateurism as superhuman radio
activity. ARS lifestylers and some old-timers just can't separate their
fantasies from realities.

>> > But I don't hear you complaining about that, yet they have the ability
>> > to change what you do and how you do it.
>>
>> No, you won't hear me complaining often though there are times when the
>> Commission makes a decision which I don't like or which is just plain
>> wrong. Len makes no such decisions and is not involved in amateur
>> radio.
>
>So why so do you give him so much attention?

He can't help himself. :-) There's another being in here who is totally
obsessed with certain individuals...concentrating on targets it thinks
are "weak" and venting all possible bile and filth on his opponents.
"Everyone knows his name." :-)

Dave NEEDS to triumph and he isn't talking about TR-3s, either.

Dave can't possibly concede any possible viewpoint other than his own
so he MUST go after the person of his opponent rather than the subject.

>
>> > > > > > But when
>> > > > > > confronted with mere Technician participation in the ARS that
>rivals
>> > > > > > his Extraness, he digs in and destroys.
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > That claim is a non-starter as it is in conflict with what I've
>written
>> > > > > here very recently.
>> > > > >
>> > > > Bully for you.
>> > > >
>> > > ...and shame on you for making yet another false accusation. That's
>two
>> > > so far in this exchange.
>> >
>> > Nothing false there.
>>
>> Just the ones beginning "But when confronted with mere Technician..."
>> and "One David Heil demands..." Are you going for three?
>
>Sure. Why not?
>
>> > > > > > Then there is Extra DICK. Probably Extra in every way except the
>dick
>> > > > > > department. Then there's Jim "DeSoda" who keeps rewriting "200
>Meters
>> > > > > > and Up." No need to mention INSANE Clown Posse in a Nurse's
>dress or
>> > > > > > the civilian with "real" military experience.
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > What's your claim to credibility?
>> > > > >
>> > > > I yam what I yam.
>> > > >
>> > > Maybe you'll find a way to do something about it.
>> >
>> > I'm satisfied with my accomplishments in the ARS.
>>
>> That has been evident for some time.
>
>And you are unsatisfied with yours?

Of course he is and will state so, regardless of whether or not it is true.

>Must you try to tear down Len at every opportunity to boost your stature?

Dave has reached a state in his obsession where he can no longer
control himself.

No problem to me. I've seen it often enough in other places on other
subjects all throughout life. :-)

Anyone not meeting Dave's viewpoints will have their person attacked,
usually by his suddenly citing "standards" that never existed before or
are totally irrelevant to the subject under discussion. Misdirection is
what it is...his trying to win message points by starting a "new thread"
on a person's "qualifications."

==========

I've been away from the newsgroup nearly two weeks, enjoying life
away from reading all the shouting and hollering in here. Now I find
there is some AOL nutcase using "Avery Fine" as a pseudonym.
That's not me anymore than the other AOL nutcase "NoCWTest" is.
:-)

Now there's probably going to be lots of wasted bandwidth about AOL
screennames and the anymouse nutcases will get all hot and huffy
about mentioning their pseudonyms. They don't have the courage to
argue subjects in anything resembling debate. All those anymouse
creatures can do is spam everyone with their garble. :-)

I guess that, for many, Dave included, the modern US ARS is all
about posturing and preening and assuming "authority" where none
was granted, and playing the radio superman role for an audience that
can see through their act. :-)

See you next week. Maybe.

Leonard H. Anderson
real person, not a pseudonym, USPS address still valid at my old
HAM RADIO Magazine bylines.

628. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 00:12:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bgs5fi$38h$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74092

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj7lux5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 5 Aug 2003 21:09:24 -0700, Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >> Your arguement dont <doesn't> hold water Bert. There was a CB band on
UHF back then.
> >> It was in the 400 mhz range FM and was called Class A.
>
> >I remember it, Dan. Now dig a little further and research when that
> >band came into being and why it was subsequently reassigned. Then tell
> >me a little more about "my arguement." ;-)
>
> It still exists - it's called GMRS.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Thanks Phil....I always hated doing research.

Dan/W4NTI

629. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 00:19:09 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <1WgYa.27922$%X6.11364@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74093

Bert,

I don't mean to just break in on your argument with Phil, but consider what we are going through in Rochester, NY. Taxes are sky high, we lost over 800,000 people in New York since the mid 90s (jobs disappearing, wages going down, taxes going up). Obviously, the local governments are trying to cut budgets. Police and firemen are not being replaced as they retire or quit. Enforcement is spotty at best. We just had a large block burn down in the city due to arson a few months ago. People were doing oil changes in the streets (if not stripping cars) and oil was left in the streets. Laws were passed, but weren't favored by a lot of folks. Loud booming radios were causing problems. Laws were passed, but ignored. Those folks that you think believe in the American Way started pushing the envelope. There is now a severe drug problem (heck, if I'm not hurting anyone, it isn't any of your business). We now have the second highest murder rate in New York outside of New York City! The problem is that there is little enforcement, and some folks get emboldened. Locally, they have a new tact. There are now City of Rochester Police, Monroe County Sheriffs, and New York State Troopers patrolling Rochester. Go ahead, spit your gum out. If you're seen, you will get a ticket. Any violation, no matter how minor, and you will get stopped. You may not be searched, but pray you don't have anything visible in your car that you shouldn't (like a little bag with some white powder in it). They are starting real enforcement and there will be a lot of minor violators that will end up paying some stiff fines. I don't see any other way around the situation here; I also don't see things getting any better in the radio business without some *serious* enforcement. That would include the skip-shooting - at least until things quiet down to a dull roar. The lack of enforcement (regardless of cause, which is invariably lack of funds) is not only allowing things to get worse, it is actively promoting things to get worse.

Just my two cents' worth!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03

630. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 00:20:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030806202054.18497.00001833@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74094

In article <d22b54c3.0308061413.42fde40f@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> The point is that hams actually using CW/Morse for communications
>> don't gather anywhere near as many enforcement actions as hams using
>> 'phone modes for communications. The difference is far more than can
>> be accounted for by the greater popularity of 'phone modes.
>>
>> Is there a CW equivalent of the W6NUT repeater, 14,313 or 3950?
>
>We're not quite above such things.

Yes, we are.

>You oughta been there the nite in
>the early '70s when the Big Guns got together and decided to hammer
>Radio Moscow off a freq around 7.030. You bet it worked, Moscow moved
>up the band and didn't come back.

That was hams uniting to repel an illegal intruder. 7.000 to 7.100 has been worldwide exclusive amateur since at least 1929.

Was there any enforcement action from FCC?

73 de Jim, N2EY

631. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 00:26:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030806202655.20198.00001215@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 74095

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hj7qdlb.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>>Total dependence on enforcement and peer group rejection is not adequate if
>>basic "social" values are not inculcated into people's thinking.
>
> For sure.

I thought the brainwashing has been quite well done by you-know-who
membership organization? :-)

LHA

632. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 00:26:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030806202656.20198.00001216@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 74096

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hj7fov2.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

> Cross-posting to alt.radio.pirate broken.
>
>On Tue, 5 Aug 2003 11:56:22 -0400, Radio Truth wrote:
>
>> Read my reply to the other stupid ass that has difficulty
>>comprehending standard English. There are NO MORE
>>MONITORING STATIONS!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
>>The land was sold off by GAO to developers. What you
>>are confused about are the satellite systems run by other
>>agencies. It is explained very clearly on the FCC web page.
>>And when are you going to FINALLY upgrade from that
>>no code tech license you have?
>
> Dwight -- why do we waste time on these ignoramuses?
>
> For the record - yesterday I had a good conversation with a former
> colleague of mine who is one of the folks at Columbia/Laurel.
>
> The remote-controlled HF monitoring system is up and running and used
> on a daily basis for investigation of complaints, controlled from
> there or from Washington as need be. As has been the case for many
> decades, the vast majority of those are non-amateur service related.
>
> Some of the property around each site (mostly the old rhombic
> fields) has been sold for uses that will not interfere with the
> accuracy of the newer log-periodic DF systems, but enough of each
> site is left to do the job properly. There is no need for the old
> buildings, many of which date to the WW-II era, and they have been
> dismantled.
>
> Enough of this crap.

Heh, heh. I see a terrible parallel to the long-timer PCTAs. They
don't want to see reality as it really is, either. :-)

Morse code, which well predates WW2, is old and needs to be
dismantled. :-)

LHA

633. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 00:29:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB57160B.21F2C%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74097

"N2EY" wrote:

> (snip) Total dependence on enforcement and peer group
> rejection is not adequate if basic "social" values
> are not inculcated into people's thinking.

Sadly, we have much of society working against us in any effort to reduce bad behavior. At this point, the problem is almost self-perpetuating.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

634. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 00:51:40 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <wohYa.122434$Wd5.27352171@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 74098

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bgqouo$got@library1.airnews.net...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:b7d1465c.0308052003.74ae149d@posting.google.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<bgpc38iqp1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> > >
> > > If all you CBers with a ham license want to go back and play in the
pig
> pen.
> > > Then go ahead.
> >
> > No thanks, Dan. I avoid the pig pen, but I still do occasionally chit
> > chat on CB ch. 38 LSB and 40 USB...and no swine present. As a matter
> > of fact, I worked a guy on ch. 38 LSB earlier this evening who ended
> > up asking me to QSY to 28.440 MHz. I happily complied. ;-)
> >
> > > Don't even think anyone that is a real ham cares what goes
> > > on there.
> >
> > Very much false.
> >
> > > Let alone wants to operate there.
> >
> > See above.
> >
> > > If you don't like that. Tough...thats the fact jack.
> >
> > Doesn't bother me one iota as it's very far from factual.
> >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
>
> I feel the same way about CB, Bert. There are ways to avoid the trash,
and
> that is on USB or LSB.

I think the combination of some selective operating practice along with some good old fashioned fool's luck has been responsible for my good fortune on the 11-meter CB. I run into an occasional overmodulated overpowered jerk whose signal splashes across the band, but they've been few and far between.

My answer? Additional IF filtering and more recently, the addition of a SGC ADSP2 DSP board. The results of which are dramatic. I like to preach receiver mods to those who simply cannot leave their rig stock. If they express a want (NOT need.) for more power, I suggest a speech processor. (Forget the amp!) There are some nice ones on the market from Astatic, CBCI, as well as the SP-1a.

> Anyone who would forsake any communication venue
> just doesn't have a clue for the value of that venue...

Actually, Kim, I betcha they do...but's it's easier to "follow" the herd.

> Kim W5TIT

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

635. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 01:18:23 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <878yq62rkw.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74099

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> writes:
>>
>>It does? Is that why he's been using you for entertainment (and I
>>might add, providing others with great laughs) for how many years?
>
> It's really Wry Amusement, Floyd. :-)

How true! The funniest part is how close you can fly these zingers
past the pointed heads and they *still* miss it.

>>Seven??? And _you_ think it bugs him!
>
> Heh heh heh.
>
> Doesn't bother me a bit. My interest has always been on removing the
> code test for a radio license. That's begun happening internationally.
> Quite satisfactory to me. More work to do on that for the US regulations
> but this newsgroup is NOT the venue for any serious debate. :-)

Ain't that the truth! The only thing serious here is the degree
of mental aberation on display.

>>Dave gets out of bed every day and immediately hangs a target on
>>himself to help Len get a good aim...
>
> Dave is a walking target. He can't help himself.
>
> "The flag is up, the flag is waving, the flag is down...you have 20
>seconds."
> Old, old command on the Army firing ranges for rapid fire exchange.
>
> I'm over-qualified for that kind of "firing," Floyd. No sense wasting any
> more "ammo" here. The "target" has been hit so many times he
> doesn't know he's been hit. Like a zombie he parades around in his
> ARS uniform as Oberst in the Amatur SchutzStaffel (A.S.S.) and the
> shine on the jackboots is enough to get a good sight picture.
>
> See you next week. Maybe.

Keep shooting Len, and trust that there are a number of folks
who tune in for the entertainment. On an average you do pretty
good, but now and then you have a *really* fine day, and those
are priceless!

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

636. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 02:02:57 UTC
From: Anonymous <rebleep@hush.com>
Message-ID: <f0c9e8d456cc9271b018fb0bd1562390@rebleep>
Source record: 74100

In article <f45722ac.0308050309.7f6b4a77@posting.google.com>
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2F27DA.C63DE672@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2EBC38.1917F426@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bgj71t$2ffe$1@adenine.netfront.net>...
> > > > >
> > > > > > Then, why the opening remarks then and now, with this post, about how long
> > > > > > Carl was a Tech and his alledged comments on CW? Why enter that into your
> > > > > > remarks at all, Dave, if not to cast attention to that? If you are casting
> > > > > > attention to that, then why?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave has a problem with the old Techs, the Tech Plusses, and
> > > > > > presumably the Techs with Code.
> > > > >
> > > > > I didn't address those you mention. I addressed Carl.
> > > >
> > > > Exactly. You continued to address Carl as if he were a Tech. Which
> > > > he is not.
> > >
> > > No, I continued to address Carl as a churl, which he is.
> >
> > Which is how you address Techs.
> >
> > > > > > They aren't 13wpm hams. They aren't
> > > > > > worthy to share his band space.
> > > > >
> > > > > No, they haven't been tested at 13 wpm or at 20 wpm. I didn't address
> > > > > that issue.
> > > >
> > > > Oh, my. Oh, dear. You merely addressed Carl's tenure on the
> > > > Technician band space.
> > >
> > > I didn't address space at all. I addressed Carl's sitting on an old
> > > Tech ticket for 2 1/2 decades until the requirements were lowered.
> >

> Ding, ding, ding. The bell on my M28 rings each time you bring that up.
>
> > > > > Now that Carl can share Dave's band space...
>
> > > > Carl may share some space with me.
> > >
> > > Carl can share any space with you that he wishes. That is what the
> > > FCC mean's by issuing him an Extra license. Get used to it. Naw,
> > > nevermind.
> >
> > Carl may share some space.
>
> May share all space.
>
> While the FCC permits Carl the same access
> > as I hold, no amount of wishing on his part will make it likely that
> > Carl will share space with me in some areas of the bands. If such did
> > come to pass, he likely wouldn't recognize that fact.
>
> Nor would you. You treat him as if he were still a Tech.
>
> > > There are plenty of areas on a
> > > > > number of bands where I doubt I'll run into Carl. Come to think of it,
> > > > > I doubt I'll run into you in those spots.
> > >
> > > Duh! I don't have Extra priv's, Oh Master of Amateur Radio!!!
> >
> > Duh, indeed! I don't operate only in Extra Class band segments but I do
> > use morse about 50% of the time. I'm banking on not running into you.
>
> I don't need West Virginia.
>
> > > Go work some Frenchmen on 6M. I've heard they've got all kinds of
> > > priveleges!!!
> >
> > French hams fall under the jurisdiction of the French PTT.
>
> Indeed they do.
>
> I don't tell
> > them where they can operate and neither does the FCC.
>
> Nor does the government of Tanzania.
>
> They are
> > responsible for the operation of their stations and I am responsible
> > only for the operation of mine.
>
> Smoke 'em if you got 'em.

Careful, Goatblower and Anti-American Dave High-el will forward your posts to your local police in an attempt to deny you your freedom of speech......

637. Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 02:17:03 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030806221703.28365.00000114@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 73951

>From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)

>> The photo of the club members homebrewing was taken before I joined the
>club.
>> They have not done that activity since I have joined the club. That photo
>is
>> still on the club page, as if thats what the club members are interested
>in.
>
> And YOU think that just because no one had taken the picture off
>the webpage that that's ALL they do???

You're right. That's a reasonable explanation. Alot of times I have seen old info stay on several websites. The same thing could have happened on their webpage.

>What I am willing to bet is that if Vippy takes someone to a
>Hamfest, the third party is likely to say "What the heck are you
>talking about...these are just good people having fun",

That's possible, but not probable. They will probably notice that its mostly older males right away. Also, if I invite them on a Hamfest that continues to Fri, Sat night, then I'll bet they will wonder why the Hams are operating rather than doing what most people do. I know of a couple of Hamfests coming up in late August. One of those had the Wouff Hong ceremony you had top wait three hours for (no activities scheduled in between).

What would the non-Ham observer think of that?

>> that hams set out for an operating activity and then waste that time by
>> operating or you being under the impression that your travel to a
>> domestic location was a "DXpedition".

>Comes to America then wonders why
>America isn't like the place he left.

At a DXpedition, that's would most (non-Ham) Americans would expect in (American) society.

Most (non-Ham) Americans would of course expect operating activities, but not the whole day and night (with the only breaks for eating alot). Especially at a vacation spot. A few weeks ago, at the club's cookout, one female person even asked "Is operating all you did, you didn't go to the beach or anything?". I doubt you'll see her at next year's event.

Most (non-Ham) Americans would expect the Hams would take a break from operating on Sat night. They would be surprised and disappointed otherwise.

638. Re: How about PBL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 02:30:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030806223001.27503.00001469@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 73952

In article <e79dbd9b.0308051629.3cabf5a@posting.google.com>, k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB) writes:

>
>Here's an alternative to BPL from a local ham here in Minnesota.
>
> http://home.comcast.net/~gbox/
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB

Hansl:

Wow -- this has real possibilities!

73 de Larry, K3LT

639. Re: Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 02:30:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030806223002.27503.00001470@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 73953

In article <bgqrrv$n3t@library1.airnews.net>, "Seagrams Seven"
<Seagrams@Seven.com> writes:

>Does this work?

Indubitably.

73 de Larry, K3LT

640. Re: For Dwight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 02:30:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030806223002.27503.00001471@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 73954

In article <bgqoqv$ihs@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>
>Hey, Dwight? Have you had any more problem with my news messages? I know
>at one point you said that you'd changed servers and didn't seem to be
>having any more. How's it been?
>
>I think the problem is with the other server. I got rid of that account; I
>also think someone "whined" (heh heh) about how pertinent my posts are and
>that they just couldn't handle it any more. The error message I would get
>is: "you are not allowed to post to rec.radio.amateur.policy."
>
>So, apparently someone can't handle the heat...
>
>--
>Kim W5TIT

What "heat" would that be, Kim? Your posts are about as "hot" as
frozen road kill on the AlCan Highway.

73 de Larry, K3LT

641. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 02:30:03 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030806223003.27503.00001472@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 73955

In article <Xns93CF65FEBD7Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>> Alun:
>>
>> My point exactly. This is one of the reasons why the requirements to be
>> licensed in the AMATEUR radio service do not require professional-level
>> RF engineering skills. Nevertheless, Carl seems to hold on to the
>notion
>> that his being an RF engineer somehow grants him exalted status as an
>> AMATEUR radio operator. Why is that?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>>
>
>Could it be because he knows a lot about radio?

Alun:

Well, I'm sure Carl expects that his professional RF engineering qualifications
should grant him exalted status in the ARS, but in truth, it just ain't so! I
know
lots of radio amateurs, of all license classes, who haven't made dime number
one as a professional electronics technician or engineer, who are infinitely
better hams than I am or Carl could ever be. What they all have in common is
the fact that they have, throughout their "careers" as radio amateurs, been
willing to explore and adopt new modes, while retaining the skills learned
with the old ones, particularly Morse/CW. Their stations are truly up-to-date,
they have usually attained high places on the DXCC standings, routinely
hold leadership positions within their clubs, and can be counted on to provide
valuable input and personal support for all club activities. They are the ones
who newcomers look to for the answers, while the so-called "professional"
hams simply cluster amongst themselves and look down their noses at the
proceedings of the rest of the club.

But yes, indeed, Carl does know a lot about radio!

73 de Larry, K3LT

642. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 02:30:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030806223005.27503.00001473@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 73956

In article <877k5ruoee.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
writes:

>Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>>>
>>> My point exactly. This is one of the reasons why the requirements to be
>>> licensed in the AMATEUR radio service do not require professional-level
>>> RF engineering skills. Nevertheless, Carl seems to hold on to the notion
>>> that his being an RF engineer somehow grants him exalted status as an
>>> AMATEUR radio operator. Why is that?
>
>...
>
>>Could it be because he knows a lot about radio?
>
>Makes no difference to Larry. His measure of an Amateur is
>simply how near to being identical to Larry Roll are they.

Floyd:

Incorrect. My "measure" of a radio amateur is based on their having
attained reasonable knowledge and proficiency in the basic skills
required to conduct effective radio communications under the rules and
regulations of the Amateur Radio Service. I hardly ever compare other
hams to my own self, since as a radio amateur, I am now, by today's
standards, an exceptionally fine example!

>If it is not important to Larry, it isn't important to the ARS.

Only if you think so, Floyd. Since you seem to be willing to suck up
to me, feel free to start impressing me at your convenience.

>If
>it is important to Larry, then any ham that doesn't measure up,
>somehow isn't a real ham.

Prove it, Floyd.

>It never occurred to him that many many hams are also
>professionals, and if we measured him by the same standard, he'd
>get laughed out of the club meeting.

I see. And this would be in keeping with the spirit of the Amateur
Radio Service…how? I'm sure you've done a lot of "laughing" at
"non-professional" hams in your day, Floyd. And I've known a lot
of "professional" hams who've done the laughing. However, I can't

really say I've learned anything useful from them, except for maybe how to have a piss-poor attitude.

>But in fact very few hams
>who are pro's in the business think that hams are measured the
>way Larry does.

Well, you must have brought up the "laughing out of meetings" for a reason, Floyd. You obviously have some experience in that area, or you wouldn't have mentioned it, if you truly feel what you just said in the quote directly above. In reality, all you've done is to expose the true nature of your attitude toward radio amateurs who truly are "amateurs" in the sense that they don't make their living as professional electronics technicians or engineers.

We do realize that it wouldn't be fair, and
>that the ARS is afterall, a hobby and should remain that way.

You're making a vain attempt to straddle the fence here, Floyd. Unfortunately, the top rail just splintered your ass but good!

73 de Larry, K3LT

643. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 02:47:31 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hj81iec.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 73957

On Thu, 07 Aug 2003 00:00:38 GMT, Dwight Stewart wrote:

>"Phil Kane" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) The remote-controlled HF monitoring system
>> is up and running and used on a daily basis for
>> investigation of complaints, controlled from there
>> or from Washington as need be. As has been the
>> case for many decades, the vast majority of those
>> are non-amateur service related.
>
>
> Hey, Phil. Do they (the FCC) ever let anyone visit their monitoring
>facilities? I realize they probably don't want the extent of their
>capabilities to become public knowledge, and they certainly don't want to
>turn their facilities into a tourist attraction, but I would love an
>opportunity to see one of those places? If it is ever done, whom would I
>write to check into it? An email response is okay (remove the "NOSPAM" from
>my email address).

An open reply is fine.

Even in the days when the stations were manned, a lot of what they
did was classified stuff for "others" and public visits were
very rare, usually limited to small groups who were somehow
connected to the technology or operations. Now, they are unmanned -
all you will see is an antenna and a box. Additionally, the
monitoring/df network is now under the Homeland Security Division,
so access is that much more limited.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

644. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 02:54:27 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0308070249050.1162@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 73958

```
On Wed, 6 Aug 2003, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308050457060.824@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > On Mon, 4 Aug 2003, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> > > news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308032322180.503@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> > > > On Sun, 3 Aug 2003, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > > > > BOTTOM LINE: *Until the FCC changes its rules* no-code Techs
> > > > > have NO HF privs ... sorry, folks, but that's the way it is.
> > > >
> > > > Neither do Novices nor the "coded" Techs. They lost their HF
> privileges
> > > > effective July 5, 2003.
> > >
> > > False ... please stop preaching this nonsense.
> >
> > If you think it's nonsense, then tell me how these licensees, under 47 CFR
> > 97.301(e) are supposed to show that they have met an international
> requirement
> > that no longer exists in order to have the privileges listed in that
> > subsection?
>
> I am not going to waste any more time arguing this ridiculous assertion of
> yours ... it is false ... and other knowledgeable folks have told you so as
> well.

No, they haven't. They all confused my position with that of someone else that
advocated that no-code technicians do have HF privileges. No one responded to
my position.

> I am inclined to think that you're just trolling for attention, and I don't
> plan
> to give you the satisfaction any more.

I have asked a legitimate question. How can one prove compliance with a
non-existent condition? If you think that's nonsense, that VALIDATES my point.
```

645. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 02:59:31 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0308070251440.1162@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 73959

On Wed, 6 Aug 2003, K0HB wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote
> > If you think it's nonsense, then tell me how these licensees, under 47 CFR
> > 97.301(e) are supposed to show that they have met an international requirement
> > that no longer exists in order to have the privileges listed in that
> > subsection?
> >
>
> Oh, this is so easy it almost makes me feel guilty ruining your lame
> rant.
>
> The "international requirement" is that each country decides whether
> their licensees need Morse testing to operate on HF.

By definition, if one has a choice, then it's NOT a requirement. If each country is free to choose, then it's a NATIONAL CHOICE, not an international requirement. Your response is non-sequitur.

My point: The international requirement was removed. However, FCC regulations still require it. Since one CANNOT comply with a non-existent requirement, then the privilege previously granted has likewise been removed.

If my position is wrong, as you seem to think, point out the fault in the logic.

> For right now, the FCC has decided that they do, and continues to
> grant Novices and "Tech Plus" certain HF operating spectrum.

And the ruling number is?

646. Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 03:06:23 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0308070257470.1162@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 73961

On Wed, 6 Aug 2003, Phil Kane wrote:
> On Tue, 05 Aug 2003 05:06:38 GMT, D. Stussy wrote:
>
> >Then explain why .301(e) based HF operating privilege on something OTHER than
> >simply holding element 1 credit....
>
> Because it was written very sloppily.

That's right. And as it is phrased, it is dependent on the licensee meeting a condition which he cannot meet (because it no longer exists). Therefore, if one of the requisite conditions for operating cannot be met (due to the July 5 2003 change), how can any Novice or Tech licensee now operate on HF?

I have said that they can't, as a result dependent on the change to the international agreement....

647. Re: Donated BPL Money at Work.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 03:12:11 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F31C389.7010900@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 73962

BPL Investment Team wrote:

>The ARRL is spending the money you donated to pay for Internet bandwidth so you
>can see the future of ham radio on HF. There is no future for HF ham radio.
>
>http://216.167.96.120/BPL_Trial-small.mpg
>
>
>
Wish I could see the S-meters better..... (I'm on a dial-up, so a
bigger mpg would take
forever to download).

648. Re: For Dwight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 03:19:22 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bgsghp$2ts@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 73963

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030806223002.27503.00001471@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <bgqoqv$ihs@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >
> >Hey, Dwight? Have you had any more problem with my news messages? I
know
> >at one point you said that you'd changed servers and didn't seem to be
> >having any more. How's it been?
> >
> >I think the problem is with the other server. I got rid of that account;
I
> >also think someone "whined" (heh heh) about how pertinent my posts are
and
> >that they just couldn't handle it any more. The error message I would
get
> >is: "you are not allowed to post to rec.radio.amateur.policy."
> >
> >So, apparently someone can't handle the heat...
> >
> >--
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> What "heat" would that be, Kim? Your posts are about as "hot" as
> frozen road kill on the AlCan Highway.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

You're such a charity case...

Kim W5TIT

649. TEST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 03:42:39 UTC
From: Seagrams Seven <Seagrams@Seven.com>
Message-ID: <3f31cab4@shknews01>
Source record: 73964

This is just a test. DOES THIS SERVER WORK?

650. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 03:44:49 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93CFF1773F58Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 73965

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0308060832.44f9c66@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns93CF5FB731F0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>> news:76WXa.17298$Vx2.8810860@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
>> > "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:Xns93CE2C5CA14F7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
>> >> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj4351y.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:
>
>> >> > On Mon, 04 Aug 2003 07:41:03 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
>> >> >> Very simple answer, Jim. The FCC has limited personnel today.
>> >> >> The few they
>> >> >>have simply don't have the time to sit around listening, as code
>> >> >>users pound out their incredibly slow conversations, to catch
>> >> >>violations. ;)
>> >> >
>> >> > For reasons that I disagreed with then and I disagree with now,
>> >> > (but that's another story) the FCC' s enforcement response is
>> >> > driven by complaints, not by "Patrolling the Ether" (tm) as in
>> >> > days of yore.
>> >> >
>> >> > How many complaints of amateur CW violations do you think
>> >> > "Riley" gets? (Somebody pounding out "FU" in Morse on a
>> >> > Touch-Tone (tm) pad on a repeater input does not count as
>> >> > CW....)
>> >> >
>> >> > --
>> >> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>> >> >
>> >> > From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
>> >> > Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>> >> So what do we call it then? I have certainly heard
>
> (expletive deleted)
>
>> >> sent in
>> >> Morse on a repeater.
>

> That's awful. I haven't heard anything that bad on the CW/data
> subbands, though. Have you?
>

I really do only use phone, so I wouldn't know what was being sent down
there.

>> > Anything from an unidentified transmission to interference to
>> > jamming for starters depending on the exact events. It probably
>> > violates a number of FCC rules.
>
> Let's see: Obscenity, failure to ID, jamming, unauthorized use of a
> repeater. For starters.
>
>> The point is that Phil is trying to say that jamming in MCW doesn't
>> count as jamming in CW, which is like trying to say that there's a
>> vital difference between using FM or SSB to jam.
>
> No, that's not the point at all.
>
> The point is that hams actually using CW/Morse for communications
> don't gather anywhere near as many enforcement actions as hams using
> 'phone modes for communications. The difference is far more than can
> be accounted for by the greater popularity of 'phone modes.
>
> Is there a CW equivalent of the W6NUT repeater, 14,313 or 3950?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Probably not. I have, however, heard endless repeated CQ calls sent in CW
by US hams on top of DX phone ops who were innocently using their phone
subbands, that happen to be regarded as CW frequencies in part 97. I am
90% sure that it is deliberate jamming, and it is a long term ongoing
situation. Presumably the perpetrators are too ignorant to understand that
FCC rules end at the border?

73 de Alun, N3KIP

651. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 03:46:01 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308061946.14d7c859@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73966
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc> wrote in message
news:<3F315EBF.93377C63@yahoo.moc>...
> > > Try these links from Google that came up when I searched that number:
> > >
> > > http://www.fcc.gov/eb/sed/csle.html
> > > http://www.fcc.gov/eb/sed/rfse.html
> > >
> > > You must have misdialed.
> >
> > Those links don't work.
>
>
> They work here.
>
> Your PC is f*cked and so is your phone.

> You have just been vitually PLONKed, troll.
>
> .:\:/:.
> +-------------------+ .:\:\:/:/:.
> | PLEASE DO NOT | :.:\:\:/:/:.:
> | FEED THE TROLLS! | :=.' - - '.=:
> | | '=(\ 9 9 /)='
> | f*ck you, | ((_))
> | rec.radio.* NG | /`-vvv-'\ <---Herb
> +-------------------+ / TROLL \
> | | @@@ / /|,,,,,|\ \
> | | @@@ /_// /^\ _\
> @x@@x@ | | |/ WW(( ))WW
> \||||/ | | \| __\,,\ /,,/__
> \||/ | | | (______Y______) jgs
> /\/\/\/\/\/\/\//\\/\

He isn't even a respectable troll . .

Just a jerk.

Typical pirate nerd.

w3rv

652. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 03:46:37 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93CFF1C67A283elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 73967

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj7mxu6.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:

> On 5 Aug 2003 08:22:13 GMT, Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>>So what do we call it then? I have certainly heard F-U-C-K sent in Morse
>>on a repeater.
>
> It is intentional and usually unidentified interference to voice
> communications (except if the repeater is running Packet or SSTV as
> several of our club and/or ARES/RACES repeaters do). It is NOT
> interference with CW/Morse communication or by a station in a
> legitimate QSO using CW/Morse.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
> Oregon Tualatin Valley Amateur Radio Club
>
>
>

So using Morse to deliberately interfere with phone is OK, then?

653. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 03:49:06 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87r83y1619.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73968

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>In article <877k5ruoee.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
>writes:
>>
>>>Could it be because he knows a lot about radio?
>>
>>Makes no difference to Larry. His measure of an Amateur is
>>simply how near to being identical to Larry Roll are they.
>
>Floyd:
>
>Incorrect. My "measure" of a radio amateur is based on their having
>attained reasonable knowledge and proficiency in the basic skills

Reasonable and proficient all seem to be defined in your book as
whatever Larry Roll can do. The fact that Carl and many others
here including myself, have been professionally involved in
radio communications for decades, and have forgotten more than
you've ever known about it, hasn't yet entered you mind.

You don't have the qualifications to determine what the measure
should be, nor how the ruler should be graded. Anyone who does
is off the scale, and you aren't.

I think it is wonderful that you passed the Extra Class license
requirements. I think it is wonderful that Carl did to, and
that many others have. That, however, is a small accomplishment
compared, for example, to probably half of what Carl manages to
accomplish on *any given day* as a professional.

The point is that Carl's level of comprehension is *not* a
suitable measure to use as a determination of who is or not a
"qualified" ham. And neither is yours, yet you continue to rant
and rave that you are qualified and others who cannot or do not
do what you did are therefore not qualified.

If Carl (or I or any number of others) stood up here and said
that until *you* can measure up to our level of comprehension
about radio communications that *you* aren't qualified, you would
have a good reason to complain. Yet that is exactly they way
you rant about the qualifications of others, and you should not
just dismiss the complaints.

>required to conduct effective radio communications under the rules and
>regulations of the Amateur Radio Service. I hardly ever compare other
>hams to my own self, since as a radio amateur, I am now, by today's

>standards, an exceptionally fine example!

You are a pissant by comparison to many. Why should we use your
level as the accepted mark on the yard stick? I'll bet Carl
passed that point when he was about 17 or 18 years old.

>>If it is not important to Larry, it isn't important to the ARS.
>
>Only if you think so, Floyd. Since you seem to be willing to suck up
>to me, feel free to start impressing me at your convenience.

I don't think so and have never said that I do. The problem is you
do think so and have repeatedly said so. My view of you lines up
with the downward angle of my nose...

>>If
>>it is important to Larry, then any ham that doesn't measure up,
>>somehow isn't a real ham.
>
>Prove it, Floyd.

You've been saying so here on a regular basis, what is there to
prove? Google has it all archived and everyone here can read...

>>It never occurred to him that many many hams are also
>>professionals, and if we measured him by the same standard, he'd
>>get laughed out of the club meeting.
>
>I see. And this would be in keeping with the spirit of the Amateur
>Radio Service…how?

It is *NOT* in keeping with what is appropriate, which is
exactly why we *don't* do that, and neither should you. So cut
it, eh.

> I'm sure you've done a lot of "laughing" at
>"non-professional" hams in your day, Floyd. And I've known a lot
>of "professional" hams who've done the laughing. However, I can't
>really say I've learned anything useful from them, except for maybe
>how to have a piss-poor attitude.

Well, you don't seem to know much and you do have a piss-poor
attitude, so you at least are admitting to what the truth is.
I'm sorry you wanted to use such sorry examples as your mentors.
I think you'd have been much better to, for example, model
yourself on someone like Carl. I'm damned impressed, and you
should be too.

>>But in fact very few hams
>>who are pro's in the business think that hams are measured the
>>way Larry does.
>
>Well, you must have brought up the "laughing out of meetings" for

>a reason, Floyd.

Indeed. I'm sorry you missed the point that you are off base.
Maybe this second attempt will sink in a little farther, maybe
not.

> You obviously have some experience in that area,
>or you wouldn't have mentioned it, if you truly feel what you just
>said in the quote directly above. In reality, all you've done is to
>expose the true nature of your attitude toward radio amateurs who
>truly are "amateurs" in the sense that they don't make their living
>as professional electronics technicians or engineers.

Why yes indeed I have Larry. They tend to be nice people, and
in no way should be treated the way you treat them. They do
not need to even reach the levels of understanding that you
have in order to be qualified to use radio as a hobby. They can
get significantly useful levels of enjoyment from Amateur Radio
without having to become as well versed as even you, a mere
piker in the world of radio. We don't need to insist that they
pass some level of Morse Code proficiency that you did just
because you did. Indeed, it is no longer of any value to anyone
to have Amateurs pass *any* level of Morse Code proficiency.
Likewise there do need to be adjustments made on a regular basis
to what kinds of theory questions are asked on written exams,
because the technology continues to change rapidly. It is
grossly unfair of you to claim that the newer testing methods
and questions are any less appropriate now than those in use
when you just happened to take the tests then.

Instead of trying to act so blessedly holier than thou, you
might compare yourself *honestly* to Carl, as an example.
Because he almost certainly is someone you could use as a role
model to help you improve your image as an Amateur Radio
operator.

>We do realize that it wouldn't be fair, and
>>that the ARS is afterall, a hobby and should remain that way.
>
>You're making a vain attempt to straddle the fence here, Floyd.
>Unfortunately, the top rail just splintered your ass but good!

It's a hobby you twit. I'm not even close to the fence, much
less stressing it enough to splinter anything.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

654. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 04:04:28 UTC
From: BIAS COMMS <biascomms@blueyonder.co.uk>
Message-ID: <gdkYa.921$bI1.8560799@news-text.cableinet.net>
Source record: 73969
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Herb wrote:

>> http://www.fcc.gov/eb/sed/csle.html
>> http://www.fcc.gov/eb/sed/rfse.html
>>
>> You must have misdialed.
>
> Those links don't work.
>
> Herb

Both links worked fine.

--
BIAS COMMS

Everything gets easier with practice, except getting up in the morning!

655. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 04:18:18 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87n0em14ol.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73970

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>>Could it be because he knows a lot about radio?
>
>Alun:
>
>Well, I'm sure Carl expects that his professional RF engineering qualifications
>should grant him exalted status in the ARS, but in truth, it just ain't so!

If you ever learn enough about Amateur Radio to catch on, you'll
eat those words. Carl, if for no other reason than his
professional qualifications, though in his case he still would
fit the bill if he were instead a store clerk, is in fact a
person who does reach the status of "exalted".

You don't Larry. And the following paragraph demonstrates why.
You've missed what it is all about. It is a hobby, with a vast
variety of areas to specialize in and enjoy and learn about.

> I
>know
>lots of radio amateurs, of all license classes, who haven't made dime number
>one as a professional electronics technician or engineer, who are infinitely
>better hams than I am or Carl could ever be. What they all have in common is
>the fact that they have, throughout their "careers" as radio amateurs, been
>willing to explore and adopt new modes, while retaining the skills learned
>with the old ones, particularly Morse/CW.

So the *only* way, in your demented opinion, to be a great Radio
Amateur, is to retain "Morse/CW" skills... No none code
licensee could ever be a good ham.

No hobbiest who forgets Morse code 10 or 20 years after passing
the test could then be a better ham than you.

Why? Well, it seems to be that you still know Morse, so they
should too!

And they *must* explore and adopt new modes! So they can't
stick with AM, or SSB, or Slow Scan, or RTTY, or NBFM, or AMSAT,
or whatever (even though they *must* continue with CW), but
instead have to jump to whatever is the latest and the greatest.

(BTW, what *is* the latest and greatest that everyone should be
doing? I'm collecting old brass triumph style straight keys and
toying with 30 year old tube radios, does that count???)

> Their stations are truly up-to-date,

I can't even begin to define what "truly up-to-date" is. I know
some really great hams that just dearly love to use only old
tube type equipment. I had an email conversation with an old
Internet friend the other day, who just dearly loves to use and
work with old AM transmitters!

He can't, in your world, be a good Ham. I'm going to have to
tell him that after 50 years, he's not an OT, he's a waste in
the Book Of Larry "Measuring Stick for All Amateur Operators"
Roll.

>they have usually attained high places on the DXCC standings, routinely

Really? Even the ones who've never worked HF in their lives?
I'd bet that the majority of really great Hams since 1950 or so
have never even gotten a DXCC certificate, much less ever been
high up on the DXCC Honor Roll.

Maybe Larry "Measuring Stick Himself" Roll like to DX?

>hold leadership positions within their clubs, and can be counted on to provide
>valuable input and personal support for all club activities.

Now, that I agree is most likely true.

>They are the ones
>who newcomers look to for the answers, while the so-called "professional"
>hams simply cluster amongst themselves and look down their noses at the
>proceedings of the rest of the club.

No Larry. It is those professionals who usually *are* the ones
people look to for answers and leadership.

>But yes, indeed, Carl does know a lot about radio!

And you don't. That's one reason why he's a such a good role
model, a recognized leader, and a good Radio Amateur.

>73 de Larry, K3LT

And Larry is a twit.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

656. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 04:20:26 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgsk2a$4n7$0@208.207.71.135>
Source record: 73971

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bgne3ekgd1@208.206.142.92>...
>
> > Not really. Anyone can learn PSK31 in a half hour of looking over the help file and
> > playing iwth their keyboard. As you know if you've been listening to all the laments
> > appearing here from the "excluded", no such possibliley exists for Morse code.
>
> 30 minutes, huh?
>
> As I recall, you couldn't get it to work.

Here we go again, regaled by the Recollections of the Lame, lazy and incompetent.

> Weeks of trying and posting here.

Go googling and get back to us when you find all that. And NOT until.
That'll keep you busy the rest of your naturl life.

>
>
> Under PSK31 testing, you would be excluded from the HF part of the ARS.

You are truly the original numb nuts.

657. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 04:20:30 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgsk2e$4n7$1@208.207.71.135>
Source record: 73972

Brian Kelly wrote:

> You oughta been there the nite in
> the early '70s when the Big Guns got together and decided to hammer
> Radio Moscow off a freq around 7.030. You bet it worked, Moscow moved
> up the band and didn't come back.

Nuther favorite trick was to zero beat 'em and work exactly on his frequency. That works fine.

658. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 04:20:36 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgsk2k$4n7$2@208.207.71.135>
Source record: 73973

K0HB wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote .
>
> > Anyone who would forsake any communication venue
> > just doesn't have a clue for the value of that venue...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Does this mean the fact that you forsake the Morse code communications
> venue indicates that you "just don't have a clue for the value of that
> venue"? (Your words, not mine.)
>
> Sunuvagun!

Yeah, she did it -- and she didn't even know she was doing it!

659. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 04:20:40 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgsk2o$4n7$3@208.207.71.135>
Source record: 73974

Jim Hampton wrote:

>
> The lack of enforcement (regardless of cause, which is invariably lack of
> funds) is not only allowing things to get worse, it is actively promoting
> things to get worse.

Been that way forever all the back, through the history of CB, clear back beyond the Wild West.

660. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 05:18:18 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308062118.66f5ad0a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73975

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hj7q1za.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 6 Aug 2003 15:13:10 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >We're not quite above such things. You oughta been there the nite in
> >the early '70s when the Big Guns got together and decided to hammer
> >Radio Moscow off a freq around 7.030. You bet it worked, Moscow moved
> >up the band and didn't come back.
>
> Remember my story about "Radio Moscow does not operate on 16.xxx
> MHz" ?? <ggg>

No, I never heard that one, pse tell.

w3rv

661. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 08:14:12 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F320A54.4010106@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 74104

K0HB wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote
>
>
>>If my position is wrong, as you seem to think, point out the fault in the
>>logic.
>>
>
>
> Logic? All I see is a troll.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Stussy doesn't apply logic, he has been spouting the same stuff
over and over. He just can't seem to except the fact that until
the FCC drops the code requirement, if it does, that nothing has
changed as far as U.S. Amateur radio.

662. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 08:16:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308070016.7729728c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73976

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030806221703.28365.00000114@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)

> > And YOU think that just because no one had taken the picture off
> >the webpage that that's ALL they do???
>
> You're right. That's a reasonable explanation. Alot of times I have seen old
> info stay on several websites. The same thing could have happened on their
> webpage.

In otherwords: "I can't provide a reasonable alternative".

> >What I am willing to bet is that if Vippy takes someone to a
> >Hamfest, the third party is likely to say "What the heck are you
> >talking about...these are just good people having fun",
>
> That's possible, but not probable. (SNIP)

It's most likely, unless the third party you take is a relative
of yours.

> They will probably notice that its mostly older males right away.)SNIP)

So are the Knights of Columbus, The Shriners, and a long list of
other social organizations I can think of...So what?

> Also, if I invite them on a Hamfest that continues to
> Fri, Sat night, then I'll bet they will wonder why the Hams are operating
> rather than doing what most people do.

"..what most people do"...?!?!

It's ABOUT Amatuer Radio, Vipul...The event is organized FOR
Amateur Radio operators by Amateurs and OPERATING radios.

If you go to a NASCAR event, "most people" are watching or racing
fast cars. If you go to a rock concert, they are listening/watching a
band play music.

Why do you fail to comprehend that Amateur Radio is ABOUT
operating radios??? It's not about sightseeing, meeting preety fems,
or discussing dietary habits.

> I know of a couple of Hamfests coming up
> in late August. One of those had the Wouff Hong ceremony you had top wait three
> hours for (no activities scheduled in between).

Well by golly why don't YOU go organize a sightseeing trip or get
Jenny Craig to come in and give a presentation...???

> What would the non-Ham observer think of that?

What does it matter, Vipul? The event was not organized for "the
non-ham observer". It was organized for the licensed Amateur
participant.

> >> that hams set out for an operating activity and then waste that time by
> >> operating or you being under the impression that your travel to a
> >> domestic location was a "DXpedition".
>
> >Comes to America then wonders why
> >America isn't like the place he left.
>
> At a DXpedition, that's would most (non-Ham) Americans would expect in
> (American) society.

It doesn't matter what a "non-ham" thinks about it, Vipul. If a
"non-ham" is looking for any of the aforementioned distractions, then
they are free to do them. Amateur Radio is ABOUT operating radios.

> Most (non-Ham) Americans would of course expect operating activities, but not
> the whole day and night (with the only breaks for eating alot). Especially at a
> vacation spot. A few weeks ago, at the club's cookout, one female person even
> asked "Is operating all you did, you didn't go to the beach or anything?". I
> doubt you'll see her at next year's event.

Well that's too bad. You had better run along an catch her,
Vippy! You and her have something in common! A complete lack of
understanding of what the event is all about.

> Most (non-Ham) Americans would expect the Hams would take a break from
> operating on Sat night. They would be surprised and disappointed otherwise.

Why? Why should "they" expect Amateurs to stop doing the very
thing the special even was organized to do...?!?!

Sheesh

Steve, K4YZ

663. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 08:27:19 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F320D67.7010802@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 74106

Brian Kelly wrote:

>
> Every once in a blue moon when I've had absolutely nothing better to
> do with my life I've gotten on 27Mhz and looked for intelligent life.
> On the rare occasions when I've actually found some it lasts maybe
> five minutes at most before the bozos blow it off the freq.
>
> YMMV . . !
>
> w3rv

So as to the subject "Do Hams get 11 Meters Back", I ask, "why
in the world would hams want 11 meters back?" Eleven meters is
the perfect example of what happens when rules are thrown out
the window, total chaos. The cber's have managed to make it the
sewer pit of the radio spectrum and the sad part is they can't
even keep it in their own territory, they have to spew their
garbage to other frequencies as well.
The fact that hams in general follow the rules, and expect other
operators to do the same is what keeps many cber's from getting
a license. I say, "good riddance, we don't need those types in
ham radio."

664. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 08:59:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308070059.1b8c2d12@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73977

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:<Pine.LNX.4.56.0308070251440.1162@kd6lvw.ampr.org>...

> My point: The international requirement was removed. However, FCC regulations
> still require it. Since one CANNOT comply with a non-existent requirement,
> then the privilege previously granted has likewise been removed.

We are a nation of laws, and those laws must be enacted or
changed in a democratic process, this one included.

The international rule was changed from "you will" to "you may",
therefore the legal premise for the continuation of code testing until
the US law has been changed IS valid.

> If my position is wrong, as you seem to think, point out the fault in the
> logic.
>
> > For right now, the FCC has decided that they do, and continues to
> > grant Novices and "Tech Plus" certain HF operating spectrum.
>
> And the ruling number is?

See Part 97. The same rules that were in effect on July 4th
still apply today.

Steve, K4YZ

665. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 09:43:24 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F321F3C.80404@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 74112

Stussy blabbered again:

> 3) You seem to think that I am saying that no-coders have HF privileges.
> That's the only thing I can conclude about your comment about dropping code.
> YOU ARE WRONG. I haven't said any such thing. What I said is that coded
> Technicians and Novices have LOST HF privileges as a result of the
> international change.

Have you seen any directive from the FCC that says that coded
Novices and Technicians can no longer operate HF?
Everything is the same as it was before the conference. Get used
to it. When you deserve the title Mr. I will address you as Mr.

666. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 10:59:07 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030807065907.14731.00001079@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 73978

>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

> Poor Dave, still smarting over his alleged expertise in State Dept.
> communications from the Cashew Nut Capital of Africa. :-)

Was Len Anderson ever there?
>
> He loves to put down others using "standards" of his own invention.
> That saves him time and embare-assment of talking ON a subject.
> It's so much easier for him to insult a communicator personally when
> he doesn't have any valid argument on subjects.
>
> That seems endemic to the members of the Gang of Four, PCTAs
> all, drunk on sour whine after the rewrite of S25.5.

You are upset, Len.

"The things that upset us most are
often things we see as qualities in our
ownselves." - Kim W5TIT

> There are a whole glob of old-timers who have been busy
> brainwashing and being brainwashed into thinking that amateurs are the
> supermen of radio. That allowed them to have superhuman status in
> their own minds...adding stature to their self-images even though not
> recognized by professionals.

"The things that upset us most are
often things we see as qualities in our
ownselves." - Kim W5TIT
>
> Amateur radio is never been anything more than a hobby/recreation
> activity in radio. That is an unwanted concept to the ARS lifestylers
> whose whole being revolved around amateurism as superhuman radio
> activity. ARS lifestylers and some old-timers just can't separate their
> fantasies from realities.

"Anyone who would forsake
any communication venue
just doesn't have a clue for
the value of that venue.."
- Kim W5TIT

> He can't help himself. :-) There's another being in here who is totally
> obsessed with certain individuals...concentrating on targets it thinks
> are "weak" and venting all possible bile and filth on his opponents.
> "Everyone knows his name." :-)

"The things that upset us most are
often things we see as qualities in our
ownselves." - Kim W5TIT

> ================
>
> I've been away from the newsgroup nearly two weeks, enjoying life
> away from reading all the shouting and hollering in here. Now I find
> there is some AOL nutcase using "Avery Fine" as a pseudonym.
> That's not me anymore than the other AOL nutcase "NoCWTest" is.
> :-)

You do far more "shouting" and "hollering"
than anyone else on RRAP, Len Anderson.

Who is the "nutcase"? ;-)
>
> Now there's probably going to be lots of wasted bandwidth about AOL
> screennames and the anymouse nutcases will get all hot and huffy
> about mentioning their pseudonyms. They don't have the courage to
> argue subjects in anything resembling debate. All those anymouse
> creatures can do is spam everyone with their garble. :-)

You have set the example, Len Anderson ;-)

".....it is often reflected in the things people
say when they try to insult others. Both of
them have a pretty stock set of insults,
which clearly are based on what they
understand about themselves, but are
gratuitously thrown at anyone who
disagrees with them." - Floyd Davidson

It is interesting to see how Len Anderson
responds to those who disagree with him.

667. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 11:17:01 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <NyqYa.124635$Wd5.28930378@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 73979

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj7ic34.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Tue, 05 Aug 2003 16:40:13 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >Enforcement? Where's the beef?! Oh, it went to pay for that $400 hammer
or
> >that $1,200 barracks toilet bowl.
>
> Well, it's time to drag out Project Accounting 101 again. As I
> posted elsewhere (with apologies to the CPAs and EAs if I used
> incorrect terminology as to the accountimne methods in the
> example):
>
> The scoffers fail to remember (or understand) that the "$500
> hammer" came about by allocation of contract overhead by line
> item rather than by proportional item cost....
>
> Follow the bouncing ball for a machine and a hammer needed to
> maintain it:
>
> Machine catalog cost = $ 10,000.00
> Hammer catalog cost = $ 10.00
> Total cost of material = $ 10,010.00
> 10% Contract overhead = $ 1,001.00
> Total contract cost = $ 11,011.00
>
> By Proportional Item Cost allocation method, overhead is allocated
> proportionally:
>
> Machine cost = $ 10,000 + 10% = $ 11.000
> Hammer cost = $ 10 + 10% = 11
> Total cost = $ 11,011
>
> By Line Item allocation method, the total overhead is divided by
> the number of line items, in this case 2:
>
> Machine cost = $ 10,000 + $ 500.50 = $ 10,500.50
> Hammer cost = $ 10 + $ 500.50 = $ 510.50
> Total cost = $ 11,011.00
>
> Note the "$ 500 hammer" in the example above !!
>
> Same hammer, same contract cost, no extra charge for the asinine
> comments by The Congress and The Press and The Critics.

Fair enough, Project Accounting 101 lesson appreciated.

> As to where the enforcement money went, the nickle-nursers in The
> Congress never appropriated it, and even if they would have, the past
> three agency chairmen - the folks who have the power to allot the
> funds inside the agency - had neither regard for nor understanding of
> the need for field enforcement.

Damn shame.

> And that takes care of that.......

Thanks again.

> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

668. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 11:22:59 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308070322.30d1a552@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73980

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<Az6Ya.111882$Wd5.25129895@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0308051608.a214039@posting.google.com...
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:<kXAXa.92552$Wd5.18542286@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> > > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:d22b54c3.0308031718.23b2c842@posting.google.com...
> > > > wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
> news:<20030802210406.21580.00000808@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> > > > > Do Hams get 11 Meters Back, as soon as all the CBers upgrade to
> there
> Free
> > > > > Handout Ham Licenses?
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > We didn't "lose" 11M, we just had use CB reddios <radios>
> >
> > It's "reddios" on 11M and radios on 12M and elsewhere. "When in Rome
> > do as the Romans do."
>
> Sorry, Brian. Within the circles that I operate, It's "radios." (On both 11m
> and the ham bands. YMMV.)

It sure does!!

> FYI, folks here are QSX when they're monitoring
> the frequency. I rarely hear the annoying "I'm QRT and on the side" anymore,
> thank goodness. :-)

I was involved in trying to use CB for it's original intended purpose
in the mid-'70s in 23 channel days. Specifically for comms for a
municipal Townwatch group of 135 citizens 95% of whom had no interest
at all in hobby radio and just wanted reasonably decent local
neighborhood mobile comms. The disgusted group would have fallen apart
if I hadn't moved the operation up onto a VHF business freq to get
away from the CB crud. Cost a bundle but they're still on that freq.

Every once in a blue moon when I've had absolutely nothing better to
do with my life I've gotten on 27Mhz and looked for intelligent life.
On the rare occasions when I've actually found some it lasts maybe
five minutes at most before the bozos blow it off the freq.

YMMV . . !

w3rv

669. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 11:28:35 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <DJqYa.124725$Wd5.28962764@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 73981

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bgrtlc$tu7$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> There is no value to CB. Whenever something good is tried the idiots
trash
> it. Jam it, play music and tones all over it.

Dan, trust me...NOBODY understands how you feel better than I. I just plain old REFUSE to let the lids win and keep the band for themselves. I and a local (relatively speaking) group of ragchewers (mostly hams) still chew the fat on 40 USB every now and then. If our operating practices rub off on a newbie CBer or two, great.

> When I heard that while working on a CB radio, I just turned the RF gain
> down and went on.

I just QSY and operate using SSB exclusively/

> Unfortunatly now I hear the exact same tactics on ham radio. Gee I wonder
> where that came from ???

That is unfortunate, but I attribute it to the lids themselves...not the band they came from or the band they're on.

> Dan/W4NTI

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

670. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 11:57:15 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <v8rYa.124962$Wd5.29044632@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 73982

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:1WgYa.27922$%X6.11364@news02.roc.ny...
> Bert,
>
> I don't mean to just break in on your argument with Phil, but consider
what
> we are going through in Rochester, NY. Taxes are sky high, we lost over
> 800,000 people in New York since the mid 90s (jobs disappearing, wages
going
> down, taxes going up). Obviously, the local governments are trying to cut
> budgets. Police and firemen are not being replaced as they retire or
quit.
> Enforcement is spotty at best. We just had a large block burn down in the
> city due to arson a few months ago. People were doing oil changes in the
> streets (if not stripping cars) and oil was left in the streets. Laws
were
> passed, but weren't favored by a lot of folks. Loud booming radios were
> causing problems. Laws were passed, but ignored. Those folks that you
> think believe in the American Way started pushing the envelope. There is
> now a severe drug problem (heck, if I'm not hurting anyone, it isn't any
of
> your business). We now have the second highest murder rate in New York
> outside of New York City! The problem is that there is little
enforcement,
> and some folks get emboldened. Locally, they have a new tact. There are
> now City of Rochester Police, Monroe County Sheriffs, and New York State
> Troopers patrolling Rochester. Go ahead, spit your gum out. If you're
> seen, you will get a ticket. Any violation, no matter how minor, and you
> will get stopped. You may not be searched, but pray you don't have
anything
> visible in your car that you shouldn't (like a little bag with some white
> powder in it). They are starting real enforcement and there will be a lot
> of minor violators that will end up paying some stiff fines. I don't see
> any other way around the situation here; I also don't see things getting
any
> better in the radio business without some *serious* enforcement. That
would
> include the skip-shooting - at least until things quiet down to a dull
roar.
> The lack of enforcement (regardless of cause, which is invariably lack of
> funds) is not only allowing things to get worse, it is actively promoting
> things to get worse.
>
> Just my two cents' worth!

>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

I certainly understand 100% wrt the situation you've described above, Jim. While I certainly don't equate working DX on the CB with some of the violations you mentioned above, I neither do it (DX on the CB.) nor encourage anyone else to do it.

HOWEVER, I do support changing the rule via the legal and proper protocol. End of story. I acknowledge that many folks do it now and the FCC does absolutely nothing, but I certainly do NOT encourage it or endorse it. If it is ever legalized, I'd tell folks to go for it...but certainly not now.

I realize my position on this subject is not popular among my fellow hams, but it's what I believe. Thus far NOBODY has really provide a satisfactory arguement against it. Most attempt to drag other unrelated subjects such as freebanding and amplifiers into the fray. "Working DX will encourage the use of illegal amplifiers," they say...conveniently forgetting that QRP demonstrates otherwise with even less power output. (5 vs. 12 Watts)

I'm not going to change my beliefs just to avoid being flamed on a USENET newsgroup. Just as I wouldn't on rec.radio.cb when I told 'em to get of their asses and study for and pass Element 1 rather than play that pathetic waiting game.

BTW, Phil and I have no argument...just a difference of opinion. I respect Phil's opinion just as I hope he would respect mine. I did not start this thread, I merely responded to the original post and it snowballed into this. I basically argue with nobody. Take care, Jim.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

671. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 14:11:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308070611.4b619efa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73983
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message news:<87oez2tv5a.fld@barrow.com>...
> "Herb" <Herb@netjammerqrm.org> wrote:
> >FAA is NOT FCC, now you get it?
> >
> >Herb
>
> Herbie, I understood right to begin with that you've gotten
> off your meds again.
>
> Why do so many of you folks get so excited about denying that
> the FCC has a rather sophisticated national spectrum monitoring
> system?

Actually when you think about it the FCC is only one player in the monitoring loop Floyd. NSA, the DoD and the CIA have and have had monitoring capabilities which make the FCC's look quite lame in comparison. They have massive spook sites globally plus who knows how many satellites snooping everywhere. Lookit how they've even tuned in terrorist cell phones recently. Whizzy scary! These guys historically could have cared less about digging up the bullshit-level SW & FM pirates, they have bigger fish to fry.

But then along comes this Homeland Security drill. One of if not the primary thrust of the Homeland Security Dept. is to stitch together assets which have not been working with each other in the past. Including the various monitoring assets of course. And the networking technology is in place.

It's obvious that if they gave a rat's patooie about pirates the FCC can probably tap into the spook monitoring assets at will in addition to using their own. Thus it is that the monitoring threat to pirates has ratcheted up enormously vs. the bullshit posted around here about the FCC going out of the monitoring biz.

w3rv

672. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 14:37:40 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F326434.7000403@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 74132

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308072052340.1350@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
>
>>3) You seem to think that I am saying that no-coders have HF privileges.
>>That's the only thing I can conclude about your comment about dropping
>
> code.
>
>>YOU ARE WRONG. I haven't said any such thing.
>
>
> Accepted ...
>
> I will probably regret responding to this, but I have to try *one* more time
> ...
>
>
>>What I said is that coded
>>Technicians and Novices have LOST HF privileges as a result of the
>>international change. Why? Because their right to operate HF was NOT
>
> based on
>
>>holding "element 1 credit" (like that of the other license classes) but on
>
> an
>
>>international requirement that has been eliminated (and replaced with a
>>national option) and with the referred to requirement gone, there is no
>
> way
>
>>under the FCC's regulation that these licensees can show compliance with
>
> the
>
>>non-existent requirement; thus, their HF privileges were CANCELLED.
>
>
> Mr. Stussy,
>
> Please read VERY SLOWLY:

>
> The international requirement has not been eliminated, it has been changed.
>
> It now says "Administrations SHALL determine ..."
>
> In ITU-ese, "shall" is mandatory.
>
> Therefore, the FCC is OBLIGATED to determine whether or not any
> class of amateur license requires a Morse test.
>
> Since the FCC had ALREADY determined that a 5 wpm Morse
> test was required for HF access, it has already met that obligation.
>
> Thus the existing FCC rules are "legal," nothing has changed,
> and NOBODY has lost ANY privileges.
>
> The fact that the FCC is free to make a NEW determination and
> eliminate the Morse requirement from its own rules makes NO
> difference.
>
> I respectfully hope you get it this time ...
>
> Carl - wk3c

Don't count on it, it just doesn't seem to take with Stussy.

>

673. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 15:02:41 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0308070702.215f1c38@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73984

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote

>
> If my position is wrong, as you seem to think, point out the fault in the
> logic.
>

Logic? All I see is a troll.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

674. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 15:03:25 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgtpnt$n8b$0@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 73985

Har de har, har!!!!! No fish so squirmy as that which is caught with
him/herself as the bait!

No CW Test wrote:

>>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>
>>
>
>
>
>> Poor Dave, still smarting over his alleged expertise in State Dept.
>> communications from the Cashew Nut Capital of Africa. :-)
>>
>>
>
>Was Len Anderson ever there?
>
>
>> He loves to put down others using "standards" of his own invention.
>> That saves him time and embare-assment of talking ON a subject.
>> It's so much easier for him to insult a communicator personally when
>> he doesn't have any valid argument on subjects.
>>
>> That seems endemic to the members of the Gang of Four, PCTAs
>> all, drunk on sour whine after the rewrite of S25.5.
>>
>>
>
>You are upset, Len.
>
>"The things that upset us most are
>often things we see as qualities in our
>ownselves." - Kim W5TIT
>
>
>
>> There are a whole glob of old-timers who have been busy
>> brainwashing and being brainwashed into thinking that amateurs are the
>> supermen of radio. That allowed them to have superhuman status in
>> their own minds...adding stature to their self-images even though not
>> recognized by professionals.
>>
>>
>

>"The things that upset us most are
>often things we see as qualities in our
>ownselves." - Kim W5TIT
>
>
>> Amateur radio is never been anything more than a hobby/recreation
>> activity in radio. That is an unwanted concept to the ARS lifestylers
>> whose whole being revolved around amateurism as superhuman radio
>> activity. ARS lifestylers and some old-timers just can't separate their
>> fantasies from realities.
>>
>>
>
>"Anyone who would forsake
>any communication venue
>just doesn't have a clue for
>the value of that venue.."
> - Kim W5TIT
>
>
>
>> He can't help himself. :-) There's another being in here who is totally
>> obsessed with certain individuals...concentrating on targets it thinks
>> are "weak" and venting all possible bile and filth on his opponents.
>> "Everyone knows his name." :-)
>>
>>
>
>"The things that upset us most are
>often things we see as qualities in our
>ownselves." - Kim W5TIT
>
>
>
>> ================
>>
>> I've been away from the newsgroup nearly two weeks, enjoying life
>> away from reading all the shouting and hollering in here. Now I find
>> there is some AOL nutcase using "Avery Fine" as a pseudonym.
>> That's not me anymore than the other AOL nutcase "NoCWTest" is.
>> :-)
>>
>>
>
>You do far more "shouting" and "hollering"
>than anyone else on RRAP, Len Anderson.
>
>Who is the "nutcase"? ;-)
>
>

>> Now there's probably going to be lots of wasted bandwidth about AOL
>> screennames and the anymouse nutcases will get all hot and huffy
>> about mentioning their pseudonyms. They don't have the courage to
>> argue subjects in anything resembling debate. All those anymouse
>> creatures can do is spam everyone with their garble. :-)
>>
>>
>
>You have set the example, Len Anderson ;-)
>
>".....it is often reflected in the things people
>say when they try to insult others. Both of
>them have a pretty stock set of insults,
>which clearly are based on what they
>understand about themselves, but are
>gratuitously thrown at anyone who
>disagrees with them." - Floyd Davidson
>
>It is interesting to see how Len Anderson
>responds to those who disagree with him.
>
>
>
>

675. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 15:13:33 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgtqatogg0@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 73986

Bert Craig wrote:

>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:bgrtlc$tu7$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
>
>
>>There is no value to CB. Whenever something good is tried the idiots
>>
>>
>trash
>
>
>>it. Jam it, play music and tones all over it.
>>
>>
>
>Dan, trust me...NOBODY understands how you feel better than I. I just plain
>old REFUSE to let the lids win and keep the band for themselves. I and a
>local (relatively speaking) group of ragchewers (mostly hams) still chew the
>fat on 40 USB every now and then. If our operating practices rub off on a
>newbie CBer or two, great.
>
>
>
>>When I heard that while working on a CB radio, I just turned the RF gain
>>down and went on.
>>
>>
>
>I just QSY and operate using SSB exclusively/
>
>
>
>>Unfortunatly now I hear the exact same tactics on ham radio. Gee I wonder
>>where that came from ???
>>
>>
>
>That is unfortunate, but I attribute it to the lids themselves...not the
>band they came from or the band they're on.
>
>
>

Bert, I quite agree, and that has long been a vital part of my "point".
It's not the CB Band that's coming down to join us once the Morse code
test is history, it's the operators. Unfortunately the vast majority are not
the sort you're involved with.. Most of those folks would just learn the
code
and go take the test, and become assets to the ARS, as you did. It's those
who had "no time nor interest" that bring on the problems en masse.

Dick

676. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 15:29:15 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgtr8bqcg0@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 73987

Bert Craig wrote:

>While I certainly don't equate working DX on the CB with some of the
>violations you mentioned above, I neither do it (DX on the CB.) nor
>encourage anyone else to do it.
>
>HOWEVER, I do support changing the rule via the legal and proper protocol.
>End of story. I acknowledge that many folks do it now and the FCC does
>absolutely nothing, but I certainly do NOT encourage it or endorse it. If it
>is ever legalized, I'd tell folks to go for it...but certainly not now.
>
>I realize my position on this subject is not popular among my fellow hams,
>but it's what I believe. Thus far NOBODY has really provide a satisfactory
>arguement against it. Most attempt to drag other unrelated subjects such as
>freebanding and amplifiers into the fray. "Working DX will encourage the use
>of illegal amplifiers," they say...conveniently forgetting that QRP
>demonstrates otherwise with even less power output. (5 vs. 12 Watts)
>
>I'm not going to change my beliefs just to avoid being flamed on a USENET
>newsgroup. Just as I wouldn't on rec.radio.cb when I told 'em to get of
>their asses and study for and pass Element 1 rather than play that pathetic
>waiting game.
>
>

You know, Bert, Jim N2EY seems to have stuck the nail squarely on the
head when he said here
that it just could be that FCC realizes the most effective way to draw
all those recalcitrants
on 27 mHz into ham radio is to make the test for licenses so easy - and
code free- that they WILL want to become hams and abandon 27 mHz.
I see thas as a very flawed plan, if it's true. There will be lots of
them who just don't want to
place themselves under rules and restrictions after so much time in
Freeband-land.
I'm familiar with a substantial number of CBers turned hams who did
indeed become the
sort of hams that carry the hobby, and no doubt there will be more in a
codefree license time.
My worry is all that comes with them. Maybe with the era of the
Internet, when even many hams are much less involved in the hobby than
before instant worldwide computer communications arrived, the
troublemakers will be fewer in number also.
At least we can hope.

Dick

677. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 16:13:28 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308070813.561d46bb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73988

```
Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93CFF1773F58Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> news:c2356669.0308060832.44f9c66@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns93CF5FB731F0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> >> news:76WXa.17298$Vx2.8810860@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
> >> > "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:Xns93CE2C5CA14F7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> >> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
> >> >> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj4351y.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:
>
> >> >> > On Mon, 04 Aug 2003 07:41:03 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> >> >> >> Very simple answer, Jim. The FCC has limited personnel today.
> >> >> >> The few they
> >> >> >>have simply don't have the time to sit around listening, as code
> >> >> >>users pound out their incredibly slow conversations, to catch
> >> >> >>violations. ;)
> >> >> >
> >> >> > For reasons that I disagreed with then and I disagree with now,
> >> >> > (but that's another story) the FCC' s enforcement response is
> >> >> > driven by complaints, not by "Patrolling the Ether" (tm) as in
> >> >> > days of yore.
> >> >> >
> >> >> > How many complaints of amateur CW violations do you think
> >> >> > "Riley" gets? (Somebody pounding out "FU" in Morse on a
> >> >> > Touch-Tone (tm) pad on a repeater input does not count as
> >> >> > CW....)
> >> >> >
> >> >> > --
> >> >> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >> >> >
> >> >> > From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> >> >> > Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
> >> >> So what do we call it then? I have certainly heard
> >> >
> >> > (expletive deleted)
> >> >
> >> >> sent in
```

> >> >> Morse on a repeater.
> >
> > That's awful. I haven't heard anything that bad on the CW/data
> > subbands, though. Have you?
>
> I really do only use phone, so I wouldn't know what was being sent down
> there.
>
I can assure you that such things don't happen nearly so often (if at
all) on the CW subbands.

Anyone who doubts this is invited to listen for themselves.

> >> > Anything from an unidentified transmission to interference to
> >> > jamming for starters depending on the exact events. It probably
> >> > violates a number of FCC rules.
> >
> > Let's see: Obscenity, failure to ID, jamming, unauthorized use of a
> > repeater. For starters.
> >
> >> The point is that Phil is trying to say that jamming in MCW doesn't
> >> count as jamming in CW, which is like trying to say that there's a
> >> vital difference between using FM or SSB to jam.
> >
> > No, that's not the point at all.
> >
> > The point is that hams actually using CW/Morse for communications
> > don't gather anywhere near as many enforcement actions as hams using
> > 'phone modes for communications. The difference is far more than can
> > be accounted for by the greater popularity of 'phone modes.
> >
> > Is there a CW equivalent of the W6NUT repeater, 14,313 or 3950?
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

> Probably not.

That's my entire point.

> I have, however, heard endless repeated CQ calls sent in CW
> by US hams on top of DX phone ops who were innocently using their phone
> subbands, that happen to be regarded as CW frequencies in part 97.

Frequency? Date, Time?

> I am
> 90% sure that it is deliberate jamming, and it is a long term ongoing
> situation.

How do you know it is deliberate? Perhaps the CQers could not hear the
DX 'phones. Perhaps the DX phones were on top of US CW ops innocently
sending CQ on frequencies that, by bandplan, are CW/digital.

The FCC has definite criteria for deliberate interference. One criterion is if a station allegedly being interfered with changes frequency, and the alleged interferer changes frequency too.

> Presumably the perpetrators are too ignorant to understand that
> FCC rules end at the border?

Who are "the perpetrators" in that case?

You are presuming guilt without adequate proof. Do you have any evidence that the alleged violators could hear the alleged victims? Or evidence that the alleged victims were using the frequency first, rather than the other way around?

Most CW ops use narrow filters - 500, 400, 250 Hz are common choices.* Useless for 'phone, of course. The CQers may not have realized how close they were to the DX 'phones. How much room should a CW station give a weak 'phone station?

Of course the DX 'phones could have switched to CW and answered the CQers, then politely asked them to move.

73 de Jim, N2EY

*My Southgate Type 7 has two cascaded 8 pole 500 Hz crystal filters, giving an effective bandwidth of less than 400 Hz and very steep filter skirts. And it has an audio LC filter as well.

678. Welcome Here

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 16:19:13 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@lloydsdinerchow.net>
Message-ID: <bgtu8q$l7$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 73989

Welcome to rec.radio.amateur.policy

Here you will find the largest collection on Usenet
of Assorted Fruits, Nuts, Wackos, Wannabes, Liars,
Bullshitters, Psychos, Weirdos, Societal Misfits, Losers,
and people with absolutely no life.

Pull up and chair and lurk, as you watch these rejects
bicker over nothing but think they are the most important
people on the planet.

Special note for anyone considering becoming a ham
radio operator. Do not judge what you see in this
news group as representative of amateur radio. Ham
radio is a great hobby with great people in it. The
people you see in this news group are those whom the
FCC has caught and fined, then kicked off the ham
bands. The people here are the ones who used to sit
on 14313 and jam their fellow hams. They are also
the nuts who used to roam 75 meters at night, making
the same trouble you see here. However, we all
are greatly appreciative to Mr Riley Hollingsworth of
the FCC who banished all these misfits off the ham
bands. Unfortunately, they have taken residence up here
in this news group. Let it be that way though, as the
rest of us can now enjoy our ham radio bands, free of
the vermin you see in this news group.

Lloyd
Dallas TX
Qso me on 14271 daily

679. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 16:30:43 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <T8vYa.133$jl2.2204@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 73990

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030806223003.27503.00001472@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <Xns93CF65FEBD7Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >> Alun:
> >>
> >> My point exactly. This is one of the reasons why the requirements to
be
> >> licensed in the AMATEUR radio service do not require professional-level
> >> RF engineering skills. Nevertheless, Carl seems to hold on to the
> >notion
> >> that his being an RF engineer somehow grants him exalted status as an
> >> AMATEUR radio operator. Why is that?
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Could it be because he knows a lot about radio?
>
> Alun:
>
> Well, I'm sure Carl expects that his professional RF engineering
qualifications
> should grant him exalted status in the ARS, but in truth, it just ain't
so!

Larry,

I don't expect "exalted status" ... just some respect as one who is arguably
more knowledgable and competent in RF technology than the average ham.

However, as has been pointed out, you insist that your superior CW skill
is ALL that counts and that since I'm not up to your standards in that area
I'm a "lesser ham."

Carl - wk3c

680. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 16:33:43 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308070833.2db83476@posting.google.com>
Source record: 73991

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<BB56960F.211FF%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
>
> > OK, I'll bite.
> >
> > What need did code testing serve in the past
> > that does not exist today?
> >
> > Before you say "other services used it", note
> > that many if not most hams had little chance
> > of ever being part of those other services when
> > they used Morse. For example, people over a
> > certain age, or with certain physical
> > conditions, would never be accepted in the
> > military.
>
>
> It served a need from the ITU's and FCC's perspectives.

Some of us would say it still does. All a matter of opinion.

> And, yes, it did
> have to do with the fact that other services used it - the pool of trained
> operators concept in 97.1 of the CFR.

That "pool" thing is in Part 97, not ITU-R

However, it says "pool of trained operators" right? Not "pool of
trained CW/Morse operators". So it applies as a general reason for the
service to exist, not as a reason for code testing.

> Since the services we serve don't use
> code anymore, code simply no longer serves that need.

If it ever did. And amateur radio does not exist to serve other
services.

The "pool of trained operators" thing in 97.1 is really about the idea
of the ARS being a service where the licensees (hams) are skilled both
operationally and technically, able to do a lot of different things
well. This distinguishes it from other services, which usually involve
various types of certified equipment, channelized operation, and the
participation of both specialized professionals and unskilled users.
Look at cell phones - lots of specialized technology and technical
people do the hardware, so that the user doesn't have to know anything

other than how to "dial" a number. Heck, some users don;t even realize
their "phone" is actually a radio transceiver.

> That only leaves code
> use by ham operators for enjoyment.

And public service.

> That doesn't warrant a unique license
> requirement (unique compared to the other modes).

Your opinion noted. Others' opinions differ.

Besides, everything hams do is either "for enjoyment" or public
service. Does that mean none of it should be tested?

73 de Jim, N2EY

681. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 16:42:46 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <akvYa.126851$Wd5.29830302@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 73992

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj7q1za.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 6 Aug 2003 15:13:10 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >We're not quite above such things. You oughta been there the nite in
> >the early '70s when the Big Guns got together and decided to hammer
> >Radio Moscow off a freq around 7.030. You bet it worked, Moscow moved
> >up the band and didn't come back.
>
> Remember my story about "Radio Moscow does not operate on 16.xxx
> MHz" ?? <ggg>
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

Hey Phil, isn't that a violation of FCC (...and international?) rules/regs?
(...and it gets a giggle?) Certainly NOT as "plain and simple" as I was led
to believe wrt following the rules. Lol. ;-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

682. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 16:55:32 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <8wvYa.126881$Wd5.29863613@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 73993

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030806202054.18497.00001833@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <d22b54c3.0308061413.42fde40f@posting.google.com>,
kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> The point is that hams actually using CW/Morse for communications
> >> don't gather anywhere near as many enforcement actions as hams using
> >> 'phone modes for communications. The difference is far more than can
> >> be accounted for by the greater popularity of 'phone modes.
> >>
> >> Is there a CW equivalent of the W6NUT repeater, 14,313 or 3950?
> >
> >We're not quite above such things.
>
> Yes, we are.

Agreed.

> >You oughta been there the nite in
> >the early '70s when the Big Guns got together and decided to hammer
> >Radio Moscow off a freq around 7.030. You bet it worked, Moscow moved
> >up the band and didn't come back.
>
> That was hams uniting to repel an illegal intruder. 7.000 to 7.100 has
been
> worldwide exclusive amateur since at least 1929.

Was that action legal, Jim? I certainly believe that it was the correct
action, given the circumstances. I'd always believed that deliberate
interference was illegal no matter what and that that intruders were to be
handled by the FCC.

> Was there any enforcement action from FCC?

I'm curious about that too, was there?

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

683. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 17:33:09 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgu2glbcn0@208.207.71.148>
Source record: 73994

Bert Craig wrote:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>>
>>That was hams uniting to repel an illegal intruder. 7.000 to 7.100 has
>>
>>
>been
>
>
>>worldwide exclusive amateur since at least 1929.
>>
>>
>
>Was that action legal, Jim? I certainly believe that it was the correct
>action, given the circumstances. I'd always believed that deliberate
>interference was illegal no matter what and that that intruders were to be
>handled by the FCC.
>
>
>

FCC said a few years ago that unauthorized users are afforded no
protection from interference
by licensed authorized users. It's as though they weren't even there,
which they should not be.

With some BPL proponents asking FCC to change that to where unlicensed
Part 15
users DO get protection from licensed users, one wonders how it will all
shake out.
It looks to me like they're trying an end run around the weak side.

684. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 17:57:58 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <877k5pz6xl.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 73995
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:
>Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message news:<87oez2tv5a.fld@barrow.com>...
>>
>> Why do so many of you folks get so excited about denying that
>> the FCC has a rather sophisticated national spectrum monitoring
>> system?
>
>Actually when you think about it the FCC is only one player in the
>monitoring loop Floyd. NSA, the DoD and the CIA have and have had
>monitoring capabilities which make the FCC's look quite lame in

Very few people seem to realize the extent of that, or even
begin to consider how it relates to specifically to themselves
on a very personal basis.

I am retired from the telecommunication industry. I've been
trying for literally decades to convince people that they should
never say anything on a telephone if they can't live with
seeing it published the next day on the front page of the local
newspaper.

That applies to *anything* communicated via a radio
transmission. If someone thinks they and the person they are
talking to are the only ones listening, they are *wrong*.

>comparison. They have massive spook sites globally plus who knows how
>many satellites snooping everywhere. Lookit how they've even tuned in
>terrorist cell phones recently. Whizzy scary! These guys historically
>could have cared less about digging up the bullshit-level SW & FM
>pirates, they have bigger fish to fry.
>
>But then along comes this Homeland Security drill. One of if not the
>primary thrust of the Homeland Security Dept. is to stitch together
>assets which have not been working with each other in the past.
>Including the various monitoring assets of course. And the networking
>technology is in place.
>
>It's obvious that if they gave a rat's patooie about pirates the FCC
>can probably tap into the spook monitoring assets at will in addition
>to using their own. Thus it is that the monitoring threat to pirates
>has ratcheted up enormously vs. the bullshit posted around here about
>the FCC going out of the monitoring biz.

Exactly!

The FCC is out of the monitoring business about as far as politicians
are out of the lying business.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

685. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 18:08:41 UTC
From: Voice In Wilderness <VIW@forest.com>
Message-ID: <pCwYa.30972$ff.23086@fed1read01>
Source record: 73996
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I once went to the 1.2 GHz Ham band -- operated simplex reduced power --
across town to a buddy in a "Private QSO"
Yep you guessed it -- another ham called me on the phone and read me the
riot act about something I had sed.

No place to (hide) transmit!

"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
news:877k5pz6xl.fld@barrow.com...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:
> >Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
news:<87oez2tv5a.fld@barrow.com>...
> >>
> >> Why do so many of you folks get so excited about denying that
> >> the FCC has a rather sophisticated national spectrum monitoring
> >> system?
> >
> >Actually when you think about it the FCC is only one player in the
> >monitoring loop Floyd. NSA, the DoD and the CIA have and have had
> >monitoring capabilities which make the FCC's look quite lame in
>
> Very few people seem to realize the extent of that, or even
> begin to consider how it relates to specifically to themselves
> on a very personal basis.
>
> I am retired from the telecommunication industry. I've been
> trying for literally decades to convince people that they should
> *never* say anything on a telephone if they can't live with
> seeing it published the next day on the front page of the local
> newspaper.
>
> That applies to *anything* communicated via a radio
> transmission. If someone thinks they and the person they are
> talking to are the only ones listening, they are *wrong*.
>
> >comparison. They have massive spook sites globally plus who knows how
> >many satellites snooping everywhere. Lookit how they've even tuned in
> >terrorist cell phones recently. Whizzy scary! These guys historically
> >could have cared less about digging up the bullshit-level SW & FM
> >pirates, they have bigger fish to fry.
> >
> >But then along comes this Homeland Security drill. One of if not the
> >primary thrust of the Homeland Security Dept. is to stitch together
> >assets which have not been working with each other in the past.

> >Including the various monitoring assets of course. And the networking
> >technology is in place.
> >
> >It's obvious that if they gave a rat's patooie about pirates the FCC
> >can probably tap into the spook monitoring assets at will in addition
> >to using their own. Thus it is that the monitoring threat to pirates
> >has ratcheted up enormously vs. the bullshit posted around here about
> >the FCC going out of the monitoring biz.
>
> Exactly!
>
> The FCC is out of the monitoring business about as far as politicians
> are out of the lying business.
>
> --
> Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
> Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

686. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 18:18:40 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgu560$gi3$0@208.206.142.74>
Source record: 73997

Lennie the limp, AKA Putzie-Poo, escrit...

> There are a whole glob of old-timers who have been busy
> brainwashing and being brainwashed into thinking that amateurs are the
> supermen of radio. That allowed them to have superhuman status in
> their own minds...adding stature to their self-images even though not
> recognized by professionals.

Isn't this dweeb a treasure? After all, one person's trash IS
another's treasure.
Evidently his vaunted "professionals" aren't any too anzious to have
anything to
do with him. Wonder why? Could it be they're embarassed to be associated
with him in any way? Since many of his targets here are also active or
retired
professionals and know the situation from both sides, it's easy to
perceive that
is exactly the situation
He very clearly has a compelling need to hang out on RECREATIONAL
radio newsgroups, haranguing *active* participantsof the type
who've been active, involved and have achieved, while pandering to
the non-participating type. Some of his few buddies here took advantage of
easy ham radio licening but who mostly just waited for time and
evolution to
take care of his dreaded Morris code test -HIS type of ham, other than
the fact that
since he never could qualify for a license he limits his participation to
haranguing those who did- successfully and *fully*. While he sat by
and jealously watched in envy.

Small wonder he soon earned the above captioned moniker

>
>

687. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 18:28:48 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93D093302F156elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 73998

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0308070813.561d46bb@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns93CFF1773F58Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>> news:c2356669.0308060832.44f9c66@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns93CF5FB731F0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>> >> news:76WXa.17298$Vx2.8810860@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>>
>> >> > "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:Xns93CE2C5CA14F7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >> >> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
>> >> >> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj4351y.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:
>>
>> >> >> > On Mon, 04 Aug 2003 07:41:03 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>> >> >> >> Very simple answer, Jim. The FCC has limited personnel
>> >> >> >> today. The few they
>> >> >> >>have simply don't have the time to sit around listening, as
>> >> >> >>code users pound out their incredibly slow conversations, to
>> >> >> >>catch violations. ;)
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > For reasons that I disagreed with then and I disagree with
>> >> >> > now, (but that's another story) the FCC' s enforcement
>> >> >> > response is driven by complaints, not by "Patrolling the
>> >> >> > Ether" (tm) as in days of yore.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > How many complaints of amateur CW violations do you think
>> >> >> > "Riley" gets? (Somebody pounding out "FU" in Morse on a
>> >> >> > Touch-Tone (tm) pad on a repeater input does not count as
>> >> >> > CW....)
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > --
>> >> >> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> > From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
>> >> >> > Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>>
>> >> >> So what do we call it then? I have certainly heard
>> >> >

>> > (expletive deleted)
>> >
>> >> >> sent in
>> >> >> Morse on a repeater.
>> >
>> > That's awful. I haven't heard anything that bad on the CW/data
>> > subbands, though. Have you?
>>
>> I really do only use phone, so I wouldn't know what was being sent
>> down there.
>>
> I can assure you that such things don't happen nearly so often (if at
> all) on the CW subbands.
>
> Anyone who doubts this is invited to listen for themselves.
>
>> >> > Anything from an unidentified transmission to interference to
>> >> > jamming for starters depending on the exact events. It probably
>> >> > violates a number of FCC rules.
>> >
>> > Let's see: Obscenity, failure to ID, jamming, unauthorized use of a
>> > repeater. For starters.
>> >
>> >> The point is that Phil is trying to say that jamming in MCW doesn't
>> >> count as jamming in CW, which is like trying to say that there's a
>> >> vital difference between using FM or SSB to jam.
>> >
>> > No, that's not the point at all.
>> >
>> > The point is that hams actually using CW/Morse for communications
>> > don't gather anywhere near as many enforcement actions as hams using
>> > 'phone modes for communications. The difference is far more than can
>> > be accounted for by the greater popularity of 'phone modes.
>> >
>> > Is there a CW equivalent of the W6NUT repeater, 14,313 or 3950?
>> >
>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>> Probably not.
>
> That's my entire point.
>
>> I have, however, heard endless repeated CQ calls sent in CW
>> by US hams on top of DX phone ops who were innocently using their
>> phone subbands, that happen to be regarded as CW frequencies in part
>> 97.
>
> Frequency? Date, Time?
>

40m, when I'm looking for stations listening up

>> I am
>> 90% sure that it is deliberate jamming, and it is a long term ongoing
>> situation.
>
> How do you know it is deliberate?

It's hard to be sure. Maybe the fact that the CQ calls go on abnormally
long is a clue, though.

> Perhaps the CQers could not hear the
> DX 'phones.

They would probably claim that, either way

> Perhaps the DX phones were on top of US CW ops innocently
> sending CQ on frequencies that, by bandplan, are CW/digital.
>

Innocent/ignorant - a fine dividing line, isn't it?

Of course, by bandplan, the frequencies are phone too, just there, not
here.

> The FCC has definite criteria for deliberate interference. One
> criterion is if a station allegedly being interfered with changes
> frequency, and the alleged interferer changes frequency too.
>
>> Presumably the perpetrators are too ignorant to understand that
>> FCC rules end at the border?
>
> Who are "the perpetrators" in that case?
>

The ones who are _not_ in QSO with anyone, who keep sending unanswered CQs
for five minutes at a time, who didn't send QRU? before calling.

> You are presuming guilt without adequate proof. Do you have any
> evidence that the alleged violators could hear the alleged victims?

No, that would be impossible to prove

> Or
> evidence that the alleged victims were using the frequency first,
> rather than the other way around?
>

Yes, or at least I would have if I taped them.

> Most CW ops use narrow filters - 500, 400, 250 Hz are common choices.*
> Useless for 'phone, of course. The CQers may not have realized how
> close they were to the DX 'phones. How much room should a CW station
> give a weak 'phone station?
>

I'm not talking about co-channel here, I mean right on top. Neither am I talking about weak phone stations, although they could be weak at some other QTH.

> Of course the DX 'phones could have switched to CW and answered the
> CQers, then politely asked them to move.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> *My Southgate Type 7 has two cascaded 8 pole 500 Hz crystal filters,
> giving an effective bandwidth of less than 400 Hz and very steep
> filter skirts. And it has an audio LC filter as well.
>

So, if say, you called QRU? on 7080 and there was a strong signal SSB QSO in progress, would you be able to tell? This is a genuine question. I don't posses a CW filter. I am guessing you would hear something,though?

73 de Alun, N3KIP

688. R U talking?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 18:45:36 UTC
From: Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc>
Message-ID: <3F329E50.77B72320@yahoo.moc>
Source record: 73999
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

> That applies to *anything* communicated via a radio
> transmission. If someone thinks they and the person they are
> talking to are the only ones listening, they are *wrong*.

That's something I've been telling others for years.

689. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 19:10:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB581C97.21F73%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74000

"Phil Kane" wrote:
>
> Even in the days when the stations were manned,
> a lot of what they did was classified stuff
> for "others" and public visits were very rare,
> usually limited to small groups who were
> somehow connected to the technology or
> operations.

I suspected it was nearly impossible. But, who knows, there might have been some little known visitor program or something. One never knows for sure until one asks, right?

> Now, they are unmanned - all you will see is an
>antenna and a box.

Of course, I was interested in the main facility in Maryland, not the unmanned facilities.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

690. Re: R U talking?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 19:34:04 UTC
From: Cool Breeze <spade#abc.com>
Message-ID: <IKOcnVak1fYgNK-iXTWJkQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 74101
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Scott Unit 69" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc> wrote in message
news:3F329E50.77B72320@yahoo.moc...
> > That applies to *anything* communicated via a radio
> > transmission. If someone thinks they and the person they are
> > talking to are the only ones listening, they are *wrong*.

> That's something I've been telling others for years.

You are a regular brain surgeon Snottie.

691. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 19:56:01 UTC
From: "Richard L. Tannehill" <w7rtrick@firstinter.net>
Message-ID: <3F32AED1.BDE9DD95@firstinter.net>
Source record: 74102

Actually, the CHP's decided that 800 MHz just wouldn't cut
it in hilly country, and there were no NPSPAC 800 MHz
channels left in the congested cities, so they decided the
best approach was to build a hybrid 150/450/800 MHz system
statewide. Don't know how they intended to get universal
interoperability for their system however. Maybe they
weren't. Anyway, a small $38B budget shortfall has taken
care of that plan for now. Last I heard, the CHP project
was worth about $1B to some lucky company whose name almost
certainly begins with M.

Rick Tannehill

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> On 4 Aug 2003 08:36:31 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >My knee-jerk reaction to this was "where are the heavy-hitters like
> >Motorola" who have a vested interest in lo-band VHF ops?" Silly me,
> >Motorola would love to have the lo-band trashed in order to move
> >*everybody" up the spectrum whether the taxpayers can afford it or
> >not.
>
> The Big Emm stopped making low-band radios and replacement parts
> almost ten years ago, and RCA and GE have been out of that business
> for a lot more. That's why several of my clients have gone to UHF
> and 800 MHz trunked systems. A biggie user in the Low-Band is the
> California Highway Patrol (5000 or so mobiles and lots of base
> stations) who has been mouthing about going to 800 MHz for at least
> twelve years that I am aware of. I'll see it when it happens.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

692. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 20:08:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F32B204.1030900@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74103

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F2C75C9.7030805@adelphia.net...
>
>>K0HB wrote:
>>
>>>"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote
>>>
>>>
>>>>Gosh, those are just a few questions people may encounter, and I am
>>>
> probably
>
>>>>now going to be lambasted for thinking about the majority.
>>>
>>>
>>>No, I think you will be lambasted for not doing your homework and
>>>understanding the issue.
>>>
>>>"BPL" is an unlicensed service which proposes that it be allowed to
>>>inject RF (radio signals) into the AC distribution grid. This RF will
>>>extend across the MF/HF spectrum, and up into the lower VHF spectrum,
>>>and the power lines will act not as a transmission line, but as an
>>>antenna. The interference will potentially affect EVERY RADIO
>>>COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE (not just hams) who use the affected spectrum.
>>
>>That includes Homeland defense, defense, broadcasting, lots of people
>>besides hams.
>>
>
>
> Well then, if it's *that* bad, I'm sure it'll be defeated, eh?

We hope! As in most things of this sort, the problem is that
Non-technical people make the decisions, and technical people have to
explain the problems to them. In addition, some of the competing forces
are happy to throw much money at those who decide. So the Hams start out
at a disadvantage.

- Mike KB3EIA -

Temporarily back from Vacation

693. Re: R U talking?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 20:21:25 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87ptjhxlq2.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74105
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc> wrote:
>> That applies to *anything* communicated via a radio
>> transmission. If someone thinks they and the person they are
>> talking to are the only ones listening, they are *wrong*.
>
>
>That's something I've been telling others for years.

Consider that it means cell phones and just your plain old
telephone in the kitchen too.

I know of one instance where a fellow admitted to having
committed a murder while talking on a cell phone. The local
newspaper had a scanner tuned to it, with a tape recorder
running. It did in fact get printed on the front page, in a
word for word transcript, and he is now in jail.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

694. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 20:33:35 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <zlyYa.1587$Wx6.447749@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 74107

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308070322.30d1a552@posting.google.com...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<Az6Ya.111882$Wd5.25129895@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> > FYI, folks here are QSX when they're monitoring
> > the frequency. I rarely hear the annoying "I'm QRT and on the side"
anymore,
> > thank goodness. :-)
>
> I was involved in trying to use CB for it's original intended purpose
> in the mid-'70s in 23 channel days. Specifically for comms for a
> municipal Townwatch group of 135 citizens 95% of whom had no interest
> at all in hobby radio and just wanted reasonably decent local
> neighborhood mobile comms.

You just can't legislate propagation. Even if all the users complied with
the 155.3 mi. limit, the QRM from legal comms in distant places makes local
work difficult, if not impossible. I've experienced a S7 noise level from
distant comms personally and the guy in Germany came in clearer than someone
across town. When the band's open, 12 Watts will work the world.

> The disgusted group would have fallen apart
> if I hadn't moved the operation up onto a VHF business freq to get
> away from the CB crud. Cost a bundle but they're still on that freq.

Good "heads-up" move.

> Every once in a blue moon when I've had absolutely nothing better to
> do with my life I've gotten on 27Mhz and looked for intelligent life.
> On the rare occasions when I've actually found some it lasts maybe
> five minutes at most before the bozos blow it off the freq.

Sorry to hear that, Brian. Do you operate AM or SSB? I've had good luck on
channels 36 through 40 using SSB.

> YMMV . . !

It sure does.

> w3rv

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

695. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 20:54:45 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0308072051480.1350@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 74108

```
On Thu, 7 Aug 2003, K0HB wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote
> > If my position is wrong, as you seem to think, point out the fault in the
> > logic.
>
> Logic? All I see is a troll.

Then you need your eyes checked....
```

696. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 21:01:47 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0308072052340.1350@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 74109

On Thu, 7 Aug 2003, JJ wrote:
> K0HB wrote:
> > "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote
> >>If my position is wrong, as you seem to think, point out the fault in the
> >>logic.
> >
> > Logic? All I see is a troll.
>
> Stussy doesn't apply logic, he has been spouting the same stuff
> over and over. He just can't seem to except the fact that until
> the FCC drops the code requirement, if it does, that nothing has
> changed as far as U.S. Amateur radio.

1) Try addressing me PROPERLY; i.e. a surname is normally prefixed by Mr.

2) I agree that the FCC hasn't changed anything, but they didn't have to. They made their regulation dependent on a regulation outside of their control, and when that outside regulation was changed, the change to the U.S. rules was AUTOMATIC on account of the dependency. The change that was made propagated down; no explicit change to U.S. law was even needed.

3) You seem to think that I am saying that no-coders have HF privileges. That's the only thing I can conclude about your comment about dropping code. YOU ARE WRONG. I haven't said any such thing. What I said is that coded Technicians and Novices have LOST HF privileges as a result of the international change. Why? Because their right to operate HF was NOT based on holding "element 1 credit" (like that of the other license classes) but on an international requirement that has been eliminated (and replaced with a national option) and with the referred to requirement gone, there is no way under the FCC's regulation that these licensees can show compliance with the non-existent requirement; thus, their HF privileges were CANCELLED.

697. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 21:17:58 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030807171758.28463.00000193@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 74110

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

writes:

> I thought the brainwashing has been quite well done by you-know-who
> membership organization? :-)

NCI? ;-) ;-)

or IEEE? ;-) ;-) ;-)

698. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 21:24:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F32C3E8.7050809@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74111

N2EY wrote:
> In article <qK_Wa.2427$lL.391902@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>
>>What WILL be the end of ham radio is a lack of significant
>>growth ...
>
>
> Let's get it straight - is dropping Element 1 going to give us lots more growth
> or not?

I'm going to interject here, since I'm still on Vacation and can only get in so many posts for a bit.

I don't understand a few of the things Carl says here. That we will dissapear unless we get "significant growth".

What exactly is that? a 100 percent increase in a day? increase at 1 percent over population increase?

I'd like to know the advances they will bring.

I want to hear how those who oppose the ending of the Morse code requirement are keeping ham radio from marching forward.

Time for the roadmap to the future to be laid out.

Or is this like the last scene in "The Candidate"?

I find it amusing that even though the PCTA's have lost the war, that those who brought this to bear cannot avoid smacking us around a little bit yet. It might be fun, but isn't doing anyone a bit of good.

Gloat time is over. Your time has come. You now have the chance to prove that you were right. And browbeating the losers isn't a very good start.

Sorry to hijack the thread, Jim!

- Mike KB3EIA -

699. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 21:55:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308071355.45b8b16e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74113

averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030806195654.27797.00001451@mb-m23.aol.com>...

> Do you know if Len Anderson is a cannibal? Claims have been made that he eats
> others for breakfast.

Who? When?

Dave thinks he's a pugilist.

700. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 21:58:26 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308071358.57bd824f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74114

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<1WgYa.27922$%X6.11364@news02.roc.ny>...
> Bert,
>
> I don't mean to just break in on your argument with Phil, but consider what
> we are going through in Rochester, NY. Taxes are sky high, we lost over
> 800,000 people in New York since the mid 90s (jobs disappearing, wages going
> down, taxes going up).

Many of them are moving across the state lines to NJ or PA, etc.

California has a similar problem. There is an exodus of non-immigrant
Americans from the Golden State for similar reasons. The turnaround
point was about 1995. Only massive immigration keeps CA numbers up.

> Obviously, the local governments are trying to cut
> budgets. Police and firemen are not being replaced as they retire or quit.
> Enforcement is spotty at best. We just had a large block burn down in the
> city due to arson a few months ago. People were doing oil changes in the
> streets (if not stripping cars) and oil was left in the streets. Laws were
> passed, but weren't favored by a lot of folks. Loud booming radios were
> causing problems. Laws were passed, but ignored. Those folks that you
> think believe in the American Way started pushing the envelope. There is
> now a severe drug problem (heck, if I'm not hurting anyone, it isn't any of
> your business). We now have the second highest murder rate in New York
> outside of New York City!

WOW!

Worse than Buffalo or Albany?

> The problem is that there is little enforcement,
> and some folks get emboldened.

Bingo.

It starts out with little things....

> Locally, they have a new tact. There are
> now City of Rochester Police, Monroe County Sheriffs, and New York State
> Troopers patrolling Rochester. Go ahead, spit your gum out. If you're
> seen, you will get a ticket. Any violation, no matter how minor, and you
> will get stopped. You may not be searched, but pray you don't have anything
> visible in your car that you shouldn't (like a little bag with some white
> powder in it). They are starting real enforcement and there will be a lot
> of minor violators that will end up paying some stiff fines.

I understand that this "zero tolerance" approach was done in New York City under Rudy Giuliani. Things like turnstile-jumping, graffiti, even jaywalking were jumped on with both feet by law enforcement AND backed up by the courts. One side effect was that a considerable number of folks for whom there were bench warrants were brought in for minor violations and kept. Another was that major crime dropped.

> I don't see
> any other way around the situation here; I also don't see things getting any
> better in the radio business without some *serious* enforcement. That would
> include the skip-shooting - at least until things quiet down to a dull roar.
> The lack of enforcement (regardless of cause, which is invariably lack of
> funds) is not only allowing things to get worse, it is actively promoting
> things to get worse.

Yup. And it's a gradual thing that shows up in many ways. Similar to when a neighborhood goes downhill. It starts with little things like not taking care of properties and not reining in minor offenses. But it doesn't stop there.
Pretty soon most of the people who can move out are gone.

This is not a minor problem in amateur radio. There's all sorts of talk about young people not wanting to learn the code, yada yada yada, but not much about how the antics of a few can turn off young people and their parents. And if that happens, forget about recruitment.

73 de Jim, N2EY

701. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 22:02:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308071402.3a6b0055@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74115

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bgsk2a$4n7$0@208.207.71.135>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bgne3ekgd1@208.206.142.92>...
> >
> > > Not really. Anyone can learn PSK31 in a half hour of looking over the help file and
> > > playing iwth their keyboard. As you know if you've been listening to all the laments
> > > appearing here from the "excluded", no such possibliley exists for Morse code.
> >
> > 30 minutes, huh?
> >
> > As I recall, you couldn't get it to work.
>
> Here we go again, regaled by the Recollections of the Lame, lazy and incompetent.
>
>
> > Weeks of trying and posting here.
>
> Go googling and get back to us when you find all that. And NOT until.
> That'll keep you busy the rest of your naturl life.
>
> >
> >
> > Under PSK31 testing, you would be excluded from the HF part of the ARS.
>
> You are truly the original numb nuts.

DICK, you go gurgle. Include Cecil in your search and you will find
when and where you failed.

702. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 22:33:36 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308071433.cf44bfc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74116

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<wcOWa.2375$lL.382710@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > > > > > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > > > > > > > . You know as well as anyone, better than most, that almost the
> only
> > > > > > > > "enforcement" we've had on the ARS for many years
> > > > > > > > prior to Riley's appointment WAS the code test.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Now, a 'difficult' (for that type of individual) test which
> discourages,
> > > > > > > > yea, FILTERS him from active, open participation is a poor
> > > > > > > > excuse for monitor vans and well trained and equipped crews.
> > > > > > > > But it's what we had.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Now we have Riley and a 5wpm code test. Soon only Riley. When
> he goes, I
> > > > > > > > for one believe the ARS will follow his exit, not far behind. By
> that time
> > > > > > > > there
> > > > > > > > will be far more than adequate evidence that the ARS is no
> longer a viable
> > > > > > > > self- policing entity, staffed with conscientious people willing
> and able to
> > > > > > > > conduct themselves in a manner commensurate with the priveleges
> granted,
> > > > > > > > most of which will shortly be summarily withdrawn.
>
> Dick,
>
> EVERY time there has been change of any real sort in ham radio, there
> have been cranky olde fartz like you preaching "end of the world" doom
> and gloom ... and every time it has not come to pass ...

There have also been predictions and promises of a "brave new world"
that the new changes would bring. Which also did not come to pass.
>
> Witness:
>
> conversion from spark to CW;
> conversion from AM to SSB;
> introduction of packet radio and other "new-fangled @^#%$ computer
> thingies";

None of these were forced on hams by regulatory change. Hams adopted
them voluntarily. For example, spark wasn't outlawed for hams until

1927, even though it was essentially abandoned by hams by 1923 or 24.

AM is still popular on HF - in fact, more popular than 20-30 years ago. What caused hams to abandon AM in large numbers was the simple fact that an SSB transceiver was less expensive than an AM receiver-transmitter combo of equal effective power. That transition also drastically reduced the amount of homebrewing done by hams.

Packet is still mostly the 1200 baud of the '80s. The biggest new modes of the past decade or so are PSK-31 and APRS. Good stuff!

> the introduction of the no-code Tech license;

Which has not resulted in greatly increased longterm growth nor a techno revolution.

> restructuring 3 years ago;

Which has not resulted in greatly increased longterm growth nor a techno revolution.
>
> and many others I'm sure I've omitted.

Here are some, just for discussion:

- the 1929 rules changes that drastically cut the spectrum available to hams and greatly increased the signal quality requirements.

- the 1951 introduction of the Novice, Tech and Extra licenses

- the "incentive licensing" changes of 1968-69 that drastically increased the requirements for a full privileges license. And ushered in a period of growth and innovation....

> The point is, the world (and ham radio) is NOT going to end ... despite
> your rants that it is.

That depends on what is meant by "ending".
>
> Actually, on the contrary, if these changes hadn't happened and we were
> still stuck in the spark era (i.e., if cranky olde fartz like you had
> stopped
> the progress of ham radio over the years), we WOULD be in danger.

Apples and oranges. Rules changes are not the same thing as choices made by hams. And the AM-SSB wars did not help amateur radio.

> If you want to see what presents the biggest danger to the future of
> ham radio LOOK IN THE MIRROR ... the enemy you fear is yourself,
> with your backward thinking, unwillingness to accept progress, and lack
> of tolerance for newcomers (unless, of course, they've suffered through
> the same fraternity hazing rituals that you had to endure, lo those many
> years ago and think in exactly the backward, narrowminded ways that
> you do).

> When you're done looking in the mirror, you can look a your cronies,
> Larry, Dave Heil, and the whole list of like-thinkers... they are also
> part of the enemy you fear ... for they think and act essentially the
> same way as you do.
>
> THERE is where the REAL danger to the future of ham radio lies ...
> in people who are so married to/stuck in its past that they despise
> any thought of change, progress, and the newcomers that it will
> bring (unless the newcomers are acceptable "clones" cast in your
> own image).

Well, there you have it.
>
> However, those newcomers are the future of ham radio ... for us older
> guys will surely die, and if there aren't younger folks to replace us ham
> radio will die with us.

I am younger than you, Carl. In fact I'm younger than many who post
here. Yet I'm more of an oldtimer, too.

There are newcomers of all ages today. I have already seen many hams
come and go, either as SKs or dropouts. There are many who are hams
only in that they are still in the FCC database. A good number of them
are much newer than me.

> It's up to us to WELCOME and ENCOURAGE
> them ... their ways will not be the ways of the past ... things change and
> nobody can freeze time.

Yet at the same time it is folly to equate "change" with "progress".
Not all of the changes in the ARS have been for the best.

I can remember a time when you simply could not find anything of
offensive content on the ham bands - they were G rated, regardless of
mode. This wasn't just because of the mores of the times or
enforcement by FCC - it was "the way hams did things" - a tradition of
high standards - passed on from oldtimers to newcomers.

I can also remember a time when most hams were unafraid to build,
repair, modify or simply fool with their equipment. Today it is the
homebrewer who is unusual.

The most important values of the ARS do not need to change. Things
like adherence to the regulations and standards, courtesy on the air
and off, technical know-how, operating skill, welcome and help for the
newcomer, respect for the oldtimer, making a place and a space for all
who follow the rules.....these things must be preserved, or ham radio
is dead.

> But insulting, berating, demeaning them, and trying
> to keep them out is not the way ..

If they see hams insulting, berating and demeaning each other, what
are they to think?

>
> Think about these things long and hard before you look yourself in
> the mirror again ... without some reflection, reconsideration, and change
> in your ways, you may not like what you see ... the enemy that is YOU.

Am I "the enemy"?
>
> (Try to be *completely* like Scrooge ... go through the change, don't stay
> stuck in the first part ...)

Words for all of us to live by....

73 de Jim, N2EY

703. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 23:16:27 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308071516.7d1b7685@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74117

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030806202054.18497.00001833@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0308061413.42fde40f@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:

>
> >> Is there a CW equivalent of the W6NUT repeater, 14,313 or 3950?
> >
> >We're not quite above such things.
>
> Yes, we are.

Maybe your "we" but I've run into some other "we's" on CW who are not
as lily-white. The infamous antics in the CW pileups on Don Miller
come to mind for one.

> >You oughta been there the nite in
> >the early '70s when the Big Guns got together and decided to hammer
> >Radio Moscow off a freq around 7.030. You bet it worked, Moscow moved
> >up the band and didn't come back.
>
> That was hams uniting to repel an illegal intruder. 7.000 to 7.100 has been
> worldwide exclusive amateur since at least 1929.
>
> Was there any enforcement action from FCC?

I dunno. If the feds did happen to be listening they probably enjoyed
it.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

704. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 23:25:18 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030807192518.08458.00001508@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 74118

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)

>I have seen old
>> info stay on several websites. The same thing could have happened on their
>> webpage.
>
> In otherwords: "I can't provide a reasonable alternative".

I am sure I'm right about the club members hating homebrewing.

This could be verified by asking people in the photo if they want to do a homebrewing project. Many of the people in the photo are still in the club.

However, I've let my club membership expire. And, tracking down people in the photo would get very time consuming. Alot of work just to prove a point. Also, I have other things that I need to do.

>> Also, if I invite them on a Hamfest that continues to
>> Fri, Sat night, then I'll bet they will wonder why the Hams are operating
>> rather than doing what most people do.
>
> "..what most people do"...?!?!
>
> It's ABOUT Amatuer Radio, Vipul...The event is organized FOR
>Amateur Radio operators by Amateurs and OPERATING radios.

Other than Field day, an event does not HAVE do be scheduled during Fri, Sat night. Most people would do more recreational activities during that time.

Its only because Hams are the type of people that would be at a Hamfest or operate Sat night. My former co-worker, the Ham that introduced me to a Hamfest, was fairly anti-social too. Also, he made weekly coffee trips to Starbucks (alot of calories). He is now out of the country. He is American, and he married some Asian girl he met online and he quit his job and moved over there.

>What does it matter, Vipul? The event was not organized for "the
>non-ham observer".

Sometimes they do try to sign up new members there. The anti-social aspect would put off the person considering the hobby. That's a reason people turn away.

>> Most (non-Ham) Americans would expect the Hams would take a break from
>> operating on Sat night. They would be surprised and disappointed otherwise.
>
> Why? Why should "they" expect Amateurs to stop doing the very

>thing the special even was organized to do...?!?!

The event more than fulfilled what it was organized to do when they operated all day with few breaks. It was not necessary to go all night as well. They could have taken at least a few hours break to do some vacation activities.

That's what most (non-Ham) people would do. Even another hobby group would take a break from that hobby on Sat night and enjoy some of the vacation activities at a vacation location. Its only Hams that would continue operating Sat night. They saw other Hams on ATV, but not other people in person. I don't expect that you would understand that most people would be disappointed with that.

705. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-07 23:37:54 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <mpBYa.34$dj3.4702@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74119

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308072052340.1350@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
>
> 3) You seem to think that I am saying that no-coders have HF privileges.
> That's the only thing I can conclude about your comment about dropping
code.
> YOU ARE WRONG. I haven't said any such thing.

Accepted ...

I will probably regret responding to this, but I have to try *one* more time
...

> What I said is that coded
> Technicians and Novices have LOST HF privileges as a result of the
> international change. Why? Because their right to operate HF was NOT
based on
> holding "element 1 credit" (like that of the other license classes) but on
an
> international requirement that has been eliminated (and replaced with a
> national option) and with the referred to requirement gone, there is no
way
> under the FCC's regulation that these licensees can show compliance with
the
> non-existent requirement; thus, their HF privileges were CANCELLED.

Mr. Stussy,

Please read VERY SLOWLY:

The international requirement has not been eliminated, it has been changed.

It now says "Administrations SHALL determine ..."

In ITU-ese, "shall" is mandatory.

Therefore, the FCC is OBLIGATED to determine whether or not any
class of amateur license requires a Morse test.

Since the FCC had ALREADY determined that a 5 wpm Morse
test was required for HF access, it has already met that obligation.

Thus the existing FCC rules are "legal," nothing has changed,
and NOBODY has lost ANY privileges.

The fact that the FCC is free to make a NEW determination and
eliminate the Morse requirement from its own rules makes NO

difference.

I respectfully hope you get it this time ...

Carl - wk3c

706. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 00:00:02 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308071600.3ed263ac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74120

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<8wvYa.126881$Wd5.29863613@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030806202054.18497.00001833@mb-m05.aol.com...
> > In article <d22b54c3.0308061413.42fde40f@posting.google.com>,
> kelly@dvol.com
> > (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >
> > >> The point is that hams actually using CW/Morse for communications
> > >> don't gather anywhere near as many enforcement actions as hams using
> > >> 'phone modes for communications. The difference is far more than can
> > >> be accounted for by the greater popularity of 'phone modes.
> > >>
> > >> Is there a CW equivalent of the W6NUT repeater, 14,313 or 3950?
> > >
> > >We're not quite above such things.
> >
> > Yes, we are.
>
> Agreed.

Agreed about what?? That CW ops are "infractionless" wrt to knowingly
interfering with each other?

> > >You oughta been there the nite in
> > >the early '70s when the Big Guns got together and decided to hammer
> > >Radio Moscow off a freq around 7.030. You bet it worked, Moscow moved
> > >up the band and didn't come back.
> >
> > That was hams uniting to repel an illegal intruder. 7.000 to 7.100 has
> been
> > worldwide exclusive amateur since at least 1929.
>
> Was that action legal, Jim? I certainly believe that it was the correct
> action, given the circumstances. I'd always believed that deliberate
> interference was illegal no matter what and that that intruders were to be
> handled by the FCC.

Radio Moscow wasn't/isn't particularly concerned about what the FCC
does or doesn't do or think. There's a procedure for handling foreign
intruders via diplomatic channels. So a bunch of guys with beams at
150 feet and kilowatts to spare saved the FCC and State from that
drudgery and got the job done in 15 minutes.

> > Was there any enforcement action from FCC?
>
> I'm curious about that too, was there?

The only place I saw anything about it in print was in a subsequent weekly spots bulletin where a few attaboys got passed around. Not a peep about it in QST.

> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

707. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 00:12:53 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308071612.7ab3d4a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74121

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bgsk2e$4n7$1@208.207.71.135>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > You oughta been there the nite in
> > the early '70s when the Big Guns got together and decided to hammer
> > Radio Moscow off a freq around 7.030. You bet it worked, Moscow moved
> > up the band and didn't come back.
>
> Nuther favorite trick was to zero beat 'em and work exactly on his frequency. That works fine.

Sure does. I heard more than one mongo RTTY station jump 'em too. I
always felt a bit sorry for the SWLs who got caught in the middle of
that nonsense but oh well.

w3rv

708. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 00:50:40 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87y8y5vuov.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74122

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>> Brian wrote:
>> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>> >
>> > > Not really. Anyone can learn PSK31 in a half hour of looking over the help file and

...

>> > Weeks of trying and posting here.
>>
>> Go googling and get back to us when you find all that. And NOT until.
>> That'll keep you busy the rest of your naturl life.
>>
>> >
>> >
>> > Under PSK31 testing, you would be excluded from the HF part of the ARS.
>>
>> You are truly the original numb nuts.
>
>DICK, you go gurgle. Include Cecil in your search and you will find
>when and where you failed.

Well, this just sounded too good not to go have a look. What a
hoot. There's was the DICK, saying that something doesn't fit
Shannon's theorum, then claiming oh, actually it is just Cecil's
way of describing it...

Lord, I was falling out of my chair laughing while I read through
that.

Extra DICK doesn't understand Shannon's work, can't relate PSK31 to
CW as far as a bandwidth limited channel is concerned, and was soundly
thrashed by others for his stubborn refusal to learn.

Of course, Extra DICK is still here telling us that he is a measure
of what makes for a good ham operator, and that anyone who's any
dumber than him shouldn't be allowed on the bands.

Hmmm... maybe when we look at it from that perspective, he may have
a point, eh?

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

709. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 01:22:06 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <2XCYa.42$dj3.7021@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74123

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0308071433.cf44bfc@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<wcOWa.2375$lL.382710@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > Dick,
> >
> > EVERY time there has been change of any real sort in ham radio, there
> > have been cranky olde fartz like you preaching "end of the world" doom
> > and gloom ... and every time it has not come to pass ...
>
> There have also been predictions and promises of a "brave new world"
> that the new changes would bring. Which also did not come to pass.

I would submit that the change from spark to CW was a big, progressive
change.

Likewise the change from AM to SSB.

From plain RTTY to things like AMTOR, PACTOR, PSK31, etc.

Did these changes come about overnight? No. Did OTs bitch
and whine? Yes.

> > Witness:
> >
> > conversion from spark to CW;
> > conversion from AM to SSB;
> > introduction of packet radio and other "new-fangled @^#%$ computer
> > thingies";
>
> None of these were forced on hams by regulatory change. Hams adopted
> them voluntarily. For example, spark wasn't outlawed for hams until
> 1927, even though it was essentially abandoned by hams by 1923 or 24.

Nobody is proposing a regulatory change that will prohibit or in any way
restrict the USE of Morse ... all that's being asked for is to eliminate the
test requirement that even the FCC and the IARU admit are not in the
best interest of the future of ham radio.

Nobody is being forced to do anything ... in fact, the proposed/anticipated
change will STOP forcing folks to do something that many don't want to
do ...

So, the "None of these were forced on hams by regulatory change." argument
doesn't hold water Jim.

> AM is still popular on HF - in fact, more popular than 20-30 years
> ago. What caused hams to abandon AM in large numbers was the simple
> fact that an SSB transceiver was less expensive than an AM
> receiver-transmitter combo of equal effective power. That transition
> also drastically reduced the amount of homebrewing done by hams.

What drastically reduced the amount of homebrewing done by hams
is a combination of the following:

1) technology got more "complicated" for the uninitiated
2) parts got harder to buy at reasonable prices in small
quantities
3) the performance and quality of "store-bought" gear
improved and at the same time the cost in (adjusted) $
dropped dramatically.

Heck, you can buy a decent 2m transciever for $150 today
... something with performance, quality, reliability, and ergonomics
that the average ham couldn't duplicate for 3x that price when
buying parts in small quantities.

Does that mean I think homebrewing should roll over and die?
CERTAINLY NOT ...

> > the introduction of the no-code Tech license;
>
> Which has not resulted in greatly increased longterm growth nor a
> techno revolution.

If it weren't for the thousands of hams who have entered via the
no-code tech license, the ham population would be something
like 1/2 what it was in 1990 ...

When you start out with an old, greying demographic (and I'm
no "spring chicken"), if there are no newcomers, the population
can only drop dramatically.
[snipped here for lack of time and tiredness ... it's been a LONG day]

Carl - wk3c

710. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 01:26:10 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <S_CYa.43$dj3.7158@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74124

"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
news:87y8y5vuov.fld@barrow.com...
>
> Extra DICK doesn't understand Shannon's work, can't relate PSK31 to
> CW as far as a bandwidth limited channel is concerned, and was soundly
> thrashed by others for his stubborn refusal to learn.

Yea ... I was in that argument with Dick too ... he kept insisting that
Shannon had NOTHING to do with ham radio (like some of the
most fundamental principles of communications theory are ... to
Dick, at least ... "irrelevant" to hams). I think I challenged him to
break Shannon's law ... :-)

> Of course, Extra DICK is still here telling us that he is a measure
> of what makes for a good ham operator, and that anyone who's any
> dumber than him shouldn't be allowed on the bands.
>
> Hmmm... maybe when we look at it from that perspective, he may have
> a point, eh?

Yes, I would say that the threshold should be more like "Anyone who's
even close to as dumb as Dick shouldn't be a ham, let alone an Extra."

Carl - wk3c

711. Re: For Dwight

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 01:49:03 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030807214903.12631.00000110@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 74125

In article <bgsghp$2ts@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> >So, apparently someone can't handle the heat...
>> >
>> >--
>> >Kim W5TIT
>>
>> What "heat" would that be, Kim? Your posts are about as "hot" as
>> frozen road kill on the AlCan Highway.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>You're such a charity case...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Ah ha. More "heat" as it were!

73 de Larry, K3LT

712. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 01:49:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030807214905.12631.00000111@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 74127

In article <87n0em14ol.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
writes:

>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>>>Could it be because he knows a lot about radio?
>>
>>Alun:
>>
>>Well, I'm sure Carl expects that his professional RF engineering
>qualifications
>>should grant him exalted status in the ARS, but in truth, it just ain't so!
>
>If you ever learn enough about Amateur Radio to catch on, you'll
>eat those words. Carl, if for no other reason than his
>professional qualifications, though in his case he still would
>fit the bill if he were instead a store clerk, is in fact a
>person who does reach the status of "exalted".

Floyd:

Perhaps the difference here is that Carl is seeking "exalted" status,
and I'm not. I have never, in seriousness, described myself as anything
other than an "average" radio amateur.

SNIP

>So the *only* way, in your demented opinion, to be a great Radio
>Amateur, is to retain "Morse/CW" skills... No none code
>licensee could ever be a good ham.

I have stated many times that it *is* possible for a "no-code" licensee
to be a good ham. However, the will be lacking the useful
communications skill of Morse/CW proficiency, and I do require then
to at least acknowledge this as a meaningful difference between
themselves and hams who do possess this skill.

>No hobbiest who forgets Morse code 10 or 20 years after passing
>the test could then be a better ham than you.
>
>Why? Well, it seems to be that you still know Morse, so they
>should too!

No, I have stated that they are missing (or not using) a valuable
communications skill -- a skill which confers practical communications
capability under conditions which render other modes unusable. This
is a proven, verifiable truth -- but only CW users know it to be so.

>And they *must* explore and adopt new modes!

The Radio Amateur's Code states: "A radio amateur is PROGRESSIVE…
with knowledge abreast of science, a well-built and efficient station and
operation above reproach." -- Paul M. Segal, W9EEA, 1928.

>So they can't
>stick with AM, or SSB, or Slow Scan, or RTTY, or NBFM, or AMSAT,
>or whatever (even though they *must* continue with CW), but
>instead have to jump to whatever is the latest and the greatest.

What part of the above excerpt from the Radio Amateur's Code
suggests that "sticking with one mode" is "progressive?" I don't see it
that way, and I'm sure that W9EEA wouldn't have, either.

>(BTW, what *is* the latest and greatest that everyone should be
>doing? I'm collecting old brass triumph style straight keys and
>toying with 30 year old tube radios, does that count???)

Pursuing the collection and use of old equipment is certainly a
popular pastime among radio amateurs, but if it is done to the
exclusion of advancing your communications capabilities to include
more modern, digital modes, then you are only serving to foster the
impression the public has that radio amateurs are, in fact, outdated
and NON-progressive. Is this an image you want people outside the
ARS to have of us, particularly in light of present and future
challenges to our spectrum allocations?

>> Their stations are truly up-to-date,
>
>I can't even begin to define what "truly up-to-date" is. I know
>some really great hams that just dearly love to use only old
>tube type equipment.

And their "love" is both self-serving and likely to be detrimental
to the future of the ARS.

>I had an email conversation with an old
>Internet friend the other day, who just dearly loves to use and
>work with old AM transmitters!

Too bad you didn't have that QSO on PSK-31, instead!

>He can't, in your world, be a good Ham.

Probably not.

>I'm going to have to
>tell him that after 50 years, he's not an OT, he's a waste in
>the Book Of Larry "Measuring Stick for All Amateur Operators"
>Roll.

And he has nobody to blame but himself. I consider myself to be a
qualified judge of what makes a good radio amateur. If your OT
friend doesn't measure up, perhaps he should consider taking steps

to rectify the situation!

>>they have usually attained high places on the DXCC standings, routinely
>
>Really? Even the ones who've never worked HF in their lives?
>I'd bet that the majority of really great Hams since 1950 or so
>have never even gotten a DXCC certificate, much less ever been
>high up on the DXCC Honor Roll.

Well, I'll accept that, as long as they've made strides in VHF/UHF
modes such as EME, satellite operation, packet radio, APRS, etc.

>Maybe Larry "Measuring Stick Himself" Roll like to DX?

Yes, I like to work DX.

>>hold leadership positions within their clubs, and can be counted on to
>provide
>>valuable input and personal support for all club activities.
>
>Now, that I agree is most likely true.

Thank you very much!

>>They are the ones
>>who newcomers look to for the answers, while the so-called "professional"
>>hams simply cluster amongst themselves and look down their noses at the
>>proceedings of the rest of the club.
>
>No Larry. It is those professionals who usually *are* the ones
>people look to for answers and leadership.

Sure, in some cases, they are. Not in my personal experience, however.

>>But yes, indeed, Carl does know a lot about radio!
>
>And you don't.

No, I don't. I'll NEVER know enough about radio. But I'm willing to
learn!

>That's one reason why he's a such a good role
>model, a recognized leader, and a good Radio Amateur.

Correct. That's what makes a good radio amateur. A willingness to
learn.

>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>And Larry is a twit.

Ah, name calling. That's what is usually brought out when the ability
to make a convincing argument dries up! Unfortunately for you, Floyd,
it also means that you lose this round!

73 de Larry, K3LT

713. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 01:49:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030807214907.12631.00000112@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 74126

In article <T8vYa.133$jI2.2204@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>
>Larry,
>
>I don't expect "exalted status" ... just some respect as one who is arguably
>more knowledgable and competent in RF technology than the average ham.

Carl:

You have been shown that respect quite consistently, particularly by me.
However, the fact that you seem to be ignoring that fact is getting to be
more than a little bit off-putting.

>However, as has been pointed out, you insist that your superior CW skill
>is ALL that counts and that since I'm not up to your standards in that area
>I'm a "lesser ham."

It's a simple fact that you don't have operating experience and proficiency
in Morse/CW, which I consider to be one of the most useful communications
skills in the radio amateur's arsenal. I have always acknowledged your
superior, professional-grade technical skills, and those of all other hams of
all license classes who possess them. However, I must reiterate, this is the
AMATEUR Radio Service. The ARS has a long-standing tradition of
requiring proficiency in the use of the Morse code, for the purpose of
permitting radio amateurs to exploit the many benefits and advantages of
that particular mode. I have consistently stated that I feel that this skill
is
important enough to radio AMATEURS that it simply cannot be replaced,
even with technical skills which exceed licensing requirements.

This is my opinion, Carl -- not a demonstration of any lack of due respect.
I would expect a person of your intelligence to recognize and acknowledge
the difference. Moreover, I have never held myself out as anything more
than an "average" ham, with the notable exception of occasional hyperbole
used in this newsgroup (and nowhere else) to push the buttons of particularly
intransigent fellow participants, including your own good self. I expect
you to recognize and acknowledge that difference as well. I'm perfectly
willing to live with the fact that we don't see eye-to-eye re: code testing.
Are you?

73 de Larry, K3LT

714. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 01:52:33 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bguvp1$a3r$0@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 74128

Brian wrote:

>averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030806195654.27797.00001451@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>
>
>
>>Do you know if Len Anderson is a cannibal? Claims have been made that he eats
>>others for breakfast.
>>
>>
>
>Who? When?
>
>Dave thinks he's a pugilist.
>

Typo. Pigilist.

715. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 02:28:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030807222823.21428.00001559@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 74130

In article <2XCYa.42$dj3.7021@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0308071433.cf44bfc@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<wcOWa.2375$lL.382710@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> > Dick,
>> >
>> > EVERY time there has been change of any real sort in ham radio, there
>> > have been cranky olde fartz like you preaching "end of the world" doom
>> > and gloom ... and every time it has not come to pass ...
>>
>> There have also been predictions and promises of a "brave new world"
>> that the new changes would bring. Which also did not come to pass.
>
>I would submit that the change from spark to CW was a big, progressive
>change.

Sure. Hams did it voluntarily.

>Likewise the change from AM to SSB.

To a certain extent. But the change had its downside, too. Ham radio used to
get a lot of free publicity and recruitment in the form of SWLs hearing hams on
AM. That pretty much ended with the switch to SSB. The number of new hams
slowed down (in part) because of that change.
>
>From plain RTTY to things like AMTOR, PACTOR, PSK31, etc.
>
Plain RTTY is still very much in use, thank you. AMTOR is pretty much dead, I
am told. Of course what really drove all that was PC/soundcard setups becoming
affordable.

>Did these changes come about overnight? No.

Actually, the change from spark to CW took only a few years.

When hams got back on the air in 1919, the dream station was a 200 meter spark
kilowatt with rotary gap, kickback preventer, etc. Good for 1000 miles when
everything worked. Within 5 years such a station was an antique, replaced by a
CW set on the shortwaves (80, 40, even 20 meters) using a tube of much lower
power but much greater performance. Two things convinced hams of that era to
change: the 1921 Transatlantic Tests, where the superiority of CW vs Spark was
demonstrated in the number of stations heard by Godley in Scotland, and the
first shortwave transatlantic QSO in 1923 (1XAM and 1MO to French 8AB on 110

meters).

It wasn't lectures or laws that got hams to change, it was demonstrations by other hams.

>Did OTs bitch and whine? Yes.

Where you there? I think not. ;-)
>
>> > Witness:
>> >
>> > conversion from spark to CW;
>> > conversion from AM to SSB;
>> > introduction of packet radio and other "new-fangled @^#%$ computer
>> > thingies";
>>
>> None of these were forced on hams by regulatory change. Hams adopted
>> them voluntarily. For example, spark wasn't outlawed for hams until
>> 1927, even though it was essentially abandoned by hams by 1923 or 24.
>
>Nobody is proposing a regulatory change that will prohibit or in any way
>restrict the USE of Morse ...

OH YES THEY ARE!!!!

Check this out from ARRL's coverage of the VEC gathering:

"Maia's proposal suggested upgrading all current Tech and Tech Plus licensees to General and allowing their use of all bands. Beginner licensees should be granted call signs from the NA-NZ#xxx call sign block, he said. Both Maia and Neustadter suggest ways to streamline the number of license classes. Maia offered up the possibility of asking the FCC to eliminate the Morse testing requirement immediately, easing code exam format restrictions"

here it comes:

"and giving serious thought to dropping CW-only subbands as well."

The only CW-only subbands are on 6 and 2 meters. I don't think those are the subbands Freddy wants to drop. I think he means "CW/data subbands" - on HF.

>all that's being asked for is to eliminate the
>test requirement that even the FCC and the IARU admit are not in the
>best interest of the future of ham radio.

That's what YOU propose. W5YI & Co. are already on the next page.
>
>Nobody is being forced to do anything ... in fact, the proposed/anticipated
>change will STOP forcing folks to do something that many don't want to
>do ...
>
>So, the "None of these were forced on hams by regulatory change." argument
>doesn't hold water Jim.

Sure it does. The point being that none of the historic changes you cite involved rules changes.
>
>> AM is still popular on HF - in fact, more popular than 20-30 years
>> ago. What caused hams to abandon AM in large numbers was the simple
>> fact that an SSB transceiver was less expensive than an AM
>> receiver-transmitter combo of equal effective power. That transition
>> also drastically reduced the amount of homebrewing done by hams.
>
>What drastically reduced the amount of homebrewing done by hams
>is a combination of the following:
>
>1) technology got more "complicated" for the uninitiated

And for the initiated. Yet we hams are supposed to keep up with technology, are we not? A lot of the reasons given for dropping the code test by NCVEC are about "technically qualified persons" and "advanced technology" and all that. Yet what does it matter how "technically qualified" someone is if all they do as a ham is use manufactured equipment in well established ways like HF SSB? What is the essential difference between a Ph.D in EE ham using a Yaesu and a bus driver using an Icom?

>2) parts got harder to buy at reasonable prices in small
>quantities

Not really. Compare the cost of parts in old catalogs compared to new ones - then adjust for inflation. $100 for a ham rig in 1958 doesn't sound like much until you realize that back then $5200/year was a good middle class annual salary. At that level, $100 was a week's gross pay.

Of course if one is used to seeing the prices paid by manufacturers for quantities in the thousands and up range, the single-unit prices are outrageous. Always been that way. Which is howcum Heath could undercut homebrew on things like power transformers 40+ years ago.

>3) the performance and quality of "store-bought" gear
>improved and at the same time the cost in (adjusted) $
>dropped dramatically.

That I can agree with - sort of. The best-performing HF transceiver for under $2000 today, however, is a kit.
>
>Heck, you can buy a decent 2m transciever for $150 today
>... something with performance, quality, reliability, and ergonomics
>that the average ham couldn't duplicate for 3x that price when
>buying parts in small quantities.

And it's a throwaway.

>Does that mean I think homebrewing should roll over and die?
>CERTAINLY NOT ...

But how will homebrewing survive? How many amateur radio HF or VHF transceivers have you designed and built, Carl? If it's not worth your time and effort, how

can the rest of us be expected to do it?
>
>> > the introduction of the no-code Tech license;
>>
>> Which has not resulted in greatly increased longterm growth nor a
>> techno revolution.
>
>If it weren't for the thousands of hams who have entered via the
>no-code tech license, the ham population would be something
>like 1/2 what it was in 1990 ...

That presumes none of them would have gotten licensed if the rules hadn't changed. That's not reasonable. You're saying that we'd be down to ~257,000 hams by now if not for the changes to the Tech.

For a historical context, here are some numbers on the growth of US amateur radio in the past 30 years or so. All numbers are rounded off but are accurate to within 2%. Sources are various Callbooks:

US Hams:

1970: 270,000
1980: 350,000
1990: 514,000
2000: 680,000

Growth Rate:

1970 to 1980: 29.6% (120,000 net growth)
1980 to 1990: 46.8% (164,000 net growth)
1990 to 2000: 32.2% (166,000 net growth)

Oddly enough, percentage growth slowed down after the introduction of code test waivers and the Tech lost its code test. The total net growth in the '90s was almost exactly the same as in the '80s, even though the US population was larger.

Do you have numbers to disprove the above?

Since the restructuring of 2000, we're up about 12,000 hams. In three years and three months.

And no techno revolution, either. Who gave us PSK-31 and APRS?
>
>When you start out with an old, greying demographic (and I'm
>no "spring chicken"), if there are no newcomers, the population
>can only drop dramatically.

Sure. But you assume there will be no newcomers solely because of the code test. The facts say differently.

73 de Jim, N2EY

716. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 02:28:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030807222824.21428.00001560@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 74129

In article <d22b54c3.0308071516.7d1b7685@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030806202054.18497.00001833@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0308061413.42fde40f@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> >> Is there a CW equivalent of the W6NUT repeater, 14,313 or 3950?

>> >We're not quite above such things.

>> Yes, we are.

>Maybe your "we" but I've run into some other "we's" on CW who are not
>as lily-white. The infamous antics in the CW pileups on Don Miller
>come to mind for one.

That was 35+ years ago. If you have to go back that far to find a one bad guy
on CW, that's pretty good, I think.
>
> >You oughta been there the nite in
>> >the early '70s when the Big Guns got together and decided to hammer
>> >Radio Moscow off a freq around 7.030. You bet it worked, Moscow moved
>> >up the band and didn't come back.
>>
>> That was hams uniting to repel an illegal intruder. 7.000 to 7.100 has been
>> worldwide exclusive amateur since at least 1929.
>>
>> Was there any enforcement action from FCC?
>
>I dunno. If the feds did happen to be listening they probably enjoyed
>it.

'zactly. Riley has said you that an authorized station is not protected from
interference of any kind. Radio Moscow had plenty of SWBC bandspace to play in.

>
73 de Jim, N2EY

717. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 02:37:46 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308071837.5fc98a61@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74131
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3F3165D0.7070900@ix.netcom.com>...
> Herb wrote:
>
> > Your confusing that with a FAA project. Check your
> >"sources" more closely. And how can you build anything on
> >land that the FCC no longer has? The FAA has constructed
> >remote air control facilities on some of the old FCC monitoring
> >station sites, and this is how you are getting so confused.
> >FAA is NOT FCC, now you get it?
> >
> >
> >
> If true, it doesn't mean that the FAA doesn't let the FCC borrow their
> equipment
> from time to time.

It's been explained elsewhere in detail. The FCC usta need serious
real estate for their old monster rhombic antenna farms. They also
needed office & lab spaces for the operators and administrative staffs
at their monitoring stations. Technology has marched on. The rhombics
have been replaced by much newer and far more compact types of
high-performance antennas which has in turn has freed up most of the
former FCC real estate for other gummint users like the FAA.

The current realities are (1) There are no more FCC monitoring station
onsite staffs and labs in most cases, those have been replaced by
high-speed digital gummint networks. (2)It appears that, based on
highly knowledgeable other's inputs on the topic, that the FCC
monitoring equipment space requirements have been boiled down to
something akin to a rack of radios and computers in a gummint spec
Sears back yard tool shed and maybe a tower or two. How many acres
does THAT take??

The fact that the FAA now shares some chunks of real estate with the
FAA means squat, has nothing to do with nothing.

What the hell, for all we actually know the Social Security
Administration has moved one of their field offices into the former
FCC monitoring station buildings and the EPA has planted an unmanned
networked air sampling monitoring station on the roofs. That would be
typical of the way the feds have managed their real estate holdings
going back to post-colonial days.

w3rv

718. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 03:18:15 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87znikvnuw.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74133

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> writes:
>
>Floyd:
>
>Perhaps the difference here is that Carl is seeking "exalted" status,

Wrong. I've yet to see any indication that he seeks any such
status. He doesn't really need to because he's had it for
apparently a significant number of years, and seems a bit modest
about it to boot.

>and I'm not. I have never, in seriousness, described myself as anything
>other than an "average" radio amateur.

Yeah sure. Don't you even read the crap you post Larry. That
article was filled with it, an this article was filled with it.

Anyone who hasn't done what Larry Role has done, is a nobody who
is an inferior Ham, is less than qualified, and probably should
not even be allowed to operate a station.

Who do you think you're kidding. You've been parading yourself
as the yard stick with which to measure what public service is,
what a good cw operator is, how difficult cw is to learn, what
cw speed an Extra Class should attain, how people can and should
learn cw, (repeat all of the previous, but swap radio theory with
cw), (repeat all of the previous, but swap diversity with radio
theory), and probably two or three things I missed.

Chuck it Larry, you don't come close to Carl, and you are never
going to be Mr. Average Ham, or "The Stick We Measure By" no
matter how often you crow.

>>So the *only* way, in your demented opinion, to be a great Radio
>>Amateur, is to retain "Morse/CW" skills... No none code
>>licensee could ever be a good ham.
>
>I have stated many times that it *is* possible for a "no-code" licensee
>to be a good ham. However, the will be lacking the useful
>communications skill of Morse/CW proficiency,

You've misspelt "useless", again.

Look, I *love* CW. But I'm not stupid enough to think it is
ever going to be useful for anything other than my personal
satisfaction.

I mean, whoop dee doooooo. Larry Roll and Floyd Davidson can
both listen to a repeater ID itself and know what the callsign
is! We can also tell what kind of gibberish they use in a movie
when they send code.

Boy, that is one really great "communications skill", ain't it!
We can also exchange information in the slowest possible way at
a time when actual communications is needed if we were dumb
enough. Instead, you and others practice for the day when you
in fact *don't* do that, and instead use a decent communications
media because if you don't someone will suffer. (I was once upon
a time *very* much involved in the communications aspects of
Emergency Medical Services delivery, and have somehow *never*
heard of any potential use for cw. If you need an explanation
of why that is, I'd be happy to enlighten you.)

> and I do require then
>to at least acknowledge this as a meaningful difference between
>themselves and hams who do possess this skill.

So you admit using your own miniscule stature as the measuring
stick.

(Two minutes of empty space is provided here, while our readers
control their laughing and regain their composure after rolling
on the floor.)

(Note that the space was compressed using a modified Lempel-Ziv
coding, which Larry may or may not be familiar with. But that's
how we got 2 minutes squeezed into only 5 empty lines. :-)

>>No hobbiest who forgets Morse code 10 or 20 years after passing
>>the test could then be a better ham than you.
>>
>>Why? Well, it seems to be that you still know Morse, so they
>>should too!
>
>No, I have stated that they are missing (or not using) a valuable
>communications skill -- a skill which confers practical communications
>capability under conditions which render other modes unusable. This
>is a proven, verifiable truth -- but only CW users know it to be so.

Damned man... I've been able to use cw for 40 some years. And
I've spent all of that engaged in the business of
communications. But not one time in 40 years did I *ever* need
that skill you claim is valuable.

And I know a few hundreds of others in the business, some of
whom could use code, some of whom could not, but none of us
ever did.

You don't suppose you could just plain be wrong do you????

>>And they *must* explore and adopt new modes!
>
>The Radio Amateur's Code states: "A radio amateur is PROGRESSIVE…
>with knowledge abreast of science, a well-built and efficient station and
>operation above reproach." -- Paul M. Segal, W9EEA, 1928.

Well goodness, ain't that great. A ham should know about tubes as
well as spark gaps! Impressive.

What do you know about Vertubi encoders, or Reed-Soloman coding?
Can you explain what "cross-pol" interference means? Or would
you have any idea why mu-law PCM coding results in a signal to
noise ratio of 37 dB because of quantization distortion?

Or are you like Extra DICK and can't understand why 20 wpm cw
working fine on a receiver with a 200 Hz bandpass filter when
a PKS31 signal doesn't work is *not* proof that cw can get through
when PKS31 cannot?

Somehow, "progressive", or "up to date", or whatever it is you'd
like to call it, is *not* an objective measure. Whatever *you*
want to use as the stick for others is going to be nothing more
than an expression of the bias that Larry Roll brings to the
table.

The fact is, Carl can probably run circles around you in many many
areas, but I don't hear him claiming that *his* expertise should be
the measure of whether you or anyone else should have a ham ticket.
I only hear you and DICK and a few others doing that.

>>So they can't
>>stick with AM, or SSB, or Slow Scan, or RTTY, or NBFM, or AMSAT,
>>or whatever (even though they *must* continue with CW), but
>>instead have to jump to whatever is the latest and the greatest.
>
>What part of the above excerpt from the Radio Amateur's Code
>suggests that "sticking with one mode" is "progressive?" I don't see it
>that way, and I'm sure that W9EEA wouldn't have, either.

I don't think you speak for W9EEA. Or anyone else for that
matter. I can't see anything at all wrong with someone sticking
with one mode for their entire lifetime. And in some cases,
that may be *extremely* progressive... if, for example, they
tend to move that particular mode itself forward.

Once again, you are just trying to use Larry "I'm the One and Only
True Measuring Stick" Roll in a roll where he won't bounce.

>>(BTW, what *is* the latest and greatest that everyone should be
>>doing? I'm collecting old brass triumph style straight keys and
>>toying with 30 year old tube radios, does that count???)
>
>Pursuing the collection and use of old equipment is certainly a
>popular pastime among radio amateurs, but if it is done to the

>exclusion of advancing your communications capabilities to include
>more modern, digital modes, then you are only serving to foster the

Oh, digital modes! Why would I do that for a hobby Larry? I've
done more with digital communications that you've ever imagined
to exist. If I want to relax, I'll play with keys and tubes!

>impression the public has that radio amateurs are, in fact, outdated
>and NON-progressive. Is this an image you want people outside the
>ARS to have of us, particularly in light of present and future
>challenges to our spectrum allocations?

That from a guy who probably hasn't got a clue what benefit
there is to multilevel digital encoding, has probably never
heard of a bandwidth limited Gaussian distribution, and who
probably couldn't even define what "digital" is in comparison to
"analog" and be expected to get it right.

The point, of course, is that you don't have the background to
be deciding what is or is not appropriate for others.

>>> Their stations are truly up-to-date,
>>
>>I can't even begin to define what "truly up-to-date" is. I know
>>some really great hams that just dearly love to use only old
>>tube type equipment.
>
>And their "love" is both self-serving and likely to be detrimental
>to the future of the ARS.

And your love of cw, to the point of demanding that *all*
Amateurs learn it, is somehow beneficial to the ARS????

You have never studied logic, have you? (It helps if you
actually want to use digital communications to have some
understanding of Boolean logic. But to post articles to Usenet,
you'd best learn a little deductive logic first.)

>>I had an email conversation with an old
>>Internet friend the other day, who just dearly loves to use and
>>work with old AM transmitters!
>
>Too bad you didn't have that QSO on PSK-31, instead!

Oh, trust me, this old fart knows more about digital communications
that you and me put together multiplied by at least 2 and then some.

Not that *you* added anything significant to that total, but...

Was it you or someone else who posted a while back in one of
these groups that cw was an analog method? It probably wasn't
you, but your the kind of guy who would say that.

Maybe Len Anderson needs to step in and beat you with a sticker
for a day or two!

>>He can't, in your world, be a good Ham.
>
>Probably not.

He's been licensed longer than I have, and was engineering the
stuff you think is "progressive" before you'd ever heard of it,
and since then has moved on to things you might learn something
about in the next decade or so as you catch up.

But you don't think he can be a good Ham...

Get a grip on yourself and take a reality check Larry!

>>I'm going to have to
>>tell him that after 50 years, he's not an OT, he's a waste in
>>the Book Of Larry "Measuring Stick for All Amateur Operators"
>>Roll.
>
>And he has nobody to blame but himself. I consider myself to be a
>qualified judge of what makes a good radio amateur. If your OT

And we see, Larry "Measuring Stick for all Hams" Roll isn't
actually nearly as up to date with technology as the people he
pretends that he can judge. What a hoot!

>friend doesn't measure up, perhaps he should consider taking steps
>to rectify the situation!

Good lord yes. I've been known to bounce a few ideas off him
over the years. He's a pretty good source of information and
technical understanding.

>>>they have usually attained high places on the DXCC standings, routinely
>>
>>Really? Even the ones who've never worked HF in their lives?
>>I'd bet that the majority of really great Hams since 1950 or so
>>have never even gotten a DXCC certificate, much less ever been
>>high up on the DXCC Honor Roll.
>
>Well, I'll accept that, as long as they've made strides in VHF/UHF
>modes such as EME, satellite operation, packet radio, APRS, etc.
>
>>Maybe Larry "Measuring Stick Himself" Roll like to DX?
>
>Yes, I like to work DX.

And here we are again... Larry "The Stick" Roll, who says he
wouldn't do any such thing as be The Stick.

>>>hold leadership positions within their clubs, and can be counted on to
>>provide
>>>valuable input and personal support for all club activities.

>>
>>Now, that I agree is most likely true.
>
>Thank you very much!

One item out of many, kind doesn't look like anyone is going to
thank you, that's for sure.

>>>They are the ones
>>>who newcomers look to for the answers, while the so-called "professional"
>>>hams simply cluster amongst themselves and look down their noses at the
>>>proceedings of the rest of the club.
>>
>>No Larry. It is those professionals who usually *are* the ones
>>people look to for answers and leadership.
>
>Sure, in some cases, they are. Not in my personal experience, however.

That could explain why you're kinda backwards and not exactly
the sharpest tech or the slickest op around too, eh?

>>>But yes, indeed, Carl does know a lot about radio!
>>
>>And you don't.
>
>No, I don't. I'll NEVER know enough about radio. But I'm willing to
>learn!

When do you plan on starting?

>>That's one reason why he's a such a good role
>>model, a recognized leader, and a good Radio Amateur.
>
>Correct. That's what makes a good radio amateur. A willingness to
>learn.
>
>>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>>And Larry is a twit.
>
>Ah, name calling. That's what is usually brought out when the ability
>to make a convincing argument dries up! Unfortunately for you, Floyd,
>it also means that you lose this round!

Ah, I see... you can say others aren't up to snuff, but when it
is pointed out, line by line, through an entire message that
you are a twit, and at the end that is exactly the word used
to summarize what we've learned, poor Larry objects.

Sorry, but it sticks, you are *still* acting like a twit.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>

Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

719. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 03:26:31 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87vft8vnh4.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74134

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:
>"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
>news:87y8y5vuov.fld@barrow.com...
>>
>> Extra DICK doesn't understand Shannon's work, can't relate PSK31 to
>> CW as far as a bandwidth limited channel is concerned, and was soundly
>> thrashed by others for his stubborn refusal to learn.
>
>Yea ... I was in that argument with Dick too ... he kept insisting that
>Shannon had NOTHING to do with ham radio (like some of the
>most fundamental principles of communications theory are ... to
>Dick, at least ... "irrelevant" to hams). I think I challenged him to
>break Shannon's law ... :-)

I only read maybe the first 1/3 of the 400 some messages. I'm
going to have to take the time this weekend and read the whole
series, because that was a classic.

>> Of course, Extra DICK is still here telling us that he is a measure
>> of what makes for a good ham operator, and that anyone who's any
>> dumber than him shouldn't be allowed on the bands.
>>
>> Hmmm... maybe when we look at it from that perspective, he may have
>> a point, eh?
>
>Yes, I would say that the threshold should be more like "Anyone who's
>even close to as dumb as Dick shouldn't be a ham, let alone an Extra."

How are we going to measure it though? ... Hmmm, I guess we may just
need Larry "The Measuring Stick" Roll after all!

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

720. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 03:29:21 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgv5eh$p40$0@208.207.71.163>
Source record: 74135

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>I would submit that the change from spark to CW was a big, progressive
>change.
>
>Likewise the change from AM to SSB.
>
>From plain RTTY to things like AMTOR, PACTOR, PSK31, etc.
>
>Did these changes come about overnight? No. Did OTs bitch
>and whine? Yes.
>
>

Someone is conginuously complaining about something at all times, within
ham radio or outside it.
You've done more than your share of it bitching about the code test for
at least two decades..
But that has never been the pertinant fact in this debate. Your entire
contention is based on a single fact - some of us, not so old at that,
support a code test of some sort for HF ham radio access. So
ON THAT BASIS AND NO OTHER you continuously berate, denigrate and
outright LIE about us, our qualifications, our operation on ham radioi
and any other non-fact you can dig up that you think may play to your
audiance of other codehaters. You are a shameful character Carl, and
that's a fact. When you have to lie like you have all along, and still
do, any validity you may have evaporated long ago.

>>>Witness:
>>>
>>>conversion from spark to CW;
>>>conversion from AM to SSB;
>>>introduction of packet radio and other "new-fangled @^#%$ computer
>>>thingies";
>>>
>>>
>>None of these were forced on hams by regulatory change. Hams adopted
>>them voluntarily. For example, spark wasn't outlawed for hams until
>>1927, even though it was essentially abandoned by hams by 1923 or 24.
>>
>>
>
>Nobody is proposing a regulatory change that will prohibit or in any way
>restrict the USE of Morse ... all that's being asked for is to eliminate the
>test requirement that even the FCC and the IARU admit are not in the

>best interest of the future of ham radio.
>

BS! Neither body has indicated any such thing. They just as wel;l have
said that written testing on technical subjects has no place in
regulations either. You go FAR out of your way to conclude that CW has
no communications applicability today when there is almost as much
activity on CW in the HF ham bands as any other mode. That's plainly
dishonest .
You hype all the latest technology for hams but what do you do frst
thing out when you finally get the codeless Extra? Jump right in on
SSB working DX, and forget all about all your glowing digital plans.
You're the poster boy for saying one thing and doing another.

>
>Nobody is being forced to do anything ... in fact, the proposed/anticipated
>change will STOP forcing folks to do something that many don't want to
>do ...
>
>

It's DUMBING DOWN THE ARS, plain and simple!

>So, the "None of these were forced on hams by regulatory change." argument
>doesn't hold water Jim.
>
>
>If it weren't for the thousands of hams who have entered via the
>no-code tech license, the ham population would be something
>like 1/2 what it was in 1990 ...
>
>

I doub that statistic but no need to bother analyzing it since I
personally have tested more than a few no-cide techs into ham radio.
There's got to be some entry point, and with the Novice enhancement
giving them and Tech Plus voice on 10 meters they abandoned CW (that
plan that I believe was designed to lure CBers and Freebanders into ham
radio-after all, they would be able to legally work SSB in the same part
of the spectrum If all them got Novice licenses the Freeband would close
down. Didn't pan out). What wasn't considered was that codehaters hate
it even at the most basic level.

>When you start out with an old, greying demographic (and I'm
>no "spring chicken"), if there are no newcomers, the population
>can only drop dramatically.
>

Most new hams today are "greying", sorry.THEY're the ones with the
time and money to indulge themselves in such things. Kids today are too
busy with instant gratification things, by and large, but still some
catch the fever.

721. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 03:30:05 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F33193A.1090206@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 74136

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>
>
>>Yep, it is true! I was once a CB'er, for a whole six months! I was the
>>Asst. Mgr. of the Radio Shack store in Depew, NY at the time,
>>
>>
>
>
>
That's about how long I fooled around with CB until I got a ham license back in the
summer of '76. The old tech license, now known as the "old tech plus", general
written and 5wpm receive *AND* send. Took my test at the FCC field office in
NYC back then. A few years back I upgraded to an "extra lite" :-) Took the
advanced and extra writtens Jan 2000 and cashed in the CSCE's on restructuring
day.

722. Re: Donated BPL Money at Work.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 03:45:56 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <U1FYa.30610$UO5.5696@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74137

No, they want people to see and hear exactly what BPL means. There can be a future for HF amateur radio so long as some people go and prove that some technologies are incompatible with HF communications. I certainly hope that large business doesn't get their way too often or one of these days folks will discover just how vulnerable the large infrastructure for telephones and the internet are. BTW, that file is over 7 MB and I'm glad I'm on broadband :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"BPL Investment Team" <BPL_member@newsguy.com> wrote in message news:bgs40j0mip@drn.newsguy.com...
> The ARRL is spending the money you donated to pay for Internet bandwidth so you
> can see the future of ham radio on HF. There is no future for HF ham radio.
>
> http://216.167.96.120/BPL_Trial-small.mpg
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03

723. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 03:49:15 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93D0F22FA31D5elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 74138

<SNIP>
>
> What do you know about Vertubi encoders,

Surely you mean Viterbi?

> or Reed-Soloman coding?

No spell-check, huh? Oh well, I haven't either. That's OK.

For those who don't know these terms and are trying to look them up he
means Viterbi and Reed-Solomon, though.

> Can you explain what "cross-pol" interference means?

I can't either. What is it?

> Or would
> you have any idea why mu-law PCM coding results in a signal to
> noise ratio of 37 dB because of quantization distortion?
>
<SNIP>

Post the proof. I'd like to see it.

724. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 03:55:34 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgv6vm$t1p$0@208.207.71.157>
Source record: 74139

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
>news:87y8y5vuov.fld@barrow.com...
>
>
>>Extra DICK doesn't understand Shannon's work, can't relate PSK31 to
>>CW as far as a bandwidth limited channel is concerned, and was soundly
>>thrashed by others for his stubborn refusal to learn.
>>
>>
>
>Yea ... I was in that argument with Dick too ... he kept insisting that
>Shannon had NOTHING to do with ham radio (like some of the
>most fundamental principles of communications theory are ... to
>Dick, at least ... "irrelevant" to hams). I think I challenged him to
>break Shannon's law ... :-)
>
>

No wonder you dipschitz are such poor hams - you havve no idea what ham radio is actually about. Yep, I said that Shannan's law really has nothing to do with ham radio, and then I proceeded to describe a case that proved it .
That was the time when I heard several European stations working PSK31 on a nearly dead 20 meter band, but was not able to lock and print any of the PSk - but the CW Id'er came through loud and clear, completely copyable Seems that polar phase shift was corruptng the PSK signal.

Of course Cecil declared that to really compare we had to 'Level the playing field by forcing the CW through a 30 cycle filter. So why would any HAM attempting to complete a contact on the air,.want to do that, so as to make the CW uncopyable as well?
No one with any sense, but of course that leaves you all out.

So it's no surprise you can't really understand nor enjopy ham radio. You can't function outside the theoretical. Ham radio is about "HAM RADIO OPERATORS OPERATING! Sure, technical issues have a large part to play, opn some level. But Shannon has about as much applicability to every day ham radio operating as applea and oranges. My experience that morning proves it.
When you get all that latest digital gear built and on the air, then *IT* can become the object of
comaparison. What, youir' STILL not working on it???

So you see, (No, you won't see but I'm suret many readers will) Shannon and his theories are the domain of the laboratory, not the province of ham radio operaters attempting to make long haul radio contacts. I know, such talk is Luddite blasphemy, but that's the way it is! And there is no surprise whatever in the fact that you fail to undestand, the both of you.

"Don't bother, they're here!"

>
>

725. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 04:35:34 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bgv9am$3fs$0@208.207.71.157>
Source record: 74140

JJ wrote:

>
>
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
>>
>> Every once in a blue moon when I've had absolutely nothing better to
>> do with my life I've gotten on 27Mhz and looked for intelligent life.
>> On the rare occasions when I've actually found some it lasts maybe
>> five minutes at most before the bozos blow it off the freq.
>>
>> YMMV . . !
>> w3rv
>
>
> So as to the subject "Do Hams get 11 Meters Back", I ask, "why in the
> world would hams want 11 meters back?" Eleven meters is the perfect
> example of what happens when rules are thrown out the window, total
> chaos. The cber's have managed to make it the sewer pit of the radio
> spectrum and the sad part is they can't even keep it in their own
> territory, they have to spew their garbage to other frequencies as well.
> The fact that hams in general follow the rules, and expect other
> operators to do the same is what keeps many cber's from getting a
> license. I say, "good riddance, we don't need those types in ham radio."

It WILL be interesting to see how many of them leap on a code-free HF
license though, won't it?

726. MD QSO Party

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 06:33:29 UTC
From: Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc>
Message-ID: <3F334439.6378EAB6@yahoo.moc>
Source record: 74141
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

Listen for stations in Maryland this weekend. For more info, go to:
http://www.w3cwc.org/funcontest.htm

Thanks for helping!

I'll be mobile on 2 meters FM and maybe 446.000 hopping
through several counties through the days. Sunday's loop
will occur after the Tailgate Fest:
http://www.qis.net/~k3pzn/mdhfest.htm

727. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 06:38:33 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87u18su00m.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74142

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>&#65533;No wonder you dipschitz are such poor hams - you havve no idea
>what ham radio is actually about. Yep, I said that Shannan's
>law really has nothing to do with ham radio, and then I
>proceeded to describe a case that&#65533; proved&#65533; it .

Nothing to do with ham radio, eh? No wonder you can't figure
out what ham radio is!

When I first read the above I didn't realize that your "case" to
prove your statement was in fact what I'd already read, and I
was thinking there was a really, really funny part of that
thread that I hadn't gotten to on google yet. Then I read the
rest of this, and realized that you think your cw/psk31
comparison is the proof. I've already read the funny part!

I thought you where an Extra Class DICK? Do you have any idea
what Claude Shannon wrote? Is that one formula the only part of
it you've ever seen? Are you, EXTRA DICK, so ignorant of the
very basis of what the ARS is all about that you don't even know
how Shannon's work applies to it?

And *you* claim removing the CW test is going to dumb down
the ARS!

>That was the time when I heard several European stations
>working PSK31 on a nearly dead 20 meter band, but was&#65533; not able
>to lock and print any of the PSk - but the CW Id'er came
>through loud and clear, completely copyable Seems that polar
>phase shift was corruptng the PSK signal.

>&#65533; Of course Cecil declared that to really compare we had to
>'Level the playing field by forcing the CW through a 30 cycle
>filter. So why would any HAM attempting to complete a contact
>on the air,.want to do that, so as to make the CW&#65533; uncopyable
>as well?

Well, just for starters, if any ham wanted to compare CW with
PSK31 to see which was the most efficient, *that* ham would be
the one who'd want to level the playing field. That ham would
also want to be well versed just what level means in
communcations, and the best source of information on that
subject... is a well known paper from 1948 titled "A
Mathematical Theory of Communications" by Claude E. Shannon.

I just can't imagine doing anything with digital communications as a hobby, meaning for the fun of it, and _not_ spending some time studying Shannon. My only regret is that I know there is a large volume titled something like "The Significant Works of Claude E. Shannon", and I don't have a copy of it, nor do I have access to one. I did sit in a library once, years ago, and forgot to go home until they threw me out because I'd discovered it on a shelf...

[In all seriousness Dick, if you would like a pdf copy of the 1948 paper, I can email it to you or anyone else that would like to have a copy It's something like 560k in size.]

>�No one with any sense, but of course that leaves you all out.

So you are saying that (where did I hear this before??? :-) if you are using a 1 watt CW rig and can't make a contract, I can easily prove that SSB is a better method by merely firing up a 1KW SSB rig and making a contact.

Okay, so now (thank you Cecil) we know that SSB is better than CW for getting through when the "polar shift" is significant. (Polar shift being something I hear a little more often than you perhaps.)

>�So it's no surprise you can't really understand nor enjopy ham
>radio. You can't function outside the theoretical. Ham radio is
>about "HAM RADIO OPERATORS OPERATING!��� Sure, technical issues
>have a large part to play, opn some level. But Shannon has
>about as much applicability to every day ham radio operating as
>applea and oranges. My experience that morning proves it.

Well there actually is a comparison to made about enjoying ham radio with Shannon or with apples and oranges. Those last provide food, and if you don't eat you won't be able to enjoy much of anything. Shannon is food for thought, and if you don't understand the basics of Information Theory, there is much of the ARS that just wouldn't be as much fun at all. QRP, CW, RTTY, PKS31, and a lot of other things being examples.

>�When you get all that latest digital gear built and on the
>air, then *IT* can become the object of comaparison. What,
>youir' STILL not working on it??? So you see, (No, you won't

I've operated just about as much state of the art digital gear as I ever care to look at again. Why would I do that for a hobby? Why wouldn't I pick out some aspect of radio communications that I consider to be *fun* (for me, not for you or Larry "The Stick" Roll) and persue it. My goodness, it could even be vhf (no DXCC), AM (not digital), and could still be as enjoyable for me (or whoever) as anything the two of you might be doing.

But you DICK, a fellow who doesn't even understand the
theory of what we are doing, say I'm not up to snuff as
an Amateur operator... snicker.

>see but I'm suret many readers will) Shannon and his theories
>are the domain of the laboratory, not the province of ham radio
>operaters attempting to make long haul radio contacts. I know,

If you want to pass information, Shannon is part of it, and
understanding what he said can only increase an operator's
ability and enjoyment of communications as a hobby.

>such talk is Luddite blasphemy, but that's the way it is! And
>there is no surprise whatever in the fact that you fail to
>undestand, the both of you.

>"Don't bother, they're here!"

So, what we get down to is Extra DICK don't know Shannon from
Shinola. What a hoot.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

728. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 06:56:39 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308072256.27841c42@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74143

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030807192518.08458.00001508@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>
> >I have seen old
> >> info stay on several websites. The same thing could have happened on their
> >> webpage.
> >
> > In otherwords: "I can't provide a reasonable alternative".
>
> I am sure I'm right about the club members hating homebrewing.

I am sure you have convinced yourself of this, however you have
not provided one iota of "evidence" other than your own tainted
opinion, Vipul.

> This could be verified by asking people in the photo if they want to do a
> homebrewing project. Many of the people in the photo are still in the club.

This could be verified by you identifying the club to us and
allowing third parties to do the asking.

> However, I've let my club membership expire. And, tracking down people in the
> photo would get very time consuming. Alot of work just to prove a point. Also,
> I have other things that I need to do.

YOU said the picture is still on the club webpage. It will take
no more than a few minutes time to read the caption and make a couple
phone calls to either confirm or eliminate your suspicions. The only
thing between you and vindication is knowing the name of the club.

> >> Also, if I invite them on a Hamfest that continues to
> >> Fri, Sat night, then I'll bet they will wonder why the Hams are operating
> >> rather than doing what most people do.
> >
> > "..what most people do"...?!?!
> >
> > It's ABOUT Amatuer Radio, Vipul...The event is organized FOR
> >Amateur Radio operators by Amateurs and OPERATING radios.
>
> Other than Field day, an event does not HAVE do be scheduled during Fri, Sat
> night. Most people would do more recreational activities during that time.

Vipul, the average American WORKS Monday through Friday with
Saturday and Sunday off. When would YOU schedule these "activities"?
Most club meetings (lasting 1-3 hours) ARE scheduled during the week,

sometimes with some pro-social activity included.

> Its only because Hams are the type of people that would be at a Hamfest or
> operate Sat night. My former co-worker, the Ham that introduced me to a
> Hamfest, was fairly anti-social too. Also, he made weekly coffee trips to
> Starbucks (alot of calories).

Well there you go...we'll blame the whole thing on too much
caffiene and too much calories.

> He is now out of the country. He is American, and
> he married some Asian girl he met online and he quit his job and moved over
> there.

Lucky him.

> >What does it matter, Vipul? The event was not organized for "the
> >non-ham observer".
>
> Sometimes they do try to sign up new members there. The anti-social aspect
> would put off the person considering the hobby. That's a reason people turn
> away.

WHAT "anti-social" aspect, Vipul? YOU call it "anti-social"
because you do not understand it or refuse to participate in it
because they are not doing it the way YOU think it should be
done...YOUR loss.

> >> Most (non-Ham) Americans would expect the Hams would take a break from
> >> operating on Sat night. They would be surprised and disappointed otherwise.
> >
> > Why? Why should "they" expect Amateurs to stop doing the very
> >thing the special even was organized to do...?!?!
>
> The event more than fulfilled what it was organized to do when they operated
> all day with few breaks. It was not necessary to go all night as well. They
> could have taken at least a few hours break to do some vacation activities.

So the other operators who work days and can only get on the
radio in the evenings should of been denied the chance to "work" this
station just because they had a day job? Foreign operators on the
other side of the world should have been denied the chance to make a
contact just becasue of thier location?

That's very bigoted, Vipul. VERY bigoted...AND selfish on YOUR
part. Your whole rant in this forum is based on your perceived
exclusion from certain actitives, yet YOU would do things to excluded
others from being able to participate in Amateur radio.

> That's what most (non-Ham) people would do. Even another hobby group would take
> a break from that hobby on Sat night and enjoy some of the vacation activities
> at a vacation location. Its only Hams that would continue operating Sat night.
> They saw other Hams on ATV, but not other people in person. I don't expect that

> you would understand that most people would be disappointed with that.

This activity was organized and executed for a certain purpose, Vippy...Activating that location for whatever program they were participating it. It was not chosen for it's tourist highlights or to satisfy "non-Hams" perceptions of what this is all about.

Furthermore, the very characteristics of HF operation generally dictate better propagation and long-distance communication opportunities at night.

Other than Amateur Astronomers, I can not think of any other "hobby group" that does better at night than in the daytime.

THAT is something I don't expect YOU would understand. You don't have the experience in Amateur Radio, and it's obvious YOU do not understand propgation characteristics that dictate these needs. No wonder you're no longer an "EE"...
(choking back laugh of Vippy having ever done ANY electrical "engineering" work)

Steve, K4YZ

729. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 07:26:39 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87ptjgtxsg.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74144

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote:
><SNIP>
>>
>> What do you know about Vertubi encoders,
>
>Surely you mean Viterbi?

Hee hee, my apologies for getting in a hurry. I 1) don't relate spelling to word sounds the way most people do, I just see the word as a symbol and can misspell the same word forty times in one message, plus 2) I tend to type about 10 words behind where I'm thinking.

I was rushing to do something else and didn't check that article over well enough.

Regardless, two missed spellings in a 300+ line article isn't bad on Usenet.

>> or Reed-Soloman coding?
>
>No spell-check, huh? Oh well, I haven't either. That's OK.
>
>For those who don't know these terms and are trying to look them up he
>means Viterbi and Reed-Solomon, though.

Exactly... Andrew Viterbi, to be exact. And author of a paper entitled "Error Bounds for Convolutional Codes and an Asymptotically Optimum Decoding Algorithm," published in 1967.

Commonly seen in convolutional forward error correction systems, which is to say most high speed modems used in the communications industry today. It is a serial data error correction scheme.

Reed-Solomon, as opposed to Viterbi, is a block error correction scheme. It is also very commonly seen today, on DVD's, in cell phones, and many xDSL Internet service schemes.

I don't really think either of those are something the average ham operator might even have ever heard of, much less recognize.

>> Can you explain what "cross-pol" interference means?
>
>I can't either. What is it?

Exactly what it says it is. :-)

Any ham should be familiar with it at least in theory, though
it might not be something everyone recognizes instantly.

>> Or would
>> you have any idea why mu-law PCM coding results in a signal to
>> noise ratio of 37 dB because of quantization distortion?
>>
><SNIP>
>
>Post the proof. I'd like to see it.

It isn't a proof! What you can get is the design specifications
for PCM, and take a look at the channel characteristics of the
quasi-analog channel provided by a PCM digital carrier system.

However, on both of these last two, for those of you who
actually are curious, just hold on for a bit and lets see what
Larry has to say. Then I'll be quit happy to post whatever
amount of detail anyone wants to satisfy their curiosity.

(Anyone who wants a big broad hint though. The Starband
satellite Internet service is quite concerned about cross-pol
interference, and everyone with a v.34 modem is very interested
in that 37 dB SNR.)

However, just be careful that the point is not missed. You or
Larry or anyone else may never have looked into PCM, for
example, and the 37 dB figure may not ring any bells, nor
perhaps would the term quantization distortion. Carl, can come
up with things I've never heard of too. We are not suggesting
that written tests for the ARS should reflect the level or even
the direction of the knowledge base any given person might bring
to the table, and these are examples of why Dick and Larry
should shitcan the idea that their experiences are somehow a
measure that someone else should live up to. If we did use that
criteria, they'd have to live up to my experienced and Carl's
experiences, since they have both made disparaging remarks about
our abilities as Amateur operators.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

730. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 09:33:26 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F336E66.3040406@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 74171

Jim Hampton wrote:
> Brian,
>
> A 24 MB file and well worth the download time. Good grief, I can't believe
> the FCC doesn't understand what this is going to do to HF communications.

It is easy to believe when you realize that the FCC is now run
by a bunch of lawyers who are completely dysfunctional when it
comes to radio communications. They wouldn't know a transmitter
from a door knob.

731. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 10:22:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308080222.14e5465d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74145

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030807222824.21428.00001560@mb-m23.aol.com>...

>
> >> >We're not quite above such things.
>
> >> Yes, we are.
>
> >Maybe your "we" but I've run into some other "we's" on CW who are not
> >as lily-white. The infamous antics in the CW pileups on Don Miller
> >come to mind for one.
>
> That was 35+ years ago. If you have to go back that far to find a one bad guy
> on CW, that's pretty good, I think.

I didn't *have* to go back 35 years, I only went back 35 years because
everybody knows the Don Miller story. I need to point out here that,
quite contrary to the folklore about the "ethical purity" of the
brass-pounding OFs of yore, that it was those sainted OFs who blitzed
Miller. And they were not refugees from 11M or any of the current crop
of codeless wonders. They *all* hiked uphill both ways thru blizzards,
etc., etc. . . .

As far as the 35 year thing goes I only have to go back to a club
meeting this past June for a current example. A well-known two-lander
who is in the habit of busting CW contest records has a couple CW
stalkers up his butt and described the annoying situation.

I fully agree that the bullshit level in the CW portions of the bands
is much, much lower than it is up the bands. But the same kinds of
bullshit certainly do exist on the low ends. This is not a digital
black and white world, it's all shades of gray. I take umbrage with
those who over-hype CW on the basis of the purity of the souls who
practice the art & science. It just ain't so, we're all just people.

> >
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

732. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 10:25:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308080225.45ae13e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74146

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<zIyYa.1587$Wx6.447749@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0308070322.30d1a552@posting.google.com...
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:<Az6Ya.111882$Wd5.25129895@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> > > FYI, folks here are QSX when they're monitoring
> > > the frequency. I rarely hear the annoying "I'm QRT and on the side"
> anymore,
> > > thank goodness. :-)
> >
> > I was involved in trying to use CB for it's original intended purpose
> > in the mid-'70s in 23 channel days. Specifically for comms for a
> > municipal Townwatch group of 135 citizens 95% of whom had no interest
> > at all in hobby radio and just wanted reasonably decent local
> > neighborhood mobile comms.
>
> You just can't legislate propagation. Even if all the users complied with
> the 155.3 mi. limit, the QRM from legal comms in distant places makes local
> work difficult, if not impossible. I've experienced a S7 noise level from
> distant comms personally and the guy in Germany came in clearer than someone
> across town. When the band's open, 12 Watts will work the world.

I'm reasonably conversant on the topic of HF propagation, I hold
5BDXCC #142 dated April '72. Which I had before I got into working
with this TW group. This is a densly populated region (Philly) and
there were/are enough garbage mouthed CB locals to jam the TW comms
without any help from distant skip-shooters.

> > Every once in a blue moon when I've had absolutely nothing better to
> > do with my life I've gotten on 27Mhz and looked for intelligent life.
> > On the rare occasions when I've actually found some it lasts maybe
> > five minutes at most before the bozos blow it off the freq.
>
> Sorry to hear that, Brian. Do you operate AM or SSB? I've had good luck on
> channels 36 through 40 using SSB.

SSB. Any channel which seems to have intelligent life. Maybe I'll take
another look in a couple years.

> > YMMV . . !
>
> It sure does.

To each their own, dit-dit?

W3RV/KLK1937

733. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 11:50:08 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030808075008.454$QE@newsreader.com>
Source record: 74147

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> JJ wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> >>
> >> Every once in a blue moon when I've had absolutely nothing better to
> >> do with my life I've gotten on 27Mhz and looked for intelligent life.
> >> On the rare occasions when I've actually found some it lasts maybe
> >> five minutes at most before the bozos blow it off the freq.
> >>
> >> YMMV . . !
> >> w3rv
> >
> >
> > So as to the subject "Do Hams get 11 Meters Back", I ask, "why in the
> > world would hams want 11 meters back?" Eleven meters is the perfect
> > example of what happens when rules are thrown out the window, total
> > chaos. The cber's have managed to make it the sewer pit of the radio
> > spectrum and the sad part is they can't even keep it in their own
> > territory, they have to spew their garbage to other frequencies as
> > well. The fact that hams in general follow the rules, and expect other
> > operators to do the same is what keeps many cber's from getting a
> > license. I say, "good riddance, we don't need those types in ham
> > radio."
>
> It WILL be interesting to see how many of them leap on a code-free HF
> license though, won't it?
>
Get the turnstiles and crying towels ready. May need to change this group's
name to rec.radio.amateur.whine . <g>

--
GO≠ 40

734. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 12:21:25 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <9BMYa.85$dj3.13151@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74148

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030807214907.12631.00000112@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <T8vYa.133$jI2.2204@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >However, as has been pointed out, you insist that your superior CW skill
> >is ALL that counts and that since I'm not up to your standards in that
area
> >I'm a "lesser ham."
>
> It's a simple fact that you don't have operating experience

Would you like me to scan and e-mail you the logs of hundreds of contacts
on 40/80m CW? (mostly 40 ... things like Johnston Is. from SoCal with
3W)

> and proficiency

No, I have not maintained proficiency ... but neither have a LOT of
code-tested
hams ... but for you, the fact that they passed (long ago) a higher-speed
Morse
test makes them forever OK ...

> in Morse/CW, which I consider to be one of the most useful communications
> skills in the radio amateur's arsenal.

That's just your opinion ... others find it slow, cumbersome, and boring ...
even when they HAVE achieved proficiency at 13 wpm+ ...

> I have always acknowledged your
> superior, professional-grade technical skills, and those of all other hams
of
> all license classes who possess them.

When it suits you, it seems ... other times, we're "lazy, knuckle-dragging,
looking-for-a-freebie," etc.

> However, I must reiterate, this is the AMATEUR Radio Service.

Read the FCC's view of what it's about ... particularly in the R&O
in 98-143 ... they say it's "primarily a technical service" and that
continued Morse requirements "do not comport with the purpose."
The fact is that while hams collectively and individually define what
happens in the ARS, it's the FCC that defines what SHOULD happen.
If we don't live up to those expectations, we are at risk.

> The ARS has a long-standing tradition of
> requiring proficiency in the use of the Morse code,

SO WHAT? We've been down this road before ... it is NOT the
FCC's legitimate regulatory purpose to prop up "tradition."

> for the purpose of
> permitting radio amateurs to exploit the many benefits and advantages of
> that particular mode. I have consistently stated that I feel that this
skill
> is
> important enough to radio AMATEURS that it simply cannot be replaced,
> even with technical skills which exceed licensing requirements.
>
> This is my opinion, Carl

That is correct ... it is you opinion ... nothing more. There is no law
that I know of that requires that your opinion correlate with reality.

-- not a demonstration of any lack of due respect.
> I would expect a person of your intelligence to recognize and acknowledge
> the difference. Moreover, I have never held myself out as anything more
> than an "average" ham, with the notable exception of occasional hyperbole
> used in this newsgroup (and nowhere else) to push the buttons of
particularly
> intransigent fellow participants, including your own good self.

Larry ... if you took a poll, I doubt that you'd find that those you've
demeaned
with your "hollier than thou" attitude and demeaning attacks on their value
as
hams would take your comments as "hyperbole." If it were once in a while,
with a "smiley," one would reasonably take it as hyperbole or "just pulling
chains." However, you have *quite consistently* expressed those views
and demeanded folks that you obviously consider "lesser hams" over a period
of something on the order of 5 years now ... with you it seems to be the
rule,
not the exception.

> I expect you to recognize and acknowledge that difference as well.

I acknowledge that there have been occasions when you have opined that
I know quite a bit about radio ... but, as stated in my previous paragraph,
those pale by comparison to the insults to just about anyone who doesn't
meet the "Larry Roll Morse-based standard of excellence in hamdom."

> I'm perfectly willing to live with the fact that we don't see eye-to-eye
> re: code testing.
> Are you?

Sure ... you have a right to your opinion ... I respect that right ... but
you do ham radio a great disservice with your elitist attitude and demeaning
comments towards those who don't share that opinion.

Carl - wk3c

735. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 12:33:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308080433.1b62389c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74149

Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message news:<87y8y5vuov.fld@barrow.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
> >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >> Brian wrote:
> >> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >> >
> >> > > Not really. Anyone can learn PSK31 in a half hour of looking over the help file
and
>
> ...
>
> >> > Weeks of trying and posting here.
> >>
> >> Go googling and get back to us when you find all that. And NOT until.
> >> That'll keep you busy the rest of your naturl life.
> >>
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > Under PSK31 testing, you would be excluded from the HF part of the ARS.
> >>
> >> You are truly the original numb nuts.
> >
> >DICK, you go gurgle. Include Cecil in your search and you will find
> >when and where you failed.
>
> Well, this just sounded too good not to go have a look. What a
> hoot. There's was the DICK, saying that something doesn't fit
> Shannon's theorum, then claiming oh, actually it is just Cecil's
> way of describing it...
>
> Lord, I was falling out of my chair laughing while I read through
> that.
>
> Extra DICK doesn't understand Shannon's work, can't relate PSK31 to
> CW as far as a bandwidth limited channel is concerned, and was soundly
> thrashed by others for his stubborn refusal to learn.
>
> Of course, Extra DICK is still here telling us that he is a measure
> of what makes for a good ham operator, and that anyone who's any
> dumber than him shouldn't be allowed on the bands.
>
> Hmmm... maybe when we look at it from that perspective, he may have
> a point, eh?

So basically, DICK is the original No-PSK Extra.

736. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 12:43:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308080443.433942ab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74150

Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message news:<87u18su00m.fld@barrow.com>...

> So, what we get down to is Extra DICK don't know Shannon from
> Shinola. What a hoot.

I think that bad dog just got swatted with a rolled newspaper.

737. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 13:00:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308080500.668c0938@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74151

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bguvp1$a3r$0@208.206.142.81>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> >averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030806195654.27797.00001451@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >
> >>Do you know if Len Anderson is a cannibal? Claims have been made that he eats
> >>others for breakfast.
> >
> >Who? When?
> >
> >Dave thinks he's a pugilist.
>
> Typo. Pigilist.

It's "pugilist."

Looks like you're hitting on all three cylinders. Same (old) stuff, different year.

738. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 13:02:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308080502.60d57092@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74152

nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
news:<20030807065907.14731.00001079@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
> > Poor Dave, still smarting over his alleged expertise in State Dept.
> > communications from the Cashew Nut Capital of Africa. :-)
>
> Was Len Anderson ever there?
> >
> > He loves to put down others using "standards" of his own invention.
> > That saves him time and embare-assment of talking ON a subject.
> > It's so much easier for him to insult a communicator personally when
> > he doesn't have any valid argument on subjects.
> >
> > That seems endemic to the members of the Gang of Four, PCTAs
> > all, drunk on sour whine after the rewrite of S25.5.
>
> You are upset, Len.

Who is Len?

739. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 13:08:18 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <6hNYa.9611$Wx6.3773746@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 74153

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308080225.45ae13e0@posting.google.com...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<zIyYa.1587$Wx6.447749@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> > You just can't legislate propagation. Even if all the users complied
with
> > the 155.3 mi. limit, the QRM from legal comms in distant places makes
local
> > work difficult, if not impossible. I've experienced a S7 noise level
from
> > distant comms personally and the guy in Germany came in clearer than
someone
> > across town. When the band's open, 12 Watts will work the world.
>
> I'm reasonably conversant on the topic of HF propagation, I hold
> 5BDXCC #142 dated April '72. Which I had before I got into working
> with this TW group. This is a densly populated region (Philly) and
> there were/are enough garbage mouthed CB locals to jam the TW comms
> without any help from distant skip-shooters.

Sorry OM, I didn't mean to "lecture" re. HF propagation. Just relating my
own personal experiences. Sorry to hear about the garbage mouthed locals.
The only real problem I've experienced up here is the "splatter" from the
really high powered (Multi-kW) guys running AM on ch. 6. An additional IF
filter to increase the ACR of the rig solved that problem.

> > Sorry to hear that, Brian. Do you operate AM or SSB? I've had good luck
on
> > channels 36 through 40 using SSB.
>
> SSB. Any channel which seems to have intelligent life. Maybe I'll take
> another look in a couple years.

Hope you have better luck. :-)

> W3RV/KLK1937

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

740. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 13:20:55 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <XsNYa.93$dj3.13294@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74154

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030807222823.21428.00001559@mb-m23.aol.com...
[triming down stuff that's been repeated in the thread]
>
> To a certain extent. But the change had its downside, too. Ham radio used
to
> get a lot of free publicity and recruitment in the form of SWLs hearing
hams on
> AM. That pretty much ended with the switch to SSB. The number of new hams
> slowed down (in part) because of that change.

So we need a new publicity mechanism ... I'd agree with that ...

> >
> >From plain RTTY to things like AMTOR, PACTOR, PSK31, etc.
> >
> Plain RTTY is still very much in use, thank you.

Yes, I know ... but that's a CHOICE, just as using CW or any other mode
is a choice.

> AMTOR is pretty much dead, I am told.

Certainly not as popular as it once was, but I don't think it's entirely
"dead."

> Of course what really drove all that was PC/soundcard setups becoming
> affordable.

Agreed ... multimode with a std SSB radio and PC ... cool stuff. However,
still limited in some respects and we can do better with purpose-made
RF modems capable of more speed and other improvements.

> It wasn't lectures or laws that got hams to change, it was demonstrations
by
> other hams.

The point I'm trying to make is that there is a BIG difference between
wholesale abandonment of a mode (Spark -> CW, AM -> SSB)
or the outlawing of a mode (Spark) than there is in simply removing
the Morse test requirement.

Removing the Morse test requirement does not take away any operating
privs from anyone ... it does not disallow the choice to use Morse. It
simply removes a requirement that is extremely dissinteresting (and in some
cases difficult) for many people.

There's a BIG difference in the comparisons.

> >Nobody is proposing a regulatory change that will prohibit or in any way
> >restrict the USE of Morse ...
>
> OH YES THEY ARE!!!!
>
> Check this out from ARRL's coverage of the VEC gathering:
>
> "Maia's proposal suggested upgrading all current Tech and Tech Plus
licensees
> to General and allowing their use of all bands. Beginner licensees should
be
> granted call signs from the NA-NZ#xxx call sign block, he said. Both Maia
and
> Neustadter suggest ways to streamline the number of license classes. Maia
> offered up the possibility of asking the FCC to eliminate the Morse
testing
> requirement immediately, easing code exam format restrictions"
>
> here it comes:
>
> "and giving serious thought to dropping CW-only subbands as well."
>
> The only CW-only subbands are on 6 and 2 meters. I don't think those are
the
> subbands Freddy wants to drop. I think he means "CW/data subbands" - on
HF.

I think that Fred knows quite well that the only CW-only subbands are at
6m/2m.

Besides, that is ONE petition of a number that have been/will be filed.

While I will not divulge the detailed contents of the draft NCI petition
that
is under Board review right now, I *will* guarantee you that it will NOT
propose any changes in band segmentation.

> >all that's being asked for is to eliminate the
> >test requirement that even the FCC and the IARU admit are not in the
> >best interest of the future of ham radio.
>
> That's what YOU propose. W5YI & Co. are already on the next page.

It's not fair to single out W5YI ... its the NCVECs ... including reps from
ARRL and all the other VECs ... one of whom used to be "top dog" in
amateur regulation at the FCC.

> >Nobody is being forced to do anything ... in fact, the
proposed/anticipated
> >change will STOP forcing folks to do something that many don't want to
> >do ...
> >
> >So, the "None of these were forced on hams by regulatory change."

argument
> >doesn't hold water Jim.
>
> Sure it does. The point being that none of the historic changes you cite
> involved rules changes.

The elimination of spark did ... and my "None ... by regulatory change" was
meant to indicate that eliminating Morse testing will not force ANYTHING
on anyone by regulatory change.

> >Heck, you can buy a decent 2m transciever for $150 today
> >... something with performance, quality, reliability, and ergonomics
> >that the average ham couldn't duplicate for 3x that price when
> >buying parts in small quantities.
>
> And it's a throwaway.

I would respectfully disagree ... the idea that "hams can't work
with SMT" is bogus ... the ARRL website has a lot of good info
on working with SMT ... and I've built a LOT of prototypes in
the lab by hand using SMT without special, expensive tools.
It just takes a different technique.

> >Does that mean I think homebrewing should roll over and die?
> >CERTAINLY NOT ...
>
> But how will homebrewing survive? How many amateur radio HF or VHF
transceivers
> have you designed and built, Carl? If it's not worth your time and effort,
how
> can the rest of us be expected to do it?

Now that the WRC is over, my business travel schedule will be less
demanding (hard to work on home projects when you're away from
home for 5 weeks).

My first priority for the rest of the summer/early fall is to get up
at least one, preferably two, tower(s) and some better antennas
than what I have now for HF, plus a good set of VHF/UHF
antennas ...

Once that is done, or work stopped due to weather, I plan to
get down to brass tacks on designing/building some gear. It
will NOT be "conventional," but it will be designed to be amenable
to reduction to kit form for those who'd like to build their own.

> >
> >> > the introduction of the no-code Tech license;
> >>
> >> Which has not resulted in greatly increased longterm growth nor a
> >> techno revolution.
> >
> >If it weren't for the thousands of hams who have entered via the

> >no-code tech license, the ham population would be something
> >like 1/2 what it was in 1990 ...
>
> That presumes none of them would have gotten licensed if the rules hadn't
> changed. That's not reasonable. You're saying that we'd be down to
~257,000
> hams by now if not for the changes to the Tech.

I had intended to say 1/2 to 2/3 ... the 1/2 would be worst case ...

Carl - wk3c

741. Re: Dear Norm: WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 14:19:58 UTC
From: Tarapia Tapioco <comesefosse@ntani.firenze.linux.it>
Message-ID: <27bd4dedd179d2d85d4d4139ebc25056@firenze.linux.it>
Source record: 74155
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.fuckwit.stagger-lee

"Std Dude" <sdude@in.georgia> wimpered:
>
> On Tue, 5 Aug 2003 11:26:44 -0400, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > Dear Norm:
> >
> > WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

742. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 15:12:43 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh0elbacq0@208.206.142.75>
Source record: 74156

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>Would you like me to scan and e-mail you the logs of hundreds of contacts
>on 40/80m CW? (mostly 40 ... things like Johnston Is. from SoCal with
>3W)
>
>

At 3 words per minute.

>
>
>>and proficiency
>>
>>
>
>No, I have not maintained proficiency ... but neither have a LOT of
>code-tested
>hams ... but for you, the fact that they passed (long ago) a higher-speed
>Morse
>test makes them forever OK ...
>
>
>
>>in Morse/CW, which I consider to be one of the most useful communications
>>skills in the radio amateur's arsenal.
>>
>>
>
>That's just your opinion ... others find it slow, cumbersome, and boring ...
>even when they HAVE achieved proficiency at 13 wpm+ ...
>
>

Slow, cumbersome, boring....but still the most basic means of
radiocommunications in existance,
available for use only by those who have learned it.

>
>
>>
>>
>
>
>>However, I must reiterate, this is the AMATEUR Radio Service.
>>

>>
>
>Read the FCC's view of what it's about ... particularly in the R&O
>in 98-143 ... they say it's "primarily a technical service"
>

WRONG!!! How about some accuracy in your quotations? FCC says they
consider the ARS
as "still FUNDAMENTALLY a technical service" BIG difference. Of course
it's *fundamentally*
technical-even if one only uses CW and a old tube rig. BuT it's not
funamendally technical. It's fundamentally about operating. THAT is
what your license allows you to do. You can build anythintg you like
legally as long as you don't operate it on the air, nor sell it in some
cases, with NO hint of a license of any class.

> and that
>continued Morse requirements "do not comport with the purpose."
>

Not what they said at all. They said "does not fulfill a reguilatory
need". Anothe big difference.

>The fact is that while hams collectively and individually define what
>happens in the ARS, it's the FCC that defines what SHOULD happen.
>If we don't live up to those expectations, we are at risk.
>

Even more nonsense! FCC hands out licenses with NO requirements to ever
do a single thing witht
them. All the FCC does is decide the qualifications, if any, and issue
the license. Unless one fouls up in some really radical way you'll never
hear from them again.

>
>
>
>>The ARS has a long-standing tradition of
>>requiring proficiency in the use of the Morse code,
>>
>>
>
>SO WHAT? We've been down this road before ... it is NOT the
>FCC's legitimate regulatory purpose to prop up "tradition."
>

Depends on more than just tradition, but therei **IS** much more than
tradition involved in radiotelegraphy. Commercials changed to more
efficient modes for mor than on reason, one of
the most important was longterm personnel costs. Read all about it in
the literature. Of course
there are many other advantages to some of the high tech systems, when

they work as intended.
That isn't all the time, by the way. The change is understandable and to
be expected. What is not so clear at all is that ham radio should do
away with radiotelegraphy, and don't harangue us with your
"No one wants to do away with CW" nonsense again, please! Just read what
your buddy W5YI
wants to do in the latest ARRL letter.

>
>
>
>>for the purpose of
>>permitting radio amateurs to exploit the many benefits and advantages of
>>that particular mode. I have consistently stated that I feel that this
>>
>>
>skill
>
>
>>is
>>important enough to radio AMATEURS that it simply cannot be replaced,
>>even with technical skills which exceed licensing requirements.
>>
>>This is my opinion, Carl
>>
>>
>
>That is correct ... it is you opinion ... nothing more. There is no law
>that I know of that requires that your opinion correlate with reality.
>

And there's no law, manmade nor natural, that says that either you OR
the FCC has to have the inside track on reality.

743. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 15:36:19 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh0g1jdeb0@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 74157

Floyd Davidson wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
>
>> No wonder you dipschitz are such poor hams - you have no idea
>>what ham radio is actually about. Yep, I said that Shannon's
>>law really has nothing to do with ham radio, and then I
>>proceeded to describe a case that proved it .
>>
>>
>
>*Nothing* to do with ham radio, eh? No wonder you can't figure
>out what ham radio is!
>
>

Well isn't this something special! Two clueless alleged "professionals" and a village idiot, all claiming expertise when not a one of them bunch has ever put a rig on the air running PSK31! How compelling!

Beyond that, the two "professionals" seem bent on insisting that Shanon's work is some sort of holy grail when all it actually is a *mathematical analysis* that can be applied to any communications system .

But it's curious that they insist that Shannon's work is vital to everything communications, when he didn't even do it until 1948, and it was't regarded as being very useful until the digital age. I suppose they feel that invalidates all radio from that time back past Marconi!

For sure it had nothing to do with conditions on the air on 20 meters that morning when I was able to copy all the CW id's being sent by the PSK stations, but conditions prevented the PSK from being received, not a single character. And unlike these three simpltons, I was a very early user of the new PSK31 mode when it was first realeased.

Dear old Frostbite Floyd says he was licensed over 40 years ago but, sadly, he spent all his time doing "professional" things and abandoned ham radio until he found this NG a few weeks ago. So he's a real "Expert". Right.

744. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 15:40:38 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh0g9mdeb1@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 74158

Brian wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bguvp1$a3r$0@208.206.142.81>...
>
>
>>Brian wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030806195654.27797.00001451@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Do you know if Len Anderson is a cannibal? Claims have been made that he eats
>>>>others for breakfast.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Who? When?
>>>
>>>Dave thinks he's a pugilist.
>>>
>>>
>>Typo. Pigilist.
>>
>>
>
>It's "pugilist."
>
>

No. Pigilist.

>ifferent year.
>
>

745. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 16:11:01 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308080811.77234aa6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74159

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308080222.14e5465d@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030807222824.21428.00001560@mb-m23.aol.com>...

> > >> >We're not quite above such things.

> > >> Yes, we are.

> > >Maybe your "we" but I've run into some other "we's" on CW who are not
> > >as lily-white. The infamous antics in the CW pileups on Don Miller
> > >come to mind for one.
> >
> > That was 35+ years ago. If you have to go back that far to find a one bad
> > guy on CW, that's pretty good, I think.
>
> I didn't *have* to go back 35 years, I only went back 35 years because
> everybody knows the Don Miller story.

I would bet most hams don't know it. He's outa jail, too. Real nice
fella that one. A doctor, too.

> I need to point out here that,
> quite contrary to the folklore about the "ethical purity" of the
> brass-pounding OFs of yore, that it was those sainted OFs who blitzed
> Miller. And they were not refugees from 11M or any of the current crop
> of codeless wonders. They *all* hiked uphill both ways thru blizzards,
> etc., etc. . . .

What story are we talking about anyway? I'm thinking of how he lied
about where his DXpeditions were. Or maybe where he was convicted of
conspiracy to commit murder (attempted) (IIRC)
>
> As far as the 35 year thing goes I only have to go back to a club
> meeting this past June for a current example. A well-known two-lander
> who is in the habit of busting CW contest records has a couple CW
> stalkers up his butt and described the annoying situation.

"Stalkers"?
>
> I fully agree that the bullshit level in the CW portions of the bands
> is much, much lower than it is up the bands.

That's all I'm saying.

Nobody's perfect, and no mode or test or fancy hardware/software will
make everyone behave perfectly 100% of the time.

But that doesn't mean there's no difference.

73 de Jim, N2EY

746. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 16:35:16 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308080835.2b89c8b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74160

```
Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93D093302F156elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> news:c2356669.0308070813.561d46bb@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns93CFF1773F58Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> >> news:c2356669.0308060832.44f9c66@posting.google.com:
> >>
> >> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:<Xns93CF5FB731F0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
> >> >> news:76WXa.17298$Vx2.8810860@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>
> >> >> > "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >> >> > news:Xns93CE2C5CA14F7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> >> >> >> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
> >> >> >> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj4351y.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:
>
> >> >> >> > On Mon, 04 Aug 2003 07:41:03 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> >> >> >> >> Very simple answer, Jim. The FCC has limited personnel
> >> >> >> >> today. The few they
> >> >> >> >>have simply don't have the time to sit around listening, as
> >> >> >> >>code users pound out their incredibly slow conversations, to
> >> >> >> >>catch violations. ;)
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> > For reasons that I disagreed with then and I disagree with
> >> >> >> > now, (but that's another story) the FCC' s enforcement
> >> >> >> > response is driven by complaints, not by "Patrolling the
> >> >> >> > Ether" (tm) as in days of yore.
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> > How many complaints of amateur CW violations do you think
> >> >> >> > "Riley" gets? (Somebody pounding out "FU" in Morse on a
> >> >> >> > Touch-Tone (tm) pad on a repeater input does not count as
> >> >> >> > CW....)
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> > --
> >> >> >> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >> >> >> >
> >> >> >> > From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> >> >> >> > Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
```

> >> >> >> So what do we call it then? I have certainly heard
> >> >
> >> > (expletive deleted)
> >> >
> >> >> >> sent in
> >> >> >> Morse on a repeater.
> >> >
> >> > That's awful. I haven't heard anything that bad on the CW/data
> >> > subbands, though. Have you?
> >>
> >> I really do only use phone, so I wouldn't know what was being sent
> >> down there.
> >>
> > I can assure you that such things don't happen nearly so often (if at
> > all) on the CW subbands.
> >
> > Anyone who doubts this is invited to listen for themselves.
> >
> >> >> > Anything from an unidentified transmission to interference to
> >> >> > jamming for starters depending on the exact events. It probably
> >> >> > violates a number of FCC rules.
> >> >
> >> > Let's see: Obscenity, failure to ID, jamming, unauthorized use of a
> >> > repeater. For starters.
> >> >
> >> >> The point is that Phil is trying to say that jamming in MCW doesn't
> >> >> count as jamming in CW, which is like trying to say that there's a
> >> >> vital difference between using FM or SSB to jam.
> >> >
> >> > No, that's not the point at all.
> >> >
> >> > The point is that hams actually using CW/Morse for communications
> >> > don't gather anywhere near as many enforcement actions as hams using
> >> > 'phone modes for communications. The difference is far more than can
> >> > be accounted for by the greater popularity of 'phone modes.
> >> >
> >> > Is there a CW equivalent of the W6NUT repeater, 14,313 or 3950?
> >> >
> >> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >> Probably not.
> >>
> > That's my entire point.
> >
> >> I have, however, heard endless repeated CQ calls sent in CW
> >> by US hams on top of DX phone ops who were innocently using their
> >> phone subbands, that happen to be regarded as CW frequencies in part
> >> 97.
> >>
> > Frequency? Date, Time?

> >
>
> 40m, when I'm looking for stations listening up

40 m is a band, not a frequency. Big difference between plopping down
an SSB signal on 7030 and 7230.

>
> >> I am
> >> 90% sure that it is deliberate jamming, and it is a long term ongoing
> >> situation.
> >
> > How do you know it is deliberate?
>
> It's hard to be sure. Maybe the fact that the CQ calls go on abnormally
> long is a clue, though.

Certainly a possibility. Long CQ isn't the best practice.

>
> > Perhaps the CQers could not hear the
> > DX 'phones.
>
> They would probably claim that, either way

It could be true, however. The US power limit is 1500 W out. 40 meter
beams are common with the big guns. There can easily be a 30 dB
difference between how well you hear a 1500 W + beam at 100' CW sig
and how well he hears your 100 W and dipole SSB.

>
> > Perhaps the DX phones were on top of US CW ops innocently
> > sending CQ on frequencies that, by bandplan, are CW/digital.
>
> Innocent/ignorant - a fine dividing line, isn't it?

Nope.

>
> Of course, by bandplan, the frequencies are phone too, just there, not
> here.

Which is the real heart of the problem. And it's being fixed.

>
> > The FCC has definite criteria for deliberate interference. One
> > criterion is if a station allegedly being interfered with changes
> > frequency, and the alleged interferer changes frequency too.
> >
> >> Presumably the perpetrators are too ignorant to understand that
> >> FCC rules end at the border?
> >
> > Who are "the perpetrators" in that case?
> >
>
> The ones who are _not_ in QSO with anyone, who keep sending unanswered CQs
> for five minutes at a time, who didn't send QRU? before calling.

Nobody sends QRU? before calling CQ. (It means "do you have anything
for me?")

The textbook procedure is to send QRL? ("Are you busy?") first. But
that's unnecessarily long. A simple "?" will do the trick, or the most
common "IE" (didit - dit), all of which have the same meaning. The
reason for the shorter inquiries is so that if the freq IS in use,
less gets messed up.

It is not uncommon for me to hear exchanges like this:

Station wishing to call CQ: "IE" ("Is the frequency in use?")

Station on freq, working station the wouldbe CQer cannot hear: "C"
("Yes")

Station wishing to call CQ: "SRI DE N2EY" ("sorry, bye, ID so you know
who it was")

> > You are presuming guilt without adequate proof. Do you have any
> > evidence that the alleged violators could hear the alleged victims?
>
> No, that would be impossible to prove

If you QSY and they follow, that's proof enough for the FCC.
>
> > Or
> > evidence that the alleged victims were using the frequency first,
> > rather than the other way around?

> Yes, or at least I would have if I taped them.

> > Most CW ops use narrow filters - 500, 400, 250 Hz are common choices.*
> > Useless for 'phone, of course. The CQers may not have realized how
> > close they were to the DX 'phones. How much room should a CW station
> > give a weak 'phone station?

> I'm not talking about co-channel here, I mean right on top.

"Right on top" is a lot of room. The CW signal needs maybe 250Hz tops,
the SSB ten times that.

Point is that what sounds like "right on top" may not sound that way
to the other guy.

Listen to a busy CW contest with a wide (AM bandwidth) rx and it
sounds like a pile of intentional inteference. Switch in appropriate
filters and you find that almost all of the stations have spaced
themselves so they don't overlap.

> Neither am I
> talking about weak phone stations, although they could be weak at some
> other QTH.
>
That's another point.

> > Of course the DX 'phones could have switched to CW and answered the
> > CQers, then politely asked them to move.

But they didn't, did they?
> >
> > *My Southgate Type 7 has two cascaded 8 pole 500 Hz crystal filters,
> > giving an effective bandwidth of less than 400 Hz and very steep
> > filter skirts. And it has an audio LC filter as well.
> >
>
> So, if say, you called QRU? on 7080 and there was a strong signal SSB QSO
> in progress, would you be able to tell? This is a genuine question.

I would listen first and steer clear of anyhting that sounds like SSB.
Then I'd send "IE" a few times to test the waters. If I heard
something start up when I did that, I'd move.

But usually I am below 7060. Above about 7060 is data and foreign SSB
country.

> I
> don't posses a CW filter.

One of the reasons some hams get turned off to CW is that they use
equipment that really isn't meant for the mode. Most HF rigs today are
primarily SSB rigs with CW tacked on. Some are pretty good, many are
awful.

> I am guessing you would hear something,though?
>
Depends on the situation. Usually SSB sounds like monkey chatter
through a narrow filter. But near the edges it can be very weak or
inaudible.

The best solution is for wide and narrow modes to have their own
subbands. They simply don't mix well.

A notch filter can remove a carrier or CW signal.

73 de Jim, N2EY

747. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 17:12:11 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308080912.7e373969@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74161

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<XsNYa.93$dj3.13294@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030807222823.21428.00001559@mb-m23.aol.com...
> [triming down stuff that's been repeated in the thread]
> >
> > To a certain extent. But the change had its downside, too. Ham radio used
> to
> > get a lot of free publicity and recruitment in the form of SWLs hearing
> hams on
> > AM. That pretty much ended with the switch to SSB. The number of new hams
> > slowed down (in part) because of that change.
>
> So we need a new publicity mechanism ... I'd agree with that ...

Point is that there were downsides to the shift to SSB. From the end
of WW2 to 1963 (17 years) the number of US hams quadrupled. Then it
stopped dead and the numbers hung at about a quarter million for more
than 5 years in the '60s.

Oddly enough, growth started back up again when the incentive
licensing changes were enacted. Huh?

> > >From plain RTTY to things like AMTOR, PACTOR, PSK31, etc.
> > >
> > Plain RTTY is still very much in use, thank you.
>
> Yes, I know ... but that's a CHOICE, just as using CW or any other mode
> is a choice.
>
> > AMTOR is pretty much dead, I am told.
>
> Certainly not as popular as it once was, but I don't think it's entirely
> "dead."

How many HF amateur AMTOR contacts have you or anyone you know made in
the past year?

> > Of course what really drove all that was PC/soundcard setups becoming
> > affordable.
>
> Agreed ... multimode with a std SSB radio and PC ... cool stuff.

Sort of. But it's actually a patch job.

> However,
> still limited in some respects and we can do better with purpose-made
> RF modems capable of more speed and other improvements.

"Purpose made RF modems"?? Why not call them data radios?

And I agree - a dig built specifically for data modes is the better
solution. Deal with the decoding right at the IF level, rather than
converting to audio and all that jazz.

But somebody's got to design and build the data radios. Who is going
to tie the bell on that cat?

One reason packet is stuck at 1200 baud all these years is because
going faster would require a purpose-built data radio. Ikensu isn't
going to do it unless there's a proven market, and the failure of 9600
to get much attention means they will wait some more.

It's up to the homebrewers to make it happen. But there are not many
of us homebrewers any more.

> > It wasn't lectures or laws that got hams to change, it was demonstrations
> > by other hams.
>
> The point I'm trying to make is that there is a BIG difference between
> wholesale abandonment of a mode (Spark -> CW, AM -> SSB)
> or the outlawing of a mode (Spark) than there is in simply removing
> the Morse test requirement.

Sure. Apples and oranges. So it's not a valid analogy.

>
> Removing the Morse test requirement does not take away any operating
> privs from anyone ... it does not disallow the choice to use Morse. It
> simply removes a requirement that is extremely dissinteresting (and in some
> cases difficult) for many people.
>
> There's a BIG difference in the comparisons.

Sure. Apples and oranges. So it's not a valid analogy. Here's a better
comparison:

Was "incentive licensing" a mistake? It was very unpopular. Lots of
folks were against it. Said it would kill amateur radio. I remember
those times - they make this whole code-test thing look like afternoon
tea.

> > >Nobody is proposing a regulatory change that will prohibit or in any way
> > >restrict the USE of Morse ...
> >
> > OH YES THEY ARE!!!!
> >
> > Check this out from ARRL's coverage of the VEC gathering:
> >
> > "Maia's proposal suggested upgrading all current Tech and Tech Plus

> licensees
> > to General and allowing their use of all bands. Beginner licensees should
> be
> > granted call signs from the NA-NZ#xxx call sign block, he said. Both Maia
> and
> > Neustadter suggest ways to streamline the number of license classes. Maia
> > offered up the possibility of asking the FCC to eliminate the Morse
> testing
> > requirement immediately, easing code exam format restrictions"
> >
> > here it comes:
> >
> > "and giving serious thought to dropping CW-only subbands as well."
> >
> > The only CW-only subbands are on 6 and 2 meters. I don't think those are
> the
> > subbands Freddy wants to drop. I think he means "CW/data subbands" - on
> HF.
>
> I think that Fred knows quite well that the only CW-only subbands are at
> 6m/2m.

Sure. And I think he means dropping the CW/data subbands on HF, not
those little pieces of 6 and 2.
>
> Besides, that is ONE petition of a number that have been/will be filed.

Does NCVEC *ever* go against what Maia wants? Or are they his puppet?
Since NCVEC is not a representative organization, and is only involved
in testing, why are they getting into things like subbands?
>
> While I will not divulge the detailed contents of the draft NCI petition
> that is under Board review right now, I *will* guarantee you that it will NOT
> propose any changes in band segmentation.

And that's a good thing.
>
> > >all that's being asked for is to eliminate the
> > >test requirement that even the FCC and the IARU admit are not in the
> > >best interest of the future of ham radio.
> >
> > That's what YOU propose. W5YI & Co. are already on the next page.
>
> It's not fair to single out W5YI ... its the NCVECs ... including reps from
> ARRL and all the other VECs ... one of whom used to be "top dog" in
> amateur regulation at the FCC.

Does NCVEC *ever* go against what Maia wants? Or are they his puppet?

ARRL's rep did not vote at the NCVEC meeting on the "drop the code
test" petition. Current ARRL policy would have required that he vote
against, but since that policy is under review, the rep abstained. So

the NCVEC reports the petition "approved without opposition".
>
> > >Nobody is being forced to do anything ... in fact, the
> proposed/anticipated
> > >change will STOP forcing folks to do something that many don't want to
> > >do ...
> > >
> > >So, the "None of these were forced on hams by regulatory change."
> argument
> > >doesn't hold water Jim.
> >
> > Sure it does. The point being that none of the historic changes you cite
> > involved rules changes.
>
> The elimination of spark did ...

No, it didn't. By the time it was outlawed, hams already had given it
up. The changeover went very fast, driven by the simple fact that a CW
station which cost X dollars would get much better results than a
spark station that cost X dollars. This also coincided with the moves
to the "short waves".

> and my "None ... by regulatory change" was
> meant to indicate that eliminating Morse testing will not force ANYTHING
> on anyone by regulatory change.

OK.
>
> > >Heck, you can buy a decent 2m transciever for $150 today
> > >... something with performance, quality, reliability, and ergonomics
> > >that the average ham couldn't duplicate for 3x that price when
> > >buying parts in small quantities.
> >
> > And it's a throwaway.
>
> I would respectfully disagree ... the idea that "hams can't work
> with SMT" is bogus ...

I agree!

> the ARRL website has a lot of good info
> on working with SMT ... and I've built a LOT of prototypes in
> the lab by hand using SMT without special, expensive tools.
> It just takes a different technique.

That's not what I'm talking about at all. My point is not about SMT,
it's about the fact that much of today's consumer electronics isn't
meant to be worked on. It's cheaper to just replace than to repair.
Lookit your PC - most of the "components" aren't resistors,
capacitors, transistors or ICs. The components in your PC are
subassemblies: drives and cards and premanufactured cables, power
supplies etc. A knowledgeable person can "build" a functioning PC from

a pile of "components" with just a screwdriver and good grounding
technique.
>
> > >Does that mean I think homebrewing should roll over and die?
> > >CERTAINLY NOT ...
> >
> > But how will homebrewing survive? How many amateur radio HF or VHF
> transceivers
> > have you designed and built, Carl? If it's not worth your time and effort,
> how
> > can the rest of us be expected to do it?
>
> Now that the WRC is over, my business travel schedule will be less
> demanding (hard to work on home projects when you're away from
> home for 5 weeks).

Sure. And that's life for most of us these days.
>
> My first priority for the rest of the summer/early fall is to get up
> at least one, preferably two, tower(s) and some better antennas
> than what I have now for HF, plus a good set of VHF/UHF
> antennas ...

Snow will be here soon. Hard to think about that in August, but it's
on the way.
>
> Once that is done, or work stopped due to weather, I plan to
> get down to brass tacks on designing/building some gear. It
> will NOT be "conventional," but it will be designed to be amenable
> to reduction to kit form for those who'd like to build their own.

It will be interesting to see what results.

> > >> > the introduction of the no-code Tech license;
> > >>
> > >> Which has not resulted in greatly increased longterm growth nor a
> > >> techno revolution.
> > >
> > >If it weren't for the thousands of hams who have entered via the
> > >no-code tech license, the ham population would be something
> > >like 1/2 what it was in 1990 ...

You're saying that one of the reasons for dropping the code test is to
promote growth in the number of hams, and if we don't drop Element 1
we will have no growth. Thank you.
> >
> > That presumes none of them would have gotten licensed if the rules hadn't
> > changed. That's not reasonable. You're saying that we'd be down to
> > ~257,000 hams by now if not for the changes to the Tech.
>
> I had intended to say 1/2 to 2/3 ... the 1/2 would be worst case ...

2/3 of 514,000 is 342,000. That's less than half of what we have now. Sorry, those numbers don't add up.

Your prediction is based on the invalid assumption that if the Tech had kept its code test we would have gotten no newcomers. Yet we had almost exactly the same growth in the '90s as in the '80s.

We may soon see what the result of dropping Element 1 will be. I predict we'll see an initial surge of new hams, then back to the same slow growth as before.

Then where will the blame be placed?

73 de Jim, N2EY

WWHD

748. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 17:12:26 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308080912.421beda@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74162

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bgv9am$3fs$0@208.207.71.157>...
> JJ wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> >>
> >> Every once in a blue moon when I've had absolutely nothing better to
> >> do with my life I've gotten on 27Mhz and looked for intelligent life.
> >> On the rare occasions when I've actually found some it lasts maybe
> >> five minutes at most before the bozos blow it off the freq.
> >>
> >> YMMV . . !
> >> w3rv
> >
> >
> > So as to the subject "Do Hams get 11 Meters Back", I ask, "why in the
> > world would hams want 11 meters back?" Eleven meters is the perfect
> > example of what happens when rules are thrown out the window, total
> > chaos. The cber's have managed to make it the sewer pit of the radio
> > spectrum and the sad part is they can't even keep it in their own
> > territory, they have to spew their garbage to other frequencies as well.
> > The fact that hams in general follow the rules, and expect other
> > operators to do the same is what keeps many cber's from getting a
> > license. I say, "good riddance, we don't need those types in ham radio."

There's another angle to this "losing 11M" topic. The band was
essentially ignored by hams, we didn't lose anything in that sense.
Part of the reason was the high level of RF crud (shades of BPL . .!)
tossed out by high-powered unlicensed industrial and medical
equipment. The junk was all over the band particularly in urban areas.
A second and a big reason the band was grossly underutilized was that
there was little or no DX on 11M. Third, the neighboring 10M band at
1.7 Mhz wide had, and still has more than enough bandwidth to
accomodate anybody who wants to operate on the band without the
crowded condx on the rest of our HF bands.

> It WILL be interesting to see how many of them leap on a code-free HF
> license though, won't it?

Prolly great heaps of 'em will do it. What the hell, they'll be almost
free. But then the show will be pretty much over. There will be
noticable shifts in the volumes of Techs vs. new Generals and Extras.
And maybe, just maybe a few non-hams will jump in. So we'll see a

short, small blip in the growth numbers a la 1991-92 then it'll drop back to bizness as usual.

I'm more interested in what the new-wave codeless wonders will actually do with their new privs. Will they pop the bucks for the expensive HF gear then put the work into the antennas? Some will of course but only a fraction of 'em. The question in my mind is whether that fraction will be large enough to have any noticeable impact at all on the HF bands. I very seriously doubt it, my bet is that most of 'em won't bother, they'll stay on the machines and the only obvious results of the whole regulatory lurch will be in the nut-and-shell games in the FCC database.

w3rv

749. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 17:20:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308080920.d97c720@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74163

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308080222.14e5465d@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030807222824.21428.00001560@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >
> > >> >We're not quite above such things.
>
> > >> Yes, we are.
>
> > >Maybe your "we" but I've run into some other "we's" on CW who are not
> > >as lily-white. The infamous antics in the CW pileups on Don Miller
> > >come to mind for one.
> >
> > That was 35+ years ago. If you have to go back that far to find a one bad guy
> > on CW, that's pretty good, I think.
>
> I didn't *have* to go back 35 years, I only went back 35 years because
> everybody knows the Don Miller story. I need to point out here that,
> quite contrary to the folklore about the "ethical purity" of the
> brass-pounding OFs of yore, that it was those sainted OFs who blitzed
> Miller. And they were not refugees from 11M or any of the current crop
> of codeless wonders. They *all* hiked uphill both ways thru blizzards,
> etc., etc. . . .
>
> As far as the 35 year thing goes I only have to go back to a club
> meeting this past June for a current example. A well-known two-lander
> who is in the habit of busting CW contest records has a couple CW
> stalkers up his butt and described the annoying situation.
>
> I fully agree that the bullshit level in the CW portions of the bands
> is much, much lower than it is up the bands. But the same kinds of
> bullshit certainly do exist on the low ends. This is not a digital
> black and white world, it's all shades of gray. I take umbrage with
> those who over-hype CW on the basis of the purity of the souls who
> practice the art & science. It just ain't so, we're all just people.
>
> > >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> w3rv

FWIW, Larry has reported that his "friend" sends QFU.

750. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 18:58:23 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308081058.6cce2101@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74164

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308070833.2db83476@posting.google.com>...
> Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<BB56960F.211FF%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>...

>
> Besides, everything hams do is either "for enjoyment" or public
> service.

But . . but . . geez, wait a minnit here! What about all the
technological leaps forward we're 'sposed to lead . . ? It sez so in
97.1 . . isn't that the Techs job??

> Does that mean none of it should be tested?

That'll be covered in the next round . .

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

751. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 19:39:13 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <B%SYa.30995$_o4.24131@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74165

Good post, Jim

I do agree with you about the antics of a few. A few Yahoo groups have started - at least one of them with the premise of no flames and everyone is welcome. I can't believe how rapidly it has grown (nor can I believe how many new licenses have been obtained). Unbelievable what can be accomplished when you get rid of the finger pointing (and the new folks, both those without tickets and those who have just obtained them are asking questions about operating procedures, antennas, coax - all the kinds of questions that so many other groups could cover if they just got past the finger pointing and flames).

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03

752. BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 20:23:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308081223.17aada85@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74166

Check out the ARRL site for the BPL video.

Brian

http://www.remote.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/08/08/2/?nc=1

753. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 20:36:56 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93D1A8E3A7743elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 74167

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0308080835.2b89c8b@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns93D093302F156elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>> news:c2356669.0308070813.561d46bb@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns93CFF1773F58Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
>> >> news:c2356669.0308060832.44f9c66@posting.google.com:
>> >>
>> >> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:<Xns93CF5FB731F0elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
>> >> >> news:76WXa.17298$Vx2.8810860@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:
>> >>
>> >> >> > "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> >> >> > news:Xns93CE2C5CA14F7elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> >> >> >> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in
>> >> >> >> news:cuvyxnansvbet.hj4351y.pminews@netnews.comcast.net:
>> >>
>> >> >> >> > On Mon, 04 Aug 2003 07:41:03 -0400, Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >> >> >> Very simple answer, Jim. The FCC has limited personnel
>> >> >> >> >> today. The few they
>> >> >> >> >>have simply don't have the time to sit around listening, as
>> >> >> >> >>code users pound out their incredibly slow conversations,
>> >> >> >> >>to catch violations. ;)
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> > For reasons that I disagreed with then and I disagree
>> >> >> >> > with now, (but that's another story) the FCC' s
>> >> >> >> > enforcement response is driven by complaints, not by
>> >> >> >> > "Patrolling the Ether" (tm) as in days of yore.
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> > How many complaints of amateur CW violations do you think
>> >> >> >> > "Riley" gets? (Somebody pounding out "FU" in Morse on a
>> >> >> >> > Touch-Tone (tm) pad on a repeater input does not count as
>> >> >> >> > CW....)
>> >> >> >> >
>> >> >> >> > --
>> >> >> >> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>> >> >> >> >

>> >> >> >> > From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
>> >> >> >> > Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>>
>> >> >> >> So what do we call it then? I have certainly heard
>> >> >
>> >> > (expletive deleted)
>> >> >
>> >> >> >> sent in
>> >> >> >> Morse on a repeater.
>> >> >
>> >> > That's awful. I haven't heard anything that bad on the CW/data
>> >> > subbands, though. Have you?
>> >>
>> >> I really do only use phone, so I wouldn't know what was being sent
>> >> down there.
>> >>
>> > I can assure you that such things don't happen nearly so often (if
>> > at all) on the CW subbands.
>> >
>> > Anyone who doubts this is invited to listen for themselves.
>> >
>> >> >> > Anything from an unidentified transmission to interference to
>> >> >> > jamming for starters depending on the exact events. It
>> >> >> > probably violates a number of FCC rules.
>> >> >
>> >> > Let's see: Obscenity, failure to ID, jamming, unauthorized use of
>> >> > a repeater. For starters.
>> >> >
>> >> >> The point is that Phil is trying to say that jamming in MCW
>> >> >> doesn't count as jamming in CW, which is like trying to say that
>> >> >> there's a vital difference between using FM or SSB to jam.
>> >> >
>> >> > No, that's not the point at all.
>> >> >
>> >> > The point is that hams actually using CW/Morse for communications
>> >> > don't gather anywhere near as many enforcement actions as hams
>> >> > using 'phone modes for communications. The difference is far more
>> >> > than can be accounted for by the greater popularity of 'phone
>> >> > modes.
>> >> >
>> >> > Is there a CW equivalent of the W6NUT repeater, 14,313 or 3950?
>> >> >
>> >> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> >> Probably not.
>> >
>> > That's my entire point.
>> >
>> >> I have, however, heard endless repeated CQ calls sent in CW
>> >> by US hams on top of DX phone ops who were innocently using their

>> >> phone subbands, that happen to be regarded as CW frequencies in
>> >> part 97.
>> >
>> > Frequency? Date, Time?
>> >
>>
>> 40m, when I'm looking for stations listening up
>
> 40 m is a band, not a frequency. Big difference between plopping down
> an SSB signal on 7030 and 7230.

I mean between 7040 and 7100, which is phone, except here.

>>
>> >> I am
>> >> 90% sure that it is deliberate jamming, and it is a long term
>> >> ongoing situation.
>> >
>> > How do you know it is deliberate?
>>
>> It's hard to be sure. Maybe the fact that the CQ calls go on
>> abnormally long is a clue, though.
>
> Certainly a possibility. Long CQ isn't the best practice.
>>
>> > Perhaps the CQers could not hear the
>> > DX 'phones.
>>
>> They would probably claim that, either way
>
> It could be true, however. The US power limit is 1500 W out. 40 meter
> beams are common with the big guns. There can easily be a 30 dB
> difference between how well you hear a 1500 W + beam at 100' CW sig
> and how well he hears your 100 W and dipole SSB.
>>
>> > Perhaps the DX phones were on top of US CW ops innocently sending CQ
>> > on frequencies that, by bandplan, are CW/digital.
>>
>> Innocent/ignorant - a fine dividing line, isn't it?
>
> Nope.
>>
>> Of course, by bandplan, the frequencies are phone too, just there, not
>> here.
>
> Which is the real heart of the problem. And it's being fixed.

I think you'll find it isn't being fixed. The ARRL bandplan is the only
one out of step, so nobody else is likely to change theirs,
notwithstanding Europe and some other areas getting 7100-7200 as
additional spectrum in 2007. All that will happen is that a DX window will

appear from 7150-7200, but the DX will continue to use phone everywhere
they use it now - indefinitely. Sorry to be the one to break that to you!

>>
>> > The FCC has definite criteria for deliberate interference. One
>> > criterion is if a station allegedly being interfered with changes
>> > frequency, and the alleged interferer changes frequency too.
>> >
>> >> Presumably the perpetrators are too ignorant to understand that
>> >> FCC rules end at the border?
>> >
>> > Who are "the perpetrators" in that case?
>> >
>>
>> The ones who are _not_ in QSO with anyone, who keep sending unanswered
>> CQs for five minutes at a time, who didn't send QRU? before calling.
>
> Nobody sends QRU? before calling CQ. (It means "do you have anything
> for me?")
>
> The textbook procedure is to send QRL? ("Are you busy?") first. But
> that's unnecessarily long. A simple "?" will do the trick, or the most
> common "IE" (didit - dit), all of which have the same meaning. The
> reason for the shorter inquiries is so that if the freq IS in use,
> less gets messed up.
>
> It is not uncommon for me to hear exchanges like this:
>
> Station wishing to call CQ: "IE" ("Is the frequency in use?")
>
> Station on freq, working station the wouldbe CQer cannot hear: "C"
> ("Yes")
>
> Station wishing to call CQ: "SRI DE N2EY" ("sorry, bye, ID so you know
> who it was")
>

I will try listening for IE. I was expecting a Q signal.

>> > You are presuming guilt without adequate proof. Do you have any
>> > evidence that the alleged violators could hear the alleged victims?
>>
>> No, that would be impossible to prove
>
> If you QSY and they follow, that's proof enough for the FCC.
>>
>> > Or
>> > evidence that the alleged victims were using the frequency first,
>> > rather than the other way around?
>
>> Yes, or at least I would have if I taped them.

>
>> > Most CW ops use narrow filters - 500, 400, 250 Hz are common
>> > choices.* Useless for 'phone, of course. The CQers may not have
>> > realized how close they were to the DX 'phones. How much room should
>> > a CW station give a weak 'phone station?
>
>> I'm not talking about co-channel here, I mean right on top.
>
> "Right on top" is a lot of room. The CW signal needs maybe 250Hz tops,
> the SSB ten times that.
>

Granted. To be more specific, the CW beat note sounds in the normal range, i.e. 800 Hz +- when the SSB is tuned in. This of course would be what you would get if they netted onto the SSB and then offset by their usual amount.

> Point is that what sounds like "right on top" may not sound that way
> to the other guy.
>

It depends which side of the nominal carrier frequency the CW signal is on. However, assuming my SSB filter is working, I would say they were low, i.e. on the same side as the LSB sideband, or I would be filtering them out. This also puts them almost in the middle of the SSB signal, doesn't it?

> Listen to a busy CW contest with a wide (AM bandwidth) rx and it
> sounds like a pile of intentional inteference. Switch in appropriate
> filters and you find that almost all of the stations have spaced
> themselves so they don't overlap.
>
>> Neither am I
>> talking about weak phone stations, although they could be weak at some
>> other QTH.
>>
> That's another point.
>
>> > Of course the DX 'phones could have switched to CW and answered the
>> > CQers, then politely asked them to move.
>
> But they didn't, did they?
>> >
>> > *My Southgate Type 7 has two cascaded 8 pole 500 Hz crystal filters,
>> > giving an effective bandwidth of less than 400 Hz and very steep
>> > filter skirts. And it has an audio LC filter as well.
>> >
>>
>> So, if say, you called QRU? on 7080 and there was a strong signal SSB
>> QSO in progress, would you be able to tell? This is a genuine
>> question.

>
> I would listen first and steer clear of anyhting that sounds like SSB.
> Then I'd send "IE" a few times to test the waters. If I heard
> something start up when I did that, I'd move.
>
> But usually I am below 7060. Above about 7060 is data and foreign SSB
> country.
>
>> I
>> don't posses a CW filter.
>
> One of the reasons some hams get turned off to CW is that they use
> equipment that really isn't meant for the mode. Most HF rigs today are
> primarily SSB rigs with CW tacked on. Some are pretty good, many are
> awful.
>

If I need it I have an outboard audio filter (a Radio Shack DSP unit,
which is fairly basic and suffers from low audio output). I hadn't thought
about that when I said I had no CW filter. It tends to 'take off' on 20
with RF getting inside it, but it's OK on 40.

>> I am guessing you would hear something,though?
>>
> Depends on the situation. Usually SSB sounds like monkey chatter
> through a narrow filter. But near the edges it can be very weak or
> inaudible.
>

As I've explained, I think this is going on in the middle of the SSB sigs,
which is another reason to be suspicious

> The best solution is for wide and narrow modes to have their own
> subbands. They simply don't mix well.
>

Yes

> A notch filter can remove a carrier or CW signal.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
True, not that I have one, though

73 de Alun, N3KIP

754. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 20:56:46 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308081256.483d39ea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74168

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308081058.6cce2101@posting.google.com>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308070833.2db83476@posting.google.com>...
> > Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<BB56960F.211FF%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>...

> > Besides, everything hams do is either "for enjoyment" or public
> > service.

> But . . but . . geez, wait a minnit here! What about all the
> technological leaps forward we're 'sposed to lead . . ? It sez so in
> 97.1 . . isn't that the Techs job??

It's everybody's job. And nobody's. You'll see, the techno folks who
will come into the ARS after Element 1 goes away will create a techno
revolution just like the one created when the Tech lost its code test.
Just watch....

> > Does that mean none of it should be tested?
>
> That'll be covered in the next round . .

Maia & Co. are already working on that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

755. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 20:58:01 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <t9UYa.31014$9S4.13055@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74169

Brian,

A 24 MB file and well worth the download time. Good grief, I can't believe
the FCC doesn't understand what this is going to do to HF communications.

Thanks and 73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308081223.17aada85@posting.google.com...
> Check out the ARRL site for the BPL video.
>
> Brian
>
> http://www.remote.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/08/08/2/?nc=1

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03

756. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 21:24:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <jyUYa.161$dj3.18615@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74170

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bh0elbacq0@208.206.142.75...

HTML format content snipped ... Dick, if you'd learn to set your newsreader
to "plain text" (the convention) and use ">'s" to preserve the attribution,
then
re-post, I'd be happy to rebut your nonsense ...

Carl - wk3c

757. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 21:49:23 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030808174923.19707.00000165@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 74172

>brianburke@juno.com

writes:

(Len Anderson wrote):

>> > Poor Dave, still smarting over his alleged expertise in State Dept.
>> > communications from the Cashew Nut Capital of Africa. :-)
>>
>> Was Len Anderson ever there?
>> >
>> > He loves to put down others using "standards" of his own invention.
>> > That saves him time and embare-assment of talking ON a subject.
>> > It's so much easier for him to insult a communicator personally when
>> > he doesn't have any valid argument on subjects.
>> >
>> > That seems endemic to the members of the Gang of Four, PCTAs
>> > all, drunk on sour whine after the rewrite of S25.5.
>>
>> You are upset, Len.
>
>Who is Len?
>
Ellen Degeneres does that character much better than you, Brian Burke.

758. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 21:56:44 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030808175644.19707.00000166@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 74174

>brianburke@juno.com

writes:

>So basically, DICK is the original No-PSK Extra.

Has Brian Burke ever
used PSK-31 on the
amateur bands?

Has Floyd Davidson ever
used PSK-31 on the
amateur bands?

Has Carl Stevenson ever
used PSK-31 on the
amateur bands?

For the record, I have not
used PSK-31 myself on
the amateur bands.

So I will not lecture others
on how well it does or
does not work.

But I would like to read
of the experiences Brian
Floyd and Carl have had
with the mode, since they
obviously have strong feelings
about it.

759. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 22:01:00 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <w4VYa.162$dj3.18912@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74173

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0308080912.7e373969@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<XsNYa.93$dj3.13294@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030807222823.21428.00001559@mb-m23.aol.com...
> > [triming down stuff that's been repeated in the thread]
> > >
> > > To a certain extent. But the change had its downside, too. Ham radio
used
> > to
> > > get a lot of free publicity and recruitment in the form of SWLs
hearing
> > hams on
> > > AM. That pretty much ended with the switch to SSB. The number of new
hams
> > > slowed down (in part) because of that change.
> >
> > So we need a new publicity mechanism ... I'd agree with that ...
>
> Point is that there were downsides to the shift to SSB. From the end
> of WW2 to 1963 (17 years) the number of US hams quadrupled. Then it
> stopped dead and the numbers hung at about a quarter million for more
> than 5 years in the '60s.
>
> Oddly enough, growth started back up again when the incentive
> licensing changes were enacted. Huh?

Now you're trying to tell us that incentive licensing PROMOTED
growth in ham radio??? I don't think so ...

More likely the boom after WWII (and Korea) was due to military
radio folks becoming hams when they got out ...

The boom in the 60's was probably due to the emergence of economical
JA radios, a general increase in the interest in electronics, and later, the
emergence of VHF/UHF FM and repeaters ...

> How many HF amateur AMTOR contacts have you or anyone you know made in
> the past year?

I have AMTOR capability, but haven't hooked it up in the 3 years I've
been here in the new house ... used it a lot from the sailboat in the early
90's ...

> > > Of course what really drove all that was PC/soundcard setups becoming
> > > affordable.
> >
> > Agreed ... multimode with a std SSB radio and PC ... cool stuff.
>
> Sort of. But it's actually a patch job.

Actually, it's not a bad idea to use existing PC capabilities to do the
signal processing for multiple modes ... it's all software ... and within
the limits of a typical SSB radio, you can do some interesting, albeit
rather slow, stuff on HF.

> > However,
> > still limited in some respects and we can do better with purpose-made
> > RF modems capable of more speed and other improvements.
>
> "Purpose made RF modems"?? Why not call them data radios?

Whatever ... I tend to think that RF modems is a good term ...
after all, modem is the concatenation of MODulator and DEModulator.

> And I agree - a dig built specifically for data modes is the better
> solution. Deal with the decoding right at the IF level, rather than
> converting to audio and all that jazz.

Actually, most modern digital radios convert directly to I/Q baseband
and do the signal processing there ...

> But somebody's got to design and build the data radios. Who is going
> to tie the bell on that cat?

I was telling you of some plans I have for after I get my antenna work
done this summer ... winter projects, so to speak. However, you will
realize that I do work for a living and have other obligations as well,
so don't hold me to some firm, preconceived schedule. Don't get me
wrong, it's something I *really* want to do, and I intend to do it with
as much diligence as I can in terms of getting something accomplished.

> One reason packet is stuck at 1200 baud all these years is because
> going faster would require a purpose-built data radio. Ikensu isn't
> going to do it unless there's a proven market, and the failure of 9600
> to get much attention means they will wait some more.

9600 is a kludge in virtually all of the rice-boxes ... and it's not fast
enough to really be interesting or all that useful ...

> Was "incentive licensing" a mistake? It was very unpopular. Lots of
> folks were against it. Said it would kill amateur radio. I remember
> those times - they make this whole code-test thing look like afternoon
> tea.

I personally think that incentive licensing, as implemented, was a mistake.
It made little sense to require higher Morse speeds for privs that were
primarily non-Morse ... I have NO problem with a *reasonable* number
(I think 3 is adequate, 2 might be alright) of license classes in order to

encourage folks to learn more about radio technology ... I know that
many will say it's impractical from an enforcement standpoint, but I would
restrict power for the lower classes (though you've probably seen me
comment that brute force power is over-rated ... I doubt that I will ever
get a legal limit amp ... 100W seems to work just fine on HF), rather than
segregate newcomers from everyone else as widely as our current rules
do. Newcomers need to be welcomed and "socialized" (not like Larry's
"don't let the door hit you in the ass on the way out" shpiel ...) That's
how
to make more good ... and better ... hams - welcome them and show them
the way (politely).

> > I think that Fred knows quite well that the only CW-only subbands are at
> > 6m/2m.
>
> Sure. And I think he means dropping the CW/data subbands on HF, not
> those little pieces of 6 and 2.

I wasn't at the NCVEC meeting and am not privy to the discussion/intent
WRT this issue ... I won't presume to speak for Fred in any sort of
definitive, authoritative way ...

> > Besides, that is ONE petition of a number that have been/will be filed.
>
> Does NCVEC *ever* go against what Maia wants? Or are they his puppet?

It is my understanding that there are 13 or 14 VECs in the NCVECs ... ARRL's
rep was there. My understanding is that there was NO opposition to the
NCVEC
petition being filed as written.

> Since NCVEC is not a representative organization, and is only involved
> in testing, why are they getting into things like subbands?

They are considered by the FCC as an authoritative source. Why they said
each and every word they said is something upon which I won't speculate.

> > While I will not divulge the detailed contents of the draft NCI petition
> > that is under Board review right now, I *will* guarantee you that it
will NOT
> > propose any changes in band segmentation.
>
> And that's a good thing.

The primary objective is to eliminate Morse testing ... we don't want to
be distracted or delayed by other non-NCI-core issues that will take
more time for the FCC to decide ...

> > > >all that's being asked for is to eliminate the
> > > >test requirement that even the FCC and the IARU admit are not in the
> > > >best interest of the future of ham radio.
> > >
> > > That's what YOU propose. W5YI & Co. are already on the next page.

> >
> > It's not fair to single out W5YI ... its the NCVECs ... including reps
from
> > ARRL and all the other VECs ... one of whom used to be "top dog" in
> > amateur regulation at the FCC.
>
> Does NCVEC *ever* go against what Maia wants? Or are they his puppet?
>
> ARRL's rep did not vote at the NCVEC meeting on the "drop the code
> test" petition. Current ARRL policy would have required that he vote
> against, but since that policy is under review, the rep abstained. So
> the NCVEC reports the petition "approved without opposition".

Read Roberts' Rules ... I think a lone abstention does not count as
opposition ... to oppose, the party in question would have had to
proactively vote "no." An abstention amounts to "I don't care one
way or the other on this issue." (Or perhaps, "I'm not *allowed* to
vote one way or the other," when the voter is someone's employee.)

> > and my "None ... by regulatory change" was
> > meant to indicate that eliminating Morse testing will not force ANYTHING
> > on anyone by regulatory change.
>
> OK.
> >
> > > >Heck, you can buy a decent 2m transciever for $150 today
> > > >... something with performance, quality, reliability, and ergonomics
> > > >that the average ham couldn't duplicate for 3x that price when
> > > >buying parts in small quantities.
> > >
> > > And it's a throwaway.
> >
> > I would respectfully disagree ... the idea that "hams can't work
> > with SMT" is bogus ...
>
> I agree!
>
> > the ARRL website has a lot of good info
> > on working with SMT ... and I've built a LOT of prototypes in
> > the lab by hand using SMT without special, expensive tools.
> > It just takes a different technique.
>
> That's not what I'm talking about at all. My point is not about SMT,
> it's about the fact that much of today's consumer electronics isn't
> meant to be worked on. It's cheaper to just replace than to repair.
> Lookit your PC - most of the "components" aren't resistors,
> capacitors, transistors or ICs. The components in your PC are
> subassemblies: drives and cards and premanufactured cables, power
> supplies etc. A knowledgeable person can "build" a functioning PC from
> a pile of "components" with just a screwdriver and good grounding
> technique.

Building a radio will involve components ... some may be "store-bought" ICs, others will be R/L/C, perhaps some discrete transistors, etc. ... BUT there is no reason that reasonably technically-inclined, intelligent hams cannot
"build" their own custom ICs at home these days ... there are all sorts of programmable logic devices, ranging from a few thousand or less gates to several millions of gates ... and the software to do design, simulation, verification,
and programming is either affordable, or in some cases free.

You do your conceptual design, code it in VHDL, simulate it, synthesize it into a file that is used to program the IC and voila, something that had NO "personalilty" ... no "idea of how to do anything" ... is now a functional "custom IC." This is REALLY cool stuff ... and there are lots and lots of free "cores"out there for all sorts of things ... SPI interfaces, microcontrollers,
FEC, and on and on and on ... all things that can be "hooked up" together and/or with your own code and synthesized into your own IC ...

The digital domain is moving closer and closer to the antennna ... folks who want to design and build need to start thinking in new paradigms ... like "I buy some off the shelf RF ICs, A/D and D/A converters and I hook them up with an FPGA that I've programmed, maybe a uController ... or an interface to a PC (maybe Ethernet) and I have a programmable radio that can be whatever I want it to be ...

Folks just need to think in new paradigms ... unfortunately, that does not seem
to be the strong suit of many present hams.

Carl - wk3c

760. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 22:12:08 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <YeVYa.19060$Vx2.9675056@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 74175

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030807192518.08458.00001508@mb-m20.aol.com...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>
> >I have seen old
> >> info stay on several websites. The same thing could have happened on
their
> >> webpage.
> >
> > In otherwords: "I can't provide a reasonable alternative".
>
> I am sure I'm right about the club members hating homebrewing.
>
> This could be verified by asking people in the photo if they want to do a
> homebrewing project. Many of the people in the photo are still in the
club.
>

Speculation is not evidence. If you haven't asked them, then there is NO
way you can know.

> However, I've let my club membership expire. And, tracking down people in
the
> photo would get very time consuming. Alot of work just to prove a point.
Also,
> I have other things that I need to do.
>

If the point is important enough to you to keep repeating it in this
newsgroup then it is absolutely necessary for you to either PROVE the point
or SHUT UP.

> >> Also, if I invite them on a Hamfest that continues to
> >> Fri, Sat night, then I'll bet they will wonder why the Hams are
operating
> >> rather than doing what most people do.
> >
> > "..what most people do"...?!?!
> >

And what do you think "most people" do? Everyone I know does something
different. No two people do the same thing. A lot of people simply stay
home because they aren't interested in spending their money on bars and
parties.

> > It's ABOUT Amatuer Radio, Vipul...The event is organized FOR
> >Amateur Radio operators by Amateurs and OPERATING radios.
>
> Other than Field day, an event does not HAVE do be scheduled during Fri,
Sat
> night. Most people would do more recreational activities during that time.
>

This is a recreational activity for hams. Besides that, this is only a few weekends out of the year. There are 52 weekends per year. In the past 12 months, I've gone to 3 hamfests. This means that there were 49 other weekends for other recreational activities.

> Its only because Hams are the type of people that would be at a Hamfest or
> operate Sat night. My former co-worker, the Ham that introduced me to a
> Hamfest, was fairly anti-social too. Also, he made weekly coffee trips to
> Starbucks (alot of calories). He is now out of the country. He is
American, and
> he married some Asian girl he met online and he quit his job and moved
over
> there.
>
> >What does it matter, Vipul? The event was not organized for "the
> >non-ham observer".
>
> Sometimes they do try to sign up new members there. The anti-social aspect
> would put off the person considering the hobby. That's a reason people
turn
> away.
>

The non-ham who is being recruited needs to know what hams do. Therefore if they are "put off" by the hamfest, it's quite possible that ham radio is not the hobby for them just like it's not appropriate for you. We don't need more people with licenses who are not active.

> >> Most (non-Ham) Americans would expect the Hams would take a break from
> >> operating on Sat night. They would be surprised and disappointed
otherwise.
> >
> > Why? Why should "they" expect Amateurs to stop doing the very
> >thing the special even was organized to do...?!?!
>

Have you ever been to other major events in other hobbies? For example, people participate in various vehicle rallies where all they do for two days is cruise their vintage automobile up and down the designated streets. Other than stopping to eat, they don't take a break to do "other things."

> The event more than fulfilled what it was organized to do when they
operated
> all day with few breaks. It was not necessary to go all night as well.
They

> could have taken at least a few hours break to do some vacation
activities.
>
> That's what most (non-Ham) people would do. Even another hobby group would
take
> a break from that hobby on Sat night and enjoy some of the vacation
activities
> at a vacation location. Its only Hams that would continue operating Sat
night.
> They saw other Hams on ATV, but not other people in person. I don't expect
that
> you would understand that most people would be disappointed with that.

The majority of other hams would not be disappointed in that. Besides that most hams that I know are adults and if they decide to partake in other activities at the site they do so. On Field Day, my husband spent several hours at a nearby lake fishing as a break from hamming. He didn't need to make other people go with him. He did what he wanted when he wanted to.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

761. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 22:17:36 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <4kVYa.19093$Vx2.9676219@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 74176

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:2XCYa.42$dj3.7021@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0308071433.cf44bfc@posting.google.com...
> If it weren't for the thousands of hams who have entered via the
> no-code tech license, the ham population would be something
> like 1/2 what it was in 1990 ...
>

Prove it. There is nothing demonstrating that this had any significant effect on the growth of the number of hams. You are stating an opinion. Nothing more.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

762. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 22:24:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bh17un$jt0$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74177

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bgv9am$3fs$0@208.207.71.157...
>
>
> JJ wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> >>
> >> Every once in a blue moon when I've had absolutely nothing better to
> >> do with my life I've gotten on 27Mhz and looked for intelligent life.
> >> On the rare occasions when I've actually found some it lasts maybe
> >> five minutes at most before the bozos blow it off the freq.
> >>
> >> YMMV . . !
> >> w3rv
> >
> >
> > So as to the subject "Do Hams get 11 Meters Back", I ask, "why in the
> > world would hams want 11 meters back?" Eleven meters is the perfect
> > example of what happens when rules are thrown out the window, total
> > chaos. The cber's have managed to make it the sewer pit of the radio
> > spectrum and the sad part is they can't even keep it in their own
> > territory, they have to spew their garbage to other frequencies as well.
> > The fact that hams in general follow the rules, and expect other
> > operators to do the same is what keeps many cber's from getting a
> > license. I say, "good riddance, we don't need those types in ham radio."
>
>
>
> It WILL be interesting to see how many of them leap on a code-free HF
> license though, won't it?
>

It will be OUR FAULT if we allow that type of operation. Get ready for the
fight.

Dan/W4NTI

763. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 22:25:06 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <6rVYa.19103$Vx2.9678226@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 74178

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:XsNYa.93$dj3.13294@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> It's not fair to single out W5YI ... its the NCVECs ... including reps
from
> ARRL and all the other VECs ... one of whom used to be "top dog" in
> amateur regulation at the FCC.
>

You didn't pay much attention when you read the article. Only 12 of the 14
VECs participated. That is NOT all.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

764. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 22:53:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308081453.3e7803e8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74179

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bh0g9mdeb1@208.207.71.144>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bguvp1$a3r$0@208.206.142.81>...
> >
> >
> >>Brian wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>>averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030806195654.27797.00001451@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Do you know if Len Anderson is a cannibal? Claims have been made that he eats
> >>>>others for breakfast.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>Who? When?
> >>>
> >>>Dave thinks he's a pugilist.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>Typo. Pigilist.
> >>
> >>
> >
> >It's "pugilist."
> >
> >
>
> No. Pigilist.
>
> >ifferent year.

Ignorant DICK.

765. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-08 23:47:49 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0308082344040.1558@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 74180

On Thu, 7 Aug 2003, JJ wrote:
> Stussy blabbered again:
> > 3) You seem to think that I am saying that no-coders have HF privileges.
> > That's the only thing I can conclude about your comment about dropping code.
> > YOU ARE WRONG. I haven't said any such thing. What I said is that coded
> > Technicians and Novices have LOST HF privileges as a result of the
> > international change.
>
> Have you seen any directive from the FCC that says that coded
> Novices and Technicians can no longer operate HF?

I don't have to. What I saw was a change to the regulations, by the FCC having incorporated a rule from a different body of law that itself was changed, and that change flowed through. All one has to do is literally read the rule that the FCC wrote to note that a change has happened.

> Everything is the same as it was before the conference. Get used
> to it. When you deserve the title Mr. I will address you as Mr.

766. Re: IMPORTANT! FCC OET extends Reply Comment Period on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 00:00:20 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh1dik$s95$0@208.206.142.71>
Source record: 74181

N2EY wrote:

Access BPL won't solve your problem, because it is basically a short-range
"last mile" technology, and the target markets are high density suburban areas, not rural.

Jim, that's not what they are saying in their reply comments I read
just this morning, in fact they're
promoting it as a benefit to rural areas where broadband isn't now
available and isn't likely to be.
BIG snow job.

Dick

767. Re: Let's end the misinformation ... (was Re: There is no International Code Requirement and techs can operate)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 00:04:55 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0308082346010.1558@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 74182

On Thu, 7 Aug 2003, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
> news:Pine.LNX.4.56.0308072052340.1350@kd6lvw.ampr.org...
> >
> > 3) You seem to think that I am saying that no-coders have HF privileges.
> > That's the only thing I can conclude about your comment about dropping
> code.
> > YOU ARE WRONG. I haven't said any such thing.
>
> Accepted ...
>
> I will probably regret responding to this, but I have to try *one* more time
> ...
>
> > What I said is that coded
> > Technicians and Novices have LOST HF privileges as a result of the
> > international change. Why? Because their right to operate HF was NOT
> based on
> > holding "element 1 credit" (like that of the other license classes) but on
> an
> > international requirement that has been eliminated (and replaced with a
> > national option) and with the referred to requirement gone, there is no
> way
> > under the FCC's regulation that these licensees can show compliance with
> the
> > non-existent requirement; thus, their HF privileges were CANCELLED.
>
> Mr. Stussy,
>
> Please read VERY SLOWLY:
>
> The international requirement has not been eliminated, it has been changed.

I disagree. The SECTION that formerly defined an international requirement was changed. The new text defines NO requirement that is imposed on the countries that are party to the agreement. It indicates that each country is free to choose whether or not they want to have a NATIONALLY imposed requirement.

What you don't seem to understand is that by giving each country a choice to impose something on their licensees (and ONLY THEIR licensees), the section is no longer an "international requirement" by definition - because countries can opt out - and thus it's not required of them. Where countries CHOOSE to impose the restriction, it's not "international" (but national) in nature.

The international requirement HAS disappeared.

> It now says "Administrations SHALL determine ..."
>
> In ITU-ese, "shall" is mandatory.
>
> Therefore, the FCC is OBLIGATED to determine whether or not any
> class of amateur license requires a Morse test.

That is NOT an obligation on the licensees, but on the licensor. The requirement that 47 CFR 97.301(e) refers to is a licensee obligation (as well as on the licensor). Since the licensor in this case is the FCC, a U.S. Government agency, should they CHOOSE (i.e. it's not a requirement that they impose it) to impose a requirement, it's a NATIONAL requirement, not an international one.

> Since the FCC had ALREADY determined that a 5 wpm Morse
> test was required for HF access, it has already met that obligation.

Not relevant. Licensees aren't required to show compliance to anything other than the "international requirement" which was eliminated. What the FCC has determined is not the requirement stated for access per .301(e).

> Thus the existing FCC rules are "legal," nothing has changed,
> and NOBODY has lost ANY privileges.

I haven't said that any of their rules are illegal. I disagree that nothing has changed: The FCC might not have changed any of their rules, but the rule that one of their rules is dependent on HAS CHANGED, and that change flows through, whether good or bad, sensical or not, etc.... It doesn't matter that the FCC didn't change a thing; the rule still changed due to the external reference changing.

> The fact that the FCC is free to make a NEW determination and
> eliminate the Morse requirement from its own rules makes NO
> difference.

I fully agree with this last statement.

> I respectfully hope you get it this time ...

Get what?

Now, if every country were required to choose that they must have a morse code testing requirement of their licensees, that would be an "international requirement" because there really isn't any choice or discretion.

768. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 00:31:24 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh1fcsvmb0@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 74183

No CW Test wrote:

>>brianburke@juno.com
>>
>>
>
>writes:
>
>
>
>>So basically, DICK is the original No-PSK Extra.
>>
>>
>
>Has Brian Burke ever
>used PSK-31 on the
>amateur bands?
>
>

No.

>Has Floyd Davidson ever
>used PSK-31 on the
>amateur bands?
>

No, nor any other. He has been mostly inactive for many years.

>
>Has Carl Stevenson ever
>used PSK-31 on the
>amateur bands?
>

No, he has been much too busy bitching about a -ANY- code test.

>
>For the record, I have not
>used PSK-31 myself on
>the amateur bands.
>
>

As a matter of fact I HAVE, in fact rather extensively for the first
several months . I first got on PSK31 shortly after it was released and
the soundcard software was made available for download on the web.

As I note in my earlier post, to which the Village Idiot responded so inaccurately, it took about 30 minutes to learn how to use it once all the gear interfaces and computer preparation was made and I actually got it on the air. I learned a lot about it, too, not just some vaporous theory such as that Carl thinks he knows. It does work very well under most conditions, but it sure isn't foolproof by any means. Thus my report, well documented in Google I'm sure, on the incident that the Village Idiot Brian so sadly misunderstood. But that's the way things go for him, he has trouble chewing gum and walking in coordination, too.

>So I will not lecture others
>on how well it does or
>does not work.
>
>

So you're a normal person, not a troll like the other three respondents. So noted.

>But I would like to read
>of the experiences Brian
>Floyd and Carl have had
>with the mode, since they
>obviously have strong feelings
>about it.
>
>

I sure hope you won't need to anxiously await that information.

769. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 00:47:30 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87wudnr719.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74184

nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote:
>>brianburke@juno.com
>
>writes:
>
>>So basically, DICK is the original No-PSK Extra.
>
>Has Brian Burke ever
>used PSK-31 on the
>amateur bands?
>
>Has Floyd Davidson ever

...

>But I would like to read
>of the experiences Brian
>Floyd and Carl have had
>with the mode, since they
>obviously have strong feelings
>about it.

Do you actually think that just using it means DICK can even begin
to understand how it works? The whole point of what has been said
was that DICK managed to use both PSK31 and CW, and yet is not
sufficiently aware of communications theory that his comparisons
of the two modes are easily demonstrated to be invalid.

His answer, which he has repeated several times now, was that
Shannon doesn't apply the anything about Amateur Radio.

At that point, what choice does one have but to write DICK off as
so ill informed that he should be totally ignored.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

770. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 00:49:27 UTC
From: Ben Coleman <oloryn@benshome.net>
Message-ID: <adg8jv4c4vscgn2nb7729oq3ghmq64npv0@4ax.com>
Source record: 74185

On Sun, 03 Aug 2003 04:53:49 -0400, Dwight Stewart <stewart@say.net>
wrote:

> You right about that, Kim. If all those outside these newsgroups were like
>those here, everyone would have probably killed each other by now.

I'll say. I've noticed for awhile that there seems to be small
segment of the ham community who seem to think that vociferous
argument ought to be the major ham activity. They're loud, brash,
obnoxious and attract a lot of attention. By the looks of things,
they all seem to have descended on rra.misc and rra.policy. Now if we
could only figure out a way to keep them there, and off the air.

Ben

771. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 01:16:29 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <gnv7jvc6k0k8htda7ar1ka35b712eo5oot@4ax.com>
Source record: 74186

Now that the furor (not Fuhrer) over this whole ex-CB'er thing has
finally died down...

On 03 Aug 2003 03:02:18 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>John:
>
>Yep, it is true! I was once a CB'er, for a whole six months! I was the
>Asst. Mgr. of the Radio Shack store in Depew, NY at the time, and I gave
>myself a 30% discount on a Realistic TRC-23 CB transceiver -- the top-of-
>the-line AM CB rig at the time in the era just before 40 channels.
>I
>installed it in my 1972 Dodge Colt with a 102" whip antenna,

1972 Would make it the original Navaho (TRC-23, no bloody A, B, or C,
as Scotty might say). Kind of bulky for a Dodge Colt, but at least
somebody took advantage of the dual power supply in one of those. Most
of 'em got used as base station rigs...and 99% of the users were off
the air if the power went out because they didn't have the sense to
provide a backup DC supply for a rig that was tailor made for it.

This was back in the days when some people who worked at Radio Shack
actually knew something about their products.

When I went in to the store in NT and bought a handheld,
crystal-controlled scanner (circa 1975) the guy there had a whole
boxful of crystals and a list he had compiled himself of local
frequencies in case folks wanted to order 'em (at $5 each). Whereas
today they have to pull the data sheet up off the internet to tell you
if the scanner you're looking at even covers a given frequency. Today
they're more like Cellphone Shack. <sigh>

Radio Shack...you've got questions, we've got dumb looks.

>and actually
>got a lot of use out of it when travelling between the area R/S stores on
>stock transfer missions and going to/from the repair shop in Buffalo.

Buffalo or Tonawanda? I thought the (so-called) "factory repair" shop
was in the Colvin/Eggert Plaza back then.

>When I quit the job at Radio Shack and joined the Air Force, that was
>the end of my brilliant career as a CB'er!

A brilliant career move on both counts.

>73 de Larry, K3LT
>Ex: KHM-7772 (Handle: "Sky King")

I assume you're aware of the significance of SKYKING relative to its appearance in AFKAI-1?

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

772. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 02:12:55 UTC
From: Ben Coleman <oloryn@benshome.net>
Message-ID: <18l8jvkbi841aqr0l13hv8h6fo5b0v1spm@4ax.com>
Source record: 74187

On 7 Aug 2003 15:33:36 -0700, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>- the "incentive licensing" changes of 1968-69 that drastically
>increased the requirements for a full privileges license. And ushered
>in a period of growth and innovation....

Actually, ham growth took a distinct drop virtually from the moment 'incentive licensing' (a.k.a. 'punishment licensing') was proposed in the early '60s. Seems a number of OTs (and NTs, probably) didn't like the idea that they were going to have privileges (including some of the most choice frequency segments) taken away from them and they'd have to pass a test (or two or three) to get them back. This coincided with a number of well-known manufacturers finding that it was no longer financially profitable to stay in the ham market. If there appears to be increased growth after 'incentive licensing', it'll likely just be that ham growth returned to its normal levels after recovering from the blow to morale inflicted by the implementation of incentive licensing.

It appears the ARRL and the FCC learned from this - I don't think there's been any proposals from either since then that envision taking away privileges from any particular class of license.

Ben

773. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 02:20:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030808222055.25052.00001664@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 74188

In article <Xns93D1A8E3A7743elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>> 40 m is a band, not a frequency. Big difference between plopping down
>> an SSB signal on 7030 and 7230.

>I mean between 7040 and 7100, which is phone, except here.

"Here" is all of Region 2. A big part of the world.

>>> >> I am
>>> >> 90% sure that it is deliberate jamming, and it is a long term
>>> >> ongoing situation.
>>> >
>>> > How do you know it is deliberate?
>>>
>>> It's hard to be sure. Maybe the fact that the CQ calls go on
>>> abnormally long is a clue, though.
>>
>> Certainly a possibility. Long CQ isn't the best practice.
>>>
>>> > Perhaps the CQers could not hear the
>>> > DX 'phones.
>>>
>>> They would probably claim that, either way
>>
>> It could be true, however. The US power limit is 1500 W out. 40 meter
>> beams are common with the big guns. There can easily be a 30 dB
>> difference between how well you hear a 1500 W + beam at 100' CW sig
>> and how well he hears your 100 W and dipole SSB.
>>>
>>> > Perhaps the DX phones were on top of US CW ops innocently sending CQ
>>> > on frequencies that, by bandplan, are CW/digital.
>>>
>>> Innocent/ignorant - a fine dividing line, isn't it?
>>
>> Nope.
>>>
>>> Of course, by bandplan, the frequencies are phone too, just there, not
>>> here.
>>
>> Which is the real heart of the problem. And it's being fixed.
>
>I think you'll find it isn't being fixed.

Sure it is, but it will take time. Before the end of the decade 7000-7200 will be worldwide exclusive amateur. That's double what Region 1 and Region 3 have now. It will make sense for those regions to move their 'phone up above 7100 and leave below 7100 to CW and digital.

>The ARRL bandplan is the only
>one out of step, so nobody else is likely to change theirs,
>notwithstanding Europe and some other areas getting 7100-7200 as
>additional spectrum in 2007.

What part of the world will not get 7100-7200? And why should Region 2 change now, with the band getting wider?

>All that will happen is that a DX window will
>appear from 7150-7200, but the DX will continue to use phone everywhere
>they use it now - indefinitely. Sorry to be the one to break that to you!

So their lack of a bandplan and good manners should cause the USA to follow their lead? I think not!
>
>>> > The FCC has definite criteria for deliberate interference. One
>>> > criterion is if a station allegedly being interfered with changes
>>> > frequency, and the alleged interferer changes frequency too.
>>> >
>>> >> Presumably the perpetrators are too ignorant to understand that
>>> >> FCC rules end at the border?
>>> >
>>> > Who are "the perpetrators" in that case?

>>> The ones who are _not_ in QSO with anyone, who keep sending unanswered
>>> CQs for five minutes at a time, who didn't send QRU? before calling.
>>
>> Nobody sends QRU? before calling CQ. (It means "do you have anything
>> for me?")
>>
>> The textbook procedure is to send QRL? ("Are you busy?") first. But
>> that's unnecessarily long. A simple "?" will do the trick, or the most
>> common "IE" (didit - dit), all of which have the same meaning. The
>> reason for the shorter inquiries is so that if the freq IS in use,
>> less gets messed up.
>>
>> It is not uncommon for me to hear exchanges like this:
>>
>> Station wishing to call CQ: "IE" ("Is the frequency in use?")
>>
>> Station on freq, working station the wouldbe CQer cannot hear: "C"
>> ("Yes")
>>
>> Station wishing to call CQ: "SRI DE N2EY" ("sorry, bye, ID so you know
>> who it was")

>I will try listening for IE. I was expecting a Q signal.

Some use QRL? but in general the procedure is as above.
>
>>> > You are presuming guilt without adequate proof. Do you have any
>>> > evidence that the alleged violators could hear the alleged victims?
>>>
>>> No, that would be impossible to prove
>>
>> If you QSY and they follow, that's proof enough for the FCC.
>>>
>>> > Or
>>> > evidence that the alleged victims were using the frequency first,
>>> > rather than the other way around?
>>
>>> Yes, or at least I would have if I taped them.
>>
>>> > Most CW ops use narrow filters - 500, 400, 250 Hz are common
>>> > choices.* Useless for 'phone, of course. The CQers may not have
>>> > realized how close they were to the DX 'phones. How much room should
>>> > a CW station give a weak 'phone station?
>>
>>> I'm not talking about co-channel here, I mean right on top.
>>
>> "Right on top" is a lot of room. The CW signal needs maybe 250Hz tops,
>> the SSB ten times that.
>
>Granted. To be more specific, the CW beat note sounds in the normal range,
>i.e. 800 Hz +- when the SSB is tuned in.

800 is pretty high. 600-700 is more common among CW ops. The SSB audio passband
is typically 300-2700 Hz, so 600 or even 800 is pretty low. 1500 would be smack
in the middle.

>This of course would be what you
>would get if they netted onto the SSB and then offset by their usual
>amount.

There is no offset in CW. The carriers are all on the same frequency.
>
>> Point is that what sounds like "right on top" may not sound that way
>> to the other guy.

>It depends which side of the nominal carrier frequency the CW signal is
>on. However, assuming my SSB filter is working, I would say they were low,
>i.e. on the same side as the LSB sideband, or I would be filtering them
>out. This also puts them almost in the middle of the SSB signal, doesn't
>it?

No. Their tone would be 1500 if it were in the middle.
>
>> Listen to a busy CW contest with a wide (AM bandwidth) rx and it
>> sounds like a pile of intentional inteference. Switch in appropriate
>> filters and you find that almost all of the stations have spaced
>> themselves so they don't overlap.

>>
>>> Neither am I
>>> talking about weak phone stations, although they could be weak at some
>>> other QTH.
>>>
>> That's another point.
>>
>>> > Of course the DX 'phones could have switched to CW and answered the
>>> > CQers, then politely asked them to move.
>>
>> But they didn't, did they?
>>> >
>>> > *My Southgate Type 7 has two cascaded 8 pole 500 Hz crystal filters,
>>> > giving an effective bandwidth of less than 400 Hz and very steep
>>> > filter skirts. And it has an audio LC filter as well.
>>> >
>>>
>>> So, if say, you called QRU? on 7080 and there was a strong signal SSB
>>> QSO in progress, would you be able to tell? This is a genuine
>>> question.
>>
>> I would listen first and steer clear of anyhting that sounds like SSB.
>> Then I'd send "IE" a few times to test the waters. If I heard
>> something start up when I did that, I'd move.
>>
>> But usually I am below 7060. Above about 7060 is data and foreign SSB
>> country.
>>
>>> I
>>> don't posses a CW filter.
>>
>> One of the reasons some hams get turned off to CW is that they use
>> equipment that really isn't meant for the mode. Most HF rigs today are
>> primarily SSB rigs with CW tacked on. Some are pretty good, many are
>> awful.
>>
>
>If I need it I have an outboard audio filter

Ugh. Audio filters are no substitute for IF filtering. And unless the AGC is
turned off, QRM can dominate the receiver.

>(a Radio Shack DSP unit,
>which is fairly basic and suffers from low audio output). I hadn't thought
>about that when I said I had no CW filter. It tends to 'take off' on 20
>with RF getting inside it, but it's OK on 40.

What sort of rig?
>
>>> I am guessing you would hear something,though?
>>>

>> Depends on the situation. Usually SSB sounds like monkey chatter
>> through a narrow filter. But near the edges it can be very weak or
>> inaudible.
>
>As I've explained, I think this is going on in the middle of the SSB sigs,
>which is another reason to be suspicious

Sure. But 1500 is the middle, not 800.

>> The best solution is for wide and narrow modes to have their own
>> subbands. They simply don't mix well.
>
>Yes

So when will the rest of the world get on the beam and have nonphone subbands?
>
>> A notch filter can remove a carrier or CW signal.
>>
>True, not that I have one, though

Well, there you have it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

774. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 02:33:33 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh1mht$ce2$0@208.207.71.160>
Source record: 74189

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>>he end
>>of WW2 to 1963 (17 years) the number of US hams quadrupled. Then it
>>stopped dead and the numbers hung at about a quarter million for more
>>than 5 years in the '60s.
>>
>>Oddly enough, growth started back up again when the incentive
>>licensing changes were enacted. Huh?
>>
>>
>
>Now you're trying to tell us that incentive licensing PROMOTED
>growth in ham radio??? I don't think so ...
>
>

That sure wouldn't be the first time you're wrong, either

>
>
>The boom in the 60's was probably due to the emergence of economical
>JA radios,
>

Uh, Carl, the JA radios didn't arrive until the early 70's, sorry.
Through the 60's the few transceivers available had Collins on them and
were outta sight for ordinary hams.
Herb Johnston started up Swan, building a few singlebanders in the
Arizona hamlet of Benson, east of Tucson sometime in that time frame,
and soon moves
the operation to the California coast. (I have a 20 meter model from the
Benson Az era)
Leo Meyerson of World Radio in Iowa produced the thrifty WRL Duobander,
a SSB-only hybrid transciever on 75/40 meters running tube finals,
worked quite well,. I had one in the car, and even
used it mobile CW some, too, though I had to rig it.. (I still have one
of those out in the shop, also)
The Tempo One/FT200 showed up in '72, I got one of the first that Henry
Radio received. A Lot of radio at a reasonable price. Hybrid with tube
driver and finals, as all the JA rigs were up till the Kewood TS120
series. Don't forget the Freebanders Wonder, the
ubiquitous FT101 series. There are still many thousands of those out
there, I'm sure.
Need a history lesson? Just ask!

And Oh, by the way, the surge in licenses didn't occur until AFTER the
adoption of Incentive Licensing, very late 60's-70's. That's as opposed
to the last round, which was definitely Disincentive Licensing.

>
>

>>How many HF amateur AMTOR contacts have you or anyone you know made in
>>the past year?
>>

>
>I have AMTOR capability, but haven't hooked it up in the 3 years I've
>been here in the new house ... used it a lot from the sailboat in the early
>90's ...
>
>

If you plan on working AMTOR any more you better arrange for someone to
meet you on the air, as there sure isn't any natural activity
remaining. PACTOR obsoleted AMTOR. Good riddance.

>
>
>>>>Of course what really drove all that was PC/soundcard setups becoming
>>>>affordable.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Agreed ... multimode with a std SSB radio and PC ... cool stuff.
>>>
>>>
>>Sort of. But it's actually a patch job.
>>
>>
>
>Actually, it's not a bad idea to use existing PC capabilities to do the
>signal processing for multiple modes ... it's all software ... and within
>the limits of a typical SSB radio, you can do some interesting, albeit
>rather slow, stuff on HF.
>

That suits ham radio perfectly. That's one of the problems you
"professionals" foist onto ham radio
There is simply NO need for hams to ever want massive traffic handling
capability . Even in emergencies the normal amateur modes serve quite
adequately.

>
>
>
>>>However,
>>>still limited in some respects and we can do better with purpose-made

>>>RF modems capable of more speed and other improvements.
>>>
>>>
>>"Purpose made RF modems"?? Why not call them data radios?
>>
>>
>
>Whatever ... I tend to think that RF modems is a good term ...
>after all, modem is the concatenation of MODulator and DEModulator.
>

You don't say!

>
>
>
>>And I agree - a dig built specifically for data modes is the better
>>solution. Deal with the decoding right at the IF level, rather than
>>converting to audio and all that jazz.
>>
>>
>
>Actually, most modern digital radios convert directly to I/Q baseband
>and do the signal processing there ...
>
>
>
>>But somebody's got to design and build the data radios. Who is going
>>to tie the bell on that cat?
>>
>>
>
>I was telling you of some plans I have for after I get my antenna work
>done this summer ... winter projects, so to speak. However, you will
>realize that I do work for a living and have other obligations as well,
>so don't hold me to some firm, preconceived schedule. Don't get me
>wrong, it's something I *really* want to do, and I intend to do it with
>as much diligence as I can in terms of getting something accomplished.
>

(Yawn) we're waiting. Been waiting several years. Prolly still be
waiting several years hence.

>
>
>
>>One reason packet is stuck at 1200 baud all these years is because
>>going faster would require a purpose-built data radio. Ikensu isn't
>>going to do it unless there's a proven market, and the failure of 9600
>>to get much attention means they will wait some more.
>>

>>
>
>9600 is a kludge in virtually all of the rice-boxes ... and it's not fast
>enough to really be interesting or all that useful ...
>
>
>
>>Was "incentive licensing" a mistake? It was very unpopular. Lots of
>>folks were against it. Said it would kill amateur radio. I remember
>>those times - they make this whole code-test thing look like afternoon
>>tea.
>>
>>

Yet it spurred growth of the ARS following a fairly long period of
stagnation. Most people used to respond positively to a challenge, but
obviously not all, as we have seen among the posters here.
Today, all bets are off, since those dame non-responders prevailed and
got it all reduce to zilch anyway.

>I personally think that incentive licensing, as implemented, was a mistake.
>

Personal problems are endemic in the human race.

>It made little sense to require higher Morse speeds for privs that were
>primarily non-Morse ...
>

Ah, like the lower 50 kHz of each HF band?

> I have NO problem with a *reasonable* number
>(I think 3 is adequate, 2 might be alright) of license classes in order to
>encourage folks to learn more about radio technology
>

There was NOTHING wrong with Novice Tech General Adanced and Extra,
either.
Except that some folks didn't feel challenged, instead they felt hooped.

>... I know that
>many will say it's impractical from an enforcement standpoint, but I would
>restrict power for the lower classes (though you've probably seen me
>comment that brute force power is over-rated ... I doubt that I will ever
>get a legal limit amp ... 100W seems to work just fine on HF), rather than
>segregate newcomers from everyone else as widely as our current rules
>do. Newcomers need to be welcomed and "socialized" (not like Larry's
>"don't let the door hit you in the ass on the way out" shpiel ...) That's
>how
>to make more good ... and better ... hams - welcome them and show them
>the way (politely).
>
>

Sure, Carl. Show us "polite".

775. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 02:36:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030808223638.24390.00001651@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 74190

In article <gnv7jvc6k0k8htda7ar1ka35b712eo5oot@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
<kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> writes:

>>Yep, it is true! I was once a CB'er, for a whole six months! I was the
>>Asst. Mgr. of the Radio Shack store in Depew, NY at the time, and I gave
>>myself a 30% discount on a Realistic TRC-23 CB transceiver -- the top-of-
>>the-line AM CB rig at the time in the era just before 40 channels.
>>I
>>installed it in my 1972 Dodge Colt with a 102" whip antenna,
>
>1972 Would make it the original Navaho (TRC-23, no bloody A, B, or C,
>as Scotty might say).

John:

Actually, it was the TRC-23 bloody C! And I got my time line mixed up, I
worked for Radio Shack from '74 to '75. In '72 I was working in the
Carhart Photo processing lab on Broadway -- remember them?

>Kind of bulky for a Dodge Colt, but at least
>somebody took advantage of the dual power supply in one of those. Most
>of 'em got used as base station rigs...and 99% of the users were off
>the air if the power went out because they didn't have the sense to
>provide a backup DC supply for a rig that was tailor made for it.

The Navajo was an excellent "base station" rig at the time! However,
I believe it had been discontinued by the time I was working at the
Shack.

>This was back in the days when some people who worked at Radio Shack
>actually knew something about their products.
>
>When I went in to the store in NT and bought a handheld,
>crystal-controlled scanner (circa 1975) the guy there had a whole
>boxful of crystals and a list he had compiled himself of local
>frequencies in case folks wanted to order 'em (at $5 each). Whereas
>today they have to pull the data sheet up off the internet to tell you
>if the scanner you're looking at even covers a given frequency. Today
>they're more like Cellphone Shack. <sigh>

I remember those crystal-controlled scanners very well, and yes, at all
the stores I worked at, we did have "home brewed" lists, and would
even keep the most popular crystals in stock! My store in Depew, NY
had a reputation as being a "CB/Scanner" specialist store, and I was
usually very busy doing ICST's (Inter-Company Stock Transfers) of
crystals to other Buffalo area stores!

>Radio Shack...you've got questions, we've got dumb looks.
>
>>and actually
>>got a lot of use out of it when travelling between the area R/S stores on
>>stock transfer missions and going to/from the repair shop in Buffalo.
>
>Buffalo or Tonawanda? I thought the (so-called) "factory repair" shop
>was in the Colvin/Eggert Plaza back then.

The repair shop was in the basement of the Main St. store in downtown
Buffalo at the time. I remember it well!

>>When I quit the job at Radio Shack and joined the Air Force, that was
>>the end of my brilliant career as a CB'er!
>
>A brilliant career move on both counts.
>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>Ex: KHM-7772 (Handle: "Sky King")
>
>I assume you're aware of the significance of SKYKING relative to its
>appearance in AFKAI-1?

I know that "SKYKING" used to be a call used by Air Force ground
stations as a general call to aircraft. As in "SKYKING, SKYKING,
This is McClellan, do not answer -- traffic follows" Am I warm?
I don't relate to "AFKAI-1." I personally got the "handle" Sky King
from the old TV program by the same name.

73 de Larry, K3LT

776. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 02:36:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030808223639.24390.00001652@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 74191

In article <S_CYa.43$dj3.7158@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>
>Yes, I would say that the threshold should be more like "Anyone who's
>even close to as dumb as Dick shouldn't be a ham, let alone an Extra."
>
>Carl - wk3c

Carl:

Ahhh -- more name calling! I guess that helps to make your point about
your technical superiority as a ham!

73 de Larry, K3LT

777. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 02:54:25 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh1np1$eb3$0@208.207.71.160>
Source record: 74192

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>In article <S_CYa.43$dj3.7158@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>
>
>>Yes, I would say that the threshold should be more like "Anyone who's
>>even close to as dumb as Dick shouldn't be a ham, let alone an Extra."
>>
>>Carl - wk3c
>>
>>
>
>Carl:
>
>Ahhh -- more name calling! I guess that helps to make your point about
>your technical superiority as a ham!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Shush now, Larry, he's just being polite!

778. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 03:00:08 UTC
From: Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <bh1o9d02lu7@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 74193

On Fri, 08 Aug 2003 20:58:01 GMT, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:

> A 24 MB file and well worth the download time. Good grief, I can't believe
> the FCC doesn't understand what this is going to do to HF communications.

Ham Radio and SWL is old technology and BPL will benefit millions of consumers
that want broadband Internet access. It is not fair to stop new technology
because 100,000 people that are active ham radio operators want to hang on to
old 1844 technology called morse code.
If ham radio had millions of active HF operators then it could be argued that
their bands should be protected in some fashion. But 100,000 vs 130 Million
households shows that the smaller group should lose their HF privileges for
better technology. Ham radio has been replaced by the Internet.

--
The Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
http://www.kilowatt-radio.org/
..it does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an
irate, tireless minority to set brush fires in people's
minds. --Samuel Adams

779. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 03:52:19 UTC
From: Ben Coleman <oloryn@benshome.net>
Message-ID: <fpn8jvgotj120ivslm7ev0eau9gp910f23@4ax.com>
Source record: 74194

On 8 Aug 2003 10:12:11 -0700, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>From the end
>of WW2 to 1963 (17 years) the number of US hams quadrupled. Then it
>stopped dead and the numbers hung at about a quarter million for more
>than 5 years in the '60s.
>
>Oddly enough, growth started back up again when the incentive
>licensing changes were enacted. Huh?

The ARRL first proposed what became incentive licensing in 1963. It was *not* well received. The upturn after incentive licensing was implemented appears to be more of a 'well, they actually did it. Might as well get on with life.' reaction than a positive result of the change.

A couple of thoughts from this:

1. It appears likely that the overall attitude of *existing* hams may affect ham growth more than licensing changes. From what I see, ham growth stopped not because of licensing changes, but because a large segment of hams became disgruntled over what was merely a proposed change (What appears to be a decent description appears in http://www.qsl.net/ecara/wayback/page13.html and http://www.qsl.net/ecara/wayback/page14.html). What that tells me today is that the future of ham radio is probably going to be affected more by the attitudes of existing hams than it is by the exact nature of the entrance exams. If you want to see growth in the numbers and character of the amateur radio community, it will probably depend more on whether or not you and hams like you (whether NCTA or PCTA) will welcome, train, and encourage new hams and prospective new hams than on squabbling over entrance test requirements. Argue all you want over the code requirement, but if you really care about the future of the hobby, pay attention to your own attitudes to other hams and to prospective hams.

2. If the ham community could 'get on with life' after the squabbling over incentive licensing, we should be able to do the same after the code requirement squabbling. It appears there may be hope for the hobby after all.

Ben

780. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 04:23:57 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030809002357.295$YI@newsreader.com>
Source record: 74195

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bgv9am$3fs$0@208.207.71.157...
> >
> >
> > JJ wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >
> > > Brian Kelly wrote:
> > >
> > >>
> > >> Every once in a blue moon when I've had absolutely nothing better to
> > >> do with my life I've gotten on 27Mhz and looked for intelligent
> > >> life. On the rare occasions when I've actually found some it lasts
> > >> maybe five minutes at most before the bozos blow it off the freq.
> > >>
> > >> YMMV . . !
> > >> w3rv
> > >
> > >
> > > So as to the subject "Do Hams get 11 Meters Back", I ask, "why in the
> > > world would hams want 11 meters back?" Eleven meters is the perfect
> > > example of what happens when rules are thrown out the window, total
> > > chaos. The cber's have managed to make it the sewer pit of the radio
> > > spectrum and the sad part is they can't even keep it in their own
> > > territory, they have to spew their garbage to other frequencies as
> > > well. The fact that hams in general follow the rules, and expect
> > > other operators to do the same is what keeps many cber's from getting
> > > a license. I say, "good riddance, we don't need those types in ham
> > > radio."
> >
> >
> >
> > It WILL be interesting to see how many of them leap on a code-free HF
> > license though, won't it?
> >
>
> It will be OUR FAULT if we allow that type of operation. Get ready for
> the fight.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
Get ready for a wooshing sound, that will be the stampede of no codes

and outlaws flooding your hallowed ground, little man. You brought
it all on..

--
GO♯ 40

781. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 04:49:30 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87fzkbqvtx.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74196

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>Ahhh -- more name calling! I guess that helps to make your point about
>your technical superiority as a ham!

As if Larry never calls anyone names on Usenet.

You're a lowlife hypocrite Larry, in so many ways its just
unbelievable how many times you trip on your own feet.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

782. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 04:51:59 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93D28AE9515Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 74197

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030808222055.25052.00001664@mb-m11.aol.com:

> In article <Xns93D1A8E3A7743elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>> 40 m is a band, not a frequency. Big difference between plopping down
>>> an SSB signal on 7030 and 7230.
>
>>I mean between 7040 and 7100, which is phone, except here.
>
> "Here" is all of Region 2. A big part of the world.

No, only the USA, it's still phone in the rest of R2

>
>>>> >> I am
>>>> >> 90% sure that it is deliberate jamming, and it is a long term
>>>> >> ongoing situation.
>>>> >
>>>> > How do you know it is deliberate?
>>>>
>>>> It's hard to be sure. Maybe the fact that the CQ calls go on
>>>> abnormally long is a clue, though.
>>>
>>> Certainly a possibility. Long CQ isn't the best practice.
>>>>
>>>> > Perhaps the CQers could not hear the
>>>> > DX 'phones.
>>>>
>>>> They would probably claim that, either way
>>>
>>> It could be true, however. The US power limit is 1500 W out. 40 meter
>>> beams are common with the big guns. There can easily be a 30 dB
>>> difference between how well you hear a 1500 W + beam at 100' CW sig
>>> and how well he hears your 100 W and dipole SSB.
>>>>
>>>> > Perhaps the DX phones were on top of US CW ops innocently sending
>>>> > CQ on frequencies that, by bandplan, are CW/digital.
>>>>
>>>> Innocent/ignorant - a fine dividing line, isn't it?
>>>
>>> Nope.
>>>>
>>>> Of course, by bandplan, the frequencies are phone too, just there,

>>>> not here.
>>>
>>> Which is the real heart of the problem. And it's being fixed.
>>
>>I think you'll find it isn't being fixed.
>
> Sure it is, but it will take time. Before the end of the decade
> 7000-7200 will be worldwide exclusive amateur. That's double what
> Region 1 and Region 3 have now. It will make sense for those regions to
> move their 'phone up above 7100 and leave below 7100 to CW and digital.
>

Not while the US has CW in 7100-7150. As long as that's the case it makes
more sense _to_them_ to leave 7000-7100 unchanged and split the 'new'
7100-7200 50/50. Net gain to you - zero.

>>The ARRL bandplan is the only
>>one out of step, so nobody else is likely to change theirs,
>>notwithstanding Europe and some other areas getting 7100-7200 as
>>additional spectrum in 2007.
>
> What part of the world will not get 7100-7200?

None

> And why should Region 2
> change now, with the band getting wider?
>

You mean the US, and I don't suppose the ARRL will change

>>All that will happen is that a DX window will
>>appear from 7150-7200, but the DX will continue to use phone everywhere
>>they use it now - indefinitely. Sorry to be the one to break that to
>>you!
>
> So their lack of a bandplan and good manners should cause the USA to
> follow their lead? I think not!

They have a bandplan. Phone stays above at least 7040, except 7030 in R3.
That's not the bandplan you want, but it's a bandplan. The reference to
good manners I don't follow. I don't expect the USA to follow anyone's
lead. Just don't be surprised when no-one follows the USA's lead either.

>>
>>>> > The FCC has definite criteria for deliberate interference. One
>>>> > criterion is if a station allegedly being interfered with changes
>>>> > frequency, and the alleged interferer changes frequency too.
>>>> >
>>>> >> Presumably the perpetrators are too ignorant to understand that
>>>> >> FCC rules end at the border?
>>>> >
>>>> > Who are "the perpetrators" in that case?

>
>>>> The ones who are _not_ in QSO with anyone, who keep sending
>>>> unanswered CQs for five minutes at a time, who didn't send QRU?
>>>> before calling.
>>>
>>> Nobody sends QRU? before calling CQ. (It means "do you have anything
>>> for me?")
>>>
>>> The textbook procedure is to send QRL? ("Are you busy?") first. But
>>> that's unnecessarily long. A simple "?" will do the trick, or the
>>> most common "IE" (didit - dit), all of which have the same meaning.
>>> The reason for the shorter inquiries is so that if the freq IS in
>>> use, less gets messed up.
>>>
>>> It is not uncommon for me to hear exchanges like this:
>>>
>>> Station wishing to call CQ: "IE" ("Is the frequency in use?")
>>>
>>> Station on freq, working station the wouldbe CQer cannot hear: "C"
>>> ("Yes")
>>>
>>> Station wishing to call CQ: "SRI DE N2EY" ("sorry, bye, ID so you
>>> know who it was")
>
>>I will try listening for IE. I was expecting a Q signal.
>
> Some use QRL? but in general the procedure is as above.
>>
>>>> > You are presuming guilt without adequate proof. Do you have any
>>>> > evidence that the alleged violators could hear the alleged
>>>> > victims?
>>>>
>>>> No, that would be impossible to prove
>>>
>>> If you QSY and they follow, that's proof enough for the FCC.
>>>>
>>>> > Or
>>>> > evidence that the alleged victims were using the frequency first,
>>>> > rather than the other way around?
>>>
>>>> Yes, or at least I would have if I taped them.
>>>
>>>> > Most CW ops use narrow filters - 500, 400, 250 Hz are common
>>>> > choices.* Useless for 'phone, of course. The CQers may not have
>>>> > realized how close they were to the DX 'phones. How much room
>>>> > should a CW station give a weak 'phone station?
>>>
>>>> I'm not talking about co-channel here, I mean right on top.
>>>
>>> "Right on top" is a lot of room. The CW signal needs maybe 250Hz

>>> tops, the SSB ten times that.
>>
>>Granted. To be more specific, the CW beat note sounds in the normal
>>range, i.e. 800 Hz +- when the SSB is tuned in.
>
> 800 is pretty high. 600-700 is more common among CW ops. The SSB audio
> passband is typically 300-2700 Hz, so 600 or even 800 is pretty low.
> 1500 would be smack in the middle.
>

True enough

>>This of course would be what you
>>would get if they netted onto the SSB and then offset by their usual
>>amount.
>
> There is no offset in CW. The carriers are all on the same frequency.
>>
>>> Point is that what sounds like "right on top" may not sound that way
>>> to the other guy.
>
>>It depends which side of the nominal carrier frequency the CW signal is
>>on. However, assuming my SSB filter is working, I would say they were
>>low, i.e. on the same side as the LSB sideband, or I would be filtering
>>them out. This also puts them almost in the middle of the SSB signal,
>>doesn't it?
>
> No. Their tone would be 1500 if it were in the middle.
>>
>>> Listen to a busy CW contest with a wide (AM bandwidth) rx and it
>>> sounds like a pile of intentional inteference. Switch in appropriate
>>> filters and you find that almost all of the stations have spaced
>>> themselves so they don't overlap.
>>>
>>>> Neither am I
>>>> talking about weak phone stations, although they could be weak at
>>>> some other QTH.
>>>>
>>> That's another point.
>>>
>>>> > Of course the DX 'phones could have switched to CW and answered
>>>> > the CQers, then politely asked them to move.
>>>
>>> But they didn't, did they?
>>>> >
>>>> > *My Southgate Type 7 has two cascaded 8 pole 500 Hz crystal
>>>> > filters, giving an effective bandwidth of less than 400 Hz and
>>>> > very steep filter skirts. And it has an audio LC filter as well.
>>>> >
>>>>
>>>> So, if say, you called QRU? on 7080 and there was a strong signal

>>>> SSB QSO in progress, would you be able to tell? This is a genuine
>>>> question.
>>>
>>> I would listen first and steer clear of anyhting that sounds like
>>> SSB. Then I'd send "IE" a few times to test the waters. If I heard
>>> something start up when I did that, I'd move.
>>>
>>> But usually I am below 7060. Above about 7060 is data and foreign SSB
>>> country.
>>>
>>>> I
>>>> don't posses a CW filter.
>>>
>>> One of the reasons some hams get turned off to CW is that they use
>>> equipment that really isn't meant for the mode. Most HF rigs today
>>> are primarily SSB rigs with CW tacked on. Some are pretty good, many
>>> are awful.
>>>
>>
>>If I need it I have an outboard audio filter
>
> Ugh. Audio filters are no substitute for IF filtering. And unless the
> AGC is turned off, QRM can dominate the receiver.
>

True, but I don't really need a narrow CW filter for anything

>>(a Radio Shack DSP unit,
>>which is fairly basic and suffers from low audio output). I hadn't
>>thought about that when I said I had no CW filter. It tends to 'take
>>off' on 20 with RF getting inside it, but it's OK on 40.
>
> What sort of rig?

I use an IC-729 in my shack. Excellent receiver RF performance. Not very
good audio, though. Ironically it has nowhere to fit a narrow SSB filter,
but has a place for a CW filter (nothing in there, of course). Not the
Rolls Royce of radios, but I'm not overloaded with cash.

>>
>>>> I am guessing you would hear something,though?
>>>>
>>> Depends on the situation. Usually SSB sounds like monkey chatter
>>> through a narrow filter. But near the edges it can be very weak or
>>> inaudible.
>>
>>As I've explained, I think this is going on in the middle of the SSB
>>sigs, which is another reason to be suspicious
>
> Sure. But 1500 is the middle, not 800.
>

>>> The best solution is for wide and narrow modes to have their own
>>> subbands. They simply don't mix well.
>>
>>Yes
>
> So when will the rest of the world get on the beam and have nonphone
> subbands?

They do, and they have done as long as I remember. In some countries they are voluntary, and in others they are compulsory, but nowhere are they as wide as in the USA.

>>
>>> A notch filter can remove a carrier or CW signal.
>>>
>>True, not that I have one, though
>
> Well, there you have it.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

73 de Alun, N3KIP

783. Re: Dear Norm: WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 06:00:23 UTC
From: PoorWogie <UglyRoger@anon.com>
Message-ID: <bh22ll$1rb$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 74198

"Stalker Dude" <sdude@in.georgia> wrote in message
news:gf4bivkba0p8ctqtinkyn4hs83in54npser@4ax.com...
On Fri, 8 Aug 2003 16:19:58 +0200 (CEST), Tara peed in her Tapioca
and said:

> "Stalker Dude" <sdude@in.georgia> wimpered:
> >
> > On Tue, 5 Aug 2003 11:26:44 -0400, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > > Dear Norm:
> > >
> > >
WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

784. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 06:05:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB5A07D1.22018%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74199

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> (snip) And amateur radio does not exist to
> serve other services. (snip)

Our public service is often service to other agencies (Red Cross, MARS,
and so on).

> The "pool of trained operators" thing in 97.1 is
> really about the idea of the ARS being a service
> where the licensees (hams) are skilled both
> operationally and technically, able to do a lot
> of different things well. This distinguishes it
> from other services, (snip)

The pool of trained operators concept relates to our ability to do the
other things outlined in 97.1 (public service, international goodwill, and
so on). At one time, code was a necessary part of at least some of that.
That is much less so today, hence the move to change the code testing
requirement.

> (snip) And public service. (snip)

I'm not aware of the use of code by any of the typical served agencies
(Red Cross, MARS, and so on).

> (snip) Besides, everything hams do is either "for
> enjoyment" or public service. Does that mean none
> of it should be tested?

Huh? I thought I was fairly clear about all this. Code was once necessary
for the goals and purposes outlined in 97.1. At the very least, that is much
less so today (some would say it is not at all so today). That severely
weakens the justification for a unique license requirement. If the license
requirement is actually removed, code will then be tested on an equal
footing with the other operating modes (written theory). Nothing in that is
an argument for or against testing anything else.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

785. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 09:20:44 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308090120.463cf391@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74200

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308080811.77234aa6@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308080222.14e5465d@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030807222824.21428.00001560@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>
> > > >> >We're not quite above such things.
>
> > > >> Yes, we are.
>
> > > >Maybe your "we" but I've run into some other "we's" on CW who are not
> > > >as lily-white. The infamous antics in the CW pileups on Don Miller
> > > >come to mind for one.
> > >
> > > That was 35+ years ago. If you have to go back that far to find a one bad
> > > guy on CW, that's pretty good, I think.
> >
> > I didn't *have* to go back 35 years, I only went back 35 years because
> > everybody knows the Don Miller story.
>
> I would bet most hams don't know it.

OK but we do.

> He's outa jail, too. Real nice
> fella that one. A doctor, too.

Picked up a law degree while he was locked up.

> > I need to point out here that,
> > quite contrary to the folklore about the "ethical purity" of the
> > brass-pounding OFs of yore, that it was those sainted OFs who blitzed
> > Miller. And they were not refugees from 11M or any of the current crop
> > of codeless wonders. They *all* hiked uphill both ways thru blizzards,
> > etc., etc. . . .
>
> What story are we talking about anyway?

How a number of CW ops intentionally jammed Miller then per 3.950
today. And they didn't do it running barefoot.

> I'm thinking of how he lied
> about where his DXpeditions were.

The jamming occurred based only on the *suspicion* that Miller was not
operating from where he said he was well before any of it landed in
the courts. The jamming was completely out of line no matter how you
look at it.

> Or maybe where he was convicted of
> conspiracy to commit murder (attempted) (IIRC)
> >
> > As far as the 35 year thing goes I only have to go back to a club
> > meeting this past June for a current example. A well-known two-lander
> > who is in the habit of busting CW contest records has a couple CW
> > stalkers up his butt and described the annoying situation.
>
> "Stalkers"?

A couple jerks following him around the bands and keying up on him
during the contests.

> > I fully agree that the bullshit level in the CW portions of the bands
> > is much, much lower than it is up the bands.
>
> That's all I'm saying.
>
> Nobody's perfect, and no mode or test or fancy hardware/software will
> make everyone behave perfectly 100% of the time.

For absolute certain.

> But that doesn't mean there's no difference.

I agree with that but you were talking in terms of absolutes.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

786. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 09:29:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308090129.59fa1e2d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74351

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308080920.d97c720@posting.google.com>...

> . . . I take umbrage with
> > those who over-hype CW on the basis of the purity of the souls who
> > practice the art & science. It just ain't so, we're all just people.
> >
> > > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > w3rv
>
> FWIW, Larry has reported that his "friend" sends QFU.

We all worked 4Q2TOO in the low end of 80, "The Island of Ambrosio".

787. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 10:11:39 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F34C8DB.3060108@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 74386

Phil wrote:

>
> There are a surprising number of hams out there that have lost the
> spirit of the hobby (one idiot told me that he won't bother to QSO
> with someone who is off by even 10 Hz....it bothers his ears!)

That is what RIT is for, but these refugees from the cb band
don't know how to use it. They would really be hacked if they
had to operate in the days when Novices were required to be
crystal controlled. You called CQ on your crystal frequency then
had to tune the band with your receiver to listen for another
Novice, who more than likely had a different crystal frequency,
giving you a call. Too many modern day jap appliance operators
are wimps when it comes to operating, they know how to turn on
the rig, read their fancy digital readout and that is the height
of their technical skills.

788. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 10:40:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308090240.7b896978@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74352

nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
news:<20030808175644.19707.00000166@mb-m23.aol.com>...

> For the record, I have not
> used PSK-31 myself on
> the amateur bands.
>
> So I will not lecture others
> on how well it does or
> does not work.

Yet Dick is free to lecture others, i.e., "any idiot can get psk going
in under 30 minutes," but by his own words here he couldn't.

That is the point.

789. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 11:16:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308090316.24c75a16@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74353

nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
news:<20030808174923.19707.00000165@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >brianburke@juno.com

> >Who is Len?
> >
> Ellen Degeneres does that character much better than you, Brian Burke.

Let's see. She's done it, you've done it, and I've done it.

You come closest to Ellen on that one.

Congratulations.

790. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 12:17:54 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <SD5Za.221$dj3.28368@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74354

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030808223639.24390.00001652@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <S_CYa.43$dj3.7158@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >
> >Yes, I would say that the threshold should be more like "Anyone who's
> >even close to as dumb as Dick shouldn't be a ham, let alone an Extra."
> >
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> Carl:
>
> Ahhh -- more name calling! I guess that helps to make your point about
> your technical superiority as a ham!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

What name calling? I refered to Dick as "Dick." :-)
The comment simply paraphrased/slightly modified something someone
else said (I think it may have been Floyd's original comment, but I don't
remember for sure ...)

Besides, this is not a discussion of a truly technical issue, so what does
my level of technical competence have to do with THIS discussion?

Carl - wk3c

791. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 12:21:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809082106.09955.00001187@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 74355

In article <fpn8jvgotj120ivslm7ev0eau9gp910f23@4ax.com>, Ben Coleman
<oloryn@benshome.net> writes:

>On 8 Aug 2003 10:12:11 -0700, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>From the end
>>of WW2 to 1963 (17 years) the number of US hams quadrupled. Then it
>>stopped dead and the numbers hung at about a quarter million for more
>>than 5 years in the '60s.
>>
>>Oddly enough, growth started back up again when the incentive
>>licensing changes were enacted. Huh?
>
>The ARRL first proposed what became incentive licensing in 1963.

No, that's not exactly correct.

Until 1951 there were three classes of license - A, B and C. B and C were
equivalent except that C was by mail.

All licenses required 13 wpm code (sending and receiving) and a ~50 question
written test on theory and regs, about equivalent to the General of later
times.

Class A required another 50 question written test on advanced theory items and
one year experience. Class A was not available by mail.

All classes could operate on any authorized amateur frequeuncy at full
authorized power - using CW or RTTY. A Class A license was required to operate
'phone on any ham band between 3 and 25 MHz.

Very simple system, with the popular HF 'phone bands as the incentive. They did
not call it incentive licnesing, but that's what it was. And iot dated back to
the early 1930s.

In 1951 FCC restructured and renamed. The new Novice, Technician and Extra
classes were added. Class C became Conditional, Class B became General and
Class A became Advanced.

Novice was a one-time short term beginner license. Technician was a VHF-UHF
only license. Advanced and Extra were full privilige licenses but Advanced
would be closed to new issues at the end of 1952.

Extra required 20 wpm code and a new ~100 question written test on advanced
theory, plus two years' experience. This effectively raised the requirements
for HF 'phone privileges by quite a bit.

Novice and Tech experience did not count towards Extra or Advanced.

Both systems were forms of "incentive licensing" .

In late 1952, FCC reversed itself and gave all operating privileges to all hams except Novices and Technicians.

>It
>was *not* well received.

In 1958 FCC started asking why there were so few Extras (fewer than 4,000). By 1963 FCC was saying they were going to restructure again.

ARRL proposed that they reopen the Advanced to new issues and simply go back to the pre-1953 system that required an Advanced or Extra for HF 'phone between 3 and 25 MHz. FCC gave that proposal an RM number, and then asked for other ideas. Which flooded in, and at least ten of them got RM numbers. From all those proposals emerged the idea of subbands-by-license-class and other things. No one proposal was the source of the system that resulted.

>The upturn after incentive licensing was
>implemented appears to be more of a 'well, they actually did it.
>Might as well get on with life.' reaction than a positive result of
>the change.
>
Perhaps. But the discussion took 5 years, and newcomers back then almost all started with Novices.

The main points are that incentive licnesing was not a new idea but rather a return to an old system in new dress. And it was not an ARRL idea, but an FCC one.

There were several factors that stalled growth in the '60s:

1) The conversion from AM to SSB took away the recruiting effect of SWLs finding ham radio on their SW receivers. (Most receivers used by casual SWLs then were terrible for SSB)

2) FCC drastically reduced "Conditional territory", the places where a Conditional license could be obtained. Before 1963, you had to live 75 miles from a quarterly exam point. There were a large number of Conditionals as a result. In 1963, the distance went to 175 miles and the number of quarterly exam points increased.

3) FCC imposed fees for licenses and license tests (except Novice). Adjusted for inflation, the fees were considerable - about $40-50 in today's money, pass or fail.

4) 27 MHz CB was becoming popular with people wanting local communications. No test at all, inexpensive equipment, small antennas. Some people dispensed with the license entirely.

5) '60s counterculture and the Vietnam war alienated many young people from "square" activities like ham radio. Young people were the primary source of new hams after 1951. (There weren't a lot of hams at Woodstock).
>
>A couple of thoughts from this:

>
>1. It appears likely that the overall attitude of *existing* hams may
>affect ham growth more than licensing changes. From what I see, ham
>growth stopped not because of licensing changes, but because a large
>segment of hams became disgruntled over what was merely a proposed
>change (What appears to be a decent description appears in
>http://www.qsl.net/ecara/wayback/page13.html and
>http://www.qsl.net/ecara/wayback/page14.html).

W2XOY's excellent history.

> What that tells me
>today is that the future of ham radio is probably going to be affected
>more by the attitudes of existing hams than it is by the exact nature
>of the entrance exams. If you want to see growth in the numbers and
>character of the amateur radio community, it will probably depend more
>on whether or not you and hams like you (whether NCTA or PCTA) will
>welcome, train, and encourage new hams and prospective new hams than
>on squabbling over entrance test requirements. Argue all you want
>over the code requirement, but if you really care about the future of
>the hobby, pay attention to your own attitudes to other hams and to
>prospective hams.

Good advice.
>
>2. If the ham community could 'get on with life' after the squabbling
>over incentive licensing, we should be able to do the same after the
>code requirement squabbling. It appears there may be hope for the
>hobby after all.
>
Some folks are still squabbling over incentive licensing!

73 de Jim, N2EY

792. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 13:49:01 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809094901.05245.00000300@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 74356

> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

writes:

> Heh, heh. I see a terrible parallel to the long-timer PCTAs. They
> don't want to see reality as it really is, either. :-)

What "reality" is that? Your reality?

"Reality does not care what you believe" - Hans Brakob

> Morse code, which well predates WW2, is old and needs to be
> dismantled. :-)

You are old and predate WW2. Len. ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-)

Perhaps your "reality" needs to be dismantled. ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-)

793. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 14:09:07 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh2va3$ru4$0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 74357

Brian wrote:

> nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
news:<20030808175644.19707.00000166@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>
> > For the record, I have not
> > used PSK-31 myself on
> > the amateur bands.
> >
> > So I will not lecture others
> > on how well it does or
> > does not work.
>
> Yet Dick is free to lecture others, i.e., "any idiot can get psk going
> in under 30 minutes," but by his own words here he couldn't.
>

Read it again, Braindead.

> That is the point.

You're wearing the point on your head.

794. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 14:10:34 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809101034.05245.00000303@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 74358

> Floyd Davidson floyd@barrow.com
wrote:

>nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote:
>>>brianburke@juno.com
>>
>>writes:
>>
>>>So basically, DICK is the original No-PSK Extra.
>>
>>Has Brian Burke ever
>>used PSK-31 on the
>>amateur bands?
>>
>>Has Floyd Davidson ever
>
No reply. Sounds like a
big fat "no".
>...
>
>>But I would like to read
>>of the experiences Brian
>>Floyd and Carl have had
>>with the mode, since they
>>obviously have strong feelings
>>about it.
>
>Do you actually think that just using it means DICK can even begin
>to understand how it works?

"You can not answer a
question with another
question" - Len Anderson

The question I asked was
whether YOU had ever used
PSK-31. I don't think you
have, Floyd Davidson.

You have theory but no
practical experience.
Dick Caroll has the opposite.

One would think your
combined knowledge
would synergize into

a greater whole. But
instead you both resist
the other's possible
contribution.

Is that the behavior you
want others to follow?

>The whole point of what has been said
>was that DICK managed to use both PSK31 and CW, and yet is >not
>sufficiently aware of communications theory that his comparisons
>of the two modes are easily demonstrated to be invalid.

Yet you have not done so.

>His answer, which he has repeated several times now, was that
>Shannon doesn't apply the anything about Amateur Radio.

That's obviously not true. Shannon's
work applies, just as Ohm's Law
applies.

Shannon's theories, however, are not
the only consideration. His work predicts
theoretical limits, or bounds, on the
performance of system models. Real
systems do not always reach the predicted
limits.

In other words, a practical system can
not exceed the Shannon bounds, but it
can fall short of them.

And not all models are accurate. For
example, if we consider only thermal noise,
PSK-31 appears to have an advantage. But
if the actual system includes random phase
shifts, PSK-31 may be unusable. These
shifts may be due to the transmitter, receiver
and/or propagation.

>At that point, what choice does one have but to write DICK off as
>so ill informed that he should be totally ignored.

You could consider his practical
experience, which you lack, as a
useful tool. Instead, you argue.
Very odd behavior.

The truth of the matter is that under some
conditions PSK-31 outperforms OOK
Morse CW, and under some conditions
OOK Morse CW outperforms PSK-31.

Can both of you
accept that fact?

795. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 14:21:19 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809102119.27503.00001516@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 74360

In article <Xns93D28AE9515Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>news:20030808222055.25052.00001664@mb-m11.aol.com:
>
>> In article <Xns93D1A8E3A7743elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>>>> 40 m is a band, not a frequency. Big difference between plopping down
>>>> an SSB signal on 7030 and 7230.
>>
>>>I mean between 7040 and 7100, which is phone, except here.
>>
>> "Here" is all of Region 2. A big part of the world.
>
>No, only the USA, it's still phone in the rest of R2

No, it isn't. Other modes are authorized, not just 'phone.

>>>I think you'll find it isn't being fixed.
>>
>> Sure it is, but it will take time. Before the end of the decade
>> 7000-7200 will be worldwide exclusive amateur. That's double what
>> Region 1 and Region 3 have now. It will make sense for those regions to
>> move their 'phone up above 7100 and leave below 7100 to CW and digital.
>>
>
>Not while the US has CW in 7100-7150. As long as that's the case it makes
>more sense _to_them_ to leave 7000-7100 unchanged and split the 'new'
>7100-7200 50/50. Net gain to you - zero.

If it gets the foreign 'phones off of 7030, it's a gain.
>
>>>The ARRL bandplan is the only
>>>one out of step, so nobody else is likely to change theirs,
>>>notwithstanding Europe and some other areas getting 7100-7200 as
>>>additional spectrum in 2007.
>>
>> What part of the world will not get 7100-7200?
>
>None

There you are.
>
>> And why should Region 2

>> change now, with the band getting wider?
>
>You mean the US, and I don't suppose the ARRL will change

It's not just ARRL but FCC.
>
>>>All that will happen is that a DX window will
>>>appear from 7150-7200, but the DX will continue to use phone everywhere
>>>they use it now - indefinitely. Sorry to be the one to break that to
>>>you!
>>
>> So their lack of a bandplan and good manners should cause the USA to
>> follow their lead? I think not!
>
>They have a bandplan. Phone stays above at least 7040, except 7030 in R3.

There are Canadians operating LSB on 7030.

>That's not the bandplan you want, but it's a bandplan. The reference to
>good manners I don't follow.

The folks who don't follow the bandplan have bad manners. Having a Canadian SSB net on 7030 when they have 7000-7030 is bad manners.

>I don't expect the USA to follow anyone's
>lead. Just don't be surprised when no-one follows the USA's lead either.

And the result is chaos.

>> 800 is pretty high. 600-700 is more common among CW ops. The SSB audio
>> passband is typically 300-2700 Hz, so 600 or even 800 is pretty low.
>> 1500 would be smack in the middle.
>
>True enough
>
>>>This of course would be what you
>>>would get if they netted onto the SSB and then offset by their usual
>>>amount.
>>
>> There is no offset in CW. The carriers are all on the same frequency.
>>>
>>>> Point is that what sounds like "right on top" may not sound that way
>>>> to the other guy.
>>
>>>It depends which side of the nominal carrier frequency the CW signal is
>>>on. However, assuming my SSB filter is working, I would say they were
>>>low, i.e. on the same side as the LSB sideband, or I would be filtering
>>>them out. This also puts them almost in the middle of the SSB signal,
>>>doesn't it?
>>
>> No. Their tone would be 1500 if it were in the middle.
>>>

>>>> Listen to a busy CW contest with a wide (AM bandwidth) rx and it
>>>> sounds like a pile of intentional inteference. Switch in appropriate
>>>> filters and you find that almost all of the stations have spaced
>>>> themselves so they don't overlap.
>>>>
>>>>> Neither am I
>>>>> talking about weak phone stations, although they could be weak at
>>>>> some other QTH.
>>>>>
>>>> That's another point.
>>>>
>>>>> > Of course the DX 'phones could have switched to CW and answered
>>>>> > the CQers, then politely asked them to move.
>>>>
>>>> But they didn't, did they?
>>>>> >
>>>>> > *My Southgate Type 7 has two cascaded 8 pole 500 Hz crystal
>>>>> > filters, giving an effective bandwidth of less than 400 Hz and
>>>>> > very steep filter skirts. And it has an audio LC filter as well.
>>>>> >
>>>>>
>>>>> So, if say, you called QRU? on 7080 and there was a strong signal
>>>>> SSB QSO in progress, would you be able to tell? This is a genuine
>>>>> question.
>>>>
>>>> I would listen first and steer clear of anyhting that sounds like
>>>> SSB. Then I'd send "IE" a few times to test the waters. If I heard
>>>> something start up when I did that, I'd move.
>>>>
>>>> But usually I am below 7060. Above about 7060 is data and foreign SSB
>>>> country.
>>>>
>>>>> I
>>>>> don't posses a CW filter.
>>>>
>>>> One of the reasons some hams get turned off to CW is that they use
>>>> equipment that really isn't meant for the mode. Most HF rigs today
>>>> are primarily SSB rigs with CW tacked on. Some are pretty good, many
>>>> are awful.
>>>>
>>>
>>>If I need it I have an outboard audio filter
>>
>> Ugh. Audio filters are no substitute for IF filtering. And unless the
>> AGC is turned off, QRM can dominate the receiver.
>>
>
>True, but I don't really need a narrow CW filter for anything

Data modes.
>
>>>(a Radio Shack DSP unit,
>>>which is fairly basic and suffers from low audio output). I hadn't
>>>thought about that when I said I had no CW filter. It tends to 'take
>>>off' on 20 with RF getting inside it, but it's OK on 40.
>>
>> What sort of rig?
>
>I use an IC-729 in my shack. Excellent receiver RF performance.

Compared to what? No offense, but there are some really good rigs out there.

>Not very
>good audio, though. Ironically it has nowhere to fit a narrow SSB filter,
>but has a place for a CW filter (nothing in there, of course).

Couldn't a narrow SSB filter be put in the CW slot?

>Not the
>Rolls Royce of radios, but I'm not overloaded with cash.

The Southgate Type 7 cost me less than $100 to build.
>
>>>>> I am guessing you would hear something,though?
>>>>>
>>>> Depends on the situation. Usually SSB sounds like monkey chatter
>>>> through a narrow filter. But near the edges it can be very weak or
>>>> inaudible.
>>>
>>>As I've explained, I think this is going on in the middle of the SSB
>>>sigs, which is another reason to be suspicious
>>
>> Sure. But 1500 is the middle, not 800.
>>
>>>> The best solution is for wide and narrow modes to have their own
>>>> subbands. They simply don't mix well.
>>>
>>>Yes
>>
>> So when will the rest of the world get on the beam and have nonphone
>> subbands?
>
>They do, and they have done as long as I remember. In some countries they
>are voluntary, and in others they are compulsory, but nowhere are they as
>wide as in the USA.

Time for them to get on the beam, then.
>
>>>> A notch filter can remove a carrier or CW signal.
>>>>
>>>True, not that I have one, though
>>

>> Well, there you have it.
>>
73 de Jim, N2EY

796. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 14:21:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809102120.27503.00001517@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 74359

In article <18l8jvkbi841aqr0l13hv8h6fo5b0v1spm@4ax.com>, Ben Coleman
<oloryn@benshome.net> writes:

>On 7 Aug 2003 15:33:36 -0700, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>- the "incentive licensing" changes of 1968-69 that drastically
>>increased the requirements for a full privileges license. And ushered
>>in a period of growth and innovation....
>
>Actually, ham growth took a distinct drop virtually from the moment
>'incentive licensing' (a.k.a. 'punishment licensing') was proposed in
>the early '60s.

See my other post about the dates and details. There were lots of other factors
to the drop in growth.

>Seems a number of OTs (and NTs, probably) didn't like
>the idea that they were going to have privileges (including some of
>the most choice frequency segments) taken away from them and they'd
>have to pass a test (or two or three) to get them back.

True - but there was also widespread support for incentive licensing among
hams. Opinion ran almost exactly 50-50.

>This
>coincided with a number of well-known manufacturers finding that it
>was no longer financially profitable to stay in the ham market.

Who?

The 1960-68 period was marked by the introduction of many new SSB transceivers
and matched-pair receiver-transmitters, often at prices lower than comparable
AM equipment Besides the high priced Drake and Collins gear, there were
offerings from WRL/Galaxy (DB-84, Galaxy 3, 5, and others), National (NCX-3,
National 200, NCX-5, NCX-1000), Swan (monobanders, tribander, 350, 500)
Hallicrafters (SR-150, SR-160, SR-400, SR-2000, HT-46/SX-146), and SBE.
Heathkit had the SB series and the monobanders.

There was no shortage of good equipment.

>If
>there appears to be increased growth after 'incentive licensing',
>it'll likely just be that ham growth returned to its normal levels
>after recovering from the blow to morale inflicted by the
>implementation of incentive licensing.

Perhaps. The '70s were a period of growth despite lots of hurdles.
>
>It appears the ARRL and the FCC learned from this - I don't think
>there's been any proposals from either since then that envision taking
>away privileges from any particular class of license.
>
ARRL learned, FCC didn't. In 1975, FCC proposed a complex 7 class "two ladder"
system that would have reduced the privilegs of many hams. ARRL and others
fought it successfully.

73 de Jim, N2EY

797. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 14:22:30 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh3036$ta4$0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 74361

leaky fawecettes wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F29B941.3060802@adelphia.net...
> > Just practicing one of the the new Q signals....
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
> Another guy in here thinks the end of CW spells
> the complete end of ham radio.....how utterly
> pathetic...

Yeah, "leaker" you sure are. You can't getit straight, either. Nothing will "end" han radio, at least not in any short time, just make it realtively useless.

798. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 14:23:46 UTC
From: Cool Breeze <spade#abc.com>
Message-ID: <euWcnQklcKefmaiiXTWJkw@comcast.com>
Source record: 74362

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030809002357.295$Yl@newsreader.com...
> Get ready for a wooshing sound, that will be the stampede of no codes
> and outlaws flooding your hallowed ground, little man. You brought
> it all on..
>
> --
> GO# 40

Are you a Ham ??? What are you doing in this
NG??
????

799. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 15:12:31 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030809111231.742$Ki@newsreader.com>
Source record: 74363

"Cool Breeze" <spade#abc.com> wrote:
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20030809002357.295$Yl@newsreader.com...
> > Get ready for a wooshing sound, that will be the stampede of no codes
> > and outlaws flooding your hallowed ground, little man. You brought
> > it all on..
> >
> > --
> > GO# 40
>
> Are you a Ham ??? What are you doing in this
> NG??
> ??? ????
>
I enjoy watching assholes like you and dan squirm.

--
GO# 40

800. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 15:12:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308090712.9126e20@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74364

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308081256.483d39ea@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308081058.6cce2101@posting.google.com>...
> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308070833.2db83476@posting.google.com>...
> > > Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<BB56960F.211FF%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>...
>
> > > Besides, everything hams do is either "for enjoyment" or public
> > > service.
>
> > But . . but . . geez, wait a minnit here! What about all the
> > technological leaps forward we're 'sposed to lead . . ? It sez so in
> > 97.1 . . isn't that the Techs job??
>
> It's everybody's job. And nobody's.

Whew: The latter gets me off the hook . .

> You'll see, the techno folks who
> will come into the ARS after Element 1 goes away will create a techno
> revolution just like the one created when the Tech lost its code test.
> Just watch....

What AGAIN??! It won't be possible for us OFs to keep up with it if
it's even close to a repeat of the technology explosion of '92-'93.
We're doomed to obsolescence. Sob.

> > > Does that mean none of it should be tested?
> >
> > That'll be covered in the next round . .
>
> Maia & Co. are already working on that.

With "leaders" like him and Stevenson how can we miss?

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

801. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 15:20:18 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93D2733067496elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 74365

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030809102119.27503.00001516@mb-m24.aol.com:

> In article <Xns93D28AE9515Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>>news:20030808222055.25052.00001664@mb-m11.aol.com:
>>
>>> In article <Xns93D1A8E3A7743elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
>>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>>
>>>>> 40 m is a band, not a frequency. Big difference between plopping
>>>>> down an SSB signal on 7030 and 7230.
>>>
>>>>I mean between 7040 and 7100, which is phone, except here.
>>>
>>> "Here" is all of Region 2. A big part of the world.
>>
>>No, only the USA, it's still phone in the rest of R2
>
> No, it isn't. Other modes are authorized, not just 'phone.
>

The point being, however, that phone is authorised there in every country
but one

>>>>I think you'll find it isn't being fixed.
>>>
>>> Sure it is, but it will take time. Before the end of the decade
>>> 7000-7200 will be worldwide exclusive amateur. That's double what
>>> Region 1 and Region 3 have now. It will make sense for those regions
>>> to move their 'phone up above 7100 and leave below 7100 to CW and
>>> digital.
>>>
>>
>>Not while the US has CW in 7100-7150. As long as that's the case it
>>makes more sense _to_them_ to leave 7000-7100 unchanged and split the
>>'new' 7100-7200 50/50. Net gain to you - zero.
>
> If it gets the foreign 'phones off of 7030, it's a gain.
>>
>>>>The ARRL bandplan is the only
>>>>one out of step, so nobody else is likely to change theirs,
>>>>notwithstanding Europe and some other areas getting 7100-7200 as

>>>>additional spectrum in 2007.
>>>
>>> What part of the world will not get 7100-7200?
>>
>>None
>
> There you are.
>>
>>> And why should Region 2 change now, with the band getting wider?
>>
>>You mean the US, and I don't suppose the ARRL will change
>
> It's not just ARRL but FCC.

You're right, but it's not the rest of the region

>>
>>>>All that will happen is that a DX window will
>>>>appear from 7150-7200, but the DX will continue to use phone
>>>>everywhere they use it now - indefinitely. Sorry to be the one to
>>>>break that to you!
>>>
>>> So their lack of a bandplan and good manners should cause the USA to
>>> follow their lead? I think not!
>>
>>They have a bandplan. Phone stays above at least 7040, except 7030 in
>>R3.
>
> There are Canadians operating LSB on 7030.
>

I wasn't aware of that. That is against any bandplan that I know of, and I
agree that it is bad manners

>>That's not the bandplan you want, but it's a bandplan. The reference to
>>good manners I don't follow.
>
> The folks who don't follow the bandplan have bad manners. Having a
> Canadian SSB net on 7030 when they have 7000-7030 is bad manners.
>

Agreed

>>I don't expect the USA to follow anyone's lead. Just don't be
>>surprised when no-one follows the USA's lead either.
>
> And the result is chaos.
>

Yes it is. However, the rest of the world probably think that it would be
easier for _one_ country to change than for 100+, which doesn't mean that
I think it will happen.

>>> 800 is pretty high. 600-700 is more common among CW ops. The SSB
>>> audio passband is typically 300-2700 Hz, so 600 or even 800 is pretty
>>> low. 1500 would be smack in the middle.
>>
>>True enough
>>
>>>>This of course would be what you
>>>>would get if they netted onto the SSB and then offset by their usual
>>>>amount.
>>>
>>> There is no offset in CW. The carriers are all on the same frequency.
>>>>
>>>>> Point is that what sounds like "right on top" may not sound that
>>>>> way to the other guy.
>>>
>>>>It depends which side of the nominal carrier frequency the CW signal
>>>>is on. However, assuming my SSB filter is working, I would say they
>>>>were low, i.e. on the same side as the LSB sideband, or I would be
>>>>filtering them out. This also puts them almost in the middle of the
>>>>SSB signal, doesn't it?
>>>
>>> No. Their tone would be 1500 if it were in the middle.
>>>>
>>>>> Listen to a busy CW contest with a wide (AM bandwidth) rx and it
>>>>> sounds like a pile of intentional inteference. Switch in
>>>>> appropriate filters and you find that almost all of the stations
>>>>> have spaced themselves so they don't overlap.
>>>>>
>>>>>> Neither am I
>>>>>> talking about weak phone stations, although they could be weak at
>>>>>> some other QTH.
>>>>>>
>>>>> That's another point.
>>>>>
>>>>>> > Of course the DX 'phones could have switched to CW and answered
>>>>>> > the CQers, then politely asked them to move.
>>>>>
>>>>> But they didn't, did they?
>>>>>> >
>>>>>> > *My Southgate Type 7 has two cascaded 8 pole 500 Hz crystal
>>>>>> > filters, giving an effective bandwidth of less than 400 Hz and
>>>>>> > very steep filter skirts. And it has an audio LC filter as well.
>>>>>> >
>>>>>>
>>>>>> So, if say, you called QRU? on 7080 and there was a strong signal
>>>>>> SSB QSO in progress, would you be able to tell? This is a genuine
>>>>>> question.
>>>>>
>>>>> I would listen first and steer clear of anyhting that sounds like
>>>>> SSB. Then I'd send "IE" a few times to test the waters. If I heard
>>>>> something start up when I did that, I'd move.

>>>>>
>>>>> But usually I am below 7060. Above about 7060 is data and foreign
>>>>> SSB country.
>>>>>
>>>>>> I
>>>>>> don't posses a CW filter.
>>>>>
>>>>> One of the reasons some hams get turned off to CW is that they use
>>>>> equipment that really isn't meant for the mode. Most HF rigs today
>>>>> are primarily SSB rigs with CW tacked on. Some are pretty good,
>>>>> many are awful.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>If I need it I have an outboard audio filter
>>>
>>> Ugh. Audio filters are no substitute for IF filtering. And unless the
>>> AGC is turned off, QRM can dominate the receiver.
>>>
>>
>>True, but I don't really need a narrow CW filter for anything
>
> Data modes.

If I ever get around to trying any

>>
>>>>(a Radio Shack DSP unit,
>>>>which is fairly basic and suffers from low audio output). I hadn't
>>>>thought about that when I said I had no CW filter. It tends to 'take
>>>>off' on 20 with RF getting inside it, but it's OK on 40.
>>>
>>> What sort of rig?
>>
>>I use an IC-729 in my shack. Excellent receiver RF performance.
>
> Compared to what? No offense, but there are some really good rigs out
> there.
>

The reviews at the time said it was comparable with anything regardless of
price bracket in _basic_ receiver performance, but that was back in '92. I
expect the world has moved on, and it never was loaded with features.

What do you use, anyway?

>>Not very
>>good audio, though. Ironically it has nowhere to fit a narrow SSB
>>filter, but has a place for a CW filter (nothing in there, of course).
>
> Couldn't a narrow SSB filter be put in the CW slot?
>

Yes, but without making any further mods it would be selected when the
mode was set to 'CW-N'.

>>Not the
>>Rolls Royce of radios, but I'm not overloaded with cash.
>
> The Southgate Type 7 cost me less than $100 to build.
>>
>>>>>> I am guessing you would hear something,though?
>>>>>>
>>>>> Depends on the situation. Usually SSB sounds like monkey chatter
>>>>> through a narrow filter. But near the edges it can be very weak or
>>>>> inaudible.
>>>>
>>>>As I've explained, I think this is going on in the middle of the SSB
>>>>sigs, which is another reason to be suspicious
>>>
>>> Sure. But 1500 is the middle, not 800.
>>>
>>>>>> The best solution is for wide and narrow modes to have their own
>>>>> subbands. They simply don't mix well.
>>>>
>>>>Yes
>>>
>>> So when will the rest of the world get on the beam and have nonphone
>>> subbands?
>>
>>They do, and they have done as long as I remember. In some countries
>>they are voluntary, and in others they are compulsory, but nowhere are
>>they as wide as in the USA.
>
> Time for them to get on the beam, then.

Depends what you mean - widen them or make them compulsory? There is no
expansion of CW use to justify the former, and most administrations don't
really care what hams do within the ham bands. I suspect that, for
example, Industry Canada don't even care about Canadian hams annoying
other Canadian hams by operating phone on CW frequencies.

>>
>>>>> A notch filter can remove a carrier or CW signal.
>>>>>
>>>>True, not that I have one, though
>>>
>>> Well, there you have it.
>>>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

73 de Alun, N3KIP

802. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 16:20:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809122055.23406.00001337@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 74366

In article <w4VYa.162$dj3.18912@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0308080912.7e373969@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<XsNYa.93$dj3.13294@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20030807222823.21428.00001559@mb-m23.aol.com...
>> > [triming down stuff that's been repeated in the thread]
>> > >
>> > > To a certain extent. But the change had its downside, too. Ham radio
>used
>> > to
>> > > get a lot of free publicity and recruitment in the form of SWLs
>hearing
>> > hams on
>> > > AM. That pretty much ended with the switch to SSB. The number of new
>hams
>> > > slowed down (in part) because of that change.
>> > >
>> > So we need a new publicity mechanism ... I'd agree with that ...
>>
>> Point is that there were downsides to the shift to SSB. From the end
>> of WW2 to 1963 (17 years) the number of US hams quadrupled. Then it
>> stopped dead and the numbers hung at about a quarter million for more
>> than 5 years in the '60s.
>>
>> Oddly enough, growth started back up again when the incentive
>> licensing changes were enacted. Huh?
>
>Now you're trying to tell us that incentive licensing PROMOTED
>growth in ham radio???

No, I'm simply pointing out the facts. There was lots of growth for about 17
years after WW2 (~8% per year!) then it stopped dead at the beginning of 1963.
Did not pick up again until about 1970, which was soon after IL was in place.

The numbers prove it. Do you have any conflicting data to present?

> I don't think so ...

Based on what? In the mid-'60s there were a few years when the numbers actually
declined.
>
>More likely the boom after WWII (and Korea) was due to military

>radio folks becoming hams when they got out ...

Immediately after WW2, yes. But after the restructuring of 1951, most newcomers were people too young to have been in either war.
>
>The boom in the 60's was probably due to the emergence of economical
>JA radios, a general increase in the interest in electronics, and later, the
>emergence of VHF/UHF FM and repeaters ...

You need to read up on the history, Carl. There was no boom in the '60s. You are thinking of the '70s, which is when the things you describe happened on a wide scale. The mid-1970s, in fact, when license requirements were the toughest.
>
>> How many HF amateur AMTOR contacts have you or anyone you know made >> in the past year?
>
>I have AMTOR capability, but haven't hooked it up in the 3 years I've
>been here in the new house

I'll take that as "NONE"

> ... used it a lot from the sailboat in the early 90's ...

Ten years ago. My point is that it's a rare thing these days, supplanted by PACTOR and PSK-31.
>
>> > > Of course what really drove all that was PC/soundcard setups becoming
>> > > affordable.
>> >
>> > Agreed ... multimode with a std SSB radio and PC ... cool stuff.
>>
>> Sort of. But it's actually a patch job.
>
>Actually, it's not a bad idea to use existing PC capabilities to do the
>signal processing for multiple modes ... it's all software ... and within
>the limits of a typical SSB radio, you can do some interesting, albeit
>rather slow, stuff on HF.

Of course - but at the same time, really new modes and maximum performance are not explored unless they fit within the "SSB/PC" mindset.
>
>> > However,
>> > still limited in some respects and we can do better with purpose-made
>> > RF modems capable of more speed and other improvements.
>>
>> "Purpose made RF modems"?? Why not call them data radios?
>
>Whatever ... I tend to think that RF modems is a good term ...
>after all, modem is the concatenation of MODulator and DEModulator.

There's a lot more to a ham rig than modulating and demodulating, though.
>
>> And I agree - a dig built specifically for data modes is the better
>> solution. Deal with the decoding right at the IF level, rather than
>> converting to audio and all that jazz.
>
>Actually, most modern digital radios convert directly to I/Q baseband
>and do the signal processing there ...

Which may or may not optimize performance.
>
>> But somebody's got to design and build the data radios. Who is going
>> to tie the bell on that cat?
>
>I was telling you of some plans I have for after I get my antenna work
>done this summer ... winter projects, so to speak.

That's good.

>However, you will
>realize that I do work for a living and have other obligations as well,

So do most of us.

>so don't hold me to some firm, preconceived schedule.

I'm not. I'm simply pointing out the challenges of homebrewing in
our "technical service" called the ARS.

>Don't get me
>wrong, it's something I *really* want to do, and I intend to do it with
>as much diligence as I can in terms of getting something accomplished.

Of course. But like many other projects, it's on the classic "round tuit"
priority list.

>> One reason packet is stuck at 1200 baud all these years is because
>> going faster would require a purpose-built data radio. Ikensu isn't
>> going to do it unless there's a proven market, and the failure of 9600
>> to get much attention means they will wait some more.
>
>9600 is a kludge in virtually all of the rice-boxes ... and it's not fast
>enough to really be interesting or all that useful ...

Exactly. And to go a lot faster, you need a new radio, and we're back to
belling the cat again.

>> Was "incentive licensing" a mistake? It was very unpopular. Lots of
>> folks were against it. Said it would kill amateur radio. I remember
>> those times - they make this whole code-test thing look like afternoon
>> tea.
>
>I personally think that incentive licensing, as implemented, was a mistake.

So how would you have implented it?

>It made little sense to require higher Morse speeds

Speed. 20 wpm.

The ARRL's 1963 proposal was for no additional code testing at all. FCC, the expert agency, wanted 20 wpm for all privileges.

>for privs that were
>primarily non-Morse ...

That's simply not true.

The final plan, as enacted Nov 22, 1968, made the lower 25 kHz of 80, 40, 20 and 15 Extra-only territory. That's 100 kHz. The Extra-only 'phone territory of that time was 3800-3825 and 21250-21275. Only 50 kHz, on two bands (75 and 15). On 40 and 20, Advanceds had all 'phone privs.

The original announced plan was for the lower 50 kHz of the four bands to be Extra-only (total 200 kHz), but that was quietly dropped in 1969.

The biggest difference in 'phone privileges was between General and Advanced:

General: 3900-4000, 7250-7300, 14275-14350, 21350-21450 (total 325 kHz)

Advanced: 3825-4000, 7200-7300, 14200-14350, 21275-21450 (total 600 kHz)

IOW, upgrading from General to Advanced in those days got you 275 more kHz of 'phone (almost double) and no additional CW on HF. And all it took was a written test.

Upgrading from Advanced to Extra got you 100 kHz more CW and only 50 kHz more 'phone. Written and code test.

Thus, the argument that the Extra was "for privs that were primarily non-Morse ..."

is simply not valid.

It is left to the reader to compare the differences at various points since 1969.

btw, I passed Advanced in 1968 at the age of 14 and Extra in 1970 at the age of 16. So even those old tests were not impossible or even that difficult if one had a little knowledge and skill.

>I have NO problem with a *reasonable* number
>(I think 3 is adequate, 2 might be alright) of license classes in order to
>encourage folks to learn more about radio technology ... I know that
>many will say it's impractical from an enforcement standpoint, but I would
>restrict power for the lower classes (though you've probably seen me
>comment that brute force power is over-rated ... I doubt that I will ever
>get a legal limit amp ... 100W seems to work just fine on HF), rather than
>segregate newcomers from everyone else as widely as our current rules
>do.

Which means you agree with the philosophy but not the details.

>Newcomers need to be welcomed and "socialized" (not like Larry's
>"don't let the door hit you in the ass on the way out" shpiel ...) That's
>how
>to make more good ... and better ... hams - welcome them and show them
>the way (politely).

Not just newcomers - everyone.
>
>> > I think that Fred knows quite well that the only CW-only subbands are at
>> > 6m/2m.
>>
>> Sure. And I think he means dropping the CW/data subbands on HF, not
>> those little pieces of 6 and 2.
>
>I wasn't at the NCVEC meeting and am not privy to the discussion/intent
>WRT this issue ... I won't presume to speak for Fred in any sort of
>definitive, authoritative way ...

I don;t expect you to. I'm merely pointing out that there ARE folks who would
eliminate the nonphone subbands.
>
>> > Besides, that is ONE petition of a number that have been/will be filed.
>>
>> Does NCVEC *ever* go against what Maia wants? Or are they his puppet?
>
>It is my understanding that there are 13 or 14 VECs in the NCVECs ... ARRL's
>rep was there. My understanding is that there was NO opposition to the
>NCVEC
>petition being filed as written.

That's not the question I asked.
>
>> Since NCVEC is not a representative organization, and is only involved
>> in testing, why are they getting into things like subbands?
>
>They are considered by the FCC as an authoritative source. Why they said
>each and every word they said is something upon which I won't speculate.

They want to determine policy.

>> > While I will not divulge the detailed contents of the draft NCI petition
>> > that is under Board review right now, I *will* guarantee you that it
>will NOT
>> > propose any changes in band segmentation.
>>
>> And that's a good thing.
>
>The primary objective is to eliminate Morse testing ... we don't want to
>be distracted or delayed by other non-NCI-core issues that will take
>more time for the FCC to decide ...

I think we're stuck with a full NPRM cycle.
>

>> > > >all that's being asked for is to eliminate the
>> > > >test requirement that even the FCC and the IARU admit are not in the
>> > > >best interest of the future of ham radio.
>> > >
>> > > That's what YOU propose. W5YI & Co. are already on the next page.
>> >
>> > It's not fair to single out W5YI ... its the NCVECs ... including reps
>from
>> > ARRL and all the other VECs ... one of whom used to be "top dog" in
>> > amateur regulation at the FCC.
>>
>> Does NCVEC *ever* go against what Maia wants? Or are they his puppet?
>>
>> ARRL's rep did not vote at the NCVEC meeting on the "drop the code
>> test" petition. Current ARRL policy would have required that he vote
>> against, but since that policy is under review, the rep abstained. So
>> the NCVEC reports the petition "approved without opposition".
>
>Read Roberts' Rules ... I think a lone abstention does not count as
>opposition ... to oppose, the party in question would have had to
>proactively vote "no." An abstention amounts to "I don't care one
>way or the other on this issue." (Or perhaps, "I'm not *allowed* to
>vote one way or the other," when the voter is someone's employee.)

Still doesn't answer the question. ARRL is, by far, the biggest VEC and they
abstained.
>
>> > and my "None ... by regulatory change" was
>> > meant to indicate that eliminating Morse testing will not force ANYTHING
>> > on anyone by regulatory change.
>>
>> OK.
>> >
>> > > >Heck, you can buy a decent 2m transciever for $150 today
>> > > >... something with performance, quality, reliability, and ergonomics
>> > > >that the average ham couldn't duplicate for 3x that price when
>> > > >buying parts in small quantities.
>> > >
>> > > And it's a throwaway.
>> >
>> > I would respectfully disagree ... the idea that "hams can't work
>> > with SMT" is bogus ...
>>
>> I agree!
>>
>> > the ARRL website has a lot of good info
>> > on working with SMT ... and I've built a LOT of prototypes in
>> > the lab by hand using SMT without special, expensive tools.
>> > It just takes a different technique.
>>

>> That's not what I'm talking about at all. My point is not about SMT,
>> it's about the fact that much of today's consumer electronics isn't
>> meant to be worked on. It's cheaper to just replace than to repair.
>> Lookit your PC - most of the "components" aren't resistors,
>> capacitors, transistors or ICs. The components in your PC are
>> subassemblies: drives and cards and premanufactured cables, power
>> supplies etc. A knowledgeable person can "build" a functioning PC from
>> a pile of "components" with just a screwdriver and good grounding
>> technique.
>
>Building a radio will involve components ... some may be "store-bought"
>ICs, others will be R/L/C, perhaps some discrete transistors, etc. ... BUT
>there is no reason that reasonably technically-inclined, intelligent hams
>cannot
>"build" their own custom ICs at home these days ... there are all sorts of
>programmable logic devices, ranging from a few thousand or less gates to
>several millions of gates ... and the software to do design, simulation,
>verification,
>and programming is either affordable, or in some cases free.

Sure. But it adds a big step to the project.

In the bad old days there were basically two steps: Mechanical construction,
then wiring. PCB construction reduced the wiring but added the step of PCB
fabrication and increased the toolkit needed. Adding programmability means yet
another step and an even bigger toolkit.

Hams need small, easy, quick projects to start with. That's why the simplicity
of CW is a real asset.
>
>You do your conceptual design, code it in VHDL, simulate it, synthesize it
>into a file that is used to program the IC and voila, something that had NO
>"personalilty" ... no "idea of how to do anything" ... is now a functional
>"custom IC." This is REALLY cool stuff ... and there are lots and lots of
>free "cores"out there for all sorts of things ... SPI interfaces,
>microcontrollers,
>FEC, and on and on and on ... all things that can be "hooked up" together
>and/or with your own code and synthesized into your own IC ...

Sure. But the beginner isn't going to start out at that level. The question is
one of growth path.
>
>The digital domain is moving closer and closer to the antennna ... folks who
>want to design and build need to start thinking in new paradigms ... like "I
>buy some off the shelf RF ICs, A/D and D/A converters and I hook them
>up with an FPGA that I've programmed, maybe a uController ... or an
>interface to a PC (maybe Ethernet) and I have a programmable radio that
>can be whatever I want it to be ...

They need practical examples, too. Completed projects that really work and are
accessible through the amateur literature.
>

>Folks just need to think in new paradigms ... unfortunately, that does not
>seem to be the strong suit of many present hams.

That's true on both sides of the code test debate.

73 de Jim, N2EY

803. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 16:23:03 UTC
From: DX'er <DXer@spam.wi.rr.com>
Message-ID: <Hd9Za.75290$7O4.1726725@twister.rdc-kc.rr.com>
Source record: 74367
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Count me in! That is exactly why I quit Pirate Broadcasting 1 1/2 years
ago. I already sold all my radio equipment.

-John
"Dwight Stewart" <stewart@say.net> wrote in message
news:BB5399A8.1FFBF%stewart@say.net...
> "N22X" wrote:
> >
> > Since the FCC closed all their monitoring stations
> > seven years ago, the number of pirates and
> > unlicensed activity on HF has jumped by quantum
> > leaps. (snip)
>
>
> If the FCC has closed all their fixed monitoring stations, it was
probably
> in favor of better and cheaper technology. In other words, I strongly
> suspect monitoring capability is still there - it just needs an employee
> interested enough to do something with it (or perhaps enough employees to
do
> something effective with it).
>
> On the other hand, I haven't seen an increase in unlicensed activity.
The
> only two pirates I've heard in this area have recently closed down their
> operations, though not as a result of FCC enforcement activities. Instead,
> since fewer people today scan around through available frequencies for
> something to listen to (scanning instead through the stations they've
> previously programmed into memories), many pirates are simply finding it
> more difficult to gain an audience today. Of those people still scanning
> around through available frequencies, fewer seem interested in pirate
> stations.
>
> Those things, perhaps more than anything else, may eventually spell the
> end of pirate broadcasting.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

804. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 16:26:04 UTC
From: DX'er <DXer@spam.wi.rr.com>
Message-ID: <wg9Za.75291$7O4.1726741@twister.rdc-kc.rr.com>
Source record: 74368
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Was that "Lucky 7" from out of Syracuse? I remember a local news report on my Milwaukee TV station about it. The operator would appear on the screen wearing a gas mask.

-John L.

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message news:3F307851.6070808@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >Many pirates are radio amateurs - they have the knowledge and skill to put
> >together a station. :-)
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> We did that back in college back in the 1970's. One of us bought a
> homebrew transmitter,
> did some repairs to clean it up some, threw together some turntables and
> a crude mixer
> board, used a mic from a cassette recorder, and went on the air Friday
> night. We knew that
> the nearest FCC office was about 150 miles away, and was closed for the
> weekend.
> We played records mostly. Some jocks from a local licensed station
> found us, and
> did a few shifts of our air time! (Guess they wanted the opportunity to
> play their own
> selections instead of a mandated playlist). I commented on our crude
> equipment, and they
> said that they had seen worse at licensed stations. We shut down Sunday
> night and
> dismantled the setup.
>
> Later on someone else at our college did a pirate TV station! That made
> the New York
> Times! This was when the VCR was first comming out on the market. It was
> said that someone built that transmitter out of an old guitar amp.
> Sounds ludercutis,
> but if it was a tube amp, could actually be done. Use the VCR's channel
> modulator

> as the exciter, and that feeds the "guitar" amp.
>

805. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 16:30:45 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0308090830.23311507@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74369

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308090240.7b896978@posting.google.com>...
> nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
news:<20030808175644.19707.00000166@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>
> > For the record, I have not
> > used PSK-31 myself on
> > the amateur bands.
> >
> > So I will not lecture others
> > on how well it does or
> > does not work.
>
> Yet Dick is free to lecture others, i.e., "any idiot can get psk going
> in under 30 minutes," but by his own words here he couldn't.
>
> That is the point.

http://www.geocities.com/horseshoestew/youdick.wav

806. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 17:16:31 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308090916.5629c2b6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74370

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<w4VYa.162$dj3.18912@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0308080912.7e373969@posting.google.com...

> More likely the boom after WWII (and Korea) was due to military
> radio folks becoming hams when they got out ...

There has never been a correlation made between the growth of ham radio and new batches of war vets. The far more likely reasons were the overall increase in the standard of living and more personal leisure time aided and abetted by a heightened awareness of radio comms and technology in general after those wars. And to a lesser extent the availability of surplus mil-spec hardware for cents per pound was a boon to growth. More younger people joined the hobby for all these reasons plus the availability of the then-new Novice license was a big shot in the arm for growth. "I wuz one" . . .

> The boom in the 60's was probably due to the emergence of economical
> JA radios,

That growth occurred when brands like (bloody expensive!) Drake, Collins, Hammarlund, Heath, B&W and the rest were the only games in town.

> a general increase in the interest in electronics, and later, the
> emergence of VHF/UHF FM and repeaters ...

HF equipment suppliers were and still are almost entirely driven by market needs and expectations and the competition to meet those needs and expectations per buck per performace capability. The availability of the HF riceboxes in the '70s did just that for the existing population of hams. I've never known of an example of anybody getting into ham radio simply because the newer HF equipment provided more bang for the buck.

Equipment availability for the bands above HF was never been much of a driver in growth until the Tech license was converted from being an experimenters ticket to a communicators ticket and even then there wasn't all that much growth. It wasn't until the 1980s that Techs got into packet in a big way and into the FM voice infrastructures because of the increasingly inexpensive VHF/UHF riceboxes that the they became major players in the growth equation. It was the Disincentive Licensing maneuver of '91 and the availabilty of $150 2M FM xcvrs which really done the deed. So now we have numbers. What else did we get out of that one?

> Actually, it's not a bad idea to use existing PC capabilities to do the
> signal processing for multiple modes ... it's all software ... and within
> the limits of a typical SSB radio, you can do some interesting, albeit
> rather slow, stuff on HF.

There ya go again dammit. It's gonna STAY that way too until YOU
figger out how to pull it off without screwing up the bands by being a
spectrum hog for your own jollies.

> 9600 is a kludge in virtually all of the rice-boxes ... and it's not fast
> enough to really be interesting or all that useful ...

9600 would have helped ten years ago but it never happened. In the
meanwhile packet and the Internet have been interlaced and the need
for 9600 has all but disappeared.

> > > I would respectfully disagree ... the idea that "hams can't work
> > > with SMT" is bogus ...
> >
> > I agree!

Then YOU snip the frigging resistors and jumpers in this frigging SMT
radio so that I can get on 60M. Ya need a 10X magnifier just the SEE
the things on the frigging PCB!

> Building a radio will involve components ... some may be "store-bought"
> ICs, others will be R/L/C, perhaps some discrete transistors, etc. ... BUT
> there is no reason that reasonably technically-inclined, intelligent hams
> cannot
> "build" their own custom ICs at home these days ... there are all sorts of
> programmable logic devices, ranging from a few thousand or less gates to
> several millions of gates ... and the software to do design, simulation,
> verification,
> and programming is either affordable, or in some cases free.
>
> You do your conceptual design, code it in VHDL, simulate it, synthesize it
> into a file that is used to program the IC and voila, something that had NO
> "personalilty" ... no "idea of how to do anything" ... is now a functional
> "custom IC." This is REALLY cool stuff ... and there are lots and lots of
> free "cores"out there for all sorts of things ... SPI interfaces,
> microcontrollers,
> FEC, and on and on and on ... all things that can be "hooked up" together
> and/or with your own code and synthesized into your own IC ...

And when it's all said and done the average ham won't learn or know
any more than he/she needs to pass the tests and/or to get on the air
and meet their specific operating objectives. Whatever takes the least
effort and brain pain prevails.

Fred is working on it . . .

> Folks just need to think in new paradigms ... unfortunately, that does not
> seem
> to be the strong suit of many present hams.

I heard exactly that same lament in the 1950s and it was just as true
then as it now. What conclusions do you draw from that as it relates
to the health, welfare and growth of ham radio?

> Carl - wk3c

w3rv

807. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 18:40:26 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bh3f5noek1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74371

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:bh1o9d02lu7@enews4.newsguy.com...

Ham radio has been replaced by the Internet.
>
> --

Great....lets give it a try then.....

CQ CQ CQ INTERNET THIS IS KEITHGOOF
COMEON.....
.....

Damn no replies.....What did I do wrong Keithgoof?

Dan/W4NTI

808. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 19:01:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308091101.35c540ad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74372

nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
news:<20030809101034.05245.00000303@mb-m01.aol.com>...

> The truth of the matter is that under some
> conditions PSK-31 outperforms OOK
> Morse CW, and under some conditions
> OOK Morse CW outperforms PSK-31.
>
> Can both of you
> accept that fact?

I think most reasonable people can accept that.

But what is unacceptable is DICK's assertion that any idiot can pick
up PSK in 30 minutes, when he has had weeks of trouble with the mode
by his own words.

No?

809. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 19:03:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308091103.25f0ae9b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74373

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bh2va3$ru4$0@208.206.142.95>...
> Brian wrote:

> > That is the point.
>
> You're wearing the point on your head.

You're wearing your name on your head.

810. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 19:54:23 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh3jhf$294$0@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 74374

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote:
> >>brianburke@juno.com
> >
> >writes:
> >
> >>So basically, DICK is the original No-PSK Extra.
> >
> >Has Brian Burke ever
> >used PSK-31 on the
> >amateur bands?
> >
> >Has Floyd Davidson ever
>
> ...
>
> >But I would like to read
> >of the experiences Brian
> >Floyd and Carl have had
> >with the mode, since they
> >obviously have strong feelings
> >about it.
>
> Do you actually think that just using it means DICK can even begin
> to understand how it works? The whole point of what has been said
> was that DICK managed to use both PSK31 and CW, and yet is not
> sufficiently aware of communications theory that his comparisons
> of the two modes are easily demonstrated to be invalid.
>
> His answer, which he has repeated several times now, was that
> Shannon doesn't apply the anything about Amateur Radio.
>
> At that point, what choice does one have but to write DICK off as
> so ill informed that he should be totally ignored.
>
> -

OK Frostproof Floyd, there you go again, or maybe I should say "still". Just can't get it together when it comes to ham radio, can you? You prove it yet one more time.

If you think I have insufficient undestanding of Shannon's infornmation theory that's because you're terribly uninformed yourself. What my little recited experience showed, when the PSK was not copyable but the CW ID was, is merely to further confirm what I said- Shannon and his little mathematical circus really *DON'T* have anything to do with ham

radio. Of course, the lone exception would have to be to allow idiots like you and a few others to put together trash posts on usenet, but that's a separate issue.

What the "PSK-NO, CW-YES" incident showed was that Shannon DOES NOT apply **when the channel is not set by his rules**, which WAS exactly the case, as is virtually always the case in ham radio. When one works PSK31, the data portion is filtered to a much tighter specification than the amateur HF receiver as a whole, being done in the DSP function of the computer. The "channel" is not set by that narrow filter, only the PSK channel.
When the CW ID comes throuth, and the PSK does not,
it confirms that **in amateur radio applications**, where the communicatons channel in use is not constrained by Shannon's rules, they cannot be applied with any accuracy. Thus they don't apply. They * CAN'T* apply.

"The Channel" is whatever the ham radio operator, and his gear, set it to be. So when I work PSK31 and it can't print, but the CW- ID comes through loud and clear, to quote Cecil Moore, "The playing field is not level, the comparison is unfair". That was the best he could do, to insist that I also push the CW signal through the 30 cycle wide filter so that IT couldn't be copied just like the PSK couldn't be. Nonsense!

When (if ever) ham radio gear is manufactured so that the Shannon limit is built into the equipment, and *that* sets the channel limit, obviously my statement will no longer be true, as I certainly trust - hope?- you can see. But I see you're not anywhere nearly as sharp as Cecil, and that certainly comes as no surprise

So you passed a ham radio test in 1960, then promptly forgot about it all. Now you show up on usenet to portray yourself as some sort of Guru Expert Professional. Why don't you just crawl back across the tundra to your rabbit hole- The game's over
You're nothing but a Lennie who once held a license.

811. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 19:57:10 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh3jmm$294$1@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 74375

Brian wrote:

> nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
news:<20030809101034.05245.00000303@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>
> > The truth of the matter is that under some
> > conditions PSK-31 outperforms OOK
> > Morse CW, and under some conditions
> > OOK Morse CW outperforms PSK-31.
> >
> > Can both of you
> > accept that fact?
>
> I think most reasonable people can accept that.
>
> But what is unacceptable is DICK's assertion that any idiot can pick
> up PSK in 30 minutes, when he has had weeks of trouble with the mode
> by his own words.
>
> No?

No, in a word. If you believe I said such a thing, why don't you google it up and post it here, to stave
off the well earned title of bald faced liar? *I* know why, but others may not. It's because YOU ARE a
bald faced liar, as well as your village's favorite
pointyhead.

812. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 19:59:49 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh3jrl$294$2@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 74376

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bh2va3$ru4$0@208.206.142.95>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > That is the point.
> >
> > You're wearing the point on your head.
>
> You're wearing your name on your head.

At least I don't have to resort to outright lying to make my namr OR my point.
That's about all you ever do.

813. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 20:22:11 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87u18qpong.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74377

nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote:
>> Floyd Davidson floyd@barrow.com wrote:
>
>>His answer, which he has repeated several times now, was that
>>Shannon doesn't apply the anything about Amateur Radio.
>
>That's obviously not true. Shannon's
>work applies, just as Ohm's Law
>applies.

It is nice to see that you do understand just how basic DICK's
error is.

[I snipped your rant about different kinds of noise, because
it had no point, wasn't necessarily correct, wandered in the
wilderness, and means nothing in this context. If you'd like
to discuss "noise" and/or "distortion" in a bandwidth limited
channel, start a different thread.]

>>At that point, what choice does one have but to write DICK off as
>>so ill informed that he should be totally ignored.
>
>You could consider his practical
>experience, which you lack, as a
>useful tool. Instead, you argue.
>Very odd behavior.

Using PSK-31 is not exactly a great indication of experience.
DICK's experience with *only* CW, PSK-31 and other common modes
used on Amateur bands is an extreme restriction. And that is
exactly why he (and Larry Roll) should *not* be using themselves
as a yard stick for other hams.

The whole point is that this business of DICK and Larry claiming
that what they can do, is what everyone else _must_ do, is
ridiculous on its face because there are many others we could
use as a standard that would put the two of them out the door as
well.

DICK and Larry have dabbled at 2, 3, maybe 4 different kinds of
digital communications systems. Thrilling. Whether I or
someone else has used or not used *any* of those, is not really
significant... if I or someone else has in fact used *dozens*
of other digital systems, including many of the more recent
ones. There is _nothing_ special about PSK-31, other than it
is just about the upper limit of DICK's lack of experience.

In fact *your* argument is the same bogus one that DICK and
Larry make! Because *they* use CW (or PSK-31), everyone else
either does, or is declared too dumb to license (or understand
how Shannon applies to PSK-31). That is invalid logic and leads
you to erroneous conclusions.

>The truth of the matter is that under some
>conditions PSK-31 outperforms OOK
>Morse CW, and under some conditions
>OOK Morse CW outperforms PSK-31.

And that tells us *nothing* about which is the more efficient or
effective mode of communications.

>Can both of you
>accept that fact?

DICK is the *only* one who has suggested otherwise. Everyone
else has told him his reasons for such claims are bogus. So
what is *your* point?

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

814. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 21:15:34 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87llu2pm6h.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74378

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>Brian wrote:
>> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote;
>> >
>> > You're wearing the point on your head.
>>
>> You're wearing your name on your head.
>
> At least I don't have to resort to outright lying to make my namr OR my point.
>That's about all you ever do.

"Yep, I said that Shannon's law really has nothing to
do with ham radio, and then I proceeded to describe a
case that proved it ."

It seems you resort to outright ignorance, which was indeed
the point above, and it clearly isn't a lie.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

815. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 21:30:49 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87he4qplh2.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74379

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>
>> His answer, which he has repeated several times now, was that
>> Shannon doesn't apply the anything about Amateur Radio.
>>
>> At that point, what choice does one have but to write DICK off as
>> so ill informed that he should be totally ignored.
>>
>> -
>
> OK Frostproof Floyd, there you go again, or maybe I should say
>"still". Just can't get it together when it comes to ham radio,
>can you? You prove it yet one more time.

Speaking of proofs, you've generated a real beauty here:

> If you think I have insufficient undestanding of Shannon's
>infornmation theory that's because you're terribly uninformed
>yourself. What my little recited experience showed, when the
>PSK was not copyable but the CW ID was, is merely to further
>confirm what I said- Shannon and his little mathematical circus
>really *DON'T* have anything to do with ham radio. ...

Now Claude Shannon's work is a "little mathematical circus"!
And you've added *EMPHASIS* to the statement that it has nothing
to do with ham radio.

DICK, you've made my point for me and there is very little else
to say.

> What the "PSK-NO, CW-YES" incident showed was that Shannon
>DOES NOT apply **when the channel is not set by his rules**,
>which WAS exactly the case, as is virtually always the case in
>ham radio.

Well, there is one other thing to say. But I've stolen this
from Cecil once or twice already, so I'll quote him directly
this time:

"Again, power level is only one of three inter-related
parameters. If they are not all equal, then the playing field
is not level. Your being able to copy the CW ID, which has an
equivalent 12dB power advantage, is like saying a 150w SSB
signal is easier to copy than a 1w CW signal. It's true but it
is also meaningless.

Thanks to DICK CARROLL'S LOGIC, SSB can be proven to be
superior to CW every time. That follows from ignoring any of
the throughput parameters."

Cecil, W6RCA

Another way of looking at it, is that Shannon's "rules" do
apply, and that is virtually *always* the case in ham radio.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

816. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 21:55:30 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <l5eZa.51540$Kb6.17211@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74380

Keith,

As soon as you can figure out what BPL is going to do to hi-fidelity stereo am broadcast (you were aware of that, right? This is new technology), you be sure and let the group know. Also, if there is a big solar flare and satellites are temporarily effected, I hope you aren't aboard a sinking ship that depends upon HF (not amateur radio) as a backup. You are aware the ships do use hf, right? I didn't say Morse code, I said HF. Amateur radio only occupies a small portion of HF. I know that the average cber thinks that no one uses HF, but 130 million households should have priority over a sinking ship? Ignorance is curable, stupid isn't. Which are you suffering from?

Jim AA2QA

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:bh1o9d02lu7@enews4.newsguy.com...
.
>
> Ham Radio and SWL is old technology and BPL will benefit millions of consumers
> that want broadband Internet access. It is not fair to stop new technology
> because 100,000 people that are active ham radio operators want to hang on to
> old 1844 technology called morse code.
> If ham radio had millions of active HF operators then it could be argued that
> their bands should be protected in some fashion. But 100,000 vs 130 Million
> households shows that the smaller group should lose their HF privileges for
> better technology. Ham radio has been replaced by the Internet.
>
> --
> The Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
> http://www.kilowatt-radio.org/
> ..it does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an
> irate, tireless minority to set brush fires in people's
> minds. --Samuel Adams

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03

817. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 21:56:47 UTC
From: Phil <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <3vpajv8t0754490jf0e7gt00gm02on0qh3@4ax.com>
Source record: 74381

On a related note to this discussion, I have just started operating on the 40 and 20 meter bands using a 50-plus-year-old SSB receiver and transmitter. Both units have been tuned up to factory specs. Frequently, I am told by those that I try to engage in QSO that I'm opeating 'off frequency', and that I should "get my rig fixed". Several folks have refused to continue the QSO for that reason. When I did get one kind soul to retune his receiver to match my transmission, I was off by 80 Hz (!). I'm not sure that this old beast could ever tune more accurately than that!

There are a surprising number of hams out there that have lost the spirit of the hobby (one idiot told me that he won't bother to QSO with someone who is off by even 10 Hz....it bothers his ears!) - experimentation and homebrewing have apparently been replaced with buying the latest microprocessor-controlled 1 KW-plus rig and top-of-the-line beam antenna, turning the tuning knob to a frequency, pointing the antenna at the target area and yakking away. (It takes me at least 45 seconds to get this old transmitter on frequency, tune the driver, plate and load controls, adjust the antenna tuner, set the level, switch from dummy load to antenna and go!). "Gee, buddy, you're coming in 20 over S9 here, beautiful signal!"....no @#$%, with $4000+ worth of commercial equipment or more, not much challenge in that. Realistically, this takes not much more than the level of skill required to hook up stereo equipment, or wire up a store-bought PC! Try contacting someone DX with an old boatanchor and a homemade wire antenna sometime - now THAT is an accomplishment!

Guess this hobby has become more of a giant telephone than an experimenters' playground - wish it weren't so! Guess that I'm only anout 40 years too late....

Phil

On 7 Aug 2003 23:56:39 -0700, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote:

>vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message news:<20030807192518.08458.00001508@mb-m20.aol.com>...
>> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>>
>> >I have seen old
>> >> info stay on several websites. The same thing could have happened on their
>> >> webpage.
>> >
>> > In otherwords: "I can't provide a reasonable alternative".
>>

>> I am sure I'm right about the club members hating homebrewing.
>
> I am sure you have convinced yourself of this, however you have
>not provided one iota of "evidence" other than your own tainted
>opinion, Vipul.
>
>> This could be verified by asking people in the photo if they want to do a
>> homebrewing project. Many of the people in the photo are still in the club.
>
> This could be verified by you identifying the club to us and
>allowing third parties to do the asking.
>
>> However, I've let my club membership expire. And, tracking down people in the
>> photo would get very time consuming. Alot of work just to prove a point. Also,
>> I have other things that I need to do.
>
> YOU said the picture is still on the club webpage. It will take
>no more than a few minutes time to read the caption and make a couple
>phone calls to either confirm or eliminate your suspicions. The only
>thing between you and vindication is knowing the name of the club.
>
>> >> Also, if I invite them on a Hamfest that continues to
>> >> Fri, Sat night, then I'll bet they will wonder why the Hams are operating
>> >> rather than doing what most people do.
>> >
>> > "..what most people do"...?!?!
>> >
>> > It's ABOUT Amatuer Radio, Vipul...The event is organized FOR
>> >Amateur Radio operators by Amateurs and OPERATING radios.
>>
>> Other than Field day, an event does not HAVE do be scheduled during Fri, Sat
>> night. Most people would do more recreational activities during that time.
>
> Vipul, the average American WORKS Monday through Friday with
>Saturday and Sunday off. When would YOU schedule these "activities"?
>Most club meetings (lasting 1-3 hours) ARE scheduled during the week,
>sometimes with some pro-social activity included.
>
>> Its only because Hams are the type of people that would be at a Hamfest or
>> operate Sat night. My former co-worker, the Ham that introduced me to a
>> Hamfest, was fairly anti-social too. Also, he made weekly coffee trips to
>> Starbucks (alot of calories).
>
> Well there you go...we'll blame the whole thing on too much
>caffiene and too much calories.
>
>> He is now out of the country. He is American, and
>> he married some Asian girl he met online and he quit his job and moved over
>> there.
>

> Lucky him.
>
>> >What does it matter, Vipul? The event was not organized for "the
>> >non-ham observer".
>>
>> Sometimes they do try to sign up new members there. The anti-social aspect
>> would put off the person considering the hobby. That's a reason people turn
>> away.
>
> WHAT "anti-social" aspect, Vipul? YOU call it "anti-social"
>because you do not understand it or refuse to participate in it
>because they are not doing it the way YOU think it should be
>done...YOUR loss.
>
>> >> Most (non-Ham) Americans would expect the Hams would take a break from
>> >> operating on Sat night. They would be surprised and disappointed otherwise.
>> >
>> > Why? Why should "they" expect Amateurs to stop doing the very
>> >thing the special even was organized to do...?!?!
>>
>> The event more than fulfilled what it was organized to do when they operated
>> all day with few breaks. It was not necessary to go all night as well. They
>> could have taken at least a few hours break to do some vacation activities.
>
> So the other operators who work days and can only get on the
>radio in the evenings should of been denied the chance to "work" this
>station just because they had a day job? Foreign operators on the
>other side of the world should have been denied the chance to make a
>contact just becasue of thier location?
>
> That's very bigoted, Vipul. VERY bigoted...AND selfish on YOUR
>part. Your whole rant in this forum is based on your perceived
>exclusion from certain actitives, yet YOU would do things to excluded
>others from being able to participate in Amateur radio.
>
>> That's what most (non-Ham) people would do. Even another hobby group would take
>> a break from that hobby on Sat night and enjoy some of the vacation activities
>> at a vacation location. Its only Hams that would continue operating Sat night.
>> They saw other Hams on ATV, but not other people in person. I don't expect that
>> you would understand that most people would be disappointed with that.
>
> This activity was organized and executed for a certain purpose,
>Vippy...Activating that location for whatever program they were
>participating it. It was not chosen for it's tourist highlights or to
>satisfy "non-Hams" perceptions of what this is all about.
>
> Furthermore, the very characteristics of HF operation generally
>dictate better propagation and long-distance communication
>opportunities at night.
>

> Other than Amateur Astronomers, I can not think of any other
>"hobby group" that does better at night than in the daytime.
>
> THAT is something I don't expect YOU would understand. You don't
>have the experience in Amateur Radio, and it's obvious YOU do not
>understand propgation characteristics that dictate these needs. No
>wonder you're no longer an "EE"...
>(choking back laugh of Vippy having ever done ANY electrical
>"engineering" work)
>
>Steve, K4YZ

818. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 21:59:16 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <U8eZa.51544$XN6.17383@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74382

Dan,

You'd best check. When 911 hit, I lost AT&T internet for over a week!
Stupid doesn't realize how vulnerable some of this high infrastructure stuff
(like cellular telephones) is. BTW, on your CQ, check the swr on your
telephone/modem line. Also check your 'swang'. :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bh3f5noek1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
>
>
> Great....lets give it a try then.....
>
> CQ CQ CQ INTERNET THIS IS KEITHGOOF
>
COMEON...
> ....
>
> Damn no replies.....What did I do wrong Keithgoof?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03

819. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 22:09:40 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <rbiajv4nf3ici31ll5cfa0mluhkf4c1e43@4ax.com>
Source record: 74383

On 09 Aug 2003 02:36:38 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Actually, it was the TRC-23 bloody C!

Well, as I said, there wasn't all that much difference between 'em.
Add a Delta Tune knob to 1974's model and call it "New For '75!"
That's how Tandy did it back then.

>And I got my time line mixed up, I
>worked for Radio Shack from '74 to '75. In '72 I was working in the
>Carhart Photo processing lab on Broadway -- remember them?

Uh, no...you have a few years on me, and I was living in NT then.

>I know that "SKYKING" used to be a call used by Air Force ground
>stations as a general call to aircraft. As in "SKYKING, SKYKING,
>This is McClellan, do not answer -- traffic follows" Am I warm?

Plenty warm, see below.

>I don't relate to "AFKAI-1." I personally got the "handle" Sky King
>from the old TV program by the same name.

AFKAI-1 is a USAF document listing tactical callsigns assigned to
various purposes. Parts of the document are classified so don't expect
to find a copy on the net.

As for SKYKING, it is believed (by long-time HF utility station
monitors) to refer to assets under STRATCOM. The current form of a
"foxtrot" goes something like, "SKYKING, SKYKING, do not answer,
sierra, oscar, lima, authentication bravo sierra, I say again,
SKYKING, SKYKING, do not answer, sierra, oscar, lima, authentication
bravo sierra, time 2027, Andrews out." Three letter message, two
letter authentication, with the timestamp of the transmission
following the second reading of the message.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

820. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 22:09:41 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <juiajv44958270osarrogd49tsg9n40rgj@4ax.com>
Source record: 74384

On Sat, 9 Aug 2003 10:23:46 -0400, "Cool Breeze" <spade#abc.com>
wrote:

>
><Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
>news:20030809002357.295$Yl@newsreader.com...
>> Get ready for a wooshing sound, that will be the stampede of no codes
>> and outlaws flooding your hallowed ground, little man. You brought
>> it all on..
>>
>> --
>> GO# 40
>
>Are you a Ham ??? What are you doing in this
>NG??
>????
>

To answer your queries in order:

1. Probably not.

2. Trolling.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

821. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 22:09:42 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <30jajv4j1hiog6mmdin9h7u48a9aitova6@4ax.com>
Source record: 74385

On 09 Aug 2003 15:12:31 GMT, Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:

>I enjoy watching assholes like you and dan squirm.

Kinda like you when you take a code test, eh?

822. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 22:39:07 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh3t6b$m9s$0@208.206.142.97>
Source record: 74387

Floyd Davidson wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
>>Brian wrote:
>>
>>
>>>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote;
>>>
>>>
>>>> You're wearing the point on your head.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>You're wearing your name on your head.
>>>
>>>
>>>>At least I don't have to resort to outright lying to make my namr OR my point.
>>That's about all you ever do.
>>
>>
>>
>
> "Yep, I said that Shannon's law really has nothing to
> do with ham radio, and then I proceeded to describe a
> case that proved it ."
>
>It seems you resort to outright ignorance, which was indeed
>the point above, and it clearly isn't a lie.
>

Well, there ya go, hopping across the tundra again, Frosty.
Since you so conveniently snipped all the information from my post,
I'll just insert it again here, for information of the
readers....wouldn't want anyone
to miss anything....

If you think I have insufficient undestanding of Shannon's infornmation theory that's because you're terribly uninformed yourself. What my little recited experience showed, when the PSK was not copyable but the CW ID was, is merely to further confirm what I said- Shannon and his little mathematical circus really *DON'T* have anything to do with ham radio. Of course, the lone exception would have to be to allow idiots like you and a few others to put together trash posts on usenet, but that's a separate issue.

What the "PSK-NO, CW-YES" incident showed was that Shannon DOES NOT apply **when the channel is not set by his rules**, which WAS exactly the case, as is virtually always the case in ham radio. When one works PSK31, the data portion is filtered to a much tighter specification than the amateur HF receiver as a whole, being done in the DSP function of the computer. The "channel" is not set by that narrow filter, only the PSK channel.
When the CW ID comes throuth, and the PSK does not,
it confirms that **in amateur radio applications**, where the communicatons channel in use is not constrained by Shannon's rules, they cannot be applied with any accuracy. Thus they don't apply. They * CAN'T* apply.

"The Channel" is whatever the ham radio operator, and his gear, set it to be. So when I work PSK31 and it can't print, but the CW- ID comes through loud and clear, to quote Cecil Moore, "The playing field is not level, the comparison is unfair". That was the best he could do, to insist that I also push the CW signal through the 30 cycle wide filter so that IT couldn't be copied just like the PSK couldn't be. Nonsense!

When (if ever) ham radio gear is manufactured so that the Shannon limit is built into the equipment, and *that* sets the channel limit, obviously my statement will no longer be true, as I certainly trust - hope?- you can see. But I see you're not anywhere nearly as sharp as Cecil, and that certainly comes as no surprise

So you passed a ham radio test in 1960, then promptly forgot about it all. Now you show up on usenet to portray yourself as some sort of Guru Expert Professional. Why don't you just crawl back across the tundra to your rabbit hole- The game's over
You're nothing but a Lennie who once held a license.

823. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 23:31:51 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh4097$ss1$0@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 74388

Floyd Davidson wrote:

>Speaking of proofs, you've generated a real beauty here:
>
>
>
>> If you think I have insufficient undestanding of Shannon's
>>infornmation theory that's because you're terribly uninformed
>>yourself. What my little recited experience showed, when the
>>PSK was not copyable but the CW ID was, is merely to further
>>confirm what I said- Shannon and his little mathematical circus
>>really *DON'T* have anything to do with ham radio. ...
>>
>>

Yep, you're unscrewed, all right, if you consider that as anything
other than
a brief interoduction.

>Now Claude Shannon's work is a "little mathematical circus"!
>

Actually it was quite ingenious. After 50 years of radio, he was the
individual who sorted it all out. Smart fella. Sorry you can't emulate
him just a little!

>And you've added *EMPHASIS* to the statement that it has nothing
>to do with ham radio.
>

READ, Floyd, READ! It's all ther, in black and white, even on a VGA screen!

>
>DICK, you've made my point for me and there is very little else
>to say.
>
>

Sorry Frosty, you don't get off that easy. Make your own point and
don't use the one on your head!

>
>
>>What the "PSK-NO, CW-YES" incident showed was that Shannon
>>DOES NOT apply **when the channel is not set by his rules**,
>>which WAS exactly the case, as is virtually always the case in
>>ham radio.

>>
>>
>
>Well, there is one other thing to say. But I've stolen this
>from Cecil once or twice already, so I'll quote him directly
>this time:
>
> "Again, power level is only one of three inter-related
> parameters. If they are not all equal, then the playing field
> is not level. Your being able to copy the CW ID, which has an
> equivalent 12dB power advantage, is like saying a 150w SSB
> signal is easier to copy than a 1w CW signal. It's true but it
> is also meaningless.
>
> Thanks to DICK CARROLL'S LOGIC, SSB can be proven to be
> superior to CW every time. That follows from ignoring any of
> the throughput parameters."
>
>

Obsuscation when Cecil said it, more of the same from you!. There is
nothing there related whatever to the case cited. QED

>
>
>Another way of looking at it, is that Shannon's "rules" do
>apply, and that is virtually *always* the case in ham radio.
>
>

If you're serious it only means that YOU don't understand Shannon's work
The channel bandwidth limit is central to any application Shannon 's theory.

824. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 23:40:03 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87n0ei8koc.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74389

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>>>
>>>At least I don't have to resort to outright lying to make my namr OR my point.
>>>That's about all you ever do.
>>
>> "Yep, I said that Shannon's law really has nothing to
>> do with ham radio, and then I proceeded to describe a
>> case that proved it ."
>>
>>It seems you resort to outright ignorance, which was indeed
>>the point above, and it clearly isn't a lie.
>>

If anyone needed proof that DICK really is that ignorant, this
post removed all doubt!

DICK, you should check out the option that google has for
removal of archived articles. You really don't want any of
these articles to be hanging around where they can be quoted
again.

Too late now though, because I sure won't ask them to remove
my post! Your statement is now on record, *forever*.

> Well, there ya go, hopping across the tundra again, Frosty.
> Since you so conveniently snipped all the information from my post,
> I'll just insert it again here, for information of the
>readers....wouldn't want anyone
>to miss anything....
>--
>
> If you think I have insufficient undestanding of Shannon's infornmation theory that's
>because you're terribly uninformed yourself. What my little recited experience showed,
>when the PSK was not copyable but the CW ID was, is merely to further confirm what I said-
>Shannon and his little mathematical circus really *DON'T* have anything to do with ham
>radio. Of course, the lone exception would have to be to allow idiots like you and a few
>others to put together trash posts on usenet, but that's a separate issue.

BTW, can you tell us why Shannon's little "circus" doesn't
relate to the Viterbi coding used by PSK-31 or the QPSK
modulation, and how that doesn't relate to effective
communications (compared, for example to CW)? I don't believe
you, and I'd sure like to hear more about it...

> What the "PSK-NO, CW-YES" incident showed was that Shannon DOES NOT apply **when the
>channel is not set by his rules**, which WAS exactly the case, as is virtually always the
>case in ham radio. When one works PSK31, the data portion is filtered to a much tighter
>specification than the amateur HF receiver as a whole, being done in the DSP function of
>the computer. The "channel" is not set by that narrow filter, only the PSK channel.

It appears you don't actually know much about PSK-31 do you?
Did you ever actually get it to work at all?

> When the CW ID comes throuth, and the PSK does not,
>it confirms that **in amateur radio applications**, where the communicatons channel in use
>is not constrained by Shannon's rules, they cannot be applied with any accuracy. Thus they
>don't apply. They * CAN'T* apply.

Wrong. *Any* communications channel in use is constrained by
Shannon's rules.

> "The Channel" is whatever the ham radio operator, and his gear, set it to be. So when I
>work PSK31 and it can't print, but the CW- ID comes through loud and clear, to quote Cecil
>Moore, "The playing field is not level, the comparison is unfair". That was the best he
>could do, to insist that I also push the CW signal through the 30 cycle wide filter so
>that IT couldn't be copied just like the PSK couldn't be. Nonsense!

What 30 cycle filter are you talking about? There is none.

The problem is you are comparing two different data rates
through the same channel. PSK-31 runs at 31.5 bits per second.
If you used CW at that rate, it works out to about 37.8 wpm.
Are you telling me *you* can copy 35 wpm using a 200 Hz filter
when there is Doppler distortion from auroral activity?

In fact, what you've done is demonstrate that Shannon's work
does apply to ham radio! PSK-31 is an m-ary channel using
QPSK (where m = 4), which trades signal to noise ratio for
bandwidth to obtain the same data rate as it would using
straight phase modulation.

What *you* should be saying is that your experience demonstrates
that Shannon's theories prove true in the practical application
of ham radio. When the SNR is low, CW can be useful, albeit at
very low data rates, if restricted bandwidth is a requirement.
Of course, if the bandwidth wasn't restricted to 200 Hz, almost
any variation on PSK modulation would out run CW for efficiency,
as can easily be demonstrated using Shannon's formula.

> When (if ever) ham radio gear is manufactured so that the Shannon limit is built into
>the equipment, and *that* sets the channel limit, obviously my statement will no longer be

Well, danged. I believe that "the Shannon limit is built into"
every piece of communciations equipment I've ever seen. Tell me
about the gear you use where it isn't! I'd like to know about
this infinite bandwidth you have, and the lack of noise. Must
be interesting.

>true, as I certainly trust - hope?- you can see. But I see you're not anywhere nearly as
>sharp as Cecil, and that certainly comes as no surprise

Cecil is indeed a sharp fellow, and I don't think I'm insulted
if I don't measure up to him.

But maybe that bit about you being too dumb to be a real ham is
true, eh?

> So you passed a ham radio test in 1960, then promptly forgot about it all. Now you show
>up on usenet to portray yourself as some sort of Guru Expert Professional. Why don't you
>just crawl back across the tundra to your rabbit hole- The game's over
>You're nothing but a Lennie who once held a license.

And that is another compliment.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

825. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-09 23:40:29 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh40pd$tt0$0@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 74390

Jim Hampton wrote:

>Dan,
>
>You'd best check. When 911 hit, I lost AT&T internet for over a week!
>

First thing I noticed late that day was the slowdown in my dialup,
which I figured was some unrelated local glitch. But it never did seem
to speed up on netwide ccnnects, though I get 42 to 44kbs connects.
Makes me wonder what got damaged and where, to cause that.

>Stupid doesn't realize how vulnerable some of this high infrastructure stuff
>(like cellular telephones) is. BTW, on your CQ, check the swr on your
>telephone/modem line. Also check your 'swang'. :)
>
>
>73 from Rochester, NY
>Jim AA2QA
>
>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:bh3f5noek1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
>
>>
>>Great....lets give it a try then.....
>>
>>CQ CQ CQ INTERNET THIS IS KEITHGOOF
>>
>>
>>
>COMEON...
>
>
>>.....................................
>>
>>Damn no replies.....What did I do wrong Keithgoof?
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>

>---
>Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
>Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
>Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03
>
>
>
>

826. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 00:00:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bh41tnvhd1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74391

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:3F34C8DB.3060108@mailcity.moc...
>
>
> Phil wrote:
>
> >
> > There are a surprising number of hams out there that have lost the
> > spirit of the hobby (one idiot told me that he won't bother to QSO
> > with someone who is off by even 10 Hz....it bothers his ears!)
>
> That is what RIT is for, but these refugees from the cb band
> don't know how to use it. They would really be hacked if they
> had to operate in the days when Novices were required to be
> crystal controlled. You called CQ on your crystal frequency then
> had to tune the band with your receiver to listen for another
> Novice, who more than likely had a different crystal frequency,
> giving you a call. Too many modern day jap appliance operators
> are wimps when it comes to operating, they know how to turn on
> the rig, read their fancy digital readout and that is the height
> of their technical skills.
>

Looks like 'JJ' has it right. He hit it right on the head. What Phil needs to do is take the boatanchors to the AM group. THey at least know how to tune a fella in. 3880/3885, 7190/95, 7160. 14280 or so. 28.1 and up.

Enjoy.

Dan/W4NTI

827. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 00:03:04 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87d6fe8jlz.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74392

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>
>>Well, there is one other thing to say. But I've stolen this
>>from Cecil once or twice already, so I'll quote him directly
>>this time:
>>
>> "Again, power level is only one of three inter-related
>> parameters. If they are not all equal, then the playing field
>> is not level. Your being able to copy the CW ID, which has an
>> equivalent 12dB power advantage, is like saying a 150w SSB
>> signal is easier to copy than a 1w CW signal. It's true but it
>> is also meaningless.
>>
>> Thanks to DICK CARROLL'S LOGIC, SSB can be proven to be
>> superior to CW every time. That follows from ignoring any of
>> the throughput parameters."
>
> Obsuscation when Cecil said it, more of the same from you!. There is
>nothing there related whatever to the case cited. QED
...
> If you're serious it only means that YOU don't understand Shannon's work
>The channel bandwidth limit is central to any application Shannon 's theory.

They why we can increase the SNR and get more channel capacity
regardless of the bandwidth? Sounds like bandwidth isn't so
central after all, eh?

Hmmm... maybe, just maybe, that was what Cecil was getting at,
by leaving all else the same and just providing more signal to
increase the channel capacity despite whatever the bandwidth
was?

See DICK, just having attempted to use PSK-31 hasn't made you into
much of a yard stick to measure hams by. Using CW didn't seem to
help you much either... so I can't see you as a shining example of
any need to have a CW test prerequisite to having a ham ticket.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

828. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 00:06:48 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bh4292$u3n@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74393

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bh40pd$tt0$0@208.206.142.110...
>
>
> Jim Hampton wrote:
>
> >Dan,
> >
> >You'd best check. When 911 hit, I lost AT&T internet for over a week!
> >
>
> First thing I noticed late that day was the slowdown in my dialup,
> which I figured was some unrelated local glitch. But it never did seem
> to speed up on netwide ccnnects, though I get 42 to 44kbs connects.
> Makes me wonder what got damaged and where, to cause that.
>

Your brain, and it's called imagination.

Kim W5TIT

829. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 00:09:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F358D6B.5080403@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74394

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> leaky fawecettes wrote:
>
>
>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>news:3F29B941.3060802@adelphia.net...
>>
>>>Just practicing one of the the new Q signals....
>>>
>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>
>>Another guy in here thinks the end of CW spells
>>the complete end of ham radio.....how utterly
>>pathetic...
>
>
> Yeah, "leaker" you sure are. You can't getit straight, either. Nothing will "end" han
> radio, at least not in any short time, just make it realtively useless.

And how exactly can he read that from my little joke anyhow, Dick? It
had nothing to do with CW at all.

- Mike KB3EIA -

830. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 00:13:01 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F358E0D.4050309@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 74395

>
>
>>
>>
>>
>Get ready for a wooshing sound, that will be the stampede of no codes
>and outlaws flooding your hallowed ground, little man. You brought
>it all on..
>
>
>
Well, nothing much happened when the hordes of 5 WPM hams invaded HF a few
years ago. And when the no coders arrive, they'll be elmered....

831. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 00:43:37 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030809204337.022$Ew@newsreader.com>
Source record: 74396

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
> >
> >
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >Get ready for a wooshing sound, that will be the stampede of no codes
> >and outlaws flooding your hallowed ground, little man. You brought
> >it all on..
> >
> >
> >
> Well, nothing much happened when the hordes of 5 WPM hams invaded HF a
> few years ago. And when the no coders arrive, they'll be elmered....
>
Too late for elmers, they will scoff.

--
GO# 40

832. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 00:47:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308091647.6398f14@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74397

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308090129.59fa1e2d@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308080920.d97c720@posting.google.com>...
>
> > . . . I take umbrage with
> > > those who over-hype CW on the basis of the purity of the souls who
> > > practice the art & science. It just ain't so, we're all just people.
> > >
> > > > >
> > > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > > w3rv
> >
> > FWIW, Larry has reported that his "friend" sends QFU.
>
> We all worked 4Q2TOO in the low end of 80, "The Island of Ambrosio".

I didn't work Larry's "friend."

833. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 00:49:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809204926.02627.00000706@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 74398

In article <3vpajv8t0754490jf0e7gt00gm02on0qh3@4ax.com>, Phil
<nomail@noway.com> writes:

>On a related note to this discussion, I have just started operating on
>the 40 and 20 meter bands using a 50-plus-year-old SSB receiver and
>transmitter. Both units have been tuned up to factory specs.

COOL! What are they - Collins?

>Frequently, I am told by those that I try to engage in QSO that I'm
>opeating 'off frequency', and that I should "get my rig fixed".
>Several folks have refused to continue the QSO for that reason. When I
>did get one kind soul to retune his receiver to match my transmission,
>I was off by 80 Hz (!). I'm not sure that this old beast could ever
>tune more accurately than that!

What band?
>
>There are a surprising number of hams out there that have lost the
>spirit of the hobby (one idiot told me that he won't bother to QSO
>with someone who is off by even 10 Hz....it bothers his ears!)

That's what RIT and SPLIT are for on modern rigs...
-
>experimentation and homebrewing have apparently been replaced with
>buying the latest microprocessor-controlled 1 KW-plus rig and
>top-of-the-line beam antenna, turning the tuning knob to a frequency,
>pointing the antenna at the target area and yakking away. (It takes
>me at least 45 seconds to get this old transmitter on frequency, tune
>the driver, plate and load controls, adjust the antenna tuner, set the
>level, switch from dummy load to antenna and go!).

Do you have to retune it when you QSY within a band?

>"Gee, buddy,
>you're coming in 20 over S9 here, beautiful signal!"....no @#$%, with
>$4000+ worth of commercial equipment or more, not much challenge in
>that. Realistically, this takes not much more than the level of skill
>required to hook up stereo equipment, or wire up a store-bought PC!
>Try contacting someone DX with an old boatanchor and a homemade wire
>antenna sometime - now THAT is an accomplishment!

Or a 100% homebrew rig. I have a few of those.

>Guess this hobby has become more of a giant telephone than an
>experimenters' playground - wish it weren't so! Guess that I'm only
>anout 40 years too late....

Tune that rig down to the low end of the band and work some CW. You will not get that sort of response from the CW folks. We run all sorts of stuff, from the latest multikilobuck top of the line to ancient pre-WW2 glowbugs to homebrew to QRP. As long as your signal and fist are decent, nobody cares much about exact QRG or such nonsense.

Try 7035 - lotta good CW ops around there.

73 de Jim, N2EY

834. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 00:51:07 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030809205107.834$7D@newsreader.com>
Source record: 74399

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> wrote:
> On 09 Aug 2003 15:12:31 GMT, Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
>
> >I enjoy watching assholes like you and dan squirm.
>
> Kinda like you when you take a code test, eh?
>
Dunno, never took it. Looks like cw is gonna be history,
just like your attitude toward no coders. Fate is a strange
animal, all you stuffy blowhards lose after-all.

You should of elmered the hobby, instead of ridiculing
any newbie who showed interest. Too late now.

--
GO# 40

835. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 00:54:13 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030809205413.390$f8@newsreader.com>
Source record: 74400

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> wrote:
> On Sat, 9 Aug 2003 10:23:46 -0400, "Cool Breeze" <spade#abc.com>
> wrote:
>
> >
> ><Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030809002357.295$Yl@newsreader.com...
> >> Get ready for a wooshing sound, that will be the stampede of no codes
> >> and outlaws flooding your hallowed ground, little man. You brought
> >> it all on..
> >>
> >> --
> >> GO# 40
> >
> >Are you a Ham ??? What are you doing in this
> >NG??
> >???? ????
> >
>
> To answer your queries in order:
>
> 1. Probably not.
>
> 2. Trolling.
>
> 73 DE John, KC2HMZ
>
Hey john, if you only knew the irony of what you posted.

--
GO# 40

836. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 01:00:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809210001.02197.00001975@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74206

In article <BB5A07D1.22018%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) And amateur radio does not exist to
>> serve other services. (snip)
>
> Our public service is often service to other agencies (Red Cross, MARS,
>and so on).
>
>> The "pool of trained operators" thing in 97.1 is
>> really about the idea of the ARS being a service
>> where the licensees (hams) are skilled both
>> operationally and technically, able to do a lot
>> of different things well. This distinguishes it
>> from other services, (snip)
>
> The pool of trained operators concept relates to our ability to do the
>other things outlined in 97.1 (public service, international goodwill, and
>so on). At one time, code was a necessary part of at least some of that.
>That is much less so today, hence the move to change the code testing
>requirement.

Dwight, that statement in 97.1 is an OLD thing going back decades.

It was put in there to rationalize the existance of amateur radio among all the other very commercial radio services.

Three to four decades ago there MIGHT have been a "need" for "trained operators" for the military draft. [the USA still had a draft and the Cold War was very warm indeed] Never mind that the military already HAD ways of training in the "radio arts."

Does national defense or the various aid agencies NEED amateurs who are "trained" in DX contesting and sitting around telling old war stories about when Kode Vas King? I don't think so.

>> (snip) And public service. (snip)
>
> I'm not aware of the use of code by any of the typical served agencies
>(Red Cross, MARS, and so on).

Morse code use will keep out the eveavsdropers and bad people from the content of communications, thus not letting them know the deep dark, very secret ways of the ham. Secure.

So I've been told.

>> (snip) Besides, everything hams do is either "for
>> enjoyment" or public service. Does that mean none
>> of it should be tested?
>
> Huh? I thought I was fairly clear about all this. Code was once necessary
>for the goals and purposes outlined in 97.1. At the very least, that is much
>less so today (some would say it is not at all so today). That severely
>weakens the justification for a unique license requirement. If the license
>requirement is actually removed, code will then be tested on an equal
>footing with the other operating modes (written theory). Nothing in that is
>an argument for or against testing anything else.

Holier-than-thou old-timers just can't live with that, Dwight!

FCC "must" keep the "tradition" of morsemanship!

<shrug>

LHA

837. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 01:00:04 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809210004.02197.00001976@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74211

In article <w4VYa.162$dj3.18912@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0308080912.7e373969@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<XsNYa.93$dj3.13294@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20030807222823.21428.00001559@mb-m23.aol.com...
>> > [triming down stuff that's been repeated in the thread]
>> > >
>> > > To a certain extent. But the change had its downside, too. Ham radio
>used
>> > to
>> > > get a lot of free publicity and recruitment in the form of SWLs
>hearing
>> > hams on
>> > > AM. That pretty much ended with the switch to SSB. The number of new
>hams
>> > > slowed down (in part) because of that change.
>> >
>> > So we need a new publicity mechanism ... I'd agree with that ...
>>
>> Point is that there were downsides to the shift to SSB. From the end
>> of WW2 to 1963 (17 years) the number of US hams quadrupled. Then it
>> stopped dead and the numbers hung at about a quarter million for more
>> than 5 years in the '60s.
>>
>> Oddly enough, growth started back up again when the incentive
>> licensing changes were enacted. Huh?
>
>Now you're trying to tell us that incentive licensing PROMOTED
>growth in ham radio??? I don't think so ...
>
>More likely the boom after WWII (and Korea) was due to military
>radio folks becoming hams when they got out ...

Now, now. Rev. Jimmie LIVED THOSE TIMES. He KNOWS.

:-)

I'm sorry that W9ERU hadn't retired, moved out west and become
K7DI, then, eventually, did the SK. Gene Hubbell and his partner
in H&H Electronics did great business selling boxes after boxes
of surplus ARC-5 units and BC-348s back in 1947. Back then,

"surplus" was a Big Thing and many hams restarted or got started
on converted surplus radios. World War 2 was over in 1945 and
the Korean War hadn't started yet (1950).

>The boom in the 60's was probably due to the emergence of economical
>JA radios, a general increase in the interest in electronics, and later, the
>emergence of VHF/UHF FM and repeaters ...

It's difficult for even old-timers to understand a postwar boom period and
the Cold War getting hotter when they've just reached First Grade. :-)

You ARE right, but some of these holier-than-thou old-timers lived in
a different reality.

>> "Purpose made RF modems"?? Why not call them data radios?
>
>Whatever ... I tend to think that RF modems is a good term ...
>after all, modem is the concatenation of MODulator and DEModulator.

The rest of the radio-electronics industry calls them "RF Modems" but
you have to remember you are talking to a holier-than-thou old-timer
who may think that amateur radio operates by different physics than
all other radio. <shrug>

>> And I agree - a dig built specifically for data modes is the better
>> solution. Deal with the decoding right at the IF level, rather than
>> converting to audio and all that jazz.
>
>Actually, most modern digital radios convert directly to I/Q baseband
>and do the signal processing there ...

Carl, I don't think that QST or QEX have described "I/Q baseband"
radio systems. Such doesn't exist in AMATEUR radio so it doesn't
help to argue the points. Never mind that one in two Americans now
have cell phones and they are all little radios using that system. :-)

>> But somebody's got to design and build the data radios. Who is going
>> to tie the bell on that cat?
>
>I was telling you of some plans I have for after I get my antenna work
>done this summer ... winter projects, so to speak. However, you will
>realize that I do work for a living and have other obligations as well,
>so don't hold me to some firm, preconceived schedule. Don't get me
>wrong, it's something I *really* want to do, and I intend to do it with
>as much diligence as I can in terms of getting something accomplished.

The holier-than-thou old-timers insist on the "no-coders" to do all
the technical advancements in amateur radio. Never mind that they
weren't able to do much in a half century. :-)

>I personally think that incentive licensing, as implemented, was a mistake.
>It made little sense to require higher Morse speeds for privs that were
>primarily non-Morse ... I have NO problem with a *reasonable* number

>(I think 3 is adequate, 2 might be alright) of license classes in order to
>encourage folks to learn more about radio technology ... I know that
>many will say it's impractical from an enforcement standpoint, but I would
>restrict power for the lower classes (though you've probably seen me
>comment that brute force power is over-rated ... I doubt that I will ever
>get a legal limit amp ... 100W seems to work just fine on HF), rather than
>segregate newcomers from everyone else as widely as our current rules
>do. Newcomers need to be welcomed and "socialized" (not like Larry's
>"don't let the door hit you in the ass on the way out" shpiel ...) That's
>how to make more good ... and better ... hams - welcome them and show them
>the way (politely).

The holier-than-thou old-timers won't hear of "being nice" to newcomers.

They have achieved TITLE, STATUS, Rank and Privelege and can sign
their callsign behind their names (just like nobility). They are Very
Important exhalted People who are "superior!"

Nobility suffers the peasantry, poor things.

>> Since NCVEC is not a representative organization, and is only involved
>> in testing, why are they getting into things like subbands?
>
>They are considered by the FCC as an authoritative source. Why they said
>each and every word they said is something upon which I won't speculate.

Hmphhh...if NCVEC is "NOT" an authoritative source, why in the hell
are they given full power to make up ALL the written exam questions
and answers?!?

>> That's not what I'm talking about at all. My point is not about SMT,
>> it's about the fact that much of today's consumer electronics isn't
>> meant to be worked on. It's cheaper to just replace than to repair.
>> Lookit your PC - most of the "components" aren't resistors,
>> capacitors, transistors or ICs. The components in your PC are
>> subassemblies: drives and cards and premanufactured cables, power
>> supplies etc. A knowledgeable person can "build" a functioning PC from
>> a pile of "components" with just a screwdriver and good grounding
>> technique.
>
>Building a radio will involve components ... some may be "store-bought"
>ICs, others will be R/L/C, perhaps some discrete transistors, etc. ... BUT
>there is no reason that reasonably technically-inclined, intelligent hams
>cannot "build" their own custom ICs at home these days ... there are all sorts
of
>programmable logic devices, ranging from a few thousand or less gates to
>several millions of gates ... and the software to do design, simulation,
>verification, and programming is either affordable, or in some cases free.

What is already being done NOW is using things like a PIC micro-
controller (a microprocessor plus some extra I/O interface) from
Microchip, Inc. They supply a full Assembler software program FREE

for download. Major distributors (Digi-Key, Allied, Mouser, etc.) stock PIC microcontrollers. They've been used in all sorts of radio-related projects which can be seen on the Web.

That sort of thing is anathema to the holier-than-thou old-timer who insists on EVERYTHING being the SAME as when he was young.
They bitch and whine about "digital" as if it were a dirty word and they don't and won't LEARN new things. Why should they? They already have Title, Rank, Status in amateurism and "real radios glow in the dark" like back in the 1950s.

>Folks just need to think in new paradigms ... unfortunately, that does not
>seem to be the strong suit of many present hams.

Think "The Emperor's New Clothes." Yes, it doesn't "suit" them at all.

When their morsemanship skills are worn out and they take off that outer clothing, they aren't wearing anything of knowledge underneath.

I think some in the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service are still making coils on round Quaker Oats cartons and finding the "sweet spot" on their galena crystals so they can hear DX from the next county...

LHA

838. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 01:00:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809210005.02197.00001977@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74207

In article <2XCYa.42$dj3.7021@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0308071433.cf44bfc@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<wcOWa.2375$lL.382710@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> > Dick,
>> >
>> > EVERY time there has been change of any real sort in ham radio, there
>> > have been cranky olde fartz like you preaching "end of the world" doom
>> > and gloom ... and every time it has not come to pass ...
>>
>> There have also been predictions and promises of a "brave new world"
>> that the new changes would bring. Which also did not come to pass.
>
>I would submit that the change from spark to CW was a big, progressive
>change.

Not in Jimmie's day of around 1923 or 1924. He lived it all. In fantasy.

>Likewise the change from AM to SSB.

...which would not have happened if AT&T hadn't used it on wireline
"carrier" equipment...or a number of commercial communications
carriers hadn't used it on HF in the 1930s...or USAF's SAC had
contracted Collins and RCA for military single-channel SSB
transceivers.

>From plain RTTY to things like AMTOR, PACTOR, PSK31, etc.

If one extra can't understand a 1947 landmark paper on communications
theory, why do you expect a bunch of amateurs will understand the
relationship between noise, bandwidth, and error rate? :-)

>Did these changes come about overnight? No. Did OTs bitch
>and whine? Yes.

"B&W." Like sour old root beer. :-) :-) :-)

Sorry to slight A&W which makes very good root beer...

>> None of these were forced on hams by regulatory change. Hams adopted
>> them voluntarily. For example, spark wasn't outlawed for hams until
>> 1927, even though it was essentially abandoned by hams by 1923 or 24.
>
>Nobody is proposing a regulatory change that will prohibit or in any way

>restrict the USE of Morse ... all that's being asked for is to eliminate the
>test requirement that even the FCC and the IARU admit are not in the
>best interest of the future of ham radio.

All them holier-than-thou old-timers are too good to be true...as long
as you agree with their old, outmoded ways of radio. :-)

>Nobody is being forced to do anything ... in fact, the proposed/anticipated
>change will STOP forcing folks to do something that many don't want to
>do ...

IARU saw the light. ARRL refused to look, so far. That kind of
spells out how it will go in the USA on test element 1.

ARRL won't let go of the code test until the last morse recording is
removed from their director's cold, dead fingers.

>So, the "None of these were forced on hams by regulatory change." argument
>doesn't hold water Jim.

You were speaking at a holier-than-thou old-timer in ham radio, Carl.

:-)

>> AM is still popular on HF - in fact, more popular than 20-30 years
>> ago. What caused hams to abandon AM in large numbers was the simple
>> fact that an SSB transceiver was less expensive than an AM
>> receiver-transmitter combo of equal effective power. That transition
>> also drastically reduced the amount of homebrewing done by hams.
>
>What drastically reduced the amount of homebrewing done by hams
>is a combination of the following:
>
>1) technology got more "complicated" for the uninitiated
>2) parts got harder to buy at reasonable prices in small quantities
>3) the performance and quality of "store-bought" gear
>improved and at the same time the cost in (adjusted) $
>dropped dramatically.
>
>Heck, you can buy a decent 2m transciever for $150 today
>... something with performance, quality, reliability, and ergonomics
>that the average ham couldn't duplicate for 3x that price when
>buying parts in small quantities.
>
>Does that mean I think homebrewing should roll over and die?
>CERTAINLY NOT ...

Nope. QST and QEX will still feature landmark weekender
project articles for regenerative receivers and two-transistor
transmitters built in tuna tin cans. Real earthshaking
technical advancements! :-)

>> > the introduction of the no-code Tech license;
>>
>> Which has not resulted in greatly increased longterm growth nor a
>> techno revolution.
>
>If it weren't for the thousands of hams who have entered via the
>no-code tech license, the ham population would be something
>like 1/2 what it was in 1990 ...

Actually, more like 2/3. That argument was done in here about
four years ago. Rev. Jimmie wouldn't accept it then, still won't.

I think his world was stuck in the 1930s when he had finally
abandoned spark for tubes.

>When you start out with an old, greying demographic (and I'm
>no "spring chicken"), if there are no newcomers, the population
>can only drop dramatically.
>[snipped here for lack of time and tiredness ... it's been a LONG day]

Poor greying babies! :-)

Boo hoo. Grey hair! Tsk, tsk. :-)

LHA

839. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 01:00:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809210006.02197.00001978@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74204

In article <c2356669.0308071433.cf44bfc@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>> (Try to be *completely* like Scrooge ... go through the change, don't stay
>> stuck in the first part ...)
>
>Words for all of us to live by....

"The Picture of Dorian Grey" is more appropriate.

LHA

Now get a cask of Amontilado while we all brick you up...

840. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 01:00:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809210007.02197.00001979@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74210

In article <3F32C3E8.7050809@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

[AND GETS ANSWERED IN ALL CAPS SO THAT HE CAN HEAR
EVERYTHING LOUD AND CLEAR]

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <qK_Wa.2427$lL.391902@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>>>What WILL be the end of ham radio is a lack of significant
>>>growth ...
>>
>> Let's get it straight - is dropping Element 1 going to give us lots more
growth
>> or not?
>
> I'm going to interject here, since I'm still on Vacation and can only
>get in so many posts for a bit.

NO EXCUSES!

> I don't understand a few of the things Carl says here. That we will
>dissapear unless we get "significant growth".
>
> What exactly is that? a 100 percent increase in a day? increase at 1
>percent over population increase?

IT'S ALL ARCHIVED IN GOOGLE. OLD ARGUMENT IN HERE, THAT REV.
JIMMIE WAS TRYING TO WEASEL OUT OF BY USING THAT TIRED OLD
LUMPING OF TECH-PLUSSES WITH TECHS PLOY.

HAD YOU SEEN THE ARGUMENT AWAYS BACK YOU WOULD HAVE
UNDERSTOOD THAT US AMATEUR RADIO WAS ACTUALLY
SHRINKING WITHOUT THE NO-CODE-TEST TECHNICIANS COMING
ON BOARD.

> I'd like to know the advances they will bring.

I WANT TO KNOW THE "ADVANCES" THE PRO-CODERS BROUGHT
IN OVER THE LAST HALF-CENTURY.

> I want to hear how those who oppose the ending of the Morse code
>requirement are keeping ham radio from marching forward.

THE LIVING MUSEUM OF THE ARCHAIC RADIOTELEGRAPHY
SERVICE IS ALWAYS OPEN, ALWAYS BEEPING. SOME AREN'T

MARCHING, BUT ARE USING WALKERS.

> Time for the roadmap to the future to be laid out.

WHO ARE YOU, RAND-MCNALLY? THE USCGS?

> Or is this like the last scene in "The Candidate"?

MORE LIKE "THE MANCHURIAN CANDIDATE."

> I find it amusing that even though the PCTA's have lost the war, that
>those who brought this to bear cannot avoid smacking us around a little
>bit yet. It might be fun, but isn't doing anyone a bit of good.

AWWWW....POOR POOR LITTLE HOCKEYPUCK!

FEEL BEAT UP DO YOU?

TSK, TSK.

> Gloat time is over.

NOT BY A LONG SHOT, HOCKEYPUCK.

PRO-CODERS HAVE HAD A HALF CENTURY PLUS OF GLOATING
AND BROW-BEATING THOSE THAT DIDN'T CARE TO USE MORSE
OR DIDN'T SEE THE NEED TO USE IT.

HALF CENTURY.

>Your time has come.

Nope. YOURS has. You aligned yourself with the pro-coders on the
barricades. You WILL lose. Try, try to get used to the reality.

>You now have the chance to prove that you were right.

That was "proven" a long time ago by every OTHER radio service.

The old Beepers wanted to preserve their youth long, long after
and kept up the pressure for all AMATEURS to test for code.

The IARU finally saw the light of reality for the International
Amateur Radio community. ARRL may never see it. ARRL
seems a law unto itself with all its brainwashing over the years.

>And browbeating the losers isn't a very good start.

POOR BABY!

My, the HOLIER-THAN-THOU attitude sounds so "noble!"

You ain't no "loser," hockeypuck. You just picked the wrong
side and try to disguise your whining with that holier-than-thou
hypocritical BS about some imaginary "ethics."

If you are going to restart all that tinnitus whining, you're out of luck. I have it too and I'm not whining or making excuses.

A half century ago I and hundreds in my outfit were busy doing primary HF communications trans-Pacific. NO morse code used for that then, none after, not even after HF communications went from primary to secondary status in 1978.

> Sorry to hijack the thread, Jim!

Back under the bridge, troll...

LHA

841. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 01:00:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809210008.02197.00001980@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74205

In article <878yq62rkw.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> writes:
>>>
>>>It does? Is that why he's been using you for entertainment (and I
>>>might add, providing others with great laughs) for how many years?
>>
>> It's really Wry Amusement, Floyd. :-)
>
>How true! The funniest part is how close you can fly these zingers
>past the pointed heads and they *still* miss it.

They don't understand. Yet another syndrome of Beeperitis.

1. They don't dare admit they "got it" because that would dimish
them in their own eyes (they don't care how others see them).
2. They are so wrapped up in their fantasy and constant ARRL
brainwashing that they cannot perceive reality.
3. Both of the preceding.

>>>Seven??? And _you_ think it bugs him!
>>
>> Heh heh heh.
>>
>> Doesn't bother me a bit. My interest has always been on removing the
>> code test for a radio license. That's begun happening internationally.
>> Quite satisfactory to me. More work to do on that for the US regulations
>> but this newsgroup is NOT the venue for any serious debate. :-)
>
>Ain't that the truth! The only thing serious here is the degree
>of mental aberation on display.

It ain't easy walking into a Looney Bin and trying to communicate with
those living in a world totally devoted to amateurism as it usta be.

>> See you next week. Maybe.
>
>Keep shooting Len, and trust that there are a number of folks
>who tune in for the entertainment. On an average you do pretty
>good, but now and then you have a *really* fine day, and those
>are priceless!

Send money then.

I AM a professional. :-)

[I never said anything about weekends... :-)]

Beep, beep

LHA

842. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 01:00:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809210009.02197.00001981@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74202

In article <SD5Za.221$dj3.28368@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>What name calling? I refered to Dick as "Dick." :-)

That's "extra DICK" to you, Carl... :-)

>The comment simply paraphrased/slightly modified something someone
>else said (I think it may have been Floyd's original comment, but I don't
>remember for sure ...)
>
>Besides, this is not a discussion of a truly technical issue, so what does
>my level of technical competence have to do with THIS discussion?

Larrah has the fantasy of being a "moderator" in here.

He's another victim of Beeperitis.

LHA

843. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 01:00:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809210009.02197.00001982@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74203

In article <f45722ac.0308080443.433942ab@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
>news:<87u18su00m.fld@barrow.com>...
>
>> So, what we get down to is Extra DICK don't know Shannon from
>> Shinola. What a hoot.
>
>I think that bad dog just got swatted with a rolled newspaper.

The man from misery doesn't have enough working neurons to
understand he was hit.

Another side-effect syndrome of Beeperitis.

LHA

844. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 01:00:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809210010.02197.00001983@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74201

In article <87vft8vnh4.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
writes:

>How are we going to measure it though? ... Hmmm, I guess we may just
>need Larry "The Measuring Stick" Roll after all!

My suggestion on that sort of "stick" is to STICK IT.

I think we all know where... :-)

LHA

845. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 01:00:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809210012.02197.00001984@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74212

In article <20030807214907.12631.00000112@mb-m28.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <T8vYa.133$jI2.2204@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>>
>>Larry,
>>
>>I don't expect "exalted status" ... just some respect as one who is arguably
>>more knowledgable and competent in RF technology than the average ham.
>
>Carl:
>
>You have been shown that respect quite consistently, particularly by me.
>However, the fact that you seem to be ignoring that fact is getting to be
>more than a little bit off-putting.

It hasn't been YOU showing any "respect" Larrah. Sure, you've tossed
in some "polite" small phrases now and then, but then followed that up
with LOTS of "off-putting" disrespectful sentences and phrases all about
your own self-promotion as "expert in communications.".

>>However, as has been pointed out, you insist that your superior CW skill
>>is ALL that counts and that since I'm not up to your standards in that area
>>I'm a "lesser ham."
>
>It's a simple fact that you don't have operating experience and proficiency
>in Morse/CW, which I consider to be one of the most useful communications
>skills in the radio amateur's arsenal.

Hmmm...let's see...

Larrah claims employment at Radio Shack prior to his 20 years with USAF.
In the USAF he flew a desk and never did any USAF communications.
Then he claims attending college with "summa cum laude" title add-on and
thus able to get any Human Resources career position he wants after
graduation...instead of landing a job as a Personnel specialist, he winds up
a BUS DRIVER but insist on calling his occupation "paratransit specialist."

Yes, a whole heaping glob of "communication skills" in that short resume.

For marketing folks and snake-oil salesmen.

A mere 50 1/2 years ago I was doing trans-Pacific HF transmissions as
part of my military service. At no time during my 3 years in that was there
ANY morse code used for primary communications. The USN radio HF

primary and USAF HF primary communications used the same TTY and
voice and FAX modes at that time. By 1978 HF comm was relegated to
secondary status, all US military branches.

For a half century the military and commercial carriers on HF have NOT
used any manual morse telegraphy for primary communications. But
the soma come loud bus driver insists that "morse code is a primary
skill!"

Ah, but the bus driver insists that is needed in amateurism! Of course,
to keep alive a living museum of the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service!

To keep that legend alive, he insists that ALL who desire to enter a
radio hobby activity MUST take a manual telegraphy test!

Larrah's only justification is his holier-than-everyone opinion and self-
elevation to Raddio Godd status.

>I have always acknowledged your
>superior, professional-grade technical skills, and those of all other hams of
>all license classes who possess them. However, I must reiterate, this is the
>AMATEUR Radio Service. The ARS has a long-standing tradition of
>requiring proficiency in the use of the Morse code, for the purpose of
>permitting radio amateurs to exploit the many benefits and advantages of
>that particular mode.

Invalid on all accounts, Larrah. Your accounts are bankrupt.

The FCC is NOT chartered to preserve old legends and old traditions.

ARRL seems to think its duty is to keep the morse legends and myths
alive and doesn't shrink from that propaganda anymore now than they
did a half century ago. They refuse to modernize even though the IARU
sided with eliminating the code test in ITU-R S25.5.

The ONLY place where morse code skills are of "value" would be in
amateur radio. Even snake-oil salesmen who were morsemen couldn't
make a living communicating in morse these days.

But, you, the NON-communicator (except as a very amateur) want to
keep a federal law that forces all newcomers to test for morsemanship!

Incredible!

>I have consistently stated that I feel that this skill is
>important enough to radio AMATEURS that it simply cannot be replaced,
>even with technical skills which exceed licensing requirements.

Not a problem for you Larrah. You know so little about radio-electronics
theory that morsemanship is ALL you have in radiocommunications.

>This is my opinion, Carl -- not a demonstration of any lack of due respect.
>I would expect a person of your intelligence to recognize and acknowledge
>the difference.

Hmmph...I would have expected someone with Summa Cum Laude
status and new BA degree in "human resources" (PERSONNEL) to
"get any job he wanted" in said "human resources." You are now
driving a bus.

Don't worry Larrah...nearly all of us have the "intelligence to recognize
and acknowledge" snake-oil salesmen when they show up in here.

>Moreover, I have never held myself out as anything more
>than an "average" ham, with the notable exception of occasional hyperbole
>used in this newsgroup (and nowhere else) to push the buttons of particularly
>intransigent fellow participants, including your own good self.

HYPOCRITE!

Google has thousands and thousands of your own words archived where
YOU hold YOURSELF up as the "role model" of "expert" in anything you
are talking about, showing your "dedication and hard work" to become
an extra class morseman. As an AMATEUR.

Self-elevation. Self-promotion. That is all you do in here.

Now go shine up your big bus, "graduate (summa etc.) human resources
specialist," your passengers are waiting...

LHA

846. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 01:00:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809210013.02197.00001985@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74208

In article <87y8y5vuov.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
writes:

>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>>> Brian wrote:
>>> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>>> >
>>> > > Not really. Anyone can learn PSK31 in a half hour of looking over the
>help file and
>
>>> > Weeks of trying and posting here.
>>>
>>> Go googling and get back to us when you find all that. And NOT until.
>>> That'll keep you busy the rest of your naturl life.
>>>
>>> > Under PSK31 testing, you would be excluded from the HF part of the ARS.
>>>
>>> You are truly the original numb nuts.
>>
>>DICK, you go gurgle. Include Cecil in your search and you will find
>>when and where you failed.
>
>Well, this just sounded too good not to go have a look. What a
>hoot. There's was the DICK, saying that something doesn't fit
>Shannon's theorum, then claiming oh, actually it is just Cecil's
>way of describing it...
>
>Lord, I was falling out of my chair laughing while I read through
>that.
>
>Extra DICK doesn't understand Shannon's work, can't relate PSK31 to
>CW as far as a bandwidth limited channel is concerned, and was soundly
>thrashed by others for his stubborn refusal to learn.

Outside of never giving in to any valid arguments against his "superior"
viewpoint and "knowledge," extra DICK may be suffering from
beeperitis.

Beeperitis is not a medical term and isn't recognized by medical folks,
but it exists. It is the result of self-fantasizing during long periods of
morse coding that enables them to enter another dimension, a
dimension of monotonic sound, a twilight zone of the imagination that
makes them think they are "experts" at radio communication.

A side effect of beeperitis is that all the concentration on beeping robs the mind's neurons of accepting modern theory. Note: Claude Elwood Shannon's famous landmark paper was first published in 1947, a mere 56 years ago...it was available from the University of Illinois' website archives page as a download (where I got my first copy for my archives). Shannon's 1947 paper uses teleprinters as an example, comparing bits per second versus bandwidth versus noise versus error rate...all at rates far in excess of human morse code cognition. The old-timer morsemen would turn away from such things. A few, like extra DICK, would refuse to consider such universally-accepted laws as valid in amateur radio. Beeperitis syndrome side effect in full flower.

>Of course, Extra DICK is still here telling us that he is a measure
>of what makes for a good ham operator, and that anyone who's any
>dumber than him shouldn't be allowed on the bands.
>
>Hmmm... maybe when we look at it from that perspective, he may have
>a point, eh?

A "point?" Let's just say, theory-wise, a dunce cap shape would fit.

Nicely.

LHA

847. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 01:00:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809210014.02197.00001986@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74209

In article <20030806223003.27503.00001472@mb-m24.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Well, I'm sure Carl expects that his professional RF engineering
>qualifications
>should grant him exalted status in the ARS, but in truth, it just ain't so!

That is NO "expectation," just the whining of someone who was never in the professional ranks of radio being envious of those who have.

Like it or not, amateur radio is still a technological activity. If it weren't
you would be little more than a "CBer" with a license. BFD.

>I know
>lots of radio amateurs, of all license classes, who haven't made dime number
>one as a professional electronics technician or engineer, who are infinitely
>better hams than I am or Carl could ever be.

Then we can all guess that your vaunted Radio Shack days were all done voluntarily? :-)

Define "better" hams.

>What they all have in common is
>the fact that they have, throughout their "careers" as radio amateurs, been
>willing to explore and adopt new modes, while retaining the skills learned
>with the old ones, particularly Morse/CW.

A "career" is what professionals do...it is their WORK.

Unless there has been a sudden change in Part 97, Title 47 CFR, US amateur radio is NOT for pecuniary compensation. [that's why it is called "amateur"]

Let's see...you've only mentioned the old-timers you know...who are, not surprisingly, all very much pro-morse-code. Would that make you "biased" as judging all of the US ARS? Not according to you (we can all see the spin coming). According to everyone else except the pro-code syncophants, the bias is VERY apparent.

Negative points for your appraisal, Larrah...

>Their stations are truly up-to-date,
>they have usually attained high places on the DXCC standings, routinely
>hold leadership positions within their clubs, and can be counted on to
>provide valuable input and personal support for all club activities.

Ahem..."truly up-to-date" is cribbing right from the old pre-WW2
Amateur's Code. You should be able to do better, with all your
Summa Cum Laude college studies for a Human Resources degree.

Well, you (and your "ilk" whatever those are) subscribe to the old
description of "amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW."
That's the high point of your "career in ham radio?" :-)

"Leadership in a club" is a rather title-hungry description, isn't it?
That would be fine if the "club" is all about DX contesting. However,
some pro-coders insist that US amateur radio is all about a "diverse"
interest range that includes other things than DXing. Which is it?

"Valuable input and personal support" is more self-gratification
phrasing, "standard boilerplate" phrasing it is called in the writing trade.
If a club is all about DXing, then I'm sure the old-timers' "valuable input
and personal support" will be for THEIR favorite activity which is DXing.
That's just self-definition stuff, Larrah, NOT something that covers the
wide range of activities possible in US amateur radio.

>They are the ones
>who newcomers look to for the answers, while the so-called "professional"
>hams simply cluster amongst themselves and look down their noses at the
>proceedings of the rest of the club.

Now, now, Larrah, there you go again showing your envy of radio and
electronics folks who have REAL careers in radio-electronics.

You are ALL about self-promotion and self-glorification.

You know so little of basic electronic theory that you don't dare get into
any discussion at all technical in nature about radio in here...you would
be shown to be the self-glorifying flim-flam salesman you probably are
and then YOU look down your nose at those who are knowledgeable!

Feel free to go out and get a REAL job in radio that needs your morse
code skill and expertise and report back, okay? Make a CAREER in
code! Bum a ride on your company's bus if you need to...

Len Anderson
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

848. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 01:06:46 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh45r6$95b$0@208.206.142.80>
Source record: 74213

Floyd Davidson wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
>>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Well, there is one other thing to say. But I've stolen this
>>>
>>>
>>>from Cecil once or twice already, so I'll quote him directly
>>
>>
>>>this time:
>>>
>>> "Again, power level is only one of three inter-related
>>> parameters. If they are not all equal, then the playing field
>>> is not level. Your being able to copy the CW ID, which has an
>>> equivalent 12dB power advantage, is like saying a 150w SSB
>>> signal is easier to copy than a 1w CW signal. It's true but it
>>> is also meaningless.
>>>
>>> Thanks to DICK CARROLL'S LOGIC, SSB can be proven to be
>>> superior to CW every time. That follows from ignoring any of
>>> the throughput parameters."
>>>
>>>
>>Obsuscation when Cecil said it, more of the same from you!. There is
>>nothing there related whatever to the case cited. QED
>>
>>
>...
>
>
>>If you're serious it only means that YOU don't understand Shannon's work
>>The channel bandwidth limit is central to any application Shannon 's theory.
>>
>>
>
>They why we can increase the SNR and get more channel capacity
>regardless of the bandwidth? Sounds like bandwidth isn't so
>central after all, eh?
>

>

So now you present a moving target. Just like dear old Cec.

OF COURSE things change with any of the conditions change.
But that really isn't pertinant to a ham radio operator making a
contact on the air. He isn't going to go "QRX while I do a Shannon
caculation to make sure we're able to make this contact." There was
virtually nothing I could do that I hadn't already done to alter-improve
any of the CHANNEL conditions that early morning. But hey, you haven't
actually been on the air in decades, so it's not too unusual that you
wouldn't be able to relate to any of that.

>See DICK, just having attempted to use PSK-31 hasn't made you into
>much of a yard stick to measure hams by.
>

See, PRICK FLOYD, I did far more that "attempt". Unlike you, The
Village Idiot Burke and Kandid Karl, I actually DID use it, rather
extensively for some time, in fact until it got boring. So it's
experience speaking not just obscure theory.

> Using CW didn't seem to
>help you much either... so I can't see you as a shining example of
>any need to have a CW test prerequisite to having a ham ticket.
>
>

Just *for the record* I couldn't care less what you think.

849. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 03:46:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030809234652.00871.00001181@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 74214

In article <bh45r6$95b$0@208.206.142.80>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>>
>>>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>>
>>>>Well, there is one other thing to say. But I've stolen this
>>>>
>>>>from Cecil once or twice already, so I'll quote him directly
>>>
>>>
>>>>this time:
>>>>
>>>> "Again, power level is only one of three inter-related
>>>> parameters. If they are not all equal, then the playing field
>>>> is not level. Your being able to copy the CW ID, which has an
>>>> equivalent 12dB power advantage, is like saying a 150w SSB
>>>> signal is easier to copy than a 1w CW signal. It's true but it
>>>> is also meaningless.
>>>>
>>>> Thanks to DICK CARROLL'S LOGIC, SSB can be proven to be
>>>> superior to CW every time. That follows from ignoring any of
>>>> the throughput parameters."
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Obsuscation when Cecil said it, more of the same from you!. There is
>>>nothing there related whatever to the case cited. QED
>>>
>>>If you're serious it only means that YOU don't understand Shannon's work
>>>The channel bandwidth limit is central to any application Shannon 's theory.
>>
>>They why we can increase the SNR and get more channel capacity
>>regardless of the bandwidth? Sounds like bandwidth isn't so
>>central after all, eh?
>
>So now you present a moving target. Just like dear old Cec.
>
>*OF COURSE* things change with any of the conditions change.
>But that really isn't pertinant to a ham radio operator making a
>contact on the air. He isn't going to go "QRX while I do a Shannon
>caculation to make sure we're able to make this contact."

I've never heard of anyone in any other radio service "doing a
pause to make a 'Shannon calculation'!" :-) :-) :-)

>There was
>virtually nothing I could do that I hadn't already done to alter-improve
>any of the CHANNEL conditions that early morning. But hey, you haven't
>actually been on the air in decades, so it's not too unusual that you
>wouldn't be able to relate to any of that.

Remarkable how you "know" what everyone has done, is doing, or will
be doing.

Maybe you don't have Beeperitis after all, just some kind of Alzheimer's?

>>See DICK, just having attempted to use PSK-31 hasn't made you into
>>much of a yard stick to measure hams by.
>
>See, PRICK FLOYD, I did far more that "attempt". Unlike you, The
>Village Idiot Burke and Kandid Karl, I actually DID use it, rather
>extensively for some time, in fact until it got boring. So it's
>experience speaking not just obscure theory.

Now, now, extra Dick, don't get all foul-mouthed. :-)

Your given name is NOT Richard and you are NOT an extra?
Oh, my, then you've deceived us all along!

You "used Shannon's Law rather extensively?!?" How?

Well, the basic formula is rather a small one. Devised in 1947.
56 years ago. At Bell Labs. The same place that had the inventors
of the transistor. Same year. :-)

>> Using CW didn't seem to
>>help you much either... so I can't see you as a shining example of
>>any need to have a CW test prerequisite to having a ham ticket.
>
> Just *for the record* I couldn't care less what you think.

No problem, Man from Misery. Most of us don't give a damn what you
post. :-)

Good pot-shooting requires practice. You provide an excellent target
for that. Big pot. Small contents.

Have a nice half weekendf, Extra Dick.

:-)

850. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 08:50:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308100050.7ce9bb65@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74215

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030809210009.02197.00001981@mb-m12.aol.com>...

> Larrah has the fantasy of being a "moderator" in here.

Whew! Pot/Kettle/Black if ever there was an example!

> He's another victim of Beeperitis.

And YOUR excuse is...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

851. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 08:55:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308100055.537786bb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74216

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030809210007.02197.00001979@mb-m12.aol.com>...

> A half century ago...(SNIP)

You were unlicensed in the Amateur Radio Service, a "tradition"
you continue to this date...

> > Sorry to hijack the thread, Jim!
>
> Back under the bridge, troll...

Takes one to know one, eh, Lennie...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

852. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 09:19:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308100119.104cfcf0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74217

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030809210001.02197.00001975@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <BB5A07D1.22018%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

> > The pool of trained operators concept relates to our ability to do the
> >other things outlined in 97.1 (public service, international goodwill, and
> >so on). At one time, code was a necessary part of at least some of that.
> >That is much less so today, hence the move to change the code testing
> >requirement.
>
> Dwight, that statement in 97.1 is an OLD thing going back decades.

Regardless of how long it was put there, it's still there today,
ergo just as binding as it was then.

> It was put in there to rationalize the existance of amateur radio among
> all the other very commercial radio services.

Every radio service MUST be justified (not rationalized) to
exist. The electromagnetic spectrum IS finnite and therefore a
valuable resource that must be conserved and used wisely.

> Three to four decades ago there MIGHT have been a "need" for "trained
> operators" for the military draft. [the USA still had a draft and the Cold
> War was very warm indeed] Never mind that the military already HAD
> ways of training in the "radio arts."

The need for a "pool of trained operators" continues to exist to
this day. Events as recent as TODAY prove that.

> Does national defense or the various aid agencies NEED amateurs who
> are "trained" in DX contesting and sitting around telling old war stories
> about when Kode Vas King? I don't think so.

You "don't think so" because you're an idiot and a troll.

"National defense" is more than Morse operators. Hundreds of
thousands of dollars are being poured into Emergency Services training
for Amateurs specifically because they ARE licensed operators...seems
someone is sufficiently satisfied with the idea of our abilities to
warrant the spending of scarce funding.

> >> (snip) And public service. (snip)
> >
> > I'm not aware of the use of code by any of the typical served agencies
> >(Red Cross, MARS, and so on).

>
> Morse code use will keep out the eveavsdropers and bad people from
> the content of communications, thus not letting them know the deep
> dark, very secret ways of the ham. Secure.
>
> So I've been told.

So it has been. It's kept YOU out, Lennie.

> >> (snip) Besides, everything hams do is either "for
> >> enjoyment" or public service. Does that mean none
> >> of it should be tested?
> >
> > Huh? I thought I was fairly clear about all this. Code was once necessary
> >for the goals and purposes outlined in 97.1. At the very least, that is much
> >less so today (some would say it is not at all so today). That severely
> >weakens the justification for a unique license requirement. If the license
> >requirement is actually removed, code will then be tested on an equal
> >footing with the other operating modes (written theory). Nothing in that is
> >an argument for or against testing anything else.
>
> Holier-than-thou old-timers just can't live with that, Dwight!
>
> FCC "must" keep the "tradition" of morsemanship!
>
> <shrug>

Morse code is not necessary to meet the criteria laid out in
97.1, and was only incidental to it. Amateur Radio (as a community)
meets all points of 97.1 with ot without it, in any number of modes.

And that's a fact YOU can't seem to live WITH, Your Scumminess!

Steve, K4YZ

853. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 09:22:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308100122.26dc8b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74218

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030809210008.02197.00001980@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <878yq62rkw.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
> writes:

> >Keep shooting Len, and trust that there are a number of folks
> >who tune in for the entertainment. On an average you do pretty
> >good, but now and then you have a *really* fine day, and those
> >are priceless!

Floyd, you must be oxygen deprived up there.

> Send money then.
>
> I AM a professional.

So is Heidi Fleiss

Steve, K4YZ

854. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 09:27:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308100127.6c22a27c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74219

Phil <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<3vpajv8t0754490jf0e7gt00gm02on0qh3@4ax.com>...

> On a related note to this discussion, I have just started operating on
> the 40 and 20 meter bands using a 50-plus-year-old SSB receiver and
> transmitter. Both units have been tuned up to factory specs.
> Frequently, I am told by those that I try to engage in QSO that I'm
> opeating 'off frequency', and that I should "get my rig fixed".
> Several folks have refused to continue the QSO for that reason. When I
> did get one kind soul to retune his receiver to match my transmission,
> I was off by 80 Hz (!). I'm not sure that this old beast could ever
> tune more accurately than that!

Well, Phil...idiots are idiots, on or off the air.

Amy and I just moved to new digs and I'm QRT for the moment or
I'd set a sked with you. That older gear has a warmth and fullness
that this solid waste (I meant solid STATE) stuff can't match...at
least not yet.

73

Steve, K4YZ

855. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 09:59:41 UTC
From: averyfine@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810055941.27618.00001162@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 74220

> brianburke@juno.com wrote:
>averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote:

>> Do you know if Len Anderson is a cannibal? Claims have been made that he
>eats
>> others for breakfast.
>
>Who? When?

Floyd Davidson wrote it about Len Anderson a few days ago.
>
>Dave thinks he's a pugilist.
>
Maybe a pugil stick? ;-) ;-)

Your master and teacher has
returned, Brian Burke.

856. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 10:09:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308100209.109eb73c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74221

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030809210001.02197.00001975@mb-m12.aol.com>...

> Does national defense or the various aid agencies NEED amateurs who
> are "trained" in DX contesting and sitting around telling old war stories
> about when Kode Vas King? I don't think so.

A quote from the ARRL website:

QUOTE

Red Cross honors ARRL for Amateur Radio's tornado work (Aug 8, 2003)
-- The ARRL has received a certificate of appreciation from the
American Red Cross for the "valuable service" League members provided
in support of Red Cross efforts after a devastating series of tornados
struck Missouri, Kansas, Tennessee and Arkansas on May 4. The
certificate specifically acknowledges Amateur Radio operation in
Missouri. "Your time and compassion resulted in more than 735
individuals and families being sustained in a time of crisis," wrote
ARC National Coordinator of Disaster Volunteers Wendy Kaplan in an
accompanying letter also signed by ARC executive vice president for
disaster services Terry Sicilia. Amateur Radio and the American Red
Cross have a long history of cooperation during disasters. The first
Memorandum of Understanding between ARRL and the ARC dates back to
1940.

UNQUOTE

It would seem that the American Red Cross, an entity that's been
in existence far longer than Lennie the Lame, sees Amateur Radio's
contributions to disaster relief and Public Service in a significantly
different light than he does.

Seems to me that this pretty well meets the criteria set out in
97.1.

Whew!

Steve, K4YZ

857. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 10:43:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308100243.38144474@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74222

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bh3jmm$294$1@208.207.71.177>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
news:<20030809101034.05245.00000303@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >
> > > The truth of the matter is that under some
> > > conditions PSK-31 outperforms OOK
> > > Morse CW, and under some conditions
> > > OOK Morse CW outperforms PSK-31.
> > >
> > > Can both of you
> > > accept that fact?
> >
> > I think most reasonable people can accept that.
> >
> > But what is unacceptable is DICK's assertion that any idiot can pick
> > up PSK in 30 minutes, when he has had weeks of trouble with the mode
> > by his own words.
> >
> > No?
>
> No, in a word. If you believe I said such a thing, why don't you google it up and post it
here, to stave
> off the well earned title of bald faced liar? *I* know why, but others may not. It's
because YOU ARE a
> bald faced liar, as well as your village's favorite
> pointyhead

DICK, your words are so magnificent; why do you deny them?

858. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 10:44:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810064427.21428.00001584@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 74223

In article <Xns93D2733067496elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>>>> "Here" is all of Region 2. A big part of the world.
>>>
>>>No, only the USA, it's still phone in the rest of R2
>>
>> No, it isn't. Other modes are authorized, not just 'phone.
>>
>The point being, however, that phone is authorised there in every country
>but one

OK, fine.
>
>>>>>I think you'll find it isn't being fixed.
>>>>
>>>> Sure it is, but it will take time. Before the end of the decade
>>>> 7000-7200 will be worldwide exclusive amateur. That's double what
>>>> Region 1 and Region 3 have now. It will make sense for those regions
>>>> to move their 'phone up above 7100 and leave below 7100 to CW and
>>>> digital.
>>>
>>>Not while the US has CW in 7100-7150. As long as that's the case it
>>>makes more sense _to_them_ to leave 7000-7100 unchanged and split the
>>>'new' 7100-7200 50/50. Net gain to you - zero.
>>
>> If it gets the foreign 'phones off of 7030, it's a gain.
>>>
>>>>>The ARRL bandplan is the only
>>>>>one out of step, so nobody else is likely to change theirs,
>>>>>notwithstanding Europe and some other areas getting 7100-7200 as
>>>>>additional spectrum in 2007.
>>>>
>>>> What part of the world will not get 7100-7200?
>>>
>>>None
>>
>> There you are.
>>>
>>>> And why should Region 2 change now, with the band getting wider?
>>>
>>>You mean the US, and I don't suppose the ARRL will change
>>
>> It's not just ARRL but FCC.
>

>You're right, but it's not the rest of the region

So because everyone else makes a mistake, the USA should make it too?
>
>>>>>All that will happen is that a DX window will
>>>>>appear from 7150-7200, but the DX will continue to use phone
>>>>>everywhere they use it now - indefinitely. Sorry to be the one to
>>>>>break that to you!
>>>>
>>>> So their lack of a bandplan and good manners should cause the USA to
>>>> follow their lead? I think not!
>>>
>>>They have a bandplan. Phone stays above at least 7040, except 7030 in
>>>R3.
>>
>> There are Canadians operating LSB on 7030.

>I wasn't aware of that. That is against any bandplan that I know of, and I
>agree that it is bad manners

Exactly. Main point is that bandplans are not much help if folks ignore them.
>
>>>That's not the bandplan you want, but it's a bandplan. The reference to
>>>good manners I don't follow.
>>
>> The folks who don't follow the bandplan have bad manners. Having a
>> Canadian SSB net on 7030 when they have 7000-7030 is bad manners.
>
>Agreed

Thanks
>
>>>I don't expect the USA to follow anyone's lead. Just don't be
>>>surprised when no-one follows the USA's lead either.
>>
>> And the result is chaos.
>
>Yes it is. However, the rest of the world probably think that it would be
>easier for _one_ country to change than for 100+, which doesn't mean that
>I think it will happen.

So even though the result is chaos, the USA should follow along and make it
that much worse?
>
>>>> 800 is pretty high. 600-700 is more common among CW ops. The SSB
>>>> audio passband is typically 300-2700 Hz, so 600 or even 800 is pretty
>>>> low. 1500 would be smack in the middle.
>>>
>>>True enough
>>>
>>>>>>This of course would be what you
>>>>>would get if they netted onto the SSB and then offset by their usual

>>>>>amount.
>>>>
>>>> There is no offset in CW. The carriers are all on the same frequency.
>>>>>
>>>>>> Point is that what sounds like "right on top" may not sound that
>>>>>> way to the other guy.
>>>>
>>>>>It depends which side of the nominal carrier frequency the CW signal
>>>>>is on. However, assuming my SSB filter is working, I would say they
>>>>>were low, i.e. on the same side as the LSB sideband, or I would be
>>>>>filtering them out. This also puts them almost in the middle of the
>>>>>SSB signal, doesn't it?
>>>>
>>>> No. Their tone would be 1500 if it were in the middle.
>>>>>
>>>>>> Listen to a busy CW contest with a wide (AM bandwidth) rx and it
>>>>>> sounds like a pile of intentional inteference. Switch in
>>>>>> appropriate filters and you find that almost all of the stations
>>>>>> have spaced themselves so they don't overlap.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Neither am I
>>>>>>> talking about weak phone stations, although they could be weak at
>>>>>>> some other QTH.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>> That's another point.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> > Of course the DX 'phones could have switched to CW and answered
>>>>>>> > the CQers, then politely asked them to move.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> But they didn't, did they?

I guess not.
>>>>>>> >
>>>>>>> > *My Southgate Type 7 has two cascaded 8 pole 500 Hz crystal
>>>>>>> > filters, giving an effective bandwidth of less than 400 Hz and
>>>>>>> > very steep filter skirts. And it has an audio LC filter as well.
>>>>>>> >
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> So, if say, you called QRU? on 7080 and there was a strong signal
>>>>>>> SSB QSO in progress, would you be able to tell? This is a genuine
>>>>>>> question.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> I would listen first and steer clear of anyhting that sounds like
>>>>>> SSB. Then I'd send "IE" a few times to test the waters. If I heard
>>>>>> something start up when I did that, I'd move.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> But usually I am below 7060. Above about 7060 is data and foreign
>>>>>> SSB country.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I

>>>>>>> don't posses a CW filter.
>>>>>>
>>>>>> One of the reasons some hams get turned off to CW is that they use
>>>>>> equipment that really isn't meant for the mode. Most HF rigs today
>>>>>> are primarily SSB rigs with CW tacked on. Some are pretty good,
>>>>>> many are awful.
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>If I need it I have an outboard audio filter
>>>>
>>>> Ugh. Audio filters are no substitute for IF filtering. And unless the
>>>> AGC is turned off, QRM can dominate the receiver.
>>>>
>>>
>>>True, but I don't really need a narrow CW filter for anything
>>
>> Data modes.
>
>If I ever get around to trying any

>>>>>(a Radio Shack DSP unit,
>>>>>which is fairly basic and suffers from low audio output). I hadn't
>>>>>thought about that when I said I had no CW filter. It tends to 'take
>>>>>off' on 20 with RF getting inside it, but it's OK on 40.
>>>>
>>>> What sort of rig?
>>>
>>>I use an IC-729 in my shack. Excellent receiver RF performance.
>>
>> Compared to what? No offense, but there are some really good rigs out
>> there.
>
>The reviews at the time said it was comparable with anything regardless of
>price bracket in _basic_ receiver performance, but that was back in '92. I
>expect the world has moved on, and it never was loaded with features.

You might want to compare it to more modern stuff. The Ten Tec and Elecraft
websites have various receiver performance measures of different rigs, as
actually measured.
>
>What do you use, anyway?
>
My homebrew 100 watt transceiver and an Elecraft K2 built from a kit.

>>>Not very
>>>good audio, though. Ironically it has nowhere to fit a narrow SSB
>>>filter, but has a place for a CW filter (nothing in there, of course).
>>
>> Couldn't a narrow SSB filter be put in the CW slot?
>
>Yes, but without making any further mods it would be selected when the

>mode was set to 'CW-N'.

There must be a mod for it.
>
>>>Not the
>>>Rolls Royce of radios, but I'm not overloaded with cash.
>>
>> The Southgate Type 7 cost me less than $100 to build.
>>>
>>>>>>> I am guessing you would hear something,though?
>>>>>>>
>>>>>> Depends on the situation. Usually SSB sounds like monkey chatter
>>>>>> through a narrow filter. But near the edges it can be very weak or
>>>>>> inaudible.
>>>>>
>>>>>As I've explained, I think this is going on in the middle of the SSB
>>>>>sigs, which is another reason to be suspicious
>>>>
>>>> Sure. But 1500 is the middle, not 800.
>>>>
>>>>>> The best solution is for wide and narrow modes to have their own
>>>>>> subbands. They simply don't mix well.
>>>>>
>>>>>Yes
>>>>
>>>> So when will the rest of the world get on the beam and have nonphone
>>>> subbands?
>>>
>>>They do, and they have done as long as I remember. In some countries
>>>they are voluntary, and in others they are compulsory, but nowhere are
>>>they as wide as in the USA.
>>
>> Time for them to get on the beam, then.
>
>Depends what you mean - widen them or make them compulsory?

Both - just like the USA.

>There is no
>expansion of CW use to justify the former,

Yes, there is. Look at participation in contests as just one measure. CW up,
phone flat.

>and most administrations don't
>really care what hams do within the ham bands. I suspect that, for
>example, Industry Canada don't even care about Canadian hams annoying
>other Canadian hams by operating phone on CW frequencies.

Then you can expect more of the behavior you have complained about.

>>>>>> A notch filter can remove a carrier or CW signal.
>>>>>>
>>>>>True, not that I have one, though
>>>>
>>>> Well, there you have it.
>>>>
73 de Jim, N2EY

859. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 10:52:29 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87ekztss2a.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74224

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>> No, in a word. If you believe I said such a thing, why don't
>> you google it up and post it here, to stave off the well
>> earned title of bald faced liar? *I* know why, but others may
>> not. It's because YOU ARE a bald faced liar, as well as your
>> village's favorite pointyhead
>
>DICK, your words are so magnificent; why do you deny them?

"... what I said- Shannon and his little mathematical circus
really *DON'T* have anything to do with ham radio."

He certainly ought to deny some of his statements!

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

860. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 11:06:56 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93D34838F9CB6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 74225

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030810064427.21428.00001584@mb-m23.aol.com:

> In article <Xns93D2733067496elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>>>> "Here" is all of Region 2. A big part of the world.
>>>>
>>>>No, only the USA, it's still phone in the rest of R2
>>>
>>> No, it isn't. Other modes are authorized, not just 'phone.
>>>
>>The point being, however, that phone is authorised there in every
>>country but one
>
> OK, fine.
>>
>>>>>>I think you'll find it isn't being fixed.
>>>>>
>>>>> Sure it is, but it will take time. Before the end of the decade
>>>>> 7000-7200 will be worldwide exclusive amateur. That's double what
>>>>> Region 1 and Region 3 have now. It will make sense for those
>>>>> regions to move their 'phone up above 7100 and leave below 7100 to
>>>>> CW and digital.
>>>>
>>>>Not while the US has CW in 7100-7150. As long as that's the case it
>>>>makes more sense _to_them_ to leave 7000-7100 unchanged and split the
>>>>'new' 7100-7200 50/50. Net gain to you - zero.
>>>
>>> If it gets the foreign 'phones off of 7030, it's a gain.
>>>>
>>>>>>The ARRL bandplan is the only
>>>>>>one out of step, so nobody else is likely to change theirs,
>>>>>>notwithstanding Europe and some other areas getting 7100-7200 as
>>>>>>additional spectrum in 2007.
>>>>>
>>>>> What part of the world will not get 7100-7200?
>>>>
>>>>None
>>>
>>> There you are.
>>>>
>>>>> And why should Region 2 change now, with the band getting wider?
>>>>

>>>>You mean the US, and I don't suppose the ARRL will change
>>>
>>> It's not just ARRL but FCC.
>>
>>You're right, but it's not the rest of the region
>
> So because everyone else makes a mistake, the USA should make it too?

This reminds me of an old comic strip. The proud mother is watching the passing out parade and calls out "Look at my Johnny, he's the only one in step!". According to you, the USA is the only country in step in the parade.

>>
>>>>>>All that will happen is that a DX window will
>>>>>>appear from 7150-7200, but the DX will continue to use phone
>>>>>>everywhere they use it now - indefinitely. Sorry to be the one to
>>>>>>break that to you!
>>>>>
>>>>> So their lack of a bandplan and good manners should cause the USA
>>>>> to follow their lead? I think not!
>>>>
>>>>They have a bandplan. Phone stays above at least 7040, except 7030 in
>>>>R3.
>>>
>>> There are Canadians operating LSB on 7030.
>
>>I wasn't aware of that. That is against any bandplan that I know of,
>>and I agree that it is bad manners
>
> Exactly. Main point is that bandplans are not much help if folks ignore
> them.
>>
>>>>That's not the bandplan you want, but it's a bandplan. The reference
>>>>to good manners I don't follow.
>>>
>>> The folks who don't follow the bandplan have bad manners. Having a
>>> Canadian SSB net on 7030 when they have 7000-7030 is bad manners.
>>
>>Agreed
>
> Thanks
>>
>>>>I don't expect the USA to follow anyone's lead. Just don't be
>>>>surprised when no-one follows the USA's lead either.
>>>
>>> And the result is chaos.
>>
>>Yes it is. However, the rest of the world probably think that it would
>>be easier for _one_ country to change than for 100+, which doesn't mean
>>that I think it will happen.

>
> So even though the result is chaos, the USA should follow along and
> make it that much worse?

If the USA followed along it would no longer be chaos. As I say, though,
I'm not holding my breath for that to happen.

>>
>>>>> 800 is pretty high. 600-700 is more common among CW ops. The SSB
>>>>> audio passband is typically 300-2700 Hz, so 600 or even 800 is
>>>>> pretty low. 1500 would be smack in the middle.
>>>>
>>>>True enough
>>>>
>>>>>>This of course would be what you
>>>>>>would get if they netted onto the SSB and then offset by their
>>>>>>usual amount.
>>>>>
>>>>> There is no offset in CW. The carriers are all on the same
>>>>> frequency.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Point is that what sounds like "right on top" may not sound that
>>>>>>> way to the other guy.
>>>>>
>>>>>>It depends which side of the nominal carrier frequency the CW
>>>>>>signal is on. However, assuming my SSB filter is working, I would
>>>>>>say they were low, i.e. on the same side as the LSB sideband, or I
>>>>>>would be filtering them out. This also puts them almost in the
>>>>>>middle of the SSB signal, doesn't it?
>>>>>
>>>>> No. Their tone would be 1500 if it were in the middle.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Listen to a busy CW contest with a wide (AM bandwidth) rx and it
>>>>>>> sounds like a pile of intentional inteference. Switch in
>>>>>>> appropriate filters and you find that almost all of the stations
>>>>>>> have spaced themselves so they don't overlap.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>> Neither am I
>>>>>>>>> talking about weak phone stations, although they could be weak
>>>>>>>>> at some other QTH.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> That's another point.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> > Of course the DX 'phones could have switched to CW and
>>>>>>>> > answered the CQers, then politely asked them to move.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> But they didn't, did they?
>
> I guess not.
>>>>>>>> >
>>>>>>>> > *My Southgate Type 7 has two cascaded 8 pole 500 Hz crystal

>>>>>>>> > filters, giving an effective bandwidth of less than 400 Hz and
>>>>>>>> > very steep filter skirts. And it has an audio LC filter as
>>>>>>>> > well.
>>>>>>>> >
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> So, if say, you called QRU? on 7080 and there was a strong
>>>>>>>> signal SSB QSO in progress, would you be able to tell? This is a
>>>>>>>> genuine question.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> I would listen first and steer clear of anyhting that sounds like
>>>>>>> SSB. Then I'd send "IE" a few times to test the waters. If I
>>>>>>> heard something start up when I did that, I'd move.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> But usually I am below 7060. Above about 7060 is data and foreign
>>>>>>> SSB country.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> I
>>>>>>>> don't posses a CW filter.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> One of the reasons some hams get turned off to CW is that they
>>>>>>> use equipment that really isn't meant for the mode. Most HF rigs
>>>>>>> today are primarily SSB rigs with CW tacked on. Some are pretty
>>>>>>> good, many are awful.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>If I need it I have an outboard audio filter
>>>>>
>>>>> Ugh. Audio filters are no substitute for IF filtering. And unless
>>>>> the AGC is turned off, QRM can dominate the receiver.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>True, but I don't really need a narrow CW filter for anything
>>>
>>> Data modes.
>>
>>If I ever get around to trying any
>
>>>>>>(a Radio Shack DSP unit,
>>>>>>which is fairly basic and suffers from low audio output). I hadn't
>>>>>>thought about that when I said I had no CW filter. It tends to
>>>>>>'take off' on 20 with RF getting inside it, but it's OK on 40.
>>>>>
>>>>> What sort of rig?
>>>>
>>>>I use an IC-729 in my shack. Excellent receiver RF performance.
>>>
>>> Compared to what? No offense, but there are some really good rigs out
>>> there.
>>
>>The reviews at the time said it was comparable with anything regardless

>>of price bracket in _basic_ receiver performance, but that was back in
>>'92. I expect the world has moved on, and it never was loaded with
>>features.
>
> You might want to compare it to more modern stuff. The Ten Tec and
> Elecraft websites have various receiver performance measures of
> different rigs, as actually measured.
>>
>>What do you use, anyway?
>>
> My homebrew 100 watt transceiver and an Elecraft K2 built from a kit.
>

I hope your K2 doesn't drift, unlike one that I heard on the bands. Of course, that may have been due to the person who put it together.

>>>>Not very
>>>>good audio, though. Ironically it has nowhere to fit a narrow SSB
>>>>filter, but has a place for a CW filter (nothing in there, of
>>>>course).
>>>
>>> Couldn't a narrow SSB filter be put in the CW slot?
>>
>>Yes, but without making any further mods it would be selected when the
>>mode was set to 'CW-N'.
>
> There must be a mod for it.

I haven't seen one so far, but you would think it could be done.

>>
>>>>Not the
>>>>Rolls Royce of radios, but I'm not overloaded with cash.
>>>
>>> The Southgate Type 7 cost me less than $100 to build.
>>>>
>>>>>>>> I am guessing you would hear something,though?
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Depends on the situation. Usually SSB sounds like monkey chatter
>>>>>>> through a narrow filter. But near the edges it can be very weak
>>>>>>> or inaudible.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>As I've explained, I think this is going on in the middle of the
>>>>>>SSB sigs, which is another reason to be suspicious
>>>>>
>>>>> Sure. But 1500 is the middle, not 800.
>>>>>
>>>>>>> The best solution is for wide and narrow modes to have their own
>>>>>>> subbands. They simply don't mix well.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Yes

>>>>>
>>>>> So when will the rest of the world get on the beam and have
>>>>> nonphone subbands?
>>>>
>>>>They do, and they have done as long as I remember. In some countries
>>>>they are voluntary, and in others they are compulsory, but nowhere
>>>>are they as wide as in the USA.
>>>
>>> Time for them to get on the beam, then.
>>
>>Depends what you mean - widen them or make them compulsory?
>
> Both - just like the USA.
>
>>There is no
>>expansion of CW use to justify the former,
>
> Yes, there is. Look at participation in contests as just one measure.
> CW up, phone flat.
>

Contesters, the really serious kind, use whatever mode is specified in the
rules. If the rules said semaphore they'd learn that too.

>>and most administrations don't
>>really care what hams do within the ham bands. I suspect that, for
>>example, Industry Canada don't even care about Canadian hams annoying
>>other Canadian hams by operating phone on CW frequencies.
>
> Then you can expect more of the behavior you have complained about.
>

Perhaps

>>>>>>> A notch filter can remove a carrier or CW signal.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>True, not that I have one, though
>>>>>
>>>>> Well, there you have it.
>>>>>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

73 de Alun, N3KIP

861. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 11:13:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308100313.1206fc98@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74226

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3F358D6B.5080403@adelphia.net>...
> Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > leaky fawecettes wrote:
> >
> >
> >>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> >>news:3F29B941.3060802@adelphia.net...
> >>
> >>>Just practicing one of the the new Q signals....
> >>>
> >>>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>>
> >>
> >>Another guy in here thinks the end of CW spells
> >>the complete end of ham radio.....how utterly
> >>pathetic...
> >
> >
> > Yeah, "leaker" you sure are. You can't getit straight, either. Nothing will "end" han
> > radio, at least not in any short time, just make it realtively useless.
>
> And how exactly can he read that from my little joke anyhow, Dick? It
> had nothing to do with CW at all.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

DICK's mind is always in the gutter. ;^)

862. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 11:22:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308100322.3a598834@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74227

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<l5eZa.51540$Kb6.17211@news02.roc.ny>...
> Keith,
>
> As soon as you can figure out what BPL is going to do to hi-fidelity stereo
> am broadcast

What will it do to lo-fidelity AM?

This must be the Dem's answer to silencing Rush Limbaugh, Glen Beck,
Mike Reagan, Ollie North, Neal Bortz, Gordon Liddy, Mike Savage, Sean
Hannity...

863. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 11:28:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810072821.12501.00001439@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 74228

In article <d22b54c3.0308090712.9126e20@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0308081256.483d39ea@posting.google.com>...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0308081058.6cce2101@posting.google.com>...
>> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0308070833.2db83476@posting.google.com>...
>> > > Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
>news:<BB56960F.211FF%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>...
>>
>> > > Besides, everything hams do is either "for enjoyment" or public
>> > > service.
>>
>> > But . . but . . geez, wait a minnit here! What about all the
>> > technological leaps forward we're 'sposed to lead . . ? It sez so in
>> > 97.1 . . isn't that the Techs job??
>>
>> It's everybody's job. And nobody's.
>
>Whew: The latter gets me off the hook . .

And everyone else.
>
>> You'll see, the techno folks who
>> will come into the ARS after Element 1 goes away will create a techno
>> revolution just like the one created when the Tech lost its code test.
>> Just watch....
>
>What AGAIN??!

Yep. Brace yourself.

>It won't be possible for us OFs to keep up with it if
>it's even close to a repeat of the technology explosion of '92-'93.

Which was dwarfed by the followup in '95 when the vanity call rules changed. And the total inundation by technorevolutionaries after the 2000 restructuring.

It was almost sad, seeing all that nearly-new ham gear made obsolete overnight by the waves of radical technical improvements the technically-knowledgeable newbies brought. Remember how Yaesu, Kenwood and Icom nearly dominated the ham market until those folks revived homebrewing to the point that "appliance operating" is just a niche interest?

>We're doomed to obsolescence. Sob.

Yeah - HRO practically giving away those IC-7800s, TenTec offering the Orion as a kit and being snubbed because there wasn't enough DSP in it. And all those surplus SINGCARS set mods cluttering up QST....

>
>> > > Does that mean none of it should be tested?
>> >
>> > That'll be covered in the next round . .
>>
>> Maia & Co. are already working on that.
>
>With "leaders" like him and Stevenson how can we miss?

Those two are NOT the same! At least Carl believes in written testing!

Fun fact: Check the lookup counter in QRZ.com for W5YI.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

864. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 13:42:23 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <3ZrZa.3144$7B6.2393@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74229

Brian,

I did make a minor mistake. BPL is cut off at 1.8 MHz, thus avoiding the deep pocket broadcasters. I'm still not sure how well the cheap Chinese radios will work with BPL being fed right into the power lines.

Then there are HF aeronautical frequencies. I forgot there are HF radio astronomy listening posts. I wonder how well folks will hear WWV at any HF frequency. SWLs will love BPL; forget hearing a lot of foreign broadcasters. This thing is looking very ugly, indeed. BTW, don't blame the Democrats; it is usually the big-money backed Republicans that will sell their own mother to make money for someone who lined their pockets. I noticed that in Japan, they blame the liberal Democrats for running huge deficits and keeping interest rates at near zero. Sounds like what our Republicans are doing, doesn't it? Frankly, I don't trust Republicans or Democrats; both have to serve special interest groups before the common good.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308100322.3a598834@posting.google.com...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<l5eZa.51540$Kb6.17211@news02.roc.ny>...
> > Keith,
> >
> > As soon as you can figure out what BPL is going to do to hi-fidelity
stereo
> > am broadcast
>
> What will it do to lo-fidelity AM?
>
> This must be the Dem's answer to silencing Rush Limbaugh, Glen Beck,
> Mike Reagan, Ollie North, Neal Bortz, Gordon Liddy, Mike Savage, Sean
> Hannity...

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03

865. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 13:56:52 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <EasZa.3153$nJ6.119@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74230

A couple of other questions for you Keith.
BPL uses frequencies between 1.8 and 80 MHz.

Question #1: Does 27 MHz CB fall between 1.8 and 80 MHz?

Question #2: Do HF radio astronomy posts use frequencies between 1.8 and 80 MHz?

Question #3: Does WWV use frequencies between 1.8 and 80 MHz?

Question #4: Do HF aeronautical frequencies lie between 1.8 and 80 MHz?

Question #5: Do HF foreign broadcasters use frequencies between 1.8 and 80 MHz?

Question #6: Will SWLs be impacted by the answer to question #5?

Question #7: I see you provide a link to short wave. Just what do you think short wave is? (BIG hint: HF; 3 to 30 MHz, just what is being impacted).

Question #8: I see you provide a link to scanners. You are aware that many scanners go down to 30 MHz or so (some lower) and even VHF frequencies to 80 MHz are affected.

Question #9: What are the frequencies occupied by the lowest channels of television in the United States? (Hint, channel two runs between 54 MHz and 60 MHz). Do these frequencies lie between 1.8 and 80 MHz?

Now think about those questions for a while.

These are just simple starter questions; it gets worse the deeper you dig. Now go back to your room and shut the padded door :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:bh1o9d02lu7@enews4.newsguy.com...
> Ham Radio and SWL is old technology and BPL will benefit millions of consumers
> that want broadband Internet access. It is not fair to stop new technology
> because 100,000 people that are active ham radio operators want to hang on to
> old 1844 technology called morse code.
> If ham radio had millions of active HF operators then it could be argued that
> their bands should be protected in some fashion. But 100,000 vs 130

Million
> households shows that the smaller group should lose their HF privileges
for
> better technology. Ham radio has been replaced by the Internet.
>
> --
> The Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
> http://www.kilowatt-radio.org/
> ..it does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an
> irate, tireless minority to set brush fires in people's
> minds. --Samuel Adams

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03

866. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 13:58:04 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bh5ivb$9j@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74231

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:3ZrZa.3144$7B6.2393@news02.roc.ny...
> BTW, don't blame
> the Democrats; it is usually the big-money backed Republicans that will
sell
> their own mother to make money for someone who lined their pockets. I
> noticed that in Japan, they blame the liberal Democrats for running huge
> deficits and keeping interest rates at near zero. Sounds like what our
> Republicans are doing, doesn't it? Frankly, I don't trust Republicans or
> Democrats; both have to serve special interest groups before the common
> good.
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>

GASP There *are* still people out there who can reason and think!! Thank
goodness!

Kim W5TIT

867. BPL -- U just Bitchin or Doing Something

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 14:14:50 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Wilderness <KITW@forest.com>
Message-ID: <vrsZa.31765$ff.7724@fed1read01>
Source record: 74232

Read the info at URL: http://www.arrl.org/tis/info/HTML/plc/

Form your opinions and go to URL:
http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi

Enter only 03-104 in Box 1 (Proceeding).

You can take it from there

Looks like over 2,000 comments have been sent to the FCC

Amateur Radio needs to be heard

Keep Bitchin -- but do make your voice (keyboard) heard.

868. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 14:45:02 UTC
From: Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc>
Message-ID: <3F365A6E.5E006A8F@yahoo.moc>
Source record: 74233

> > Frankly, I don't trust Republicans or
> > Democrats; both have to serve special interest groups before the common
> > good.
>
> *GASP* There *are* still people out there who can reason and think!! Thank
> goodness!

Jim Hampton for President!

869. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 14:48:28 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030810104828.501$Mk@newsreader.com>
Source record: 74234

Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc> wrote:
> > > Frankly, I don't trust Republicans or
> > > Democrats; both have to serve special interest groups before the
> > > common good.
> >
> > *GASP* There *are* still people out there who can reason and think!!
> > Thank goodness!
>
> Jim Hampton for President!
>
I'll second that.

--
GO# 40
---
http://NewsReader.Com/
50GB/Month

870. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 15:24:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030810112459.12631.00000196@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 74241

In article <bh4292$u3n@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>>
>> First thing I noticed late that day was the slowdown in my dialup,
>> which I figured was some unrelated local glitch. But it never did seem
>> to speed up on netwide ccnnects, though I get 42 to 44kbs connects.
>> Makes me wonder what got damaged and where, to cause that.
>>
>
>Your brain, and it's called imagination.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Don't look now, but you replied to Jim Hampton's post, not Dick's!

Of course, you were probably just being "imaginative."

73 de Larry, K3LT

871. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 15:25:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030810112500.12631.00000197@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 74242

In article <87u18qpong.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
writes:

>Using PSK-31 is not exactly a great indication of experience.
>DICK's experience with *only* CW, PSK-31 and other common modes
>used on Amateur bands is an extreme restriction. And that is
>exactly why he (and Larry Roll) should *not* be using themselves
>as a yard stick for other hams.

Frostbite Floyd:

This newsgroup is about AMATEUR Radio. The experience that Dick and I
have with CW, PSK-31, and other modes "common" to AMATEUR Radio
is certainly not a "restriction," and is, indeed, a "yard stick" by which we
can
analyze other hams on the basis of their technical and operational activities.
The more you take this discussion out of the context of AMATEUR radio,
the more irrelevant you make yourself. If you have professional-grade
technical qualifications, I think that's great. However, I don't -- and very
few AMATEUR radio operators do. What we do have is curiosity, and a
willingness to learn. We also have the operating authority to experiment with
modes such as PSK-31 and adapt them to effective communications in keeping
with the rules, regulations, and purpose of the AMATEUR Radio Service.

>The whole point is that this business of DICK and Larry claiming
>that what they can do, is what everyone else _must_ do, is
>ridiculous on its face because there are many others we could
>use as a standard that would put the two of them out the door as
>well.

I won't presume to speak for Dick, but I consider myself to be a typical,
average AMATEUR radio operator who has pursued the art and science
of AMATEUR radio communications at a level which is considerably
above that of other hams who, for whatever reasons (excuses), fail to
pursue modes beyond those involving voice communications. Now, to
be fair, I don't include among that group those who tend to specialize in
more technical aspects of the hobby such as building and maintaining
repeater systems. I've known a lot of hams who do this, but are No-Code
Techs who don't have any interest in CW, or anything else on HF, for
that matter. I value their contribution and consider them to be full-fledged
radio amateurs. However, they represent a very tiny minority of the
overall ham radio population, and an even smaller minority of No-Code
Techs. They are even further diluted when you consider the fact that a
lot of the technical/repeater gurus are also CW-tested, CW-using, CW-
loving, and Morse code test supporting Pre-Restructuring Extra class
licensees.

>DICK and Larry have dabbled at 2, 3, maybe 4 different kinds of
>digital communications systems. Thrilling. Whether I or

Yup. "Dabbled" is just about what I'd call it myself. However, my
"dabbling" represents a level of technical involvement which I would
dare say places me in the top 5th percentile of just Extra-class hams,
not including all other license classes. Therefore, I consider myself
to be more than qualified to judge other hams on this basis.

>someone else has used or not used *any* of those, is not really
>significant... if I or someone else has in fact used *dozens*
>of other digital systems, including many of the more recent
>ones. There is _nothing_ special about PSK-31, other than it
>is just about the upper limit of DICK's lack of experience.

However low Dick's "upper level" of experience is compared to your
professional technical experience is irrelevant. This is a discussion of
the AMATEUR radio service, and the experiences of AMATEUR
radio operators is the only valid basis for the comparison of the relative
level of technical involvement among radio amateurs. Legitimate
"pros" like Len, Carl, and yourself do add considerable value to the
ARS as a whole, but you cannot in any sense of fairness use yourselves
as any kind of objective "yardstick" by which other hams are measured.

>In fact *your* argument is the same bogus one that DICK and
>Larry make! Because *they* use CW (or PSK-31), everyone else
>either does, or is declared too dumb to license (or understand
>how Shannon applies to PSK-31). That is invalid logic and leads
>you to erroneous conclusions.

Fallacy. You are making apples-to-oranges comparisons, which is a
well known Usenet tactic, but one which always ultimately ends up
disqualifying the person using it.

>>The truth of the matter is that under some
>>conditions PSK-31 outperforms OOK
>>Morse CW, and under some conditions
>>OOK Morse CW outperforms PSK-31.
>
>And that tells us *nothing* about which is the more efficient or
>effective mode of communications.

No, it doesn't. That would depend on a universally accepted
definition of the terms "efficient" and "effective" in the context
of the use of these modes within the ARS. To the extent that the
meaning of these terms are infinitely arguable, only those of us
with fairly extensive operating experience in each can even come
close to being qualified to render an objective opinion.

>>Can both of you
>>accept that fact?

I cannot accept something which isn't true.

>DICK is the *only* one who has suggested otherwise. Everyone
>else has told him his reasons for such claims are bogus. So
>what is *your* point?

Dick's claims are not "bogus" in any way, since they are based on
his practical operating experience as a radio AMATEUR using
modes authorized in the AMATEUR radio service. The only thing
"bogus" around here is your futile attempt to discredit him.

BTW, I do believe that Mr. Shannon's theory is relevant to Amateur
Radio. I believe that what Dick is doing is making observations
based on actual operating experience, rather than empirical theory.
This may be the cause of the confusion, but as I said earlier, I do
not presume to speak for Dick.

73 de Larry, K3LT

872. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 15:25:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030810112501.12631.00000198@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 74235

In article <20030809101034.05245.00000303@mb-m01.aol.com>, nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) writes:

>
>The truth of the matter is that under some
>conditions PSK-31 outperforms OOK
>Morse CW,

I have a feeling that if and when BPL is implemented on a large scale, PSK-31 is going to be rendered useless for hams that have BPL service in their area.

>and under some conditions
>OOK Morse CW outperforms PSK-31.

On many occasions, the only part of a PSK-31 transmission I could "copy" was the Morse code CW ID at the end of the transmission! And these instances were under what I'd call "normal" operating conditions. The one thing that has kind of disappointed me about PSK-31 is that it really isn't all that robust when faced with even moderately trashy band conditions. In fact, a lot of times when I had to give up on PSK-31, I went over to plain 'ole RTTY and was able to keep going. PSK-31 is great, and I like it a lot, but I'm glad I have CW and RTTY/AMTOR/PACTOR as a backup.

73 de Larry, K3LT

873. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 15:25:01 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030810112501.12631.00000199@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 74238

In article <f45722ac.0308090240.7b896978@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Yet Dick is free to lecture others, i.e., "any idiot can get psk going
>in under 30 minutes," but by his own words here he couldn't.

Brian:

It took me more like four hours to get PSK-31 running, counting the time
it took to cobble together my sound card interface, download and install
the software (DigiPan, at the time), and get the settings right. However,
it's good to know I'm not an "idiot!"

73 de Larry, K3LT

874. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 15:25:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030810112502.12631.00000201@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 74237

In article <87fzkbqvtx.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
writes:

>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>>Ahhh -- more name calling! I guess that helps to make your point about
>>your technical superiority as a ham!
>
>As if Larry never calls anyone names on Usenet.
>
>You're a lowlife hypocrite Larry, in so many ways its just
>unbelievable how many times you trip on your own feet.

Floyd:

Ah ha -- raise objections to my "name calling" and make your point with
more name calling of your own! A typical non-response! I must
admit, Floyd, you're really dialed-in on the classic Usenet attitude!

73 de Larry, K3LT

875. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 15:25:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030810112502.12631.00000200@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 74239

In article <d22b54c3.0308090129.59fa1e2d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>
>We all worked 4Q2TOO in the low end of 80, "The Island of Ambrosio".
>

"Four Q Two Too?" Isn't that redundant?

73 de Larry, K3LT

876. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 15:25:03 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030810112503.12631.00000202@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 74240

In article <SD5Za.221$dj3.28368@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>> >
>> >Yes, I would say that the threshold should be more like "Anyone who's
>> >even close to as dumb as Dick shouldn't be a ham, let alone an Extra."
>> >
>> >Carl - wk3c
>>
>> Carl:
>>
>> Ahhh -- more name calling! I guess that helps to make your point about
>> your technical superiority as a ham!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>What name calling? I refered to Dick as "Dick." :-)
>The comment simply paraphrased/slightly modified something someone
>else said (I think it may have been Floyd's original comment, but I don't
>remember for sure ...)

Carl:

You referred to Dick as "dumb." Any reasonably objective observer in
this NG would not arrive at that conclusion. Hence, you were engaged
in name calling, regardless of whether it was a quoted source or not.

>Besides, this is not a discussion of a truly technical issue, so what does
>my level of technical competence have to do with THIS discussion?
>
>Carl - wk3c

A good question, Carl. I've always wondered exactly what your alleged
technical competence has to do with ANY discussion in this NG! After
all, this is about AMATEUR radio! While I freely admit that I do have a
great deal of respect for hams who do possess genuine, professional-
grade technical qualifications, you, and your apologists Floyd Davidson
and Len Anderson, tend to raise the noise level to BPL standards!

73 de Larry, K3LT

877. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 15:25:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030810112505.12631.00000203@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 74236

In article <20030809210014.02197.00001986@mb-m12.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030806223003.27503.00001472@mb-m24.aol.com>,
>yodoc@aol.comnospam
>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
>>Well, I'm sure Carl expects that his professional RF engineering
>>qualifications
>>should grant him exalted status in the ARS, but in truth, it just ain't so!
>
> That is NO "expectation," just the whining of someone who was never
> in the professional ranks of radio being envious of those who have.
>
> Like it or not, amateur radio is still a technological activity. If it
>weren't
> you would be little more than a "CBer" with a license. BFD.
>
>>I know
>>lots of radio amateurs, of all license classes, who haven't made dime number
>>one as a professional electronics technician or engineer, who are infinitely
>>better hams than I am or Carl could ever be.
>
> Then we can all guess that your vaunted Radio Shack days were all
> done voluntarily? :-)
>
> Define "better" hams.
>
>>What they all have in common is
>>the fact that they have, throughout their "careers" as radio amateurs, been
>>willing to explore and adopt new modes, while retaining the skills learned
>>with the old ones, particularly Morse/CW.
>
> A "career" is what professionals do...it is their WORK.
>
> Unless there has been a sudden change in Part 97, Title 47 CFR, US
> amateur radio is NOT for pecuniary compensation. [that's why it is
> called "amateur"]
>
> Let's see...you've only mentioned the old-timers you know...who are,
> not surprisingly, all very much pro-morse-code. Would that make you
> "biased" as judging all of the US ARS? Not according to you (we can
> all see the spin coming). According to everyone else except the pro-
> code syncophants, the bias is VERY apparent.

>
> Negative points for your appraisal, Larrah...
>
>>Their stations are truly up-to-date,
>>they have usually attained high places on the DXCC standings, routinely
>>hold leadership positions within their clubs, and can be counted on to
>>provide valuable input and personal support for all club activities.
>
> Ahem..."truly up-to-date" is cribbing right from the old pre-WW2
> Amateur's Code. You should be able to do better, with all your
> Summa Cum Laude college studies for a Human Resources degree.
>
> Well, you (and your "ilk" whatever those are) subscribe to the old
> description of "amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW."
> That's the high point of your "career in ham radio?" :-)
>
> "Leadership in a club" is a rather title-hungry description, isn't it?
> That would be fine if the "club" is all about DX contesting. However,
> some pro-coders insist that US amateur radio is all about a "diverse"
> interest range that includes other things than DXing. Which is it?
>
> "Valuable input and personal support" is more self-gratification
> phrasing, "standard boilerplate" phrasing it is called in the writing
>trade.
> If a club is all about DXing, then I'm sure the old-timers' "valuable
>input
> and personal support" will be for THEIR favorite activity which is DXing.
> That's just self-definition stuff, Larrah, NOT something that covers the
> wide range of activities possible in US amateur radio.
>
>>They are the ones
>>who newcomers look to for the answers, while the so-called "professional"
>>hams simply cluster amongst themselves and look down their noses at the
>>proceedings of the rest of the club.
>
> Now, now, Larrah, there you go again showing your envy of radio and
> electronics folks who have REAL careers in radio-electronics.
>
> You are ALL about self-promotion and self-glorification.
>
> You know so little of basic electronic theory that you don't dare get into
> any discussion at all technical in nature about radio in here...you would
> be shown to be the self-glorifying flim-flam salesman you probably are
> and then YOU look down your nose at those who are knowledgeable!
>
> Feel free to go out and get a REAL job in radio that needs your morse
> code skill and expertise and report back, okay? Make a CAREER in
> code! Bum a ride on your company's bus if you need to...
>
> Len Anderson

> retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

ZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZnchnoffrrzgnopf.......Whaaaa......Oh, Lennie...
did you say sumpthin?

73 de Larry, K3LT

878. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 16:01:04 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308100801.24c9ee5c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74243

nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
news:<20030809094901.05245.00000300@mb-m01.aol.com>...

> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

> > Morse code, which well predates WW2, is old and needs to be
> > dismantled. :-)
>
> You are old and predate WW2. Len.
>
> Perhaps your "reality" needs to be dismantled.

Lennie's "reality" was dismantled a long time ago...he just
hasn't accepted it yet.

Steve, K4YZ

879. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 16:14:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030810121412.12631.00000205@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 74244

In article <20030810072821.12501.00001439@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Fun fact: Check the lookup counter in QRZ.com for W5YI.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter! OTOH, Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!

Now, now, Kim -- don't be jealous of Michelle -- even though you have a right to be!

73 de Larry, K3LT

880. Re: BPL -- U just Bitchin or Doing Something

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 16:52:11 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810125211.21660.00001333@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74245

>Keep Bitchin -- but do make your voice (keyboard) heard

WHY, who cares, with the Direction Ham Radio is headed, bring on BPL.

881. Re: BPL -- U just Bitchin or Doing Something

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 16:56:37 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Wilderness <KITW@forest.com>
Message-ID: <9PuZa.31790$ff.15613@fed1read01>
Source record: 74246

Oh you dropped out instead of trying to improve whatever it is that is buggun you. Poor Choice sez I.

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030810125211.21660.00001333@mb-m07.aol.com...
> >Keep Bitchin -- but do make your voice (keyboard) heard
>
> WHY, who cares, with the Direction Ham Radio is headed, bring on BPL.

882. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 17:08:05 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bh5u3l$6cm@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74247

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030810112459.12631.00000196@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <bh4292$u3n@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >>
> >> First thing I noticed late that day was the slowdown in my dialup,
> >> which I figured was some unrelated local glitch. But it never did seem
> >> to speed up on netwide ccnnects, though I get 42 to 44kbs connects.
> >> Makes me wonder what got damaged and where, to cause that.
> >>
> >
> >Your brain, and it's called imagination.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Don't look now, but you replied to Jim Hampton's post, not Dick's!
>
> Of course, you were probably just being "imaginative."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

No, I think that was you being imaginative, Larry. I replied to the comment
made by Dick...

Kim W5TIT

883. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 17:13:16 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bh5udb$hch@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74248

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030810121412.12631.00000205@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <20030810072821.12501.00001439@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >Fun fact: Check the lookup counter in QRZ.com for W5YI.
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim:
>
> W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter! OTOH,
> Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!
>
> Now, now, Kim -- don't be jealous of Michelle -- even though you have a
> right to be!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Jealous? Because of a woman who has a link to her commercial site on her
lookup on QRZ? Not at all.

Kim W5TIT

884. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 18:19:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F368CEA.6000309@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74249

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <20030810072821.12501.00001439@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
>
>>Fun fact: Check the lookup counter in QRZ.com for W5YI.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
> Jim:
>
> W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter! OTOH,
> Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!

Perhaps we can get Vipul a date?

- Mike KB3EIA -

885. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 18:44:54 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <GowZa.4294$Y91.374@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74250

Never work, Scott. The first individual who actually tries to fix the sordid mess will find he/she has no backing from the party and will be voted out the next time by big buck 30 second videos extolling the virtues of the opponent. I remember that happening to Charlie Goodell of New York back in the late 60s or early 70s. My guess is to *never* re-elect anyone. That avoids forming too close of ties with the money folks.

Just my two cents' worth

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Scott Unit 69" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc> wrote in message news:3F365A6E.5E006A8F@yahoo.moc...
> > > Frankly, I don't trust Republicans or
> > > Democrats; both have to serve special interest groups before the common
> > > good.
> >
> > *GASP* There *are* still people out there who can reason and think!! Thank
> > goodness!
>
>
> Jim Hampton for President!

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03

886. Re: BPL -- U just Bitchin or Doing Something

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 18:47:59 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <zrwZa.4345$_31.303@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74251

What about HF aeronautical communications? HF ship communications? Radio astronomy frequencies? How will OATS (open air test sites) be able to operate, or should we ship that to China as well? Of course, if you are close by, you still can communicate. Better check your calibration. Tune WWV. Oops, I forgot, WWV is buried unless you live within 20 miles of the site. Maybe the shortwave listeners should complain.

Just a thought or two.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030810125211.21660.00001333@mb-m07.aol.com...
> >Keep Bitchin -- but do make your voice (keyboard) heard
>
> WHY, who cares, with the Direction Ham Radio is headed, bring on BPL.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03

887. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 19:47:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810154740.18497.00001942@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74259

In article <5c01b95b.0308100801.24c9ee5c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (pSycho pSteve) writes:

>nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
>news:<20030809094901.05245.00000300@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>
>> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>> > Morse code, which well predates WW2, is old and needs to be
>> > dismantled. :-)
>>
>> You are old and predate WW2. Len.
>>
>> Perhaps your "reality" needs to be dismantled.
>
> Lennie's "reality" was dismantled a long time ago...he just
>hasn't accepted it yet.

Pity the sick psychotics. Now there's TWO of them and one is "anonymous." They go together in their fantasy.

888. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 19:47:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810154741.18497.00001944@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74253

In article <3F365A6E.5E006A8F@yahoo.moc>, Scott Unit 69
<scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc> writes:

>> > Frankly, I don't trust Republicans or
>> > Democrats; both have to serve special interest groups before the common
>> > good.
>>
>> *GASP* There *are* still people out there who can reason and think!! Thank
>> goodness!
>
>Jim Hampton for President!

Jim Weir, WX6RST for Governor of California!!!

I am NOT kidding! :-)

LHA

889. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 19:47:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810154741.18497.00001943@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74255

In article <20030810112459.12631.00000196@mb-m28.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Of course, you were probably just being "imaginative."

YOU do that all the time...

890. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 19:47:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810154742.18497.00001945@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74260

In article <5c01b95b.0308100127.6c22a27c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> Well, Phil...idiots are idiots, on or off the air.
>
> Amy and I just moved to new digs and I'm QRT for the moment or
>I'd set a sked with you. That older gear has a warmth and fullness
>that this solid waste (I meant solid STATE) stuff can't match...at
>least not yet.

Ah, progress?

I thought pSycho pSteve finally reached the 1970s level of the amateur radio technical art...

No, he has aligned himself with the Anti-Semiconductor Movement.

"Real radios glow in the dark" and that sort of thing. "Warmth."

Or is he just technically constipated, therefore thinking about waste?

LHA

891. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 19:47:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810154742.18497.00001946@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74261

In article <5c01b95b.0308100122.26dc8b0@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (pSycho pSteve) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030809210008.02197.00001980@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> In article <878yq62rkw.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
>> writes:
>
>> >Keep shooting Len, and trust that there are a number of folks
>> >who tune in for the entertainment. On an average you do pretty
>> >good, but now and then you have a *really* fine day, and those
>> >are priceless!
>
> Floyd, you must be oxygen deprived up there.

Stop insinuating everyone is like yourself.

Try opening your own oxygen tank valve, NOT the one marked "nitrous oxygen."

That way you won't get into another laughing hyena "BWAHAH" mode again.

>> I AM a professional.
>
> So is Heidi Fleiss

Poor baby...all pSycho pSteve can think about is whores and madams.

Evidently he's been swiping testosterone supplements out of the hospital pharmacy room again...

892. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 19:47:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810154743.18497.00001947@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74257

In article <5c01b95b.0308100119.104cfcf0@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message >news:<20030809210001.02197.00001975@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> In article <BB5A07D1.22018%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart
>> <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

> You "don't think so" because you're an idiot and a troll.

> So it has been. It's kept YOU out, Lennie.

> And that's a fact YOU can't seem to live WITH, Your Scumminess!

Everyone can see you still haven't taken your medications, pSycho pSteve. Shame on you, high holy medical professional...

893. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 19:47:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810154746.18497.00001949@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74254

In article <20030810112505.12631.00000203@mb-m28.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>ZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZZnchnoffrrzgnopf.......Whaaaa......Oh, Lennie...
>did you say sumpthin?

Yes. You fell asleep at the wheel again.

W A K E U P ! ! !

894. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 19:47:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810154746.18497.00001948@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74262

In article <20030810112500.12631.00000197@mb-m28.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <87u18qpong.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
>writes:
>
>>Using PSK-31 is not exactly a great indication of experience.
>>DICK's experience with *only* CW, PSK-31 and other common modes
>>used on Amateur bands is an extreme restriction. And that is
>>exactly why he (and Larry Roll) should *not* be using themselves
>>as a yard stick for other hams.
>
>Frostbite Floyd:
>
>This newsgroup is about AMATEUR Radio.

Amateur radio POLICY, soma come loud bus driver.

RADIO is a technical activity involving communications.

Electrons, fields and waves don't work any differently in one radio service versus another just because a human regulating agency separated them in some regulations. You still don't understand that concept.

>The experience that Dick and I
>have with CW, PSK-31, and other modes "common" to AMATEUR Radio
>is certainly not a "restriction," and is, indeed, a "yard stick" by which we can
>analyze other hams on the basis of their technical and operational activities.

Larrah, you CONSTANTLY use YOURSELF as the "yardstick" by which others are "measured"...whether it's in ham radio or occupation or anything.

Ho hum. Your constant ego-boo is very tired-putting of readers.

>The more you take this discussion out of the context of AMATEUR radio,
>the more irrelevant you make yourself.

Is someone actually MAKING MONEY posting in this newsgroup?!?

All posts in here are DEFINITELY "amateur" in that regard...the opposite of professional writing.

The only thing irrelevant in here is your insistence that US amateur radio is full of technical dummies (like yourself).

Not very nice of you.

>If you have professional-grade
>technical qualifications, I think that's great. However, I don't -- and very
>few AMATEUR radio operators do.

See? Your own "yardstick" in action.

You've just implied that YOUR "expertise" is the SAME as two-thirds of
a million US ARS licensees...all of them technical dummies who can't
do anything but plug-and-play-ham-radio.

A great and glorious gratuitous INSULT to thousands of US ARS licensees
who ARE ALSO professionals in radio.

Feel proud of yourself. You are an archtypical ham Dumb who can't get
dumber.

>What we do have is curiosity, and a willingness to learn.

Tsk, tsk, there you go again, shaking your little "we-we" thing.

>We also have the operating authority to experiment with
>modes such as PSK-31 and adapt them to effective communications in keeping
>with the rules, regulations, and purpose of the AMATEUR Radio Service.

Of course...Amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW.

Not to mention collecting colorful postcards, fancy certificates, and
rising above all others in radio on self-inflated ego balloons filled with
hot air.

>>The whole point is that this business of DICK and Larry claiming
>>that what they can do, is what everyone else _must_ do, is
>>ridiculous on its face because there are many others we could
>>use as a standard that would put the two of them out the door as
>>well.
>
>I won't presume to speak for Dick, but I consider myself to be a typical,
>average AMATEUR radio operator who has pursued the art and science
>of AMATEUR radio communications at a level which is considerably
>above that of other hams who, for whatever reasons (excuses), fail to
>pursue modes beyond those involving voice communications.

Oh, my, you so good and great margarine don't melt in yo' mout.

>Now, to
>be fair, I don't include among that group those who tend to specialize in
>more technical aspects of the hobby such as building and maintaining
>repeater systems. I've known a lot of hams who do this, but are No-Code
>Techs who don't have any interest in CW, or anything else on HF, for
>that matter. I value their contribution and consider them to be full-fledged
>radio amateurs.

Thank you, Your Holiness.

Sigh...another sermon on the antenna mount.

>However, they represent a very tiny minority of the
>overall ham radio population, and an even smaller minority of No-Code
>Techs. They are even further diluted when you consider the fact that a
>lot of the technical/repeater gurus are also CW-tested, CW-using, CW-
>loving, and Morse code test supporting Pre-Restructuring Extra class
>licensees.

Sigh...morsemanship is the epitome of the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
Service.

In your imaginary reality. One that Rod Serling never touched...

>>DICK and Larry have dabbled at 2, 3, maybe 4 different kinds of
>>digital communications systems. Thrilling. Whether I or
>
>Yup. "Dabbled" is just about what I'd call it myself. However, my
>"dabbling" represents a level of technical involvement which I would
>dare say places me in the top 5th percentile of just Extra-class hams,
>not including all other license classes.

QEX ought to devote a whole two-month issue just to YOU...

>Therefore, I consider myself
>to be more than qualified to judge other hams on this basis.

You just consider yourself "more qualified" than ANYONE.

>However low Dick's "upper level" of experience is compared to your
>professional technical experience is irrelevant. This is a discussion of
>the AMATEUR radio service, and the experiences of AMATEUR
>radio operators is the only valid basis for the comparison of the relative
>level of technical involvement among radio amateurs.

Tsk, tsk, there you go again...making US ham radio nothing but
Dummies like YOURSELF.

>Legitimate
>"pros" like Len, Carl, and yourself do add considerable value to the
>ARS as a whole, but you cannot in any sense of fairness use yourselves
>as any kind of objective "yardstick" by which other hams are measured.

You've got "yardstick" engraved with your own name in gold.

This isn't a "yardstick" for egos, gas man.

Those who KNOW radio technology can MAKE radios and APPLY
them in communications.

Amateur Dummies can only buy them, plug them in, and play with
them.

>>In fact *your* argument is the same bogus one that DICK and
>>Larry make! Because *they* use CW (or PSK-31), everyone else
>>either does, or is declared too dumb to license (or understand
>>how Shannon applies to PSK-31). That is invalid logic and leads
>>you to erroneous conclusions.

>
>Fallacy. You are making apples-to-oranges comparisons, which is a
>well known Usenet tactic, but one which always ultimately ends up
>disqualifying the person using it.

Geez...you've NEVER been qualified in anything except being a
newsgroupie, Larrah.

>>And that tells us *nothing* about which is the more efficient or
>>effective mode of communications.
>
>No, it doesn't. That would depend on a universally accepted
>definition of the terms "efficient" and "effective" in the context
>of the use of these modes within the ARS. To the extent that the
>meaning of these terms are infinitely arguable, only those of us
>with fairly extensive operating experience in each can even come
>close to being qualified to render an objective opinion.

1. You aren't objective, you are SUBJECTIVE.
2. All you can claim is "operating" and even then no one gets on
a "sked" with you.
3. All you claim is nothing more than plug-and-play with ready-
made toys.
4. All you've learned as a soma come loud personnel student is a
bunch of gobbledegook nonsense phrases.

>I cannot accept something which isn't true.

Translated: You won't acknowledge anything that doesn't prove your
intrinsic glory and greatness.

>>DICK is the *only* one who has suggested otherwise. Everyone
>>else has told him his reasons for such claims are bogus. So
>>what is *your* point?
>
>Dick's claims are not "bogus" in any way, since they are based on
>his practical operating experience as a radio AMATEUR using
>modes authorized in the AMATEUR radio service. The only thing
>"bogus" around here is your futile attempt to discredit him.

Extra DICK discredits himself technically very handily.

>
>BTW, I do believe that Mr. Shannon's theory is relevant to Amateur
>Radio. I believe that what Dick is doing is making observations
>based on actual operating experience, rather than empirical theory.
>This may be the cause of the confusion, but as I said earlier, I do
>not presume to speak for Dick.

"Empirical theory?!?"

Did you learn that as a soma come loud college student?!?

No wonder no personnel department ever offered you a job.

LHA

895. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 19:47:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810154752.18497.00001950@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74256

In article <20030810112502.12631.00000201@mb-m28.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Ah ha -- raise objections to my "name calling" and make your point with
>more name calling of your own! A typical non-response! I must
>admit, Floyd, you're really dialed-in on the classic Usenet attitude!

Poor baby...got your own ego shown to you and now you whine and
carry on as a holier-than-thou beeper suffering sour-grapes hangover.

896. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 19:47:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810154755.18497.00001952@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74252

In article <5c01b95b.0308100055.537786bb@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (pSycho pSteve) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030809210007.02197.00001979@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>
>> A half century ago...(SNIP)
>
> You were unlicensed in the Amateur Radio Service, a "tradition"
>you continue to this date...

You still off your medications, pSycho pSteve?

897. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 19:47:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810154755.18497.00001951@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74258

In article <5c01b95b.0308100050.7ce9bb65@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030809210009.02197.00001981@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>
>> Larrah has the fantasy of being a "moderator" in here.
>
> Whew! Pot/Kettle/Black if ever there was an example!

We all KNOW Larrah to be a "pot-kettle-black" for many years, even back on FIDOnet. No need to state the obvious.

Now stop with reduncancies in posting, pSycho pSteve, and take your medications like a good lad.

Remember, YOU aren't the moderator in here despite what your psychosis imagines.

898. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 19:48:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810154845.18497.00001953@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74264

In article <20030810112503.12631.00000202@mb-m28.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <SD5Za.221$dj3.28368@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>>> >Yes, I would say that the threshold should be more like "Anyone who's
>>> >even close to as dumb as Dick shouldn't be a ham, let alone an Extra."
>>> >
>>> >Carl - wk3c
>>>
>>> Carl:
>>>
>>> Ahhh -- more name calling! I guess that helps to make your point about
>>> your technical superiority as a ham!
>>>
>>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>>What name calling? I refered to Dick as "Dick." :-)
>>The comment simply paraphrased/slightly modified something someone
>>else said (I think it may have been Floyd's original comment, but I don't
>>remember for sure ...)
>
>Carl:
>
>You referred to Dick as "dumb." Any reasonably objective observer in
>this NG would not arrive at that conclusion.

Trouble is, YOU don't belong here as any sort of "objective observer."

>Hence, you were engaged
>in name calling, regardless of whether it was a quoted source or not.

Poor baby...you saw a mirror held up and thought someone was
reflecting YOUR image. Baaaaad overinflated ego complex you have.

>>Besides, this is not a discussion of a truly technical issue, so what does
>>my level of technical competence have to do with THIS discussion?
>>
>>Carl - wk3c
>
>A good question, Carl. I've always wondered exactly what your alleged
>technical competence has to do with ANY discussion in this NG! After
>all, this is about AMATEUR radio!

Larrah, it's just too bad that US amateur radio doesn't have a book, "Radio for Dummies" that you could read to find out what radio, ANY radio IS...you NEED one.

"Radio" is a general activity involving technology in and about radio communication.

Radios do NOT work "differently" because some regulating agency states one radio activity is "amateur" and another radio activity is "commercial/professional." Electrons, fields and waves work the SAME in ANY radio regardless of human legislation.

You can't understand that. I wonder why?

Maybe its because you can't distinguish one active from another...like all your bragging about "summa cum laude human resources graduate" and then you get a BUS DRIVER job.

>While I freely admit that I do have a
>great deal of respect for hams who do possess genuine, professional-
>grade technical qualifications, you, and your apologists Floyd Davidson
>and Len Anderson, tend to raise the noise level to BPL standards!

Poor baby...still miffed at no one recognizing your intrinsic Greatness?

Technically, you know NOTHING about "BPL" except a lot of hysteric emotionally-fueled gabbling and paranoia and ten kinds of NIMBY shouts and hollerings.

Come back when you've learned a smidgen of technical knowledge and can talk sensibly with some evidence of knowing a small bit about the technology. [I doubt that will ever happen...]

PROFESSIONALS made all your little radios possible as a product so that you could buy them, play with them, and then sit around POSING as an "amateur guru-expert-knowitall."

Don't bite the hands of those who made all your toys.

LHA

899. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 19:48:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810154846.18497.00001954@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74263

In article <20030810112502.12631.00000201@mb-m28.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Ah ha -- raise objections to my "name calling" and make your point with
>more name calling of your own! A typical non-response! I must
>admit, Floyd, you're really dialed-in on the classic Usenet attitude!

Poor baby...got your own ego shown to you and now you whine and
carry on as a holier-than-thou beeper suffering sour-grapes hangover.

900. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 21:36:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308101336.79058623@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74265

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030810112501.12631.00000199@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0308090240.7b896978@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Yet Dick is free to lecture others, i.e., "any idiot can get psk going
> >in under 30 minutes," but by his own words here he couldn't.
>
> Brian:
>
> It took me more like four hours to get PSK-31 running, counting the time
> it took to cobble together my sound card interface, download and install
> the software (DigiPan, at the time), and get the settings right. However,
> it's good to know I'm not an "idiot!"
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

True enough, but you know how DICK has a knack for saying the wrong thing.

Regardless, if it took 4 hours, you would have to join DICK as a No PSK Tech.

901. Re: BPL -- U just Bitchin or Doing Something

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 21:40:37 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030810174037.06329.00000317@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 74266

>What about HF aeronautical communications? HF ship communications? Radio
>astronomy frequencies? How will OATS (open air test sites) be able to
>operate

Not my problem, let those Orgs take care of there own problems themselves.

902. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 21:45:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308101345.510dba91@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74267

averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030810055941.27618.00001162@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com wrote:
> >averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote:
>
> >> Do you know if Len Anderson is a cannibal? Claims have been made that he
> eats
> >> others for breakfast.
> >
> >Who? When?
>
> Floyd Davidson wrote it about Len Anderson a few days ago.

I don't recall Floyd saying Len was a cannibal.

> >Dave thinks he's a pugilist.
> >
> Maybe a pugil stick? ;-) ;-)

Does he?

> Your master and teacher has
> returned, Brian Burke.

Noted.

903. L.A. Times Editorial Correction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 21:45:23 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <e5fdjvk6pr98luinivqqkaovvm9e2ih19k@4ax.com>
Source record: 74268

I would like to state for the public record that the L.A. Times article ("Race for Governor) has a misquote from me. They stated that I designed the landing radar for the Apollo. My comment was clear that I was part of the TEAM that did the design. Somehow that TEAM word was left out. To my colleagues that were on that team, I offer my apologies. I was a dim bulb amongst the stars of the project.

Nor do I chastise the Times. They had to get 158 biographies by telephone in a very few hours. That they got as much right as they did is a minor miracle.

Jim Weir

Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

904. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 22:56:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hjetrgn.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74269
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

[No readable article body recovered]

905. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 22:56:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hjf5uqo.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74270

On 8 Aug 2003 10:12:11 -0700, N2EY wrote:

>> > AMTOR is pretty much dead, I am told.
>>
>> Certainly not as popular as it once was, but I don't think it's entirely
>> "dead."
>
>How many HF amateur AMTOR contacts have you or anyone you know made in
>the past year?

Yet SITOR - the commercial version of AMTOR - is the standard HF
mode of data communication in the maritime service. That, and not
obscenenly-expensive satellite comms, is what killed maritime CW.
The ship's purser or deck officers can pull up the preset HF
transceiver channel and pound away, and even personal e-mail is now
sent and received by a SITOR connection to AOL via Globe Wireless,
the successor to RCA and ITT, via an AOL "kiosk" in the recreation
areas. No Radio Officer needed.

One of the San Francisco area marine radio techs, a ham, applied to
the FCC to be able to offer PACTOR service in the marine bands, and
after consulation with the ITU, his request was turned down because
it was not an international standard and would not give that much
improvement over SITOR considering the changes necessary.

And the US Coast Guard and other similar agencies world-wide
continue to transmit NAVTEX bulletins (marine broadcasts) on 518 kHz
worldwide using SITOR.

>> > Of course what really drove all that was PC/soundcard setups becoming
>> > affordable.
>>
>> Agreed ... multimode with a std SSB radio and PC ... cool stuff.

Yeah - I can tune SITOR by setting the (suppressed) carrier 2.2 kHz
higher than the channel center and using LSB. Cheapie "FSK".

Going to be "more easier" later on this week when my new Ten-Tec
computer-tuned DSP HF receiver arrives, and I can set the filtering
to just where I want it.

I'm not throwing my AMTOR/SITOR TNCs away just yet.

>Sort of. But it's actually a patch job.

>One reason packet is stuck at 1200 baud all these years is because
>going faster would require a purpose-built data radio. Ikensu isn't

>going to do it unless there's a proven market, and the failure of 9600
>to get much attention means they will wait some more.

Hey, we know that we can get at least 28K or more in a standard
audio channel. But hams are cheap - nobody (including me) wants
to throw away existing 1200 baud radios and TNCs that work really
well for the type of canned messages that we get on packet, unless
they are super-whizzes at Qualcom, with due appolgies to Phil Karn
who fits that description and has done a LOT for digital ham radio
specifically and whom I admire greatly.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

906. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 22:59:18 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh6io6$7kn$0@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 74271

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>In article <f45722ac.0308090240.7b896978@posting.google.com>,
>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>
>
>>Yet Dick is free to lecture others, i.e., "any idiot can get psk going
>>in under 30 minutes," but by his own words here he couldn't.
>>
>>
>
>Brian:
>
>It took me more like four hours to get PSK-31 running, counting the time
>it took to cobble together my sound card interface, download and install
>the software (DigiPan, at the time), and get the settings right. However,
>it's good to know I'm not an "idiot!"
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry, no will note that Brian refuses to substantiate his lies by
finding and posting any such statement by me. The reason for this is
obvious- he's an ignorant liar and no such statement was ever made. It
probably does take most of 4 hours to initially get everything
interfaced, work out the setup details, get the souindcard in the mood
to work as intended, etc other hardware issued resolved, and
get up and running on PSK 31. But that isn't considering that learning
to use it only takes only a short time for anyone who has ever done
anything like that, and using the internet isn't all that diffeent.

Poor Brain(less) Village Idiot Brian can't find anything better to chew
on so let him have at it.

>
>
>

907. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 23:08:48 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh6ja0$8qf$0@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 74272

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>In article <87u18qpong.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
>writes:
>
>
>
>>Using PSK-31 is not exactly a great indication of experience.
>>DICK's experience with *only* CW, PSK-31 and other common modes
>>used on Amateur bands is an extreme restriction. And that is
>>exactly why he (and Larry Roll) should *not* be using themselves
>>as a yard stick for other hams.
>>
>>
>
>Frostbite Floyd:
>
>This newsgroup is about AMATEUR Radio. The experience that Dick and I
>have with CW, PSK-31, and other modes "common" to AMATEUR Radio
>is certainly not a "restriction," and is, indeed, a "yard stick" by which we
>can
>analyze other hams on the basis of their technical and operational activities.
>The more you take this discussion out of the context of AMATEUR radio,
>the more irrelevant you make yourself. If you have professional-grade
>technical qualifications, I think that's great. However, I don't -- and very
>few AMATEUR radio operators do.
>

If you check Floyd on QRZ you'll see that he said he has been
inactive for 20 years . But he knows all about the current state of
affairs in ham radio. Right! Another instant expert! As if we didn't
already have an oversupply!

908. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 23:20:52 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh6k0k$9lg$0@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 74273

Brian wrote:

>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3F358D6B.5080403@adelphia.net>...
>
>
>>Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>
>>
>>>leaky fawecettes wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>>news:3F29B941.3060802@adelphia.net...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Just practicing one of the the new Q signals....
>>>>>
>>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>Another guy in here thinks the end of CW spells
>>>>the complete end of ham radio.....how utterly
>>>>pathetic...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Yeah, "leaker" you sure are. You can't getit straight, either. Nothing will "end" han
>>>radio, at least not in any short time, just make it realtively useless.
>>>
>>>
>> And how exactly can he read that from my little joke anyhow, Dick? It
>>had nothing to do with CW at all.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>
>DICK's mind is always in the gutter. ;^)
>

At least I have one that works!

909. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 23:28:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bh6kd7egi1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74274

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:3ZrZa.3144$7B6.2393@news02.roc.ny...
> Brian,
>
> I did make a minor mistake. BPL is cut off at 1.8 MHz, thus avoiding the
> deep pocket broadcasters. I'm still not sure how well the cheap Chinese
> radios will work with BPL being fed right into the power lines.
>
> Then there are HF aeronautical frequencies. I forgot there are HF radio
> astronomy listening posts. I wonder how well folks will hear WWV at any
HF
> frequency. SWLs will love BPL; forget hearing a lot of foreign
> broadcasters. This thing is looking very ugly, indeed. BTW, don't blame
> the Democrats; it is usually the big-money backed Republicans that will
sell
> their own mother to make money for someone who lined their pockets. I
> noticed that in Japan, they blame the liberal Democrats for running huge
> deficits and keeping interest rates at near zero. Sounds like what our
> Republicans are doing, doesn't it? Frankly, I don't trust Republicans or
> Democrats; both have to serve special interest groups before the common
> good.
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0308100322.3a598834@posting.google.com...
> > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:<l5eZa.51540$Kb6.17211@news02.roc.ny>...
> > > Keith,
> > >
> > > As soon as you can figure out what BPL is going to do to hi-fidelity
> stereo
> > > am broadcast
> >
> > What will it do to lo-fidelity AM?
> >
> > This must be the Dem's answer to silencing Rush Limbaugh, Glen Beck,
> > Mike Reagan, Ollie North, Neal Bortz, Gordon Liddy, Mike Savage, Sean
> > Hannity...
>

>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03
>
>
When you consider the FCC Chairman was raised by Colin....you figure it out.

Dan/W4NTI

910. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-10 23:50:51 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308101550.7c8115e3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74275

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bh5udb$hch@library2.airnews.net>...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030810121412.12631.00000205@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > In article <20030810072821.12501.00001439@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY)
> > writes:
> >
> > >Fun fact: Check the lookup counter in QRZ.com for W5YI.
> > >
> > >73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Jim:
> >
> > W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter! OTOH,
> > Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!
> >
> > Now, now, Kim -- don't be jealous of Michelle -- even though you have a
> > right to be!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
> Jealous? Because of a woman who has a link to her commercial site on her
> lookup on QRZ? Not at all.

If I were you I'd give up trying to compete with her too.

> Kim W5TIT

911. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 00:00:41 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <8765l5qd06.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74276

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>In article <20030810112500.12631.00000197@mb-m28.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>>
>>BTW, I do believe that Mr. Shannon's theory is relevant to Amateur
>>Radio. I believe that what Dick is doing is making observations
>>based on actual operating experience, rather than empirical theory.
>>This may be the cause of the confusion, but as I said earlier, I do
>>not presume to speak for Dick.
>
> "Empirical theory?!?"
>
> Did you learn that as a soma come loud college student?!?
>
> No wonder no personnel department ever offered you a job.
>
> LHA

Do you get the feeling, deep down in the depths of your gut, that
Larry "Yardstick" Roll is never going to hear the end of this

"Empirical Theory"

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

912. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 00:04:05 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <871xvtqcui.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74277

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>In article <20030810112459.12631.00000196@mb-m28.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
>>Of course, you were probably just being "imaginative."
>
> YOU do that all the time...

That's some of his *real experience*, not none of that empirical
theory stuff!

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

913. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 00:05:59 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh6ml7ftl0@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 74278

Phil Kane wrote:

>On 8 Aug 2003 10:12:11 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>
>
>
>>>>AMTOR is pretty much dead, I am told.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Certainly not as popular as it once was, but I don't think it's entirely
>>>"dead."
>>>
>>>
>>How many HF amateur AMTOR contacts have you or anyone you know made in
>>the past year?
>>
>>
>
> Yet SITOR - the commercial version of AMTOR - is the standard HF
> mode of data communication in the maritime service. That, and not
> obscenenly-expensive satellite comms, is what killed maritime CW.
> The ship's purser or deck officers can pull up the preset HF
> transceiver channel and pound away, and even personal e-mail is now
> sent and received by a SITOR connection to AOL via Globe Wireless,
> the successor to RCA and ITT, via an AOL "kiosk" in the recreation
> areas. No Radio Officer needed.
>
> One of the San Francisco area marine radio techs, a ham, applied to
> the FCC to be able to offer PACTOR service in the marine bands, and
> after consulation with the ITU, his request was turned down because
> it was not an international standard and would not give that much
> improvement over SITOR considering the changes necessary.
>
> And the US Coast Guard and other similar agencies world-wide
> continue to transmit NAVTEX bulletins (marine broadcasts) on 518 kHz
> worldwide using SITOR.
>
>
>
>>>>Of course what really drove all that was PC/soundcard setups becoming
>>>>affordable.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Agreed ... multimode with a std SSB radio and PC ... cool stuff.

>>>
>>>
>
> Yeah - I can tune SITOR by setting the (suppressed) carrier 2.2 kHz
> higher than the channel center and using LSB. Cheapie "FSK".
>
> Going to be "more easier" later on this week when my new Ten-Tec
> computer-tuned DSP HF receiver arrives, and I can set the filtering
> to just where I want it.
>
> I'm not throwing my AMTOR/SITOR TNCs away just yet.
>
>
>
>>Sort of. But it's actually a patch job.
>>
>>
>
>
>
>>One reason packet is stuck at 1200 baud all these years is because
>>going faster would require a purpose-built data radio. Ikensu isn't
>>going to do it unless there's a proven market, and the failure of 9600
>>to get much attention means they will wait some more.
>>
>>
>
> Hey, we know that we can get at least 28K or more in a standard
> audio channel. But hams are cheap - nobody (including me) wants
> to throw away existing 1200 baud radios and TNCs that work really
> well for the type of canned messages that we get on packet, unless
> they are super-whizzes at Qualcom, with due appolgies to Phil Karn
> who fits that description and has done a LOT for digital ham radio
> specifically and whom I admire greatly.
>
>
>

Please don't apologize to Carl Stevenson. He's still stuck on Single
Sideband Voice.

914. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 00:08:18 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh6mpiftl1@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 74279

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
>news:3ZrZa.3144$7B6.2393@news02.roc.ny...
>
>
>>Brian,
>>
>>I did make a minor mistake. BPL is cut off at 1.8 MHz, thus avoiding the
>>deep pocket broadcasters. I'm still not sure how well the cheap Chinese
>>radios will work with BPL being fed right into the power lines.
>>
>>Then there are HF aeronautical frequencies. I forgot there are HF radio
>>astronomy listening posts. I wonder how well folks will hear WWV at any
>>
>>
>HF
>
>
>>frequency. SWLs will love BPL; forget hearing a lot of foreign
>>broadcasters. This thing is looking very ugly, indeed. BTW, don't blame
>>the Democrats; it is usually the big-money backed Republicans that will
>>
>>
>sell
>
>
>>their own mother to make money for someone who lined their pockets. I
>>noticed that in Japan, they blame the liberal Democrats for running huge
>>deficits and keeping interest rates at near zero. Sounds like what our
>>Republicans are doing, doesn't it? Frankly, I don't trust Republicans or
>>Democrats; both have to serve special interest groups before the common
>>good.
>>
>>
>>73 from Rochester, NY
>>Jim AA2QA
>>
>>
>>
>>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>>news:f45722ac.0308100322.3a598834@posting.google.com...
>>
>>

>>>"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
>>>
>>>
>>news:<l5eZa.51540$Kb6.17211@news02.roc.ny>...
>>
>>
>>>>Keith,
>>>>
>>>>As soon as you can figure out what BPL is going to do to hi-fidelity
>>>>
>>>>
>>stereo
>>
>>
>>>>am broadcast
>>>>
>>>>
>>>What will it do to lo-fidelity AM?
>>>
>>>This must be the Dem's answer to silencing Rush Limbaugh, Glen Beck,
>>>Mike Reagan, Ollie North, Neal Bortz, Gordon Liddy, Mike Savage, Sean
>>>Hannity...
>>>
>>>
>>---
>>Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
>>Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
>>Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03
>>
>>
>>
>>
>When you consider the FCC Chairman was raised by Colin....you figure it out.
>
>

Brian figure it out? You gotta be kidding!

915. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 01:09:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308101709.291ad2f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74280

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bh6io6$7kn$0@208.206.142.69>...

> Larry, no will note that Brian refuses to substantiate his lies by
> finding and posting any such statement by me.

Message 37 in thread
From: Dick Carroll; (dixie@townsqr.com)
Subject: Re: NCVEC Position on Code

View this article only
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-04 22:07:58 PST

> Dick Carroll; wrote:

Not really. Anyone can learn PSK31 in a half hour of looking over the help file and playing iwth their keyboard. As you know if you've been listening to all the laments appearing here from the "excluded", no such possibliley exists for Morse code.

And that's why they call him DICK.

916. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 01:29:57 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bh6tsk$e7v@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74282

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308101550.7c8115e3@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bh5udb$hch@library2.airnews.net>...
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20030810121412.12631.00000205@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > > In article <20030810072821.12501.00001439@mb-m04.aol.com>,
n2ey@aol.com
> > (N2EY)
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >Fun fact: Check the lookup counter in QRZ.com for W5YI.
> > > >
> > > >73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > > Jim:
> > >
> > > W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter! OTOH,
> > > Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!
> > >
> > > Now, now, Kim -- don't be jealous of Michelle -- even though you have
a
> > > right to be!
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> >
> > Jealous? Because of a woman who has a link to her commercial site on
her
> > lookup on QRZ? Not at all.
>
> If I were you I'd give up trying to compete with her too.
>
> > Kim W5TIT

Brian: perhaps you can give me some kind of clue as to what the Hell you are
talking about?

Kim W5TIT

917. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 01:39:01 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bh96vk$vqnq5$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 74342

>
> > They are supposed to make those provisions. If they did not, they were
in
> > the wrong. However, I would not favor them using hand sent code with an
> > oscillator for two reasons. 1) Oscillators are often not adjustable in
> > pitch. 2) Some people who copy quite well have absolutely lousy fists
and
> > do not send good clean code. It takes a pretty good op to copy some of
> the
> > people out there.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> And the fluctuation in CW skills is yet another reason to question its
> validity as a testing element.
>
> Kim W5TIT

But gee Kim, if someone has "made it" as a VE, shouldn't they be proficient in the mode(s) they are testing on? Seems to me that if someone is going to qualify as a VE, they should be at an extreme proficiency level......

If a VE or VE team cannot effectively send a method of communication like morse code as a required testing mode, it makes me wonder of the value of the mode in the first place. If they are relagated to only using CD's or tapes, I guess that would show the "dumbing down" of amateur radio, bringing it "one step further to extinction."

Seems to me it should not be a problem for the whole VE groups to have a set "pre-scripted" QSO's. There could be as many as needed, 10, 20, 30 or more pre-made QSO's to send.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

918. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 01:49:36 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB5C6EBB.22113%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74281

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> Dwight, that statement in 97.1 is an OLD thing
> going back decades.
>
> It was put in there to rationalize the existance
> of amateur radio among all the other very
> commercial radio services.
>
> Three to four decades ago there MIGHT have been
> a "need" for "trained operators" for the military
> draft. (snip)

It's not just a matter of national defense, Len. The pool of trained operators concept also applies to civil defense, public service, and so on. As such, the concept is just as valid today.

> (snip) Does national defense or the various aid
> agencies NEED amateurs who are "trained" in DX
> contesting and sitting around telling old war
> stories about when Kode Vas King? I don't think
> so.

Since I haven't seen too many of that type, I wouldn't know. However, I do know than many hams contribute their time, skills, and equipment, to help out where needed. That help isn't always exactly perfect, but it is available and free (which can't be said for much else in this world).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

919. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 03:11:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030810231145.08200.00001303@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74283

In article <3F368CEA.6000309@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>> Jim:
>>
>> W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter! OTOH,
>> Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!
>
> Perhaps we can get Vipul a date?

No -- but I'm available!

73 de Larry, K3LT

920. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 03:11:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030810231145.08200.00001302@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74285

In article <bh5udb$hch@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> Jim:
>>
>> W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter! OTOH,
>> Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!
>>
>> Now, now, Kim -- don't be jealous of Michelle -- even though you have a
>> right to be!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Jealous? Because of a woman who has a link to her commercial site on her
>lookup on QRZ? Not at all.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Don't look now, but I don't think you'd be jealous of her sales volume, even
though I expect it looks just as good as she does!

73 de Larry, K3LT

921. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 03:11:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030810231146.08200.00001305@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74284

In article <20030810154755.18497.00001951@mb-m05.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>
> We all KNOW Larrah to be a "pot-kettle-black" for many years, even
> back on FIDOnet. No need to state the obvious.
>
> Now stop with reduncancies in posting, pSycho pSteve, and take
> your medications like a good lad.
>
> Remember, YOU aren't the moderator in here despite what your
> psychosis imagines.

That's right, Steve! I'm the "moderator" here! If you don't believe me, just aks Lennie!

73 de Larry, K3LT

922. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 03:11:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030810231146.08200.00001304@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74287

In article <d22b54c3.0308101550.7c8115e3@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> > Jim:
>> >
>> > W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter! OTOH,
>> > Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!
>> >
>> > Now, now, Kim -- don't be jealous of Michelle -- even though you have a
>> > right to be!
>> >
>> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>> >
>>
>> Jealous? Because of a woman who has a link to her commercial site on her
>> lookup on QRZ? Not at all.
>
>If I were you I'd give up trying to compete with her too.

Brian:

I'm certainly not in competition with Michelle, just an admirer!

73 de Larry, K3LT

923. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 03:11:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030810231147.08200.00001306@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74286

In article <20030810154845.18497.00001953@mb-m05.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>A good question, Carl. I've always wondered exactly what your alleged
>>technical competence has to do with ANY discussion in this NG! After
>>all, this is about AMATEUR radio!
>
> Larrah, it's just too bad that US amateur radio doesn't have a book,
> "Radio for Dummies" that you could read to find out what radio, ANY
> radio IS...you NEED one.
>
> "Radio" is a general activity involving technology in and about radio
> communication.
>
> Radios do NOT work "differently" because some regulating agency
> states one radio activity is "amateur" and another radio activity is
> "commercial/professional." Electrons, fields and waves work the SAME
> in ANY radio regardless of human legislation.
>
> You can't understand that. I wonder why?

Lennie:

I understand it just fine, thank you. However, my "understanding" will never measure up to your standards, so I will just have to live with that. Too bad you can't!

> Maybe its because you can't distinguish one active from another...like
> all your bragging about "summa cum laude human resources graduate"
> and then you get a BUS DRIVER job.

Well, find me an entry-level Personnel Officer job in Kent County, DE with the same pay and benefits as my present job, and I'll take it! BTW, I applied for one in my own company last year, but it went to, of all people, one of my own classmates, a very fine, sexy-looking YL! She did NOT graduate with any kind of honors, since she took her program part-time and took over 7 years to get her degree, whereas I did mine on a full-time basis in 2.5 years. But I don't look as good in a cubicle as she does!

>>While I freely admit that I do have a
>>great deal of respect for hams who do possess genuine, professional-
>>grade technical qualifications, you, and your apologists Floyd Davidson
>>and Len Anderson, tend to raise the noise level to BPL standards!
>
> Poor baby...still miffed at no one recognizing your intrinsic Greatness?

I hadn't noticed that anyone isn't recognizing it, Lennie. But then again, you seem to have been the only one who noticed, so thanks for that!

> Technically, you know NOTHING about "BPL" except a lot of hysteric
> emotionally-fueled gabbling and paranoia and ten kinds of NIMBY
> shouts and hollerings.

Hey, it sounds like it could be a very useful thing indeed -- much more so than a lot of former CB'ers squaking on the HF phone bands! The problem is, hams aren't the only HF users that would be affected!

> Come back when you've learned a smidgen of technical knowledge and
> can talk sensibly with some evidence of knowing a small bit about the
> technology. [I doubt that will ever happen...]

I am a BUS DRIVER, remember? My knowledge of communications is limited to what I've done in AMATEUR radio, and the use of my 800 MHz voice/data comm system in my bus. You're the pro, not me! And I've never claimed to be one!

> PROFESSIONALS made all your little radios possible as a product so
> that you could buy them, play with them, and then sit around POSING
> as an "amateur guru-expert-knowitall."

Lennie, you're obviously in need of new reading glasses. I've never claimed to be anything but an average ham with average, AMATEUR-level technical skills.

> Don't bite the hands of those who made all your toys.

Never. They may not have been washed after the last time they used the rest room!

73 de Larry, K3LT

924. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 04:32:21 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh768l$h1d$0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 74288

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bh6io6$7kn$0@208.206.142.69>...
>
> > Larry, no will note that Brian refuses to substantiate his lies by
> > finding and posting any such statement by me.
>
> ---
>
> Message 37 in thread
> From: Dick Carroll; (dixie@townsqr.com)
> Subject: Re: NCVEC Position on Code
>
>
> View this article only
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Date: 2003-08-04 22:07:58 PST
>
> > Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> Not really. Anyone can learn PSK31 in a half hour of looking over the help file and
> playing iwth their keyboard. As you know if you've been listening to all the laments
> appearing here from the "excluded", no such possibliley exists for Morse code.
>
> ---
>
> And that's why they call him DICK.

Your village is calling again.....

925. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 05:22:00 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308102122.22926378@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74289
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hjetrgn.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...

"QRZ the Kilo Two, again please?"

926. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 05:34:03 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308102134.59ac041c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74290

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030810112502.12631.00000200@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0308090129.59fa1e2d@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >
> >We all worked 4Q2TOO in the low end of 80, "The Island of Ambrosio".
> >
>
> "Four Q Two Too?" Isn't that redundant?

Quite. My goof. Been awhile. It was something like 4Q2BUB or something
like that.

One of those slims announced that some W1 he had a problem with was
his QSL manager. Drove the W1 nuts.

> 73 de Larry, K3LT

w3rv

927. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 08:57:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308110057.e158ba9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74291

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030810154742.18497.00001945@mb-m05.aol.com>...

> No, he has aligned himself with the Anti-Semiconductor Movement.

No, Your Putziness...Quality is quality whether it is the
fidelity of a tube-based radio or a well-aged wine.

> "Real radios glow in the dark" and that sort of thing. "Warmth."

Embracing technology changes simply because it's a "change" does
not make it better...just different.

> Or is he just technically constipated, therefore thinking about waste?

As witless as ever, I see.

Steve, K4YZ

928. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 09:00:20 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308110100.59130e15@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74292

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030810154740.18497.00001942@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0308100801.24c9ee5c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (pSycho pSteve) writes:

Yet more professional civil debate, I see.

> >nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
> >news:<20030809094901.05245.00000300@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >
> >> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
> >
> >> > Morse code, which well predates WW2, is old and needs to be
> >> > dismantled. :-)
> >>
> >> You are old and predate WW2. Len.
> >>
> >> Perhaps your "reality" needs to be dismantled.
> >
> > Lennie's "reality" was dismantled a long time ago...he just
> >hasn't accepted it yet.
>
> Pity the sick psychotics. Now there's TWO of them and one is
> "anonymous." They go together in their fantasy.

Bet it irks the heck out of you that not one but TWO of your
former screen names has been acquired by someone who thinks you are an
idiot too.

And with good cause!

Sucks to be you, Lennie!

Steve, K4YZ

929. Re: L.A. Times Editorial Correction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 09:03:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308110103.5cfcfd31@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74293

Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:<e5fdjvk6pr98luinivqqkaovvm9e2ih19k@4ax.com>...

> I would like to state for the public record that the L.A. Times article ("Race
> for Governor) has a misquote from me. They stated that I designed the landing
> radar for the Apollo. My comment was clear that I was part of the TEAM that did
> the design. Somehow that TEAM word was left out. To my colleagues that were on
> that team, I offer my apologies. I was a dim bulb amongst the stars of the
> project....(SNIP)

That you pre-empted any negative critique and offered this up
unsolicited puts a lot of good stock in your portfolio, Jim.

Bravo.

Steve, K4YZ

930. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 09:06:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308110106.18eb9f9c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74294

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030810154755.18497.00001951@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0308100050.7ce9bb65@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030809210009.02197.00001981@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> >
> >> Larrah has the fantasy of being a "moderator" in here.
> >
> > Whew! Pot/Kettle/Black if ever there was an example!
>
> We all KNOW Larrah to be a "pot-kettle-black" for many years, even
> back on FIDOnet. No need to state the obvious.

Nice try at a dodge, Lennie. Weak, predictable, and obviously
humiliating for you...but it seems you LIKE self-humiliation.

> Now stop with reduncancies in posting, pSycho pSteve, and take
> your medications like a good lad.

I am sure you wished it true, Oh Lying One.

> Remember, YOU aren't the moderator in here despite what your
> psychosis imagines.

I imagine nothing of the like, Lennie...That's YOUR schtick.

Steve, K4YZ

931. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 10:56:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308110256.d36fbe4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74295

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bh768l$h1d$0@208.207.71.142>...
>
> Your village is calling again.....

Yet you answer the phone...

932. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 11:12:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308110312.34ba9f76@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74296

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bh6k0k$9lg$0@208.206.142.69>...

> At least I have one that works!

Only in a rudimentary fashion.

933. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 11:47:22 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308110347.1b5f839a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74297

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030810121412.12631.00000205@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <20030810072821.12501.00001439@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >Fun fact: Check the lookup counter in QRZ.com for W5YI.
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim:
>
> W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter!

Ding ding ding!

Now why would he be the only one without a lookup counter? Every other
callsign I've ever checked has one.

> OTOH,
> Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!

Naw, I've seen some really high lookup numbers.
>
> Now, now, Kim -- don't be jealous of Michelle -- even though you have a
> right to be!

Hint: Check out their birthdates....

73 de Jim, N2EY

934. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 12:53:15 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <%kMZa.373$dj3.60973@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74298

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB5C6EBB.22113%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
>
> It's not just a matter of national defense, Len. The pool of trained
> operators concept also applies to civil defense, public service, and so
on.
> As such, the concept is just as valid today.

True, but the paradigm has changed. When CW was the ONLY, or
even the DOMINANT mode of communication via radio, the need for
a pool of (CW) trained operators was legitimate.

That is no longer the case. Trained ops, yes, but trained in what is
actually USED in modern day emergency communications, which is
overwhelmingly voice (VHF/UHF and HF SSB, and data modes).

Carl - wk3c

935. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 13:18:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F379753.1361794D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74299

Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > In article <20030810072821.12501.00001439@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > writes:
> >
> >
> >>Fun fact: Check the lookup counter in QRZ.com for W5YI.
> >>
> >>73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
> > Jim:
> >
> > W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter! OTOH,
> > Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!
>
> Perhaps we can get Vipul a date?

My guess would be, not with one hundred dollar bills pinned to his shirt
though my friend K3FK's adage comes to mind: "They never made a trash
can for which there wasn't a lid".

Dave K8MN

936. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 13:21:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3797F7.10A6A693@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74300

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030810112459.12631.00000196@mb-m28.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >Of course, you were probably just being "imaginative."
>
> YOU do that all the time...

Ahh, Ahh, Len! Please remember that you enjoy hanging out here with the
hams, fantasizing that you are somehow a part of amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

937. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 13:30:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3799F9.5CA006D5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74301

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030810112502.12631.00000201@mb-m28.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >Ah ha -- raise objections to my "name calling" and make your point with
> >more name calling of your own! A typical non-response! I must
> >admit, Floyd, you're really dialed-in on the classic Usenet attitude!
>
> Poor baby...got your own ego shown to you and now you whine and
> carry on as a holier-than-thou beeper suffering sour-grapes hangover.

Is the Anderson home communications center experiencing difficulties
again. This one wasn't any more worthy than its earlier twin, Leonard.

Dave K8MN

"New York, New York
New York, New York
You know it sounds so nice
They had to name it twice
New York, New York"
--Johnny Winter

938. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 13:38:12 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh8684rtu0@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 74302

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bh768l$h1d$0@208.207.71.142>...
> >
> > Your village is calling again.....
>
> Yet you answer the phone...

"Brian, it's for you....."

939. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 13:59:59 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh87gv$ur2$0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 74303

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >>
> >> His answer, which he has repeated several times now, was that
> >> Shannon doesn't apply the anything about Amateur Radio.
> >>
> >> At that point, what choice does one have but to write DICK off as
> >> so ill informed that he should be totally ignored.
> >>
> >> -
> >
> > OK Frostproof Floyd, there you go again, or maybe I should say
> >"still". Just can't get it together when it comes to ham radio,
> >can you? You prove it yet one more time.
>
> Speaking of proofs, you've generated a real beauty here:
>
> > If you think I have insufficient undestanding of Shannon's
> >infornmation theory that's because you're terribly uninformed
> >yourself. What my little recited experience showed, when the
> >PSK was not copyable but the CW ID was, is merely to further
> >confirm what I said- Shannon and his little mathematical circus
> >really *DON'T* have anything to do with ham radio. ...
>
> Now Claude Shannon's work is a "little mathematical circus"!
> And you've added *EMPHASIS* to the statement that it has nothing
> to do with ham radio.
>
> DICK, you've made my point for me and there is very little else
> to say.
>
> > What the "PSK-NO, CW-YES" incident showed was that Shannon
> >DOES NOT apply **when the channel is not set by his rules**,
> >which WAS exactly the case, as is virtually always the case in
> >ham radio.
>
> Well, there is one other thing to say. But I've stolen this
> from Cecil once or twice already, so I'll quote him directly
> this time:
>
> "Again, power level is only one of three inter-related
> parameters. If they are not all equal, then the playing field

> is not level. Your being able to copy the CW ID, which has an
> equivalent 12dB power advantage, is like saying a 150w SSB
> signal is easier to copy than a 1w CW signal. It's true but it
> is also meaningless.
>
> Thanks to DICK CARROLL'S LOGIC, SSB can be proven to be
> superior to CW every time. That follows from ignoring any of
> the throughput parameters."
>
> Cecil, W6RCA
>
> Another way of looking at it, is that Shannon's "rules" do
> apply, and that is virtually *always* the case in ham radio.
>

Cecil was spreading bullshit, just as you are.Shannon simply will not reveal which mode is useful and which is not under the conditions which ham radio operators work. When PSK31 won't function within it's own 30 hz channel, but the CWID *WILL* work within the 2.4 khz channel in use for both, it makes the solution very simple- CW is the mode of choice! To insist that the PSK is the "more efficient" when it is useless is far beyond stupid. It is more efficient only in it's own individual environment. Ham radio operators - that is, those who actually get on the air and learn how to USE all these modes, know how to sort it out, and did long before Shannon ever came along.

Now, *thats the way things work in the real world* where hams actually get on the air and use radiocommunications. I know, you and The Putz have no real world experience in such things, so you have nothing else to fall back on.You can do whatever theorizing you wish off the air.

As for Carl Stevenson, well he's still stuck on 20 meter Single Sideband Voice.
I guess he's awaiting the arrival of all the Freebanders and their new no-code "Extra Class" licenses to show up so he'll have someone to talk to.

940. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 14:01:54 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh87ki$ur2$1@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 74304

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> > If you're serious it only means that YOU don't understand Shannon's work
> >The channel bandwidth limit is central to any application Shannon 's theory.
>
> They why we can increase the SNR and get more channel capacity
> regardless of the bandwidth? Sounds like bandwidth isn't so
> central after all, eh?

When you can increase the SNR by narrowing the bandwidth? I knew you
has your head on bassackwards.

941. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 14:09:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F37A340.722964AC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74305

Alun Palmer wrote:
>
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20030803122121.27503.00001415@mb-m24.aol.com:
>
> > In article <Xns93CBC6A1646A4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

> Not atall. Since about 1995 there has been a paradigm shift caused by this
> medium we're using right now (the Internet). If code testing had been
> abolished significantly before that it would have boosted our numbers far
> more than it ever can now. All I'm really saying is that that opportunity
> is lost.

I find it hard to take anyone seriously who uses the term "paradigm
shift", especially if he proceeds to jump to a false conclusion or to
several of them.

> >>Sure. there is a lot of CW use by hams on HF, but there are precious
> >>few prospective hams who want to use it.
> >
> > How do you know they don't want to use it? At the past several Field
> > Days, the CW ops generated the most interest.
>
> As a sideshow it generates interest. Think of it as being like a
> demonstration of some obscure craft in a living museum. Sure, people find
> it interesting watching a blacksmith shoe a horse (and that's not a dead
> art either), but it doesn't mean they are going to learn to do it.

But you haven't addressed the question posed: How do you know what
prospective hams want to do?

Dave K8MN

942. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 14:18:40 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh88k0$1ku$0@208.207.71.153>
Source record: 74306

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> > When the CW ID comes throuth, and the PSK does not,
> >it confirms that **in amateur radio applications**, where the communicatons channel in use
> >is not constrained by Shannon's rules, they cannot be applied with any accuracy. Thus they
> >don't apply. They * CAN'T* apply.
>
> Wrong. *Any* communications channel in use is constrained by
> Shannon's rules.
>

Heh heh... shows what you know about ham radio!....when hams who actually get on the air find
the need, they just modify their channel. You know, things like variable width IF, various filters, IF shift all those things you're unfamiliar with since you'vve never actually used any of them.
Sure, you can reconsult Shannon to get the skinny on the new channel, but we hams have no need to do that, if you don't already know. We'll leave all that to you and Putzie to handle in
your spare time for your own entertainment. We have more interesting things to do ON THE AIR.
IT DOES NOT APPLY to ham radio operation, you fool!

>
> > "The Channel" is whatever the ham radio operator, and his gear, set it to be. So when I
> >work PSK31 and it can't print, but the CW- ID comes through loud and clear, to quote Cecil
> >Moore, "The playing field is not level, the comparison is unfair". That was the best he
> >could do, to insist that I also push the CW signal through the 30 cycle wide filter so
> >that IT couldn't be copied just like the PSK couldn't be. Nonsense!
>
> What 30 cycle filter are you talking about? There is none.
>

Ask Cecil, it was his assertion. And if you actually look into it you may find that the DSP function in the PC used includes a PSK filter at 30 cycles -thus the
name PSK31. Eureka!

>
> The problem is you are comparing two different data rates
> through the same channel. PSK-31 runs at 31.5 bits per second.
> If you used CW at that rate, it works out to about 37.8 wpm.
> Are you telling me *you* can copy 35 wpm using a 200 Hz filter
> when there is Doppler distortion from auroral activity?

>

No, you idiot- do you come from the same village as Burke?-
What I said is that we REAL HAMS have no NEED to invoke laboratory nonsense
to interfere with our on the air operation!
ANd they are NOT THROUGH THE SAME 31 cycle channel! They both come through the channel tha
I
set, not Shannon, which was a 2.4 kc channel which is modifiable by all those snazzy IF

> In fact, what you've done is demonstrate that Shannon's work
> *does* apply to ham radio! PSK-31 is an m-ary channel using
> QPSK (where m = 4), which trades signal to noise ratio for
> bandwidth to obtain the same data rate as it would using
> straight phase modulation.
>
> What *you* should be saying is that your experience demonstrates
> that Shannon's theories prove true in the practical application
> of ham radio. When the SNR is low, CW can be useful, albeit at
> very low data rates, if restricted bandwidth is a requirement.
> Of course, if the bandwidth wasn't restricted to 200 Hz, almost
> any variation on PSK modulation would out run CW for efficiency,
> as can easily be demonstrated using Shannon's formula.
>

Yeah, Frosty, most of us know all that, it's been well published, and quoted here for some
time. But it still has no applicability to ham radio outside the theoretical.
Yep, Shannon was a mathematical genius. I guess it makes you feel good just to
think about it all, doesn't it? But any ham *of experience* could have told you how it
worked
long before Shannon came along! No math needed, beyond that which one does automatically in
your head as conditions show need for changing a receiving parameter...
But you can't know any of that, you're not an active ham, you just hold a license.....

943. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 14:21:55 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F37A616.57C51762@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74307

```
"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3F2E6711.7F1E4CE5@earthlink.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > >
> > > > In article <f45722ac.0308010249.313b156a@posting.google.com>,
> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > >
> > > > >And we've already heard from the Extra's how if they don't get their
> > > > >way they are going to destroy the amateur radio service. Dick,
> Larry,
> > > > >Dan, Bruce...
> > > >
> > > Wait a minute ... don't tar all of us Extras with the same brush that
> > > Dick, Larry, et al deserve ...
> > >
> > "Us Extras"? Whooo, that's rich, Carl!
>
> Yes, Dave, "Us Extras" ... much as it may eat at you, I'm an Extra, too.

Sure you are, Carl--now.

> (FCC said so ... and it's up to them, not you ... :-P

That's right. After all, "us" Extras have to stick together. Right?

> > > For example the vast majority of the Directors of NCI are Extras (or
> > > their national equivalent thereof).
> > >
> > What differentiates a majority from a vast majority? In a country with
> > only two license classes, the higher class license is equivalent to the
> > U.S. Extra?
>
> When I said "or their national equivalent thereof," I was refering to our
> Director from New Zealand ... a long-time, coded ham of their highest
> class.

Their *higher* class. In a country with two classes of license, the
higher class is equivalent to the U.S. Extra?

> > > Additionally, there are a significant number of Extras amongst our
> > > membership ... at least in proportion to the % of Extras to other
> > > license classes.
> > >
> > What constitutes a "significant number" of Extas when compared to the
```

> > percentage of your membership holding a license for which no code test
> > is required?
>
> I haven't calculated the exact percentage, but we have a LOT of members
> who hold an Extra class license ... and that's not just since folks were
> able
> to upgrade with "only 5 wpm."

Noted that there is no indication of what "significant number" or "a LOT
of" actually means.

> > > So, it's not "the Extras" ... it's the PCTAs ...
> >
> > ...and I gather that you don't have many members who support code
> > testing :-)
>
> That's right ... one of the requirements for membership is supporting
> the elimination of Morse testing.

I'm glad you made that clear. Then it certainly isn't "the Extras" You
mean anyone of any class who supports continued morse testing.

Dave K8MN

944. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 14:34:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F37A8F7.6E9ED32A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74308

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3F2E675E.16905547@earthlink.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > >
> > > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > > news:20030802230218.25052.00001540@mb-m11.aol.com...
> > > > In article <7dfliv4n5tild30d19s7lneg3kpt67v69r@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur
> > > KC2HMZ
> > > > <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> writes:
> > > > >
> > > > >>QR10-4, QGB! I'm QPM, so QBD me!
> > > > >>
> > > > >>(Translation: "Ten-Fawhar, Good Buddie! I'll be putting the pedal
> to
> > > the
> > > > >>metal now, so watch my back door!)
> > > > >>
> > > > >>73 de Larry, K3LT
> > > > >
> > > > >You seem to toss that CB jargon around pretty well, Larry. Don't tell
> > > > >me...no, it couldn't be...could it?
> > > > >
> > > > >73 DE John, KC2HMZ
> > > > >
> > > > John:
> > > > >
> > > > Yep, it is true! I was once a CB'er, for a whole six months! I was
> the
> > > > Asst. Mgr. of the Radio Shack store in Depew, NY at the time,
> > > >
> > > We should have known ... "Radio Shack, you've got questions, we're
> > > clueless,"
> > > I'm sure Larry fit in quite well.
> >
> > So where is Kim? Shouldn't she be jumping on Carl over irrelevant
> > comments directed at Larry?
>
> Dave ... it's not irrelevant ... Larry has always spoken quite freely of his
> disdain for CBers and other "lower forms of life" (knuckle-draggers, etc.)

Sure it is irrelevant. My own experience is that most CBers I've met
don't have much technical knowledge, know little about propagation and

have poor operating skills and habits. If you see someone driving a primer gray and blue pickup truck sporting a CB whip, hauling a second hand mattress and the truck is driven by an unshaven guy with a ball cap and a T-shirt featuring the Confederate battle flag, do you say to yourself, "Now there's a fellow I'd like to hang out with"?

> The fact that Larry was a CBer, yet talks down to folks with such a
> superior attitude, shows what a hypocrite he is ...

The operative phrase here is "Larry was a CBer..." That's probably how he came to realize the limitations of CB radio with its low range and population of those doing bad "Smokey and the Bandit" imitations. Larry chose ham radio. I don't choose to spend my time with NASCAR fans or those who think an evening of fun is going to a karaoke bar. That's freedom of association.

Dave K8MN

945. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 14:45:22 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <6_NZa.61$jw4.58@nwrdny03.gnilink.net>
Source record: 74309

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:B%SYa.30995$_o4.24131@news02.roc.ny...
> Good post, Jim

Which Jim?

> I do agree with you about the antics of a few.

'Tis a shame indeed.

> A few Yahoo groups have
> started - at least one of them with the premise of no flames and everyone
is
> welcome. I can't believe how rapidly it has grown (nor can I believe how
> many new licenses have been obtained). Unbelievable what can be
> accomplished when you get rid of the finger pointing (and the new folks,
> both those without tickets and those who have just obtained them are
asking
> questions about operating procedures, antennas, coax - all the kinds of
> questions that so many other groups could cover if they just got past the
> finger pointing and flames).

Agreed. I personally find that the following approach works pretty well. CB QSO's on SSB generally have something in common with AR QSO's, "what kind of gear are you running?" The minute I tell them I'm using a 40m dipole through a tuner, I usually get one of two responses. "Are you an amateur?" usually comes from those wha are also ARO's. "What's that and how does it work?" comes from those who are genuinely interested. I'm all too happy to oblige them. Funny thing is the 40m doublet actually shows a 1.4:1 SWR on 27.3850 MHz (Ch. 38) with the tuner offline, go figure.

> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

946. Re: Dear Norn: WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 14:45:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F37ABA0.B30E93C1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74310

Dave Heil wrote:
>
> Dear Norm:
>
> WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!
> WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!
>
> Woger Wiseman is harassing me and making me feel like a little man, Norm...He's atacking me in newsgroups, etc again... I know I gave you a blowjob before but if I give you another one can I forward some more posts to you and we can meet behind the donut shop again? Can't you do something? I went to the ARES meeting to confront him, and he was so non-plussed he ignored me after awhile, and I even wore my best clothes (even though they were dirty and smelled) and I even used cheap cologne that the wife swiped from the samples counter....
> WHAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!!!!!! WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!!!!!!!!!
>
> I try to answer his posts even though I have the option of just ignoring or using a killfile on them...I guess the people at Lackland was correct they said High-el you are stupid.....
>
> WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!!!!! WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!!!!!

You're now posing as me, Roger? It'd be real tough to killfile your many anonymous remailer identities, Roger. Now you're using my e-mail address.

What, by the way, is your fixation on Lackland AFB? I haven't been there for over 32 years. I note your attraction to the material on my web site.

Anyone interested in finding out more about Roger's activities can do a google web or newsgroup search on "Roger Wiseman", "KC8JBO" or "AB8MQ". If you don't have strong stomach, skip it.

Roger hasn't been exactly a credit to amateur radio either:

http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/1999/1119.html

http://www2.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/2000/0503.html

http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/2000/0719.html

Dave K8MN

947. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 15:02:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F37AF98.183C4210@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74311

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F301D6D.D7A189F5@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2FA40B.6CBD0E90@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2F1ADF.9E64A43D@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:

> > It serves to point out Len's total lack of experience in the amateur
> > service.
>
> Yet he knows more about radio then you.

It hasn't been demonstrated that he knows more about radio "then" me.
There is every possibility that Len knows more about electronics theory
than me. There is a similar possibility that I have much more
operational experience in "radio" or that I have much more knowledge of
wave propagation than Len. There is a certainty that I have forty years
more experience in amateur radio than Len.

> How can that be if he has no experience?

What I wrote addressed Len's experience in amateur radio. He has none.

> > > The vast majority of the policy makers
> > > at the FCC aren't licensed in the amateur radio service and have no
> > > experience in amateur radio.
> >
> > The vast majority of policy makers at the FCC have nothing whatever to
> > do with amateur radio. Those that are involved in the regulation of the
> > ARS, are quite knowledgeable about the service.
>
> They fooled me with the last restructuring NOI/NPRM.
>
> > They are paid to know.
>
> Wasted money.

Well, after all, you're the expert.

> > Additionally, there are radio amateurs on the FCC staff.
>
> So every amateur on "staff" makes policy and rules?

Is that what you read?

> That has
> > nothing to do with the issue of Len Anderson. He isn't a participant in
> > amateur nor is he a regulator of amateur radio. Len is totally
> > irrelevant to amateur radio.
>
> You are in the minority in thinking that.

And your statement is based on what strong indications?

> > > But I don't hear you complaining about that, yet they have the ability
> > > to change what you do and how you do it.
> >
> > No, you won't hear me complaining often though there are times when the
> > Commission makes a decision which I don't like or which is just plain
> > wrong. Len makes no such decisions and is not involved in amateur
> > radio.
>
> So why so do you give him so much attention?

A smart fellow would have figured out that laughing at Len isn't exactly
an endorsement of his views.

> > > > > > But when
> > > > > > confronted with mere Technician participation in the ARS that rivals
> > > > > > his Extraness, he digs in and destroys.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That claim is a non-starter as it is in conflict with what I've written
> > > > > > here very recently.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Bully for you.
> > > > >
> > > > ...and shame on you for making yet another false accusation. That's two
> > > > so far in this exchange.
> > >
> > > Nothing false there.
> >
> > Just the ones beginning "But when confronted with mere Technician..."
> > and "One David Heil demands..." Are you going for three?
>
> Sure. Why not?

Why not? Didn't you tell us that there was nothing false in your
comments?

> > > > > > Then there is Extra DICK. Probably Extra in every way except the dick
> > > > > > department. Then there's Jim "DeSoda" who keeps rewriting "200 Meters
> > > > > > and Up." No need to mention INSANE Clown Posse in a Nurse's dress or
> > > > > > the civilian with "real" military experience.

> > > > > >
> > > > > > What's your claim to credibility?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I yam what I yam.
> > > > >
> > > > > Maybe you'll find a way to do something about it.
> > > >
> > > > I'm satisfied with my accomplishments in the ARS.
> >
> > That has been evident for some time.
>
> And you are unsatisfied with yours?

Yes indeed, much as I am with my guitar playing. I've been in amateur radio and have played the guitar for forty years. I learn something new about both and sharpen my skills in both with every passing year. I am never satisfied with what I know and what I can do. I do not advocate striving for mediocrity.

> Must you try to tear down Len at every opportunity to boost your stature?

Poking fun at Leonard Anderson has never been done for purposes of boosting my own stature, nor is it a "must" on my list of things to do. If I had to list reasons for doing so, I'd likely come up with a list like:

1) Because Len Anderson does it to others on a continuing basis

2) Because my views are in opposition to those held by Anderson, a non-radio amateur.

3) Because Len comes across as a pontificating windbag who sees himself as an expert in all things relating to radio communication.

4) Because it is soooooo easy.

Dave K8MN

948. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 15:03:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F37AFDE.6D3406E4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74312

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F301FE3.951681BE@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2FA842.281A9C16@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2F27DA.C63DE672@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2EBC38.1917F426@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > > > > > > Now that Carl can share Dave's band space...
> > >
> > > > > > > > > Carl may share some space with me.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Carl can share any space with you that he wishes. That is what the
> > > > > > > > > FCC mean's by issuing him an Extra license. Get used to it. Naw,
> > > > > > > > > nevermind.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Carl may share some space.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > May share all space.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > He may and he may not.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Take it up with his hairdresser. The FCC says he may share all space,
> > > > > > > and thats good enough for me.
> > >
> > > Please quote that "may share space" FCC document.
>
> Please quote the "Farnsworth Exam at 13-15wpm is the same as the Morse
> Exam at 5wpm" FCC document.

That's totally irrelevant to the discussion at hand.

> > He's allocated the same frequencies. He may or may not share the same
> > space.
>
> Which is it?

> May or May Not?

That's correct.

Dave K8MN

949. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 15:35:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F37B75A.D47CAEF1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74313

"privacy.at Anonymous Remailer" wrote:
>
> In article <3F2DC086.A0898140@earthlink.net>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> >
> >
> > JMBCV wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3F2C9682.FFEC97A8@earthlink.net>
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Vshah101 wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > From (Larry Roll K3LT):
> > >
> > > >
> > > > I'm involved in a county group which is part of ARES.
> > >
> > > Feh. You've attended only one meeting..and just to harass and stalk another ham,
ASSHOLE.
> >
> > Why, Roger Wiseman! Fancy you slithering from beneath your bed to make
>
> Why Dave High-el, imagine you stopping downloading kiddie porn to answer a post.....

I do no such thing, Roger. What is your fixation with child
pornography?

> > yet another anonymous post.
>
> If this is anonymous, how do you know who sent it, dumbass?

Roger: "Duuuuh, how'd you know it was me"? Shall we say that you have a
rather unique writing style and that your topics of interest repeat
themselves on a regular basis.

> > I've attended a number of meetings and
> > functions, Roger.
>
> Guess you had to suck off Bertie Garcia one way or another, eh, ASSHOLE?

No, Roger. What is your fixation with homosexuality?

> > I'm told that you only came to the one meeting.
>
> I'm told you shouldn't stalk other hams like you do, kiddie diddler.

It is peculiar that one who has posted numerous untruths about others
would consider himself to be a stalking victim. What is your fixation
on sex with children?

> > By the way, I'd go very carefully on that stalking stuff, Rog. You've
> > frequently harrassed me here and in direct e-mails.
>
> Awww, poor Dicksucking Davey.......you stalked Rog as well, because the only reason you came to the ARES meeting to confront him, and let's not forget how you were going to break the law by posting his "best newsgroup material" on telephone poles in Rog's neighborhood.

What is your fixation with homosexual activity, Roger?

Bert and I attended an ARES meeting at the invitation of the Emergency
Coordinator for purposes of joining.

I think you've gotten your wires crossed on the breaking of law, Roger.
You were asked if you'd be proud to have your wife, mother or children
see some of your handiwork. You were asked if you thought your
neighbors would enjoy seeing some of your memorable posts tacked to
telephone poles in the neighborhood. I can post my exact comments and
your sparkling reply here if you feel that would set the record
straight. After all, you seemed to think enough of your numerous
newsgroup postings to post them in this very public venue.

> > You have an arrest
>
> I do? Prove it.......

It is public record, Roger. By the way, is this another "Duuuh, how'd
you know it was me"?

> > record and you've been booted from a couple of ISP's.
>
> Bwhahahahahahahaha....prove it, kiddie diddling Dave.

One note to OVIS should clear that one up. What is your fixation with
child sex?

> > You've been
> > cautioned for malicious QRMing on 20 meters and have been forced to
> > retest.
>
> So some fake info was submitted and dumbfuck Riley believed it.......

Who Riley? The fake info was in the form of audio tape. I know the
fellow who supplied it. I have no reason to disbelieve him and to
believe your claim that it was "fake".

> he still PASSED the "retest" it's doubtful you could as of today, ASSHOLE.

"He/you" passed. Whether I could or couldn't isn't an issue. I wasn't
contacted and told that I needed to retest. There's been no enforcement
action taken toward me in forty years.

> > > > Most of the hams
> > > > involved are not interested in contesting or DXing. Many operate VHF FM
> > > > only. I don't know any who've designed and built a linear amplifier.
> > > > Only one other is interested in collecting and restoring vintage gear.
> > > >
> > > > Yep, they are a clique of losers.....
> > >
> > Oh yes, I neglected to mention that we have one dysfunctional individual
> > who exhibits sociopathic behavior on several levels. He frequently
>
> I wonder if the WV Medical board is aware of you practicing psychology without a degree
in it or a license?

Take it up with the board.

> > haunts the rec.radio.amateur.misc and rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > newsgroups and posts irrelevant stream-of-consciousness filth (usually
> > unrelated to the thread topic. His over exhuberance has led him to the
> > malicious interference incidents on 20m.
>
> Poor Davey......the Lackland press release boy, the flunky who couldn't get/or was so
fucking stupid he couldn't get a real job then after a piss poor service record, had to
take a flunky courier job with the State department, until he was terminated.

What is your fixation with Lackland AFB and my web page? I haven't been
to Lackland in over thirty years. You know nothing of my service
record. I have an honorable discharge from the military. You know
nothing of my State Department service other than what you can glean
from my web site or here.

> > Actually, Roger, the only real loser is you. You're hardly a clique.
>
> IKYABWAI, dicksucking Davey.....

What is your obsession with homosexual oral sex?

> Actually, kiddiediddler High-el, how is it you had to get a mail order bride for
yourself? Maybe it's you lack of personal cleanliness, as evidenced by the stench you had
when you attened that meeting and your wrinkled clothes.

What is your fixation on sex with children?

I don't have a mail-order bride. I bathe on a regular basis and my
clothing is washed and pressed. What is your fixation on body odor and
wrinkled clothing?

> > > > I continue to attend. We interact
> > > >
> > > Except the fact you fail to bathe regularly, you mean.......fuckstick.

I don't recall your being here during shower time, Roger.

> > It looks like your still battling that rare form of Tourette's Syndrome.
>
> Looks like you need to go to Hair Club For men and Jenny Craig.

There's a hair club for Jenny Craig?

Dave has a bad comb-over and his fat belly makes him look like he's
about 8 months pregnant. Given this along with his wrinkled clothes that
he looks like he slept in for a week, he makes such a good impression...
> With that small skull he really looks like Baby Huey.

Your powers of observation are lacking, Roger. I have a full head of
hair without even a hint of a bald spot. My hat size is 7 7/8 which is
considered "Large". If you like, I can post a photo of the top of my
head so that others won't engage in a "comb over" debate. Why is any of
this of interest to you, Roger?

> > > >based on our common interests rather than the things which divide us.
> > >
> > > Yeah, those common interests being not helping newer hams......
> >
> > How could you come to that conclusion?
>
> Unlike you, I don't pull my conclusions out of my ass, goat blower Davey.

Where'd they come from then?

> > You haven't been attending
> > meetings.
>
> When some new hams needed help, they didn't get it, fuckstick.

Who are the new hams who needed help? What was the help requested of me
and why wasn't it provided? You seem to be a little short on facts
here. Care to comment on the fact that you don't attend meetings and
would have no way to know about anything which goes on unless overheard
by you on a local repeater?

> > > > > The other alternative is to start my own club. I tried it, but that was not too
> > > > > successful.
> > >
> > > btw, fuck off, High-el.
> >
> > BTW, forwarded your stuff to Chief Stenger in Glen Dale. It is about
> > the only way to make a case against someone who has no interpersonal
> > skills.
>
> BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHA..... you've said that ALL ALONG, DICKBREATH....

Yes, I have. That's because, as you aware from being paid a number of
visits, that is what I have been doing. What is your fixation with
homosexual oral sex? How would you, the non-Roger anonymous poster know
anything about what I've said all along? "Duuuh, How'd you know it was
me"?

> Maybe you need to give him another blowjob so he might pay attention
> to you next time..haven't heard a thing from him though

Is that how you write about your chief of police--a man who is on your
city council?

> ....some
> case, dickhead...... BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA...maybe it's because > I don't live in Glen Dale, Davey, not everybody who posts anon is your > obsession.

Maniacal laughter aside, Roger, is this another, "Duuuh, how'd you know
it was me"? Do you know how few anonymous posters post items about me
filled with nonsense rants about child pornography, sex with children,
homosexual oral sex, fixations with body odor and wrinkled apparel?

> > Ta-Ta for now.
>
> Your not-so-Closeted homosexuality, noted.

You fascination with homosexuality is noted.

Dave K8MN

950. Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 15:51:09 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93D478705383elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 74314

So far, Switzerland, the UK and Belgium have axed the CW test.

The IARU modified s25.5 effective the 5th of July so that CW testing would be optional for administrations.

Switzerland announced on the 6th of July that letters would be sent out to all class 2 hams giving provisional access to HF from receipt of the letter. By the 15th of July most Swiss hams had their letters. HB still has a Class 3 licence with only 2m/70cm, but no CW test is required for any licence.

The UK abolished CW as a requirement effective the 26th of July. The licence structure is now Full, Intermediate and Foundation with different power levels. Foundation licencees cannot use 10m. CW tests are still available for a proficiency certificate for reciprocal operating.

Belgium abolished the CW test on the 4th of August. Class 2s have to apply for a Class 1 licence to use HF, but it only takes three days to get one, and no CW test is required. I understand that ON has also now introduced a Foundation licence.

Apparently, 'Funkamateur' magazine reported (incorrectly) that Germany would abolish CW testing on the 6th of August, but nothing happened. Now DARC (the German ham soceity) reports that from the 15th of August German hams with Class 2 licences will be able to use their existing calls on HF.

The German text follows:

RTA im BMWA
Klasse 2: Jetzt geht es weiter!
(11.08.03/js) Ab 15. August 2003 d&#65533;rfen in Deutschland Inhaber der CEPT-Klasse-2 mit ihrem pers&#65533;nlichen Rufzeichen die Kurzwellenb&#65533;nder unter Einhaltung der daf&#65533;r g&#65533;ltigen Bedingungen benutzten. Dies teilten die Mitarbeiter des BMWA dem RTA-Vorsitzenden bei einer Besprechung mit. Das BMWA wird dazu noch in eine gesonderte Pressemitteilung ver&#65533;ffentlichen. Weitere Einzelheiten folgen.

951. Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 15:51:38 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93D478850369Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 74315
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

So far, Switzerland, the UK and Belgium have axed the CW test.

The IARU modified s25.5 effective the 5th of July so that CW testing would be optional for administrations.

Switzerland announced on the 6th of July that letters would be sent out to all class 2 hams giving provisional access to HF from receipt of the letter. By the 15th of July most Swiss hams had their letters. HB still has a Class 3 licence with only 2m/70cm, but no CW test is required for any licence.

The UK abolished CW as a requirement effective the 26th of July. The licence structure is now Full, Intermediate and Foundation with different power levels. Foundation licencees cannot use 10m. CW tests are still available for a proficiency certificate for reciprocal operating.

Belgium abolished the CW test on the 4th of August. Class 2s have to apply for a Class 1 licence to use HF, but it only takes three days to get one, and no CW test is required. I understand that ON has also now introduced a Foundation licence.

Apparently, 'Funkamateur' magazine reported (incorrectly) that Germany would abolish CW testing on the 6th of August, but nothing happened. Now DARC (the German ham soceity) reports that from the 15th of August German hams with Class 2 licences will be able to use their existing calls on HF.

The German text follows:

RTA im BMWA
Klasse 2: Jetzt geht es weiter!
(11.08.03/js) Ab 15. August 2003 d�rfen in Deutschland Inhaber der CEPT-Klasse-2 mit ihrem pers�nlichen Rufzeichen die Kurzwellenb�nder unter Einhaltung der daf�r g�ltigen Bedingungen benutzten. Dies teilten die Mitarbeiter des BMWA dem RTA-Vorsitzenden bei einer Besprechung mit. Das BMWA wird dazu noch in eine gesonderte Pressemitteilung ver�ffentlichen. Weitere Einzelheiten folgen.

952. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 16:13:44 UTC
From: K3UD <K3UD@charter.net>
Message-ID: <110820031113444794%K3UD@charter.net>
Source record: 74316

In article <EasZa.3153$nJ6.119@news02.roc.ny>, Jim Hampton
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:

> A couple of other questions for you Keith.
> BPL uses frequencies between 1.8 and 80 MHz.
>
> Question #1: Does 27 MHz CB fall between 1.8 and 80 MHz?
>
> Question #2: Do HF radio astronomy posts use frequencies between 1.8 and 80
> MHz?
>
> Question #3: Does WWV use frequencies between 1.8 and 80 MHz?
>
> Question #4: Do HF aeronautical frequencies lie between 1.8 and 80 MHz?
>
> Question #5: Do HF foreign broadcasters use frequencies between 1.8 and 80
> MHz?
>
> Question #6: Will SWLs be impacted by the answer to question #5?
>
> Question #7: I see you provide a link to short wave. Just what do you
> think short wave is? (BIG hint: HF; 3 to 30 MHz, just what is being
> impacted).
>
> Question #8: I see you provide a link to scanners. You are aware that many
> scanners go down to 30 MHz or so (some lower) and even VHF frequencies to 80
> MHz are affected.
>
> Question #9: What are the frequencies occupied by the lowest channels of
> television in the United States? (Hint, channel two runs between 54 MHz and
> 60 MHz). Do these frequencies lie between 1.8 and 80 MHz?
>
>
> Now think about those questions for a while.
>
> These are just simple starter questions; it gets worse the deeper you dig.
> Now go back to your room and shut the padded door :)
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
Jim, to add a few to your list........

Question #10 Do TV Channels 2 through 5 use spectrum in this range?

Question #11 Do you know that even with Digital TV that broadcasters will still have to broadcast on the old frequencies until about 80% of the households in their class A & B coverage areas upgrade to digital? This means that VHF over the air brodcast will likely go on well past 1996.

Question #12 Do you know that RC aircraft use spectrum in the 70 MHz range for control?

Question #13 Did you know that there are literally millions of RC flyers out ther and some of these aircraft tip the scales at over 30 pounds, are powered by actual tubojet engines and can approach 300 MPH?

Question #14 Do you really believe that the cutoff frequency will be sharp enough to stop interference to at least the upper part of AM broadcast and the lower part of FM broadcast?

73
George
K3UD

953. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 18:15:07 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <L2RZa.399$dj3.65741@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74317

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bh87ki$ur2$1@208.207.71.147...
>
>
> Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
> > > If you're serious it only means that YOU don't understand Shannon's
work
> > >The channel bandwidth limit is central to any application Shannon 's
theory.
> >
> > They why we can increase the SNR and get more channel capacity
> > regardless of the bandwidth? Sounds like bandwidth isn't so
> > central after all, eh?
>
> When you can increase the SNR by narrowing the bandwidth? I knew you
> has your head on bassackwards.

Dick, your technical ignorance is showing TWOFOLD.

First, Floyd said "the SNR and get more channel capacity
> > regardless of the bandwidth" ... which is clearly true.

Second, you said "When you can increase the SNR by narrowing
the bandwidth? I knew you has your head on bassackwards."

You certainly CAN increase SNR by narrowing the bandwidth.
Since noise is essentially constant across the spectrum, it can
be measured in noise power per unit bandwidth (noise power/Hz).
Thus, in a 1 kHz bandwidth, there will be 1000x more noise
power (30 log 10) than in a 1 Hz bandwidth. Thus, the noise floor
is lower in narrower bandwidths.

What part of this don't you get? (How did you pass the Extra test
anyway???)

Carl - wk3c

954. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 18:22:33 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh8mt9$v3u$0@208.207.71.129>
Source record: 74318

Dave Heil wrote:

> > So why so do you give him so much attention?
>
> A smart fellow would have figured out that laughing at Len isn't exactly
> an endorsement of his views.

No question about it, that describes the situation in a nutshell.

955. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 18:41:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811144119.20962.00000451@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 74319

>How did you pass the Extra test
>anyway???)
>
>Carl - wk3c

Dont know how he did, but will bet all you did was Memorize the Q&As. Besides, why did it take you over a year to upgrade. I know, it took you that long to memoruze the Q&As.

956. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 19:22:39 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87he4ongn4.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74320

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>
>> The problem is you are comparing two different data rates
>> through the same channel. PSK-31 runs at 31.5 bits per second.
>> If you used CW at that rate, it works out to about 37.8 wpm.
>> Are you telling me *you* can copy 35 wpm using a 200 Hz filter
>> when there is Doppler distortion from auroral activity?
>>
>
> No, you idiot- do you come from the same village as Burke?-
>What I said is that we REAL HAMS have no NEED to invoke laboratory nonsense
>to interfere with our on the air operation!
> ANd they are NOT THROUGH THE SAME 31 cycle channel! They both come through the channel
tha *I*
>set, not Shannon, which was a 2.4 kc channel which is modifiable by all those snazzy IF

Sounds as if you, like Larry Roll, don't want to have anything
to do with any of that "Empirical Theory" stuff of his, eh?

Perhaps I remembered the previous discussion incorrectly? Were
you using a 2.4 KHz channel, or a 200 Hz channel? In either
case the agc, and hence SNR, are affected by the noise in that
channel, not the 30Hz filter in DSP software.

But once again, Shannon *does* apply to everything you've got there.
If you want to actually understand it, that is the *only* way to
explain it.

Or you can continue to be a glorified CB operator.

>> In fact, what you've done is demonstrate that Shannon's work
>> *does* apply to ham radio! PSK-31 is an m-ary channel using
>> QPSK (where m = 4), which trades signal to noise ratio for
>> bandwidth to obtain the same data rate as it would using
>> straight phase modulation.
>>
>> What *you* should be saying is that your experience demonstrates
>> that Shannon's theories prove true in the practical application
>> of ham radio. When the SNR is low, CW can be useful, albeit at
>> very low data rates, if restricted bandwidth is a requirement.
>> Of course, if the bandwidth wasn't restricted to 200 Hz, almost
>> any variation on PSK modulation would out run CW for efficiency,
>> as can easily be demonstrated using Shannon's formula.
>>
>

>Yeah, Frosty, most of us know all that, it's been well
>published, and quoted here for some time. But it still has no
>applicability to ham radio outside the theoretical.

Apparently your Empirical Theory is a little sparse there DICK.

Why and how do you think PSK-31 was invented to begin with? It clearly does have practical benefits, and when you attempted to use PSK-31 you *were* making use of those benefits.

>Yep, Shannon was a mathematical genius. I guess it makes you
>feel good just to think about it all, doesn't it? But any ham
>*of experience* could have told you how it worked long before
>Shannon came along! No math needed, beyond that which one does

If that is so, then just exactly why didn't they? No Ham did tell anyone how it worked. _Nobody_ knew! What they knew up to that point was what Nyquist and Hartley had figured out. But once again, that won't be part of your "Empirical Theory" experience will it...

Tell us just how many hams were experimenting with m-ary encoding schemes prior to 1947. (Just try to find any that had even heard of it!)

>automatically in your head as conditions show need for changing
>a receiving parameter... But you can't know any of that,
>you're not an active ham, you just hold a license.....

So if I was to get on the air and talk to folks like you and Larry I, like you, would be less concerned with "Empirical Theory", eh?

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

957. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 19:25:47 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87d6fcnghw.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74321

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
>> > If you're serious it only means that YOU don't understand Shannon's work
>> >The channel bandwidth limit is central to any application Shannon 's theory.
>>
>> They why we can increase the SNR and get more channel capacity
>> regardless of the bandwidth? Sounds like bandwidth isn't so
>> central after all, eh?
>
> When you can increase the SNR by narrowing the bandwidth? I knew you
>has your head on bassackwards.

Increase the SNR by narrowing the bandwidth???? That doesn't work!
(Do you know what Gaussian distribution means.???)

You increase the SNR, regardless of the bandwidth, by increasing the
signal level DICK. Probably an idea you've never thought about, eh?
Too close to Empirical Theory, no doubt.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

958. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 19:27:18 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <878yq0ngfd.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74322

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>Brian wrote:
>
>> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bh768l$h1d$0@208.207.71.142>...
>> >
>> > Your village is calling again.....
>>
>> Yet you answer the phone...
>
>"Brian, it's for you....."

They don't want to talk to an idiot?

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com
```

959. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 19:36:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F37F02F.5090703@psu.edu>
Source record: 74323
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Alun Palmer wrote:
> So far, Switzerland, the UK and Belgium have axed the CW test.

Snip

Okay Alun, we got it the first time.. or two.. or three.. or four.. 8^)

- mike KB3EIA -

960. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 19:41:52 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh8ri0$a5r$0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 74324

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>>>y why we can increase the SNR and get more channel capacity
>>>regardless of the bandwidth? Sounds like bandwidth isn't so
>>>central after all, eh?
>>>
>>>
>> When you can increase the SNR by narrowing the bandwidth? I knew you
>>has your head on bassackwards.
>>
>>
>
>Dick, your technical ignorance is showing TWOFOLD.
>
>First, Floyd said "the SNR and get more channel capacity
>
>
>>>regardless of the bandwidth" ... which is clearly true.
>>>

>>>
>>>
>
>Second, you said "When you can increase the SNR by narrowing
>the bandwidth? I knew you has your head on bassackwards."
>
>You certainly CAN increase SNR by narrowing the bandwidth.
>

Which is EXACTLY the meaning of what I said in question form!
Uh, Carl, where'd you learn to read?
You don't think that "bandwidth is central" when you can increase
SNR by narrowing bandwidth? What physics do you and Frosty practice?
Surely not the same that ALL hams do. Narrowing the bandwidth to eliminate
noise and other interference IS the most common way to get it done, for
darn
sure within ham radio.

>Since noise is essentially constant across the spectrum,
>

No, it isn't, although I understand the concept of assuming it to be so
for any
reasonably narrow slice of spectrum under consideration.

> it can
>be measured in noise power per unit bandwidth (noise power/Hz).
>Thus, in a 1 kHz bandwidth, there will be 1000x more noise
>power (30 log 10) than in a 1 Hz bandwidth. Thus, the noise floor
>is lower in narrower bandwidths.
>
>What part of this don't you get?
>

Where'd you get the idea that I don't get this???

That's EXACTlY what I said when I asked

"When you can increase the SNR by narrowing
the bandwidth?"

>(How did you pass the Extra test
>anyway???)
>
>

I'm beginning to wonder how you made it out of elementary school

I sure passed it long, long, long, long before you did, and at the FCC
district office!
Didn't miss a single question, either- you watch the grader's pencil
hand to see how many
check marks he/she makes. In my case it was none.

If you and your other buddy with limited or NO amateur radio experience
had spent some time on the CW bands WORKING CW instead of bitching about
the code test maybe you'd know some of this stuff without having to
resort to
an obscure theory that isn't even mentioned until third year of a
college EE program,
never appeared ANYWHERE in the amateur radio technical literature until
recently,
and only briefly in electrical engineering handbooks. You're absolutely
FIXATED on
insisting that all hams MUST have engineering level; knowledge and
experience in
manipulating Information Theory at the laboratory level.

What a load of Bullshit! ALL of radio got along quite well for a half
century before
Shannon ever thought it up, and after he did there was virtually no use
for it until the advent
of DSP chips.

So why don't you join Frosty out on the tundra and do a ritual dance to
celebrate Shannon
and all his math?

OBIT-- want work some DX? Here's my log from last night on ~14.010,
just sitting at the computer with the radio headphones on and idly
listening to what
was going on---

CYO
RN6AT
SV1LV

Betcha you won't catch many of those folks on 20 meter SSB these days.

And I didn't have to give Shannon a single thought.

961. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 19:46:55 UTC
From: "Gareth (G1LVN)" <gareth@mycallsign.freeserve.co.uk>
Message-ID: <bh8s5u$js4$1@news8.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 74325
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:3F37F02F.5090703@psu.edu...
> Alun Palmer wrote:
> > So far, Switzerland, the UK and Belgium have axed the CW test.
>
> Snip
>
>
> Okay Alun, we got it the first time.. or two.. or three.. or four.. 8^)
>
I'd like to personally invite all subscribers of rec.radio.amateur to join
uk.radio.amateur. Come on in! - the water's lovely.

--
73 de G1LVN
Gateway details at: www.g1lvn.org.uk
(change "mycallsign" to reply by email)
send spam to abuse@theplanet.net

962. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 20:01:40 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh8sn4$c2r$0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 74326

Floyd Davidson wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
>>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>
>>
>>>The problem is you are comparing two different data rates
>>>through the same channel. PSK-31 runs at 31.5 bits per second.
>>>If you used CW at that rate, it works out to about 37.8 wpm.
>>>Are you telling me *you* can copy 35 wpm using a 200 Hz filter
>>>when there is Doppler distortion from auroral activity?
>>>
>>>
>>>
>> No, you idiot- do you come from the same village as Burke?-
>>What I said is that we REAL HAMS have no NEED to invoke laboratory nonsense
>>to interfere with our on the air operation!
>>ANd they are NOT THROUGH THE SAME 31 cycle channel! They both come through the channel
tha *I*
>>set, not Shannon, which was a 2.4 kc channel which is modifiable by all those snazzy IF
>>
>>
>
>
>But once again, Shannon *does* apply to everything you've got there.
>*If* you want to actually understand it, that is the *only* way to
>explain it.
>
>

NOOO, it doesn't apply. It applies when one has a need to analyze a
channel with an intent
to maximize data throughput. In 48 years in ham radio I've never
encountered a single time when
such a situation presented itself.

>Or you can continue to be a glorified CB operator.
>
>

And you *really* expect us tp believe you've never once been on CB when
you've spent
all that time where CB was a major communciations venue in an extremely

rural community
where communications is not just a convenenience, but a vital
necessity? Yeah, Right Frostbite.
We believe you. NOT!

>
>
>>>In fact, what you've done is demonstrate that Shannon's work
>>>*does* apply to ham radio! PSK-31 is an m-ary channel using
>>>QPSK (where m = 4), which trades signal to noise ratio for
>>>bandwidth to obtain the same data rate as it would using
>>>straight phase modulation.
>>>
>>>

And tyhe answer here is "So what? It wouldn't function **in an amateur
radio
communications channel** at a time and under conditions did allow CW to
function properly. Now as far as I, as a radio amateur, am concerned, that
is the pertinent fact, not that theoretically, and actually under
identical narrow
bandwidth conditions, that would not be true.

I leave it to you and your obviously flawed amateur radio buddies,
Kandid Karl and
Putzy Poo , to do as you wish, when you wish with Shannon's stuff. I
have no need for
any of it. Of course it's of interest, and explains how some of this
stuff works, mathematically
as though serious numbers of hams were actually involved in such
computations. They are not,
as you SHOULD know but clearly do not. Hell, memorizing a few
question/answer pairs
to get on the air and yak (should I say as you do?) won't have a clue
what you're
chattering about. I do. I know that they won't have any need to bother
with it.

Ask Carl's buddy W5YI what *HE* wants to do with the tests.

963. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 20:09:58 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <cuvyxnansvbet.hjgswns.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74327

On 10 Aug 2003 22:22:00 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hjetrgn.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
>
>"QRZ the Kilo Two, again please?"

The DELETE key ate my reply and I don;t even remember what it was.

Ain't modern technology wonderful ??

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

964. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 20:10:04 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh8t6s$d6h$0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 74328

Floyd Davidson wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
>>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>>If you're serious it only means that YOU don't understand Shannon's work
>>>>The channel bandwidth limit is central to any application Shannon 's theory.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>They why we can increase the SNR and get more channel capacity
>>>regardless of the bandwidth? Sounds like bandwidth isn't so
>>>central after all, eh?
>>>
>>>
>>When you can increase the SNR by narrowing the bandwidth? I knew you
>>has your head on bassackwards.
>>
>>
>
>Increase the SNR by narrowing the bandwidth???? That doesn't work!
>

Maybe it doesn't work for yoiu, you frosty old "professional" , but it
sure works for me and
scads of other ham radio operators!

>(Do you know what Gaussian distribution means.???)
>

I've seen the term somewhere, but hey, you know what? When I was working I
had a REAL job keeping a real, live radio communicatiions system working
and fixing
whatever part of it broke, not just wondering around BSing the
administration by tossing
out the big words to keep 'em snowed. Sorry your experience varies.

>
>You increase the SNR, regardless of the bandwidth, by increasing the
>signal level DICK.
>

Well, so much for your technical knowledge if THAT"S all you know
about it. Any experienced
ham, even without ANY tech schooling whatever, knows better than that.

Better check with your buddy Carl, I think he does too.

> Probably an idea you've never thought about, eh?
>Too close to Empirical Theory, no doubt.
>
>
>

965. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 20:15:26 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh8tgudpp0@208.206.142.92>
Source record: 74329

Dick Carroll; wrote:

>
>
> OBIT-- want work some DX? Here's my log from last night on ~14.010,
> just sitting at the computer with the radio headphones on and idly
> listening to what
> was going on---
>
> CYO
> RN6AT
> SV1LV

See what6 can happenm when yoiu DO use a spellchecker? Changes things
you really didn't want changed!

Ahould have been---

OBTW-- want work some DX? Here's my log from last night on ~14.010,
just sitting at the computer with the radio headphones on and idly
listening to what
was going on (and catching them as they came along)---

CY9A
RN6AT
SV1LV

966. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 20:18:22 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <871xvsne29.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74330

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>>
>>Dick, your technical ignorance is showing TWOFOLD.
>>
>>First, Floyd said "the SNR and get more channel capacity
>>
>>
>>>>>>regardless of the bandwidth" ... which is clearly true.
>>>>>
>>
>>Second, you said "When you can increase the SNR by narrowing
>>the bandwidth? I knew you has your head on bassackwards."
>>
>>You certainly CAN increase SNR by narrowing the bandwidth.
>>
>
>
> Which is EXACTLY the meaning of what I said in question form!
>Uh, Carl, where'd you learn to read?

Where did you learn to communicate?

If you increase the SNR by decreasing the bandwidth, you *don't*
get any increase in the channel capacity. What have you gained?

Nothing...

On the other hand, if you increase the SNR by leaving the
bandwidth as it is, and increase the signal level, you get more
capacity!

>You don't think that "bandwidth is central" when you can increase
>SNR by narrowing bandwidth? What physics do you and Frosty practice?

Try physics that actually accomplish something. What you are
suggesting has no effect on channel capacity.

>Surely not the same that ALL hams do. Narrowing the bandwidth to eliminate
>noise and other interference IS the most common way to get it done, for
>darn
>sure within ham radio.

It also reduces the channel capacity. At 500 Hz, with CW, you
are limited to what? 40 wpm or so for a good CW operator.

But with a 2.1 KHz bandwidth they could use SSB, for example,
and transfer *many* *many* times more information.

By *your* methods of comparision, you've just proven that SSB is
more efficient than CW.

(Of course, using your methods we could "prove" almost
anything!)

>>Since noise is essentially constant across the spectrum,
>>
>
> No, it isn't, although I understand the concept of assuming it to be so
>for any
>reasonably narrow slice of spectrum under consideration.
>
>
>> it can
>>be measured in noise power per unit bandwidth (noise power/Hz).
>>Thus, in a 1 kHz bandwidth, there will be 1000x more noise
>>power (30 log 10) than in a 1 Hz bandwidth. Thus, the noise floor
>>is lower in narrower bandwidths.
>>
>>What part of this don't you get?
>>
>
> Where'd you get the idea that I don't get this???
>
>That's EXACTlY what I said when I asked
>
>"When you can increase the SNR by narrowing
>the bandwidth?"

The answer is: you get no change in the channel capacity.

>>(How did you pass the Extra test
>>anyway???)
>>
>>
>
>I'm beginning to wonder how you made it out of elementary school
>
>I sure passed it long, long, long, long before you did, and at the FCC
>district office!
>Didn't miss a single question, either- you watch the grader's pencil
>hand to see how many
>check marks he/she makes. In my case it was none.

Yes, and here you are years later *proving* that none of that
was accomplishing a darned thing, because obviously *you* passed
so it can't have been working correctly. That's exactly why
none of that is now required.

>If you and your other buddy with limited or NO amateur radio experience
>had spent some time on the CW bands WORKING CW instead of bitching about

I'll bet that I have more time actually copying CW than you do!

>the code test maybe you'd know some of this stuff without having to
>resort to
>an obscure theory that isn't even mentioned until third year of a
>college EE program,
>never appeared ANYWHERE in the amateur radio technical literature until
>recently,
>and only briefly in electrical engineering handbooks. You're absolutely
>FIXATED on
>insisting that all hams MUST have engineering level; knowledge and
>experience in
>manipulating Information Theory at the laboratory level.

Hmmm... you mean hams are that ignorant as a rule???

I don't believe you. I think it's just you and Larry.

>What a load of Bullshit! ALL of radio got along quite well for a half
>century before
>Shannon ever thought it up, and after he did there was virtually no use
>for it until the advent
>of DSP chips.

More of your ignorance. As I've pointed out previously, the
entire direction of communications technology switched gears
immediately after Shannon published his works. DSP chips were a
result of Shannon's work, not something that enabled Shannon.

>So why don't you join Frosty out on the tundra and do a ritual dance to
>celebrate Shannon
>and all his math?
>
>
>OBIT-- want work some DX? Here's my log from last night on ~14.010,
>just sitting at the computer with the radio headphones on and idly
>listening to what
>was going on---
>
>CYO
>RN6AT
>SV1LV
>
>Betcha you won't catch many of those folks on 20 meter SSB these days.
>
>And I didn't have to give Shannon a single thought.

With no brain to use for thinking, how could you have?

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

967. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 20:28:04 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87wudklz1n.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74331

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>> "Again, power level is only one of three inter-related
>> parameters. If they are not all equal, then the playing field
>> is not level. Your being able to copy the CW ID, which has an
>> equivalent 12dB power advantage, is like saying a 150w SSB
>> signal is easier to copy than a 1w CW signal. It's true but it
>> is also meaningless.
>>
>> Thanks to DICK CARROLL'S LOGIC, SSB can be proven to be
>> superior to CW every time. That follows from ignoring any of
>> the throughput parameters."
>>
>> Cecil, W6RCA
>>
>> Another way of looking at it, is that Shannon's "rules" do
>> apply, and that is virtually *always* the case in ham radio.
>>
>
>
>
> Cecil was spreading bullshit, just as you are.Shannon simply will not reveal which mode

YOU are the one who wanted to claim he could compare the
efficiency of CW and PSK-31.

Cecil is *exactly* right, and you are totally wrong. The *only*
way you can compare the two is by using Shannon's work to level
the field and get an accurate comparison.

You can deny that from now until your Extra Class ham ticket
rolls up in hides itself in embarrassment at having your name on
it, but it is still precisely true.

>is useful and which is not under the conditions which ham radio operators work. When PSK31
>won't function within it's own 30 hz channel, but the CWID *WILL* work within the 2.4 khz
>channel in use for both, it makes the solution very simple- CW is the mode of choice! To

SSB will work even better. What's your point?

>insist that the PSK is the "more efficient" when it is useless is far beyond stupid. It is

To insist that CW is "more efficient" when it is so slow is
beyond stupid, eh?

>more efficient only in it's own individual environment. Ham radio operators - that is,
>those who actually get on the air and learn how to USE all these modes, know how to sort
>it out, and did long before Shannon ever came along.

>
> Now, *thats the way things work in the real world* where hams actually get on the air
>and use radiocommunications. I know, you and The Putz have no real world experience in
>such things, so you have nothing else to fall back on.You can do whatever theorizing you
>wish off the air.

Making false claims for just how much "real world experience"
one can get from operating CW, or anything else on ham bands,
isn't going to do you much good.

> As for Carl Stevenson, well he's still stuck on 20 meter Single Sideband Voice.
>I guess he's awaiting the arrival of all the Freebanders and their new no-code "Extra
>Class" licenses to show up so he'll have someone to talk to.

But he *does* know how it works. That tops you every day.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

968. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 20:36:34 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87smo8lynh.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74332

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>
>>But once again, Shannon *does* apply to everything you've got there.
>>*If* you want to actually understand it, that is the *only* way to
>>explain it.
>
> NOOO, it doesn't apply. It applies when one has a need to analyze a
>channel with an intent
>to maximize data throughput. In 48 years in ham radio I've never
>encountered a single time when
>such a situation presented itself.

YOU are the one who was making comparisons between modes for
which is the most "efficient". In your 48 years in ham radio,
do you happen to remember that *you* not only encountered that
situation, but presented it here for discussion?

>>Or you can continue to be a glorified CB operator.
>>
>>
>
>
>And you *really* expect us tp believe you've never once been on CB when
>you've spent
>all that time where CB was a major communciations venue in an extremely
>rural community
>where communications is not just a convenenience, but a vital
>necessity? Yeah, Right Frostbite.
>We believe you. NOT!

Your ignorance is showing again. I've never owned a CB radio.
I've had an operational CB radio in my home or at work.

And I've never lived where CB was used as a "major
communications venue".

Where do you get such odd ideas? I even posted an article here
once that went into that in some detail too, but you seem to have
misunderstood what was said. Why don't you go back and *read* it
this time.

> And tyhe answer here is "So what? It wouldn't function **in an amateur
>radio
>communications channel** at a time and under conditions did allow CW to
>function properly. Now as far as I, as a radio amateur, am concerned, that

>is the pertinent fact, not that theoretically, and actually under
>identical narrow
> bandwidth conditions, that would not be true.

All fine and dandy, except that you then try to say that means CW
is "more efficient". You haven't shown that at all. With your
methods we could assume using wideband TV is more efficient too.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

969. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 20:47:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F3800CB.7080600@psu.edu>
Source record: 74334

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
>
> Floyd Davidson wrote:

<some snippage>

>> You increase the SNR, regardless of the bandwidth, by increasing the
>> signal level DICK.
>>
>
> Well, so much for your technical knowledge if THAT"S all you know about
> it. Any experienced
> ham, even without ANY tech schooling whatever, knows better than that.

As a dilletante, I realize that in any ratio, there are two numbers.

So while it is quite possible to make the s/n ratio larger by
increasing the signal, it is equally possible, and sometimes much better
to increase the s/n ratio by lowering the noise. Sometimes it is the
only option available.

Seems like narrowing the bandwidth might just do that!

your humble hockey puck, 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

970. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 20:47:23 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87n0efncpw.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74333

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>>>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>>>If you're serious it only means that YOU don't understand Shannon's work
>>>>The channel bandwidth limit is central to any application Shannon 's theory.
>>>>
>>>>They why we can increase the SNR and get more channel capacity
>>>>regardless of the bandwidth? Sounds like bandwidth isn't so
>>>>central after all, eh?
>>>>
>>>When you can increase the SNR by narrowing the bandwidth? I knew you
>>>has your head on bassackwards.
>>>
>>
>>Increase the SNR by narrowing the bandwidth???? That doesn't work!
>
> Maybe it doesn't work for yoiu, you frosty old "professional" , but it
>sure works for me and
>scads of other ham radio operators!

It doesn't work to do what you said above, which is increase the
channel capacity.

The problem is you don't understand the theory and continue to
attribute various results to the wrong source, and applying it
to claims like your "proof" that CW is more efficient than
PSK-31.

>>(Do you know what Gaussian distribution means.???)
>>
>
>I've seen the term somewhere, but hey, you know what? When I was working I
>had a REAL job keeping a real, live radio communicatiions system working
>and fixing
>whatever part of it broke, not just wondering around BSing the
>administration by tossing
>out the big words to keep 'em snowed. Sorry your experience varies.

Well, maybe you worked at fixing CB rigs or something, I don't
know. Where I worked we put that kind of information to use on
a fairly regular basis. But then we dealt with thousands of
channels at a time, not just one.

>>You increase the SNR, regardless of the bandwidth, by increasing the
>>signal level DICK.

>>
>
> Well, so much for your technical knowledge if THAT"S all you know
>about it. Any experienced
>ham, even without ANY tech schooling whatever, knows better than that.

Oh, do you think changing the signal level will affect bandwidth???

That's a good one.

>Better check with your buddy Carl, I think he does too.

Carl knows *exactly* what I'm saying.

>> Probably an idea you've never thought about, eh?
>>Too close to Empirical Theory, no doubt.

More of your Empirical Theory.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

971. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 21:05:34 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh90eujae0@208.206.142.89>
Source record: 74335

Floyd Davidson wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
>>>Dick, your technical ignorance is showing TWOFOLD.
>>>
>>>First, Floyd said "the SNR and get more channel capacity
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>regardless of the bandwidth" ... which is clearly true.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>Second, you said "When you can increase the SNR by narrowing
>>>the bandwidth? I knew you has your head on bassackwards."
>>>
>>>You certainly CAN increase SNR by narrowing the bandwidth.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>Which is EXACTLY the meaning of what I said in question form!
>>Uh, Carl, where'd you learn to read?
>>
>>
>
>Where did you learn to communicate?
>
>If you increase the SNR by decreasing the bandwidth, you *don't*
>get any increase in the channel capacity. What have you gained?
>
>Nothing...
>

And now we see your ignorance come into full view, Frosty-- and why I
say that
Shannon has nothing to do with ham radio!.

Ask any experienced ham what you gain- and why they spend so much money
on narrow IF filters.

>On the other hand, if you increase the SNR by leaving the
>bandwidth as it is, and increase the signal level, you get more

>capacity!
>
>

Heh, heh.....sorta hard to do on a weaksignal DX station, Frosty.
Pardon, Your inexperience as a ham is showing!

>
>
>>You don't think that "bandwidth is central" when you can increase
>>SNR by narrowing bandwidth? What physics do you and Frosty practice?
>>
>>
>
>Try physics that actually accomplish something. What you are
>suggesting has no effect on channel capacity.
>

AH, we finally arrive at the core issue! The VERY reason I say that
Shannon has nothing
to do with ham radio.. One more time, with feeling---

"Maximum throughput is NEVER a requirement.or even an issue in ham
radio!!!!"

You see, Frosty, we NEVER need to do things like the military and some
commercials.
We don't use our radios to handle the most traffic the fastest it can be
handled. Anyone who
watdched the packet network disintegrate due to all the "store and
forward" nponsense that went on in teh late 80's knows of which I speak
Reams and reams of nott they sure passed a lot of it!

>
>
>
>>Surely not the same that ALL hams do. Narrowing the bandwidth to eliminate
>>noise and other interference IS the most common way to get it done, for
>>darn
>>sure within ham radio.
>>
>>
>
>It also reduces the channel capacity. At 500 Hz, with CW, you
>are limited to what? 40 wpm or so for a good CW operator.
>
>But with a 2.1 KHz bandwidth they could use SSB, for example,
>and transfer *many* *many* times more information.
>
>

Well, there you have it!

>By *your* methods of comparision, you've just proven that SSB is
>more efficient than CW.
>
>(Of course, using your methods we could "prove" almost
>anything!)
>

The world will note that the "proof" not mine at all, rather it's YOURS!

>
>
>
>>>Since noise is essentially constant across the spectrum,
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>No, it isn't, although I understand the concept of assuming it to be so
>>for any
>>reasonably narrow slice of spectrum under consideration.
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>>it can
>>>be measured in noise power per unit bandwidth (noise power/Hz).
>>>Thus, in a 1 kHz bandwidth, there will be 1000x more noise
>>>power (30 log 10) than in a 1 Hz bandwidth. Thus, the noise floor
>>>is lower in narrower bandwidths.
>>>
>>>What part of this don't you get?
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>Where'd you get the idea that I don't get this???
>>
>>That's EXACTlY what I said when I asked
>>
>>"When you can increase the SNR by narrowing
>>the bandwidth?"
>>
>>
>
>The answer is: you get no change in the channel capacity.
>

And we all already knew that, didn't we? ALso we *hams* knew that we
didn't inten d nor want to get more channel capacity! What *we* want is
to complete the intended communication!

> As I've pointed out previously, the
>entire direction of communications technology switched gears
>immediately after Shannon published his works.

>

You're a lightweifgh here t, Frosty, a number of the REAL learned from
academia have stated otherwise.

> DSP chips were a
>*result* of Shannon's work, not something that enabled Shannon.
>
>
>

And I Didn't say otherwise. However anyone famililar with any of this
will know that the DSP
chips were not possible until LSI technology matured, some 35 to 40
years after Shannon's
fantastic discovery.

972. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 21:12:04 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308111312.2a8895e3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74336

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93D34838F9CB6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20030810064427.21428.00001584@mb-m23.aol.com:
>
> > In article <Xns93D2733067496elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >
> >>>>> "Here" is all of Region 2. A big part of the world.
> >>>>
> >>>>No, only the USA, it's still phone in the rest of R2
> >>>
> >>> No, it isn't. Other modes are authorized, not just 'phone.
> >>>
> >>>>The point being, however, that phone is authorised there in every
> >>>>country but one
> >>
> >> OK, fine.
> >>
> >>>>>>I think you'll find it isn't being fixed.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Sure it is, but it will take time. Before the end of the decade
> >>>>> 7000-7200 will be worldwide exclusive amateur. That's double what
> >>>>> Region 1 and Region 3 have now. It will make sense for those
> >>>>> regions to move their 'phone up above 7100 and leave below 7100 to
> >>>>> CW and digital.
> >>>>
> >>>>Not while the US has CW in 7100-7150. As long as that's the case it
> >>>>makes more sense _to_them_ to leave 7000-7100 unchanged and split the
> >>>>'new' 7100-7200 50/50. Net gain to you - zero.
> >>>
> >>> If it gets the foreign 'phones off of 7030, it's a gain.
> >>>>
> >>>>>>The ARRL bandplan is the only
> >>>>>>one out of step, so nobody else is likely to change theirs,
> >>>>>>notwithstanding Europe and some other areas getting 7100-7200 as
> >>>>>>additional spectrum in 2007.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> What part of the world will not get 7100-7200?
> >>>>
> >>>>None
> >>>
> >>> There you are.
> >>>>

> >>>>> And why should Region 2 change now, with the band getting wider?
> >>>>
> >>>>You mean the US, and I don't suppose the ARRL will change
> >>>
> >>> It's not just ARRL but FCC.
> >>
> >>You're right, but it's not the rest of the region
> >
> > So because everyone else makes a mistake, the USA should make it too?
>
> This reminds me of an old comic strip. The proud mother is watching the
> passing out parade and calls out "Look at my Johnny, he's the only one in
> step!".

It reminds me of a different strip. The lemmings are rushing over the
cliff, and one grabs his ankles and yells "CANNONBALL!!!!"

> According to you, the USA is the only country in step in the
> parade.

Nope.

According to me, the USA has a better system and the other countries
haven;t caught on yet.

Here in the USA we have some roads reserved for autos only, and some
lanes reserved for car pools and transit buses. Act as incentives to
use more efficient means of transport. Also acknowledges the basic
incompatibility of small and large vehicles. Non-phone subbands act as
an incentive to use more efficient modes than analog voice, and
acknowledge the basic incompatibility between wide and narrow modes.
>
> >>>>>>All that will happen is that a DX window will
> >>>>>>appear from 7150-7200, but the DX will continue to use phone
> >>>>>>everywhere they use it now - indefinitely. Sorry to be the one to
> >>>>>>break that to you!
> >>>>>
> >>>>> So their lack of a bandplan and good manners should cause the USA
> >>>>> to follow their lead? I think not!
> >>>>
> >>>>They have a bandplan. Phone stays above at least 7040, except 7030 in
> >>>>R3.
> >>>
> >>> There are Canadians operating LSB on 7030.
> >
> >>I wasn't aware of that. That is against any bandplan that I know of,
> >>and I agree that it is bad manners
> >
> > Exactly. Main point is that bandplans are not much help if folks ignore
> > them.

And the only reason "DX windows" exist is so that foreign 'phones have
a place to go where they won't be buried by hordes of 1.5 KW USA
'phones. IOW, so the DX can work each other once in a while.
> >>
> >>>>That's not the bandplan you want, but it's a bandplan. The reference
> >>>>to good manners I don't follow.
> >>>
> >>> The folks who don't follow the bandplan have bad manners. Having a
> >>> Canadian SSB net on 7030 when they have 7000-7030 is bad manners.
> >>
> >>Agreed
> >
> > Thanks
> >>
> >>>>I don't expect the USA to follow anyone's lead. Just don't be
> >>>>surprised when no-one follows the USA's lead either.
> >>>
> >>> And the result is chaos.
> >>
> >>Yes it is. However, the rest of the world probably think that it would
> >>be easier for _one_ country to change than for 100+, which doesn't mean
> >>that I think it will happen.
> >
> > So even though the result is chaos, the USA should follow along and
> > make it that much worse?
>
> If the USA followed along it would no longer be chaos.

Yes, it would. In fact, it would be worse, because the DX would have
nowhere to hide.

Ask yourself this: Why do DX 'phones operate in the US CW/data
subbands at all if they can operate in the US 'phone subbands?

> As I say, though,
> I'm not holding my breath for that to happen.

> >>>>> 800 is pretty high. 600-700 is more common among CW ops. The SSB
> >>>>> audio passband is typically 300-2700 Hz, so 600 or even 800 is
> >>>>> pretty low. 1500 would be smack in the middle.
> >>>>
> >>>>True enough
> >>>>
> >>>>>>This of course would be what you
> >>>>>>would get if they netted onto the SSB and then offset by their
> >>>>>>usual amount.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> There is no offset in CW. The carriers are all on the same
> >>>>> frequency.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Point is that what sounds like "right on top" may not sound that
> >>>>>>> way to the other guy.

>
> >>>>>>It depends which side of the nominal carrier frequency the CW
> >>>>>>signal is on. However, assuming my SSB filter is working, I would
> >>>>>>say they were low, i.e. on the same side as the LSB sideband, or I
> >>>>>>would be filtering them out. This also puts them almost in the
> >>>>>>middle of the SSB signal, doesn't it?
> >>>>>
> >>>>> No. Their tone would be 1500 if it were in the middle.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Listen to a busy CW contest with a wide (AM bandwidth) rx and it
> >>>>>>> sounds like a pile of intentional inteference. Switch in
> >>>>>>> appropriate filters and you find that almost all of the stations
> >>>>>>> have spaced themselves so they don't overlap.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> Neither am I
> >>>>>>>> talking about weak phone stations, although they could be weak
> >>>>>>>> at some other QTH.
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> That's another point.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> > Of course the DX 'phones could have switched to CW and
> >>>>>>>> > answered the CQers, then politely asked them to move.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> But they didn't, did they?
> >
> > I guess not.
> >>>>>>>> >
> >>>>>>>> > *My Southgate Type 7 has two cascaded 8 pole 500 Hz crystal
> >>>>>>>> > filters, giving an effective bandwidth of less than 400 Hz and
> >>>>>>>> > very steep filter skirts. And it has an audio LC filter as
> >>>>>>>> > well.
> >>>>>>>> >
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> So, if say, you called QRU? on 7080 and there was a strong
> >>>>>>>> signal SSB QSO in progress, would you be able to tell? This is a
> >>>>>>>> genuine question.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> I would listen first and steer clear of anyhting that sounds like
> >>>>>>> SSB. Then I'd send "IE" a few times to test the waters. If I
> >>>>>>> heard something start up when I did that, I'd move.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> But usually I am below 7060. Above about 7060 is data and foreign
> >>>>>>> SSB country.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>> I
> >>>>>>>> don't posses a CW filter.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> One of the reasons some hams get turned off to CW is that they
> >>>>>>> use equipment that really isn't meant for the mode. Most HF rigs
> >>>>>>> today are primarily SSB rigs with CW tacked on. Some are pretty

> >>>>>>> good, many are awful.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>If I need it I have an outboard audio filter
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Ugh. Audio filters are no substitute for IF filtering. And unless
> >>>>> the AGC is turned off, QRM can dominate the receiver.
> >>>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>True, but I don't really need a narrow CW filter for anything
> >>>
> >>> Data modes.
> >>
> >>If I ever get around to trying any
>
> >>>>>>(a Radio Shack DSP unit,
> >>>>>>which is fairly basic and suffers from low audio output). I hadn't
> >>>>>>thought about that when I said I had no CW filter. It tends to
> >>>>>>'take off' on 20 with RF getting inside it, but it's OK on 40.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> What sort of rig?
> >>>>
> >>>>I use an IC-729 in my shack. Excellent receiver RF performance.
> >>>
> >>> Compared to what? No offense, but there are some really good rigs out
> >>> there.
> >>
> >>The reviews at the time said it was comparable with anything regardless
> >>of price bracket in _basic_ receiver performance, but that was back in
> >>'92. I expect the world has moved on, and it never was loaded with
> >>features.
> >
> > You might want to compare it to more modern stuff. The Ten Tec and
> > Elecraft websites have various receiver performance measures of
> > different rigs, as actually measured.
> >>
> >>What do you use, anyway?
> >>
> > My homebrew 100 watt transceiver and an Elecraft K2 built from a kit.
> >
>
> I hope your K2 doesn't drift, unlike one that I heard on the bands.

It doesn't. I have had it for over two years now and it's done very
well.

> Of
> course, that may have been due to the person who put it together.

The classic problem with kits is that they are only as good as the
builder.

>
> >>>>Not very
> >>>>good audio, though. Ironically it has nowhere to fit a narrow SSB
> >>>>filter, but has a place for a CW filter (nothing in there, of
> >>>>course).
> >>>
> >>> Couldn't a narrow SSB filter be put in the CW slot?
> >>
> >>Yes, but without making any further mods it would be selected when the
> >>mode was set to 'CW-N'.
> >
> > There must be a mod for it.
>
> I haven't seen one so far, but you would think it could be done.

Be the first....

>
> >>
> >>>>Not the
> >>>>Rolls Royce of radios, but I'm not overloaded with cash.
> >>>
> >>> The Southgate Type 7 cost me less than $100 to build.
> >>>>
> >>>>>>>> I am guessing you would hear something,though?
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Depends on the situation. Usually SSB sounds like monkey chatter
> >>>>>>> through a narrow filter. But near the edges it can be very weak
> >>>>>>> or inaudible.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>As I've explained, I think this is going on in the middle of the
> >>>>>>SSB sigs, which is another reason to be suspicious
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Sure. But 1500 is the middle, not 800.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>> The best solution is for wide and narrow modes to have their own
> >>>>>>> subbands. They simply don't mix well.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>Yes
> >>>>>
> >>>>> So when will the rest of the world get on the beam and have
> >>>>> nonphone subbands?
> >>>>
> >>>>They do, and they have done as long as I remember. In some countries
> >>>>they are voluntary, and in others they are compulsory, but nowhere
> >>>>are they as wide as in the USA.
> >>>
> >>> Time for them to get on the beam, then.
> >>
> >>Depends what you mean - widen them or make them compulsory?
> >

> > Both - just like the USA.
> >
> >>There is no
> >>expansion of CW use to justify the former,
> >
> > Yes, there is. Look at participation in contests as just one measure.
> > CW up, phone flat.
> >
>
> Contesters, the really serious kind, use whatever mode is specified in the
> rules. If the rules said semaphore they'd learn that too.

Almost all contests have separate CW and 'phone weekends. (FD and ARRL
160 are the exceptions that prove the rule). The ham population can
choose to operate one, both, or neither. CW participation is UP while
'phone is flat.

>
> >>and most administrations don't
> >>really care what hams do within the ham bands. I suspect that, for
> >>example, Industry Canada don't even care about Canadian hams annoying
> >>other Canadian hams by operating phone on CW frequencies.
> >
> > Then you can expect more of the behavior you have complained about.
> >
>
> Perhaps

Count on it. Remember the story of the Tower of Babel?

73 de Jim, N2EY

973. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 21:15:03 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh910n$kb8$0@208.206.142.89>
Source record: 74337

Floyd Davidson wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
>>> "Again, power level is only one of three inter-related
>>> parameters. If they are not all equal, then the playing field
>>> is not level. Your being able to copy the CW ID, which has an
>>> equivalent 12dB power advantage, is like saying a 150w SSB
>>> signal is easier to copy than a 1w CW signal. It's true but it
>>> is also meaningless.
>>>
>>> Thanks to DICK CARROLL'S LOGIC, SSB can be proven to be
>>> superior to CW every time. That follows from ignoring any of
>>> the throughput parameters."
>>>
>>> Cecil, W6RCA
>>>
>>>Another way of looking at it, is that Shannon's "rules" do
>>>apply, and that is virtually *always* the case in ham radio.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>> Cecil was spreading bullshit, just as you are.Shannon simply will not reveal which mode
>>
>>
>
>YOU are the one who wanted to claim he could compare the
>efficiency of CW and PSK-31.
>
>Cecil is *exactly* right, and you are totally wrong. The *only*
>way you can compare the two is by using Shannon's work to level
>the field and get an accurate comparison.
>
>You can deny that from now until your Extra Class ham ticket
>rolls up in hides itself in embarrassment at having your name on
>it, but it is still precisely true.
>
>
>
>>is useful and which is not under the conditions which ham radio operators work. When
PSK31
>>won't function within it's own 30 hz channel, but the CWID *WILL* work within the 2.4 khz

>>channel in use for both, it makes the solution very simple- CW is the mode of choice! To
>>
>>
>
>SSB will work even better. What's your point?
>

Exactly what I've been saying all along---- Ham radio is NOT ruled by Shannon. We *still* have
NO need to join the footrace for maximum throughput, and that isn't going to change. The type of
communication hams do are simply not adapted to use nor need i, nor will they bet.
That's true even emergency situations. High rate throughput means little or nothing to us

And NO, SSB wouldn;'t have worked even better, nor as well. I was hearing several extremely weak PSK31 stations from Europe on a virtually dead 20 meter band with polar phase shift present. I seriously doubt I could have understood a SSB transmission at the same power level as the PSK and CW. But I was able to copy the CW!

974. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 21:19:25 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh918tkrh0@208.206.142.89>
Source record: 74338

Floyd Davidson wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
>>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>
>>
>>>But once again, Shannon *does* apply to everything you've got there.
>>>*If* you want to actually understand it, that is the *only* way to
>>>explain it.
>>>
>>>
>>NOOO, it doesn't apply. It applies when one has a need to analyze a
>>channel with an intent
>>to maximize data throughput. In 48 years in ham radio I've never
>>encountered a single time when
>>such a situation presented itself.
>>
>>
>
>*YOU* are the one who was making comparisons between modes for
>which is the most "efficient". In your 48 years in ham radio,
>do you happen to remember that *you* not only encountered that
>situation, but presented it here for discussion?
>
>
>
>>>Or you can continue to be a glorified CB operator.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>And you *really* expect us tp believe you've never once been on CB when
>>you've spent
>>all that time where CB was a major communciations venue in an extremely
>>rural community
>>where communications is not just a convenenience, but a vital
>>necessity? Yeah, Right Frostbite.
>>We believe you. NOT!
>>
>>
>
>Your ignorance is showing again. I've never owned a CB radio.

>I've had an operational CB radio in my home or at work.
>
>And I've never lived where CB was used as a "major
>communications venue".
>
>Where do you get such odd ideas? I even posted an article here
>once that went into that in some detail too, but you seem to have
>misunderstood what was said. Why don't you go back and *read* it
>this time.
>
>
>
>>And the answer here is "So what? It wouldn't function **in an amateur
>>radio
>>communications channel** at a time and under conditions did allow CW to
>>function properly. Now as far as I, as a radio amateur, am concerned, that
>>is the pertinent fact, not that theoretically, and actually under
>>identical narrow
>>bandwidth conditions, that would not be true.
>>
>>
>
>All fine and dandy, except that you then try to say that means CW
>is "more efficient".
>

I said no such thing! I said that to contend that the mode which is
considered the most efficient
but won't work is better than the one which does in a particular
situation is ludicrous.

> You haven't shown that at all. With your
>methods we could assume using wideband TV is more efficient too.
>
>
>

975. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 21:45:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bh92o0qsr1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74339

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:cuvyxnansvbet.hjgswns.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 10 Aug 2003 22:22:00 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hjetrgn.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> >
> >"QRZ the Kilo Two, again please?"
>
> The DELETE key ate my reply and I don;t even remember what it was.
>
> Ain't modern technology wonderful ??
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Dang Phil....you need to remove that remote control link from your ear.

Dan/W4NTI

976. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 22:09:29 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87isp3n8x2.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74340

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>
>>
>> Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
> <some snippage>
>
>>> You increase the SNR, regardless of the bandwidth, by increasing the
>>> signal level DICK.
>>>
>>
>> Well, so much for your technical knowledge if THAT"S all you know about
>> it. Any experienced
>> ham, even without ANY tech schooling whatever, knows better than that.
>
>
> As a dilletante, I realize that in any ratio, there are two numbers.

Actually, there are three (bandwidth, signal, and noise) which
are related to channel capacity by the following formula

Capacity = Bandwidth * Log2 (1 + Signal/Noise)

The debate is over comparing *efficiency* of different modes (CW
and PSK-31), and hence the channel capacity for such a
comparison, must be normalized.

Reducing the Bandwidth parameter does decrease the observed SNR
in the channel, but the Capacity is not increased because the
actual noise power per Hz is unchanged.

> So while it is quite possible to make the s/n ratio larger by
>increasing the signal, it is equally possible, and sometimes much better
> to increase the s/n ratio by lowering the noise. Sometimes it is the
>*only* option available.

However, what has to change is the noise power per Hz, and
reducing the bandwidth does not change that.

> Seems like narrowing the bandwidth might just do that!

Increasing the signal power has the desired effect. There are
other ways to accomplish that, of course. Reduction of noise by
any means other than reducing the bandwidth (switching from an
omni directional antenna to a directional antenna, for example)
will have the desired effect.

> your humble hockey puck, 8^)

Hows come, then, you don't have a Canadian call sign?

> - Mike KB3EIA -

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

977. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 22:49:50 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <h4VZa.20387$Vx2.10554141@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 74341

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:%kMZa.373$dj3.60973@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:BB5C6EBB.22113%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> >
> > It's not just a matter of national defense, Len. The pool of trained
> > operators concept also applies to civil defense, public service, and so
> on.
> > As such, the concept is just as valid today.
>
> True, but the paradigm has changed. When CW was the ONLY, or
> even the DOMINANT mode of communication via radio, the need for
> a pool of (CW) trained operators was legitimate.
>
> That is no longer the case. Trained ops, yes, but trained in what is
> actually USED in modern day emergency communications, which is
> overwhelmingly voice (VHF/UHF and HF SSB, and data modes).
>
> Carl - wk3c

CW is a data mode. All other data modes change too fast along the lines of "flavor of the month". Which data mode would you propose be used for emergency communications. There is RTTY, Amtor, packet, Gtor, pactor, PSK31, and a host of others. PSK31 is new enough that there is activity generated by its very newness but will it last? Even now the techies are moving on to the "next generation" version of PSK31. Outside of PSK31 and RTTY, the other computer aided digital modes are now scarce to non-existent on the HF bands.

In a practical sense, the computer aided digital modes won't be as useful as some people like to tell themselves since there just aren't that many people working any one mode.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

978. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 22:58:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F381FB4.7090207@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74343

Dave Heil wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>>
>>>In article <20030810072821.12501.00001439@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>>>writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Fun fact: Check the lookup counter in QRZ.com for W5YI.
>>>>
>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>>
>>>Jim:
>>>
>>>W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter! OTOH,
>>>Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!
>>
>> Perhaps we can get Vipul a date?
>
>
> My guess would be, not with one hundred dollar bills pinned to his shirt
> though my friend K3FK's adage comes to mind: "They never made a trash
> can for which there wasn't a lid".

Heheh. Well, I tried. We'll have to mention her when he sends out his
standard missive on nonexistant attractive TL's.

Not that it matters how attactive a YL or XYL is. At least in the ARS
context.

- Mike KB3EIA -

979. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 23:04:34 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh97e2$1eg$0@208.206.142.114>
Source record: 74345

Floyd Davidson wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>
>>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Increase the SNR by narrowing the bandwidth???? That doesn't work!
>>>
>>>
>>Maybe it doesn't work for yoiu, you frosty old "professional" , but it
>>sure works for me and
>>scads of other ham radio operators!
>>
>>
>
>It doesn't work to do what you said above, which is increase the
>channel capacity.
>

NOWHERE have I *ever* said that and if you can read you'd know it! In
fact what
I said is exactly the opposite - that ham radio never needs to maximize
throughpout, rether
what we need is to be able to modify the "channel" to meed the needs of
the moment.

>
>The problem is you don't understand the theory and continue to
>attribute various results to the wrong source, and applying it
>to claims like your "proof" that CW is more efficient than
>PSK-31.
>

WRONG, WRONG,WRONG, Frosty! Yoiu're the dude with the misunderstanding
problem!
I've said all along what I say now- Shannon has no impact on hams
working ham radio on the air. We don't need the benefits shown by his
calculations. When our gear is designed radically differently that MAY
change.

>
>

>
>>>(Do you know what Gaussian distribution means.???)
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>I've seen the term somewhere, but hey, you know what? When I was working I
>>had a REAL job keeping a real, live radio communicatiions system working
>>and fixing
>>whatever part of it broke, not just wondering around BSing the
>>administration by tossing
>>out the big words to keep 'em snowed. Sorry your experience varies.
>>

>>
>>
> I don't know.
>

That's obvious, Frosty.

> Where I worked we put that kind of information to use on
>a fairly regular basis. But then we dealt with thousands of
>channels at a time, not just one.
>
>

Aw, Gee, now were're *really* Impressed!

>
>
>>>You increase the SNR, regardless of the bandwidth, by increasing the
>>>signal level DICK.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>Well, so much for your technical knowledge if THAT"S all you know
>>about it. Any experienced
>>ham, even without ANY tech schooling whatever, knows better than that.
>>
>>
>
>Oh, do you think changing the signal level will affect bandwidth???
>
>That's a good one.
>

It would be if I'd said it! But YOU said it! I know better. I also
know -right alaong with every active ham- that you increase SNR by
narrowing bandwidth. Seems it gets rid of some of the noise while
preserving the signal, assuming of course the signal is narrow enough to
fit within the narrowed bandwidth. As it happens, a CW signal is!

>
>
>
>>Better check with your buddy Carl, I think he does too.
>>
>>
>
>Carl knows *exactly* what I'm saying.
>

YOU better read his post on the subject again.

>
>
>
>>> Probably an idea you've never thought about, eh?
>>>Too close to Empirical Theory, no doubt.
>>>
>>>
>
>More of your Empirical Theory.
>
>

Heh heh... you just can't stay on target OR topic.

980. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 23:07:11 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <zkVZa.427$dj3.68015@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74344

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bh8ri0$a5r$0@208.206.142.92...
> OBIT-- want work some DX? Here's my log from last night on ~14.010,
> just sitting at the computer with the radio headphones on and idly
> listening to what
> was going on---
>
> CYO
> RN6AT
> SV1LV
>
> Betcha you won't catch many of those folks on 20 meter SSB these days.

Gee, Dick, I've logged SV2, RNx's, UAx's and a lot of others ... have you worked those Russian Islands WAY north of Norway? I think there are only 1 or 2 ops there ... I have that one, too.

BFD ...

> And I didn't have to give Shannon a single thought.

You don't appear to be *capable* of thinking Shannon through and really understanding the significance of his work ... Floyd is right ... you're just a "glorified CBer."

Carl - wk3c

981. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 23:09:20 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB5D9B43.221A4%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74347

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart" wrote:
>> (my comments snipped)
>
>
> True, but the paradigm has changed. When CW was the
> ONLY, or even the DOMINANT mode of communication
> via radio, the need for a pool of (CW) trained
> operators was legitimate.
>
> That is no longer the case. Trained ops, yes, but
> trained in what is actually USED in modern day
> emergency communications, which is overwhelmingly
> voice (VHF/UHF and HF SSB, and data modes).

That's nice, Carl. However, it's the exact same argument I've repeatedly used throughout this thread (the same argument concerning CW). In other words, you're preaching to the choir and, on top of that, preaching what the choir has already pretty much said.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

982. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 23:10:52 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh97ps$28a$0@208.206.142.114>
Source record: 74346

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
>>
>>
>> Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
>
> <some snippage>
>
>>> You increase the SNR, regardless of the bandwidth, by increasing the
>>> signal level DICK.
>>>
>>
>> Well, so much for your technical knowledge if THAT"S all you know
>> about it. Any experienced
>> ham, even without ANY tech schooling whatever, knows better than that.
>
>
>
> As a dilletante, I realize that in any ratio, there are two numbers.
>
> So while it is quite possible to make the s/n ratio larger by
> increasing the signal, it is equally possible, and sometimes much
> better to increase the s/n ratio by lowering the noise. Sometimes it
> is the *only* option available.
>
> Seems like narrowing the bandwidth might just do that!

Mike, Floyd is a perfect illustraition of someone who has no real
amateur radio experence. He is accustomed to commercial circuits where
the power can be raised to compensate for poor channel conditions. We
hams have a problem doing that when copying a weak one from the other
side of the planet.

Or course anything that can make the ratio of signal/noise improve will
change it, and obviously that includes raisnig the signal just as it
includes narrowing the bandwidth to slice off noise.
In the olden days they used to sell a receiver attachment called a
Signal Slicer. Guess what it did? :-)
Dick

983. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 23:18:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811191824.25815.00002123@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74348

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hjf5uqo.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 8 Aug 2003 10:12:11 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>
>>> > AMTOR is pretty much dead, I am told.
>>>
>>> Certainly not as popular as it once was, but I don't think it's entirely
>>> "dead."
>>
>>How many HF amateur AMTOR contacts have you or anyone you know made in
>>the past year?
>
> Yet SITOR - the commercial version of AMTOR - is the standard HF
> mode of data communication in the maritime service. That, and not
> obscenenly-expensive satellite comms, is what killed maritime CW.

Wasn't maritime MF Morse capability mandatory until the satellite based distress system came online?

> The ship's purser or deck officers can pull up the preset HF
> transceiver channel and pound away, and even personal e-mail is now
> sent and received by a SITOR connection to AOL via Globe Wireless,
> the successor to RCA and ITT, via an AOL "kiosk" in the recreation
> areas. No Radio Officer needed.

Sure. And the reason all that happened was that the shipping companies decided to make the inital investment in SITOR equipment, and pay for it with the salaries of the laid-off radio officers. And as long as the SITOR equipment does the job and costs less per year, there will be no reason to replace it with something better.

> One of the San Francisco area marine radio techs, a ham, applied to
> the FCC to be able to offer PACTOR service in the marine bands, and
> after consulation with the ITU, his request was turned down because
> it was not an international standard and would not give that much
> improvement over SITOR considering the changes necessary.

Exactly - the improvement was judged to be not worth the investment. Since decisions like this are made at the top and conformity is deemed more important than what people *want* to do, the existing system is kept.

Which is why you can watch a 2003 TV show on a 50+ year old TV receiver. NTSC, anyway.

> And the US Coast Guard and other similar agencies world-wide

> continue to transmit NAVTEX bulletins (marine broadcasts) on 518 kHz
> worldwide using SITOR.

Using a system that is almost completely automated.
>
>>> > Of course what really drove all that was PC/soundcard setups becoming
>>> > affordable.
>>>
>>> Agreed ... multimode with a std SSB radio and PC ... cool stuff.
>
> Yeah - I can tune SITOR by setting the (suppressed) carrier 2.2 kHz
> higher than the channel center and using LSB. Cheapie "FSK".
>
> Going to be "more easier" later on this week when my new Ten-Tec
> computer-tuned DSP HF receiver arrives, and I can set the filtering
> to just where I want it.

bwaahaahaa
>
> I'm not throwing my AMTOR/SITOR TNCs away just yet.

But how much AMTOR will be found in the HF ham bands today? I daresay not much.
In fact you'll probably find more 60 wpm Baudot RTTY on the ham bands in the
course of a year than you will find AMTOR. (if you count contests).
>
>>Sort of. But it's actually a patch job.
>
>>One reason packet is stuck at 1200 baud all these years is because
>>going faster would require a purpose-built data radio. Ikensu isn't
>>going to do it unless there's a proven market, and the failure of 9600
>>to get much attention means they will wait some more.
>
> Hey, we know that we can get at least 28K or more in a standard
> audio channel.

Sure - if the channel's characteristics are good enough.

There's also the question of what FCC will allow in symbol rate and such.

> But hams are cheap - nobody (including me) wants
> to throw away existing 1200 baud radios and TNCs that work really
> well for the type of canned messages that we get on packet, unless
> they are super-whizzes at Qualcom, with due appolgies to Phil Karn
> who fits that description and has done a LOT for digital ham radio
> specifically and whom I admire greatly.

I disagree with hams being "cheap". It's more a matter of not being able to
write off expenditures. Businesses can depreciate equipment - hams can't. They
can also pay for equipment out of reduced labor and repair cost - hams can't.
Engineering economics 101.

73 de Jim, N2EY

984. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 23:19:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F3824B7.2070706@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74349

Floyd Davidson wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
>>Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>
>>>
>>>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>
>> <some snippage>
>>
>>>>You increase the SNR, regardless of the bandwidth, by increasing the
>>>>signal level DICK.
>>>>
>>>
>>>Well, so much for your technical knowledge if THAT"S all you know about
>>>it. Any experienced
>>>ham, even without ANY tech schooling whatever, knows better than that.
>>
>>
>> As a dilletante, I realize that in any ratio, there are two numbers.
>
>
> Actually, there are three (bandwidth, signal, and noise) which
> are related to channel capacity by the following formula
>
> Capacity = Bandwidth * Log2 (1 + Signal/Noise)
>
> The debate is over comparing *efficiency* of different modes (CW
> and PSK-31), and hence the channel capacity for such a
> comparison, must be normalized.
>
> Reducing the Bandwidth parameter does decrease the observed SNR
> in the channel, but the Capacity is not increased because the
> actual noise power per Hz is unchanged.
>
>
>> So while it is quite possible to make the s/n ratio larger by
>>increasing the signal, it is equally possible, and sometimes much better
>> to increase the s/n ratio by lowering the noise. Sometimes it is the
>>*only* option available.
>
>
> However, what has to change is the noise power per Hz, and
> reducing the bandwidth does not change that.

>
>
>> Seems like narrowing the bandwidth might just do that!
>
>
> Increasing the signal power has the desired effect. There are
> other ways to accomplish that, of course. Reduction of noise by
> any means other than reducing the bandwidth (switching from an
> omni directional antenna to a directional antenna, for example)
> will have the desired effect.

Okay. What we have here is two separate arguments IMO. Everyone is right

>> your humble hockey puck, 8^)
>
>
> Hows come, then, you don't have a Canadian call sign?

Ohh, I just got that pejorative from someone here. I kind of like it
tho'. I'm still playing Hockey at my ripe old age, and will as long as I
can.

And I do like to get up to Canada whenever I can.

- Mike KB3EIA -

985. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 23:20:43 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh98cb$2u6$0@208.206.142.114>
Source record: 74350
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

GM wrote:

>You are a troll.
>

You are a complete fool

986. Re: American w/ Disability Act and CW Proficiency Test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 23:25:14 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bh98r8$9fq$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74402
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
wrote in message
news:bh96vk$vqnq5$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de
> >
> > > They are supposed to make those provisions. If they did not, they
were
> in
> > > the wrong. However, I would not favor them using hand sent code with
an
> > > oscillator for two reasons. 1) Oscillators are often not adjustable
in
> > > pitch. 2) Some people who copy quite well have absolutely lousy fists
> and
> > > do not send good clean code. It takes a pretty good op to copy some
> > > of the people out there.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> >
> > And the fluctuation in CW skills is yet another reason to question its
> > validity as a testing element.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> But gee Kim, if someone has "made it" as a VE, shouldn't they be
proficient
> in the mode(s) they are testing on?

At this point, it's not important or needed for morse
testing has LONG AGO deleted the "sending" part
of it and relied ONLY on the applicant decoding
pre-recorded tapes.

> Seems to me that if someone is going to
> qualify as a VE, they should be at an extreme proficiency level......

I've helped correct tests for teachers for subjects I
knew nothing about...nothing extradordinary there with
multiple choice...or checking a submitted set of
decoded morse text.

> If a VE or VE team cannot effectively send a method of communication like
> morse code as a required testing mode, it makes me wonder of the value of
> the mode in the first place. If they are relagated to only using CD's or

> tapes, I guess that would show the "dumbing down" of amateur radio,
bringing
> it "one step further to extinction."

The reliance on tapes and CDs is because it is NOT all that
easy to be right on with sending code at any set speed (5, 13, 20
or whatever) by hand.

It is far easier to "machine generate" code text at specific speeds
and record them for a permanent use in testing.

> Seems to me it should not be a problem for the whole VE groups to have a
set
> "pre-scripted" QSO's. There could be as many as needed, 10, 20, 30 or
more
> pre-made QSO's to send.

Far better to have the 20-30 or 40 prescripted QSOs recorded
and simply play back one. I initially learned morse for the
5 wpm test using 78 rpm record set from (I think) AMECO.

But, for all this speculation, the code test is soon to be just a historic
footnote, so what's all the fuss?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

987. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 23:26:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F382660.5020204@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74401
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Gareth (G1LVN) wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:3F37F02F.5090703@psu.edu...
>
>>Alun Palmer wrote:
>>
>>>So far, Switzerland, the UK and Belgium have axed the CW test.
>>
>>Snip
>>
>>
>>Okay Alun, we got it the first time.. or two.. or three.. or four.. 8^)
>>
>
> I'd like to personally invite all subscribers of rec.radio.amateur to join
> uk.radio.amateur. Come on in! - the water's lovely.

Someone's inviting *us* in? That doesn't happen too often! Most people
tell us where to go though.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

988. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 23:30:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811193048.07566.00001147@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 74403

> Floyd is
>right ... you're just a "glorified CBer."
>
>Carl - wk3c

This is Really Cute, MR CBplusser Carl, also head of CB International, calling someone a Glorifed Cber.

989. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 23:32:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F382712.DE6C3C58@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74404

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <BB5A07D1.22018%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" wrote:
> >>
> >> (snip) And amateur radio does not exist to
> >> serve other services. (snip)
> >
> > Our public service is often service to other agencies (Red Cross, MARS,
> >and so on).
> >
> >> The "pool of trained operators" thing in 97.1 is
> >> really about the idea of the ARS being a service
> >> where the licensees (hams) are skilled both
> >> operationally and technically, able to do a lot
> >> of different things well. This distinguishes it
> >> from other services, (snip)
> >
> > The pool of trained operators concept relates to our ability to do the
> >other things outlined in 97.1 (public service, international goodwill, and
> >so on). At one time, code was a necessary part of at least some of that.
> >That is much less so today, hence the move to change the code testing
> >requirement.
>
> Dwight, that statement in 97.1 is an OLD thing going back decades.
>
> It was put in there to rationalize the existance of amateur radio among
> all the other very commercial radio services.
>
> Three to four decades ago there MIGHT have been a "need" for "trained
> operators" for the military draft. [the USA still had a draft and the Cold
> War was very warm indeed] Never mind that the military already HAD
> ways of training in the "radio arts."

I obtained enough knowledge through amateur radio that I was able to take a "Bypassed Specialist" exam in basic training. The Air Force gave me the "3" or apprentice skill level and allowed me to bypass tech school. I was sent to my first assignment and obtained my "5" or journeyman level skill code through OJT and correspondence classes. The military, at least back then, recognized when an individual had enough knowledge to skip military training in the "radio arts". Do you know when the U.S. might need trained operators or when another draft will be

instituted?

> Does national defense or the various aid agencies NEED amateurs who
> are "trained" in DX contesting and sitting around telling old war stories
> about when Kode Vas King? I don't think so.

Are you miffed because you don't have any war stories relating to code?
Do you know anything about the operating skills of any contest types?

> Morse code use will keep out the eveavsdropers and bad people from
> the content of communications, thus not letting them know the deep
> dark, very secret ways of the ham. Secure.
>
> So I've been told.

It is a cinch that you don't have first hand knowledge of anything to do
with morse code. Whoever told you was wrong. <shrug> :-)

Dave K8MN

990. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 23:36:11 UTC
From: "Gareth (G1LVN)" <gareth@mycallsign.freeserve.co.uk>
Message-ID: <bh99jpgh1@newsg2.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 74405
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F382660.5020204@adelphia.net...
> Someone's inviting *us* in? That doesn't happen too often! Most people
> tell us where to go though.....

Like IRAQ for example....;-)

991. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 23:41:28 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bh99kk$bqn@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74406

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030810231145.08200.00001302@mb-m25.aol.com...
> In article <bh5udb$hch@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Jim:
> >>
> >> W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter! OTOH,
> >> Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!
> >>
> >> Now, now, Kim -- don't be jealous of Michelle -- even though you have a
> >> right to be!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >Jealous? Because of a woman who has a link to her commercial site on her
> >lookup on QRZ? Not at all.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Don't look now, but I don't think you'd be jealous of her sales volume,
even
> though I expect it looks just as good as she does!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Your "don't look now" phrase is about as old as ROFLMAO, Larry. And, I am
not jealous of this lady at all. More importantly, her sales volume would
be of little significance to me, since I am not in sales. My point was that
she probably has a lot of lookups because of people remembering her call
from a trade show and seeing if there's a link to the company she
represented.

Oh, hey, why don't you look her up and get a date, Larry. Looks like you're
interested.

Kim W5TIT

992. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 23:44:20 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bh99q1$4aa@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74408

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F379753.1361794D@earthlink.net...
> Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > In article <20030810072821.12501.00001439@mb-m04.aol.com>,
n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > > writes:
> > >
> > >
> > >>Fun fact: Check the lookup counter in QRZ.com for W5YI.
> > >>
> > >>73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > >
> > > Jim:
> > >
> > > W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter! OTOH,
> > > Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!
> >
> > Perhaps we can get Vipul a date?
>
> My guess would be, not with one hundred dollar bills pinned to his shirt
> though my friend K3FK's adage comes to mind: "They never made a trash
> can for which there wasn't a lid".
>
> Dave K8MN
>

K3FK???????????!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Kim W5TIT

993. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 23:46:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F382A57.A6B30B7F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74407

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <w4VYa.162$dj3.18912@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >news:c2356669.0308080912.7e373969@posting.google.com...
> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> >news:<XsNYa.93$dj3.13294@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:20030807222823.21428.00001559@mb-m23.aol.com...

> >Now you're trying to tell us that incentive licensing PROMOTED
> >growth in ham radio??? I don't think so ...
> >
> >More likely the boom after WWII (and Korea) was due to military
> >radio folks becoming hams when they got out ...
>
> Now, now. Rev. Jimmie LIVED THOSE TIMES. He KNOWS.
>
> :-)

You've told us about morse landline telegraphy. Did you LIVE THOSE
TIMES? Do you KNOW? Maybe you read it in a BOOK or saw an article on
the WEB. :-)

> >The boom in the 60's was probably due to the emergence of economical
> >JA radios, a general increase in the interest in electronics, and later, the
> >emergence of VHF/UHF FM and repeaters ...

Incorrect. There was no boom of JA radios in the 1960's.

> It's difficult for even old-timers to understand a postwar boom period and
> the Cold War getting hotter when they've just reached First Grade. :-)

I don't know about when you were in school, Len. They provided us
history books. Most of us figured out that there was additional
historical material available. :-) :-)

> The holier-than-thou old-timers insist on the "no-coders" to do all
> the technical advancements in amateur radio. Never mind that they
> weren't able to do much in a half century. :-)

What's it to you? You aren't involved. If you're to make any technical
advancements in amateur radio, you'd better get cracking. You've wasted
decades talking about "getting into" amateur radio. :-)

> The holier-than-thou old-timers won't hear of "being nice" to newcomers.
>
> They have achieved TITLE, STATUS, Rank and Privelege and can sign
> their callsign behind their names (just like nobility). They are Very
> Important exhalted People who are "superior!"

Love your "fox and the grapes" routine. You got the callsign and
privilege portion partially correct.

> Nobility suffers the peasantry, poor things.

In this game, you aren't nobility and you aren't a peasant. You're an
onlooker.

Dave K8MN

994. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 23:47:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bh99v0$v42@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74410

```
"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:L2RZa.399$dj3.65741@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bh87ki$ur2$1@208.207.71.147...
> >
> >
> > Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >
> > > > If you're serious it only means that YOU don't understand Shannon's
> work
> > > >The channel bandwidth limit is central to any application Shannon 's
> theory.
> > >
> > > They why we can increase the SNR and get more channel capacity
> > > regardless of the bandwidth? Sounds like bandwidth isn't so
> > > central after all, eh?
> >
> > When you can increase the SNR by narrowing the bandwidth? I knew you
> > has your head on bassackwards.
>
> Dick, your technical ignorance is showing TWOFOLD.
>

I've a feeling Dick's got a lot more than just two folds...

Kim W5TIT
```

995. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-11 23:53:42 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <a0WZa.431$dj3.71519@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74409

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bh90eujae0@208.206.142.89...
> And we all already knew that, didn't we? ALso we *hams* knew that we
> didn't inten d nor want to get more channel capacity! What *we* want is
> to complete the intended communication!

That's where your lack of acumen shows, Dick. Hams should
strive to communicate efficiently. Inefficient use of our spectrum
promotes congestion in the popular bands. Inefficient use of our
spectrum will subject us to increased threats of spectrum grabs
by commercial interests.

Carl - wk3c

996. Re: L.A. Times Editorial Correction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:01:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811200130.15462.00002190@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 74421

In article <5c01b95b.0308110103.5cfcfd31@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
>news:<e5fdjvk6pr98luinivqqkaovvm9e2ih19k@4ax.com>...
>
>> I would like to state for the public record that the L.A. Times article ("Race
>> for Governor) has a misquote from me. They stated that I designed the landing
>> radar for the Apollo. My comment was clear that I was part of the TEAM that did
>> the design. Somehow that TEAM word was left out. To my colleagues that were on
>> that team, I offer my apologies. I was a dim bulb amongst the stars of the
>> project....(SNIP)
>
> That you pre-empted any negative critique and offered this up
>unsolicited puts a lot of good stock in your portfolio, Jim.
>
> Bravo.

WHAT "pre-empting of any negative critique?"

Here is the full text as it appeared in the right-most column of the Los Angeles Times Sunday edition, 10 August 2003, page A34:

==========
Jim Weir

Age: 56

Occupation: Electronics technology instructor and small-business owner.

Residence: Grass Valley

Education: B.S., physics, math and aerospace, San Diego State, 1967.

Career Highlights: Designed landing radar for the Apollo lunar spacecraft at Teledyne Ryan. Founder and president of small aircraft electronics company. Served on Nevada County Board of Supervisors, 1986-94.

Quote: "My motivation is obviously to win, but also to get the maximum number of people to the polls so that this election is not determined by a small minority of voters at either end of the spectrum. Transportation and education are the heart and soul of California; they need to be dealt with at all costs."

==========

The Sunday edition of the Los Angeles Times had no less than NINETY-SEVEN biographies of the 158 total filings needing FOUR FULL PAGES of the main section. The remainder of the 158 were listed briefly on the fourth page and continued on a fifth page.

There is no real need for Jim Weir to apologize for anything but it is gracious of him to do so. The Apollo program involved many teams of designers-engineers-craftsmen-technicians all over the USA in many corporations. Apollo was a resounding success, a credit to EVERYONE on all the teams.

Nevada County is a county in mid-state California, in the midst of California's "Gold Country." Nevada City is a wonderful place featuring many historical sites and reminders of the gold rush times of the 1800s. My wife and I had the distinct pleasure of walking in Nevada City during a local fair, guided by my old friend and colleague Jim Hall (KD6JG) and his wife Terry. Jim and Terry live in the outskirts of Grass Valley in a beautiful home and are gracious hosts.

I don't know Jim Weir personally but we have corresponded some in e-mail on other things. I was surprised and delighted to find Jim Weir's name in the L.A. Times after Sunday breakfast. I wish him all the best in the "recall circus" election for governor of California in October.

Some in here, too keyed to message point making and emotional attachment to "credentials" will make a big correlation to Jim Weir being a radio amateur. I really don't think that ham radio has much to do with that since Jim Weir is a professional in radio-electronics. Further, his serving eight years as a county supervisor is not a job for amateurs in government and politics.

Those who want to practice the puerile geo-political bashing in here should remember that, if California was ranked as a nation, its annual budget would make it the fifth to seventh in the world, greater than most of the other countries in the world. About one out of nine Americans live in California now, the most populous state in the USA. California feeds much of the USA from the agribusinesses in the San Joaquin Valley and is the aerospace center, both in aviation and electronics, of the nation.

Leonard H. Anderson
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

997. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:01:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811200131.15462.00002191@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 74420

In article <5c01b95b.0308110100.59130e15@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030810154740.18497.00001942@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0308100801.24c9ee5c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (pSycho pSteve) writes:
>
> Yet more professional civil debate, I see.

Poor baby. You don't come close to any civil debate yet you
DEMAND others do so.

You REALLY need some mental therapy on being able to
get along with anyone else.

>> >nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
>> >news:<20030809094901.05245.00000300@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> >
>> >> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>>
>> >> > Morse code, which well predates WW2, is old and needs to be
>> >> > dismantled. :-)
>> >>
>> >> You are old and predate WW2. Len.
>> >>
>> >> Perhaps your "reality" needs to be dismantled.
>> >
>> > Lennie's "reality" was dismantled a long time ago...he just
>> >hasn't accepted it yet.
>>
>> Pity the sick psychotics. Now there's TWO of them and one is
>> "anonymous." They go together in their fantasy.
>
> Bet it irks the heck out of you that not one but TWO of your
>former screen names has been acquired by someone who thinks you are an
>idiot too.

It's the "copycat killer" syndrome...those are trying to make a "name"
for themselves but hiding behind pseudonyms, afraid to give their
real identity.

> And with good cause!
>
> Sucks to be you, Lennie!

Tsk, tsk, tsk...not even amateur civil debate from pSycho pSteve.

pStevie, you REALLY need some mental therapy.

998. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:01:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811200132.15462.00002192@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 74419

In article <3F3797F7.10A6A693@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <20030810112459.12631.00000196@mb-m28.aol.com>,
>yodoc@aol.comnospam
>> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>>
>> >Of course, you were probably just being "imaginative."
>>
>> YOU do that all the time...
>
>Ahh, Ahh, Len! Please remember that you enjoy hanging out here with the
>hams, fantasizing that you are somehow a part of amateur radio.

I've NEVER been a "part" of ham radio according to YOUR OWN
DEFINITION.

YOUR fantasy seems to be stuck in the rut that whatever YOU like
"defines" what ALL other radio amateurs do, think, and must act
like in some rigid set of rules of YOUR imagination.

YOU are NOT an authority or an official anything in US ham radio.
YOU are NOT an official in the FCC, federal government, or even
that pseudo-governmental organization called ARRL.

YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis.

I've been a professional in radio-electronics since 1952...51 years.
I've also been a radio-electronics HOBBYIST since 1947. Hobby
activities not for pecuniary interest are AMATEUR activites. If they
involved making money at it they would be professional activities.

YOU keep insisting one MUST be "licensed" to be an AMATEUR.

YOU keep holding up having a license grant is somehow making
YOU "better" than anyone not having an amateur license. YOU
seem to think that amateur radio is some event of epiphany, of glory
and greatness in radio, some kind of nebulous "service" to the
nation, transcending anything done in any other radio service.

Feel free to indulge in your fantasy. Just remember that your output
of constant personal attack of others not accepting your views makes
YOU the perverse individual here.

I'm just arguing against a morse code test for any US radio license but there is this constant barrage of Personal Attack filth from the fantasyland control freaks diverting everyone from the subjects to the usual flame fest flings that must make your warped mind happy.

So far, you haven't "won" anything. Why do you keep on with the same old flame trash?

LHA

999. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:01:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811200133.15462.00002193@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 74411

In article <871xvtqcui.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>In article <20030810112459.12631.00000196@mb-m28.aol.com>,
>yodoc@aol.comnospam
>>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>>
>>>Of course, you were probably just being "imaginative."
>>
>> YOU do that all the time...
>
>That's some of his *real experience*, not none of that empirical
>theory stuff!

Larrah the Lip should have gotten a job with a fertilizer company,
advertising over the Internet...instead of becoming a bus driver
with a "Summa Cum Laude BA degree in 'Human Resources'"
who had any number of terrific job opportunities waiting for him
in personnel departments!

THEN I would believe him. :-)

LHA

1000. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:01:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811200134.15462.00002194@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 74418

In article <5c01b95b.0308110057.e158ba9@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030810154742.18497.00001945@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>
>> No, he has aligned himself with the Anti-Semiconductor Movement.
>
> No, Your Putziness...Quality is quality whether it is the
>fidelity of a tube-based radio or a well-aged wine.

Take your medications, pSycho pSteve. You are still in fantasies.

The "fidelity of a TUBE-based radio" is a myth, a fantasy, and probably concocted by other ignorant radio piddlers who want to apply supernatural "magic" to something they aren't able to comprehend.

>> "Real radios glow in the dark" and that sort of thing. "Warmth."
>
> Embracing technology changes simply because it's a "change" does
>not make it better...just different.

The solid-state era began in industry about 1960. That's 43 years ago.

Radio AMATEURS didn't really discover it until about two decades later. Still, that's 23 years ago.

Hardly a recently changed technology. :-)

>> Or is he just technically constipated, therefore thinking about waste?
>
> As witless as ever, I see.

TRY TO REMEMBER TO TAKE YOUR MEDICATIONS!

1001. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:01:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811200137.15462.00002196@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 74416

In article <f45722ac.0308101345.510dba91@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
>news:<20030810055941.27618.00001162@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>> > brianburke@juno.com wrote:
>> >averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote:
>>
>> >> Do you know if Len Anderson is a cannibal? Claims have been made that he
>> eats
>> >> others for breakfast.
>> >
>> >Who? When?
>>
>> Floyd Davidson wrote it about Len Anderson a few days ago.
>
>I don't recall Floyd saying Len was a cannibal.
>
>> >Dave thinks he's a pugilist.
>> >
>> Maybe a pugil stick? ;-) ;-)
>
>Does he?
>
>> Your master and teacher has
>> returned, Brian Burke.
>
>Noted.

Brian, why are you answering a copycat wanna-be?

That creature doesn't exist.

LHA

1002. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:01:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811200137.15462.00002195@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 74423

In article <3F37AF98.183C4210@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3F301D6D.D7A189F5@earthlink.net>...
>> > Brian wrote:
>> > >
>> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3F2FA40B.6CBD0E90@earthlink.net>...
>> > > > Brian wrote:
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3F2F1ADF.9E64A43D@earthlink.net>...
>> > > > > > Brian wrote:
>
>> > It serves to point out Len's total lack of experience in the amateur
>> > service.
>>
>> Yet he knows more about radio then you.
>
>It hasn't been demonstrated that he knows more about radio "then" me.

YOU won't accept any evidence that any court would accept as
valid. You wish to posture as judge, jury, and executioner. You
are none of those.

I've presented just a tiny bit of the "evidence" I have on what I've
done, complete with all references for independent investigation
in this newsgroup. You have disregarded all of that, preferring to
act the judge, jury, and executioner in order to "win" some kind of
"debate" that only exists in your mind. You have presented nothing
but generalities without any corroborating evidence.

You insist on making this some kind of personal "battle" over some
imagined "superiority" in amateurism and the "elitism" as well as
"superiority" of your status, rank, title, etc. in nothing but amateur
radio. That keeps happening regardless of the subject title or thread.

You keep forgetting you aren't any official and aren't any judge (you
keep falling off the bench). You may think you speak for some
"majority" of ham radio but all you do is speak for yourself. All you can
do is attempt to put down others not agreeing with you.

>There is every possibility that Len knows more about electronics theory
>than me.

Not only theory, but design, practical hardware prototyping to finished
product, field application and liason, and writing about it in national
magazines. I've done all that as a professional AND as a hobbyist in
radio-electronics.

>There is a similar possibility that I have much more
>operational experience in "radio" or that I have much more knowledge of
>wave propagation than Len.

"Wave propagation?" Would you know Biot from Savart? E and H
fields? Knife-edge diffraction? Were you intimately involved with HF
communications across the Pacific in the early 1950s for "24/7"
primary communications service? I can go on and on without ever
touching the recorded and evidencible facts of having spent three
years being actively involved with the latter. That grates on you.

Put that in your Icepack and stroke it.

>There is a certainty that I have forty years
>more experience in amateur radio than Len.

I've been a radio-electronics hobbyist for 56 years and never bothered
to get any amateur radio license with its official certificate plus the
rank/title/status accorded it by some other amateurs. You ARE
granted that one item but it would seem you've never ventured out of
"the bands" (HF) for all your tenure as an amateur.

>> How can that be if he has no experience?
>
>What I wrote addressed Len's experience in amateur radio. He has none.

Since when is that SUCH an important factor in "radio?"

The FCC doesn't require any commissioners or staff to hold amateur
licenses. The Congress of the United States has never chartered the
FCC to "only" regulate US amateur radio by licensed radio amateurs.

You keep acting like some kind of land squatter, claiming territorial
imperative and divine right for holding a grant a long time. That alone
is NO evidence of ANY expertise, only the ability to not be caught for
violations and being able to renew your vaunted license every decade
or so.

>> So why so do you give him so much attention?
>
>A smart fellow would have figured out that laughing at Len isn't exactly
>an endorsement of his views.

You wish to squelch all opponents to your royal viewpoints by trying
to make fun of them, trying to put them down.

You can't bear the thought that your viewpoints aren't of the nobility, divine statements of some higher radio god. Since you can't talk on the subjects, you try to hit the person of the communicator.

That's been evident for years in here.

>> Must you try to tear down Len at every opportunity to boost your stature?
>
>Poking fun at Leonard Anderson has never been done for purposes of
>boosting my own stature, nor is it a "must" on my list of things to do.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...false claim.

It is fairly clear what you do to anyone not embracing your godlike views of amateurism...try to put them down any way you can.

After all these years you keep failing. The technique doesn't work.

>If I had to list reasons for doing so, I'd likely come up with a list
>like:
>
>1) Because Len Anderson does it to others on a continuing basis

Poor baby. It's "okay" to attempt humiliation of others because you are a radio god and you've been an amateur for four decades.

Sigh...another over-inflated EGO...

>2) Because my views are in opposition to those held by Anderson, a
>non-radio amateur.

Hardly. :-)

Google is full of Heil's put-downs and humiliations of NON-licensed radio amateurs...because Heil feels they are "inferior" to his godlike status. :-)

>3) Because Len comes across as a pontificating windbag who sees
>himself as an expert in all things relating to radio communication.

Poor baby. More damage evident to the super ego of Heil's.

I've never claimed "expertise" in any field of endeavor, just a few where I've had lots of experience, hands-on experience for a long time. That's anathema to Heil and his "superior" four decades as an AMATEUR.

To quote another quoting a late ballplayer, "It ain't braggin if ya done it."

I've done a lot. :-)

>4) Because it is soooooo easy.

No...because you are unable to argue on the subjects. All you can do is attempt put-downs, attempt humiliating others who won't worship you as the "foremost authority."

Living a fantasy is VERY easy. No work required, very little thought.
Fantasylands allow anyone to destroy their "opponents" with impunity.

Feel free to indulge your super ego and demand all do as you say.
Few will. You aren't the "authority" and are no "official." Your credence
went to hell along with your robust oberst uniform a long time ago.

LHA

1003. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:01:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811200138.15462.00002198@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 74412

In article <20030810231145.08200.00001303@mb-m25.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <3F368CEA.6000309@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>writes:
>
>>> Jim:
>>>
>>> W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter! OTOH,
>>> Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!
>>
>> Perhaps we can get Vipul a date?
>
>No -- but I'm available!

Are you finally coming out of the closet?!?!?

1004. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:01:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811200138.15462.00002197@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 74413

In article <%kMZa.373$dj3.60973@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
>news:BB5C6EBB.22113%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
>>
>> It's not just a matter of national defense, Len. The pool of trained
>> operators concept also applies to civil defense, public service, and so
>on.
>> As such, the concept is just as valid today.
>
>True, but the paradigm has changed. When CW was the ONLY, or
>even the DOMINANT mode of communication via radio, the need for
>a pool of (CW) trained operators was legitimate.

You are right, but haven't pointed out that was a half century ago,
Carl. :-)

>That is no longer the case. Trained ops, yes, but trained in what is
>actually USED in modern day emergency communications, which is
>overwhelmingly voice (VHF/UHF and HF SSB, and data modes).

It's no use trying to show reality in here, Carl. <shrug>

These folk are obediant servants of the Church of St. Hiram and all
things in amateur radio are as they were back before WW2. To
show reality and all the other radio services' modes and operations
is tantamount to heresy. Blasphemy, even...

LHA

1005. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:01:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811200139.15462.00002199@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 74415

In article <bh88k0$1ku$0@208.207.71.153>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

> Heh heh... shows what you know about ham radio!....when hams who actually
>get on the air find
>the need, they just modify their channel. You know, things like variable
>width IF, various
>filters, IF shift all those things you're unfamiliar with since you'vve
>never actually used
>any of them.

Extra DICK, you shouldn't drink and Internet.

> Sure, you can reconsult Shannon to get the skinny on the new channel, but
>we hams have no
>need to do that, if you don't already know. We'll leave all that to you and
>Putzie to handle in
>your spare time for your own entertainment. We have more interesting things
>to do ON THE AIR.
>IT DOES NOT APPLY to ham radio operation, you fool!

Must be a lot of 'shine runnin going on in Misery.

Might explain the state's upcoming wine industry. :-)

LHA

1006. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:01:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811200141.15462.00002201@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 74417

In article <8765l5qd06.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>In article <20030810112500.12631.00000197@mb-m28.aol.com>,
>yodoc@aol.comnospam
>>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>>>
>>>BTW, I do believe that Mr. Shannon's theory is relevant to Amateur
>>>Radio. I believe that what Dick is doing is making observations
>>>based on actual operating experience, rather than empirical theory.
>>>This may be the cause of the confusion, but as I said earlier, I do
>>>not presume to speak for Dick.
>>
>> "Empirical theory?!?"
>>
>> Did you learn that as a soma come loud college student?!?
>>
>> No wonder no personnel department ever offered you a job.
>>
>> LHA
>
>Do you get the feeling, deep down in the depths of your gut, that
>Larry "Yardstick" Roll is never going to hear the end of this
>
> *"Empirical Theory"*

Yardstick..."Give a man an inch and he thinks he's a ruler!"

:-)

LHA

1007. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:01:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811200141.15462.00002200@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 74422

In article <20030810231147.08200.00001306@mb-m25.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20030810154845.18497.00001953@mb-m05.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>
>>>A good question, Carl. I've always wondered exactly what your alleged
>>>technical competence has to do with ANY discussion in this NG! After
>>>all, this is about AMATEUR radio!
>>
>> Larrah, it's just too bad that US amateur radio doesn't have a book,
>> "Radio for Dummies" that you could read to find out what radio, ANY
>> radio IS...you NEED one.
>>
>> "Radio" is a general activity involving technology in and about radio
>> communication.
>>
>> Radios do NOT work "differently" because some regulating agency
>> states one radio activity is "amateur" and another radio activity is
>> "commercial/professional." Electrons, fields and waves work the SAME
>> in ANY radio regardless of human legislation.
>>
>> You can't understand that. I wonder why?
>
>Lennie:
>
>I understand it just fine, thank you. However, my "understanding" will
>never measure up to your standards, so I will just have to live with that.
>Too bad you can't!

Larrah, you don't even measure up to YOUR standards... :-)

>> Maybe its because you can't distinguish one active from another...like
>> all your bragging about "summa cum laude human resources graduate"
>> and then you get a BUS DRIVER job.
>
>Well, find me an entry-level Personnel Officer job in Kent County, DE with
>the same pay and benefits as my present job, and I'll take it! BTW, I
>applied
>for one in my own company last year, but it went to, of all people, one of my
>own classmates, a very fine, sexy-looking YL! She did NOT graduate
>with any kind of honors, since she took her program part-time and took over
>7 years to get her degree, whereas I did mine on a full-time basis in 2.5
>years. But I don't look as good in a cubicle as she does!

No problem, we've never expected anything but the usual Roll
Rationalizations.

You are keeping up the usual level of Roll misogyny. Some things
never change.

>>>While I freely admit that I do have a
>>>great deal of respect for hams who do possess genuine, professional-
>>>grade technical qualifications, you, and your apologists Floyd Davidson
>>>and Len Anderson, tend to raise the noise level to BPL standards!
>>
>> Poor baby...still miffed at no one recognizing your intrinsic Greatness?
>
>I hadn't noticed that anyone isn't recognizing it, Lennie.

No one HAS recognized your greatness. It isn't there.

But you keep insisting you have it.

Beeperitis.

>I am a BUS DRIVER, remember?

Strange...you keep insisting you are a "paratransit specialist."

Which is it?

>My knowledge of communications is
>limited to what I've done in AMATEUR radio, and the use of my 800 MHz
>voice/data comm system in my bus.

You've been licensed as an AMATEUR how long? And you've never
bothered to find out about radio technology since you became an
extra something-or-other?

Are you LAZY?

>Lennie, you're obviously in need of new reading glasses. I've never claimed
>to be anything but an average ham with average, AMATEUR-level
>technical skills.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...how quickly they forget. You claimed to be in the "upper
percentile of amateur radio." :-)

I would classify you as little more than an ego-driven salesman type
who does CB-like radio activity with a federal license grant.

Aren't you supposed to be in the national pool of "trained
communicators" for the nation's benefit and "advancing the state
of the art" of AMATEURISM?

I liked it better when you were just a Soma Come Loud student who
could get any human resources job he wanted after graduation.

LHA

1008. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:01:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811200142.15462.00002202@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 74414

In article <3F37A340.722964AC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Alun Palmer wrote:
>>
>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>> news:20030803122121.27503.00001415@mb-m24.aol.com:
>>
>> > In article <Xns93CBC6A1646A4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
>> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>> Not atall. Since about 1995 there has been a paradigm shift caused by this
>> medium we're using right now (the Internet). If code testing had been
>> abolished significantly before that it would have boosted our numbers far
>> more than it ever can now. All I'm really saying is that that opportunity
>> is lost.
>
>I find it hard to take anyone seriously who uses the term "paradigm
>shift", especially if he proceeds to jump to a false conclusion or to
>several of them.

No problem. We all find your attempts at judge, jury, and executioner
to be ineffectual, puerile, and rather stupid.

"False conclusion?"

Hardly. Had the no-code-test Technician never been created, US ham
radio would have been short by 200K ham licenses by the time of
"Reconstruction."

>> >>Sure. there is a lot of CW use by hams on HF, but there are precious
>> >>few prospective hams who want to use it.
>> >
>> > How do you know they don't want to use it? At the past several Field
>> > Days, the CW ops generated the most interest.
>>
>> As a sideshow it generates interest. Think of it as being like a
>> demonstration of some obscure craft in a living museum. Sure, people find
>> it interesting watching a blacksmith shoe a horse (and that's not a dead
>> art either), but it doesn't mean they are going to learn to do it.
>
>But you haven't addressed the question posed: How do you know what
>prospective hams want to do?

Oh, my, now the judge, jury, and executioner pretends to have
prescience!

Tsk, tsk, tsk...all you can do is put down others who raise questions that might threaten your "superior" status in amateur radio.

Try READING what Alun said. He raises a valid point.

You are still REFUSING to accept anything contrary to your precious viewpoints.

That won't make them go away.

It just arouses enmity among all those who refuse to worship your radiogod status.

LHA

1009. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:09:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F382F9C.EB92C7B0@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74424

```
Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3F379753.1361794D@earthlink.net...
> > Mike Coslo wrote:
> > >
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > > In article <20030810072821.12501.00001439@mb-m04.aol.com>,
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > > > writes:
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > >>Fun fact: Check the lookup counter in QRZ.com for W5YI.
> > > > >>
> > > > >>73 de Jim, N2EY
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Jim:
> > > >
> > > > W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter! OTOH,
> > > > Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!
> > >
> > > Perhaps we can get Vipul a date?
> >
> > My guess would be, not with one hundred dollar bills pinned to his shirt
> > though my friend K3FK's adage comes to mind: "They never made a trash
> > can for which there wasn't a lid".
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> K3FK???????????!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Does that call hold some special significance for you, Kim?

Dave K8MN
```

1010. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:11:13 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F38309F.4090308@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 74425

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Just practicing one of the the new Q signals....
>
>

There's also "QFU", which I don't think I need to define.... ;)

1011. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:15:14 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh9bii$9pa$0@208.207.71.157>
Source record: 74426

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Floyd Davidson wrote:
>
>> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>>
>>> Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>>
>>>>
>>>> Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>> <some snippage>
>>>
>>>>> You increase the SNR, regardless of the bandwidth, by increasing the
>>>>> signal level DICK.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Well, so much for your technical knowledge if THAT"S all you know
>>>> about it. Any experienced
>>>> ham, even without ANY tech schooling whatever, knows better than that.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> As a dilletante, I realize that in any ratio, there are two
>>> numbers.
>>
>>
>>
>> Actually, there are three (bandwidth, signal, and noise) which
>> are related to channel capacity by the following formula
>>
>> Capacity = Bandwidth * Log2 (1 + Signal/Noise)
>> The debate is over comparing *efficiency* of different modes (CW
>> and PSK-31), and hence the channel capacity for such a
>> comparison, must be normalized.
>>
>> Reducing the Bandwidth parameter does decrease the observed SNR
>> in the channel, but the Capacity is not increased because the
>> actual noise power per Hz is unchanged.
>>
>>
>>> So while it is quite possible to make the s/n ratio larger by
>>> increasing the signal, it is equally possible, and sometimes much

>>> better to increase the s/n ratio by lowering the noise. Sometimes it
>>> is the *only* option available.
>>
>>
>>
>> However, what has to change is the noise power per Hz, and
>> reducing the bandwidth does not change that.
>>
>>
>>> Seems like narrowing the bandwidth might just do that!
>>
>>
>>
>> Increasing the signal power has the desired effect. There are
>> other ways to accomplish that, of course. Reduction of noise by
>> any means other than reducing the bandwidth (switching from an
>> omni directional antenna to a directional antenna, for example)
>> will have the desired effect.
>
>
> Okay. What we have here is two separate arguments IMO. Everyone is
> right
>

Aw, Mike, don't mess up Floyd and Carl's playhouse. They're doing their
darndest to
trash an old CW fan, and you're spoiling it!

1012. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:15:54 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh9bjq$9qf$0@208.207.71.157>
Source record: 74427

Floyd Davidson wrote:

>The debate is over comparing *efficiency* of different modes (CW
>and PSK-31), and hence the channel capacity for such a
>comparison, must be normalized.
>
>

That's *your* debate -and was Cecil's-, butit's NOT mine. You guys
consistantly insist
on distorting my argument to fit yours.

>Reducing the Bandwidth parameter does decrease the observed SNR
>in the channel, but the Capacity is not increased because the
>actual noise power per Hz is unchanged.
>
>
>
>> So while it is quite possible to make the s/n ratio larger by
>>increasing the signal, it is equally possible, and sometimes much better
>> to increase the s/n ratio by lowering the noise. Sometimes it is the
>>*only* option available.
>>
>>
>
>However, what has to change is the noise power per Hz, and
>reducing the bandwidth does not change that.
>

That *Can't* be correct for all cases.
The total noise appearing in the channel is the sum of that appearing in
every Hz
within the entire channel. A narrow signal such as a radiotelegraph
signal may not
occupy the entire width of the channel. So narrowing the channel width DOES
reduce the noise while preserving the signal and improving the SNR..
Obviously where the signal is as wide as the channel this doesn't work,
but in
ham radio, working CW it sure does. Guaranteed.

>Increasing the signal power has the desired effect. There are
>other ways to accomplish that, of course. Reduction of noise by
>any means other than reducing the bandwidth (switching from an
>omni directional antenna to a directional antenna, for example)
>will have the desired effect.
>

Another example of why his stuff doesn't apply to the real world of ham
radio.
When a ham is working another station he has no control over the power that
station is injecting into the channel. What he can control is the
bandwidth,within limits of course.
Within ham radio such situations vary widely, but for CW the sitiation
is pretty well
straightforward. Hams almost always enhance CW signals by reducing the
bandwidth
which raises the SNR.

1013. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:16:56 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F3831F6.8050707@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 74428
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

DX'er wrote:

>Was that "Lucky 7" from out of Syracuse? I remember a local news report on
>my Milwaukee TV station about it. The operator would appear on the screen
>wearing a gas mask.
>
>
>
That was it. I didn't get a chance to see it myself, but heard about it.

1014. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:24:40 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh9c48apm0@208.207.71.157>
Source record: 74429

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:bh90eujae0@208.206.142.89...
>
>
>>And we all already knew that, didn't we? ALso we *hams* knew that we
>>didn't inten d nor want to get more channel capacity! What *we* want is
>>to complete the intended communication!
>>
>>
>
>That's where your lack of acumen shows, Dick. Hams should
>strive to communicate efficiently.
>

Well, well! If you truly believed that then you'd have gone on to
really learn the code
and used it long ago, instead of just complaining. After all, efficiency
means more than
anything Shannon came up with.

> Inefficient use of our spectrum
>promotes congestion in the popular bands. Inefficient use of our
>spectrum will subject us to increased threats of spectrum grabs
>by commercial interests.
>
>

By your measure, then, CW should be one of the most desirable modes in
existance!

1015. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:28:24 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh9cb8$b69$0@208.207.71.157>
Source record: 74430

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:bh8ri0$a5r$0@208.206.142.92...
>
>
>>OBIT-- want work some DX? Here's my log from last night on ~14.010,
>>just sitting at the computer with the radio headphones on and idly
>>listening to what
>>was going on---
>>
>>CYO
>>RN6AT
>>SV1LV
>>
>>Betcha you won't catch many of those folks on 20 meter SSB these days.
>>
>>
>
>Gee, Dick, I've logged SV2, RNx's, UAx's and a lot of others ... have you
>worked those Russian Islands WAY north of Norway? I think there are
>only 1 or 2 ops there ... I have that one, too.
>
>BFD ...
>
>

Yeah, and you waited for decades, stewing over a mere code test, for
the day to come when you could...Then the frenzy started. I do it
relaxed as an incidental to other activities, working them as they show up.

>
>
>>And I didn't have to give Shannon a single thought.
>>
>>
>
>You don't appear to be *capable* of thinking Shannon through
>and really understanding the significance of his work ... Floyd is
>right ... you're just a "glorified CBer."
>
>Carl - wk3c
>
>
>

Carl, you're truly a jewel. I think that's plain funny, coming from you
OR Floyd.

1016. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:41:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F38372D.8B73F1AA@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74431

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F3797F7.10A6A693@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <20030810112459.12631.00000196@mb-m28.aol.com>,
> >yodoc@aol.comnospam
> >> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> >>
> >> >Of course, you were probably just being "imaginative."
> >>
> >> YOU do that all the time...
> >
> >Ahh, Ahh, Len! Please remember that you enjoy hanging out here with the
> >hams, fantasizing that you are somehow a part of amateur radio.
>
> I've NEVER been a "part" of ham radio according to YOUR OWN
> DEFINITION.

That's RIGHT. You've NEVER been a part of ham radio. But you can
dream.

> YOUR fantasy seems to be stuck in the rut that whatever YOU like
> "defines" what ALL other radio amateurs do, think, and must act
> like in some rigid set of rules of YOUR imagination.

Not all all, Len old boy. I realize that others have different fields
of interest within amateur radio and they might have different levels of
interest in the game. You however, aren't a part of amateur radio.

> YOU are NOT an authority or an official anything in US ham radio.

No I'm not. I'm a participant, a license radio amateur. I have been
for decades.

> YOU are NOT an official in the FCC, federal government, or even
> that pseudo-governmental organization called ARRL.

No, and I don't need to be employed by the FCC. The ARRL is not a
pseudo-governmental organization. I am a life member of the ARRL and
have been for over 25 years. With small lapses prior to my life
membership, I've been a League member for nearly four decades.

> YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
> make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.

> That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis.

It is clear that I have as much "authority" to do those things as you.
You do them frequently. Are you a control freak?

> I've been a professional in radio-electronics since 1952...51 years.

Bully for you. This group doesn't have anything to do with being a
professional in radio or electronics.

> I've also been a radio-electronics HOBBYIST since 1947. Hobby
> activities not for pecuniary interest are AMATEUR activites.

Part of your radio amateur fantasy? You can claim all the hobbyist
time-in-grade you like. Those might be AMATEUR but that doesn't make
you a radio amateur.

> If they
> involved making money at it they would be professional activities.

Maybe you'd like to tell us about your Citizens Band activities having
to do with the fact that you are a citizen and that you once played in a
band.

> YOU keep insisting one MUST be "licensed" to be an AMATEUR.

YOU keep getting it wrong. For you to be a radio amateur, you must pass
a license exam. You haven't.

> YOU keep holding up having a license grant is somehow making
> YOU "better" than anyone not having an amateur license.

No, YOU keep interpreting my words in that manner. Passing a license
exam makes you a radio amateur, a part of ham radio. You haven't passed
such an exam and are not a part of amateur radio.

> YOU seem to think that amateur radio is some event of epiphany, of glory
> and greatness in radio, some kind of nebulous "service" to the
> nation, transcending anything done in any other radio service.

That is incorrect. It doesn't matter what you've done in any other
radio service. If you want to participate in amateur radio, you'll pass
a license exam. You haven't done so.

> Feel free to indulge in your fantasy. Just remember that your output
> of constant personal attack of others not accepting your views makes
> YOU the perverse individual here.

You're a million laughs, Leonard old chap (or chapped). You're the king
of personal attacks and the grand poobah of rejected views. To top it
all off, you aren't involved in amateur radio whatsoever.

> I'm just arguing against a morse code test for any US radio license
> but there is this constant barrage of Personal Attack filth from the
> fantasyland control freaks diverting everyone from the subjects to

> the usual flame fest flings that must make your warped mind happy.

Filth? You must have come across some of Roger Wiseman's material.
You've never "just argued" nor have you limited your agenda to removal
of the morse test.

> So far, you haven't "won" anything. Why do you keep on with the
> same old flame trash?

I thought you were supposed to be eating me for breakfast. Aren't you a
little touchy for one who uses those who disagree with him as
playthings? Floyd must have gotten it wrong.

Dave K8MN

1017. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:42:50 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F383774.33417EA6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74432

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <871xvtqcui.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
> writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> >>In article <20030810112459.12631.00000196@mb-m28.aol.com>,
> >yodoc@aol.comnospam
> >>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> >>
> >>>Of course, you were probably just being "imaginative."
> >>
> >> YOU do that all the time...
> >>
> >That's some of his *real experience*, not none of that empirical
> >theory stuff!
>
> Larrah the Lip should have gotten a job with a fertilizer company,
> advertising over the Internet...instead of becoming a bus driver
> with a "Summa Cum Laude BA degree in 'Human Resources'"
> who had any number of terrific job opportunities waiting for him
> in personnel departments!
>
> THEN I would believe him. :-)

Did you check to see whether you have authority for name-calling,
insulting and demeaning those who disagree with you?

Dave K8MN

1018. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 00:45:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811204504.23745.00001692@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 74433

In article <d22b54c3.0308090916.5629c2b6@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<w4VYa.162$dj3.18912@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> news:c2356669.0308080912.7e373969@posting.google.com...
>
>> More likely the boom after WWII (and Korea) was due to military
>> radio folks becoming hams when they got out ...
>
>There has never been a correlation made between the growth of ham
>radio and new batches of war vets.

It should be noted that the number of US hams grew from about 60,000 on VJ Day to almost 100,000 in 1951, when the restructuring that gave us the "name" classes (including Novice) took place. Some of that was obviously returning vets, some was "pent up demand", etc.

btw, FCC continued to conduct ham exams and issue amateur operator licenses during WW2. They simply suspended all station licenses. So there were plenty of hams but no ham stations for them to operate legally. This was a big improvement over WW1, when all licenses were revoked, equipment had to be dismantled and sealed, and even antennas had to be lowered to the ground and removed.

>The far more likely reasons were
>the overall increase in the standard of living and more personal
>leisure time aided and abetted by a heightened awareness of radio
>comms and technology in general after those wars.

All big factors. Something as simple as a VA or FHA mortgage and a bunch of Liberty bonds made a big difference.

>And to a lesser
>extent the availability of surplus mil-spec hardware for cents per
>pound was a boon to growth.

Sure. Plus wartime manufacturing advances meant that prices on both parts and manufactured gear went down compared to inflation.

>More younger people joined the hobby for
>all these reasons plus the availability of the then-new Novice license
>was a big shot in the arm for growth. "I wuz one" . . .

The Novice had the effect of drastically reducing the age of the average newcomer. Some folks back then were not happy about that.

>
>> The boom in the 60's was probably due to the emergence of economical
>> JA radios,
>
There was no boom in the '60s. JA radios did not really appear until the mid
'70s.

>That growth occurred when brands like (bloody expensive!) Drake,
>Collins, Hammarlund, Heath, B&W and the rest were the only games in
>town.

Yep - the '40s, 50s and very early '60s.
>
>> a general increase in the interest in electronics, and later, the
>> emergence of VHF/UHF FM and repeaters ...

'70s, not '60s. Driven by cheap surplus land-mobile stuff.
>
>HF equipment suppliers were and still are almost entirely driven by
>market needs and expectations and the competition to meet those needs
>and expectations per buck per performace capability. The availability
>of the HF riceboxes in the '70s did just that for the existing
>population of hams. I've never known of an example of anybody getting
>into ham radio simply because the newer HF equipment provided more
>bang for the buck.

Actually, what really has a big effect is the perceived cost to get started. In
the bad old days most hams started out with a receiver and simple wire antenna,
costing whatever they could afford. For many it was a $10 Command set or $25
used SWL rx or homebrew. Once the license was earned, a simple tx and TR system
was added. Not state of the art even for the times but a lot of fun was had and
the expenditures were modest and spread out in time. Most of all, beginners had
lots of examples of simple inexpensive first stations. And there was a long
road of improvements possible, all spread out in time.

Today the "paradigm" seems to be a new transceiver, manufactured antenna, etc.,
all at considerable cost up-front before even any listening is done.
>
>Equipment availability for the bands above HF was never been much of a
>driver in growth until the Tech license was converted from being an
>experimenters ticket to a communicators ticket and even then there
>wasn't all that much growth. It wasn't until the 1980s that Techs got
>into packet in a big way and into the FM voice infrastructures because
>of the increasingly inexpensive VHF/UHF riceboxes that the they became
>major players in the growth equation. It was the Disincentive
>Licensing maneuver of '91 and the availabilty of $150 2M FM xcvrs
>which really done the deed. So now we have numbers. What else did we
>get out of that one?

I dunno that we even got that much in the way of numbers. Sure, a lot of hams
started out as post-1991 Techs, and we've grown considerably since then. But
look at the '80s growth, and the '70s growth....

>
>> Actually, it's not a bad idea to use existing PC capabilities to do the
>> signal processing for multiple modes ... it's all software ... and within
>> the limits of a typical SSB radio, you can do some interesting, albeit
>> rather slow, stuff on HF.
>
>There ya go again dammit. It's gonna STAY that way too until YOU
>figger out how to pull it off without screwing up the bands by being a
>spectrum hog for your own jollies.
>
>> 9600 is a kludge in virtually all of the rice-boxes ... and it's not fast
>> enough to really be interesting or all that useful ...
>
>9600 would have helped ten years ago but it never happened. In the
>meanwhile packet and the Internet have been interlaced and the need
>for 9600 has all but disappeared.
>
>> > > I would respectfully disagree ... the idea that "hams can't work
>> > > with SMT" is bogus ...
>> >
>> > I agree!
>
>Then YOU snip the frigging resistors and jumpers in this frigging SMT
>radio so that I can get on 60M. Ya need a 10X magnifier just the SEE
>the things on the frigging PCB!

All part of the tool kit.
>
>> Building a radio will involve components ... some may be "store-bought"
>> ICs, others will be R/L/C, perhaps some discrete transistors, etc. ... BUT
>> there is no reason that reasonably technically-inclined, intelligent hams
>> cannot
>> "build" their own custom ICs at home these days ... there are all sorts of
>> programmable logic devices, ranging from a few thousand or less gates to
>> several millions of gates ... and the software to do design, simulation,
>> verification,
>> and programming is either affordable, or in some cases free.
>>
>> You do your conceptual design, code it in VHDL, simulate it, synthesize it
>> into a file that is used to program the IC and voila, something that had NO
>> "personalilty" ... no "idea of how to do anything" ... is now a functional
>> "custom IC." This is REALLY cool stuff ... and there are lots and lots of
>> free "cores"out there for all sorts of things ... SPI interfaces,
>> microcontrollers,
>> FEC, and on and on and on ... all things that can be "hooked up" together
>> and/or with your own code and synthesized into your own IC ...

Let's see,

What I'm hearing is that it's "reasonable" to expect hams who are not
electrical engineering professionals to

do a "conceptual design, code it in VHDL, simulate it, synthesize it into a file that is used to
program the IC" and then integrate it. We can also expect them to use "lots and lots of
free "cores"out there for all sorts of things ... SPI interfaces, microcontrollers,
FEC, and on and on and on ... all things that can be "hooked up" together
and/or with your own code and synthesized into your own IC"s. And then put it all together into
a functioning, useful RADIO - on their own time and with their own money and tools.

But it is not "reasonable" to expect them to learn enough Morse code to pass Element 1. OK, fine.
>
>And when it's all said and done the average ham won't learn or know
>any more than he/she needs to pass the tests and/or to get on the air
>and meet their specific operating objectives. Whatever takes the least
>effort and brain pain prevails.

btw, I don't see anyhting on Shannon's work in the question pools.
>
>Fred is working on it . . .
>
Actually I think a "21st century Novice" license isn't such a bad idea. The problem is on the other end of the scale.

>> Folks just need to think in new paradigms ... unfortunately, that does not
>> seem to be the strong suit of many present hams.

Another "bell the cat" problem. Which new paradigms? The real problems most hams, particularly new ones, face are
things like CC&Rs, and RFI.
>
>I heard exactly that same lament in the 1950s and it was just as true
>then as it now. What conclusions do you draw from that as it relates
>to the health, welfare and growth of ham radio?

What matters is not how many hams there are but how many active hams there are. The FCC database sez 687,000 or so in the USA alone. What do you think the bands would sound like if even 10% of them were on the air at once?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1019. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 01:01:39 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93D4D5C16A581elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 74434

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0308111312.2a8895e3@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns93D34838F9CB6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>> news:20030810064427.21428.00001584@mb-m23.aol.com:
>>
>> > In article <Xns93D2733067496elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
>> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>> >
>> >>>>> "Here" is all of Region 2. A big part of the world.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>No, only the USA, it's still phone in the rest of R2
>> >>>
>> >>> No, it isn't. Other modes are authorized, not just 'phone.
>> >>>
>> >>The point being, however, that phone is authorised there in every
>> >>country but one
>> >
>> > OK, fine.
>> >>
>> >>>>>>I think you'll find it isn't being fixed.
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>> Sure it is, but it will take time. Before the end of the decade
>> >>>>> 7000-7200 will be worldwide exclusive amateur. That's double
>> >>>>> what Region 1 and Region 3 have now. It will make sense for
>> >>>>> those regions to move their 'phone up above 7100 and leave below
>> >>>>> 7100 to CW and digital.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>Not while the US has CW in 7100-7150. As long as that's the case
>> >>>>it makes more sense _to_them_ to leave 7000-7100 unchanged and
>> >>>>split the 'new' 7100-7200 50/50. Net gain to you - zero.
>> >>>
>> >>> If it gets the foreign 'phones off of 7030, it's a gain.
>> >>>>>>
>> >>>>>>The ARRL bandplan is the only
>> >>>>>>one out of step, so nobody else is likely to change theirs,
>> >>>>>>notwithstanding Europe and some other areas getting 7100-7200 as
>> >>>>>>additional spectrum in 2007.
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>> What part of the world will not get 7100-7200?
>> >>>>
>> >>>>None

>> >>>
>> >>> There you are.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>> And why should Region 2 change now, with the band getting wider?
>> >>>>
>> >>>>You mean the US, and I don't suppose the ARRL will change
>> >>>
>> >>> It's not just ARRL but FCC.
>> >>
>> >>You're right, but it's not the rest of the region
>> >
>> > So because everyone else makes a mistake, the USA should make it
>> > too?
>>
>> This reminds me of an old comic strip. The proud mother is watching
>> the passing out parade and calls out "Look at my Johnny, he's the only
>> one in step!".
>
> It reminds me of a different strip. The lemmings are rushing over the
> cliff, and one grabs his ankles and yells "CANNONBALL!!!!"
>
>> According to you, the USA is the only country in step in the parade.
>
> Nope.
>
> According to me, the USA has a better system and the other countries
> haven;t caught on yet.
>
> Here in the USA we have some roads reserved for autos only, and some
> lanes reserved for car pools and transit buses. Act as incentives to
> use more efficient means of transport. Also acknowledges the basic
> incompatibility of small and large vehicles. Non-phone subbands act as
> an incentive to use more efficient modes than analog voice, and
> acknowledge the basic incompatibility between wide and narrow modes.
>>
>> >>>>>>All that will happen is that a DX window will
>> >>>>>>appear from 7150-7200, but the DX will continue to use phone
>> >>>>>>everywhere they use it now - indefinitely. Sorry to be the one
>> >>>>>>to break that to you!
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>> So their lack of a bandplan and good manners should cause the
>> >>>>> USA to follow their lead? I think not!
>> >>>>
>> >>>>They have a bandplan. Phone stays above at least 7040, except 7030
>> >>>>in R3.
>> >>>
>> >>> There are Canadians operating LSB on 7030.
>>
>> >>I wasn't aware of that. That is against any bandplan that I know of,
>> >>and I agree that it is bad manners

>> >
>> > Exactly. Main point is that bandplans are not much help if folks
>> > ignore them.
>
> And the only reason "DX windows" exist is so that foreign 'phones have
> a place to go where they won't be buried by hordes of 1.5 KW USA
> 'phones. IOW, so the DX can work each other once in a while.
>> >>
>> >>>>That's not the bandplan you want, but it's a bandplan. The
>> >>>>reference to good manners I don't follow.
>> >>>
>> >>> The folks who don't follow the bandplan have bad manners. Having a
>> >>> Canadian SSB net on 7030 when they have 7000-7030 is bad manners.
>> >>
>> >>Agreed
>> >
>> > Thanks
>> >>
>> >>>>I don't expect the USA to follow anyone's lead. Just don't be
>> >>>>surprised when no-one follows the USA's lead either.
>> >>>
>> >>> And the result is chaos.
>> >>
>> >>Yes it is. However, the rest of the world probably think that it
>> >>would be easier for _one_ country to change than for 100+, which
>> >>doesn't mean that I think it will happen.
>> >
>> > So even though the result is chaos, the USA should follow along and
>> > make it that much worse?
>>
>> If the USA followed along it would no longer be chaos.
>
> Yes, it would. In fact, it would be worse, because the DX would have
> nowhere to hide.
>
> Ask yourself this: Why do DX 'phones operate in the US CW/data
> subbands at all if they can operate in the US 'phone subbands?
>

In the case of 40, it's to avoid BCI.

On the other bands, I think a lot of DX ops don't even know how far down
US hams can go on phone (although the serious DXers do).

>> As I say, though,
>> I'm not holding my breath for that to happen.
>
>> >>>>> 800 is pretty high. 600-700 is more common among CW ops. The SSB
>> >>>>> audio passband is typically 300-2700 Hz, so 600 or even 800 is
>> >>>>> pretty low. 1500 would be smack in the middle.
>> >>>>

>> >>>>True enough
>> >>>>
>> >>>>>>This of course would be what you
>> >>>>>>would get if they netted onto the SSB and then offset by their
>> >>>>>>usual amount.
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>> There is no offset in CW. The carriers are all on the same
>> >>>>> frequency.
>> >>>>>>
>> >>>>>>> Point is that what sounds like "right on top" may not sound
>> >>>>>>> that way to the other guy.
>>
>> >>>>>>It depends which side of the nominal carrier frequency the CW
>> >>>>>>signal is on. However, assuming my SSB filter is working, I
>> >>>>>>would say they were low, i.e. on the same side as the LSB
>> >>>>>>sideband, or I would be filtering them out. This also puts them
>> >>>>>>almost in the middle of the SSB signal, doesn't it?
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>> No. Their tone would be 1500 if it were in the middle.
>> >>>>>>
>> >>>>>>> Listen to a busy CW contest with a wide (AM bandwidth) rx and
>> >>>>>>> it sounds like a pile of intentional inteference. Switch in
>> >>>>>>> appropriate filters and you find that almost all of the
>> >>>>>>> stations have spaced themselves so they don't overlap.
>> >>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> Neither am I
>> >>>>>>>>> talking about weak phone stations, although they could be
>> >>>>>>>>> weak at some other QTH.
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>> That's another point.
>> >>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> > Of course the DX 'phones could have switched to CW and
>> >>>>>>>>> > answered the CQers, then politely asked them to move.
>> >>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>> But they didn't, did they?
>> >>>>>
>> > I guess not.
>> >>>>>>>>> >
>> >>>>>>>>> > *My Southgate Type 7 has two cascaded 8 pole 500 Hz crystal
>> >>>>>>>>> > filters, giving an effective bandwidth of less than 400 Hz
>> >>>>>>>>> > and very steep filter skirts. And it has an audio LC filter
>> >>>>>>>>> > as well.
>> >>>>>>>>> >
>> >>>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> So, if say, you called QRU? on 7080 and there was a strong
>> >>>>>>>>> signal SSB QSO in progress, would you be able to tell? This
>> >>>>>>>>> is a genuine question.
>> >>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>> I would listen first and steer clear of anyhting that sounds
>> >>>>>>> like SSB. Then I'd send "IE" a few times to test the waters.

>> >>>>>>> If I heard something start up when I did that, I'd move.
>> >>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>> But usually I am below 7060. Above about 7060 is data and
>> >>>>>>> foreign SSB country.
>> >>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>>>> I
>> >>>>>>>>> don't posses a CW filter.
>> >>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>> One of the reasons some hams get turned off to CW is that they
>> >>>>>>> use equipment that really isn't meant for the mode. Most HF
>> >>>>>>> rigs today are primarily SSB rigs with CW tacked on. Some are
>> >>>>>>> pretty good, many are awful.
>> >>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>
>> >>>>>>If I need it I have an outboard audio filter
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>> Ugh. Audio filters are no substitute for IF filtering. And
>> >>>>> unless the AGC is turned off, QRM can dominate the receiver.
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>
>> >>>>True, but I don't really need a narrow CW filter for anything
>> >>>
>> >>> Data modes.
>> >>
>> >>If I ever get around to trying any
>> >
>> >>>>>>(a Radio Shack DSP unit,
>> >>>>>>which is fairly basic and suffers from low audio output). I
>> >>>>>>hadn't thought about that when I said I had no CW filter. It
>> >>>>>>tends to 'take off' on 20 with RF getting inside it, but it's OK
>> >>>>>>on 40.
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>> What sort of rig?
>> >>>>
>> >>>>I use an IC-729 in my shack. Excellent receiver RF performance.
>> >>>
>> >>> Compared to what? No offense, but there are some really good rigs
>> >>> out there.
>> >>
>> >>The reviews at the time said it was comparable with anything
>> >>regardless of price bracket in _basic_ receiver performance, but
>> >>that was back in '92. I expect the world has moved on, and it never
>> >>was loaded with features.
>> >
>> > You might want to compare it to more modern stuff. The Ten Tec and
>> > Elecraft websites have various receiver performance measures of
>> > different rigs, as actually measured.
>> >>
>> >>What do you use, anyway?
>> >>

>> > My homebrew 100 watt transceiver and an Elecraft K2 built from a
>> > kit.
>> >
>>
>> I hope your K2 doesn't drift, unlike one that I heard on the bands.
>
> It doesn't. I have had it for over two years now and it's done very
> well.
>
>> Of
>> course, that may have been due to the person who put it together.
>
> The classic problem with kits is that they are only as good as the
> builder.

BTW, I just received the parts for my K5OOR linear. We're supposed to call it a project instead of a kit, HI. Anyway, when I've built it, it will amplify the output of my FT817 to 35 watts on 160-10. It will be pretty small too, i.e. the FT817 plus the linear will still be much smaller and lighter than the IC729.

>>
>> >>>>Not very
>> >>>>good audio, though. Ironically it has nowhere to fit a narrow SSB
>> >>>>filter, but has a place for a CW filter (nothing in there, of
>> >>>>course).
>> >>>
>> >>> Couldn't a narrow SSB filter be put in the CW slot?
>> >>
>> >>Yes, but without making any further mods it would be selected when
>> >>the mode was set to 'CW-N'.
>> >
>> > There must be a mod for it.
>>
>> I haven't seen one so far, but you would think it could be done.
>
> Be the first....

Maybe

>>
>> >>
>> >>>>Not the
>> >>>>Rolls Royce of radios, but I'm not overloaded with cash.
>> >>>
>> >>> The Southgate Type 7 cost me less than $100 to build.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>>>>> I am guessing you would hear something,though?
>> >>>>>>>>
>> >>>>>>> Depends on the situation. Usually SSB sounds like monkey
>> >>>>>>> chatter through a narrow filter. But near the edges it can be

>> >>>>>>> very weak or inaudible.
>> >>>>>>
>> >>>>>>As I've explained, I think this is going on in the middle of the
>> >>>>>>SSB sigs, which is another reason to be suspicious
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>> Sure. But 1500 is the middle, not 800.
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>>>> The best solution is for wide and narrow modes to have their
>> >>>>>>> own subbands. They simply don't mix well.
>> >>>>>>
>> >>>>>>Yes
>> >>>>>
>> >>>>> So when will the rest of the world get on the beam and have
>> >>>>> nonphone subbands?
>> >>>>
>> >>>>They do, and they have done as long as I remember. In some
>> >>>>countries they are voluntary, and in others they are compulsory,
>> >>>>but nowhere are they as wide as in the USA.
>> >>>
>> >>> Time for them to get on the beam, then.
>> >>
>> >>Depends what you mean - widen them or make them compulsory?
>> >
>> > Both - just like the USA.
>> >
>> >>There is no
>> >>expansion of CW use to justify the former,
>> >
>> > Yes, there is. Look at participation in contests as just one
>> > measure. CW up, phone flat.
>> >
>>
>> Contesters, the really serious kind, use whatever mode is specified in
>> the rules. If the rules said semaphore they'd learn that too.
>
> Almost all contests have separate CW and 'phone weekends. (FD and ARRL
> 160 are the exceptions that prove the rule). The ham population can
> choose to operate one, both, or neither. CW participation is UP while
> 'phone is flat.

That puzzles me. I honestly don't think it's due to new hams preferring
CW. Maybe there are people who used to only contest on phone that are now
doing the CW leg as well.

>>
>> >>and most administrations don't
>> >>really care what hams do within the ham bands. I suspect that, for
>> >>example, Industry Canada don't even care about Canadian hams
>> >>annoying other Canadian hams by operating phone on CW frequencies.
>> >
>> > Then you can expect more of the behavior you have complained about.

>> >
>>
>> Perhaps
>
> Count on it. Remember the story of the Tower of Babel?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

1020. BPL & US Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 01:40:16 UTC
From: Hams <Hams_member@newsguy.com>
Message-ID: <bh9gi001goo@drn.newsguy.com>
Source record: 74444

http://www1.commsworld.com.au/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=commsworld/home&var_el=art&art_id=1034683529903&var_sect=NEWS&from=home

http://tinyurl.com/jpua

NEWS

HAMS' HIGH TENSION OVER POWERLINE - 12 August 2003
Richard Chirgwin

Stray Signals Spoil Spectrum

Amateur radio operators in America have conducted tests which they say demonstrate unacceptable radio interference caused by powerline broadband systems.

The ham radio operators conducted tests in four US states where powerline is in pilots, and the results of those tests were presented at the group's Austin Summerfest earlier this month.

The tests demonstrated that powerline broadband systems using frequencies between 2Mbps and 80Mbps created wide-spectrum interference on HF and low-VHF amateur radio allocations.

The test was conducted by the laboratory manager of America's ARRL (the American Radio Relay League), Ed Hare, who tested spectrum measurements in Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania and New York. He is quoted in the ARRL's online publication as saying that interference "ranged from moderate to extremely strong". In some tests, powerline interference was propagating for miles.

The tests found three types of interference: static, pulse noise, and "warbling". The interference was detectable both from overhead and from underground cabling.

The ARRL had already filed technical exhibits to an FCC powerline inquiry, and says it will file further comments this month.

The ARRL article can be found here.{ Http://arrl.org/ }
CommsWorld Comment:

The first trials of powerline technology during the 1990s were killed off by interference, and by overhyped vendor claims. When powerline started to make its comeback, the vendor community put its hand on its collective heart and promised that interference was solved.

If the ARRL's tests are right " which is a reasonable assumption given the demanding nature of a ham radio license " then powerline vendors were mistaken about interference.

This is hardly surprising. The physical parameters of an electricity distribution network vary much more widely than anything you'll see in a laboratory. It's quite likely that the interference seen in lab tests was small enough to convince the industry the technology works. But out in the field, there's plenty of things to fool around with the line impedance.

This could have been foreseen. If the powerline vendors were wrong about interference, can we trust their claims about speed, performance, and cost?

It's easy to trivialise the concerns of the ham operators and that is exactly the tack utilities are taking in America. But ham operators aren't ignorant; and they're not without rights. In all countries, ham is licensed and that means the operator has paid a fee for the right to use spectrum.

1021. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 01:44:00 UTC
From: averyfine@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811214400.10282.00001428@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74435

>Subject: Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 8/11/03 8:01 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030811200137.15462.00002196@mb-m06.aol.com>
>
>In article <f45722ac.0308101345.510dba91@posting.google.com>,
>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>>averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
>>news:<20030810055941.27618.00001162@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>>> > brianburke@juno.com wrote:
>>> >averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote:
>>>
>>> >> Do you know if Len Anderson is a cannibal?

Are you a cannibal, Len Anderson?

>>> >> Claims have been made that he eats
>>> >> others for breakfast.
>>> >
>>> >Who? When?
>>>
>>> Floyd Davidson wrote it about Len Anderson a few days ago.
>>
>>I don't recall Floyd saying Len was a cannibal.
>>
>>> >Dave thinks he's a pugilist.
>>> >
>>> Maybe a pugil stick? ;-) ;-)
>>
>>Does he?
>>
>>> Your master and teacher has
>>> returned, Brian Burke.
>>
>>Noted.
>
> Brian, why are you answering a copycat wanna-be?

Of whom do you speak?

I am not copying anyone. I am simply being myself. I have not called anyone a
"psychotic", "wanna-be" or any other names.

You have.
>

> That creature doesn't exist.

Then who is writing these posts? ;-)

You do not seem to have a sense of humor, Len Anderson. ;-) ;-)

Your acolytes try to emulate you. They come close at times. ;-) ;-) ;-)

You would do well to heed these words of wisdom:

"The things that upset us most are often things we see as qualities in our ownselves." - Kim W5TIT

"....it is often reflected in the things people say when they try to insult others.....have a pretty stock set of insults, which clearly are based on what they understand about themselves, but are gratuitously thrown at anyone who disagrees with them." - Floyd Davidson

1022. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 01:55:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030811215504.08200.00001318@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74436

In article <bh6tsk$e7v@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:

>
>Brian: perhaps you can give me some kind of clue as to what the Hell you are
>talking about?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

You couldn't buy a clue if they were three for a dollar.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1023. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 01:55:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030811215504.08200.00001317@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74441

In article <20030811200133.15462.00002193@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> Larrah the Lip should have gotten a job with a fertilizer company,
> advertising over the Internet...instead of becoming a bus driver
> with a "Summa Cum Laude BA degree in 'Human Resources'"
> who had any number of terrific job opportunities waiting for him
> in personnel departments!
>
> THEN I would believe him. :-)
>
> LHA

**********ADVERTISEMENT**********
Hey everyone, we're having a Fertilizer Sale here on the internet! All the freshest, highest-quality fertilizer you need is right here for you, and the price is right! All you need is a computer, modem, and ISP service, and then subscribe to rec.radio.amateur.policy. There, you can read Lennie Anderson's daily output of the best fertilizer in town! Come one, come all! It's waiting right here at Larrah's Fertilizer Emporium, a.k.a. rrap, just look for the postings by Lenover21@aol.com!
**********ADVERTISEMENT**********

73 de Larry, K3LT

1024. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 01:55:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030811215505.08200.00001320@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74442

In article <bh99kk$bqn@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:

>Your "don't look now" phrase is about as old as ROFLMAO, Larry.

But at least it's mine, Kim! Don't look now, but it's one of my Usenet persona trademarks, as it were. And unlike you and your ROFLMAO, It is usually followed by witty, insightful, and well-reasoned remarks on the subject at hand.

>And, I am
>not jealous of this lady at all. More importantly, her sales volume would
>be of little significance to me, since I am not in sales. My point was that
>she probably has a lot of lookups because of people remembering her call
>from a trade show and seeing if there's a link to the company she
>represented.
>
>Oh, hey, why don't you look her up and get a date, Larry. Looks like you're
>interested.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Any normal, healthy male would be interested in Michelle, Kim. Sorry, I know you're not personally familiar with that concept from your own experience. In fact, you had to come up with your "...one step closer to extinction" Vanity call sign, just to stir up some interest. Too bad it's the wrong kind!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1025. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 01:55:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030811215505.08200.00001319@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74443

In article <c2356669.0308110347.1b5f839a@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>> Jim:
>>
>> W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter!
>
>Ding ding ding!
>
>Now why would he be the only one without a lookup counter? Every other
>callsign I've ever checked has one.
>
>> OTOH,
>> Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!
>
>Naw, I've seen some really high lookup numbers.
>>
>> Now, now, Kim -- don't be jealous of Michelle -- even though you have a
>> right to be!
>
>Hint: Check out their birthdates....
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

Just looked up the birthdates for Kim, Michelle, and Fred. Kim's is in 1955, making her 48 years old, Michelle's is in 0010, making her 1,993 years old, and Fred's is in 1935, making him 68. I must say, Michelle is very well preserved for a little old lady! However, I guess she's a bit too old for me now!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1026. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 01:55:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030811215506.08200.00001322@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74437

In article <20030811200138.15462.00002198@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>> Perhaps we can get Vipul a date?
>>
>>No -- but I'm available!
>
> Are you finally coming out of the closet?!?!?

Lennie:

Yup! I'm coming out of the closet: I want a date with Michelle, KC0MYV! Yum, Yum!!! She could even sell me a microphone, as long as I got to talk to her!

73 de Larry, K3LT
An out-of-the closet heterosexual (Something Lennie disapproves of!)

1027. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 01:55:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030811215506.08200.00001321@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74438

In article <bh99q1$4aa@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>
>K3FK???????????!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

That's an Amateur Extra-class 1x2 call sign, Kim. A very good one, in
fact! Unlike yours, it doesn't spell something that makes an inappropriate
reference to the female anatomy for the sake of inciting prurient interest
in the callsign's owner.

BTW -- why aren't you an Extra, Kim? Those written tests too tough
for you?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1028. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 01:55:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030811215506.08200.00001323@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74439

In article <87he4ongn4.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
writes:

>So if I was to get on the air and talk to folks like you and
>Larry I, like you, would be less concerned with "Empirical
>Theory", eh?

Floyd:

Please, enlighten us. Provide a definition of the term "empirical."

73 de Larry, K3LT

1029. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 01:55:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030811215508.08200.00001324@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74440

In article <20030811200141.15462.00002200@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>Well, find me an entry-level Personnel Officer job in Kent County, DE with
>>the same pay and benefits as my present job, and I'll take it! BTW, I
>>applied
>>for one in my own company last year, but it went to, of all people, one of
>my
>>own classmates, a very fine, sexy-looking YL! She did NOT graduate
>>with any kind of honors, since she took her program part-time and took over
>>7 years to get her degree, whereas I did mine on a full-time basis in 2.5
>>years. But I don't look as good in a cubicle as she does!
>
> No problem, we've never expected anything but the usual Roll
> Rationalizations.

Lennie:

That's pretty funny, but that is what actually happened! Quite frankly, if I had to choose between hiring "Suzie" (not her real name) and myself, I'd hire her each time!

> You are keeping up the usual level of Roll misogyny. Some things
> never change.

I gues snot!

>>>>While I freely admit that I do have a
>>>>great deal of respect for hams who do possess genuine, professional-
>>>>grade technical qualifications, you, and your apologists Floyd Davidson
>>>>and Len Anderson, tend to raise the noise level to BPL standards!
>>>
>>> Poor baby...still miffed at no one recognizing your intrinsic Greatness?
>>
>>I hadn't noticed that anyone isn't recognizing it, Lennie.
>
> No one HAS recognized your greatness. It isn't there.
>
> But you keep insisting you have it.

No, Lennie, YOU did! I never mentioned my "intrinsic Greatness."

> Beeperitis.

That would be an inflammation of the beeper. Is your beeper inflamed, Lennie? I recommend Preparation H!

>>I am a BUS DRIVER, remember?
>
> Strange...you keep insisting you are a "paratransit specialist."
>
> Which is it?

Suit yourself. Either one is true.

>>My knowledge of communications is
>>limited to what I've done in AMATEUR radio, and the use of my 800 MHz
>>voice/data comm system in my bus.
>
> You've been licensed as an AMATEUR how long? And you've never
> bothered to find out about radio technology since you became an
> extra something-or-other?

Twenty-two years this month, Lennie. And, yes, I have!

> Are you LAZY?

Most definitely!

>>Lennie, you're obviously in need of new reading glasses. I've never claimed
>>to be anything but an average ham with average, AMATEUR-level
>>technical skills.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...how quickly they forget. You claimed to be in the "upper
> percentile of amateur radio." :-)

I think that was the upper fifth percentile, IIRC. Get it right.

> I would classify you as little more than an ego-driven salesman type
> who does CB-like radio activity with a federal license grant.
>
> Aren't you supposed to be in the national pool of "trained
> communicators" for the nation's benefit and "advancing the state
> of the art" of AMATEURISM?
>
> I liked it better when you were just a Soma Come Loud student who
> could get any human resources job he wanted after graduation.

Well, Lennie, I learned the truth the hard way. I'm not a 5'2" red head
with a sexy figure, a sweet-as-honey Southern twang in my voice, and
a tight little butt. Then again, she's collecting dust in that cubicle all
day,
and I'm out enjoying a paid ride in the countryside, enjoying my tunes
on the stereo, helping out people who need my help to be able to live
relatively normal lives. I decided a while ago that if my company has
some other job for me to do, it had better be something I can do from
behind the wheel of my bus! So go ahead, keep up the whining about
my alleged claims of what I was going to do after graduation. That's
about all you're good for around here!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1030. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 02:38:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811223851.08200.00001325@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74445

In article <3F382712.DE6C3C58@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <BB5A07D1.22018%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart
>> <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" wrote:
>> >>
>> >> (snip) And amateur radio does not exist to
>> >> serve other services. (snip)
>> >
>> > Our public service is often service to other agencies (Red Cross, MARS,
>> >and so on).
>> >
>> >> The "pool of trained operators" thing in 97.1 is
>> >> really about the idea of the ARS being a service
>> >> where the licensees (hams) are skilled both
>> >> operationally and technically, able to do a lot
>> >> of different things well. This distinguishes it
>> >> from other services, (snip)
>> >
>> > The pool of trained operators concept relates to our ability to do the
>> >other things outlined in 97.1 (public service, international goodwill, and
>> >so on). At one time, code was a necessary part of at least some of that.
>> >That is much less so today, hence the move to change the code testing
>> >requirement.
>>
>> Dwight, that statement in 97.1 is an OLD thing going back decades.
>>
>> It was put in there to rationalize the existance of amateur radio among
>> all the other very commercial radio services.
>>
>> Three to four decades ago there MIGHT have been a "need" for "trained
>> operators" for the military draft. [the USA still had a draft and the
>Cold
>> War was very warm indeed] Never mind that the military already HAD
>> ways of training in the "radio arts."
>
>I obtained enough knowledge through amateur radio that I was able to
>take a "Bypassed Specialist" exam in basic training. The Air Force gave
>me the "3" or apprentice skill level and allowed me to bypass tech
>school. I was sent to my first assignment and obtained my "5" or

>journeyman level skill code through OJT and correspondence classes. The
>military, at least back then, recognized when an individual had enough
>knowledge to skip military training in the "radio arts".

Oh MY but aren't you a military wonderful all through AMATEUR
RADIO!

Tsk, tsk, tsk, most of us in my Fort Monmouth Signal School
classes were NOT radio amateurs. Few were professionals. WE
couldn't use morsemanship skills to advance in radar or microwave
radio relay MOS training. Of course that was in 1952 when all
US radio amateurs were very knowledgeable about radar and multi-
channel radio relay, right? :-)

Once out of Signal School and assigned to a unit, most of us had
to do professional level work like keeping all those multi-channel
radio relay systems up and running 24/7. Of course, YOU don't
recognize "24/7" as anything at all, do you? [you haven't done so
before, why hope you might?]

In my case, I had to learn, on the job, all about high power HF
transmitters and keeping the primary communications circuits
across the Pacific up and running for 24/7 for a year and a half.
No problem. Made E-5, NCO and not the Specialist, in a year and
a half, waiting around for the microwave radio relay equipment to
finally arrive. Morsemanship skills didn't matter one whit. Neither
were there any points for DX contesting or reading QST ads cover to
cover.

>Do you know
>when the U.S. might need trained operators or when another draft will be
>instituted?

You mean REinstituted. The military draft (conscription) ended way
back in 1973. That's THIRTY YEARS AGO.

The ENTIRE US military is VOLUNTEER. For 30 years.

I've seen enough examples of the all-volunteer US military to know they
are bright, go-getting military professionals who know what to do with
professional equipment.

Once the all-volunteer military is assigned a task they DO it, and DO
IT professionally and they WIN their objectives. See Panama, see
Grenada, see fun in the skies over Libya, see the First Gulf War, see
Afghanistan, see the Second Gulf War. It was Whupass time and
the "other side' got whupped.

The US military has an excellent schooling system for electronics and
radio, NOT needing some ham skilled hobbyist "training" in working
DX for contest points or having fine picnics-with-radios called "Field Day."
The US Army can DO field communications anytime and for months.

>Are you miffed because you don't have any war stories relating to code?

Hell NO. None of us at station ADA had to know any morse code or use it for primary communications trans-Pacific a half century ago. Morsemanship was NOT a useful skill back then and it isn't a useful still in radio NOW.

Too many of you mighty macho morsemen are living in a fantasyland like the fake "colonel" in here five (six?) years ago trying to make us believe his "son was behind enemy lines in Iraq sending intel back via CW" during the First Gulf War. Fantasy bullshit then, still is.

>Do you know anything about the operating skills of any contest types?

I could care less.

The US military is trained to WIN. It DOES that. AMATEURISM in military radio is for off-duty fun and games with special services, not special forces.

>> Morse code use will keep out the eveavsdropers and bad people from
>> the content of communications, thus not letting them know the deep
>> dark, very secret ways of the ham. Secure.
>>
>> So I've been told.
>
>It is a cinch that you don't have first hand knowledge of anything to do
>with morse code. Whoever told you was wrong. <shrug> :-)

It's a cast-iron cinch that all you have is some more fantasies of greatness in radio while at third-world embassies in Africa.

Show us all your greatness with experiences with SHARES and ALE, not the drink. We've seen the results of drinking from others. Sober up.

You are wasting everyone's time in here.

LHA

1031. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 02:38:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811223853.08200.00001326@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74447

In article <3F382A57.A6B30B7F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <w4VYa.162$dj3.18912@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> >news:c2356669.0308080912.7e373969@posting.google.com...
>> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>> >news:<XsNYa.93$dj3.13294@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:20030807222823.21428.00001559@mb-m23.aol.com...
>
>> >Now you're trying to tell us that incentive licensing PROMOTED
>> >growth in ham radio??? I don't think so ...
>> >
>> >More likely the boom after WWII (and Korea) was due to military
>> >radio folks becoming hams when they got out ...
>>
>> Now, now. Rev. Jimmie LIVED THOSE TIMES. He KNOWS.
>>
>> :-)
>
>You've told us about morse landline telegraphy. Did you LIVE THOSE
>TIMES? Do you KNOW? Maybe you read it in a BOOK or saw an article on
>the WEB. :-)

Irrelevant. No one in here lived in 1844 when morse code was first used
in commercial landline communications.

No one in here lived when Marconi did his first radio communications in
Switzerland in 1895, or proved in Italy in 1896...using morse code for
on-off keying of a spark transmitter.

No one in here lived when the Titanic went down and mighty morse code
managed to get through for rescuing some...morse code could get
through because there was NOTHING ELSE to compare it with.

Try reading a BOOK on the REST of the world of radio instead of what
if spoon-fed you by the little publisher in Newington. You might find out
that the REST OF THE RADIO WORLD has gone beyond amateurism.

There is NO need in the rest of the radio world for DX contesting or
morsemanship skills or collecting QSL cards.

>> >The boom in the 60's was probably due to the emergence of economical
>> >JA radios, a general increase in the interest in electronics, and later,
the
>> >emergence of VHF/UHF FM and repeaters ...
>
>Incorrect. There was no boom of JA radios in the 1960's.

Of course not. Hallicrafters, National Radio, RME, Collins were all
having terrific sales, snowing the amateur market with ham gear.

Right. Sure. Where are they now?

Collins quit the ham market long ago. Hallicrafters folded or something
even longer ago. National Radio went for the military electronics stuff
quitting ham radio sales. Even Heathkit went belly-up.

Are you in some kind of dream world where you think Yaesu, Icom,
Kenwood, and JRC are "American" companies?!?!?

>> It's difficult for even old-timers to understand a postwar boom period
and
>> the Cold War getting hotter when they've just reached First Grade. :-)
>
>I don't know about when you were in school, Len. They provided us
>history books. Most of us figured out that there was additional
>historical material available. :-) :-)

Paper, moveable type, and the printing press were all invented LONG
before 1844 and the first use of commercial morse code
communications.

I was a working radio professional in 1952 when the Cold War was
already started. Are you saying your holiness as a school boy has
MORE experience in Cold War life?!?!?

>> The holier-than-thou old-timers insist on the "no-coders" to do all
>> the technical advancements in amateur radio. Never mind that they
>> weren't able to do much in a half century. :-)
>
>What's it to you?

Stuff it, Colonel Klunk.

>You aren't involved. If you're to make any technical
>advancements in amateur radio, you'd better get cracking.

Stuff it twice. YOU are NOT a judge. You are NOT an official who can
"run" the US amateur radio community. You are NOT in government
anymore and were NEVER a radio regulator at the FCC.

I've had a successful career in PROFESSIONAL radio-electronics and
still enjoy that in retirement. Radio-electronics has been a fun hobby
for me for a longer time.

Now tell us, great big four-decade experienced AMATEUR radio god,
what have YOU ever done to "advance amateur radio?!?"

Show us your patents, your marvelous discoveries, all your important
technical contributions. You've had FORTY YEARS of amateurism
and all you can come up with is trying to put down folks in an amateur
newsgroup?!?

>In this game, you aren't nobility and you aren't a peasant. You're an
>onlooker.

That's all you are, big radio god of the AMATEUR bands.

A hot-air balloon who plays with ready-built radios and talks tuff as a
newsgroupie.

Get a better life.

LHA

1032. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 02:38:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030811223854.08200.00001327@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74446

In article <87isp3n8x2.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
writes:

>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>>Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>>
>>> Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>
>> <some snippage>
>>
>>>> You increase the SNR, regardless of the bandwidth, by increasing the
>>>> signal level DICK.
>>>>
>>>
>>> Well, so much for your technical knowledge if THAT"S all you know about
>>> it. Any experienced
>>> ham, even without ANY tech schooling whatever, knows better than that.
>>
>> As a dilletante, I realize that in any ratio, there are two numbers.
>
>Actually, there are three (bandwidth, signal, and noise) which
>are related to channel capacity by the following formula
>
> Capacity = Bandwidth * Log2 (1 + Signal/Noise)
>
>The debate is over comparing *efficiency* of different modes (CW
>and PSK-31), and hence the channel capacity for such a
>comparison, must be normalized.
>
>Reducing the Bandwidth parameter does decrease the observed SNR
>in the channel, but the Capacity is not increased because the
>actual noise power per Hz is unchanged.

Ahem. Four. Include error rate. :-)

Claude Shannon used teleprinters as a working example in his 1947
landmark paper.

That made it more familiar to communications people in the REST of
the communications world. Not many radio amateurs knew how
teleprinters worked or how they were coded in 1947. :-)

"Shannon's Laws" apply to EVERY communications medium, wired or
wireless. According to a few ignorant extras the "don't apply" to amateur
radio. :-)

>> So while it is quite possible to make the s/n ratio larger by
>>increasing the signal, it is equally possible, and sometimes much better
>> to increase the s/n ratio by lowering the noise. Sometimes it is the
>>*only* option available.
>
>However, what has to change is the noise power per Hz, and
>reducing the bandwidth does not change that.

Heh, it's hard enough to get amateurs to use the proper multiplier
prefix on frequencies, let alone grasp a concept of noise power per
unit bandwidth. :-)

>> Seems like narrowing the bandwidth might just do that!
>
>Increasing the signal power has the desired effect. There are
>other ways to accomplish that, of course. Reduction of noise by
>any means other than reducing the bandwidth (switching from an
>omni directional antenna to a directional antenna, for example)
>will have the desired effect.
>
>> your humble hockey puck, 8^)
>
>Hows come, then, you don't have a Canadian call sign?

He might have drunk all his Canadian Club. :-)

LHA

1033. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 03:03:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F385931.8090408@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74448

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>
>>> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>>>
>>>> Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> <some snippage>
>>>>
>>>>>>> You increase the SNR, regardless of the bandwidth, by increasing the
>>>>>>> signal level DICK.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> Well, so much for your technical knowledge if THAT"S all you know
>>>>>> about it. Any experienced
>>>>>> ham, even without ANY tech schooling whatever, knows better than that.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> As a dilletante, I realize that in any ratio, there are two
>>>> numbers.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Actually, there are three (bandwidth, signal, and noise) which
>>> are related to channel capacity by the following formula
>>>
>>> Capacity = Bandwidth * Log2 (1 + Signal/Noise)
>>> The debate is over comparing *efficiency* of different modes (CW
>>> and PSK-31), and hence the channel capacity for such a
>>> comparison, must be normalized.
>>>
>>> Reducing the Bandwidth parameter does decrease the observed SNR

>>> in the channel, but the Capacity is not increased because the
>>> actual noise power per Hz is unchanged.
>>>
>>>
>>>> So while it is quite possible to make the s/n ratio larger by
>>>> increasing the signal, it is equally possible, and sometimes much
>>>> better to increase the s/n ratio by lowering the noise. Sometimes it
>>>> is the *only* option available.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> However, what has to change is the noise power per Hz, and
>>> reducing the bandwidth does not change that.
>>>
>>>
>>>> Seems like narrowing the bandwidth might just do that!
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> Increasing the signal power has the desired effect. There are
>>> other ways to accomplish that, of course. Reduction of noise by
>>> any means other than reducing the bandwidth (switching from an
>>> omni directional antenna to a directional antenna, for example)
>>> will have the desired effect.
>>
>>
>>
>> Okay. What we have here is two separate arguments IMO. Everyone is
>> right
>>
>
>
> Aw, Mike, don't mess up Floyd and Carl's playhouse. They're doing their
> darndest to
> trash an old CW fan, and you're spoiling it!

Ah tries ma best, tha knows!

In fact, their argument, which is correct as much as I've heard of it,
seems to me to be the *reason* why your argument is correct.

Ohhh, now I gave myself a headache.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1034. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 03:13:59 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <XXYZa.450$dj3.73770@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74449

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bh9cb8$b69$0@208.207.71.157...
>
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >news:bh8ri0$a5r$0@208.206.142.92...
> > >
> > >
> > >>OBIT-- want work some DX? Here's my log from last night on ~14.010,
> > >>just sitting at the computer with the radio headphones on and idly
> > >>listening to what
> > >>was going on---
> > >>
> > >>CYO
> > >>RN6AT
> > >>SV1LV
> > >>
> > >>Betcha you won't catch many of those folks on 20 meter SSB these days.
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > >Gee, Dick, I've logged SV2, RNx's, UAx's and a lot of others ... have you
> > >worked those Russian Islands WAY north of Norway? I think there are
> > >only 1 or 2 ops there ... I have that one, too.
> > >
> > >BFD ...
> > >
> > >
>
> Yeah, and you waited for decades, stewing over a mere code test, for
> the day to come when you could...Then the frenzy started.

What "frenzy" ...

> I do it
> relaxed as an incidental to other activities, working them as they show
up.

So do I ...

Carl - wk3c

1035. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 03:19:59 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <z1ZZa.452$dj3.73572@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74450

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bh9c48apm0@208.207.71.157...
>
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >news:bh90eujae0@208.206.142.89...
> > >
> > >
> > >>And we all already knew that, didn't we? ALso we *hams* knew that we
> > >>didn't inten d nor want to get more channel capacity! What *we* want is
> > >>to complete the intended communication!
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > >That's where your lack of acumen shows, Dick. Hams should
> > >strive to communicate efficiently.
> > >
> >
> > Well, well! If you truly believed that then you'd have gone on to
> > *really* learn the code
> > and used it long ago, instead of just complaining. After all, efficiency
> > means more than
> > anything Shannon came up with.

ROTFLMAO!

> > > Inefficient use of our spectrum
> > >promotes congestion in the popular bands. Inefficient use of our
> > >spectrum will subject us to increased threats of spectrum grabs
> > >by commercial interests.
> > >
> > >
> >
> > By your measure, then, CW should be one of the most desirable modes in
> > existance!

REALLY ROTFLMAO NOW!!!

It's clear that you actually, really believe this crap you spout ... that's
pathetic. You actually, truly BELIEVE that OOK CW is efficient.

Sad ...

If you'd simply say, "It's fun and I like it and I hope it's with us forever as a mode available to hams." I'd say "Right on!" ... however ...

Carl - wk3c

1036. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 04:00:19 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bh9ooj$37r$0@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 74551

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:bh9c48apm0@208.207.71.157...
>
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>
>>
>>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>>news:bh90eujae0@208.206.142.89...
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>And we all already knew that, didn't we? ALso we *hams* knew that we
>>>>didn't inten d nor want to get more channel capacity! What *we* want is
>>>>to complete the intended communication!
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>That's where your lack of acumen shows, Dick. Hams should
>>>strive to communicate efficiently.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>> Well, well! If you truly believed that then you'd have gone on to
>>*really* learn the code
>>and used it long ago, instead of just complaining. After all, efficiency
>>means more than
>>anything Shannon came up with.
>>
>>
>
>ROTFLMAO!
>

That's a *very* hollow laugh, Carl. Efficiency goes way beyond
anything Shannon ever described.
You should know that. The word applies to far more than just what goes on
within any single "channel". But you choose to ignore every bit of it
save what Shannon had to say.
I find that very revealing- An Information Theory fixation!

I just realized---You're a Shannonist!!!!

>
>
>
>>> Inefficient use of our spectrum
>>>promotes congestion in the popular bands. Inefficient use of our
>>>spectrum will subject us to increased threats of spectrum grabs
>>>by commercial interests.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>By your measure, then, CW should be one of the most desirable modes in
>>existance!
>>
>>
>
>REALLY ROTFLMAO NOW!!!
>

That laugh is REALLY hollow now.

>It's clear that you actually, really believe this crap you spout ... that's
>pathetic. You actually, truly BELIEVE that OOK CW is efficient.
>

Yup. It is very efficient, just uses operator skill in place of unneeded
technology. One can put a min- imal but very effective CW station the
air with little problem.

Lets see now, what was that you had in mind for new hams -the ones who
just passed a memorize-it 30- question written, sans learning--
you said...

>>Building a radio will involve components ... some may be "store-bought"
>>ICs, others will be R/L/C, perhaps some discrete transistors, etc. ... BUT
>>there is no reason that reasonably technically-inclined, intelligent hams
>>cannot
>>"build" their own custom ICs at home these days ... there are all sorts of
>>programmable logic devices, ranging from a few thousand or less gates to
>>several millions of gates ... and the software to do design, simulation,
>>verification,
>>and programming is either affordable, or in some cases free.
>>You do your conceptual design, code it in VHDL, simulate it, synthesize it
>>into a file that is used to program the IC and voila, something that had NO
>>"personalilty" ... no "idea of how to do anything" ... is now a functional
>>"custom IC." This is REALLY cool stuff ... and there are lots and lots of
>>free "cores"out there for all sorts of things ... SPI interfaces,
>>microcontrollers,
>>FEC, and on and on and on ... all things that can be "hooked up" together
>>and/or with your own code and synthesized into your own IC ...
>>

>>

My turn::: ROFLM-Young-AO!!!!!

>
>Sad ...
>

Yes, Carl it really is... after all those years, you still know so
little about ham radio.

>
>If you'd simply say, "It's fun and I like it and I hope it's with us forever
>as a mode available to hams." I'd say "Right on!" ... however ...
>

For sure that's a large part of the story, but it's not the entire book
by any means.

1037. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 04:21:31 UTC
From: Phil <nomail@noway.com>
Message-ID: <3qqgjvovs53fgqvvde31qn9gigvs6r9lob@4ax.com>
Source record: 74552

Len,

Steve's point regarding older equipment does have considerable merit - modern equipment was not designed to be tinkered with or repaired by anyone without very complex equipment at their disposal. The tube era (and transistorised solid state) equipment could easily be adapted and experimented with by a reasonably skilled operator. In fact, I recall that the initial intent of ham radio was to encourage people to develop technical expertise in the radio art (I asked one ham to switch his Icom rig to USB on 40 meters, so that I could check whether I my audio roblem was limited to LSB - after around 5 minutes, he confessed that he could not figure out how to do it! - so much for technical skills...) As such, I don't see how this goal is being accomplished by the current generation of 'set the dial and talk' equipment. As such, I'd suggest that your observations regarding Steve's position on current equipment is flawed. I certainly don't care if the radio glows in the dark - but it would be refreshing to meet more people who can apply basic radio theory to a simple QSO!

Steve, you are absolutely correct - idiots are idiots, on or off the air. Or the internet, apparently.

Phil

>snip
>
>> Well, Phil...idiots are idiots, on or off the air.
>>
>> Amy and I just moved to new digs and I'm QRT for the moment or
>>I'd set a sked with you. That older gear has a warmth and fullness
>>that this solid waste (I meant solid STATE) stuff can't match...at
>>least not yet.
>
> Ah, progress?
>
> I thought pSycho pSteve finally reached the 1970s level of the amateur
> radio technical art...
>
> No, he has aligned himself with the Anti-Semiconductor Movement.
>
> "Real radios glow in the dark" and that sort of thing. "Warmth."
>
> Or is he just technically constipated, therefore thinking about waste?
>
> LHA

1038. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 04:28:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030812002818.25815.00002128@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74557

In article <20030811215508.08200.00001324@mb-m25.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20030811200141.15462.00002200@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>>Well, find me an entry-level Personnel Officer job in Kent County, DE with
>>>the same pay and benefits as my present job, and I'll take it! BTW, I
>>>applied
>>>for one in my own company last year, but it went to, of all people, one of
>>my
>>>own classmates, a very fine, sexy-looking YL! She did NOT graduate
>>>with any kind of honors, since she took her program part-time and took over
>>>7 years to get her degree, whereas I did mine on a full-time basis in 2.5
>>>years. But I don't look as good in a cubicle as she does!
>>
>> No problem, we've never expected anything but the usual Roll
>> Rationalizations.
>
>Lennie:
>
>That's pretty funny, but that is what actually happened! Quite frankly, if I
>had to choose between hiring "Suzie" (not her real name) and myself, I'd
>hire her each time!

Quit fantasizing.

You are in one of your dream-trance modes again, imagining you are
able to hire anyone. You are NOT in any personnel department. You
are a bus driver, not a "human resources specialist."

>> You are keeping up the usual level of Roll misogyny. Some things
>> never change.
>
>I gues snot!

You got "Summa cum Laude" for THAT kind of remark?!?

>
>>>>>While I freely admit that I do have a
>>>>>great deal of respect for hams who do possess genuine, professional-
>>>>>grade technical qualifications, you, and your apologists Floyd Davidson
>>>>>and Len Anderson, tend to raise the noise level to BPL standards!
>>>>
>>>> Poor baby...still miffed at no one recognizing your intrinsic
>Greatness?

>>>
>>>I hadn't noticed that anyone isn't recognizing it, Lennie.
>>
>> No one HAS recognized your greatness. It isn't there.
>>
>> But you keep insisting you have it.
>
>No, Lennie, YOU did! I never mentioned my "intrinsic Greatness."

What do you call your self-inflated self-praising ego trips in here?

Oh, yes, "witty, insightful" thoughts. About as witty and insightful
as your "snot" remark.

>> Beeperitis.
>
>That would be an inflammation of the beeper. Is your beeper inflamed,
>Lennie?
>I recommend Preparation H!

Wrong, monoxide breath. There is NO cure for Beeperitis. It is
terminal and all victims are, in their last stages, trying to take
everyone to an agonizing end with them.

>>>I am a BUS DRIVER, remember?
>>
>> Strange...you keep insisting you are a "paratransit specialist."
>>
>> Which is it?
>
>Suit yourself. Either one is true.

I'm not a tailor. You never got a job as a Personnel person despite
your many claims you could have your choice of any such job.

>>>My knowledge of communications is
>>>limited to what I've done in AMATEUR radio, and the use of my 800 MHz
>>>voice/data comm system in my bus.
>>
>> You've been licensed as an AMATEUR how long? And you've never
>> bothered to find out about radio technology since you became an
>> extra something-or-other?
>
>Twenty-two years this month, Lennie. And, yes, I have!

What kind of "education?" Memorizing the ads in QST every month?

>> Are you LAZY?
>
>Most definitely!

We finally agree on something.

>>>Lennie, you're obviously in need of new reading glasses. I've never
>claimed
>>>to be anything but an average ham with average, AMATEUR-level
>>>technical skills.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...how quickly they forget. You claimed to be in the "upper
>> percentile of amateur radio." :-)
>
>I think that was the upper fifth percentile, IIRC. Get it right.

The only "fifth" you are in is a booze bottle...dreaming fantasies
of glory and greatness of self and then writing epic stories of
your accomplishments in amateurism.

Maybe it isn't booze. Maybe it is monoxide poisoning from being
stuck in mental gridlock too long.

>> I would classify you as little more than an ego-driven salesman type
>> who does CB-like radio activity with a federal license grant.
>>
>> Aren't you supposed to be in the national pool of "trained
>> communicators" for the nation's benefit and "advancing the state
>> of the art" of AMATEURISM?
>>
>> I liked it better when you were just a Soma Come Loud student who
>> could get any human resources job he wanted after graduation.
>
>Well, Lennie, I learned the truth the hard way. I'm not a 5'2" red head
>with a sexy figure, a sweet-as-honey Southern twang in my voice, and
>a tight little butt.

My, my, you aren't? Everyone got the impression you could have
any woman you wanted according to old Google archives.

Whatever happened to "Natasha" of your dreams? Have a
nightmare?

>Then again, she's collecting dust in that cubicle all day,
>and I'm out enjoying a paid ride in the countryside, enjoying my tunes
>on the stereo, helping out people who need my help to be able to live
>relatively normal lives. I decided a while ago that if my company has
>some other job for me to do, it had better be something I can do from
>behind the wheel of my bus! So go ahead, keep up the whining about
>my alleged claims of what I was going to do after graduation. That's
>about all you're good for around here!

Google has archives. Your "alleged claims" existed in reality.

No one can take you seriously. No one could.

Go back to playing with your radios. Try to make a PSK31 contact
or something. Or with other modes. No one really cares. <shrug>

1039. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 04:28:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030812002819.25815.00002129@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74553

In article <20030811215506.08200.00001323@mb-m25.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Floyd:
>
>Please, enlighten us. Provide a definition of the term "empirical."

YOU are the one who wrote it, Einstein.

You forget so easily. Ask a real MD about that. Short-term mnemonic disorder may be an indication of Alzheimer's.
Or it may just be Beeperitis in its usual form.

LHA

1040. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 04:28:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030812002820.25815.00002130@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74554

In article <20030811215504.08200.00001317@mb-m25.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20030811200133.15462.00002193@mb-m06.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> Larrah the Lip should have gotten a job with a fertilizer company,
>> advertising over the Internet...instead of becoming a bus driver
>> with a "Summa Cum Laude BA degree in 'Human Resources'"
>> who had any number of terrific job opportunities waiting for him
>> in personnel departments!
>>
>> THEN I would believe him. :-)
>>
>> LHA
>
>*****************************ADVERTISEMENT*********************************
>Hey everyone, we're having a Fertilizer Sale here on the internet! All
>the freshest, highest-quality fertilizer you need is right here for you, and
>the price is right! All you need is a computer, modem, and ISP service,
>and then subscribe to rec.radio.amateur.policy. There, you can read
>Lennie Anderson's daily output of the best fertilizer in town! Come one,
>come all! It's waiting right here at Larrah's Fertilizer Emporium, a.k.a.
>rrap, just look for the postings by Lenover21@aol.com!
>*****************************ADVERTISEMENT*********************************

Take out an advertisment in QST.

You spread so much manure in here that you should be able to sell
tons of your own product.

1041. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 04:28:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030812002820.25815.00002131@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74556

In article <3F383774.33417EA6@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <871xvtqcui.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
>> writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>> >>In article <20030810112459.12631.00000196@mb-m28.aol.com>,
>> >yodoc@aol.comnospam
>> >>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>> >>
>> >>>Of course, you were probably just being "imaginative."
>> >>
>> >> YOU do that all the time...
>> >
>> >That's some of his *real experience*, not none of that empirical
>> >theory stuff!
>>
>> Larrah the Lip should have gotten a job with a fertilizer company,
>> advertising over the Internet...instead of becoming a bus driver
>> with a "Summa Cum Laude BA degree in 'Human Resources'"
>> who had any number of terrific job opportunities waiting for him
>> in personnel departments!
>>
>> THEN I would believe him. :-)
>
>Did you check to see whether you have authority for name-calling,
>insulting and demeaning those who disagree with you?

I do. It's called the First Amendment of the United States
Constitution.

Ever hear of it?

The First Amendment doesn't give special dispensation to long-time
licensed radio amateurs.

Talking down to folks is not what this newsgroup is about...but you
keep trying to play radio god.

Poor baby. Big hero "I was in 'Nam" radio god can't stand ordinary
fire fights...cries and carries on when he is subjected to return fire.

Quit acting like an Oberst in the Amatur SchutzStaffel (A.S.S.) and maybe all could discuss SUBJECTS instead of personalities.

LHA

1042. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 04:28:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030812002823.25815.00002132@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74555

In article <3F38372D.8B73F1AA@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3F3797F7.10A6A693@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <20030810112459.12631.00000196@mb-m28.aol.com>,
>> >yodoc@aol.comnospam
>> >> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>> >>
>> >> >Of course, you were probably just being "imaginative."
>> >>
>> >> YOU do that all the time...
>> >
>> >Ahh, Ahh, Len! Please remember that you enjoy hanging out here with the
>> >hams, fantasizing that you are somehow a part of amateur radio.
>>
>> I've NEVER been a "part" of ham radio according to YOUR OWN
>> DEFINITION.
>
>That's RIGHT. You've NEVER been a part of ham radio. But you can
>dream.

I do not "dream" of having a radio license.

I got one of those 47 years ago.

>> YOUR fantasy seems to be stuck in the rut that whatever YOU like
>> "defines" what ALL other radio amateurs do, think, and must act
>> like in some rigid set of rules of YOUR imagination.
>
>Not all all, Len old boy. I realize that others have different fields
>of interest within amateur radio and they might have different levels of
>interest in the game. You however, aren't a part of amateur radio.

I'm not interested in either getting or dreaming about any AMATEUR
license.

My interest is eliminating the morse code test for any radio license
in the USA.

>> YOU are NOT an authority or an official anything in US ham radio.
>
>No I'm not. I'm a participant, a license radio amateur. I have been
>for decades.

Whoopee. Do we crown you emperor or something?

Maybe your nobility will get you a job at the FCC where you can
"rule" over amateur radio.

How about at ARRL? All those years of AMATEUR experience ought
to put you in the Executive President position...right behind another
Dave now holding Executive President For Life. <shrug>

>> YOU are NOT an official in the FCC, federal government, or even
>> that pseudo-governmental organization called ARRL.
>
>No, and I don't need to be employed by the FCC.

Oh, my, assuming the mantle of leadership without authorization?!?

>The ARRL is not a pseudo-governmental organization.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...then they've been deceiving everyone with all their
"district directors elected by democratic action" and all that!

>I am a life member of the ARRL and
>have been for over 25 years. With small lapses prior to my life
>membership, I've been a League member for nearly four decades.

Wonderful. I'm only a life member of the human race and a citizen
of the United States of America.

Nothing can compare to "life membership" in ARRL!

>> YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
>> make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
>> That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis.
>
>It is clear that I have as much "authority" to do those things as you.
>You do them frequently. Are you a control freak?

I'm just trying to discuss SUBJECTS, not personalities.

You keep on endlessly attempting to put down and humilate anyone
who won't agree with you.

Then you get all bent out of shape whenever someone doesn't bow
down to your majestic whatever and continue with the put-down and
humiliation attempts.

>> I've been a professional in radio-electronics since 1952...51 years.
>
>Bully for you. This group doesn't have anything to do with being a
>professional in radio or electronics.

Well then, you just have me LOCKED OUT of the newsgroup, why
don't you?

Make this newsgroup some kind of "ARRL South" and all you
morsemen can sit around giving each other high-fives and claiming
greatness in the very closed, closeted elite area of your own making.
The rest of the world won't care much since the professionals in radio
are busy keeping world communications going around the clock.

"If thine eye offend thee, put it out."

>> I've also been a radio-electronics HOBBYIST since 1947. Hobby
>> activities not for pecuniary interest are AMATEUR activites.
>
>Part of your radio amateur fantasy? You can claim all the hobbyist
>time-in-grade you like. Those might be AMATEUR but that doesn't make
>you a radio amateur.

Sigh...the credentialist is stuck on a one-note theme.

You've carried your radio god personna so long you've gotten to believe
that the only radio is amateur radio.

>> If they
>> involved making money at it they would be professional activities.
>
>Maybe you'd like to tell us about your Citizens Band activities having
>to do with the fact that you are a citizen and that you once played in a
>band.

You are in a delerium again. It's an old model and doesn't work well.
Put it out of its misery.

Bad try at some misdirection into more personality plonking. It doesn't
work.

>> YOU keep insisting one MUST be "licensed" to be an AMATEUR.
>
>YOU keep getting it wrong. For you to be a radio amateur, you must pass
>a license exam. You haven't.

Let's see...according to Heilian definitions, only LICENSED radio
amateurs are AMATEURS. That would make every other radio hobbyist
"professional?" Not so. Your Beeperitis has led you off on another
merry morse chase of illogic.

>> YOU keep holding up having a license grant is somehow making
>> YOU "better" than anyone not having an amateur license.
>
>No, YOU keep interpreting my words in that manner.

There's no need for "interpreters." What you keep harping about is just
the same old judge-jury-executioner bullshit you've always used.

It doesn't work. Fix it. Remember, you are the self-styled Radio God.

>Passing a license
>exam makes you a radio amateur, a part of ham radio. You haven't passed
>such an exam and are not a part of amateur radio.

I'm not interested in "becoming part of amateur radio."

You don't seem to understand the concept. [Radio gods are like that]

I'm just trying to get the morse code test off of all US radio license examinations.

Maybe you ought to review the FCC rules and regulations regarding Internet access. You cannot issue any "NAL" for someone objecting to your self-proclaimed "authority" or "judgement" over who can and who cannot post in newsgroups.

>> YOU seem to think that amateur radio is some event of epiphany, of glory
>> and greatness in radio, some kind of nebulous "service" to the
>> nation, transcending anything done in any other radio service.
>
>That is incorrect. It doesn't matter what you've done in any other
>radio service. If you want to participate in amateur radio, you'll pass
>a license exam. You haven't done so.

You are stuck on this topic, aren't you Kolonel Klunk?

Best you get very busy and ENFORCE the newsgroup then, ONLY permitting licensed radio amateurs from communicating anything in here.

Your vigilante "enforcement" hasn't been working...yet you keep whining and carrying on, using the same old tired arguments.

>You're a million laughs, Leonard old chap (or chapped). You're the king
>of personal attacks and the grand poobah of rejected views. To top it
>all off, you aren't involved in amateur radio whatsoever.

Poor baby. Still thinking the First Amendment only applies to licensed radio amateurs?

>I thought you were supposed to be eating me for breakfast.

???

I'm not "supposed" to be anything you say I am...you are not only disagreeable but indigestible.

Go back to your fantasies of greatness in radio and your authorized judgement of all who disagree with your holiness' views.

You are wasting everyone's time.

LHA

1043. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 05:55:24 UTC
From: Anonymous <rebleep@hush.com>
Message-ID: <f533823052be6871be54970e45226184@rebleep>
Source record: 74558

In article <3F37AFDE.6D3406E4@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F301FE3.951681BE@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2FA842.281A9C16@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2F27DA.C63DE672@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F2EBC38.1917F426@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > > > > > > > Now that Carl can share Dave's band space...
>
> > > > > > > > > > Carl may share some space with me.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Carl can share any space with you that he wishes. That is what the
> > > > > > > > > > FCC mean's by issuing him an Extra license. Get used to it. Naw,
> > > > > > > > > > nevermind.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Carl may share some space.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > May share all space.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > He may and he may not.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Take it up with his hairdresser. The FCC says he may share all space,
> > > > > > > > and thats good enough for me.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Please quote that "may share space" FCC document.
> > > > >
> > > > > Please quote the "Farnsworth Exam at 13-15wpm is the same as the Morse
> > > > > Exam at 5wpm" FCC document.
> > > >
> > > > That's totally irrelevant to the discussion at hand.

Translation: Goatblower High-el couldn't give an answer.

> > > He's allocated the same frequencies. He may or may not share the same
> > > space.
> >
> > Which is it?
>
> > May or May Not?

You are an ASSHOLE, Goatblower High-el...
> That's correct.
>
> Dave K8MN

Nice of you to admit it ,fucktard.

1044. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 07:52:14 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <878ypzl3dd.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74559

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>In article <87u18qpong.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
>writes:
>
>>Using PSK-31 is not exactly a great indication of experience.
>>DICK's experience with *only* CW, PSK-31 and other common modes
>>used on Amateur bands is an extreme restriction. And that is
>>exactly why he (and Larry Roll) should *not* be using themselves
>>as a yard stick for other hams.
>
>Frostbite Floyd:
>
>This newsgroup is about AMATEUR Radio. The experience that Dick and I
>have with CW, PSK-31, and other modes "common" to AMATEUR Radio
>is certainly not a "restriction," and is, indeed, a "yard stick" by which we

You need a micrometer, not a yard stick Larry. That's a very
small area of exposure.

>The more you take this discussion out of the context of AMATEUR radio,
>the more irrelevant you make yourself. If you have professional-grade

The more we put it in the context of reality, and remove it from the
small sand box you play in, the more appropriate it becomes as a way
to measure the ARS as a whole.

>technical qualifications, I think that's great. However, I don't -- and very
>few AMATEUR radio operators do. What we do have is curiosity, and a
>willingness to learn. We also have the operating authority to experiment with
>modes such as PSK-31 and adapt them to effective communications in keeping
>with the rules, regulations, and purpose of the AMATEUR Radio Service.

If hams and the ARS were where all the innovations in radio and
communications come from, your point would be valid. But
exactly the opposite is true, and what actually happens is that
hams and the ARS pick up innovations, mostly from the *many*
hams that do work in the industry.

A perfect example of what happens when the rest of the world is
closed off per your specifications is this entire concept that
CW is still somehow a vital and useful mode of radio operation.
Despite all of your blathering, it is not vital and it is useful
virtually *only* as a hobby pastime for ham operators to enjoy
if they wish.

>I won't presume to speak for Dick, but I consider myself to be a typical,
>average AMATEUR radio operator who has pursued the art and science

Look Larry the Liar, you can't have it both ways. You've claimed
that *everyone* should learn CW, because you were forced to and then
you ended up enjoying it; you've claimed that your written exam
was more difficult than those given today; you've claimed that your
experience puts you in the top 5% of all hams.

>of AMATEUR radio communications at a level which is considerably
>above that of other hams who, for whatever reasons (excuses), fail to
>pursue modes beyond those involving voice communications. Now, to

So you *aren't*, by your measure, "a typical, average AMATEUR radio
operator". So stop trying obfuscate your claims of being the
Great Stick To Measure All of Hamdom By.

>be fair, I don't include among that group those who tend to specialize in
>more technical aspects of the hobby such as building and maintaining
>repeater systems.

Yeah, they don't count... they do something you don't.

>I've known a lot of hams who do this, but are No-Code
>Techs who don't have any interest in CW, or anything else on HF, for

And that is what you like, so that is where the Stick Dips. Hmmmm...

Larry, the Calibrated Dip Stick for all of the Amateur Radio Service.

>that matter. I value their contribution and consider them to be full-fledged
>radio amateurs.

Garsh, I bet everyone of them is just *so* glad to hear about that.

>However, they represent a very tiny minority of the
>overall ham radio population, and an even smaller minority of No-Code
>Techs.

You constitute the *tiniest possible* minority of the overall
ham radio population: One Dip Stick.

>They are even further diluted when you consider the fact that a
>lot of the technical/repeater gurus are also CW-tested, CW-using, CW-
>loving, and Morse code test supporting Pre-Restructuring Extra class
>licensees.

So you've just demonstrated that CW doesn't have much to do with
the highly technical aspects of the ARS.

>>DICK and Larry have dabbled at 2, 3, maybe 4 different kinds of
>>digital communications systems. Thrilling. Whether I or
>
>Yup. "Dabbled" is just about what I'd call it myself. However, my
>"dabbling" represents a level of technical involvement which I would
>dare say places me in the top 5th percentile of just Extra-class hams,

>not including all other license classes. Therefore, I consider myself
>to be more than qualified to judge other hams on this basis.

That's an exceptionally rude insult to all Amateur Radio
operators. You appear to me to be probably at about the 25%,
where 3 out of 4 Extra Class hams have a broader base of
experience. (Note that that *is* rather complimentary for
someone who is not a professional. Now if only your ego matched
your experience, you'd be a valuable ham instead of an
embarrassment.)

>level of technical involvement among radio amateurs. Legitimate
>"pros" like Len, Carl, and yourself do add considerable value to the
>ARS as a whole, but you cannot in any sense of fairness use yourselves
>as any kind of objective "yardstick" by which other hams are measured.

And we *aren't*. That's the point. We don't think *you* should
either.

>>In fact *your* argument is the same bogus one that DICK and
>>Larry make! Because *they* use CW (or PSK-31), everyone else
>>either does, or is declared too dumb to license (or understand
>>how Shannon applies to PSK-31). That is invalid logic and leads
>>you to erroneous conclusions.
>
>Fallacy. You are making apples-to-oranges comparisons, which is a
>well known Usenet tactic, but one which always ultimately ends up
>disqualifying the person using it.

You just did the exact same thing up above using repeaters instead
of CW or PSK-31. I'm not comparing apples-to-oranges Larry, I'm
just tossing one bad apple out of a barrel of apples.

>>>The truth of the matter is that under some
>>>conditions PSK-31 outperforms OOK
>>>Morse CW, and under some conditions
>>>OOK Morse CW outperforms PSK-31.
>>
>>And that tells us *nothing* about which is the more efficient or
>>effective mode of communications.
>
>No, it doesn't. That would depend on a universally accepted
>definition of the terms "efficient" and "effective" in the context
>of the use of these modes within the ARS. To the extent that the
>meaning of these terms are infinitely arguable, only those of us
>with fairly extensive operating experience in each can even come
>close to being qualified to render an objective opinion.

Actually, the definition of "efficient" isn't much in debate.
It's a simple measure of the percentage of the channel capacity
attained. "Effective" is as you say, open to debate. In the ARS
"effective" can mean does it make Larry Roll puff up with pride

after a half and hour CW session, or does it take him 4 hours...

>Dick's claims are not "bogus" in any way, since they are based on

Dick's claims are simply ludicrous. He is spouting absolute
nonsense. Everything he says is right up there with your concept
of Empirical Theory.

>BTW, I do believe that Mr. Shannon's theory is relevant to Amateur
>Radio. I believe that what Dick is doing is making observations
>based on actual operating experience, rather than empirical theory.
>This may be the cause of the confusion, but as I said earlier, I do
>not presume to speak for Dick.

That paragraph sums it up just so perfectly that you can't imagine
what you've said!

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

1045. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 08:11:02 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f38a23e$1_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74560
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Where the murderous Yank invaders are receiving
their just deserts - being dropped like flies by the
modern equivalent of the French Resistance.

Gareth (G1LVN) <gareth@mycallsign.freeserve.co.uk> wrote in message
news:bh99jpgh1@newsg2.svr.pol.co.uk...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F382660.5020204@adelphia.net...
> > Someone's inviting *us* in? That doesn't happen too often! Most people
> > tell us where to go though.....
> Like IRAQ for example....;-)

1046. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 08:17:37 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87znifjnmm.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74561

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>> Increasing the signal power has the desired effect. There are
>> other ways to accomplish that, of course. Reduction of noise by
>> any means other than reducing the bandwidth (switching from an
>> omni directional antenna to a directional antenna, for example)
>> will have the desired effect.
>
> Okay. What we have here is two separate arguments IMO. Everyone is right

No. Dick has repeatedly stated that Shannon has no significance
for hams. He is wrong. He has said that his observations prove
that CW is more efficient than PSK-31, and he is wrong about it
being proven by his observations.

>>> your humble hockey puck, 8^)
>>
>> Hows come, then, you don't have a Canadian call sign?
>
> Ohh, I just got that pejorative from someone here. I kind of like it
>tho'. I'm still playing Hockey at my ripe old age, and will as long as I
>can.

What? You think that is a perjorative???? You, sir, are
no *real* hockey puck!

Heh, years ago I can remember going to a hockey game in
Fairbanks, when the house was full, with hardly a seat left.
Not a big deal, except that there were *four* hockey games going
that night, and *all* of them were playing to a full house.
Something like 1/4 the population of Fairbanks was taking in a
hockey game that night.

> And I do like to get up to Canada whenever I can.

Here in Alaska we tend to like our neighbors... and agree
with them about folks in the Lower-48 being strange, eh!

> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

1047. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 08:38:15 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87vft3jmo8.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74562

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>
>>> So while it is quite possible to make the s/n ratio larger by
>>>increasing the signal, it is equally possible, and sometimes much better
>>> to increase the s/n ratio by lowering the noise. Sometimes it is the
>>>*only* option available.
>>>
>>
>>However, what has to change is the noise power per Hz, and
>>reducing the bandwidth does not change that.
>
> That *Can't* be correct for all cases.
>The total noise appearing in the channel is the sum of that appearing in
>every Hz
>within the entire channel. A narrow signal such as a radiotelegraph
>signal may not
>occupy the entire width of the channel. So narrowing the channel width DOES
>reduce the noise while preserving the signal and improving the SNR..
>Obviously where the signal is as wide as the channel this doesn't work,
>but in
>ham radio, working CW it sure does. Guaranteed.

DICK, you are not discussing the efficiency of a mode. What you
are arguing is the *operator's* ability to effectively use a mode.

Yet you insist that you are proving something about the mode itself,
rather than the operator and his equipment.

If the operator is effectively utilizing the mode he has chosen,
the bandwidth requirement of the mode is closely matched to the
channel the operator provides.

You are saying that your ineffective use of one mode compared to
your more effective use of another mode proves that it was the
mode that was more effective. All you've done is demonstrate
that you don't understand the effective use of radio
communications, the theory behind efficient use of the modes
involved, or what you have observed.

>>Increasing the signal power has the desired effect. There are
>>other ways to accomplish that, of course. Reduction of noise by
>>any means other than reducing the bandwidth (switching from an
>>omni directional antenna to a directional antenna, for example)
>>will have the desired effect.
>>

>
>Another example of why his stuff doesn't apply to the real world of ham
>radio.
>When a ham is working another station he has no control over the power that
>station is injecting into the channel. What he can control is the
>bandwidth,within limits of course.

DICK, the operator can do any number of things. We should
assume that just for starters the receive operator is correctly
adjusting the bandwidth of the channel to match the bandwidth
being transmitted.

There are *many* other things that can be controlled to change
the effective use of a communications channel. Your suggestion
reduces the channel capacity rather than making it more
effective.

If you want more *effective* communications, either increase the
data rate within the existing channel, or if it is already being
used as best that a given mode can provide, increasing the
channel capacity to either 1) allow a higher data rate or 2)
reduce the error rate.

To increase the channel capacity an operator has several
choices. Asking the distant end to increase power is one
possible solution. Another is to use, or adjust, an antenna to
provide an increase SNR, whether by reducing noise or by
increasing the signal, or both.

>Within ham radio such situations vary widely, but for CW the sitiation
>is pretty well
>straightforward. Hams almost always enhance CW signals by reducing the
>bandwidth
>which raises the SNR.

Only if it was misadjusted to begin with. You aren't making a case
for CW, you're making a case that you are a poor operator.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

1048. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 09:24:41 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030812052441.00688.00001816@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74563

>Subject: Re: Question for the No coders
>From: lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>Date: 8/9/03 9:00 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <20030809210001.02197.00001975@mb-m12.aol.com>
>
>In article <BB5A07D1.22018%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart
><stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:
>
>>"N2EY" wrote:
>>>
>>> (snip) And amateur radio does not exist to
>>> serve other services. (snip)
>>
>> Our public service is often service to other agencies (Red Cross, MARS,
>>and so on).
>>
>>> The "pool of trained operators" thing in 97.1 is
>>> really about the idea of the ARS being a service
>>> where the licensees (hams) are skilled both
>>> operationally and technically, able to do a lot
>>> of different things well. This distinguishes it
>>> from other services, (snip)
>>
>> The pool of trained operators concept relates to our ability to do the
>>other things outlined in 97.1 (public service, international goodwill, and
>>so on). At one time, code was a necessary part of at least some of that.
>>That is much less so today, hence the move to change the code testing
>>requirement.
>
> Dwight, that statement in 97.1 is an OLD thing going back decades.

Len, you are an
old thing, going
back decades.
>
> It was put in there to rationalize the existance of amateur radio among
> all the other very commercial radio services.

You keep rationalizing
your existence here
among all the other
very amateur operators.
>
> Three to four decades ago there MIGHT have been a "need" for "trained
> operators" for the military draft. [the USA still had a draft and the

>Cold
> War was very warm indeed] Never mind that the military already HAD
> ways of training in the "radio arts."

It just says "pool of trained
operators". Nothing about
the Morse code or military
draft or other services.
>
> Does national defense or the various aid agencies NEED amateurs who
> are "trained" in DX contesting and sitting around telling old war stories
> about when Kode Vas King? I don't think so.

Does anyone NEED alleged
retired nonamateurs who are
"trained" in telling old war
stories about their nonamateur
exploits of fiftyplus years ago?
>
>>> (snip) And public service. (snip)
>>
>> I'm not aware of the use of code by any of the typical served agencies
>>(Red Cross, MARS, and so on).
>
> Morse code use will keep out the eveavsdropers and bad people from
> the content of communications, thus not letting them know the deep
> dark, very secret ways of the ham. Secure.

Watch out for those
"eveavsdropers"!!!
>
> So I've been told.

It seems sometimes
that no one can tell
you anything, Len. ;-)
>
>>> (snip) Besides, everything hams do is either "for
>>> enjoyment" or public service. Does that mean none
>>> of it should be tested?
>>
>> Huh? I thought I was fairly clear about all this. Code was once necessary
>>for the goals and purposes outlined in 97.1. At the very least, that is much
>>less so today (some would say it is not at all so today). That severely
>>weakens the justification for a unique license requirement. If the license
>>requirement is actually removed, code will then be tested on an equal
>>footing with the other operating modes (written theory). Nothing in that is
>>an argument for or against testing anything else.
>
> Holier-than-thou old-timers just can't live with that, Dwight!

You are a holier-than-thou
old-timer, Len.
>
> FCC "must" keep the "tradition" of morsemanship!
>
> <shrug>

Are you Atlas?
>
> LHA

1049. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 09:44:44 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87n0efjjlf.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74564

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>And now we see your ignorance come into full view, Frosty-- and why I
>say that
>Shannon has nothing to do with ham radio!.
>
> Ask any experienced ham what you gain- and why they spend so much money
> on narrow IF filters.
>
>>On the other hand, if you increase the SNR by leaving the
>>bandwidth as it is, and increase the signal level, you get more
>>capacity!
>
> Heh, heh.....sorta hard to do on a weaksignal DX station, Frosty.
>Pardon, Your inexperience as a ham is showing!

Yeah. Mea Culpa. I'd never heard of a beam antenna, not to
mention a rhombic, until I was 10 years old.

How did you get to be your age and never hear about directional
antennas with gain?

> AH, we finally arrive at the core issue! The VERY reason I say that
>Shannon has nothing
>to do with ham radio.. One more time, with feeling---
>
> "Maximum throughput is NEVER a requirement.or even an issue in ham
>radio!!!!"

Wrong. It is not a requirement, unless you want to compare
modes the way you were trying to do. Then it becomes *the*
issue.

It should also be noted that though understanding communications
theory is not a "requirement", in that one can and many do enjoy
ham radio without knowing much about it, I do believe that
almost everyone except you will agree that the enjoyment is
dramatically increased by the degree that one does understand
Shannon's work. After all... it does *define* what it is we do:
communications.

>You see, Frosty, we NEVER need to do things like the military and some
>commercials.
>We don't use our radios to handle the most traffic the fastest it can be
>handled. Anyone who
>watdched the packet network disintegrate due to all the "store and

>forward" nponsense that went on in teh late 80's knows of which I speak
>Reams and reams of nott they sure passed a lot of it!

You are just a wonderful advertisement... for redistributing the
ARS frequency allocations to more useful services. Thank goodness
that the FCC and eveyone else realizes you are NOT the norm.

>>It also reduces the channel capacity. At 500 Hz, with CW, you
>>are limited to what? 40 wpm or so for a good CW operator.
>>
>>But with a 2.1 KHz bandwidth they could use SSB, for example,
>>and transfer *many* *many* times more information.
>
> Well, there you have it!
>
>>By *your* methods of comparision, you've just proven that SSB is
>>more efficient than CW.
>>
>>(Of course, using your methods we could "prove" almost
>>anything!)
>
> The world will note that the "proof" not mine at all, rather it's YOURS!

Well, we did prove your head is where the sun don't shine...

>> As I've pointed out previously, the
>>entire direction of communications technology switched gears
>>immediately after Shannon published his works.
>
>You're a lightweifgh here t, Frosty, a number of the REAL learned from
>academia have stated otherwise.

Put up or shut up, DICK. Lets see you quote a couple cases
where anyone has ever said any such thing.

Here is what academia actually has said:

In 1985 Shannon and his wife decided on a whim to visit the
IEEE International Information Theory Symposium being held
in Brighton, England. ... Recalls Robert J. McEliece of the
California Institute of Technology, "It was as if Newton had
showed up at a physics conference."
http://www.ecs.umass.edu/ece/hill/ece221.dir/shannon.html

"... the man who, as a young engineer at Bell
Laboratories in 1948, wrote the Magna Carta of the
information age: "The Mathematical Theory of
Communications"? Whose work Robert W. Lucky, executive
director of research at AT&T Bell Laboratories, calls the
greatest "in the annals of technological thought?" Whose
"pioneering insight" IBM Fellow Rolf W. Landauer equates
with Einstein's"
http://www.ecs.umass.edu/ece/hill/ece221.dir/shannon.html

[Warning: context was removed from the above quote for
brevity, and it is *really* worth seeing the entire statement.]

"Noted as a founder of information theory, Claude Shannon
combined mathematical theories with engineering principles
to set the stage for the development of the digital
computer."
http://www.thocp.net/biographies/shannon_claude.htm

"Shannon's information theories eventually saw application
in a number of disciplines in which language is a factor,
including linguistics, phonetics, psychology and
cryptography, which was an early love of Shannon's. His
theories also became a cornerstone of the developing field
of artificial intelligence"
http://www.thocp.net/biographies/shannon_claude.htm

"It is generally accepted that the modern discipline of
information theory began with the publication by Claude
E. Shannon of his article "The Mathematical Theory of
Communication" in the Bell System Technical Journal in July
and October of 1948."
http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Information_theory

"Shannon had written "a blueprint for the digital age," says
MIT information theorist Robert Gallager, who is still awed
by the 1948 paper."
http://www.kjist.ac.kr/~slic/est/cshannon.pdf

And of course one could go on and on and on, because you can't find
a reference to Shannon that does not include some similar statement.
The work he did has just had a awesome effect on how we live today.

And of course it has greatly *more* effect on ham operators than it
does for the average person!

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

1050. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 10:06:16 UTC
From: Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI <g3vki@turner-smith.co.uk>
Message-ID: <bhae6o$10k2d3$1@ID-201868.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 74565
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f38a23e$1_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> Where the murderous Yank invaders are receiving
> their just deserts - being dropped like flies by the
> modern equivalent of the French Resistance.
>
There's no limit to your bullshit, is there?
(_!_)

1051. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 10:10:39 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87ekzrjie8.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74566

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>
>Floyd:
>
>Please, enlighten us. Provide a definition of the term "empirical."

Your term was "Empirical Theory". Why don't *you* try to define
that in terms of "empirical" and "theory".

In theory at least, we should be able to empirically determine that
Larry is not theorist about empiricism, but rather an empiricist.

empiricist, n. -- a quack

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

1052. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 10:15:27 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87adafji68.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74567

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> That's a *very* hollow laugh, Carl. Efficiency goes way beyond
>anything Shannon ever described.
> You should know that. The word applies to far more than just what goes on
>within any single "channel". But you choose to ignore every bit of it
>save what Shannon had to say.
>I find that very revealing- An Information Theory fixation!
>
>I just realized---You're a Shannonist!!!!

Everyone who uses a telephone, a CD player, any form of digital
communications on the ham bands, a digital computer, and or many
many other things... is indeed a Shannonist. The theory of
communications that he set forth *is* that all pervasive.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

1053. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 11:01:12 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bhahdo$sc5$0@208.206.142.112>
Source record: 74568

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >
> >It would be if I'd said it! But YOU said it! I know better. I also
> >know -right alaong with every active ham- that you increase SNR by
> >*narrowing* bandwidth. Seems it gets rid of some of the noise while
> >preserving the signal, assuming of course the signal is narrow enough to
> >fit within the narrowed bandwidth. As it happens, a CW signal is!
>
> We were discussing how to get increase efficiency, not how to
> demonstrate a 0 bit error rate for the slowest possible bit rate.
>
> If narrowing the bandwidth does reduce the SNR, then you were
> not making effective use of the channel bandwidth to start with,
> and must be using a relatively inefficient mode of operation for
> the conditions you have chosen.
>
> On the other hand, if you are making effective use of the
> bandwidth, reducing it is merely going to make your
> communications *less* efficient by reducing the channel capacity
> and thus causing you to pass less information.
>
> Knowing Shannon's theories would make all of this much easier for
> you to understand. Here, I did put it up on my web page, so that
> you can download it without have to embarass yourself asking for
> it in email. I said it was 500K... but I'd misplaced a decimal
> and it is more like 5.7Mb in size.
>
> <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson/techie/shannon.pdf>

Don't bother Frostbite, I already know how to use Shannon. I have a pretty large book here some containing about 1300 page that does a pretty good job on Shannon It's entitled "Electronics Engineers Handbook" and devotes a few pages tothe subjectt, and I've read it.

But I also know enough about ham radio to know how it DOESN'T apply, too.

1054. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 11:15:07 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bhai7rusa0@208.206.142.98>
Source record: 74569

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >>
> >>> So while it is quite possible to make the s/n ratio larger by
> >>>increasing the signal, it is equally possible, and sometimes much better
> >>> to increase the s/n ratio by lowering the noise. Sometimes it is the
> >>>*only* option available.
> >>>
> >>
> >>However, what has to change is the noise power per Hz, and
> >>reducing the bandwidth does not change that.
> >>
> > That *Can't* be correct for all cases.
> >The total noise appearing in the channel is the sum of that appearing in
> >every Hz
> >within the entire channel. A narrow signal such as a radiotelegraph
> >signal may not
> >occupy the entire width of the channel. So narrowing the channel width DOES
> >reduce the noise while preserving the signal and improving the SNR..
> >Obviously where the signal is as wide as the channel this doesn't work,
> >but in
> >ham radio, working CW it sure does. Guaranteed.
>
> DICK, you are not discussing the efficiency of a mode. What you
> are arguing is the *operator's* ability to effectively use a mode.
>

Gasp! Floyd, are you *finally* beginning to understand what ham radio is all about????

>
> Yet you insist that you are proving something about the mode itself,
> rather than the operator and his equipment.
>

Nop, Frosty, I'm trying my best to 'splain to how ham radio works!

>
> If the operator is effectively utilizing the mode he has chosen,
> the bandwidth requirement of the mode is closely matched to the
> channel the operator provides.
>

Ah! So comes the day when ham radio is *completly* modified to mirror the
most desirable characteristics of commercial/military communications, you just

might have a point! And ham radio will have disappeared!

>
> You are saying that your ineffective use of one mode compared to
> your more effective use of another mode proves that it was the
> *mode* that was more effective. All you've done is demonstrate
> that you don't understand the effective use of radio
> communications, the theory behind efficient use of the modes
> involved, or what you have observed.
>

NO, Frostbite, what you've done is desmonstrate that you know virtually nothing
about anything except Shannon. I happen to ALSO know how it is with ham radio!

>
> >>Increasing the signal power has the desired effect. There are
> >>other ways to accomplish that, of course. Reduction of noise by
> >>any means other than reducing the bandwidth (switching from an
> >>omni directional antenna to a directional antenna, for example)
> >>will have the desired effect.
> >>
> >
> >Another example of why his stuff doesn't apply to the real world of ham
> >radio.
> >When a ham is working another station he has no control over the power that
> >station is injecting into the channel. What he can control is the
> >bandwidth,within limits of course.
>
> DICK, the operator can do any number of things. We should
> assume that just for starters the receive operator is correctly
> adjusting the bandwidth of the channel to match the bandwidth
> being transmitted.

Basically because *I* was the operator and (I) know how things were the morning with the
singnals in question!

>
>
> There are *many* other things that can be controlled to change
> the effective use of a communications channel. Your suggestion
> *reduces* the channel capacity rather than making it more
> effective.
>

FLOYD, FLOYD , FLOYD!!!!! One more time-----

**IN HAM RADIO WE VIRTUALLY ///NEVER/// NEED TO EMPLOY
MAXIMUM CHANNEL THROUGHPUT/DATA RATE!!!***

Did that by any chance land on you so that it might accidently stick???

> If you want more *effective* communications, either increase the
> data rate within the existing channel, or if it is already being

> used as best that a given mode can provide, increasing the
> channel capacity to either 1) allow a higher data rate or 2)
> reduce the error rate.
>

Floyd, in ham radio we most often employ operator skills and minimal equipment/circuit capacity to best advantage. Most hams understand that
is a very large part of the attraction of *being* a ham! What happened to you??
And Carl??

>
> To increase the channel capacity an operator has several
> choices. Asking the distant end to increase power is one
> possible solution. Another is to use, or adjust, an antenna to
> provide an increase SNR, whether by reducing noise or by
> increasing the signal, or both.
>

Do tell. And you actuall suppose that I and by extension most other hams don't know this?

>
> >Within ham radio such situations vary widely, but for CW the sitiation
> >is pretty well
> >straightforward. Hams almost always enhance CW signals by reducing the
> >bandwidth
> >which raises the SNR.
>
> Only if it was misadjusted to begin with. You aren't making a case
> for CW, you're making a case that you are a poor operator.

You're nuts. AND have zero experience as a ham.

1055. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 11:15:14 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <8765l3jfel.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74570

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>
>> Knowing Shannon's theories would make all of this much easier for
>> you to understand. Here, I did put it up on my web page, so that
>> you can download it without have to embarass yourself asking for
>> it in email. I said it was 500K... but I'd misplaced a decimal
>> and it is more like 5.7Mb in size.
>>
>> <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson/techie/shannon.pdf>
>
>Don't bother Frostbite, I already know how to use Shannon. I have a pretty large
>book here some containing about 1300 page that does a pretty good job on Shannon It's
>entitled "Electronics Engineers Handbook" and devotes a few pages
>tothe subjectt, and I've read it.
>
> But I also know enough about ham radio to know how it DOESN'T apply, too.

The arrogance of your ignorance is astounding, DICK.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

1056. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 11:55:22 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bhakja$4u9$0@208.206.142.89>
Source record: 74571

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >And now we see your ignorance come into full view, Frosty-- and why I
> >say that
> >Shannon has nothing to do with ham radio!.
> >
> > Ask any experienced ham what you gain- and why they spend so much money
> > on narrow IF filters.
> >
> >>On the other hand, if you increase the SNR by leaving the
> >>bandwidth as it is, and increase the signal level, you get more
> >>capacity!
> >
> > Heh, heh.....sorta hard to do on a weaksignal DX station, Frosty.
> >Pardon, Your inexperience as a ham is showing!
>
> Yeah. Mea Culpa. I'd never heard of a beam antenna, not to
> mention a rhombic, until I was 10 years old.
>
> How did you get to be your age and never hear about directional
> antennas with gain?
>

Here we go again Frosty! So how do you propose to raise the power in the channel when a ham is communicating with a distant ham radio station who is running all the power he has availalble? Magic perhaps?

Sort of look like we're left to improve things on the receive end how ever we can arrange to do it, doesn't it? Or is all this outside your ham radio experience?

>
> > AH, we finally arrive at the core issue! The VERY reason I say that
> >Shannon has nothing
> >to do with ham radio.. One more time, with feeling---
> >
> > "Maximum throughput is NEVER a requirement.or even an issue in ham
> >radio!!!!"
>
> Wrong. It is not a requirement, unless you want to compare
> modes the way you were trying to do. Then it becomes *the*
> issue.
>

NOOOOOOOO, Floyd, the *only* comparison in ham radio that matters
is what works and what doesn't in a given set of circumstances at a given time.

>
> It should also be noted that though understanding communications
> theory is not a "requirement", in that one can and many do enjoy
> ham radio without knowing much about it, I do believe that
> almost everyone except you will agree that the enjoyment is
> *dramatically* increased by the degree that one does understand
> Shannon's work. After all... it does *define* what it is we do:
> communications.
>

Where did I ever say anything in opposition to any of that? I didn't! I merely said
you Shannonists incorrectly insist that we ALL apply Shannon's theories to each and every
situation within ham radio,and it simply doesn't work! All it does is to satisfy
some inner urge within you and Carl etc to do your thing instead of do ham radio.
Kind of like you have this bad itch you just HAVE to scratch!

>
> >You see, Frosty, we NEVER need to do things like the military and some
> >commercials.
> >We don't use our radios to handle the most traffic the fastest it can be
> >handled. Anyone who
> >watdched the packet network disintegrate due to all the "store and
> >forward" nponsense that went on in teh late 80's knows of which I speak
> >Reams and reams of nott they sure passed a lot of it!
>
> You are just a wonderful advertisement... for redistributing the
> ARS frequency allocations to more useful services. Thank goodness
> that the FCC and eveyone else realizes you are NOT the norm.

If you ever actually put even a receiver on the ham radio bands, among many other
RF sources, and *paid attention* you'd soon see how far off base you are.

>
>
> >>It also reduces the channel capacity. At 500 Hz, with CW, you
> >>are limited to what? 40 wpm or so for a good CW operator.
> >>
> >>But with a 2.1 KHz bandwidth they could use SSB, for example,
> >>and transfer *many* *many* times more information.
> >
> > Well, there you have it!
> >
> >>By *your* methods of comparision, you've just proven that SSB is
> >>more efficient than CW.
> >>
> >>(Of course, using your methods we could "prove" almost
> >>anything!)
> >
> > The world will note that the "proof" not mine at all, rather it's YOURS!
>

> Well, we did prove your head is where the sun don't shine...
>

Well it *doesn't* shine around the clock, like you have there. Maybe that's your problem-you don't get enough sleep!

> >> As I've pointed out previously, the
> >>entire direction of communications technology switched gears
> >>immediately after Shannon published his works.
> >
> >You're a lightweifgt here t, Frosty, a number of the REAL learned from
> >academia have stated otherwise.
>
> Put up or shut up, DICK. Lets see you quote a couple cases
> where anyone has ever said any such thing.
>
> Here is what academia actually has said:
>
> In 1985 Shannon and his wife decided on a whim to visit the
> IEEE International Information Theory Symposium being held
> in Brighton, England. ... Recalls Robert J. McEliece of the
> California Institute of Technology, "It was as if Newton had
> showed up at a physics conference."
> http://www.ecs.umass.edu/ece/hill/ece221.dir/shannon.html
>
> "... the man who, as a young engineer at Bell
> Laboratories in 1948, wrote the Magna Carta of the
> information age: "The Mathematical Theory of
> Communications"? Whose work Robert W. Lucky, executive
> director of research at AT&T Bell Laboratories, calls the
> greatest "in the annals of technological thought?" Whose
> "pioneering insight" IBM Fellow Rolf W. Landauer equates
> with Einstein's"
> http://www.ecs.umass.edu/ece/hill/ece221.dir/shannon.html
> [Warning: context was removed from the above quote for
> brevity, and it is *really* worth seeing the entire statement.]
>
> "Noted as a founder of information theory, Claude Shannon
> combined mathematical theories with engineering principles
> to set the stage for the development of the digital
> computer."
> http://www.thocp.net/biographies/shannon_claude.htm
>
> "Shannon's information theories eventually saw application
> in a number of disciplines in which language is a factor,
> including linguistics, phonetics, psychology and
> cryptography, which was an early love of Shannon's. His
> theories also became a cornerstone of the developing field
> of artificial intelligence"
> http://www.thocp.net/biographies/shannon_claude.htm
>

> "It is generally accepted that the modern discipline of
> information theory began with the publication by Claude
> E. Shannon of his article "The Mathematical Theory of
> Communication" in the Bell System Technical Journal in July
> and October of 1948."
> http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Information_theory
>
> "Shannon had written "a blueprint for the digital age," says
> MIT information theorist Robert Gallager, who is still awed
> by the 1948 paper."
> http://www.kjist.ac.kr/~slic/est/cshannon.pdf
>
> And of course one could go on and on and on, because you can't find
> a reference to Shannon that does not include some similar statement.
> The work he did has just had a awesome effect on how we live today.
>

All very neat, Floyd. It IS very impressive, and in no way have I ever said,
done nor indicated anything that should detract from his work. It was brilliant, without
doubt. One of those things that should be obvious but which requires
a flash of uncommon insight.

Experienced hams understand what he was talking about, and how everyday
ham radio digital communications functions. But it WON'T, CAN'T cause
the "most efficient" mode to function best in cases such as the one I was in when I could
copy the CW Id but not the PSK. And such"comparisons" ring hollow
at those times. The same power levels in use, in a single ham radio channel, but the least
efficient mode performed while the most efficient one didn't. And yes, I understand why as
well as you do.

>And of course it has greatly *more* effect on ham operators than it
>does for the average person!

Maybe you should actually get on the air sometime and find out for yourself,
instead of having to take some other person's word for it all.

1057. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 11:57:53 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bhako1$4u9$1@208.206.142.89>
Source record: 74572

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >
> > That's a *very* hollow laugh, Carl. Efficiency goes way beyond
> >anything Shannon ever described.
> > You should know that. The word applies to far more than just what goes on
> >within any single "channel". But you choose to ignore every bit of it
> >save what Shannon had to say.
> >I find that very revealing- An Information Theory fixation!
> >
> >I just realized---You're a Shannonist!!!!
>
> Everyone who uses a telephone, a CD player, any form of digital
> communications on the ham bands, a digital computer, and or many
> many other things... is indeed a Shannonist. The theory of
> communications that he set forth *is* that all pervasive.

Wrong, Floyd. We can appreciate what Shannon did without considering him a
God. And that's exactly what you and Carl have done.

1058. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 12:11:36 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87wudjhy87.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74573

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>> DICK, you are not discussing the efficiency of a mode. What you
>> are arguing is the *operator's* ability to effectively use a mode.
>>
>
> Gasp! Floyd, are you *finally* beginning to understand what ham radio is all about????

DICK, I've known for decades that there are hams as dumb as you!

> NO, Frostbite, what you've done is desmonstrate that you know virtually nothing
>about anything except Shannon. I happen to ALSO know how it is with ham radio!

Yeah, we can tell!

>> There are *many* other things that can be controlled to change
>> the effective use of a communications channel. Your suggestion
>> *reduces* the channel capacity rather than making it more
>> effective.
>>
>
> FLOYD, FLOYD , FLOYD!!!!! One more time-----
>
>
>**IN HAM RADIO WE VIRTUALLY ///NEVER/// NEED TO EMPLOY
>MAXIMUM CHANNEL THROUGHPUT/DATA RATE!!!***

DICK, DICK, DICK, no shit DICK. Because Shannon says that
you *can't* use it.

> Do tell. And you actuall suppose that I and by extension most other hams don't
>know this?

If you know anything at all DICK, it is impossible to determine
so from the posts you make on Usenet.

> You're nuts. AND have zero experience as a ham.

My experience as a ham is probably more than yours.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

1059. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 12:31:04 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <c65_a.478$dj3.78100@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74574

"Floyd Davidson" <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message
news:87n0efjjlf.fld@barrow.com...
>
> "Shannon had written "a blueprint for the digital age," says
> MIT information theorist Robert Gallager, who is still awed
> by the 1948 paper."
> http://www.kjist.ac.kr/~slic/est/cshannon.pdf
>
That's probably why Dick is so anti-Shannon and continually
denies that Shannon's work has anything to do with ham radio ...
Dick is scared to death that modern digital communications
(that he obviously isn't capable of comprehending) will ultimately
supplant his beloved Morse ... which appears to be the only thing
in ham radio at which he can claim true proficiency.

Simple version: Dick can't face the fact that his only "claim to
fame" (as in "a legend in his own mind") is irrelevant except as
a recreational activity.

(NOTE: I have no problem with folks pursuing Morse as a
recreational activity ... what I have a problem with is their
insistence that it's "essential" to be a "Real Ham" and that a
pass/fail proficiency test should forever remain a "gatekeeper"
to the HF bands.

Carl - wk3c

1060. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 13:18:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F38E93D.2030409@psu.edu>
Source record: 74575

Floyd Davidson wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:

<some snippage>

>>
>> Ohh, I just got that pejorative from someone here. I kind of like it
>>tho'. I'm still playing Hockey at my ripe old age, and will as long as I
>>can.
>
>
> What? You think that is a perjorative???? You, sir, are
> no *real* hockey puck!

Oh, I don't think it is. but the gentleman saying it does.

> Heh, years ago I can remember going to a hockey game in
> Fairbanks, when the house was full, with hardly a seat left.
> Not a big deal, except that there were *four* hockey games going
> that night, and *all* of them were playing to a full house.
> Something like 1/4 the population of Fairbanks was taking in a
> hockey game that night.

Now that sounds like a real blast!

>
>> And I do like to get up to Canada whenever I can.
>
>
> Here in Alaska we tend to like our neighbors... and agree
> with them about folks in the Lower-48 being strange, eh!

You betchya!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1061. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 13:24:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F38EA89.9090000@psu.edu>
Source record: 74576
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Airy R Bean wrote:
> Where the murderous Yank invaders are receiving
> their just deserts - being dropped like flies by the
> modern equivalent of the French Resistance.
>
> Gareth (G1LVN) <gareth@mycallsign.freeserve.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:bh99jpgh1@newsg2.svr.pol.co.uk...
>
>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>news:3F382660.5020204@adelphia.net...
>>
>>>Someone's inviting *us* in? That doesn't happen too often! Most people
>>>tell us where to go though.....
>>
>>Like IRAQ for example....;-)

hmmm, maybe we'll just take a rain check on that invite.....

Thanks tho'!

- Mike KB3EIA -

1062. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 15:01:59 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308120701.52cc418c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74577

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030812002823.25815.00002132@mb-m07.aol.com>...

> >That's RIGHT. You've NEVER been a part of ham radio. But you can
> >dream.
>
> I do not "dream" of having a radio license.

Sure you do. But for no reason other than to say "See...I did
it"

> I got one of those 47 years ago.

Not in the Amatuer Radio Service you didn't. You're still a
non-licensee.

> I'm not interested in either getting or dreaming about any AMATEUR
> license.

Then the only OTHER reason for your lurking in an Amateur Radio
related newsgroup is trolling and antagonizing the participants.

> My interest is eliminating the morse code test for any radio license
> in the USA.

With no intent on obtaing a license therein you are the radio
version of a carpetbagger.

> >No, and I don't need to be employed by the FCC.
>
> Oh, my, assuming the mantle of leadership without authorization?!?

No more so than a non-licensed troll in an Amateur-related NG
trying to promote regulations that will never affect you.

> >The ARRL is not a pseudo-governmental organization.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...then they've been deceiving everyone with all their
> "district directors elected by democratic action" and all that!

And the ARRL's democratic-styled charitable organization is
different from any OTHER such styled organizations...HOW?

> Wonderful. I'm only a life member of the human race and a citizen
> of the United States of America.

Well....One out of two isn't bad, I suppose.
>
> Nothing can compare to "life membership" in ARRL!

And you'd know...HOW?

> >It is clear that I have as much "authority" to do those things as you.
> >You do them frequently. Are you a control freak?
>
> I'm just trying to discuss SUBJECTS, not personalities.

Uh huh..."Pendantic Parson"..."Dill Sergeant"..."Larrah"....

Seems those are some inventions of YOURS, are they not, Lennie?

> You keep on endlessly attempting to put down and humilate anyone
> who won't agree with you.

Whew...Out of the pan, into the fire, eh Lennie...?!?!

> Then you get all bent out of shape whenever someone doesn't bow
> down to your majestic whatever and continue with the put-down and
> humiliation attempts.

"Brown Shirts"..."Nazis"..."Elitists"...All generated from YOUR
keyboard, Lennie...How do YOUR "put-downs" differ from any one elses?

> >> I've been a professional in radio-electronics since 1952...51 years.
> >
> >Bully for you. This group doesn't have anything to do with being a
> >professional in radio or electronics.
>
> Well then, you just have me LOCKED OUT of the newsgroup, why
> don't you?

Would if we could. The world has enough pathological liars,
antagonists and wannabee's without YOU to add to the pot.

> "If thine eye offend thee, put it out."

Don't flatter yourself with Bible passages, Lennie.

> >> I've also been a radio-electronics HOBBYIST since 1947. Hobby
> >> activities not for pecuniary interest are AMATEUR activites.
> >
> >Part of your radio amateur fantasy? You can claim all the hobbyist
> >time-in-grade you like. Those might be AMATEUR but that doesn't make
> >you a radio amateur.
>
> Sigh...the credentialist is stuck on a one-note theme.

In THIS forum, "Amateur Radio" >>IS<< the "theme". You are not a
member of it.

> You are in a delerium again. It's an old model and doesn't work well.
> Put it out of its misery.

Ahhhhh.....Lennie's exercising his psychiatrist-by-association
privileges again...

> Bad try at some misdirection into more personality plonking. It doesn't
> work.

Then why are YOU so prolific at it?

> Let's see...according to Heilian definitions, only LICENSED radio
> amateurs are AMATEURS. That would make every other radio hobbyist
> "professional?" Not so. Your Beeperitis has led you off on another
> merry morse chase of illogic.

Only those holding an FCC form 660 with a callsign and class of
operator privileges are LICENSED Amateur Radio Operators.

YOU don't have one of those.

> >Passing a license
> >exam makes you a radio amateur, a part of ham radio. You haven't passed
> >such an exam and are not a part of amateur radio.
>
> I'm not interested in "becoming part of amateur radio."
>
> You don't seem to understand the concept. [Radio gods are like that]
>
> I'm just trying to get the morse code test off of all US radio license
> examinations.

Since there are only two that require it, and both of THEM are
Amateur Radio licenses, and since YOU insist you don't want to be a
"part" of Amateur Radio, that confirms my hypothesis that you are only
a troll and antagonist.

Thanks for the proof.

> You are stuck on this topic, aren't you Kolonel Klunk?

Hmmmmmm.....What was Lennie the Lame saying just a few paragraphs
ago about only wanting to discuss "subjects" and not "plonking"
personalities?

Does this complete and total idiot not proffread his own stuff to
make sure he doesn't double-back and step on his own toes?

Apparently NOT since he does it with such regularity!

> Your vigilante "enforcement" hasn't been working...yet you keep
> whining and carrying on, using the same old tired arguments.

Pot/Kettle/Black

> >You're a million laughs, Leonard old chap (or chapped). You're the king
> >of personal attacks and the grand poobah of rejected views. To top it
> >all off, you aren't involved in amateur radio whatsoever.
>
> Poor baby. Still thinking the First Amendment only applies to
> licensed radio amateurs?

The First Amendment doesn't apply to you either, Lennie. It
applies to the GOVERNMENT being able to suppress the media.

> Go back to your fantasies of greatness in radio and your authorized
> judgement of all who disagree with your holiness' views.

Let's make the same offer to you, Lennie. Go back to Japan in
1953, and go back to your days of glory and greatness at "Ham Radio
Magazine" and Raytheon, et al, where you made almost no discernable
impact on anything "radio" related at all.

> You are wasting everyone's time.

Back to ya, Spineless One.

Steve, K4YZ

1063. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 15:07:16 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bhavr4$2u8$0@208.207.71.140>
Source record: 74578

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
> >Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
> >> Increasing the signal power has the desired effect. There are
> >> other ways to accomplish that, of course. Reduction of noise by
> >> any means other than reducing the bandwidth (switching from an
> >> omni directional antenna to a directional antenna, for example)
> >> will have the desired effect.
> >>
> > Okay. What we have here is two separate arguments IMO. Everyone is right
> >
> No. Dick has repeatedly stated that Shannon has no significance
> for hams. He is wrong. He has said that his observations prove
> that CW is more efficient than PSK-31, and he is wrong about it
> being proven by his observations.

And Floyd makes up things to ascribe to others. I said no such things.

1064. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 16:38:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308120838.6ceccac5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74579

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hjgswns.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On 10 Aug 2003 22:22:00 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> >"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<cuvyxnansvbet.hjetrgn.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> >
> >"QRZ the Kilo Two, again please?"
>
> The DELETE key ate my reply and I don;t even remember what it was.

Heh. Nothing lost, that's completely in line with the rest of the
posts in this goofy NG.

>
> Ain't modern technology wonderful ??

Any more of it and I'm gonna curl up in a fetal position and cry.

1065. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 17:30:43 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bhb883hmf0@208.206.142.66>
Source record: 74580

Floyd Davidson wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
> >Floyd Davidson wrote:
> >>
> >> Knowing Shannon's theories would make all of this much easier for
> >> you to understand. Here, I did put it up on my web page, so that
> >> you can download it without have to embarass yourself asking for
> >> it in email. I said it was 500K... but I'd misplaced a decimal
> >> and it is more like 5.7Mb in size.
> >>
> >> <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson/techie/shannon.pdf>
> >
> >Don't bother Frostbite, I already know how to use Shannon. I have a pretty large
> >book here some containing about 1300 page that does a pretty good job on Shannon It's
> >entitled "Electronics Engineers Handbook" and devotes a few pages
> >tothe subjectt, and I've read it.
> >
> > But I also know enough about ham radio to know how it DOESN'T apply, too.
>
> The arrogance of your ignorance is astounding, DICK

Wrong yet one more time, Frosty. It's the density of your skull that's truly amazing.

1066. Austria: Nocode LIS from Sept?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 18:34:33 UTC
From: Ralph Aichinger <ralph@dolphy.pangea.at>
Message-ID: <1060712109.174061@news.liwest.at>
Source record: 74581

Just if anybody is interested, there are people writing on
the packet network here in Austria, that we will get
access to shortwave without a code test sometime in september,
on a provisional basis.

CEPT 2 licensed Amateurs will go on the air with their
usual OE calls, if this message is right.

/ralph oe5arp

1067. Re: ...does anyone really know who this is?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 19:40:44 UTC
From: rfburns2003@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <634e00e4.0308121140.89a845b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74582
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"X-No-archive: yes"
"Chuck...K1KW" <cdoneal@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<qhITa.131201$ye4.93756@sccrnsc01>...
> This idiot has been broadcasting and jamming legitimate
> amateur QSO's for years on several selected amateur
> radio frequencies with his inane BS. In one
> bold statement a few years ago he stated that he would
> be "bigger" than the ARRL is by today...anyone notice
> this flea? Just curious....is this guy a jerk or what???

If it's the a-hole I'm thinking of... Yes he is a jerk! I'd call him a "jerk-off" but that would be an insult to masturbation. I remember listening to his bogus ranting and raving over the air. This would have been about last December through about March or April of this year. Talk about your sassy fruitcakes. Aparently he divorced his husband, since he hasn't been heard on the air in months. I understand Maine is pretty progressive when it comes to same sex marriages.

I have to say, he has tamed it down quite a bit since he came under the scrutiny of the FEDS for all his alleged nefarious activities here in the states and abroad. Unfortunatley, he still QRMS all the hams on the east coast when he fires up nightly, splattering up and down the bands with absolutely no regard for law or considerate amateur practices. Here in New England we are all still waiting for Riley to eat his lunch. Hope it happens soon!

He says he is an alternative to the ARRL. I suppose he is, in the way your hand could be an alternative to toilet paper! He is such an asshole in fact, that I call him an alternative to a MAN.

See you on the air,

Chris

1068. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 19:42:12 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308121142.32fd82b0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74583

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308110347.1b5f839a@posting.google.com>...
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030810121412.12631.00000205@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > In article <20030810072821.12501.00001439@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > writes:
> >
> > >Fun fact: Check the lookup counter in QRZ.com for W5YI.
> > >
> > >73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > Jim:
> >
> > W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter!
>
> Ding ding ding!
>
> Now why would he be the only one without a lookup counter? Every other
> callsign I've ever checked has one.
>
> > OTOH,
> > Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!
>
> Naw, I've seen some really high lookup numbers.
> >
> > Now, now, Kim -- don't be jealous of Michelle -- even though you have a
> > right to be!
>
> Hint: Check out their birthdates....

Then compare their DIMENSIONS!

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1069. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 20:19:57 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308121219.382a9c33@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74584

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030811200142.15462.00002202@mb-m06.aol.com>...

> Had the no-code-test Technician never been created, US ham
> radio would have been short by 200K ham licenses by the time of
> "Reconstruction."

Prove it.

Show proof that 200,000 people would not have gotten US amateur radio
licenses between February 14, 1991 and April 15, 2000 if the Technician
class license had never lost its code test.

I don't think you have any proof. Or even any evidence. Just bluster.

1070. Re: Anniston, AL: TOXIC WASTE DUMP OF US MILITARY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 21:01:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhbkindne1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74585
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Help me out here. How does living near a storage area for Nerve Agent relate to reliving my Nam experience?

You brought it up, so you explain what you mean. Everyone is waiting.

Dan/W4NTI

"JMBCV" <nobody@mail.jmbcv.net> wrote in message news:91260a4aa50f6e2ec36a7a496adb04da@mail.jmbcv.net...
> Which explains W4NTI's reason to live where the crippled gimp can relive Vietnam every day...
>

1071. Re: BPL & US Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 21:09:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhbl0b$5f0$1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74586

"Hams" <Hams_member@newsguy.com> wrote in message
news:bh9gi001goo@drn.newsguy.com...
>
http://www1.commsworld.com.au/NASApp/cs/ContentServer?pagename=commsworld/ho
me&var_el=art&art_id=1034683529903&var_sect=NEWS&from=home
>
> http://tinyurl.com/jpua
>
> NEWS
>
>
>
> HAMS' HIGH TENSION OVER POWERLINE - 12 August 2003
> Richard Chirgwin
>
> Stray Signals Spoil Spectrum
>
>
> Amateur radio operators in America have conducted tests which they say
> demonstrate unacceptable radio interference caused by powerline broadband
> systems.
>
> The ham radio operators conducted tests in four US states where powerline
is in
> pilots, and the results of those tests were presented at the group's
Austin
> Summerfest earlier this month.
>
> The tests demonstrated that powerline broadband systems using frequencies
> between 2Mbps and 80Mbps created wide-spectrum interference on HF and
low-VHF
> amateur radio allocations.
>
> The test was conducted by the laboratory manager of America's ARRL (the
American
> Radio Relay League), Ed Hare, who tested spectrum measurements in
Maryland,
> Virginia, Pennsylvania and New York. He is quoted in the ARRL's online
> publication as saying that interference "ranged from moderate to extremely
> strong". In some tests, powerline interference was propagating for miles.
>
> The tests found three types of interference: static, pulse noise, and
> "warbling". The interference was detectable both from overhead and from
> underground cabling.

>
> The ARRL had already filed technical exhibits to an FCC powerline inquiry,
and
> says it will file further comments this month.
>
> The ARRL article can be found here.{ Http://arrl.org/ }
> CommsWorld Comment:
>
> The first trials of powerline technology during the 1990s were killed off
by
> interference, and by overhyped vendor claims. When powerline started to
make its
> comeback, the vendor community put its hand on its collective heart and
promised
> that interference was solved.
>
> If the ARRL's tests are right - which is a reasonable assumption given the
> demanding nature of a ham radio license - then powerline vendors were
mistaken
> about interference.
>
> This is hardly surprising. The physical parameters of an electricity
> distribution network vary much more widely than anything you'll see in a
> laboratory. It's quite likely that the interference seen in lab tests was
small
> enough to convince the industry the technology works. But out in the
field,
> there's plenty of things to fool around with the line impedance.
>
> This could have been foreseen. If the powerline vendors were wrong about
> interference, can we trust their claims about speed, performance, and
cost?
>
> It's easy to trivialise the concerns of the ham operators - and that is
exactly
> the tack utilities are taking in America. But ham operators aren't
ignorant; and
> they're not without rights. In all countries, ham is licensed - and that
means
> the operator has paid a fee for the right to use spectrum.
>

For anyone that don't believe it yet go to the ARRL web site and download
the 24mb file and see for yourself. It is beyone belief.

Dan/W4NTI

1072. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 21:10:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhbl3c$7vi$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74587
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Just another blip from the BBC loving fool in a has been country that thinks
its still a world power.

Dan/W4NTI

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f38a23e$1_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> Where the murderous Yank invaders are receiving
> their just deserts - being dropped like flies by the
> modern equivalent of the French Resistance.
>
> Gareth (G1LVN) <gareth@mycallsign.freeserve.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:bh99jpgh1@newsg2.svr.pol.co.uk...
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F382660.5020204@adelphia.net...
> > > Someone's inviting *us* in? That doesn't happen too often! Most people
> > > tell us where to go though.....
> > Like IRAQ for example....;-)
>
>
>

1073. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 21:13:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F395779.63FCCE51@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74588

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F37AF98.183C4210@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3F301D6D.D7A189F5@earthlink.net>...
> >> > Brian wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3F2FA40B.6CBD0E90@earthlink.net>...
> >> > > > Brian wrote:
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3F2F1ADF.9E64A43D@earthlink.net>...
> >> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> >> >
> >> > It serves to point out Len's total lack of experience in the amateur
> >> > service.
> >>
> >> Yet he knows more about radio then you.
> >
> >It hasn't been demonstrated that he knows more about radio "then" me.
>
> YOU won't accept any evidence that any court would accept as
> valid. You wish to posture as judge, jury, and executioner. You
> are none of those.

That matters not. You don't have any such "evidence". What I wrote is
quite correct. Neither Brian nor you knows whether you know more about
radio than me.

> I've presented just a tiny bit of the "evidence" I have on what I've
> done, complete with all references for independent investigation
> in this newsgroup. You have disregarded all of that, preferring to
> act the judge, jury, and executioner in order to "win" some kind of
> "debate" that only exists in your mind. You have presented nothing
> but generalities without any corroborating evidence.

You've presented nothing as "evidence". You've just made claims.

> You insist on making this some kind of personal "battle" over some
> imagined "superiority" in amateurism and the "elitism" as well as

> "superiority" of your status, rank, title, etc. in nothing but amateur
> radio. That keeps happening regardless of the subject title or thread.

That wouldn't be correct, Len. Superiority in amateurism doesn't enter
into it. You aren't a radio amateur. You have nothing to do with
amateur radio. You are to amateur radio what a bowling pin is to
archery.

> You keep forgetting you aren't any official and aren't any judge (you
> keep falling off the bench). You may think you speak for some
> "majority" of ham radio but all you do is speak for yourself.

You aren't any official but you are officious.
You aren't a judge but you are judgmental toward radio amateurs.
You believe you know best how amateur radio should be regulated but you
are not a radio amateur. You are a self-anointed committee of one and
you are a non-participant.

> All you can
> do is attempt to put down others not agreeing with you.

Naw, Len. That's not all I do. I do pay special attention to your
posts though.

> >There is every possibility that Len knows more about electronics theory
> >than me.
>
> Not only theory, but design, practical hardware prototyping to finished
> product, field application and liason, and writing about it in national
> magazines. I've done all that as a professional AND as a hobbyist in
> radio-electronics.

Okay. There's every possibility that Len knows more about electronics
theory (to include design, practical hardware prototyping in finished
product, field application and liason, and writing about it in national
magazines).

> >There is a similar possibility that I have much more
> >operational experience in "radio" or that I have much more knowledge of
> >wave propagation than Len.
>
> "Wave propagation?" Would you know Biot from Savart?

Old Jean Bapiste and Felix? Certainly.

> E and H fields?

But of course.

> Knife-edge diffraction?

Most assuredly.

> Were you intimately
> involved with HF

> communications across the Pacific in the early 1950s for "24/7"
> primary communications service?

I knew there'd be a trick question. Why no, Len. I was busy being ages two through five in the early 1950's. No responsible entity would be likely to put a preschooler in such a position.

I was "intimately" involved with HF communications across the Pacific in the 1960's at hours of my own choosing. My station also worked across the Atlantic and across the Indian Ocean. It did so with less power than yours and I was still a teenager.

I was "intimately" involved with HF military communications, working transatlantic and transpacific paths using a variety of log periodic, inverted discone and rhombic antennas and either 10 kw or 45 kw transmitters from 1968-1970. The station was in operation 24/7 but I generally pulled eight hour shifts.

I was "intimately" involved with in-country HF military operations for a year in Vietnam.

I spent fifteen "intimate" years overseas with the U.S. Department of State where I was responsible for all HF and VHF communications whether by voice, asynchronous data or morse.

I've spent forty years as an active radio amateur, operating various modes on bands from 1.8 through 432 MHz.

> I can go on and on without ever
> touching the recorded and evidencible facts of having spent three
> years being actively involved with the latter. That grates on you.

Three years? Three measly years? It grates on me that you'd dare compare your three years to my experience and pretend to have a lock on knowledge.

> Put that in your Icepack and stroke it.

Is this the part where you eat me for breakfast?

> >There is a certainty that I have forty years
> >more experience in amateur radio than Len.
>
> I've been a radio-electronics hobbyist for 56 years and never bothered
> to get any amateur radio license with its official certificate plus the
> rank/title/status accorded it by some other amateurs.

I'm certain that no one here wants to "bother" you.

> You ARE
> granted that one item but it would seem you've never ventured out of
> "the bands" (HF) for all your tenure as an amateur.

1.8 through 432 MHz *just* as an amateur. Don't you feel foolish?

> >> How can that be if he has no experience?
> >
> >What I wrote addressed Len's experience in amateur radio. He has none.
>
> Since when is that SUCH an important factor in "radio?"

This group deals with amateur radio and my comments were addressed to
you lack of amateur radio experience.

> The FCC doesn't require any commissioners or staff to hold amateur
> licenses. The Congress of the United States has never chartered the
> FCC to "only" regulate US amateur radio by licensed radio amateurs.

You aren't paid to regulate radio. You're just some guy with no amateur
radio license.

> You keep acting like some kind of land squatter, claiming territorial
> imperative and divine right for holding a grant a long time.

No, I'm not a squatter. I have a license which says I am permitted to
operate anywhere in the amateur bands. What's your story?

> That alone
> is NO evidence of ANY expertise, only the ability to not be caught for
> violations and being able to renew your vaunted license every decade
> or so.

If you had obtained such a license, you'd be in the same boat.

> >> So why so do you give him so much attention?
> >
> >A smart fellow would have figured out that laughing at Len isn't exactly
> >an endorsement of his views.
>
> You wish to squelch all opponents to your royal viewpoints by trying
> to make fun of them, trying to put them down.

I don't have any royal viewpoints but I do enjoy a laugh at your
expense. If I can share it with others, so much the better.

> You can't bear the thought that your viewpoints aren't of the nobility,
> divine statements of some higher radio god. Since you can't talk on
> the subjects, you try to hit the person of the communicator.

Shall I repost some more of your old archived material to refresh your
memory of reality, Len? I wouldn't have to go back very far in the
archives.

> That's been evident for years in here.

It is sure to be "evident" to a guy who sees only what others do but who
is blind to his own past and present actions.

> >> Must you try to tear down Len at every opportunity to boost your stature?
> >
> >Poking fun at Leonard Anderson has never been done for purposes of

> >boosting my own stature, nor is it a "must" on my list of things to do.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...false claim.

How would you know that, Leonard?

> It is fairly clear what you do to anyone not embracing your godlike views
> of amateurism...try to put them down any way you can.

That doesn't matter. You are in no way involved.

> After all these years you keep failing. The technique doesn't work.

Really? The indications are otherwise.

> >If I had to list reasons for doing so, I'd likely come up with a list
> >like:
> >
> >1) Because Len Anderson does it to others on a continuing basis
>
> Poor baby. It's "okay" to attempt humiliation of others because
> you are a radio god and you've been an amateur for four decades.

I note you didn't address your own shortcomings.

> Sigh...another over-inflated EGO...

There, there, Leonard. Your ego isn't THAT big.

> >2) Because my views are in opposition to those held by Anderson, a
> >non-radio amateur.
>
> Hardly. :-)

Hardly in opposition or hardly a radio amateur?

> Google is full of Heil's put-downs and humiliations of NON-licensed
> radio amateurs...because Heil feels they are "inferior" to his godlike
> status. :-)

Individuals? Do you have a mouse in your pocket?

> >3) Because Len comes across as a pontificating windbag who sees
> >himself as an expert in all things relating to radio communication.
>
> Poor baby. More damage evident to the super ego of Heil's.

Really? I checked my ego and it seems intact. Better check yours for
leaks.

> I've never claimed "expertise" in any field of endeavor, just a few where
> I've had lots of experience, hands-on experience for a long time. That's
> anathema to Heil and his "superior" four decades as an AMATEUR.

The experience you listed above doesn't seem like very much at all.

> To quote another quoting a late ballplayer, "It ain't braggin if ya done
> it."
>
> I've done a lot. :-)

...but you never quite got around to nailing that elusive amateur radio
license.

> >4) Because it is soooooo easy.
>
> No...because you are unable to argue on the subjects. All you can do
> is attempt put-downs, attempt humiliating others who won't worship you
> as the "foremost authority."

Would you really like to see those Anderson quotes from Google?

> Living a fantasy is VERY easy. No work required, very little thought.
> Fantasylands allow anyone to destroy their "opponents" with impunity.

Is this anything like your fantasy that you're a real radio amateur?
Do you ever wake up and realize that this is only a newsgroup and that
you aren't a part of the real thing?

> Feel free to indulge your super ego and demand all do as you say.

I've never demanded you do anything, Len. I don't give a rat's patoot
if you ever obtain a ham ticket.

> Few will.

A few might if any demands had ever been made...but they've never been
made.

You aren't the "authority" and are no "official."

Back at ya, Len and you're no radio amateur.

> Your credence
> went to hell along with your robust oberst uniform a long time ago.

No, my Creedence went to Helsinki. I don't know what to make of your
peculiar comment about a uniform.

Dave K8MN

1074. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 21:39:43 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030812173943.717$Fk@newsreader.com>
Source record: 74589
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote:
> Where the murderous Yank invaders are receiving
> their just deserts - being dropped like flies by the
> modern equivalent of the French Resistance.
>
The French fight with their face, I hope you ain't one of them.

--
GO# 40
---
http://NewsReader.Com/
50GB/Month

1075. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 21:43:11 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <n1jijvcmdqb3k0m2i9ounrmggv2gnt6j8o@4ax.com>
Source record: 74590

On 10 Aug 2003 00:51:07 GMT, Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:

>Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> wrote:
>> On 09 Aug 2003 15:12:31 GMT, Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
>>
>> >I enjoy watching assholes like you and dan squirm.
>>
>> Kinda like you when you take a code test, eh?
>>
>Dunno, never took it. Looks like cw is gonna be history,
>just like your attitude toward no coders. Fate is a strange
>animal, all you stuffy blowhards lose after-all.

Welcome to RRAP. Get a few years in the group and maybe you'll get to know what my attitude toward no-coders IS. Right now, you obviously have no clue as to what my opinion of code testing is, instead jumping to a conclusion based on one sentence from just one of hundreds of posts I've made in this NG over the years since I got my ham ticket.

What I *do* have an attitude about - and it's not a good one - is when people hide behind posting anonymously, demonstrating that they don't even take their *own* opinions seriously enough to attach a name and call to what they post, then whine when nobody else takes their posts seriously. Fit anybody you know?

>You should of elmered the hobby, instead of ridiculing
>any newbie who showed interest. Too late now.

Putting aside the fact that you're a borderline illiterate ("should of" instead of "should have"? C'mon, I knew better than that before I finished second grade...what year did you drop out?), I for one wouldn't be very interested in elmering anybody who demonstrates callous disregard for the regulations, like certain trolls in this NG for example. Beyond that, I think my track record shows that you lack sufficient knowledge of the truth on which to base an intelligent opinion regarding my elmering activities, so instead, you posted a singularly unintelligent one instead. You really shouldn't post when you're smoking crack. :-)

1076. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 22:04:00 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030812180400.18595.00001258@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 74591

>Subject: Re: NCVEC Position on Code
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 8/9/03 6:40 AM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0308090240.7b896978@posting.google.com>
>
>nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
>news:<20030808175644.19707.00000166@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>
>> For the record, I have not
>> used PSK-31 myself on
>> the amateur bands.
>>
>> So I will not lecture others
>> on how well it does or
>> does not work.
>
>Yet Dick is free to lecture others, i.e., "any idiot can get psk going
>in under 30 minutes," but by his own words here he couldn't.

He did get it going,
did he not?

>That is the point.

Only to you.

1077. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 22:18:58 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030812181858.18595.00001259@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 74592

>Subject: Re: NCVEC Position on Code
>From: Floyd Davidson floyd@barrow.com
>Date: 8/11/03 3:22 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <87he4ongn4.fld@barrow.com>
>
>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>>Floyd Davidson wrote:
>>>
>>> The problem is you are comparing two different data rates
>>> through the same channel. PSK-31 runs at 31.5 bits per second.
>>> If you used CW at that rate, it works out to about 37.8 wpm.
>>> Are you telling me *you* can copy 35 wpm using a 200 Hz filter
>>> when there is Doppler distortion from auroral activity?

Can you, Floyd?

>> No, you idiot- do you come from the same village as Burke?-
>>What I said is that we REAL HAMS have no NEED to invoke laboratory nonsense
>>to interfere with our on the air operation!
>> ANd they are NOT THROUGH THE SAME 31 cycle channel! They both come through
>the channel tha *I*
>>set, not Shannon, which was a 2.4 kc channel which is modifiable by all
>those snazzy IF
>
>Sounds as if you, like Larry Roll, don't want to have anything
>to do with any of that "Empirical Theory" stuff of his, eh?
>
>Perhaps I remembered the previous discussion incorrectly? Were
>you using a 2.4 KHz channel, or a 200 Hz channel?
> In either
>case the agc, and hence SNR, are affected by the noise in that
>channel, not the 30Hz filter in DSP software.
>
Only if the AGC was turned on.
In many situations, reception
can be improved by disabling
the AGC.

Old CW operator's trick.

>But once again, Shannon *does* apply to everything you've got there.
>*If* you want to actually understand it, that is the *only* way to
>explain it.

Shannon's work sets a limit.
Real world performance cannot

be "better" than Shannon predicts.

But it can be worse.
>
>Or you can continue to be a glorified CB operator.
>
Have you ever actually
used PSK-31, Floyd?

>>> In fact, what you've done is demonstrate that Shannon's work
>>> *does* apply to ham radio! PSK-31 is an m-ary channel using
>>> QPSK (where m = 4), which trades signal to noise ratio for
>>> bandwidth to obtain the same data rate as it would using
>>> straight phase modulation.

Which is good in some situations
and not so good in others.
>>>
>>> What *you* should be saying is that your experience demonstrates
>>> that Shannon's theories prove true in the practical application
>>> of ham radio. When the SNR is low, CW can be useful, albeit at
>>> very low data rates, if restricted bandwidth is a requirement.
>>> Of course, if the bandwidth wasn't restricted to 200 Hz, almost
>>> any variation on PSK modulation would out run CW for efficiency,
>>> as can easily be demonstrated using Shannon's formula.

That depends on how
"efficiency" is defined,
doesn't it? If we count
the power required to
operate the radio and
the power required to
operate the laptop,
PSK-31 isn't that
"efficient"....
>>>
>>Yeah, Frosty, most of us know all that, it's been well
>>published, and quoted here for some time. But it still has no
>>applicability to ham radio outside the theoretical.
>
>Apparently your Empirical Theory is a little sparse there DICK.
>
>Why and how do you think PSK-31 was invented to begin with?

I happen to know
the answer to that
question.

The inventor and
his helpers were
interested in a very
narrow bandwidth

"keyboard to keyboard"
mode to replace
Baudot RTTY.

> It
>clearly does have practical benefits, and when you attempted to
>use PSK-31 you *were* making use of those benefits.
>
Of course.

OOK CW has benefits, too.
Yet it seems to bother some
people to admit that.

It is interesting to note
that Larry Roll and
Dick Carroll have actual
experience with PSK-31,
while Brian Burke, Floyd
Davidson and Len
Anderson have none. Yet
the latter insist upon
denying the experience of the
former.

And vice versa.

Why not just use the mode
you like best and have fun?

If PSK-31 is so wonderful,
why is it that only two of
the five named have actually
used it?

1078. Re: L.A. Times Editorial Correction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 22:30:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308121430.66544155@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74593

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030811200130.15462.00002190@mb-m06.aol.com>...

> Those who want to practice the puerile geo-political bashing in
> here should remember that...(SNIP)

Ranting about completely irrelevent subject matter deleted.

There was no "geo-political bashing".

Jim states he was misquoted in such a way as to make it appear
that he was taking "credit" for work that he was only partially
responsible for.

He stated here that such was not the case and that he wanted to
make it clear that such was not his intent.

Nice try at character assasination, you lying sack of pus.

> Leonard H. Anderson
> retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

A scumbag idiot with nothing better to do than act like a scumbag
idiot.

Steve, K4YZ

1079. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 22:38:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308121438.7df10277@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74594

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030811200131.15462.00002191@mb-m06.aol.com>...

> Poor baby. You don't come close to any civil debate yet you
> DEMAND others do so.

I didn't "demand" anything, Lennie.

I point out that you make it a point of harrassing others about
it, yet indulge yourself in the most childish and pathetic of efforts
to see who can out-insult the other.

You insist on referring to yourself as a "professional", but you
have yet to prove yourself "professional" in ANY discipline.

> You REALLY need some mental therapy on being able to
> get along with anyone else.

Uh huh. Coming from you, I rate this about 136 on a scale of 1
to 10 on important things to do.

> > Bet it irks the heck out of you that not one but TWO of your
> >former screen names has been acquired by someone who thinks you are an
> >idiot too.
>
> It's the "copycat killer" syndrome...those are trying to make a "name"
> for themselves but hiding behind pseudonyms, afraid to give their
> real identity.

Uh huh...(Geeze this idiot makes this easy...) Just like YOU
tried to hide behind "Avery Fine" and "Avery Fineman" until your ego
got the better of you one day and you signed your name to a post that
you had specifically denied BEING you.

Sheesh.

> Tsk, tsk, tsk...not even amateur civil debate from pSycho pSteve.

I wasn't the one making the claim, Lennie...you are.

> pStevie, you REALLY need some mental therapy.

As I was saying...Get Mamma Lennie's correspondence books out and
try again, Lennie

Steve, K4YZ

1080. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 22:44:19 UTC
From: "No Code, No Ham" <No@e.mail>
Message-ID: <vjire3b9l5l836@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 74595
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in
news:20030802210406.21580.00000808@mb-m07.aol.com:

> Do Hams get 11 Meters Back, as soon as all the CBers upgrade to there
> Free Handout Ham Licenses?
>

There has been a free ham license ever since the codeless tech was introduced a few years back. The 5 wpm code requirement has further moved things in that direction. Idiots on the ham bands.

11 meters has come to the ham bands. I listen to the bands and it's certainly not the way things were in the 1980's when I got licenced. I might as well just listen to CB channel 19, it all sounds the same now.

ARRL plan back fired on them. They worked to dumb things done in order to produce more licensee's who might join the organization and fill the corporate bank accounts, but instead, they got a bunch of idiots who don't care bacause getting a license is easy now and when you don't have to work to get the benefits, the benefits you get don't mean a whole lot.

All real hams out there who remember how the bands used to be, send the ARRL a nasty-gram and cancel your League memberships. They screwed us over big time by not protecting the integrity of the Amateur radio Service.

No Code.... No Ham!

1081. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 22:46:15 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308121446.50c90650@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74596

```
Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93D4D5C16A581elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
> news:c2356669.0308111312.2a8895e3@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns93D34838F9CB6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> >> news:20030810064427.21428.00001584@mb-m23.aol.com:
> >>
> >> > In article <Xns93D2733067496elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> >> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >> >
> >> >>>>> "Here" is all of Region 2. A big part of the world.
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>No, only the USA, it's still phone in the rest of R2
> >> >>>
> >> >>> No, it isn't. Other modes are authorized, not just 'phone.
> >> >>>
> >> >>The point being, however, that phone is authorised there in every
> >> >>country but one
> >> >>
> >> > OK, fine.
> >> >>
> >> >>>>>>I think you'll find it isn't being fixed.
> >> >>>>>
> >> >>>>> Sure it is, but it will take time. Before the end of the decade
> >> >>>>> 7000-7200 will be worldwide exclusive amateur. That's double
> >> >>>>> what Region 1 and Region 3 have now. It will make sense for
> >> >>>>> those regions to move their 'phone up above 7100 and leave below
> >> >>>>> 7100 to CW and digital.
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>Not while the US has CW in 7100-7150. As long as that's the case
> >> >>>>it makes more sense _to_them_ to leave 7000-7100 unchanged and
> >> >>>>split the 'new' 7100-7200 50/50. Net gain to you - zero.
> >> >>>
> >> >>> If it gets the foreign 'phones off of 7030, it's a gain.
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>>>The ARRL bandplan is the only
> >> >>>>>>one out of step, so nobody else is likely to change theirs,
> >> >>>>>>notwithstanding Europe and some other areas getting 7100-7200 as
> >> >>>>>>additional spectrum in 2007.
> >> >>>>>
> >> >>>>> What part of the world will not get 7100-7200?
```

> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>None
> >> >>>
> >> >>> There you are.
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>> And why should Region 2 change now, with the band getting wider?
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>You mean the US, and I don't suppose the ARRL will change
> >> >>>
> >> >>> It's not just ARRL but FCC.
> >> >>
> >> >>You're right, but it's not the rest of the region
> >> >
> >> > So because everyone else makes a mistake, the USA should make it
> >> > too?
> >>
> >> This reminds me of an old comic strip. The proud mother is watching
> >> the passing out parade and calls out "Look at my Johnny, he's the only
> >> one in step!".
> >
> > It reminds me of a different strip. The lemmings are rushing over the
> > cliff, and one grabs his ankles and yells "CANNONBALL!!!!"
> >
> >> According to you, the USA is the only country in step in the parade.
> >
> > Nope.
> >
> > According to me, the USA has a better system and the other countries
> > haven;t caught on yet.
> >
> > Here in the USA we have some roads reserved for autos only, and some
> > lanes reserved for car pools and transit buses. Act as incentives to
> > use more efficient means of transport. Also acknowledges the basic
> > incompatibility of small and large vehicles. Non-phone subbands act as
> > an incentive to use more efficient modes than analog voice, and
> > acknowledge the basic incompatibility between wide and narrow modes.
> >>
> >> >>>>>>All that will happen is that a DX window will
> >> >>>>>>appear from 7150-7200, but the DX will continue to use phone
> >> >>>>>>everywhere they use it now - indefinitely. Sorry to be the one
> >> >>>>>>to break that to you!
> >> >>>>>
> >> >>>>> So their lack of a bandplan and good manners should cause the
> >> >>>>> USA to follow their lead? I think not!
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>They have a bandplan. Phone stays above at least 7040, except 7030
> >> >>>>in R3.
> >> >>>
> >> >>> There are Canadians operating LSB on 7030.
> >

> >> >>I wasn't aware of that. That is against any bandplan that I know of,
> >> >>and I agree that it is bad manners
> >> >
> >> > Exactly. Main point is that bandplans are not much help if folks
> >> > ignore them.
> >
> > And the only reason "DX windows" exist is so that foreign 'phones have
> > a place to go where they won't be buried by hordes of 1.5 KW USA
> > 'phones. IOW, so the DX can work each other once in a while.
> >> >>
> >> >>>>That's not the bandplan you want, but it's a bandplan. The
> >> >>>>reference to good manners I don't follow.
> >> >>>
> >> >>> The folks who don't follow the bandplan have bad manners. Having a
> >> >>> Canadian SSB net on 7030 when they have 7000-7030 is bad manners.
> >> >>
> >> >>Agreed
> >> >
> >> > Thanks
> >> >>
> >> >>>>I don't expect the USA to follow anyone's lead. Just don't be
> >> >>>>surprised when no-one follows the USA's lead either.
> >> >>>
> >> >>> And the result is chaos.
> >> >>
> >> >>Yes it is. However, the rest of the world probably think that it
> >> >>would be easier for _one_ country to change than for 100+, which
> >> >>doesn't mean that I think it will happen.
> >> >
> >> > So even though the result is chaos, the USA should follow along and
> >> > make it that much worse?
> >>
> >> If the USA followed along it would no longer be chaos.
> >
> > Yes, it would. In fact, it would be worse, because the DX would have
> > nowhere to hide.
> >
> > Ask yourself this: Why do DX 'phones operate in the US CW/data
> > subbands at all if they can operate in the US 'phone subbands?
> >
>
> In the case of 40, it's to avoid BCI.

Maybe in Regions 1 and 3, but why in Region 2?
>
> On the other bands, I think a lot of DX ops don't even know how far down
> US hams can go on phone (although the serious DXers do).

I disagree. American hams are obvious by their absence. The DX goes
outside the US 'phone bands to avoid Yank QRM.
>

> >> As I say, though,
> >> I'm not holding my breath for that to happen.
>
> >> >>>>> 800 is pretty high. 600-700 is more common among CW ops. The SSB
> >> >>>>> audio passband is typically 300-2700 Hz, so 600 or even 800 is
> >> >>>>> pretty low. 1500 would be smack in the middle.
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>True enough
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>>>This of course would be what you
> >> >>>>>>would get if they netted onto the SSB and then offset by their
> >> >>>>>>usual amount.
> >> >>>>>
> >> >>>>> There is no offset in CW. The carriers are all on the same
> >> >>>>> frequency.
> >> >>>>>>
> >> >>>>>>> Point is that what sounds like "right on top" may not sound
> >> >>>>>>> that way to the other guy.
>
> >> >>>>>>It depends which side of the nominal carrier frequency the CW
> >> >>>>>>signal is on. However, assuming my SSB filter is working, I
> >> >>>>>>would say they were low, i.e. on the same side as the LSB
> >> >>>>>>sideband, or I would be filtering them out. This also puts them
> >> >>>>>>almost in the middle of the SSB signal, doesn't it?
> >> >>>>>
> >> >>>>> No. Their tone would be 1500 if it were in the middle.
> >> >>>>>>
> >> >>>>>>> Listen to a busy CW contest with a wide (AM bandwidth) rx and
> >> >>>>>>> it sounds like a pile of intentional inteference. Switch in
> >> >>>>>>> appropriate filters and you find that almost all of the
> >> >>>>>>> stations have spaced themselves so they don't overlap.
> >> >>>>>>>
> >> >>>>>>>>> Neither am I
> >> >>>>>>>>> talking about weak phone stations, although they could be
> >> >>>>>>>>> weak at some other QTH.
> >> >>>>>>>>
> >> >>>>>>> That's another point.
> >> >>>>>>>
> >> >>>>>>>>> > Of course the DX 'phones could have switched to CW and
> >> >>>>>>>>> > answered the CQers, then politely asked them to move.
> >> >>>>>>>
> >> >>>>>>> But they didn't, did they?
> >> >
> >> > I guess not.
> >> >>>>>>>>> >
> >> >>>>>>>>> > *My Southgate Type 7 has two cascaded 8 pole 500 Hz crystal
> >> >>>>>>>>> > filters, giving an effective bandwidth of less than 400 Hz
> >> >>>>>>>>> > and very steep filter skirts. And it has an audio LC filter
> >> >>>>>>>>> > as well.
> >> >>>>>>>>> >

> >> >>>>>>>>
> >> >>>>>>>> So, if say, you called QRU? on 7080 and there was a strong
> >> >>>>>>>> signal SSB QSO in progress, would you be able to tell? This
> >> >>>>>>>> is a genuine question.
> >> >>>>>>>
> >> >>>>>>> I would listen first and steer clear of anyhting that sounds
> >> >>>>>>> like SSB. Then I'd send "IE" a few times to test the waters.
> >> >>>>>>> If I heard something start up when I did that, I'd move.
> >> >>>>>>>
> >> >>>>>>> But usually I am below 7060. Above about 7060 is data and
> >> >>>>>>> foreign SSB country.
> >> >>>>>>>
> >> >>>>>>>> I
> >> >>>>>>>> don't posses a CW filter.
> >> >>>>>>>
> >> >>>>>>> One of the reasons some hams get turned off to CW is that they
> >> >>>>>>> use equipment that really isn't meant for the mode. Most HF
> >> >>>>>>> rigs today are primarily SSB rigs with CW tacked on. Some are
> >> >>>>>>> pretty good, many are awful.
> >> >>>>>>>
> >> >>>>>>
> >> >>>>>>If I need it I have an outboard audio filter
> >> >>>>>
> >> >>>>> Ugh. Audio filters are no substitute for IF filtering. And
> >> >>>>> unless the AGC is turned off, QRM can dominate the receiver.
> >> >>>>>
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>True, but I don't really need a narrow CW filter for anything
> >> >>>
> >> >>> Data modes.
> >> >>
> >> >>If I ever get around to trying any
>
> >> >>>>>>(a Radio Shack DSP unit,
> >> >>>>>>which is fairly basic and suffers from low audio output). I
> >> >>>>>>hadn't thought about that when I said I had no CW filter. It
> >> >>>>>>tends to 'take off' on 20 with RF getting inside it, but it's OK
> >> >>>>>>on 40.
> >> >>>>>
> >> >>>>> What sort of rig?
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>I use an IC-729 in my shack. Excellent receiver RF performance.
> >> >>>
> >> >>> Compared to what? No offense, but there are some really good rigs
> >> >>> out there.
> >> >>
> >> >>The reviews at the time said it was comparable with anything
> >> >>regardless of price bracket in _basic_ receiver performance, but
> >> >>that was back in '92. I expect the world has moved on, and it never
> >> >>was loaded with features.

> >> >
> >> > You might want to compare it to more modern stuff. The Ten Tec and
> >> > Elecraft websites have various receiver performance measures of
> >> > different rigs, as actually measured.
> >> >>
> >> >>What do you use, anyway?
> >> >>
> >> > My homebrew 100 watt transceiver and an Elecraft K2 built from a
> >> > kit.
> >> >
> >>
> >> I hope your K2 doesn't drift, unlike one that I heard on the bands.
> >
> > It doesn't. I have had it for over two years now and it's done very
> > well.
> >
> >> Of
> >> course, that may have been due to the person who put it together.
> >
> > The classic problem with kits is that they are only as good as the
> > builder.
>
> BTW, I just received the parts for my K5OOR linear.

Never heard of it. Any good?

> We're supposed to call
> it a project instead of a kit, HI.

That's because it's illegal to call it a kit. Thanks to misnehaving cb
and freeband folks.

> Anyway, when I've built it, it will
> amplify the output of my FT817 to 35 watts on 160-10. It will be pretty
> small too, i.e. the FT817 plus the linear will still be much smaller and
> lighter than the IC729.

But how many amps will the combo draw, transmit and receive? My K2
draws about 250 mills on receive.
>
> >>
> >> >>>>Not very
> >> >>>>good audio, though. Ironically it has nowhere to fit a narrow SSB
> >> >>>>filter, but has a place for a CW filter (nothing in there, of
> >> >>>>course).
> >> >>>
> >> >>> Couldn't a narrow SSB filter be put in the CW slot?
> >> >>
> >> >>Yes, but without making any further mods it would be selected when
> >> >>the mode was set to 'CW-N'.
> >> >
> >> > There must be a mod for it.

> >>
> >> I haven't seen one so far, but you would think it could be done.
> >
> > Be the first....
>
> Maybe
>
> >>
> >> >>
> >> >>>>Not the
> >> >>>>Rolls Royce of radios, but I'm not overloaded with cash.
> >> >>>
> >> >>> The Southgate Type 7 cost me less than $100 to build.
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>>>>> I am guessing you would hear something,though?
> >> >>>>>>>>
> >> >>>>>>> Depends on the situation. Usually SSB sounds like monkey
> >> >>>>>>> chatter through a narrow filter. But near the edges it can be
> >> >>>>>>> very weak or inaudible.
> >> >>>>>>
> >> >>>>>>As I've explained, I think this is going on in the middle of the
> >> >>>>>>SSB sigs, which is another reason to be suspicious
> >> >>>>>
> >> >>>>> Sure. But 1500 is the middle, not 800.
> >> >>>>>
> >> >>>>>>> The best solution is for wide and narrow modes to have their
> >> >>>>>>> own subbands. They simply don't mix well.
> >> >>>>>>
> >> >>>>>>Yes
> >> >>>>>
> >> >>>>> So when will the rest of the world get on the beam and have
> >> >>>>> nonphone subbands?
> >> >>>>
> >> >>>>They do, and they have done as long as I remember. In some
> >> >>>>countries they are voluntary, and in others they are compulsory,
> >> >>>>but nowhere are they as wide as in the USA.
> >> >>>
> >> >>> Time for them to get on the beam, then.
> >> >>
> >> >>Depends what you mean - widen them or make them compulsory?
> >> >
> >> > Both - just like the USA.
> >> >
> >> >>There is no
> >> >>expansion of CW use to justify the former,
> >> >
> >> > Yes, there is. Look at participation in contests as just one
> >> > measure. CW up, phone flat.
> >> >
> >>

> >> Contesters, the really serious kind, use whatever mode is specified in
> >> the rules. If the rules said semaphore they'd learn that too.
> >
> > Almost all contests have separate CW and 'phone weekends. (FD and ARRL
> > 160 are the exceptions that prove the rule). The ham population can
> > choose to operate one, both, or neither. CW participation is UP while
> > 'phone is flat.
>
> That puzzles me.

It's a fact.

> I honestly don't think it's due to new hams preferring
> CW.

Why not? I know lots of new hams who prefer CW, once they get a
reasonable set of skills. That doesn't mean everyone will like it.

> Maybe there are people who used to only contest on phone that are now
> doing the CW leg as well.

Perhaps.

Or perhaps the declining sunspots and proven superior performance of
CW are drawing more hams to use it.

Perhaps the simple fact that CW is unique is the attraction.

Perhaps it's just the rising number of hams.

But the fact remains that for whatever reasons, HF CW USE by hams is
increasing in at least some measurable ways.

This fact puts the lie to the claim that "young people" and "new hams"
aren't interested in the mode. At least some of them are.
>
> >>
> >> >>and most administrations don't
> >> >>really care what hams do within the ham bands. I suspect that, for
> >> >>example, Industry Canada don't even care about Canadian hams
> >> >>annoying other Canadian hams by operating phone on CW frequencies.
> >> >
> >> > Then you can expect more of the behavior you have complained about.
> >> >
> >>
> >> Perhaps
> >
> > Count on it. Remember the story of the Tower of Babel?

I guess not.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1082. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 22:50:07 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030812185007.210$mE@newsreader.com>
Source record: 74597
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"No Code, No Ham" <No@e.mail> wrote:
> wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in
> news:20030802210406.21580.00000808@mb-m07.aol.com:
>
> > Do Hams get 11 Meters Back, as soon as all the CBers upgrade to there
> > Free Handout Ham Licenses?
> >
>
> There has been a free ham license ever since the codeless tech was
> introduced a few years back. The 5 wpm code requirement has further
> moved things in that direction. Idiots on the ham bands.
>
> 11 meters has come to the ham bands. I listen to the bands and it's
> certainly not the way things were in the 1980's when I got licenced. I
> might as well just listen to CB channel 19, it all sounds the same now.
>
-snippage-
Take that cross posted stink bait outta' here, chump.

--
GO# 40

1083. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 23:06:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308121506.1dd54e15@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74598

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030810154755.18497.00001952@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0308100055.537786bb@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (pSycho pSteve) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030809210007.02197.00001979@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> >
> >> A half century ago...(SNIP)
> >
> > You were unlicensed in the Amateur Radio Service, a "tradition"
> >you continue to this date...
>
> You still off your medications, pSycho pSteve?

Hmmmm...I think YOU would call that a "misdirection".

I call it a childish dodge.

You're STILL not licensed in the Amateur Radio service.

Steve, K4YZ

1084. Re: L.A. Times Editorial Correction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 23:13:34 UTC
From: Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com>
Message-ID: <n1tijv4k4dss18utmlf1tk5dl36t2cdhrg@4ax.com>
Source record: 74599

Please, folks, I appreciate all your kind words. I don't think either of you had anything but the best of intentions.

If you want to have a spittin' contest, could you take it to the spittin' channel? Please?

Jim

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
shared these priceless pearls of wisdom:

->lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030811200130.15462.00002190@mb-m06.aol.com>...
->
->> Those who want to practice the puerile geo-political bashing in
->> here should remember that...(SNIP)

-> Nice try at character assasination,
Jim Weir, VP Eng. RST Eng. WX6RST
A&P, CFI, and other good alphabet soup

1085. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 23:14:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308121514.33b3c286@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74600

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030811200134.15462.00002194@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0308110057.e158ba9@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030810154742.18497.00001945@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >
> >> No, he has aligned himself with the Anti-Semiconductor Movement.
> >
> > No, Your Putziness...Quality is quality whether it is the
> >fidelity of a tube-based radio or a well-aged wine.
>
> Take your medications, pSycho pSteve. You are still in fantasies.
>
> The "fidelity of a TUBE-based radio" is a myth, a fantasy, and
> probably concocted by other ignorant radio piddlers who want
> to apply supernatural "magic" to something they aren't able to
> comprehend.

In as much as you are not practiced in Amateur Radio techniques
no one would expect you to know the difference.

There IS a diffrence.

> >> "Real radios glow in the dark" and that sort of thing. "Warmth."
> >
> > Embracing technology changes simply because it's a "change" does
> >not make it better...just different.
>
> The solid-state era began in industry about 1960. That's 43 years ago.
>
> Radio AMATEURS didn't really discover it until about two decades
> later. Still, that's 23 years ago.

Actually that would be over 40 years ago as Heathkit had already
incorporated hybrid technology in the mid sixties.

(What a lame try, Lennie...You really DO have to try harder!)

> Hardly a recently changed technology.

Hardly any effort to poke holes in your anti-Amateur Radio rants.

> TRY TO REMEMBER TO TAKE YOUR MEDICATIONS!

Try a better obfuscation, Lennie. You're getting just too easy
to make an idiot out of...Again.

Steve, K4YZ

1086. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 23:17:49 UTC
From: West Coast Radio <westcoastradio@no-spambudweiser.com>
Message-ID: <9nugjv0itbmgjaq79kuuub6cerdafm69qa@4ax.com>
Source record: 74451
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Sounds like you old pro-coders are getting upset! I worked and had to pay to get my no-code ticket. Now that Im a coded tech, I still say, rid the code test. You may say it dumbs it down, to me it makes for more conversation and more to converse with. Who wants to talk on a piece of equipment that cost $1000 + but no-one to hear you? Why not let these CB'rs get there license so they can learn the principals of ham radio instead of bootlegging. I realise that you guys are all stuck in 1950, but WAKE UP!!!!!! This is 2003!!!!! This reminds me, Wasnt it quite a few years ago that a bunch of HAMS like yourselves were complaining about solid-state over tube? Oh my god! There dumbing down radio with RF transistors!!!! What is next!!!!! Quit whining and get involved in making the radio better for all. All you pro-coders are just wasting your breath. They still make tubes, but you have a choice if you want to use tube or transistor equipment. Isnt that nice, To have a choice? I chose to advance in my hobby by going to Extra soon, and I dont need a code holding me back. Do you actually think that the bad CB'rs are going to go get a license so they can JAM and CUSS at you? NO!!! The good ones will! So where is the FREE at?

Cya, wouldnt want to be ya.

73
KF6FOZ

On Tue, 12 Aug 2003 22:44:19 -0000, "No Code, No Ham" <No@e.mail>
wrote:

>wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in
>news:20030802210406.21580.00000808@mb-m07.aol.com:
>
>> Do Hams get 11 Meters Back, as soon as all the CBers upgrade to there
>> Free Handout Ham Licenses?
>>
>
>There has been a free ham license ever since the codeless tech was
>introduced a few years back. The 5 wpm code requirement has further
>moved things in that direction. Idiots on the ham bands.
>
>11 meters has come to the ham bands. I listen to the bands and it's
>certainly not the way things were in the 1980's when I got licenced. I
>might as well just listen to CB channel 19, it all sounds the same now.
>
>ARRL plan back fired on them. They worked to dumb things done in order
>to produce more licensee's who might join the organization and fill the

>corporate bank accounts, but instead, they got a bunch of idiots who
>don't care bacause getting a license is easy now and when you don't have
>to work to get the benefits, the benefits you get don't mean a whole lot.
>
>All real hams out there who remember how the bands used to be, send the
>ARRL a nasty-gram and cancel your League memberships. They screwed us
>over big time by not protecting the integrity of the Amateur radio
>Service.
>
>
>
>No Code.... No Ham!
>
>

1087. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 23:18:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308121518.32154afe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74452

Phil <nomail@noway.com> wrote in message
news:<3qqgjvovs53fgqvvde31qn9gigvs6r9lob@4ax.com>...
> Len,
>
> Steve's point regarding older equipment does have considerable merit -...(SNIP)

Oooops..watch out, Phil! You suggested that Lennie MIGHT be in
error! The epithets will fly soon!

> Steve's position on current equipment is flawed. I certainly don't
> care if the radio glows in the dark - but it would be refreshing to
> meet more people who can apply basic radio theory to a simple QSO!

I wasn't the one who said the "glow in the dark" comment, Phil.
I do have a soft spot for old gear, but I certainly embrace the new
technologies too, despite Lennie's attempts to make it appear
othrwise...I don't know who made the original assertion.

> Steve, you are absolutely correct - idiots are idiots, on or off the
> air. Or the internet, apparently.

73

Steve, K4YZ

1088. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 23:23:40 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030812192340.770$uw@newsreader.com>
Source record: 74453
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

West Coast Radio <westcoastradio@no-spambudweiser.com> wrote:
> Sounds like you old pro-coders are getting upset! I worked and had to
> pay to get my no-code ticket.
>
You paid someone to help you get through a dumbed down IQ test?

--
GO⌿ 40

1089. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 23:25:35 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030812192535.147$gk@newsreader.com>
Source record: 74454
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> West Coast Radio <westcoastradio@no-spambudweiser.com> wrote:
> > Sounds like you old pro-coders are getting upset! I worked and had to
> > pay to get my no-code ticket.
> >
> You paid someone to help you get through a dumbed down IQ test?
>
Heads up. This guy is your next extra class. dit dat..

--
GO# 40

1090. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 23:40:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030812194010.18497.00002029@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74456

In article <3F38309F.4090308@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>Subject: Re: QR10-4
>From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
>Date: Tue, 12 Aug 2003 00:11:13 GMT
>
>Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> Just practicing one of the the new Q signals....
>>
>>
>
>There's also "QFU", which I don't think I need to define.... ;)

Here's the definition anyway:

QFU? - What is the magnetic direction (or number) of the runway to be used?

QFU - The magnetic direction (or number) of the runway to be used is ...

I've never heard that on the ham bands, though.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1091. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 23:40:34 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030812194034.034$2I@newsreader.com>
Source record: 74455

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> wrote:
> On 10 Aug 2003 00:51:07 GMT, Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
>
> >Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> wrote:
> >> On 09 Aug 2003 15:12:31 GMT, Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> >>
> >> >I enjoy watching assholes like you and dan squirm.
> >>
> >> Kinda like you when you take a code test, eh?
> >>
> >Dunno, never took it. Looks like cw is gonna be history,
> >just like your attitude toward no coders. Fate is a strange
> >animal, all you stuffy blowhards lose after-all.
>
> Welcome to RRAP. Get a few years in the group and maybe you'll get to
> know what my attitude toward no-coders IS.
>
I'm really not interested in rrap, or you, thanks anyway.

I don't mean to include all ham radio operators, and afterall, it's
only my friggin opinion anyway.
>
What I *do* have an attitude about - and it's not a good one - is when
> people hide behind posting anonymously, demonstrating that they don't
> even take their *own* opinions seriously enough to attach a name and
> call to what they post, then whine when nobody else takes their posts
> seriously. Fit anybody you know?
>
I've used the same NSP and ISP for years and years, my email is
valid too (remove nospam) So in your opinion, don't trust anyone
on Usenet, without a callsign?
>
> >You should of elmered the hobby, instead of ridiculing
> >any newbie who showed interest. Too late now.
>
> Putting aside the fact that you're a borderline illiterate ("should
> of" instead of "should have"? C'mon, I knew better than that before I
> finished second grade...what year did you drop out?),
>
The first sign of a blow hard, spelling and grammer corrections.

You fit right in here.
>
> I for one
> wouldn't be very interested in elmering anybody who demonstrates

> callous disregard for the regulations, like certain trolls in this NG
> for example. Beyond that, I think my track record shows that you lack
> sufficient knowledge of the truth on which to base an intelligent
> opinion regarding my elmering activities, so instead, you posted a
> singularly unintelligent one instead. You really shouldn't post when
> you're smoking crack. :-)
>
So, when you realize you haven't made a point yet, you accuse me
of smoking crack?

Sorry, you sound like an N8WWM type person. I hope you're not. :)

--
GO# 40

1092. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 23:48:39 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030812194839.19192.00000340@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 74457

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)

>I am sure you have convinced yourself of this, however you have
>not provided one iota of "evidence" other than your own tainted
>opinion, Vipul.

I let my membership expire. Its going to be hard to verify. I may be able to meet them at the weekly breakfast. Still, people just show up, and I don't know exactly who from the club will show up. I cannot provide an answer right away. Or I could make an announcement at next club meet'g. Next club meet'g is in Sept. (they don't have meetings in Jun, Jul).

>> Other than Field day, an event does not HAVE do be scheduled during Fri,
>Sat
>> night. Most people would do more recreational activities during that time.
>
> Vipul, the average American WORKS Monday through Friday with
>Saturday and Sunday off. When would YOU schedule these "activities"?

Still, Hams find the time off work to do the DXexpedition, go to Hamfests on Fri when that Hamfest is Fri and Sat. So, they took that day off to attend the Hamfest or DXpedition.

Why take Fri off to go shopp'g at a Hamfest, when the Hamfest is also on Sat? If you went to a vacation spot, wouldn't you go to the beach, rather than stay at your trailer/shack?

If you are taking time off, wouldn't you want to do more recreational activities than shopping, or operating? If I was at a vacation spot, I would do the local activities.

>Foreign operators on the
>other side of the world should have been denied the chance to make a
>contact just becasue of thier location?

Only one of the days would be needed to do that, either Fri night or Sat night, not both. There would still be plenty of time do the local vacation stuff.

>Furthermore, the very characteristics of HF operation generally
>dictate better propagation and long-distance communication
>opportunities at night.

And still, it would not be necessary to do the whole night. And it would not require every Ham to be present at all hours (they could take turns).

>YOU call it "anti-social"
>because you do not understand it or refuse to participate in it
>because they are not doing it the way YOU think it should be

>done.

Not just the way I think it should be done. The great majority of Americans would feel the same way. There is a time for radio contacts, just not on Sat night.

1093. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 23:53:05 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <B5f_a.23334$Vx2.10833508@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 74458

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0308121446.50c90650@posting.google.com...
> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93D4D5C16A581elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > > Almost all contests have separate CW and 'phone weekends. (FD and ARRL
> > > 160 are the exceptions that prove the rule). The ham population can
> > > choose to operate one, both, or neither. CW participation is UP while
> > > 'phone is flat.
> >
> > That puzzles me.
>
> It's a fact.
>
> > I honestly don't think it's due to new hams preferring
> > CW.
>
> Why not? I know lots of new hams who prefer CW, once they get a
> reasonable set of skills. That doesn't mean everyone will like it.
>

Work the next November Sweepstakes on the CW weekend. Since the year first
licensed is part of the exchange, you'll see that there are indeed some new
hams working CW. I worked it in 2001 (skipped 2002 due to OM's birthday
being that weekend) and there were people who had only been licensed a
couple of years out there working it.

> > Maybe there are people who used to only contest on phone that are now
> > doing the CW leg as well.
>
> Perhaps.
>
> Or perhaps the declining sunspots and proven superior performance of
> CW are drawing more hams to use it.
>
> Perhaps the simple fact that CW is unique is the attraction.
>
> Perhaps it's just the rising number of hams.
>
> But the fact remains that for whatever reasons, HF CW USE by hams is
> increasing in at least some measurable ways.
>
> This fact puts the lie to the claim that "young people" and "new hams"
> aren't interested in the mode. At least some of them are.

It's probably a combination of all the above. However I've known several new hams who are fascinated by the mode and see the CW contests as a way to both master the mode and have fun.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1094. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 23:57:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F397E0A.F4890914@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74459

Len Over 21 wrote:

> It's no use trying to show reality in here, Carl. <shrug>
>
> These folk are obediant servants of the Church of St. Hiram and all
> things in amateur radio are as they were back before WW2. To
> show reality and all the other radio services' modes and operations
> is tantamount to heresy. Blasphemy, even...

To quote from Leonard H. Anderson:

"YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis."

What goes around often comes around very quickly.

Dave K8MN

1095. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-12 23:59:47 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F397E7C.172951A2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74460

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Tsk, tsk, tsk...how quickly they forget. You claimed to be in the "upper
> percentile of amateur radio." :-)
>
> I would classify you as little more than an ego-driven salesman type
> who does CB-like radio activity with a federal license grant.
>
> Aren't you supposed to be in the national pool of "trained
> communicators" for the nation's benefit and "advancing the state
> of the art" of AMATEURISM?
>
> I liked it better when you were just a Soma Come Loud student who
> could get any human resources job he wanted after graduation.

From Leonard H. Anderson:

"YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis."

This one is starting to come in handy already. Thanks, Len.

Dave K8MN

1096. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 00:09:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3980D8.E1FDBCF3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74461

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F37A340.722964AC@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Alun Palmer wrote:
> >>
> >> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> >> news:20030803122121.27503.00001415@mb-m24.aol.com:
> >>
> >> > In article <Xns93CBC6A1646A4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> >> > <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >
> >> Not atall. Since about 1995 there has been a paradigm shift caused by this
> >> medium we're using right now (the Internet). If code testing had been
> >> abolished significantly before that it would have boosted our numbers far
> >> more than it ever can now. All I'm really saying is that that opportunity
> >> is lost.
> >
> >I find it hard to take anyone seriously who uses the term "paradigm
> >shift", especially if he proceeds to jump to a false conclusion or to
> >several of them.
>
> No problem. We all find your attempts at judge, jury, and
> executioner to be ineffectual, puerile, and rather stupid.

Who's "We"? Do you have a mouse in your pocket?

> "False conclusion?"

Yes, false conclusion.

> Hardly.

You've been wrong before. It shouldn't come as a surprise this time.

> Had the no-code-test Technician never been created, US ham
> radio would have been short by 200K ham licenses by the time of
> "Reconstruction."

I referred to the statement concluding that the internet is the reason
we don't have more hams. Ham radio is not about web pages, e-mail and
usenet.

> >> >Sure. there is a lot of CW use by hams on HF, but there are precious
> >> >few prospective hams who want to use it.
> >> >

> >> > How do you know they don't want to use it? At the past several Field
> >> > Days, the CW ops generated the most interest.
> >>
> >> As a sideshow it generates interest. Think of it as being like a
> >> demonstration of some obscure craft in a living museum. Sure, people find
> >> it interesting watching a blacksmith shoe a horse (and that's not a dead
> >> art either), but it doesn't mean they are going to learn to do it.
> >
> >But you haven't addressed the question posed: How do you know what
> >prospective hams want to do?
>
> Oh, my, now the judge, jury, and executioner pretends to have
> prescience!

See? Now YOU'VE jumped to a false conclusion. I didn't pretend
prescience; I asked a question.

> Tsk, tsk, tsk...all you can do is put down others who raise > questions
> that might threaten your "superior" status in amateur radio.

Tsk, tsk indeed, Foghorn. You have it backwards. Someone made a
statement, I asked the question. Why are you concerned with my status
in amateur radio? You aren't involved.

> Try READING what Alun said. He raises a valid point.

Try reading what I said. Alun raised a point. It isn't necessarily
valid. I asked a question. You're all fogged up.

> You are still REFUSING to accept anything contrary to your precious
> viewpoints.
>
> That won't make them go away.

Granted, my precious viewpoints are not going away. Let me ask you, are
you now accepting anything contrary to YOUR precious viewpoints?

> It just arouses enmity among all those who refuse to worship your
> radiogod status.

What's it to you? You have nothing to do with amateur radio. Have you
made up your mind yet. Some time back you stated that I wasn't a radio
god then I was a radio god then I wasn't a radio god. Have you made up
your mind yet?

Dave K8MN

1097. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 00:17:40 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030812201740.19192.00000341@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 74462

From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net

>Speculation is not evidence. If you haven't asked them, then there is NO
>way you can know.

I'm trying my best. Meet'g up with those Hams and verifying the claim is not an easy task.

>And what do you think "most people" do? Everyone I know does something
>different.
>A lot of people simply stay
>home because they aren't interested in spending their money on bars and
>parties.

Most people would vacation at a vacation spot. Especially when they took the day off. Especially when they are at that location the want to do the vacation activities specific to that location.

After their visit to that vacation location, they won't be able to do those activities again. They can operate from their shack any day of the week.

>Besides that, this is only a few
>weekends out of the year.

That's why, when you actually get a vacation, you should do the vacation activities. You won't get that chance to do those activities at another time/place. Why go to THAT location if you aren't going to do anything there that involves THAT location.

Now, I'm not saying radio propagation does not involve THAT location. But, they had plenty of operating time day, and night to experience that. They just chose to cut themselves off from the other experiences of THAT location.

>Therefore if
>they are "put off" by the hamfest, it's quite possible that ham radio is not
>the hobby for them just like it's not appropriate for you.

I'm not put off by Hamfests, just Hams. Originally something in amateur radio got me interested, even addicted. Although, a few months ago, I personally dropped out of the EE field. I still like to build stuff for fun. I just don't see those same qualities in what got me interested in Amateur radio and the activities and interests in the Ham radio clubs support. Also, that most Hams are anti-social, doesn't help either.

>We don't need
>more people with licenses who are not active.

"Active" does not just mean contest scores. It can also mean Homebrewing, troubleshooting, tuning, radio direction finding, AND antenna setups.

>Have you ever been to other major events in other hobbies?

This applies to any hobby, not just radio. I still wouldn't do those hobbies either on Fri, Sat night at a vacation spot.

1098. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 00:28:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F398531.DB813F64@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74463

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F382712.DE6C3C58@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:

> >> Three to four decades ago there MIGHT have been a "need" for "trained
> >> operators" for the military draft. [the USA still had a draft and the
> >Cold
> >> War was very warm indeed] Never mind that the military already HAD
> >> ways of training in the "radio arts."
> >>
> >I obtained enough knowledge through amateur radio that I was able to
> >take a "Bypassed Specialist" exam in basic training. The Air Force gave
> >me the "3" or apprentice skill level and allowed me to bypass tech
> >school. I was sent to my first assignment and obtained my "5" or
> >journeyman level skill code through OJT and correspondence classes. The
> >military, at least back then, recognized when an individual had enough
> >knowledge to skip military training in the "radio arts".
>
> Oh MY but aren't you a military wonderful all through AMATEUR
> RADIO!

What is a "military wonderful"? The military often elects to allow
those with experience to skip technical school.

> Tsk, tsk, tsk, most of us in my Fort Monmouth Signal School
> classes were NOT radio amateurs. Few were professionals.

I wasn't writing about your class.

> WE
> couldn't use morsemanship skills to advance in radar or microwave
> radio relay MOS training. Of course that was in 1952 when all
> US radio amateurs were very knowledgeable about radar and multi-
> channel radio relay, right? :-)

My job didn't involve radar. I guess the Air Force found it lacking for
handling long range message traffic.

> Once out of Signal School and assigned to a unit, most of us had
> to do professional level work like keeping all those multi-channel
> radio relay systems up and running 24/7. Of course, YOU don't
> recognize "24/7" as anything at all, do you? [you haven't done so
> before, why hope you might?]

You never ever worked "24/7" No one has ever worked "24/7". Your
station was open and operation for "24/7". I have three years military
experience in which my station was open "24/7". I never worked "24/7".
Then again, I didn't have to go to technical school. I was sent
straight to my first post where I immediately began doing--what do you
call it?--professional level work.

> In my case, I had to learn, on the job, all about high power HF
> transmitters and keeping the primary communications circuits
> across the Pacific up and running for 24/7 for a year and a half.
> No problem. Made E-5, NCO and not the Specialist, in a year and
> a half, waiting around for the microwave radio relay equipment to
> finally arrive. Morsemanship skills didn't matter one whit. Neither
> were there any points for DX contesting or reading QST ads cover to
> cover.

You had to learn on the job? Didn't you complete the schooling?

> >Do you know
> >when the U.S. might need trained operators or when another draft will be
> >instituted?
>
> You mean REinstituted. The military draft (conscription) ended way
> back in 1973. That's THIRTY YEARS AGO.

No, I meant instituted. Did you happen to notice the modifier "another"
before the word "draft"?

> The ENTIRE US military is VOLUNTEER. For 30 years.

I knew all about that. Unfortunately, that isn't what I asked.

> I've seen enough examples of the all-volunteer US military to know they
> are bright, go-getting military professionals who know what to do with
> professional equipment.

Couldn't you answer the questions?

> Once the all-volunteer military is assigned a task they DO it, and DO
> IT professionally and they WIN their objectives. See Panama, see
> Grenada, see fun in the skies over Libya, see the First Gulf War, see
> Afghanistan, see the Second Gulf War. It was Whupass time and
> the "other side' got whupped.

Did you understand the questions?

> The US military has an excellent schooling system for electronics and
> radio, NOT needing some ham skilled hobbyist "training" in working
> DX for contest points or having fine picnics-with-radios called "Field Day."
> The US Army can DO field communications anytime and for months.

Did you even bother to read the questions?

> >Are you miffed because you don't have any war stories relating to code?
>

> Hell NO. None of us at station ADA had to know any morse code or
> use it for primary communications trans-Pacific a half century ago.

So what?

> Morsemanship was NOT a useful skill back then and it isn't a useful
> still in radio NOW.

That is simply a bogus claim from one who does not possess the skill in
question.

> Too many of you mighty macho morsemen are living in a fantasyland
> like the fake "colonel" in here five (six?) years ago trying to make us
> believe his "son was behind enemy lines in Iraq sending intel back via
> CW" during the First Gulf War. Fantasy bullshit then, still is.

Why not admit that you don't really have any way of knowing.

> >Do you know anything about the operating skills of any contest types?
>
> I could care less.

Yet you care enough to make snide claims about them.

> The US military is trained to WIN. It DOES that. AMATEURISM in
> military radio is for off-duty fun and games with special services, not
> special forces.

You've gone off on a tangent, old boy and you still haven't responded to
the questions I posed.

>
> >> Morse code use will keep out the eveavsdropers and bad people from
> >> the content of communications, thus not letting them know the deep
> >> dark, very secret ways of the ham. Secure.
> >>
> >> So I've been told.
> >
> >It is a cinch that you don't have first hand knowledge of anything to do
> >with morse code. Whoever told you was wrong. <shrug> :-)
>
> It's a cast-iron cinch that all you have is some more fantasies of
> greatness in radio while at third-world embassies in Africa.

I think your cast iron has developed a crack. Not all of my tours were
in Africa. You don't have a clue as to what I did during any of my
tours. Is this the part where you're supposed to be eating me for
breakfast?

> Show us all your greatness with experiences with SHARES and ALE,
> not the drink. We've seen the results of drinking from others. Sober up.

Your wild rants are very sobering, Len.

> You are wasting everyone's time in here.

Everyone's? Do you have a telegraph key in your pocket?

Dave K8MN

1099. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 00:33:59 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030812203359.03115.00002488@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 74464

>Why not
>let these CB'rs get there license so they can learn the principals of
>ham radio instead of bootlegging

Get real

>Oh my god! There dumbing
>down radio with RF transistors!!!!

Hams never made that comment, it was probably a bunch of your Cb buddies

>I chose to advance in my hobby by going to
>Extra soon

Thats not advancement, that is picking up your Welfare Extra, hell there
basically giving them away now.

1100. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 00:42:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F398885.A5E1CFFD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74465

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F382A57.A6B30B7F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <w4VYa.162$dj3.18912@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >> >news:c2356669.0308080912.7e373969@posting.google.com...
> >> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:<XsNYa.93$dj3.13294@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> >> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >> > news:20030807222823.21428.00001559@mb-m23.aol.com...
> >>
> >> >Now you're trying to tell us that incentive licensing PROMOTED
> >> >growth in ham radio??? I don't think so ...
> >> >
> >> >More likely the boom after WWII (and Korea) was due to military
> >> >radio folks becoming hams when they got out ...
> >>
> >> Now, now. Rev. Jimmie LIVED THOSE TIMES. He KNOWS.
> >>
> >> :-)
> >
> >You've told us about morse landline telegraphy. Did you LIVE THOSE
> >TIMES? Do you KNOW? Maybe you read it in a BOOK or saw an article on
> >the WEB. :-)
>
> Irrelevant. No one in here lived in 1844 when morse code was first used
> in commercial landline communications.

> No one in here lived when Marconi did his first radio communications in
> Switzerland in 1895, or proved in Italy in 1896...using morse code for
> on-off keying of a spark transmitter.

> No one in here lived when the Titanic went down and mighty morse code
> managed to get through for rescuing some...morse code could get
> through because there was NOTHING ELSE to compare it with.

What I wrote was precisely relevant. You wrote of someone's having not
been alive when something took place. I pointed out that you weren't
alive during some of the things which you've pontificated on in this

venue.

> Try reading a BOOK on the REST of the world of radio instead of what
> if spoon-fed you by the little publisher in Newington.

"YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis."

--Leonard H. Anderson

> You might find out
> that the REST OF THE RADIO WORLD has gone beyond amateurism.

What the hell are you prattling about?

> There is NO need in the rest of the radio world for DX contesting or
> morsemanship skills or collecting QSL cards.

Did you have a point?

> >> >The boom in the 60's was probably due to the emergence of economical
> >> >JA radios, a general increase in the interest in electronics, and later,
> the
> >> >emergence of VHF/UHF FM and repeaters ...
> >
> >Incorrect. There was no boom of JA radios in the 1960's.
>
> Of course not. Hallicrafters, National Radio, RME, Collins were all
> having terrific sales, snowing the amateur market with ham gear.
>
> Right. Sure. Where are they now?
>
> Collins quit the ham market long ago. Hallicrafters folded or something
> even longer ago. National Radio went for the military electronics stuff
> quitting ham radio sales. Even Heathkit went belly-up.
>
> Are you in some kind of dream world where you think Yaesu, Icom,
> Kenwood, and JRC are "American" companies?!?!?

You certainly wrote a large number of diversionary words to cover your
gaffe. There was no boom of Japanese ham gear in the 1960's. Is it
clear now?

> >> It's difficult for even old-timers to understand a postwar boom period
> and
> >> the Cold War getting hotter when they've just reached First Grade. :-)
> >
> >I don't know about when you were in school, Len. They provided us
> >history books. Most of us figured out that there was additional
> >historical material available. :-) :-)
>
> Paper, moveable type, and the printing press were all invented LONG

> before 1844 and the first use of commercial morse code
> communications.
>
> I was a working radio professional in 1952 when the Cold War was
> already started. Are you saying your holiness as a school boy has
> MORE experience in Cold War life?!?!?

Why no, Len, not as a school boy. I certainly have more governmental communications experience during the cold war.

> >> The holier-than-thou old-timers insist on the "no-coders" to do all
> >> the technical advancements in amateur radio. Never mind that they
> >> weren't able to do much in a half century. :-)
> >
> >What's it to you?
>
> Stuff it, Colonel Klunk.
>
> >You aren't involved. If you're to make any technical
> >advancements in amateur radio, you'd better get cracking.
>
> Stuff it twice. YOU are NOT a judge. You are NOT an official who can
> "run" the US amateur radio community. You are NOT in government
> anymore and were NEVER a radio regulator at the FCC.

It doesn't take a regulator to truthfully state that you weren't involved and are not involved in amateur radio. Don't tell me what I am to amateur radio. I'm a licensed ham and have been for decades. You, quite truthfully are not involved at all in amateur radio. You aren't a judge of what hams do or have done. You are not a regulator.

> I've had a successful career in PROFESSIONAL radio-electronics and
> still enjoy that in retirement. Radio-electronics has been a fun hobby
> for me for a longer time.

Trust me. Things have a way of evening out.

> Now tell us, great big four-decade experienced AMATEUR radio god,
> what have YOU ever done to "advance amateur radio?!?"

No, I don't believe I will, Len.

> Show us your patents, your marvelous discoveries, all your > important technical contributions.

Still have your patent fetish?

> You've had FORTY YEARS of amateurism
> and all you can come up with is trying to put down folks in an amateur
> newsgroup?!?

Folks? Well, there's you. Then again, you aren't a ham. You're just a groupie.

> >In this game, you aren't nobility and you aren't a peasant. You're an
> >onlooker.
>
> That's all you are, big radio god of the AMATEUR bands.

You've got it wrong, Len. I have a license and have had it for decades.
I make contacts via amateur radio daily. I'm a participant in amateur
radio. I don't issue catcalls from the sidelines. The guy who does
that is you.

> A hot-air balloon who plays with ready-built radios and talks tuff as a
> newsgroupie.

Why, Len, you're the wanna-be.

> Get a better life.

I'm quite happy with this one, Len. Yours seems to be a little lacking
in light of your ham radio envy.

Dave K8MN

1101. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 01:13:39 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhc43e$h1j@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74466

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030811215505.08200.00001320@mb-m25.aol.com...
> In article <bh99kk$bqn@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >Your "don't look now" phrase is about as old as ROFLMAO, Larry.
>
> But at least it's mine, Kim! Don't look now, but it's one of my Usenet
> persona trademarks, as it were. And unlike you and your ROFLMAO,
> It is usually followed by witty, insightful, and well-reasoned remarks on
> the subject at hand.
>
>
>
> >And, I am
> >not jealous of this lady at all. More importantly, her sales volume
would
> >be of little significance to me, since I am not in sales. My point was
that
> >she probably has a lot of lookups because of people remembering her call
> >from a trade show and seeing if there's a link to the company she
> >represented.
> >
> >Oh, hey, why don't you look her up and get a date, Larry. Looks like
you're
> >interested.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Any normal, healthy male would be interested in Michelle, Kim. Sorry, I
know
> you're not personally familiar with that concept from your own experience.
> In fact, you had to come up with your "...one step closer to extinction"
Vanity
> call sign, just to stir up some interest. Too bad it's the wrong kind!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

You're stretching now, Larry. Running out of wit, are you?

Kim W5TIT

1102. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 01:14:37 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhc43f$h1j@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74467

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030811215505.08200.00001319@mb-m25.aol.com...
> In article <c2356669.0308110347.1b5f839a@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >> Jim:
> >>
> >> W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter!
> >
> >Ding ding ding!
> >
> >Now why would he be the only one without a lookup counter? Every other
> >callsign I've ever checked has one.
> >
> >> OTOH,
> >> Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that account!
> >
> >Naw, I've seen some really high lookup numbers.
> >>
> >> Now, now, Kim -- don't be jealous of Michelle -- even though you have a
> >> right to be!
> >
> >Hint: Check out their birthdates....
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim:
>
> Just looked up the birthdates for Kim, Michelle, and Fred. Kim's is in
> 1955, making her 48 years old, Michelle's is in 0010, making her 1,993
> years old, and Fred's is in 1935, making him 68. I must say, Michelle
> is very well preserved for a little old lady! However, I guess she's a
bit
> too old for me now!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Naw!!!! I bet you're desperate enough...

Kim W5TIT

1103. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 01:29:53 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhc4cc$lq5@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74469

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0308120701.52cc418c@posting.google.com...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030812002823.25815.00002132@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>
> > I'm not interested in either getting or dreaming about any AMATEUR
> > license.
>
> Then the only OTHER reason for your lurking in an Amateur Radio
> related newsgroup is trolling and antagonizing the participants.
>

Right in there with no less than a couple of others I can think of!! ;)

Kim W5TIT

1104. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 01:31:54 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hjj1w32.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74468

On 11 Aug 2003 23:18:24 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>> Yet SITOR - the commercial version of AMTOR - is the standard HF
>> mode of data communication in the maritime service. That, and not
>> obscenenly-expensive satellite comms, is what killed maritime CW.
>
>Wasn't maritime MF Morse capability mandatory until the satellite based
>distress system came online?

MF Morse CW (the "500 kHz SOS system") was mandatory for vessels
making voyages in the open sea except for vessels under 1500 gross
tons displacement and all vessels operating exclusively on the Great
Lakes. For those vessels, MF (2182 kHz) 'phone was mandatory.

The GMDSS system offers the choice of MF/HF (DSC, SITOR and SSB) or
INMARSAT use in those areas where both are available. Even where the
ship elects to use INMARSAT, it must still have the MF/HF capability.

>> One of the San Francisco area marine radio techs, a ham, applied to
>> the FCC to be able to offer PACTOR service in the marine bands, and
>> after consulation with the ITU, his request was turned down because
>> it was not an international standard and would not give that much
>> improvement over SITOR considering the changes necessary.

>Exactly - the improvement was judged to be not worth the investment.
>Since decisions like this are made at the top and conformity is deemed
>more important than what people *want* to do, the existing system is
>kept.

Yup. Money talks.

>Which is why you can watch a 2003 TV show on a 50+ year old TV
>receiver. NTSC, anyway.

I spent part of the day at the local Fox TV station with our Society
of Broadcast Engineers chapter getting the nickel guided tour of
their digital TV installation with all the automated whiz-bang
systems. It has its advantages....

>> And the US Coast Guard and other similar agencies world-wide
>> continue to transmit NAVTEX bulletins (marine broadcasts) on 518 kHz
>> worldwide using SITOR.

>Using a system that is almost completely automated.

Someone has got to cut the "tape" (computer memory, to be exact) and
occasionally we get bulletins for Chesapeake Bay and New York Harbor
(with local message IDs) intermixed with those for the Pacific

Northwest.... <ggg>

Overnight I get the signals from the Canadian station between
Vancouver and Alaska, and it's interesting to see the difference in
approach and procedure between the USCG and its Canadian counterpart.

>> I'm not throwing my AMTOR/SITOR TNCs away just yet.

>But how much AMTOR will be found in the HF ham bands today? I daresay
>not much. In fact you'll probably find more 60 wpm Baudot RTTY on the ham
>bands in the course of a year than you will find AMTOR. (if you count
>contests).

No prob...the TNCs will also do PACTOR, G-TOR, and such, and I always
have those audio patch cords switchable to the sound card. <ggg>

>I disagree with hams being "cheap". It's more a matter of not being able to
>write off expenditures. Businesses can depreciate equipment - hams can't.
>They can also pay for equipment out of reduced labor and repair cost -
>hams can't.

>Engineering economics 101.

Hey, I'm a nerd-geek, not an economist <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1105. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 01:33:04 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhc4ic$uec@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74470

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030812194010.18497.00002029@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <3F38309F.4090308@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: QR10-4
> >From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
> >Date: Tue, 12 Aug 2003 00:11:13 GMT
> >
> >Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> >> Just practicing one of the the new Q signals....
> >>
> >>
> >
> >There's also "QFU", which I don't think I need to define.... ;)
>
> Here's the definition anyway:
>
> QFU? - What is the magnetic direction (or number) of the runway to be
used?
>
> QFU - The magnetic direction (or number) of the runway to be used is ...
>
> I've never heard that on the ham bands, though.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Hmmmmmm, wonder what Mike's definition is.... :o

Kim W5TIT

1106. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 01:39:33 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhc4ui$61i@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74471

SysD. If I put it over there we can remove the engine for backup and put
all the system data on SysA and SysB. The database is written and I'm near
finalization on coding. I should be able to develop a test environment over
the weekend. If you will create a small database of around 250 records, we
should then be able to test next week. Hopefully, we'll be ready for the
launch end of Q3!
"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F382F9C.EB92C7B0@earthlink.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F379753.1361794D@earthlink.net...
> > > Mike Coslo wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > > > In article <20030810072821.12501.00001439@mb-m04.aol.com>,
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > > > > writes:
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >>Fun fact: Check the lookup counter in QRZ.com for W5YI.
> > > > >>
> > > > >>73 de Jim, N2EY
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Jim:
> > > > >
> > > > > W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter! OTOH,
> > > > > Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that
account!
> > > >
> > > > Perhaps we can get Vipul a date?
> > >
> > > My guess would be, not with one hundred dollar bills pinned to his
shirt
> > > though my friend K3FK's adage comes to mind: "They never made a trash
> > > can for which there wasn't a lid".
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > K3FK????????????!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
>
> Does that call hold some special significance for you, Kim?

>
> Dave K8MN
>

Nope. Just like the call.

Kim W5TIT

1107. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 02:08:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030812220813.23745.00001702@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 74472

In article <87ekzrjie8.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
writes:

>>Floyd:
>>
>>Please, enlighten us. Provide a definition of the term "empirical."
>
>Your term was "Empirical Theory". Why don't *you* try to define
>that in terms of "empirical" and "theory".
>
>In theory at least, we should be able to empirically determine that
>Larry is not theorist about empiricism, but rather an empiricist.
>
>
> empiricist, n. -- a quack

Floyd:

I request meaningful participation in the debate, you respond with more
name calling. If I made some sort of faux pas in the use of the term
"empirical theory," anyone interested in maintaining a useful discussion
of the issues would have simply corrected the error, and let it go. However,
it seems as though I've merely armed you with a straw to grasp, to be
utilized whenever you can't be bothered to continue to contribute
rational, logical arguments.

Since you've obviously abandoned the notion of reasoned
discourse, you automatically lose. You're out of your league here,
Floyd. Just like your colleague, Lennie.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1108. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 02:08:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030812220813.23745.00001701@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 74473

In article <20030812002819.25815.00002129@mb-m07.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>Floyd:
>>
>>Please, enlighten us. Provide a definition of the term "empirical."
>
> YOU are the one who wrote it, Einstein.
>
> You forget so easily. Ask a real MD about that. Short-term
> mnemonic disorder may be an indication of Alzheimer's.
> Or it may just be Beeperitis in its usual form.
>
> LHA

Lennie:

I've already done my homework. I was waiting for Floyd's contribution, but only received more name calling. I can only assume that you brought Floyd into this discussion to keep up the pressure of churlish, immature behavior in order to eventually claim victory. Don't look now, but it's not working. You're losing traction faster than a wet worm climbing a greased pole.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1109. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 02:20:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030812222028.12631.00000244@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 74474

In article <3F32C3E8.7050809@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <qK_Wa.2427$lL.391902@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>>>What WILL be the end of ham radio is a lack of significant
>>>growth ...

>> Let's get it straight - is dropping Element 1 going to give us lots more
>> growth or not?
>
> I don't understand a few of the things Carl says here. That we will
>dissapear unless we get "significant growth".

There are more US hams today than at any time in the past.
>
> What exactly is that? a 100 percent increase in a day? increase at 1
>percent over population increase?

That's what I've been asking.
>
> I'd like to know the advances they will bring.

Similar to what newcomers have always brought.
>
> I want to hear how those who oppose the ending of the Morse code
>requirement are keeping ham radio from marching forward.
>
> Time for the roadmap to the future to be laid out.

Don't hold yer breath waiting;-)
>
> Or is this like the last scene in "The Candidate"?

Refresh my memory on that one, Mike.
>
> I find it amusing that even though the PCTA's have lost the war, that
>those who brought this to bear cannot avoid smacking us around a little
>bit yet. It might be fun, but isn't doing anyone a bit of good.

What "war"?

FCC has been pushing for nocodetest since 1975. They've been nibbling away at
both the code and written tests since then.
>

> Gloat time is over. Your time has come. You now have the chance to
>prove that you were right. And browbeating the losers isn't a very good
>start.

Maybe we'll see a lot of newcomers and technoadvances after the code test goes.
And maybe we won't. Personally, I don't think we'll see either.

If that happens, what will be blamed for the ARS' perceived problems??

A few other countries have dumped code testing. More are on the way to it. It
will be interesting to see what happens in those countries.
>
> Sorry to hijack the thread, Jim!
>
You didn't hijack anything.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1110. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 02:24:59 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhc7jl$jtq@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74475

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030812220813.23745.00001702@mb-m22.aol.com...
> In article <87ekzrjie8.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
> writes:
>
> >>Floyd:
> >>
> >>Please, enlighten us. Provide a definition of the term "empirical."
> >
> >Your term was "Empirical Theory". Why don't *you* try to define
> >that in terms of "empirical" and "theory".
> >
> >In theory at least, we should be able to empirically determine that
> >Larry is not theorist about empiricism, but rather an empiricist.
> >
> >
> > empiricist, n. -- a quack
>
> Floyd:
>
> I request meaningful participation in the debate, you respond with more
> name calling.
>

Following your lead, no doubt.

>
> If I made some sort of faux pas in the use of the term
> "empirical theory," anyone interested in maintaining a useful discussion
> of the issues would have simply corrected the error, and let it go.
>

Whine, whine, whine. You reap what you sow, Larry.

>
> However,
> it seems as though I've merely armed you with a straw to grasp, to be
> utilized whenever you can't be bothered to continue to contribute
> rational, logical arguments.
>

Pot/Kettle.

>
> Since you've obviously abandoned the notion of reasoned
> discourse, you automatically lose. You're out of your league here,

> Floyd. Just like your colleague, Lennie.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Pah!! You gotta be kidding. You're out on a league of one, Larry. Save for Dick, I see no one in your court. I, at least, see occasional posts in good standing from nearly everyone...gosh, except for you and Dick...

Kim W5TIT

1111. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 02:26:12 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhc7lu$g3p@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74476

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030812220813.23745.00001701@mb-m22.aol.com...
> In article <20030812002819.25815.00002129@mb-m07.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >>Floyd:
> >>
> >>Please, enlighten us. Provide a definition of the term "empirical."
> >
> > YOU are the one who wrote it, Einstein.
> >
> > You forget so easily. Ask a real MD about that. Short-term
> > mnemonic disorder may be an indication of Alzheimer's.
> > Or it may just be Beeperitis in its usual form.
> >
> > LHA
>
> Lennie:
>
> I've already done my homework. I was waiting for Floyd's contribution,
> but only received more name calling. I can only assume that you
> brought Floyd into this discussion to keep up the pressure of churlish,
> immature behavior in order to eventually claim victory. Don't look now,
> but it's not working. You're losing traction faster than a wet worm
climbing
> a greased pole.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Actually, the right compound in the right combination of water could provide
quite a good amount of friction...

Kim W5TIT

1112. Re: L.A. Times Editorial Correction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 02:55:19 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bhc9an$ie5$0@208.206.142.86>
Source record: 74477

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" wrote:

> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030811200130.15462.00002190@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
> > Those who want to practice the puerile geo-political bashing in
> > here should remember that...(SNIP)
>
> Ranting about completely irrelevent subject matter deleted.
>
> There was no "geo-political bashing".
>
> Jim states he was misquoted in such a way as to make it appear
> that he was taking "credit" for work that he was only partially
> responsible for.

Well, there you have it! Loose Lennie the Putz is even jealous of wehat
he perceives as his own kind, other *successful* professionals!

Should we be surprised?? I think not.

1113. Re: L.A. Times Editorial Correction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 02:55:29 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bhc9b1ieo0@208.206.142.86>
Source record: 74478

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" wrote:

> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030811200130.15462.00002190@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
> > Those who want to practice the puerile geo-political bashing in
> > here should remember that...(SNIP)
>
> Ranting about completely irrelevent subject matter deleted.
>
> There was no "geo-political bashing".
>
> Jim states he was misquoted in such a way as to make it appear
> that he was taking "credit" for work that he was only partially
> responsible for.

Well, there you have it! Loose Lennie the Putz is even jealous of what
he perceives as his own kind, other *successful* professionals!

Should we be surprised?? I think not.

1114. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 03:03:24 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bhc9ps$jc0$0@208.206.142.86>
Source record: 74479

No CW Test wrote:

> >Subject: Re: NCVEC Position on Code
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 8/9/03 6:40 AM Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0308090240.7b896978@posting.google.com>
> >
> >nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
> >news:<20030808175644.19707.00000166@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >
> >> For the record, I have not
> >> used PSK-31 myself on
> >> the amateur bands.
> >>
> >> So I will not lecture others
> >> on how well it does or
> >> does not work.
> >
> >Yet Dick is free to lecture others, i.e., "any idiot can get psk going
> >in under 30 minutes," but by his own words here he couldn't.
>
> He did get it going,
> did he not?
>
> >That is the point.
>
> Only to you.

Liar Burke still hasn't posted a quote showing that I said that, and he never will, for it isn't true. Not even close, no part of it. What I said is "can learn to use PSK31 in 30 minutes". That is certainly true.

1115. Re: BPL & US Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 03:08:55 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <bZh_a.17471$Oc.7605@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74480

Dan, I did. You are right, it is *unbelievable*. I wonder if the power companies hired some of the former tobacco spin doctors?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03

1116. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 03:22:07 UTC
From: averyfine@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030812232207.06382.00000481@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 74482

> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
writes:
>
> Irrelevant.

Yes, you certainly are,
Len Anderson ;-) ;-)

> No one in here lived in 1844 when morse code was first used
> in commercial landline communications.

No one "in here" lived when
the telephone was first used
in commercial landline
communications.
>
> No one in here lived when Marconi did his first radio communications in
> Switzerland in 1895, or proved in Italy in 1896...using morse code for
> on-off keying of a spark transmitter.

No one "in here" lived when
Fessenden did his first voice
radio communications in
1900 (or was it 1906?)
>
> No one in here lived when the Titanic went down and mighty morse code
> managed to get through for rescuing some...morse code could get
> through because there was NOTHING ELSE to compare it with.

The Titanic sank at
least six years after
Fessenden demonstrated
voice radio communications.
>
> Try reading a BOOK on the REST of the world of radio instead of what
> if spoon-fed you by the little publisher in Newington.

Why?

> You might find out
> that the REST OF THE RADIO WORLD has gone beyond amateurism.

If that is true, Len Anderson
why do you post here?

And why are you so nasty
in your postings?

Do you have some sort of
unresolved anger towards
others?

"I'm not interested in either getting or dreaming about any AMATEUR license."
- Leonard Anderson
>
> There is NO need in the rest of the radio world for DX contesting or
> morsemanship skills or collecting QSL cards.

There is NO need in the amateur
radio world for your posts, Leonard
Anderson.

"The things that upset us most are often things we see as
qualities in our ownselves." - Kim W5TIT
>
> Paper, moveable type, and the printing press were all invented LONG
> before 1844 and the first use of commercial morse code
> communications.
>
> I was a working radio professional in 1952 when the Cold War was
> already started. Are you saying your holiness as a school boy has
> MORE experience in Cold War life?!?!?

Perhaps Dave Heil has more
experience in hot wars than you,
Len Anderson. He was in
Vietnam when there was a
war going on there.

Were you ever in a country
where a war was going on?

> Stuff it, Colonel Klunk.

"YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis."

Guess who said that?

Perhaps you should
take your own advice, Len.

1117. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 03:22:39 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <3ai_a.17475$im.5757@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74481
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

No, Mopar, the VEs charge. It used to be free at the FCC, but, for me at least, that meant a 60 mile trip (120 miles round trip) to the FCC in Buffalo, NY, and one minute of perfect copy at 20 words per minute. When I had dropped my tickets and decided to retest in 1993, I believe it was under $6.00 for the session. That was 20 words per minute, but multiple guess. Now it is 5 words per minute, but the testing charge is considerably higher (don't ask me, I don't know. I simply showed up for the tests in '93. You don't have to score 100%). So, while someone may pay for the exam, that 120 mile round trip savings is worth something. Don't worry too much though. I hear the FCC is going to try to package the licenses in boxes of Cracker Jax. :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030812192535.147$gk@newsreader.com...
> Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > West Coast Radio <westcoastradio@no-spambudweiser.com> wrote:
> > > Sounds like you old pro-coders are getting upset! I worked and had to
> > > pay to get my no-code ticket.
> > >
> > You paid someone to help you get through a dumbed down IQ test?
> >
> Heads up. This guy is your next extra class. dit dat..
>
> --
> GO# 40

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03

1118. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 03:27:17 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030812232717.794$Hw@newsreader.com>
Source record: 74483
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote:
> No, Mopar, the VEs charge. It used to be free at the FCC, but, for me at
> least, that meant a 60 mile trip (120 miles round trip) to the FCC in
> Buffalo, NY, and one minute of perfect copy at 20 words per minute. When
> I had dropped my tickets and decided to retest in 1993, I believe it was
> under $6.00 for the session. That was 20 words per minute, but multiple
> guess. Now it is 5 words per minute, but the testing charge is
> considerably higher (don't ask me, I don't know. I simply showed up for
> the tests in '93. You don't have to score 100%). So, while someone may
> pay for the exam, that 120 mile round trip savings is worth something.
> Don't worry too much though. I hear the FCC is going to try to package
> the licenses in boxes of Cracker Jax. :)
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim
>
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20030812192535.147$gk@newsreader.com...
> > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > > West Coast Radio <westcoastradio@no-spambudweiser.com> wrote:
> > > > Sounds like you old pro-coders are getting upset! I worked and had
> > > > to pay to get my no-code ticket.
> > > >
> > > You paid someone to help you get through a dumbed down IQ test?
> > >
> > Heads up. This guy is your next extra class. dit dat..
>
They don't have me worried yet, Jim. Note to self: buy some
Cracker Jax stock.

Or they will come with the radio, you take the te$t and mail
it back with a check.

--
GO♯ 40

1119. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 03:28:11 UTC
From: averyfine@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030812232811.06382.00000482@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 74484

"Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>Yes, I would say that the threshold should be more like "Anyone who's
>even close to as dumb as Dick shouldn't be a ham, let alone an Extra."

There are some who would say that
the threshold should be more like:

"Anyone who's even close to being as
nasty, insulting, and intolerant as Carl
shouldn't be a ham, let alone an Extra."

I'm not one of them, but there are
some who would say that.

Carl, do you think that calling people
dumb is going to make them want to
learn things?

"Anyone who would forsake any communication venue
just doesn't have a clue for the value of that venue..."
- Kim W5TIT

"The things that upset us most are often things we see
as qualities in our ownselves." - Kim W5TIT

The lady's wisdom bears repeating.

1120. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 03:34:14 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F39B0AC.8006A43@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74485

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Wrong, monoxide breath. There is NO cure for Beeperitis. It is
> terminal and all victims are, in their last stages, trying to take
> everyone to an agonizing end with them.

> What kind of "education?" Memorizing the ads in QST every month?

> The only "fifth" you are in is a booze bottle...dreaming fantasies
> of glory and greatness of self and then writing epic stories of
> your accomplishments in amateurism.
>
> Maybe it isn't booze. Maybe it is monoxide poisoning from being
> stuck in mental gridlock too long.

> Go back to playing with your radios. Try to make a PSK31 contact
> or something. Or with other modes. No one really cares. <shrug>

"YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis."

-- Leonard H. Anderson

Dave K8MN

1121. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 03:40:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F39B21B.AD74B14C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74486

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F383774.33417EA6@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <871xvtqcui.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> >> >>In article <20030810112459.12631.00000196@mb-m28.aol.com>,
> >> >yodoc@aol.comnospam
> >> >>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> >> >>
> >> >>>Of course, you were probably just being "imaginative."
> >> >>
> >> >> YOU do that all the time...
> >> >
> >> >That's some of his *real experience*, not none of that empirical
> >> >theory stuff!
> >>
> >> Larrah the Lip should have gotten a job with a fertilizer company,
> >> advertising over the Internet...instead of becoming a bus driver
> >> with a "Summa Cum Laude BA degree in 'Human Resources'"
> >> who had any number of terrific job opportunities waiting for him
> >> in personnel departments!
> >>
> >> THEN I would believe him. :-)
> >
> >Did you check to see whether you have authority for name-calling,
> >insulting and demeaning those who disagree with you?
>
> I do. It's called the First Amendment of the United States
> Constitution.
>
> Ever hear of it?

Sure I have, Len. But then you just wrote "YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them, make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so. That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis." I didn't understand that you reserved the right to do those particular things only unto yourself. Can you tell us why the Constitution protects only you?

> The First Amendment doesn't give special dispensation to long-time
> licensed radio amateurs.

I think I have it now. It's only for those non-radio amateurs who get
their jollies by playing Phineas T. Bluster in an amateur radio
newsgroup.

> Talking down to folks is not what this newsgroup is about...but you
> keep trying to play radio god.

I'm waiting for you to decide if I am a radio god or I'm not a radio
god. When you finalize your decision, I'll formulate a view.

> Poor baby. Big hero "I was in 'Nam" radio god can't stand ordinary
> fire fights...cries and carries on when he is subjected to return fire.

Is THIS the part where you're eating me for breakfast?

> Quit acting like an Oberst in the Amatur SchutzStaffel (A.S.S.) and
> maybe all could discuss SUBJECTS instead of personalities.

Are you waiting for others to do as you say and not as you do before
adopting your own advice, Mr. Bluster?

Dave K8MN

1122. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 03:46:31 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <Hwi_a.10644$Kx1.151395@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74487
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030812173943.717$Fk@newsreader.com...
> "Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote:
> > Where the murderous Yank invaders are receiving
> > their just deserts - being dropped like flies by the
> > modern equivalent of the French Resistance.
> >
> The French fight with their face, I hope you ain't one of them.
>
Shame they haven't won a war in the last hundred years

Steve Terry

1123. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 04:03:47 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93D682A8381elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 74488

<snip>

>> >
>> > Ask yourself this: Why do DX 'phones operate in the US CW/data
>> > subbands at all if they can operate in the US 'phone subbands?
>> >
>>
>> In the case of 40, it's to avoid BCI.
>
> Maybe in Regions 1 and 3, but why in Region 2?

The BCI is pretty severe at night in the US, so hams in VE, for example,
who have available phone spectrum below 7100 are likely to use it.

>>
>> On the other bands, I think a lot of DX ops don't even know how far
>> down US hams can go on phone (although the serious DXers do).
>
> I disagree. American hams are obvious by their absence. The DX goes
> outside the US 'phone bands to avoid Yank QRM.

Those of the DX who are not DXers are more likely oblivious

<SNIP>
>> >
>> > The classic problem with kits is that they are only as good as the
>> > builder.
>>
>> BTW, I just received the parts for my K5OOR linear.
>
> Never heard of it. Any good?

Hopefully. Quite a lot of people in HF Pack have built it, and I don't
hear much about problems with it.

>
>> We're supposed to call it a project instead of a kit, HI.
>
> That's because it's illegal to call it a kit. Thanks to misnehaving cb
> and freeband folks.
>
>> Anyway, when I've built it, it will
>> amplify the output of my FT817 to 35 watts on 160-10. It will be
>> pretty small too, i.e. the FT817 plus the linear will still be much
>> smaller and lighter than the IC729.
>

> But how many amps will the combo draw, transmit and receive? My K2
> draws about 250 mills on receive.

The Yaesu isn't as light on current as it ought to be for a portable rig. With the linear, the current drain of the rig will pale into insignificance anyway, at least on transmit. I'll try to look up some actual figures, though. I don't backpack, although I often go camping in tents, so I can bring a fairly large battery to power a linear.

I also use the FT-817 mobile. I would love to also own an FT-100 or an FT-857 for mobile use, but my bank account dictates otherwise.

<SNIP>
>> >
>> > Almost all contests have separate CW and 'phone weekends. (FD and
>> > ARRL 160 are the exceptions that prove the rule). The ham population
>> > can choose to operate one, both, or neither. CW participation is UP
>> > while 'phone is flat.
>>
>> That puzzles me.
>
> It's a fact.
>
>> I honestly don't think it's due to new hams preferring
>> CW.
>
> Why not? I know lots of new hams who prefer CW, once they get a
> reasonable set of skills. That doesn't mean everyone will like it.
>
>> Maybe there are people who used to only contest on phone that are now
>> doing the CW leg as well.
>
> Perhaps.
>
> Or perhaps the declining sunspots and proven superior performance of
> CW are drawing more hams to use it.
>

I can see that some contesters would switch, as they are pragmatic about what mode they use provided they score points. With poor band conditions a 'smaller' station might be more competitive in the CW leg.

> Perhaps the simple fact that CW is unique is the attraction.
>
> Perhaps it's just the rising number of hams.
>
> But the fact remains that for whatever reasons, HF CW USE by hams is
> increasing in at least some measurable ways.
>
> This fact puts the lie to the claim that "young people" and "new hams"
> aren't interested in the mode. At least some of them are.

It depends how young. Often kids like CW.

>>
>> >>
>> >> >>and most administrations don't
>> >> >>really care what hams do within the ham bands. I suspect that,
>> >> >>for example, Industry Canada don't even care about Canadian hams
>> >> >>annoying other Canadian hams by operating phone on CW
>> >> >>frequencies.
>> >> >
>> >> > Then you can expect more of the behavior you have complained
>> >> > about.
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >> Perhaps
>> >
>> > Count on it. Remember the story of the Tower of Babel?
>
> I guess not.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Alun, N3KIP

1124. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 04:04:16 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F39B8BF.5090406@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 74489
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:

>West Coast Radio <westcoastradio@no-spambudweiser.com> wrote:
>
>
>>Sounds like you old pro-coders are getting upset! I worked and had to
>>pay to get my no-code ticket.
>>
>>
>>
>You paid someone to help you get through a dumbed down IQ test?
>
>
>
Application fee. It's not as if he was guaranteed to pass by paying
someone.... ;)

1125. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 04:13:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F39B9E4.DCCED6AC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74490

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F38372D.8B73F1AA@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3F3797F7.10A6A693@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <20030810112459.12631.00000196@mb-m28.aol.com>,
> >> >yodoc@aol.comnospam
> >> >> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >Of course, you were probably just being "imaginative."
> >> >>
> >> >> YOU do that all the time...
> >> >>
> >> >Ahh, Ahh, Len! Please remember that you enjoy hanging out here with the
> >> >hams, fantasizing that you are somehow a part of amateur radio.
> >>
> >> I've NEVER been a "part" of ham radio according to YOUR OWN
> >> DEFINITION.
> >>
> >That's RIGHT. You've NEVER been a part of ham radio. But you can
> >dream.
>
> I do not "dream" of having a radio license.

The newsgroup deals with amateur radio.

> I got one of those 47 years ago.

No, you never obtained an amateur radio license. The one you got can't
be used under Part 97.

> >> YOUR fantasy seems to be stuck in the rut that whatever YOU like
> >> "defines" what ALL other radio amateurs do, think, and must act
> >> like in some rigid set of rules of YOUR imagination.
> >>
> >Not all all, Len old boy. I realize that others have different fields
> >of interest within amateur radio and they might have different levels of

> >interest in the game. You however, aren't a part of amateur radio.
>
> I'm not interested in either getting or dreaming about any AMATEUR
> license.

Really? What about your decades-long interest? What about the "Extra
right out of the box"?

> My interest is eliminating the morse code test for any radio license in the USA.

To what end? You aren't involved.

> >> YOU are NOT an authority or an official anything in US ham radio.
> >
> >No I'm not. I'm a participant, a license radio amateur. I have been
> >for decades.
>
> Whoopee. Do we crown you emperor or something?

We? Got a Vibroplex in your pocket? YOU don't do anything. You don't
have a role in amateur radio.

> Maybe your nobility will get you a job at the FCC where you can
> "rule" over amateur radio.

How would that effect you?

> How about at ARRL? All those years of AMATEUR experience ought
> to put you in the Executive President position...right behind another
> Dave now holding Executive President For Life. <shrug>

Well, kindly old gent, I turned down such a position in 1975. The
Leagure really doesn't pay very well. Besides, why would that interest
you?

> >> YOU are NOT an official in the FCC, federal government, or even
> >> that pseudo-governmental organization called ARRL.
> >
> >No, and I don't need to be employed by the FCC.
>
> Oh, my, assuming the mantle of leadership without authorization?!?

I don't need FCC permission to remind you that you having nothing
whatsoever to do with amateur radio.

> >The ARRL is not a pseudo-governmental organization.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...then they've been deceiving everyone with all their
> "district directors elected by democratic action" and all that!

You mean you've been deceived by the League? I don't think there's been
any misinterpretation of the League's role by others. Why should any of
this interest you. You aren't an ARRL member and you aren't a radio
amateur.

> >I am a life member of the ARRL and
> >have been for over 25 years. With small lapses prior to my life
> >membership, I've been a League member for nearly four decades.
>
> Wonderful. I'm only a life member of the human race and a citizen
> of the United States of America.

Would it be too much for you to offer proof of that first claim?

> Nothing can compare to "life membership" in ARRL!

How would you know?

> >> YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
> >> make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
> >> That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis.
> >
> >It is clear that I have as much "authority" to do those things as you.
> >You do them frequently. Are you a control freak?
>
> I'm just trying to discuss SUBJECTS, not personalities.

Your record here says otherwise.

> You keep on endlessly attempting to put down and humilate anyone
> who won't agree with you.

Remind us again of your history here.

> Then you get all bent out of shape whenever someone doesn't bow
> down to your majestic whatever and continue with the put-down and
> humiliation attempts.

Again, what you've written sounds awfully much like your actions, Len.

> >> I've been a professional in radio-electronics since 1952...51 years.
> >
> >Bully for you. This group doesn't have anything to do with being a
> >professional in radio or electronics.
>
> Well then, you just have me LOCKED OUT of the newsgroup, why
> don't you?

It isn't necessary. If its all the same to you, I have much more fun
the way things are going at present.

> Make this newsgroup some kind of "ARRL South" and all you
> morsemen can sit around giving each other high-fives and claiming
> greatness in the very closed, closeted elite area of your own > making.

I still don't follow your fixation on morse, the ARRL and the like.
You don't belong to the ARRL. You aren't being forced to use morse.
As a matter of fact, you aren't a radio amateur.

> The rest of the world won't care much since the professionals in radio
> are busy keeping world communications going around the clock.

>
> "If thine eye offend thee, put it out."

It really makes little difference what the "professionals" are doin in
radio. I have quite a bit of experience in the "professional" side of
radio. This group happens to deal with amateur radio. You have nothing
to do with amateur radio.

> >> I've also been a radio-electronics HOBBYIST since 1947. Hobby
> >> activities not for pecuniary interest are AMATEUR activites.
> >
> >Part of your radio amateur fantasy? You can claim all the hobbyist
> >time-in-grade you like. Those might be AMATEUR but that doesn't make
> >you a radio amateur.
>
> Sigh...the credentialist is stuck on a one-note theme.

Nope. Just correcting your incorrect statement.

> You've carried your radio god personna so long you've gotten to believe
> that the only radio is amateur radio.

Not at all. I simply recognize that this particular newsgroup has
nothing to do with professional radio operation or policy.

> >> If they
> >> involved making money at it they would be professional activities.
> >
> >Maybe you'd like to tell us about your Citizens Band activities having
> >to do with the fact that you are a citizen and that you once played in a
> >band.
>
> You are in a delerium again. It's an old model and doesn't work well.
> Put it out of its misery.
>
> Bad try at some misdirection into more personality plonking. It doesn't
> work.

It was sarcasm, Leonard. It was directed to your babbling about being a
radio hobbyist at the amateur level and attempting to equate that to
amateur radio.

> >> YOU keep insisting one MUST be "licensed" to be an AMATEUR.
> >
> >YOU keep getting it wrong. For you to be a radio amateur, you must pass
> >a license exam. You haven't.
>
> Let's see...according to Heilian definitions, only LICENSED radio
> amateurs are AMATEURS.

Actually you've managed to screw that one up too. Only those who have
passed an amateur radio license exam become licensed radio amateurs,
permitted to operate under FCC Part 97.

That would make every other radio hobbyist
> "professional?" Not so. Your Beeperitis has led you off on another
> merry morse chase of illogic.

The illogic and confusion are yours.

> >> YOU keep holding up having a license grant is somehow making
> >> YOU "better" than anyone not having an amateur license.
> >
> >No, YOU keep interpreting my words in that manner.
>
> There's no need for "interpreters." What you keep harping about is just
> the same old judge-jury-executioner bullshit you've always used.

As long as you have some confusion over whether or not you're a radio
amateur, interpretation is needed.

> It doesn't work. Fix it. Remember, you are the self-styled Radio God.

Is that your final answer?

> >Passing a license
> >exam makes you a radio amateur, a part of ham radio. You haven't passed
> >such an exam and are not a part of amateur radio.
>
> I'm not interested in "becoming part of amateur radio."

Just a few posts ago you told us that you were involved in radio as an
amateur and you seemed to believe that made you a radio amateur.

> You don't seem to understand the concept. [Radio gods are like that]

You don't seem to give your dieties much in the way of power.

> I'm just trying to get the morse code test off of all US radio license
> examinations.

To what end? You aren't involved.

> Maybe you ought to review the FCC rules and regulations regarding
> Internet access. You cannot issue any "NAL" for someone objecting
> to your self-proclaimed "authority" or "judgement" over who can and
> who cannot post in newsgroups.

Really? Do you know anyone who tried that?

> >> YOU seem to think that amateur radio is some event of epiphany, of glory
> >> and greatness in radio, some kind of nebulous "service" to the
> >> nation, transcending anything done in any other radio service.
> >
> >That is incorrect. It doesn't matter what you've done in any other
> >radio service. If you want to participate in amateur radio, you'll pass
> >a license exam. You haven't done so.
>
> You are stuck on this topic, aren't you Kolonel Klunk?

"YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis."

--Leonard H. Anderson

> Best you get very busy and ENFORCE the newsgroup then, ONLY
> permitting licensed radio amateurs from communicating anything in
> here.

You've commented. So what?

> Your vigilante "enforcement" hasn't been working...yet you keep
> whining and carrying on, using the same old tired arguments.

Enforcement? Whining? I'm doing neither. I'm responding to your posts
in much the same manner which you use with others. Sorry that you don't
like it when it is directed your way.

> >You're a million laughs, Leonard old chap (or chapped). You're the king
> >of personal attacks and the grand poobah of rejected views. To top it
> >all off, you aren't involved in amateur radio whatsoever.
>
> Poor baby. Still thinking the First Amendment only applies to
> licensed radio amateurs?

Nothing in the First Amendment requires my agreement with your views or
mandates that I keep mum when you state them. Your First Amendment
rights do not outweigh mine.

> >I thought you were supposed to be eating me for breakfast.
>
> ???
>
> I'm not "supposed" to be anything you say I am...you are not only
> disagreeable but indigestible.

I didn't say it. Floyd said it. He appears to have been mistaken.

> Go back to your fantasies of greatness in radio and your authorized
> judgement of all who disagree with your holiness' views.
>
> You are wasting everyone's time.

No one forced you to reply to my post or even to read it. You're a
captive of the N2EY profile.

Dave K8MN

1126. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 04:29:28 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F39BD8E.2A5DA420@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74491

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> SysD. If I put it over there we can remove the engine for backup and put
> all the system data on SysA and SysB. The database is written and I'm near
> finalization on coding. I should be able to develop a test environment over
> the weekend. If you will create a small database of around 250 records, we
> should then be able to test next week. Hopefully, we'll be ready for the
> launch end of Q3!
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3F382F9C.EB92C7B0@earthlink.net...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3F379753.1361794D@earthlink.net...
> > > > Mike Coslo wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > > > > In article <20030810072821.12501.00001439@mb-m04.aol.com>,
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > > > > > writes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >>Fun fact: Check the lookup counter in QRZ.com for W5YI.
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >>73 de Jim, N2EY
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Jim:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter! OTOH,
> > > > > > Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that
> > account!
> > > > > >
> > > > > Perhaps we can get Vipul a date?
> > > > >
> > > > My guess would be, not with one hundred dollar bills pinned to his
> > shirt
> > > > though my friend K3FK's adage comes to mind: "They never made a trash
> > > > can for which there wasn't a lid".
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > >
> > > K3FK???????????!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

> >
> > Does that call hold some special significance for you, Kim?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> Nope. Just like the call.

I didn't understand the significance of
"K3FK???????????!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!" His father was W3FK.

What's with the strange stuff at the top of your post?

Dave K8MN

1127. Austria?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 04:52:41 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93D68CC84530elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 74492
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The latest rumour is that Austria will provisionally abolish CW testing in September. The rumour is said to emanate from OEVSV (their national soceity). This would make them 5th, unless another country beats them to it!

1128. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 05:12:43 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <j3ijjv89l35ahpj9mjsu9h79916n1mpt5m@4ax.com>
Source record: 74493

On Tue, 12 Aug 2003 21:26:12 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
wrote:

>Actually, the right compound in the right combination of water could provide
>quite a good amount of friction...

Don't look now (ahem!), but Larry's getting all red in the face.
Better stop talking about moisture and friction before he explodes.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

1129. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 05:29:14 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f39cdad$1_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74494
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

I don't love the BBC, to whom do you refer?

(Any country having a religious loony at the helm is
a 3rd World country; esp. Yankland whose prominence
will collapse as soon as the World realises how bankrupt
the country really is - you'll all be dying of thirst in a few
years and go the way of the Central Americas civilisations.)

Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhbl3c$7vi$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> Just another blip from the BBC loving fool in a has been country that
thinks
> its still a world power.
> "Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
> news:3f38a23e$1_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> > Where the murderous Yank invaders are receiving
> > their just deserts - being dropped like flies by the
> > modern equivalent of the French Resistance.
> > Gareth (G1LVN) <gareth@mycallsign.freeserve.co.uk> wrote in message
> > news:bh99jpgh1@newsg2.svr.pol.co.uk...
> > > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3F382660.5020204@adelphia.net...
> > > > Someone's inviting *us* in? That doesn't happen too often! Most
people
> > > > tell us where to go though.....
> > > Like IRAQ for example....;-)

1130. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 06:01:32 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87ekzqhz9f.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74495

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
>In article <87ekzrjie8.fld@barrow.com>, Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
>writes:
>>>Floyd:
>>>
>>>Please, enlighten us. Provide a definition of the term "empirical."
>>
>>Your term was "Empirical Theory". Why don't *you* try to define
>>that in terms of "empirical" and "theory".
>>
>>In theory at least, we should be able to empirically determine that
>>Larry is not theorist about empiricism, but rather an empiricist.
>>
>>
>> empiricist, n. -- a quack
>
>Floyd:
>
>I request meaningful participation in the debate, you respond with more
>name calling. If I made some sort of faux pas in the use of the term
>"empirical theory," anyone interested in maintaining a useful discussion
>of the issues would have simply corrected the error, and let it go. However,
>it seems as though I've merely armed you with a straw to grasp, to be
>utilized whenever you can't be bothered to continue to contribute
>rational, logical arguments.
>
>Since you've obviously abandoned the notion of reasoned
>discourse, you automatically lose. You're out of your league here,
>Floyd. Just like your colleague, Lennie.

Larry:

Look it up in a dictionary if you don't believe me, though that
probably won't get you in anybody's league, given the above
bunch of hypocracy.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

1131. Re: L.A. Times Editorial Correction

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 06:05:16 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0308122205.2bfc763d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74496

Jim Weir <jim@rst-engr.com> wrote in message
news:<n1tijv4k4dss18utmlf1tk5dl36t2cdhrg@4ax.com>...
> Please, folks, I appreciate all your kind words. I don't think either of you
> had anything but the best of intentions.
>
> If you want to have a spittin' contest, could you take it to the spittin'
> channel? Please?

... and if you want to post something about the Arnold election
process, could you take it to the "Arnold Channel"... Please? After
all, EVERYONE knows that the ONLY thing this group ever ends up
discussing is MORSE CODE and TITS.

- Stewart

1132. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 06:22:45 UTC
From: Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI <g3vki@turner-smith.co.uk>
Message-ID: <bhclfn$10molf$1@ID-201868.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 74497
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f39cdad$1_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> I don't love the BBC, to whom do you refer?
>
Does your keeper know you're using his PC again?
(_!_)

1133. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 09:22:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308130122.657e734e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74498

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F39B9E4.DCCED6AC@earthlink.net>...
> Len Over 21 wrote:

> > I do not "dream" of having a radio license.
>
> The newsgroup deals with amateur radio.
>
> > I got one of those 47 years ago.
>
> No, you never obtained an amateur radio license. The one you got can't
> be used under Part 97.

Nor can it be used in any other radio service without a STATION
license under which he can operate. No station license...No
operating...

Every other radio service is going to specify channels of
operation, modes, etc. An Amateur license grants liberties Lennie can
only dream of. The only thing he CAN do that Amateurs can't is bill
for his servies as an operator or repairman.

Of course there's always Part 15 and Part 95...

> > >> YOUR fantasy seems to be stuck in the rut that whatever YOU like
> > >> "defines" what ALL other radio amateurs do, think, and must act
> > >> like in some rigid set of rules of YOUR imagination.
> > >
> > >Not all all, Len old boy. I realize that others have different fields
> > >of interest within amateur radio and they might have different levels of
> > >interest in the game. You however, aren't a part of amateur radio.
> >
> > I'm not interested in either getting or dreaming about any AMATEUR
> > license.
>
> Really? What about your decades-long interest? What about the "Extra
> right out of the box"?

Dave, you didn't expect this Sir Creepy to be honest AND witty,
did you...?!?!

> > >I am a life member of the ARRL and
> > >have been for over 25 years. With small lapses prior to my life
> > >membership, I've been a League member for nearly four decades.
> >
> > Wonderful. I'm only a life member of the human race and a citizen
> > of the United States of America.

>
> Would it be too much for you to offer proof of that first claim?

Don't do THAT, Dave...it will just give His Putziness an excuse
to make another "mistake" with his e mails or attachments.

> > I'm just trying to discuss SUBJECTS, not personalities.
>
> Your record here says otherwise.

Ain't THAT the truth!

> > >> I've been a professional in radio-electronics since 1952...51 years.
> > >
> > >Bully for you. This group doesn't have anything to do with being a
> > >professional in radio or electronics.
> >
> > Well then, you just have me LOCKED OUT of the newsgroup, why
> > don't you?
>
> It isn't necessary. If its all the same to you, I have much more fun
> the way things are going at present.

Beats going to the gym for exercise! Our own "virtual" punchbag!
Or is it Punch and Judy?

> > It doesn't work. Fix it. Remember, you are the self-styled Radio God.
>
> Is that your final answer?

Funny how I've NEVER seen ANYONE in this NG assume that role, but
Lennie keeps ASSIGNING it...Hmmmm....Maybe this is his Golden
Calf...?!?!

> > You are stuck on this topic, aren't you Kolonel Klunk?
>
> "YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
> make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
> That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis."
>
> --Leonard H. Anderson

I love how Lennie keeps dropping himself into the
"pot/kettle/black" mold. He LOVES to accuse others of doing exactly
what HE does.

Sheeesh.

> I didn't say it. Floyd said it. He appears to have been mistaken.
>
> > Go back to your fantasies of greatness in radio and your authorized
> > judgement of all who disagree with your holiness' views.
> >
> > You are wasting everyone's time.

>
> No one forced you to reply to my post or even to read it. You're a
> captive of the N2EY profile.

Captive...?!?! Naaah...I'd say POSTER BOY!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1134. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 09:36:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308130136.59e34be4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74499

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030811200132.15462.00002192@mb-m06.aol.com>...

> >Len Over 21 wrote:

> YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
> make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
> That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis.

And YOU do...?!?! You sure take advantage of the opportunity!

> YOU keep insisting one MUST be "licensed" to be an AMATEUR.

As always, only HALF of the answer..One must be "licensed" to be
a RADIO AMATEUR...THAT is specified by Part 97 of the FCC's Rules and
regulations, Lennie.

You remember them, don't you? That unlicensed Federal body that
establishes the radio rules for ALL of us...INCLUDING you...?!?!

> YOU keep holding up having a license grant is somehow making
> YOU "better" than anyone not having an amateur license. YOU
> seem to think that amateur radio is some event of epiphany, of glory
> and greatness in radio, some kind of nebulous "service" to the
> nation, transcending anything done in any other radio service.

In many cases it DOES "transcend" anything done in any other
radio service.

It is the ONLY radio service in which the FCC holds operators
responsible for meeting certain SERVICE obligations and expectations.

This is codified in 97.1. You keep trying to ignore this
paragraph, but the FCC keeps enforcing it. Ya think they know
something YOU don't, Sir Scumminess?

> Feel free to indulge in your fantasy. Just remember that your output
> of constant personal attack of others not accepting your views makes
> YOU the perverse individual here.

Uhhhhhh, I don't think so. That would belong to the unlicensed
outsider.

> I'm just arguing against a morse code test for any US radio license
> but there is this constant barrage of Personal Attack filth from the
> fantasyland control freaks diverting everyone from the subjects to
> the usual flame fest flings that must make your warped mind happy.

And WHY are you "arguing" Morse Code in a thread addressing the
BPL threat, Lennie?

> So far, you haven't "won" anything. Why do you keep on with the
> same old flame trash?

Why do YOU keep on with the same pathetic excuses, lies and
rhetoric, Lennie?

Steve, K4YZ

1135. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 09:44:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308130144.3f909ea0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74500

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030812002820.25815.00002131@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> In article <3F383774.33417EA6@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:

> >Did you check to see whether you have authority for name-calling,
> >insulting and demeaning those who disagree with you?
>
> I do. It's called the First Amendment of the United States
> Constitution.
>
> Ever hear of it?

Are YOU aware that it applies to the GOVERNMENT, not to you?

> Talking down to folks is not what this newsgroup is about...but you
> keep trying to play radio god.

What IS this newsgroup about, Lennie?

From what >>I<< see, it starts out "rec.radio.amateur", and you
are NOT a "radio amateur", as has been pointed out to you.

> Poor baby. Big hero "I was in 'Nam" radio god can't stand ordinary
> fire fights...cries and carries on when he is subjected to return fire.

Ahhhhh....so you're here to fight. I thought so...YOU said you
were here for "civil debate".

See what happens when you lie all the time, Lennie? You get
caught up in your own tales and then usually wind up stepping on your
own tail!

> Quit acting like an Oberst in the Amatur SchutzStaffel (A.S.S.) and
> maybe all could discuss SUBJECTS instead of personalities.

You're the one calling HIM names in a thread about the BPL
threat.

Steve, K4YZ

1136. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 09:52:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308130152.668d0857@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74501

averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030812232207.06382.00000481@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

> Were you ever in a country
> where a war was going on?

Naaaah...He was CLOSE to one once, and since a bunch of guys he
didn't know got killed in it, he just used THIER share of war stories
to make up the difference.

> > Stuff it, Colonel Klunk.
>
> "YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
> make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
> That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis."
>
> Guess who said that?
>
> Perhaps you should
> take your own advice, Len.

Never thought I'd be agreeing with a post from "Avery Fine"... !
! !

Actually, I am beginning to think this is just Lennie arguing
with his darker alter ego in a public forum!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1137. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 10:12:30 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308130212.6fd5dd85@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74502

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030812194839.19192.00000340@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)

> >I am sure you have convinced yourself of this, however you have
> >not provided one iota of "evidence" other than your own tainted
> >opinion, Vipul.

> I let my membership expire. Its going to be hard to verify. I may be able to
> meet them at the weekly breakfast. Still, people just show up, and I don't know
> exactly who from the club will show up. I cannot provide an answer right away.
> Or I could make an announcement at next club meet'g. Next club meet'g is in
> Sept. (they don't have meetings in Jun, Jul).

Actually, you can't provide ANY answer, Vipul, and probably never
will. Just like Lennie, you get caught up in your own tales and
usually wind up stepping on your own!

I just think you don't want to ID the club because YOU know the
kind of responses I'd probably solicit if I mentioned YOUR name to any
of these folks.

Of course you KNOW I could just stick a pin in your QTH and draw
a 50 mile radius and start making inquiries...Wanna bet on what I'd
turn up, Vippy...?!?!

> >> Other than Field day, an event does not HAVE do be scheduled during Fri,
> Sat
> >> night. Most people would do more recreational activities during that time.
> >
> > Vipul, the average American WORKS Monday through Friday with
> >Saturday and Sunday off. When would YOU schedule these "activities"?
>
> Still, Hams find the time off work to do the DXexpedition, go to Hamfests on
> Fri when that Hamfest is Fri and Sat. So, they took that day off to attend the
> Hamfest or DXpedition.

And look at who goes on "DXpeditions", Vippy...

It's NOT "Joe Q Ham"...It's guys with the personal finances to
afford going on a DXpedition!

And sliding out of work a few hours early on a Friday to attend a
once-a-year function hardly "makes" your point about doing things on
alternate days. Almost everyone can squeeze in a three-day weekend
once in a while...even you!

> Why take Fri off to go shopp'g at a Hamfest, when the Hamfest is also on Sat?
> If you went to a vacation spot, wouldn't you go to the beach, rather than stay
> at your trailer/shack?

Uhhhhhh....perhaps, like ME, he has a job that requires he WORK on
Saturdays?

Maybe he's a Seventh Day Adventist and going to the hamfest on
Saturday would violate his faith?

> If you are taking time off, wouldn't you want to do more recreational
> activities than shopping, or operating? If I was at a vacation spot, I would do
> the local activities.

Maybe because you are boring and unimaginative.

YOU assume that "operating" the radio had no recreational value
for that person just becasue YOU don't like it!

> >Foreign operators on the
> >other side of the world should have been denied the chance to make a
> >contact just becasue of thier location?
>
> Only one of the days would be needed to do that, either Fri night or Sat night,
> not both. There would still be plenty of time do the local vacation stuff.

And from what perspective of practiced experience do YOU make the
assumption that Saturday is inappropriate for this?

Just because it's unacceptable to YOU becasue of YOUR personal
needs, wants or desires...?!?! HA!

> >Furthermore, the very characteristics of HF operation generally
> >dictate better propagation and long-distance communication
> >opportunities at night.
>
> And still, it would not be necessary to do the whole night. And it would not
> require every Ham to be present at all hours (they could take turns).

"They" usually do...Except when the other operator in the shack
is an inexperienced No-Code Tech who can't or won't learn how to "do
it" the way hundreds of thousands of others do it...

Ooooops! That would be YOU, Vippy!

> >YOU call it "anti-social"
> >because you do not understand it or refuse to participate in it
> >because they are not doing it the way YOU think it should be
> >done.
>
> Not just the way I think it should be done. The great majority of Americans
> would feel the same way. There is a time for radio contacts, just not on Sat
> night.

The "great majority of Americans" are NOT licensed Amateur Radio operators.

The great majority >>OF<< licensed Amateur Radio operators around the world see it differently, Vipul!

The "system" that exists today IS the way it is because EIGHTY YEARS of practice and experience has demonstrated that this is the way it works best for the "great majority" of >>LICENSED<< operators...NOT lay citizens.

That YOU find it inconvienient or "inappropriate" is just too darn bad for you!

Steve, K4YZ

1138. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 10:13:28 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <874r0lj25z.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 74503

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote:
>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>>>Did you check to see whether you have authority for name-calling,
>>>insulting and demeaning those who disagree with you?
>>
>>I do. It's called the First Amendment of the United States
>>Constitution.
>>
>>Ever hear of it?
>
>Are YOU aware that it applies to the GOVERNMENT, not to you?

The authority??

You'd better go read it again. It doesn't authorize the government.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

1139. Re: Antisocial Hams- The Reason People Turn Away

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 10:57:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308130257.4397761f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74504

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030812201740.19192.00000341@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> From: "Dee D. Flint" deehays@qix.net
>
> >Speculation is not evidence. If you haven't asked them, then there is NO
> >way you can know.
>
> I'm trying my best. Meet'g up with those Hams and verifying the claim is not an
> easy task.

You mean it's not as easy to be as INSULTING and ARROGANT in
person as it is here, huh Vippy?

> >And what do you think "most people" do? Everyone I know does something
> >different.
> >A lot of people simply stay
> >home because they aren't interested in spending their money on bars and
> >parties.
>
> Most people would vacation at a vacation spot. Especially when they took the
> day off. Especially when they are at that location the want to do the vacation
> activities specific to that location.

Who are YOU to decide what is "recreation" for ANYONE except
yourself, Vipul...?!?!

And if that "location" is "rare" from an Amateur Radio
perspective, they ARE doing something "specific to that location" ! !

I certainly cannot append my callsign with "/V31" or "/3Y"
sitting in Winchester, Tennessee. You have to GO there to do it!

> After their visit to that vacation location, they won't be able to do those
> activities again. They can operate from their shack any day of the week.

You mean if I go to Aruba to operate during the ARRL DX contest
I cannot got there on a different weekend and go swimming, dancing,
etc etc etc...?!?!

Where is THAT law posted, Vippy...?!?!

> >Besides that, this is only a few
> >weekends out of the year.
>
> That's why, when you actually get a vacation, you should do the vacation
> activities. You won't get that chance to do those activities at another
> time/place. Why go to THAT location if you aren't going to do anything there

> that involves THAT location.

You got the intent of Dee's statement backwards, "Mr. I'm An EE".
There are only certain weekends that certain >>Amateur Radio<< events
occur! The ARRL or CQ contests only occur on certain weekends each
year. Assuming that you have two or three contests you care to
operate in, and wish to activate an unusual callsign, (ie: Belize,
V31), you are limited to THAT weekend.

If you want to go barefoot on the beach and collect coconut
shells, there's still 48 more weekends in the year to plan for. If
you can't squeeze out more than one Saturday-Sunday "vacation" a year,
maybe you need to reassess your career choice!

> Now, I'm not saying radio propagation does not involve THAT location. But, they
> had plenty of operating time day, and night to experience that. They just chose
> to cut themselves off from the other experiences of THAT location.

Says who? You? HA!

> >Therefore if
> >they are "put off" by the hamfest, it's quite possible that ham radio is not
> >the hobby for them just like it's not appropriate for you.
>
> I'm not put off by Hamfests, just Hams.

That's like saying you don't hate chocolate milk, just the taste!

(Waht an IDIOT!)

> Originally something in amateur radio
> got me interested, even addicted.

Looking for "preety fems", no doubt.

> Although, a few months ago, I personally dropped out of the EE field.

You were never in the "EE field", Vippy. Why do you keep
suggesting you were?

> I still like to build stuff for fun. I just don't
> see those same qualities in what got me interested in Amateur radio and the
> activities and interests in the Ham radio clubs support. Also, that most Hams
> are anti-social, doesn't help either.

You ahve yet to prove that Amatuer Radio is anti-social! it is
not. By it's very nature Amateur Radio is VERY social. Unless you
obtained an Amateur license for the SOLE purpose of cunducting one-way
experimentation or remote control of models, you will invariably
interact with OTHER Amateurs.

Now...Considering your ATTITUDE in THIS forum, I have NO DOUBT
that local Amatuers do their best to cross the street when they see
you coming, making it APPEAR as though they are anti-social...They're
just anti-PITA Idiot.

> >We don't need
> >more people with licenses who are not active.
>
> "Active" does not just mean contest scores. It can also mean Homebrewing,
> troubleshooting, tuning, radio direction finding, AND antenna setups.

Hmmmm...You mean like Field Day, ARES, RACES, Public Service,
Foxhunting, VE testing, etc etc etc...?!?!

ALREADY BEING DONE!

> >Have you ever been to other major events in other hobbies?
>
> This applies to any hobby, not just radio. I still wouldn't do those hobbies
> either on Fri, Sat night at a vacation spot.

I imagine that your life is a laundry list of unfulfilled
activities and thier corresponding excuses as to why you couldn't or
wouldn't do them.

Your loss...Stop bothering us.

Steve, K4YZ

1140. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 11:08:22 UTC
From: averyfine@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030813070822.22063.00000604@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74505

> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)

writes:
>
>averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
>news:<20030812232207.06382.00000481@mb-m02.aol.com>...
>> > lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)
>
>> Were you ever in a country
>> where a war was going on?
>
> Naaaah...He was CLOSE to one once, and since a bunch of guys he
>didn't know got killed in it, he just used THIER share of war stories
>to make up the difference.
>
Well, there you have it.

Why do you let Len Anderson's postings here bother you, Steve Robeson? Have you
not noticed that his pattern of behavior is designed to elicit angry responses
from you?

>> > Stuff it, Colonel Klunk.
>>
>> "YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
>> make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
>> That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis."
>>
>> Guess who said that?
>>
>> Perhaps you should
>> take your own advice, Len.
>
> Never thought I'd be agreeing with a post from "Avery Fine"... !
>! !

Why not?
>
> Actually, I am beginning to think this is just Lennie arguing
>with his darker alter ego in a public forum!

I am not "Lennie". Nor am I Len Anderson. I am just someone
who writes here when the mood strikes me.

Is that wrong?

1141. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 11:15:56 UTC
From: averyfine@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030813071556.22063.00000605@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74506

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>soma come loud bus driver.

> your insistence that US amateur radio
> is full of technical dummies (like yourself).

> all of them technical dummies who can't
> do anything but plug-and-play-ham-radio.
>
> A great and glorious gratuitous INSULT to thousands of US ARS licensees
> who ARE ALSO professionals in radio.
>
> Feel proud of yourself. You are an archtypical ham Dumb who can't get
> dumber.
>
> Tsk, tsk, there you go again, shaking your little "we-we" thing.
>
> Amateur radio is all about working DX on HF with CW.
>
> Not to mention collecting colorful postcards, fancy certificates, and
> rising above all others in radio on self-inflated ego balloons filled with
> hot air.
>
> Oh, my, you so good and great margarine don't melt in yo' mout.
>
> Thank you, Your Holiness.
>
> Sigh...another sermon on the antenna mount.
>
> Sigh...morsemanship is the epitome of the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
> Service.
>
> In your imaginary reality. One that Rod Serling never touched...

> Tsk, tsk, there you go again...making US ham radio nothing but
> Dummies like YOURSELF.

> This isn't a "yardstick" for egos, gas man.
>
> Amateur Dummies can only buy them, plug them in, and play with
> them.

> Geez...you've NEVER been qualified in anything except being a
> newsgroupie, Larrah.

"The things that upset us most are often things we see as qualities in our ownselves." - Kim W5TIT

1142. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 12:20:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030813082048.08200.00001366@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74507

In article <3ai_a.17475$im.5757@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>No, Mopar, the VEs charge. It used to be free at the FCC, but, for me at
>least, that meant a 60 mile trip (120 miles round trip) to the FCC in
>Buffalo, NY, and one minute of perfect copy at 20 words per minute.

It was free at the FCC until 1963 or 1964, when they began charging for exams (except Novice). That continued into the mid 1970s. The fee for an exam started out at $4 and went up to $9.

Now $9 doesn't sound like a lot today but back circa 1970 it was a lot of lawns cut or papers delivered if you were a kid. Even if you were an adult it could be a few hours' net pay. $10,000/yr was a good income back then, which works out to about $5/hour. Adjust that for inflation and today's VE fees are cheap.

As AA2QA points out, though, the big expense and effort for many hams wasn't the exam itself but getting there. A kid in school had to wait for summer and working folk had to take at least a half day off 'cause the exams were on weekday mornings. No do-overs or CSCEs, either, if you failed by even one question, or were one letter short of the required copy, you could not retest for 30 days.

I was lucky; Upper Darby to the Philly Custom House was just a subway ride with a short walk at each end. For a kid in Harrisburg, Scranton or South Jersey it was a big deal just to get there.

The end result, though, was that most hams went to the exams extremely overprepared. Wasn't worth taking a chance on failing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1143. Re: Anniston, AL: TOXIC WASTE DUMP OF US MILITARY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 13:00:10 UTC
From: "A.Melon" <juicy@melontraffickers.com>
Message-ID: <a5c2d9efeb7de2d8e5b0a880dc0f1779@melontraffickers.com>
Source record: 74508
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

In article
Lllllllardasssssss Lllllllllllllllllllooooooser Llllllllloyd <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote:

>On 12 Aug 2003 15:56:46 GMT, Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com>
wrote:
> JMBCV <nobody@mail.jmbcv.net> wrote:
> > Which explains W4NTI's reason to live where the crippled gimp can relive
> > Vietnam every day...
> >
> Isn't this his pic?
>
> http://www.alchemicalwedding.com/drawings/dali.htm

That looks more like Ambassador Heil's buddy, Woger, AB8MQ.

And it still bests a cueballed FATASS cow cornholer and pizza delivery boy Lloyd the toid,
with that shaved head and fatass.

1144. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 14:31:38 UTC
From: "J." <nordland37@yahoo.fr>
Message-ID: <MPG.19a45c2589935fcc9896a3@news.freeserve.net>
Source record: 74509
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

In article <3f39cdad$1_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>,
me@privacy.net says...
> I don't love the BBC, to whom do you refer?
>
> (Any country having a religious loony at the helm is
> a 3rd World country; esp. Yankland whose prominence
> will collapse as soon as the World realises how bankrupt
> the country really is - you'll all be dying of thirst in a few
> years and go the way of the Central Americas civilisations.)

I understand that their national debt is so enormous that
even scientific notation is having problems expressing it.

--
J@GL20

1145. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 14:54:40 UTC
From: Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI <g3vki@turner-smith.co.uk>
Message-ID: <bhdjfh$10m7sa$1@ID-201868.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 74510
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"J." <nordland37@yahoo.fr> wrote in message
news:MPG.19a45c2589935fcc9896a3@news.freeserve.net...
> In article <3f39cdad$1_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>,
> me@privacy.net says...
> > I don't love the BBC, to whom do you refer?
> >
> > (Any country having a religious loony at the helm is
> > a 3rd World country; esp. Yankland whose prominence
> > will collapse as soon as the World realises how bankrupt
> > the country really is - you'll all be dying of thirst in a few
> > years and go the way of the Central Americas civilisations.)
>
> I understand that their national debt is so enormous that
> even scientific notation is having problems expressing it.
>
Ask Airy to calculate their inflation rate in dB per annum.
--
;>)
73 de Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI - mine's a pint.

1146. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 15:35:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F3A5AAC.8080401@psu.edu>
Source record: 74511

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3F32C3E8.7050809@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <qK_Wa.2427$lL.391902@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>
>>>>What WILL be the end of ham radio is a lack of significant
>>>>growth ...
>>>
>>
>>
>>>Let's get it straight - is dropping Element 1 going to give us lots more
>>>growth or not?
>>
>> I don't understand a few of the things Carl says here. That we will
>>dissapear unless we get "significant growth".
>
>
> There are more US hams today than at any time in the past.
>
>> What exactly is that? a 100 percent increase in a day? increase at 1
>>percent over population increase?
>
>
> That's what I've been asking.
>
>> I'd like to know the advances they will bring.
>
>
> Similar to what newcomers have always brought.
>
>> I want to hear how those who oppose the ending of the Morse code
>>requirement are keeping ham radio from marching forward.
>>
>> Time for the roadmap to the future to be laid out.
>
>
> Don't hold yer breath waiting;-)

>
>> Or is this like the last scene in "The Candidate"?
>
> Refresh my memory on that one, Mike.
>
The Candidate is a pretty good film about an idealistic fellow, (Robert Redford) the son of a former Governor, who gets caught up in running for office after being prodded by the local political machinery. Along the way, he compromises most all of his values (all that is not relevant to the case at hand. But in the end, after being elected to office, amongst the victory celebration, he looks to his campaign manager (Peter Boyle - Haw) completely confused, and asks "What do we do now?" He was completely lost and didn't know what to do.

My point is that I see a close relationship between that ending and the situation we have here. No real thought has been given to the aftermath of the ending of the Morse code test.

Back to now...

After such a change, lots of different ideas come out of the woodwork to replace the vacuum left by the probable disappearance of the Morse code test. Some ideas are good, some make me shudder.

But the fact is that since if the test disappears and nothing else happens, it very well does mean that it is a reduction in knowledge required to get a ticket. All arguments on what constitutes "knowledge" in these regards is kind of like defining "is". You have to learn less, no possible dispute without looking pretty silly.

All this means that those who believe that requirements for a ticket should be lowered have the upper hand.

Those who do not believe that, that is to say that a Morse code test is a desirable thing, or those who want the writtens to be reflective of a fair degree of competence, have an uphill battle, and at the moment are regarded as the losers.

I am very disappointed that the winners in this one do not seem to have any plan at all. All we hear are their personal thought on how *they* don't support some of what is being proposed. That's nice, but Doggonit, That doesn't cut it! They have to be darn active in seeing that things don't fall apart around us. The ball is in their court now, and it seems they don't know what to do with it. I don't really care what they personally think, I want to see what they are going to do. And so far.....

>> Gloat time is over. Your time has come. You now have the chance to
>>prove that you were right. And browbeating the losers isn't a very good
>>start.
>
>
> Maybe we'll see a lot of newcomers and technoadvances after the code test goes.
> And maybe we won't. Personally, I don't think we'll see either.

Probably not. Those who do advance the art are a small core of technical adroit's, who come up with techniques that must not only advance the art, but must be adapted by enough people to make them viable. After all, it isn't much fun to have the newest cool method of communication if there is only a couple people to communicate with.

> If that happens, what will be blamed for the ARS' perceived problems??

The PCTA's, because of their being so negative, and scaring the new people away? I'd bet a cup of coffee on that one. It is a pity when you lose someone to blame, eh?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1147. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 16:17:57 UTC
From: "William H. O'Hara, III" <whoohara@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93D67D6711A0FAX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@216.168.3.44>
Source record: 74512
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in
news:3f39cdad$1_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com:

> I don't love the BBC, to whom do you refer?
>
> (Any country having a religious loony at the helm is
> a 3rd World country; esp. Yankland whose prominence

I know many that take it as severe insult.
We are not Yankees. Yankees were the ones
that started the civil war and trashed
Germans, Irish, and Italians during the
turn of the century.

Yankees are pure bred english descendants
that did not like immigrants.

bill

1148. Israel Approves PLC/BPL Test, Hams Fume

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 16:38:15 UTC
From: Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <bhdphn020ov@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 74514

http://www.globes.co.il/serveen/globes/docview.asp?did=714612&fid=942

The Ministry of Communications this week granted a license to Main.net Communications to test its power line communications (PLC) access network solution. The test in the Kryot area will include scores of participants, who will not pay for the service. Main.net has an understanding with Israel Electric Corporation (IEC) on the subject.

The Ham Radio Association filed an object to the test with the Ministry of Communications, claiming the use of the electricity grid for communications would disrupt ham radio communications.

--
Best Regards, Keith AOL IM:kilowattradio
NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
"Give SCO $699 for using Linux or the Penguin gets it."

1149. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 16:50:12 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f3a6d19_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74513
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

From this side of the pond you are all Yankees.

William H. O'Hara, III <whoohara@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns93D67D6711A0FAX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@216.168.3.44...
> "Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in
> news:3f39cdad$1_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com:
> > I don't love the BBC, to whom do you refer?
> > (Any country having a religious loony at the helm is
> > a 3rd World country; esp. Yankland whose prominence
> I know many that take it as severe insult.
> We are not Yankees. Yankees were the ones
> that started the civil war and trashed
> Germans, Irish, and Italians during the
> turn of the century.
> Yankees are pure bred english descendants
> that did not like immigrants.

1150. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 17:26:08 UTC
From: Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI <g3vki@turner-smith.co.uk>
Message-ID: <bhdsbg$11507s$1@ID-201868.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 74515
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f3a6d19_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> From this side of the pond you are all Yankees.
>
and the Welsh are the Irish that couldn't swim.
(_!_)

1151. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 20:21:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030813162126.22063.00000618@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74516

>Hams can have as many meters as they like, though most commercially made
>ham radios use LCD displays. I can't imagine anyone needing 11 meters.
>Where is there?
>
>
>-Barry

Typical CBplusser answer.

1152. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 20:46:01 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <9f7ljvspn07ashfl1urmaan846jl32ti6f@4ax.com>
Source record: 74517

On 12 Aug 2003 23:40:34 GMT, Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:

>I'm really not interested in rrap, or you, thanks anyway.

Then why are you posting here?

>I don't mean to include all ham radio operators, and afterall, it's
>only my friggin opinion anyway.

Well, that's what rrap is all about, expressing our opinions. However, there are a lot of people who will respect an opinion - even one they disagree with - if the person expressing it feels strongly enough about what they're saying to let others know who is saying it, which by extension means it's a legitimate expression of an opinion rather than some anonymous troll trying to stir up the hornets' nest. There are exceptions, of course - some people just don't have enough pride in themselves to care how much of an imbecile they look like in front of the rest of the world - but generally this has shown to be the case. As for not meaning to include all ham operators, that's good, but your comments about the code test were directed to *me* in that you posted them in a reply to a message that I posted...and if you trouble yourself to check, you'll see that I've been posting in favor of doing away with the code test for, oh, about six years now.

>I've used the same NSP and ISP for years and years, my email is
>valid too (remove nospam) So in your opinion, don't trust anyone
>on Usenet, without a callsign?

See the above.

What troubles me is this: You claimed to be a "coded Tech" and yet here you are griping about code testing. To me, this doesn't add up. If you've already passed the code test, then as long as you hold onto the CSCE and keep your license current, you no longer have to worry about it. The next step for you is to pass Element 3 and upgrade to General. Your tone suggests to me that you haven't passed a code test. Now, if you had posted your call like many (most) of us here do, I could have checked on QRZ and removed any such suspicions. As things stand, I and the rest of us here in rrap have to wonder, under the circumstances, if you even have a license at all. No license is required for posting here, but if you are indeed a ham - regardless of your license class - then be proud of that fact ande have the courtesy to let the rest of us know who we're talking to, that's all.

>The first sign of a blow hard, spelling and grammer corrections.
>
>You fit right in here.

Well, you asked for this now, so: The first sign of a functional illiterate, spelling and grammar errors. You fit right in on rec.radio.cb.

>So, when you realize you haven't made a point yet, you accuse me
>of smoking crack?

That was giving you the benefit of the doubt, actually.

>Sorry, you sound like an N8WWM type person. I hope you're not. :)

No, I'm a KC2HMZ type person...whatever that means. Bottom line, though, is that if you want to retain any credibility here (which I'm not sure you care to do) you might consider following the thread and noticing who's on which side of an issue before you go spraying folks who happen to agree with you (like me) with shots intended for folks who disagree (like you did to me the day before yesterday). Or are you just trolling rather than trying to make a point here?

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

1153. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 20:46:03 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <bl8ljv0su04k9dsthmlacl6v4u9c306tim@4ax.com>
Source record: 74518

On 12 Aug 2003 23:40:10 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Here's the definition anyway:
>
>QFU? - What is the magnetic direction (or number) of the runway to be used?
>
>QFU - The magnetic direction (or number) of the runway to be used is ...
>
>I've never heard that on the ham bands, though.

I've never heard it on the aeronautical bands, either, even though
that's obviously the intended application of that particular Q-signal.
That's a relic from days long forgotten. Today they get that info from
ATIS before they even contact approach control.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
"Advise on initial contact you have information Lima."

1154. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 20:59:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308131259.68a78fae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74519

averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030813070822.22063.00000604@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)

> Why do you let Len Anderson's postings here bother you, Steve Robeson? Have you
> not noticed that his pattern of behavior is designed to elicit angry responses
> from you?

Because I do not well tolerate pathological liars. Lennie is a
pathological liar. He also grossly misrepresents Amateur Radio in
such a way as to bring discredit upon it. Poking the obvious holes in
his rants is sport.

> > Never thought I'd be agreeing with a post from "Avery Fine"... !
> >! !
>
> Why not?

Why?

> > Actually, I am beginning to think this is just Lennie arguing
> >with his darker alter ego in a public forum!
>
> I am not "Lennie". Nor am I Len Anderson. I am just someone
> who writes here when the mood strikes me.
>
> Is that wrong?

Nope. Did I say it was...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

1155. Re: BPL & US Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 22:09:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhect9juq1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74520

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:bZh_a.17471$Oc.7605@news02.roc.ny...
> Dan, I did. You are right, it is *unbelievable*. I wonder if the power
> companies hired some of the former tobacco spin doctors?
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.507 / Virus Database: 304 - Release Date: 8/4/03
>
>

They must have. I hope the ARRL plays this for the commissioners.

If it goes through you can kiss off HF radio for anything at all. Even if
you live in the boonies, that wont help. It will propagate for miles.

Dan/W4NTI

1156. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 22:16:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030813181640.02197.00002135@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74523

In article <5c01b95b.0308121438.7df10277@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030811200131.15462.00002191@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
>> Poor baby. You don't come close to any civil debate yet you
>> DEMAND others do so.
>
> I didn't "demand" anything, Lennie.

Yes, you do. You have a long history of it, even on the public record of four years ago at the FCC.

> I point out that you make it a point of harrassing others about
>it, yet indulge yourself in the most childish and pathetic of efforts
>to see who can out-insult the other.

Actually you yourself meet "childish and pathetic of efforts" and cannot stop trying to insult me in posts clearly not including you.

> You insist on referring to yourself as a "professional", but you
>have yet to prove yourself "professional" in ANY discipline.

Several corporations, the US government, three state governments all disagree with you. :-)

>> You REALLY need some mental therapy on being able to
>> get along with anyone else.
>
> Uh huh. Coming from you, I rate this about 136 on a scale of 1
>to 10 on important things to do.

Psychotics will never admit they are crazy. <shrug>

> Uh huh...(Geeze this idiot makes this easy...) Just like YOU
>tried to hide behind "Avery Fine" and "Avery Fineman" until your ego
>got the better of you one day and you signed your name to a post that
>you had specifically denied BEING you.

The AOL screen name of "Avery Fineman" is still registered to me.

I have, currently, six other screen names at AOL (including this one) but "Avery Fine" was NOT one of them. Never.

Yes, I've used the screen name of "Avery Fineman" in here and also identified myself at the end of the post.

Apparently some in here are terribly uptight and can see no humor in the pseudonym of "a very fine man" that lacks two spaces. :-) I used that pseudonym first about 1992 on a Bulletin Board System as Co-Sysop. "Len Over 21" came from the pseudonym used on the BBS US Pompeii a year later (run and sysoped by Stan and Zippy Manus in the Hollywood Hills). It is word play based on the BBS software...takes too long to explain to anal-retentive control freaks. :-)

I can't "prove" who "Avery Fine" is...but both you and Reverend Jim are prolific posters from AOL. Coincidence? :-)

LHA

1157. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 22:16:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030813181641.02197.00002137@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74521

In article <bhc43e$h1j@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:

>You're stretching now, Larry. Running out of wit, are you?

Larrie can't "run out of" something he never had... :-)

1158. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 22:16:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030813181641.02197.00002136@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74526

In article <5c01b95b.0308120701.52cc418c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> The First Amendment doesn't apply to you either, Lennie. It
>applies to the GOVERNMENT being able to suppress the media.

Since 1791 the First Amendment of the United States Consitution reads:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

It should be clear to all thinking persons (psychotics aren't able to think rationally) that free speech is NOT "illegal." :-)

This particular forum is public access and unmoderated.

You desire closure to the public and elitism...CONTROL.

You've already attempted to specifically stop MY "petition for a redress of grievances" on 25 January 1999. That's on the public FCC record.

Symptoms of your psychosis have been growing for four years. It is time you got some proper psychiatric care and return to being normal...if medical science is advanced enough for that.

>> Go back to your fantasies of greatness in radio and your authorized
>> judgement of all who disagree with your holiness' views.
>
> Let's make the same offer to you, Lennie. Go back to Japan in
>1953, and go back to your days of glory and greatness at "Ham Radio
>Magazine" and Raytheon, et al, where you made almost no discernable
>impact on anything "radio" related at all.

I have NO desire to "go back to Japan of 1953" since I was there then and up until 1956. It was interesting. The task was challenging and interesting and I met that and succeeded.

I had NO "glory and greatness" at Ham Radio magazine, was just a contributor and an Associate Editor. Interesting and challenging again and (from the compensation) little more than an extension of ongoing hobby activites.

I was never employed by Raytheon. Raytheon's old Santa Barbara, CA, division came up with the RadaRange, the progenitor of today's ubiquitous microwave oven. Raytheon sold all the rights to that to Amana Corporation of Amana, Iowa. My wife and I visited there

in 2001, two years after buying an Amana natural gas range and overhead microwave oven and vent fan for a complete makeover of our kitchen in 1999.

pSycho pSteve seems lost on the concept that I actually DID what I've said I did...and have the documentation and still-living witnesses to that fact. All pSycho pSteve can do is attempt character assassination for his own aberrated ends...he NEVER had anything to compare with that.

Poor thing.

LHA

1159. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 22:16:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030813181642.02197.00002138@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74525

In article <20030812220813.23745.00001701@mb-m22.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>I've already done my homework.

Yes, and all you achieved was a Some Come Loud award. From all.

>I was waiting for Floyd's contribution,
>but only received more name calling.

Never met Floyd before.

No one has to "bring someone else in to this newsgroup."

It's a public access newsgroup and anyone can jump in anytime.

>I can only assume that you
>brought Floyd into this discussion to keep up the pressure of churlish,
>immature behavior in order to eventually claim victory.

YOU are the churlish immature being claiming victory. :-)

YOU haven't achieved any "victory."

>Don't look now, but it's not working.

Yes it is. You are totally pissed and your immense EGO demands
a comment.

>You're losing traction faster than a wet worm climbing a greased pole.

No.

You have the wrong metaphor.

Metaphors be with you, Larrie Skytalker.

LHA

1160. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 22:16:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030813181643.02197.00002139@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74527

In article <3F3A5AAC.8080401@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <3F32C3E8.7050809@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>> writes:

> The Candidate is a pretty good film about an idealistic fellow, (Robert

>Redford) the son of a former Governor, who gets caught up in running for
>office after being prodded by the local political machinery. Along the
>way, he compromises most all of his values (all that is not relevant to
>the case at hand. But in the end, after being elected to office, amongst
>the victory celebration, he looks to his campaign manager (Peter Boyle -
>Haw) completely confused, and asks "What do we do now?" He was
>completely lost and didn't know what to do.

That is a good film (few of Redford's films are "bad")...but it is
entirely FICTION.

Some in here (some time back) tried to use another movie,
"Independence Day," as some kind of backing for the glory and
greatness of morse code. A decidedly FICTIONAL story. :-)

> My point is that I see a close relationship between that ending and the

>situation we have here. No real thought has been given to the aftermath
>of the ending of the Morse code test.

Is that a "problem?"

It would seem that you are just setting the stage for more False
Charges to level against the NCTAs.

You need a better stage manager.

> After such a change, lots of different ideas come out of the woodwork
>to replace the vacuum left by the probable disappearance of the Morse
>code test. Some ideas are good, some make me shudder.

There's NO "problem." Try not to manufacture one.

The only "problems" have been put forth by PCTAs, some of whom
"predict" the doom of amateurism due to loss of the code test.

There's NO sign of that.

There IS a lot of weeping, wailing, and whining by those who had to
jump through the morse hoops in order to get their rank/status/title/

priveleges in a hobby activity. Most of those few are totally pissed
and become overly antagonistic in here.

> But the fact is that since if the test disappears and nothing else
>happens, it very well does mean that it is a reduction in knowledge
>required to get a ticket.

No, that is a biased PRESUMPTION on your part.

Morsemanship is NOT "knowledge." It is a skill, not a "knowledge."

It is an outmoded skill, no longer applicable to the modern world or
the future.

>All arguments on what constitutes "knowledge"
>in these regards is kind of like defining "is".

Not at all. Amateur radio is the ONLY radio service in the USA that
requires demonstrated cognition of morse code for a license having
below-30-MHz privileges.

Morse code skill has been steadily declining in lawful use of HF and
lower by most national administrations.

>You have to learn less, no possible dispute without looking pretty silly.

Refusal to accept factual data looks even sillier.

You are on record as refusing to accept arguments against elimination
of the morse code test. You thus join the ranks of all the other PCTA
"sillies."

> All this means that those who believe that requirements for a ticket
>should be lowered have the upper hand.

No, it just means that the PCTA are still weeping, wailing, and whining
that no newcomer need go throught their initiations long ago.

Poor babies.

> Those who do not believe that, that is to say that a Morse code test is

>a desirable thing, or those who want the writtens to be reflective of a
>fair degree of competence, have an uphill battle, and at the moment are
>regarded as the losers.

Only by the PCTA....for obvious reasons.

Morsemen seem to regard themselves as gods of radio because of
their claimed "knowledge" (really just another skill). That's even
sillier.

> I am very disappointed that the winners in this one do not seem to have

>any plan at all. All we hear are their personal thought on how *they*
>don't support some of what is being proposed.

A future with change must be terrifying to you. Accept our sympathies.

No "plan" is required...either by law or ethics or morals.

>That's nice, but Doggonit, That doesn't cut it!

Yes it does.

>They have to be darn active in seeing that things don't fall apart around us.

Oh, did you expect some kind of medicare and welfare for once
being tested for morsemanship?

Just how did you think you earned some kind of "right" to be supported
after major rules changes?

The only ones likely to make things "fall apart all around YOU" is the
weeping, wailing, whiny PCTA brethren refusing to obey regulation
changes and fighting everyone who won't see their way.

>The ball is in their court now, and it seems
>they don't know what to do with it. I don't really care what they
>personally think, I want to see what they are going to do. And so far.....

Once the morse code examination is completely removed from
the license examinations, I plan to stop accessing this little beeping
Din of Inequity and all its weeping, wailing, and whiny PCTAs.

The FUTURE is the next fraction of time from right NOW. "Today is
the tomorrow you worried about yesterday."

Preservation of the status quo is nice, safe, convenient, and relatively
free of worry. All the rules, regulations, etc., remain as they were and
those who met the challenges of old have achieved to old title, rank,
status, and privilege can brag about it and make themselves "superior"
to those who didn't.

The future can be terrifying to those who NEED the old ways to make
them "superior" to others. If they lose all that status, rank, title, and
privilege, they can't claim any "superiority." That LOSS is a tragedy
to them and they need something, anything to give back their
"rightful superiority." You can see it in here right now.

CHANGE HAPPENS. Accept it or die. Simple Darwinism.

You have NO "right" to continual support for PAST "superiority."

The future will work itself out. It has in the past.

LHA

1161. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 22:16:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030813181645.02197.00002140@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74528

In article <3F398885.A5E1CFFD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <3F382A57.A6B30B7F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
><k8mn@earthlink.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Len Over 21 wrote:
>> >>
>> >> In article <w4VYa.162$dj3.18912@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> >> >news:c2356669.0308080912.7e373969@posting.google.com...
>> >> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>> >> >news:<XsNYa.93$dj3.13294@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> >> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >> >> > news:20030807222823.21428.00001559@mb-m23.aol.com...

>What I wrote was precisely relevant.

Radio gods have the irritating habit of stating that only THEIR
viewpoints are "relevant." :-)

>You wrote of someone's having not
>been alive when something took place. I pointed out that you weren't
>alive during some of the things which you've pontificated on in this
>venue.

Now, now, Kolonel...you're busy trying to divert attention to someone
else by saying you are "relevant" and anyone disbelieving such a
godlike statement is "irrelevant."

You are worse than the other whiny PCTAs who want to "win" old
arguments that they LOST in here.

>> Try reading a BOOK on the REST of the world of radio instead of what
>> if spoon-fed you by the little publisher in Newington.
>
> "YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
> make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
> That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis."
>
> --Leonard H. Anderson

...and you still don't have any of that authority, divine radio god.

>What the hell are you prattling about?

...about a whiny radio god (yourself) getting all hot and bothered
by negative criticsm and not being able to argue any subject without
attempting misdirection into personalities.

>Did you have a point?

Yes. But, like Reverend Jim, you can't accept it even though everyone
else (except fellow PCTAs) can see it for what it is. :-)

>You certainly wrote a large number of diversionary words to cover your
>gaffe. There was no boom of Japanese ham gear in the 1960's. Is it
>clear now?

Again, you refuse to accept what was happening in the markets for
amateur radio equipment.

The Japanese companies were already IN the ham radio marketplace
in the USA then and they've occupied the prime position ever since.

>Why no, Len, not as a school boy. I certainly have more governmental
>communications experience during the cold war.

Any more tales of wondrous radio pioneering from the International
Cashew Nut exporting capital of the world? :-)

No doubt you were awarded an Intelligence Star for your James Bomb
duties getting the goods on nearby commies in other countries. :-)

>It doesn't take a regulator to truthfully state that you weren't
>involved and are not involved in amateur radio.

You mean NOT LICENSED. That's ALL you can claim. :-)

Keep up with that "charge," big radio god. It seems about the only
valid statement you can make.

>Don't tell me what I am to amateur radio.

No problem. You do that constantly about yourself. :-)

>I'm a licensed ham and have been for decades.

Which only proves that you've been able to renew that license
periodically and within the legal time. :-)

You should also describe the stamping on your hide from the FDA.

>You, quite truthfully are not involved at all in amateur radio.

Well then, HAM RADIO magazine made some dreadful errors in
personnel, did it? :-)

You ought to bring up outright charges of fraud and misrepresentation.
Psycho pSteve does that periodically. Of course, he can't understand

any of the article's technical things so he just says they are "forgeries."

>You aren't a judge of what hams do or have done.

Real hams sometimes contain unsafe amounts of Escherichia coli
O157:H7. Be careful of infecting others when spouting off in here.

>You are not a regulator.

Neither are YOU, big radio god.

>> Now tell us, great big four-decade experienced AMATEUR radio god,
>> what have YOU ever done to "advance amateur radio?!?"
>
>No, I don't believe I will, Len.

I don't believe you CAN. :-)

>> Show us your patents, your marvelous discoveries, all your >
>important technical contributions.
>
>Still have your patent fetish?

Never had any "fetish." But, I DO have a patent in radio.

>> You've had FORTY YEARS of amateurism
>> and all you can come up with is trying to put down folks in an amateur
>> newsgroup?!?
>
>Folks? Well, there's you.

You don't hesitate one bit to put down ANYONE who doesn't worship
your statements or ideals. That's clearly evident in this newsgroup
and available on Google.

>Then again, you aren't a ham. You're just a groupie.

"Ham is the butchered meat of swine."

I'm just advocating the elimination of the morse code test for ANY
US radio license examination.

>You've got it wrong, Len. I have a license and have had it for decades.

You get a nice gold star for renewing your license periodically.

Other than that, what can you claim?

>I make contacts via amateur radio daily.

I make contacts with switches and relays. Break those contacts, too.

Daily. :-)

>I'm a participant in amateur radio.

Well, that proves the radio god's "validity." One can't get IN amateur radio without ALREADY being IN amateur radio. Know the morse code. Worship morse code. It is the key to GREATNESS!

>I don't issue catcalls from the sidelines.

You have a "license" to catcall from inside the lines?

Of course you do. "Authority" from the US government!

Your license grant "authorizes" you to be a horse's ass to anyone not in league with your godlike opinions, statements, and general personal insults.

No problem. Everyone sees that.

>> Get a better life.
>
>I'm quite happy with this one, Len. Yours seems to be a little lacking
>in light of your ham radio envy.

What "envy?"

I'm just advocating the elimination of the morse code test for radio license examinations.

You seem to think that anyone doing that is committing some kind of heresy or blasphemy.

You seem to think that ALL in this newsgroup MUST have a valid amateur radio license to participate. You don't have any validity in that demand so all you do is attempt individual personal insults.

You are still under the misconception that a valid amateur radio license is required to participate in here.

This newsgroup isn't "ham radio." It is supposed to be about talking policy matters for that. In the United States all us citizens have the absolute RIGHT to free speech under our Constitution. You won't accept that, thus you are acting unconstitutionally.

Radio gods are like that. Mere earthly laws don't apply to them.

LHA

1162. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 22:16:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030813181646.02197.00002141@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74522

In article <3F3980D8.E1FDBCF3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>What's it to you? You have nothing to do with amateur radio.

Still trying the old misdirection & personal insult type thing. :-)

>Have you
>made up your mind yet. Some time back you stated that I wasn't a radio
>god then I was a radio god then I wasn't a radio god. Have you made up
>your mind yet?

You PRETEND to have great expertise (on the order of godlike
judgement and capability).

It would seem that your PRETENSE has made you very tense
(and angry) when someone shows your pretense for what it is. :-)

LHA

1163. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 22:16:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030813181646.02197.00002142@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 74524

In article <c2356669.0308121219.382a9c33@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030811200142.15462.00002202@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
>> Had the no-code-test Technician never been created, US ham
>> radio would have been short by 200K ham licenses by the time of
>> "Reconstruction."
>
>Prove it.
>
>Show proof that 200,000 people would not have gotten US amateur radio
>licenses between February 14, 1991 and April 15, 2000 if the Technician
>class license had never lost its code test.
>
>I don't think you have any proof. Or even any evidence. Just bluster.

Jimmie, that was an OLD argument in here and you LOST it.

Getting all puffed up and antagonistic won't prove any case for you on the morse code test. It won't prove any case for your false interpretation of statistics that was on the AH0A website.

You would not accept statistics of a noted PCTA taken from the FCC public database then and you refuse to accept it now. There's no point in rehashing an old argument where you LOST.

You won't make any valid "points" in here by repeating "you're mistaken" and continual refusal to accept FCC database information.

LHA

1164. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 22:18:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bheddp$240$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74529

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030813082048.08200.00001366@mb-m25.aol.com...
> In article <3ai_a.17475$im.5757@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
> >No, Mopar, the VEs charge. It used to be free at the FCC, but, for me at
> >least, that meant a 60 mile trip (120 miles round trip) to the FCC in
> >Buffalo, NY, and one minute of perfect copy at 20 words per minute.
>
> It was free at the FCC until 1963 or 1964, when they began charging for
exams
> (except Novice). That continued into the mid 1970s. The fee for an exam
started
> out at $4 and went up to $9.
>
> Now $9 doesn't sound like a lot today but back circa 1970 it was a lot of
lawns
> cut or papers delivered if you were a kid. Even if you were an adult it
could
> be a few hours' net pay. $10,000/yr was a good income back then, which
works
> out to about $5/hour. Adjust that for inflation and today's VE fees are
cheap.
>
> As AA2QA points out, though, the big expense and effort for many hams
wasn't
> the exam itself but getting there. A kid in school had to wait for summer
and
> working folk had to take at least a half day off 'cause the exams were on
> weekday mornings. No do-overs or CSCEs, either, if you failed by even one
> question, or were one letter short of the required copy, you could not
retest
> for 30 days.
>
> I was lucky; Upper Darby to the Philly Custom House was just a subway ride
with
> a short walk at each end. For a kid in Harrisburg, Scranton or South
Jersey it
> was a big deal just to get there.
>
> The end result, though, was that most hams went to the exams extremely
> overprepared. Wasn't worth taking a chance on failing.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

>
>
But you know Jim even if they did prepare, A LOT FAILED, it was really an exercise in who could overcome the nerves.

I had to take a 90 mile train ride to and from to take my test. I was 13 at the time, and my mother came along. We spent the night at my aunt and uncles.

Years later I realized it was the 'original incentive licensing'. He stern words were " You better pass this thing the first time, we ain't doing this again". I nicknamed her 'Old Sarge'...but never to her face.. hi. Sure do miss her.

Dan/W4NTI

1165. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 22:19:20 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhedg0$626$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74530
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Steve Terry" <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote in message
news:Hwi_a.10644$Kx1.151395@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net...
>
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20030812173943.717$Fk@newsreader.com...
> > "Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote:
> > > Where the murderous Yank invaders are receiving
> > > their just deserts - being dropped like flies by the
> > > modern equivalent of the French Resistance.
> > >
> > The French fight with their face, I hope you ain't one of them.
> >
> Shame they haven't won a war in the last hundred years
>
> Steve Terry
>
>

You mean the French or the Germans?

Dan/W4NTI

1166. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 22:23:15 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhednalbs1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74531
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

If it wasn't for your old colony your country would be speaking German and eating raw fish. You ungrateful piece of crap.

Go ahead and dream all you want. But don't forget you best keep the USA on at least talking terms, or England will be the third world country.

I spent a lot of time in Europe in the 70s. Made a lot of English friends. Whats your problem? All your mates at the pub throw you out on your ear for your stupidity?

Dan/W4NTI

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f39cdad$1_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> I don't love the BBC, to whom do you refer?
>
> (Any country having a religious loony at the helm is
> a 3rd World country; esp. Yankland whose prominence
> will collapse as soon as the World realises how bankrupt
> the country really is - you'll all be dying of thirst in a few
> years and go the way of the Central Americas civilisations.)
>
> Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bhbl3c$7vi$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Just another blip from the BBC loving fool in a has been country that
> thinks
> > its still a world power.
> > "Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
> > news:3f38a23e$1_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> > > Where the murderous Yank invaders are receiving
> > > their just deserts - being dropped like flies by the
> > > modern equivalent of the French Resistance.
> > > Gareth (G1LVN) <gareth@mycallsign.freeserve.co.uk> wrote in message
> > > news:bh99jpgh1@newsg2.svr.pol.co.uk...
> > > > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3F382660.5020204@adelphia.net...
> > > > > Someone's inviting *us* in? That doesn't happen too often! Most
> people
> > > > > tell us where to go though.....
> > > > Like IRAQ for example....;-)
>
>
>

1167. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 22:25:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhedrk$ka5$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74532
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Yeah? You mean the ones that cut your redcoats to pieces and kicked
Cornwalles out of here on his ear?

Dan/W4NTI

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f3a6d19_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> From this side of the pond you are all Yankees.
>
> William H. O'Hara, III <whoohara@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns93D67D6711A0FAX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@216.168.3.44...
> > "Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in
> > news:3f39cdad$1_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com:
> > > I don't love the BBC, to whom do you refer?
> > > (Any country having a religious loony at the helm is
> > > a 3rd World country; esp. Yankland whose prominence
> > I know many that take it as severe insult.
> > We are not Yankees. Yankees were the ones
> > that started the civil war and trashed
> > Germans, Irish, and Italians during the
> > turn of the century.
> > Yankees are pure bred english descendants
> > that did not like immigrants.
>
>
>

1168. Re: Question for the No coders : post from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 22:25:57 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <v9eljv4o26fkrasmtgp7nbavbf3h12hfs1@4ax.com>
Source record: 74535

On Tue, 12 Aug 2003 23:53:05 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

>Work the next November Sweepstakes on the CW weekend. Since the year first
>licensed is part of the exchange, you'll see that there are indeed some new
>hams working CW. I worked it in 2001 (skipped 2002 due to OM's birthday
>being that weekend) and there were people who had only been licensed a
>couple of years out there working it.

One needs to be able to copy the code in order to follow the CW
contacts during Sweepstakes, of course...and the contacts during most
contests are at a lot faster speed than I can generally copy. I can
say this, though. Of a dozen or so folks in our club who upgraded from
Tech (no-code) to General over the past year, only one actually went
on to make CW contacts on the air.

On the other hand, we had a new Tech getting elmered on the code
before the ink was dry on his new license, and he told us it wasn't
just because he wanted to learn it so he could upgrade but that he's
actually interested in using the mode on the air.

I think the conclusion one can draw from this is that there are,
indeed, new hams interested in using CW, although most aren't.
Admittedly a dozen or so isn't a very large sample, but this is the
experience we've had here over the past year.

>It's probably a combination of all the above. However I've known several
>new hams who are fascinated by the mode and see the CW contests as a way to
>both master the mode and have fun.

In my case, they've been a way to become both humiliated and
frustrated. But, other folks' mileage may vary.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

1169. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 22:26:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhee0hmrb1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74533
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"William H. O'Hara, III" <whoohara@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns93D67D6711A0FAX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@216.168.3.44...
> "Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in
> news:3f39cdad$1_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com:
>
> > I don't love the BBC, to whom do you refer?
> >
> > (Any country having a religious loony at the helm is
> > a 3rd World country; esp. Yankland whose prominence
>
> I know many that take it as severe insult.
> We are not Yankees. Yankees were the ones
> that started the civil war and trashed
> Germans, Irish, and Italians during the
> turn of the century.
>
> Yankees are pure bred english descendants
> that did not like immigrants.
>
> bill

Thats right !!

Dan/W4NTI

1170. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 22:28:15 UTC
From: Gary Cavie <m0jjh@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.19a4cbd9f475edf98968e@news.freeserve.com>
Source record: 74534
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

In article <bhednalbs1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>,
w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com says...
> If it wasn't for your old colony your country would be speaking German and
> eating raw fish. You ungrateful piece of crap.
>
> Go ahead and dream all you want. But don't forget you best keep the USA on
> at least talking terms, or England will be the third world country.
>
> I spent a lot of time in Europe in the 70s. Made a lot of English friends.
> Whats your problem? All your mates at the pub throw you out on your ear for
> your stupidity?
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Don't take old Airy to heart - he suffers from delusions of adequacy, and
makes up for it by being as obnoxious as possible. In his own little
world, nothing happened on September 11th 2001, apart from someone making
a valid disagreement with American policy. At least when he's on his PC,
where everything is handmade, he's not roaming the streets causing real
damage.

1171. FYI: Q-signals -- Now, Then, and Way Back When (Was QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 22:52:51 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Wilderness <KITW@forest.com>
Message-ID: <7jz_a.33070$ff.21183@fed1read01>
Source record: 74536

Three to look at URL:
http://www.wemsi.org/qsigs.html

Another:
http://www.kloth.net/radio/qcodes.php

Today's Q-signals (More or Less)
http://home.earthlink.net/~k7bfl/intqsig.html

From The Keyboard In The Wilderness.

And QFU is legitimate as below.

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> wrote in message
news:bl8ljv0su04k9dsthmlacl6v4u9c306tim@4ax.com...
> On 12 Aug 2003 23:40:10 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >Here's the definition anyway:
> >
> >QFU? - What is the magnetic direction (or number) of the runway to be
used?
> >
> >QFU - The magnetic direction (or number) of the runway to be used is ...
> >
> >I've never heard that on the ham bands, though.
>
> I've never heard it on the aeronautical bands, either, even though
> that's obviously the intended application of that particular Q-signal.
> That's a relic from days long forgotten. Today they get that info from
> ATIS before they even contact approach control.
>
> 73 DE John, KC2HMZ
> "Advise on initial contact you have information Lima."
>

1172. What troubles me (was Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 23:03:48 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <863cg5gnxn.fsf_-_@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 74537

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "John" == Radio Amateur <KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>> writes:

[...]

John> What troubles me is this: You claimed to be a "coded Tech" and
John> yet here you are griping about code testing. To me, this doesn't
John> add up. If you've already passed the code test, then as long as
John> you hold onto the CSCE and keep your license current, you no
John> longer have to worry about it. The next step for you is to pass
John> Element 3 and upgrade to General. Your tone suggests to me that
John> you haven't passed a code test. Now, if you had posted your
John> call like many (most) of us here do, I could have checked on QRZ
John> and removed any such suspicions. As things stand, I and the rest
John> of us here in rrap have to wonder, under the circumstances, if
John> you even have a license at all. No license is required for
John> posting here, but if you are indeed a ham - regardless of your
John> license class - then be proud of that fact ande have the
John> courtesy to let the rest of us know who we're talking to, that's
John> all.

What troubles *me* is this:

1. Posters here see inconsistency where it doesn't exist.

There is no reason for a 20wpm Extra or a 5wpm Extra to support
code testing just because they passed it. I am a 5wpm Extra, and
I feel that the treaty was the only reason to maintain the test.
I wanted the license bad enough to pass the test, so I passed.
That doesn't mean I think that everyone else should. Trying to
read whether or not someone has passed the code test by their tone
is foolish, and wrapping the entire newsgroup under your "have to
wonder" umbrella is just foolish, which leads me to...

2. Posters here look down on those who post without callsigns.

Your comment that hams should "be proud" of their license is
foolish, but not as foolish as your justification for callsign
posting expectations -- "have the courtesy to let the rest of us
know who we're talking to". This thing we're using is called
"Usenet". It's been around for a long time, and the primary
technical form of identification for posters is something called
an "email address". It is also traditional to include one's real
name or a pseudonym, often in something called a "signature" which
is appended to their posts. I am using Dr. Evil quotes to make a

point. If you haven't figured it out yet, here it is again from another direction. If I were calling CQ on 80 meters and using my email address, you'd be unimpressed. Someone out there could easily Google my email address to find out my name and other information and then search the FCC database to find my callsign and license class, but that's not an acceptable defense for not using the proper and traditional identification methods. My callsign shows up in approximately seven Usenet posts across three newsgroups, none of which include this group. When I speak here, I address myself as I wish to be addressed, which is by those forms of identifications, formal and traditional, that are appropriate to this media. The headers of my posts even include suggested attributions for replies to my posts. The lack of a callsign in my posts doesn't negate the value of what I type. It frankly isn't relevant to any posts -- my license class is relevant to some posts, but not many -- so I don't see any need to include that information.

These comments aren't solely directed at you. You just wrote a post that pushed two of my buttons. You should only take it personally if those two items are things you really personally believe.

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.2 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE/OsPbGPFSfAB/ezgRArY9AKCskgctJLmecnj+wg8uLHGcqF2H4QCg7oE7
oNqMdjKL8kXAsp59D/WO5Kc=
=Xk87
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

1173. Re: FYI: Q-signals -- Now, Then, and Way Back When (Was QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 23:05:04 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <4sgljvklln6opmhh62oniqhc630pf3ar82@4ax.com>
Source record: 74538

On Wed, 13 Aug 2003 15:52:51 -0700, "Keyboard In The Wilderness"
<KITW@forest.com> wrote:

>And QFU is legitimate as below.
>--

If I gave the impression that I meant to imply otherwise, I apologize
to N2EY. There are numerous Q-signals that were originally for
aeronautical use, back when CW was used for communications with
airplanes. I was just pointing out that they aren't used anymore.
Comms between aircraft and from air-to-ground are in AM mode. No need
for q-signals there, and as I say, the ATIS tells the flight crew
which runway is in use anyway.

7e DE John, KC2HMZ

1174. Re: What troubles me (was Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 23:17:56 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <u6hljv46js7fpnf6sp064qcp6bj7uhgsch@4ax.com>
Source record: 74539

On Wed, 13 Aug 2003 16:03:48 -0700, Jack Twilley
<jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote:

>1. Posters here see inconsistency where it doesn't exist.
>
> There is no reason for a 20wpm Extra or a 5wpm Extra to support
> code testing just because they passed it. I am a 5wpm Extra, and
> I feel that the treaty was the only reason to maintain the test.
> I wanted the license bad enough to pass the test, so I passed.
> That doesn't mean I think that everyone else should. Trying to
> read whether or not someone has passed the code test by their tone
> is foolish, and wrapping the entire newsgroup under your "have to
> wonder" umbrella is just foolish, which leads me to...

Well, Jack...I dunno how long you've been reading this NG, but I've
been here long enough to have noticed some patterns in other people's
posts. One of them is that trolls from rec.radio.cb who come here to
whine about code testing never post a callsign, frequently post
anonymously using a phony e-mail address, and post messages with a
tone that makes their agenda obvious to even the most casual of
observers. If you think that such reading between the lines is
foolish, you're entitled to your opinion. My opinion is that, rather
than foolish, I find it a useful tool for determining which posters
are interested in a serious discussion of an issue and which are
merely trolls that aren't worth wasting the time to reply to.

>2. Posters here look down on those who post without callsigns.
>
> Your comment that hams should "be proud" of their license is
> foolish, but not as foolish as your justification for callsign
> posting expectations -- "have the courtesy to let the rest of us
> know who we're talking to". This thing we're using is called
> "Usenet". It's been around for a long time, and the primary
> technical form of identification for posters is something called
> an "email address". It is also traditional to include one's real
> name or a pseudonym, often in something called a "signature" which
> is appended to their posts. I am using Dr. Evil quotes to make a
> point. If you haven't figured it out yet, here it is again from
> another direction. If I were calling CQ on 80 meters and using my
> email address, you'd be unimpressed. Someone out there could
> easily Google my email address to find out my name and other
> information and then search the FCC database to find my callsign
> and license class, but that's not an acceptable defense for not
> using the proper and traditional identification methods. My
> callsign shows up in approximately seven Usenet posts across three

> newsgroups, none of which include this group. When I speak here,
> I address myself as I wish to be addressed, which is by those
> forms of identifications, formal and traditional, that are
> appropriate to this media. The headers of my posts even include
> suggested attributions for replies to my posts. The lack of a
> callsign in my posts doesn't negate the value of what I type. It
> frankly isn't relevant to any posts -- my license class is
> relevant to some posts, but not many -- so I don't see any need to
> include that information.

In the case of morphoholic, the issue isn't what his license class is, but whether or not he even HAS one. He claimed to. Anyone can claim to have a license. That doesn't mean that he or she does actually have one. This is a ham radio related newsgroup. Hams know one another by our calls, not our e-mail addresses or x-trace info or other server junk that goes into the headers on a usenet message. Most of us here like to know who we're talking to...and, being hams, we do that by callsign. I think you'll find plenty of regulars here who will agree with that.

>These comments aren't solely directed at you. You just wrote a post
>that pushed two of my buttons. You should only take it personally if
>those two items are things you really personally believe.

No, I don't think I'm taking it personally; however, as I said, I think you'll find that many of the regulars here will agree that, this being a ham NG, there's a certain courtesy with posting your call to let others know who they are dealing with. If you choose not to do so, well, okay...you're not posting messages that border on trollism. If you were, I wouldn't be wasting my time with a reply. ;-)

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

1175. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 23:55:53 UTC
From: jim <3carroll@optonline.net>
Message-ID: <3F3AD041.5000908@optonline.net>
Source record: 74540
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> "No Code, No Ham" <No@e.mail> wrote:
>
>>wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in
>>news:20030802210406.21580.00000808@mb-m07.aol.com:
>>
>>
>>>Do Hams get 11 Meters Back, as soon as all the CBers upgrade to there
>>>Free Handout Ham Licenses?
>>>
>>
>>There has been a free ham license ever since the codeless tech was
>>introduced a few years back. The 5 wpm code requirement has further
>>moved things in that direction. Idiots on the ham bands.
>>
>>11 meters has come to the ham bands. I listen to the bands and it's
>>certainly not the way things were in the 1980's when I got licenced. I
>>might as well just listen to CB channel 19, it all sounds the same now.
>>
>
> -snippage-
> Take that cross posted stink bait outta' here, chump.
>
hey mopar did ya get to see the new audioslave video on mtv showing
challengers and coronets? brings back memories of the old mans '70
coronet 440 with a 383....first car i broke a 100 in....

1176. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-13 23:56:41 UTC
From: averyfine@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030813195641.21660.00001543@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74541

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21)

writes:

> Actually you yourself meet "childish and pathetic of efforts" and
> cannot stop trying to insult me in posts clearly not including you.

"The things that upset us most are often things we see as qualities in our ownselves." - Kim W5TIT

> The AOL screen name of "Avery Fineman" is still registered to me.
>
> I have, currently, six other screen names at AOL (including this one)
> but "Avery Fine" was NOT one of them.

Why do you need six screen names. Leonard Anderson?

Are you an anal-retentive control freak? ;-)

> Never.

Are you sure?
>
> Yes, I've used the screen name of "Avery Fineman" in here and also
> identified myself at the end of the post.

In some posts you identify yourself and in other posts you do not.
>
> Apparently some in here are terribly uptight and can see no humor in
> the pseudonym of "a very fine man" that lacks two spaces. :-)

Judging by your behavior here, Leonard Anderson, you are not "a very fine man" ;-) ;-) ;-)

> I used
> that pseudonym first about 1992 on a Bulletin Board System as
> Co-Sysop. "Len Over 21" came from the pseudonym used on the BBS
> US Pompeii a year later (run and sysoped by Stan and Zippy Manus in
> the Hollywood Hills). It is word play based on the BBS software...takes
> too long to explain to anal-retentive control freaks. :-)

I don't really think anyone gives a rat's behind, Leonard. I most certainly do not.

Why do you use pseudonyms at all?
>
> I can't "prove" who "Avery Fine" is...but both you and Reverend Jim
> are prolific posters from AOL. Coincidence? :-)

Yes. There are several prolific posters here with AOL accounts. You are easily the most prolific poster here.

And you have an AOL account. ;-)

And you say you have at least seven screen names. ;-) ;-)

Coincidence? I think not. ;-) ;-) ;-)

1177. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 00:00:32 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030813200032.325$yR@newsreader.com>
Source record: 74542
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

jim <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote:
> Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > "No Code, No Ham" <No@e.mail> wrote:
> >
> >>wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in
> >>news:20030802210406.21580.00000808@mb-m07.aol.com:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Do Hams get 11 Meters Back, as soon as all the CBers upgrade to there
> >>>Free Handout Ham Licenses?
> >>>
> >>
> >>There has been a free ham license ever since the codeless tech was
> >>introduced a few years back. The 5 wpm code requirement has further
> >>moved things in that direction. Idiots on the ham bands.
> >>
> >>11 meters has come to the ham bands. I listen to the bands and it's
> >>certainly not the way things were in the 1980's when I got licenced. I
> >>might as well just listen to CB channel 19, it all sounds the same now.
> >>
> >
> > -snippage-
> > Take that cross posted stink bait outta' here, chump.
> >
> hey mopar did ya get to see the new audioslave video on mtv showing
> challengers and coronets? brings back memories of the old mans '70
> coronet 440 with a 383....first car i broke a 100 in....
>
No I didn't Jim, I usually scan right past mtv. What is it a
music video from a band called audioslave?

--
GO# 40

1178. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 00:20:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030813202056.21428.00001654@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 74543

In article <bl8ljv0su04k9dsthmlacl6v4u9c306tim@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
<kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> writes:

>On 12 Aug 2003 23:40:10 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Here's the definition anyway:
>>
>>QFU? - What is the magnetic direction (or number) of the runway to be used?
>>
>>QFU - The magnetic direction (or number) of the runway to be used is ...
>>
>>I've never heard that on the ham bands, though.
>
>I've never heard it on the aeronautical bands, either, even though
>that's obviously the intended application of that particular Q-signal.

Of course.

Morse code was used in aviation from the earliest days until at least the
1950s.
Of course that's all gone now except for some range markers.

>That's a relic from days long forgotten.

Gone, but not forgotten. Some years back I read an article in "Air and Space"
by someone who had been a commercial aviation radio operator in the '50s and
who had used Morse in that job.

> Today they get that info from
>ATIS before they even contact approach control.

Of course.

Didja know that there used to be questions on the common Q signals on the
written tests?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1179. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 00:26:49 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhekv1jh1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74544
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Gary Cavie" <m0jjh@despammed.com> wrote in message
news:MPG.19a4cbd9f475edf98968e@news.freeserve.com...
> In article <bhednalbs1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>,
> w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com says...
> > If it wasn't for your old colony your country would be speaking German
and
> > eating raw fish. You ungrateful piece of crap.
> >
> > Go ahead and dream all you want. But don't forget you best keep the USA
on
> > at least talking terms, or England will be the third world country.
> >
> > I spent a lot of time in Europe in the 70s. Made a lot of English
friends.
> > Whats your problem? All your mates at the pub throw you out on your ear
for
> > your stupidity?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Don't take old Airy to heart - he suffers from delusions of adequacy, and
> makes up for it by being as obnoxious as possible. In his own little
> world, nothing happened on September 11th 2001, apart from someone making
> a valid disagreement with American policy. At least when he's on his PC,
> where everything is handmade, he's not roaming the streets causing real
> damage.

Point well taken.....I'll do my best to keep him occupied. Perhaps that
will keep him off the streets....

Dan/W4NTI

1180. Re: What troubles me (was Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 00:49:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F3ADCD0.6030501@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74545

Jack Twilley wrote:

> 2. Posters here look down on those who post without callsigns.

I think it's more like those who post here trying to hide their identity.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1181. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 00:51:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3ADB7C.2328AFB1@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74546

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <bhc43e$h1j@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >You're stretching now, Larry. Running out of wit, are you?
>
> Larrie can't "run out of" something he never had... :-)

"YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis."

--Leonard H. Anderson

Dave K8MN

1182. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 01:15:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030813211557.25815.00002192@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74547

In article <bhc43e$h1j@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:

>You're stretching now, Larry. Running out of wit, are you?

Kim:

I may be down a couple of percent, but you've only got half of yours!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1183. New Ham Term

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 01:22:11 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030813212211.06745.00001707@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 74548

All new Amateurs entering into Amateur Radio, will no longer be refered to as Hams. The new Name will be CBerHams.

1184. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 01:39:41 UTC
From: Jerry <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <7zB_a.7759$rh1.7484@fe04.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 74549
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ray Neville" <hoot@smiilexinc.org> wrote in message
news:bgpnbm$4i7$0@pita.alt.net...

> So despite all the facts to the contrary, you cling to this
> fairy tale belief there are still mythical "monitoring" stations?
> First of all you need to realize that as a no code tech, you
> really have no idea what is going on. Do you have a
> grip on reality? No, I did not think so. Now run along
> and go back to your CB friends, or better yet take all your
> ravings to 14313, like hams do. You are a very strange
> lad indeed!
>
> Ken
>
>

> So despite all the facts to the contrary, you cling to this
> fairy tale belief there are still mythical "monitoring" stations?
> First of all you need to realize that as a no code tech, you
> really have no idea what is going on. Do you have a
> grip on reality? No, I did not think so. Now run along
> and go back to your CB friends, or better yet take all your
> ravings to 14313, like hams do. You are a very strange
> lad indeed!
>
> Ken

Tell ya what, Mr. Ken, or whatever you call yourself, you deluded chicken
bander, go up on this "6980" KHZ or whatever frequency you choose and start
yelling "AUUUUDDIIIIOOOOOOOOOOOO", or "Worldwide, worldwide", whatever and
just see if there are no monitoring station(s). They ARE controlled
romotely from Laurel/Columbia, MD. You'll eventually get caught

Stupid.....

J

1185. Re: FCC Monitoring Station

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 01:51:22 UTC
From: Jerry <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <QJB_a.8053$_3.2358@fe02.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 74550
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Herb" <Herb@netjammerqrm.org> wrote in message
news:bgrkii$vr2$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Scott Unit 69" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc> wrote in message
> news:3F314712.C152739@yahoo.moc...
> > The monitoring station in Columbia is still there on the map.
> >
> > See ADC's Howard County, MD map, page 20, grid squares B1, C1,
> > B2, C2, D2 and C3 (upper left corner). Shown in gov't gray.
>
> That's an outdated map, over 15 years old. The monitoring
> stations were dismantled only seven years ago.
>
> Herb
>
>
>

Then if you are so sure FCC has no more "monitoring" stations, park in front
of the above referenced location and throw a 500 watt dead key. After all,
since
you know so much about the FCC, there is no danger of getting
caught--especially from that
location,.....

Right?

J

1186. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 01:58:53 UTC
From: Jerry <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <9WB_a.11911$xQ1.7429@fe05.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 74601
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.pirate,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Scott Unit 69" <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc> wrote in message
news:3F3147B5.72DC483B@yahoo.moc...
> > > Hey stupid ass, dial 202-418-1122 and ask if they have FCC monitoring
> > > facilities up and running and tuning for pirates. Right now.
>
> > It's the number of a liquor store.
>
> Try these links from Google that came up when I searched that number:
>
> http://www.fcc.gov/eb/sed/csle.html
> http://www.fcc.gov/eb/sed/rfse.html
>
> You must have misdialed.

If the guy has at least the IQ of 70, perhaps he can dial 717-338-2502.
THAT is Riley Hollingsworth's personal office number. I have talked to him a
number times at that number--as have many other hams! See if IT is a "fake"
number. I am sure he can point you in the right direction.

J

1187. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 02:04:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030813220449.25815.00002193@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74605

In article <20030812232811.06382.00000482@mb-m02.aol.com>, averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) writes:

>
>"Anyone who would forsake any communication venue
> just doesn't have a clue for the value of that venue..."
>- Kim W5TIT
>
>"The things that upset us most are often things we see
>as qualities in our ownselves." - Kim W5TIT
>
>The lady's wisdom bears repeating.

Uh Oh, I feel a bit queasy...RRRAAAWWWLLLFFFFFPH!!!!! Dang, forgot I had a meatball sub for lunch!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1188. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 02:04:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030813220450.25815.00002194@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74603

In article <j3ijjv89l35ahpj9mjsu9h79916n1mpt5m@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
<kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> writes:

>
>>Actually, the right compound in the right combination of water could provide
>>quite a good amount of friction...
>
>Don't look now (ahem!), but Larry's getting all red in the face.
>Better stop talking about moisture and friction before he explodes.

John:

Where Kim is concerned, no amount of moisture and friction could
possibly help anyone "explode."

73 de Larry, K3LT

1189. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 02:04:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030813220450.25815.00002195@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74604

In article <20030813181642.02197.00002138@mb-m12.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>
> Metaphors be with you, Larrie Skytalker.
>
> LHA

Thanks, Darth!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1190. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 02:04:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030813220451.25815.00002196@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74602

In article <3F3ADB7C.2328AFB1@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> >You're stretching now, Larry. Running out of wit, are you?
>>
>> Larrie can't "run out of" something he never had... :-)
>
>"YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
> make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
> That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis."
>
> --Leonard H. Anderson

Dave:

Lennie lives in a glass house, keeps a big pile of stones in the back
yard, and has a bad case of "pitcher's elbow" from tossing them!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1191. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 02:20:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030813222029.18497.00002061@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74606

In article <20030813181646.02197.00002142@mb-m12.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0308121219.382a9c33@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM >(N2EY) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message >>news:<20030811200142.15462.00002202@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>>
>>> Had the no-code-test Technician never been created, US ham
>>> radio would have been short by 200K ham licenses by the time of
>>> "Reconstruction."
>>
>>Prove it.
>>
>>Show proof that 200,000 people would not have gotten US amateur radio
>>licenses between February 14, 1991 and April 15, 2000 if the Technician
>>class license had never lost its code test.
>>
>>I don't think you have any proof. Or even any evidence. Just bluster.
>
> that was an OLD argument in here and you LOST it.

How did I "lose" it, Len? Show us some proof of your assertion.

>
> Getting all puffed up and antagonistic won't prove any case for
> you on the morse code test. It won't prove any case for your
> false interpretation of statistics that was on the AH0A website.

The only person I see getting puffed up and antagonistic is you, Len.

>
> You would not accept statistics of a noted PCTA taken from the
> FCC public database then and you refuse to accept it now.

What are you talking about?

In 1991, all Technicians were code tested.

In 2000, most Technicians were not code tested.

200,000 Technicians who were not code tested in 2000 is somewhere in the ball park. Nobody denies that in 2000 there were a lot of Technicians who had not passed code tests.

However, you claimed:

"Had the no-code-test Technician never been created, US ham radio would have been short by 200K ham licenses by the time of "Reconstruction.""

Reconstruction?

The only way we'd be "short" 200,000 is if none of the 200,000 got licenses. Did your crystal ball tell you that none of them would have learned the code?

> There's no point in rehashing an old argument where you LOST.

Ah, I see. You're using the Big Lie technique, where you simply claim to have "won" without presenting any proof or even any evidence.
>
> You won't make any valid "points" in here by repeating "you're
> mistaken" and continual refusal to accept FCC database
> information.

I'm not after "points". Just the facts. But you don't have any facts to back up your claims.

You can repeat the same mistakes over and over but they'll still be mistakes, Len.

N2EY

1192. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 02:20:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030813222030.18497.00002062@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74607

In article <bheddp$240$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>But you know Jim even if they did prepare, A LOT FAILED, it was really an
>exercise in who could overcome the nerves.

My sources tell me that the pass rate has been about 2/3 for years and years. I don't know how true that is. I do know that it's a good thing the exam sessions are more accessible than in those times.

I recall that one of the major complaints some hams had about incentive licensing was the travel expense and time. Something like 1/6 of the ham population back then were Conditionals. Something like 1/3 of the hams of the '60s had never been to an FCC office exam (Novice, Tech and Conditional were all by mail). None of the IL proposals included making the Advanced or Extra available by mail.

For my money, the *best* system was that of the late '70s and very early '80s. FCC examiners did all the testing and exam preparing, and there were office sessions. BUT, if a ham group could guarantee a certain number of folks wanting tests (I think the quororm/minyan was 10) then FCC would send out an examiner. Most big hamfests had the FCC "traveling road show" giving exams.

Reagan's budget cuts ended all that.
>
>I had to take a 90 mile train ride to and from to take my test. I was 13 at
>the time, and my mother came along. We spent the night at my aunt and
>uncles.

That's why I said I was lucky. At 13 it was a mile walk to K3NYT's house for the Novice, and at 14 a subway ride. Nobody went with me, but those were different times.

And since we were school kids, we were used to taking tests.
>
>Years later I realized it was the 'original incentive licensing'. He stern
>words were " You better pass this thing the first time, we ain't doing this
>again". I nicknamed her 'Old Sarge'...but never to her face.. hi. Sure do
>miss her.

I hear ya!

I recall that the Philly office gave exams on Monday thru Wednesday, and I think there were no code tests on Wednesday. There was no way a kid would be allowed to miss school for a ham exam back then. So all testing had to be done in the summer, or over Xmas break if the holiday didn't fall on the wrong day. With the 30 day retest rule and school getting out in mid-June, there were at

most three chances per summer or four chances per year - tops.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1193. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 03:36:26 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <ytD_a.12051$yl6.9689@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74608
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhedg0$626$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> "Steve Terry" <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote in message
> news:Hwi_a.10644$Kx1.151395@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net...
> > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030812173943.717$Fk@newsreader.com...
> > > "Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote:
> > > > Where the murderous Yank invaders are receiving
> > > > their just deserts - being dropped like flies by the
> > > > modern equivalent of the French Resistance.
> > > >
> > > The French fight with their face, I hope you ain't one of them.
> > >
> > Shame they haven't won a war in the last hundred years
> > Steve Terry
>
> You mean the French or the Germans?
> Dan/W4NTI
>
French of course, the Germans won the Namibian colonial war of 1904 ;-)

Steve Terry
```

1194. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 04:05:04 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhf1ua$dea@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74609

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030813211557.25815.00002192@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <bhc43e$h1j@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >You're stretching now, Larry. Running out of wit, are you?
>
> Kim:
>
> I may be down a couple of percent, but you've only got half of yours!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I only need half with you around...

Kim W5TIT

1195. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 04:13:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030814001308.01814.00000941@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 74610

In article <20030813222029.18497.00002061@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(Reverend Jim at the Taxi stand) writes:

>In article <20030813181646.02197.00002142@mb-m12.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <c2356669.0308121219.382a9c33@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>>(N2EY) writes:
>>
>>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>>news:<20030811200142.15462.00002202@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>>>
>>>> Had the no-code-test Technician never been created, US ham
>>>> radio would have been short by 200K ham licenses by the time of
>>>> "Reconstruction."
>>>
>>>Prove it.
>>>
>>>Show proof that 200,000 people would not have gotten US amateur radio
>>>licenses between February 14, 1991 and April 15, 2000 if the Technician
>>>class license had never lost its code test.
>>>
>>>I don't think you have any proof. Or even any evidence. Just bluster.
>>
>> that was an OLD argument in here and you LOST it.
>
>How did I "lose" it, Len? Show us some proof of your assertion.

You did. It's all in Google. You just flat-out REFUSED to consider
the FCC's own database information (as compiled by a PCTA) and
wanted to hide 9 years worth of New Licensees.

>> Getting all puffed up and antagonistic won't prove any case for
>> you on the morse code test. It won't prove any case for your
>> false interpretation of statistics that was on the AH0A website.
>
>The only person I see getting puffed up and antagonistic is you, Len.

Nah.

I'm just poking an old morseman who is blinded to the truth. :-)

>> You would not accept statistics of a noted PCTA taken from the
>> FCC public database then and you refuse to accept it now.
>
>What are you talking about?

Go back a few years in Google, extract several hundred posts on
the subject in there. You will see it. Anyone would if they wanted
to endlessly rehash past arguments.

>In 1991, all Technicians were code tested.
>
>In 2000, most Technicians were not code tested.
>
>200,000 Technicians who were not code tested in 2000 is somewhere in the ball
>park. Nobody denies that in 2000 there were a lot of Technicians who had not
>passed code tests.
>
>However, you claimed:
>
>"Had the no-code-test Technician never been created, US ham radio would have
>been short by 200K ham licenses by the time of "Reconstruction.""
>
>Reconstruction?

Carpet baggers and all. :-)

>The only way we'd be "short" 200,000 is if none of the 200,000 got licenses.
>Did your crystal ball tell you that none of them would have learned the code?
>
>> There's no point in rehashing an old argument where you LOST.
>
>Ah, I see. You're using the Big Lie technique, where you simply claim to have
>"won" without presenting any proof or even any evidence.

Did it all years ago. You refused to believe any of it then, still do.

You need your brain washed. It's too full of dits and dahs.

>> You won't make any valid "points" in here by repeating "you're
>> mistaken" and continual refusal to accept FCC database
>> information.
>
>I'm not after "points". Just the facts. But you don't have any facts to back
>up your claims.

I did, but trying to present FACTS back then was useless when you
refused to accept them. You still refuse to accept such facts. Not
worth the trouble to go back through the past over and over and over
again.

>You can repeat the same mistakes over and over but they'll still be mistakes,
>Len.

See? There you go once more. You won't accept any truth that is
against your viewpoint. You call all of such things "mistakes." :-)

"You have met the enemy and dey is you!"

LHA

1196. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 04:13:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030814001309.01814.00000942@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 74612

In article <20030813220451.25815.00002196@mb-m07.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Lennie lives in a glass house, keeps a big pile of stones in the back >yard, and has a bad case of "pitcher's elbow" from tossing them!

Not really. It's a nice wood-frame single-story, 3 bedroom, 2 bath, 2000 square foot house on a third of an acre. New roof and new exterior paint as of two months ago. Market worth about $375,000 right now...paid all of $30,500 for it 40 years ago. :-)

The soil in this neighborhood is decomposed granite so there are lots of rocks in it. Big ones, a few. You are correct in that assumption. They make nice decorations in the flower planters.

No need to "toss rocks" around...the PCTAs in here are too busy doing that, along with brickbats and usual demeaning filth...at others and themselves. :-)

It's always cheering to know that the Amateur's Code is alive and well and all the morsemen are respecting others. NOT.

LHA

1197. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 04:13:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030814001310.01814.00000943@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 74613

In article <3F3ADB7C.2328AFB1@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> In article <bhc43e$h1j@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
><fahgedit@nomail.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >You're stretching now, Larry. Running out of wit, are you?
>>
>> Larrie can't "run out of" something he never had... :-)
>
>"YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
> make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
> That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis."
>
> --Leonard H. Anderson

Yup. Herr Robust is once again proving I'm right. :-)

Not only that, Big Bad Dave is getting into the Obsession with
Personal Attacks on certain individuals with lots of intensity. :-)

He's giving pSycho pSteve lots of competition! :-)

LHA

1198. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 04:13:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030814001311.01814.00000944@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 74611

In article <20030813202056.21428.00001654@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(Reverend Jim at the Taxi stand) writes:

>In article <bl8ljv0su04k9dsthmlacl6v4u9c306tim@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
><kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> writes:
>
>>On 12 Aug 2003 23:40:10 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>>Here's the definition anyway:
>>>
>>>QFU? - What is the magnetic direction (or number) of the runway to be used?
>>>
>>>QFU - The magnetic direction (or number) of the runway to be used is ...
>>>
>>>I've never heard that on the ham bands, though.
>>
>>I've never heard it on the aeronautical bands, either, even though
>>that's obviously the intended application of that particular Q-signal.
>
>Of course.
>
>Morse code was used in aviation from the earliest days until at least the
1950s.
>Of course that's all gone now except for some range markers.

Please tell us all about when you flew those old "A-N" ranges. :-)

VORs have been in use on civil airways since before 1960. A lot more
accurate, easier to use, much less pilot error than the "range markers."

>>That's a relic from days long forgotten.
>
>Gone, but not forgotten. Some years back I read an article in "Air and Space"
>by someone who had been a commercial aviation radio operator in the '50s and
>who had used Morse in that job.

Oh, my, you love the past. :-)

I bought my first PC from a former TWA radio operator, John, who
managed ComSoft in Sun Valley, CA. He was selling computer
stuff because he'd been downsized from international flying long
before. Just a block from the intersection of San Fernando Road
and Vineland. John and his Dragon Lady retired years ago, a victim
of capitalism, unable to compete with CompUSA and Fry's Electronics.

Nice guy, told a lot of stories. Of flying, not about morsemanship.

>> Today they get that info from
>>ATIS before they even contact approach control.
>
>Of course.

You KNOW what "ATIS" is, right? :-)

>Didja know that there used to be questions on the common Q signals on the
>written tests?

Didja know you can address all your written test content complaints to
the VEC QPC? They are radio amateurs themselves.

I'm sure they would include a question on "QFU" if any ham is expected
to line up his ham aircraft on a runway bearing.

Beep, beep.

LHA

1199. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 04:48:17 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3B12D9.871DBF3D@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74614

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F3ADB7C.2328AFB1@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <bhc43e$h1j@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
> ><fahgedit@nomail.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >You're stretching now, Larry. Running out of wit, are you?
> >>
> >> Larrie can't "run out of" something he never had... :-)
> >>
> >"YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
> > make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
> > That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis."
> >
> > --Leonard H. Anderson
>
> Yup. Herr Robust is once again proving I'm right. :-)

You are perhaps the only person on the planet incapable of seeing the
irony of what you tell others when compared to what you actually do.
You lecture others on what they have no "authority" to do then proceed
to do those very same things.

> Not only that, Big Bad Dave is getting into the Obsession with
> Personal Attacks on certain individuals with lots of intensity. :-)

Tsk, tsk tsk. You're certainly an individual with lots of intensity.
Poor baby. :-) :-)

What's the deal with "Personal" "Obsession and "Attacks". Perhaps
You're Having Problems With Your Keyboard. :-) :-) Tsk, Tsk, Tsk.
Poor Baby.

> He's giving pSycho pSteve lots of competition! :-)

zI'm znot zcompeting zwith zSteve, zLen. Good luck with the keyboard
and your other problems.

Dave K8MN

1200. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 04:54:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3B1441.1AA0EB23@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74615

Len Over 21 wrote:

> Please tell us all about when you flew those old "A-N" ranges. :-)

Did they let you fly your model aircraft on some old airfields, Len? :-)

> VORs have been in use on civil airways since before 1960. A lot more
> accurate, easier to use, much less pilot error than the "range markers."
>

> Oh, my, you love the past. :-)

An interesting comment coming from one who frequently brings up THE past
as well as his own past. :-)

> Didja know you can address all your written test content complaints to
> the VEC QPC? They are radio amateurs themselves.
>
> I'm sure they would include a question on "QFU" if any ham is expected
> to line up his ham aircraft on a runway bearing.
>
> Beep, beep.

Why are you concerned? You're no more a radio amateur than you are a
pilot.

Dave K8MN

1201. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 05:48:58 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3B210D.9B7A354F@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74616

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F398885.A5E1CFFD@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> In article <3F382A57.A6B30B7F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> ><k8mn@earthlink.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> In article <w4VYa.162$dj3.18912@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >> >> >news:c2356669.0308080912.7e373969@posting.google.com...
> >> >> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> >> >> >news:<XsNYa.93$dj3.13294@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> >> >> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >> >> > news:20030807222823.21428.00001559@mb-m23.aol.com...
>
> >What I wrote was precisely relevant.
>
> Radio gods have the irritating habit of stating that only THEIR
> viewpoints are "relevant." :-)

Why, you've habitually dismissed the viewpoints of others with a brusque
"irrelevant" and have stubbornly clung to your own views. Does that
mean that you're a radio god? :-)

> >You wrote of someone's having not
> >been alive when something took place. I pointed out that you weren't
> >alive during some of the things which you've pontificated on in this
> >venue.
>
> Now, now, Kolonel...you're busy trying to divert attention to someone
> else by saying you are "relevant" and anyone disbelieving such a
> godlike statement is "irrelevant."

Not at all, Mr. Bluster. I wrote nothing about MY being relevant. You
chastised another for making a statement about something which took
place in the distant past. You make similar statements quite
frequently.

> You are worse than the other whiny PCTAs who want to "win" old
> arguments that they LOST in here.

Which old arguments were lost? Why are you attempting diversion just
after trying to paint another's comments as a diversion. Do you ever
practice what you preach? :-) :-)

> >> Try reading a BOOK on the REST of the world of radio instead of what
> >> if spoon-fed you by the little publisher in Newington.
> >
> > "YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
> > make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
> > That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis."
> >
> > --Leonard H. Anderson
>
> ...and you still don't have any of that authority, divine radio god.

But somehow--maybe you view it as manifest destiny--you have such
authority. You're pathetic.

> >What the hell are you prattling about?
>
> ...about a whiny radio god (yourself) getting all hot and bothered
> by negative criticsm and not being able to argue any subject without
> attempting misdirection into personalities.

You're all about misdirection and personalties, Len. Your bluster isn't
going to accomplish much.

> >Did you have a point?
>
> Yes. But, like Reverend Jim, you can't accept it even though everyone
> else (except fellow PCTAs) can see it for what it is. :-)

Everyone else? We haven't heard from everyone else. Are you claiming
chortle prescience?

> >You certainly wrote a large number of diversionary words to cover your
> >gaffe. There was no boom of Japanese ham gear in the 1960's. Is it
> >clear now?
>
> Again, you refuse to accept what was happening in the markets for
> amateur radio equipment.

I refuse to accept your claim because it is incorrect. You don't know
what you're talking about.

> The Japanese companies were already IN the ham radio marketplace
> in the USA then and they've occupied the prime position ever since.

There were a very few Japanese transmitters and receivers in the very
late 1960s. There was no boom of Japanese equipment in the 1960's. The
Japanese weren't even in the "prime position" in the mid-1970's.

> >Why no, Len, not as a school boy. I certainly have more governmental
> >communications experience during the cold war.
>
> Any more tales of wondrous radio pioneering from the International
> Cashew Nut exporting capital of the world? :-)

Why? Are you folks in the International Nut capital of the world in the
market for more? :-) :-)

> No doubt you were awarded an Intelligence Star for your James Bomb
> duties getting the goods on nearby commies in other countries. :-)

Then again, you wouldn't be in a position to know anything about it. :-)

> >It doesn't take a regulator to truthfully state that you weren't
> >involved and are not involved in amateur radio.
>
> You mean NOT LICENSED. That's ALL you can claim. :-)

I mean "not involved". You have nothing to do with amateur radio.

> Keep up with that "charge," big radio god. It seems about the only
> valid statement you can make.
>
> >Don't tell me what I am to amateur radio.
>
> No problem. You do that constantly about yourself. :-)

Actually I haven't done much of that here but I'd be entitled to do so.
I am, after all, a licensed radio amateur. I'm a part of amateur radio.
You, on the other hand... :-)

> >I'm a licensed ham and have been for decades.
>
> Which only proves that you've been able to renew that license
> periodically and within the legal time. :-)

I've passed four different written exams and morse exams at three
speeds. I took and passed all the exams they had, Len. You've not even
attempted the most basic, despite your "decades-long interest".

> You should also describe the stamping on your hide from the FDA.

You write some pretty peculiar things.

> >You, quite truthfully are not involved at all in amateur radio.
>
> Well then, HAM RADIO magazine made some dreadful errors in
> personnel, did it? :-)

How long has it been since there was such a magazine? Yes, I agree that
HAM RADIO magazine made at least one dreadful error in personnel.

> You ought to bring up outright charges of fraud and misrepresentation.
> Psycho pSteve does that periodically. Of course, he can't understand
> any of the article's technical things so he just says they are "forgeries."

I don't know about fraud but you've certainly been guilty of
misrepresentation here on a number of occasions.

> >You aren't a judge of what hams do or have done.
>
> Real hams sometimes contain unsafe amounts of Escherichia coli
> O157:H7. Be careful of infecting others when spouting off in here.

Nice dodge.

> >You are not a regulator.
>
> Neither are YOU, big radio god.

I have no need to be. I'm quite happy to be active as a licensed radio
amateur. I'm one-for-two. You're oh-for-two.

> >> Now tell us, great big four-decade experienced AMATEUR radio god,
> >> what have YOU ever done to "advance amateur radio?!?"
> >
> >No, I don't believe I will, Len.
>
> I don't believe you CAN. :-)

I'm sure it'd be something like your line about Steve: You wouldn't be
capable of understanding. :-)

> >> Show us your patents, your marvelous discoveries, all your >
> >important technical contributions.
> >
> >Still have your patent fetish?
>
> Never had any "fetish." But, I DO have a patent in radio.

It sure seems like a fetish. I can Google up a number of occasions
where you bring up the existence of your patent while asking others, "Do
YOU have a patent"?

> >> You've had FORTY YEARS of amateurism
> >> and all you can come up with is trying to put down folks in an amateur
> >> newsgroup?!?
> >
> >Folks? Well, there's you.
>
> You don't hesitate one bit to put down ANYONE who doesn't worship
> your statements or ideals. That's clearly evident in this newsgroup
> and available on Google.

I don't require worship, nor do my ideals. That's another
misrepresentation on your part. That is clearly evident without a trip
to Google.

> >Then again, you aren't a ham. You're just a groupie.
>
> "Ham is the butchered meat of swine."

Then you're in the wrong newsgroup.

> I'm just advocating the elimination of the morse code test for ANY
> US radio license examination.

You've never "just" advocated. You've always done the things of which you frequently accuse others. You want a minimum age requirement for entry into amateur radio. When others have argued that no age limit is needed, you've come close to apoplexy and the capital letters fly as you've typed "CHILDREN" As to the elimination of morse testing: What's it to you?

> >You've got it wrong, Len. I have a license and have had it for decades.
>
> You get a nice gold star for renewing your license periodically.
>
> Other than that, what can you claim?

I can and do claim that 1) you don't hold such a license 2) you aren't a part of amateur radio 3) that your credibility here on the code test issue is almost non-existent.

> >I make contacts via amateur radio daily.
>
> I make contacts with switches and relays. Break those contacts, too.

I'll bet you could break anything.

> Daily. :-)
>
> >I'm a participant in amateur radio.
>
> Well, that proves the radio god's "validity." One can't get IN amateur
> radio without ALREADY being IN amateur radio. Know the morse code.
> Worship morse code. It is the key to GREATNESS!

One can get in quite easily. You haven't taken the first step toward obtaining an amateur radio license of any class. You can't blame others for your own inertia.

> >I don't issue catcalls from the sidelines.
>
> You have a "license" to catcall from inside the lines?

I'm in the game, not on the sidelines. I'll be happy to dish out all the catcalls you can handle.

> Of course you do. "Authority" from the US government!

Not from the sidelines. If you'd develop a more positive outlook, you could be one of our cheerleaders.

> Your license grant "authorizes" you to be a horse's ass to anyone not
> in league with your godlike opinions, statements, and general personal
> insults.

Which simply makes you an unlicensed horse's ass.

> No problem. Everyone sees that.

Everyone? You have an ARRL study guide in your pocket?

> >> Get a better life.
> >
> >I'm quite happy with this one, Len. Yours seems to be a little lacking
> >in light of your ham radio envy.
>
> What "envy?"

You know. Your envy.

> I'm just advocating the elimination of the morse code test for radio
> license examinations.

Naw. You know in your heart of hearts that it just isn't so.

> You seem to think that anyone doing that is committing some kind of
> heresy or blasphemy.

Not at all. I don't think you know the first thing about it.

> You seem to think that ALL in this newsgroup MUST have a valid
> amateur radio license to participate. You don't have any validity in
> that demand so all you do is attempt individual personal insults.

I don't think that at all. You've commented here for years. You've
dropped road apples of insults on numerous individuals who don't happen
to agree with you. Then you get sore when the insults come your way.
You tell others about how tough newsgroups can be but you, the little
old pirhana, can't take it.

> You are still under the misconception that a valid amateur radio license
> is required to participate in here.

You are still under the misconception about what I believe.

> This newsgroup isn't "ham radio." It is supposed to be about talking
> policy matters for that. In the United States all us citizens have the
> absolute RIGHT to free speech under our Constitution. You won't
> accept that, thus you are acting unconstitutionally.

More road apples. I'd give you some oats but you're the wrong end.
The constitution does not require my silence or force any deference
toward your views. It does not prohibit my laughing at you or my
sarcasm directed toward you. You may unwrap the flag and stand down
from your soapbox.

> Radio gods are like that. Mere earthly laws don't apply to them.

You can't even make up your mind if I'm a god or not.

Dave K8MN

1202. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 05:53:09 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3B2209.8DC58CF5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74617

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F3980D8.E1FDBCF3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >What's it to you? You have nothing to do with amateur radio.
>
> Still trying the old misdirection & personal insult type thing. :-)

Are you insulted by a truthful statement? Do you find the fact that you
have no amateur radio license to be insulting? What does morse code
testing or an age limit in amateur radio licensing have to do with you?

> >Have you
> >made up your mind yet. Some time back you stated that I wasn't a radio
> >god then I was a radio god then I wasn't a radio god. Have you made up
> >your mind yet?
>
> You PRETEND to have great expertise (on the order of godlike
> judgement and capability).

I do have some expertise in amateur radio and I have decades of
experience. That something grates on you doesn't make it a pretense.

> It would seem that your PRETENSE has made you very tense
> (and angry) when someone shows your pretense for what it is. :-)

I'm not angry, Leonard. I'm actually smiling as I write these words:
You haven't shown anything to anyone when it comes to amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

1203. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 09:44:52 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308140144.174576e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74618

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030813222030.18497.00002062@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <bheddp$240$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>

Us kids who lived virtually within sight of the Custom House had it made in comparison to the older folk who had 8/5 jobs, we had what . . three month long summer vacations? The big annual kid crunch at the FCC office came around Labor Day when kids got home from the shore just before school started. Very tight window of opportunity. There was another window of opportunity around Thanksgiving weekend which is when I took both of my early tests. I guess the Test Room had different operating hours then. Or maybe I just sed to hell with school those two mornings and done the do.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1204. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 09:46:04 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f3b5bb7$2_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74619
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Grow up, OM

Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhednalbs1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> If it wasn't for your old colony your country would be speaking German and
> eating raw fish. You ungrateful piece of crap.

1205. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 09:47:26 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f3b5bb8_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74620
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Any human who sets out on a journey round the world with
the specific intention of killing his fellow man deserves all
he gets. Especially the Yanks in Iraq today.

Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhedrk$ka5$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> Yeah? You mean the ones that cut your redcoats to pieces and kicked
> Cornwalles out of here on his ear?

1206. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 14:04:53 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308140604.18861367@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74621

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bheddp$240$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message

> > The end result, though, was that most hams went to the exams extremely
> > overprepared. Wasn't worth taking a chance on failing.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >
> But you know Jim even if they did prepare, A LOT FAILED, it was really an
> exercise in who could overcome the nerves.

Absolute fact!

> I had to take a 90 mile train ride to and from to take my test. I was 13 at
> the time, and my mother came along. We spent the night at my aunt and
> uncles.
>
> Years later I realized it was the 'original incentive licensing'. He stern
> words were " You better pass this thing the first time, we ain't doing this
> again". I nicknamed her 'Old Sarge'...but never to her face.. hi. Sure do
> miss her.

Hee! I was brought up in the same area where Jim lived, the FCC office
was only a trolley & an elevated ride away so neither of us had to
walk ten miles uphill both ways in blizzards to take the exams.

My Mom was brought up under well-heeled circumstances and had an older
brother whom she often referred to as a "ham radio operator". I never
met him because he passed away young around 1922 long before I was
born. He had a whole room full of radio gear and had, as she explained
it, the "first radio tubes in town". I suspected for a long time that
he was an SWL type, not a ham.

Time marched on and it got to be time for me to take my Novice exam, I
was 15-16 and roamed the rails at will by then. I told Mom I was going
downtown to take the gummint test to become a ham radio operator.
"That's nice dear, I don't remember Joseph taking a test though. Be
home for dinner" and that was the end of my folk's involvement to that
point. Until I actually got on the air and tore up every TV set on the
block. Then it became "Joseph didn't do that, turn that thing off!"
Oops. Thus it was that I became the "80M Midnite Stalker", I only got
on the air after midnite when the TV stations were broadcasting test
patterns and/or shut down.

We have a nickname for our Mom too. She has four sets of X-Ray eyes, can hear whispers six blocks away and has radar the Navy would kill for. We got away with *NOTHING*. The best way to get any of her ten grandchildren back in line was to threaten to call Spooky Old Alice and have her swoop in on her broom and deal with them. OhYeah it worked! So for decades now she's been known universally as The Spook, or just "Spook" or "Spooky". Her e-mail address was spook@dvol.com. She'll be 90 in a couple weeks. She spends a lot of time in what we call "Alice's World" these days but she's still kickin'.

> Dan/W4NTI

w3rv

1207. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 14:27:02 UTC
From: steve H <steve@cpstelecomspam.co.uk>
Message-ID: <bhg67l$i8h$1@titan.btinternet.com>
Source record: 74622
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Your tact and diplomacy has got you where you are today mr bean. broke old and lonely.
"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f3a6d19_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> From this side of the pond you are all Yankees.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.509 / Virus Database: 306 - Release Date: 12/08/03

1208. Question 'off' subject, ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 16:11:15 UTC
From: kc5cqa@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <3f3cb359.3487558@news.devtex.net>
Source record: 74623

I know this is off the subject, but feel I will get a 'good answer'
here. I am wondering if it is possible (is there a program like this)
to send emails to cell phones from my computer 'on' the net????
My son in law has a business cell phone, (Seattle) and there are times
when I would like to ''''just send a question'''', NOT use up his
business 'time', I hope I am making sense. Thanks in advance. cl.
73

1209. Re: Question 'off' subject, ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 16:15:05 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <2-WcnfmewsAPKKaiXTWJkQ@crocker.com>
Source record: 74624

you will have to check with him to see if his service supports that option
and how to do it.

"kc5cqa" <kc5cqa@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:3f3cb359.3487558@news.devtex.net...
> I know this is off the subject, but feel I will get a 'good answer'
> here. I am wondering if it is possible (is there a program like this)
> to send emails to cell phones from my computer 'on' the net????
> My son in law has a business cell phone, (Seattle) and there are times
> when I would like to ''''just send a question'''', NOT use up his
> business 'time', I hope I am making sense. Thanks in advance. cl.
> 73

1210. Re: What troubles me (was Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 16:29:31 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030814122931.710$2a@newsreader.com>
Source record: 74625

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> wrote:
>> In the case of morphoholic, the issue isn't what his license class is,
> but whether or not he even HAS one. He claimed to. Anyone can claim to
> have a license.
>
Please show me one post where I claimed anything of the sort. Stop
making shit up to fit your agenda, or STFU.

--
GO# 40

1211. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 16:33:18 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308140833.131a602b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74626

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030813222030.18497.00002062@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <bheddp$240$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >But you know Jim even if they did prepare, A LOT FAILED, it was really an
> >exercise in who could overcome the nerves.
>
> My sources tell me that the pass rate has been about 2/3 for years and years. I
> don't know how true that is. I do know that it's a good thing the exam sessions
> are more accessible than in those times.

There was another side to that coin, "access abuse". We had a nitwit
who took the Novice test at least four times. Each time he took the
test his score went up a bit. He figgered that if he took it often
enough he'd eventually pass. Which he did.

> For my money, the *best* system was that of the late '70s and very early '80s.
> FCC examiners did all the testing and exam preparing, and there were office
> sessions. BUT, if a ham group could guarantee a certain number of folks wanting
> tests (I think the quororm/minyan was 10) then FCC would send out an examiner.
> Most big hamfests had the FCC "traveling road show" giving exams.
>
> Reagan's budget cuts ended all that.

Din do any good. There's a piece in one of his autobiographies about
the day he got a report on how, after all his attempts to reduce the
gummint head count, the head count was up 10% from the previous year.
Whereupon he went off on what has been described as probably the most
"colorful" half hour rant to ever originate in the Oval Office.
Followed by an admotion to his successors in that office to not expect
to have any control of the gummint, "It has a #$@!xF# life of it's
own!"

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1212. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 17:07:07 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308140907.15375f60@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74627

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308140144.174576e6@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030813222030.18497.00002062@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> > In article <bheddp$240$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> Us kids who lived virtually within sight of the Custom House had it
> made in comparison to the older folk who had 8/5 jobs, we had what . .
> three month long summer vacations?

Heck yes, said that in me post. Coupla tokens and good walking shoes
was all ya needed.

> The big annual kid crunch at the
> FCC office came around Labor Day when kids got home from the shore
> just before school started.

Those of us who did not spend summers at the shore had even more
opportunities. Of course there was the 30 day retest wait....

> Very tight window of opportunity. There
> was another window of opportunity around Thanksgiving weekend which is
> when I took both of my early tests. I guess the Test Room had
> different operating hours then. Or maybe I just sed to hell with
> school those two mornings and done the do.

It was prolly kids like you and King George who caused FCC to change
the rules in '54 so that all Novices and Techs were done by mail,
regardless of distance.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1213. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 17:38:10 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308140938.e2260e1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74628

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F3A5AAC.8080401@psu.edu>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <3F32C3E8.7050809@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> > writes:

> >>N2EY wrote:

> >>>In article <qK_Wa.2427$lL.391902@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

> >>>>What WILL be the end of ham radio is a lack of significant
> >>>>growth ...

> >>>Let's get it straight - is dropping Element 1 going to give us lots more
> >>>growth or not?

> >> I don't understand a few of the things Carl says here. That we will
> >>dissapear unless we get "significant growth".

> > There are more US hams today than at any time in the past.

> >> What exactly is that? a 100 percent increase in a day? increase at 1
> >>percent over population increase?

> > That's what I've been asking.

> >> I'd like to know the advances they will bring.

> > Similar to what newcomers have always brought.

> >> I want to hear how those who oppose the ending of the Morse code
> >>requirement are keeping ham radio from marching forward.

> >> Time for the roadmap to the future to be laid out.

> > Don't hold yer breath waiting;-)

> >> Or is this like the last scene in "The Candidate"?

> > Refresh my memory on that one, Mike.

> The Candidate is a pretty good film about an idealistic fellow, (Robert
> Redford) the son of a former Governor, who gets caught up in running for
> office after being prodded by the local political machinery. Along the
> way, he compromises most all of his values (all that is not relevant to
> the case at hand. But in the end, after being elected to office, amongst
> the victory celebration, he looks to his campaign manager (Peter Boyle -
> Haw) completely confused, and asks "What do we do now?" He was
> completely lost and didn't know what to do.

Sounds pretty familiar.....
>
> My point is that I see a close relationship between that ending and the
> situation we have here. No real thought has been given to the aftermath
> of the ending of the Morse code test.

Some of us have given it real thought, and have posted ideas. But the
mantra has always been that eliminating the code test would solve
everything.
>
> Back to now...
>
> After such a change, lots of different ideas come out of the woodwork
> to replace the vacuum left by the probable disappearance of the Morse
> code test. Some ideas are good, some make me shudder.

Such as?

> But the fact is that since if the test disappears and nothing else
> happens, it very well does mean that it is a reduction in knowledge
> required to get a ticket. All arguments on what constitutes "knowledge"
> in these regards is kind of like defining "is". You have to learn less,
> no possible dispute without looking pretty silly.

Sure. But that's been going on for decades now. Some folks would even
say it is justified because a ham doesn't have to know as much today
to get on the air and avoid breaking the rules.

For example: How many hams do you know who use barefoot rigs that
require tuneup in order to operate properly? (Not the ATU - the rig
itself). Besides me, that is.

How many do you know who regularly use 100% homebrew stations?

Etc.
>
> All this means that those who believe that requirements for a ticket
> should be lowered have the upper hand.

Been that way for decades.
>
> Those who do not believe that, that is to say that a Morse code test is
> a desirable thing, or those who want the writtens to be reflective of a
> fair degree of competence, have an uphill battle, and at the moment are
> regarded as the losers.

Not by everyone.

Looking back on the history, however, shows that license requirements
are only one factor - and probably not as major a factor as some would
have us believe. What really matters is the interest and drive of the
person involved. Some people will learn just enough to pass the test
and then shut down, forgetting most of what they "learned" in a short
time. Others will go far beyond the test levels. It's all a choice.

"Radio" and "electronics" are such wide-ranging subjects that nobody
can be an expert at all of it. Or even most of it. The repeater expert
may be in the dark about wire antennas. The digital folks may be
helpless with power supplies. And even the most knowledgeable "radio
professionals" can be utterly clueless about the practical aspects of
amateur radio.
>
> I am very disappointed that the winners in this one do not seem to have
> any plan at all.

Actually, some of them do. For instance, here are some gems from Fred
Maia, W5YI:

- Outlaw all forms of amateur bulletins and one way information
transmissions, INCLUDING CODE PRACTICE, below 30 MHz (1995 petition to
the FCC)

- Reduce the entry level license to a 20 question written and include
voice privileges on the bands above 20 meters

Here are some others I've seen, by various others:

- Institute an age requirement of 14 years as the minimum for any
class of amateur license

- Eliminate all subbands-by-mode

- Reduce the number of license classes to one all-privs license.

- Reduce the number of license classes to two - entry and all-privs.

You get the idea.

> All we hear are their personal thought on how *they*
> don't support some of what is being proposed. That's nice, but Doggonit,
> That doesn't cut it! They have to be darn active in seeing that things
> don't fall apart around us. The ball is in their court now, and it seems
> they don't know what to do with it. I don't really care what they
> personally think, I want to see what they are going to do. And so far.......

What you're seeing is what I call the "Zen method of design", where
they will never tell you what they want, only what they don't want.
>
> >> Gloat time is over. Your time has come. You now have the chance to
> >>prove that you were right. And browbeating the losers isn't a very good
> >>start.

> > Maybe we'll see a lot of newcomers and technoadvances after the code test goes.
> > And maybe we won't. Personally, I don't think we'll see either.
>
> Probably not. Those who do advance the art are a small core of
> technical adroit's, who come up with techniques that must not only
> advance the art, but must be adapted by enough people to make them
> viable. After all, it isn't much fun to have the newest cool method of
> communication if there is only a couple people to communicate with.

BINGO!

Which means that the advance must be publicized, affordable, and offer hams something they want.

Example: Cecil, W5DXP, used to rave about PACTOR-2. I started to look into it, and discovered that (at the time) implementing it required not just a shack computer but a $600 dedicated PACTOR 2 box. Which explains why so few hams use the mode, compared to, say, PSK-31.

> > If that happens, what will be blamed for the ARS' perceived problems??

> The PCTA's, because of their being so negative, and scaring the new
> people away?

"Negative"? We're not "negative" - we're FOR something!

> I'd bet a cup of coffee on that one. It is a pity when you
> lose someone to blame, eh?

'zactly. But you'll never sell that one.

Meanwhile, the real challenges don't get the spotlight. Like CC&Rs - what good are licenses if we cannot put up effective antennas?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1214. Re: Question 'off' subject, ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 19:00:51 UTC
From: Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc>
Message-ID: <3F3BDC63.3EA4DAE9@yahoo.moc>
Source record: 74629

> I know this is off the subject, but feel I will get a 'good answer'
> here. I am wondering if it is possible (is there a program like this)
> to send emails to cell phones from my computer 'on' the net????
> My son in law has a business cell phone, (Seattle) and there are times
> when I would like to ''''just send a question'''', NOT use up his
> business 'time', I hope I am making sense. Thanks in advance. cl.

It's called SMS, short messaging system. Cingular charges me $.10
for each message sent or received. You can send them from your phone,
or from the provider's website.

1215. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 19:20:32 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F3BE101.5000802@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 74630

>
>
>>
>>
>
>Those of us who did not spend summers at the shore had even more
>opportunities. Of course there was the 30 day retest wait....
>
>
Did anyone ever get caught showing up say a week early for retest?
Today you'd
have computers that could spot it, but back in the old days did they
bother to check?

1216. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 20:49:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhgsjk$mt6$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74631
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:jckljvstfo7pqgqb75h308u7tu5lo4a651@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 13 Aug 2003 17:23:15 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >If it wasn't for your old colony your country would be speaking German
and
> >eating raw fish. You ungrateful piece of crap.
> >
> >Go ahead and dream all you want. But don't forget you best keep the USA
on
> >at least talking terms, or England will be the third world country.
>
> You will meet your match when the Chinese start playing up. It's only
> a matter of time.
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

Your right...the Chinese are the real threat in this world, at this time.
But how do you think the USA is going to demise? And you think it will NOT
effect England? You sir are a world class fool.

Oh and BTW. The USA may indeed 'meet its match'....but keep this under your
high hat mate......we have over 9000 nukes looking for a target. And since
we are the ONLY country to use them against a civilian population, we will
damn sure do it again. In otherwords, sir, we will draw enough blood to
make our enemies hurt beyond words.

Oh and let the ragheads keep up their crap and we will turn the entire
middle east into glass.

Dan/W4NTI

1217. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 20:52:12 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhgsoi$9nq$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74632
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Gee Airy......isn't that EXACTLY what the British did in the 17th and 18th century??? How did it go...."The sun never sets on the British empire" ?????.

Go get your red coat and stand tall. Its all you have left me boy.

Dan/W4NTI

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message news:3f3b5bb8_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> Any human who sets out on a journey round the world with
> the specific intention of killing his fellow man deserves all
> he gets. Especially the Yanks in Iraq today.
>
> Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bhedrk$ka5$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Yeah? You mean the ones that cut your redcoats to pieces and kicked
> > Cornwalles out of here on his ear?
>
>
>

1218. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-14 22:17:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308141417.dceda51@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74633

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308140907.15375f60@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308140144.174576e6@posting.google.com>...

>
> > Very tight window of opportunity. There
> > was another window of opportunity around Thanksgiving weekend which is
> > when I took both of my early tests. I guess the Test Room had
> > different operating hours then. Or maybe I just sed to hell with
> > school those two mornings and done the do.
>
> It was prolly kids like you and King George who caused FCC to change
> the rules in '54 so that all Novices and Techs were done by mail,
> regardless of distance.....

I woudn't bet on that, more than likely that move was made to (a) make
life easier for folks like Dan and his Mom and (b) keep us beginners
from cluttering up the FCC office on test days.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

1219. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 00:25:03 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0308141625.53e806b5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74634
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:<3f3b5bb8_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>...
> Any human who sets out on a journey round the world with
> the specific intention of killing his fellow man deserves all
> he gets. Especially the Yanks in Iraq today.

Thanks, we are doing splendidly...

If there was ever a "fellow man" that required being killed, it is Saddam... If you folks would have done the same with 'ol Hitler, it would have saved a lot of problems before they got out of control. We aren't about to make the same mistake again... Saddam will end up like Mussolini - but BEFORE he has a chance to cause too much trouble for us.

BTW - if you don't like it - TOUGH SHIT.

Go Yankees.

- Stewart

1220. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 00:59:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhhb8j$1ch$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74635
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

<lucifer@eternal-flames.gov> wrote in message
news:hbvnjvsmnngb42f5bn5r09prennol7bo00@4ax.com...
> On Thu, 14 Aug 2003 15:49:34 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> pausing to cast envious glances at those
> who had mastered the skill of reading without moving their lips,
> wrote:
>
> >Oh and let the ragheads keep up their crap and we will turn the entire
> >middle east into glass.
>
> I'd vote for that.
>
> I recall reading somewhere recently, that there was overproduction
> worldwide of cement, why not just mix it with the sand in the average
> towel-head's country and then add water? We could do with a decent
> car-park.
>
> Old Nick.
>
>

Yeah, I like that, similar results with no radiation. Hmmmmmm.

Dan/W4NTI

1221. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 01:21:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308141721.4308c591@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74636

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F37AFDE.6D3406E4@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F301FE3.951681BE@earthlink.net>...

> > > Please quote that "may share space" FCC document.
> >
> > Please quote the "Farnsworth Exam at 13-15wpm is the same as the Morse
> > Exam at 5wpm" FCC document.
>
> That's totally irrelevant to the discussion at hand.

Why? Farnsworth exists as the de facto "code" exam, even though the
FCC documents specify Morse Code. Yet the FCC documents DO assign the
exact same priveleges to Carl that they do you, yet you insist on
arguing it.

That would make you a fool.

> > > He's allocated the same frequencies. He may or may not share the same
> > > space.
> >
> > Which is it?
>
> > May or May Not?
>
> That's correct.

So you don't know.

1222. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 01:36:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308141736.319a6a5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74637

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bhc9ps$jc0$0@208.206.142.86>...
> No CW Test wrote:
>
> > >Subject: Re: NCVEC Position on Code
> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >Date: 8/9/03 6:40 AM Eastern Daylight Time
> > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0308090240.7b896978@posting.google.com>
> > >
> > >nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
> > >news:<20030808175644.19707.00000166@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > >
> > >> For the record, I have not
> > >> used PSK-31 myself on
> > >> the amateur bands.
> > >>
> > >> So I will not lecture others
> > >> on how well it does or
> > >> does not work.
> > >
> > >Yet Dick is free to lecture others, i.e., "any idiot can get psk going
> > >in under 30 minutes," but by his own words here he couldn't.
> >
> > He did get it going,
> > did he not?
> >
> > >That is the point.
> >
> > Only to you.
>
> Liar Burke still hasn't posted a quote showing that I said that, and he never will,
> for it isn't true. Not even close, no part of it. What I said is "can learn to use PSK31
> in 30 minutes". That is certainly true.

DICK, there are weeks and weeks of your own postings documenting your
problems with PSK.

Don't call me a liar and don't blame me for your own shortcomings.
After all, amateur radio isn't for everyone.

1223. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 01:40:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308141740.3bce1274@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74638

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bhc9ps$jc0$0@208.206.142.86>...
> No CW Test wrote:
>
> > >Subject: Re: NCVEC Position on Code
> > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > >Date: 8/9/03 6:40 AM Eastern Daylight Time
> > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0308090240.7b896978@posting.google.com>
> > >
> > >nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
> > >news:<20030808175644.19707.00000166@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > >
> > >> For the record, I have not
> > >> used PSK-31 myself on
> > >> the amateur bands.
> > >>
> > >> So I will not lecture others
> > >> on how well it does or
> > >> does not work.
> > >
> > >Yet Dick is free to lecture others, i.e., "any idiot can get psk going
> > >in under 30 minutes," but by his own words here he couldn't.
> >
> > He did get it going,
> > did he not?
> >
> > >That is the point.
> >
> > Only to you.
>
> Liar Burke still hasn't posted a quote showing that I said that, and he never will,
> for it isn't true. Not even close, no part of it. What I said is "can learn to use PSK31
> in 30 minutes". That is certainly true.

DICK, there are weeks and weeks of your own postings documenting your
problems with PSK, and you certainly didn't learn it in less than 30
minutes. Sorry, but continued denial only makes you the liar.

Don't blame me for your inabilities and/or lack of hard work. After
all, I'm told that amateur radio isn't for everyone.

1224. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 01:43:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308141743.ffdbf7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74639

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F37A616.57C51762@earthlink.net>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F2E6711.7F1E4CE5@earthlink.net...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > > > Wait a minute ... don't tar all of us Extras with the same brush that
> > > > Dick, Larry, et al deserve ...
> > >
> > > "Us Extras"? Whooo, that's rich, Carl!
> >
> > Yes, Dave, "Us Extras" ... much as it may eat at you, I'm an Extra, too.
>
> Sure you are, Carl--now.

David, are you living in the past?

> > (FCC said so ... and it's up to them, not you ... :-P
>
> That's right. After all, "us" Extras have to stick together. Right?

I hope not. I would expect some of them to be "forward" thinkers.

1225. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 01:48:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030814214844.01893.00000006@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 74640

In article <bhf1ua$dea@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> >You're stretching now, Larry. Running out of wit, are you?
>>
>> Kim:
>>
>> I may be down a couple of percent, but you've only got half of yours!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>I only need half with you around...
>
>Kim W5TIT

There you go, folks! Kim just admitted that she's a half-wit! Too bad
the wit she has is also very dim!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1226. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 02:18:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308141818.78e2a7af@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74641

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F395779.63FCCE51@earthlink.net>...
>
> I was "intimately" involved with HF communications across the Pacific in
> the 1960's at hours of my own choosing. My station also worked across
> the Atlantic and across the Indian Ocean. It did so with less power
> than yours and I was still a teenager.

Was this an amateur station? Was it capable of only working over
oceans, or could it work over land masses as well?

> I was "intimately" involved with HF military communications, working
> transatlantic and transpacific paths using a variety of log periodic,
> inverted discone and rhombic antennas and either 10 kw or 45 kw
> transmitters from 1968-1970. The station was in operation 24/7 but I
> generally pulled eight hour shifts...

Of your own choosing, right?

Were you an "Air Force of One?"

> I was "intimately" involved with in-country HF military operations for a
> year in Vietnam.
>
> I spent fifteen "intimate" years overseas with the U.S. Department of
> State where I was responsible for all HF and VHF communications whether
> by voice, asynchronous data or morse.

So this wasn't amateur radio either?

> I've spent forty years as an active radio amateur, operating various
> modes on bands from 1.8 through 432 MHz.

Why did you stop at 432 MHz? Even most store bought amateur UHF rigs
are capable of going up to 450 Mhz.

Oh, uhhh. Forgot. Superior Heil "doan do FM (tm Kelly)"

> > I can go on and on without ever
> > touching the recorded and evidencible facts of having spent three
> > years being actively involved with the latter. That grates on you.
>
> Three years? Three measly years? It grates on me that you'd dare
> compare your three years to my experience and pretend to have a lock on
> knowledge.

Grates on you, huh?

Some people learn faster than others. Look at everyone's vastly different learning experiences with Morse Cose to see what I mean. Some are never able to learn it at all.

But with respect to radio theory and ops, perhaps Len is a quicker learner than you. Perhaps not.

You tell me everyone if learns the same, and if so, I'll have to give you this one. Unless Len actually has more than just the three years RF experience that you reference.

And what of education? Can education play a role in knowledge?

1227. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 02:20:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308141820.3513e6fe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74642

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030811200137.15462.00002196@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0308101345.510dba91@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
> >news:<20030810055941.27618.00001162@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >> > brianburke@juno.com wrote:
> >> >averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote:
>
> >> >> Do you know if Len Anderson is a cannibal? Claims have been made that he
> eats
> >> >> others for breakfast.
> >> >
> >> >Who? When?
> >>
> >> Floyd Davidson wrote it about Len Anderson a few days ago.
> >
> >I don't recall Floyd saying Len was a cannibal.
> >
> >> >Dave thinks he's a pugilist.
> >> >
> >> Maybe a pugil stick? ;-) ;-)
> >
> >Does he?
> >
> >> Your master and teacher has
> >> returned, Brian Burke.
> >
> >Noted.
>
> Brian, why are you answering a copycat wanna-be?
>
> That creature doesn't exist.
>
> LHA

Because Dave needs web attention to keep him off the streets.

Consider it a public service.

1228. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 02:23:48 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308141823.47993098@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74643

averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message news:<20030811214400.10282.00001428@mb-m05.aol.com>...

> I am not copying anyone. I am simply being myself.

But you copy the same smugness as noted in David Heil/K8MN.

1229. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 02:33:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308141833.187d7d5c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74644

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F37B75A.D47CAEF1@earthlink.net>...

> Roger: "Duuuuh, how'd you know it was me"? Shall we say that you have a
> rather unique writing style and that your topics of interest repeat
> themselves on a regular basis.

Gee David, someone posting as Avery Fine is sure doing a ringer impression of you.

What could it mean?

1230. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 04:04:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3C58F1.86EDE9C2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74645

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F37AFDE.6D3406E4@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F301FE3.951681BE@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > Please quote that "may share space" FCC document.
> > >
> > > Please quote the "Farnsworth Exam at 13-15wpm is the same as the Morse
> > > Exam at 5wpm" FCC document.
> >
> > That's totally irrelevant to the discussion at hand.
>
> Why?

...because the Farnsworth method was not under discussion. It is
irrelevant to the request made of you.

> Farnsworth exists as the de facto "code" exam, even though the
> FCC documents specify Morse Code. Yet the FCC documents DO assign the
> exact same priveleges to Carl that they do you, yet you insist on
> arguing it.

What doest it have to do with the FCC's "may share space" document?

> That would make you a fool.

I'd guess the fool to be one who is asked about a regulation about
"sharing space" and responds with some nonsense about the Farnsworth
method of learning morse.

> > > > He's allocated the same frequencies. He may or may not share the same
> > > > space.
> > >
> > > Which is it?
> >
> > May or May Not?
> >
> > That's correct.
>
> So you don't know.

Incorrect, Farnsworth. I do know and I provided the answer.

Dave K8MN

1231. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 04:17:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3C5C1A.641EDF8C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74646

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F395779.63FCCE51@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > I was "intimately" involved with HF communications across the Pacific in
> > the 1960's at hours of my own choosing. My station also worked across
> > the Atlantic and across the Indian Ocean. It did so with less power
> > than yours and I was still a teenager.
>
> Was this an amateur station?

It most certainly was.

> Was it capable of only working over oceans, or could it work over land > masses as well?

I wasn't simultaneously living on both coasts, Brian. Try to figure it
out.

> > I was "intimately" involved with HF military communications, working
> > transatlantic and transpacific paths using a variety of log periodic,
> > inverted discone and rhombic antennas and either 10 kw or 45 kw
> > transmitters from 1968-1970. The station was in operation 24/7 but I
> > generally pulled eight hour shifts...
>
> Of your own choosing, right?

What's the difference for purposes of discussion? Do you know anyone
who ever worked 24 hour days for a solid week?

> Were you an "Air Force of One?"

Does my statement read as if I was. I pulled eight hour shifts and the
station was open 24/7. Figure it out.

> > I was "intimately" involved with in-country HF military operations for a
> > year in Vietnam.
> >
> > I spent fifteen "intimate" years overseas with the U.S. Department of
> > State where I was responsible for all HF and VHF communications whether
> > by voice, asynchronous data or morse.
>
> So this wasn't amateur radio either?

Read it again and perhaps you'll figure it out.

> > I've spent forty years as an active radio amateur, operating various
> > modes on bands from 1.8 through 432 MHz.

Aren't you going to ask me if this was military communications or State Department communications?

> Why did you stop at 432 MHz? Even most store bought amateur UHF rigs
> are capable of going up to 450 Mhz.

Weak signal work on SSB and CW takes place in that area of the band. That's where I happen to spend much of my time. Is that all right with you?

> Oh, uhhh. Forgot. Superior Heil "doan do FM (tm Kelly)"

I have a 440 rig at home. I use it occasionally. I use 2m FM regularly. Looks like you've struck out on your attempt to hit a nerve, little electrolyte.

> > > I can go on and on without ever
> > > touching the recorded and evidencible facts of having spent three
> > > years being actively involved with the latter. That grates on you.
> >
> > Three years? Three measly years? It grates on me that you'd dare
> > compare your three years to my experience and pretend to have a lock on
> > knowledge.
>
> Grates on you, huh?

Figure it out.

> Some people learn faster than others. Look at everyone's vastly
> different learning experiences with Morse Cose to see what I mean.
> Some are never able to learn it at all.

Learning rate isn't under discussion. Experience is.

> But with respect to radio theory and ops, perhaps Len is a quicker
> learner than you. Perhaps not.

Ask him.

> You tell me everyone if learns the same, and if so, I'll have to give
> you this one.

Figure it out.

> Unless Len actually has more than just the three years
> RF experience that you reference.

Ask him. I'm sure he'll be happy to go on about it at great length.

> And what of education? Can education play a role in knowledge?

Figure it out.

Dave K8MN

1232. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 04:20:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3C5CE3.D964193@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74647

Brian wrote:
>
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030811200137.15462.00002196@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0308101345.510dba91@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
> > >news:<20030810055941.27618.00001162@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > >> > brianburke@juno.com wrote:
> > >> >averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote:
> >
> > >> >> Do you know if Len Anderson is a cannibal? Claims have been made that he
> > eats
> > >> >> others for breakfast.
> > >> >
> > >> >Who? When?
> > >>
> > >> Floyd Davidson wrote it about Len Anderson a few days ago.
> > >
> > >I don't recall Floyd saying Len was a cannibal.
> > >
> > >> >Dave thinks he's a pugilist.
> > >> >
> > >> Maybe a pugil stick? ;-) ;-)
> > >
> > >Does he?
> > >
> > >> Your master and teacher has
> > >> returned, Brian Burke.
> > >
> > >Noted.
> >
> > Brian, why are you answering a copycat wanna-be?
> >
> > That creature doesn't exist.
> >
> > LHA
>
> Because Dave needs web attention to keep him off the streets.

I wasn't involved in this exchange at all and I have no idea what "web
attention" means...unless you happen to be a spider.

> Consider it a public service.

What--your presentation of yourself as a horrible example?

Dave K8MN

1233. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 04:21:49 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3C5D1C.E6292AC5@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74648

Brian wrote:
>
> averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030811214400.10282.00001428@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>
> > I am not copying anyone. I am simply being myself.
>
> But you copy the same smugness as noted in David Heil/K8MN.

You mean the one who isn't an AOL user? Get a life.

Dave K8MN

1234. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 04:22:34 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3C5D48.951FFE94@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74649

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F37B75A.D47CAEF1@earthlink.net>...
>
> > Roger: "Duuuuh, how'd you know it was me"? Shall we say that you have a
> > rather unique writing style and that your topics of interest repeat
> > themselves on a regular basis.
>
> Gee David, someone posting as Avery Fine is sure doing a ringer impression of you.
>
> What could it mean?

It could mean that someone is doing an impression of Len and you aren't
bright enough to figure it out.

Dave K8MN

1235. Interesting Aug 14th Solar Data

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 05:10:45 UTC
From: Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <bhhq0l02nev@enews1.newsguy.com>
Source record: 74650

http://www.sec.noaa.gov/rt_plots/xray_5m.html
http://www.sec.noaa.gov/pmap/AnimateN.html

--
Best Regards, Keith AOL IM:kilowattradio
NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
"Give SCO $699 for using Linux or the Penguin gets it."

1236. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 05:47:10 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308142147.67866cad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74651

>denies that Shannon's work has anything to do with ham radio ...
>Dick is scared to death that modern digital communications
>(that he obviously isn't capable of comprehending) will ultimately
>supplant his beloved Morse ... which appears to be the only thing
>in ham radio at which he can claim true proficiency.

>Simple version: Dick can't face the fact that his only "claim to
>fame" (as in "a legend in his own mind") is irrelevant except as
>a recreational activity.

I don't *claim* to have a claim to fame, Carl,I'll leave that for
clowns like you.

I'm rather sure that I'm not the only reader here who finds it very
revealing that while you and Frozen Floyd expound and glorify the
virtues of an all-digital ham radio "sometime in the future"-you do
continually insist that digital *is* the future-it is *I* and a few
others like Larry,who actually are on the air USING advanced digital
modes, along with a few which aren't so recent,like HELLSCHREIBER.

ALONG WITH cw.

What this shows to all is that what you actually are is all talk and
no walk, Pal. Show and tell but don't ask me to do it. Yeah.

Oh, yes, you did actually use a little AMTOR when you had a boat.
Hey, we all gotta get our mail somehow. But you abandoned it when the
boat went. Meanwhile
I have to think about it a bit to add up all the digital modes I've
worked *besides* CW.

How about a little PACTOR, some CLOVER-not much, there just wasn't
but a couple other stations that I ever caught on the air running
CLOVER, but my RTTY goes back to a Teletype Corp Model 15 which was
eventually replaced with a
Commodore 16 (yep, 16K of ram, not a C-64)with a costly, for those
days, Microlog AIR-1 module. I Followed that with a Commodore 64 and a
AEA PK64 which ran several modes, really worked great on packet too,
then when MS DOS took
over the world I got a PK232,which I still have, along with the HAL
P-38 card and a bunch of other stuff that will get traded one of these
days(Heath HK232, DSP232 and a MFJ which model mumber I forget).
Then came the soundcard era, and that's where things really heated up
with
PSK31, RTTY, HELLSCHREIBER and if I could have found anyone on the air
when I was looking, I'd try MFSK-16.

Meanwhile since I/we sincerely believe that radiotelegraphy is valuable to the point that new hams should be required to get just a bit of it before being allowed to forgo *any* further required actions-they won't have to ever do anything whatever with that license, if that's their bent- you and a few other like minded who were just too lame or lazy to "do it" lay out all sorts of labels and accusations toward us, not the least of which is the clearly visible, easily-identified lie about our attitudes toward digital communications.

For once and for all-- **IT JUST IS NOT SO!!!!!*

Facts don't budge you for a moment. OF COURSE Shannon's works are quite important and I challenge you to find where I ever suggested otherwise. But for you and Frosty to insist that Shannon controls the ARS is beyond ludicrous, and it seems that everyone reading here but you two and that idiot Anderson knows it. Oh, Don't forget the village idiot Burke.
Have you actually spent any serious time trying to be a ham? Sure doesn't look like from your postings, either of you.

Shannon controls nothing but explains much.

Aren't you intelligent enough to understand what this does to your credibility? All this confirms just how much the old No Code hatred has consumed you.
No Code International, indeed!

>NOTE: I have no problem with folks pursuing Morse as a
>recreational activity

So in your view CW is the only recreational activity within the ARS.
How novel.

1237. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 05:51:55 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f3c8594_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74654
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Hence the hypocrisy of the religious loony in his attack on
Iraq for WOMD.

Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhgsjk$mt6$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> we are the ONLY country to use them against a civilian population

1238. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 05:53:55 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f3c8594$2_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74653
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Britland is equally guilty of murder around the world as
is Yankland today in Afghanistan and Iraq.

You will find many postings from me on this topic since
I joined the Internet in March of this year.

Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhgsoi$9nq$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> Gee Airy......isn't that EXACTLY what the British did in the 17th and 18th
> century??? How did it go...."The sun never sets on the British empire"
> "Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
> news:3f3b5bb8_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> > Any human who sets out on a journey round the world with
> > the specific intention of killing his fellow man deserves all
> > he gets. Especially the Yanks in Iraq today.
> > Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:bhedrk$ka5$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > Yeah? You mean the ones that cut your redcoats to pieces and kicked
> > > Cornwalles out of here on his ear?

1239. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 05:59:33 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308142159.4f0f742a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74652

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308141736.319a6a5@posting.google.com>...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bhc9ps$jc0$0@208.206.142.86>...
> > No CW Test wrote:
> >
> > > >Subject: Re: NCVEC Position on Code
> > > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > >Date: 8/9/03 6:40 AM Eastern Daylight Time
> > > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0308090240.7b896978@posting.google.com>
> > > >
> > > >nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
> > > >news:<20030808175644.19707.00000166@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > > >
> > > >> For the record, I have not
> > > >> used PSK-31 myself on
> > > >> the amateur bands.
> > > >>
> > > >> So I will not lecture others
> > > >> on how well it does or
> > > >> does not work.
> > > >
> > > >Yet Dick is free to lecture others, i.e., "any idiot can get psk going
> > > >in under 30 minutes," but by his own words here he couldn't.
> > >
> > > He did get it going,
> > > did he not?
> > >
> > > >That is the point.
> > >
> > > Only to you.
> >
> > Liar Burke still hasn't posted a quote showing that I said that, and he never will,
> > for it isn't true. Not even close, no part of it. What I said is "can learn to use
PSK31
> > in 30 minutes". That is certainly true.
>
> DICK, there are weeks and weeks of your own postings documenting your
> problems with PSK.
>
> Don't call me a liar and don't blame me for your own shortcomings.
> After all, amateur radio isn't for everyone.

Well you're *STILL* a liar and you're ritght-hama radio isn't for everyone.
Seems you might have understood that by now, instead of just regurgitating.

1240. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 07:00:07 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f3c859a_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74655
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Saddam was neutralised. It is the loony in the White House who is the
greatest threat to World peace. He even kills
defenceless Yanks in his own prisons.

stewart <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0308141625.53e806b5@posting.google.com...
> "Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:<3f3b5bb8_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>...
> > Any human who sets out on a journey round the world with
> > the specific intention of killing his fellow man deserves all
> > he gets. Especially the Yanks in Iraq today.
> If there was ever a "fellow man" that required being killed, it is
> Saddam

1241. Re: Interesting Aug 14th Solar Data

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 07:38:44 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0308150524180.218@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 74656

On Fri, 15 Aug 2003, Keith wrote:
> http://www.sec.noaa.gov/rt_plots/xray_5m.html
> http://www.sec.noaa.gov/pmap/AnimateN.html

Are you trying to imply that a solar storm had something to do with the
northeastern North American power failure on that day?

1242. Re: Question 'off' subject, ??

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 09:37:13 UTC
From: nocwtest@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030815053713.06296.00000019@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 74657

>Scott Unit 69 scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc

>It's called SMS, short messaging system.

Yes, and it's quite useful.

Many makes of cellular telephone send "SMS" in Morse code when a new message comes in, to alert the user.

Distinctive!

1243. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 12:16:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308150416.7f8701e3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74658

dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308142159.4f0f742a@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308141736.319a6a5@posting.google.com>...
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bhc9ps$jc0$0@208.206.142.86>...
> > > No CW Test wrote:
> > >
> > > >Subject: Re: NCVEC Position on Code
> > > >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> > > >Date: 8/9/03 6:40 AM Eastern Daylight Time
> > > >Message-id: <f45722ac.0308090240.7b896978@posting.google.com>
> > > >
> > > >nocwtest@aol.com (No CW Test) wrote in message
> > > >news:<20030808175644.19707.00000166@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> > > >
> > > >> For the record, I have not
> > > >> used PSK-31 myself on
> > > >> the amateur bands.
> > > >>
> > > >> So I will not lecture others
> > > >> on how well it does or
> > > >> does not work.
> > > >
> > > >Yet Dick is free to lecture others, i.e., "any idiot can get psk going
> > > >in under 30 minutes," but by his own words here he couldn't.
> > > >
> > > He did get it going,
> > > did he not?
> > >
> > > >That is the point.
> > >
> > > Only to you.
> > >
> > Liar Burke still hasn't posted a quote showing that I said that, and he never will,
> > for it isn't true. Not even close, no part of it. What I said is "can learn to use
PSK31
> > in 30 minutes". That is certainly true.
> >
> > DICK, there are weeks and weeks of your own postings documenting your
> > problems with PSK.
> >
> > Don't call me a liar and don't blame me for your own shortcomings.
> > After all, amateur radio isn't for everyone.

>
>
>
> Well you're *STILL* a liar and you're ritght-hama radio isn't for everyone.
> Seems you might have understood that by now, instead of just regurgitating.

DICK, I understand that you're not a nice man.

1244. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 12:21:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308150421.64189471@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74659

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F3C5D48.951FFE94@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F37B75A.D47CAEF1@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > > Roger: "Duuuuh, how'd you know it was me"? Shall we say that you have a
> > > rather unique writing style and that your topics of interest repeat
> > > themselves on a regular basis.
> >
> > Gee David, someone posting as Avery Fine is sure doing a ringer impression of you.
> >
> > What could it mean?
>
> It could mean that someone is doing an impression of Len and you aren't
> bright enough to figure it out.
>
> Dave K8MN

But it's you they're imitating.

1245. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 12:23:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308150423.32a58ca1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74660

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F3C5D1C.E6292AC5@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030811214400.10282.00001428@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >
> > > I am not copying anyone. I am simply being myself.
> >
> > But you copy the same smugness as noted in David Heil/K8MN.
>
> You mean the one who isn't an AOL user? Get a life.
>
> Dave K8MN

AveryFine and you have a lot in common.

1246. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 13:06:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308150506.76189aa8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74661

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F3C5C1A.641EDF8C@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F395779.63FCCE51@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > I was "intimately" involved with HF communications across the Pacific in
> > > the 1960's at hours of my own choosing. My station also worked across
> > > the Atlantic and across the Indian Ocean. It did so with less power
> > > than yours and I was still a teenager.
> >
> > Was this an amateur station?
>
> It most certainly was.

Cool. What amateur call sign did you use?

> > Was it capable of only working over oceans, or could it work over land > masses as
well?
>
> I wasn't simultaneously living on both coasts, Brian. Try to figure it
> out.

Try not being so smug, David.

You never did say where you were; where your station could work across
the Pacific ocean, and across the Indian and Atlantic oceans. I'm
trying to think of a geographic location with "both coasts" and those
three oceans.

So kindly tell us what country that you operated from that had "both
coasts" and three oceans.

> > > I was "intimately" involved with HF military communications, working
> > > transatlantic and transpacific paths using a variety of log periodic,
> > > inverted discone and rhombic antennas and either 10 kw or 45 kw
> > > transmitters from 1968-1970. The station was in operation 24/7 but I
> > > generally pulled eight hour shifts...
> >
> > Of your own choosing, right?
>
> What's the difference for purposes of discussion? Do you know anyone
> who ever worked 24 hour days for a solid week?

Your comment, "of my own choosing" sounds very odd for a military
radio station.

You said that you had an amateur station, and you pulled military shifts of your own choosing.

In your original statements above, did you really mean to string together an amateur station from a country with two coasts and three oceans, with your military station in Vietnam?

> > > I was "intimately" involved with in-country HF military operations for a
> > > year in Vietnam.
> > >
> > > I spent fifteen "intimate" years overseas with the U.S. Department of
> > > State where I was responsible for all HF and VHF communications whether
> > > by voice, asynchronous data or morse.
> >
> > So this wasn't amateur radio either?
>
> Read it again and perhaps you'll figure it out.

But I thought this group was to discuss amateur radio. And you do get after Len for bringing up other services communications, however long ago it may have been.

> > > I've spent forty years as an active radio amateur, operating various
> > > modes on bands from 1.8 through 432 MHz.
>
> Aren't you going to ask me if this was military communications or State
> Department communications?

No. I recognize this as an amateur radio discussion group, and I recognize that you are finally addressing amateur radio operations. Congratulations.

> > Why did you stop at 432 MHz? Even most store bought amateur UHF rigs
> > are capable of going up to 450 Mhz.
>
> Weak signal work on SSB and CW takes place in that area of the band.

It may. Or it may not.

> That's where I happen to spend much of my time. Is that all right with
> you?

Peachy.

> > Oh, uhhh. Forgot. Superior Heil "doan do FM (tm Kelly)"
>
> I have a 440 rig at home. I use it occasionally. I use 2m FM

So your statement of frequency ranges above is inaccurate. It would more accurately read, "1.8 to 450 MHz."

> regularly. Looks like you've struck out on your attempt to hit a nerve,
> little electrolyte.

No attempt made. I just figured that such a great ham as yourself was
short changing himself with such a limited portfolio of RF activity.

> > > > I can go on and on without ever
> > > > touching the recorded and evidencible facts of having spent three
> > > > years being actively involved with the latter. That grates on you.
> > > >
> > > Three years? Three measly years? It grates on me that you'd dare
> > > compare your three years to my experience and pretend to have a lock on
> > > knowledge.
> > >
> > Grates on you, huh?
> >
> Figure it out.

No problem.

> > Some people learn faster than others. Look at everyone's vastly
> > different learning experiences with Morse Cose to see what I mean.
> > Some are never able to learn it at all.
> >
> Learning rate isn't under discussion. Experience is.

Ah, No. You specifically said, "knowledge." Think about it. Can one
attain knowledge only through experience?

> > But with respect to radio theory and ops, perhaps Len is a quicker
> > learner than you. Perhaps not.
> >
> Ask him.

I wonder what he would say?

> > You tell me everyone if learns the same, and if so, I'll have to give
> > you this one.
> >
> Figure it out.

Ah, sorry. You don't get this one.

> > Unless Len actually has more than just the three years
> > RF experience that you reference.
> >
> Ask him. I'm sure he'll be happy to go on about it at great length.

Much like your military and dept. of state resume?

> > And what of education? Can education play a role in knowledge?
> >
> Figure it out.

Ah, you don't get this one either.

Dave, you deserve a much needed vacation from rrap. At least consider
it.

1247. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 13:15:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308150515.90fa36d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74662

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F3C58F1.86EDE9C2@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F37AFDE.6D3406E4@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F301FE3.951681BE@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > > Please quote that "may share space" FCC document.
> > > >
> > > > Please quote the "Farnsworth Exam at 13-15wpm is the same as the Morse
> > > > Exam at 5wpm" FCC document.
> > >
> > > That's totally irrelevant to the discussion at hand.
> >
> > Why?
>
> ...because the Farnsworth method was not under discussion. It is
> irrelevant to the request made of you.

I thought the existence of FCC documents were now part of the
discussion. At least you broght it up.

Tell you what David, in the future put your comments that are not open
for discussion in brackets [xxx].

OK?

> > Farnsworth exists as the de facto "code" exam, even though the
> > FCC documents specify Morse Code. Yet the FCC documents DO assign the
> > exact same priveleges to Carl that they do you, yet you insist on
> > arguing it.
>
> What doest it have to do with the FCC's "may share space" document?

Part 97 addresses your and Carls priveleges.

> > That would make you a fool.
>
> I'd guess the fool to be one who is asked about a regulation about
> "sharing space" and responds with some nonsense about the Farnsworth
> method of learning morse.

You don't believe in sharing space which the FCC says you must share
in a document called Part 97.

You remain the fool, Farnsworth not withstanding.

> > > > > He's allocated the same frequencies. He may or may not share the same
> > > > > space.
> > > > >
> > > > Which is it?
>
> > > > May or May Not?
> > > >
> > > That's correct.
> > >
> > So you don't know.
>
> Incorrect, Farnsworth. I do know and I provided the answer.

Wrong.

1248. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 13:18:29 UTC
From: Gary Cavie <m0jjh@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <MPG.19a6ee02cf30c316989693@news.freeserve.com>
Source record: 74663
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

In article <3f3c8594$2_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>,
me@privacy.net says...
> ... since
> I joined the Internet in March of this year.
>

Still living in Cloud Cuckoo Land then Gareth?

1249. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 16:08:47 UTC
From: averyfine@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030815120847.07430.00000023@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 74664

>Subject: Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)
>From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
>Date: 8/15/03 8:23 AM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <f45722ac.0308150423.32a58ca1@posting.google.com>
>
>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3F3C5D1C.E6292AC5@earthlink.net>...
>> Brian wrote:
>> >
>> > averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
>news:<20030811214400.10282.00001428@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>> >
>> > > I am not copying anyone. I am simply being myself.
>> >
>> > But you copy the same smugness as noted in David Heil/K8MN.
>>
>> You mean the one who isn't an AOL user? Get a life.
>>
>> Dave K8MN
>
>AveryFine and you have a lot in common.
>
I take that as a compliment!

1250. BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 16:29:47 UTC
From: Bill Evans <bevans@ebsys.mb.ca>
Message-ID: <x08%a.39127$Rz6.54279@news1.mts.net>
Source record: 74665

Perhaps yesterday's, continuing massive power failure in the northeastern U.S.A. and Canada will convince the power utilities that they should focus their energies and resources on their core business, rather than entering a new business that is already served by telephone companies, competitive local exchange carriers (CLEC), cable television operators, satellite services and, in some markets, broadband wireless access (BWA) carriers.

According to the August 15th Toronto Globe and Mail, "critics have been calling for breakers to be installed throughout North America's grids for some time, only to be told by the grid operators (power companies) that there is no money to fund such a massive infrastructure overhaul."

Why would regulators, politicians and the power companies' shareholders be interested in spending billions of dollars entering a new business when they obviously have major challenges in their own backyard. Seems like time to "stick to the knitting".

William E. Evans, P. Eng.
VE4UD

1251. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 17:25:45 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hjmeau5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74666

[No readable article body recovered]

1252. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 18:38:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3D2556.34E27B82@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74667

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3C5D48.951FFE94@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F37B75A.D47CAEF1@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > Roger: "Duuuuh, how'd you know it was me"? Shall we say that you have a
> > > > rather unique writing style and that your topics of interest repeat
> > > > themselves on a regular basis.
> > >
> > > Gee David, someone posting as Avery Fine is sure doing a ringer impression of you.
> > >
> > > What could it mean?
> > >
> > It could mean that someone is doing an impression of Len and you aren't
> > bright enough to figure it out.

> But it's you they're imitating.

See, you weren't bright enough to figure it out even after an
explanation.

Dave K8MN

1253. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 18:41:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3D261C.E96C3279@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74668

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3C5D1C.E6292AC5@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030811214400.10282.00001428@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> > >
> > > > I am not copying anyone. I am simply being myself.
> > >
> > > But you copy the same smugness as noted in David Heil/K8MN.
> >
> > You mean the one who isn't an AOL user? Get a life.

> AveryFine and you have a lot in common.

I don't do a real Lennie imitation. Avery is much, much better at it.

Dave K8MN

1254. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 19:00:02 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3D2A76.AA8AF78E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74669

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3C5C1A.641EDF8C@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F395779.63FCCE51@earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > > I was "intimately" involved with HF communications across the Pacific in
> > > > the 1960's at hours of my own choosing. My station also worked across
> > > > the Atlantic and across the Indian Ocean. It did so with less power
> > > > than yours and I was still a teenager.
> > >
> > > Was this an amateur station?
> >
> > It most certainly was.
>
> Cool. What amateur call sign did you use?

Mine.

> > > Was it capable of only working over oceans, or could it work over land > masses as
well?
> >
> > I wasn't simultaneously living on both coasts, Brian. Try to figure it
> > out.
>
> Try not being so smug, David.

I wasn't being smug. I suggested that you ponder the question and try
to come up with a plausible answer.

> You never did say where you were; where your station could work across
> the Pacific ocean, and across the Indian and Atlantic oceans.

No, I didn't say. There are numerous places within the continent in
which we live where such is possible. Ponder the matter.

> I'm
> trying to think of a geographic location with "both coasts" and those
> three oceans.

Keep pondering.

> So kindly tell us what country that you operated from that had "both
> coasts" and three oceans.

I never wrote that it "had" them. I wrote that I operated a station
capable to working across them.

> > > > I was "intimately" involved with HF military communications, working
> > > > transatlantic and transpacific paths using a variety of log periodic,
> > > > inverted discone and rhombic antennas and either 10 kw or 45 kw
> > > > transmitters from 1968-1970. The station was in operation 24/7 but I
> > > > generally pulled eight hour shifts...
> > > >
> > > Of your own choosing, right?
> >
> > What's the difference for purposes of discussion? Do you know anyone
> > who ever worked 24 hour days for a solid week?
>
> Your comment, "of my own choosing" sounds very odd for a military
> radio station.

Those words don't appear in the paragraph concerning military
communications. You might want to read it again.

> You said that you had an amateur station, and you pulled military
> shifts of your own choosing.

I said nothing of the kind. If you have problems, maybe you can have
someone read it for you.

> In your original statements above, did you really mean to string
> together an amateur station from a country with two coasts and three
> oceans, with your military station in Vietnam?

Those things were not strung together. Perhaps you can find someone
with writing skills explain the idea behind paragraphing.

> > > > I was "intimately" involved with in-country HF military operations for a
> > > > year in Vietnam.
> > > >
> > > > I spent fifteen "intimate" years overseas with the U.S. Department of
> > > > State where I was responsible for all HF and VHF communications whether
> > > > by voice, asynchronous data or morse.
> > > >
> > > So this wasn't amateur radio either?
> >
> > Read it again and perhaps you'll figure it out.
>
> But I thought this group was to discuss amateur radio. And you do get
> after Len for bringing up other services communications, however long
> ago it may have been.

Where've you been? Did you read Len's material to which I replied?

> > > > I've spent forty years as an active radio amateur, operating various
> > > > modes on bands from 1.8 through 432 MHz.
> > >
> > Aren't you going to ask me if this was military communications or State

> > Department communications?
>
> No. I recognize this as an amateur radio discussion group, and I
> recognize that you are finally addressing amateur radio operations.
> Congratulations.

Maybe you can congratulate Len as well, if he ever gets back from the
Korean War.

> > > Why did you stop at 432 MHz? Even most store bought amateur UHF rigs
> > > are capable of going up to 450 Mhz.
> >
> > Weak signal work on SSB and CW takes place in that area of the band.
>
> It may. Or it may not.

My logs say that it does.

> > That's where I happen to spend much of my time. Is that all right with
> > you?
>
> Peachy.
>
> > > Oh, uhhh. Forgot. Superior Heil "doan do FM (tm Kelly)"
> >
> > I have a 440 rig at home. I use it occasionally. I use 2m FM
>
> So your statement of frequency ranges above is inaccurate. It would
> more accurately read, "1.8 to 450 MHz."

It is much more accurate than your statements in which you could not
properly attribute the words "of my own choosing".

> > regularly. Looks like you've struck out on your attempt to hit a nerve,
> > little electrolyte.
>
> No attempt made. I just figured that such a great ham as yourself was
> short changing himself with such a limited portfolio of RF activity.

You may consider my words as a mere summary.

> > > > > I can go on and on without ever
> > > > > touching the recorded and evidencible facts of having spent three
> > > > > years being actively involved with the latter. That grates on you.
> > > >
> > > > Three years? Three measly years? It grates on me that you'd dare
> > > > compare your three years to my experience and pretend to have a lock on
> > > > knowledge.
> > >
> > > Grates on you, huh?
> >
> > Figure it out.
>

> No problem.

Then why'd you ask a question?

> > > Some people learn faster than others. Look at everyone's vastly
> > > different learning experiences with Morse Cose to see what I mean.
> > > Some are never able to learn it at all.
> >
> > Learning rate isn't under discussion. Experience is.
>
> Ah, No. You specifically said, "knowledge." Think about it. Can one
> attain knowledge only through experience?

Most certainly.

> > > But with respect to radio theory and ops, perhaps Len is a quicker
> > > learner than you. Perhaps not.
> >
> > Ask him.
>
> I wonder what he would say?

Let me repeat: Ask him.

> > > You tell me everyone if learns the same, and if so, I'll have to give
> > > you this one.
> >
> > Figure it out.
>
> Ah, sorry. You don't get this one.

You can't give what isn't yours.

> > > Unless Len actually has more than just the three years
> > > RF experience that you reference.
> >
> > Ask him. I'm sure he'll be happy to go on about it at great length.
>
> Much like your military and dept. of state resume?

Resume? You mean the summary to counter Len's absurdity?

> > > And what of education? Can education play a role in knowledge?
> >
> > Figure it out.
>
> Ah, you don't get this one either.

Ah, you haven't figured it out.

> Dave, you deserve a much needed vacation from rrap. At least consider
> it.

I've considered it. My response is: No.

Dave K8MN

1255. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 19:05:36 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3D2BC4.5C421A33@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74670

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3C58F1.86EDE9C2@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F37AFDE.6D3406E4@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F301FE3.951681BE@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > > > > Please quote that "may share space" FCC document.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Please quote the "Farnsworth Exam at 13-15wpm is the same as the Morse
> > > > > > Exam at 5wpm" FCC document.
> > > > >
> > > > > That's totally irrelevant to the discussion at hand.
> > > >
> > > > Why?
> > >
> > ...because the Farnsworth method was not under discussion. It is
> > irrelevant to the request made of you.
>
> I thought the existence of FCC documents were now part of the
> discussion. At least you broght it up.
>
> Tell you what David, in the future put your comments that are not open
> for discussion in brackets [xxx].
>
> OK?

It'd be easier if you just stuck to the matter being discussed.

> > > Farnsworth exists as the de facto "code" exam, even though the
> > > FCC documents specify Morse Code. Yet the FCC documents DO assign the
> > > exact same priveleges to Carl that they do you, yet you insist on
> > > arguing it.
> > >
> > What doest it have to do with the FCC's "may share space" document?
>
> Part 97 addresses your and Carls priveleges.

It certainly does. So? We weren't discussing installing towers within
a certain distance from an airport but that's in Part 97.

> > > That would make you a fool.
> >
> > I'd guess the fool to be one who is asked about a regulation about
> > "sharing space" and responds with some nonsense about the Farnsworth
> > method of learning morse.
>
> You don't believe in sharing space which the FCC says you must share
> in a document called Part 97.

I've never stated that I don't believe in sharing space.
That's something you've tried to establish.

> You remain the fool, Farnsworth not withstanding.

I'm sure that's the way you see it, little electrolyte.

> > > > > > He's allocated the same frequencies. He may or may not share the same
> > > > > > space.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Which is it?
> > >
> > > > > > May or May Not?
> > > > >
> > > > > That's correct.
> > > >
> > > So you don't know.
> > >
> > Incorrect, Farnsworth. I do know and I provided the answer.
>
> Wrong.

Something does not become "wrong" due to your failure to comprehend it.

Dave K8MN

1256. See Lloyd Davies at the Huntsville Hamfest Tomorrow!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 19:20:52 UTC
From: daviesl2003@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030815152052.08383.00000060@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 74671

I will be signing autographs too

You better get me to sign your Bible, ARRL Handbook, repeater atlas, etc.
Someday, I will become as popular as Art Bell, Rush Limbaugh, etc.

Better watch out!

Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
"On the Domestic Front"
http://nitepirate66.tripod.com/domesticfront/index.htm

Lloyd Davies - Time Lord and Talk show host
"On the Domestic Front"
http://nitepirate66.tripod.com/domesticfront/index.htm

1257. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 19:26:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308151126.12ba9afe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74672

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030814214844.01893.00000006@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <bhf1ua$dea@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >> >You're stretching now, Larry. Running out of wit, are you?
> >>
> >> Kim:
> >>
> >> I may be down a couple of percent, but you've only got half of yours!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >I only need half with you around...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> There you go, folks! Kim just admitted that she's a half-wit! Too bad
> the wit she has is also very dim!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Actually, Larry, she said that she only needed to be a half-wit to debate you.

It wasn't a kind remark, and it went right over your head.

1258. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 20:04:01 UTC
From: g3pho@blueyonder.co.uk
Message-ID: <3f3bfd1d.2583133@news.blueyonder.co.uk>
Source record: 74673
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

On Wed, 13 Aug 2003 17:23:15 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:

>If it wasn't for your old colony your country would be speaking German and
>eating raw fish. You ungrateful piece of crap.
>
>Go ahead and dream all you want. But don't forget you best keep the USA on
>at least talking terms, or England will be the third world country.
>
>I spent a lot of time in Europe in the 70s. Made a lot of English friends.
>Whats your problem? All your mates at the pub throw you out on your ear for
>your stupidity?
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Dan ...

None of us over here in the UK want Airy Bean to carry on breathing!
As you say, he's a an ungrateful piece of crap .. and that's a
compliment!

Regards,

Peter, G3PHO

1259. Dropping the code caused the blackout?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 21:06:57 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F3D4B72.2050507@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 74674

I'm sure someone can figure out a connection.....

(;

1260. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 21:29:56 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308151329.7b96c19a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74675

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030813181640.02197.00002135@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0308121438.7df10277@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030811200131.15462.00002191@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >
> >> Poor baby. You don't come close to any civil debate yet you
> >> DEMAND others do so.

He's just following your lead, Len. Perhaps if you set an example of
"civil debate", others would follow. But I doubt you would do that.
> >
> > I didn't "demand" anything, Lennie.
>
> Yes, you do.

Where?

> You have a long history of it, even on the public record
> of four years ago at the FCC.

You mean where Steve asked the FCC to disregard your reply comments to
the FCC.
That's what reply comments are for, Len - people either supporting or
opposing the comments of others. You spent over a dozen pages of YOUR
reply comments telling FCC to ignore and disregard the comments of one
Michael P. Deignan. So you have to accept others telling FCC to
disregard your reply comments. Otherwise you're a hypocrite.
>
> > I point out that you make it a point of harrassing others about
> >it, yet indulge yourself in the most childish and pathetic of efforts
> >to see who can out-insult the other.
>
> Actually you yourself meet "childish and pathetic of efforts" and
> cannot stop trying to insult me in posts clearly not including you.

He's just following your example, Len. Perhaps if you set an example
of "adult and reasoned civil debate", others would follow. But I doubt
you would do that.

> > You insist on referring to yourself as a "professional", but you
> >have yet to prove yourself "professional" in ANY discipline.
>
> Several corporations, the US government, three state governments

> all disagree with you. :-)

Getting paid and being a professional are not the same thing.
>
> >> You REALLY need some mental therapy on being able to
> >> get along with anyone else.
> >
> > Uh huh. Coming from you, I rate this about 136 on a scale of 1
> >to 10 on important things to do.
>
> Psychotics will never admit they are crazy. <shrug>

Let's remember that phrase, shall we?
>
> > Uh huh...(Geeze this idiot makes this easy...) Just like YOU
> >tried to hide behind "Avery Fine" and "Avery Fineman" until your ego
> >got the better of you one day and you signed your name to a post that
> >you had specifically denied BEING you.
>
> The AOL screen name of "Avery Fineman" is still registered to me.

Yeah, we KNOW.
>
> I have, currently, six other screen names at AOL (including this one)
> but "Avery Fine" was NOT one of them. Never.

"Avery Fine" was NEVER one of your screen names, you say? That's
simply not true. You posted with that screen name here a few years
back.

Of course you will never admit that you did so, regardless of the
evidence presented.
>
> Yes, I've used the screen name of "Avery Fineman" in here and also
> identified myself at the end of the post.

Sometimes you have identified yourself in posts. Other times you have
not.

Let's see - you have used the AOL screen names "nocwtest", "lenof21",
"averyfine", "averyfineman" and "lenover21" in this newsgroup. That's
five. You admit to having seven. For all anyone knows, you could be
"vshah101" and a host of others.....

But you are not me. ;-)

In fact, for all anyone knows, "nocwtest" and "averyfine" could still
be registered to you.
>
> Apparently some in here are terribly uptight and can see no humor in
> the pseudonym of "a very fine man" that lacks two spaces. :-) I used
> that pseudonym first about 1992 on a Bulletin Board System as
> Co-Sysop. "Len Over 21" came from the pseudonym used on the BBS

> US Pompeii a year later (run and sysoped by Stan and Zippy Manus in
> the Hollywood Hills). It is word play based on the BBS software...takes
> too long to explain to anal-retentive control freaks. :-)

Why should anyone care?

The important question is "why does Len need so many different screen
names from the same ISP in order to post to a few newsgroups"?

Perhaps touching your tongue to that B battery fried some
neurons....;-)
>
> I can't "prove" who "Avery Fine" is...but both you and Reverend Jim
> are prolific posters from AOL. Coincidence? :-)

It can be proven that "Avery Fine" used to be YOU, even though you
have denied it. Perhaps "Avery Fine" still is you, Len. And YOU are
the most prolific and wordy poster to rrap - AOL or not. Coincidence?
;-) ;-)

Hmmmm...Len uses terms like "psychotic" and "copycat killer syndrome"
to describe other posters, and claims to know the motivations of
others he has never met. ;-)

"Psychotics will never admit they are crazy."

Ayup - you oughta know, Len ;-) ;-) ;-)

Toodles fer now, Len. The bands are alive with the sound of Morse and
there's much to do here before the snow flies.

N2EY (so you know who I am)

1261. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 21:51:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030815175106.00545.00000019@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 74681

In article <c2356669.0308140938.e2260e1@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F3A5AAC.8080401@psu.edu>...
>> N2EY wrote:
>> > In article <3F32C3E8.7050809@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>> > writes:
>
>> >>N2EY wrote:
>
>> >>>In article <qK_Wa.2427$lL.391902@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> >>>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>> >>>>What WILL be the end of ham radio is a lack of significant
>> >>>>growth ...
>
>> >>>Let's get it straight - is dropping Element 1 going to give us lots more
>> >>>growth or not?
>
>> >> I don't understand a few of the things Carl says here. That we will
>> >>dissapear unless we get "significant growth".
>
>> > There are more US hams today than at any time in the past.
>
>> >> What exactly is that? a 100 percent increase in a day? increase at 1
>> >>percent over population increase?
>
>> > That's what I've been asking.
>
>> >> I'd like to know the advances they will bring.
>
>> > Similar to what newcomers have always brought.
>
>> >> I want to hear how those who oppose the ending of the Morse code
>> >>requirement are keeping ham radio from marching forward.
>
>> >> Time for the roadmap to the future to be laid out.
>
>> > Don't hold yer breath waiting;-)
>
>> >> Or is this like the last scene in "The Candidate"?
>
>> > Refresh my memory on that one, Mike.

>
>> The Candidate is a pretty good film about an idealistic fellow, (Robert

>> Redford) the son of a former Governor, who gets caught up in running for
>> office after being prodded by the local political machinery. Along the
>> way, he compromises most all of his values (all that is not relevant to
>> the case at hand. But in the end, after being elected to office, amongst
>> the victory celebration, he looks to his campaign manager (Peter Boyle -
>> Haw) completely confused, and asks "What do we do now?" He was
>> completely lost and didn't know what to do.
>
>Sounds pretty familiar.....
>>
>> My point is that I see a close relationship between that ending and the

>> situation we have here. No real thought has been given to the aftermath
>> of the ending of the Morse code test.
>
>Some of us have given it real thought, and have posted ideas. But the
>mantra has always been that eliminating the code test would solve
>everything.

YOU ARE MISTAKEN.

Unless that was YOUR twisted "mantra."

It could be...you equate morse code with amateur radio so strongly
that you can't separate them, even in your imagination.

>> Those who do not believe that, that is to say that a Morse code test is

>> a desirable thing, or those who want the writtens to be reflective of a
>> fair degree of competence, have an uphill battle, and at the moment are
>> regarded as the losers.
>
>Not by everyone.

The VEC Question Pool Committee is open to input. They are the ones
who ORIGINATE questions and answers.

>Looking back on the history, however, shows that license requirements
>are only one factor - and probably not as major a factor as some would
>have us believe. What really matters is the interest and drive of the
>person involved. Some people will learn just enough to pass the test
>and then shut down, forgetting most of what they "learned" in a short
>time. Others will go far beyond the test levels. It's all a choice.

"Interest and drive." :-)

That equates to "laziness" and other negative moral/ethical things?

>"Radio" and "electronics" are such wide-ranging subjects that nobody
>can be an expert at all of it.

You aren't an "expert" in radio-electronics?

Gosh, and you "DO electrical engineering." With a Masters degree, too!

>... And even the most knowledgeable "radio
>professionals" can be utterly clueless about the practical aspects of
>amateur radio.

HARF!!! :-)

>Here are some others I've seen, by various others:
>
>- Institute an age requirement of 14 years as the minimum for any
>class of amateur license

Yeah...let's hear it for all those "mature" 6-year-olds on the air
wiith the "big gun contesters."

Wow, that 14-year-old arbitrary limit sure must have stung you!

>- Eliminate all subbands-by-mode

Blasphemy! Morsemen DESERVE elitism and their own private
spectral playpen!

>- Reduce the number of license classes to one all-privs license.

Horrors! Remove the STATUS-TITLE-RANK-PRIVELEGE?!?!?

Can't have that!

>- Reduce the number of license classes to two - entry and all-privs.

The OLD system - the one in which you triumphed - is ALWAYS
the BEST!!!

>You get the idea.

Absolutely. Keep your elite morseman status and titles...after all
you are in the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service!

>> The PCTA's, because of their being so negative, and scaring the new
>> people away?
>
>"Negative"? We're not "negative" - we're FOR something!

What you are FOR is to keep your rank-title-status-privilege and you
don't want that "contaminated" by large-scale changes.

>Meanwhile, the real challenges don't get the spotlight. Like CC&Rs -
>what good are licenses if we cannot put up effective antennas?

What good are you that can't give in to new ideas, progressive ideas,
that intefere with your standards and practices of the 1930s?

LHA

1262. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 21:51:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030815175107.00545.00000021@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 74676

In article <3F3B210D.9B7A354F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Not at all, Mr. Bluster. I wrote nothing about MY being relevant.

That's true. You are NOT relevant to any subject in here except
your over-prideful nonsense and trying to put down others who
won't worship you. Pfaughhh.

LHA

1263. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 21:51:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030815175107.00545.00000020@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 74678

In article <3F3B2209.8DC58CF5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>I do have some expertise in amateur radio and I have decades of
>experience.

Whoopee. Now go off and USE all that "experience."

Try "elmering" some nincompoops. Gain some worship from idiots.

All you do in here is a lot of bullying nonsense and trying to toss your
weight around.

Go ahead, punk, advance the state of the amateur art.

You've had DECADES of "experience" and should be able to...

You haven't done it.

LHA

1264. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 21:51:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030815175108.00545.00000022@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 74677

In article <3F3B12D9.871DBF3D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Yup. Herr Robust is once again proving I'm right. :-)
>
>You are perhaps the only person on the planet incapable of seeing the
>irony of what you tell others when compared to what you actually do.
>You lecture others on what they have no "authority" to do then proceed
>to do those very same things.

Stuff it, crybaby. I'm still RIGHT and you're still the egotist who is
pissed off.

Now go and try to "moderate" someone else.

You are wasting our time in here.

LHA

1265. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 21:51:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030815175109.00545.00000023@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 74680

In article <3F3B1441.1AA0EB23@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

<about a post to James Miccolis>

>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> Please tell us all about when you flew those old "A-N" ranges. :-)
>
>Did they let you fly your model aircraft on some old airfields, Len? :-)

Not "old" ones. Try Apollo Field at the Sepulveda Dam Recreation
Area in Los Angeles' San Fernando Valley. Real runway and ramp.
Popular with the Large Scale R/C groups here. Lots of model helo
flying too.

Model aircraft hobbyists lobbied for and got a whole bunch of 72 MHz
channels for R/C some while back. They still have them. Look in
Part 95, Title 47 CFR.

>> VORs have been in use on civil airways since before 1960. A lot more
>> accurate, easier to use, much less pilot error than the "range markers."
>>
>> Oh, my, you love the past. :-)
>
>An interesting comment coming from one who frequently brings up THE past
>as well as his own past. :-)

The OLD "range markers" (actually "range beacon system") went
out with civil aviation way back in 1955 with new ICAO rules on
radio and radionavigation.

VOR or Very high frequency Omnidirectional radio Range, offers at
least a quantum leap over the old morse keyed "A-N" beacons.
Anyone claiming they do air navigation by those old "A-N" beacons
is at least 48 years out of touch with reality.

Morsemen tend to be out of touch with reality.

>> Didja know you can address all your written test content complaints to
>> the VEC QPC? They are radio amateurs themselves.
>>
>> I'm sure they would include a question on "QFU" if any ham is expected
>> to line up his ham aircraft on a runway bearing.
>>
>> Beep, beep.
>

>Why are you concerned? You're no more a radio amateur than you are a
>pilot.

I've designed and proved civil aviation radionavigation avionics. Those worked very well.

Of course that was as a professional, something you detest.

I passed my US private pilot written exam in 1962. Gave up piloting due to cost...$17.50/hour dual, $12.00/hour solo back then. A typical four-place, single-engine, retractable-gear light aircraft back then cost $30K (Mooney, only bare essentials of instrumentation). Hull insurance premiums were 10% annual for beginning pilot-owners.

Back in 1963 my house purchase price was $30,500. It is now worth about $375 to $390 thousand if I were to put it on the market. I made a wise move to invest in real estate instead of a cute lil airplane...those haven't appreciated very much in 40 years.

What the hell is your problem, Herr Robust? AVIATION isn't the subject of this thread...someone else brought up aviation. You don't have anything to do with aviation except to rack up frequent cryer miles in here.

You don't know a VORTAC from hardtack. If you heard ATCRBS pronounced you would think it an insect infestation. Pfffft.

LHA.

1266. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 21:51:54 UTC
From: averyfine@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030815175154.20925.00000034@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 74679

>Subject: Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)
>From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
>Date: 8/15/03 2:41 PM Eastern Daylight Time
>Message-id: <3F3D261C.E96C3279@earthlink.net>
>
>Brian wrote:
>>
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<3F3C5D1C.E6292AC5@earthlink.net>...
>> > Brian wrote:
>> > >
>> > > averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
>news:<20030811214400.10282.00001428@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>> > >
>> > > > I am not copying anyone. I am simply being myself.
>> > >
>> > > But you copy the same smugness as noted in David Heil/K8MN.
>> >
>> > You mean the one who isn't an AOL user? Get a life.
>
>> AveryFine and you have a lot in common.
>
>I don't do a real Lennie imitation. Avery is much, much better at it.

I am not imitating anyone.

Do you see me calling people names?

Do you see me insulting other people?

Do you see me behaving in any way like Leonard Anderson?

Perhaps that's what bothers him so much.

Oh well, not to worry.

1267. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 22:18:08 UTC
From: erik@theswansons.net
Message-ID: <93b0bb21.0308151418.36e08be@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74682

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030724234303.02197.00001552@mb-m12.aol.com>...

... previous quoted message elided ...

> >
>
> Well, I did just what you asked! Here is what I sent:
>
> ----------
>
> TO: Michael K. Powell, Chairman, FCC <mpowell@fcc.gov>
>
> Dear Chairman Powell,
>
...

> You will undoubtedly be receiving many petitions from current and
> prospective radio amateurs to do this, but the fact is, these people are
> simply unqualified to know and understand the benefits and advantages
> of the Morse/CW mode in the Amateur Radio Service.

A mode that is now out of use by pretty much all government services
(emergency services included). I personally have an interest in
learning the code, but don't see how it should remain a requirement if
it is no longer to be the 'lingua franca' of HF throughout the world.
Yes it is a low bandwidth, low power mode that can be very useful, as
this writer points out, but without that international status I don't
think that it should be required anymore than an in depth
understanding of psk31 or any other digital mode. All operators
should know of its existance, where on the bands it is expected to be
located, and where to learn more. There will always be a place for
Morse/CW and I'm sure there will always be enthusiasts... even if it
is no longer a requirement... just like french is no longer THE lingua
franca of the world ironically enough.

Erik Swanson KG6GOP

1268. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 22:27:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308151427.e86bcd8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74683

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F3D2A76.AA8AF78E@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3C5C1A.641EDF8C@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F395779.63FCCE51@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I was "intimately" involved with HF communications across the Pacific in
> > > > > > the 1960's at hours of my own choosing. My station also worked across
> > > > > > the Atlantic and across the Indian Ocean. It did so with less power
> > > > > > than yours and I was still a teenager.
> > > > >
> > > > > Was this an amateur station?
> > > >
> > > > It most certainly was.
> > >
> > > Cool. What amateur call sign did you use?
> >
> > Mine.
> >
> > > > > Was it capable of only working over oceans, or could it work over land > masses as
well?
> > >
> > > I wasn't simultaneously living on both coasts, Brian. Try to figure it
> > > out.
> > >
> > > Try not being so smug, David.
> >
> > I wasn't being smug. I suggested that you ponder the question and try
> > to come up with a plausible answer.

Dave, this basically shows that you are smug without even trying, or
even being cognizant of it.

> > You never did say where you were; where your station could work across
> > the Pacific ocean, and across the Indian and Atlantic oceans.
> >
> > No, I didn't say. There are numerous places within the continent in
> > which we live where such is possible. Ponder the matter.

OK.

> > I'm
> > trying to think of a geographic location with "both coasts" and those
> > three oceans.
>
> Keep pondering.

I am. I'm still trying to think of a location that has a coast on the
Indian Ocean, a coast on the Atlantic Ocean, and able to work across
the Pacific Ocean with intimate involvement.

> > So kindly tell us what country that you operated from that had "both
> > coasts" and three oceans.
>
> I never wrote that it "had" them. I wrote that I operated a station
> capable to working across them.

Now you want me to believe that a landmass has no coasts nor adjoining
oceans?

> > > > > I was "intimately" involved with HF military communications, working
> > > > > transatlantic and transpacific paths using a variety of log periodic,
> > > > > inverted discone and rhombic antennas and either 10 kw or 45 kw
> > > > > transmitters from 1968-1970. The station was in operation 24/7 but I
> > > > > generally pulled eight hour shifts...
> > > >
> > > > Of your own choosing, right?
> > >
> > > What's the difference for purposes of discussion? Do you know anyone
> > > who ever worked 24 hour days for a solid week?
> >
> > Your comment, "of my own choosing" sounds very odd for a military
> > radio station.
>
> Those words don't appear in the paragraph concerning military
> communications. You might want to read it again.

The occur in the paragraph where you didn't define the communication
service that you used. You might want to be a little more clear in
your web communications.

> > You said that you had an amateur station, and you pulled military
> > shifts of your own choosing.
>
> I said nothing of the kind. If you have problems, maybe you can have
> someone read it for you.

Maybe, but I wouldn't want them to suffer through your usual muddy
communications.

> > In your original statements above, did you really mean to string
> > together an amateur station from a country with two coasts and three
> > oceans, with your military station in Vietnam?
>
> Those things were not strung together. Perhaps you can find someone

> with writing skills explain the idea behind paragraphing.

It wouldn't be you.

> > > > > I was "intimately" involved with in-country HF military operations for a
> > > > > year in Vietnam.
> > > > >
> > > > > I spent fifteen "intimate" years overseas with the U.S. Department of
> > > > > State where I was responsible for all HF and VHF communications whether
> > > > > by voice, asynchronous data or morse.
> > > >
> > > > So this wasn't amateur radio either?
> > >
> > > Read it again and perhaps you'll figure it out.
> >
> > But I thought this group was to discuss amateur radio. And you do get
> > after Len for bringing up other services communications, however long
> > ago it may have been.
>
> Where've you been? Did you read Len's material to which I replied?

I read what you tell Len when he tries to bring up his radio
communication experiences.

> > > > > I've spent forty years as an active radio amateur, operating various
> > > > > modes on bands from 1.8 through 432 MHz.
> > >
> > > Aren't you going to ask me if this was military communications or State
> > > Department communications?
> >
> > No. I recognize this as an amateur radio discussion group, and I
> > recognize that you are finally addressing amateur radio operations.
> > Congratulations.
>
> Maybe you can congratulate Len as well, if he ever gets back from the
> Korean War.

How can this be possible? You continually remind the world that Len
has no amateur experience.

> > > > Why did you stop at 432 MHz? Even most store bought amateur UHF rigs
> > > > are capable of going up to 450 Mhz.
> > >
> > > Weak signal work on SSB and CW takes place in that area of the band.
> >
> > It may. Or it may not.
>
> My logs say that it does.

Both.

> > > That's where I happen to spend much of my time. Is that all right with
> > > you?

> >
> > Peachy.
> >
> > > > Oh, uhhh. Forgot. Superior Heil "doan do FM (tm Kelly)"
> > >
> > > I have a 440 rig at home. I use it occasionally. I use 2m FM
> >
> > So your statement of frequency ranges above is inaccurate. It would
> > more accurately read, "1.8 to 450 MHz."
>
> It is much more accurate than your statements in which you could not
> properly attribute the words "of my own choosing".

If you would only be more clear.

> > > regularly. Looks like you've struck out on your attempt to hit a nerve,
> > > little electrolyte.
> >
> > No attempt made. I just figured that such a great ham as yourself was
> > short changing himself with such a limited portfolio of RF activity.
>
> You may consider my words as a mere summary.

I consider them as mere words.

> > > > > > I can go on and on without ever
> > > > > > touching the recorded and evidencible facts of having spent three
> > > > > > years being actively involved with the latter. That grates on you.
> > > > >
> > > > > Three years? Three measly years? It grates on me that you'd dare
> > > > > compare your three years to my experience and pretend to have a lock on
> > > > > knowledge.
> > > >
> > > > Grates on you, huh?
> > >
> > > Figure it out.
> >
> > No problem.
>
> Then why'd you ask a question?

I just wanted to verify that you experience what the rest of us would
call, "emotion."

> > > > Some people learn faster than others. Look at everyone's vastly
> > > > different learning experiences with Morse Cose to see what I mean.
> > > > Some are never able to learn it at all.
> > >
> > > Learning rate isn't under discussion. Experience is.
> >
> > Ah, No. You specifically said, "knowledge." Think about it. Can one
> > attain knowledge only through experience?

>
> Most certainly.

Then put the things that you are willing to say, but unwilling to
discuss, in brackets [xxx].

> > > > But with respect to radio theory and ops, perhaps Len is a quicker
> > > > learner than you. Perhaps not.
> > >
> > > Ask him.
> >
> > I wonder what he would say?
>
> Let me repeat: Ask him.

I think with respect to radio theory and ops, he would say that he
were the quicker learner.

> > > > You tell me everyone if learns the same, and if so, I'll have to give
> > > > you this one.
> > >
> > > Figure it out.
> >
> > Ah, sorry. You don't get this one.
>
> You can't give what isn't yours.

It's done every day. Have you never heard of government?

> > > > Unless Len actually has more than just the three years
> > > > RF experience that you reference.
> > >
> > > Ask him. I'm sure he'll be happy to go on about it at great length.
> >
> > Much like your military and dept. of state resume?
>
> Resume? You mean the summary to counter Len's absurdity?

Absurdity is a land location with two coasts and three oceans.

> > > > And what of education? Can education play a role in knowledge?
> > >
> > > Figure it out.
> >
> > Ah, you don't get this one either.
>
> Ah, you haven't figured it out.

I've figured out that you've run out of anything that matters.

> > Dave, you deserve a much needed vacation from rrap. At least consider
> > it.
>

> I've considered it. My response is: No.
>
> Dave K8MN

Then continue to be "grated."

1269. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 22:29:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308151429.5908d9dc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74684

averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030815120847.07430.00000023@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)
> >From: brianburke@juno.com (Brian)
> >Date: 8/15/03 8:23 AM Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <f45722ac.0308150423.32a58ca1@posting.google.com>
> >
> >Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:<3F3C5D1C.E6292AC5@earthlink.net>...
> >> Brian wrote:
> >> >
> >> > averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
> news:<20030811214400.10282.00001428@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >> >
> >> > > I am not copying anyone. I am simply being myself.
> >> >
> >> > But you copy the same smugness as noted in David Heil/K8MN.
> >>
> >> You mean the one who isn't an AOL user? Get a life.
> >>
> >> Dave K8MN
> >
> >AveryFine and you have a lot in common.
> >
> I take that as a compliment!

Call it "self love."

1270. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 22:32:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308151432.4a4c54a7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74685

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F3D2556.34E27B82@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3C5D48.951FFE94@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F37B75A.D47CAEF1@earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > > > Roger: "Duuuuh, how'd you know it was me"? Shall we say that you have a
> > > > > rather unique writing style and that your topics of interest repeat
> > > > > themselves on a regular basis.
> > > >
> > > > Gee David, someone posting as Avery Fine is sure doing a ringer impression of you.
> > > >
> > > > What could it mean?
> > >
> > > It could mean that someone is doing an impression of Len and you aren't
> > > bright enough to figure it out.
> >
> > But it's you they're imitating.
> >
> See, you weren't bright enough to figure it out even after an
> explanation.
>
> Dave K8MN

No doubt attributable to your superb powers of explanation.

1271. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 22:52:29 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhjo61$431$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74686

"Bill Evans" <bevans@ebsys.mb.ca> wrote in message
news:x08%a.39127$Rz6.54279@news1.mts.net...
> Perhaps yesterday's, continuing massive power failure in the northeastern
> U.S.A. and Canada will convince the power utilities that they should focus
> their energies and resources on their core business, rather than entering
a
> new business that is already served by telephone companies, competitive
> local exchange carriers (CLEC), cable television operators, satellite
> services and, in some markets, broadband wireless access (BWA) carriers.
>
> According to the August 15th Toronto Globe and Mail, "critics have been
> calling for breakers to be installed throughout North America's grids for
> some time, only to be told by the grid operators (power companies) that
> there is no money to fund such a massive infrastructure overhaul."
>
> Why would regulators, politicians and the power companies' shareholders be
> interested in spending billions of dollars entering a new business when
they
> obviously have major challenges in their own backyard. Seems like time to
> "stick to the knitting".
>
> William E. Evans, P. Eng.
> VE4UD
>
>

Probably because they are waiting for a guberment buy out to finance it.

Dan/W4NTI

1272. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 22:54:02 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhjo8v$v9c$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74687

"Erik Swanson" <erik@theswansons.net> wrote in message
news:93b0bb21.0308151418.36e08be@posting.google.com...
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030724234303.02197.00001552@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>
> ... previous quoted message elided ...
>
> > >
> >
> > Well, I did just what you asked! Here is what I sent:
> >
> > ----------------------
> >
> > TO: Michael K. Powell, Chairman, FCC <mpowell@fcc.gov>
> >
> > Dear Chairman Powell,
> >
> > ...
>
> > You will undoubtedly be receiving many petitions from current and
> > prospective radio amateurs to do this, but the fact is, these people are
> > simply unqualified to know and understand the benefits and advantages
> > of the Morse/CW mode in the Amateur Radio Service.
>
> A mode that is now out of use by pretty much all government services
> (emergency services included). I personally have an interest in
> learning the code, but don't see how it should remain a requirement if
> it is no longer to be the 'lingua franca' of HF throughout the world.
> Yes it is a low bandwidth, low power mode that can be very useful, as
> this writer points out, but without that international status I don't
> think that it should be required anymore than an in depth
> understanding of psk31 or any other digital mode. All operators
> should know of its existance, where on the bands it is expected to be
> located, and where to learn more. There will always be a place for
> Morse/CW and I'm sure there will always be enthusiasts... even if it
> is no longer a requirement... just like french is no longer THE lingua
> franca of the world ironically enough.
>
> Erik Swanson KG6GOP

You did real well up to the Frency part. Whatever they agree with is
screwed up to start with.

Dan/W4NTI

1273. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 22:56:26 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhjode$gd0$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74688
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Poor 'Airy' unable to argue with conviction, so he attacks religion.

Go on back to the pub Airy, the blokes won't laugh at ya...I promise.

But this time...please wear your pants.

Dan/W4NTI

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f3c8594_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> Hence the hypocrisy of the religious loony in his attack on
> Iraq for WOMD.
>
> Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bhgsjk$mt6$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> > we are the ONLY country to use them against a civilian population
>
>
>

1274. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 22:57:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhjoep$m11$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74689
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Glad you admit it Airy. We learned from experts, eh?

Dan/W4NTI

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f3c8594$2_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> Britland is equally guilty of murder around the world as
> is Yankland today in Afghanistan and Iraq.
>
> You will find many postings from me on this topic since
> I joined the Internet in March of this year.
>
> Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bhgsoi$9nq$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Gee Airy......isn't that EXACTLY what the British did in the 17th and
18th
> > century??? How did it go...."The sun never sets on the British empire"
> > "Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
> > news:3f3b5bb8_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> > > Any human who sets out on a journey round the world with
> > > the specific intention of killing his fellow man deserves all
> > > he gets. Especially the Yanks in Iraq today.
> > > Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:bhedrk$ka5$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > > Yeah? You mean the ones that cut your redcoats to pieces and kicked
> > > > Cornwalles out of here on his ear?
>
>
>

1275. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 22:58:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhjoh1kof1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74690
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Help me out here Airy? What the blazes are you talking about prisons????

Dan/W4NTI

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f3c859a_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> Saddam was neutralised. It is the loony in the White House who is the
> greatest threat to World peace. He even kills
> defenceless Yanks in his own prisons.
>
> stewart <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:5f4fe4c2.0308141625.53e806b5@posting.google.com...
> > "Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
> news:<3f3b5bb8_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>...
> > > Any human who sets out on a journey round the world with
> > > the specific intention of killing his fellow man deserves all
> > > he gets. Especially the Yanks in Iraq today.
> > If there was ever a "fellow man" that required being killed, it is
> > Saddam
>
>
>
>

1276. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 23:03:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhjor3ibo1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74691
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:egapjv8pqfh6273t74ublmqs2ctgpsvatp@4ax.com...
> On Thu, 14 Aug 2003 15:49:34 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >Oh and BTW. The USA may indeed 'meet its match'....but keep this under
your
> >high hat mate......we have over 9000 nukes looking for a target. And
since
> >we are the ONLY country to use them against a civilian population, we
will
> >damn sure do it again. In otherwords, sir, we will draw enough blood to
> >make our enemies hurt beyond words.
>
> Oh, that's alright then. That makes it all OK!
> :-)
>
> I believe that was the real reason for the attack on Iraq. To "draw
> enough blood", as you so delicately put it, to exact revenge for the
> 9/11 atrocity. It doesn't matter whose blood it was ... just that it
> was seen to be drawn, to satisfy the lynch-mob mentality so prolific
> in Western society nowadays.
>
> Not surprising, really, as most of America's principal institutions
> are run by Zionists whose philosophy is "An eye for an eye, a tooth
> for a tooth."
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

Good show Walt. Bring in the 'Jewish problem'. Perhaps you are mad that
Hitler didn't win, eh? Are you perchance a 'closet anti-semite' ??

As for our reasons to stop Iraq....you don't get it do you? We didn't and
don't want to hurt the average Iraqi. We just wanted to get rid of So Damn
Insane and his henchmen. Before he became the Hitler of the 21st century.

You see old boy, if Chamerlain (sp?) would have had his arse out of his
boot the whole thing (ww2) would never have been.

So I AGREE with Mr. Bush. Kill the bastards before they kill us.

And yes indeed...I can guarantee 9/11 and the murder of innocents PISSED US OFF. And guess what? YOU AIN'T SEEN NOTHING YET.

Dan/W4NTI

1277. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 23:05:18 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhjou3kkc1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74692
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

<g3pho@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote in message
news:3f3bfd1d.2583133@news.blueyonder.co.uk...
> On Wed, 13 Aug 2003 17:23:15 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >If it wasn't for your old colony your country would be speaking German
and
> >eating raw fish. You ungrateful piece of crap.
> >
> >Go ahead and dream all you want. But don't forget you best keep the USA
on
> >at least talking terms, or England will be the third world country.
> >
> >I spent a lot of time in Europe in the 70s. Made a lot of English
friends.
> >Whats your problem? All your mates at the pub throw you out on your ear
for
> >your stupidity?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
>
> Dan ...
>
> None of us over here in the UK want Airy Bean to carry on breathing!
> As you say, he's a an ungrateful piece of crap .. and that's a
> compliment!
>
> Regards,
>
> Peter, G3PHO

I know Peter. And believe you me I love the English folks. Im just
rattling his head a bit. So excuse me if I enjoy it too much...

Dan/W4NTI

1278. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 23:13:57 UTC
From: Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI <g3vki@turner-smith.co.uk>
Message-ID: <ROd%a.13435$yl6.7612@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74693
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhjoh1kof1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net...
> Help me out here Airy? What the blazes are you talking about
prisons????
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
You'll have to make allowances for The Anus. He lives in a little world all
of his own.
--
;>)
73 de Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI - mine's a pint.

1279. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 23:15:16 UTC
From: Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI <g3vki@turner-smith.co.uk>
Message-ID: <4Qd%a.13436$yl6.5163@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74694
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhjode$gd0$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> Poor 'Airy' unable to argue with conviction, so he attacks religion.
>
> Go on back to the pub Airy, the blokes won't laugh at ya...I promise.
>
> But this time...please wear your pants.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
Why did you tell him? You've spoiled the fun now.
--
;>)
73 de Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI - mine's a pint.

1280. Re: Dropping the code caused the blackout?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 23:16:11 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <%Qd%a.11948$Qa4.2703@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74695

No,

That was me hooking up a doorbell :)
Did that before in college in 1965!

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F3D4B72.2050507@ix.netcom.com...
> I'm sure someone can figure out a connection.....
>
> (;
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.510 / Virus Database: 307 - Release Date: 8/14/03

1281. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 23:19:48 UTC
From: Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI <g3vki@turner-smith.co.uk>
Message-ID: <jUd%a.13441$yl6.11078@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74696
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

<g3pho@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote in message
news:3f3bfd1d.2583133@news.blueyonder.co.uk...
>
> Dan ...
>
> None of us over here in the UK want Airy Bean to carry on breathing!
> As you say, he's a an ungrateful piece of crap .. and that's a
> compliment!
>
> Regards,
>
> Peter, G3PHO

You're too polite to him. Perhaps if enough people tell him to FOAD he'll
take the hint.
--
;>)
73 de Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI - mine's a pint.

1282. Re: What troubles me (was Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 23:29:08 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <sbhqjv8mt10ui9iblhrifie65501a8p74b@4ax.com>
Source record: 74697

On 14 Aug 2003 16:29:31 GMT, Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:

>Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> wrote:
>>> In the case of morphoholic, the issue isn't what his license class is,
>> but whether or not he even HAS one. He claimed to. Anyone can claim to
>> have a license.
>>
>Please show me one post where I claimed anything of the sort. Stop
>making shit up to fit your agenda, or STFU.

Okay, fine, that's better yet - if you're now saying you do not have a
license, that makes you a worthless CB troll, which is what I
suspected all along.

Funny how every time guys like you open their mouths, it's to change
which foot is in there.

You might as well go back to rec.radio.cb now - where you belong.

1283. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 23:41:46 UTC
From: Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI <g3vki@turner-smith.co.uk>
Message-ID: <Vce%a.13467$yl6.10053@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74698
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhjor3ibo1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:egapjv8pqfh6273t74ublmqs2ctgpsvatp@4ax.com...
> > On Thu, 14 Aug 2003 15:49:34 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > >Oh and BTW. The USA may indeed 'meet its match'....but keep this under
> your
> > >high hat mate......we have over 9000 nukes looking for a target. And
> since
> > >we are the ONLY country to use them against a civilian population, we
> will
> > >damn sure do it again. In otherwords, sir, we will draw enough blood
to
> > >make our enemies hurt beyond words.
> >
> > Oh, that's alright then. That makes it all OK!
> > :-)
> >
> > I believe that was the real reason for the attack on Iraq. To "draw
> > enough blood", as you so delicately put it, to exact revenge for the
> > 9/11 atrocity. It doesn't matter whose blood it was ... just that it
> > was seen to be drawn, to satisfy the lynch-mob mentality so prolific
> > in Western society nowadays.
> >
> > Not surprising, really, as most of America's principal institutions
> > are run by Zionists whose philosophy is "An eye for an eye, a tooth
> > for a tooth."
> >
> > 73 de G3NYY
> >
> > --
> > Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com
>
> Good show Walt. Bring in the 'Jewish problem'. Perhaps you are mad that
> Hitler didn't win, eh? Are you perchance a 'closet anti-semite' ??
>
> As for our reasons to stop Iraq....you don't get it do you? We didn't and
> don't want to hurt the average Iraqi. We just wanted to get rid of So
Damn
> Insane and his henchmen. Before he became the Hitler of the 21st century.

>
> You see old boy, if Chamerlain (sp?) would have had his arse out of his
> boot the whole thing (ww2) would never have been.
>
> So I AGREE with Mr. Bush. Kill the bastards before they kill us.
>
> And yes indeed...I can guarantee 9/11 and the murder of innocents PISSED
US
> OFF. And guess what? YOU AIN'T SEEN NOTHING YET.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
I have to say though, that I find it strange that after all the searching,
not one WOMD was found in Iraq. I simply don't believe they were all
destroyed without trace; put in their position I would have used any weapons
I really had.
--
;>)
73 de Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI - mine's a pint.

1284. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 23:48:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hjogoh5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74699
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

On Thu, 14 Aug 2003 15:49:34 -0500, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>Oh and let the ragheads keep up their crap and we will turn the entire
>middle east into glass.

Including my brother's apartment in Tel Aviv? Not bloody likely.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane (ex-4X4UQ)

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1285. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 23:48:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hjoh0p7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74700
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

On Fri, 15 Aug 2003 11:05:43 +0100, Walt Davidson wrote:

>Not surprising, really, as most of America's principal institutions
>are run by Zionists whose philosophy is "An eye for an eye, a tooth
>for a tooth."

Ah, your anti-semitism bigotry (and ignorance of biblical
interpretation) has finally shone forth in all its glory, eh,
Ya Chatichat Charra.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1286. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 23:48:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hjogu56.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74701
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

On Fri, 15 Aug 2003 08:00:07 +0100, Airy R Bean wrote:

>Saddam was neutralised. It is the loony in the White House who is the
>greatest threat to World peace. He even kills
>defenceless Yanks in his own prisons.

My bother the prosecutor says that those whom he puts there for that
purpose deserve no better.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1287. Re: Click to sign petition supporting radio free brattleboro

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 23:48:30 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hjoge44.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74702

On Thu, 14 Aug 2003 17:16:31 -0400, KR-879 wrote:

>> "It is time to move from being a passive consumer of media to becoming
>> a co-creator in a movement which gives voice to the voiceless. If you
>> can't communicate, you can't organize. If you can't organize, you
>> can't fight back. And, if you can't fight back, you have no chance of
>> winning."
>>
>> Stephen Dunifer of Free Radio Berkeley paraphrasing "Scoop" Nisker

Ah yes, the same Stephen Dunifer who was enjoined by the Federal
District Court for the Northern District of California from
operating his "Free Radio Berkeley" operation until and unless the
FCC grants him a license.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

(Dunifer's FCC Case Officer
in the above action)

1288. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-15 23:48:31 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hjohhy8.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74703

Dave Heil wrote :

> I was "intimately" involved with HF military communications, working
> transatlantic and transpacific paths using a variety of log periodic,
> inverted discone and rhombic antennas and either 10 kw or 45 kw
> transmitters from 1968-1970. The station was in operation 24/7 but I
> generally pulled eight hour shifts...

Don't forget my favorites, the Sterba Curtains (SAC "Short Order")
on the six towers in a hexagon.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1289. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 00:19:56 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <gvtqjvskvf7upn4o095hsdkivqnivgk1c9@4ax.com>
Source record: 74704

On 15 Aug 2003 15:27:46 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:

>Now you want me to believe that a landmass has no coasts nor adjoining
>oceans?

I can think of one place that fits that description. You get there after departing Christchurch, New Zealand, aboard an LC-130. Nowadays, at least - back then maybe not. The 109th AMW in Schenectady, NY flies the LC-130s. Dave, am I warm?

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

1290. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 00:57:10 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhjvkj$q0g@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74705

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F39BD8E.2A5DA420@earthlink.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > SysD. If I put it over there we can remove the engine for backup and
put
> > all the system data on SysA and SysB. The database is written and I'm
near
> > finalization on coding. I should be able to develop a test environment
over
> > the weekend. If you will create a small database of around 250 records,
we
> > should then be able to test next week. Hopefully, we'll be ready for
the
> > launch end of Q3!
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F382F9C.EB92C7B0@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:3F379753.1361794D@earthlink.net...
> > > > > Mike Coslo wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > > > > > In article <20030810072821.12501.00001439@mb-m04.aol.com>,
> > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > > > > > > writes:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >>Fun fact: Check the lookup counter in QRZ.com for W5YI.
> > > > > > > >>
> > > > > > > >>73 de Jim, N2EY
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Jim:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > W5YI's QRZ record seems to be missing the lookup counter!
OTOH,
> > > > > > > Michelle, KC0MYV, seems to be breaking all records on that
> > account!
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Perhaps we can get Vipul a date?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > My guess would be, not with one hundred dollar bills pinned to his

> > shirt
> > > > > though my friend K3FK's adage comes to mind: "They never made a
trash
> > > > > can for which there wasn't a lid".
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave K8MN
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > K3FK????????????!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
> > >
> > > Does that call hold some special significance for you, Kim?
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > Nope. Just like the call.
>
> I didn't understand the significance of
> "K3FK????????????!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!" His father was W3FK.
>
> What's with the strange stuff at the top of your post?
>
> Dave K8MN
>

'Spose that's what I get for being on the newsgroup while I'm working....

Kim W5TIT

1291. Re: Dropping the code caused the blackout?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 01:07:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hjoicib.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74706

On Fri, 15 Aug 2003 23:16:11 GMT, Jim Hampton wrote:

>No,
>
>That was me hooking up a doorbell :)

No kidding! A friend of mine in NY (Long Island) related that all
the heavy-current appliances in her house were going, and she had
just plugged in and turned on the vacuum cleaner when the juice went
off..... <ggg>

(Buy stock in Generac....)

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1292. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 01:07:02 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hjoi6ka.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74707

On 15 Aug 2003 15:18:08 -0700, Erik Swanson wrote:

>> Well, I did just what you asked! Here is what I sent:

You do know that one does not "tell" the FCC to do anything if one
is smart. That turns them off "really quickly".

You do know that letters, e-mails, etc. do not get put into the
Docket Record and therefore are not required to be considered in
reaching a decision unless they are formally filed using the format
and procedures specified in Part 1 of the FCC Rules.

Don't get me wrong -- I am dead set against continuing the CW test
requirement and the establishment of BPL. I just don't rant and
rave about it.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1293. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 01:07:03 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hjoisyc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74708
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

On Sat, 16 Aug 2003 00:41:46 +0100, Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI wrote:

>I have to say though, that I find it strange that after all the searching,
>not one WOMD was found in Iraq. I simply don't believe they were all
>destroyed without trace; put in their position I would have used any weapons
>I really had.

They're all in Syrian custody in hidden storage in the Bekaa Valley,
but Syria is too scared to use them on behalf of Saadam because they
don't want Damesek (Damascus) turned into a sea of glass as it almost
was in '67.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1294. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 01:56:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6307F5.22439%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74709

"Bill Evans" wrote:
>
> Perhaps yesterday's, continuing massive power
> failure will convince the power utilities that
> they should focus their energies and resources
> on their core business, rather than entering a
> new business (snip)
>
> (snip) critics...told by the grid operators
> (power companies) that there is no money to
> fund such a massive infrastructure overhaul."
>
> Why would regulators, politicians and the power
> companies' shareholders be interested in
> spending billions of dollars entering a new
> business when they obviously have major
> challenges in their own backyard. (snip)

It's very simply, Bill. BPL offers far more potential profit than further investment in existing infrastructure does.

Besides, power companies aren't really bothered by the occasional power outage, especially since angry consumers can't go elsewhere to get power. The companies lose a little money while the power is off, but they know consumers will crank up those heaters and air conditioners just as soon as the power comes back on - pretty much making up any loses from the power outage itself.

On the other hand, the potential money from BPL is enough to get those companies, and their investors, really excited. And, unless we come up with something really strong to fight it, something much stronger then rhetorical evidence from the UK, it is going to be almost impossible to stop.

What we need is well done studies from the areas where BPL is now being tested - studies showing the actual impact on radio (frequencies, noise levels, and so on). And, to be honest with you, I'm not even sure that will be enough.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1295. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 02:00:11 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F3D902C.6080107@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 74710

Phil Kane wrote:

>
> You do know that letters, e-mails, etc. do not get put into the
> Docket Record and therefore are not required to be considered in
> reaching a decision unless they are formally filed using the format
> and procedures specified in Part 1 of the FCC Rules.
>
>
Now if there was a way to find the petition for rule making the NCVEC
sent in, then we
could comment on it. I can't find it at the FCC's web page. Seems if
you don't know the
number, you're screwed.....

1296. NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 02:11:24 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <gpg%a.32$6e5.6019@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74711

Hello all,

I just got back tonight from several days of meetings
in Washington.

Wed. when I arrived in Washington, one of the first things
I did was file NCI's Petition for Rulemaking with the FCC.

It is available in .pdf format at http://www.nocode.org
under the "Articles" link ...

Some will undoubtedly say "What took you so long?"

The answer is simply "We wanted to do the best possible
job of getting it right."

73,
--
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
Grid Square FN20fm
http://home.ptd.net/~wk3c

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, IEEE Standards Association
Chair, IEEE 802.18 Radio Regulatory Technical Advisory Group
Chair-elect, Wi-Fi Alliance Regulatory Committee
Co-Chair, Wi-Fi Alliance Legislative Committee
Member, QCWA (31424)
Member, ARRL
Member, TAPR
Member, The SETI League

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

1297. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 02:16:37 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <9ug%a.34$6e5.6188@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74712

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F3D902C.6080107@ix.netcom.com...
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> >
> > You do know that letters, e-mails, etc. do not get put into the
> > Docket Record and therefore are not required to be considered in
> > reaching a decision unless they are formally filed using the format
> > and procedures specified in Part 1 of the FCC Rules.
> >
> >
> Now if there was a way to find the petition for rule making the NCVEC
> sent in, then we
> could comment on it. I can't find it at the FCC's web page. Seems if
> you don't know the
> number, you're screwed.....

It hasn't been assigned an RM number or put on public notice yet ...

NONE of the Petitions are open for comment yet ... the procedure
is to wait for them to be assigned an RM number and put on public
notice. Comments filed before then probably go into the bit-bucket.

BTW, NCI's Petition was filed Aug. 13 and is available on the
NCI website at http://www.nocode.org under the "Articles" link
as a .pdf download.

73,
--
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
Grid Square FN20fm
http://home.ptd.net/~wk3c

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, IEEE Standards Association
Chair, IEEE 802.18 Radio Regulatory Technical Advisory Group
Chair-elect, Wi-Fi Alliance Regulatory Committee
Co-Chair, Wi-Fi Alliance Legislative Committee
Member, QCWA (31424)
Member, ARRL
Member, TAPR
Member, The SETI League

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

1298. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 02:20:36 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Uxg%a.35$6e5.6035@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74713

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB6307F5.22439%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...

>
> On the other hand, the potential money from BPL is enough to get those
> companies, and their investors, really excited. And, unless we come up
with
> something really strong to fight it, something much stronger then
rhetorical
> evidence from the UK, it is going to be almost impossible to stop.
>
> What we need is well done studies from the areas where BPL is now being
> tested - studies showing the actual impact on radio (frequencies, noise
> levels, and so on). And, to be honest with you, I'm not even sure that
will
> be enough.

Ed Hare, W1RFI, of the ARRL isn't the only one measuring the interference
at the BPL pilot test sites ... I was in a meeting today with folks from
NTIA
(the equivalent of the FCC for federal govt. users of the spectrum) and they
are out doing measurements, too. The meeting was about something else,
but I got the impression that they aren't happy with what they are seeing
either ...

73,
Carl -wk3c

1299. Portable/mobile call signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 02:30:27 UTC
From: Sterling Garwood <slgarwood@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <slgarwood-AF225E.21302615082003@netnews.attbi.com>
Source record: 74714

I have a question on mobile/portable operation ... I seem to recall that the FCC dropped the requirement to sign as portable/mobile with the region the station is operating in. I can't seem to find any reference to it. I assume that W9XXX/W5 is good operating procedure but is it an FCC requirement? I do know that a change in the 90s made W5/W9XXX equally vaid as W9XXX/W5 ....

1300. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 02:56:44 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308151856.f42e3d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74715

"Bill Evans" <bevans@ebsys.mb.ca> wrote in message
news:<x08%a.39127$Rz6.54279@news1.mts.net>...
> Perhaps yesterday's, continuing massive power failure in the northeastern
> U.S.A. and Canada will convince the power utilities that they should focus
> their energies and resources on their core business, rather than entering a
> new business that is already served by telephone companies, competitive
> local exchange carriers (CLEC), cable television operators, satellite
> services and, in some markets, broadband wireless access (BWA) carriers.
>
> According to the August 15th Toronto Globe and Mail, "critics have been
> calling for breakers to be installed throughout North America's grids for
> some time, only to be told by the grid operators (power companies) that
> there is no money to fund such a massive infrastructure overhaul."
>
> Why would regulators, politicians and the power companies' shareholders be
> interested in spending billions of dollars entering a new business when they
> obviously have major challenges in their own backyard. Seems like time to
> "stick to the knitting".

The only issue investors care about is income. They won't make any new
income by sinking capital into repairs and upgrades, they would
generate new income with BPL. Capitalism 101.

>
> William E. Evans, P. Eng.
> VE4UD

w3rv

1301. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 04:00:21 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308152000.7c63dd99@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74716

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308150416.7f8701e3@posting.google.com>...
> dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308142159.4f0f742a@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
> > Well you're *STILL* a liar and you're ritght-hama radio isn't for everyone.
> > Seems you might have understood that by now, instead of just regurgitating.
>
> DICK, I understand that you're not a nice man.

It's very clear that you've misunderstood most of what has gone on
here over the years.

1302. Re: Dropping the code caused the blackout?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 04:43:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030816004319.12631.00000328@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 74718

In article <3F3D4B72.2050507@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>
>I'm sure someone can figure out a connection.....
>
>(;
>

Obviously it was caused by all the eager, young, computer-literate
technically-savvy new hams all using their computers, doing the coding
on wonderful new digital modes for us hams to use!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1303. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 04:43:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030816004320.12631.00000330@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 74717

In article <f45722ac.0308151126.12ba9afe@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> There you go, folks! Kim just admitted that she's a half-wit! Too bad
>> the wit she has is also very dim!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Actually, Larry, she said that she only needed to be a half-wit to debate
>you.
>
>It wasn't a kind remark, and it went right over your head.

Brian:

Ah ha! So even you agree that Kim is a half-wit! Well, I guess it takes
one to know one!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1304. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 04:43:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030816004320.12631.00000329@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 74719

In article <9829b709.0308142147.67866cad@posting.google.com>, dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) writes:

> Then came the soundcard era, and that's where things really heated up
>with
>PSK31, RTTY, HELLSCHREIBER and if I could have found anyone on the air
>when I was looking, I'd try MFSK-16.

Dick:

MFSK-16? Man, talk about all the fresh, young, computer-literate digital-mode experts flooding ham radio since we dropped the code down to 5 Words Per. I have NEVER found anyone who can have an MFSK-16 QSO with me! Not one. In fact, MixW gives me an armload of digital modes, but all I've done with it so far is PSK-31, RTTY, Hellschreiber, and SSTV.

> Meanwhile since I/we sincerely believe that radiotelegraphy is
>valuable to the point that new hams should be required to get just a
>bit of it before being allowed to forgo *any* further required
>actions-they won't have to ever do anything whatever with that
>license, if that's their bent- you and a few other like minded who
>were just too lame or lazy to "do it" lay out all sorts of labels and
>accusations toward us, not the least of which is the clearly visible,
>easily-identified lie about our attitudes toward digital
>communications.

Well, I guess it's a lot easier for them to CLAIM technical superiority, and look down their pointy noses at Morse code proficiency, than to actually PROVE anything. But, hey, we're used to that!

> For once and for all-- **IT JUST IS NOT SO!!!!!*
>
> Facts don't budge you for a moment. OF COURSE Shannon's works are
>quite important and I challenge you to find where I ever suggested
>otherwise.

Frostbite Floyd, Lennie, et. al. -- in case you're wondering, I'll give you a clue -- Dick never suggested that Shannon's works were not important. But then, I have an unfair advantage over you -- I've been reading!

>But for you and Frosty to insist that Shannon controls the
>ARS is beyond ludicrous, and it seems that everyone reading here but
>you two and that idiot Anderson knows it. Oh, Don't forget the village
>idiot Burke.

Well, look at it this way, Dick -- at least, they give us some amusement!

> Have you actually spent any serious time trying to be a ham? Sure
>doesn't look like from your postings, either of you.
>
> Shannon controls nothing but explains much.

Shannon? That's an airport in Ireland, isn't it? :-) (I threw in the "Smiley Face" so all the villiage idiots out there would know I was only kidding!)

73 de Larry, K3LT

1305. Re: Portable/mobile call signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 04:46:24 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hjovcfe.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 74720

On Sat, 16 Aug 2003 02:30:27 GMT, Sterling Garwood wrote:

>I have a question on mobile/portable operation ... I seem to recall that
>the FCC dropped the requirement to sign as portable/mobile with the
>region the station is operating in. I can't seem to find any reference
>to it. I assume that W9XXX/W5 is good operating procedure but is it an
>FCC requirement? I do know that a change in the 90s made W5/W9XXX
>equally vaid as W9XXX/W5 ....

Portable or mobile operation have not required a special identifier
for several decades.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1306. Re: Portable/mobile call signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 05:27:36 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <chj%a.9$aN.5@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74721

Phil ... several? I think that was a requirement when I was a novice in
1962 ... could you give us a year?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA (former WN2CJV, WB2OSP, WA3RJX, N2JH)

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hjovcfe.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sat, 16 Aug 2003 02:30:27 GMT, Sterling Garwood wrote:
>
> >I have a question on mobile/portable operation ... I seem to recall that
> >the FCC dropped the requirement to sign as portable/mobile with the
> >region the station is operating in. I can't seem to find any reference
> >to it. I assume that W9XXX/W5 is good operating procedure but is it an
> >FCC requirement? I do know that a change in the 90s made W5/W9XXX
> >equally vaid as W9XXX/W5 ....
>
> Portable or mobile operation have not required a special identifier
> for several decades.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.510 / Virus Database: 307 - Release Date: 8/14/03

1307. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 05:53:31 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f3dc9bd$2_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74722
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Master Day confirms our perception of his maturity.....

<g3pho@blueyonder.co.uk> wrote in message
news:3f3bfd1d.2583133@news.blueyonder.co.uk...
> None of us over here in the UK want Airy Bean to carry on breathing!
> As you say, he's a an ungrateful piece of crap .. and that's a
> compliment!

1308. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 05:54:04 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f3dc9be$1_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74724
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Grow up, OM.

Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhjode$gd0$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> Poor 'Airy' unable to argue with conviction, so he attacks religion.
> Go on back to the pub Airy, the blokes won't laugh at ya...I promise.
> But this time...please wear your pants.
> "Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
> news:3f3c8594_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> > Hence the hypocrisy of the religious loony in his attack on
> > Iraq for WOMD.
> > Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:bhgsjk$mt6$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > we are the ONLY country to use them against a civilian population

1309. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 05:55:47 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f3dc9bf$1_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74723
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Now that Yankland has had sufficient time to start planting
WOMD, miraculously they'll start "finding" them pretty soon.

Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hjoisyc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sat, 16 Aug 2003 00:41:46 +0100, Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI wrote:
> >I have to say though, that I find it strange that after all the
searching,
> >not one WOMD was found in Iraq. I simply don't believe they were all
> >destroyed without trace; put in their position I would have used any
weapons
> >I really had.
> They're all in Syrian custody in hidden storage in the Bekaa Valley,
> but Syria is too scared to use them on behalf of Saadam because they
> don't want Damesek (Damascus) turned into a sea of glass as it almost
> was in '67.

1310. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 07:04:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB63501C.23806%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74725

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> Ed Hare, W1RFI, of the ARRL isn't the only one
> measuring the interference at the BPL pilot
> test sites ... I was in a meeting today with
> folks from NTIA (the equivalent of the FCC
> for federal govt. users of the spectrum) and
> they are out doing measurements, too. The
> meeting was about something else, but I got
> the impression that they aren't happy with
> what they are seeing either ...

I'm glad to hear that. Hopefully the studies will generate results that will get someone's attention. Regardless, BPL is obviously going to be tough to fight.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1311. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 07:39:44 UTC
From: Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI <g3vki@turner-smith.co.uk>
Message-ID: <7dl%a.13622$yl6.10177@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74726
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f3dc9bf$1_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> Now that Yankland has had sufficient time to start planting
> WOMD, miraculously they'll start "finding" them pretty soon.
>
On closer inspection they might be found to be your discarded home brew CB
rigs.
(_!_)

1312. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 10:17:39 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3E0101.1B9C7B68@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74727

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <c2356669.0308140938.e2260e1@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F3A5AAC.8080401@psu.edu>...
> >> N2EY wrote:
> >> > In article <3F32C3E8.7050809@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> ><mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> >> > writes:
> >
> >> >>N2EY wrote:

> >> My point is that I see a close relationship between that ending and the
>
> >> situation we have here. No real thought has been given to the aftermath
> >> of the ending of the Morse code test.
> >
> >Some of us have given it real thought, and have posted ideas. But the
> >mantra has always been that eliminating the code test would solve
> >everything.
>
> YOU ARE MISTAKEN.

About real thought? posting ideas? the mantra? eliminating the code test
solving everything?

> Unless that was YOUR twisted "mantra."

That couldn't be correct, Len. Why would someone who supports continued
morse testing have a mantra about the removal of morse testing solving
everything?

> It could be...you equate morse code with amateur radio so strongly
> that you can't separate them, even in your imagination.

How would you be in a position to know that?

> >"Radio" and "electronics" are such wide-ranging subjects that nobody
> >can be an expert at all of it.
>
> You aren't an "expert" in radio-electronics?

He has answered the same question from you a couple of times.

> Gosh, and you "DO electrical engineering." With a Masters degree, too!

Does that irk you?

> >... And even the most knowledgeable "radio
> >professionals" can be utterly clueless about the practical aspects of
> >amateur radio.
>
> HARF!!! :-)

Okay, HARF clueless.

> >Here are some others I've seen, by various others:
> >
> >- Institute an age requirement of 14 years as the minimum for any
> >class of amateur license
>
> Yeah...let's hear it for all those "mature" 6-year-olds on the air
> wiith the "big gun contesters."

I really appreciate your confirming what I wrote about your minimum age requirement just a couple of days ago.

> Wow, that 14-year-old arbitrary limit sure must have stung you!

Apparently not nearly as much as the blanket rejection of your idea for instituting a minimum age requirement.

> Blasphemy! Morsemen DESERVE elitism and their own private
> spectral playpen!

> Horrors! Remove the STATUS-TITLE-RANK-PRIVELEGE?!?!?

> Can't have that!

> The OLD system - the one in which you triumphed - is ALWAYS
> the BEST!!!

> Absolutely. Keep your elite morseman status and titles...after all
> you are in the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service!

> What you are FOR is to keep your rank-title-status-privilege and > you don't want that "contaminated" by large-scale changes.

> What good are you that can't give in to new ideas, progressive > ideas, that intefere with your standards and practices of the > 1930s?

Maybe Schuler will give you a guest preaching shot at the Chrystal Cathedral. If so, you can introduce your Improbability Thinking to the world.

Remember, Len, none of this need concern you. You aren't remotely involved in amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

1313. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 10:25:25 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3E02D3.3AC2500E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74728

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F3B210D.9B7A354F@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Not at all, Mr. Bluster. I wrote nothing about MY being relevant.
>
> That's true. You are NOT relevant to any subject in here except
> your over-prideful nonsense and trying to put down others who
> won't worship you. Pfaughhh.

I can claim interest in any of the topics dealing with amateur radio and to some of those which take slide off into the field of professional radio. The fact is, I am actively involved in amateur radio and you are not. That aside, I wrote nothing about MY relevance to the material you conveniently snipped. You got it wrong.

I have no need for others to worship me, Len. I haven't even asked for your quiet veneration after correcting your erroneous comment about the Japanese equipment boom of the 1960's.

You have yet to provide a definition of "over-prideful".

Dave K8MN

1314. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 10:28:31 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3E038C.5C31812E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74729

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F3B2209.8DC58CF5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I do have some expertise in amateur radio and I have decades of
> >experience.
>
> Whoopee. Now go off and USE all that "experience."
>
I'm sure that it will come as no surprise if I tell you that I use my
experience almost daily.

> Try "elmering" some nincompoops. Gain some worship from idiots.

Are you looking for some help?

> All you do in here is a lot of bullying nonsense and trying to toss your
> weight around.

That seems to be your function here, Leonard.

> Go ahead, punk, advance the state of the amateur art.
>
> You've had DECADES of "experience" and should be able to...
>
> You haven't done it.

You've had a self-declared "interest" in amateur radio for decades.
You told us a number of years ago that you were going for an "Extra
right out of the box".

You haven't done anything to gain entry into amateur radio.

Dave K8MN

1315. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 10:34:41 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3E04FD.185EFD83@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74730

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F3B12D9.871DBF3D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Yup. Herr Robust is once again proving I'm right. :-)
> > >
> > >You are perhaps the only person on the planet incapable of seeing the
> > >irony of what you tell others when compared to what you actually do.
> > >You lecture others on what they have no "authority" to do then proceed
> > >to do those very same things.
>
> Stuff it, crybaby. I'm still RIGHT and you're still the egotist who is
> pissed off.

Is this your bullying nonsense? "Stuff it, crybaby" sure doesn't come
off as much of a counter to my comments.

"YOU have NO authority to call anyone anything, demean them,
make fun of them, or anything else...yet YOU continue to do so.
That indicates the perversity of your control-freak psychosis."

--Leonard H. Anderson

> Now go and try to "moderate" someone else.
>
> You are wasting our time in here.

"Our" time? Do you have multiple personalities? How many of you are
there?

Dave K8MN

1316. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 13:03:07 UTC
From: An Metet <anmetet@liberty.gmsociety.org>
Message-ID: <d2536d0a9d0f4cc0e6a08e7165f74e02@aonymous.poster>
Source record: 74731

NOTICE: This message may not have been sent by the Sender Name
above. Always use cryptographic digital signatures to verify
the identity of the sender of any usenet post or e-mail.

THE ASSHOLE <3F37B75A.D47CAEF1@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>
> "privacy.at Anonymous Remailer" wrote:
> >
> > In article <3F2DC086.A0898140@earthlink.net>
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > JMBCV wrote:
> > > >
> > > > In article <3F2C9682.FFEC97A8@earthlink.net>
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Vshah101 wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > From (Larry Roll K3LT):
>
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I'm involved in a county group which is part of ARES.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Feh. You've attended only one meeting..and just to harass and stalk another ham,
ASSHOLE.
> > > >
> > > > Why, Roger Wiseman! Fancy you slithering from beneath your bed to make
> > >
> > > Why Dave High-el, imagine you stopping downloading kiddie porn to answer a post.....
>
> I do no such thing, Roger.

That's not what your hard drive contents says.....

> What is your fixation with child pornography?

What is your fixation with turning the argument around like a fucking woman? You download kiddie porn, your hard drive has a gig of it on there. Tell us all of your radio accomplishments....tel us more lies, Goatblower High-el.

> > > yet another anonymous post.
> >
> > If this is anonymous, how do you know who sent it, dumbass?
>
> Roger:

Dicksucking Dave: You are a stupid fuck. You cannot prove who wrote this, even if you give deep throat to all the law enforcement in inbred Marshall county.

> "Duuuuh,

Your "Duhhh!" is about the extent of your conversation, ASSHOLE, why don't you try making sense?

> how'd you know it was me"?

Poor High-el the goatblower and kiddie porn downloader, so desperate......thinks everybody posting anon is Wiseman. But that fits with his narrow-minded and paranoid mindset.

> Shall we say that you have a
> rather unique writing style and that your topics of interest repeat
> themselves on a regular basis.

And no class, no style Dicksucking Dave High-el, jealous of those who has style...pulls another theory out of his fatass.
Dumbass Dave's Rule #1: Everybody who attacks me or disagrees with me is Wiseman...

> > > I've attended a number of meetings and
> > > functions, Roger.
> >
> > Guess you had to suck off Bertie Garcia one way or another, eh, ASSHOLE?
>
> No, Roger.

Feh, sure, dicksucking Dave....that why you and your equally odorous lover were giggling like two schoolgirls from all reports?

> What is your fixation with homosexuality?

What's the matter, fat, smelly, homosexual Dave afraid his secret is out? Maybe Leila will grease up her strap-on and use it on you as you suck off Bertie. You know you told Wiseman that's what you liked to do when you sat on that goodwill donated couch...as you and your gay lover bertie sat and giggled.

>
> > > I'm told that you only came to the one meeting.
> >
> > I'm told you shouldn't stalk other hams like you do, kiddie diddler.
>
> It is peculiar that one who has posted numerous untruths about others
> would consider himself to be a stalking victim.

Pot..Kettle..black, Dumbfuck High-el......maybe you can tell us all about your messenger boy job as a courier again...give us some more lies...you tell lies about posters on here all the time, High-el.

> What is your fixation on sex with children?

Why is your only tactic similar to Pee Wee Heman's? Is it beacuse you're so fucking dense and narrow-minded that you just have to give the impression that you are a megalomaniac?

> > > By the way, I'd go very carefully on that stalking stuff, Rog. You've
> > > frequently harrassed me here and in direct e-mails.
> >
> > Awww, poor Dicksucking Davey.......you stalked Rog as well, because the only reason you came to the ARES meeting to confront him, and let's not forget how you were going to break the law by posting his "best newsgroup material" on telephone poles in Rog's neighborhood.
>
> What is your fixation with homosexual activity, Roger?

So defensive, homosexual Davey? That's all right, you can pretend your marriage to the finnish mail-order whale is not a sham.

> Bert and I attended an ARES meeting at the invitation of the Emergency
> Coordinator for purposes of joining.

That why you practically held hands and made loving eyes at each other? Oh maybe you gave each other the reach around before you got there that might explain the peculiar smell along with both of yours' body odor.

> I think you've gotten your wires crossed on the breaking of law, Roger.

I think you've been caught, Dicksucking Dave. I think you need to locate the law that prohibits you from putting posters on telephone poles, because American Electric Power (who supplies the power in your area) might just want to prosecute.

>You were asked if you'd be proud to have your wife, mother or children
> see some of your handiwork. You were asked if you thought your

I was? Looks like you asked Wiseman, who I'm sure would report your tacking up of posters of such things to the proper authorities....he made sure AEP got a copy of your letter saying you were going to do that.

> neighbors would enjoy seeing some of your memorable posts tacked to
> telephone poles in the neighborhood. I can post my exact comments and
> your sparkling reply here if you feel that would set the record
> straight.

You mean the reply where Wiseman told you to fuck off? Bwhahahahahaha!!!!!!!! Did it make widdle Davey so mad?

> After all, you seemed to think enough of your numerous
> newsgroup postings to post them in this very public venue.

Awww, don't cry, you are the one who made the threats, dumbfuck...Wiseman only posted them...lol!!!!! How does it feel to be a fucking retard, baby huey High-el?
You pull that "goggle" thing with posters here you don't like, like Lenny and whomever else disagrees with the overbearing gasbag known as Dave High-el.

> > > You have an arrest
> >
> > I do? Prove it.......

>
> It is public record,

Prove that Wiseman has a criminal record, dicksplash.

>Roger.

Obession...well looks like the mental health people will want to know about this one.....

> By the way, is this another <IKYABWAI>

More likely it's a pathetic backpedal, just like you always do.

> > > record and you've been booted from a couple of ISP's.
> >
> > Bwhahahahahahahaha....prove it, kiddie diddling Dave.
>
> One note to OVIS should clear that one up.

Mwhahaha.....You mean you'll get told that Wiseman told that FATASSED HAG Pam Hoffer to go fuck herself and to quit giving Anthony those blowjobs in the server room????? Wiseman sent me a copy of the e-mail he sent cancelling his account there. And no, I won't post it because that's more your style...or lack thereof...<guffaw>

> What is your fixation with child sex?

Just want to converse in subjects you know so much about.

> > > You've been
> > > cautioned for malicious QRMing on 20 meters and have been forced to
> > > retest.
> >
> > So some fake info was submitted and dumbfuck Riley believed it.......
>
> Who Riley? The fake info was in the form of audio tape. I know the
> fellow who supplied it. I have no reason to disbelieve him and to
> believe your claim that it was "fake".

Lying for your friend? Or maybe he knows about your kiddie porn pics you try to sell. Maybe he's another gay lover for you.....

> > he still PASSED the "retest" it's doubtful you could as of today, ASSHOLE.
>
> "He/you" passed.

Awww, a feat you couldn't do. And try harder..."He/you" <guffaw> couldn't pass the Technician class exam today if you were called in to retest. By your own admission you don't know a fucking thing about electronics.

> Whether I could or couldn't isn't an issue.

Admission you couldn't pass, noted.

> I wasn't contacted and told that I needed to retest.

In reviewing Wiseman's letter to retest, there's no reason given for it. Are you saying you speak for baldy and the FCC now?

> There's been no enforcement
> action taken toward me in forty years.

Liar. But before forty years is a different story, eh? Or maybe they just don't publish those letters like they do in the last couple of years or so....I'd say you did get letters.

>
> > > > > Most of the hams
> > > > > involved are not interested in contesting or DXing. Many operate VHF FM
> > > > > only. I don't know any who've designed and built a linear amplifier.
> > > > > Only one other is interested in collecting and restoring vintage gear.
> > > > >
> > > > > Yep, they are a clique of losers.....
> > > >
> > > > Oh yes, I neglected to mention that we have one dysfunctional individual
> > > > who exhibits sociopathic behavior on several levels. He frequently
> > >
> > > I wonder if the WV Medical board is aware of you practicing psychology without a degree in it or a license?
>
> Take it up with the board.

Feh. And hear you whine again? You do enough whining in the newsgroup.

> > > haunts the rec.radio.amateur.misc and rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > newsgroups and posts irrelevant stream-of-consciousness filth (usually
> > > unrelated to the thread topic. His over exhuberance has led him to the
> > > malicious interference incidents on 20m.
> > >
> > > Poor Davey......the Lackland press release boy, the flunky who couldn't get/or was so fucking stupid he couldn't get a real job then after a piss poor service record, had to take a flunky courier job with the State department, until he was terminated.
>
> What is your fixation with Lackland AFB and my web page? I haven't been
> to Lackland in over thirty years. You know nothing of my service
> record. I have an honorable discharge from the military. You know
> nothing of my State Department service other than what you can glean
> from my web site or here.

You sure are defensive about that piss-poor service and State department record. No wonder they fired you <translate: take an "early retirement" for your incompetence.>

> > > Actually, Roger, the only real loser is you. You're hardly a clique.
> > >
> > > IKYABWAI, dicksucking Davey.....
>
> What is your obsession with homosexual oral sex?

Just want to relate by talking about topics you're so well aware of?

> > Actually, kiddiediddler High-el, how is it you had to get a mail order bride for yourself? Maybe it's you lack of personal cleanliness, as evidenced by the stench you had when you attened that meeting and your wrinkled clothes.
>
> What is your fixation on sex with children?

I just want you to know that people know about you, kiddie diddling Dave?

>
> I don't have a mail-order bride.

No, you had to beg some finnish fat fuck to marry you, after using that mail-order bride service since you are too fucking ugly with your thick glasses to get an American woman.

> I bathe on a regular basis and my
> clothing is washed and pressed. What is your fixation on body odor and
> wrinkled clothing?

According to some fellow, you showed up smelling like dung with cheap cologne trying to mask it that didn't work and wrinkled clothing at an ARES meeting. Reportedly, they looked like they were not washed or pressed in a week. Although with today's fabrics, most clothes aren't pressed that much anymore. But somebody as backward looking as you wouldn't be expected to have modern things around..is that why you only run cheap-assed, old, used ham equipment?

> > > > > I continue to attend. We interact
> > > > >
> > > > > Except the fact you fail to bathe regularly, you mean.......fuckstick.
>
> I don't recall your being here during shower time, Roger.

If I want to see elephants bathe, I'll wait until the circus is in town.

> > > It looks like your still battling that rare form of Tourette's Syndrome.
> >
> > Looks like you need to go to Hair Club For men and Jenny Craig.
>
> There's a hair club for Jenny Craig?

No, you dumb fat fuck get some hair and lose some weight. Can't you fucking read?

> Dave has a bad comb-over and his fat belly makes him look like he's
> about 8 months pregnant. Given this along with his wrinkled clothes that
> he looks like he slept in for a week, he makes such a good impression...
> > With that small skull he really looks like Baby Huey.
>
> Your powers of observation are lacking, Roger.

Dance, baby huey, dance....

> I have a full head of
> hair without even a hint of a bald spot.

Liar. You have a bad comb over with totally grey hair.

> My hat size is 7 7/8 which is
> considered "Large". If you like, I can post a photo of the top of my
> head so that others won't engage in a "comb over" debate.

Looks like you're quite defensive about your fat head, FATASS baby Huey High-el.

>Why is any of this of interest to you, Roger?

There you go with that obsession again...It's fun to see you dance, Davey the dancing bear.

> > > > >based on our common interests rather than the things which divide us.
> > > > >
> > > > > Yeah, those common interests being not helping newer hams......
> > > >
> > > > How could you come to that conclusion?
> > >
> > > Unlike you, I don't pull my conclusions out of my ass, goat blower Davey.
> >
> Where'd they come from then?

Awww, can't face the truth about you and your asshole friends who won't help new hams, Davey?

> > > You haven't been attending
> > > meetings.
> > >
> > > When some new hams needed help, they didn't get it, fuckstick.
> >
> Who <whaaaaaa!!!!!!!!!!!!!!>>>>.

Poor Davey........lend him a crying towel, willya?

> > > > > > The other alternative is to start my own club. I tried it, but that was not too
> > > > > > successful.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > btw, fuck off, High-el.
> > > > >
> > > > > BTW, forwarded your stuff to Chief Stenger in Glen Dale. It is about
> > > > > the only way to make a case against someone who has no interpersonal
> > > > > skills.
> > > >
> > > > BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHA....... you've said that ALL ALONG, DICKBREATH....
> > >
> > Yes, I have. That's because, as you aware from being paid a number of
> > visits, that is what I have been doing.

Pussy....Nope, haven't heard a thing, and haven't been paid any visits, so you are talking out of your fat ass.

> What is your fixation with homosexual oral sex?

Why does talking about your homosexuality bothers you so?

> How would you, the non-Roger anonymous poster know
> anything about what I've said all along?

Most people can read, dipshit. Unlike you, who skated along in school. You have no fucking idea how many people read this newsgroup do you?

>"Duuuh,

There, there, Forrest Gump High-el, you can stalk your obsession some other time. And don't forget to boil those shrimp.

> > Maybe you need to give him another blowjob so he might pay attention
> > to you next time..haven't heard a thing from him though
>
> Is that how you write about your chief of police--a man who is on your
> city council?

He's not my chief or councilman, you dumb fucking bastard. And since you ask, are you so un-American you want to censor freedom of speech? Looks like High-el has ties with the Taliban.....
Somebody needs to know.

>
> > ....some
> > case, dickhead...... BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA...maybe it's because > I don't live in Glen Dale, Davey, not everybody who posts anon is your > obsession.
>
> Maniacal laughter aside,

Oh, is that fatassed whale Leila feeding at the trough again?

>Roger, is this another, "Duuuh, how'd you know
> it was me"? Do you know how few anonymous posters post items about me
> filled with nonsense rants about child pornography, sex with children,
> homosexual oral sex, fixations with body odor and wrinkled apparel?

Looks like it hit quite the nerve, you're either so rattled or so stupid or a combination, you're repeating yourself, dumbfuck. I'd go with the rattled theory, since you think everybody is Roger.

> > > Ta-Ta for now.
> >
> > Your not-so-Closeted homosexuality, noted.
>
> You fascination with homosexuality is noted.

Your denial of your pedophilia, noted.

1317. Col. High-el/klunk still blows goats (Was Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 13:41:17 UTC
From: "privacy.at Anonymous Remailer" <mixmaster@remailer.privacy.at>
Message-ID: <e23dd557edde723c80632e676681aa2e@remailer.privacy.at>
Source record: 74732

In article <3F3B2209.8DC58CF5@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3F3980D8.E1FDBCF3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >What's it to you? You have nothing to do with amateur radio.
> >
> > Still trying the old misdirection & personal insult type thing. :-)
>
> Are you insulted by a truthful statement? Do you find the fact that you
> have no amateur radio license to be insulting? What does morse code
> testing or an age limit in amateur radio licensing have to do with you?

And the Anti-American High-el still tries to censor others' freedom of speech...he does his neo-Nazi and Taliban friends proud. In fact, he helped dictators get a foothold while he was in Africa.

> > >Have you
> > >made up your mind yet. Some time back you stated that I wasn't a radio
> > >god then I was a radio god then I wasn't a radio god. Have you made up
> > >your mind yet?
> >
> > You PRETEND to have great expertise (on the order of godlike
> > judgement and capability).
>
> I do have some expertise in amateur radio and I have decades of
> experience. That something grates on you doesn't make it a pretense.

The only "experience" you have is cornholing little boys. You sure as hell haven't advanced ham radio in your so-called 40 years of tenure.

> > It would seem that your PRETENSE has made you very tense
> > (and angry) when someone shows your pretense for what it is. :-)
>
> I'm not angry, Leonard. I'm actually smiling as I write these words:
> You haven't shown anything to anyone when it comes to amateur radio.

Neither have you, ASSHOLE.

1318. Re: Dropping the code caused the blackout?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 13:55:57 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030816095557.14622.00001851@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 74733

From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com

>Dropping the code caused the blackout?

No, but with cell phones down, all communications was lost - except to those that knew Morse code.

1319. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:06:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308160606.3cc2f46d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74734

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030816004320.12631.00000330@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0308151126.12ba9afe@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> There you go, folks! Kim just admitted that she's a half-wit! Too bad
> >> the wit she has is also very dim!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >Actually, Larry, she said that she only needed to be a half-wit to debate
> >you.
> >
> >It wasn't a kind remark, and it went right over your head.
>
> Brian:
>
> Ah ha! So even you agree that Kim is a half-wit! Well, I guess it takes
> one to know one!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

I didn't say that. But by extension, -you- would think that Rush
Limbaugh is a half-wit because he ties half his brain behind his back
to make it fair for the libs.

1320. Re: QR10-4

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:08:22 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3E36FD.E72393EE@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74735

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <3F3B1441.1AA0EB23@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> <about a post to James Miccolis>
>
> >Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >> Please tell us all about when you flew those old "A-N" ranges. :-)
> >
> >Did they let you fly your model aircraft on some old airfields, Len? :-)
>
> Not "old" ones. Try Apollo Field at the Sepulveda Dam Recreation
> Area in Los Angeles' San Fernando Valley. Real runway and ramp.
> Popular with the Large Scale R/C groups here. Lots of model helo
> flying too.

That's great, Len--almost like the real thing.

> Model aircraft hobbyists lobbied for and got a whole bunch of 72 MHz
> channels for R/C some while back. They still have them. Look in
> Part 95, Title 47 CFR.

That's perfectly marvelous.

> >> VORs have been in use on civil airways since before 1960. A lot more
> >> accurate, easier to use, much less pilot error than the "range markers."
> >>
> >> Oh, my, you love the past. :-)
> >
> >An interesting comment coming from one who frequently brings up THE past
> >as well as his own past. :-)
>
> The OLD "range markers" (actually "range beacon system") went
> out with civil aviation way back in 1955 with new ICAO rules on
> radio and radionavigation.
>
> VOR or Very high frequency Omnidirectional radio Range, offers at
> least a quantum leap over the old morse keyed "A-N" beacons.
> Anyone claiming they do air navigation by those old "A-N" beacons
> is at least 48 years out of touch with reality.

So who claimed the be doing such navigation? I knew a guy who, back in
the early 1980's, regularly navigated to Louisville from Cincinnati by
homing on WHAS's signal.

> Morsemen tend to be out of touch with reality.

How would you know?

> >> Didja know you can address all your written test content complaints to
> >> the VEC QPC? They are radio amateurs themselves.
> >>
> >> I'm sure they would include a question on "QFU" if any ham is expected
> >> to line up his ham aircraft on a runway bearing.
> >>
> >> Beep, beep.
> >
> >Why are you concerned? You're no more a radio amateur than you are a
> >pilot.
>
> I've designed and proved civil aviation radionavigation avionics. Those
> worked very well.

Is that the same as being a pilot?

> Of course that was as a professional, something you detest.

I don't detest professionals. I worked as a professional.

> I passed my US private pilot written exam in 1962. Gave up piloting
> due to cost...$17.50/hour dual, $12.00/hour solo back then. A typical
> four-place, single-engine, retractable-gear light aircraft back then cost
> $30K (Mooney, only bare essentials of instrumentation). Hull insurance
> premiums were 10% annual for beginning pilot-owners.

All of that to state that you are not currently a pilot?

> Back in 1963 my house purchase price was $30,500. It is now worth
> about $375 to $390 thousand if I were to put it on the market. I made a
> wise move to invest in real estate instead of a cute lil airplane...those
> haven't appreciated very much in 40 years.

Don't get overly-prideful on us, Len. That's the second time you've
mentioned the worth of your home in as many days.

> What the hell is your problem, Herr Robust? AVIATION isn't the
> subject of this thread...someone else brought up aviation.

Oh, my mistake. I could have sworn that you were commenting about
aviation. In fact, I believe you wrote about it in the post to which
I'm currently responding.

> You don't
> have anything to do with aviation except to rack up frequent cryer
> miles in here.

How would you know?

> You don't know a VORTAC from hardtack. If you heard ATCRBS
> pronounced you would think it an insect infestation. Pfffft.

ATCRBS doesn't have any vowels.

Dave K8MN

1321. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:14:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308160614.461ea1c2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74736

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> wrote in message
news:<gvtqjvskvf7upn4o095hsdkivqnivgk1c9@4ax.com>...
> On 15 Aug 2003 15:27:46 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
>
> >Now you want me to believe that a landmass has no coasts nor adjoining
> >oceans?
>
> I can think of one place that fits that description. You get there
> after departing Christchurch, New Zealand, aboard an LC-130. Nowadays,
> at least - back then maybe not. The 109th AMW in Schenectady, NY flies
> the LC-130s. Dave, am I warm?
>
> 73 DE John, KC2HMZ

John, if you were getting close, you would be cold, not warm. I used
to "flight follow" those routes with respect to the upper level winds
and the computer flight plan database.

And that location has coasts and adjoining oceans. More importantly,
Heil was never there.

Brian

1322. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:22:30 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3E3A4C.F72EB796@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74737

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3D2A76.AA8AF78E@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3C5C1A.641EDF8C@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F395779.63FCCE51@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I was "intimately" involved with HF communications across the Pacific in
> > > > > > the 1960's at hours of my own choosing. My station also worked across
> > > > > > the Atlantic and across the Indian Ocean. It did so with less power
> > > > > > than yours and I was still a teenager.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Was this an amateur station?
> > > > >
> > > > It most certainly was.
> > > >
> > > Cool. What amateur call sign did you use?
> > >
> > Mine.
> >
> > > > > Was it capable of only working over oceans, or could it work over land > masses
as well?
> > > > >
> > > > I wasn't simultaneously living on both coasts, Brian. Try to figure it
> > > > out.
> > > >
> > > Try not being so smug, David.
> >
> > I wasn't being smug. I suggested that you ponder the question and try
> > to come up with a plausible answer.
>
> Dave, this basically shows that you are smug without even trying, or
> even being cognizant of it.

No, it "basically" does nothing of the kind. At that, there is nothing
necessarily negative about being smug.

> > > You never did say where you were; where your station could work across
> > > the Pacific ocean, and across the Indian and Atlantic oceans.

> >
> > No, I didn't say. There are numerous places within the continent in
> > which we live where such is possible. Ponder the matter.
>
> OK.
>
> > > I'm
> > > trying to think of a geographic location with "both coasts" and those
> > > three oceans.
> >
> > Keep pondering.
>
> I am. I'm still trying to think of a location that has a coast on the
> Indian Ocean, a coast on the Atlantic Ocean, and able to work across
> the Pacific Ocean with intimate involvement.

You seem to have misread. I've never written that the location has a
coast on the Indian Ocean and Atlantic Ocean.

> > > So kindly tell us what country that you operated from that had "both
> > > coasts" and three oceans.
> >
> > I never wrote that it "had" them. I wrote that I operated a station
> > capable to working across them.
>
> Now you want me to believe that a landmass has no coasts nor adjoining
> oceans?

No, I don't want you to believe that.

> > > > > I was "intimately" involved with HF military communications, working
> > > > > transatlantic and transpacific paths using a variety of log periodic,
> > > > > inverted discone and rhombic antennas and either 10 kw or 45 kw
> > > > > transmitters from 1968-1970. The station was in operation 24/7 but I
> > > > > generally pulled eight hour shifts...
> > > > >
> > > > Of your own choosing, right?
> > > >
> > > What's the difference for purposes of discussion? Do you know anyone
> > > who ever worked 24 hour days for a solid week?
> > >
> > > Your comment, "of my own choosing" sounds very odd for a military
> > > radio station.
> >
> > Those words don't appear in the paragraph concerning military
> > communications. You might want to read it again.
>
> The occur in the paragraph where you didn't define the communication
> service that you used. You might want to be a little more clear in
> your web communications.

How is it that only you are confused?

> > > You said that you had an amateur station, and you pulled military
> > > shifts of your own choosing.
> >
> > I said nothing of the kind. If you have problems, maybe you can have
> > someone read it for you.
>
> Maybe, but I wouldn't want them to suffer through your usual muddy
> communications.

The only thing muddy is your thought process.

> > > In your original statements above, did you really mean to string
> > > together an amateur station from a country with two coasts and three
> > > oceans, with your military station in Vietnam?
> >
> > Those things were not strung together. Perhaps you can find someone
> > with writing skills explain the idea behind paragraphing.
>
> It wouldn't be you.

You're right. I'm not going to help you with remedials.

> > > > > I was "intimately" involved with in-country HF military operations for a
> > > > > year in Vietnam.
> > > > > >
> > > > > I spent fifteen "intimate" years overseas with the U.S. Department of
> > > > > State where I was responsible for all HF and VHF communications whether
> > > > > by voice, asynchronous data or morse.
> > > > > >
> > > > > So this wasn't amateur radio either?
> > > >
> > > Read it again and perhaps you'll figure it out.
> > >
> > > But I thought this group was to discuss amateur radio. And you do get
> > > after Len for bringing up other services communications, however long
> > > ago it may have been.
> >
> > Where've you been? Did you read Len's material to which I replied?
>
> I read what you tell Len when he tries to bring up his radio
> communication experiences.

That isn't what I asked.

> > > > > I've spent forty years as an active radio amateur, operating various
> > > > > modes on bands from 1.8 through 432 MHz.
> > > >
> > > Aren't you going to ask me if this was military communications or State
> > > Department communications?
> > >
> > No. I recognize this as an amateur radio discussion group, and I
> > > recognize that you are finally addressing amateur radio operations.
> > > Congratulations.

> >
> > Maybe you can congratulate Len as well, if he ever gets back from the
> > Korean War.
>
> How can this be possible? You continually remind the world that Len
> has no amateur experience.

That hasn't stopped Len from attempting to speak with authority about
what is best for amateur radio.

> > > > > Why did you stop at 432 MHz? Even most store bought amateur UHF rigs
> > > > > are capable of going up to 450 Mhz.
> > > > >
> > > > > Weak signal work on SSB and CW takes place in that area of the band.
> > > >
> > > It may. Or it may not.
> > >
> > My logs say that it does.
> >
> Both.

FM is not a good weak signal mode.

> > > > That's where I happen to spend much of my time. Is that all right with
> > > > you?
> > > >
> > > Peachy.
> > > >
> > > > > Oh, uhhh. Forgot. Superior Heil "doan do FM (tm Kelly)"
> > > > >
> > > > I have a 440 rig at home. I use it occasionally. I use 2m FM
> > > >
> > > So your statement of frequency ranges above is inaccurate. It would
> > > more accurately read, "1.8 to 450 MHz."
> > >
> > It is much more accurate than your statements in which you could not
> > properly attribute the words "of my own choosing".
> >
> If you would only be more clear.

If only your waters ran a bit deeper...

> > > > regularly. Looks like you've struck out on your attempt to hit a nerve,
> > > > little electrolyte.
> > > >
> > > No attempt made. I just figured that such a great ham as yourself was
> > > short changing himself with such a limited portfolio of RF activity.
> > >
> > You may consider my words as a mere summary.
> >
> I consider them as mere words.

Once you have the vocabulary built up, you can begin sentence
comprehension.

> > > > > > > I can go on and on without ever
> > > > > > > touching the recorded and evidencible facts of having spent three
> > > > > > > years being actively involved with the latter. That grates on you.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Three years? Three measly years? It grates on me that you'd dare
> > > > > > > compare your three years to my experience and pretend to have a lock on
> > > > > > > knowledge.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Grates on you, huh?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Figure it out.
> > > > >
> > > > > No problem.
> > >
> > Then why'd you ask a question?
>
> I just wanted to verify that you experience what the rest of us would
> call, "emotion."

It might have been easier to ask that, if it's all you were after.

> > > > > > Some people learn faster than others. Look at everyone's vastly
> > > > > > different learning experiences with Morse Cose to see what I mean.
> > > > > > Some are never able to learn it at all.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Learning rate isn't under discussion. Experience is.
> > > > >
> > > > > Ah, No. You specifically said, "knowledge." Think about it. Can one
> > > > > attain knowledge only through experience?
> > >
> > > Most certainly.
> >
> > Then put the things that you are willing to say, but unwilling to
> > discuss, in brackets [xxx].

Does everything need to be diagrammed in order for you to put the
picture together?

> > > > > > But with respect to radio theory and ops, perhaps Len is a quicker
> > > > > > learner than you. Perhaps not.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Ask him.
> > > > >
> > > > > I wonder what he would say?
> > >
> > > Let me repeat: Ask him.
> >
> > I think with respect to radio theory and ops, he would say that he
> > were the quicker learner.

You're guessing. Ask him.

> > > > > You tell me everyone if learns the same, and if so, I'll have to give
> > > > > you this one.
> > > > >
> > > > > Figure it out.
> > > >
> > > > Ah, sorry. You don't get this one.
> > >
> > > You can't give what isn't yours.
> >
> > It's done every day. Have you never heard of government?

I pay the government.

> > > > > Unless Len actually has more than just the three years
> > > > > RF experience that you reference.
> > > > >
> > > > > Ask him. I'm sure he'll be happy to go on about it at great length.
> > > >
> > > > Much like your military and dept. of state resume?
> > >
> > > Resume? You mean the summary to counter Len's absurdity?
> >
> > Absurdity is a land location with two coasts and three oceans.

It surely is. It's a good thing I didn't make any claims about such a
place.

> > > > > And what of education? Can education play a role in knowledge?
> > > > >
> > > > > Figure it out.
> > > >
> > > > Ah, you don't get this one either.
> > >
> > > Ah, you haven't figured it out.
> >
> > I've figured out that you've run out of anything that matters.

You are the one with the unanswered questions and you expect me to do
all your work for you?

Dave K8MN

1323. Re: What of NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:23:34 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhlequ$p0t@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74739

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F18C154.813AFBF4@earthlink.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> >
> > heh heh...he just doesn't understand the concept of "not my problem,"
Brian!
> > ;)
>
> Brian's saying that it isn't his problem does not mean that he has no
> problem. In this case, it only means that he doesn't care to
> acknowledge it.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

People who generally don't acknowledge problems, generally don't have
them... But, that is much too liberating a thought for you, Dave.

Kim W5TIT

1324. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:24:01 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3E3AA9.994B6F3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74738

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3D2556.34E27B82@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3C5D48.951FFE94@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F37B75A.D47CAEF1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Roger: "Duuuuh, how'd you know it was me"? Shall we say that you have a
> > > > > > rather unique writing style and that your topics of interest repeat
> > > > > > themselves on a regular basis.
> > > > > >
> > > > > Gee David, someone posting as Avery Fine is sure doing a ringer impression of
you.
> > > > > >
> > > > > What could it mean?
> > > > >
> > > > It could mean that someone is doing an impression of Len and you aren't
> > > > bright enough to figure it out.
> > >
> > > But it's you they're imitating.
> >
> > See, you weren't bright enough to figure it out even after an
> > explanation.
>
> No doubt attributable to your superb powers of explanation.

It is likely the result of your difficulty in comprehending.

Dave K8MN

1325. Re: What of NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:25:29 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhleug$vdf@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74741

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F1A060E.C22C5CEF@earthlink.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > > >
> > > > heh heh...he just doesn't understand the concept of "not my
problem,"
> > Brian!
> > > > ;)
> > >
> > > Brian's saying that it isn't his problem does not mean that he has no
> > > problem. In this case, it only means that he doesn't care to
> > > acknowledge it.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > If someone does not acknowledge/accept something as a problem to them,
it is
> > generally a moot point from their perspective.
>
> Fine. That does not mean that the person has no problem. It only means
> that the individual chooses to ignore it.
>

No, it means that it is the person doing the announcing (you, in this
example) has the problem, Dave.

>
> > But, you don't understand
> > such things, Dave.... You have a book to live by.
>
> It is precisely because I have a book to live by that I understand such
> things. I understand, for example, that this is simply another time
> that you've attempted to inject yourself into an issue when you really
> have nothing to say.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Your book doesn't include many more scenarios than your little "me" world,
Dave.

Kim W5TIT

1326. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:28:42 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhlf4i$b36@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74742

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F2F1DA4.B76F9D30@earthlink.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> >
> > Yeah, all folks like you like to do is "imply" and then get all uppity
and
> > persnickity when you're asked about your implication.
>
> Folks "like you" snipe at my comments directed toward Carl and not at
> Carl for his comments to Larry. Don't get all uppity with me, Kim.
>

Why not, Dave? I'm bored and going through old stuff of yours to stir you
up. You've probably already responded to some old, old, stuff...

Kim W5TIT

1327. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:28:52 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3E3BCA.59CB0A2C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74740

Phil Kane wrote:
>
> Dave Heil wrote :
>
> > I was "intimately" involved with HF military communications, working
> > transatlantic and transpacific paths using a variety of log periodic,
> > inverted discone and rhombic antennas and either 10 kw or 45 kw
> > transmitters from 1968-1970. The station was in operation 24/7 but I
> > generally pulled eight hour shifts...
>
> Don't forget my favorites, the Sterba Curtains (SAC "Short Order")
> on the six towers in a hexagon.....

My memory fails me on that one. I don't believe we had any in the Giant Voice system. The LP's were the big twin boom Collins design and they were massive. The receiver site and transmitter site were several miles apart. We had the capability of selecting and controlling antennas at both sites from the receiver site.

Dave K8MN

1328. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:31:43 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhlfa7$1m2@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74744

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030816004320.12631.00000330@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <f45722ac.0308151126.12ba9afe@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> There you go, folks! Kim just admitted that she's a half-wit! Too bad
> >> the wit she has is also very dim!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >Actually, Larry, she said that she only needed to be a half-wit to debate
> >you.
> >
> >It wasn't a kind remark, and it went right over your head.
>
> Brian:
>
> Ah ha! So even you agree that Kim is a half-wit! Well, I guess it takes
> one to know one!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Brian, Brian, Brian, it did not go over Larry's head at all... He is in
denial (as usual)

Kim W5TIT

1329. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:32:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3E3CB9.87077735@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74743

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ wrote:
>
> On 15 Aug 2003 15:27:46 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
> >Now you want me to believe that a landmass has no coasts nor adjoining
> >oceans?
>
> I can think of one place that fits that description. You get there
> after departing Christchurch, New Zealand, aboard an LC-130. Nowadays,
> at least - back then maybe not. The 109th AMW in Schenectady, NY flies
> the LC-130s. Dave, am I warm?

You fell into Brian's trap of concocting such a place. I operated right here in the United States but I know the place you're thinking of though. My old pal Bob Harler K8MWO, a retired Naval Commander was in charge of Christchurch support operations for the one you came up with.

Dave K8MN

1330. Re: Dropping the code caused the blackout?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:33:36 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhlfdn$p4b@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74745

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030816004319.12631.00000328@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <3F3D4B72.2050507@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
> <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:
>
> >
> >I'm sure someone can figure out a connection.....
> >
> >(;
> >
>
> Obviously it was caused by all the eager, young, computer-literate
> technically-savvy new hams all using their computers, doing the coding
> on wonderful new digital modes for us hams to use!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

If they're all that computer-literate and technically-savvy as you espouse them to be, then they're obviously intelligent enough to spend their time on far more constructive things....

Kim W5TIT

1331. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:37:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308160637.14d81b0a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74746

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message

> The soil in this neighborhood is decomposed granite so there are
> lots of rocks in it.

The biggest rock on that property is IN the house.

> No need to "toss rocks" around...the PCTAs in here are too busy
> doing that, along with brickbats and usual demeaning filth...at others
> and themselves.

Pot/kettle/black.

> It's always cheering to know that the Amateur's Code is alive and
> well and all the morsemen are respecting others. NOT.

This is a USENET forum, NOT Amatuer Radio.

And even if it WAS, you'd STILL not be a licensed user.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

1332. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:37:12 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhlfkg$tsg@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74747

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB63501C.23806%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > Ed Hare, W1RFI, of the ARRL isn't the only one
> > measuring the interference at the BPL pilot
> > test sites ... I was in a meeting today with
> > folks from NTIA (the equivalent of the FCC
> > for federal govt. users of the spectrum) and
> > they are out doing measurements, too. The
> > meeting was about something else, but I got
> > the impression that they aren't happy with
> > what they are seeing either ...
>
>
> I'm glad to hear that. Hopefully the studies will generate results that
> will get someone's attention. Regardless, BPL is obviously going to be
tough
> to fight.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Whew....someone finally gets it--just kidding, Dwight. You probably "had"
it all along. That is exactly what my rattling has been all about. I just
don't see this fight being won (from the amateur radio perspective) and, I
think there a "ways around" BPL interference. So, where do we spend the
energy? Before, or after and, on what? I'd rather think that the way to
fight BPL and win (for sure) is to get busy designing, testing and
implementing ways around it, *before* it becomes the major issue that it
will--because, like I said, I don't see this fight being won. Way, way too
much commercial interest--the very people that feed the pockets of the
politicians.

Kim W5TIT

1333. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:40:42 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhlfr1$u1k@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74749

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F3E04FD.185EFD83@earthlink.net...
> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> > In article <3F3B12D9.871DBF3D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
<k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >> Yup. Herr Robust is once again proving I'm right. :-)
> > >
> > >You are perhaps the only person on the planet incapable of seeing the
> > >irony of what you tell others when compared to what you actually do.
> > >You lecture others on what they have no "authority" to do then proceed
> > >to do those very same things.
> >
> > Stuff it, crybaby. I'm still RIGHT and you're still the egotist who
is
> > pissed off.
>
> Is this your bullying nonsense? "Stuff it, crybaby" sure doesn't come
> off as much of a counter to my comments.
>

You mean you feel bullied, Dave? Oh, and "stuff it" generally means a
response to indicate indifference to something that has been said. So, it's
a very appropriate counter.

Oh, and try not to feel so bullied...

Kim W5TIT

1334. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:41:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308160641.75feebb7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74748

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030815175108.00545.00000022@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article <3F3B12D9.871DBF3D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:

> Stuff it, crybaby. I'm still RIGHT and you're still the egotist who is
> pissed off.

Right about WHAT?
>
> Now go and try to "moderate" someone else.

Like Dave said...you're the only idiot (my added adjective) who
can't see the irony of your rants versus your conduct.

> You are wasting our time in here.

There's no "our" in here for you, Lennie. You're a
non-participating, unlicensed wuffo with nothing TO offer but sarcasm,
antagonism and undignified name calling.

Hence, here's one for you...

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

1335. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:44:03 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhlg1b$17h@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74750

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308151856.f42e3d@posting.google.com...
> "Bill Evans" <bevans@ebsys.mb.ca> wrote in message
news:<x08%a.39127$Rz6.54279@news1.mts.net>...
> > Perhaps yesterday's, continuing massive power failure in the
northeastern
> > U.S.A. and Canada will convince the power utilities that they should
focus
> > their energies and resources on their core business, rather than
entering a
> > new business that is already served by telephone companies, competitive
> > local exchange carriers (CLEC), cable television operators, satellite
> > services and, in some markets, broadband wireless access (BWA) carriers.
> >
> > According to the August 15th Toronto Globe and Mail, "critics have been
> > calling for breakers to be installed throughout North America's grids
for
> > some time, only to be told by the grid operators (power companies) that
> > there is no money to fund such a massive infrastructure overhaul."
> >
> > Why would regulators, politicians and the power companies' shareholders
be
> > interested in spending billions of dollars entering a new business when
they
> > obviously have major challenges in their own backyard. Seems like time
to
> > "stick to the knitting".
>
> The only issue investors care about is income. They won't make any new
> income by sinking capital into repairs and upgrades, they would
> generate new income with BPL. Capitalism 101.
>
> >
> > William E. Evans, P. Eng.
> > VE4UD
>
> w3rv
>

No rattling chains, there... And, I think you're right...

Kim W5TIT

1336. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:46:05 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhlg54$eb8@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74802

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308160606.3cc2f46d@posting.google.com...
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030816004320.12631.00000330@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0308151126.12ba9afe@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >> There you go, folks! Kim just admitted that she's a half-wit! Too
bad
> > >> the wit she has is also very dim!
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> > >Actually, Larry, she said that she only needed to be a half-wit to
debate
> > >you.
> > >
> > >It wasn't a kind remark, and it went right over your head.
> >
> > Brian:
> >
> > Ah ha! So even you agree that Kim is a half-wit! Well, I guess it
takes
> > one to know one!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> I didn't say that. But by extension, -you- would think that Rush
> Limbaugh is a half-wit because he ties half his brain behind his back
> to make it fair for the libs.
>

Now you're giving away my secrets, Brian! I didn't want Larry to know I am
giving him the advantage... ;)

Kim W5TIT

1337. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:48:52 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308160648.46207915@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74801

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030813181646.02197.00002142@mb-m12.aol.com>...

> >Show proof that 200,000 people would not have gotten US amateur radio
> >licenses between February 14, 1991 and April 15, 2000 if the Technician
> >class license had never lost its code test.
> >
> >I don't think you have any proof. Or even any evidence. Just bluster.
>
> Jimmie, that was an OLD argument in here and you LOST it.

Uh huh...You still have yet to provide the evidence that those
200K folks would have NEVER obtained an Amateur license without the
"No Code" option.

> Getting all puffed up and antagonistic won't prove any case for
> you on the morse code test. It won't prove any case for your
> false interpretation of statistics that was on the AH0A website.

There's an antagonist here alright, Lennie...It AIN'T Jim
Miccolis.

> You would not accept statistics of a noted PCTA taken from the
> FCC public database then and you refuse to accept it now. There's
> no point in rehashing an old argument where you LOST.

What "statistics", Your Scumminess? You have NOTHING that can
"prove" your assertion. It was an empty verbal joust, and the
windmill won.

> You won't make any valid "points" in here by repeating "you're
> mistaken" and continual refusal to accept FCC database
> information.

WHAT in the FCC database "proves" that 200K people would NOT have
obtained an Amateur Radio license without the No COde option?

As for the "careers" of those who got the NCT license, I suggest
YOU take a look at Mike Carrol's site sometime and watch the expiring
callsigns part. NCT expirations outnumber all others by almost
5-to-1.

Steve, K4YZ

1338. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:49:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3E4096.A361EF07@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74803
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Walt Davidson wrote:
>
> On Fri, 15 Aug 2003 23:48:30 GMT, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
>
> >On Fri, 15 Aug 2003 11:05:43 +0100, Walt Davidson wrote:
> >
> >>Not surprising, really, as most of America's principal institutions
> >>are run by Zionists whose philosophy is "An eye for an eye, a tooth
> >>for a tooth."
> >
> > Ah, your anti-semitism bigotry (and ignorance of biblical
> > interpretation) has finally shone forth in all its glory, eh,
> > Ya Chatichat Charra.....
>
> As I said ... "run by Zionists". Point proven. There is nothing
> anti-semitic about stating a fact.

So every Jew is, by default, a Zionist? And you're quite sure that only Jews and only Jews who are Zionists control American media? Nothing wrong with a fact, if you've got one.

> Listen sunshine ... we might have to treat ya as equals nowadays, but
> we don't have to like ya.
> :-)

You know, Walt, sometimes you can be a really world-class yobo.

Dave K8MN

1339. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 14:53:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308160653.42ee4baa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74804

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030815175107.00545.00000020@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> In article <3F3B2209.8DC58CF5@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >I do have some expertise in amateur radio and I have decades of
> >experience.
>
> Whoopee. Now go off and USE all that "experience."
>
> Try "elmering" some nincompoops.

Here we have Lennie the Loser insulting people who aren't even
Hams yet, despite HIS assertion he's "only here for civil debate over
the morse test issue.

> Gain some worship from idiots.

Are you finally getting the license, Lennie? Is there ONE thing
you can do to prove me, Dave, Jim, Brian Kelly, Dick Carrol, etc etc
etc WRONG over you?

> All you do in here is a lot of bullying nonsense and trying to toss your
> weight around.
>
> Go ahead, punk, advance the state of the amateur art.

Ahhhhhhh....Yet another "civil debate" response from a "radio
engineering professional"

Some role model.

> You've had DECADES of "experience" and should be able to...
>
> You haven't done it.

Speaking of "decades to do it"...

Steve, K4YZ

1340. Re: What of NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 15:04:13 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3E4406.29824060@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74805

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3F18C154.813AFBF4@earthlink.net...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > heh heh...he just doesn't understand the concept of "not my problem,"
> Brian!
> > > ;)
> >
> > Brian's saying that it isn't his problem does not mean that he has no
> > problem. In this case, it only means that he doesn't care to
> > acknowledge it.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> People who generally don't acknowledge problems, generally don't have
> them... But, that is much too liberating a thought for you, Dave.

Read any of the filth coming from the interesting fellow here in my
county who posts through the "anonymous" remailers? He doesn't
acknowledge that he has problems. That doesn't mean that he doesn't
have any.

Or perhaps you'd disagree.

Dave K8MN

1341. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 15:05:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3E444B.53D5247E@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74806

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3F2F1DA4.B76F9D30@earthlink.net...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > Yeah, all folks like you like to do is "imply" and then get all uppity
> and
> > > persnickity when you're asked about your implication.
> >
> > Folks "like you" snipe at my comments directed toward Carl and not at
> > Carl for his comments to Larry. Don't get all uppity with me, Kim.
> >
>
> Why not, Dave? I'm bored and going through old stuff of yours to stir you
> up. You've probably already responded to some old, old, stuff...

Len's older than you, right?

Dave K8MN

1342. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 15:12:16 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhlhm7$jsj@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74807

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:a4urjvou03583co9np6qombqkdtgh2ok1s@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 15 Aug 2003 23:48:30 GMT, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:
>
> >On Fri, 15 Aug 2003 11:05:43 +0100, Walt Davidson wrote:
> >
> >>Not surprising, really, as most of America's principal institutions
> >>are run by Zionists whose philosophy is "An eye for an eye, a tooth
> >>for a tooth."
> >
> > Ah, your anti-semitism bigotry (and ignorance of biblical
> > interpretation) has finally shone forth in all its glory, eh,
> > Ya Chatichat Charra.....
>
> As I said ... "run by Zionists". Point proven. There is nothing
> anti-semitic about stating a fact.
>
> Listen sunshine ... we might have to treat ya as equals nowadays, but
> we don't have to like ya.
> :-)
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com
>

I don't know who you are, Walt, but you're absolutely disgusting.

Kim W5TIT

1343. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 15:16:16 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3E46D2.903D5DFB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74808

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3F3E04FD.185EFD83@earthlink.net...
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3F3B12D9.871DBF3D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >> Yup. Herr Robust is once again proving I'm right. :-)
> > > >
> > > >You are perhaps the only person on the planet incapable of seeing the
> > > >irony of what you tell others when compared to what you actually do.
> > > >You lecture others on what they have no "authority" to do then proceed
> > > >to do those very same things.
> > >
> > > Stuff it, crybaby. I'm still RIGHT and you're still the egotist who
> is
> > > pissed off.
> >
> > Is this your bullying nonsense? "Stuff it, crybaby" sure doesn't come
> > off as much of a counter to my comments.
> >
>
> You mean you feel bullied, Dave? Oh, and "stuff it" generally means a
> response to indicate indifference to something that has been said. So, it's
> a very appropriate counter.
>
> Oh, and try not to feel so bullied...

So you haven't been keeping up and you don't recognized Len's own phrase
including the words "bullying nonsense", now turned toward him?

Try to keep up.

Dave K8MN

1344. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 15:25:06 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308160725.19edc896@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74809

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of August 15, 2003:

Novice - 33,205 (decrease of 16,124)
Technician - 258,384 (increase of 52,990)
Technician Plus - 66,402 (decrease of 62,458)
General - 141,381 (increase of 28,840)
Advanced - 83,038 (decrease of 16,699)
Extra - 104,543 (increase of 25,793)
Total - 687,134 (increase of 12,342)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1345. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 15:44:00 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308160744.19006d94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74810

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<gpg%a.32$6e5.6019@nnrp1.ptd.net>...

> NCI's Petition for Rulemaking with the FCC.
>
> It is available in .pdf format at http://www.nocode.org
> under the "Articles" link ...

OK, let's cut to the chase.

Obviously the main request is to dump Element 1 ASAP. And there's probably lots of reasons given for doing so, including the Commission's own words "no regulatory purpose".

But what else was in the petition?
>
> Some will undoubtedly say "What took you so long?"
>
> The answer is simply "We wanted to do the best possible
> job of getting it right."

What did it take - six weeks? Not really long at all. Plus there was always the chance FCC would have simply dumped Element 1 on its own, instead of doing the whole NPRM thing.

What surprises me personally is that NCI didn't have a proposal ready to go before WRC-03 even began. But that's all water under the bridge now.

As you have pointed out, Carl, FCC hasn't even given any of the proposals an RM number yet. And it's reasonable to assume there will be more proposals - from NCVEC, ARRL, and other groups. FCC may assign numbers, or they may take ideas from each one and produce an NPRM.

And of course those wheels turn slowly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1346. Re: What of NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 15:59:20 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhlkeb$bu0@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74811

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F3E4406.29824060@earthlink.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F18C154.813AFBF4@earthlink.net...
> > > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > heh heh...he just doesn't understand the concept of "not my
problem,"
> > Brian!
> > > > > ;)
> > >
> > > Brian's saying that it isn't his problem does not mean that he has no
> > > problem. In this case, it only means that he doesn't care to
> > > acknowledge it.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> >
> > People who generally don't acknowledge problems, generally don't have
> > them... But, that is much too liberating a thought for you, Dave.
>
> Read any of the filth coming from the interesting fellow here in my
> county who posts through the "anonymous" remailers? He doesn't
> acknowledge that he has problems. That doesn't mean that he doesn't
> have any.
>
> Or perhaps you'd disagree.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

Maybe you just don't get the philosophy, Dave.

Kim W5TIT

1347. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 16:01:48 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhlkiv$o6n@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74812

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F3E46D2.903D5DFB@earthlink.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F3E04FD.185EFD83@earthlink.net...
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >
> > > > In article <3F3B12D9.871DBF3D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> > <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > writes:
> > > > >
> > > > >> Yup. Herr Robust is once again proving I'm right. :-)
> > > > >
> > > > >You are perhaps the only person on the planet incapable of seeing
the
> > > > >irony of what you tell others when compared to what you actually
do.
> > > > >You lecture others on what they have no "authority" to do then
proceed
> > > > >to do those very same things.
> > > >
> > > > Stuff it, crybaby. I'm still RIGHT and you're still the egotist
who
> > is
> > > > pissed off.
> > >
> > > Is this your bullying nonsense? "Stuff it, crybaby" sure doesn't come
> > > off as much of a counter to my comments.
> > >
> >
> > You mean you feel bullied, Dave? Oh, and "stuff it" generally means a
> > response to indicate indifference to something that has been said. So,
it's
> > a very appropriate counter.
> >
> > Oh, and try not to feel so bullied...
>
> So you haven't been keeping up and you don't recognized Len's own phrase
> including the words "bullying nonsense", now turned toward him?
>
> Try to keep up.
>
> Dave K8MN

>

You should try *less* keeping up, Dave. I don't even scan for Len's posts. And, *usually* when I see Len's name embedded in a post I open, it gets closed right back up.

Maybe your and Len's personalities are closer aligned to each other than one would even imagine possible...

You play right into his game...

Kim W5TIT

1348. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 16:06:49 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhlksb$j1e@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74813
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:7rhsjvs2l8e27dba2vo9hjaf2c0ccov9nh@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 16 Aug 2003 14:49:29 GMT, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> wrote:
>
> >You know, Walt, sometimes you can be a really world-class yobo.
>
> That matches very closely the opinion that a large proportion of the
> British population (and most of Europe) holds about the Americans at
> present.
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com
>

It sounds to me like you (because I work with a lot of Brits, Walt, and you don't emulate their opinions at all) like using a broad paintbrush. You are disgusting to promote, joke about, or align yourself with bigoted, racial remarks. You'll find true friendship, though, in a few people from this very newsgroup.

I could not care one iota less what the likes of you think of Americans (was that North- or South-Americans by the way, you geographic ignoramus) because you're opinion is obviously obscured by some kind of hate. And, like I keep trying to tell Dave: that is not my problem, it is yours. So, off to Hell with you, and quickly.

Kim W5TIT

1349. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 16:33:03 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f3e5d61_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74814
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

You think that the astute Brit who is taking you
for as much money as he can get out of you is going
to tell you what he really thinks of you?

Bwahahahahahahahahahahaha!

Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bhlksb$j1e@library1.airnews.net...
> It sounds to me like you (because I work with a lot of Brits, Walt, and
you
> don't emulate their opinions at all)

1350. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 16:48:56 UTC
From: A Radar led news thug <newbury66@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <Rft%a.13038$Kx1.197219@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74815
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f3e5d61_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> You think that the astute Brit who is taking you
> for as much money as he can get out of you is going
> to tell you what he really thinks of you?
>
> Bwahahahahahahahahahahaha!
>
> Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:bhlksb$j1e@library1.airnews.net...
> > It sounds to me like you (because I work with a lot of Brits, Walt, and
> you
> > don't emulate their opinions at all)
>
>
If I was in the desert, hundreds of miles from the nearest town, I know who
I would trust with my life Airy, and it wouldn't be you.

1351. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 16:59:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308160859.2b88a90c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74816

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F3D2BC4.5C421A33@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3C58F1.86EDE9C2@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F37AFDE.6D3406E4@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F301FE3.951681BE@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > > > > Please quote that "may share space" FCC document.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Please quote the "Farnsworth Exam at 13-15wpm is the same as the Morse
> > > > > > > Exam at 5wpm" FCC document.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That's totally irrelevant to the discussion at hand.
> > > > >
> > > > > Why?
> > > >
> > > > ...because the Farnsworth method was not under discussion. It is
> > > > irrelevant to the request made of you.
> > >
> > > I thought the existence of FCC documents were now part of the
> > > discussion. At least you broght it up.
> > >
> > > Tell you what David, in the future put your comments that are not open
> > > for discussion in brackets [xxx].
> > >
> > > OK?
> >
> > It'd be easier if you just stuck to the matter being discussed.

FCC documents that don't exist?

> > > > Farnsworth exists as the de facto "code" exam, even though the
> > > > FCC documents specify Morse Code. Yet the FCC documents DO assign the
> > > > exact same priveleges to Carl that they do you, yet you insist on
> > > > arguing it.
> > >
> > > What doest it have to do with the FCC's "may share space" document?
> > >

> > Part 97 addresses your and Carls priveleges.
>
> It certainly does.

You implied that it didn't.

So? We weren't discussing installing towers within
> a certain distance from an airport but that's in Part 97.

Yes, it is. Do you live near an airport?

> > > > That would make you a fool.
> > >
> > > I'd guess the fool to be one who is asked about a regulation about
> > > "sharing space" and responds with some nonsense about the Farnsworth
> > > method of learning morse.
> >
> > You don't believe in sharing space which the FCC says you must share
> > in a document called Part 97.
>
> I've never stated that I don't believe in sharing space.
> That's something you've tried to establish.

That's something that you implied, with "he may not."

> > You remain the fool, Farnsworth not withstanding.
>
> I'm sure that's the way you see it, little electrolyte.

It is, battery acid.

> > > > > > > He's allocated the same frequencies. He may or may not share the same
> > > > > > > space.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Which is it?
> >
> > > > > > > May or May Not?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > That's correct.
> > > > > >
> > > > > So you don't know.
> > > >
> > > Incorrect, Farnsworth. I do know and I provided the answer.
> > >
> > Wrong.
>
> Something does not become "wrong" due to your failure to comprehend it.

True. It is wrong when it is wrong.

1352. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 17:18:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308160918.26cf56a0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74817

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F3E3A4C.F72EB796@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > I've figured out that you've run out of anything that matters.
>
> You are the one with the unanswered questions and you expect me to do
> all your work for you?

I'm good either way. You just seemed to be in a question answering
mood, but as usual, they were nonsense answers. Perhaps there should
be a no content indicator in the preamble of your messages.

1353. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 17:21:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308160921.3dbce55@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74818

averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030815175154.20925.00000034@mb-m13.aol.com>...
> >Subject: Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)
> >From: Dave Heil k8mn@earthlink.net
> >Date: 8/15/03 2:41 PM Eastern Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <3F3D261C.E96C3279@earthlink.net>

> >I don't do a real Lennie imitation. Avery is much, much better at it.
>
> I am not imitating anyone.
>
> Do you see me calling people names?
>
> Do you see me insulting other people?
>
> Do you see me behaving in any way like Leonard Anderson?
>
> Perhaps that's what bothers him so much.
>
> Oh well, not to worry.

Now you're talking to yourself.

1354. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 17:27:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308160927.8678658@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74819

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F3E3AA9.994B6F3@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3D2556.34E27B82@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3C5D48.951FFE94@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F37B75A.D47CAEF1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Roger: "Duuuuh, how'd you know it was me"? Shall we say that you have a
> > > > > > > rather unique writing style and that your topics of interest repeat
> > > > > > > themselves on a regular basis.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Gee David, someone posting as Avery Fine is sure doing a ringer impression of
you.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > What could it mean?
> > > > >
> > > > > It could mean that someone is doing an impression of Len and you aren't
> > > > > bright enough to figure it out.
> >
> > > > But it's you they're imitating.
> > >
> > > See, you weren't bright enough to figure it out even after an
> > > explanation.
> >
> > No doubt attributable to your superb powers of explanation.
>
> It is likely the result of your difficulty in comprehending.

Avery, you crack me up.

1355. Re: Dropping the code caused the blackout?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 18:46:54 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <y_u%a.229$iU3.173@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74821

No, our repeaters were up and running. There are repeaters around here that aren't even connected to the mains :)

btw, cell phones were in trouble, they can't handle all of those calls to 911 "what happened to the power?" - pagers were out, and the local tv stations were down. I found out what was going on (my e-mail and homepage were down too) via those repeaters. Funny how that happens just when folks are convinced that there is no need for amateur radio what with telephones, cell phones, internet, etc.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030816095557.14622.00001851@mb-m04.aol.com...
> From: Robert Casey wa2ise@ix.netcom.com
>
> >Dropping the code caused the blackout?
>
> No, but with cell phones down, all communications was lost - except to
those
> that knew Morse code.
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.510 / Virus Database: 307 - Release Date: 8/14/03

1356. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 18:47:40 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <g%u%a.72$6e5.16725@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74820

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0308160744.19006d94@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<gpg%a.32$6e5.6019@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>
> > NCI's Petition for Rulemaking with the FCC.
> >
> > It is available in .pdf format at http://www.nocode.org
> > under the "Articles" link ...
>
> OK, let's cut to the chase.
>
> Obviously the main request is to dump Element 1 ASAP. And there's
> probably lots of reasons given for doing so, including the
> Commission's own words "no regulatory purpose".
>
> But what else was in the petition?

I gave you a URL where you could read it ...

> >
> > Some will undoubtedly say "What took you so long?"
> >
> > The answer is simply "We wanted to do the best possible
> > job of getting it right."
>
> What did it take - six weeks? Not really long at all. Plus there was
> always the chance FCC would have simply dumped Element 1 on its own,
> instead of doing the whole NPRM thing.
>
> What surprises me personally is that NCI didn't have a proposal ready
> to go before WRC-03 even began. But that's all water under the bridge
> now.

There was some question as to whether S25.5 would be suppressed
or modified (as it was) to eliminate the Morse requirement ... that
uncertainty made us decide to see the final outcome before developing
a final strategy/proposal.

> As you have pointed out, Carl, FCC hasn't even given any of the
> proposals an RM number yet. And it's reasonable to assume there will
> be more proposals - from NCVEC, ARRL, and other groups. FCC may assign
> numbers, or they may take ideas from each one and produce an NPRM.

NCVEC already filed a petition, as have several individuals.

From a meeting I had at FCC on Thursday, the indication is that
they will lump them all together in whatever course of action they
decide to take.

ARRL doesn't need to file a petition on the Morse issue, unless, of
course, they wise up and decide to ask the FCC to eliminate Morse
testing ASAP so they won't continue to alienate a portion of the
US amateur population that's larger than their current total membership :-)
(They don't need to file a petition to keep code testing, because that
is the status quo ...)

> And of course those wheels turn slowly.

We shall see ...

73,
--
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
Grid Square FN20fm
http://home.ptd.net/~wk3c

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, IEEE Standards Association
Chair, IEEE 802.18 Radio Regulatory Technical Advisory Group
Chair-elect, Wi-Fi Alliance Regulatory Committee
Co-Chair, Wi-Fi Alliance Legislative Committee
Member, QCWA (31424)
Member, ARRL
Member, TAPR
Member, The SETI League

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

1357. Re: Dropping the code caused the blackout?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 19:32:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F3E8707.3080600@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74822

Jim Hampton wrote:
> No, our repeaters were up and running. There are repeaters around here that
> aren't even connected to the mains :)
>
> btw, cell phones were in trouble, they can't handle all of those calls to
> 911 "what happened to the power?" - pagers were out, and the local tv
> stations were down. I found out what was going on (my e-mail and homepage
> were down too) via those repeaters. Funny how that happens just when folks
> are convinced that there is no need for amateur radio what with telephones,
> cell phones, internet, etc.

Funny you should mention that. At a recent public service event, the organizers were trying out cell phones for support this year, in conjunction with the amateurs. They were hoing to replace the hams with the actual support people that we interfaced with having a cell phone.

Well, most of the race was in areas where cell coverage was not. The phone my cohort had would ring occasionally, but he couldn't raise anyone after answering. And for general announcements, HQ had to call everyone who had a phone, since there was no way of all the cell phone users getting the message at once. Then they had to try recalling those who were out of range.

Took about a half hour for them to realize that the cells simply didn't work.

"can you hear me now?".....now? 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1358. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 19:40:02 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F3E8894.9090903@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 74823

>
>
>
>ARRL doesn't need to file a petition on the Morse issue, unless, of
>course, they wise up and decide to ask the FCC to eliminate Morse
>testing ASAP so they won't continue to alienate a portion of the
>US amateur population that's larger than their current total membership :-)
>(They don't need to file a petition to keep code testing, because that
>is the status quo ...)
>
Well would there be much of a point in submitting a petition that would
be a duplication of
those already submitted? I'd just as soon let them focus on BPL....

>
>
>
>>And of course those wheels turn slowly.
>>
>>
>
>We shall see ...
>
>73,
>
>

1359. Re: FYI: Q-signals -- Now, Then, and Way Back When (Was QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 19:55:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308161155.d51aea8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74824

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net> wrote in message
news:<4sgljvklln6opmhh62oniqhc630pf3ar82@4ax.com>...
> On Wed, 13 Aug 2003 15:52:51 -0700, "Keyboard In The Wilderness"
> <KITW@forest.com> wrote:
>
> >And QFU is legitimate as below.
> >--
>
> If I gave the impression that I meant to imply otherwise, I apologize
> to N2EY. There are numerous Q-signals that were originally for
> aeronautical use, back when CW was used for communications with
> airplanes. I was just pointing out that they aren't used anymore.
> Comms between aircraft and from air-to-ground are in AM mode. No need
> for q-signals there, and as I say, the ATIS tells the flight crew
> which runway is in use anyway.
>
> 7e DE John, KC2HMZ

And last but not least . . .

http://www.zerobeat.net/drakelist/missingq.html

w3rv

1360. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 21:35:54 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhm82o$n2l$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74825

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bhlfkg$tsg@library2.airnews.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:BB63501C.23806%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> > >
> > > Ed Hare, W1RFI, of the ARRL isn't the only one
> > > measuring the interference at the BPL pilot
> > > test sites ... I was in a meeting today with
> > > folks from NTIA (the equivalent of the FCC
> > > for federal govt. users of the spectrum) and
> > > they are out doing measurements, too. The
> > > meeting was about something else, but I got
> > > the impression that they aren't happy with
> > > what they are seeing either ...
> > >
> > >
> > I'm glad to hear that. Hopefully the studies will generate results
that
> > will get someone's attention. Regardless, BPL is obviously going to be
> tough
> > to fight.
> > >
> > >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > >
>
> Whew....someone finally gets it--just kidding, Dwight. You probably "had"
> it all along. That is exactly what my rattling has been all about. I
just
> don't see this fight being won (from the amateur radio perspective) and, I
> think there a "ways around" BPL interference. So, where do we spend the
> energy? Before, or after and, on what? I'd rather think that the way to
> fight BPL and win (for sure) is to get busy designing, testing and
> implementing ways around it, *before* it becomes the major issue that it
> will--because, like I said, I don't see this fight being won. Way, way
too
> much commercial interest--the very people that feed the pockets of the
> politicians.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>

>

If it was JUST ham radio that would affected then your right. No way in hell. However it isn't just ham radio. Its any user at all on HF and low VHF...and PROBABLY due to harmonics , etc way up the spectrum.

I think we a missing the boat of how to fight this thing tho. The ARRL recently signed a agreement on 'first response' being a HAM RADIO thing. This with DHS (Department of Homeland Security). Should we not be pushing this fact? Its gonna be real tough to be a first responder with all kinds of radio goodies and no way to hear each other.

Oh sure now I hear....it not gonna bother the 2 meter and above bands. WANNA BET?????????????

Dan/W4NTI

1361. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 21:42:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhm8eu$5u3$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74826
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

```
"Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI" <g3vki@turner-smith.co.uk> wrote in message
news:Vce%a.13467$yl6.10053@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bhjor3$ibo$1@slb4.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> > "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> > news:egapjv8pqfh6273t74ublmqs2ctgpsvatp@4ax.com...
> > > On Thu, 14 Aug 2003 15:49:34 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > >Oh and BTW. The USA may indeed 'meet its match'....but keep this
under
> > your
> > > >high hat mate......we have over 9000 nukes looking for a target. And
> > since
> > > >we are the ONLY country to use them against a civilian population,
we
> > will
> > > >damn sure do it again. In otherwords, sir, we will draw enough
blood
> to
> > > >make our enemies hurt beyond words.
> > >
> > > Oh, that's alright then. That makes it all OK!
> > > :-)
> > >
> > > I believe that was the real reason for the attack on Iraq. To "draw
> > > enough blood", as you so delicately put it, to exact revenge for the
> > > 9/11 atrocity. It doesn't matter whose blood it was ... just that it
> > > was seen to be drawn, to satisfy the lynch-mob mentality so prolific
> > > in Western society nowadays.
> > >
> > > Not surprising, really, as most of America's principal institutions
> > > are run by Zionists whose philosophy is "An eye for an eye, a tooth
> > > for a tooth."
> > >
> > > 73 de G3NYY
> > >
> > > --
> > > Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com
> >
> > Good show Walt. Bring in the 'Jewish problem'. Perhaps you are mad
that
```

> > Hitler didn't win, eh? Are you perchance a 'closet anti-semite' ??
> >
> > As for our reasons to stop Iraq....you don't get it do you? We didn't
and
> > don't want to hurt the average Iraqi. We just wanted to get rid of So
> Damn
> > Insane and his henchmen. Before he became the Hitler of the 21st
century.
> >
> > You see old boy, if Chamerlain (sp?) would have had his arse out of his
> > boot the whole thing (ww2) would never have been.
> >
> > So I AGREE with Mr. Bush. Kill the bastards before they kill us.
> >
> > And yes indeed...I can guarantee 9/11 and the murder of innocents PISSED
> US
> > OFF. And guess what? YOU AIN'T SEEN NOTHING YET.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> I have to say though, that I find it strange that after all the searching,
> not one WOMD was found in Iraq. I simply don't believe they were all
> destroyed without trace; put in their position I would have used any
weapons
> I really had.
> --
> ;>)
> 73 de Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI - mine's a pint.
>
>

I believe you will find they ended up in Syria and possibly Iran and Turkey.
They had years to spirit them anywhwer they wanted to. Of course it really
doesn't matter much. Saddam is history and thats what counts in the long
run.

Dan/W4NTI

1362. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 21:44:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhm8hkdah1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74827
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

I recommend we plant one up your 'boot'. Wat say old chap?

Dan/W4NTI

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f3dc9bf$1_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> Now that Yankland has had sufficient time to start planting
> WOMD, miraculously they'll start "finding" them pretty soon.
>
> Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:xnfcneeyarg.hjoisyc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> > On Sat, 16 Aug 2003 00:41:46 +0100, Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI wrote:
> > >I have to say though, that I find it strange that after all the
> searching,
> > >not one WOMD was found in Iraq. I simply don't believe they were all
> > >destroyed without trace; put in their position I would have used any
> weapons
> > >I really had.
> > They're all in Syrian custody in hidden storage in the Bekaa Valley,
> > but Syria is too scared to use them on behalf of Saadam because they
> > don't want Damesek (Damascus) turned into a sea of glass as it almost
> > was in '67.
>
>
>

1363. Re: Col. High-el/klunk still blows goats (Was Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 21:44:48 UTC
From: Poor Wogie <Woger@PoWittleWogie.com>
Message-ID: <bhm8j6fvp0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 74828

"privacy.at Anonymous Remailer" <mixmaster@remailer.privacy.at> wrote in
message news:e23dd557edde723c80632e676681aa2e@remailer.privacy.at...
>
> In article <3F3B2209.8DC58CF5@earthlink.net>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> >
> >
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3F3980D8.E1FDBCF3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
<k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >What's it to you? You have nothing to do with amateur radio.
> > >
> > > Still trying the old misdirection & personal insult type thing.
:-)
> >
> > Are you insulted by a truthful statement? Do you find the fact that you
> > have no amateur radio license to be insulting? What does morse code
> > testing or an age limit in amateur radio licensing have to do with you?
>
> And the Anti-American High-el still tries to censor others' freedom of
speech...he does his neo-Nazi and Taliban friends proud. In fact, he helped
dictators get a foothold while he was in Africa.
>
> > > >Have you
> > > >made up your mind yet. Some time back you stated that I wasn't a
radio
> > > >god then I was a radio god then I wasn't a radio god. Have you made
up
> > > >your mind yet?
> > >
> > > You PRETEND to have great expertise (on the order of godlike
> > > judgement and capability).
> >
> > I do have some expertise in amateur radio and I have decades of
> > experience. That something grates on you doesn't make it a pretense.
>
> The only "experience" you have is cornholing little boys. You sure as hell
haven't advanced ham radio in your so-called 40 years of tenure.
>
> > > It would seem that your PRETENSE has made you very tense
> > > (and angry) when someone shows your pretense for what it is. :-)

> >
> > I'm not angry, Leonard. I'm actually smiling as I write these words:
> > You haven't shown anything to anyone when it comes to amateur radio.
>
> Neither have you, ASSHOLE.
>
>

Wow! It seems Woger is vewy vewy upset with
Ambassador Heil.
LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL

1364. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 21:45:51 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhm8l2gas1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74829
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI" <g3vki@turner-smith.co.uk> wrote in message
news:7dl%a.13622$yl6.10177@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net...
> "Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
> news:3f3dc9bf$1_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> > Now that Yankland has had sufficient time to start planting
> > WOMD, miraculously they'll start "finding" them pretty soon.
> >
> On closer inspection they might be found to be your discarded home brew CB
> rigs.
> (_!_)
>
>
>

Unfortunatly the good ole 'Yanks' are destroying all the WOMD, you know those nasty chemical things. This per a worldwide agreement. How do I know you say? Well the 2000 TONS of the stuff next door to me is being smoked as we speak.

Now if you are refering to the nukes? Sorry, we are keeping those.

Dan/W4NTI

1365. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 21:47:57 UTC
From: Poor Wogie <Woger@PoWittleWogie.com>
Message-ID: <bhm8p6$g9d$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 74830

"An Metet" <anmetet@liberty.gmsociety.org> wrote in message
news:d2536d0a9d0f4cc0e6a08e7165f74e02@aonymous.poster...
> NOTICE: This message may not have been sent by the Sender Name
> above. Always use cryptographic digital signatures to verify
> the identity of the sender of any usenet post or e-mail.
>
> THE ASSHOLE <3F37B75A.D47CAEF1@earthlink.net>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> >
> >
> > "privacy.at Anonymous Remailer" wrote:
> > >
> > > In article <3F2DC086.A0898140@earthlink.net>
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > JMBCV wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > In article <3F2C9682.FFEC97A8@earthlink.net>
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Vshah101 wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > From (Larry Roll K3LT):
> > >
> > > > > > > I'm involved in a county group which is part of ARES.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Feh. You've attended only one meeting..and just to harass and
stalk another ham, ASSHOLE.
> > > >
> > > > Why, Roger Wiseman! Fancy you slithering from beneath your bed to
make
> > >
> > > Why Dave High-el, imagine you stopping downloading kiddie porn to
answer a post.....
> >
> > I do no such thing, Roger.
>
> That's not what your hard drive contents says.....
>
> > What is your fixation with child pornography?

>
> What is your fixation with turning the argument around like a fucking
woman? You download kiddie porn, your hard drive has a gig of it on there.
Tell us all of your radio accomplishments....tel us more lies, Goatblower
High-el.
>
> > > > yet another anonymous post.
> > >
> > > If this is anonymous, how do you know who sent it, dumbass?
> >
> > Roger:
>
> Dicksucking Dave: You are a stupid fuck. You cannot prove who wrote this,
even if you give deep throat to all the law enforcement in inbred Marshall
county.
>
> > "Duuuuh,
>
> Your "Duhhh!" is about the extent of your conversation, ASSHOLE, why don't
you try making sense?
>
>
> > how'd you know it was me"?
>
> Poor High-el the goatblower and kiddie porn downloader, so
desperate......thinks everybody posting anon is Wiseman. But that fits with
his narrow-minded and paranoid mindset.
>
>
> > Shall we say that you have a
> > rather unique writing style and that your topics of interest repeat
> > themselves on a regular basis.
>
> And no class, no style Dicksucking Dave High-el, jealous of those who has
style...pulls another theory out of his fatass.
> Dumbass Dave's Rule #1: Everybody who attacks me or disagrees with me is
Wiseman...
>
> > > > I've attended a number of meetings and
> > > > functions, Roger.
> > >
> > > Guess you had to suck off Bertie Garcia one way or another, eh,
ASSHOLE?
> >
> > No, Roger.
>
> Feh, sure, dicksucking Dave....that why you and your equally odorous lover
were giggling like two schoolgirls from all reports?
>
> > What is your fixation with homosexuality?

>
> What's the matter, fat, smelly, homosexual Dave afraid his secret is out?
Maybe Leila will grease up her strap-on and use it on you as you suck off
Bertie. You know you told Wiseman that's what you liked to do when you sat
on that goodwill donated couch...as you and your gay lover bertie sat and
giggled.
>
> >
> > > > I'm told that you only came to the one meeting.
> > >
> > > I'm told you shouldn't stalk other hams like you do, kiddie diddler.
> >
> > It is peculiar that one who has posted numerous untruths about others
> > would consider himself to be a stalking victim.
>
> Pot..Kettle..black, Dumbfuck High-el......maybe you can tell us all about
your messenger boy job as a courier again...give us some more lies...you
tell lies about posters on here all the time, High-el.
>
> > What is your fixation on sex with children?
>
> Why is your only tactic similar to Pee Wee Heman's? Is it beacuse you're
so fucking dense and narrow-minded that you just have to give the impression
that you are a megalomaniac?
>
>
> > > > By the way, I'd go very carefully on that stalking stuff, Rog.
You've
> > > > frequently harrassed me here and in direct e-mails.
> > >
> > > Awww, poor Dicksucking Davey.......you stalked Rog as well, because
the only reason you came to the ARES meeting to confront him, and let's not
forget how you were going to break the law by posting his "best newsgroup
material" on telephone poles in Rog's neighborhood.
> >
> > What is your fixation with homosexual activity, Roger?
>
>
> So defensive, homosexual Davey? That's all right, you can pretend your
marriage to the finnish mail-order whale is not a sham.
>
>
> > Bert and I attended an ARES meeting at the invitation of the Emergency
> > Coordinator for purposes of joining.
>
> That why you practically held hands and made loving eyes at each other? Oh
maybe you gave each other the reach around before you got there that might
explain the peculiar smell along with both of yours' body odor.
>
> > I think you've gotten your wires crossed on the breaking of law, Roger.

>
> I think you've been caught, Dicksucking Dave. I think you need to locate
the law that prohibits you from putting posters on telephone poles, because
American Electric Power (who supplies the power in your area) might just
want to prosecute.
>
> >You were asked if you'd be proud to have your wife, mother or children
> > see some of your handiwork. You were asked if you thought your
>
> I was? Looks like you asked Wiseman, who I'm sure would report your
tacking up of posters of such things to the proper authorities....he made
sure AEP got a copy of your letter saying you were going to do that.
>
> > neighbors would enjoy seeing some of your memorable posts tacked to
> > telephone poles in the neighborhood. I can post my exact comments and
> > your sparkling reply here if you feel that would set the record
> > straight.
>
> You mean the reply where Wiseman told you to fuck off?
Bwhahahahahaha!!!!!!!! Did it make widdle Davey so mad?
>
>
> > After all, you seemed to think enough of your numerous
> > newsgroup postings to post them in this very public venue.
>
> Awww, don't cry, you are the one who made the threats, dumbfuck...Wiseman
only posted them...lol!!!!! How does it feel to be a fucking retard, baby
huey High-el?
> You pull that "goggle" thing with posters here you don't like, like Lenny
and whomever else disagrees with the overbearing gasbag known as Dave
High-el.
>
>
> > > > You have an arrest
> > >
> > > I do? Prove it.......
> >
> > It is public record,
>
> Prove that Wiseman has a criminal record, dicksplash.
>
> >Roger.
>
> Obession...well looks like the mental health people will want to know
about this one.....
>
> > By the way, is this another <IKYABWAI>
>
> More likely it's a pathetic backpedal, just like you always do.
>

>
> > > > record and you've been booted from a couple of ISP's.
> > >
> > > Bwhahahahahahahaha....prove it, kiddie diddling Dave.
> >
> > One note to OVIS should clear that one up.
>
> Mwhahaha.....You mean you'll get told that Wiseman told that FATASSED HAG
Pam Hoffer to go fuck herself and to quit giving Anthony those blowjobs in
the server room????? Wiseman sent me a copy of the e-mail he sent cancelling
his account there. And no, I won't post it because that's more your
style...or lack thereof...<guffaw>
>
>
> > What is your fixation with child sex?
>
> Just want to converse in subjects you know so much about.
>
> > > > You've been
> > > > cautioned for malicious QRMing on 20 meters and have been forced to
> > > > retest.
> > >
> > > So some fake info was submitted and dumbfuck Riley believed it.......
> >
> > Who Riley? The fake info was in the form of audio tape. I know the
> > fellow who supplied it. I have no reason to disbelieve him and to
> > believe your claim that it was "fake".
>
> Lying for your friend? Or maybe he knows about your kiddie porn pics you
try to sell.
> Maybe he's another gay lover for you.....
>
> > > he still PASSED the "retest" it's doubtful you could as of today,
ASSHOLE.
> >
> > "He/you" passed.
>
> Awww, a feat you couldn't do. And try harder..."He/you" <guffaw> couldn't
pass the Technician class exam today if you were called in to retest. By
your own admission you don't know a fucking thing about electronics.
>
>
> > Whether I could or couldn't isn't an issue.
>
> Admission you couldn't pass, noted.
>
>
> > I wasn't contacted and told that I needed to retest.
>
> In reviewing Wiseman's letter to retest, there's no reason given for it.

Are you saying you speak for baldy and the FCC now?
>
> > There's been no enforcement
> > action taken toward me in forty years.
>
> Liar. But before forty years is a different story, eh? Or maybe they just
don't publish those letters like they do in the last couple of years or
so....I'd say you did get letters.
>
> >
> > > > > > Most of the hams
> > > > > > involved are not interested in contesting or DXing. Many
operate VHF FM
> > > > > > only. I don't know any who've designed and built a linear
amplifier.
> > > > > > Only one other is interested in collecting and restoring vintage
gear.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Yep, they are a clique of losers.....
> > > > >
> > > > > Oh yes, I neglected to mention that we have one dysfunctional
individual
> > > > > who exhibits sociopathic behavior on several levels. He frequently
> > >
> > > I wonder if the WV Medical board is aware of you practicing psychology
without a degree in it or a license?
> >
> > Take it up with the board.
>
> Feh. And hear you whine again? You do enough whining in the newsgroup.
>
> > > > haunts the rec.radio.amateur.misc and rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > > newsgroups and posts irrelevant stream-of-consciousness filth
(usually
> > > > unrelated to the thread topic. His over exhuberance has led him to
the
> > > > malicious interference incidents on 20m.
> > >
> > > Poor Davey......the Lackland press release boy, the flunky who
couldn't get/or was so fucking stupid he couldn't get a real job then after
a piss poor service record, had to take a flunky courier job with the State
department, until he was terminated.
> >
> > What is your fixation with Lackland AFB and my web page? I haven't been
> > to Lackland in over thirty years. You know nothing of my service
> > record. I have an honorable discharge from the military. You know
> > nothing of my State Department service other than what you can glean
> > from my web site or here.
>
> You sure are defensive about that piss-poor service and State department

record. No wonder they fired you <translate: take an "early retirement" for your incompetence.>
>
> > > > Actually, Roger, the only real loser is you. You're hardly a clique.
> > >
> > > IKYABWAI, dicksucking Davey.....
> >
> > What is your obsession with homosexual oral sex?
>
> Just want to relate by talking about topics you're so well aware of?
>
> > > Actually, kiddiediddler High-el, how is it you had to get a mail order bride for yourself? Maybe it's you lack of personal cleanliness, as evidenced by the stench you had when you attened that meeting and your wrinkled clothes.
> >
> > What is your fixation on sex with children?
>
> I just want you to know that people know about you, kiddie diddling Dave?
>
> >
> > I don't have a mail-order bride.
>
> No, you had to beg some finnish fat fuck to marry you, after using that mail-order bride service since you are too fucking ugly with your thick glasses to get an American woman.
>
> > I bathe on a regular basis and my
> > clothing is washed and pressed. What is your fixation on body odor and
> > wrinkled clothing?
>
> According to some fellow, you showed up smelling like dung with cheap cologne trying to mask it that didn't work and wrinkled clothing at an ARES meeting. Reportedly, they looked like they were not washed or pressed in a week. Although with today's fabrics, most clothes aren't pressed that much anymore. But somebody as backward looking as you wouldn't be expected to have modern things around..is that why you only run cheap-assed, old, used ham equipment?
>
> > > > > > I continue to attend. We interact
> > > > >
> > > > > Except the fact you fail to bathe regularly, you mean.......fuckstick.
> >
> > I don't recall your being here during shower time, Roger.
>
> If I want to see elephants bathe, I'll wait until the circus is in town.
>
> > > > It looks like your still battling that rare form of Tourette's

Syndrome.
> > >
> > > Looks like you need to go to Hair Club For men and Jenny Craig.
> >
> > There's a hair club for Jenny Craig?
>
> No, you dumb fat fuck get some hair and lose some weight. Can't you
fucking read?
>
> > Dave has a bad comb-over and his fat belly makes him look like he's
> > about 8 months pregnant. Given this along with his wrinkled clothes that
> > he looks like he slept in for a week, he makes such a good impression...
> > > With that small skull he really looks like Baby Huey.
> >
> > Your powers of observation are lacking, Roger.
>
> Dance, baby huey, dance....
>
> > I have a full head of
> > hair without even a hint of a bald spot.
>
> Liar. You have a bad comb over with totally grey hair.
>
>
> > My hat size is 7 7/8 which is
> > considered "Large". If you like, I can post a photo of the top of my
> > head so that others won't engage in a "comb over" debate.
>
> Looks like you're quite defensive about your fat head, FATASS baby Huey
High-el.
>
> >Why is any of this of interest to you, Roger?
>
> There you go with that obsession again...It's fun to see you dance, Davey
the dancing bear.
>
> > > > > > >based on our common interests rather than the things which divide
us.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Yeah, those common interests being not helping newer hams......
> > > > >
> > > > > How could you come to that conclusion?
> > > >
> > > Unlike you, I don't pull my conclusions out of my ass, goat blower
Davey.
> >
> > Where'd they come from then?
>
> Awww, can't face the truth about you and your asshole friends who won't
help new hams, Davey?

>
> > > > You haven't been attending
> > > > meetings.
> > > >
> > > When some new hams needed help, they didn't get it, fuckstick.
> > >
> > Who <whaaaaaa!!!!!!!!!!!!!!>>>>.
>
>
> Poor Davey.....lend him a crying towel, willya?
>
>
>
> > > > > > > The other alternative is to start my own club. I tried it, but
that was not too
> > > > > > > successful.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > btw, fuck off, High-el.
> > > > >
> > > > BTW, forwarded your stuff to Chief Stenger in Glen Dale. It is
about
> > > > the only way to make a case against someone who has no interpersonal
> > > > skills.
> > > >
> > > BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHA..... you've said that ALL ALONG, DICKBREATH....
> > >
> > Yes, I have. That's because, as you aware from being paid a number of
> > visits, that is what I have been doing.
>
> Pussy....Nope, haven't heard a thing, and haven't been paid any visits,
so you are talking out of your fat ass.
>
>
> > What is your fixation with homosexual oral sex?
>
> Why does talking about your homosexuality bothers you so?
>
> > How would you, the non-Roger anonymous poster know
> > anything about what I've said all along?
>
> Most people can read, dipshit. Unlike you, who skated along in school. You
have no fucking idea how many people read this newsgroup do you?
>
>
> >"Duuuh,
>
> There, there, Forrest Gump High-el, you can stalk your obsession some
other time. And don't forget to boil those shrimp.
>
>

> > > Maybe you need to give him another blowjob so he might pay attention
> > > to you next time..haven't heard a thing from him though
> >
> > Is that how you write about your chief of police--a man who is on your
> > city council?
>
> He's not my chief or councilman, you dumb fucking bastard. And since you
ask, are you so un-American you want to censor freedom of speech? Looks like
High-el has ties with the Taliban.....
> Somebody needs to know.
>
> >
> > > ....some
> > > case, dickhead...... BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA...maybe it's because
> I don't live in Glen Dale, Davey, not everybody who posts anon is your >
obsession.
> >
> > Maniacal laughter aside,
>
> Oh, is that fatassed whale Leila feeding at the trough again?
>
> >Roger, is this another, "Duuuh, how'd you know
> > it was me"? Do you know how few anonymous posters post items about me
> > filled with nonsense rants about child pornography, sex with children,
> > homosexual oral sex, fixations with body odor and wrinkled apparel?
>
> Looks like it hit quite the nerve, you're either so rattled or so stupid
or a combination, you're repeating yourself, dumbfuck. I'd go with the
rattled theory, since you think everybody is Roger.
>
> > > > Ta-Ta for now.
> > >
> > > Your not-so-Closeted homosexuality, noted.
> >
> > You fascination with homosexuality is noted.
>
> Your denial of your pedophilia, noted.
>
>
>

Hey Dave, Good job annoying Roger. It will take
Wogie a week to get over his tantrum!!!!!
ROTFLMAO !

1366. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 21:52:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhm90o$19b$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74831
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:e9urjv4ntpdp52efegbfr9q7fcf361ifgq@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 15 Aug 2003 18:03:42 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >Good show Walt. Bring in the 'Jewish problem'. Perhaps you are mad that
> >Hitler didn't win, eh?
>
> Your remark is highly offensive to a person whose close relatives lost
> their lives during the 1940s in the struggle against Hitler. Your
> country, in contrast, had little interest in coming to the aid of the
> Jewish people of Europe until the day the Japs bombed Pearl Harbor.

I apologize for my remark towards your family background.

And you are 100% correct. The USA was indeed very anti-semite in the time before and during WW2. However after seeing what the NAZIs did in the 'camps' we became a very big supporter of the 'Jews'. In fact we were instrumental in helping to establish the modern country of ISRAEL and are to this day there best friend on this planet.

Since were on the subject Walt. Shall we now discuss how the Brits did there best to stop the Jewish refugees from landing in Palestine??????? No, we better not.

>
> >We didn't and don't want to hurt the average Iraqi.
>
> So you keep saying, but you seem to be having a very tough time trying
> to convince "the average Iraqi" of that claim.

Perhaps if they would quit shooting at us we wouldn't have to shoot back.

Ive come to the conclusion that they are basically just dumb bastards and are acting like children. Unfortunatly they have guns.

It's turning into
> another Vietnam, as many people predicted from the outset.

No, not really. VN had real fighters. With real leadership. And they wipped our ass. I know...I was there.

>
> >Are you perchance a 'closet anti-semite' ??
>
> Are you perchance a closet homosexual?

No, I don't believe I am. Let me check with the wife and 4 kids, I'll get back to you on that later.

Dan/W4NTI

>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

1367. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 21:53:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhm93okuu1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74832
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI" <g3vki@turner-smith.co.uk> wrote in message
news:4Qd%a.13436$yl6.5163@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bhjode$gd0$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > Poor 'Airy' unable to argue with conviction, so he attacks religion.
> >
> > Go on back to the pub Airy, the blokes won't laugh at ya...I promise.
> >
> > But this time...please wear your pants.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> Why did you tell him? You've spoiled the fun now.
> --
> ;>)
> 73 de Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI - mine's a pint.
>
>

Sorry Frank, I wasn't thinking.

Dan/W4NTI

1368. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 21:59:01 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308161359.600a6bac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74833

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<Uxg%a.35$6e5.6035@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:BB6307F5.22439%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
>

> Ed Hare, W1RFI, of the ARRL isn't the only one measuring the interference
> at the BPL pilot test sites ... I was in a meeting today with folks from
> NTIA
> (the equivalent of the FCC for federal govt. users of the spectrum) and they
> are out doing measurements, too. The meeting was about something else,
> but I got the impression that they aren't happy with what they are seeing
> either ...

That's the first best piece of news yet today abt BPL. I've been
wondering where NTIA has been in the mix. Given their key position in
Homeland Security I suspect that they will have the final word on BPL.
Assuming they come out opposed to BPL of course.

The second best piece of news today is the new eggs in the face of the
power industry. Their credibility has dropped to zip in 48 hours flat
and methinks that they'll now have bigger problems selling BPL given
the fact that their core technologies need all the attention they can
muster.

>
> 73,
> Carl -wk3c

w3rv

1369. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 22:04:56 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <kUx%a.14218$yl6.6021@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74834
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:egapjv8pqfh6273t74ublmqs2ctgpsvatp@4ax.com...
> On Thu, 14 Aug 2003 15:49:34 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
<snip>
> Not surprising, really, as most of America's principal institutions
> are run by Zionists whose philosophy is "An eye for an eye, a tooth
> for a tooth."
> 73 de G3NYY
> Walt Davidson
>
It wasn't until I had a Jewish Girlfriend, did I discover that IS what they
really believe ;-(
The Christian concept of being able to turn the other cheek is quite alien to
them

Interesting thing Anthropology

Steve Terry

1370. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 22:21:02 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <r7y%a.14227$yl6.6452@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74835
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:hpnsjvsrhdj4chf3u3mh88qegf0lkctcj7@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 16 Aug 2003 11:06:49 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> wrote:
>
> >(was that North- or South-Americans by the way, you geographic ignoramus)
>
> LOL! That's pretty rich ... coming, as it does, from a nation that
> thinks England, the United Kingdom and the British Isles are all one
> and the same thing.
> 73 de G3NYY
> Walt Davidson
>
Aint that the truth !
When I went though JFK passport control they changed my entry on the visa
from English to British, I'd like to see them try to do that to an Irishman

Steve Terry

1371. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 22:32:40 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308161432.2d8138de@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74836

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308131259.68a78fae@posting.google.com>...
> averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030813070822.22063.00000604@mb-m07.aol.com>...

> > I am not "Lennie". Nor am I Len Anderson. I am just someone
> > who writes here when the mood strikes me.
> >
> > Is that wrong?
>
> Nope. Did I say it was...?!?!
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, meet Dave. Dave, meet Steve.

1372. FCC EFCS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 22:33:38 UTC
From: clutch@lycos.com
Message-ID: <vjtca9aplvrl94@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 74837

I went to the Fcc website to file comments on bpl and got this
message:

The ECFS system will be unavailable for scheduled maintenance from
Saturday Agugust 16th, 2003 until Monsday August 18th, 2003.

Check the spelling, makes you wonder what is going on there.

Wes
--
Reply to:
Whiskey Echo Sierra Sierra AT Gee Tee EYE EYE dot COM
Lycos address is a spam trap.

1373. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 23:18:58 UTC
From: Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI <g3vki@ntlworld.com>
Message-ID: <yZy%a.13298$Kx1.199663@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74838
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhm8eu$5u3$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
>
>
> I believe you will find they ended up in Syria and possibly Iran and
Turkey.
> They had years to spirit them anywhwer they wanted to. Of course it
really
> doesn't matter much. Saddam is history and thats what counts in the long
> run.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
Wasn't it GREAT news about Idi Amin today? I don't think many will mourn the
loss of that Anus prototype.
--
;>)
73 de Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI - mine's a pint.

1374. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-16 23:57:34 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Oxz%a.26224$Vx2.11802710@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 74839

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:g%u%a.72$6e5.16725@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
>
> [snip]
> ARRL doesn't need to file a petition on the Morse issue, unless, of
> course, they wise up and decide to ask the FCC to eliminate Morse
> testing ASAP so they won't continue to alienate a portion of the
> US amateur population that's larger than their current total membership
:-)
> (They don't need to file a petition to keep code testing, because that
> is the status quo ...)
>

No matter what stance the ARRL takes or no stance at all, they will alienate a portion of the US amateur population than their membership. The number of non-ARRL members supporting code testing is larger than ARRL's membership as well as the group opposing code testing.

The various surverys that have been taken indicate that the ham community is about 50/50 on this issue. That seems to hold true inside the ARRL membership as well as outside it. Thus the ARRL will "alienate" half the US ham population no matter what stance they take.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1375. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 00:30:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhmia9lrk1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74840
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI" <g3vki@ntlworld.com> wrote in message
news:yZy%a.13298$Kx1.199663@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bhm8eu$5u3$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> >
> >
> > I believe you will find they ended up in Syria and possibly Iran and
> Turkey.
> > They had years to spirit them anywhwer they wanted to. Of course it
> really
> > doesn't matter much. Saddam is history and thats what counts in the
long
> > run.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> Wasn't it GREAT news about Idi Amin today? I don't think many will mourn
the
> loss of that Anus prototype.
> --
> ;>)
> 73 de Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI - mine's a pint.
>
>

Yep....no loss as far as Im concerned.

Dan/W4NTI

1376. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 00:53:08 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <UIA%a.77$6e5.20725@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74841

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:Oxz%a.26224$Vx2.11802710@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> No matter what stance the ARRL takes or no stance at all, they will
alienate
> a portion of the US amateur population [CRS insert ... I think you meant
to
> put a "larger" here] than their membership. The number of
> non-ARRL members supporting code testing is larger than ARRL's membership
as
> well as the group opposing code testing.

How did you arrive at that pseudo-fact?

> The various surverys that have been taken indicate that the ham community
is
> about 50/50 on this issue. That seems to hold true inside the ARRL
> membership as well as outside it. Thus the ARRL will "alienate" half the
US
> ham population no matter what stance they take.

The "various surveys" have all been self-selecting and have no scientific
validity.

Plus, they are all several years old and the demographic and thoughts have
changed a lot since "restructuring."

If you look at the numbers of licensees with less than General class
licenses,
do you really believe that anything approaching 50% of them are in favor
of continued Morse testing?

I seriously doubt it ...

Those licensees alone outnumber the ARRL's entire current membership.
Also, many current ARRL members (and a lot of NCI's members are
ARRL members, too), including holders of General, Advanced, and Extra
class licenses oppose continued Morse testing.

Have you read the NCI Petition? If not, I would suggest you read it
with an open mind and give due consideration to its content.

Carl - wk3c

1377. Spell Checker for CW ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 01:21:19 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <iMA%a.825$qS2.13@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74842

Is there a spell checker for CW ?
How educated must a CW purist be in order carry on the cause to the highest order ?
Should anyone with less than a masters degree be allowed to transmit CW ?

1378. Re: What of NCI?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 02:10:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3EE40E.E84C80E7@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74843

Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3F3E4406.29824060@earthlink.net...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3F18C154.813AFBF4@earthlink.net...
> > > > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > heh heh...he just doesn't understand the concept of "not my
> problem,"
> > > > Brian!
> > > > > ;)
> > > >
> > > > Brian's saying that it isn't his problem does not mean that he has no
> > > > problem. In this case, it only means that he doesn't care to
> > > > acknowledge it.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > > >
> > >
> > > People who generally don't acknowledge problems, generally don't have
> > > them... But, that is much too liberating a thought for you, Dave.
> >
> > Read any of the filth coming from the interesting fellow here in my
> > county who posts through the "anonymous" remailers? He doesn't
> > acknowledge that he has problems. That doesn't mean that he doesn't
> > have any.
> >
> > Or perhaps you'd disagree.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> Maybe you just don't get the philosophy, Dave.

Perhaps I don't, Kim. What philosophy is that?

Dave K8MN

1379. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 02:16:24 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3EE574.70BAE0E2@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74844

```
Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:3F3E46D2.903D5DFB@earthlink.net...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > "Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3F3E04FD.185EFD83@earthlink.net...
> > > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > In article <3F3B12D9.871DBF3D@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> > > <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > > writes:
> > > > >
> > > > >> Yup. Herr Robust is once again proving I'm right. :-)
> > > > >
> > > > >You are perhaps the only person on the planet incapable of seeing
> the
> > > > >irony of what you tell others when compared to what you actually
> do.
> > > > >You lecture others on what they have no "authority" to do then
> proceed
> > > > >to do those very same things.
> > > > >
> > > > > Stuff it, crybaby. I'm still RIGHT and you're still the egotist
> who
> > > is
> > > > > pissed off.
> > > >
> > > > Is this your bullying nonsense? "Stuff it, crybaby" sure doesn't come
> > > > off as much of a counter to my comments.
> > > >
> > >
> > > You mean you feel bullied, Dave? Oh, and "stuff it" generally means a
> > > response to indicate indifference to something that has been said. So,
> it's
> > > a very appropriate counter.
> > >
> > > Oh, and try not to feel so bullied...
> >
> > So you haven't been keeping up and you don't recognized Len's own phrase
> > including the words "bullying nonsense", now turned toward him?
> >
> > Try to keep up.
```

> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> You should try *less* keeping up, Dave. I don't even scan for Len's posts.
> And, *usually* when I see Len's name embedded in a post I open, it gets
> closed right back up.
>
> Maybe your and Len's personalities are closer aligned to each other than one
> would even imagine possible...

Anyone who can read understands that is not the case. I have never in
my life attempted to set standards for an avocation in which I am not
involved.

> You play right into his game...

You probably don't understand the philosophy, Kim. It may well be that
he plays right into my game.

Dave K8MN

1380. HAARP Cam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 02:24:47 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <7vB%a.4280$sA4.971@fe02.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 74845

Interesting webcam:

http://www.haarp.alaska.edu/haarp/cam.fcgi

de KR4AJ

1381. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 02:25:23 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3EE791.79F57C60@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74846

```
Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3D2BC4.5C421A33@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3C58F1.86EDE9C2@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F37AFDE.6D3406E4@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F301FE3.951681BE@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > > > > > Please quote that "may share space" FCC document.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Please quote the "Farnsworth Exam at 13-15wpm is the same as the Morse
> > > > > > > > Exam at 5wpm" FCC document.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > That's totally irrelevant to the discussion at hand.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Why?
> > > > > >
> > > > > ...because the Farnsworth method was not under discussion. It is
> > > > > irrelevant to the request made of you.
> > > > >
> > > I thought the existence of FCC documents were now part of the
> > > discussion. At least you broght it up.
> > >
> > > Tell you what David, in the future put your comments that are not open
> > > for discussion in brackets [xxx].
> > >
> > > OK?
> >
> > It'd be easier if you just stuck to the matter being discussed.
>
> FCC documents that don't exist?

We were discussing one of those--the one which uses the words "may share
space".
```

> > > > > Farnsworth exists as the de facto "code" exam, even though the
> > > > > FCC documents specify Morse Code. Yet the FCC documents DO assign the
> > > > > exact same priveleges to Carl that they do you, yet you insist on
> > > > > arguing it.
> > > > >
> > > > > What doest it have to do with the FCC's "may share space" document?
> > > >
> > > > Part 97 addresses your and Carls priveleges.
> > >
> > It certainly does.
> >
> You implied that it didn't.

No, Brian. Your attempts at reading between the lines often gets you
into trouble with understanding what has actually been written.

> So? We weren't discussing installing towers within
> > a certain distance from an airport but that's in Part 97.
> >
> Yes, it is. Do you live near an airport?

We weren't discussing that.

> > > > > That would make you a fool.
> > > > >
> > > > > I'd guess the fool to be one who is asked about a regulation about
> > > > > "sharing space" and responds with some nonsense about the Farnsworth
> > > > > method of learning morse.
> > > >
> > > > You don't believe in sharing space which the FCC says you must share
> > > > in a document called Part 97.
> > >
> > > I've never stated that I don't believe in sharing space.
> > > That's something you've tried to establish.
> >
> That's something that you implied, with "he may not."

Incorrect, little electrolyte. If I write "It may rain or it may not",
the words do not imply that I don't believe in rain.

Dave K8MN

1382. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 02:28:48 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3EE85E.E8A0DA4C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74847

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3E3A4C.F72EB796@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > I've figured out that you've run out of anything that matters.
> >
> > You are the one with the unanswered questions and you expect me to do
> > all your work for you?
>
> I'm good either way.

It doesn't appear that way. You even want me to tell you what Len might
say about something.

> You just seemed to be in a question answering
> mood, but as usual, they were nonsense answers.

...to nonsense questions.

> Perhaps there should
> be a no content indicator in the preamble of your messages.

I usually find your name a giveaway.

Dave K8MN

1383. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 02:30:03 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3EE8AA.9C953474@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74848

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F3E3AA9.994B6F3@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3D2556.34E27B82@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3C5D48.951FFE94@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F37B75A.D47CAEF1@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Roger: "Duuuuh, how'd you know it was me"? Shall we say that you have a
> > > > > > > > rather unique writing style and that your topics of interest repeat
> > > > > > > > themselves on a regular basis.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Gee David, someone posting as Avery Fine is sure doing a ringer impression of
you.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > What could it mean?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > It could mean that someone is doing an impression of Len and you aren't
> > > > > > > > bright enough to figure it out.
> > > >
> > > > > > > But it's you they're imitating.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > See, you weren't bright enough to figure it out even after an
> > > > > > explanation.
> > > > >
> > > > > No doubt attributable to your superb powers of explanation.
> > >
> > It is likely the result of your difficulty in comprehending.
>
> Avery, you crack me up.

Looks like you're beginning to crack under the strain of being Len's
electrolyte.

Dave K8MN

1384. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:08:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <dIC%a.26289$Vx2.11842534@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 74849

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:UlA%a.77$6e5.20725@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:Oxz%a.26224$Vx2.11802710@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > No matter what stance the ARRL takes or no stance at all, they will
> alienate
> > a portion of the US amateur population [CRS insert ... I think you meant
> to
> > put a "larger" here] than their membership. The number of
> > non-ARRL members supporting code testing is larger than ARRL's
membership
> as
> > well as the group opposing code testing.
>
> How did you arrive at that pseudo-fact?

The size of the ARRL membership and its demographics is documented. The
size and demographics of the overall ham population are also documented.
Anyone can do the math.

>
> > The various surverys that have been taken indicate that the ham
community
> is
> > about 50/50 on this issue. That seems to hold true inside the ARRL
> > membership as well as outside it. Thus the ARRL will "alienate" half
the
> US
> > ham population no matter what stance they take.
>
> The "various surveys" have all been self-selecting and have no scientific
> validity.
>
> Plus, they are all several years old and the demographic and thoughts have
> changed a lot since "restructuring."
>

There have been internet surveys within the past year. Although they have
all been "self-selecting", it still shows a pretty even split. It's the data
that is available to us at this time.

> If you look at the numbers of licensees with less than General class
> licenses,

> do you really believe that anything approaching 50% of them are in favor
> of continued Morse testing?
>
> I seriously doubt it ...
>

Based on the Techs I know, it's possible. But that is not the point. The available data, although limited and not of the best quality, still indicates that overall there is a 50/50 split.

And do you really believe that all Techs and down want to ditch the code test and all Generals and up want to keep it? That's not a valid assumption at all.

> Those licensees alone outnumber the ARRL's entire current membership.
> Also, many current ARRL members (and a lot of NCI's members are
> ARRL members, too), including holders of General, Advanced, and Extra
> class licenses oppose continued Morse testing.

Do you really believe that the ARRL's membership includes no Technicians? Just as in the overall ham population, the number of members with less than General class licenses is approximately 50%.

>
> Have you read the NCI Petition? If not, I would suggest you read it
> with an open mind and give due consideration to its content.
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

I made no comment on the NCI petition. My comments were simply to demonstrate that the ARRL is in a position where it may not even be reasonable for them to take a stance either for or against code testing. With the nearly even split within the ARRL, any position that they take could alienate approximately half the hams in their own membership let alone the overall ham community. How does this become a comment on the NCI petition?

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1385. Re: Spell Checker for CW ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:10:07 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <jmC%a.26290$Vx2.11842722@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 74850

"Steve Stone" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in message
news:iMA%a.825$qS2.13@news02.roc.ny...
> Is there a spell checker for CW ?
> How educated must a CW purist be in order carry on the cause to the
highest
> order ?
> Should anyone with less than a masters degree be allowed to transmit CW ?
>

And what is your point?

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1386. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:21:13 UTC
From: Glenn <kg5uc1@charter.net>
Message-ID: <vjtt5a731lil0c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 74751

I have recently been reading on this thread and agree with all points made in it.

In my observation, it goes like this:

When a lot of Amateur Radio Operators (A.K.A., private citizens) get their toes stepped on, gather under the banner of their (arguably) representative organization (A.K.A., The ARRL) and say, "No, No! Look at these problems," the answer from regulatory agencies is, "Ahem...yes, well we'll do a study of this data and let you know the results," and then nothing else is heard about it.

But When the GUM'MIT get's IT'S toes stepped on and says, "No, No," generally it's, 'NO, NO!"

==========

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:bhlfkg$tsg@library2.airnews.net...
>
>>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
>>news:BB63501C.23806%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
>>
>>>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>>>
>>>>Ed Hare, W1RFI, of the ARRL isn't the only one
>>>>measuring the interference at the BPL pilot
>>>>test sites ... I was in a meeting today with
>>>> folks from NTIA (the equivalent of the FCC
>>>>for federal govt. users of the spectrum) and
>>>>they are out doing measurements, too. The
>>>>meeting was about something else, but I got
>>>>the impression that they aren't happy with
>>>>what they are seeing either ...
>>>
>>>
>>> I'm glad to hear that. Hopefully the studies will generate results
>
> that
>
>>>will get someone's attention. Regardless, BPL is obviously going to be
>>
>>tough
>>

>>>to fight.
>>>
>>>
>>>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>>
>>>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>>>
>>
>>Whew....someone finally gets it--just kidding, Dwight. You probably "had"
>>it all along. That is exactly what my rattling has been all about. I
>
> just
>
>>don't see this fight being won (from the amateur radio perspective) and, I
>>think there a "ways around" BPL interference. So, where do we spend the
>>energy? Before, or after and, on what? I'd rather think that the way to
>>fight BPL and win (for sure) is to get busy designing, testing and
>>implementing ways around it, *before* it becomes the major issue that it
>>will--because, like I said, I don't see this fight being won. Way, way
>
> too
>
>>much commercial interest--the very people that feed the pockets of the
>>politicians.
>>
>>Kim W5TIT
>>
>>
>
>
> If it was JUST ham radio that would affected then your right. No way in
> hell. However it isn't just ham radio. Its any user at all on HF and low
> VHF...and PROBABLY due to harmonics , etc way up the spectrum.
>
> I think we a missing the boat of how to fight this thing tho. The ARRL
> recently signed a agreement on 'first response' being a HAM RADIO thing.
> This with DHS (Department of Homeland Security). Should we not be pushing
> this fact? Its gonna be real tough to be a first responder with all kinds
> of radio goodies and no way to hear each other.
>
> Oh sure now I hear....it not gonna bother the 2 meter and above bands.
> WANNA BET?????????????
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

--
73 from Glenn - KG5UC

1387. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:24:11 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <GzC%a.13376$Kx1.200214@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74752
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hjogu56.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Fri, 15 Aug 2003 08:00:07 +0100, Airy R Bean wrote:
>
> >Saddam was neutralised. It is the loony in the White House who is the
> >greatest threat to World peace. He even kills
> >defenceless Yanks in his own prisons.
>
> My bother the prosecutor says that those whom he puts there for that
> purpose deserve no better.
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
The Spanish judiciary think otherwise, they won't extradite to a US state
that has capital punishment.

So states that have capital punishment, are foolishly providing escape routes
for their own murderers

Steve Terry

1388. Re: Spell Checker for CW ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:25:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F3EF60F.1080000@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74753

Steve Stone wrote:
> Is there a spell checker for CW ?
> How educated must a CW purist be in order carry on the cause to the highest
> order ?
> Should anyone with less than a masters degree be allowed to transmit CW ?

Steve, Steve, Steve!! You mean you don't have the spellchecking keyer yet?

Actually, I have no respect for anyone that only knows one way to spell
a word......

- Mike KB3EIA -

1389. Re: Portable/mobile call signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:33:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030816233343.29815.00000035@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 74755

In article <chj%a.9$aN.5@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
writes:

>Phil ... several? I think that was a requirement when I was a novice in
>1962 ... could you give us a year?

Jim:

It's been at least two decades. The requirement was dropped very shortly
after I was first licensed in 1981.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1390. Words of "Wisdom???" from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:33:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030816233343.29815.00000034@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 74760

Sorry to re-expose all of you to this, but I just thought it would be interesting
to examine some of Kim's "wisdom" extracted from what is obviously one of her better days on the newsgroup!

****
****

I don't know who you are, Walt, but you're absolutely disgusting.

Kim W5TIT

Why not, Dave? I'm bored and going through old stuff of yours to stir you up. You've probably already responded to some old, old, stuff...

Kim W5TIT

No rattling chains, there... And, I think you're right...

Kim W5TIT

If they're all that computer-literate and technically-savvy as you espouse them to be, then they're obviously intelligent enough to spend their time on far more constructive things....

Kim W5TIT

Maybe your and Len's personalities are closer aligned to each other than one would even imagine possible...

You play right into his game...

Kim W5TIT

Now you're giving away my secrets, Brian! I didn't want Larry to know I am giving him the advantage... ;)

Kim W5TIT

You mean you feel bullied, Dave? Oh, and "stuff it" generally means a response to indicate indifference to something that has been said. So, it's a very appropriate counter.

Oh, and try not to feel so bullied...

Kim W5TIT

Brian, Brian, Brian, it did not go over Larry's head at all... He is in denial (as usual)

Kim W5TIT

Maybe you just don't get the philosophy, Dave.

Kim W5TIT

Your book doesn't include many more scenarios than your little "me" world,
Dave.

Kim W5TIT

People who generally don't acknowledge problems, generally don't have
them... But, that is much too liberating a thought for you, Dave.

Kim W5TIT

****
****

Well, there you have it! Unfortunately, "it" adds up to absolutely nothing!

Kim, you'll never make a dime as a persuasive, motivational speaker --
so don't give up your day job!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1391. Re: Portable/mobile call signs

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:33:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030816233344.29815.00000036@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 74759

In article <slgarwood-AF225E.21302615082003@netnews.attbi.com>, Sterling Garwood <slgarwood@comcast.net> writes:

>
>I have a question on mobile/portable operation ... I seem to recall that
>the FCC dropped the requirement to sign as portable/mobile with the
>region the station is operating in.

Sterling:

That is correct.

> I can't seem to find any reference to it.

That's because the requirement no longer exists.

>I assume that W9XXX/W5 is good operating procedure but is it an
>FCC requirement?

No, it is not.

>I do know that a change in the 90s made W5/W9XXX
>equally vaid as W9XXX/W5 ...

Neither configuration is necessary if a U.S. licensed amateur is operating within the United States. A U.S. licensed amateur operating under reciprocal operating authority in a foreign country would sign using the host nation's prefix plus the U.S. amateur callsign, such as DL2/K3LT, should I be visiting/operating in Germany.

73 de Larry, K3LT
Ex: KA3HXE, N3CRA, DA1RZ, AFA7LR, DA1ZW, WR2F, G0LYW

1392. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:33:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030816233345.29815.00000037@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 74756

In article <c2356669.0308160725.19edc896@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>As of May 14, 2000:
>
>Novice - 49,329
>Tech - 205,394
>Tech Plus - 128,860
>General - 112,677
>Advanced - 99,782
>Extra - 78,750
>Total - 674,792
>
>
>As of August 15, 2003:
>
>Novice - 33,205 (decrease of 16,124)
>Technician - 258,384 (increase of 52,990)
>Technician Plus - 66,402 (decrease of 62,458)
>General - 141,381 (increase of 28,840)
>Advanced - 83,038 (decrease of 16,699)
>Extra - 104,543 (increase of 25,793)
>Total - 687,134 (increase of 12,342)
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Dear NCTA:

I regret to inform you that "Restructuring" the US Amateur Radio Service's licensing system, to reduce the code testing speed to 5 WPM for General and Extra class, in addition to the existing No-Code Technician-class license, has resulted in a whopping 1.79 percent growth rate in the ARS overall! What do you suppose we're gonna get from No-Code HF? Maybe 2 percent?

Perhaps I should take this time to suggest a new motto for the ARRL:

Ham Radio -- Stick A Fork In Us, We're Done!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1393. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:33:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030816233345.29815.00000038@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 74757

In article <f45722ac.0308160606.3cc2f46d@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Brian:
>>
>> Ah ha! So even you agree that Kim is a half-wit! Well, I guess it takes
>> one to know one!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>I didn't say that. But by extension, -you- would think that Rush
>Limbaugh is a half-wit because he ties half his brain behind his back
>to make it fair for the libs.

Brian:

I don't think that Rush (that's MISTER Limbaugh to you!) would appreciate
your drawing comparisons between him and Kim!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1394. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:33:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030816233346.29815.00000039@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 74754

In article <bhlfa7$1m2@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> Brian:
>>
>> Ah ha! So even you agree that Kim is a half-wit! Well, I guess it takes
>> one to know one!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Brian, Brian, Brian, it did not go over Larry's head at all... He is in
>denial (as usual)
>
>Kim W5TIT

No, Kim, denial is where it's always been -- in Egypt! Why don't you do
a "Cleo" and take a raft-ride down it? You better watch your asp, however!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1395. Re: Dropping the code caused the blackout?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:33:46 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030816233346.29815.00000040@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 74758

In article <bhlfdn$p4b@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> Obviously it was caused by all the eager, young, computer-literate
>> technically-savvy new hams all using their computers, doing the coding
>> on wonderful new digital modes for us hams to use!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>If they're all that computer-literate and technically-savvy as you espouse
>them to be, then they're obviously intelligent enough to spend their time on
>far more constructive things....
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

As usual, you don't know what you're talking about. It is the NCTA who
always spoke of the young, computer-literate, technically-savvy people
who would create a digital paradise for amateur radio when the code
testing requirements were reduced and/or eliminated! I was simply
poking fun at them, but, typically, it went right over your head! Perhaps
you were too busy "reading between the lines."

73 de Larry, K3LT

1396. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:39:40 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <aOC%a.13380$Kx1.200394@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74761
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhgsoi$9nq$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> Gee Airy......isn't that EXACTLY what the British did in the 17th and 18th
> century??? How did it go...."The sun never sets on the British empire"
> ?????.
> Go get your red coat and stand tall. Its all you have left me boy.
> Dan/W4NTI
>
Are you admitting current US foreign policy is one of Imperialism ?!

Steve Terry

1397. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:50:03 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <WXC%a.13382$Kx1.200385@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74762
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:f3etjv4ltdlg1vq7bghu0vtv482dlqmftb@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 16 Aug 2003 23:04:56 +0100, "Steve Terry"
> <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote:
>
> >"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote
> >
> >> Not surprising, really, as most of America's principal institutions
> >> are run by Zionists whose philosophy is "An eye for an eye, a tooth
> >> for a tooth."
> >
> >It wasn't until I had a Jewish Girlfriend, did I discover that IS what they
> >really believe ;-(
> >The Christian concept of being able to turn the other cheek is quite alien to
> >them.
>
> Indeed. But they try to deny it.
> 73 de G3NYY
> Walt Davidson
>
Yes it's not just Islam that needs being dragged in the 21st Century.
Existentialism and the humanities need to be made mandatory studies in both
societies

Steve Terry

1398. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:52:07 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <HZC%a.943$qE6.913@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74763

What *might* prove interesting is some emergency where communications can't get through due to interference. Then the high power lawyers step up to the plate and see if they can do to the power company involved what was done to big tobacco. Of course, by then the damage will be done. Let someone win a billion dollars and then see what happens with BPL. I'm not pushing amateur radio here; I simply see radio communications (fire, police, aircraft, etc.) as more reliable than cell phones. It is also difficult to call 20 police cars individually when you need a rapid response to a large problem as opposed to just pressing the button on a radio transmitter. I am very rapidly learning to dislike the present administration a *lot*. An interesting aside with the power companies; Wall Street doesn't like them generating power. They simply want to buy power and resell it at a profit. Where is this power supposed to come from? With all manufacturing jobs going offshore and no one interested in actually building (or generating) anything ... well, I'll bet 50 years down the road they'll be teaching courses in business schools about what *not* to do. And these will be the years referred to in the books.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.510 / Virus Database: 307 - Release Date: 8/14/03

1399. Re: FCC EFCS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:58:01 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308161958.1a53414a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74764

clutch@lycos.com wrote in message news:<vjtca9aplvrl94@corp.supernews.com>...
> I went to the Fcc website to file comments on bpl and got this
> message:
>
> The ECFS system will be unavailable for scheduled maintenance from
> Saturday Agugust 16th, 2003 until Monsday August 18th, 2003.
>
> Check the spelling, makes you wonder what is going on there.
>
> Wes

Musta been written by the same two part time FCC summer interns (in
D.C. on their Green Cards) who wrote that astoundingly cogent
masterpiece of English composition NPRM which in the end resulted in
the elimination of the 20 & 13 wpm code tests.

Expect more of the same.

That's the way it is.

w3rv

1400. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:58:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030816235837.29815.00000041@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 74765

In article <bhmia9lrk1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:

>> Wasn't it GREAT news about Idi Amin today? I don't think many will mourn
>the
>> loss of that Anus prototype.
>> --
>> ;>)
>> 73 de Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI - mine's a pint.
>>
>>
>
>Yep....no loss as far as Im concerned.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Gee -- first Uday and Qusay, now Idi Amin has assumed room temperature!
The world is getting to be a better place, one dead maniac at a time! Let's
just hope that Saddam isn't far behind his colleagues in the race to the grave!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1401. Re: Spell Checker for CW ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 03:58:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030816235837.29815.00000042@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 74766

In article <iMA%a.825$qS2.13@news02.roc.ny>, "Steve Stone"
<spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> writes:

>Is there a spell checker for CW ?

No.

>How educated must a CW purist be in order carry on the cause to the highest
>order ?

All he or she would require is adequate operational experience with the
Morse/CW mode in order to recognize and appreciate it's many benefits
and advantages.

>Should anyone with less than a masters degree be allowed to transmit CW ?

Of course not. Young children in Elementary school have learned the
Morse code, and passed the Pre-Restructuring code tests up to the
former Element 1(c) 20 WPM requirement. They have gone on to be very
good operators on the air. However, a few more college graduates on
the HF phone bands would certainly be a big help!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1402. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 04:22:52 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308162022.51279ac1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74767

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote

> the new eggs in the face of the
> power industry. Their credibility has dropped to zip in 48 hours flat
> and methinks that they'll now have bigger problems selling BPL given
> the fact that their core technologies need all the attention they can
> muster.
>

You don't suppose that some 'user' of the HF spectrum, sitting at a console
in a control room in the Cleveland area.....Naw.....

But stranger things have happened!

1403. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 04:31:25 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308162031.13344b39@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74768

"Bill Evans" <bevans@ebsys.mb.ca> wrote in message
news:<x08%a.39127$Rz6.54279@news1.mts.net>...
> Perhaps yesterday's, continuing massive power failure in the northeastern
> U.S.A. and Canada will convince the power utilities that they should focus
> their energies and resources on their core business, rather than entering a
> new business that is already served by telephone companies, competitive
> local exchange carriers (CLEC), cable television operators, satellite
> services and, in some markets, broadband wireless access (BWA) carriers.
>
> According to the August 15th Toronto Globe and Mail, "critics have been
> calling for breakers to be installed throughout North America's grids for
> some time, only to be told by the grid operators (power companies) that
> there is no money to fund such a massive infrastructure overhaul."
>
> Why would regulators, politicians and the power companies' shareholders be
> interested in spending billions of dollars entering a new business when they
> obviously have major challenges in their own backyard. Seems like time to
> "stick to the knitting".
>
> William E. Evans, P. Eng.
> VE4UD

Why not post your own comments to that effect on the FCC's EFCS
website?
There is no requirement that one be a US citizen to comment, and you
certainly have a direct interest in the outcome of the proceeding.

Dick W0EX

1404. Re: Spell Checker for CW ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 05:09:46 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F3F0E1A.8000508@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 74769

Steve Stone wrote:

>Is there a spell checker for CW ?
>How educated must a CW purist be in order carry on the cause to the highest
>order ?
>Should anyone with less than a masters degree be allowed to transmit CW ?
>
>
>
>
>
Oh, a commercial bus driver's license should be enough.... :-)

1405. Re: Spell Checker for CW ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 05:28:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030817012829.25815.00002275@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74771

In article <jmC%a.26290$Vx2.11842722@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>
>"Steve Stone" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in message
>news:iMA%a.825$qS2.13@news02.roc.ny...
>> Is there a spell checker for CW ?
>> How educated must a CW purist be in order carry on the cause to the
>highest
>> order ?
>> Should anyone with less than a masters degree be allowed to transmit CW ?
>>
>
>And what is your point?
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dee:

I think the more relevant question is, "Where is his point?" And the answer is, under his hat!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1406. Re: Spell Checker for CW ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 05:28:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030817012830.25815.00002276@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 74770

In article <3F3F0E1A.8000508@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>Is there a spell checker for CW ?
>>How educated must a CW purist be in order carry on the cause to the highest
>>order ?
>>Should anyone with less than a masters degree be allowed to transmit CW ?
>>
>>
>>
>>
>>
>Oh, a commercial bus driver's license should be enough.... :-)

Bob:

Well, I just looked over my CDL, and I can't find anywhere on it where it
authorizes me to use CW on amateur radio frequencies. Maybe if Kim
saw it, she could "read between the lines" and find that authority, since
I cannot.

73 de Larry, K3LT
CDL Class "B" with Passenger and Air Brake Endorsements

1407. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 05:57:06 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030817015706.339$X7@newsreader.com>
Source record: 74772

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <bhmia9lrk1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> Wasn't it GREAT news about Idi Amin today? I don't think many will
> >> mourn
> >the
> >> loss of that Anus prototype.
> >> --
> >> ;>)
> >> 73 de Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI - mine's a pint.
> >>
> >>
> > >
> > >Yep....no loss as far as Im concerned.
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Gee -- first Uday and Qusay, now Idi Amin has assumed room temperature!
> The world is getting to be a better place, one dead maniac at a time!
> Let's just hope that Saddam isn't far behind his colleagues in the race
> to the grave!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
Let us not forget how much help the french have been.

http://www.jaxdigitalmedia.com/french/french.html

--
GO# 40

1408. Re: New Ham Term

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 06:40:28 UTC
From: Howard <misterrnNOSPAM@mercednet.com>
Message-ID: <3q8ujvst773e7po52bcstl3886ed664u48@4ax.com>
Source record: 74773

On 14 Aug 2003 01:22:11 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>All new Amateurs entering into Amateur Radio, will no longer be refered to as
>Hams. The new Name will be CBerHams.

only by total dumb asses

1409. Re: New Ham Term

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 06:47:22 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030817024722.500$Ft@newsreader.com>
Source record: 74774

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> All new Amateurs entering into Amateur Radio, will no longer be refered
> to as Hams. The new Name will be CBerHams.
>
That's some stinky bait, but it's funny.

--
GO# 40

1410. spectrum analyser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 07:41:29 UTC
From: payam79b@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <1e2005ff.0308162341.70b18cf5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74775

Hi,I am student & curiously want to build a practical ,high frequency spectrum analyzer , I have searched a lot for a one such : GBPPR 0 - 1000 MHz Spectrum Analyzer,
A Spectrum Analyzer for the Radio Amateur By Wes Hayward, W7ZOI, and Terry White, K7TAU & some others ï¿½, according that I live in iran I have some restrictions a bout some parts that they use in their circuits , but I think may poor mans spectrum analyzer is a good chaos because always I can find tv tuner as mixer , I think about four times I have emailed to MURRAY BARLOWE, WA2PZO
(radioguy@hoflink.com) the owner of home page of poormans sa on www.science-workshop.com (Updated 2/26/2003) but he doesn't answare ! has anyone buy recently from it ? does any one see the book or CD of "BUILD YOUR SPECTRUM ANALYZER " THAT IS SELLED ON HIS HOMEPAGE?
I DON'T WANT TO BUY THE KIT , I WANT TO BUY THE book or CD & according to the circuits & the parts I can find here make it,so does that book indicate circuits in detail or only say how do the kits should be connected together ? if so where can I found the circuit of it ?
Any help would be most appreciated.
Payam
Can you email me for reply instead of answering on group ?
payam79b@yahoo.com
thanks

1411. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 08:45:40 UTC
From: Glenn <kg5ucNOSPAM@charter.net>
Message-ID: <vjug5kkj6nhf2e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 74776

I've been following this thread and subject with some interest.

It's a good thing that the government might become involved. When a group of Amateur Radio Operator's (A.K.A., private citizens) toes are stepped on, gather together under their (arguable) representative organization (A.K.A., the ARRL), and say, "No, No...look at this data," normally the answer from the regulatory branch is, "Ah, Ahem...well, we'll do a study of this and liet you know what we find," usually with nothing further heard about it.

But when the Government's toes are stepped on, when they say, "No, No," by and large it turns into, "NO, NO!"

==========

Brian Kelly wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<Uxg%a.35$6e5.6035@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>
>>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
>>news:BB6307F5.22439%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
>>
>
>
>
>>Ed Hare, W1RFI, of the ARRL isn't the only one measuring the interference
>>at the BPL pilot test sites ... I was in a meeting today with folks from
>>NTIA
>>(the equivalent of the FCC for federal govt. users of the spectrum) and they
>>are out doing measurements, too. The meeting was about something else,
>>but I got the impression that they aren't happy with what they are seeing
>>either ...
>
>
> That's the first best piece of news yet today abt BPL. I've been
> wondering where NTIA has been in the mix. Given their key position in
> Homeland Security I suspect that they will have the final word on BPL.
> Assuming they come out opposed to BPL of course.
>
> The second best piece of news today is the new eggs in the face of the
> power industry. Their credibility has dropped to zip in 48 hours flat
> and methinks that they'll now have bigger problems selling BPL given
> the fact that their core technologies need all the attention they can
> muster.
>

>
>>73,
>>Carl -wk3c
>
>
> w3rv

--
73 from Glenn - KG5UC

1412. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 09:15:30 UTC
From: Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI <g3vki@turner-smith.co.uk>
Message-ID: <bhnh3i$17uim$1@ID-201868.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 74777
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhmia9lrk1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
>
> "Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI" <g3vki@ntlworld.com> wrote in message
> news:yZy%a.13298$Kx1.199663@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net...
> >
> > Wasn't it GREAT news about Idi Amin today? I don't think many will mourn
> the
> > loss of that Anus prototype.
> > --
> > ;>)
> > 73 de Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI - mine's a pint.
> >
> >
>
> Yep....no loss as far as Im concerned.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
I'm sure Nick's given him a warm reception.
--
;>)
73 de Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI - mine's a pint.

1413. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 09:36:07 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f3f4fd3$1_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74778
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Small wonder the Yanks are the cause of so much strife in today's world.....

Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhm8hkdah1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> I recommend we plant one up your 'boot'. Wat say old chap?

1414. Re: Spell Checker for CW ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 10:22:31 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <HHI%a.9525$Bp1.8909@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 74779

No point at all ..

--

>> Remove "zz" from e-mail address to direct reply. <<

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:jmC%a.26290$Vx2.11842722@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Steve Stone" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in message
> news:iMA%a.825$qS2.13@news02.roc.ny...
> > Is there a spell checker for CW ?
> > How educated must a CW purist be in order carry on the cause to the
> highest
> > order ?
> > Should anyone with less than a masters degree be allowed to transmit CW
> ?
> >
>
> And what is your point?
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

1415. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 11:02:38 UTC
From: mcdu_pkearn_lsk4@cockpit.eircom.12wpm.co.uk.net
Message-ID: <3f3f60ad.368835@news1.eircom.net>
Source record: 74780
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

On Sat, 16 Aug 2003 23:21:02 +0100, "Steve Terry"
<g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote:

>Aint that the truth !
>When I went though JFK passport control they changed my entry on the visa
>from English to British, I'd like to see them try to do that to an Irishman

did somebody call ?

begorrah begorrah.

1416. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 12:11:08 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308170411.f2366d1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74781

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<g%u%a.72$6e5.16725@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0308160744.19006d94@posting.google.com...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:<gpg%a.32$6e5.6019@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> >
> > > NCI's Petition for Rulemaking with the FCC.
> > >
> > > It is available in .pdf format at http://www.nocode.org
> > > under the "Articles" link ...
> >
> > OK, let's cut to the chase.
> >
> > Obviously the main request is to dump Element 1 ASAP. And there's
> > probably lots of reasons given for doing so, including the
> > Commission's own words "no regulatory purpose".
> >
> > But what else was in the petition?
>
> I gave you a URL where you could read it ...

That's not what I asked.

Here's the answer, to save others the bother of reading 20 pages to
get the answer to my question:

NOTHING.

The NCI petition consists of a request to drop Element 1 without
further delay or discussion and give Techs the same privileges as Tech
Pluses. No other changes proposed. Most of the 20 pages is supporting
reasons to make the change.

> > > Some will undoubtedly say "What took you so long?"

> > > The answer is simply "We wanted to do the best possible
> > > job of getting it right."

> > What did it take - six weeks? Not really long at all. Plus there was
> > always the chance FCC would have simply dumped Element 1 on its own,
> > instead of doing the whole NPRM thing.

> > What surprises me personally is that NCI didn't have a proposal ready
> > to go before WRC-03 even began. But that's all water under the bridge
> > now.
>

> There was some question as to whether S25.5 would be suppressed
> or modified (as it was) to eliminate the Morse requirement ... that
> uncertainty made us decide to see the final outcome before developing
> a final strategy/proposal.

99% of what was in the petition would have been the same regardless.
>
> > As you have pointed out, Carl, FCC hasn't even given any of the
> > proposals an RM number yet. And it's reasonable to assume there will
> > be more proposals - from NCVEC, ARRL, and other groups. FCC may assign
> > numbers, or they may take ideas from each one and produce an NPRM.
>
> NCVEC already filed a petition, as have several individuals.

It's clear NCVEC isn't done yet. They're talking about other changes
too.
>
> From a meeting I had at FCC on Thursday, the indication is that
> they will lump them all together in whatever course of action they
> decide to take.

In terms of requested rules changes, the NCI and NCVEC petitions are
essentially identical.
>
> ARRL doesn't need to file a petition on the Morse issue, unless, of
> course, they wise up and decide to ask the FCC to eliminate Morse
> testing ASAP so they won't continue to alienate a portion of the
> US amateur population that's larger than their current total membership :-)

Who is this alienated population? You can't mean NCI members, because
they are less than 1% of US hams.

> (They don't need to file a petition to keep code testing, because that
> is the status quo ...)

They may want changes other than elimination of Element 1.
>
> > And of course those wheels turn slowly.
>
> We shall see ...

You in The Pool yet? (see rrap thread by that name)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1417. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 12:18:15 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhnsna$p3u@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74783

"A Radar led news thug" <newbury66@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:Rft%a.13038$Kx1.197219@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net...
> "Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
> news:3f3e5d61_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> > You think that the astute Brit who is taking you
> > for as much money as he can get out of you is going
> > to tell you what he really thinks of you?
> >
> > Bwahahahahahahahahahahaha!
> >
> > Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > news:bhlksb$j1e@library1.airnews.net...
> > > It sounds to me like you (because I work with a lot of Brits, Walt,
and
> > you
> > > don't emulate their opinions at all)
> >
> >
> If I was in the desert, hundreds of miles from the nearest town, I know
who
> I would trust with my life Airy, and it wouldn't be you.
>
>

This Airy person is obviously used to people who deal with him/her only from
an untruthful position.

Kim W5TIT

1418. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 12:20:32 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhnsnb$p3u@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74782
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f3f4fd3$1_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> Small wonder the Yanks are the cause of so much strife in today's
world.....
>
> Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bhm8hkdah1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > I recommend we plant one up your 'boot'. Wat say old chap?
>
>
>

You're a nitwit, Airy. How would you like for me to blame your entire citizenry for some act that is the deed of your government? You just don't realize that we are peasants among our governments. So, if you truly believe that this country of citizens has done something against the world, perhaps you'd like to tell me when I was present at whatever act it is you think I've done?

What an idiot...

Kim W5TIT

1419. Re: Words of "Wisdom???" from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 12:41:25 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhnt75$u09@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74785

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030816233343.29815.00000034@mb-m21.aol.com...
> Sorry to re-expose all of you to this, but I just thought it would be
> interesting
> to examine some of Kim's "wisdom" extracted from what is obviously one of
> her better days on the newsgroup!
>
> **********
> **********
>
> I don't know who you are, Walt, but you're absolutely disgusting.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
> Why not, Dave? I'm bored and going through old stuff of yours to stir you
> up. You've probably already responded to some old, old, stuff...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
> No rattling chains, there... And, I think you're right...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
> If they're all that computer-literate and technically-savvy as you espouse
> them to be, then they're obviously intelligent enough to spend their time
on
> far more constructive things....
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
> Maybe your and Len's personalities are closer aligned to each other than
one
> would even imagine possible...
>
> You play right into his game...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
> Now you're giving away my secrets, Brian! I didn't want Larry to know I
am
> giving him the advantage... ;)
>
> Kim W5TIT
>

> You mean you feel bullied, Dave? Oh, and "stuff it" generally means a
> response to indicate indifference to something that has been said. So,
it's
> a very appropriate counter.
>
> Oh, and try not to feel so bullied...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
> Brian, Brian, Brian, it did not go over Larry's head at all... He is in
> denial (as usual)
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
> Maybe you just don't get the philosophy, Dave.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
> Your book doesn't include many more scenarios than your little "me" world,
> Dave.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
> People who generally don't acknowledge problems, generally don't have
> them... But, that is much too liberating a thought for you, Dave.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
> **********
> **********
>
> Well, there you have it! Unfortunately, "it" adds up to absolutely
nothing!
>
> Kim, you'll never make a dime as a persuasive, motivational speaker --
> so don't give up your day job!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Larry, leadership is a role I get paid to do so, sorry, you're too late on
that one.

Oh, and uh, are you drinking now, or something?

Kim W5TIT

1420. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 12:42:36 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhnt9d$1jn@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74784

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030816233345.29815.00000038@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <f45722ac.0308160606.3cc2f46d@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> Brian:
> >>
> >> Ah ha! So even you agree that Kim is a half-wit! Well, I guess it
takes
> >> one to know one!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >I didn't say that. But by extension, -you- would think that Rush
> >Limbaugh is a half-wit because he ties half his brain behind his back
> >to make it fair for the libs.
>
> Brian:
>
> I don't think that Rush (that's MISTER Limbaugh to you!) would appreciate
> your drawing comparisons between him and Kim!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

ROFLMAO!!! Brian, see? Denial...

Kim W5TIT

1421. Re: Dropping the code caused the blackout?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 12:44:12 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhntcd$253@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74786

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030816233346.29815.00000040@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <bhlfdn$p4b@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Obviously it was caused by all the eager, young, computer-literate
> >> technically-savvy new hams all using their computers, doing the coding
> >> on wonderful new digital modes for us hams to use!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >If they're all that computer-literate and technically-savvy as you
espouse
> >them to be, then they're obviously intelligent enough to spend their time
on
> >far more constructive things....
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> As usual, you don't know what you're talking about. It is the NCTA who
> always spoke of the young, computer-literate, technically-savvy people
> who would create a digital paradise for amateur radio when the code
> testing requirements were reduced and/or eliminated!
>

I could have swore that was a post from you.

>
> I was simply
> poking fun at them, but, typically, it went right over your head! Perhaps
> you were too busy "reading between the lines."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

And, I was simply poking fun at you. But, typically that went over *your*
head.

Kim W5TIT

1422. Re: Spell Checker for CW ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 12:46:10 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhntg2$9ib@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74787

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F3EF60F.1080000@adelphia.net...
> Steve Stone wrote:
> > Is there a spell checker for CW ?
> > How educated must a CW purist be in order carry on the cause to the
highest
> > order ?
> > Should anyone with less than a masters degree be allowed to transmit CW
?
>
> Steve, Steve, Steve!! You mean you don't have the spellchecking keyer yet?
>
> Actually, I have no respect for anyone that only knows one way to spell
> a word......
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

ROFLMAO!!!!!

Kim W5TIT

1423. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 12:50:38 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhntof$vmd@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74788

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:3gnsjv4l2ub8v4apa0caq3d9s497205lge@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 16 Aug 2003 11:06:49 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> wrote:
>
> >I could not care one iota less what the likes of you think of Americans
(was
> >that North- or South-Americans by the way, you geographic ignoramus)
because
> >you're opinion is obviously obscured by some kind of hate. And, like I
keep
> >trying to tell Dave: that is not my problem, it is yours. So, off to
Hell
> >with you, and quickly.
>
> LOL!
>
> That's set the yanks off quite nicely, then.
> It never takes much to get them fired up with self-righteous
> indignation.
> :-)))
>
> >Kim W5TIT
> ^^^^^
>
> How appropriate.
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

Your lack of intelligence is showing now. But I won't blame the rest of
your country for that...

Kim W5TIT

1424. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 12:52:49 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhntsi$d62@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74789
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:hpnsjvsrhdj4chf3u3mh88qegf0lkctcj7@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 16 Aug 2003 11:06:49 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> wrote:
>
> >(was that North- or South-Americans by the way, you geographic ignoramus)
>
> LOL! That's pretty rich ... coming, as it does, from a nation that
> thinks England, the United Kingdom and the British Isles are all one
> and the same thing.
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

I am not a nation, Walt. It is interesting though...you are the first UK person that I've ever seen display anything resembling idiocy...

Kim W5TIT

1425. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 12:54:04 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhntus$l4j@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74790
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:f3etjv4ltdlg1vq7bghu0vtv482dlqmftb@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 16 Aug 2003 23:04:56 +0100, "Steve Terry"
> <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote:
>
> >"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote
> >
> >> Not surprising, really, as most of America's principal institutions
> >> are run by Zionists whose philosophy is "An eye for an eye, a tooth
> >> for a tooth."
> >
> >It wasn't until I had a Jewish Girlfriend, did I discover that IS what
they
> >really believe ;-(
> >The Christian concept of being able to turn the other cheek is quite
alien to
> >them.
>
> Indeed. But they try to deny it.
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

Oh good grief. You are hanging your opinion of a whole group of people based on one girlfriend?! You just have a propensity for picking up shitty women, obviously...

Kim W5TIT

1426. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 12:59:15 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhnu8k$pk5@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74791

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:vd3ujv8tu6ft9t47vk49364nrqm24knl08@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 04:39:40 +0100, "Steve Terry"
> <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> >news:bhgsoi$9nq$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> >> Gee Airy......isn't that EXACTLY what the British did in the 17th and
18th
> >> century??? How did it go...."The sun never sets on the British empire"
> >> ?????.
> >> Go get your red coat and stand tall. Its all you have left me boy.
> >> Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >Are you admitting current US foreign policy is one of Imperialism ?!
>
> We do not transport people suspected of a crime to a military prison
> camp in one of our off-shore colonies and keep them incarcerated there
> for a year or more without trial. I can think of a country that
> does.
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

Ummmm, that would be something the US Govt is doing and--just to fill your puny head with some knowledge--there are a number of US Citizens who are protesting this very action.

And, it's quite obvious that all the Brits supported this action, since their PM got on the boat first launch... Right? The actions of a PM speak for the beliefs of everyone in that country right?

Get a life...

Kim W5TIT

1427. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 13:04:53 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhnuj6$po2@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 74792

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:75lujvccbhceotf6o0c3q8pl8gjac549cd@4ax.com...
> On 17 Aug 2003 07:06:23 GMT, Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
>
> >I asked about -YOU-, the last time I heard, the UK was with us all
> >the way in the middle east.
>
> That was before we realised we had been taken for a ride. Who's going
> to be next with "hidden" WMDs? Syria? Iran? We won't be such a soft
> touch next time.
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

Walt, listen to your PM--he isn't questioning a thing about England's involvement with the US. He's even come over here a few weeks ago to pat 'ol GW on the back and say, "there, there now" it's OK, we're still with you.

Just as you are painting some stupid-ass picture of "Americans" (US Citizens) because of the actions of a government; so is Morph painting with a broad paintbrush because of your PM.

So, your incessant rambling is designed for nothing less than pure antagonism--or you are an idiot who really believes what you are printing. And, I'm done with you. You and Dick Carroll would fit in nicely with each other. He like broad paintbrushes also.

Kim W5TIT

1428. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 13:23:43 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <zIL%a.96807$_R5.35879430@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 74793

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0308170411.f2366d1@posting.google.com...
> You in The Pool yet? (see rrap thread by that name)
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Hey Jim, can I change my response to The Pool? My new answer is NEVER! I think they're going to grant Techs HF privies by allowing them on the Novice/Tech "+" sub-bands and leave it at that. Element 1 lives on as a requirement for General and Extra.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1429. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 13:46:47 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <bHL%a.96870$_R5.35957933@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 74794

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:UlA%a.77$6e5.20725@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:Oxz%a.26224$Vx2.11802710@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > No matter what stance the ARRL takes or no stance at all, they will
> alienate
> > a portion of the US amateur population [CRS insert ... I think you meant
> to
> > put a "larger" here] than their membership. The number of
> > non-ARRL members supporting code testing is larger than ARRL's
membership
> as
> > well as the group opposing code testing.
>
> How did you arrive at that pseudo-fact?

Dee, please allow me.

http://www.speroni.com/FCC/

> > The various surverys that have been taken indicate that the ham
community
> is
> > about 50/50 on this issue. That seems to hold true inside the ARRL
> > membership as well as outside it. Thus the ARRL will "alienate" half
the
> US
> > ham population no matter what stance they take.
>
> The "various surveys" have all been self-selecting and have no scientific
> validity.

http://www.eham.net/survey/539

Gee Carl, you're right. It's NOT 50%. Out of 5,020 votes, PCTA got 62% while
NCTA got 33%. I'll take that split, Dee. ;-)

Shall we try QRZ...?

> Plus, they are all several years old and the demographic and thoughts have
> changed a lot since "restructuring."

Late December, 2002 isn't "several years old," Carl.

> If you look at the numbers of licensees with less than General class
> licenses,
> do you really believe that anything approaching 50% of them are in favor
> of continued Morse testing?

Yes, I do.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1430. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 14:25:44 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <IfM%a.97$6e5.29598@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74795

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:dlC%a.26289$Vx2.11842534@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:UlA%a.77$6e5.20725@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> >

[snipped the unresolvable debate about survey validity, etc.]

> > Have you read the NCI Petition? If not, I would suggest you read it
> > with an open mind and give due consideration to its content.
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
> >
>
> I made no comment on the NCI petition.

I didn't mean to imply that you did ... just encouraged you to read
it and give it due consideration.

> My comments were simply to
> demonstrate that the ARRL is in a position where it may not even be
> reasonable for them to take a stance either for or against code testing.
> With the nearly even split within the ARRL, any position that they take
> could alienate approximately half the hams in their own membership let
alone
> the overall ham community.

I agree that the ARRL is "between a rock and a hard place" with respect to
the split in their existing membership. However, outside of their
membership
(in the >75% of US hams who are NOT members of the ARRL), I believe
that the demographic is heavily tilted towards the no code test side ...
thus,
I believe that the ARRL stands to pick up more members than they stand
to lose if they take a position that it's time for Morse testing to go.
(Not
Morse use, not taking away spectrum where Morse can be used, just the
test requirement ...)

> How does this become a comment on the NCI petition?

It didn't, and as I said above, I didn't mean to imply that it did.

Carl - wk3c

1431. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 14:27:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308170627.5eba430a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74797

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030816233345.29815.00000038@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0308160606.3cc2f46d@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> Brian:
> >>
> >> Ah ha! So even you agree that Kim is a half-wit! Well, I guess it takes
> >> one to know one!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >I didn't say that. But by extension, -you- would think that Rush
> >Limbaugh is a half-wit because he ties half his brain behind his back
> >to make it fair for the libs.
>
> Brian:
>
> I don't think

Larry, maybe that's your problem. Maha Rushi is big enough to take
any comparison I might make.

Brian

1432. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 14:31:46 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <mlM%a.98$6e5.29672@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74796

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0308170411.f2366d1@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<g%u%a.72$6e5.16725@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > news:c2356669.0308160744.19006d94@posting.google.com...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > news:<gpg%a.32$6e5.6019@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > >
> > > > NCI's Petition for Rulemaking with the FCC.
> > > >
> > > > It is available in .pdf format at http://www.nocode.org
> > > > under the "Articles" link ...
> > >
> > > OK, let's cut to the chase.
> > >
> > > Obviously the main request is to dump Element 1 ASAP. And there's
> > > probably lots of reasons given for doing so, including the
> > > Commission's own words "no regulatory purpose".
> > >
> > > But what else was in the petition?
> >
> > I gave you a URL where you could read it ...
>
> That's not what I asked.
>
> Here's the answer, to save others the bother of reading 20 pages to
> get the answer to my question:
>
> NOTHING.

Jim,

You say "NOTHING" ... but in the following paragraphs you admit
that "Most of the 20 pages is supporting reasons to make the change."
I think that's important information for folks to consider ... that's why
I encourage folks to actually READ and consider the NCI Petition,
rather than relying on your "5 cent synopsis."

Why do you want to "save others the bother" of reading the Petition?
(Could it be that you find the arguments so compelling that you don't
WANT others to read them???)

> The NCI petition consists of a request to drop Element 1 without
> further delay or discussion and give Techs the same privileges as Tech

> Pluses. No other changes proposed. Most of the 20 pages is supporting
> reasons to make the change.
>
> > > As you have pointed out, Carl, FCC hasn't even given any of the
> > > proposals an RM number yet. And it's reasonable to assume there will
> > > be more proposals - from NCVEC, ARRL, and other groups. FCC may assign
> > > numbers, or they may take ideas from each one and produce an NPRM.
> >
> > NCVEC already filed a petition, as have several individuals.
>
> It's clear NCVEC isn't done yet. They're talking about other changes
> too.

That's their business ... NCI is focused on the Morse test issue and
is not proposing more sweeping changes that are outside of our
charter ...

Carl - wk3c

1433. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 14:37:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308170637.8e5f2b5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74798

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F3EE85E.E8A0DA4C@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:

> > Perhaps there should
> > be a no content indicator in the preamble of your messages.
>
> I usually find your name a giveaway.
>
> Dave K8MN

In addition to putting AveryFine in front of your messages, you're
going to start putting my name on them?

1434. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 14:47:15 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <TzM%a.26441$Vx2.11964873@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 74800

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:IfM%a.97$6e5.29598@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> I agree that the ARRL is "between a rock and a hard place" with respect to
> the split in their existing membership. However, outside of their
> membership
> (in the >75% of US hams who are NOT members of the ARRL), I believe
> that the demographic is heavily tilted towards the no code test side ...
> thus,
> I believe that the ARRL stands to pick up more members than they stand
> to lose if they take a position that it's time for Morse testing to go.
> (Not
> Morse use, not taking away spectrum where Morse can be used, just the
> test requirement ...)

You believe but have NO data of any kind. Sorry but that doesn't fly.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1435. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 14:47:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308170647.b9c8466@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74799

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F3EE791.79F57C60@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3D2BC4.5C421A33@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3C58F1.86EDE9C2@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F37AFDE.6D3406E4@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F301FE3.951681BE@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > > > > > > Please quote that "may share space" FCC document.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Please quote the "Farnsworth Exam at 13-15wpm is the same as the Morse
> > > > > > > > > Exam at 5wpm" FCC document.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > That's totally irrelevant to the discussion at hand.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Why?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > ...because the Farnsworth method was not under discussion. It is
> > > > > > > > > irrelevant to the request made of you.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I thought the existence of FCC documents were now part of the
> > > > > > > > discussion. At least you broght it up.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Tell you what David, in the future put your comments that are not open
> > > > > > > > for discussion in brackets [xxx].
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > OK?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > It'd be easier if you just stuck to the matter being discussed.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > FCC documents that don't exist?
> > > > >
> > > > > We were discussing one of those--the one which uses the words "may share
> > > > > space".

Why do existing FCC documents have to comply to your specific choice
of words?
Why must we discuss documents which don't exist?

You must share space with Carl. It is as simple as that.

> > > > > > Farnsworth exists as the de facto "code" exam, even though the
> > > > > > FCC documents specify Morse Code. Yet the FCC documents DO assign the
> > > > > > exact same priveleges to Carl that they do you, yet you insist on
> > > > > > arguing it.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > What doest it have to do with the FCC's "may share space" document?
> > > > >
> > > > > Part 97 addresses your and Carls priveleges.
> > > >
> > > It certainly does.
> >
> > You implied that it didn't.
>
> No, Brian. Your attempts at reading between the lines often gets you
> into trouble with understanding what has actually been written.

So which is it, again? May or May Not?

> > So? We weren't discussing installing towers within
> > > a certain distance from an airport but that's in Part 97.
> >
> > Yes, it is. Do you live near an airport?
>
> We weren't discussing that.

Then kindly put the topics which you bring up, but are not open for
discussion inside brackets, i.e., [So? We weren't discussing
installing towers within
a certain distance from an airport but that's in Part 97].

> > > > > > That would make you a fool.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I'd guess the fool to be one who is asked about a regulation about
> > > > > > "sharing space" and responds with some nonsense about the Farnsworth
> > > > > > method of learning morse.
> > > > >
> > > > > You don't believe in sharing space which the FCC says you must share
> > > > > in a document called Part 97.
> > > >
> > > I've never stated that I don't believe in sharing space.
> > > That's something you've tried to establish.
> >
> > That's something that you implied, with "he may not."
>
> Incorrect, little electrolyte. If I write "It may rain or it may not",
> the words do not imply that I don't believe in rain.

It implies that you don't know if its going to rain.

Besides, we were not discussing your beliefs. We were discussing your and Carl's priveleges. He has the same priveleges as you, regardless of your beliefs on the matter.

1436. Re: spectrum analyser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 15:20:57 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030817112057.20931.00000145@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 74851

From: payam79b@yahoo.com (payam)

>Hi,I am student & curiously want to build a practical ,high frequency
>spectrum analyzer

You are in the wrong group for that. Try the rec.radio.amateur.homebrew group.

1437. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 15:40:56 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030817114056.20931.00000146@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 74852

From Larry, K3LT

>I regret to inform you that "Restructuring" the US Amateur Radio Service's
>licensing system, to reduce the code testing speed to 5 WPM for General
>and Extra class, in addition to the existing No-Code Technician-class
>license, has resulted in a whopping 1.79 percent growth rate in the ARS
>overall! What do you suppose we're gonna get from No-Code HF? Maybe
>2 percent?

The base of EEs can be expanded. You can get more EE from the rf specialty. Not all EEs have an interest in that specialty. But, from those that do, amateur radio could be a good hobby.

Amateur radio is not an EE friendly hobby. Those that like to build circuits are not welcomed as those that want to learn Morse code, contest, or work DX. EEs that are put off by Hams don't join the hobby.

As, I have noted before, the quality of rf courses could be improved with ARRL publications. The projects have real, rather than just textbook applications. This is not being currently done in most colleges.

Secondly, EEs are not joining amateur radio clubs. Some Profs that teach rf courses that I took do not have amateur radio licenses. People in the rf field are not attending club meetings.

The ARRL should make more efforts in this area. This would increase the number of people in the hobby. Also, there is a strong connection between EE and amateur radio that is not being realized.

1438. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 17:00:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030817130022.23171.00000048@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74853

In article <bhnt9d$1jn@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:

>> Brian:
>>
>> I don't think that Rush (that's MISTER Limbaugh to you!) would appreciate
>> your drawing comparisons between him and Kim!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>ROFLMAO!!! Brian, see? Denial...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

You're really out-doing yourself here. You've produced one non-responsive, irrelevant and un-enlightening response to each and every thing I've posted these last two days. You have truly perfected the art of wasting bandwidth on Usenet, not to mention your own time.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1439. Re: Dropping the code caused the blackout?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 17:00:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030817130022.23171.00000049@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74854

In article <bhntcd$253@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> Kim:
>>
>> As usual, you don't know what you're talking about. It is the NCTA who
>> always spoke of the young, computer-literate, technically-savvy people
>> who would create a digital paradise for amateur radio when the code
>> testing requirements were reduced and/or eliminated!
>>
>
>I could have swore that was a post from you.
>
>>
>> I was simply
>> poking fun at them, but, typically, it went right over your head! Perhaps
>> you were too busy "reading between the lines."
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>And, I was simply poking fun at you. But, typically that went over *your*
>head.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Hmmm, I just tried your "reading between the lines" technique, and it works!
What you just said is, "I'm too intellectually lazy to come up with an original
response, so I'll just do what I usually do, and parrot what Larry just said!"

73 de Larry, K3LT

1440. Re: Words of "Wisdom???" from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 17:00:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030817130023.23171.00000050@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74855

In article <bhnt75$u09@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:

>
>Larry, leadership is a role I get paid to do so, sorry, you're too late on
>that one.

Kim:

I find that pretty difficult to believe, based on the display of cognitive dissonance you're famous for in this newsgroup.

>Oh, and uh, are you drinking now, or something?

No sooner do I mention it, than you provide a classic example. It's much easier for you to offer another of your half-witted remarks than attempt to compose a logical, rational argument.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1441. Re: Words of "Wisdom???" from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 17:05:03 UTC
From: Scott Unit 69 <scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc>
Message-ID: <3F3FB5BF.3521FDB7@yahoo.moc>
Source record: 74856

With all your trolling, how do you find time for radio?

1442. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 17:27:58 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308170927.346c4e95@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74857

```
"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<mlM%a.98$6e5.29672@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0308170411.f2366d1@posting.google.com...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:<g%u%a.72$6e5.16725@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > > news:c2356669.0308160744.19006d94@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:<gpg%a.32$6e5.6019@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > > >
> > > > > NCI's Petition for Rulemaking with the FCC.
> > > > >
> > > > > It is available in .pdf format at http://www.nocode.org
> > > > > under the "Articles" link ...
> > > >
> > > > OK, let's cut to the chase.
> > > >
> > > > Obviously the main request is to dump Element 1 ASAP. And there's
> > > > probably lots of reasons given for doing so, including the
> > > > Commission's own words "no regulatory purpose".
> > > >
> > > > But what else was in the petition?
> > >
> > > I gave you a URL where you could read it ...
> >
> > That's not what I asked.
> >
> > Here's the answer, to save others the bother of reading 20 pages to
> > get the answer to my question:
> >
> > NOTHING.
>
> Jim,
>
> You say "NOTHING"

That's right.

>... but in the following paragraphs you admit
> that "Most of the 20 pages is supporting reasons to make the change."

Yup. And that was already referred to.

Look again at what I wrote:
```

"Obviously the main request is to dump Element 1 ASAP."

Which is true.

"And there's probably lots of reasons given for doing so, including
the
Commission's own words "no regulatory purpose"."

Which is also true.

And then the question:

"But what else was in the petition?"

The "what else" refers to things OTHER THAN dropping Element 1 and
reasons to drop Element 1.

And the correct answer is: NOTHING. The petition consists of a request
to drop element 1 and reasons to do so.

> I think that's important information for folks to consider ... that's why
> I encourage folks to actually READ and consider the NCI Petition,
> rather than relying on your "5 cent synopsis."

I've read and cosidered it, and I'm opposed to it.
>
> Why do you want to "save others the bother" of reading the Petition?

Because we already know that it would contain a request to drop
Element 1 and reasons to do so. Those reasons have been argued
endlessly here and elsewhere.

My question was about what else was in the petition besides dropping
Element 1 and reasons to do so.

> (Could it be that you find the arguments so compelling that you don't
> WANT others to read them???)

Nope. None of the arguments are compelling at all. Not to me, anyway -
YMMV. And we've all read them many times before.

I don't think the petition will change anyone's mind.

>
> > The NCI petition consists of a request to drop Element 1 without
> > further delay or discussion and give Techs the same privileges as Tech
> > Pluses. No other changes proposed. Most of the 20 pages is supporting
> > reasons to make the change.

Is this synopsis not 100% accurate?
> >
> > > > As you have pointed out, Carl, FCC hasn't even given any of the
> > > > proposals an RM number yet. And it's reasonable to assume there will
> > > > be more proposals - from NCVEC, ARRL, and other groups. FCC may assign
> > > > numbers, or they may take ideas from each one and produce an NPRM.
> > >

> > > NCVEC already filed a petition, as have several individuals.
> >
> > It's clear NCVEC isn't done yet. They're talking about other changes
> > too.
>
> That's their business ... NCI is focused on the Morse test issue and
> is not proposing more sweeping changes that are outside of our
> charter ...

That's the smart way to go. Focus on the core issue and don't be delayed or derailed by other issues.

Because while all NCI members agree on what's in the petition (they have to agree, by definition, in order to remain members), there may be a lot of dispute in other areas.

And since part of NCI's charter is to cease existence once the code test is gone, getting into other areas could cause all kinds of problems.

There are supposedly four other petitions filed, too. Wonder what they say?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1443. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 17:42:28 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308170942.5bb877f9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74859

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<TzM%a.26441$Vx2.11964873@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:IfM%a.97$6e5.29598@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> >
> > I agree that the ARRL is "between a rock and a hard place" with respect to
> > the split in their existing membership. However, outside of their
> > membership
> > (in the >75% of US hams who are NOT members of the ARRL), I believe
> > that the demographic is heavily tilted towards the no code test side ...
> > thus,
> > I believe that the ARRL stands to pick up more members than they stand
> > to lose if they take a position that it's time for Morse testing to go.
> > (Not
> > Morse use, not taking away spectrum where Morse can be used, just the
> > test requirement ...)
>
> You believe but have NO data of any kind. Sorry but that doesn't fly.
>

And history runs counter also. No coders have mostly stayed away from
ARRL , and that seems unlikely to change anytime soon. They just don't
see much in it for them.

Dick

1444. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 17:42:37 UTC
From: g3pho@blueyonder.co.uk
Message-ID: <3f3fbc49.21489436@news.blueyonder.co.uk>
Source record: 74858
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

On 17 Aug 2003 07:06:23 GMT, Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:

>I asked about -YOU-, the last time I heard, the UK was with us all
>the way in the middle east.

Whatever gave you that impression?

1445. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 17:55:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB653A45.24627%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74860

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> IN2EY@AOL.COM writes:
>
>> As of May 14, 2000:
>>
>> Novice - 49,329
>> Tech - 205,394
>> Tech Plus - 128,860
>> General - 112,677
>> Advanced - 99,782
>> Extra - 78,750
>> Total - 674,792
>>
>> As of August 15, 2003:
>>
>> Novice - 33,205 (decrease of 16,124)
>> Technician - 258,384 (increase of 52,990)
>> Technician Plus - 66,402 (decrease of 62,458)
>> General - 141,381 (increase of 28,840)
>> Advanced - 83,038 (decrease of 16,699)
>> Extra - 104,543 (increase of 25,793)
>> Total - 687,134 (increase of 12,342)
>
>
> I regret to inform you that "Restructuring" the
> US Amateur Radio Service's licensing system, to
> reduce the code testing speed to 5 WPM for
> General and Extra class, in addition to the
> existing No-Code Technician-class license, has
> resulted in a whopping 1.79 percent growth rate
> in the ARS overall! (snip)

And without the 52,990 increase in non-code proficient Technicians, there would instead be a 7.85 percent decrease in overall numbers. Of course, that's a rough estimate - as rough as the numbers used in your argument.

> What do you suppose we're gonna get from No-Code
> HF? Maybe 2 percent?
>
> Perhaps I should take this time to suggest a new
> motto for the ARRL: Ham Radio -- Stick A Fork In
> Us, We're Done!

If those with your views continue to deride modern Ham Radio, perhaps even less then 2 percent. Those changes are part of Ham Radio today. If you belittle those changes, you belittle today's Ham Radio.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1446. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 18:04:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308171004.48cdd97a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74861

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<TzM%a.26441$Vx2.11964873@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:IfM%a.97$6e5.29598@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> >
> > I agree that the ARRL is "between a rock and a hard place" with respect to
> > the split in their existing membership. However, outside of their
> > membership
> > (in the >75% of US hams who are NOT members of the ARRL), I believe
> > that the demographic is heavily tilted towards the no code test side ...
> > thus,
> > I believe that the ARRL stands to pick up more members than they stand
> > to lose if they take a position that it's time for Morse testing to go.
> > (Not
> > Morse use, not taking away spectrum where Morse can be used, just the
> > test requirement ...)
>
> You believe but have NO data of any kind. Sorry but that doesn't fly.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

The ARRL would be wise to sit this one out for the very reasons that
Carl has listed.

So where is your data (of any kind), Dee?

1447. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 18:07:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308171007.511d99de@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74862

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308131259.68a78fae@posting.google.com>...
> averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030813070822.22063.00000604@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>
> > Why do you let Len Anderson's postings here bother you, Steve Robeson? Have you
> > not noticed that his pattern of behavior is designed to elicit angry responses
> > from you?
>
> Because I do not well tolerate pathological liars.

You don't tolerate anonymous posters, either.

Or do you?

1448. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 18:09:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB653D60.24629%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74863

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
>
> Whew....someone finally gets it--just kidding, Dwight.
> You probably "had" it all along. That is exactly what
> my rattling has been all about. I just don't see this
> fight being won (from the amateur radio perspective)
> and, I think there a "ways around" BPL interference.
> So, where do we spend the energy? Before, or after
> and, on what? I'd rather think that the way to fight
> BPL and win (for sure) is to get busy designing, testing
> and implementing ways around it, *before* it becomes
> the major issue that it will--because, like I said, I
> don't see this fight being won. Way, way too much
> commercial interest--the very people that feed the
> pockets of the politicians.

Oh, I think the odds of stopping BPL are sharply against us. In the end, unless there are some shocking results in the studies being done, we'll have to learn to deal with it. Hopefully our existing equipment will help us do so. If not, we'll have to look for new technology. To do that, we need the results of those studies. If a new solution is needed, I hope it is found before BPL is widespread.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1449. Wiseman Whines

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 18:17:24 UTC
From: It Sucks Being Roger <"I'm Daft"@Momma's>
Message-ID: <bhogrm$n39$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 74864

Poor motherless Momma's Boy Wiseman crawls from under his bridge and snipes from an anonymous server. Then he licks his festering wounds and belly-crawls back under the pilings where he mewls for a mother he never knew.
It must be lonely being Roger.

1450. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 18:19:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB653FDA.2462B%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74865

"Brian Kelly" wrote:

> (snip) The second best piece of news today is
> the new eggs in the face of the power industry.
> Their credibility has dropped to zip in 48 hours
> flat and methinks that they'll now have bigger
> problems selling BPL given the fact that their
> core technologies need all the attention they
> can muster.

You're an optimist, Brian. Instead, I see the power industry more likely claiming they need the new income from BPL to raise the additional funds needed to modernize the existing infrastructure. Industry has plenty of people to spin anything into a positive outcome for industry.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1451. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 18:28:26 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308171028.46bc2af6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74866

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<bHL%a.96870$_R5.35957933@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:UlA%a.77$6e5.20725@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:Oxz%a.26224$Vx2.11802710@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > No matter what stance the ARRL takes or no stance at all, they will
> > > alienate
> > > a portion of the US amateur population [CRS insert ... I think you meant
> > > to
> > > put a "larger" here] than their membership. The number of
> > > non-ARRL members supporting code testing is larger than ARRL's
> > > membership
> > > as
> > > well as the group opposing code testing.
> >
> > How did you arrive at that pseudo-fact?
>
> Dee, please allow me.
>
> http://www.speroni.com/FCC/
>
> > > The various surverys that have been taken indicate that the ham
> > > community
> > > is
> > > about 50/50 on this issue. That seems to hold true inside the ARRL
> > > membership as well as outside it. Thus the ARRL will "alienate" half
> > > the
> > > US
> > > ham population no matter what stance they take.
> >
> > The "various surveys" have all been self-selecting and have no scientific
> > validity.
>
> http://www.eham.net/survey/539
>
> Gee Carl, you're right. It's NOT 50%. Out of 5,020 votes, PCTA got 62% while
> NCTA got 33%. I'll take that split, Dee. ;-)

Me, too!

The 1996 READEX survey, paid for by ARRL, showed that 63% of members
PCTA and 30% NCTA (8% undecided). Nonmembers were 54% PCTA and 37%

NCTA (9% undecided).

This survey also showed something very interesting when age groups
were analyzed. All ages of members were majority PCTA. Here are the
results, PCTA/NCTA/undecided:

65+ - 65%/27%/8%
55 to 64 - 55%/36%/9%
45 to 54 - 66%/26%/8%
35 to 44 - 58%/34%/7%
25 to 34 - 52%/45%/3%
under 25 - 85%/15%/0%

Note that last result - the 24-and-unders are the strongest PCTAs!
These are the young people we are supposed to be wooing, right?

No wonder Len Anderson wants an age limit for a ham license!

>
> Shall we try QRZ...?
>
> > Plus, they are all several years old and the demographic and thoughts have
> > changed a lot since "restructuring."
>
> Late December, 2002 isn't "several years old," Carl.

> > If you look at the numbers of licensees with less than General class
> > licenses,
> > do you really believe that anything approaching 50% of them are in favor
> > of continued Morse testing?
>
> Yes, I do.

Me, too. The mere fact that someone hasn't done something doesn't mean
they are not in favor of it. Look at how many hams with code test
credit don't have Extras yet, more than 3 years since restructuring.
Is that an indication that the Extra license should be dumped?

Let's look at the "survey" that should have counted the most -
comments to FCC about 98-143. The majority not only favored code
testing but wanted either two code test speeds or three code test
speeds. Yet FCC overruled them.

I have a feeling that majority is going to get overruled again.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1452. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 18:47:17 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f3fcefc_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74867
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Small wonder the Yanks are the cause of so much strife in today's world.....

Grow up, OM.

Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message news:bhnsnb$p3u@library1.airnews.net...
> "Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
> news:3f3f4fd3$1_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> > Small wonder the Yanks are the cause of so much strife in today's
> world.....
> > Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:bhm8hkdah1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > I recommend we plant one up your 'boot'. Wat say old chap?
> You're a nitwit, Airy. What an idiot...

1453. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 19:04:52 UTC
From: toxic_waste@citizensband.com
Message-ID: <1f2adfc1.0308171104.3375b00c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74868
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bhm90o$19b$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
>
> And you are 100% correct. The USA was indeed very anti-semite in the time
> before and during WW2. However after seeing what the NAZIs did in the
> 'camps' we became a very big supporter of the 'Jews'. In fact we were
> instrumental in helping to establish the modern country of ISRAEL and are to
> this day there best friend on this planet.
>
> Since were on the subject Walt. Shall we now discuss how the Brits did
> there best to stop the Jewish refugees from landing in Palestine??????? No,
> we better not.
>

The Middle East problem could have been dealt with way back in 1956,
when we, along with the French invaded Egypt, to re-take the Suez
Canal, after Nasser nationalized it

IIRC it was Eisenhower, who demanded we got out and of course, we were
stupid enough to do just that!

I'll bet it would have been a different story if the canal had
belonged to the Americans!

Cheers
tox

1454. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 19:44:08 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <cWQ%a.26528$Vx2.12035330@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 74869

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308171004.48cdd97a@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<TzM%a.26441$Vx2.11964873@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > news:IfM%a.97$6e5.29598@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > >
> > > I agree that the ARRL is "between a rock and a hard place" with
respect to
> > > the split in their existing membership. However, outside of their
> > > membership
> > > (in the >75% of US hams who are NOT members of the ARRL), I believe
> > > that the demographic is heavily tilted towards the no code test side
...
> > > thus,
> > > I believe that the ARRL stands to pick up more members than they stand
> > > to lose if they take a position that it's time for Morse testing to
go.
> > > (Not
> > > Morse use, not taking away spectrum where Morse can be used, just the
> > > test requirement ...)
> > >
> > You believe but have NO data of any kind. Sorry but that doesn't fly.
> > >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> The ARRL would be wise to sit this one out for the very reasons that
> Carl has listed.
>
> So where is your data (of any kind), Dee?

Data on what specifics of the issue? eHam and ARRL have had surveys within
the past year that contradict Carl's statement. And I've already listed
these sources several times before. Must I keep repeating myself?

You are getting my statements mixed up other peoples. I have already
referenced the current data on ARRL membership, ham radio membership,
surveys on Morse code, etc. I then stated that the ARRL may very well be
wise to not take a stance on the issue since the split is roughly even and
no matter what stance they take, a significant number of hams will probably
be dissatisfied.

Carl has stated that most hams want Morse testing to go away and has
provided no data to support that. I and others have pointed out that the
data that does exist contradicts his "belief". These are the recent surveys

done on the various ham radio sites.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1455. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 20:05:16 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <eeR%a.14893$yl6.13725@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74870
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bhntus$l4j@library1.airnews.net...
> "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:f3etjv4ltdlg1vq7bghu0vtv482dlqmftb@4ax.com...
> > On Sat, 16 Aug 2003 23:04:56 +0100, "Steve Terry"
> > <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote:
> > >"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote
> > >
> > >> Not surprising, really, as most of America's principal institutions
> > >> are run by Zionists whose philosophy is "An eye for an eye, a tooth
> > >> for a tooth."
> > >
> > >It wasn't until I had a Jewish Girlfriend, did I discover that IS what
> they
> > >really believe ;-(
> > >The Christian concept of being able to turn the other cheek is quite
> alien to
> > >them.
> >
> > Indeed. But they try to deny it.
> > 73 de G3NYY
> > Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com
>
> Oh good grief. You are hanging your opinion of a whole group of people
> based on one girlfriend?! You just have a propensity for picking up shitty
> women, obviously...
> Kim W5TIT
>
Of course not, I've had 3 Jewish girlfriends and they all believed in the right
of revenge.

Although I "Majored" in Interpersonal psychology, I also have a passing
interest in Anthropology.

I tinkered with the idea of making an Anthropological study of Americans,
but life is only 3 score and 10 years.

Steve Terry

1456. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 20:12:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308171212.7b5c5b35@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74871

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030813181641.02197.00002136@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0308120701.52cc418c@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> > The First Amendment doesn't apply to you either, Lennie. It
> >applies to the GOVERNMENT being able to suppress the media.
>
> Since 1791 the First Amendment of the United States Consitution reads:
>
> "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion,
> or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of
> speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to
> assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

This still applies to the Government...Not you. It says CONGRESS
shall not do these things.

> It should be clear to all thinking persons (psychotics aren't able to
> think rationally) that free speech is NOT "illegal."

Of course it's not. Since CONGRESS is prohibited, by the
Constitution, from doing exactly that.

> This particular forum is public access and unmoderated.
>
> You desire closure to the public and elitism...CONTROL.

And youa re, once again, blatantly lying.

> You've already attempted to specifically stop MY "petition for a redress
> of grievances" on 25 January 1999. That's on the public FCC record.

Nope...I just asked them to ignore you since your purpose is to
impose certain rules and regulations on a radio service for which YOU
have no vested interest and wish to do nothing but harm.

> Symptoms of your psychosis have been growing for four years. It is
> time you got some proper psychiatric care and return to being
> normal...if medical science is advanced enough for that.

Hmmmmm...What you ahve done here is make a medical diagnoisis. I
ONCE AGAIN ask you from which entity YOU were rendered a license to
practice medicine...?!?!

> >> Go back to your fantasies of greatness in radio and your authorized
> >> judgement of all who disagree with your holiness' views.

> >
> > Let's make the same offer to you, Lennie. Go back to Japan in
> >1953, and go back to your days of glory and greatness at "Ham Radio
> >Magazine" and Raytheon, et al, where you made almost no discernable
> >impact on anything "radio" related at all.
>
> I have NO desire to "go back to Japan of 1953" since I was there then
> and up until 1956. It was interesting. The task was challenging and
> interesting and I met that and succeeded.

That was your one and only venture to HF radio. It was NOT
Amateur Radio.

> I had NO "glory and greatness" at Ham Radio magazine, was just a
> contributor and an Associate Editor. Interesting and challenging again
> and (from the compensation) little more than an extension of ongoing
> hobby activites.

And it was the only way you'sd ever see YOUR name in print in ANY
electronics forum with your name as a byline.

> I was never employed by Raytheon. Raytheon's old Santa Barbara,
> CA, division came up with the RadaRange, the progenitor of today's
> ubiquitous microwave oven. Raytheon sold all the rights to that
> to Amana Corporation of Amana, Iowa. My wife and I visited there
> in 2001, two years after buying an Amana natural gas range and
> overhead microwave oven and vent fan for a complete makeover of our
> kitchen in 1999.
>
> pSycho pSteve seems lost on the concept that I actually DID what I've
> said I did...and have the documentation and still-living witnesses to that
> fact. All pSycho pSteve can do is attempt character assassination for
> his own aberrated ends...he NEVER had anything to compare with that.

As of today you are still not a licensed Amateur and have zero
point zero experience as a licensed operator.

Poor thing.

Steve, K4yz

1457. Re: BPL Video On-Line

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 20:13:42 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308171213.4853e0c0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74872

Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message news:<874r0lj25z.fld@barrow.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote:
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
> >>Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >>>Did you check to see whether you have authority for name-calling,
> >>>insulting and demeaning those who disagree with you?
> >>
> >>I do. It's called the First Amendment of the United States
> >>Constitution.
> >>
> >>Ever hear of it?
> >
> >Are YOU aware that it applies to the GOVERNMENT, not to you?
>
> The authority??
>
> You'd better go read it again. It doesn't authorize the government.

You'd better do it yourself, Floyd. The Constitution is the very
basis for the formation of this Nations' govenment.

Steve, K4YZ

1458. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 20:23:31 UTC
From: Brian Reay <brian.reay@bigfoot.com>
Message-ID: <bhoo6b$1k4ti$1@ID-140397.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 74873
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bhntus$l4j@library1.airnews.net...
> "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:f3etjv4ltdlg1vq7bghu0vtv482dlqmftb@4ax.com...
> > On Sat, 16 Aug 2003 23:04:56 +0100, "Steve Terry"
> > <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote:
> >
> > >"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote
> > >
> > >> Not surprising, really, as most of America's principal institutions
> > >> are run by Zionists whose philosophy is "An eye for an eye, a tooth
> > >> for a tooth."
> > >
> > >It wasn't until I had a Jewish Girlfriend, did I discover that IS what
> they
> > >really believe ;-(
> > >The Christian concept of being able to turn the other cheek is quite
> alien to
> > >them.
> >
> > Indeed. But they try to deny it.
> >
> > 73 de G3NYY
> >
> > --
> > Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com
>
> Oh good grief. You are hanging your opinion of a whole group of people
> based on one girlfriend?!

Of course he isn't. He also watches "60 mins" and "The Discovery Channel"

>You just have a propensity for picking up shitty
> women, obviously...

If you know where he looks for them then you would know why ;-)

--
73
Brian
G8OSN
www.g8osn.org.uk
www.amateurradiotraining.org.uk for FREE training material for the UK
Foundation and Intermediate Licences

www.phoenixradioclub.org.uk - a RADIO club specifically for those wishing to learn more about amateur radio

1459. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 20:26:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308171226.40d01d48@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74874

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308171007.511d99de@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308131259.68a78fae@posting.google.com>...
> > averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030813070822.22063.00000604@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>
> > > Why do you let Len Anderson's postings here bother you, Steve Robeson? Have you
> > > not noticed that his pattern of behavior is designed to elicit angry responses
> > > from you?
> >
> > Because I do not well tolerate pathological liars.
>
> You don't tolerate anonymous posters, either.
>
> Or do you?

Since I know who it is, he is not anonymous.

Steve, K4YZ

1460. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 20:29:36 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <3BR%a.14916$yl6.668@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74875
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Brian Reay" <brian.reay@bigfoot.com> wrote in message
news:bhoo6b$1k4ti$1@ID-140397.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:bhntus$l4j@library1.airnews.net...
> > "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> > news:f3etjv4ltdlg1vq7bghu0vtv482dlqmftb@4ax.com...
> > > On Sat, 16 Aug 2003 23:04:56 +0100, "Steve Terry"
> > > <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > >"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote
<snip>
> >You just have a propensity for picking up shitty
> > women, obviously...
>
> If you know where he looks for them then you would know why ;-)
> 73
> Brian
> G8OSN
>
Two of them are Class A Radio Amateurs, which is more than you'll ever be Brian

Steve Terry

1461. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 20:31:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F3FE66C.3030906@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74876

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> I agree that the ARRL is "between a rock and a hard place" with respect to
> the split in their existing membership.

Very much so, I'd agree.

> However, outside of their membership
> (in the >75% of US hams who are NOT members of the ARRL), I believe
> that the demographic is heavily tilted towards the no code test side ...

What makes you think this? I'm not trying to be a wise guy, but I agree with you about the polls being self directing. Therefore are you operating on gut feeling, what your friends tell you, or what?

> thus,
> I believe that the ARRL stands to pick up more members than they stand
> to lose if they take a position that it's time for Morse testing to go.

It remains to be seen. Those for who the Morse test is too much trouble may not be bothered to join the ARRL either.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1462. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 20:48:07 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3FEA06.449E77FD@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74877

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3EE85E.E8A0DA4C@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
>
> > > Perhaps there should
> > > be a no content indicator in the preamble of your messages.
> >
> > I usually find your name a giveaway.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> In addition to putting AveryFine in front of your messages, you're
> going to start putting my name on them?

I am not now, nor have I ever posted as Avery Fine or any other name
than my own.

Dave K8MN

1463. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 20:51:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F3FEB0A.6070607@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74878

Jim Hampton wrote:
> What *might* prove interesting is some emergency where communications can't
> get through due to interference. Then the high power lawyers step up to the
> plate and see if they can do to the power company involved what was done to
> big tobacco. Of course, by then the damage will be done. Let someone win a
> billion dollars and then see what happens with BPL. I'm not pushing amateur
> radio here; I simply see radio communications (fire, police, aircraft, etc.)
> as more reliable than cell phones. It is also difficult to call 20 police
> cars individually when you need a rapid response to a large problem as
> opposed to just pressing the button on a radio transmitter. I am very
> rapidly learning to dislike the present administration a *lot*. An
> interesting aside with the power companies; Wall Street doesn't like them
> generating power. They simply want to buy power and resell it at a profit.
> Where is this power supposed to come from?

The same place that we will get our food from after the Midwest is top
soilless, fertilized out and saline, and all the other farmland is
turned into housing developments! "someone else will do it"

> With all manufacturing jobs
> going offshore and no one interested in actually building (or generating)
> anything ...

Uh-huh. And what happens when for some reason or another we NEED to
have a manufacturing capability again? We're doing what Great Britain
did before WW2.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1464. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 20:56:08 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3FEBE6.105A3225@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74879

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3EE791.79F57C60@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3D2BC4.5C421A33@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3C58F1.86EDE9C2@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F37AFDE.6D3406E4@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F301FE3.951681BE@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > > > > > > > > Please quote that "may share space" FCC document.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Please quote the "Farnsworth Exam at 13-15wpm is the same as the Morse
> > > > > > > > > > Exam at 5wpm" FCC document.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > That's totally irrelevant to the discussion at hand.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Why?
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > ...because the Farnsworth method was not under discussion. It is
> > > > > > > > > > irrelevant to the request made of you.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > I thought the existence of FCC documents were now part of the
> > > > > > > > > > discussion. At least you broght it up.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Tell you what David, in the future put your comments that are not open
> > > > > > > > > > for discussion in brackets [xxx].
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > OK?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > It'd be easier if you just stuck to the matter being discussed.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > FCC documents that don't exist?

> >
> > We were discussing one of those--the one which uses the words "may share
> > space".
>
> Why do existing FCC documents have to comply to your specific choice
> of words?

Actually, you chose the words.

> Why must we discuss documents which don't exist?

You brought up "FCC documents which don't exist".

> You must share space with Carl. It is as simple as that.

It is entirely likely that Carl and I will never have to share space on
the ham bands. We may or may not share space. Why are you having
troubles with the concept?

> > > > > > > Farnsworth exists as the de facto "code" exam, even though the
> > > > > > > FCC documents specify Morse Code. Yet the FCC documents DO assign the
> > > > > > > exact same priveleges to Carl that they do you, yet you insist on
> > > > > > > arguing it.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > What doest it have to do with the FCC's "may share space" document?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Part 97 addresses your and Carls priveleges.
> > > > >
> > > > > It certainly does.
> > > >
> > > > You implied that it didn't.
> > >
> > > No, Brian. Your attempts at reading between the lines often gets you
> > > into trouble with understanding what has actually been written.
>
> So which is it, again? May or May Not?

I've already given you an answer. You didn't care for it.

> > > So? We weren't discussing installing towers within
> > > > a certain distance from an airport but that's in Part 97.
> > >
> > > Yes, it is. Do you live near an airport?
> >
> > We weren't discussing that.
>
> Then kindly put the topics which you bring up, but are not open for
> discussion inside brackets, i.e., [So? We weren't discussing
> installing towers within
> a certain distance from an airport but that's in Part 97].

I mentioned something in Part 97 that was not under discussion and you
ask me a question relating to it. Now you need brackets. Whew!

> > > > > > > That would make you a fool.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I'd guess the fool to be one who is asked about a regulation about
> > > > > > > "sharing space" and responds with some nonsense about the Farnsworth
> > > > > > > method of learning morse.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > You don't believe in sharing space which the FCC says you must share
> > > > > > > in a document called Part 97.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > I've never stated that I don't believe in sharing space.
> > > > > > That's something you've tried to establish.
> > > > >
> > > > That's something that you implied, with "he may not."
> > >
> > Incorrect, little electrolyte. If I write "It may rain or it may not",
> > the words do not imply that I don't believe in rain.
>
> It implies that you don't know if its going to rain.

Again, it does not imply that I don't believe in rain. I may share
space with Carl and I may not. The previous sentence does not indicate
that I don't believe in sharing space.

> Besides, we were not discussing your beliefs. We were discussing your
> and Carl's priveleges. He has the same priveleges as you, regardless
> of your beliefs on the matter.

I've understood the matter of privileges all along. I don't believe
Carl will be using all of his.

Dave K8MN

1465. Re: 6980 khz USB - 0530 UTC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 21:10:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308171310.46e70509@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74880

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030813181640.02197.00002135@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0308121438.7df10277@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> > I didn't "demand" anything, Lennie.
>
> Yes, you do. You have a long history of it, even on the public record
> of four years ago at the FCC.

Lennie, please cite the item where I "demand" anything...

> > I point out that you make it a point of harrassing others about
> >it, yet indulge yourself in the most childish and pathetic of efforts
> >to see who can out-insult the other.
>
> Actually you yourself meet "childish and pathetic of efforts" and
> cannot stop trying to insult me in posts clearly not including you.

Only when confronted with it, Lennie, since that seems to be the
only mode you are capable in functioning in.

> > You insist on referring to yourself as a "professional", but you
> >have yet to prove yourself "professional" in ANY discipline.
>
> Several corporations, the US government, three state governments
> all disagree with you.

No doubt you received money for the time you were there, Lennie,
but money does not a professional make...You have yet to demonstrate
ANY characteristics that even remotely "prove" you "professional".

> >> You REALLY need some mental therapy on being able to
> >> get along with anyone else.
> >
> > Uh huh. Coming from you, I rate this about 136 on a scale of 1
> >to 10 on important things to do.
>
> Psychotics will never admit they are crazy. <shrug>

Then we know YOUR problem, don't we.

> > Uh huh...(Geeze this idiot makes this easy...) Just like YOU
> >tried to hide behind "Avery Fine" and "Avery Fineman" until your ego
> >got the better of you one day and you signed your name to a post that
> >you had specifically denied BEING you.
>

> The AOL screen name of "Avery Fineman" is still registered to me.

I didn't say it wasn't. I said you tried to hide "Lennie" behind
them.

> I have, currently, six other screen names at AOL (including this one)
> but "Avery Fine" was NOT one of them. Never.

Uh huh.

> Yes, I've used the screen name of "Avery Fineman" in here and also
> identified myself at the end of the post.

You TRIED to make us think that "Avery Fineman" was someone OTHER
than you at one point. Being unable to rally any number of otherwise
credible posters behind your rants, you manufactured them.

Didn't work. Your ego overdrove your common sense and you got
caught. Sucks to be you.

> Apparently some in here are terribly uptight and can see no humor in
> the pseudonym of "a very fine man" that lacks two spaces. :-) I used
> that pseudonym first about 1992 on a Bulletin Board System as
> Co-Sysop. "Len Over 21" came from the pseudonym used on the BBS
> US Pompeii a year later (run and sysoped by Stan and Zippy Manus in
> the Hollywood Hills). It is word play based on the BBS software...takes
> too long to explain to anal-retentive control freaks.

It doesn't take too long to explain anything about you, Lennie.
>
> I can't "prove" who "Avery Fine" is...but both you and Reverend Jim
> are prolific posters from AOL. Coincidence?

Might be, but I can honestly state that I am not using any screen
name herein except this one, whether I post directly from AOL or from
Google.

And Jim and I are not the only AOL'ers here. We may never know who
all they are.

Steve, K4YZ

1466. Roger Wiseman material

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 21:16:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F3FF08D.86661718@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74881

The material below contains numerous crudities from the keyboard of
Roger Wiseman. Those of you who find this kind of thing objectionable
need read no further.

In the interest of accuracy, Roger "How'd You Know It Was Me", I thought
I'd refresh your memory of our little exchange. Here are three messages
containing fascinating examples of your interpersonal skills:

#1

Subject:
Re: Steven Spielberg quits BSA over discrimination
Date:
Fri, 20 Apr 2001 12:48:25 +0000
From:
Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
To:
KC8JBO <rmccall@cotse.com>
References:
1 , 2

Roger,

Would you like to see some of your best newsgroup material posted on
utility poles in your immediate neighborhood?

Dave K8MN

KC8JBO wrote:
>
> Aids-infected "Stupid Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> babbled incoherently in
> message news:9bo3u7$n1u$0@dosa.alt.net...
> >
> > On Thu, 19 Apr 2001 07:38:26 -0400, J. Duffy Beischel wrote:
> >:
> > : Stop the incorrect reference. Men that choose men instead of women are not
> > : gay, they are homosexuals. There is nothing gay about being a homosexual.
>
> The only reason Stupid Lee got in this thread is because the BSA rejected him
> for membership, due to his sexual preferences.
>
> > And what about men who choose cats?
>
> Abusing cats, now, Daron? With your hideous looks, I suppose you have to get
> some "pussy" any way you can.
>

> 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> EM99|
> Yaesu FT-920 | Inverted vee @ 40 Feet
> Yaesu FT-90R | Copper J-pole

#2

Subject:
Re: Steven Spielberg quits BSA over discrimination
Date:
Sat, 21 Apr 2001 03:47:43 +0000
From:
Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
To:
KC8JBO <rmccall@cotse.com>
References:
1 , 2 , 3 , 4

Roger,

You're newsgroup postings go way, way over the line. Do you really
believe that a jury would, after comparing your words to my words find
you the winner in a civil action?

If you're using language that you wouldn't want your mother or your wife
or your daughter or the kids in the neighborhood to see, then you
shouldn't be using it. You can take the first step in cleaning up the
newsgroups in which you participate.

Your recent stuff is an embarrassment to amateur radio, to Marshall
County and to West Virginia.

Dave Heil K8MN

KC8JBO wrote:
>
> Quoting Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>:
>
> > Roger,
> >
> > Would you like to see some of your best newsgroup material posted on
> > utility poles in your immediate neighborhood?
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Would you like to see your FAT ASS hauled into court, FUYCKNUTS?
> Go fuck yourself.

---

and #3

Subject:
Re: Steven Spielberg quits BSA over discrimination
Date:
Sat, 21 Apr 2001 12:39:39 +0000
From:
Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
To:
KC8JBO <rmccall@cotse.com>
References:
1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6

Roger,

Your inability to use language other than filth is simply amazing.
Again, you wouldn't use language like that in front of your family or
neighbors and I doubt you'd use it if I was standing in front of you.

Your "rights" end where you infringe on mine and those of others. If
you post in a public newsgroup and I am one of those who regularly read
that newsgroup, I AM minding my own business. This isn't some exchange
of filth between yourself and another party by private e-mail; it is
publicly posted. Why would you object to the people of Glen Dale seeing
what you've already posted for the rest of the world to see?

Dave K8MN

KC8JBO wrote:
>
> Quoting Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>:
>
> > Roger,
> >
> > You're newsgroup postings go way, way over the line. Do you really
> > believe that a jury would, after comparing your words to my words find
> > you the winner in a civil action?
>
> No, DUMBASS, I'm going to go to the police with that threat to post things on
> utility poles. It will go to criminal court.
> If you don't like what I post, use a killfile and quit whining about it.
>
> > If you're using language that you wouldn't want your mother or your
> > wife
> > or your daughter or the kids in the neighborhood to see, then you
> > shouldn't be using it. You can take the first step in cleaning up the
> > newsgroups in which you participate.
>
> Go fuck yourself..and learn to use a killfilter on my posts, STUPID.
> I'll use whatever language I feel like using. Neo-nazis like you need to quit
> trying to quash other people's rights. Clean up your own backyard, before you
> stick your nose in somebody else's business.
> Any harassment in my neighborhood will land you in hot water with the police.
>
> > Your recent stuff is an embarrassment to amateur radio, to Marshall

> > County and to West Virginia.
> >
> > Dave Heil K8MN
>
> Opinions vary. Learn to use a killfile, STUPIDASS.

To be fair, Roger, the e-mails quoted above are among your least objectionable writings. By your standards, they are mild.

Dave K8MN

1467. Re: Wiseman worshiper Whines

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 21:25:47 UTC
From: Anonymous <rebleep@hush.com>
Message-ID: <6179f955795a329b66b88ee34b2b4327@rebleep>
Source record: 74882
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

In article
"It Sucks Being Roger" wrote:
>
>
> Poor motherless Momma's Boy Wiseman crawls from under his bridge and snipes
> from an anonymous server.

IRONY ALERT......poor little fatass snipes from anonymous Altopia servers...

> Then he licks his festering wounds and

And you lick your mommie's fserting cunt.

> belly-crawls back under the pilings where he mewls for a mother he never
> knew.

While Dicksucking Dave High-el wishes he could suck and swallow Norm again like he did those little boys he molests. Poor Davey's mommy was a well known Moundsville whore.

> It must be lonely being Roger.

It must suck to be you, pedophile. Poor goatblower.

1468. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 22:18:39 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <2bT%a.26564$Vx2.12068231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 74883

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030817114056.20931.00000146@mb-m13.aol.com...
> From Larry, K3LT
>
> >I regret to inform you that "Restructuring" the US Amateur Radio
Service's
> >licensing system, to reduce the code testing speed to 5 WPM for General
> >and Extra class, in addition to the existing No-Code Technician-class
> >license, has resulted in a whopping 1.79 percent growth rate in the ARS
> >overall! What do you suppose we're gonna get from No-Code HF? Maybe
> >2 percent?
>
> The base of EEs can be expanded. You can get more EE from the rf
specialty.
> Not all EEs have an interest in that specialty. But, from those that do,
> amateur radio could be a good hobby.
>
> Amateur radio is not an EE friendly hobby. Those that like to build
circuits
> are not welcomed as those that want to learn Morse code, contest, or work
DX.
> EEs that are put off by Hams don't join the hobby.
>

You keep putting out this misinformation. I know of no one who has not been
welcomed into ham radio. Everyone is welcom. As far as building circuits,
again everyone is welcome. When someone in our club mentions that they are
building something, others ask about the progress of the project and help if
needed.

> As, I have noted before, the quality of rf courses could be improved with
ARRL
> publications. The projects have real, rather than just textbook
applications.
> This is not being currently done in most colleges.
>
> Secondly, EEs are not joining amateur radio clubs. Some Profs that teach
rf
> courses that I took do not have amateur radio licenses. People in the rf
field
> are not attending club meetings.
>

It is not the business of a university or college to promote ham radio. The
university will have no higher percentage of hams than the general

population. Unless one is or wants to become a ham, there is no need for someone to attend ham club meetings. There is no requirement that EE professors be hams or need for them to be so.

> The ARRL should make more efforts in this area. This would increase the number
> of people in the hobby. Also, there is a strong connection between EE and
> amateur radio that is not being realized.

As with any organization, the ARRL has limited resources. They must pick and choose where to apply those resources. Recruiting new hams is something that can be done easily and cheaply by individual hams via word of mouth if they choose. It would be much more costly for the ARRL to try to do that recruiting as they would need to purchase advertising on TV, radio, and in the magazines and send recruiters out on lecture circuits to schools of all levels. They just can't do it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1469. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 22:20:10 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308171420.63cf610d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74884

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<BB653FDA.2462B%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" wrote:
>
> > (snip) The second best piece of news today is
> > the new eggs in the face of the power industry.
> > Their credibility has dropped to zip in 48 hours
> > flat and methinks that they'll now have bigger
> > problems selling BPL given the fact that their
> > core technologies need all the attention they
> > can muster.
>
>
> You're an optimist, Brian.

Yer damned right I am and I haven't "lost" yet.

> Instead, I see the power industry more likely
> claiming they need the new income from BPL to raise the additional funds
> needed to modernize the existing infrastructure. Industry has plenty of
> people to spin anything into a positive outcome for industry.

WHAT?? The gurus have been bleating for years that the power
distribution infrastructure needs a cash infusion of somewhere in the
neighborhood of $50 to $100 *BILLION* dollars to catch up.

Never mind, you're either dumber than a box of rocks or an almost
decent troll. I rather suspect the former. Now go back to work and
finally figger out how to put up a pole to support yer scanner
antennas . .

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

w3rv

1470. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 22:25:42 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <g7T%a.653$a9.382@fe03.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 74885

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:gpg%a.32$6e5.6019@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> Hello all,
>
> I just got back tonight from several days of meetings
> in Washington.
>
> Wed. when I arrived in Washington, one of the first things
> I did was file NCI's Petition for Rulemaking with the FCC.
>
> It is available in .pdf format at http://www.nocode.org
> under the "Articles" link ...
>
> Some will undoubtedly say "What took you so long?"
>
> The answer is simply "We wanted to do the best possible
> job of getting it right."
>
> 73,
> --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
> Grid Square FN20fm

Well-written petition. I personally oppose it, but it is well-written with what might be considered a logical rationale giving all of the justifications for the NCI position. It deserves a chance to be considered, in my opinion, and I hope that the FCC does issue a call for comments. They probably will not, believing that the recent reduction to very-slow-code (5 wpm) was a good compromise, i.e. not acceptable to either side. And, it is very recent. Having said that, I would hope that whatever the outcome, we should accept it and quit trying to change the law. This requirement certainly has had a good and lengthy hearing and additional work on this item is just a waste of time.

It is said that Isaac Newton spent the majority of his career trying to find the exact displacement of Noah's ark; in his spare time he discovered gravity.

de KR4AJ

1471. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 22:54:49 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <ZIT%a.141$6e5.34853@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74886

```
"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0308170927.346c4e95@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<mlM%a.98$6e5.29672@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > news:c2356669.0308170411.f2366d1@posting.google.com...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > news:<g%u%a.72$6e5.16725@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > > > news:c2356669.0308160744.19006d94@posting.google.com...
> > > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > news:<gpg%a.32$6e5.6019@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > > > >
> > > > > > NCI's Petition for Rulemaking with the FCC.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > It is available in .pdf format at http://www.nocode.org
> > > > > > under the "Articles" link ...
> > > > >
> > > > > OK, let's cut to the chase.
> > > > >
> > > > > Obviously the main request is to dump Element 1 ASAP. And there's
> > > > > probably lots of reasons given for doing so, including the
> > > > > Commission's own words "no regulatory purpose".
> > > > >
> > > > > But what else was in the petition?
> > > >
> > > > I gave you a URL where you could read it ...
> > >
> > > That's not what I asked.
> > >
> > > Here's the answer, to save others the bother of reading 20 pages to
> > > get the answer to my question:
> > >
> > > NOTHING.
> >
> > Jim,
> >
> > You say "NOTHING"
>
> That's right.
>
> >... but in the following paragraphs you admit
> > that "Most of the 20 pages is supporting reasons to make the change."
>
```

> Yup. And that was already referred to.

Yes, referred to with a thinly-veiled attempt to dissuade others from
reading and considering all of those reasons.

> Look again at what I wrote:
>
> "Obviously the main request is to dump Element 1 ASAP."
>
> Which is true.

Yes ... what did you expect? That *IS* NCI's chartered goal.

> "And there's probably lots of reasons given for doing so, including
> the
> Commission's own words "no regulatory purpose"."
>
> Which is also true.
>
> And then the question:
>
> "But what else was in the petition?"
>
> The "what else" refers to things OTHER THAN dropping Element 1 and
> reasons to drop Element 1.
>
> And the correct answer is: NOTHING. The petition consists of a request
> to drop element 1 and reasons to do so.

What did you expect? That is what a Petition for Rulemaking IS ... a
specific
request(s) and all of the supporting arguments ... I *really* don't know
what
else you're asking for ...

> > I think that's important information for folks to consider ... that's
why
> > I encourage folks to actually READ and consider the NCI Petition,
> > rather than relying on your "5 cent synopsis."
>
> I've read and cosidered it, and I'm opposed to it.

Really? (what a surprise)

> > Why do you want to "save others the bother" of reading the Petition?
>
> Because we already know that it would contain a request to drop
> Element 1 and reasons to do so. Those reasons have been argued
> endlessly here and elsewhere.

The reasons elaborated in the Petition form the factual, legal, and
rational basis for granting the request ... I think they're presented
clearly in a well-organized manner that, in only 20 pages, tells a

a reader all they need to know to make an informed decision based
on the facts.

You don't WANT people reading it and coming to the logical
conclusion, IMHO ...

> My question was about what else was in the petition besides dropping
> Element 1 and reasons to do so.

That wasn't clear at all ... and why you would expect more escapes me,
since, as I pointed out above, all of the essential elements of a Petition
for Rulemaking are there (and you knew the what the goal of the Petition
would be before it was written ...)

> > (Could it be that you find the arguments so compelling that you don't
> > WANT others to read them???)
>
> Nope. None of the arguments are compelling at all. Not to me, anyway -
> YMMV. And we've all read them many times before.

OK, we disagree ... but I believe the FCC (and MANY amateurs) will
find the arguments compelling.

> I don't think the petition will change anyone's mind.

You HOPE not ... that's why you try to brush it off as somehow being
insignficant and "not worth the time to read." Interesting tactic, but
I doubt that it will work.

> > > The NCI petition consists of a request to drop Element 1 without
> > > further delay or discussion and give Techs the same privileges as Tech
> > > Pluses. No other changes proposed. Most of the 20 pages is supporting
> > > reasons to make the change.
>
> Is this synopsis not 100% accurate?

Yup ... and that's EXACTLY what's SUPPOSED to be there.

> > > > > As you have pointed out, Carl, FCC hasn't even given any of the
> > > > > proposals an RM number yet. And it's reasonable to assume there
will
> > > > > be more proposals - from NCVEC, ARRL, and other groups. FCC may
assign
> > > > > numbers, or they may take ideas from each one and produce an NPRM.
> > > >
> > > > NCVEC already filed a petition, as have several individuals.
> > >
> > > It's clear NCVEC isn't done yet. They're talking about other changes
> > > too.
> >
> > That's their business ... NCI is focused on the Morse test issue and
> > is not proposing more sweeping changes that are outside of our
> > charter ...

>
> That's the smart way to go. Focus on the core issue and don't be
> delayed or derailed by other issues.

Bingo ... and I don't believe that the FCC will allow this issue to
get bogged down with other unrelated issues. It's too clear-cut,
whereas other issues (band segmentation, privs by license class,
etc.) are clearly going to be harder to deal with because they are
not so clear-cut.
(They're also not NCI's charter, so they're not our "ox to gore.")

> There are supposedly four other petitions filed, too. Wonder what they
> say?

They basically say the same thing, in various levels of detail and
sophistication,
ranging from a 1-pager from a guy who's filed MANY (read between the lines)
to a few pages of generally well-considered material that doesn't have the
cites
to law, previous FCC decisions/determinations, etc. that NCI's has. They
all
add to the momentum, however ...

73,
Carl - wk3c

BTW, those who want to read the NCI Petition for Rulemaking and see what
Jim doesn't want you to see and consider can find a .pdf copy at
http://www.nocode.org under the "Articles" link.
However, a number of new articles have been added (other countries dropping
Morse testing ... Germany, Austria, Norway, and New Zealand have been added
to the ever-growing list), so you have to scroll down the Articles page a
bit to get
to the piece on the Petition ... :-)

1472. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 22:59:12 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <4NT%a.142$6e5.34942@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74887

"DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:9829b709.0308170942.5bb877f9@posting.google.com...
>> And history runs counter also. No coders have mostly stayed away from
> ARRL , and that seems unlikely to change anytime soon. They just don't
> see much in it for them.

Dick,

Did you (or the ARRL Board of Directors, more importantly)
EVER CONSIDER the POSSIBILITY that the nocoders are
staying away from the ARRL (in droves) because they don't
want to contribute dues to an organization that's been dedicated
(and still is, by policy) to keep them off of HF???

If the ARRL would "get with it" and actively, openly support this
inevitable change, rather than fighting to keep the nocoders off
of HF until the bitter end, they might be able to restore the goodwill
they've lost exactly because of their Morse policy ...

Carl - wk3c

1473. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 23:05:14 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <KST%a.143$6e5.34981@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74888

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F3FE66C.3030906@adelphia.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > I agree that the ARRL is "between a rock and a hard place" with respect
to
> > the split in their existing membership.
>
> Very much so, I'd agree.
>
> > However, outside of their membership
> > (in the >75% of US hams who are NOT members of the ARRL), I believe
> > that the demographic is heavily tilted towards the no code test side ...
>
> What makes you think this? I'm not trying to be a wise guy, but I agree
> with you about the polls being self directing. Therefore are you
> operating on gut feeling, what your friends tell you, or what?

I'm going on what I hear from members, from clubs, from e-mails I
get from folks, etc. I'm ALSO going on the demographic of all those
nocode techs who could get on HF were it not for a stupid Morse
requirement ... do you REALLY think they are "hot to learn Morse"???
I don't ...

> > thus,
> > I believe that the ARRL stands to pick up more members than they stand
> > to lose if they take a position that it's time for Morse testing to go.
>
> It remains to be seen. Those for who the Morse test is too much trouble
> may not be bothered to join the ARRL either.

ARRL membership provides a lot of benefits through QST, the website,
and all of the good things they DO do for amateur radio. However, selling
those benefits is difficult when the prospective buyer is someone who knows
his/her membership dues are going to an organization that's dedicated by
current policy to keep them off of HF ... it doesn't take Einstein or a
Gallup
poll to figure that one out ...

Carl - wk3c

1474. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 23:08:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <mVT%a.144$6e5.34951@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74889

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:g7T%a.653$a9.382@fe03.atl2.webusenet.com...
>
> Well-written petition. I personally oppose it, but it is well-written with
> what might be considered a logical rationale giving all of the
> justifications for the NCI position. It deserves a chance to be
considered,
> in my opinion, and I hope that the FCC does issue a call for comments.

Thanks for the kind words, Dan ... and for the spirit of faireness your
comments above show.

>They
> probably will not, believing that the recent reduction to very-slow-code
(5
> wpm) was a good compromise, i.e. not acceptable to either side.

I have ZERO doubt that the FCC will consider this matter.
It's merely a question of how soon and how quickly they move.

Carl - wk3c

1475. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 23:09:54 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <6XT%a.102645$_R5.37919362@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 74890

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:4NT%a.142$6e5.34942@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:9829b709.0308170942.5bb877f9@posting.google.com...
> >> And history runs counter also. No coders have mostly stayed away from
> > > ARRL , and that seems unlikely to change anytime soon. They just don't
> > > see much in it for them.
>
> Dick,
>
> Did you (or the ARRL Board of Directors, more importantly)
> EVER CONSIDER the POSSIBILITY that the nocoders are
> staying away from the ARRL (in droves) because they don't
> want to contribute dues to an organization that's been dedicated
> (and still is, by policy) to keep them off of HF???

That's odd, Carl. I used the ARRL CD's to prepare for Element 1. When I had specific questions, league employees responded promptly via e-mail with helpful answers.

To this young (...and then no-code Technician class.) newbie, the ARRL actually appeared very dedicated to helping me get ON HF.

> If the ARRL would "get with it" and actively, openly support this
> inevitable change, rather than fighting to keep the nocoders off
> of HF until the bitter end, they might be able to restore the goodwill
> they've lost exactly because of their Morse policy ...

I'm a league member, Carl. I (...and I suspect many others.) have written the league informing them that I do NOT support the removal of Element 1. While I stopped short of telling them that my family membership was at stake, it may hve been inferred. (Fine by me.) I also made a point to inform them of our demographic, young newbies who are NOT put off by the code test and willing to meet the requirements for HF.
>
> Carl - wk3c

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1476. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 23:15:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhp28lmnn1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74891
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:vd3ujv8tu6ft9t47vk49364nrqm24knl08@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 04:39:40 +0100, "Steve Terry"
> <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> >news:bhgsoi$9nq$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> >> Gee Airy......isn't that EXACTLY what the British did in the 17th and
18th
> >> century??? How did it go...."The sun never sets on the British empire"
> >> ?????.
> >> Go get your red coat and stand tall. Its all you have left me boy.
> >> Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >Are you admitting current US foreign policy is one of Imperialism ?!
>
> We do not transport people suspected of a crime to a military prison
> camp in one of our off-shore colonies and keep them incarcerated there
> for a year or more without trial. I can think of a country that
> does.
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

I agree with Walt. The USA needs to stop putting these enemies in a camp.
What we should do is just shoot them on site.

Dan/W4NTI

1477. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 23:20:25 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030817192025.01893.00000057@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 74892

In article <BB653A45.24627%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

> And without the 52,990 increase in non-code proficient Technicians,

Dwight,

That 52,990 "increase" is not all new license issues.

Some of it is new hams getting their Techs.
Some of it is existing Novices upgrading by passing Element 2 (Tech written)
Some of it is existing Tech Pluses being renewed by FCC as Techs.

The latter two groups are codetested hams with HF privs. Some of the first group are codetested too, if they have passed Element 1 but not Element 3.

How "code proficient" any amateur is cannot be determined from license class alone.

>there
>would instead be a 7.85 percent decrease in overall numbers. Of course,
>that's a rough estimate - as rough as the numbers used in your argument.

The important point is that the number of US hams is growing at a slow rate. Restructuring did not result in a big change in growth. If Element 1 is dropped, it will be interesting to see if there is any significant increase in growth.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1478. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 23:28:44 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhp519dlp1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74894
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Ged" <Ged73@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk> wrote in message
news:HnK1NTGjX+P$Ew+d@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk...
> In message <eeR%a.14893$yl6.13725@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>, Steve
> Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com> writes
> >I tinkered with the idea of making an Anthropological study of Americans,
> >but life is only 3 score and 10 years.
> >
> >Steve Terry
>
> What a pity, Steve. We could do with more knowledge about the effects of
> in-breeding.
> --
> Ged

Then I suggest you check with mother England. EH.

Dan/W4NTI

1479. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 23:34:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhp51bdlp2@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74895
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"toxic waste" <toxic_waste@citizensband.com> wrote in message
news:1f2adfc1.0308171104.3375b00c@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bhm90o$19b$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> >
> > And you are 100% correct. The USA was indeed very anti-semite in the
time
> > before and during WW2. However after seeing what the NAZIs did in the
> > 'camps' we became a very big supporter of the 'Jews'. In fact we were
> > instrumental in helping to establish the modern country of ISRAEL and
are to
> > this day there best friend on this planet.
> >
> > Since were on the subject Walt. Shall we now discuss how the Brits did
> > there best to stop the Jewish refugees from landing in Palestine???????
No,
> > we better not.
> >
>
> The Middle East problem could have been dealt with way back in 1956,
> when we, along with the French invaded Egypt, to re-take the Suez
> Canal, after Nasser nationalized it
>
> IIRC it was Eisenhower, who demanded we got out and of course, we were
> stupid enough to do just that!
>
> I'll bet it would have been a different story if the canal had
> belonged to the Americans!
>
> Cheers
> tox

If it did indeed 'belong' to the Americans....then we would have given it
back. Look at the Panama Canal.

We don't have a colonial view on anybody. We made that mistake with the
Phillipines and Puerto Rico. And we still can't get rid of Puerto Rico.

Dan/W4NTI

1480. Re: Spell Checker for CW ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 23:38:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhp51bdlp3@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74896

"Steve Stone" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in message
news:iMA%a.825$qS2.13@news02.roc.ny...
> Is there a spell checker for CW ?
> How educated must a CW purist be in order carry on the cause to the
highest
> order ?
> Should anyone with less than a masters degree be allowed to transmit CW ?
>
>
>

If you can't spell it is not a problem. Just make up a 'new' abbreviation.

Dan/W4NTI

1481. Re: Wiseman worshiper Whines

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-17 23:41:31 UTC
From: SLee@houston-hunks.com
Message-ID: <89185761.767067889@houston-hunks.com>
Source record: 74893
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.roger-wiseman

On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 17:25:47 -0400, Anonymous <rebleep@hush.com> wrote:
[absolutely nothing important]

Are you going to force me out of retirement, Woger? I have been enjoying almost a year of Wiseman-free Usenet, ever since you got kicked off of both Altopia and Ovis. Your love poem to Pam Hoffer, the President of Ovis, was doubtless a strong influence in your departure from Ovis, and the silence which ensued last September was pure joy.

Now the window licker returns, uttering his obscenities while he picks his nose looking for his brain. Pathetic (but entertaining).

A couple of quotes from Google:

==========
"And that fat hog Pam shouldn't caterwaul with her hunchbacked fatass mommy with the Xtian band anymore, she caused more stray dogs to come around that run-down shack that Ovis is housed in. Another Xtian hypocrite, that radio station is a known haven for child abuse in the mound town. She is a fucking idiot." -- ab8mq in message <akd8bpkce8@pita.alt.net>

==========
In message <a19ubh$e7u$0@pita.alt.net>, the regulars voting for the alt.flame awards elected Roger Wiseman as: Most Boring Writer, Worst Flamer, Fuckhead of the Year, Most Tenuous Spankclaim, Best Punching Bag, Most Unwelcome Comeback, and gave him the Golden Peewee Award for most Blatant IKYABWAI.

1482. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 00:16:58 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308171616.2103f329@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74897

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<4NT%a.142$6e5.34942@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:9829b709.0308170942.5bb877f9@posting.google.com...
> >> And history runs counter also. No coders have mostly stayed away from
> > > ARRL , and that seems unlikely to change anytime soon. They just don't
> > > see much in it for them.
> >
> > Dick,
> >
> > Did you (or the ARRL Board of Directors, more importantly)
> > EVER CONSIDER the POSSIBILITY that the nocoders are
> > staying away from the ARRL (in droves) because they don't
> > want to contribute dues to an organization that's been dedicated
> > (and still is, by policy) to keep them off of HF???
> >

Yep, I considered it, then rejected it as inaccurate. Nocoders aren't
about
to dole out $34 per year for *nothing* That's exactly what most of
then see
of value to them in ARRL membership, since they really aren't into ham
radio
beyond their HT, and have no use for al the many ARRL "bennies".

> If the ARRL would "get with it" and actively, openly support this
> inevitable change, rather than fighting to keep the nocoders off
> of HF until the bitter end, they might be able to restore the goodwill
> they've lost exactly because of their Morse policy ...
>

That's about as accurate as your prediction that no code will bring
hordes of geniuses into the hobby.

1483. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 00:34:48 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308171634.31f81a2b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74898

"Carl R. Stevenson"
>

>
> BTW, those who want to read the NCI Petition for Rulemaking and see what
> Jim doesn't want you to see and consider

Not to be concerned, Jim, he always gets paranoid like this when decision
time looms......

You can bet that far more people agree with your assesment than his.

1484. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 00:35:23 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhp866$bop@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74901

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB653FDA.2462B%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "Brian Kelly" wrote:
>
> > (snip) The second best piece of news today is
> > the new eggs in the face of the power industry.
> > Their credibility has dropped to zip in 48 hours
> > flat and methinks that they'll now have bigger
> > problems selling BPL given the fact that their
> > core technologies need all the attention they
> > can muster.
>
>
> You're an optimist, Brian. Instead, I see the power industry more likely
> claiming they need the new income from BPL to raise the additional funds
> needed to modernize the existing infrastructure. Industry has plenty of
> people to spin anything into a positive outcome for industry.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

The crux of the matter is that the greater part of the power industry is
investor-owned. That says it all as to how easy this will be to win, etc.

Kim W5TIT

1485. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 00:38:51 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhp867$bop@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74900

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:iacvjv4jv2agp0up38rliqc0bfa6okc6nb@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 07:20:32 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> wrote:
>
> >You're a nitwit, Airy. How would you like for me to blame your entire
> >citizenry for some act that is the deed of your government? You just
don't
> >realize that we are peasants among our governments. So, if you truly
> >believe that this country of citizens has done something against the
world,
> >perhaps you'd like to tell me when I was present at whatever act it is
you
> >think I've done?
>
> I seem to remember reading 9 months ago that 99 percent of the US
> citizenry supported the Bush administration's policy regarding Iraq.
>
> Trying to distance ourselves from it now, are we?
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

No, that sounds like some kind of idiotic tactic you would do, and you're a
nitwit too. Go hug your PM.

Kim W5TIT

1486. Wiseman's "Dictionary"....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 00:45:10 UTC
From: Ed Norton <haaaynorton@comnos.pam>
Message-ID: <bhp7iq$o0v$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 74899

These are only a few of the misspelled words I have seen in Wiseman's posts.
I guess he can't afford a spell checker.

"Champoin".Whassup, Wiseman? No dictionaries in the mental ward?

"Anoinymous"...a cross between anonymous and annoying?

"Acident" Roger's mom got preggers by accident.

"Alreaedy" Alright, already!

"Amouints" Roger amounts to nothing.

"Aposterphe" This guy is a hoot, ain't he?

"Basios"...word Woger uses when he gets neeeerrrrvous.
"Behing"...a cross between being and behind?

"Coiward" As in peeking from behind his mommy's curtains.
"Feamle"...I think he meant female.
"Losser"...only loser Roger can do it better.
"Ignroant"...typical, considering the source.
"Sluprs"...only Rogie knows what this means.
"Travelled"...a Rogerism, replete with ignorance.
"Postss"...pssst...Roger..that should be Posts.
"Defgenerate"...well, it's Roger's word...
"Faity"...he meant to say Fairy, but you know Roger.

"Ghet" Get a load of Curtain Boy!
"Distribiution"...Roger likes using phonics.
"Biotch"...he meant Bitch, but his phonics took over again.
"Methjadone"...a West Virginia substitute for Heroin.
"Sumbliminal"...one of Roger's favorites.
"Recepticle"...either of Roger's moist cavaties.
"Cociane"...a West Virginia drug of choice?
"Tiome"...Roger meant to say Time...but his fingers were numb.
"Beraking"...no definition. Could mean 'beraking' the leaves,
"Amny"...he meant 'any',
"Nlay"...a town in Maylaysia? Vermont?
"Al;ong"...only Wussman knows what this means.
"Becasu"...well, becasu Roger is not the brightest bulb on the tree.
"Seperation". Why? Because Roger cannot "seperate" from his mommie!
"Sisnce" He meant Since, but his pudgy little fingers slipped off the keys.
"gnetically" What?
"provce" (prove?)
"Piuzza" (West Virginia Pizza)
"Schol" (school?)

"strill" (still?)
"shoitgun" 12 ga or 20 ga?
"Snoip" (How they spell "snip" in Glen Dale)
"Maturbater". Wiseman does it all the time, he just can't spell it.(leaves a sticky residue on his right hand)
"Coskscuking". It's a Roger thing, as in Lavender Lads.
"Waddleing". Only in Glen Dale, eh?
"Spaeaking". Curtain Boy did this after his second retest.

" Stgop" Roger's version of Stop.

"Fahter's" He meant Father's Day.

"fserting"..would that be festering?

"poists". Roger meant "posts".

"snadwich" As in peanut butter and jelly?

"regualr" Glen Dale rendition of "regular".

"aftrer" After? Aftrer what?

"soory". Sorry Roger fucks up again.

"didnb't" He didn't?

"whoile". He ate the whoile thing?

"Woamn" He's hooked on West Virginia phonics, all right.

"prrof" And he kin prove it, too.

"beforfe" Was that before he lurned to spell?

"yoiuy" Roger's version of "y'all".

"illarate" Only illiterate Roger can spell like this.

"haeart" Aw, how heartless of me to laugh!

"valule" Roger has no values. No wonder he can't spell it.

"proch" Doesn't everyone have one on their house?

"inmstitution" Where Roger's mom put him in June 1999.

"timne" It's Howdy Doody time?

"whgo" What? Who dat?

"gnetically" Only Roger knows what this one means.

"crfy" Like, cry, Roger, cry.

"stutrtering" Some stutter, Wiseman stutrters.

"Whjere" Where is Curtain Boy?

"Webiste" That's Website to the rest of us.

"Youire" Your? You're? Who knows.

"fiored" As in fired?

"Parety" Roger gave a party once. Nobody came.

"Bouynce" Bounce?

"Varification" Verifiable mental case.

"Probelms" Poor Rogie.has many problems of the mental sort.

"Partricipate" Oh, DUH!!!!

"Cryed" Gee, Wogie..cry me a river.you dolt!

"Stoick" What a dork. His old 386 has no spell check program.

"Partiall" More WV Phonics, I see.

"Obsucred" Either obscured or Rogie has "sucre" on his mind.

"Infinate" Stupid. Think finite, Rogie.

"Sustinance" As in Sustenance?

"Juvinile". This is the way Roger likes his boys.

"Piut" Put it where, Rogie?

"Toyus". "Toyus R Us?

"Diminuative". Roger's height.

"Percriptions" Say what?

"Credibiliy" More Glen Dale intellect.

"Thsoe" Yet another Glen Dale gaffe.

1487. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 00:45:49 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhp868$bop@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 74902

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030817130022.23171.00000048@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <bhnt9d$1jn@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Brian:
> >>
> >> I don't think that Rush (that's MISTER Limbaugh to you!) would
appreciate
> >> your drawing comparisons between him and Kim!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >ROFLMAO!!! Brian, see? Denial...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> You're really out-doing yourself here. You've produced one
non-responsive,
> irrelevant and un-enlightening response to each and every thing I've
posted
> these last two days. You have truly perfected the art of wasting
bandwidth
> on Usenet, not to mention your own time.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I haven't anything of substance to respond to, Larry. Produce some
literate, logical, intelligent form in your style and I will respond in
kind...

Kim W5TIT

1488. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 01:01:11 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308171701.7a29c99a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74903

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<HZC%a.943$qE6.913@news02.roc.ny>...
> What *might* prove interesting is some emergency where communications can't
> get through due to interference. Then the high power lawyers step up to the
> plate and see if they can do to the power company involved what was done to
> big tobacco. Of course, by then the damage will be done. Let someone win a
> billion dollars and then see what happens with BPL. I'm not pushing amateur
> radio here; I simply see radio communications (fire, police, aircraft, etc.)
> as more reliable than cell phones.

BPL, if allowed, will put several states' statewide public service
agency radio system out of business, teo include California, which
also has a low VHF statewide radio system. So much for protection from
part 15 interference!

It is also difficult to call 20 police
> cars individually when you need a rapid response to a large problem as
> opposed to just pressing the button on a radio transmitter. I am very
> rapidly learning to dislike the present administration a *lot*.

If they ram BPL through in the face of massive negative evidence
there'll
be a whole lot of people feeling much more than just dislike!

An
> interesting aside with the power companies; Wall Street doesn't like them
> generating power. They simply want to buy power and resell it at a profit.
> Where is this power supposed to come from?

Do you ever get the feeling that Wall Street is more *the* problem
than the solution to our problems? The bean counters are in absolute
control and The Bottom Line rules. No matter who or what gets hurt,
nor how badly. If they have to send all our good jobs and
manufacturing offshore and rely on capitol gains to rake in all that
stock gain and profit, they'll do it in a heartbeat, regardless of
what it does to the country.

With all manufacturing jobs
> going offshore and no one interested in actually building (or generating)
> anything ... well, I'll bet 50 years down the road they'll be teaching
> courses in business schools about what *not* to do. And these will be the
> years referred to in the books.
>

Assuming it stays glued together another 50 years.

1489. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 01:13:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F40288D.8070704@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74904

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:9829b709.0308170942.5bb877f9@posting.google.com...
>
>>>And history runs counter also. No coders have mostly stayed away from
>>
>>ARRL , and that seems unlikely to change anytime soon. They just don't
>>see much in it for them.
>
>
> Dick,
>
> Did you (or the ARRL Board of Directors, more importantly)
> EVER CONSIDER the POSSIBILITY that the nocoders are
> staying away from the ARRL (in droves) because they don't
> want to contribute dues to an organization that's been dedicated
> (and still is, by policy) to keep them off of HF???

Who on earth can tell? It's all speculation! When I was a tech, I wasn't a member of ARRL because it wasn't relevent to what I was doing. I joined after getting my General license. That may mean that you are right, or it may not. We are all acting on opinion here, and no hard data at all.

> If the ARRL would "get with it" and actively, openly support this
> inevitable change, rather than fighting to keep the nocoders off
> of HF until the bitter end, they might be able to restore the goodwill
> they've lost exactly because of their Morse policy ...

Do you think they have to cater to those who do not learn morse?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1490. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 01:20:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F402A21.4020904@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74905

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F3FE66C.3030906@adelphia.net...
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>
>>>I agree that the ARRL is "between a rock and a hard place" with respect
>>
> to
>
>>>the split in their existing membership.
>>
>>Very much so, I'd agree.
>>
>>
>>>However, outside of their membership
>>>(in the >75% of US hams who are NOT members of the ARRL), I believe
>>>that the demographic is heavily tilted towards the no code test side ...
>>
>>What makes you think this? I'm not trying to be a wise guy, but I agree
>>with you about the polls being self directing. Therefore are you
>>operating on gut feeling, what your friends tell you, or what?
>
>
> I'm going on what I hear from members, from clubs, from e-mails I
> get from folks, etc. I'm ALSO going on the demographic of all those
> nocode techs who could get on HF were it not for a stupid Morse
> requirement ... do you REALLY think they are "hot to learn Morse"???
> I don't ...

Okay, it's speculation. I guess it depends on who you hang out with. I
know a lot of people who don't like the idea of dropping the
requirement. And most of the tech's I know are pretty happy with their
lot in life. Just a comparison.

>
>>>thus,
>>>I believe that the ARRL stands to pick up more members than they stand
>>>to lose if they take a position that it's time for Morse testing to go.
>>
>>It remains to be seen. Those for who the Morse test is too much trouble
>>may not be bothered to join the ARRL either.
>
>

> ARRL membership provides a lot of benefits through QST, the website,
> and all of the good things they DO do for amateur radio. However, selling
> those benefits is difficult when the prospective buyer is someone who knows
> his/her membership dues are going to an organization that's dedicated by
> current policy to keep them off of HF ... it doesn't take Einstein or a
> Gallup poll to figure that one out ...

But they really do benefit the tech's also, Of course that all depends
on the level of interest in amateur radio to begin with. Whether they
are interested in the VHF or HF/MF aspect. Those are pretty much
different worlds.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1491. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 01:43:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308171743.689f3e22@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74906

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<cWQ%a.26528$Vx2.12035330@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0308171004.48cdd97a@posting.google.com...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:<TzM%a.26441$Vx2.11964873@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > > news:IfM%a.97$6e5.29598@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > > >
> > > > I agree that the ARRL is "between a rock and a hard place" with
> respect to
> > > > the split in their existing membership. However, outside of their
> > > > membership
> > > > (in the >75% of US hams who are NOT members of the ARRL), I believe
> > > > that the demographic is heavily tilted towards the no code test side
> ...
> > > > thus,
> > > > I believe that the ARRL stands to pick up more members than they stand
> > > > to lose if they take a position that it's time for Morse testing to
> go.
> > > > (Not
> > > > Morse use, not taking away spectrum where Morse can be used, just the
> > > > test requirement ...)
> > > >
> > > You believe but have NO data of any kind. Sorry but that doesn't fly.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> > The ARRL would be wise to sit this one out for the very reasons that
> > Carl has listed.
> >
> > So where is your data (of any kind), Dee?
>
> Data on what specifics of the issue? eHam and ARRL have had surveys within
> the past year that contradict Carl's statement. And I've already listed
> these sources several times before. Must I keep repeating myself?

Of course you must. We had to address and readdress all those Morse
Myths time after time, day after day, year after year.

As an ARRL member, I've yet to see them repeat the debacle that they
tried to pass off as a legitimate survey prior to the last
restructuring. Please tell me what issue it was published in and I'll
look it up.

As for eHam, I'm sorry but I've never heard of them.

> You are getting my statements mixed up other peoples. I have already
> referenced the current data on ARRL membership, ham radio membership,
> surveys on Morse code, etc. I then stated that the ARRL may very well be
> wise to not take a stance on the issue

That is correct.

since the split is roughly even and
> no matter what stance they take, a significant number of hams will probably
> be dissatisfied.

What is "roughly?" 70/30?

> Carl has stated that most hams want Morse testing to go away and has
> provided no data to support that. I and others have pointed out that the
> data that does exist contradicts his "belief". These are the recent surveys
> done on the various ham radio sites.

Is this one of those surveys where you can click and click and click?

1492. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 01:43:10 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030817214310.21232.00000044@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 74907

In article <20030815175106.00545.00000019@mb-m02.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0308140938.e2260e1@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:<3F3A5AAC.8080401@psu.edu>...
>>> N2EY wrote:
>>> > In article <3F32C3E8.7050809@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
>><mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>>> > writes:
>>
>>> >>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>> >>>In article <qK_Wa.2427$lL.391902@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>>> >>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>>> >>>>What WILL be the end of ham radio is a lack of significant
>>> >>>>growth ...
>>
>>> >>>Let's get it straight - is dropping Element 1 going to give us lots
>more
>>> >>>growth or not?
>>
>>> >> I don't understand a few of the things Carl says here. That we will
>>> >>dissapear unless we get "significant growth".
>>
>>> > There are more US hams today than at any time in the past.
>>
>>> >> What exactly is that? a 100 percent increase in a day? increase at 1
>>> >>percent over population increase?
>>
>>> > That's what I've been asking.
>>
>>> >> I'd like to know the advances they will bring.
>>
>>> > Similar to what newcomers have always brought.
>>
>>> >> I want to hear how those who oppose the ending of the Morse code
>>> >>requirement are keeping ham radio from marching forward.
>>
>>> >> Time for the roadmap to the future to be laid out.
>>

>>> > Don't hold yer breath waiting;-)
>>
>>> >> Or is this like the last scene in "The Candidate"?
>>
>>> > Refresh my memory on that one, Mike.
>>
>>> The Candidate is a pretty good film about an idealistic fellow, (Robert
>
>>> Redford) the son of a former Governor, who gets caught up in running for
>>> office after being prodded by the local political machinery. Along the
>>> way, he compromises most all of his values (all that is not relevant to
>>> the case at hand. But in the end, after being elected to office, amongst
>>> the victory celebration, he looks to his campaign manager (Peter Boyle -
>>> Haw) completely confused, and asks "What do we do now?" He was
>>> completely lost and didn't know what to do.
>>
>>Sounds pretty familiar.....
>>>
>>> My point is that I see a close relationship between that ending and the
>
>>> situation we have here. No real thought has been given to the aftermath
>>> of the ending of the Morse code test.
>>
>>Some of us have given it real thought, and have posted ideas. But the
>>mantra has always been that eliminating the code test would solve
>>everything.
>
> YOU ARE MISTAKEN.

About what?
>
> Unless that was YOUR twisted "mantra."
>
Nope. Not mine.

> It could be...you equate morse code with amateur radio so strongly
> that you can't separate them, even in your imagination.

My main interest in amateur radio is HF Morse/CW operation, and designing, building, aligning, maintaining and restoring equipment to do so. I have other interests in amateur radio, too.

Others have different interests in amateur radio than I. They do their thing, I do mine.

But we are all radio amateurs.

You, Len, are not a radio amateur. Nor have you ever been one. Your sole interests seem to be in a few newsgroups.

>>> Those who do not believe that, that is to say that a Morse code test is
>>> a desirable thing, or those who want the writtens to be reflective of a

>>> fair degree of competence, have an uphill battle, and at the moment are
>>> regarded as the losers.
>>
>>Not by everyone.
>
> The VEC Question Pool Committee is open to input. They are the ones
> who ORIGINATE questions and answers.

Anyone can originate questions and answers for the pools, and submit them to
the QPC.

However, changes the syllabus, testing methods, or other requirements require
FCC rules changes that are beyond QPC authority.
>
>>Looking back on the history, however, shows that license requirements
>>are only one factor - and probably not as major a factor as some would
>>have us believe. What really matters is the interest and drive of the
>>person involved. Some people will learn just enough to pass the test
>>and then shut down, forgetting most of what they "learned" in a short
>>time. Others will go far beyond the test levels. It's all a choice.
>
> "Interest and drive." :-)

Yes, interest and drive. Those are good things, Len.
>
> That equates to "laziness" and other negative moral/ethical things?

Nope. Laziness is the opposite. Laziness is not a good thing.
>
>>"Radio" and "electronics" are such wide-ranging subjects that nobody
>>can be an expert at all of it.
>
> You aren't an "expert" in radio-electronics?

Nope. I don't claim to be an expert at anything. I challenge you to find a post
where I have called myself an expert.
>
> Gosh, and you "DO electrical engineering."

Yep. For a living. Since at least 1976.

> With a Masters degree, too!

That's right. BSEE from the University of Pennsylvania, MaSEE from Drexel
University.

Where is our degree from, Len?

>>... And even the most knowledgeable "radio
>>professionals" can be utterly clueless about the practical aspects of
>>amateur radio.
>
> HARF!!! :-)

Do try to control yourself.

>>Here are some others I've seen, by various others:
>>
>>- Institute an age requirement of 14 years as the minimum for any
>>class of amateur license
>
> Yeah...let's hear it for all those "mature" 6-year-olds on the air
> wiith the "big gun contesters."

Your behavior here is often less mature than that of a typical six-year-old,
Len ;-)

Can you name any problems caused by the licensing of young children in the ARS?
Violations by them?
>
> Wow, that 14-year-old arbitrary limit sure must have stung you!

Not me. I'm 49.

Did you know that the 1996 READEX survey commissioned by the ARRL showed that
the age group that was most procodetest was the 24-and-younger group? 85%
procodetest, 15% nocodetest. The hams of the future...
>
>>- Eliminate all subbands-by-mode
>
> Blasphemy! Morsemen DESERVE elitism and their own private
> spectral playpen!

Sounds good to me. I say the FCC should make at least the lower 15% of each HF
amateur band CW-only.

Right now, the only amateur CW-only subbands are on VHF.

Would you rather eliminate the CW/data subbands, Len?
>
>>- Reduce the number of license classes to one all-privs license.
>
> Horrors! Remove the STATUS-TITLE-RANK-PRIVELEGE?!?!?
>
> Can't have that!
>
>>- Reduce the number of license classes to two - entry and all-privs.
>
> The OLD system - the one in which you triumphed - is ALWAYS
> the BEST!!!

Where do you get that idea?
>
>>You get the idea.
>
> Absolutely. Keep your elite morseman status and titles...after all
> you are in the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service!

No, I'm in the Amateur Radio Service. Since 1967.

You are not. You never have been.
>
>>> The PCTA's, because of their being so negative, and scaring the new
>>> people away?
>>
>>"Negative"? We're not "negative" - we're FOR something!
>
> What you are FOR is to keep your rank-title-status-privilege and you
> don't want that "contaminated" by large-scale changes.

Nothing could be further from the truth.
>
>>Meanwhile, the real challenges don't get the spotlight. Like CC&Rs -
>>what good are licenses if we cannot put up effective antennas?
>
> What good are you that can't give in to new ideas, progressive ideas,
> that intefere with your standards and practices of the 1930s?

I don't give in to bad ideas. And my standards and practices are those of
today.

You live too much in the past, Len.

N2EY

1493. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 01:59:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308171759.6b41b49f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74908

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F3FEBE6.105A3225@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3EE791.79F57C60@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3D2BC4.5C421A33@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3C58F1.86EDE9C2@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F37AFDE.6D3406E4@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F301FE3.951681BE@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > > > > > > > > Please quote that "may share space" FCC document.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Please quote the "Farnsworth Exam at 13-15wpm is the same as the Morse
> > > > > > > > > > > Exam at 5wpm" FCC document.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > That's totally irrelevant to the discussion at hand.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Why?
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > ...because the Farnsworth method was not under discussion. It is
> > > > > > > > > > > irrelevant to the request made of you.
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > I thought the existence of FCC documents were now part of the
> > > > > > > > > > discussion. At least you broght it up.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Tell you what David, in the future put your comments that are not open
> > > > > > > > > > for discussion in brackets [xxx].
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > OK?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > It'd be easier if you just stuck to the matter being discussed.
> > > > > > > >

> > > > FCC documents that don't exist?
> > >
> > > We were discussing one of those--the one which uses the words "may share
> > > space".
> > >
> > Why do existing FCC documents have to comply to your specific choice
> > of words?
>
> Actually, you chose the words.

I may have, I may not have.

> > Why must we discuss documents which don't exist?
>
> You brought up "FCC documents which don't exist".

The documents exist. They're called "Part 97."

> > You must share space with Carl. It is as simple as that.
>
> It is entirely likely that Carl and I will never have to share space on
> the ham bands. We may or may not share space. Why are you having
> troubles with the concept?

You are the one who abhors the concept of sharing space with Carl.

Isn't he worthy?

> > > > > > > > Farnsworth exists as the de facto "code" exam, even though the
> > > > > > > > FCC documents specify Morse Code. Yet the FCC documents DO assign the
> > > > > > > > exact same priveleges to Carl that they do you, yet you insist on
> > > > > > > > arguing it.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > What doest it have to do with the FCC's "may share space" document?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Part 97 addresses your and Carls priveleges.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > It certainly does.
> > > > >
> > > > > You implied that it didn't.
> > > >
> > > > No, Brian. Your attempts at reading between the lines often gets you
> > > > into trouble with understanding what has actually been written.
> > >
> > So which is it, again? May or May Not?
>
> I've already given you an answer. You didn't care for it.

You give many answers. Most are nonsense. May and May Not are nonsense answers.

> > > > So? We weren't discussing installing towers within
> > > > > a certain distance from an airport but that's in Part 97.
> > > >

> > > > Yes, it is. Do you live near an airport?
> > >
> > > We weren't discussing that.
> >
> > Then kindly put the topics which you bring up, but are not open for
> > discussion inside brackets, i.e., [So? We weren't discussing
> > installing towers within
> > a certain distance from an airport but that's in Part 97].
>
> I mentioned something in Part 97 that was not under discussion and you
> ask me a question relating to it. Now you need brackets. Whew!

Then why mention it if its not open for discussion?

> > > > > > > > That would make you a fool.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I'd guess the fool to be one who is asked about a regulation about
> > > > > > > > "sharing space" and responds with some nonsense about the Farnsworth
> > > > > > > > method of learning morse.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > You don't believe in sharing space which the FCC says you must share
> > > > > > > > in a document called Part 97.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I've never stated that I don't believe in sharing space.
> > > > > > That's something you've tried to establish.
> > > >
> > > > That's something that you implied, with "he may not."
> > >
> > > Incorrect, little electrolyte. If I write "It may rain or it may not",
> > > the words do not imply that I don't believe in rain.
> >
> > It implies that you don't know if its going to rain.
>
> Again, it does not imply that I don't believe in rain.

Never said it did. Please stay on topic.

I may share
> space with Carl and I may not.

You must.

The previous sentence does not indicate
> that I don't believe in sharing space.

It indicates that you reject the concept of sharing space with Carl.

> > Besides, we were not discussing your beliefs. We were discussing your
> > and Carl's priveleges. He has the same priveleges as you, regardless
> > of your beliefs on the matter.
>
> I've understood the matter of privileges all along.

Then you know that you must share.

I don't believe
> Carl will be using all of his.

Do you think he'll avoid 440 - 450 MHz?

1494. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 02:01:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308171801.d11f85b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74909

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308171226.40d01d48@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308171007.511d99de@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308131259.68a78fae@posting.google.com>...
> > > averyfine@aol.com (AveryFine) wrote in message
news:<20030813070822.22063.00000604@mb-m07.aol.com>...
> > > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>
> > > > > Why do you let Len Anderson's postings here bother you, Steve Robeson? Have you
> > > > > not noticed that his pattern of behavior is designed to elicit angry responses
> > > > > from you?
> > >
> > > Because I do not well tolerate pathological liars.
> >
> > You don't tolerate anonymous posters, either.
> >
> > Or do you?
>
> Since I know who it is, he is not anonymous.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

You can thank me for the introduction anytime.

73, Brian

1495. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 02:55:24 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <ReX%a.15145$yl6.1259@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74910
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhp28lmnn1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:vd3ujv8tu6ft9t47vk49364nrqm24knl08@4ax.com...
> > On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 04:39:40 +0100, "Steve Terry"
> > <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote:
> > >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > >news:bhgsoi$9nq$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
<snip>
> > We do not transport people suspected of a crime to a military prison
> > camp in one of our off-shore colonies and keep them incarcerated there
> > for a year or more without trial. I can think of a country that
> > does.
> > 73 de G3NYY
> > Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com
>
> I agree with Walt. The USA needs to stop putting these enemies in a camp.
> What we should do is just shoot them on site.
> Dan/W4NTI
>
It would be more honest, and be what's expected of Americans

It's worrying, if the British are supposed to be Americas conscience,
what would they get up to without us ! ;-(

Steve Terry

1496. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 03:01:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030817230156.22081.00000042@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 74912

In article <BB653A45.24627%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

> If those with your views continue to deride modern Ham Radio, perhaps even
>less then 2 percent. Those changes are part of Ham Radio today. If you
>belittle those changes, you belittle today's Ham Radio.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dwight:

Belittling ham radio? Moi??? Hmmm, you may have a point there. Now that ham radio licensing requirements in the U.S. have been reduced to insignificance, and are about to be made a whole lot less significant when code testing is abolished, I guess one could make the point that there is a lot "belittleable" about ham radio these days! We are about to start the first "generation" of hams who have never been bothered to learn the Morse code, and will never know the benefits and advantages of the Morse/CW mode from personal operational experience. Now THERE's a perfect example of something that would inspire one to "belittle" ham radio, indeed!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1497. Re: Words of "Wisdom???" from Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 03:01:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030817230157.22081.00000043@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 74911

In article <3F3FB5BF.3521FDB7@yahoo.moc>, Scott Unit 69
<scott_unit_69@yahoo.moc> writes:

>With all your trolling, how do you find time for radio?

Kim has stated many times that she is not actively involved in ham
radio, therefore she would seem to have unlimited time for trolling.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1498. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 03:11:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB65BC75.2471C%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74913

"WA3IYC" wrote:
>
> That 52,990 "increase" is not all new license
> issues. (snip)
>
> (snip) How "code proficient" any amateur is
> cannot be determined from license class alone.

Of course, Jim. I clearly stated my numbers were a "rough estimate."

> The important point is that the number of US hams
> is growing at a slow rate. Restructuring did not
> result in a big change in growth. (snip)

True. However, to make something out of that, one has to eliminate all factors outside restructuring. In my last message, I hinted at factors such as the attitude of current operators towards those new to ham radio. Today's new operator faces more ridicule and harassment than perhaps any new operator in the history of this activity. And lets face it, that new operator is not likely going to invite friends or family members to join after an negative exchange with Larry in this newsgroup (or someone like him here or elsewhere). Clearly, the attitude of current operators has a role to play in the lackluster growth of ham radio today, perhaps even far more than restructuring at this point.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1499. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 03:14:20 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <BwX%a.15151$yl6.5469@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74914
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:je70kvs4jshf5e3cj133rjggltkdaphoco@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 18:34:42 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >We don't have a colonial view on anybody. We made that mistake with the
> >Phillipines and Puerto Rico. And we still can't get rid of Puerto Rico.
>
> And the US Virgin Islands. And Guantanamo Bay. And Guam. And
> numerous other Pacific islands (many of which were used for nuclear
> testing).
> 73 de G3NYY
> Walt Davidson
>
Not forgetting what was British Honduras, and all the unsinkable aircraft
carriers like RAF Lakenheath and hundreds of other countries airfields around
the world

Steve Terry

1500. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 03:16:42 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <PyX%a.15152$yl6.7247@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74915
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:i5tvjvckmnkcct2cop244jd9cbsriefoh7@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 21:30:27 +0100, Ged <Ged73@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk>
> wrote:
>
> >What a pity, Steve. We could do with more knowledge about the effects of
> >in-breeding.
>
> I think inbreeding is the last thing you could accuse them of!
> Another generation and they will all be coffee-coloured!
> 73 de G3NYY
> Walt Davidson
>
That's what impressed me most about the US, just how many interracial couples I
saw
It truly is a melting pot, we could learn a thing or two from them.

Steve Terry

1501. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 03:24:06 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F4046D6.D6294DED@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74917

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3FEBE6.105A3225@earthlink.net>...
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3EE791.79F57C60@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3D2BC4.5C421A33@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3C58F1.86EDE9C2@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F37AFDE.6D3406E4@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F301FE3.951681BE@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> Please quote that "may share space" FCC document.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> Please quote the "Farnsworth Exam at 13-15wpm is the same as the
Morse
> Exam at 5wpm" FCC document.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> That's totally irrelevant to the discussion at hand.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> Why?
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> ...because the Farnsworth method was not under discussion. It is
> irrelevant to the request made of you.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> I thought the existence of FCC documents were now part of the
> discussion. At least you broght it up.
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > >
> Tell you what David, in the future put your comments that are not open
> for discussion in brackets [xxx].
> > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > > >

> > > > > > > OK?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > It'd be easier if you just stuck to the matter being discussed.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > FCC documents that don't exist?
> > > > >
> > > > > We were discussing one of those--the one which uses the words "may share
> > > > > space".
> > > >
> > > > Why do existing FCC documents have to comply to your specific choice
> > > > of words?
> > >
> > > Actually, you chose the words.
> >
> > I may have, I may not have.

That bird won't fly. Your words appear with attribution above.

> > > Why must we discuss documents which don't exist?
> > >
> > > You brought up "FCC documents which don't exist".
> >
> > The documents exist. They're called "Part 97."

Then why are you prattling on about documents which don't exist?

> > > You must share space with Carl. It is as simple as that.
> > >
> > > It is entirely likely that Carl and I will never have to share space on
> > > the ham bands. We may or may not share space. Why are you having
> > > troubles with the concept?
> >
> > You are the one who abhors the concept of sharing space with Carl.

You keep making statements similar to this one yet I've not made such a
statement.

> Isn't he worthy?

If he isn't, it would have nothing to do with class of license.

> > > > > > > > > Farnsworth exists as the de facto "code" exam, even though the
> > > > > > > > > FCC documents specify Morse Code. Yet the FCC documents DO assign the
> > > > > > > > > exact same priveleges to Carl that they do you, yet you insist on
> > > > > > > > > arguing it.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > What doest it have to do with the FCC's "may share space" document?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Part 97 addresses your and Carls priveleges.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > It certainly does.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You implied that it didn't.

> > > >
> > > > No, Brian. Your attempts at reading between the lines often gets you
> > > > into trouble with understanding what has actually been written.
> > >
> > > So which is it, again? May or May Not?
> >
> > I've already given you an answer. You didn't care for it.
>
> You give many answers. Most are nonsense. May and May Not are nonsense answers.

...or they appear that way to you due to your reading comprehension
difficulties.

> > > > > So? We weren't discussing installing towers within
> > > > > > a certain distance from an airport but that's in Part 97.
> > > > >
> > > > > Yes, it is. Do you live near an airport?
> > > >
> > > > We weren't discussing that.
> > >
> > > Then kindly put the topics which you bring up, but are not open for
> > > discussion inside brackets, i.e., [So? We weren't discussing
> > > installing towers within
> > > a certain distance from an airport but that's in Part 97].
> >
> > I mentioned something in Part 97 that was not under discussion and you
> > ask me a question relating to it. Now you need brackets. Whew!
>
> Then why mention it if its not open for discussion?

Your problem is reading comprehension. The term was used as an example
of things we were not discussing.

> > > > > > > > > That would make you a fool.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > I'd guess the fool to be one who is asked about a regulation about
> > > > > > > > > > "sharing space" and responds with some nonsense about the Farnsworth
> > > > > > > > > > method of learning morse.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > You don't believe in sharing space which the FCC says you must share
> > > > > > > > > in a document called Part 97.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I've never stated that I don't believe in sharing space.
> > > > > > > > That's something you've tried to establish.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > That's something that you implied, with "he may not."
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Incorrect, little electrolyte. If I write "It may rain or it may not",
> > > > > > the words do not imply that I don't believe in rain.
> > > >
> > > > It implies that you don't know if its going to rain.

> >
> > Again, it does not imply that I don't believe in rain.
>
> Never said it did. Please stay on topic.

I'm right on target, Brian.

Carl may or may not share space with me.
It may or may not rain.

Neither sentence implies disbelief on my part.

> I may share
> > space with Carl and I may not.
>
> You must.

I haven't shared space with him yet.

> > The previous sentence does not indicate
> > that I don't believe in sharing space.
>
> It indicates that you reject the concept of sharing space with Carl.

It may or may not rain. Rejection of the concept of rain is not
indicated. Work on your reading comprehension.

> > > Besides, we were not discussing your beliefs. We were discussing your
> > > and Carl's priveleges. He has the same priveleges as you, regardless
> > > of your beliefs on the matter.
> >
> > I've understood the matter of privileges all along.
>
> Then you know that you must share.

It hasn't happened so far.

> I don't believe
> > Carl will be using all of his.
>
> Do you think he'll avoid 440 - 450 MHz?

Nope. Besides, he'd need one helluva signal for us to share space there.
Oddly enough, I have no difficulty working stations in his area on 432.

Dave K8MN

1502. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 03:25:59 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <bHX%a.174$6e5.38134@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74916

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:6XT%a.102645$_R5.37919362@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:4NT%a.142$6e5.34942@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> >
> > "DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> > news:9829b709.0308170942.5bb877f9@posting.google.com...
> > >> And history runs counter also. No coders have mostly stayed away from
> > > > ARRL , and that seems unlikely to change anytime soon. They just don't
> > > > see much in it for them.
> > >
> > > Dick,
> > >
> > > Did you (or the ARRL Board of Directors, more importantly)
> > > EVER CONSIDER the POSSIBILITY that the nocoders are
> > > staying away from the ARRL (in droves) because they don't
> > > want to contribute dues to an organization that's been dedicated
> > > (and still is, by policy) to keep them off of HF???
> >
> > That's odd, Carl. I used the ARRL CD's to prepare for Element 1. When I
had
> > specific questions, league employees responded promptly via e-mail with
> > helpful answers.
> >
> > To this young (...and then no-code Technician class.) newbie, the ARRL
> > actually appeared very dedicated to helping me get ON HF.

Yes, IF you were willing to meet their criteria by jumping through the
Morse code hoop ...

Carl - wk3c

1503. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 03:26:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB65C00A.2471E%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74918

"Brian Kelly" wrote:

> (snip) Never mind, you're either dumber than
> a box of rocks or an almost decent troll. I
> rather suspect the former. (snip)

Excuse me? You posted a message speculating that the current power outages will hinder BPL and I responded with my opinion that the power outages will more likely be used to support BPL. To that, you respond with the garbage above. You really need to learn some basic manners, Brian.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1504. Re: <expletive deleted> High-el needs to learn the definition of stalking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 03:54:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F404DED.D6133671@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74919

Dave_High-el_is_an_ASSHOLE wrote:
>
> Oh, <expletive deleted>, you need to learn the proper definitions of stalking you <expletive deleted>.

> You don't try to contact Len Over 21's or Carl Stevenson's or Kim's > police chief do you?

Why no, Roger. Apparently it is difficult for you to understand their typical posts compared to your own.

> You don't go to their local ARES meetings to try to harass them, do > you?

Why, Roger, "your" local ARES meetings are my local ARES meetings. You signed on for membership the same evening as I did. The only difference is, you haven't been back.

> The only reason you do is because Wiseman resides in the same county
> as you do...it all probably stems from the fact you look like Baby
> Huey and ran to the teacher in school whenever your stupidiy and
> appearance were made fun of...and from most indications, this was > quite frequent.

That's quite a statement, Roger. So I attend ARES meetings because you live in this county? Maybe you believe that you live in the same county because you believe I had difficulty in school. I'm sure you'll issue a correction.

> You have just proven that you are a whining, Anti_American, facist > <expletive deleted>.

How has that been proven--by your peculiar notion that we attended the same meeting?

> Now, go to school, FATASS:

Sorry, I've finished my schooling.

> From WV Code ï¿½61-2-9a Stalking; hrassment; penalties; definitions
> (a)Any person who willfully and repeatedly follows and harasses a > person with whom he or she has or in the past has had or he or she > seeks to establish a personal or social relationship<...>

That's nice. We haven't had a personal or social relationship and I don't wish to have one.

> <expletive deleted> High-el, NOBODY wants to have _any_ kind of > relationship with you......unless they're your desperate wife or gay > lover Bertie,

Oh, that's silly, Roger. I have numerous social relationships here, in other parts of this state, in other states and in other countries.

How would you know about any of them?

> I don't want one now, in the past or in the future, but you still try > to suppress the freedom of speech in which you are told that YOU ARE > AN <expletive deleted>.

I'm sure you don't mind that I've suggested for anyone who is interested to check out both Google's web and newsgroup search engines for examples of your "free speech". Searches under "Roger Wiseman", "KC8JBO" or "AB8MQ" will yield an abundance of examples.

> Nobody has made credible threats to you, although the reverse cannot be said, eh:
>
> Date: Fri, 20 April 2001 12:48:25 +0000
> From: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
> Reply-To: Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
> Subject: Re: Steven Spielburg qiuts BSA over discrimination
> To: KC8JBO <rmmcall@cotse.com>
>
> Roger,
>
> Would you like to see some of your best newsgroup material posted on
> utility poles in your immediate neighborhood?
>
> Dave K8MN

I've already reposted our exchanges earlier, Roger. Your filth led to the ruin of the rec.radio.amateur.misc newsgroup. Your absence after getting the boot from a couple of ISP's was a breath of fresh air. My comment to you was not a threat, it was a question. After all, your usenet posts are already public.

> Not to mention how you run to your neighbor's houses, phone booths in > restaurants, etc. and call Wiseman......

That's absurd. If you have any proof of such activity, take it to the local authorities.

> <continuing>
> (1) "Harasses" means willful conduct directed at a specific person or > persons which would cause a reasonable person mental injury or > emotional distress.

You already came with the mental injury and emotional distress. Google knows. Your bilious vile in usenet was present before I returned to the U.S.

By the way, did you realize that the material you quoted above fits you to a tee? You've posted outright fabrications about any number of people. If they ever got together on this stuff, you could go away for a long time.

Dave K8MN

1505. Re: The Morse Code Requirement - Is It Really The Reason People Turn Away?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 04:32:25 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <c7c76d94750db705f594210dc6855782@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 74920

```
In article <bhm8p6$g9d$0@pita.alt.net>
"Poor Wogie" <Woger@PoWittleWogie.com> wrote:

Poor lisping homosexual...poor lisping homosexual..... poor suckboy posting from altopia.

>
>
> "An Metet" <anmetet@liberty.gmsociety.org> wrote in message
> news:d2536d0a9d0f4cc0e6a08e7165f74e02@aonymous.poster...
> > NOTICE: This message may not have been sent by the Sender Name
> > above. Always use cryptographic digital signatures to verify
> > the identity of the sender of any usenet post or e-mail.
> >
> > THE ASSHOLE <3F37B75A.D47CAEF1@earthlink.net>
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > "privacy.at Anonymous Remailer" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > In article <3F2DC086.A0898140@earthlink.net>
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > JMBCV wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > In article <3F2C9682.FFEC97A8@earthlink.net>
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Vshah101 wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > From (Larry Roll K3LT):
>
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > I'm involved in a county group which is part of ARES.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Feh. You've attended only one meeting..and just to harass and
> stalk another ham, ASSHOLE.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Why, Roger Wiseman! Fancy you slithering from beneath your bed to
> make
> > > > >
> > > > > Why Dave High-el, imagine you stopping downloading kiddie porn to
```

> answer a post.....
> > >
> > > I do no such thing, Roger.
> >
> > That's not what your hard drive contents says.....
> >
> > > What is your fixation with child pornography?
> >
> > What is your fixation with turning the argument around like a fucking
> woman? You download kiddie porn, your hard drive has a gig of it on there.
> Tell us all of your radio accomplishments....tel us more lies, Goatblower
> High-el.
> >
> > > > > yet another anonymous post.
> > > >
> > > > If this is anonymous, how do you know who sent it, dumbass?
> > >
> > > Roger:
> >
> > Dicksucking Dave: You are a stupid fuck. You cannot prove who wrote this,
> even if you give deep throat to all the law enforcement in inbred Marshall
> county.
> >
> > > "Duuuuh,
> >
> > Your "Duhhh!" is about the extent of your conversation, ASSHOLE, why don't
> you try making sense?
> >
> >
> > > how'd you know it was me"?
> >
> > Poor High-el the goatblower and kiddie porn downloader, so
> desperate......thinks everybody posting anon is Wiseman. But that fits with
> his narrow-minded and paranoid mindset.
> >
> >
> > > Shall we say that you have a
> > > rather unique writing style and that your topics of interest repeat
> > > themselves on a regular basis.
> >
> > And no class, no style Dicksucking Dave High-el, jealous of those who has
> style...pulls another theory out of his fatass.
> > Dumbass Dave's Rule #1: Everybody who attacks me or disagrees with me is
> Wiseman...
> >
> > > > > I've attended a number of meetings and
> > > > > functions, Roger.
> > > >
> > > > Guess you had to suck off Bertie Garcia one way or another, eh,
> ASSHOLE?

> > >
> > > No, Roger.
> >
> > Feh, sure, dicksucking Dave....that why you and your equally odorous lover
> were giggling like two schoolgirls from all reports?
> >
> > > What is your fixation with homosexuality?
> >
> > What's the matter, fat, smelly, homosexual Dave afraid his secret is out?
> Maybe Leila will grease up her strap-on and use it on you as you suck off
> Bertie. You know you told Wiseman that's what you liked to do when you sat
> on that goodwill donated couch...as you and your gay lover bertie sat and
> giggled.
> >
> > >
> > > > > I'm told that you only came to the one meeting.
> > > > >
> > > > > I'm told you shouldn't stalk other hams like you do, kiddie diddler.
> > > >
> > > > It is peculiar that one who has posted numerous untruths about others
> > > > would consider himself to be a stalking victim.
> >
> > Pot..Kettle..black, Dumbfuck High-el......maybe you can tell us all about
> your messenger boy job as a courier again...give us some more lies...you
> tell lies about posters on here all the time, High-el.
> >
> > > What is your fixation on sex with children?
> >
> > Why is your only tactic similar to Pee Wee Heman's? Is it beacuse you're
> so fucking dense and narrow-minded that you just have to give the impression
> that you are a megalomaniac?
> >
> >
> > > > > By the way, I'd go very carefully on that stalking stuff, Rog.
> You've
> > > > > frequently harrassed me here and in direct e-mails.
> > > > >
> > > > > Awww, poor Dicksucking Davey.......you stalked Rog as well, because
> the only reason you came to the ARES meeting to confront him, and let's not
> forget how you were going to break the law by posting his "best newsgroup
> material" on telephone poles in Rog's neighborhood.
> > >
> > > What is your fixation with homosexual activity, Roger?
> >
> >
> > So defensive, homosexual Davey? That's all right, you can pretend your
> marriage to the finnish mail-order whale is not a sham.
> >
> >
> > > Bert and I attended an ARES meeting at the invitation of the Emergency

> > > Coordinator for purposes of joining.
> >
> > That why you practically held hands and made loving eyes at each other? Oh
> maybe you gave each other the reach around before you got there that might
> explain the peculiar smell along with both of yours' body odor.
> >
> > > I think you've gotten your wires crossed on the breaking of law, Roger.
> >
> > I think you've been caught, Dicksucking Dave. I think you need to locate
> the law that prohibits you from putting posters on telephone poles, because
> American Electric Power (who supplies the power in your area) might just
> want to prosecute.
> >
> > >You were asked if you'd be proud to have your wife, mother or children
> > > see some of your handiwork. You were asked if you thought your
> >
> > I was? Looks like you asked Wiseman, who I'm sure would report your
> tacking up of posters of such things to the proper authorities....he made
> sure AEP got a copy of your letter saying you were going to do that.
> >
> > > neighbors would enjoy seeing some of your memorable posts tacked to
> > > telephone poles in the neighborhood. I can post my exact comments and
> > > your sparkling reply here if you feel that would set the record
> > > straight.
> >
> > You mean the reply where Wiseman told you to fuck off?
> Bwhahahahahaha!!!!!!!! Did it make widdle Davey so mad?
> >
> >
> > > After all, you seemed to think enough of your numerous
> > > newsgroup postings to post them in this very public venue.
> >
> > Awww, don't cry, you are the one who made the threats, dumbfuck...Wiseman
> only posted them...lol!!!!! How does it feel to be a fucking retard, baby
> huey High-el?
> > You pull that "goggle" thing with posters here you don't like, like Lenny
> and whomever else disagrees with the overbearing gasbag known as Dave
> High-el.
> >
> >
> > > > > You have an arrest
> > > > >
> > > > I do? Prove it.......
> > >
> > > It is public record,
> >
> > Prove that Wiseman has a criminal record, dicksplash.
> >
> > >Roger.
> >

> > Obession...well looks like the mental health people will want to know
> about this one.....
> >
> > > By the way, is this another <IKYABWAI>
> >
> > More likely it's a pathetic backpedal, just like you always do.
> >
> >
> > > > > record and you've been booted from a couple of ISP's.
> > > > >
> > > > Bwhahahahahahahaha....prove it, kiddie diddling Dave.
> > > >
> > > One note to OVIS should clear that one up.
> > >
> > Mwhahaha.....You mean you'll get told that Wiseman told that FATASSED HAG
> Pam Hoffer to go fuck herself and to quit giving Anthony those blowjobs in
> the server room????? Wiseman sent me a copy of the e-mail he sent cancelling
> his account there. And no, I won't post it because that's more your
> style...or lack thereof...<guffaw>
> >
> >
> > > What is your fixation with child sex?
> > >
> > Just want to converse in subjects you know so much about.
> >
> > > > > > You've been
> > > > > > cautioned for malicious QRMing on 20 meters and have been forced to
> > > > > > retest.
> > > > >
> > > > So some fake info was submitted and dumbfuck Riley believed it.......
> > > >
> > > Who Riley? The fake info was in the form of audio tape. I know the
> > > fellow who supplied it. I have no reason to disbelieve him and to
> > > believe your claim that it was "fake".
> > >
> > Lying for your friend? Or maybe he knows about your kiddie porn pics you
> try to sell.
> > Maybe he's another gay lover for you.....
> >
> > > > he still PASSED the "retest" it's doubtful you could as of today,
> ASSHOLE.
> > > >
> > > "He/you" passed.
> > >
> > Awww, a feat you couldn't do. And try harder..."He/you" <guffaw> couldn't
> pass the Technician class exam today if you were called in to retest. By
> your own admission you don't know a fucking thing about electronics.
> >
> >
> > > Whether I could or couldn't isn't an issue.

> >
> > Admission you couldn't pass, noted.
> >
> >
> > > I wasn't contacted and told that I needed to retest.
> >
> > In reviewing Wiseman's letter to retest, there's no reason given for it.
> Are you saying you speak for baldy and the FCC now?
> >
> > > There's been no enforcement
> > > action taken toward me in forty years.
> >
> > Liar. But before forty years is a different story, eh? Or maybe they just
> don't publish those letters like they do in the last couple of years or
> so....I'd say you did get letters.
> >
> > >
> > > > > > > > Most of the hams
> > > > > > > > involved are not interested in contesting or DXing. Many
> operate VHF FM
> > > > > > > > only. I don't know any who've designed and built a linear
> amplifier.
> > > > > > > > Only one other is interested in collecting and restoring vintage
> gear.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Yep, they are a clique of losers.....
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Oh yes, I neglected to mention that we have one dysfunctional
> individual
> > > > > > who exhibits sociopathic behavior on several levels. He frequently
> > > > >
> > > > > I wonder if the WV Medical board is aware of you practicing psychology
> without a degree in it or a license?
> > >
> > > Take it up with the board.
> >
> > Feh. And hear you whine again? You do enough whining in the newsgroup.
> >
> > > > > > haunts the rec.radio.amateur.misc and rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > > > > > newsgroups and posts irrelevant stream-of-consciousness filth
> (usually
> > > > > > unrelated to the thread topic. His over exhuberance has led him to
> the
> > > > > > malicious interference incidents on 20m.
> > > > >
> > > > > Poor Davey......the Lackland press release boy, the flunky who
> couldn't get/or was so fucking stupid he couldn't get a real job then after
> a piss poor service record, had to take a flunky courier job with the State
> department, until he was terminated.
> > >

> > > What is your fixation with Lackland AFB and my web page? I haven't been
> > > to Lackland in over thirty years. You know nothing of my service
> > > record. I have an honorable discharge from the military. You know
> > > nothing of my State Department service other than what you can glean
> > > from my web site or here.
> >
> > You sure are defensive about that piss-poor service and State department
> record. No wonder they fired you <translate: take an "early retirement" for
> your incompetence.>
> >
> > > > > Actually, Roger, the only real loser is you. You're hardly a
> clique.
> > > >
> > > > IKYABWAI, dicksucking Davey.....
> > >
> > > What is your obsession with homosexual oral sex?
> >
> > Just want to relate by talking about topics you're so well aware of?
> >
> > > > Actually, kiddiediddler High-el, how is it you had to get a mail order
> bride for yourself? Maybe it's you lack of personal cleanliness, as
> evidenced by the stench you had when you attened that meeting and your
> wrinkled clothes.
> > >
> > > What is your fixation on sex with children?
> >
> > I just want you to know that people know about you, kiddie diddling Dave?
> >
> > >
> > > I don't have a mail-order bride.
> >
> > No, you had to beg some finnish fat fuck to marry you, after using that
> mail-order bride service since you are too fucking ugly with your thick
> glasses to get an American woman.
> >
> > > I bathe on a regular basis and my
> > > clothing is washed and pressed. What is your fixation on body odor and
> > > wrinkled clothing?
> >
> > According to some fellow, you showed up smelling like dung with cheap
> cologne trying to mask it that didn't work and wrinkled clothing at an ARES
> meeting. Reportedly, they looked like they were not washed or pressed in a
> week. Although with today's fabrics, most clothes aren't pressed that much
> anymore. But somebody as backward looking as you wouldn't be expected to
> have modern things around..is that why you only run cheap-assed, old, used
> ham equipment?
> >
> > > > > > > I continue to attend. We interact
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Except the fact you fail to bathe regularly, you

> mean.......fuckstick.
> > >
> > > I don't recall your being here during shower time, Roger.
> >
> > If I want to see elephants bathe, I'll wait until the circus is in town.
> >
> > > > > It looks like your still battling that rare form of Tourette's
> Syndrome.
> > > >
> > > > Looks like you need to go to Hair Club For men and Jenny Craig.
> > >
> > > There's a hair club for Jenny Craig?
> >
> > No, you dumb fat fuck get some hair and lose some weight. Can't you
> fucking read?
> >
> > > Dave has a bad comb-over and his fat belly makes him look like he's
> > > about 8 months pregnant. Given this along with his wrinkled clothes that
> > > he looks like he slept in for a week, he makes such a good impression...
> > > > With that small skull he really looks like Baby Huey.
> > >
> > > Your powers of observation are lacking, Roger.
> >
> > Dance, baby huey, dance....
> >
> > > I have a full head of
> > > hair without even a hint of a bald spot.
> >
> > Liar. You have a bad comb over with totally grey hair.
> >
> >
> > > My hat size is 7 7/8 which is
> > > considered "Large". If you like, I can post a photo of the top of my
> > > head so that others won't engage in a "comb over" debate.
> >
> > Looks like you're quite defensive about your fat head, FATASS baby Huey
> High-el.
> >
> > >Why is any of this of interest to you, Roger?
> >
> > There you go with that obsession again...It's fun to see you dance, Davey
> the dancing bear.
> >
> > > > > > > >based on our common interests rather than the things which divide
> us.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Yeah, those common interests being not helping newer hams......
> > > > > >
> > > > > > How could you come to that conclusion?
> > > >

> > > > Unlike you, I don't pull my conclusions out of my ass, goat blower
> Davey.
> > >
> > > Where'd they come from then?
> >
> > Awww, can't face the truth about you and your asshole friends who won't
> help new hams, Davey?
> >
> > > > > You haven't been attending
> > > > > meetings.
> > > > >
> > > > When some new hams needed help, they didn't get it, fuckstick.
> > >
> > > Who <whaaaaaa!!!!!!!!!!!!!!>>>>.
> >
> >
> > Poor Davey........lend him a crying towel, willya?
> >
> >
> >
> > > > > > > > The other alternative is to start my own club. I tried it, but
> that was not too
> > > > > > > > successful.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > btw, fuck off, High-el.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > BTW, forwarded your stuff to Chief Stenger in Glen Dale. It is
> about
> > > > > > the only way to make a case against someone who has no interpersonal
> > > > > > skills.
> > > > >
> > > > BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHA....... you've said that ALL ALONG, DICKBREATH....
> > >
> > > Yes, I have. That's because, as you aware from being paid a number of
> > > visits, that is what I have been doing.
> >
> > Pussy....Nope, haven't heard a thing, and haven't been paid any visits,
> so you are talking out of your fat ass.
> >
> >
> > > What is your fixation with homosexual oral sex?
> >
> > Why does talking about your homosexuality bothers you so?
> >
> > > How would you, the non-Roger anonymous poster know
> > > anything about what I've said all along?
> >
> > Most people can read, dipshit. Unlike you, who skated along in school. You
> have no fucking idea how many people read this newsgroup do you?
> >

> >
> > >"Duuuh,
> >
> > There, there, Forrest Gump High-el, you can stalk your obsession some
> other time. And don't forget to boil those shrimp.
> >
> >
> > > > Maybe you need to give him another blowjob so he might pay attention
> > > > to you next time..haven't heard a thing from him though
> > >
> > > Is that how you write about your chief of police--a man who is on your
> > > city council?
> >
> > He's not my chief or councilman, you dumb fucking bastard. And since you
> ask, are you so un-American you want to censor freedom of speech? Looks like
> High-el has ties with the Taliban.....
> > Somebody needs to know.
> >
> > >
> > > > ....some
> > > > case, dickhead...... BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA...maybe it's because
> > I don't live in Glen Dale, Davey, not everybody who posts anon is your >
> obsession.
> > >
> > > Maniacal laughter aside,
> >
> > Oh, is that fatassed whale Leila feeding at the trough again?
> >
> > >Roger, is this another, "Duuuh, how'd you know
> > > > it was me"? Do you know how few anonymous posters post items about me
> > > > filled with nonsense rants about child pornography, sex with children,
> > > > homosexual oral sex, fixations with body odor and wrinkled apparel?
> >
> > Looks like it hit quite the nerve, you're either so rattled or so stupid
> or a combination, you're repeating yourself, dumbfuck. I'd go with the
> rattled theory, since you think everybody is Roger.
> >
> > > > > > Ta-Ta for now.
> > > > >
> > > > > Your not-so-Closeted homosexuality, noted.
> > > >
> > > > You fascination with homosexuality is noted.
> > >
> > Your denial of your pedophilia, noted.
> >
> >
> >
>
> Hey Dave, <slurp!!!>

As much as you want to have Dave suck you off, you are probably too old since he only like those that are underage.....
Looks like you'll have to go back to blowing winos behind the pizza shop dumpster.
Bwhahahahahaha......

1506. Re: Dear Norm: WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 04:53:13 UTC
From: Anonymous Sender <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com>
Message-ID: <8aceb3c5eb147e79e64fd0eeba83e717@remailer.metacolo.com>
Source record: 74921

THE ASSHOLE <3F37ABA0.B30E93C1@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> whined:
>
>
> Dave Heil wrote:
> >
> > Dear Norm:
> >
> > WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!
> > WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!
> >
> > Woger Wiseman is harassing me and making me feel like a little man, Norm...He's atacking me in newsgroups, etc again... I know I gave you a blowjob before but if I give you another one can I forward some more posts to you and we can meet behind the donut shop again? Can't you do something? I went to the ARES meeting to confront him, and he was so non-plussed he ignored me after awhile, and I even wore my best clothes (even though they were dirty and smelled) and I even used cheap cologne that the wife swiped from the samples counter....
> > WHAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!!!!!! WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!!!!!!!!
> >
> > I try to answer his posts even though I have the option of just ignoring or using a killfile on them...I guess the people at Lackland was correct they said High-el you are stupid.....
> >
> > WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!!!!! WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!!!!!
>
> You're now posing as me, Roger? It'd be real tough to killfile your

Pussy.... Cry, you fucking PUSSY. Nice of you to admit that you gave Stenger that blowjob.

> many anonymous remailer identities, Roger.

But you blustered that you would try to stop me from posting that way, looks like you are out of your league, situation normal, eh, baby huey? How that must make you look in the eyes of the newsgroup. The fatassed, radio "god" with the bad comb-over looking so desperate.

> Now you're using my e-mail
> address.

Don't cry fatass...you might actually have some clean clothes for a change.

> What, by the way, is your fixation on Lackland AFB? I haven't been
> there for over 32 years. I note your attraction to the material on my
> web site.

You mean that freshman attempt at a website. Nice of you to include info on that whore mommy Terry.
You mean where you were forced to be a press release boy because of your piss poor service record? High-el was in the brig more than out. You had a crappy job in 'nam that you fucked up and was sent back home to paper shuffle in the press release department. Then, after getting yet another early retirement you were a courier for the State Department, where you continued your pattern of fucking up on the job until they gave you yet another early retirement.

> Anyone interested in finding out more about Roger's activities can do a
> google web or newsgroup search on "Roger Wiseman", "KC8JBO" or "AB8MQ".

And they can google Dumbass Dave Heil's hostile and belligerent comments there as well. What about your comments to Carl Stevenson and Lenny,and let's not forget Kim, Dicksucking Davey?

> If you don't have strong stomach, skip it.

Not everybody has a sagging, bloated stomach like you do, ASSHOLE. Incidentally, Goatblower, try taking a fucking bath, you smell worse than those goats you blow out at your trailer in Cameron.

> Roger hasn't been exactly a credit to amateur radio either:
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/1999/1119.html
>
> http://www2.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/2000/0503.html
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/enforcement_logs/2000/0719.html

Mheh. That the best you can do, Goatblowing High-el? A three fucking year old letter about a retest, which Roger passed, a letter to Roger and another ham advising them not to take their disagreements on the air, something you should heed, since that's what you do , and a warning letter from 1999 in which false information was submited to the FCC. Roger never lost his license, never was fined, never was suspended. Looks like you made a complete ASS of yourself on that one, but that situation is completely status quo for you, ASSHOLE High-el.

And Goatblowing Dave High-el _is_ registered as a sex offender....

1507. Re: Blackout: Ohio Hams Help Out

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 05:23:50 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bhrnr3$2gfh7$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 74954

Better watch out... the arrl will try to claim credit for this!

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:bhj1f106c4@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
> POWERLESS: Millions affected by largest blackout in US history - Lorain
> Morning Journal, OH
>
> http://www.morningjournal.com/site/news.cfm?BRD=1699&dept_id=46371&news
> id=10012542&PAG=461&rfi=9
>
> http://tinyurl.com/k4rr
>
> ... About 10 HAM Radio operators of the Amateur Radio Association were
> able to help the Red Cross and assist EMS services with communications
> throughout Lorain ...
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith AOL IM:kilowattradio
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> "Give SCO $699 for using Linux or the Penguin gets it."

1508. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 05:27:02 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bhrnr5$2gfh7$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 74955
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.cb

(sarcasm mode on)

But gee, dontcha know the arrl is blameless? Of course they only take
credit for good news/stuff.

(sarcasm mode off)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
> All real hams out there who remember how the bands used to be, send the
> ARRL a nasty-gram and cancel your League memberships. They screwed us
> over big time by not protecting the integrity of the Amateur radio
> Service.
>
>
>
> No Code.... No Ham!
>
>
>

1509. Re: Col. High-el/klunk still blows goats (Was Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 05:55:29 UTC
From: starwars <nobody@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Message-ID: <005c0b7cbe8e5e39bde023148a52f0ae@tatooine.homelinux.net>
Source record: 74922

In article <bhm8j6fvp0@pita.alt.net>
"Poor Wogie" <Woger@PoWittleWogie.com> wrote:

Poor lisping homosexual. Poor little lisping homosexual hiding again.....did you have to get a new altopia account after being turned in to the Feds? <guffaw!>
>
>
> "privacy.at Anonymous Remailer" <mixmaster@remailer.privacy.at> wrote in
> message news:e23dd557edde723c80632e676681aa2e@remailer.privacy.at...
> >
> > In article <3F3B2209.8DC58CF5@earthlink.net>
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > > >
> > > > In article <3F3980D8.E1FDBCF3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil
> <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> > > > writes:
> > > >
> > > > >What's it to you? You have nothing to do with amateur radio.
> > > >
> > > > Still trying the old misdirection & personal insult type thing.
> -)
> > >
> > > Are you insulted by a truthful statement? Do you find the fact that you
> > > have no amateur radio license to be insulting? What does morse code
> > > testing or an age limit in amateur radio licensing have to do with you?
> >
> > And the Anti-American High-el still tries to censor others' freedom of
> speech...he does his neo-Nazi and Taliban friends proud. In fact, he helped
> dictators get a foothold while he was in Africa.
> >
> > > > >Have you
> > > > >made up your mind yet. Some time back you stated that I wasn't a
> radio
> > > > >god then I was a radio god then I wasn't a radio god. Have you made
> up
> > > > >your mind yet?
> > > >
> > > > You PRETEND to have great expertise (on the order of godlike
> > > > judgement and capability).
> > >
> > > I do have some expertise in amateur radio and I have decades of

> > > experience. That something grates on you doesn't make it a pretense.
> >
> > The only "experience" you have is cornholing little boys. You sure as hell
> haven't advanced ham radio in your so-called 40 years of tenure.
> >
> > > > It would seem that your PRETENSE has made you very tense
> > > > (and angry) when someone shows your pretense for what it is. :-)
> > >
> > > I'm not angry, Leonard. I'm actually smiling as I write these words:
> > > You haven't shown anything to anyone when it comes to amateur radio.
> >
> > Neither have you, ASSHOLE.
> >
> >
>
> Wow! It seems Woger is vewy vewy upset with
> Abassodor Heil.
> LOL LOL LOL LOL LOL

Wow...looks like Lardasssss Lllllllllloyd is still waiting for his first piece of ass at age 30.
Instead he slurps the asshole of a well-known asshole
High-el.......BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!

1510. FATASS GOATBLOWER ANTI-FREE SPEECH HIGH-EL WHINES LIKE A FUCKING BABY (material)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 07:37:48 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <b300c7df66b17f4ba7c8d1d2295e8c16@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 74923

ASSHOLE <3F3FF08D.86661718@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> desperately whined his damage control:
>
>
> The material below contains numerous crudities from the keyboard of
> Roger Wiseman. Those of you who find this kind of thing objectionable
> need read no further.
>
>
> In the interest of accuracy, Roger "How'd You Know It Was Me", I thought
> I'd refresh your memory of our little exchange. Here are three messages
> containing fascinating examples of your interpersonal skills:

Your accuracy is like your contribution to amateur radio...nonexistent.

> #1
>
> Subject:
> Re: Steven Spielberg quits BSA over discrimination
> Date:
> Fri, 20 Apr 2001 12:48:25 +0000
> From:
> Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
> To:
> KC8JBO <rmccall@cotse.com>
> References:
> 1 , 2
>
>
>
>
> Roger,
>
> Would you like to see some of your best newsgroup material posted on
> utility poles in your immediate neighborhood?
>
> Dave K8MN

So you threaten to stalk another ham by illegally posting papers on utility poles? What does that say about your "law-abiding" status, ASSHOLE?

> KC8JBO wrote:
> >
> > Aids-infected "Stupid Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> babbled incoherently in

> > message news:9bo3u7$n1u$0@dosa.alt.net...
> > >
> > > On Thu, 19 Apr 2001 07:38:26 -0400, J. Duffy Beischel wrote:
> > >:
> > > : Stop the incorrect reference. Men that choose men instead of women are not
> > > : gay, they are homosexuals. There is nothing gay about being a homosexual.
> > >
> > The only reason Stupid Lee got in this thread is because the BSA rejected him
> > for membership, due to his sexual preferences.
> >
> > > And what about men who choose cats?
> >
> > Abusing cats, now, Daron? With your hideous looks, I suppose you have to get
> > some "pussy" any way you can.
> >
> > 73 de Roger, KC8JBO
> > EM99|
> > Yaesu FT-920 | Inverted vee @ 40 Feet
> > Yaesu FT-90R | Copper J-pole

Bad comb over and wrinkled clothes High-el really needs that crying towel right now, that's the only way his clothes get cleaned.
nice of you to dwell on Roger's every word, what will your pivot man Bertie think?

> ---
> #2
>
> Subject:
> Re: Steven Spielberg quits BSA over discrimination
> Date:
> Sat, 21 Apr 2001 03:47:43 +0000
> From:
> Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
> To:
> KC8JBO <rmccall@cotse.com>
> References:
> 1 , 2 , 3 , 4
>
>
>
>
> Roger,
>
> You're newsgroup postings go way, way over the line. Do you really
> believe that a jury would, after comparing your words to my words find
> you the winner in a civil action?
>
> If you're using language that you wouldn't want your mother or your wife
> or your daughter or the kids in the neighborhood to see, then you
> shouldn't be using it. You can take the first step in cleaning up the
> newsgroups in which you participate.

>
> Your recent stuff is an embarrassment to amateur radio, to Marshall
> County and to West Virginia.
>
> Dave Heil K8MN
>

Anti-American and anti-free speech High-el would like to bring back the Third Reich.

> KC8JBO wrote:
> >
> > Quoting Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>:
> >
> > > Roger,
> > >
> > > Would you like to see some of your best newsgroup material posted on
> > > utility poles in your immediate neighborhood?
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Would you like to see your FAT ASS hauled into court, FUYCKNUTS?
> > Go fuck yourself.

In which Fatass High-el cried on his fucking fat finnish mail order bride's hunchbacked shoulders for days......

> ---
> and #3
>
> Subject:
> Re: Steven Spielberg quits BSA over discrimination
> Date:
> Sat, 21 Apr 2001 12:39:39 +0000
> From:
> Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>
> To:
> KC8JBO <rmccall@cotse.com>
> References:
> 1 , 2 , 3 , 4 , 5 , 6
>
>
>
>
> Roger,
>
> Your inability to use language other than filth is simply amazing.
> Again, you wouldn't use language like that in front of your family or
> neighbors and I doubt you'd use it if I was standing in front of you.
>
> Your "rights" end where you infringe on mine and those of others. If
> you post in a public newsgroup and I am one of those who regularly read

> that newsgroup, I AM minding my own business. This isn't some exchange
> of filth between yourself and another party by private e-mail; it is
> publicly posted. Why would you object to the people of Glen Dale seeing
> what you've already posted for the rest of the world to see?
>
> Dave K8MN

Translation: Whaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaahhhhhhhhh!!!!!! I'm gonna run antell the teacher, I am I am I am...poor baby huey High-el......

> KC8JBO wrote:
> >
> > Quoting Dave Heil <k8mn@ovis.net>:
> >
> > > Roger,
> > >
> > > You're newsgroup postings go way, way over the line. Do you really
> > > believe that a jury would, after comparing your words to my words find
> > > you the winner in a civil action?
> >
> > No, DUMBASS, I'm going to go to the police with that threat to post things on
> > utility poles. It will go to criminal court.
> > If you don't like what I post, use a killfile and quit whining about it.
> >
> > > If you're using language that you wouldn't want your mother or your
> > > wife
> > > or your daughter or the kids in the neighborhood to see, then you
> > > shouldn't be using it. You can take the first step in cleaning up the
> > > newsgroups in which you participate.
> >
> > Go fuck yourself..and learn to use a killfilter on my posts, STUPID.
> > I'll use whatever language I feel like using. Neo-nazis like you need to quit
> > trying to quash other people's rights. Clean up your own backyard, before you
> > stick your nose in somebody else's business.
> > Any harassment in my neighborhood will land you in hot water with the police.
> >
> > > Your recent stuff is an embarrassment to amateur radio, to Marshall
> > > County and to West Virginia.
> > >
> > > Dave Heil K8MN
> >
> > Opinions vary. Learn to use a killfile, STUPIDASS.
>
> ---
> To be fair, Roger, the e-mails quoted above are among your least
> objectionable writings. By your standards, they are mild.
>
> Dave K8MN

And dumbfuck High-el still is too fucking stupid to either ignore posts he doesn't like of the use of a killfile. But he justs wants to fight with Lennie, Kim, Carl, or anybody else

that doesn't share his narrow-minded views.

1511. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 09:01:20 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f409761_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74924
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

And the worst example (in modern times, too, and cannot
be dismissed as the colonial morals of a far-distant age)
is the island of Diego Garcia where the invading Brits
forcibly removed all the natives in order to give the
island to the Yanks as an aircraft carrier. Until the Yanks
and the Brits refuse to have anything to do with the island,
then their actions in the Malvinas and in Kuwait are pure hypocrisy.

Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote in message
news:BwX%a.15151$yl6.5469@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net...
> "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:je70kvs4jshf5e3cj133rjggltkdaphoco@4ax.com...
> > On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 18:34:42 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
> > >We don't have a colonial view on anybody. We made that mistake with
the
> > >Phillipines and Puerto Rico. And we still can't get rid of Puerto
Rico.
> > And the US Virgin Islands. And Guantanamo Bay. And Guam. And
> > numerous other Pacific islands (many of which were used for nuclear
> > testing).
> Not forgetting what was British Honduras, and all the unsinkable aircraft
> carriers like RAF Lakenheath and hundreds of other countries airfields
around
> the world

1512. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 11:17:55 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030818071755.01893.00000095@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 74925

In article <ZIT%a.141$6e5.34853@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0308170927.346c4e95@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<mlM%a.98$6e5.29672@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> > news:c2356669.0308170411.f2366d1@posting.google.com...
>> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<g%u%a.72$6e5.16725@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> > > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> > > > news:c2356669.0308160744.19006d94@posting.google.com...
>> > > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<gpg%a.32$6e5.6019@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> > > > >
>> > > > > > NCI's Petition for Rulemaking with the FCC.
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > > It is available in .pdf format at http://www.nocode.org
>> > > > > > under the "Articles" link ...
>> > > > > >
>> > > > > OK, let's cut to the chase.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Obviously the main request is to dump Element 1 ASAP. And there's
>> > > > > probably lots of reasons given for doing so, including the
>> > > > > Commission's own words "no regulatory purpose".
>> > > > >
>> > > > > But what else was in the petition?
>> > > >
>> > > I gave you a URL where you could read it ...

Not really. You gave the main website and left it up to the reader to find the
article, then download it and open it as a pdf.

If you really wanted people to read it, you'd have it front-and-center on the
webpage and post a direct link.
>> > >
>> > That's not what I asked.
>> >
>> > Here's the answer, to save others the bother of reading 20 pages to
>> > get the answer to my question:
>> >
>> > NOTHING.
>> >
>> Jim,

>> >
>> > You say "NOTHING"
>>
>> That's right.
>>
>> >... but in the following paragraphs you admit
>> > that "Most of the 20 pages is supporting reasons to make the change."
>>
>> Yup. And that was already referred to.
>
>Yes, referred to with a thinly-veiled attempt to dissuade others from
>reading and considering all of those reasons.

Not at all. My main concern was whether there were other things in the
petition, such as written test changes, license class changes, etc. There
weren't.
>
>> Look again at what I wrote:
>>
>> "Obviously the main request is to dump Element 1 ASAP."
>>
>> Which is true.
>
>Yes ... what did you expect?

I expected that much. It's the unexpected that I was concerned about.

Since NCI does not want me as a member, and keeps its internal policy functions
secret, I was simply asking for a quick indication of what other issues would
be covered.

> That *IS* NCI's chartered goal.

And it's a good thing they are sticking to it, rather than getting bogged down
in other issues.
>
>> "And there's probably lots of reasons given for doing so, including
>> the
>> Commission's own words "no regulatory purpose"."
>>
>> Which is also true.
>>
>> And then the question:
>>
>> "But what else was in the petition?"
>>
>> The "what else" refers to things OTHER THAN dropping Element 1 and
>> reasons to drop Element 1.
>>
>> And the correct answer is: NOTHING. The petition consists of a request
>> to drop element 1 and reasons to do so.
>

>What did you expect?

See above.

> That is what a Petition for Rulemaking IS ... a
>specific
>request(s) and all of the supporting arguments ...

Those specific requests could be anything.

> I *really* don't know what else you're asking for ...

Here, I'll spell it out for ya:

You could have simply answered my question this way:

'NCI requested the immediate removal of Element 1 for all classes of license
and the granting of Novice/Tech Plus privileges to all Technicians. Detailed
supporting arguments were included in the proposal. No other changes were
requested because they fall outside the stated purpose of NCI."

One paragraph. Three sentences. Short sweet and concise. 100% accurate. Would
it have been so hard to have answered my question that way?
>
>> > I think that's important information for folks to consider ... that's
>> > why
>> > I encourage folks to actually READ and consider the NCI Petition,
>> > rather than relying on your "5 cent synopsis."
>>
>> I've read and cosidered it, and I'm opposed to it.
>
>Really? (what a surprise)

Yes, really.
>
>> > Why do you want to "save others the bother" of reading the Petition?
>>
>> Because we already know that it would contain a request to drop
>> Element 1 and reasons to do so. Those reasons have been argued
>> endlessly here and elsewhere.
>
>The reasons elaborated in the Petition form the factual, legal, and
>rational basis for granting the request ... I think they're presented
>clearly in a well-organized manner that, in only 20 pages, tells a
>a reader all they need to know to make an informed decision based
>on the facts.

My summary, above, boils it down to three sentences.
>
>You don't WANT people reading it and coming to the logical
>conclusion, IMHO ...

Not at all! Did I say anyone should not read it? Of course not! I simply wanted
to save the time of wading through 20 pages of same-old same-old looking for

something new.
>
>> My question was about what else was in the petition besides dropping
>> Element 1 and reasons to do so.
>
>That wasn't clear at all ...

Sure it was...if you read what I wrote.

>and why you would expect more escapes me,
>since, as I pointed out above, all of the essential elements of a Petition
>for Rulemaking are there (and you knew the what the goal of the Petition
>would be before it was written ...)

Because there is always the chance that something unexpected would be in there.

>
>> > (Could it be that you find the arguments so compelling that you don't
>> > WANT others to read them???)
>>
>> Nope. None of the arguments are compelling at all. Not to me, anyway -
>> YMMV. And we've all read them many times before.
>
>OK, we disagree ... but I believe the FCC (and MANY amateurs) will
>find the arguments compelling.

Sure. They've already been convinced. Did not FCC write, almost 4 years ago,
"no regulatory purpose"? Those three little words say it all.
>
>> I don't think the petition will change anyone's mind.
>
>You HOPE not ... that's why you try to brush it off as somehow being
>insignficant and "not worth the time to read." Interesting tactic, but
>I doubt that it will work.

Has anyone's mind been changed?
>
>> > > The NCI petition consists of a request to drop Element 1 without
>> > > further delay or discussion and give Techs the same privileges as Tech
>> > > Pluses. No other changes proposed. Most of the 20 pages is supporting
>> > > reasons to make the change.
>>
>> Is this synopsis not 100% accurate?
>
>Yup ... and that's EXACTLY what's SUPPOSED to be there.

In your opinion. Do you dictate NCI policy, Carl, or is it formulated by the
Board? I'm an outsider, remember - not even privileged to know how many
members NCI has.
>
>> > > > > As you have pointed out, Carl, FCC hasn't even given any of the
>> > > > > proposals an RM number yet. And it's reasonable to assume there

>will
>> > > > > be more proposals - from NCVEC, ARRL, and other groups. FCC may
>assign
>> > > > > numbers, or they may take ideas from each one and produce an NPRM.
>> > > >
>> > > > NCVEC already filed a petition, as have several individuals.
>> > >
>> > > It's clear NCVEC isn't done yet. They're talking about other changes
>> > > too.
>> >
>> > That's their business ... NCI is focused on the Morse test issue and
>> > is not proposing more sweeping changes that are outside of our
>> > charter ...
>>
>> That's the smart way to go. Focus on the core issue and don't be
>> delayed or derailed by other issues.
>
>Bingo ... and I don't believe that the FCC will allow this issue to
>get bogged down with other unrelated issues. It's too clear-cut,
>whereas other issues (band segmentation, privs by license class,
>etc.) are clearly going to be harder to deal with because they are
>not so clear-cut.
>(They're also not NCI's charter, so they're not our "ox to gore.")

Maybe. OTOH, if the issue is that clear cut, why is FCC dragging its feet? I actually thought the main delay would be ratification, and that the removal of Element 1 would be a quick MO&O thing. Now it looks like the whole NPRM cycle will be invoked. A year - 2 years....?

>> There are supposedly four other petitions filed, too. Wonder what they
>> say?
>
>They basically say the same thing, in various levels of detail and
>sophistication,
>ranging from a 1-pager from a guy who's filed MANY (read between the lines)

Not many lines to read between in a one-pager...

>to a few pages of generally well-considered material that doesn't have the
>cites
>to law, previous FCC decisions/determinations, etc. that NCI's has. They
>all
>add to the momentum, however ...

Maybe. NPRM means comments...

I urge all to read the NCI proposal and consider the arguments contained therein. I don't agree with them or find them compleiing - maybe others will.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1513. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 12:17:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308180417.e2d83ea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74926

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<BB65C00A.2471E%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" wrote:
>
> > (snip) Never mind, you're either dumber than
> > a box of rocks or an almost decent troll. I
> > rather suspect the former. (snip)
>
>
> Excuse me? You posted a message speculating that the current power outages
> will hinder BPL and I responded with my opinion that the power outages will
> more likely be used to support BPL.

Then explain exactly how/why you think the introduction of BPL will
impact the economics of upgrading the power grids, e.g., how big a
chunk of the $50-$100 billion dollar upgrade tab do you expect BPL
would raise for that cause?

> To that, you respond with the garbage
> above. You really need to learn some basic manners, Brian.

I have a low tolerance level for people who consistently "don't get"
the obvious.

>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
w3rv

1514. Re: radio-amateur and CB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 12:47:08 UTC
From: F4ASK <f4ask@wanadoo.fr>
Message-ID: <XnF93DB9663FE8CFGilbertF4ASK@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 74927

"David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> a cru bon de raconter en ce si beau jour
news:duednezNa40WjriiU-KYvA@crocker.com:

Hi all

> depends on your country's rules, but in the United States and many
other

In France, it is not legal :

The french CB rules are very precise : freqs from 26960 Khz to 27410 Khz,
step 10 Khz according the FCC freqs in USA (smiley), exactly 40 channels,
output power 4w in AM (2 side bands and carrier), FM and SSB (LSB and
USB). Phone only.

> countries it is not legal.

I don't know exactly why French (and other) administration let the CBers
working around the legal band : I think (but only me) this band is not
good enough for HF transmissions... But what about 10 m ? Very
strange....

>
> "Louat Marc" <marc.louat@edf.fr> wrote in message
> news:3F250F74.C47F5674@edf.fr...
>> Hello
>> I have known radio-amateurism and its rules for years and I have
>> recently met someone who claims to be a cibist and communicate all
>> around the world, send and recieve postcards, talks about any subject,
>> belongs to a club and says it is new CB and it is legal. In my opinion
>> it is not. Is it?
>> Marc Louat
>>
>
>

--
Gilbert F4ASK
LE HAVRE

1515. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 13:44:38 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <aL40b.111097$_R5.40625014@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 74929

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:bHX%a.174$6e5.38134@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:6XT%a.102645$_R5.37919362@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > news:4NT%a.142$6e5.34942@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > >
> > > "DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> > > news:9829b709.0308170942.5bb877f9@posting.google.com...
> > > >> And history runs counter also. No coders have mostly stayed away
from
> > > > ARRL , and that seems unlikely to change anytime soon. They just
don't
> > > > see much in it for them.
> > >
> > > Dick,
> > >
> > > Did you (or the ARRL Board of Directors, more importantly)
> > > EVER CONSIDER the POSSIBILITY that the nocoders are
> > > staying away from the ARRL (in droves) because they don't
> > > want to contribute dues to an organization that's been dedicated
> > > (and still is, by policy) to keep them off of HF???
> >
> > That's odd, Carl. I used the ARRL CD's to prepare for Element 1. When I
> had
> > specific questions, league employees responded promptly via e-mail with
> > helpful answers.
> >
> > To this young (...and then no-code Technician class.) newbie, the ARRL
> > actually appeared very dedicated to helping me get ON HF.
>
> Yes, IF you were willing to meet their criteria by jumping through the
> Morse code hoop ...
>
> Carl - wk3c

Speak for yourself, Carl. I certainly did NOT have to jump through any
hoops. I set a goal, researched the requirements, and then set about meeting
said requirements.

I also make sure that in all the letters and e-mails I send to the league,
FCC, political reps, etc. I inform them that the current Morse code test was
no barrier for this newbie and did NOT "force" me to jump through any hoops.
So please don't allow any individual or group promoting the "barrier/hoop"

line of Bravo Sierra to include me in their demographic. I suspect there are more NTs (As opposed to OTs or OFs) like me who dislike being associated with underachievement. I hope they too will take the time to make their views on the matter heard.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI
FISTS# 9384

1516. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 13:47:38 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <_N40b.196$6e5.44391@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74928

"WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030818071755.01893.00000095@mb-m22.aol.com...
> In article <ZIT%a.141$6e5.34853@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >news:c2356669.0308170927.346c4e95@posting.google.com...
> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> >news:<mlM%a.98$6e5.29672@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> >> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >> > news:c2356669.0308170411.f2366d1@posting.google.com...
> >> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:<g%u%a.72$6e5.16725@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> >> > > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >> > > > news:c2356669.0308160744.19006d94@posting.google.com...
> >> > > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:<gpg%a.32$6e5.6019@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > > > NCI's Petition for Rulemaking with the FCC.
> >> > > > > >
> >> > > > > > It is available in .pdf format at http://www.nocode.org
> >> > > > > > under the "Articles" link ...
> >> > > > > >
> >> > > > > OK, let's cut to the chase.
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > Obviously the main request is to dump Element 1 ASAP. And
there's
> >> > > > probably lots of reasons given for doing so, including the
> >> > > > Commission's own words "no regulatory purpose".
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > But what else was in the petition?
> >> > > >
> >> > > I gave you a URL where you could read it ...
>
> Not really. You gave the main website and left it up to the reader to find
the
> article, then download it and open it as a pdf.
>
> If you really wanted people to read it, you'd have it front-and-center on
the
> webpage and post a direct link.

That's not the way the website is structured ... I inherited the structure
and

have been too busy with more important things to change it.

Besides, it works ... it's easy to find the Articles link (QUITE prominent
in
the "toolbar" in the upper left), then scroll to the article you want.

As far as the link to the entire Petition in .pdf goes ... .pdf is a
widely-accepted
way of distributing docs that can be read on virtually any computer/OS
platform
(the doc looks exactly the same on my Linux machine as on my WinDoze
machine)

It's also the exact same document that was printed to file with the FCC, so
the
content and formatting are exactly what we filed, no ifs, ands, or buts ...

> Not at all. My main concern was whether there were other things in the
> petition, such as written test changes, license class changes, etc. There
> weren't.

Not NCI's charter ... we've always said that the accusations that we
had an agenda to "gut" the writtens and other such falsehoods and inuendo
were untrue. We've proved it by asking for exactly what we said we
wanted to achieve all along.

> >> Look again at what I wrote:
> >>
> >> "Obviously the main request is to dump Element 1 ASAP."
> >>
> >> Which is true.
> >
> >Yes ... what did you expect?
>
> I expected that much. It's the unexpected that I was concerned about.

And why did you "expect" something "unexpected" ??? NCI has always
been totally up-front about its goals ...

> Since NCI does not want me as a member, and keeps its internal policy
functions
> secret, I was simply asking for a quick indication of what other issues
would
> be covered.

If you support continued Morse proficiency testing, you don't meet the
qualifications for membership ... if you honestly change your views, we'd
welcome you as a member, same as everyone else.

> >You don't WANT people reading it and coming to the logical
> >conclusion, IMHO ...
>
> Not at all! Did I say anyone should not read it? Of course not! I simply

wanted
> to save the time of wading through 20 pages of same-old same-old looking
for
> something new.

You said "save others the bother" of reading the Petition ... which is
tantamount
to encouraging others to not read it ...

> >and why you would expect more escapes me,
> >since, as I pointed out above, all of the essential elements of a
Petition
> >for Rulemaking are there (and you knew the what the goal of the Petition
> >would be before it was written ...)
>
> Because there is always the chance that something unexpected would be in
there.

So, you also insinuate that NCI *might* be dishonest about its agenda/goals
and "try to pull a fast one on you"???

We've said all along what our goals are ... the paranoia of the PCTA is what
has been the source of all sorts of ridiculous FUD about "NCI's hidden
agendas"
and "what NCI will do AFTER the code test is gone."

> >> > > The NCI petition consists of a request to drop Element 1 without
> >> > > further delay or discussion and give Techs the same privileges as
Tech
> >> > > Pluses. No other changes proposed. Most of the 20 pages is
supporting
> >> > > reasons to make the change.
> >>
> >> Is this synopsis not 100% accurate?
> >
> >Yup ... and that's EXACTLY what's SUPPOSED to be there.
>
> In your opinion. Do you dictate NCI policy, Carl, or is it formulated by
the
> Board? I'm an outsider, remember - not even privileged to know how many
> members NCI has.

No, I do NOT dictate NCI policy ... it is formed by the Board, with input
from the membership. I'm just telling you the reality that "the Petition
has
exactly what's supposed to be there" ... in other words, it's what was
approved
by the Board.

> >> That's the smart way to go. Focus on the core issue and don't be
> >> delayed or derailed by other issues.
> >

> >Bingo ... and I don't believe that the FCC will allow this issue to
> >get bogged down with other unrelated issues. It's too clear-cut,
> >whereas other issues (band segmentation, privs by license class,
> >etc.) are clearly going to be harder to deal with because they are
> >not so clear-cut.
> >(They're also not NCI's charter, so they're not our "ox to gore.")
>
> Maybe. OTOH, if the issue is that clear cut, why is FCC dragging its feet?
I
> actually thought the main delay would be ratification, and that the
removal of
> Element 1 would be a quick MO&O thing. Now it looks like the whole NPRM
cycle
> will be invoked. A year - 2 years....?

Ratification is not necessary for the FCC to act ... that's spelled out clearly in law ... heck the Senate is SEVERAL WRCs behind in ratification ... the FCC is sending them a "catch up" package. But, again, that has no bearing on the FCC's ability to act on the changes in Article 25.

We shall see what course the FCC takes on this matter ... as they say, "It's not over until the fat lady sings."

> Maybe. NPRM means comments...

Been there, done that ... the facts haven't changed, except in NCI's favor in terms of the progress of technology making the "need" for Morse less and less with time, and the changing demographic of the US amateur population.

> I urge all to read the NCI proposal and consider the arguments contained
> therein. I don't agree with them or find them compleiing - maybe others
will.

OK, thanks Jim ... I appreciate your gesture. It's certainly better than implying
that reading the Petition would be a waste of time.

73,
Carl - wk3c

1517. Autopatch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 14:11:12 UTC
From: "Alan D. Woodford" <awoodford@espatl.com>
Message-ID: <bhqmoq$m0g$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74930

I am new to ham radios. Would someone explain to me how autopatch works and
How I can use it in Norcross.
I have a vertec vx150 handheld.

Thanks in advance!

Alan Woodford
KI4BSP (Technician)

1518. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 14:19:57 UTC
From: toxic_waste@citizensband.com
Message-ID: <1f2adfc1.0308180619.3ca18958@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74931
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:<3f409761_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>...

Usual pile of top-posted, old bollocks snipped...

> Until the Yanks
> and the Brits refuse to have anything to do with the island,
> then their actions in the Malvinas and in Kuwait are pure hypocrisy.
>

And of course Gareth, you'd know all about hypocrisy, being a staunch
supporter of the IRA?

tox

1519. Jawnie Shitball Whines

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 14:25:21 UTC
From: Anonymous Sender <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com>
Message-ID: <6683e10738391b3fba21fa5bede25cb3@remailer.metacolo.com>
Source record: 74932
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.cocksucker.john-kimball,alt.flame

In article <89185761.767067889@houston-hunks.com>
SLee@houston-hunks.com (Stagger Lee) wrote:

> Now the window licker returns,
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

It's Jawnnie Shitball aka Brent Hamm of Moberley, Missouri.....Hey, Shitball, you get any recent DUI's to add to your already thick police file?

1520. Re: Autopatch

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 15:17:23 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <9umdnRrOP9WUc92iXTWJiw@crocker.com>
Source record: 74933

autopatch is a way of making phone calls through a repeater. you usually have to dial some kind of access code on your touchtone mic and then dial the number. most repeaters restrict the calling area and may have other restrictions and membership requirements. you should contact the owner of the repeater or the club that runs it for specific information.

"Alan D. Woodford" <awoodford@espatl.com> wrote in message news:bhqmoq$m0g$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> I am new to ham radios. Would someone explain to me how autopatch works and
> How I can use it in Norcross.
> I have a vertec vx150 handheld.
>
> Thanks in advance!
>
> Alan Woodford
> KI4BSP (Technician)
>
>
>

1521. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 15:20:02 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <4b96eda24cf695973b8c5d298855f486@dizum.com>
Source record: 74934

In article <3F3FEA06.449E77FD@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3EE85E.E8A0DA4C@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > Perhaps there should
> > > > be a no content indicator in the preamble of your messages.
> > >
> > > I usually find your name a giveaway.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > In addition to putting AveryFine in front of your messages, you're
> > going to start putting my name on them?
>
> I am not now, nor have I ever posted as Avery Fine or any other name
> than my own.

Liar.

1522. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 15:35:16 UTC
From: paul s <paulslinux@REMOVESPAMhotmail.comKILLER>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.08.18.15.35.10.632485@REMOVESPAMhotmail.comKILLER>
Source record: 74935
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 18:15:00 -0500, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>
> "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:vd3ujv8tu6ft9t47vk49364nrqm24knl08@4ax.com...
>> On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 04:39:40 +0100, "Steve Terry"
>> <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
>> >news:bhgsoi$9nq$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
>> >> Gee Airy......isn't that EXACTLY what the British did in the 17th and
> 18th
>> >> century??? How did it go...."The sun never sets on the British empire"
>> >> ?????.
>> >> Go get your red coat and stand tall. Its all you have left me boy.
>> >> Dan/W4NTI
>> >>
>> >Are you admitting current US foreign policy is one of Imperialism ?!
>>
>> We do not transport people suspected of a crime to a military prison
>> camp in one of our off-shore colonies and keep them incarcerated there
>> for a year or more without trial. I can think of a country that
>> does.
>>
>> 73 de G3NYY
>>
>> --
>> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com
>
> I agree with Walt. The USA needs to stop putting these enemies in a camp.

Why don't the ameriKKKans sort it properly, and give them a trial?

> What we should do is just shoot them on site.

Nah shoot that idiot George W Bush on sight, and our own stupid Tony
Blair. Have they found any WMDs yet?? Nope. Are they likely to?? I don't
think so.

--
Paul S

- You possess a mind not merely twisted, but actually sprained. -
---

1523. Re: Wiseman's "Dictionary"....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 15:41:39 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@lloydszplace.org>
Message-ID: <bhqs2f$b8f$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 74936

"Ed Norton" <haaaynorton@comnos.pam> wrote in message
news:bhp7iq$o0v$0@pita.alt.net...
> These are only a few of the misspelled words I have seen in Wiseman's
posts.
> I guess he can't afford a spell checker.
>
>
>
> "Champoin".Whassup, Wiseman? No dictionaries in the mental ward?
>
> "Anoinymous"...a cross between anonymous and annoying?
>
> "Acident" Roger's mom got preggers by accident.
>
> "Alreaedy" Alright, already!
>
> "Amouints" Roger amounts to nothing.
>
> "Aposterphe" This guy is a hoot, ain't he?
>
> "Basios"...word Woger uses when he gets neeeerrrrvous.
> "Behing"...a cross between being and behind?
>
> "Coiward" As in peeking from behind his mommy's curtains.
> "Feamle"...I think he meant female.
> "Losser"...only loser Roger can do it better.
> "Ignroant"...typical, considering the source.
> "Sluprs"...only Rogie knows what this means.
> "Travelled"...a Rogerism, replete with ignorance.
> "Postss"...pssst...Roger..that should be Posts.
> "Defgenerate"...well, it's Roger's word...
> "Faity"...he meant to say Fairy, but you know Roger.
>
> "Ghet" Get a load of Curtain Boy!
> "Distribiution"...Roger likes using phonics.
> "Biotch"...he meant Bitch, but his phonics took over again.
> "Methjadone"...a West Virginia substitute for Heroin.
> "Sumbliminal"...one of Roger's favorites.
> "Recepticle"...either of Roger's moist cavaties.
> "Cociane"...a West Virginia drug of choice?
> "Tiome"...Roger meant to say Time...but his fingers were numb.
> "Beraking"...no definition. Could mean 'beraking' the leaves,
> "Amny"...he meant 'any',
> "Nlay"...a town in Maylaysia? Vermont?

> "Al;ong"...only Wussman knows what this means.
> "Becasu"...well, becasu Roger is not the brightest bulb on the tree.
> "Seperation". Why? Because Roger cannot "seperate" from his mommie!
> "Sisnce" He meant Since, but his pudgy little fingers slipped off the
keys.
> "gnetically" What?
> "provce" (prove?)
> "Piuzza" (West Virginia Pizza)
> "Schol" (school?)
> "strill" (still?)
> "shoitgun" 12 ga or 20 ga?
> "Snoip" (How they spell "snip" in Glen Dale)
> "Maturbater". Wiseman does it all the time, he just can't spell it.(leaves
a
> sticky residue on his right hand)
> "Coskscuking". It's a Roger thing, as in Lavender Lads.
> "Waddleing". Only in Glen Dale, eh?
> "Spaeaking". Curtain Boy did this after his second retest.
>
> " Stgop" Roger's version of Stop.
>
> "Fahter's" He meant Father's Day.
>
> "fserting"..would that be festering?
>
> "poists". Roger meant "posts".
>
> "snadwich" As in peanut butter and jelly?
>
> "regualr" Glen Dale rendition of "regular".
>
> "aftrer" After? Aftrer what?
>
> "soory". Sorry Roger fucks up again.
>
> "didnb't" He didn't?
>
> "whoile". He ate the whoile thing?
>
> "Woamn" He's hooked on West Virginia phonics, all right.
>
> "prrof" And he kin prove it, too.
>
> "beforfe" Was that before he lurned to spell?
>
> "yoiuy" Roger's version of "y'all".
>
> "illarate" Only illiterate Roger can spell like this.
>
> "haeart" Aw, how heartless of me to laugh!

>
> "valule" Roger has no values. No wonder he can't spell it.
>
> "proch" Doesn't everyone have one on their house?
>
> "inmstitution" Where Roger's mom put him in June 1999.
>
> "timne" It's Howdy Doody time?
>
> "whgo" What? Who dat?
>
> "gnetically" Only Roger knows what this one means.
>
> "crfy" Like, cry, Roger, cry.
>
> "stutrtering" Some stutter, Wiseman stutrters.
>
> "Whjere" Where is Curtain Boy?
>
> "Webiste" That's Website to the rest of us.
>
> "Youire" Your? You're? Who knows.
>
> "fiored" As in fired?
>
> "Parety" Roger gave a party once. Nobody came.
>
> "Bouynce" Bounce?
>
> "Varification" Verifiable mental case.
>
> "Probelms" Poor Rogie.has many problems of the mental sort.
>
> "Partricipate" Oh, DUH!!!!
>
> "Cryed" Gee, Wogie..cry me a river.you dolt!
>
> "Stoick" What a dork. His old 386 has no spell check program.
>
> "Partiall" More WV Phonics, I see.
>
> "Obsucred" Either obscured or Rogie has "sucre" on his mind.
>
> "Infinate" Stupid. Think finite, Rogie.
>
> "Sustinance" As in Sustenance?
>
> "Juvinile". This is the way Roger likes his boys.
>
> "Piut" Put it where, Rogie?

>
> "Toyus". "Toyus R Us?
>
> "Diminuative". Roger's height.
>
> "Percriptions" Say what?
>
> "Credibiliy" More Glen Dale intellect.
>
> "Thsoe" Yet another Glen Dale gaffe.
>
>

ROTFLMAO !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Lloyd

1524. Re: Wiseman Whines

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 15:43:58 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@lloydszplace.org>
Message-ID: <bhqs6o$bk7$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 74937
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

"It Sucks Being Roger" wrote in message
news:bhogrm$n39$0@pita.alt.net...
> Poor motherless Momma's Boy Wiseman crawls from under his bridge and
snipes
> from an anonymous server. Then he licks his festering wounds and
> belly-crawls back under the pilings where he mewls for a mother he never
> knew.
> It must be lonely being Roger.
>
>

Yes, it must be VERY lonely! LOL!!!!

Lloyd

1525. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 16:15:12 UTC
From: Sam <super@heterodyne.fs???d.co.uk>
Message-ID: <MPG.19ab0bcc80718283989680@news.freeserve.co.uk>
Source record: 74938
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

In article <bhp519dlp1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>,
w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com says...

>
> Then I suggest you check with mother England. EH.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Do you still have compulsory blood tests before marriage over there to
prevent the in-breeding?

--
Super Sam

1526. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 16:27:07 UTC
From: Anonymous <rebleep@hush.com>
Message-ID: <f22c46f4d1aad944320eb2574ee5ba96@rebleep>
Source record: 74939

```
In article <3F4046D6.D6294DED@earthlink.net>
Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3FEBE6.105A3225@earthlink.net>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3EE791.79F57C60@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3D2BC4.5C421A33@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3C58F1.86EDE9C2@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F37AFDE.6D3406E4@earthlink.net>...
> > > > > > > > > > > Brian wrote:
> > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F301FE3.951681BE@earthlink.net>...
>
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Please quote that "may share space" FCC document.
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Please quote the "Farnsworth Exam at 13-15wpm is the same as the
Morse
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Exam at 5wpm" FCC document.
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > That's totally irrelevant to the discussion at hand.
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > Why?
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > ...because the Farnsworth method was not under discussion. It is
> > > > > > > > > > > > > irrelevant to the request made of you.
> > > > > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > > > > I thought the existence of FCC documents were now part of the
> > > > > > > > > > > > > discussion. At least you broght it up.
```

> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Tell you what David, in the future put your comments that are not open
> > > > > > > > > for discussion in brackets [xxx].
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > OK?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > It'd be easier if you just stuck to the matter being discussed.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > FCC documents that don't exist?
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > We were discussing one of those--the one which uses the words "may share
> > > > > > > > space".
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Why do existing FCC documents have to comply to your specific choice
> > > > > > > of words?
> > > > > >
> > > > > Actually, you chose the words.
> > >
> > I may have, I may not have.
>
> That bird won't fly. Your words appear with attribution above.

In denial?

> > > > Why must we discuss documents which don't exist?
> > >
> > > You brought up "FCC documents which don't exist".
> >
> > The documents exist. They're called "Part 97."
>
> Then why are you prattling on about documents which don't exist?

Part 97 doesn't exist? Bwhaaawhoohaahahahahahahahahahahahahahahahaha, way to go, dumbfuck High-el.

> > > > You must share space with Carl. It is as simple as that.
> > >
> > > It is entirely likely that Carl and I will never have to share space on
> > > the ham bands. We may or may not share space. Why are you having
> > > troubles with the concept?
> >
> > You are the one who abhors the concept of sharing space with Carl.
>
> You keep making statements similar to this one yet I've not made such a
> statement.
>
> > Isn't he worthy?
>
> If he isn't, it would have nothing to do with class of license.
>
> > > > > > > > > Farnsworth exists as the de facto "code" exam, even though the

> > > > > > > > > > FCC documents specify Morse Code. Yet the FCC documents DO assign the
> > > > > > > > > > exact same priveleges to Carl that they do you, yet you insist on
> > > > > > > > > > arguing it.
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > What doest it have to do with the FCC's "may share space" document?
> > > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > > Part 97 addresses your and Carls priveleges.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > It certainly does.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > You implied that it didn't.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > No, Brian. Your attempts at reading between the lines often gets you
> > > > > > > > into trouble with understanding what has actually been written.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > So which is it, again? May or May Not?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I've already given you an answer. You didn't care for it.
> > > > >
> > > > You give many answers. Most are nonsense. May and May Not are nonsense answers.
> > >
> > ...or they appear that way to you due to your reading comprehension
> > difficulties.
> >
> > > > > > > So? We weren't discussing installing towers within
> > > > > > > a certain distance from an airport but that's in Part 97.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Yes, it is. Do you live near an airport?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > We weren't discussing that.
> > > > >
> > > > > Then kindly put the topics which you bring up, but are not open for
> > > > > discussion inside brackets, i.e., [So? We weren't discussing
> > > > > installing towers within
> > > > > a certain distance from an airport but that's in Part 97].
> > > >
> > > > I mentioned something in Part 97 that was not under discussion and you
> > > > ask me a question relating to it. Now you need brackets. Whew!
> > >
> > > Then why mention it if its not open for discussion?
> >
> > Your problem is reading comprehension. The term was used as an example
> > of things we were not discussing.
> >
> > > > > > > > > > That would make you a fool.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > I'd guess the fool to be one who is asked about a regulation about
> > > > > > > > > "sharing space" and responds with some nonsense about the Farnsworth
> > > > > > > > > method of learning morse.
> > > > > > > >

> > > > > > > > You don't believe in sharing space which the FCC says you must share
> > > > > > > > in a document called Part 97.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > I've never stated that I don't believe in sharing space.
> > > > > > > That's something you've tried to establish.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > That's something that you implied, with "he may not."
> > > > > >
> > > > > Incorrect, little electrolyte. If I write "It may rain or it may not",
> > > > > the words do not imply that I don't believe in rain.
> > > >
> > > It implies that you don't know if its going to rain.
> > >
> > Again, it does not imply that I don't believe in rain.
> >
> Never said it did. Please stay on topic.
>
I'm right on target, Brian.
>
Carl may or may not share space with me.
It may or may not rain.
>
Neither sentence implies disbelief on my part.
>
> I may share
> > space with Carl and I may not.
> >
> You must.
>
I haven't shared space with him yet.
>
> > The previous sentence does not indicate
> > that I don't believe in sharing space.
> >
> It indicates that you reject the concept of sharing space with Carl.
>
It may or may not rain. Rejection of the concept of rain is not
indicated. Work on your reading comprehension.
>
> > > Besides, we were not discussing your beliefs. We were discussing your
> > > and Carl's priveleges. He has the same priveleges as you, regardless
> > > of your beliefs on the matter.
> > >
> > I've understood the matter of privileges all along.
> >
> Then you know that you must share.
>
It hasn't happened so far.
>
> I don't believe

> > > Carl will be using all of his.
> >
> > Do you think he'll avoid 440 - 450 MHz?
>
> Nope. Besides, he'd need one helluva signal for us to share space there.
> Oddly enough, I have no difficulty working stations in his area on 432.

Those award-winning "people-skills" are sure shining, goatblower.

1527. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 16:50:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308180850.4df738ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74940

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030817114056.20931.00000146@mb-m13.aol.com>...

> Amateur radio is not an EE friendly hobby. Those that like to build circuits
> are not welcomed as those that want to learn Morse code, contest, or work DX.
> EEs that are put off by Hams don't join the hobby.

This is so absolutely false and rediculous as to make one wonder
what you were consuming when you wrote it, Vipul.

> Secondly, EEs are not joining amateur radio clubs. Some Profs that teach rf
> courses that I took do not have amateur radio licenses. People in the rf field
> are not attending club meetings.

Most people who do "x" for a living generally do not do it for a
past time either, Vippy. So what?

> The ARRL should make more efforts in this area. This would increase the number
> of people in the hobby. Also, there is a strong connection between EE and
> amateur radio that is not being realized.

How? Hit them over the head with a mallet then drag them off to
the shack?

Sheeesh.

Steve, K4YZ

1528. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 18:54:11 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4120D3.9080905@psu.edu>
Source record: 74941

N2EY wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F3A5AAC.8080401@psu.edu>...
<some snippage>

>> My point is that I see a close relationship between that ending and the
>>situation we have here. No real thought has been given to the aftermath
>>of the ending of the Morse code test.
>
>
> Some of us have given it real thought, and have posted ideas. But the
> mantra has always been that eliminating the code test would solve
> everything.
>
>>Back to now...
>>
>> After such a change, lots of different ideas come out of the woodwork
>>to replace the vacuum left by the probable disappearance of the Morse
>>code test. Some ideas are good, some make me shudder.
>
>
> Such as?

Okay. Carl's (NCI's?) approach sounds reasonable and should work okay -
even though I disagree with it.

On the other end of the spectrum, the proposal to turn everyone into HF
weenies is just plain stupid in my book.

>> But the fact is that since if the test disappears and nothing else
>>happens, it very well does mean that it is a reduction in knowledge
>>required to get a ticket. All arguments on what constitutes "knowledge"
>>in these regards is kind of like defining "is". You have to learn less,
>>no possible dispute without looking pretty silly.
>
>
> Sure. But that's been going on for decades now. Some folks would even
> say it is justified because a ham doesn't have to know as much today
> to get on the air and avoid breaking the rules.

The times do change, no doubt. It all comes back to my thinking we can
be as adroit as we want to be. On that spectrum, it varies from no test
whatsoever - proven by the many CB'ers who run power amps, to those who
think that a person needs to be an EE to get on the air.

What do WE want? I want the ham to have enough knowledge to get on the
air safely, to realize that he or she can do some nasty things to

themselves and others if they aren't careful. I want the ham to be able to read instructions and comprehend them. I want them to know at at least a superficial level just what their rigs are doing. I want the ham to know where to look up things like band edges and allowable powers on a band. I want the ham to know that they are expected to act like they learned manners at some point. I want the ham to know basic theory such as Ohms law, and very simple antenna design.

Oh, and BTW, I want the ham to know how to communicate at what I consider the base mode - CW.

This is just my opinion.

> For example: How many hams do you know who use barefoot rigs that
> require tuneup in order to operate properly? (Not the ATU - the rig
> itself). Besides me, that is.
>
> How many do you know who regularly use 100% homebrew stations?

Personally, just you.

<some snippage>

>
> Looking back on the history, however, shows that license requirements
> are only one factor - and probably not as major a factor as some would
> have us believe. What really matters is the interest and drive of the
> person involved. Some people will learn just enough to pass the test
> and then shut down, forgetting most of what they "learned" in a short
> time. Others will go far beyond the test levels. It's all a choice.

True. That is one of the reasons that I like the idea of having a bit of challenge to the tests. I'd wager that those who are willing to put forth extra effort are more likely to be an asset to the ARS than those who aren't. All this is on average, and does not apply to the individual ham.

> "Radio" and "electronics" are such wide-ranging subjects that nobody
> can be an expert at all of it. Or even most of it. The repeater expert
> may be in the dark about wire antennas. The digital folks may be
> helpless with power supplies. And even the most knowledgeable "radio
> professionals" can be utterly clueless about the practical aspects of
> amateur radio.

And how! The idea that we are going to get EE's in here is essentially meaningless. It should be changed to RF engineers.... and of course the ones who want to have their hobby also be their vocation. It takes a special person indeed.

>> I am very disappointed that the winners in this one do not seem to have
>>any plan at all.
>
>

> Actually, some of them do. For instance, here are some gems from Fred
> Maia, W5YI:
>
> - Outlaw all forms of amateur bulletins and one way information
> transmissions, INCLUDING CODE PRACTICE, below 30 MHz (1995 petition to
> the FCC)

Booooring! And I know why too. Well, I oculd be wrong too. Was W1MAN
transmitting back then?

> - Reduce the entry level license to a 20 question written and include
> voice privileges on the bands above 20 meters

It's good to see he "retired" as a VEC. He really wanted that job to be
easy.

> Here are some others I've seen, by various others:
>
> - Institute an age requirement of 14 years as the minimum for any
> class of amateur license
>
> - Eliminate all subbands-by-mode
>
> - Reduce the number of license classes to one all-privs license.
>
> - Reduce the number of license classes to two - entry and all-privs.
>
> You get the idea.
>
>
>>All we hear are their personal thought on how *they*
>>don't support some of what is being proposed. That's nice, but Doggonit,
>>That doesn't cut it! They have to be darn active in seeing that things
>>don't fall apart around us. The ball is in their court now, and it seems
>>they don't know what to do with it. I don't really care what they
>>personally think, I want to see what they are going to do. And so far.......
>
>
> What you're seeing is what I call the "Zen method of design", where
> they will never tell you what they want, only what they don't want.

And howaboddit! they don't like whatever I come up with.

>>>> Gloat time is over. Your time has come. You now have the chance to
>>>>prove that you were right. And browbeating the losers isn't a very good
>>>>start.
>>>
>
>
>>>Maybe we'll see a lot of newcomers and technoadvances after the code test goes.
>>>And maybe we won't. Personally, I don't think we'll see either.
>>

>> Probably not. Those who do advance the art are a small core of
>>technical adroit's, who come up with techniques that must not only
>>advance the art, but must be adapted by enough people to make them
>>viable. After all, it isn't much fun to have the newest cool method of
>>communication if there is only a couple people to communicate with.
>
>
> BINGO!
>
> Which means that the advance must be publicized, affordable, and offer
> hams something they want.
>
> Example: Cecil, W5DXP, used to rave about PACTOR-2. I started to look
> into it, and discovered that (at the time) implementing it required
> not just a shack computer but a $600 dedicated PACTOR 2 box. Which
> explains why so few hams use the mode, compared to, say, PSK-31.

Haw! I wonder how many hams use that mode, any stats? It sounds like
some of the EME frequencies noted in QST where they name off all six of
the people who use it!

>>>If that happens, what will be blamed for the ARS' perceived problems??
>>
>
>
>> The PCTA's, because of their being so negative, and scaring the new
>>people away?
>
>
> "Negative"? We're not "negative" - we're FOR something!

I'd sure think so.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1529. The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 19:14:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4125A2.8070100@psu.edu>
Source record: 74942

Now taking nominations for the "BPL" of rrap!

The successful candidate will be capable of keeping up a virtual S9
group noise level.

Who will it be????

- Mike KB3EIA -

1530. Re: CW sub-bands must disapear

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 20:09:38 UTC
From: F4ASK <f4ask@wanadoo.fr>
Message-ID: <XnF93DBE16A19585GilbertF4ASK@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 74943

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) a cru bon de raconter en ce si beau jour
news:c2356669.0307220809.18893bc2@posting.google.com:

> "Tobias" <tobias@ntlworld.com> wrote in message
> news:<DUSSa.1818$D67.92684@newsfep1-win.server.ntli.net>...
>> The Titanic sunk, becouse of the way it was built.
>> Remember what year it was.
>> "Nomen Nescio" <nobody@dizum.com> wrote in message
>> news:5b8059907b021f46b1f67ca6e9f44593@dizum.com...
>
>> > Remember TITANIC had sunk because CW
>> > was used. If SSB was used, the ship
>> > has been saved.
>
> Yes, it's an obvious troll. However, the sinking was a direct result
> of multiple human errors rather than any technological breakdown.
> Other radio modes would not have made a difference. For radio to be
> any good somebody has to turn it on, and do something with the
> information received.
>
> The Marconi ops delivered at least six ice warnings to Captain Smith
> but he did not order a reduction in speed or change of course.
> Although it was a moonless calm night, the lookouts did not have
> binoculars. Etc. The list goes on and on.
>
> Sister ships Olympic and Britannic were modified after the Titanic
> loss, but Britannic was lost after striking a mine in the Med while
> serving as a hospital ship. Olympic ("Old Reliable" to her crew)
> served 25 years, including WW1 service as a troop ship, and wound up
> being scrapped.
>
> The Titanic disaster serves as an object lesson of how even the best
> available technology cannot prevent all possible disasters due to
> human error. IOW, there's no cure for stupid.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

One thing is sure, Jim and others : The trolling guy who began the thread
has the same speech in french and, I'm sure, in many other languages.
This guy is a disaster... So let him trolling - alone !

--
Gilbert F4ASK
LE HAVRE

1531. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 20:32:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4137D2.6060003@psu.edu>
Source record: 74945

Thanks for the link to your proposal, Carl.

A question though. I notice that the proposal to drop element one is there, but why doesn't the proposal rename the other elements so that they are in sequence?

I've been around enough of these sort of documents to know that sooner or later it will have to be changed.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1532. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 20:34:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F413841.7050003@psu.edu>
Source record: 74944

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:9829b709.0308170942.5bb877f9@posting.google.com...
>
>>>And history runs counter also. No coders have mostly stayed away from
>>
>>ARRL , and that seems unlikely to change anytime soon. They just don't
>>see much in it for them.
>
>
> Dick,
>
> Did you (or the ARRL Board of Directors, more importantly)
> EVER CONSIDER the POSSIBILITY that the nocoders are
> staying away from the ARRL (in droves) because they don't
> want to contribute dues to an organization that's been dedicated
> (and still is, by policy) to keep them off of HF???

If they don't want to join the ARRL, there's no way you're gonna stop
'em! (apologies to Yogi)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1533. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 20:56:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308181256.63c3351d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74946

Anonymous <rebleep@hush.com> wrote in message
news:<f22c46f4d1aad944320eb2574ee5ba96@rebleep>...
> In article <3F4046D6.D6294DED@earthlink.net>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> >
> >
> > Brian wrote:

> > > Do you think he'll avoid 440 - 450 MHz?
> >
> > Nope. Besides, he'd need one helluva signal for us to share space there.
> > Oddly enough, I have no difficulty working stations in his area on 432.
>
> Those award-winning "people-skills" are sure shining, goatblower.

Would you cut it out!

You're making it really difficult to have a serious discussion with Dave.

Oh, nevermind. There never could be a serious discussion with Dave.

1534. For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 21:37:13 UTC
From: Derek <danda95@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <cGb0b.131$5S2.87@newsfep3-gui.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74947

What makes you all better operators it HAS been removed, so if you do not like it why don't you take up knitting or something. or stop all the bickering If the truth is known a lot of us have come up from the CB ranks over the years

--

1535. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 21:53:40 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB66C391.24751%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 74948

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> Belittling ham radio? Moi??? Hmmm, you may have
> a point there. Now that ham radio licensing
> requirements in the U.S. have been reduced to
> insignificance, and are about to be made a whole
> lot less significant when code testing is
> abolished, I guess one could make the point that
> there is a lot "belittleable" about ham radio
> these days! We are about to start the first
> "generation" of hams who have never been bothered
> to learn the Morse code, and will never know the
> benefits and advantages of the Morse/CW mode from
> personal operational experience. Now THERE's a
> perfect example of something that would inspire
> one to "belittle" ham radio, indeed!

Well, if you don't like ham radio today, perhaps you should find another hobby. Only a masochist would continue doing something that makes him or her miserable. Ham radio is moving in a direction opposite from what you seem to want and is not likely to move in the direction you want anytime soon. When that happens, you either learn to live with it, walk away, or continue to be miserable. If you choose the later, it is rather sleazy of you to take your misery out on the new members of this activity. They didn't ask for your negative garbage (none of us did), and this activity certainly would be far better off without it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1536. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 22:37:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308181437.61fe6a6c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74949

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308140938.e2260e1@posting.google.com>...

> Some of us have given it real thought, and have posted ideas. But the
> mantra has always been that eliminating the code test would solve
> everything.

No-code isn't a religion. No Mantra.

The Mantra has always been that:

1. The Code always gets thru
2. The Code will keep out the riff-raff
3. The Code requires just the right amount of suffering to prove ones devotions

Aaron Jones keeps the other 47 Mantras.

1537. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 22:48:03 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <DIc0b.27019$Vx2.12334843@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 74950

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:aL40b.111097$_R5.40625014@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> Speak for yourself, Carl. I certainly did NOT have to jump through any
> hoops. I set a goal, researched the requirements, and then set about
meeting
> said requirements.
>
> I also make sure that in all the letters and e-mails I send to the league,
> FCC, political reps, etc. I inform them that the current Morse code test
was
> no barrier for this newbie and did NOT "force" me to jump through any
hoops.
> So please don't allow any individual or group promoting the "barrier/hoop"
> line of Bravo Sierra to include me in their demographic. I suspect there
are
> more NTs (As opposed to OTs or OFs) like me who dislike being associated
> with underachievement. I hope they too will take the time to make their
> views on the matter heard.
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
> FISTS# 9384
>
>

Nor did I find Morse to be a barrier. Just as you did, I researched the requirements, investigated study methods, and then proceeded to fulfill the requirements. Although I did not use the mode all that much at first, I find in the last two years that my usage is growing by leaps and bounds.

As a supporter of Morse, I've recently sent in my membership request to FISTS. I'll also be putting together a "learn/improve your Morse code" class for our club sometime this year.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1538. Re: radio-amateur and CB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 22:52:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <dNc0b.27047$Vx2.12336032@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 74951

"F4ASK" <f4ask@wanadoo.fr> wrote in message
news:XnF93DB9663FE8CFGilbertF4ASK@130.133.1.4...
> I don't know exactly why French (and other) administration let the CBers
> working around the legal band : I think (but only me) this band is not
> good enough for HF transmissions... But what about 10 m ? Very
> strange....
>

The CB band, being between the 10m and 12m ham bands, will follow the same physics of radio propagation as the surrounding ham bands. When conditions are good, you can work the world on a few watts. When conditions are bad, all the power in the world won't help.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1539. Re: Larry "outed" as ex-CBer (was Re: QR10-4)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 22:54:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308181454.5799b6e0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74952

```
Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com> wrote in message
news:<4b96eda24cf695973b8c5d298855f486@dizum.com>...
> In article <3F3FEA06.449E77FD@earthlink.net>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> >
> >
> > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F3EE85E.E8A0DA4C@earthlink.net>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > Perhaps there should
> > > > > be a no content indicator in the preamble of your messages.
> > > >
> > > > I usually find your name a giveaway.
> > > >
> > > > Dave K8MN
> > >
> > > In addition to putting AveryFine in front of your messages, you're
> > > going to start putting my name on them?
> >
> > I am not now, nor have I ever posted as Avery Fine or any other name
> > than my own.
>
> Liar.

Wow! Is your real name Steve?

73, Brian
```

1540. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 23:27:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308181527.76384ed9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74953

wa3iyc@aol.com (WA3IYC) wrote in message
news:<20030818071755.01893.00000095@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <ZIT%a.141$6e5.34853@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >news:c2356669.0308170927.346c4e95@posting.google.com...
> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:<mlM%a.98$6e5.29672@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> >> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >> > news:c2356669.0308170411.f2366d1@posting.google.com...
> >> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:<g%u%a.72$6e5.16725@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> >> > > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >> > > > news:c2356669.0308160744.19006d94@posting.google.com...
> >> > > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:<gpg%a.32$6e5.6019@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > > > NCI's Petition for Rulemaking with the FCC.
> >> > > > > >
> >> > > > > > It is available in .pdf format at http://www.nocode.org
> >> > > > > > under the "Articles" link ...
> >> > > > > >
> >> > > > > OK, let's cut to the chase.
> >> > > > > >
> >> > > > > Obviously the main request is to dump Element 1 ASAP. And there's
> >> > > > > probably lots of reasons given for doing so, including the
> >> > > > > Commission's own words "no regulatory purpose".
> >> > > > > >
> >> > > > > But what else was in the petition?
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > I gave you a URL where you could read it ...
>
> Not really. You gave the main website and left it up to the reader to find the
> article, then download it and open it as a pdf.
>
> If you really wanted people to read it, you'd have it front-and-center on the
> webpage and post a direct link.

I found it, read it, and understood it. And Bunion Heil has all but
called me retarded.

What exactly was your problem?

> >> > >
> >> > > That's not what I asked.
> >> > >
> >> > > Here's the answer, to save others the bother of reading 20 pages to
> >> > > get the answer to my question:
> >> > >
> >> > > NOTHING.
> >> >
> >> > Jim,
> >> >
> >> > You say "NOTHING"
> >>
> >> That's right.
> >>
> >> >... but in the following paragraphs you admit
> >> > that "Most of the 20 pages is supporting reasons to make the change."
> >>
> >> Yup. And that was already referred to.
> >
> >Yes, referred to with a thinly-veiled attempt to dissuade others from
> >reading and considering all of those reasons.
>
> Not at all. My main concern was whether there were other things in the
> petition, such as written test changes, license class changes, etc. There
> weren't.

That could be learned by reading it. Congratulations.

> >> Look again at what I wrote:
> >>
> >> "Obviously the main request is to dump Element 1 ASAP."
> >>
> >> Which is true.
> >
> >Yes ... what did you expect?
>
> I expected that much. It's the unexpected that I was concerned about.
>
> Since NCI does not want me as a member, and keeps its internal policy functions
> secret, I was simply asking for a quick indication of what other issues would
> be covered.

I just love these non-members demanding resources and actions.
Typical code welfare mentality.

> > That *IS* NCI's chartered goal.
>
> And it's a good thing they are sticking to it, rather than getting bogged down
> in other issues.

Such as?

> >> "And there's probably lots of reasons given for doing so, including
> >> the
> >> Commission's own words "no regulatory purpose"."
> >>
> >> Which is also true.
> >>
> >> And then the question:
> >>
> >> "But what else was in the petition?"
> >>
> >> The "what else" refers to things OTHER THAN dropping Element 1 and
> >> reasons to drop Element 1.
> >>
> >> And the correct answer is: NOTHING. The petition consists of a request
> >> to drop element 1 and reasons to do so.
> >
> >What did you expect?
>
> See above.

See above.

> > That is what a Petition for Rulemaking IS ... a
> >specific
> >request(s) and all of the supporting arguments ...
>
> Those specific requests could be anything.

The supporting arguments could be anything also.

> > I *really* don't know what else you're asking for ...
>
> Here, I'll spell it out for ya:
>
> You could have simply answered my question this way:
>
> 'NCI requested the immediate removal of Element 1 for all classes of license
> and the granting of Novice/Tech Plus privileges to all Technicians. Detailed
> supporting arguments were included in the proposal. No other changes were
> requested because they fall outside the stated purpose of NCI."

All you have to do is denounce the code exam as the true saviour of
amateur radio, join the organization, and issue such a statement
yourself.

> One paragraph. Three sentences. Short sweet and concise. 100% accurate. Would
> it have been so hard to have answered my question that way?

Yet you have arrived at a short, sweet, concise, and apparently 100%
accurate answer without any help from Carl. The mind is a powerful
tool, isn't it?

> >> > I think that's important information for folks to consider ... that's
> >> > why

> >> > I encourage folks to actually READ and consider the NCI Petition,
> >> > rather than relying on your "5 cent synopsis."
> >>
> >> I've read and cosidered it, and I'm opposed to it.
> >
> >Really? (what a surprise)
>
> Yes, really.

That's what I love about America. We can have differences of opinion
without blowing up oil pipelines or water pipelines.

> >> > Why do you want to "save others the bother" of reading the Petition?
> >>
> >> Because we already know that it would contain a request to drop
> >> Element 1 and reasons to do so. Those reasons have been argued
> >> endlessly here and elsewhere.
> >
> >The reasons elaborated in the Petition form the factual, legal, and
> >rational basis for granting the request ... I think they're presented
> >clearly in a well-organized manner that, in only 20 pages, tells a
> >a reader all they need to know to make an informed decision based
> >on the facts.
>
> My summary, above, boils it down to three sentences.

But the FCC contract attorneys get paid by the page.

> >You don't WANT people reading it and coming to the logical
> >conclusion, IMHO ...
>
> Not at all! Did I say anyone should not read it? Of course not! I simply wanted
> to save the time of wading through 20 pages of same-old same-old looking for
> something new.

Code is something old. Code Exams are something old. What did you
expect, Farnsworth?

> >> My question was about what else was in the petition besides dropping
> >> Element 1 and reasons to do so.
> >
> >That wasn't clear at all ...
>
> Sure it was...if you read what I wrote.
>
> >and why you would expect more escapes me,
> >since, as I pointed out above, all of the essential elements of a Petition
> >for Rulemaking are there (and you knew the what the goal of the Petition
> >would be before it was written ...)
>
> Because there is always the chance that something unexpected would be in there.

More the reason to read it yourself.

> >> > (Could it be that you find the arguments so compelling that you don't
> >> > WANT others to read them???)
> >>
> >> Nope. None of the arguments are compelling at all. Not to me, anyway -
> >> YMMV. And we've all read them many times before.
> >
> >OK, we disagree ... but I believe the FCC (and MANY amateurs) will
> >find the arguments compelling.
>
> Sure. They've already been convinced. Did not FCC write, almost 4 years ago,
> "no regulatory purpose"? Those three little words say it all.

Yet you disagree. Is that not enough for you?

> >> I don't think the petition will change anyone's mind.
> >
> >You HOPE not ... that's why you try to brush it off as somehow being
> >insignficant and "not worth the time to read." Interesting tactic, but
> >I doubt that it will work.
>
> Has anyone's mind been changed?

Nope.

> >> > > The NCI petition consists of a request to drop Element 1 without
> >> > > further delay or discussion and give Techs the same privileges as Tech
> >> > > Pluses. No other changes proposed. Most of the 20 pages is supporting
> >> > > reasons to make the change.
> >>
> >> Is this synopsis not 100% accurate?
> >
> >Yup ... and that's EXACTLY what's SUPPOSED to be there.
>
> In your opinion. Do you dictate NCI policy, Carl, or is it formulated by the
> Board? I'm an outsider, remember - not even privileged to know how many
> members NCI has.

All you have to do is denounce the code exam as the true saviour of
amateur radio. We might even initiate you into the Wolf Wong Club,
the PTT Pounders Club, and DX Millenium Club (DXMC).

Just kidding. We have none of that in NCI.

> >> > > > > As you have pointed out, Carl, FCC hasn't even given any of the
> >> > > > > proposals an RM number yet. And it's reasonable to assume there
> will
> >> > > > > be more proposals - from NCVEC, ARRL, and other groups. FCC may
> assign
> >> > > > > numbers, or they may take ideas from each one and produce an NPRM.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > NCVEC already filed a petition, as have several individuals.
> >> > >

> >> > > It's clear NCVEC isn't done yet. They're talking about other changes
> >> > > too.
> >> >
> >> > That's their business ... NCI is focused on the Morse test issue and
> >> > is not proposing more sweeping changes that are outside of our
> >> > charter ...
> >>
> >> That's the smart way to go. Focus on the core issue and don't be
> >> delayed or derailed by other issues.
> >
> >Bingo ... and I don't believe that the FCC will allow this issue to
> >get bogged down with other unrelated issues. It's too clear-cut,
> >whereas other issues (band segmentation, privs by license class,
> >etc.) are clearly going to be harder to deal with because they are
> >not so clear-cut.
> >(They're also not NCI's charter, so they're not our "ox to gore.")
>
> Maybe. OTOH, if the issue is that clear cut, why is FCC dragging its feet? I
> actually thought the main delay would be ratification, and that the removal of
> Element 1 would be a quick MO&O thing. Now it looks like the whole NPRM cycle
> will be invoked. A year - 2 years....?

Why does the government drag its feet? It took 10 months to hire a
Sky Marshall after 9/11, and you want them to address the code exam
issue within moments of the end of the meeting?

> >> There are supposedly four other petitions filed, too. Wonder what they
> >> say?
> >
> >They basically say the same thing, in various levels of detail and
> >sophistication,
> >ranging from a 1-pager from a guy who's filed MANY (read between the lines)
>
> Not many lines to read between in a one-pager...

The key word was "MANY."

> >to a few pages of generally well-considered material that doesn't have the
> >cites
> >to law, previous FCC decisions/determinations, etc. that NCI's has. They
> >all
> >add to the momentum, however ...
>
> Maybe. NPRM means comments...

So does NOI.

> I urge all to read the NCI proposal and consider the arguments contained
> therein. I don't agree with them or find them compleiing - maybe others will.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I encourage all thinking people to read and consider the proposal,
especially should the FCC address it through an NOI or NPRM.
Participatory government fails when citizens don't participate.

Brian

1541. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 23:46:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhrofmpnf1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74956

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bhp866$bop@library2.airnews.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:BB653FDA.2462B%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> > "Brian Kelly" wrote:
> >
> > > (snip) The second best piece of news today is
> > > the new eggs in the face of the power industry.
> > > Their credibility has dropped to zip in 48 hours
> > > flat and methinks that they'll now have bigger
> > > problems selling BPL given the fact that their
> > > core technologies need all the attention they
> > > can muster.
> >
> >
> > You're an optimist, Brian. Instead, I see the power industry more
likely
> > claiming they need the new income from BPL to raise the additional funds
> > needed to modernize the existing infrastructure. Industry has plenty of
> > people to spin anything into a positive outcome for industry.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
>
> The crux of the matter is that the greater part of the power industry is
> investor-owned. That says it all as to how easy this will be to win, etc.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

I feel that if/when the FCC authorizes this trash the NTIA will way in.
Just like they did with the 5 mhz deal. If you don't know NTIA is the
agency that takes care of EVERYTHING else in the RF world that the FCC
don't. Such as FEMA, Military...etc frequency allocations and assignments.

Even after all this and if it fails to knock some sense into the FCC then we
can try congress intervention. Like what happened when the FCC wanted to
increase the monopoly of large corporations to own more media access
systems.

And if that don't work, which it likely will, we can all just fire up a lot more often with a lot more power.

In a short while the problem will be over. Because if it bugs us I'll guarantee we will trash it.

Dan/W4NTI

1542. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 23:54:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhrp2fuft1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74957
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:k770kv0fpurotsj8f0o239e0vd3vnpi2db@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 18:15:00 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >I agree with Walt. The USA needs to stop putting these enemies in a
camp.
> >What we should do is just shoot them on site.
>
> Yes, Dan. You are in good company. Idi Amin, who died this week,
> used to do just that to anyone who opposed him.
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

No my dear sir I am not acting like that idiot. I am simply trying to state that since this country is at WAR. And those you feel so tender toward ARE trying to KILL every American they can. THen then are indeed ENEMIES in a time of WAR. And deserve NO QUARTER, NO TRIAL, perhaps a military tribunal and then we shoot them.

Dan/W4NTI

1543. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 23:58:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhrp5e$2na$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74958
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:je70kvs4jshf5e3cj133rjggltkdaphoco@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 18:34:42 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >We don't have a colonial view on anybody. We made that mistake with the
> >Phillipines and Puerto Rico. And we still can't get rid of Puerto Rico.
>
> And the US Virgin Islands. And Guantanamo Bay. And Guam. And
> numerous other Pacific islands (many of which were used for nuclear
> testing).
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

Yes I missed the US Virgin Islands. They are a protectorite and remain so
WILLINGLY. As for Gitmo. We LEASED that fair and square. And the lease is
STILL VALID. And Guam has had the chance to clear out. THey choose not to.

As for the 'other' Pacific islands...would you perhaps be refering to the
Marshals? The ONLY Island that was nuked was BIKINI. No others. It is
part of a several hundred mile string of islands that are now INDEPENDENT
and have been from several years.

Gets your facts please....Oh BTW I was in the Marshalls in the 80s.

Dan/W4NTI

1544. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-18 23:59:44 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhrp8e$5mo$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74959
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Steve Terry" <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote in message
news:BwX%a.15151$yl6.5469@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net...
> "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:je70kvs4jshf5e3cj133rjggltkdaphoco@4ax.com...
> > On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 18:34:42 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > >We don't have a colonial view on anybody. We made that mistake with
the
> > >Phillipines and Puerto Rico. And we still can't get rid of Puerto
Rico.
> >
> > And the US Virgin Islands. And Guantanamo Bay. And Guam. And
> > numerous other Pacific islands (many of which were used for nuclear
> > testing).
> > 73 de G3NYY
> > Walt Davidson
> >
> Not forgetting what was British Honduras, and all the unsinkable aircraft
> carriers like RAF Lakenheath and hundreds of other countries airfields
around
> the world
>
> Steve Terry
>
>

Poor Steve. Feeling sorry for yourselves? Perhaps we could give you
Liberia to make you feel better, wat say mate?

Dan/W4NTI

1545. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 00:04:18 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhrpgvajl1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74960
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Steve Terry" <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote in message
news:ReX%a.15145$yl6.1259@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bhp28lmnn1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> > news:vd3ujv8tu6ft9t47vk49364nrqm24knl08@4ax.com...
> > > On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 04:39:40 +0100, "Steve Terry"
> > > <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote:
> > > >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > >news:bhgsoi$9nq$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> <snip>
> > > We do not transport people suspected of a crime to a military prison
> > > camp in one of our off-shore colonies and keep them incarcerated there
> > > for a year or more without trial. I can think of a country that
> > > does.
> > > 73 de G3NYY
> > > Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com
> >
> > I agree with Walt. The USA needs to stop putting these enemies in a
camp.
> > What we should do is just shoot them on site.
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> It would be more honest, and be what's expected of Americans
>
> It's worrying, if the British are supposed to be Americas conscience,
> what would they get up to without us ! ;-(
>
> Steve Terry
>
>
Got a point there Steve. But I hate to tell you.....we have outgrown King
George.

Dan/W4NTI

1546. Hello folks! I'm looking for reasonably-priced gear.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 00:04:27 UTC
From: danielmorlan@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <a7dee37b.0308181604.647c667d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74961

I'm just a month away from nailing both my technician and will be for sure, chasing after that general license. (I'm getting both books) I've been studying like mad, and I've even gotten to where I could do 5 wpm morse code already. I'm pretty much going to jump right into all this. That being said...

I'm probably not going to be buying brand-spanking-new gear. But I want something of a transciever. A tabletop unit... Could any of you vets suggest a good brand? I'll have about $700.00 to work with.

DJM

1547. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 00:11:02 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030818201102.14837.00002274@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 74963

In article <_N40b.196$6e5.44391@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030818071755.01893.00000095@mb-m22.aol.com...
>> In article <ZIT%a.141$6e5.34853@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> >news:c2356669.0308170927.346c4e95@posting.google.com...
>> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>> >news:<mlM%a.98$6e5.29672@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> >> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> >> > news:c2356669.0308170411.f2366d1@posting.google.com...
>> >> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:<g%u%a.72$6e5.16725@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> >> > > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>> >> > > > news:c2356669.0308160744.19006d94@posting.google.com...
>> >> > > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:<gpg%a.32$6e5.6019@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> >> > > > > >
>> >> > > > > > NCI's Petition for Rulemaking with the FCC.
>> >> > > > > > >
>> >> > > > > > It is available in .pdf format at http://www.nocode.org
>> >> > > > > > under the "Articles" link ...
>> >> > > > > >
>> >> > > > > OK, let's cut to the chase.
>> >> > > > > >
>> >> > > > > Obviously the main request is to dump Element 1 ASAP. And
>there's
>> >> > > > > probably lots of reasons given for doing so, including the
>> >> > > > > Commission's own words "no regulatory purpose".
>> >> > > > > >
>> >> > > > > But what else was in the petition?
>> >> > > > >
>> >> > > > I gave you a URL where you could read it ...
>>
>> Not really. You gave the main website and left it up to the reader to find
>the
>> article, then download it and open it as a pdf.
>>
>> If you really wanted people to read it, you'd have it front-and-center on
>the
>> webpage and post a direct link.

>
>That's not the way the website is structured ... I inherited the structure
>and have been too busy with more important things to change it.

There is no one else to work on it?
>
>Besides, it works ... it's easy to find the Articles link (QUITE prominent
>in the "toolbar" in the upper left), then scroll to the article you want.
>
>As far as the link to the entire Petition in .pdf goes ... .pdf is a
>widely-accepted
>way of distributing docs that can be read on virtually any computer/OS
>platform
>(the doc looks exactly the same on my Linux machine as on my WinDoze
>machine)
>
>It's also the exact same document that was printed to file with the FCC, so
>the content and formatting are exactly what we filed, no ifs, ands, or buts
...
>
Then why not simply post this URL:

http://www.nocode.org/articles/NCI_Pet_RM.pdf

One click and there you are.

>> Not at all. My main concern was whether there were other things in the
>> petition, such as written test changes, license class changes, etc. There
>> weren't.
>
>Not NCI's charter ...

Agreed.

>we've always said that the accusations that we
>had an agenda to "gut" the writtens and other such falsehoods and inuendo
>were untrue.

That's because some folks confuse the writings and speech of Fred Maia, W6YI,
and NCI. Mr. Maia is an NCI director, is he not?

>We've proved it by asking for exactly what we said we
>wanted to achieve all along.
>
This time.

>> >> Look again at what I wrote:
>> >>
>> >> "Obviously the main request is to dump Element 1 ASAP."
>> >>
>> >> Which is true.
>> >
>> >Yes ... what did you expect?

>>
>> I expected that much. It's the unexpected that I was concerned about.
>
>And why did you "expect" something "unexpected" ???

Some time back a petition was filed by the Central States VHF Society. IIRCm
that petition sought to replace the 100 kHz CW-only subbands on 6 and 2 meters
with 300 kHz wide "narrowmode" subbands. I think it may have also involved
small parts of 222 and 432 MHz. The petition sought to create a "weak signal"
haven from FM and other "wide" modes.

The CSVHFS petition had nothing to do with code testing or license
requirements. The subbands requested in the petition would have been open to
all hams except Novices. The subbands requested represented a tiny percentage
of the bands involved (7.5% or less) and would have been open to many modes
besides CW/Morse.

NCI vigorously OPPOSED that petition, even though it had nothing whatsoever to
do with code testing. I clearly recall the catchphrase "no setasides for legacy
modes!".

You were saying about "not in NCI's charter"? Perhaps NCI learned from that
experience...

>NCI has always been totally up-front about its goals ...

"No setasides for legacy modes"? Ahem....
>
>> Since NCI does not want me as a member, and keeps its internal policy
>> functions secret, I was simply asking for a quick indication of what other
issues
>> would be covered.
>
>If you support continued Morse proficiency testing, you don't meet the
>qualifications for membership

That's right, I don't.

>... if you honestly change your views, we'd
>welcome you as a member, same as everyone else.
>
How many members has NCI welcomed?

>> >You don't WANT people reading it and coming to the logical
>> >conclusion, IMHO ...
>>
>> Not at all! Did I say anyone should not read it? Of course not! I simply
>>wanted
>> to save the time of wading through 20 pages of same-old same-old looking
>> for something new.
>
>You said "save others the bother" of reading the Petition ... which is
>tantamount to encouraging others to not read it ...

Do you think my comment caused anyone to not read the petition? I don't.
>
>> >and why you would expect more escapes me,
>> >since, as I pointed out above, all of the essential elements of a
>> >Petition
>> >for Rulemaking are there (and you knew the what the goal of the Petition
>> >would be before it was written ...)
>>
>> Because there is always the chance that something unexpected would be in
>> there.
>
>So, you also insinuate that NCI *might* be dishonest about its agenda/goals
>and "try to pull a fast one on you"???

"No setasides for legacy modes..." AHEM.
>
>We've said all along what our goals are ... the paranoia of the PCTA is what
>has been the source of all sorts of ridiculous FUD about "NCI's hidden
>agendas" and "what NCI will do AFTER the code test is gone."

CSVHFS petition......

After the last code test is gone, NCI will cease to exist, right?

>> >> > > The NCI petition consists of a request to drop Element 1 without
>> >> > > further delay or discussion and give Techs the same privileges as
>> >> > > Tech
>> >> > > Pluses. No other changes proposed. Most of the 20 pages is
>> >> > > supporting reasons to make the change.
>> >>
>> >> Is this synopsis not 100% accurate?
>> >
>> >Yup ... and that's EXACTLY what's SUPPOSED to be there.
>>
>> In your opinion. Do you dictate NCI policy, Carl, or is it formulated by
>> the
>> Board? I'm an outsider, remember - not even privileged to know how many
>> members NCI has.
>
>No, I do NOT dictate NCI policy ... it is formed by the Board, with input
>from the membership.

W5YI is on that board, right? He has proposed things that go far beyond mere
removal of Element 1.

> I'm just telling you the reality that "the Petition
>has
>exactly what's supposed to be there" ... in other words, it's what was
>approved by the Board.

Of course.
>
>> >> That's the smart way to go. Focus on the core issue and don't be

>> >> delayed or derailed by other issues.
>> >
>> >Bingo ... and I don't believe that the FCC will allow this issue to
>> >get bogged down with other unrelated issues. It's too clear-cut,
>> >whereas other issues (band segmentation, privs by license class,
>> >etc.) are clearly going to be harder to deal with because they are
>> >not so clear-cut.
>> >(They're also not NCI's charter, so they're not our "ox to gore.")
>>
>> Maybe. OTOH, if the issue is that clear cut, why is FCC dragging its feet?
>> I actually thought the main delay would be ratification, and that the
>> removal of
>> Element 1 would be a quick MO&O thing. Now it looks like the whole NPRM
>> cycle will be invoked. A year - 2 years....?
>
>Ratification is not necessary for the FCC to act ... that's spelled out
>clearly in law ...

Yet a few weeks ago another NCI board member thought we'd have to wait for
ratification. So did I. We were mistaken.

>heck the Senate is SEVERAL WRCs behind in ratification ..

Not the Senate. They can't ratify what has not been sent to them by the State
Dept.

> the FCC is sending them a "catch up" package.

I thought it was the State Dept.

>But,
>again, that has no bearing on the FCC's ability to act on the changes
>in Article 25.
>
>We shall see what course the FCC takes on this matter ... as they
>say, "It's not over until the fat lady sings."
>
It may take her two years to get to the stage, though.

>> Maybe. NPRM means comments...
>
>Been there, done that

Yes - the MAJORITY of comments to 98-143 wanted at least two code test speeds.
So the nocodetest position is a minority view. I recall someone here saying
something about how 'those in the minority should take 'no' for an answer and
get on with life' or words to that effect. Wasn't a PCTA who wrote that,,,,

>... the facts haven't changed, except in NCI's favor
>in terms of the progress of technology making the "need" for Morse less
>and less with time,

Is it about the MODE or the TEST?

>and the changing demographic of the US amateur population.

Hmmm...back in 1996, the ARRL/READEX poll (which was a random group, not self-selected) showed that the procodetest opinion varied with age. Oddly enough, the YOUNGEST group (24 and under) were the MOST procodetest! 85% procodetest vs 15% nocodetest. Almost 6 to 1 - and these are the YOUNG PEOPLE whom we are told are the FUTURE of amateur radio. Shouldn't we listen very hard to what those folks say?

The oldest of those folks are now 30 or 31.
>
>> I urge all to read the NCI proposal and consider the arguments contained
>> therein. I don't agree with them or find them compleiing - maybe others
>>will.
>
>OK, thanks Jim ... I appreciate your gesture. It's certainly better than
>implying that reading the Petition would be a waste of time.

And you say the PCTA are paranoid?

Here's that URL again:

http://www.nocode.org/articles/NCI_Pet_RM.pdf

I don't find any of the arguments convincing at all. But it's FCC that matters, and they're already sold on the idea.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1548. Re: New Ham Term

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 00:11:20 UTC
From: danielmorlan@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <a7dee37b.0308181611.2348beba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74962

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030813212211.06745.00001707@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> All new Amateurs entering into Amateur Radio, will no longer be refered to as
> Hams. The new Name will be CBerHams.

I take it this is your expression of distaste for the lowering of
standards to get a ham license?

1549. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 00:13:20 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhrq1uiqp1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74964
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"paul s" <paulslinux@REMOVESPAMhotmail.comKILLER> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.08.18.15.35.10.632485@REMOVESPAMhotmail.comKILLER...
> On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 18:15:00 -0500, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >
> > "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> > news:vd3ujv8tu6ft9t47vk49364nrqm24knl08@4ax.com...
> >> On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 04:39:40 +0100, "Steve Terry"
> >> <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> >
> >> >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:bhgsoi$9nq$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> >> >> Gee Airy......isn't that EXACTLY what the British did in the 17th
and
> > 18th
> >> >> century??? How did it go...."The sun never sets on the British
empire"
> >> >> ?????.
> >> >> Go get your red coat and stand tall. Its all you have left me boy.
> >> >> Dan/W4NTI
> >> >>
> >> >Are you admitting current US foreign policy is one of Imperialism ?!
> >>
> >> We do not transport people suspected of a crime to a military prison
> >> camp in one of our off-shore colonies and keep them incarcerated there
> >> for a year or more without trial. I can think of a country that
> >> does.
> >>
> >> 73 de G3NYY
> >>
> >> --
> >> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com
> >
> > I agree with Walt. The USA needs to stop putting these enemies in a
camp.
>
> Why don't the ameriKKKans sort it properly, and give them a trial?
>
> > What we should do is just shoot them on site.
>
> Nah shoot that idiot George W Bush on sight, and our own stupid Tony
> Blair. Have they found any WMDs yet?? Nope. Are they likely to?? I don't

> think so.
>
> --
> Paul S
> ---
> - You possess a mind not merely twisted, but actually sprained. -
> ---
>

They don't deserve a trial. A military tribunal at the best. Then hang them.

Have you forgotten 9/11? We haven't. They have declared WAR on the USA and westerners in general, in case your too damn stupid to know that by now.

Bitch and moan all you want. We WILL TAKE CARE OF BUSINESS. And we will even cover your sorry ass doing it.

Dan/W4NTI

1550. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 00:15:09 UTC
From: paul s <paulslinux@REMOVESPAMhotmail.comKILLER>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.08.19.00.15.05.293699@REMOVESPAMhotmail.comKILLER>
Source record: 74966
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

On Mon, 18 Aug 2003 19:13:20 -0500, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> They don't deserve a trial. A military tribunal at the best. Then hang
> them.
>
> Have you forgotten 9/11? We haven't. They have declared WAR on the USA and
> westerners in general, in case your too damn stupid to know that by now.
>
> Bitch and moan all you want. We WILL TAKE CARE OF BUSINESS. And we will
> even cover your sorry ass doing it.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

PLONK

--
Paul S

- "OK, so you're a Ph.D. Just don't TOUCH anything!" -

1551. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 00:15:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhrq65pkd1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74965
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Sam" <super@heterodyne.fs???d.co.uk> wrote in message
news:MPG.19ab0bcc80718283989680@news.freeserve.co.uk...
> In article <bhp519dlp1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>,
> w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com says...
>
> >
> > Then I suggest you check with mother England. EH.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Do you still have compulsory blood tests before marriage over there to
> prevent the in-breeding?
>
> --
> Super Sam

Nope.

Dan/W4NTI

1552. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 00:16:54 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bhrq8j$221$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 74967

"Derek" <danda95@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:cGb0b.131$5S2.87@newsfep3-gui.server.ntli.net...
>
> What makes you all better operators it HAS been removed, so if you do not
> like it why don't you take up knitting or something. or stop all the
> bickering If the truth is known a lot of us have come up from the CB ranks
> over the years
>
> --
>
>
>
>

I know a lot of ex CBers, now HAMS that are excellent CW operators. In fact
WORLD CLASS CW Operators. So your logic is flawed.

Dan/W4NTI

1553. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 01:00:44 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <0Fe0b.245$6e5.53456@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 74968

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F413841.7050003@psu.edu...
>
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > "DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> > news:9829b709.0308170942.5bb877f9@posting.google.com...
> >
> >>>And history runs counter also. No coders have mostly stayed away from
> >>
> >>ARRL , and that seems unlikely to change anytime soon. They just don't
> >>see much in it for them.
> >
> >
> > Dick,
> >
> > Did you (or the ARRL Board of Directors, more importantly)
> > EVER CONSIDER the POSSIBILITY that the nocoders are
> > staying away from the ARRL (in droves) because they don't
> > want to contribute dues to an organization that's been dedicated
> > (and still is, by policy) to keep them off of HF???
>
> If they don't want to join the ARRL, there's no way you're gonna stop
> 'em! (apologies to Yogi)
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Mike,

I've been a member of ARRL since before I became a ham
and I'm a QCWA member ...

Carl - wk3c

1554. Re: New Ham Term

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 01:18:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030818211858.21678.00000215@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 74969

>I take it this is your expression of distaste for the lowering of
>standards to get a ham license?
>

No Im just calling it what it is turning into.

1555. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 01:53:30 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308181753.3bb9ac63@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74970

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308181452.4b47c9cd@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308180850.4df738ec@posting.google.com>...
> > vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030817114056.20931.00000146@mb-m13.aol.com>...
>
> > > Secondly, EEs are not joining amateur radio clubs. Some Profs that teach rf
> > > courses that I took do not have amateur radio licenses. People in the rf field
> > > are not attending club meetings.
> >
> > Most people who do "x" for a living generally do not do it for a
> > past time either, Vippy. So what?
>
> From just the small sample called RRAP,
>
> Exhibit 1: David Heil. Claims to have been a Dept. of State
> Radioman.
>
> Exhibit 2: Parson Jim. Claims to be an EE.
>
> Exhibit 3: Barrister Phil. Claims to be an Radio attorney.
>
> Exhibit 4: Labman Ed. Claims to be ARRL Lab Manager.
>
> Exhibit 5: 1000' tall Alien Ed. Claims to be an EE.
>
> Exhibit 6: Machine Gun Kelly. Claims to be some kind of an Engineer,
> mainly in rubberband technologies.
>
> But, as Heil, Jim, Kelly, and you continually point out, doing it for
> a living, i.e., professionally, has absolutely nothing to do with
> doing it amateurishly, i.e., without compensation.

Well, that's a few percent of all posters to rrap.

Evidently you thught you had a point but discovered you were still wearing
it as headgear.

1556. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 02:10:57 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308181810.43a9ba26@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74971

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<KST%a.143$6e5.34981@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F3FE66C.3030906@adelphia.net...
> > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >
> > > I agree that the ARRL is "between a rock and a hard place" with respect
> to
> > > the split in their existing membership.
> >
> > Very much so, I'd agree.
> >
> > > However, outside of their membership
> > > (in the >75% of US hams who are NOT members of the ARRL), I believe
> > > that the demographic is heavily tilted towards the no code test side ...
> >
> > What makes you think this? I'm not trying to be a wise guy, but I agree
> > with you about the polls being self directing. Therefore are you
> > operating on gut feeling, what your friends tell you, or what?
>
> I'm going on what I hear from members, from clubs, from e-mails I
> get from folks, etc.

So you're clearly hearing just what you want to hear.If you'd tunein
the low end of the 40 meter band some night you'd hear the real
evidence.

I'm ALSO going on the demographic of all those
> nocode techs who could get on HF were it not for a stupid Morse
> requirement ... do you REALLY think they are "hot to learn Morse"???
> I don't ...
>

They make it clear they're not "hot to get on HF" either. If they
were
they'd be doing juste as Bert, Dee and Mike have done, and work toward
meeting the requirements instead of ranting and bitching about a
mundane *verey* minimal Morse code test.

> > > thus,
> > > I believe that the ARRL stands to pick up more members than they stand
> > > to lose if they take a position that it's time for Morse testing to go.
> >
> > It remains to be seen. Those for who the Morse test is too much trouble
> > may not be bothered to join the ARRL either.

At $34 per year there'll never be any large percentage of the
minimally interested joining the ARRL, whatever the code test is or
isn't.

>
> ARRL membership provides a lot of benefits through QST, the website,
> and all of the good things they DO do for amateur radio.

Very little if any of which is of any interestinterest to the HT
jocks.

However, selling
> those benefits is difficult when the prospective buyer is someone who knows
> his/her membership dues are going to an organization that's dedicated by
> current policy to keep them off of HF

None of which is in the least applicible to those who have no
interest in joining in the first place.

]

... it doesn't take Einstein or a
> Gallup
> poll to figure that one out ...

It just takes a huge leap to a conclusion.

1557. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 02:24:04 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030818222404.12300.00000033@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 74973

In article <KST%a.143$6e5.34981@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:3F3FE66C.3030906@adelphia.net...
>> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>> > I agree that the ARRL is "between a rock and a hard place" with respect
>> > to the split in their existing membership.
>>
>> Very much so, I'd agree.
>>
>> > However, outside of their membership
>> > (in the >75% of US hams who are NOT members of the ARRL), I believe
>> > that the demographic is heavily tilted towards the no code test side ...
>>
>> What makes you think this? I'm not trying to be a wise guy, but I agree
>> with you about the polls being self directing. Therefore are you
>> operating on gut feeling, what your friends tell you, or what?
>
>I'm going on what I hear from members, from clubs, from e-mails I
>get from folks, etc.

With all due respect, Carl, I don't think that "self selected sample" is
representative of the entire amateur radio community. And I don't think you are
a totally objective observer...;-)

>I'm ALSO going on the demographic of all those
>nocode techs

Which demographic? The ARRL/READEX poll of 1996 showed that the youngest hams
were the most procodetest. Bert Craig, WA2SI, has told you here that he does
not consider Element 1 a "barrier" or "hoop". Other newcomers have said the
same thing. Don't they count?

>who could get on HF were it not for a stupid Morse
>requirement ...

Hmmm...."stupid Morse requirement"? It's been passed by elementary school
children, old people, people with severe disabilities, and everything in
between. Heck, under the old rules we had at least one 8 year old Extra!

The fact is that if Element 1 is dropped, all those non-code-tested Techs will
gain some SSB on 10 meters and four slices of HF CW. (Ironic) In order for them
to get more, they have to jump through another hoop...I mean, pass another
written exam.....;-)

You may not think the General or Extra writtens are very hard, nor that they are "unreasonable", but the fact remains that they have not been shown to be necessary for safe and legal operation of an amateur station.

Why is a Tech considered qualified to use any authorized mode/freq above 30 MHz but unqualified to use all but CW and SSB on a few narrow slices of HF?

>do you REALLY think they are "hot to learn Morse"???

Some of them are. Others aren't.

>I don't ...

With all due respect, Carl, I don't see you as a good spokesperson for the CW/Morse mode....
>
>> > thus,
>> > I believe that the ARRL stands to pick up more members than they stand
>> > to lose if they take a position that it's time for Morse testing to go.
>>
>> It remains to be seen. Those for who the Morse test is too much trouble
>> may not be bothered to join the ARRL either.
>
>ARRL membership provides a lot of benefits through QST, the website,
>and all of the good things they DO do for amateur radio.

Sure - but a lot of hams, of all license classes, don't see those things. Or they aren't interested. I know at least one ham here who gave up on HF because she doesn't like the noise and distortion of HF. And, comparing even the best HF SSB to typical VHF/UHF FM, I can understand her point of view.

Some are still mad about incentive licensing, of all things.

One of the real problems with the Tech license being defacto the entry-level is that, for the most part, beginners nowadays are VHF/UHF centered, with their main focus on voice operation and manufactured equipment. Those things are not bad of themselves. They do, however, tend to distract new hams from nonvoice modes, building their own equipment, and national interests vs. local ones. IOW, they are more likely to join a local radio club than the distant ARRL.

>However, selling
>those benefits is difficult when the prospective buyer is someone who knows
>his/her membership dues are going to an organization that's dedicated by
>current policy to keep them off of HF ...

That's simply not true. Everyone has the same opportunity to pass the required tests - code and written - and get whatever license they desire. There is no policy to keep anyone off HF.

There is also the option of becoming a member, electing new directors, and changing the policy.

>it doesn't take Einstein or a Gallup
>poll to figure that one out ...

How about the ARRL/READEX poll, and what it told us about hams under 24? 85% of them were procodetest. Do you think that number has radically changed since then?

The nocodetest position may carry the day when all is said and done. And then we may well find that the whole issue was a red herring.

Consider this, Carl:

Once the license is in hand, getting on HF can be quite daunting for the newcomer, compared to VHF/UHF.

All a newbie needs on VHF/UHF is an HT, if they are close to repeaters. For a few dollars more, they can have a nice base/mobile duobander with antennas that mount on TV hardware, and/or in the car with a few wires and a magmount.

HF requires much more hardware, big antennas, and a whole pile of other stuff. There are 9 bands and a bunch of modes. Propagation varies all over the place, and mobile is a different game altogether. More time, more space and more money. If you have CC&Rs, things get even tougher.

You have a new house with plenty of space and more resources than perhaps 99% of the rest of us, Carl. What sort of HF station do you have? Yes, I know you're busy - we're ALL busy, though.

Surf on over to

http://www.dell.com

and check out what sort of computer setup $500 to $1000 will buy. That's the competition.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1558. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 02:24:18 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308181824.3c5e5a2e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74972

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308181437.61fe6a6c@posting.google.com>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308140938.e2260e1@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Some of us have given it real thought, and have posted ideas. But the
> > mantra has always been that eliminating the code test would solve
> > everything.
>
> No-code isn't a religion. No Mantra.
>

What??? No "Hoops"??? No "unnecessary requirements"?? No
"Unjustified bogus BOHICA thingies"?? No "Morsedits" holding
back the intelligentsia?? No "If it wasn't for that dastardly
Morris code test I'd take my rightful place on HF??

No Mantra???? Get back to your village!

1559. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 03:10:54 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308181910.3e87545d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74974

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote
>
> As for eHam, I'm sorry but I've never heard of them.
>
>

Well,well... Who was that satirest who used to write a column
entitled "Pardon, your slip is showing"?

I just read in another venue, this from a OT ham who was first
licensed morehan a half-century ago..

"review on eHam.net, a ham radio grand central station which I
financially support, although that is optional.."

So we can easily see why it is you "never heard of it". You've been
sorta distracted for the past couple decades, what with dodging all
those hoops and such.

1560. Re: Blackout: Ohio Hams Help Out

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 03:33:25 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F419A84.6010309@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 74975

Keith wrote:

>POWERLESS: Millions affected by largest blackout in US history - Lorain
>Morning Journal, OH
>
>http://www.morningjournal.com/site/news.cfm?BRD=1699&dept_id=46371&news
>id=10012542&PAG=461&rfi=9
>
>http://tinyurl.com/k4rr
>
>... About 10 HAM Radio operators of the Amateur Radio Association were
>able to help the Red Cross and assist EMS services with communications
>throughout Lorain ...
>
>
>
If BPL actually happens, about the only time hams will be able to do
anything is
during a blackout..... :-)

1561. Re: Dropping the code caused the blackout?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 03:47:52 UTC
From: News Poster <News@News.Poster.com>
Message-ID: <p_g0b.42$NZ1.25@fe05.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 74976

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F3D4B72.2050507@ix.netcom.com...
> I'm sure someone can figure out a connection.....
>
> (;
>

No. See attached news article:

Special Dispatch Series - No. 553
August 19, 2003 No.553

Al-Qa'ida Claims Responsibility for Last Week's Blackout

Al-Qa'ida's Abu Hafs Brigades has claimed responsibility for "Operation Quick Lightning in the Land of the Tyrant of this Generation," referring to the blackout last week in the Northeast and Midwest United States. A communiqu&#65533; by the Abu Hafs Brigades was published at http://groups.yahoo.com/group/abubanan2/message/330. This is the third communiqu&#65533; by the "Brigades" that is being published by the same web-group; in the first, they accepted responsibility for the downing of an airplane in Kenya. The second accepted responsibility for the Jakarta bombing of the Marriott hotel on August 5, 2003.

The new communiqu&#65533; says that in compliance with the orders of Osama bin Laden to strike at the American economy, the Brigades struck two important electricity supply targets on the East coast. The Brigades say that they cannot reveal how they did it, because they will probably have to use the same method again soon. The communiqu&#65533; also claimed that the operation was meant as a present for the Iraqi people.

The following are excerpts from a report by the London-based Arabic daily Al-Hayat about the communiqu&#65533;: [1]

The Blackout was 'a Realization of bin Laden's Promise to Offer the Iraqi People a Present'

"A communiqu&#65533; attributed to Al Qaeda claimed responsibility for the power blackout that happened in the U.S. last Thursday, saying that the brigades of Abu Fahes Al Masri had hit two main power plants supplying the East of the U.S., as well as major industrial cities in the U.S. and Canada, 'its ally in the war against Islam (New York and Toronto) and their neighbors.'

"The communiqu&#65533; assured that the operation 'was carried out on the orders of Osama bin Laden to hit the pillars of the U.S. economy,' as 'a

realization of bin Laden's promise to offer the Iraqi people a present.'

'The Americans Lived a Black Day they will Never Forget'

"The statement, which Al-Hayat obtained from the website of the International Islamic Media Center, didn't specify the way the alleged sabotage was carried out. The communiqu&#65533; read: 'let the criminal Bush and his gang know that the punishment is the result of the action, the soldiers of God cut the power on these cities, they darkened the lives of the Americans as these criminals blackened the lives of the Muslim people in Iraq, Afghanistan and Palestine. The Americans lived a black day they will never forget. They lived a day of terror and fear. a state of chaos and confusion where looting and pillaging rampaged the cities, just like the capital of the caliphate Baghdad, and Afghanistan and Palestine were. Let the American people take a sip from the same glass.'

'The U.S. will not Live in Peace until Our Conditions are Met'

"It added: 'we heard amazing statements made by the American and Canadian enemies which have nuclear physics universities and space agencies, that lightning hit and destroyed the two plants. And we are supposed to believe this nonsense. If the blackout occurred in one or two cities, their lie would have been credible. But the fact is that the blackout hit the entire East and part of Canada.'

"The communiqu&#65533; continued: 'one of the benefits of this strike is that the U.S. will not live in peace until our conditions are met, such as releasing all the detainees including Sheikh Omar Abdulrahman, and getting out of the land of the Muslims, including Jerusalem and Kashmir.'

"The authors of the communiqu&#65533; said that the strikes aimed at 'hitting the major pillar of the U.S. economy (the Stock Exchange). [and] the UN, which is opposed to Islam, and is based in New York. It is a message to all the investors that the U.S. is no longer a safe country for their money, knowing that the U.S. economy greatly relies on the trust of the investor.'

'The Gift of Sheikh Osama bin Laden is on Its Way to the White House'

"The communiqu&#65533; mentioned that some economists said the blackout in the U.S. and Canada would cost the U.S. Treasury no less than ten billion U.S. dollars and in order to 'break the hearts of U.S. officials, just know that the cost paid by the Moujahideen to sabotage the power plants was a mere seven thousand dollars. Die of sorrow!'

"The communiqu&#65533; ended with: 'we tell the Muslims that this is not the awaited strike, but it is called the war of skirmishes (to drain the enemy), and that the American snakes are enormous and need to be consumed and weakened to be destroyed. We tell the people of Afghanistan and Kashmir that the gift of Sheikh Osama bin Laden is on its way to the White House; then the gift of Al Aqsa, and do we know what is the gift of Al Aqsa, where and when? The answer is what you are seeing!'

---

[1] Published in English on Dar Al-Hayat website, August 18, 2003, http://english.daralhayat.com/arab_news/08-2003/Article-20030818-14bdd659-c0a8-01ed-0079-6e1c903b7552/story.html

1562. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 03:53:20 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F419F40.7F698198@earthlink.net>
Source record: 74977

Brian wrote:
>
> Anonymous <rebleep@hush.com> wrote in message
news:<f22c46f4d1aad944320eb2574ee5ba96@rebleep>...
> > In article <3F4046D6.D6294DED@earthlink.net>
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > Do you think he'll avoid 440 - 450 MHz?
> > >
> > > Nope. Besides, he'd need one helluva signal for us to share space there.
> > > Oddly enough, I have no difficulty working stations in his area on 432.
> >
> > Those award-winning "people-skills" are sure shining, goatblower.
>
> Would you cut it out!
>
> You're making it really difficult to have a serious discussion with Dave.
>
> Oh, nevermind. There never could be a serious discussion with Dave.

You could get a serious discussion going with Roger/not Roger, Brian.
Be careful what you wish for.

Dave K8MN

1563. Re: New Ham Term

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 03:57:41 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030818235741.22785.00000228@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74978

From (Daniel J. Morlan)

>The new Name will be CBerHams.
>
>I take it this is your expression of distaste for the lowering of
>standards to get a ham license?

You are mistaken. The license is an Amateur Radio license, not a "ham" license as you state above.

You really should follow what's going on. The standards have not been lowered to get an amateur radio license- the code requirement may be dropped.

Also, not that the code requirement MAY be dropped. It hasn't been dropped yet. Lets hope it does get dropped.

1564. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 04:11:31 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bht4jq$2t36o$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75005

Wrong..... All the arrl needs to do is create the PSA's and distribute them to the various radio and/or television stations.
Commercial radio and television stations are REQUIRED to air a certain amount of PSA announcements per day and being a non-profit, allegedly service-based organization, that would definitely fit the bill. The only cost involved is the creation of the tapes, and the distribution thereof.

>
> As with any organization, the ARRL has limited resources. They must pick
> and choose where to apply those resources. Recruiting new hams is
something
> that can be done easily and cheaply by individual hams via word of mouth
if
> they choose.

Aparently that has not worked like it should..... If the word of mouth thing really worked, we have better numbers to have N2EY to post each month! After all, how many times can we hit up our friends and relatives??

It would be much more costly for the ARRL to try to do that
> recruiting as they would need to purchase advertising on TV, radio, and in
> the magazines and send recruiters out on lecture circuits to schools of
all
> levels. They just can't do it.

As far as sending out "recruiters," where the hell is this all-fired important field organization?? Apparently there is a decent enough amount of people that could direct people/groups to work on presentations! I worked out a wonderful Powerpoint presentation to take to the schools and tried and tried to get at least ONE person to assist me in going to the 30-40 schools just in my county alone! Not one person would help. I don't have a ton of stuff along the lines of equipment to "impress upon" some of these students so I wanted to enlist the help of others. My goal was to attract ONE person from each school (not a huge effort) each year with this plan. What really boiled my ass in all of this, was that to get information regarding the ARRL (their brochures) was going to cost me a bunch of cash. What the hell do these people pay dues for? Apparently the ARRL does not have to justify where the money goes, although they allege to spend it in the defense of amateur radio. I have asked in the past (as a possible condition of choosing to be a member or not) as to where in DC the money goes, and so far, still have not heard anything. Still have yet to see proof that the ARRL is nothing more than an expensive subscription to a magazine. (I do however think QST is a decent magazine, not the best, but pretty good.)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

1565. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 04:12:57 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bht4js$2t36o$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75006

Probably a little growth initially, but it will flatten back out to where it
is now is my guess Jim.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >there
> >would instead be a 7.85 percent decrease in overall numbers. Of course,
> >that's a rough estimate - as rough as the numbers used in your argument.
>
> The important point is that the number of US hams is growing at a slow
rate.
> Restructuring did not result in a big change in growth. If Element 1 is
> dropped, it will be interesting to see if there is any significant
increase in
> growth.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1566. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 04:14:41 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bht4jt$2t36o$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75007

In addition to my other response to this particular message is, "A good defense is a good offense." This can be read into as if something is promoted more in a positive light, to educate the public, then less effort is needed to defend it.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:2bT%a.26564$Vx2.12068231@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030817114056.20931.00000146@mb-m13.aol.com...
> > From Larry, K3LT
> >
> > >I regret to inform you that "Restructuring" the US Amateur Radio
> Service's
> > >licensing system, to reduce the code testing speed to 5 WPM for General
> > >and Extra class, in addition to the existing No-Code Technician-class
> > >license, has resulted in a whopping 1.79 percent growth rate in the ARS
> > >overall! What do you suppose we're gonna get from No-Code HF? Maybe
> > >2 percent?
> >
> > The base of EEs can be expanded. You can get more EE from the rf
> specialty.
> > Not all EEs have an interest in that specialty. But, from those that do,
> > amateur radio could be a good hobby.
> >
> > Amateur radio is not an EE friendly hobby. Those that like to build
> circuits
> > are not welcomed as those that want to learn Morse code, contest, or
work
> DX.
> > EEs that are put off by Hams don't join the hobby.
> >
>
> You keep putting out this misinformation. I know of no one who has not
been
> welcomed into ham radio. Everyone is welcom. As far as building
circuits,
> again everyone is welcome. When someone in our club mentions that they
are

> building something, others ask about the progress of the project and help
if
> needed.
>
> > As, I have noted before, the quality of rf courses could be improved
with
> ARRL
> > publications. The projects have real, rather than just textbook
> applications.
> > This is not being currently done in most colleges.
> >
> > Secondly, EEs are not joining amateur radio clubs. Some Profs that teach
> rf
> > courses that I took do not have amateur radio licenses. People in the rf
> field
> > are not attending club meetings.
> >
>
> It is not the business of a university or college to promote ham radio.
The
> university will have no higher percentage of hams than the general
> population. Unless one is or wants to become a ham, there is no need for
> someone to attend ham club meetings. There is no requirement that EE
> professors be hams or need for them to be so.
>
> > The ARRL should make more efforts in this area. This would increase the
> number
> > of people in the hobby. Also, there is a strong connection between EE
and
> > amateur radio that is not being realized.
>
> As with any organization, the ARRL has limited resources. They must pick
> and choose where to apply those resources. Recruiting new hams is
something
> that can be done easily and cheaply by individual hams via word of mouth
if
> they choose. It would be much more costly for the ARRL to try to do that
> recruiting as they would need to purchase advertising on TV, radio, and in
> the magazines and send recruiters out on lecture circuits to schools of
all
> levels. They just can't do it.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

1567. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 04:22:00 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bht4jv$2t36o$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75008
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Hey Dan,

Maybe that would explain the whole teeth issue over there? :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
> > What a pity, Steve. We could do with more knowledge about the effects of
> > in-breeding.
> > --
> > Ged
>
> Then I suggest you check with mother England. EH.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

1568. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 04:32:04 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bht4k0$2t36o$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75009

> Yep, I considered it, then rejected it as inaccurate. Nocoders aren't
> about
> to dole out $34 per year for *nothing* That's exactly what most of
> then see
> of value to them in ARRL membership, since they really aren't into ham
> radio
> beyond their HT, and have no use for al the many ARRL "bennies".
>
>

Gee... I have more than just the "HT" as you elude to and still don't
believe in the value of the membership at the rates it currently is now.
Other than a really expensive magazine subscription, these "bennies" as you
elude to have yet to be proven.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

1569. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 04:38:02 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030819003802.22785.00000232@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74979

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)

>Some Profs that teach rf
>> courses that I took do not have amateur radio licenses.

>Most people who do "x" for a living generally do not do it for a
>past time either, Vippy. So what?

Some EE got interested from building kits as a hobby and then decided to get an EE degree. Most EEs like to build circuits for fun. They enjoy that.

Many Profs or working EEs belong to the IEEE section of their field. For example If they are in the rf field, they would be a member of the microwave techniques society.

In other words, you would be a part of the organizations and associations related to your field. If you are a professor or a person working in the rf field, it seems logical and likely you would get an amateur radio license.

I know a few Profs that teach rf courses. An antenna theory Prof has also worked in industry doing rf antenna work. This Prof does NOT have an amateur radio license. Also, another Prof that teaches microwave circuits do not have an amateur radio license.

That points to the lack of relavance of amateur radio to people in the rf specialization.

>> The ARRL should make more efforts in this area. This would increase the
>number
>> of people in the hobby. Also, there is a strong connection between EE and
>> amateur radio that is not being realized.
>
> How? Hit them over the head with a mallet then drag them off to
>the shack?

One idea is to expand the ARRL courses available now (such as antenna modelling). More publicity on these courses as useful to industry would help as well. It would show that people that took these courses have certain skills that could be useful in industry.

Sleep.

1570. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 04:55:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F41AE1F.6010401@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74980

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F413841.7050003@psu.edu...
>
>>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>>"DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
>>>news:9829b709.0308170942.5bb877f9@posting.google.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>And history runs counter also. No coders have mostly stayed away from
>>>>
>>>>ARRL , and that seems unlikely to change anytime soon. They just don't
>>>>see much in it for them.
>>>
>>>
>>>Dick,
>>>
>>>Did you (or the ARRL Board of Directors, more importantly)
>>>EVER CONSIDER the POSSIBILITY that the nocoders are
>>>staying away from the ARRL (in droves) because they don't
>>>want to contribute dues to an organization that's been dedicated
>>>(and still is, by policy) to keep them off of HF???
>>
>>If they don't want to join the ARRL, there's no way you're gonna stop
>>'em! (apologies to Yogi)
>>
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Mike,
>
> I've been a member of ARRL since before I became a ham
> and I'm a QCWA member ...
>
> Carl - wk3c

Generally when people quote Yogi Berra, it's a joke......

- Mike KB3EIA -

1571. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 05:14:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030819011434.23171.00000086@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74983

In article <pan.2003.08.18.15.35.10.632485@REMOVESPAMhotmail.comKILLER>, paul s <paulslinux@REMOVESPAMhotmail.comKILLER> writes:

>Nah shoot that idiot George W Bush on sight, and our own stupid Tony
>Blair. Have they found any WMDs yet?? Nope. Are they likely to?? I don't
>think so.

Perhaps you'd prefer to have the Saddam Hussein regime back in power in Iraq?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1572. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 05:14:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030819011434.23171.00000087@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74986

In article <aL40b.111097$_R5.40625014@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>> > To this young (...and then no-code Technician class.) newbie, the ARRL
>> > actually appeared very dedicated to helping me get ON HF.
>>
>> Yes, IF you were willing to meet their criteria by jumping through the
>> Morse code hoop ...
>>
>> Carl - wk3c
>
>Speak for yourself, Carl. I certainly did NOT have to jump through any
>hoops. I set a goal, researched the requirements, and then set about meeting
>said requirements.
>
>I also make sure that in all the letters and e-mails I send to the league,
>FCC, political reps, etc. I inform them that the current Morse code test was
>no barrier for this newbie and did NOT "force" me to jump through any hoops.
>So please don't allow any individual or group promoting the "barrier/hoop"
>line of Bravo Sierra to include me in their demographic. I suspect there are
>more NTs (As opposed to OTs or OFs) like me who dislike being associated
>with underachievement. I hope they too will take the time to make their
>views on the matter heard.
>
>--
>73 de Bert
>WA2SI
>FISTS# 9384

Bert:

Well said, OM! Unfortunately, it was wasted on Carl. Carl is one of those
murderously resentful NCTA's who would much rather waste all his time
whining about being tested for a useful communications skill than doing what it
takes to learn it. He is truly to be pitied, for he has wasted many years that
could have been spent happily pursuing the hobby of ham radio. The true
irony is that in spite of his professional-grade technical knowledge, he will
never be as good a radio amateur as you are!

73 de Larry, K3LT
FISTS #2008, CC #0703

1573. Re: HAARP Cam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 05:14:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030819011435.23171.00000088@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74982

In article <7vB%a.4280$sA4.971@fe02.atl2.webusenet.com>, "Dan Finn"
<djfinn2@bellsouth.net> writes:

>Interesting webcam:
>
>http://www.haarp.alaska.edu/haarp/cam.fcgi
>
>de KR4AJ

Not just an interesting webcam, it was an interesting site! I learned
a lot about HAARP. Thanks for the clue.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1574. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 05:14:35 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030819011435.23171.00000089@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74984

In article <cGb0b.131$5S2.87@newsfep3-gui.server.ntli.net>, "Derek"
<danda95@hotmail.com> writes:

>What makes you all better operators it HAS been removed, so if you do not
>like it why don't you take up knitting or something. or stop all the
>bickering If the truth is known a lot of us have come up from the CB ranks
>over the years

Gee, I guess "Derek" has a point! I was a CB'er for a whole six months --
and that was seven years before I became a ham! However, "Derek,"
I'm not going away! You're going to have to deal with me and those like
me from now on! So don't get any ideas about being "equal" to your
20 WPM code tested, Extra-class SUPERIORS!!!

73 de Larry, K3LT
This is way too easy...

1575. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 05:14:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030819011436.23171.00000090@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74981

In article <3F4125A2.8070100@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Now taking nominations for the "BPL" of rrap!
>
>The successful candidate will be capable of keeping up a virtual S9
>group noise level.
>
>
> Who will it be????

It's definitely a four-way tie between Kim, Lennie, Brian, and Dwight!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1576. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 05:14:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030819011436.23171.00000091@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74985

In article <bhp868$bop@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> Kim:
>>
>> You're really out-doing yourself here. You've produced one
>non-responsive,
>> irrelevant and un-enlightening response to each and every thing I've
>posted
>> these last two days. You have truly perfected the art of wasting
>bandwidth
>> on Usenet, not to mention your own time.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>I haven't anything of substance to respond to, Larry. Produce some
>literate, logical, intelligent form in your style and I will respond in
>kind...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

One hundred percent of my postings provide what you call "literate,
logical, and intelligent" arguments for you and others to respond to in
the same manner. Yet, you usually just toss dismissive one-liners,
or, just a simple "ROFLMAO." You have never demonstrated any
capability to produce "literate, logical, or intelligent" commentary in
this newsgroup whatsoever. And it's not just my postings which you
seem incapable of dealing with in an intelligent manner. You are
universally childish, immature, and just plain dumb in all of your
replies to each and every participant in this newsgroup -- and this
includes those with which you merely indicate agreement and call
it "participation."

You are so completely out of your intellectual depth that it is truly
a sad thing to witness on a daily basis. Have you no pride, woman?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1577. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 05:14:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030819011437.23171.00000092@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 74987

In article <BB66C391.24751%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>We are about to start the first
>> "generation" of hams who have never been bothered
>> to learn the Morse code, and will never know the
>> benefits and advantages of the Morse/CW mode from
>> personal operational experience. Now THERE's a
>> perfect example of something that would inspire
>> one to "belittle" ham radio, indeed!
>
>
> Well, if you don't like ham radio today, perhaps you should find another
>hobby. Only a masochist would continue doing something that makes him or her
>miserable. Ham radio is moving in a direction opposite from what you seem to
>want and is not likely to move in the direction you want anytime soon. When
>that happens, you either learn to live with it, walk away, or continue to be
>miserable. If you choose the later, it is rather sleazy of you to take your
>misery out on the new members of this activity. They didn't ask for your
>negative garbage (none of us did), and this activity certainly would be far
>better off without it.

Dwight:

Quite the contrary, they most certainly did "ask for [my] negative 'garbage'." When the NCTA made their case to reduce and ultimately eliminate code testing, they asked for, and received, an ARS where the old and new members are stratified into distinct classes based on their demonstrated levels of technical knowledge and operational proficiency in basic communications skills. The Pre-Restructuring hams have earned their operating privileges under a quantifiably more comprehensive and challenge set of licensing requirements. The Post-Restructuring/WRC-03 will receive identical operational privileges under a licensing system which has been significantly diminished in requirements for technical knowledge, and totally devoid of the requirement to demonstrate even the most basic knowledge of the Morse code - the most basic of all radio communications skills.

The newcomer "hams" will, from now on, have to deal with the fact that they are here on a pass. I'm not suggesting that they be deliberately treated with antagonism; however they will have to be VERY careful not to make any implications of total equality with their Pre-Restructuring superiors. The only "equality" they possess is that granted by a government agency that could simply care less, as opposed to that granted by their superior "peers" in the ARS itself. The newcomers

are here on a pass, and will have a lot to prove in order to be granted acceptance. To date, they have not even scratched the surface.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1578. Re: Hello folks! I'm looking for reasonably-priced gear.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 05:23:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F41B4B2.2080505@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74988

Daniel J. Morlan wrote:
> I'm just a month away from nailing both my technician and will be for
> sure, chasing after that general license. (I'm getting both books)
> I've been studying like mad, and I've even gotten to where I could do
> 5 wpm morse code already. I'm pretty much going to jump right into
> all this. That being said...
>
> I'm probably not going to be buying brand-spanking-new gear. But I
> want something of a transciever. A tabletop unit... Could any of you
> vets suggest a good brand? I'll have about $700.00 to work with.

Hey Daniel.

I can tell you what I did:

I picked up a IC-745 at a Hamfest. I got lucky and got it for $250.00. Depending on how patient you are for a deal, you can pick up something like this also. The brand may vary of course, although I like the size of the 745 and the gaggle of buttons and adjustments on it YMMV.

Next, I suggest putting up a dipole, with as much wire as you can get in the air. Feed it with twin lead line. My dipole cost me perhaps 20 dollars - with lots of wire left over. I think the twinlead price was 15 dollars.

Pick up or even make a tuner MFJ makes some pretty inexpensive ones. They aren't top quality ones, but they work well enough. I got a 949e. IIRC the price was 129-149 dollars or somesuch.

This way you will have an rig and antenna setup that will cover the whole HF band. You can even use it on 160 - just don't expect too much there.

hope this helps! lett me know if you want any details.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1579. Re: New Ham Term

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 05:25:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F41B522.8020300@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74989

Daniel J. Morlan wrote:
> wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030813212211.06745.00001707@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
>>All new Amateurs entering into Amateur Radio, will no longer be refered to as
>>Hams. The new Name will be CBerHams.
>
>
> I take it this is your expression of distaste for the lowering of
> standards to get a ham license?

BTW, Daniel, remember that this group is the seamy underside of the ARS,
so bear in mind we like to argue..... tain't a safe place at all.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1580. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 05:32:35 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308182132.f93db4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74990

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bhrofmpnf1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:bhp866$bop@library2.airnews.net...
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:BB653FDA.2462B%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> > > "Brian Kelly" wrote:
> > >
> > > > (snip) The second best piece of news today is
> > > > the new eggs in the face of the power industry.
> > > > Their credibility has dropped to zip in 48 hours
> > > > flat and methinks that they'll now have bigger
> > > > problems selling BPL given the fact that their
> > > > core technologies need all the attention they
> > > > can muster.
> > >
> > >
> > > You're an optimist, Brian. Instead, I see the power industry more
> likely
> > > claiming they need the new income from BPL to raise the additional funds
> > > needed to modernize the existing infrastructure. Industry has plenty of
> > > people to spin anything into a positive outcome for industry.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > >
> >
> > The crux of the matter is that the greater part of the power industry is
> > investor-owned. That says it all as to how easy this will be to win, etc.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> I feel that if/when the FCC authorizes this trash the NTIA will way in.
> Just like they did with the 5 mhz deal.

There it is: You got it.

> If you don't know NTIA is the
> agency that takes care of EVERYTHING else in the RF world that the FCC
> don't. Such as FEMA, Military...etc frequency allocations and assignments.

I think that when it's all said and done it's the NTIA which might
come up as our best friend in this and perhaps other battles in the
future when it comes to commercial interests trashing the HF spectrum.
It's basically a game of pitting one gummint agency against another.
Absolutely goofy.

> Even after all this and if it fails to knock some sense into the FCC then we
> can try congress intervention. Like what happened when the FCC wanted to
> increase the monopoly of large corporations to own more media access
> systems.

Yup, yup, yup. There are also "judicial remedies" as remote a
possibility as they may be. Lawyers are bloody expensive critters so
we gotta keep putting our bucks where our moufs is and keep buying
those ARRL BPL War Bonds.

Powell Jr. did the copout of all copouts yesterday on the media
hassle, he shipped a broadside at Congress, "You people rewrite the
laws I'm trying to enforce, I need your GUIDANCE".

No SHIT . . !

> And if that don't work, which it likely will, we can all just fire up a
> lot more often with a lot more power.
>
> In a short while the problem will be over. Because if it bugs us I'll
> guarantee we will trash it.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

w3rv

1581. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 05:46:26 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308182146.31736474@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74991

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4125A2.8070100@psu.edu>...
> Now taking nominations for the "BPL" of rrap!

I dunno, depends I guess, gotta be one of the usual cast of lurkers
around here who are also members of the ARRL Brass Pounders League.

> The successful candidate will be capable of keeping up a virtual S9
> group noise level.
>
>
> Who will it be????

. . the floor is open for nominations . .

> - Mike KB3EIA -

w3rv

1582. OT but worth a look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 05:48:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F41BA77.1050505@adelphia.net>
Source record: 74992

I just got back from an evening of looking at Mars. Since it is closer now than it has been in a long time, and won't be this close again when any of us are around, I suggest getting out and taking a look-see. And if you don't have a scope, latch on to someone who does.

It was an awe inspiring evening.

From my other hobby:

12.5 inch F5.9 Dobsonian telescope

Art-deco styling all homebrew including mirror

Winner, first place large class, Mason-Dixon star party

- Mike KB3EIA -

1583. Re: N8WWM, rain reported again.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 06:39:19 UTC
From: thor6883@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <971a42a7.0308182239.734bc852@posting.google.com>
Source record: 74993
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

gw@webhideout.com (gw) wrote in message
>
> well the point is , is that if this continues to go the way it
> is.......the hamsters are going to be faced with a large segment of cb
> types who behave like cb types on the ham bands.........and to a large
> extent this is already going on.....but they have only themselves to
> blame

Got that right. if your in Michigan, tune to 147.140 N8KD Repeater
(The SMART Repeater) and you'll hear all the Extra Class and No-Code
Tech CB'ers you ever want to hear... Best to listen during morning and
evening drive times.

Pure LIDVille Man..

-Me

1584. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 07:20:45 UTC
From: A Radar led news thug <newbury66@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <Yck0b.15987$yl6.828@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 74994
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

<lucifer@eternal-flames.gov> wrote in message
news:48i3kv0mf939pt6ttb11kinjk45ouf28ee@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 18 Aug 2003 18:59:44 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> pausing to cast envious glances at those
> who had mastered the skill of reading without moving their lips,
> wrote:
>
> >Poor Steve. Feeling sorry for yourselves? Perhaps we could give you
> >Liberia to make you feel better, wat say mate?
>
> Would you be interested in swapping Death Valley for Chippenham?
>
OH pleease say yes :-)

1585. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 08:38:28 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f41e74b_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74995
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

I thought that the Bush Baby had said the war was over?

Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhrp2fuft1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
> I am simply trying to state
> that since this country is at WAR.

1586. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 08:39:42 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f41e74c_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74997
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Yesterday the Nazis today the Yanks.

Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhrq1uiqp1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> They don't deserve a trial. A military tribunal at the best. Then hang
> them.

1587. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 08:42:11 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f41e74c$2_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 74996
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Have you forgotten 8/11? We haven't.
The Yanks made an unprovoked attack on the sovereign state
of Iraq, flying airborne projectiles into buildings, burning them up
and bringing them crashing down around the unfortunate human
beings trapped inside.

Perhaps we in Brit should invade Yankland in order to displace
the murderous hypocrites who are at the head of the state?

Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhrq1uiqp1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> Have you forgotten 9/11? We haven't.

1588. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 09:41:42 UTC
From: Martin <mabmrtn.delete.this@icqmail.com>
Message-ID: <3f41f0e8$0$46001$65c69314@mercury.nildram.net>
Source record: 74998
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f41e74c$2_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> Have you forgotten 8/11? We haven't.
> The Yanks made an unprovoked attack on the sovereign state
> of Iraq, flying airborne projectiles into buildings, burning them up
> and bringing them crashing down around the unfortunate human
> beings trapped inside.
>
> Perhaps we in Brit should invade Yankland in order to displace
> the murderous hypocrites who are at the head of the state?
>
Hmmm, now there is an interesting idea :-) Count me out of that one for
sure, Gareth!

Martin (G8FXC)

1589. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 09:42:37 UTC
From: Frank Turner-Smith G3VKI <g3vki@turner-smith.co.uk>
Message-ID: <bhsrei$2pphn$1@ID-201868.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 74999
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f41e74c_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> Yesterday the Nazis today the Yanks.
>
Yawn. Another day dawns and The Anus continues to rant.

1590. Code / No Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 11:15:24 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <gFn0b.27165$Vx2.12494241@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75000

I don't have any strong preference about the Code / No Code issue, but I have a well developed opinion about the group of hams who have endlessly repeated the same tired flamewar crapola for years on this newsgroup, over the Code / No Code issue.

Less than a dozen "hams" have used this issue as an excuse to turn this newsgroup into a running flame war that has gone on for years, much to the detriment of the hobby. People look at this newsgroup to see what hams are like - and what they see would reflect poorly on any hobby.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

1591. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 11:38:07 UTC
From: paul s <paulslinux@REMOVESPAMhotmail.comKILLER>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.08.19.11.38.02.990395@REMOVESPAMhotmail.comKILLER>
Source record: 75001
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

On Tue, 19 Aug 2003 00:15:09 +0000, paul s wrote:

> On Mon, 18 Aug 2003 19:13:20 -0500, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
>> They don't deserve a trial. A military tribunal at the best. Then hang
>> them.
>>
>> Have you forgotten 9/11? We haven't. They have declared WAR on the USA and
>> westerners in general, in case your too damn stupid to know that by now.
>>
>> Bitch and moan all you want. We WILL TAKE CARE OF BUSINESS. And we will
>> even cover your sorry ass doing it.
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>
> PLONK

And while you're residing inside my bozo bin, enjoy this free MP3 tune:
http://www.destruction.de/realaudio/Destruction-Fuck-The-U.S.A.mp3

With my compliments.

--
Paul S

- 'Designed for Windows XP': Now this is the problem. -

1592. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 11:41:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308190341.685cf366@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75002

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F419F40.7F698198@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Anonymous <rebleep@hush.com> wrote in message
news:<f22c46f4d1aad944320eb2574ee5ba96@rebleep>...
> > > In article <3F4046D6.D6294DED@earthlink.net>
> > > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > > > Do you think he'll avoid 440 - 450 MHz?
> > > >
> > > > Nope. Besides, he'd need one helluva signal for us to share space there.
> > > > Oddly enough, I have no difficulty working stations in his area on 432.
> > >
> > > Those award-winning "people-skills" are sure shining, goatblower.
> >
> > Would you cut it out!
> >
> > You're making it really difficult to have a serious discussion with Dave.
> >
> > Oh, nevermind. There never could be a serious discussion with Dave.
>
> You could get a serious discussion going with Roger/not Roger, Brian.
> Be careful what you wish for.
>
> Dave K8MN

Noted. bb

1593. Re: Code / No Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 11:42:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bht3dl$5dt$1@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 75003

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:gFn0b.27165$Vx2.12494241@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> I don't have any strong preference about the Code / No Code issue, but I
> have a well developed opinion about the group of hams who have endlessly
> repeated the same tired flamewar crapola for years on this newsgroup, over
> the Code / No Code issue.
>
> Less than a dozen "hams" have used this issue as an excuse to turn this
> newsgroup into a running flame war that has gone on for years, much to the
> detriment of the hobby. People look at this newsgroup to see what hams are
> like - and what they see would reflect poorly on any hobby.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL

Historically Charles, this newsgroup was formed specifically to take
the code/nocode debate out of rec.radio.amateur.misc. That was
about 8-10 years ago.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

1594. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 11:55:19 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bht3dn$5dt$2@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>
Source record: 75004

"WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030818222404.12300.00000033@mb-m20.aol.com...
> In article <KST%a.143$6e5.34981@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> >news:3F3FE66C.3030906@adelphia.net...
> >> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >>
> >> > I agree that the ARRL is "between a rock and a hard place" with
respect
> >> > to the split in their existing membership.
> >>
> >> Very much so, I'd agree.
> >>
> >> > However, outside of their membership
> >> > (in the >75% of US hams who are NOT members of the ARRL), I believe
> >> > that the demographic is heavily tilted towards the no code test side
...
> >>
> >> What makes you think this? I'm not trying to be a wise guy, but I agree
> >> with you about the polls being self directing. Therefore are you
> >> operating on gut feeling, what your friends tell you, or what?
> >
> >I'm going on what I hear from members, from clubs, from e-mails I
> >get from folks, etc.
>
> With all due respect, Carl, I don't think that "self selected sample" is
> representative of the entire amateur radio community. And I don't think
you are
> a totally objective observer...;-)
>
> >I'm ALSO going on the demographic of all those
> >nocode techs
>
> Which demographic? The ARRL/READEX poll of 1996 showed that the youngest
hams
> were the most procodetest. Bert Craig, WA2SI, has told you here that he
does
> not consider Element 1 a "barrier" or "hoop". Other newcomers have said
the
> same thing. Don't they count?

The ONLY thing that counts is the answer to the question: What is the rational
for retaining any code test now that the ITU treaty has eliminated the requirement from the treaty?

The FCC answered that in their R&O for 98-143. The FCC indicated none of the arguments, comments or suggested reasons put forth by pro-code test advocates were of sufficient rational or justification. to keep any testing of morse.

> >who could get on HF were it not for a stupid Morse
> >requirement ...
>
> Hmmm...."stupid Morse requirement"? It's been passed by elementary school
> children, old people, people with severe disabilities, and everything in
> between. Heck, under the old rules we had at least one 8 year old Extra!
>
> The fact is that if Element 1 is dropped, all those non-code-tested Techs will
> gain some SSB on 10 meters and four slices of HF CW. (Ironic) In order for them
> to get more, they have to jump through another hoop...I mean, pass another
> written exam.....;-)
>
> You may not think the General or Extra writtens are very hard, nor that they
> are "unreasonable", but the fact remains that they have not been shown to be
> necessary for safe and legal operation of an amateur station.

Just where has that been shown and by whom? The FCC certainly hasn't been convinced of that.

> Why is a Tech considered qualified to use any authorized mode/freq above 30 MHz
> but unqualified to use all but CW and SSB on a few narrow slices of HF?

You are now arguing privileges, not code testing. Others have already suggested
a need for a different set of licenses and privileges. Jim, you and I have long agreed
that privileges in many cases don't map well against the testing for a particular license
class.

.....

> >ARRL membership provides a lot of benefits through QST, the website,
> >and all of the good things they DO do for amateur radio.
>
> Sure - but a lot of hams, of all license classes, don't see those things. Or
> they aren't interested. I know at least one ham here who gave up on HF

because
> she doesn't like the noise and distortion of HF. And, comparing even the
best
> HF SSB to typical VHF/UHF FM, I can understand her point of view.
>
> Some are still mad about incentive licensing, of all things.
>
> One of the real problems with the Tech license being defacto the
entry-level is
> that, for the most part, beginners nowadays are VHF/UHF centered, with
their
> main focus on voice operation and manufactured equipment. Those things are
not
> bad of themselves. They do, however, tend to distract new hams from
nonvoice
> modes, building their own equipment, and national interests vs. local
ones.
> IOW, they are more likely to join a local radio club than the distant
ARRL.

Again, that has nothing to do with code testing and everything to
do with license class and privileges being revisted.

1595. Re: Code / No Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 12:25:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F421744.1070401@psu.edu>
Source record: 75011

charlesb wrote:
> I don't have any strong preference about the Code / No Code issue, but I
> have a well developed opinion about the group of hams who have endlessly
> repeated the same tired flamewar crapola for years on this newsgroup, over
> the Code / No Code issue.
>
> Less than a dozen "hams" have used this issue as an excuse to turn this
> newsgroup into a running flame war that has gone on for years, much to the
> detriment of the hobby. People look at this newsgroup to see what hams are
> like - and what they see would reflect poorly on any hobby.

Sorry Charles, but that is pretty much the purpose of this newsgroup.
This group is not representative of hams in general, it is a pit for
those of us with the inclination towards argument to play in.

That beats having us out with the general population, no?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1596. Whine Lenny whine

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 12:28:42 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <9dd7780981504a8fc5984fde9d00aa5b@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 75010
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.fuckwit.stagger-lee

In article <89185761.767067889@houston-hunks.com>
SLee@houston-hunks.com (Stagger Lee aka Leonard H. Anderson) wheezed:
>
> Are you going to force me out of retirement

You misspelled SPANK, Lennie. When are you going to post from your regular AOL account again? Having fun in Alaska, are you?

1597. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 12:30:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308190430.2d0fdbde@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75012

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308182146.31736474@posting.google.com>...
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4125A2.8070100@psu.edu>...
> > Now taking nominations for the "BPL" of rrap!
>
> I dunno, depends I guess, gotta be one of the usual cast of lurkers
> around here who are also members of the ARRL Brass Pounders League.
>
> > The successful candidate will be capable of keeping up a virtual S9
> > group noise level.
> >
> >
> > Who will it be????
>
> . . the floor is open for nominations

Well...You KNOW who I nominate:

For his pages long recitings of his CV...

For his frequent retelling of how he "worked DX" in a 1950's-era
Army radio station...

For his frequent demeaning of not only individual Amateurs, but
of the Amateur Service as a whole...

For his frequent attempts to associate himself with Soldiers who
died in combat for the purpose of improving his own "reputation"...

For countless lies, mistruths (especially that one about "get my
Extra Lite out of the box...) and use of profanity and insults...

The envelope pleeeeeeease! (drom roll ensuses....)

Leonard H. "Lennie the Liar" Anderson!

Respectfully submitted,

Steve, K4YZ

1598. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 12:41:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308190441.39c495de@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75013

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030819003802.22785.00000232@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>
> >Some Profs that teach rf
> >> courses that I took do not have amateur radio licenses.
>
> >Most people who do "x" for a living generally do not do it for a
> >past time either, Vippy. So what?
>
> Some EE got interested from building kits as a hobby and then decided to get an
> EE degree. Most EEs like to build circuits for fun. They enjoy that.

And they are certainly welcome to do exactly that, with or
without an Amatuer Radio license.

> Many Profs or working EEs belong to the IEEE section of their field. For
> example If they are in the rf field, they would be a member of the microwave
> techniques society.

Those "societies" are professional organization, Vippy. Hardly
relevent to the Amateur Radio service.

> In other words, you would be a part of the organizations and associations
> related to your field. If you are a professor or a person working in the rf
> field, it seems logical and likely you would get an amateur radio license.

Which STILL does not, in any way, shape of form, make any sense
of your assertion that EE's are "turned away" from Amatuer Radio. I
know of at least 15 people who are EE's (two holding doctorates) who
are Amateurs.

> I know a few Profs that teach rf courses. An antenna theory Prof has also
> worked in industry doing rf antenna work. This Prof does NOT have an amateur
> radio license. Also, another Prof that teaches microwave circuits do not have
> an amateur radio license.

And your "Prof" is not in this forum or insisting that he be
granted an Amateur license based solely upon his status as an
instructor, either...

You STILL have not answered the question, Vippy...SO WHAT...?!?!?

> That points to the lack of relavance of amateur radio to people in the rf
> specialization.

No more than my lack of membership in the NRA "proves" that I am
not interested in firearms. I can still hit a target in the black
from 800 meters and am not a member of the NRA..So what?

> >> The ARRL should make more efforts in this area. This would increase the
> number
> >> of people in the hobby. Also, there is a strong connection between EE and
> >> amateur radio that is not being realized.
> >
> > How? Hit them over the head with a mallet then drag them off to
> >the shack?
>
> One idea is to expand the ARRL courses available now (such as antenna
> modelling). More publicity on these courses as useful to industry would help as
> well. It would show that people that took these courses have certain skills
> that could be useful in industry.

These courses aer well distributed and made available to anyone
who cares to use them.

They are, however, written for NON-TECHNICALLY educated folks who
want to LEARN the basics...NOT for professional engineers.

> Sleep.

Please do. Maybe you'll wake up a bit more alert and responsible
when you do.

Steve, K4YZ

1599. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 12:41:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308190441.177ddf8f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75014

dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308181824.3c5e5a2e@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308181437.61fe6a6c@posting.google.com>...
> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308140938.e2260e1@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > Some of us have given it real thought, and have posted ideas. But the
> > > mantra has always been that eliminating the code test would solve
> > > everything.
> >
> > No-code isn't a religion. No Mantra.
>
> What??? No "Hoops"??? No "unnecessary requirements"?? No
> "Unjustified bogus BOHICA thingies"?? No "Morsedits" holding
> back the intelligentsia?? No "If it wasn't for that dastardly
> Morris code test I'd take my rightful place on HF??

No mantra.

> No Mantra???? Get back to your village!

You miss me?

1600. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 12:43:19 UTC
From: citizensband <citizensband@ntlworld.com>
Message-ID: <AXo0b.14$gc6.25634@newsfep1-win.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75015
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Laurie" <nospam@localhost> wrote in message
news:3f41f82b$0$15038$cc9e4d1f@news.dial.pipex.com...
> X-No-archive: Yes
> In bhrp5e$2na$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net,
> Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> typed:
> >
> > As for the 'other' Pacific islands...would you perhaps be refering to
> > the Marshals? The ONLY Island that was nuked was BIKINI. No others.
> Dan, I'm afraid you are mistaken, it wasn't just Bikini.
> The following pacific islands were used for nuclear tests by the US :
>
> Bikini Atoll
> Enewetak Atoll
> Christmas Island
> Johnston Island
>
> http://nuketesting.enviroweb.org/hew/Usa/Tests/
>
> --
> 73 Laurie - G6ISY
>
Well as far as I'm concerned, the USA can practice letting of nuclear
weapons. Just make sure it's somewhere in France. Should be OK though, ISTR,
'they' don't mind testing their weapons in someone else's backyard!

Cheers
tox

1601. Re: Wiseman worshiper Whines

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 12:49:09 UTC
From: Anonymous Sender <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com>
Message-ID: <54e5d8d91d61cf0b2a2372eef7922bb7@remailer.metacolo.com>
Source record: 75016
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.fuckwit.stagger-lee

In article <89185761.767067889@houston-hunks.com>
SLee@houston-hunks.com (Stagger Lee) wrote:
>
>
>
> On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 17:25:47 -0400, Anonymous <rebleep@hush.com> wrote:
> [absolutely nothing important]
>
> Are you going to force me out of retirement, Woger?

I see you still haven't lost that cocksucker's lisp...What's the mater, you still wanting to try to turn people over to your homosexual lifestyle, Hambrecht?

> I have been
> enjoying almost a year of Wiseman-free Usenet, ever since you got
> kicked off of both Altopia and Ovis.

Wrong dickhead, Wiseman cancelled both accounts.

> Your love poem to Pam Hoffer,

That fatassed bitch? Bwhahahahahahahahahahahaha..I wonder if Lemons still lets her give him blowjobs in the server room.

> the President of Ovis, was doubtless a strong influence in your
> departure from Ovis, and the silence which ensued last September was
> pure joy.

Not unlike the silence after your ass was kicked off of altopia for spamming the newsgroups.

> Now the window licker returns,

Now, Hammy, you don't want me to post your numerous DUI records, do you?

> uttering his obscenities while he picks
> his nose looking for his brain.

No,people could pick their noses to feed you though.

> Pathetic (but entertaining).

That why you whined so loudly to get Wiseman kicked off off isp's? Looks like your story doesn't hold water.

> A couple of quotes from Google:
>
> ==========

> "And that fat hog Pam shouldn't caterwaul with her hunchbacked fatass
> mommy with the Xtian band anymore, she caused more stray dogs to come
> around that run-down shack that Ovis is housed in. Another Xtian
> hypocrite, that radio station is a known haven for child abuse in the
> mound town. She is a fucking idiot." -- ab8mq in message
> <akd8bpkce8@pita.alt.net>

BWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH That's funny.....

> ===============
> In message <a19ubh$e7u$0@pita.alt.net>, the regulars voting for the
> alt.flame awards elected Roger Wiseman as: Most Boring Writer, Worst
> Flamer, Fuckhead of the Year, Most Tenuous Spankclaim, Best Punching
> Bag, Most Unwelcome Comeback, and gave him the Golden Peewee Award for
> most Blatant IKYABWAI.

How was your chat with the FEDS, fucktard? Bwhahahahahahahahahahahaha.........

1602. Re: Code / No Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 12:54:25 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87u18d24fy.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 75017

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
>"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
>news:gFn0b.27165$Vx2.12494241@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>> I don't have any strong preference about the Code / No Code issue, but I
>> have a well developed opinion about the group of hams who have endlessly
>> repeated the same tired flamewar crapola for years on this newsgroup, over
>> the Code / No Code issue.
>>
>> Less than a dozen "hams" have used this issue as an excuse to turn this
>> newsgroup into a running flame war that has gone on for years, much to the
>> detriment of the hobby. People look at this newsgroup to see what hams are
>> like - and what they see would reflect poorly on any hobby.
>>
>> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>Historically Charles, this newsgroup was formed specifically to take
>the code/nocode debate out of rec.radio.amateur.misc. That was
>about 8-10 years ago.
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

Which is all the more support for his point that it does not advertise
hams well.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

1603. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 12:57:21 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB679753.247C7%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75018

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> (snip) The newcomer "hams" will, from now on,
> have to deal with the fact that they are here
> on a pass. I'm not suggesting that they be
> deliberately treated with antagonism; however
> they will have to be VERY careful not to make
> any implications of total equality with their
> Pre-Restructuring superiors. The only
> "equality" they possess is that granted by a
> government agency that could simply care less,
> as opposed to that granted by their superior
> "peers" in the ARS itself. The newcomers are
> here on a pass, and will have a lot to prove
> in order to be granted acceptance. To date,
> they have not even scratched the surface.

Larry, you're one of the most pampas, bigoted, individuals I've ever talked to. I've honestly met Klux Klux Klan members with less bigoted views. How do you live with yourself? How can you post what you write and still have any self-respect afterward?

Let me make something very clear - you don't have the right, or moral high ground, to assign or not assign equality to others. You're a two-bit punk trying to make yourself feel important by pointing to your petty code skill. In this world today, that skill is so trivial as to be almost laughable (and you know that is true). For you to hold it up like a badge of honor is laughable.

I'm one of those newcomers you keep talking about - a newcomer damn tired of your hateful comments towards those like me in this newsgroup. If you want to play this game, then you, Larry, are my inferior, as a human being and as a ham operator. In fact, you're inferior to just about anyone with more civilized views, which probably includes just about everyone else.

You keep yelling about how superior you are. Each time you do, you instead show how inferior you are, as a person and as a member of this ham radio community.

If I were not aware of how harmful bigoted people who practice discrimination can be in a community, I would almost pity your desperate need to feel important. As it is, I'm simply ashamed to be associated with you, even if that association is nothing more than a mutual interest.

And that is all I have to say to you, Larry. If you want to talk further, do so with someone who is interested in what you have to say.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1604. ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 13:04:56 UTC
From: jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam
Message-ID: <98434152.65867878@pavillage.net>
Source record: 75019
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

The claim that BPL will seriously and negatively impact amateur radio is simply fear, uncertainty, and doubt (FUD) spread by the ARRL. That organization needs to justify its existence, and the BPL issue is a convenient way for it to show its activism. The ARRL has apparently followed the path of other self-justifying organizations such as NOW and the NAACP.

Unfortunately, the technically unsophisticated do not recognize the difference between coherent and non-coherent noise, and this makes it easy for the ARRL to spread its FUD. But the fact is that, if BPL signals are heard at all, they are coherent (have a predictable phase and amplitude) and therefore can be completely removed at the receiver. This can be done in many ways, most of which amount to nulling the BPL signals by introducing an identical signal which is 180 degrees out of phase with the original. As a matter of fact, most current HF transceivers have what they call a "noise reduction" option already built into them which uses the nulling method to accomplish its goal. Therefore, many amateurs and SWLers already have the needed equipment to deal with any BPL "interference." The ARRL reports have conveniently omitted any mention of the coherency issue, and their measurements are therefore flawed, because they don't reflect real world situations.

So take the ARRL claims with a large grain of salt, and don't succumb to the FUD they are spreading. Instead, do some reading on your own by going to non-ARRL web pages such as http://www.uplc.utc.org, and http://www.wave-report.com/tutorials/bpl.htm before accepting the ARRL claims at face value.

1605. Re: Code / No Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 13:14:56 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <87ptj123hr.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 75020

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>charlesb wrote:
>> I don't have any strong preference about the Code / No Code issue, but I
>> have a well developed opinion about the group of hams who have endlessly
>> repeated the same tired flamewar crapola for years on this newsgroup, over
>> the Code / No Code issue.
>>
>> Less than a dozen "hams" have used this issue as an excuse to turn this
>> newsgroup into a running flame war that has gone on for years, much to the
>> detriment of the hobby. People look at this newsgroup to see what hams are
>> like - and what they see would reflect poorly on any hobby.
>
>
> Sorry Charles, but that is pretty much the purpose of this newsgroup.
>This group is not representative of hams in general, it is a pit for
>those of us with the inclination towards argument to play in.
>
> That beats having us out with the general population, no?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Ten years ago, I'd have agreed that nothing on Usenet should
have been confused with "The General Population".

Since about 1995 though, I'm not sure but what Usenet isn't just
exactly The General Population. Or perhaps just close enough
for Government Work.

There are certainly *millions* of people who have read a few
articles in the rec.radio.amateur.* groups in the last 2 or 3
years. And *millions* of people (including most hams that
looked) quickly went on to something not so clearly devoid of
intelligent life. They took with them a very poor image of
Amateur Radio.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

1606. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 13:16:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030819091619.29741.00000192@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 75021

> Larry, you're one of the most pampas, bigoted, individuals I've ever
>talked to. I've honestly met Klux Klux Klan members with less bigoted views.
>How do you live with yourself? How can you post what you write and still
>have any self-respect afterward?
>
> Let me make something very clear - you don't have the right, or moral high
>ground, to assign or not assign equality to others. You're a two-bit punk
>trying to make yourself feel important by pointing to your petty code skill.
>In this world today, that skill is so trivial as to be almost laughable (and
>you know that is true). For you to hold it up like a badge of honor is
>laughable.
>
> I'm one of those newcomers you keep talking about - a newcomer damn tired
>of your hateful comments towards those like me in this newsgroup. If you
>want to play this game, then you, Larry, are my inferior, as a human being
>and as a ham operator. In fact, you're inferior to just about anyone with
>more civilized views, which probably includes just about everyone else.
>
> You keep yelling about how superior you are. Each time you do, you instead
>show how inferior you are, as a person and as a member of this ham radio
>community.
>
> If I were not aware of how harmful bigoted people who practice
>discrimination can be in a community, I would almost pity your desperate
>need to feel important. As it is, I'm simply ashamed to be associated with
>you, even if that association is nothing more than a mutual interest.
>
> And that is all I have to say to you, Larry. If you want to talk further,
>do so with someone who is interested in what you have to say.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Cry Whinner CRY. All you CBplussers have left, is your useless attempts to try and Justify your Welfare Status as Hams.
All we want to be is an Equal to you real Hams, seems to be all you guys can come up with. Guess what Dwight, it will never happen.You guys have got what you wanted a Dumb Down Service with no effort required. So stop your Damn Whinning and get to the back of the Bus where you belong.

1607. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 13:43:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F42299F.14877923@earthlink.net>
Source record: 75022

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> Larry, you're one of the most pampas...

Was Larry ever a gaucho in Argentina?

Dave K8MN

1608. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 14:38:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F42367A.30909@psu.edu>
Source record: 75023

Dave Heil wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
>
>> Larry, you're one of the most pampas...
>
>
> Was Larry ever a gaucho in Argentina?

Anyone here remember Gaucho cookies?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1609. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 14:47:06 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <zLScnW2F4pLzpd-iXTWJhg@crocker.com>
Source record: 75024
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jim Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
news:98434152.65867878@pavillage.net...
> The claim that BPL will seriously and negatively impact amateur radio
> is simply fear, uncertainty, and doubt (FUD) spread by the ARRL. That
> organization needs to justify its existence, and the BPL issue is a
> convenient way for it to show its activism. The ARRL has apparently
> followed the path of other self-justifying organizations such as NOW
> and the NAACP.
>
> Unfortunately, the technically unsophisticated do not recognize the
> difference between coherent and non-coherent noise, and this makes it
> easy for the ARRL to spread its FUD. But the fact is that, if BPL
> signals are heard at all, they are coherent (have a predictable phase
> and amplitude) and therefore can be completely removed at the

if they are predictable then they must be constant, if they are constant
then they can't carry data, doesn't make much sense to me.

> receiver. This can be done in many ways, most of which amount to
> nulling the BPL signals by introducing an identical signal which is
> 180 degrees out of phase with the original. As a matter of fact, most

now, just where do you propose getting this out of phase signal? true,
there are devices out there now that can do this, but they are fussy and
must be constantly adjusted as you change frequency or switch antennas. and
they also have problems with overloading and distortion.

> current HF transceivers have what they call a "noise reduction" option
> already built into them which uses the nulling method to accomplish
> its goal. Therefore, many amateurs and SWLers already have the needed

sorry, not with this type of signal. the common noise reduction processors
in most radios rely on the noise signal to be broadbanded, bpl is a myriad
of short narrow band bursts. the common noise reduction filter would not
only not work on these, but may be fooled into blanking what it thinks is
noise but really isn't in the rx passband, thereby causing more distortion
or false noise.

the other option, the dsp noise filter does not remove the undesired signal
from the receiver input, thus reducing sensitivity.

> equipment to deal with any BPL "interference." The ARRL reports have
> conveniently omitted any mention of the coherency issue, and their
> measurements are therefore flawed, because they don't reflect real
> world situations.

>
> So take the ARRL claims with a large grain of salt, and don't succumb
> to the FUD they are spreading. Instead, do some reading on your own
> by going to non-ARRL web pages such as http://www.uplc.utc.org, and
> http://www.wave-report.com/tutorials/bpl.htm before accepting the ARRL
> claims at face value.

1610. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 15:27:07 UTC
From: jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam
Message-ID: <98434152.45867878@pavillage.net>
Source record: 75025
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

On Tue, 19 Aug 2003 14:47:06 -0000, David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote:
>
> "Jim Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
> news:98434152.65867878@pavillage.net...
> > The claim that BPL will seriously and negatively impact amateur radio
> > is simply fear, uncertainty, and doubt (FUD) spread by the ARRL. That
> > organization needs to justify its existence, and the BPL issue is a
> > convenient way for it to show its activism. The ARRL has apparently
> > followed the path of other self-justifying organizations such as NOW
> > and the NAACP.
> >
> > Unfortunately, the technically unsophisticated do not recognize the
> > difference between coherent and non-coherent noise, and this makes it
> > easy for the ARRL to spread its FUD. But the fact is that, if BPL
> > signals are heard at all, they are coherent (have a predictable phase
> > and amplitude) and therefore can be completely removed at the
>
> if they are predictable then they must be constant, if they are constant
> then they can't carry data, doesn't make much sense to me.

You clearly haven't become acquainted with the mathematical definition
of "coherent," which doesn't demaind a constant signal at all. What
it DOES demand is either a sharply peaked or a periodic
autocorrelation function -- properties which enable engineers to come
up with predictive filters.

> > receiver. This can be done in many ways, most of which amount to
> > nulling the BPL signals by introducing an identical signal which is
> > 180 degrees out of phase with the original. As a matter of fact, most
>
> now, just where do you propose getting this out of phase signal? true,
> there are devices out there now that can do this, but they are fussy and
> must be constantly adjusted as you change frequency or switch antennas. and
> they also have problems with overloading and distortion.
>
> > current HF transceivers have what they call a "noise reduction" option
> > already built into them which uses the nulling method to accomplish
> > its goal. Therefore, many amateurs and SWLers already have the needed
>
> sorry, not with this type of signal. the common noise reduction processors

Sorry, but that's not right. The Icom 746PRO for example, has two
noise reduction functions, one of which samples slightly out-of-band
signals to come up with a time-varying estimate of the values to be

subtracted from the in-band signals. There is no need for the signal to be constant with respect to time. The second noise reduction function is directed at impulse noise and is a traditional noise blanker.

In any case, you are missing the main point of the original post, and that was that the ARRL FUD conveniently ignores the coherent nature of BPL leakage signals -- a property which makes them far less formidable than the ARRL articles would lead you to believe.

1611. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 15:48:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4246C4.7030300@psu.edu>
Source record: 75026
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Jim Nye wrote:
> The claim that BPL will seriously and negatively impact amateur radio
> is simply fear, uncertainty, and doubt (FUD) spread by the ARRL. That
> organization needs to justify its existence, and the BPL issue is a
> convenient way for it to show its activism. The ARRL has apparently
> followed the path of other self-justifying organizations such as NOW
> and the NAACP.

Hoo, here we go.

> Unfortunately, the technically unsophisticated do not recognize the
> difference between coherent and non-coherent noise, and this makes it
> easy for the ARRL to spread its FUD. But the fact is that, if BPL
> signals are heard at all, they are coherent (have a predictable phase
> and amplitude) and therefore can be completely removed at the
> receiver.

Lessee, when we have a lot of people using this, it is going to be a
coherent signal? That video of Ed Hare's certainly didn't sound like
coherent noise to me.

This can be done in many ways, most of which amount to
> nulling the BPL signals by introducing an identical signal which is
> 180 degrees out of phase with the original. As a matter of fact, most
> current HF transceivers have what they call a "noise reduction" option
> already built into them which uses the nulling method to accomplish
> its goal.

And it makes mush out of the recieved signal. If there is an S9 signal,
will I be able to pick a weak signal out of that?

Therefore, many amateurs and SWLers already have the needed
> equipment to deal with any BPL "interference."

"many"? That's nice. That means "many" do not have the needed
equipment. And there's still that nasty little byproduct of any
filtering scheme

> The ARRL reports have
> conveniently omitted any mention of the coherency issue, and their
> measurements are therefore flawed, because they don't reflect real
> world situations.

Seems like Ed Hare's little video showed some real world situations. S9
noise and lots of it seems like a problem to me.

> So take the ARRL claims with a large grain of salt, and don't succumb
> to the FUD they are spreading. Instead, do some reading on your own
> by going to non-ARRL web pages such as http://www.uplc.utc.org,

And for a mere 900 dollars they will tell me how wonderful a thing it
is. Why don't you get a copy and share it with us?

> and http://www.wave-report.com/tutorials/bpl.htm

Hey, *there's* a technical report. I didn't know that Modems used
Silicon chips!

> before accepting the ARRL
> claims at face value.

Lessee, you just told us we have to accept these high level noise
pulses, with NR methods which nuke most of the (wanted) recieved
signals, disregarded *real* real world proof, and given us some feel
good links of no value.

It IS a good idea to take some suggestions with a grain of salt!

- mike KB3EIA -

1612. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 16:32:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030819123204.22081.00000061@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 75027

In article <3F42299F.14877923@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
>> Larry, you're one of the most pampas...
>
>Was Larry ever a gaucho in Argentina?
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

Si!

73 de Larry, LU3LT

Disclaimer: "LU3LT" is not my real callsign. In fact, it isn't anyone's
real callsign!

1613. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 16:32:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030819123204.22081.00000060@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 75028

In article <BB679753.247C7%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>
> Larry, you're one of the most pampas, bigoted, individuals I've ever
>talked to. I've honestly met Klux Klux Klan members with less bigoted views.
>How do you live with yourself? How can you post what you write and still
>have any self-respect afterward?
>
> Let me make something very clear - you don't have the right, or moral high
>ground, to assign or not assign equality to others. You're a two-bit punk
>trying to make yourself feel important by pointing to your petty code skill.
>In this world today, that skill is so trivial as to be almost laughable (and
>you know that is true). For you to hold it up like a badge of honor is
>laughable.
>
> I'm one of those newcomers you keep talking about - a newcomer damn tired
>of your hateful comments towards those like me in this newsgroup. If you
>want to play this game, then you, Larry, are my inferior, as a human being
>and as a ham operator. In fact, you're inferior to just about anyone with
>more civilized views, which probably includes just about everyone else.
>
> You keep yelling about how superior you are. Each time you do, you instead
>show how inferior you are, as a person and as a member of this ham radio
>community.
>
> If I were not aware of how harmful bigoted people who practice
>discrimination can be in a community, I would almost pity your desperate
>need to feel important. As it is, I'm simply ashamed to be associated with
>you, even if that association is nothing more than a mutual interest.
>
> And that is all I have to say to you, Larry. If you want to talk further,
>do so with someone who is interested in what you have to say.

Awww, c'mon, Dwight -- what do you really think???

Unfortunately, Bruce stole my thunder as far as a reply to the above
is concerned, so all I have to say is, enjoy the ride in the back of the
bus with the rest of your dumbed-down Welfare-class ham radio
underlings. And, do feel free to open the Emergency Exit door and bail
out whenever you please!

Anyway, it's nice to know that when I yank a chain, it STAYS yanked!
Keep stewing, Dwight!

73 de Larry, K3LT
Dwight's Intellectual and Moral Superior (which doesn't take much effort on my part!)

1614. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 16:33:49 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <tqmdnWszSOg_zN-iU-KYgw@crocker.com>
Source record: 75029
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jim Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
news:98434152.45867878@pavillage.net...
> On Tue, 19 Aug 2003 14:47:06 -0000, David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
> > news:98434152.65867878@pavillage.net...
> > > The claim that BPL will seriously and negatively impact amateur radio
> > > is simply fear, uncertainty, and doubt (FUD) spread by the ARRL. That
> > > organization needs to justify its existence, and the BPL issue is a
> > > convenient way for it to show its activism. The ARRL has apparently
> > > followed the path of other self-justifying organizations such as NOW
> > > and the NAACP.
> > >
> > > Unfortunately, the technically unsophisticated do not recognize the
> > > difference between coherent and non-coherent noise, and this makes it
> > > easy for the ARRL to spread its FUD. But the fact is that, if BPL
> > > signals are heard at all, they are coherent (have a predictable phase
> > > and amplitude) and therefore can be completely removed at the
> >
> > if they are predictable then they must be constant, if they are constant
> > then they can't carry data, doesn't make much sense to me.
>
> You clearly haven't become acquainted with the mathematical definition
> of "coherent," which doesn't demaind a constant signal at all. What
> it DOES demand is either a sharply peaked or a periodic
> autocorrelation function -- properties which enable engineers to come
> up with predictive filters.
>
> > > receiver. This can be done in many ways, most of which amount to
> > > nulling the BPL signals by introducing an identical signal which is
> > > 180 degrees out of phase with the original. As a matter of fact, most
> >
> > now, just where do you propose getting this out of phase signal? true,
> > there are devices out there now that can do this, but they are fussy and
> > must be constantly adjusted as you change frequency or switch antennas.
and
> > they also have problems with overloading and distortion.
> >
> > > current HF transceivers have what they call a "noise reduction" option
> > > already built into them which uses the nulling method to accomplish
> > > its goal. Therefore, many amateurs and SWLers already have the needed
> >
> > sorry, not with this type of signal. the common noise reduction

processors
>
> Sorry, but that's not right. The Icom 746PRO for example, has two
> noise reduction functions, one of which samples slightly out-of-band
> signals to come up with a time-varying estimate of the values to be
> subtracted from the in-band signals. There is no need for the signal
> to be constant with respect to time. The second noise reduction
> function is directed at impulse noise and is a traditional noise
> blanker.
>
> In any case, you are missing the main point of the original post, and
> that was that the ARRL FUD conveniently ignores the coherent nature of
> BPL leakage signals -- a property which makes them far less formidable
> than the ARRL articles would lead you to believe.

i think you are missing the main point. any in band signal that is not desired is noise. if you have to do processing to get rid of it you are going to lose some of the desired signal in the process... i'm sorry, but that is a fact of life, mathematics, and electronics. if you want to ignore facts and just start making attacks against an organization that is at least trying to prevent many of us from having to deal with an avoidable noise source then it is clear that you don't care about ham radio, your agenda is simply anti-arrl.

1615. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 16:45:11 UTC
From: Derek <danda95@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <Avs0b.2609$%Y1.334456@newsfep2-gui.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75047

Superiors My arse, Morse code does not make you a better opperator, I did learn it back in 1986 up to 12 words a min but due to family probs could not take the test.
So why not give the newcomers a helping hand instead of slagging them off all the time, Just REMEMBER you was new to the hobby ONCE

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20030819011435.23171.00000089@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <cGb0b.131$5S2.87@newsfep3-gui.server.ntli.net>, "Derek"
> <danda95@hotmail.com> writes:
>
> >What makes you all better operators it HAS been removed, so if you do not
> >like it why don't you take up knitting or something. or stop all the
> >bickering If the truth is known a lot of us have come up from the CB ranks
> >over the years
>
> Gee, I guess "Derek" has a point! I was a CB'er for a whole six months --
> and that was seven years before I became a ham! However, "Derek,"
> I'm not going away! You're going to have to deal with me and those like
> me from now on! So don't get any ideas about being "equal" to your
> 20 WPM code tested, Extra-class SUPERIORS!!!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> This is way too easy...
>
>

1616. Re: HAARP Cam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 16:54:11 UTC
From: Donnie <"look me up"@qrz.com>
Message-ID: <50l4kv0l4p5nqhktj7368sm4hga3jn4250@4ax.com>
Source record: 75030

On 19 Aug 2003 05:14:35 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:

>In article <7vB%a.4280$sA4.971@fe02.atl2.webusenet.com>, "Dan Finn"
><djfinn2@bellsouth.net> writes:
>
>>Interesting webcam:
>>
>>http://www.haarp.alaska.edu/haarp/cam.fcgi
>>
>>de KR4AJ
>
>Not just an interesting webcam, it was an interesting site! I learned
>a lot about HAARP. Thanks for the clue.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Yes the Haarp is very interesting, back in 1998 they tested the transmitters close to the 40 and 80
meter bands at about 3am est one evening talk about a BIG signal 20 over here on the east coast.

I did manage to get a neat QSL card for copying the message they sent during the test of the
equipment.

Tax dollars hard at work? In the 80's this was called ''Star Wars''

Momma Always Said:"Life is like a box of chocolates, Forrest. You never know what you're gonna get"

1617. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 17:05:01 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308190905.c27e8a4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75031

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bht3dn$5dt$2@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>...
> "WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030818222404.12300.00000033@mb-m20.aol.com...
> > In article <KST%a.143$6e5.34981@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >
> > >"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > >news:3F3FE66C.3030906@adelphia.net...
> > >> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > >>
> > >> > I agree that the ARRL is "between a rock and a hard place" with
> respect
> > >> > to the split in their existing membership.
> > >>
> > >> Very much so, I'd agree.
> > >>
> > >> > However, outside of their membership
> > >> > (in the >75% of US hams who are NOT members of the ARRL), I believe
> > >> > that the demographic is heavily tilted towards the no code test side
> ...
> > >>
> > >> What makes you think this? I'm not trying to be a wise guy, but I agree
> > >> with you about the polls being self directing. Therefore are you
> > >> operating on gut feeling, what your friends tell you, or what?
> > >
> > >I'm going on what I hear from members, from clubs, from e-mails I
> > >get from folks, etc.
> >
> > With all due respect, Carl, I don't think that "self selected sample" is
> > representative of the entire amateur radio community. And I don't think
> you are
> > a totally objective observer...;-)
> >
> > >I'm ALSO going on the demographic of all those
> > >nocode techs
> >
> > Which demographic? The ARRL/READEX poll of 1996 showed that the youngest
> hams
> > were the most procodetest. Bert Craig, WA2SI, has told you here that he
> does
> > not consider Element 1 a "barrier" or "hoop". Other newcomers have said
> the
> > same thing. Don't they count?

>
> The ONLY thing that counts

Hold on a sec, Bill.

We've been told that:

- we have to get rid of the code test to increase growth in the ARS
- (most) young people aren't interested in learning the code
- The future is newcomers and young hams
- The current 5 wpm test is an unreasonable burden on the VECs and new hams but written tests aren't

and the big one:

"the demographic is heavily tilted towards the no code test side"

Now, do these things matter or not?

> is the answer to the question: What is the
> rational
> for retaining any code test now that the ITU treaty has eliminated the
> requirement from the treaty?

I think you meant "rationale"

And here it is:

1) Morse code is widely used in the ARS, particularly HF/MF amateur radio.
2) Knowledge of morse code can only be measured by a practical skill test.
3) Morse code offers unique advantages to the radio amateur, but these advantages are only available if Morse code skills are learned.
4) All of the above support the Basis and Purposes of the ARS.

Does that constitute an irrefutable proof? Of course not. Neither does the 20 pages of the NCI petition.
>
> The FCC answered that in their R&O for 98-143. The FCC indicated
> none of the arguments, comments or suggested reasons put forth by
> pro-code test advocates were of sufficient rational or justification. to
> keep any testing of morse.

Sure.

And this is the same FCC that thinks BPL is a good idea. Take a look at the 120 page ARRL report and the videos, then tell me what kind of "expert agency" should give such a system the time of day. Note that the BPL'rs want the Part 15 levels RAISED!

This is also the same FCC that wanted to allow media giants to become practical monopolies so that radio and TV programming become even more homogenized.

This is the FCC that "solved" the freebander linear problem by
restricting the manufacture and sale of HF amplifiers, which ties the
hands of legitimate ARS manufacturers but hasn't kept one amp out of
any illegal's hands.

"Expert agency", they're called, right?
>
> > >who could get on HF were it not for a stupid Morse
> > >requirement ...
> >
> > Hmmm...."stupid Morse requirement"? It's been passed by elementary school
> > children, old people, people with severe disabilities, and everything in
> > between. Heck, under the old rules we had at least one 8 year old Extra!
> >
> > The fact is that if Element 1 is dropped, all those non-code-tested Techs
> > will
> > gain some SSB on 10 meters and four slices of HF CW. (Ironic) In order for
> > them
> > to get more, they have to jump through another hoop...I mean, pass another
> > written exam.....;-)
> >
> > You may not think the General or Extra writtens are very hard, nor that
> > they
> > are "unreasonable", but the fact remains that they have not been shown to
> > be
> > necessary for safe and legal operation of an amateur station.
>
> Just where has that been shown and by whom?

It's self evident. Common sense.

FCC considers a Tech to be competent to
design/build/repair/align/maintain and most of all OPERATE an amateur
transmitter on any authorized frequency above 30MHz, using any
authorized mode, at full legal power.

But it requires a General license for the FCC to consider someone to
be competent to design/build/repair/align/maintain and most of all
OPERATE an amateur transmitter on most authorizeds frequency below
30MHz, using any authorized mode, at full legal power. In fact,
Techs-with-HF are only authorized to use two modes and small slices of
four bands.

Why is a Tech considered competent to run a 1500 W transmitter on 51
MHz but not 29 MHz? Why is a Tech considered competent to use CW, SSB,
AM, FM, FSK, PSK, and a host of other modes above 30 MHz but only CW
and SSB below 30 MHz?
What is in the General written (besides a few regs) that is so
essential that it MUST be tested?

Now consider the Extra vs. General written. There's no difference
between what a General can do and what an Extra can do on the air
except that the Extra has a little more spectrum to do it in. Why is a

General considered competent to run a 1500 W transmitter on 3.530 MHz
but not 3.520 MHz?

> The FCC certainly hasn't been convinced of that.

See above about convincing FCC.
>
> > Why is a Tech considered qualified to use any authorized mode/freq above
> > 30 MHz
> > but unqualified to use all but CW and SSB on a few narrow slices of HF?
>
> You are now arguing privileges, not code testing.

I am arguing that focusing on the code test as a "stupid" requirement
opens up the same can of worms on the writtens.

> Others have already suggested
> a need for a different set of licenses and privileges.

Yup - and a lot of those changes are not for the better. But how can
they be defended against?

> Jim, you and I have
> long agreed
> that privileges in many cases don't map well against the testing for a
> particular license
> class.

Sure. And I see that situation getting worse, not better.

>
> ....
>
> > >ARRL membership provides a lot of benefits through QST, the website,
> > >and all of the good things they DO do for amateur radio.
> >
> > Sure - but a lot of hams, of all license classes, don't see those things.
> > Or
> > they aren't interested. I know at least one ham here who gave up on HF
> > because
> > she doesn't like the noise and distortion of HF. And, comparing even the
> > best
> > HF SSB to typical VHF/UHF FM, I can understand her point of view.
> >
> > Some are still mad about incentive licensing, of all things.
> >
> > One of the real problems with the Tech license being defacto the
> > entry-level is
> > that, for the most part, beginners nowadays are VHF/UHF centered, with
> > their
> > main focus on voice operation and manufactured equipment. Those things are
> > not
> > bad of themselves. They do, however, tend to distract new hams from

> > nonvoice
> > modes, building their own equipment, and national interests vs. local
> > ones.
> > IOW, they are more likely to join a local radio club than the distant
> > ARRL.
>
> Again, that has nothing to do with code testing and everything to
> do with license class and privileges being revisted.

It has to do with the patchwork changes made to the license structure.
Our basic system dates from 1951.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1618. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 18:24:05 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308191024.3b7bf204@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75032

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308190441.177ddf8f@posting.google.com>...
> dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308181824.3c5e5a2e@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308181437.61fe6a6c@posting.google.com>...
> > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308140938.e2260e1@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > > Some of us have given it real thought, and have posted ideas. But the
> > > > mantra has always been that eliminating the code test would solve
> > > > everything.
> > >
> > > No-code isn't a religion. No Mantra.
> >
> > What??? No "Hoops"??? No "unnecessary requirements"?? No
> > "Unjustified bogus BOHICA thingies"?? No "Morsedits" holding
> > back the intelligentsia?? No "If it wasn't for that dastardly
> > Morris code test I'd take my rightful place on HF??
>
> No mantra.

Then the term has no meaning.

>
> > No Mantra???? Get back to your village!
>
> You miss me?

Hammer>>>>>nail = NO MISS

1619. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 18:27:18 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308191027.4a22c0cc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75033

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bht4k0$2t36o$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > Yep, I considered it, then rejected it as inaccurate. Nocoders aren't
> > about
> > to dole out $34 per year for *nothing* That's exactly what most of
> > then see
> > of value to them in ARRL membership, since they really aren't into ham
> > radio
> > beyond their HT, and have no use for al the many ARRL "bennies".
> >
> >
>
> Gee... I have more than just the "HT" as you elude to and still don't
> believe in the value of the membership at the rates it currently is now.
> Other than a really expensive magazine subscription, these "bennies" as you
> elude to have yet to be proven.

What I Said!

1620. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 18:36:33 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <R6u0b.307$6e5.61829@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75034

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0308190905.c27e8a4@posting.google.com...
> I think you meant "rationale"
>
> And here it is:
>
> 1) Morse code is widely used in the ARS, particularly HF/MF amateur
> radio.

So??? That use is purely a matter of choice ... those who chose to use Morse should have the freedom of choice to learn it and to so ... however, at the same time, those who are not interested in using Morse should not be forced to learn it in order to gain HF privileges ...

> 2) Knowledge of morse code can only be measured by a practical skill
> test.

Excuse me ... I think you mean "proficiency in " not "knowledge of" ... those are important distinctions ... I have no problem with test questions on the theory of OOK Morse ("What's the necessary bw for x wpm?" "What are "key-clicks" and how can they be prevented?" etc.) But a proficiency requirement as a condition of access to HF is totally out of line.

> 3) Morse code offers unique advantages to the radio amateur, but these
> advantages are only available if Morse code skills are learned.

Other modes also offer "unique advantages" ... those advantages are in the eye of the beholder and largely subjective ... those who believe that it is advantageous to learn/use Morse will do so ... those who don't should not be forced.

> 4) All of the above support the Basis and Purposes of the ARS.

The FCC disagrees ...

[snipped the remainder of debate on privs vs. license class as irrelevant to the Morse question]

Carl - wk3c

1621. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 18:48:25 UTC
From: Bill <brian@iquest.net>
Message-ID: <Zhu0b.349$B8.12@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75035
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

All I know is I have heard it with my own ears, and seen it with my own eyes
and it will wreck HF for me.

I don't care how much theory or alleged science you want to try to wrap
around the BPL issue, it won't solve my personal loss if it becomes the ISP
of the future.

So I will keep sending my money to the ARRL and I will encourage them to
work towards keeping my hobby fun.

73

"Jim Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
news:98434152.65867878@pavillage.net...
> The claim that BPL will seriously and negatively impact amateur radio
> is simply fear, uncertainty, and doubt (FUD) spread by the ARRL. That
> organization needs to justify its existence, and the BPL issue is a
> convenient way for it to show its activism. The ARRL has apparently
> followed the path of other self-justifying organizations such as NOW
> and the NAACP.
>
> Unfortunately, the technically unsophisticated do not recognize the
> difference between coherent and non-coherent noise, and this makes it
> easy for the ARRL to spread its FUD. But the fact is that, if BPL
> signals are heard at all, they are coherent (have a predictable phase
> and amplitude) and therefore can be completely removed at the
> receiver. This can be done in many ways, most of which amount to
> nulling the BPL signals by introducing an identical signal which is
> 180 degrees out of phase with the original. As a matter of fact, most
> current HF transceivers have what they call a "noise reduction" option
> already built into them which uses the nulling method to accomplish
> its goal. Therefore, many amateurs and SWLers already have the needed
> equipment to deal with any BPL "interference." The ARRL reports have
> conveniently omitted any mention of the coherency issue, and their
> measurements are therefore flawed, because they don't reflect real
> world situations.
>
> So take the ARRL claims with a large grain of salt, and don't succumb
> to the FUD they are spreading. Instead, do some reading on your own
> by going to non-ARRL web pages such as http://www.uplc.utc.org, and
> http://www.wave-report.com/tutorials/bpl.htm before accepting the ARRL
> claims at face value.

1622. Re: Code / No Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 19:15:58 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308191115.62c9068e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75036

Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com> wrote in message news:<87u18d24fy.fld@barrow.com>...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote:
> >"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
> >news:gFn0b.27165$Vx2.12494241@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >> I don't have any strong preference about the Code / No Code issue, but I
> >> have a well developed opinion about the group of hams who have endlessly
> >> repeated the same tired flamewar crapola for years on this newsgroup, over
> >> the Code / No Code issue.
> >>
> >> Less than a dozen "hams" have used this issue as an excuse to turn this
> >> newsgroup into a running flame war that has gone on for years, much to the
> >> detriment of the hobby. People look at this newsgroup to see what hams are
> >> like - and what they see would reflect poorly on any hobby.
> >>
> >> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> >
> >Historically Charles, this newsgroup was formed specifically to take
> >the code/nocode debate out of rec.radio.amateur.misc. That was
> >about 8-10 years ago.
> >
> >Cheers,
> >Bill K2UNK
>
> Which is all the more support for his point that it does not advertise
> hams well.

Floyd, I suggest you look up any post by K2UNK and see if his manner
of conducting civil debate "does not advertise hams well". I mention
Bill specifically because although I disagree with many things he
writes here, he is able to debate effectively without being insulting
or derogatory to the other side.

IOW, "gentlemen can disagree without being disagreeable".

He is not the only one, just the one that comes quickest to mind.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1623. News: AP Article on Hams and NE Power Grid Failure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 19:18:07 UTC
From: Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <bhtt5t02c0a@enews4.newsguy.com>
Source record: 75040

http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=/ap/20030819/ap_on_hi_te/blackout_ham_radio_1

http://tinyurl.com/kiml

HARTFORD, Conn. - When technology failed on a massive scale last week, some old-fashioned broadcasting stepped into the breach as ham radio operators took to the airwaves to reach emergency workers.

--
The Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
http://www.kilowatt-radio.org/
..it does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an irate, tireless minority to set brush fires in people's minds. --Samuel Adams

1624. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 19:19:11 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308191119.6ad10b05@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75037

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote > >

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> Cry Whinner CRY. All you CBplussers have left, is your useless attempts to try
> and Justify your Welfare Status as Hams.
> All we want to be is an Equal to you real Hams, seems to be all you guys can
> come up with. Guess what Dwight, it will never happen.You guys have got what
> you wanted a Dumb Down Service with no effort required. So stop your Damn
> Whinning and get to the back of the Bus where you belong.

Y'know, Dwight, it's kinda surreal to read somebody lambasting others
about "effort" who won't even turn on the spellchecker, let alone look
at grammar, punctuation and capitalization.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1625. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 19:34:35 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F427BDC.1CB4466A@earthlink.net>
Source record: 75038

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> In article <3F42299F.14877923@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
> writes:
>
> >Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> >> Larry, you're one of the most pampas...
> >
> >Was Larry ever a gaucho in Argentina?
> >
> >Dave K8MN
>
> Dave:
>
> Si!
>
> 73 de Larry, LU3LT
>
> Disclaimer: "LU3LT" is not my real callsign. In fact, it isn't anyone's
> real callsign!

Larry,

You're just going to have to be less pampas.

Dave K8MN

1626. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 19:34:57 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <BZu0b.125200$_R5.46158518@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 75039

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:R6u0b.307$6e5.61829@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0308190905.c27e8a4@posting.google.com...
> > 2) Knowledge of morse code can only be measured by a practical skill
> > test.
>
> Excuse me ... I think you mean "proficiency in " not "knowledge of" ...
> those are important distinctions

Those are inaccurate distinctions, Carl. Element 1 is IN NO WAY a test of one's Morse code "proficiency." The 5-wpm test is just barely sufficient to test the applicant's "knowledge of" the 43 required characters. IOW, did s/he memorize the required character set. Are you intentionally trying to spread this mistruth to rationalize NCI's "goal" or do you really consider a newbie whose Element 1 CSCE hasn't even dried yet Morse "proficient?" Why don't you just tap into the knowledge base, Carl? Ask the OT's and learn from them That's what they're there for.

> ... I have no problem with test questions
> on the theory of OOK Morse ("What's the necessary bw for x wpm?"
> "What are "key-clicks" and how can they be prevented?" etc.)

With the answers unpublished?

> But a
> proficiency requirement as a condition of access to HF is totally out of
> line.

I agree. I'm glad we don't currently have one.

> > 3) Morse code offers unique advantages to the radio amateur, but these
> > advantages are only available if Morse code skills are learned.
>
> Other modes also offer "unique advantages" ... those advantages are in
> the eye of the beholder and largely subjective ... those who believe that
> it is advantageous to learn/use Morse will do so ... those who don't
should
> not be forced.

"Forced?" Lol!

> > 4) All of the above support the Basis and Purposes of the ARS.
>
> The FCC disagrees ...

I wonder how much you'd support the "big brother knows best" if they agreed?
Luckily, they too wish to reduce their work.

> [snipped the remainder of debate on privs vs. license class as
> irrelevant to the Morse question]
>
> Carl - wk3c

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

1627. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 20:27:08 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <wKv0b.320$6e5.62637@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75041

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:BZu0b.125200$_R5.46158518@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:R6u0b.307$6e5.61829@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> >
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > news:c2356669.0308190905.c27e8a4@posting.google.com...
> > > 2) Knowledge of morse code can only be measured by a practical skill
> > > test.
> >
> > Excuse me ... I think you mean "proficiency in " not "knowledge of" ...
> > those are important distinctions
>
> Those are inaccurate distinctions, Carl. Element 1 is IN NO WAY a test of
> one's Morse code "proficiency." The 5-wpm test is just barely sufficient
to
> test the applicant's "knowledge of" the 43 required characters. IOW, did
> s/he memorize the required character set. Are you intentionally trying to
> spread this mistruth to rationalize NCI's "goal" or do you really consider
a
> newbie whose Element 1 CSCE hasn't even dried yet Morse "proficient?" Why
> don't you just tap into the knowledge base, Carl? Ask the OT's and learn
> from them That's what they're there for.

Bert ... I *am* an OT ... member of QCWA ... learned the code ... didn't
particularly enjoy it ... have no use for it any more.

And, yes, the Element 1 test IS a measure of proficiency ... at 5 wpm ...
if you can't do 5 wpm you don't pass ... ergo, it's a measure of proficiency
(and that's how the FCC characterizes it as well ...)

> > ... I have no problem with test questions
> > on the theory of OOK Morse ("What's the necessary bw for x wpm?"
> > "What are "key-clicks" and how can they be prevented?" etc.)
>
> With the answers unpublished?

Question pools are a fact of life ... not just for ham exams, but for all
sorts of exams in other pursuits ...

> > But a
> > proficiency requirement as a condition of access to HF is totally out of
> > line.
>
> I agree. I'm glad we don't currently have one.

Yes, we do ... 5 wpm ... for the moment, at least.

> > > 3) Morse code offers unique advantages to the radio amateur, but these
> > > advantages are only available if Morse code skills are learned.
> >
> > Other modes also offer "unique advantages" ... those advantages are in
> > the eye of the beholder and largely subjective ... those who believe
that
> > it is advantageous to learn/use Morse will do so ... those who don't
> > should not be forced.
>
> "Forced?" Lol!

OK, I'll settle for "coerced" ... as in "If you don't jump through this
irrelevant
hoop, you can't have HF privileges." That is coercion.

> > > 4) All of the above support the Basis and Purposes of the ARS.
> >
> > The FCC disagrees ...
>
> I wonder how much you'd support the "big brother knows best" if they
agreed?
> Luckily, they too wish to reduce their work.

It's not a "big brother knows best" view ... it's a "What's rational and
serves a
regulatory purpose" view.

Carl - wk3c

1628. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 20:30:46 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <WNv0b.321$6e5.62519@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75042
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

It's also interesting that Mr. Nye points us to the websites of folks
who are advocating BPL ...

I wonder, is Mr. Nye a consultant to the utilities or BPL manufacturers?

I live just outside of Emmaus, PA, (test site #3 in Ed Hare's video).
While I am currently far enough away from the limited deployment
that I cannot detect it here at my QTH, I have gone down to the
area with my FT-817 and can verify that the noise is HORRIBLE.

I shudder to think what havoc large-scale deployments would bring.

Despite Mr. Nye's allegations of "FUD" ... the ARRL is right on
this one.

Carl - wk3c

"Bill" <brian@iquest.net> wrote in message
news:Zhu0b.349$B8.12@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> All I know is I have heard it with my own ears, and seen it with my own
eyes
> and it will wreck HF for me.
>
> I don't care how much theory or alleged science you want to try to wrap
> around the BPL issue, it won't solve my personal loss if it becomes the
ISP
> of the future.
>
> So I will keep sending my money to the ARRL and I will encourage them to
> work towards keeping my hobby fun.
>
> 73
>
>
>
> "Jim Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
> news:98434152.65867878@pavillage.net...
> > The claim that BPL will seriously and negatively impact amateur radio
> > is simply fear, uncertainty, and doubt (FUD) spread by the ARRL. That
> > organization needs to justify its existence, and the BPL issue is a
> > convenient way for it to show its activism. The ARRL has apparently
> > followed the path of other self-justifying organizations such as NOW
> > and the NAACP.
> >
> > Unfortunately, the technically unsophisticated do not recognize the

> > difference between coherent and non-coherent noise, and this makes it
> > easy for the ARRL to spread its FUD. But the fact is that, if BPL
> > signals are heard at all, they are coherent (have a predictable phase
> > and amplitude) and therefore can be completely removed at the
> > receiver. This can be done in many ways, most of which amount to
> > nulling the BPL signals by introducing an identical signal which is
> > 180 degrees out of phase with the original. As a matter of fact, most
> > current HF transceivers have what they call a "noise reduction" option
> > already built into them which uses the nulling method to accomplish
> > its goal. Therefore, many amateurs and SWLers already have the needed
> > equipment to deal with any BPL "interference." The ARRL reports have
> > conveniently omitted any mention of the coherency issue, and their
> > measurements are therefore flawed, because they don't reflect real
> > world situations.
> >
> > So take the ARRL claims with a large grain of salt, and don't succumb
> > to the FUD they are spreading. Instead, do some reading on your own
> > by going to non-ARRL web pages such as http://www.uplc.utc.org, and
> > http://www.wave-report.com/tutorials/bpl.htm before accepting the ARRL
> > claims at face value.
>
>

1629. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 20:48:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F428D0C.5040309@psu.edu>
Source record: 75043

N2EY wrote:
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bht3dn$5dt$2@slb0.atl.mindspring.net>...
<some snipage>

>>>>I'm ALSO going on the demographic of all those
>>>>nocode techs
>>>
>>>Which demographic? The ARRL/READEX poll of 1996 showed that the youngest
>>
>> hams
>>
>>>were the most procodetest. Bert Craig, WA2SI, has told you here that he
>>
>> does
>>
>>>not consider Element 1 a "barrier" or "hoop". Other newcomers have said
>>
>> the
>>
>>>same thing. Don't they count?
>>
>>The ONLY thing that counts
>
>
> Hold on a sec, Bill.
>
> We've been told that:
>
> - we have to get rid of the code test to increase growth in the ARS
> - (most) young people aren't interested in learning the code
> - The future is newcomers and young hams
> - The current 5 wpm test is an unreasonable burden on the VECs and new
> hams but written tests aren't
>
> and the big one:
>
> "the demographic is heavily tilted towards the no code test side"
>
> Now, do these things matter or not?

It's all opinion and marketing. Marketing is what brings us milkshakes
that are so thick you can't get them through a straw. Marketing is what
gives us Ketchup that you can't get out of the bottle. but then "thicker
and richer" sells don't it. Marketing is what causes convenience stores

to sell "Ultra Mega" soda's with 144 ounces of soda and the resulting calories, and fast food restaraunts to prepare us "Super doopersize" 2000 calorie meals when all we need is 300 calories.

The relation is that the marketing words (or contramarketing words) thrown around sound like they might be a good thing. Here the NCTA's have the edge too. Look at the words used and it s pretty clear, "Outdated" "Future" all the marketing words are there.

And as anyone familiar with marketing knows, It does not make a damn bit of difference if you are right or not.

The truth does *not matter* in this case, and besides, what exactly is the truth? I guess it is who you hang out with.

PCTA's haven't done enough proper marketing of their product IMO.

>>is the answer to the question: What is the
>>rational
>>for retaining any code test now that the ITU treaty has eliminated the
>>requirement from the treaty?
>
>
> I think you meant "rationale"
>
> And here it is:
>
> 1) Morse code is widely used in the ARS, particularly HF/MF amateur
> radio.
> 2) Knowledge of morse code can only be measured by a practical skill
> test.
> 3) Morse code offers unique advantages to the radio amateur, but these
> advantages are only available if Morse code skills are learned.
> 4) All of the above support the Basis and Purposes of the ARS.
>
> Does that constitute an irrefutable proof? Of course not. Neither does
> the 20 pages of the NCI petition.

NCI pettition is all opinion.

>>The FCC answered that in their R&O for 98-143. The FCC indicated
>>none of the arguments, comments or suggested reasons put forth by
>>pro-code test advocates were of sufficient rational or justification. to
>>keep any testing of morse.
>
>
> Sure.
>
> And this is the same FCC that thinks BPL is a good idea. Take a look
> at the 120 page ARRL report and the videos, then tell me what kind of
> "expert agency" should give such a system the time of day. Note that
> the BPL'rs want the Part 15 levels RAISED!

>
> This is also the same FCC that wanted to allow media giants to become
> practical monopolies so that radio and TV programming become even more
> homogenized.
>
> This is the FCC that "solved" the freebander linear problem by
> restricting the manufacture and sale of HF amplifiers, which ties the
> hands of legitimate ARS manufacturers but hasn't kept one amp out of
> any illegal's hands.
>
> "Expert agency", they're called, right?
>
>>>>who could get on HF were it not for a stupid Morse
>>>>requirement ...
>>>
>>>Hmmm...."stupid Morse requirement"? It's been passed by elementary school
>>>children, old people, people with severe disabilities, and everything in
>>>between. Heck, under the old rules we had at least one 8 year old Extra!
>>>
>>>The fact is that if Element 1 is dropped, all those non-code-tested Techs
>>>will
>>>gain some SSB on 10 meters and four slices of HF CW. (Ironic) In order for
>>>them
>>>to get more, they have to jump through another hoop...I mean, pass another
>>>written exam.....;-)
>>>
>>>You may not think the General or Extra writtens are very hard, nor that
>>>they
>>>are "unreasonable", but the fact remains that they have not been shown to
>>>be
>>>necessary for safe and legal operation of an amateur station.
>>
>>Just where has that been shown and by whom?
>
>
> It's self evident. Common sense.
>
> FCC considers a Tech to be competent to
> design/build/repair/align/maintain and most of all OPERATE an amateur
> transmitter on any authorized frequency above 30MHz, using any
> authorized mode, at full legal power.
>
> But it requires a General license for the FCC to consider someone to
> be competent to design/build/repair/align/maintain and most of all
> OPERATE an amateur transmitter on most authorizeds frequency below
> 30MHz, using any authorized mode, at full legal power. In fact,
> Techs-with-HF are only authorized to use two modes and small slices of
> four bands.
>
> Why is a Tech considered competent to run a 1500 W transmitter on 51

> MHz but not 29 MHz? Why is a Tech considered competent to use CW, SSB,
> AM, FM, FSK, PSK, and a host of other modes above 30 MHz but only CW
> and SSB below 30 MHz?
> What is in the General written (besides a few regs) that is so
> essential that it MUST be tested?

One of the reasons I heard was that the VHF bands are more localized,
and therefore the technician, if he or she did commit rules violations,
would at least confine it to frequencies that were not globe spanning.

> Now consider the Extra vs. General written. There's no difference
> between what a General can do and what an Extra can do on the air
> except that the Extra has a little more spectrum to do it in. Why is a
> General considered competent to run a 1500 W transmitter on 3.530 MHz
> but not 3.520 MHz?

Who knows what the rationale is? Maybe a little bit less crowding for
the Extras?

>>The FCC certainly hasn't been convinced of that.
>
>
> See above about convincing FCC.
>
>>>Why is a Tech considered qualified to use any authorized mode/freq above
>>>30 MHz
>>>but unqualified to use all but CW and SSB on a few narrow slices of HF?
>>
>>You are now arguing privileges, not code testing.
>
>
> I am arguing that focusing on the code test as a "stupid" requirement
> opens up the same can of worms on the writtens.

Bingo! I've been saying that for while now.

It's a fact that you do not need to be tested at all to operate high
power levels on HF. CB'ers do it all the time.

Let's try a little marketing talk ....

"The written tests are an obsolete throwback to an earlier time when
Amateurs HAD to know how to put a station together using a lot of their
own handicraft. Now that HF rigs are no more complicated to put on the
air than hooking up a VCR to a television, it is pointless to insist on
the hazing requirement of forcing the prospective amateur to spend
countless hours learning things that he or she may have no use for."

There is nothing wrong with an Amateur having knowledge of the things
covered in the present and obsolete written examinations, but why should
a person who has no intention of ever doing anything but using his ready
made rig to talk to other hams be forced to learn these things that he
or she will never use.

Those who wish to know things like Ohms law, and various arcane laws are encouraged to do so, but to require all hams to know such things is a form of hazing, or is this a case of "I had to learn the band edges, so by gaw, everyone has to"!

The written examinations are keeping people out of the ARS who refuse to jump through these arbitray hoops set up by those who want to see the ARS as some kind of elite service. Those elite people are destroying the ARS by discouraging participation by all Americans.

Sound about right Jim? Reasonable arguments I think. Wrong, but reasonable.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1630. Re: New Ham Term

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 20:51:10 UTC
From: danielmorlan@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <a7dee37b.0308191251.523e5f05@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75044

Well, I am greener than green when it comes to these things, as I have yet to get my technician license, but I expect to get my general right after, if not immediately after taking the technician test. I am studying morse code, and expect that only a week left of study will leave me more than able to pass the test.

As far as people being upset with the deterioration of ham, I might agree to a certain degree. Once in a while, a little levity is okay, but people burping, farting, and playing weird sound effects doesn't constitute (as far as I'm concerned) good use of the ham bands... I question its legality, as well. I hear people trying to imitate other hams (though they don't go so far as blathering out other people's callsigns)

Again, I'm profoundly green, and at this point of study, would barely pass my tech exam. I want to ace it. I expect to ace it.

Hopefully it won't be too long.

DJM

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3F41B522.8020300@adelphia.net>...
> Daniel J. Morlan wrote:
> > wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030813212211.06745.00001707@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >
> >>All new Amateurs entering into Amateur Radio, will no longer be refered to as
> >>Hams. The new Name will be CBerHams.
> >
> >
> > I take it this is your expression of distaste for the lowering of
> > standards to get a ham license?
>
> BTW, Daniel, remember that this group is the seamy underside of the ARS,
> so bear in mind we like to argue..... tain't a safe place at all.
>
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

1631. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 20:57:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030819165748.10744.00000153@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 75045

>Y'know, Dwight, it's kinda surreal to read somebody lambasting others
>about "effort" who won't even turn on the spellchecker, let alone look
>at grammar, punctuation and capitalization.....

Hell no I wont turn it on.

1632. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 21:07:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308191307.658531d9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75046
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam (Jim Nye) wrote in message
news:<98434152.65867878@pavillage.net>...
> The claim that BPL will seriously and negatively impact amateur radio
> is simply fear, uncertainty, and doubt (FUD) spread by the ARRL.

No, it's a real issue. Have you seen the video? Have you conducted
tests on the BPL demo areas?

> That
> organization needs to justify its existence, and the BPL issue is a
> convenient way for it to show its activism. The ARRL has apparently
> followed the path of other self-justifying organizations such as NOW
> and the NAACP.

Every organization needs to justify its existence.

Are you saying we don't need the ARRL, NAACP, or NOW? How about the
NRA?
>
> Unfortunately, the technically unsophisticated do not recognize the
> difference between coherent and non-coherent noise, and this makes it
> easy for the ARRL to spread its FUD.

You admit, then, that BPL emits noise.

> But the fact is that, if BPL
> signals are heard at all, they are coherent (have a predictable phase
> and amplitude) and therefore can be completely removed at the
> receiver. This can be done in many ways, most of which amount to
> nulling the BPL signals by introducing an identical signal which is
> 180 degrees out of phase with the original. As a matter of fact, most
> current HF transceivers have what they call a "noise reduction" option
> already built into them which uses the nulling method to accomplish
> its goal. Therefore, many amateurs and SWLers already have the needed
> equipment to deal with any BPL "interference." The ARRL reports have
> conveniently omitted any mention of the coherency issue, and their
> measurements are therefore flawed, because they don't reflect real
> world situations.

Have you actually done this? Where is your 120 page report and demo
video?

Are the BPL folks going to buy me a new transceiver if my existing one
doesn't have these alleged noise-cancelling features?

Let's get down to basics on this.

What you're saying is:

1) BPL does radiate lots of noise
2) Rather than the unlicensed BPL folks not radiating the noise, it should be up to the licensed users to filter out the noise using techniques you have not demonstrated.
3) If an amateur does not have the technology to filter out the noise, he/she is out of luck.

Let's do an analogy, shall we?

Imagine the RF spectrum as a river that is used by many different people for many different purposes - transportation, recreation, fishing, irrigation, energy generation, drinking water, etc. All are licensed and have their uses balanced against each other. Nobody is allowed to just dump trash in the river.

Along comes a group that wants to use an existing bridge over the river for transport. But the vehicles they want to use on the bridge leak and spill their contents, some of which falls into the river. They claim that:

- the spillage is harmless
- proof of harm is up to the other users
- anybody who doesn't like the spillage should simply equip themselves with filters to strain it out, rather than requiring the transport company to seal up their vehicles and not spill in the first place.

Here's another: Perhaps we should remove all air pollution devices, and simply have everyone go around wearing gas masks.
>
> So take the ARRL claims with a large grain of salt, and don't succumb
> to the FUD they are spreading.

What about the inaccuracies YOU are spreading?

> Instead, do some reading on your own
> by going to non-ARRL web pages such as http://www.uplc.utc.org, and
> http://www.wave-report.com/tutorials/bpl.htm before accepting the ARRL
> claims at face value.

I did. I saw nothing about "coherent noise". I did see a lot of boosterism for a polluting technology.

DSL and cable modems don't pollute the RF spectrum. Why should BPL be allowed to do so?

N2EY

1633. Re: OT but worth a look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 21:40:54 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F429966.6DA5BB23@ptt.edu>
Source record: 75048

> I just got back from an evening of looking at Mars. Since it is closer
> now than it has been in a long time, and won't be this close again when
> any of us are around, I suggest getting out and taking a look-see. And
> if you don't have a scope, latch on to someone who does.

Mars is the BIG bright reddish-orange star that appears to the
east at about 2230 local time. You CANNOT miss it!

It is worth the look even with binoculars.

1634. Re: New Ham Term

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 21:45:31 UTC
From: Keyboard In The Wilderness <KITW@forest.com>
Message-ID: <Afx0b.5910$S_.4266@fed1read01>
Source record: 75101

Dan keep in mind the ham population of the USA is over 680,000 licensees.
So several dozen renegades on the bands can reek havoc.
Was that way since way back when, not just today.
The greater % of hams are very well behaved.

As far as new license requirements -- when you get the ticket -- you are
every bit an Amateur Radio Operator as any one else.
Don't let anyone tell you otherwise. Just some old timers are 40 years
behind times.

Welcome to Ham Radio and ignore the grizzly old timers who had to draw a
Colpitts Oscillator to get their license.

That from an extra class licensee - for 25 Years.

"Daniel J. Morlan" <danielmorlan@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:a7dee37b.0308191251.523e5f05@posting.google.com...
> Well, I am greener than green when it comes to these things, as I have
> yet to get my technician license, but I expect to get my general right
> after, if not immediately after taking the technician test. I am
> studying morse code, and expect that only a week left of study will
> leave me more than able to pass the test.
>
> As far as people being upset with the deterioration of ham, I might
> agree to a certain degree. Once in a while, a little levity is okay,
> but people burping, farting, and playing weird sound effects doesn't
> constitute (as far as I'm concerned) good use of the ham bands... I
> question its legality, as well. I hear people trying to imitate other
> hams (though they don't go so far as blathering out other people's
> callsigns)
>
> Again, I'm profoundly green, and at this point of study, would barely
> pass my tech exam. I want to ace it. I expect to ace it.
>
> Hopefully it won't be too long.
>
> DJM
>
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3F41B522.8020300@adelphia.net>...
> > Daniel J. Morlan wrote:
> > > wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030813212211.06745.00001707@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > >
> > >>All new Amateurs entering into Amateur Radio, will no longer be

refered to as
> > >>Hams. The new Name will be CBerHams.
> > >
> > >
> > > I take it this is your expression of distaste for the lowering of
> > > standards to get a ham license?
> >
> > BTW, Daniel, remember that this group is the seamy underside of the ARS,
> > so bear in mind we like to argue..... tain't a safe place at all.
> >
> >
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -

1635. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 21:50:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308191350.26a4101e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75049

dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308181910.3e87545d@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote
> >
> > As for eHam, I'm sorry but I've never heard of them.

>
> Well,well... Who was that satirest who used to write a column
> entitled "Pardon, your slip is showing"?

Never heard of him, either.

> I just read in another venue, this from a OT ham who was first
> licensed morehan a half-century ago..
> ---------
> "review on eHam.net, a ham radio grand central station which I
> financially support, although that is optional.."
> ---------

I thought QRZ and AC6V were the Grand Central Station and Yankee
Stadium of amateur radio.

> So we can easily see why it is you "never heard of it". You've been
> sorta distracted for the past couple decades, what with dodging all
> those hoops and such.

Poor little DICK, still requiring other people to accept his version
of life.

1636. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 21:53:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308191353.513c1301@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75050

dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308191024.3b7bf204@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308190441.177ddf8f@posting.google.com>...
> > dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308181824.3c5e5a2e@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308181437.61fe6a6c@posting.google.com>...
> > > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308140938.e2260e1@posting.google.com>...
> > > >
> > > > > Some of us have given it real thought, and have posted ideas. But the
> > > > > mantra has always been that eliminating the code test would solve
> > > > > everything.
> > > >
> > > > No-code isn't a religion. No Mantra.
> > >
> > > What??? No "Hoops"??? No "unnecessary requirements"?? No
> > > "Unjustified bogus BOHICA thingies"?? No "Morsedits" holding
> > > back the intelligentsia?? No "If it wasn't for that dastardly
> > > Morris code test I'd take my rightful place on HF??
> >
> > No mantra.
>
> Then the term has no meaning.

Much like your posts.

> > > No Mantra???? Get back to your village!
> >
> > You miss me?
>
> Hammer>>>>>nail = NO MISS

Sounds like a big blood blister to me.

1637. Re: Code / No Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 22:14:47 UTC
From: Floyd Davidson <floyd@barrow.com>
Message-ID: <8765kt1ei0.fld@barrow.com>
Source record: 75102

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>> >Historically Charles, this newsgroup was formed specifically to take
>> >the code/nocode debate out of rec.radio.amateur.misc. That was
>> >about 8-10 years ago.
>> >
>> >Cheers,
>> >Bill K2UNK
>>
>> Which is all the more support for his point that it does not advertise
>> hams well.
>
>Floyd, I suggest you look up any post by K2UNK and see if his manner

Actually Jim, you probably didn't spend enough time reading what
little I wrote. It doesn't say a *thing* about Bill. You might
notice that he doesn't flood this or any newsgroup with innane
posts on a daily basis, and in fact I agree with almost
everything I've seen him post here.

I will grant though, that it _was_ about you.

>of conducting civil debate "does not advertise hams well". I mention
>Bill specifically because although I disagree with many things he
>writes here, he is able to debate effectively without being insulting
>or derogatory to the other side.
>
>IOW, "gentlemen can disagree without being disagreeable".
>
>He is not the only one, just the one that comes quickest to mind.

So you have exceptions that prove the rule. The point was that
the rule *is* valid.

Which is all the more support for that point that it does not
advertise hams well.

--
Floyd L. Davidson <http://web.newsguy.com/floyd_davidson>
Ukpeagvik (Barrow, Alaska) floyd@barrow.com

1638. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 22:15:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308191415.13ca05e2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75103

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308190430.2d0fdbde@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308182146.31736474@posting.google.com>...
> > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4125A2.8070100@psu.edu>...
> > > Now taking nominations for the "BPL" of rrap!
> >
> > I dunno, depends I guess, gotta be one of the usual cast of lurkers
> > around here who are also members of the ARRL Brass Pounders League.
> >
> > > The successful candidate will be capable of keeping up a virtual S9
> > > group noise level.
> > >
> > >
> > > Who will it be????
> >
> > . . the floor is open for nominations
>
> Well...You KNOW who I nominate:
>
> For his pages long recitings of his CV...
>
> For his frequent retelling of how he "worked DX" in a 1950's-era
> Army radio station...

What would you call long distance communications?

> For his frequent demeaning of not only individual Amateurs, but
> of the Amateur Service as a whole...

I'm an individual amateur and a member of the ARS as a whole. I don't
"feel" demeaned. There is some truth in Len's observation of the ARS.
Accept it.

> For his frequent attempts to associate himself with Soldiers who
> died in combat for the purpose of improving his own "reputation"...

If you served, you are associated with soldiers who died in combat.
That's just the way it is, and no amaount of running away from it will
disassociate you from them. Yet there are those who never served and
claim "military experience." That is disgusting.

> For countless lies, mistruths (especially that one about "get my
> Extra Lite out of the box...) and use of profanity and insults...

We have all desired things which we have not achieved.

> The envelope pleeeeeeease! (drom roll ensuses....)
>
> Leonard H. "Lennie the Liar" Anderson!
>
> Respectfully submitted,

Obviously disrespectfully submitted.

> Steve, K4YZ

At least you didn't start a new thread over it.

1639. Re: radio-amateur and CB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 22:42:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308191442.458dd255@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75104

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<dNc0b.27047$Vx2.12336032@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "F4ASK" <f4ask@wanadoo.fr> wrote in message
> news:XnF93DB9663FE8CFGilbertF4ASK@130.133.1.4...
> > I don't know exactly why French (and other) administration let the CBers
> > working around the legal band : I think (but only me) this band is not
> > good enough for HF transmissions... But what about 10 m ? Very
> > strange....
> >
>
> The CB band, being between the 10m and 12m ham bands, will follow the same
> physics of radio propagation as the surrounding ham bands. When conditions
> are good, you can work the world on a few watts. When conditions are bad,
> all the power in the world won't help.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dee, I wished I were able to keep all of my QST's, but I tend to move
a lot and can't keep hauling everything I'd like.

Anyway, about 10 years ago, QST featured a ham in Texas that kept
records of his 10M activity. He was able to make contacts beyond
ground wave when most everyone else thought 10M prop was closed. It
was a good story and worth looking up if you have access to back
issues or the CD-ROMS.

But power does help, always has, always will. And a few watts may
work, but not necessarily reliably.

There is quite a network of 10M beacons, and you can often hear the
beacons when you hear no other traffic higher up in the band. 10M
just isn't glamorous, some OT hams calling it the "kiddie band." And
you risk running in to the Ten-Tenners (I am told). ;^)

73, Brian

1640. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 22:44:53 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308191444.3b8be9f2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75105
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Bill" <brian@iquest.net> wrote in message
news:<Zhu0b.349$B8.12@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> All I know is I have heard it with my own ears, and seen it with my own eyes
> and it will wreck HF for me.
>
> I don't care how much theory or alleged science you want to try to wrap
> around the BPL issue, it won't solve my personal loss if it becomes the ISP
> of the future.
>
> So I will keep sending my money to the ARRL and I will encourage them to
> work towards keeping my hobby fun.
>
> 73

Bill,

One more thing: COMMENT TO THE FCC about BPL. Your firsthand, detailed
experience is sorely needed in the fight. We can do theory all day but
somebody who was there has the definitive answer.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1641. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 22:50:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308191450.13503deb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75106

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4137D2.6060003@psu.edu>...
> Thanks for the link to your proposal, Carl.
>
>
> A question though. I notice that the proposal to drop element one is
> there, but why doesn't the proposal rename the other elements so that
> they are in sequence?
>
> I've been around enough of these sort of documents to know that sooner
> or later it will have to be changed.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I dunno, Mike. Were you around during the last restructuring? The NPRM was the most amateurish piece of literature I've ever seen from a government agency. The R/O was the second most. Left more questions than answers. Of course, there was a lot of interference from the ARRL in the process, so...

1642. Plagiarized posts (Was:Re: Wiseman's "Dictionary"....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 22:58:36 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <a5cb2afbb372b1b029e725f0ca975520@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 75107

In article <bhp7iq$o0v$0@pita.alt.net>
"Ed Norton" <haaaynorton@comnos.pam> wrote:

Wrong, fucktard....you still downloading kiddie porn?

>
> These are only a few of the <plagiarized post flushed>

These have already been lamed out, fatass.....they weren't very effective when prisonbitch Paris did them......had to get a new altopia account after getting booted from there, did you, fucktard? Did you enjoy explaining those illegal activities to the federal agents?

1643. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 22:59:56 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030819185956.14837.00002310@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 75108

In article <WNv0b.321$6e5.62519@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>It's also interesting that Mr. Nye points us to the websites of folks
>who are advocating BPL ...

Yup.
>
>I wonder, is Mr. Nye a consultant to the utilities or BPL manufacturers?

I think you just outed him.....
>
>I live just outside of Emmaus, PA, (test site #3 in Ed Hare's video).
>While I am currently far enough away from the limited deployment
>that I cannot detect it here at my QTH, I have gone down to the
>area with my FT-817 and can verify that the noise is HORRIBLE.

Your detailed firsthand comments to FCC are much-needed in the fight, Carl.
Theory is great but having lots of hams say "I was there and it raised the
noise floor XX db 160-6" is even better.

And IIRC the demos are meeting Part 15, and the BPL folks want to RAISE the
allowable levels!!

Did DSL or cable get that sort of gimmee? I don't think so!! If the utilities
want to get into the broadband game, let 'em play by the same rules as
everybody else.
>
>I shudder to think what havoc large-scale deployments would bring.

Would make our codetest debates kinda moot, huh? And don't forget that access
BPL goes up to 80 MHz on fundamentals. Harmonics, anyone?
>
>Despite Mr. Nye's allegations of "FUD" ... the ARRL is right on
>this one.

AGREED!

I say the stuff about "coherent noise" is simply a smokescreen to divert away
from the real issue. Which is simply that BPL puts out a lot of noise that will
cause harmful interference to all licensed users of the affected spectrum. And
this interference is totally avoidable by using better technology, like "PBL".

Do you agree, Carl?

73 de Jim, N2EY

btw, how far from the test site do you have to get before the BPL noise disappears?

1644. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 23:02:13 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <V%x0b.100916$OG3.19604@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 75109
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Jim,

Having worked in EMC labs (electromagnetic compatibility), I've heard the signals generated by some equipment. What you fail to understand is that these signals are being modulated at very high rates of speed. Inside of your computer exist a number of oscillators. You assume that only those frequencies and their harmonics would be broadcast. Do yourself a favor and put an HF radio or HF scanner next to your computer while it is on. Turn off the monitor so you won't blame the monitor. Guess what? A ton of garbage. BPL will be worse since it will be carrying more than one signal over the power lines. These will likely carry information at a 1.5 megabaud rate. Check out the ARRL website and view (and listen to) the 26 MB video they have available showing the radio, S-meter, and the car driving around. It is a veritable cacophony of noise all over HF.

The fact is that folks such as yourself who are not particularly technically inclined make statements that other non technically inclined individuals will believe without actually studying the matter. I can assure you that your position is totally in error.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.510 / Virus Database: 307 - Release Date: 8/14/03

1645. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 23:21:23 UTC
From: wn6bdb@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <fda4618.0308191521.57537aef@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75110
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

What you are proposing is to shift the cost of correcting the
interference caused by this technology from those who will profit from
it to the victims of the interference.
Do you plan to invest your BPL profits into stock in the companys
that will manufacture the new radio equipment that your technology
will force us all to buy?
Steve .. AI7W

jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam (Jim Nye) wrote in message
news:<98434152.65867878@pavillage.net>...
> The claim that BPL will seriously and negatively impact amateur radio
> is simply fear, uncertainty, and doubt (FUD) spread by the ARRL. That
> organization needs to justify its existence, and the BPL issue is a
> convenient way for it to show its activism. The ARRL has apparently
> followed the path of other self-justifying organizations such as NOW
> and the NAACP.
>
> Unfortunately, the technically unsophisticated do not recognize the
> difference between coherent and non-coherent noise, and this makes it
> easy for the ARRL to spread its FUD. But the fact is that, if BPL
> signals are heard at all, they are coherent (have a predictable phase
> and amplitude) and therefore can be completely removed at the
> receiver. This can be done in many ways, most of which amount to
> nulling the BPL signals by introducing an identical signal which is
> 180 degrees out of phase with the original. As a matter of fact, most
> current HF transceivers have what they call a "noise reduction" option
> already built into them which uses the nulling method to accomplish
> its goal. Therefore, many amateurs and SWLers already have the needed
> equipment to deal with any BPL "interference." The ARRL reports have
> conveniently omitted any mention of the coherency issue, and their
> measurements are therefore flawed, because they don't reflect real
> world situations.
>
> So take the ARRL claims with a large grain of salt, and don't succumb
> to the FUD they are spreading. Instead, do some reading on your own
> by going to non-ARRL web pages such as http://www.uplc.utc.org, and
> http://www.wave-report.com/tutorials/bpl.htm before accepting the ARRL
> claims at face value.

1646. Re: radio-amateur and CB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 23:42:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F42B5F0.1060009@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75111

>
>
>
>Anyway, about 10 years ago, QST featured a ham in Texas that kept
>records of his 10M activity. He was able to make contacts beyond
>ground wave when most everyone else thought 10M prop was closed. It
>was a good story and worth looking up if you have access to back
>issues or the CD-ROMS.
>
>
Back then I has one or two QSOs at 10:30 PM on ten. Usually the band is
dead at
that time. Wonder if I QSOed with that ham?

1647. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-19 23:56:54 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhue5v$384@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75114

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030817230156.22081.00000042@mb-m17.aol.com...
> In article <BB653A45.24627%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:
>
> > If those with your views continue to deride modern Ham Radio, perhaps
even
> >less then 2 percent. Those changes are part of Ham Radio today. If you
> >belittle those changes, you belittle today's Ham Radio.
> >
> >
> >Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> Dwight:
>
> Belittling ham radio? Moi??? Hmmm, you may have a point there. Now
> that ham radio licensing requirements in the U.S. have been reduced to
> insignificance, and are about to be made a whole lot less significant when
> code testing is abolished, I guess one could make the point that there is
> a lot "belittleable" about ham radio these days! We are about to start
> the first "generation" of hams who have never been bothered to learn the
> Morse code, and will never know the benefits and advantages of the
> Morse/CW mode from personal operational experience. Now THERE's
> a perfect example of something that would inspire one to "belittle"
> ham radio, indeed!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I wonder if you realize how incessant your whining is...

Kim W5TIT

1648. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 00:02:14 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhue60$384@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75113

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030819011436.23171.00000090@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <3F4125A2.8070100@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >Now taking nominations for the "BPL" of rrap!
> >
> >The successful candidate will be capable of keeping up a virtual S9
> >group noise level.
> >
> >
> > Who will it be????
>
> It's definitely a four-way tie between Kim, Lennie, Brian, and Dwight!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Oh, yeah. Now, there's some intellect for ya...

Kim W5TIT

1649. Re: Question for the No coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 00:09:26 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhue61$384@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75112

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030819011436.23171.00000091@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <bhp868$bop@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Kim:
> >>
> >> You're really out-doing yourself here. You've produced one
> >non-responsive,
> >> irrelevant and un-enlightening response to each and every thing I've
> >posted
> >> these last two days. You have truly perfected the art of wasting
> >bandwidth
> >> on Usenet, not to mention your own time.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >I haven't anything of substance to respond to, Larry. Produce some
> >literate, logical, intelligent form in your style and I will respond in
> >kind...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> One hundred percent of my postings provide what you call "literate,
> logical, and intelligent" arguments for you and others to respond to in
> the same manner.
>

Now, Larry, if that were true, then we'd be having intelligent communication
rather than this blather. You are about as bright as a 2-watt light bulb.

>
> Yet, you usually just toss dismissive one-liners,
> or, just a simple "ROFLMAO." You have never demonstrated any
> capability to produce "literate, logical, or intelligent" commentary in
> this newsgroup whatsoever.
>

The reason you have missed it is because you are incapable of recognizing
anything intelligent, Larry. Like I said you're about as bright as a 2-watt
lightbulb.

>
> And it's not just my postings which you
> seem incapable of dealing with in an intelligent manner. You are
> universally childish, immature, and just plain dumb in all of your
> replies to each and every participant in this newsgroup -- and this
> includes those with which you merely indicate agreement and call
> it "participation."
>

You are not worthy to judge my posts, Larry. They are far superior to your poor intellect.

>
> You are so completely out of your intellectual depth that it is truly
> a sad thing to witness on a daily basis. Have you no pride, woman?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Well, at least you can spell the word "intellectual." Now, could you start practicing it? Go ahead, challenge me. I'd like to see something intelligent from you for a change. When you do that, I will respond in kind...

Kim W5TIT

1650. Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 00:15:55 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <%4z0b.27620$Vx2.12650271@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75116

Hams ought to know better. After all, we are used to being ambassadors for the hobby while on the air... Strictly speaking, this would lead one to expect hams to be one of the very best-behaved groups on usenet as well. The basic, guiding principal is the same: Our behavior when on the air (or on the Internet) reflects directly upon the hobby.

These days it is easy to come up with a specialized mailing list, and that's where this newsgroup's type of discussion belongs, in a semi-private venue. Usenet is too public for airing out our dirty underwear. This repetitious code / no code stuff should be moved out of the public eye. The discussion has migrated before - and should do so again, for the same reason. - To cut down on the noise level, and put a better face on the hobby at a critical time.

The fact that you can point out bad behavior done in the past does nothing to justify further bad behavior today or tomorrow. Instead, it points out the need to do better, to set our sights on where we really want to be.

Charles, N5PVL

1651. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 00:20:51 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <D9z0b.474$6e5.65018@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75115

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F428D0C.5040309@psu.edu...
>
> PCTA's haven't done enough proper marketing of their product IMO.

It's really HARD to market a product that few want ... that's why the PCTA's feel the need for a government-sponsored support system.

> NCI pettition is all opinion.

No ... the NCI petition is loaded with the facts about how any legitimate need for a government-mandated Morse test evaporated years ago, how the FCC has determined that it does not comport with the purpose of the ARS, how the test serves no regulatory purpose, how it doesn't "make for a better, more well-behaved, more technically competent operator, etc., etc.

The petition is chock-full of facts ...

[snipped the rest because I refuse to get drawn into unrelated debates about privs vs. license class, etc. that have nothing to do with the Morse test issue ...]

Carl - wk3c

1652. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 00:31:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <zjz0b.27627$Vx2.12654343@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75117
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Jim Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
news:98434152.65867878@pavillage.net...
> [snip] As a matter of fact, most
> current HF transceivers have what they call a "noise reduction" option
> already built into them which uses the nulling method to accomplish
> its goal. Therefore, many amateurs and SWLers already have the needed
> equipment to deal with any BPL "interference." The ARRL reports have
> conveniently omitted any mention of the coherency issue, and their
> measurements are therefore flawed, because they don't reflect real
> world situations.
>

The noise reduction options also distort the signal that you are trying to
hear. It makes it unpleasant to listen to. Hams and SWLs will object if
they have to use it all them time.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1653. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 00:51:01 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308191651.8926164@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75118

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308191353.513c1301@posting.google.com>...
> dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308191024.3b7bf204@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308190441.177ddf8f@posting.google.com>...
> > > dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308181824.3c5e5a2e@posting.google.com>...
> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308181437.61fe6a6c@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308140938.e2260e1@posting.google.com>...
> > > > >
> > > > > > Some of us have given it real thought, and have posted ideas. But the
> > > > > > mantra has always been that eliminating the code test would solve
> > > > > > everything.
> > > > >
> > > > > No-code isn't a religion. No Mantra.
> > > >
> > > > What??? No "Hoops"??? No "unnecessary requirements"?? No
> > > > "Unjustified bogus BOHICA thingies"?? No "Morsedits" holding
> > > > back the intelligentsia?? No "If it wasn't for that dastardly
> > > > Morris code test I'd take my rightful place on HF??
> > >
> > > No mantra.
> >
> > Then the term has no meaning.
>
> Much like your posts.
>
> > > > No Mantra???? Get back to your village!
> > >
> > > You miss me?
> >
> > Hammer>>>>>nail = NO MISS
>
> Sounds like a big blood blister to me.

You *do* often act like one.

1654. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 00:54:24 UTC
From: lk <lklose@net-link.net>
Message-ID: <vk5hosqrh74v04@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 75119

That is great Charles, you are using your free speech right to tell others
that they should not debate public issues in public.

I predict that 47 CFR 97.503(a) will last long then this thread.

Please, this newsgroup is reserved for the endless code/nocode debate.
The censorship debate is on another newsgroup.

:-((((Larry

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:%4z0b.27620$Vx2.12650271@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> Usenet is too public for airing out our dirty underwear. This repetitious
> code / no code stuff should be moved out of the public eye.

> Charles, N5PVL

1655. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 00:58:09 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308191658.6c52916b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75120

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308191400.32a83110@posting.google.com>...
> dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308181753.3bb9ac63@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308181452.4b47c9cd@posting.google.com>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308180850.4df738ec@posting.google.com>...
> > > > vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030817114056.20931.00000146@mb-m13.aol.com>...
>
> > > > > Secondly, EEs are not joining amateur radio clubs. Some Profs that teach rf
> > > > > courses that I took do not have amateur radio licenses. People in the rf field
> > > > > are not attending club meetings.
> > > >
> > > > Most people who do "x" for a living generally do not do it for a
> > > > past time either, Vippy. So what?
> > >
> > > From just the small sample called RRAP,
> > >
> > > Exhibit 1: David Heil. Claims to have been a Dept. of State
> > > Radioman.
> > >
> > > Exhibit 2: Parson Jim. Claims to be an EE.
> > >
> > > Exhibit 3: Barrister Phil. Claims to be an Radio attorney.
> > >
> > > Exhibit 4: Labman Ed. Claims to be ARRL Lab Manager.
> > >
> > > Exhibit 5: 1000' tall Alien Ed. Claims to be an EE.
> > >
> > > Exhibit 6: Machine Gun Kelly. Claims to be some kind of an Engineer,
> > > mainly in rubberband technologies.
> > >
> > > But, as Heil, Jim, Kelly, and you continually point out, doing it for
> > > a living, i.e., professionally, has absolutely nothing to do with
> > > doing it amateurishly, i.e., without compensation.
> >
> >
> >
> > Well, that's a few percent of all posters to rrap.
>
> DICK, you're just miffed that I left you and gudbuddy Bruce off.
>

> Exhibit 7: DICK, former SWR adjuster at the Sheriff's office.
>
> Exhibit 8: Bruce, professional electronics repairman. Specialized in
> getting p-nut butter sandwiches and vanilla wafers out of the kids
> VCR.
>
> > Evidently you thught you had a point but discovered you were still wearing
> > it as headgear.
>
> I've never worn a thught as headgear.

Nor did you ever experience one of any value.

> Are they comfortable in long
> contests? Can you get one with a boom mic?

Those pointy caps need no further introduction nor accessories.

1656. Re: radio-amateur and CB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 01:13:25 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <VWz0b.27636$Vx2.12662970@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75121

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308191442.458dd255@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<dNc0b.27047$Vx2.12336032@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "F4ASK" <f4ask@wanadoo.fr> wrote in message
> > news:XnF93DB9663FE8CFGilbertF4ASK@130.133.1.4...
> > > I don't know exactly why French (and other) administration let the
CBers
> > > working around the legal band : I think (but only me) this band is not
> > > good enough for HF transmissions... But what about 10 m ? Very
> > > strange....
> > >
> >
> > The CB band, being between the 10m and 12m ham bands, will follow the
same
> > physics of radio propagation as the surrounding ham bands. When
conditions
> > are good, you can work the world on a few watts. When conditions are
bad,
> > all the power in the world won't help.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Dee, I wished I were able to keep all of my QST's, but I tend to move
> a lot and can't keep hauling everything I'd like.
>
> Anyway, about 10 years ago, QST featured a ham in Texas that kept
> records of his 10M activity. He was able to make contacts beyond
> ground wave when most everyone else thought 10M prop was closed. It
> was a good story and worth looking up if you have access to back
> issues or the CD-ROMS.
>

I've worked stations on 10 when the band was "closed" as there are other
propagation modes besides the normal ionospheric refraction that occurs
during times of high solar flux.

> But power does help, always has, always will. And a few watts may
> work, but not necessarily reliably.
>

Up to a point power helps. If there is no propagation mode currently
between you and the other station, power won't help no matter how much you
use. However if there is some propagation, then additional power can indeed
let you maintain clear communications under marginal conditions. If the

other station is already receiving you at say S9 and there is no background static, more power will not help. You get a higher meter reading but there is no enhancement of the communication.

> There is quite a network of 10M beacons, and you can often hear the
> beacons when you hear no other traffic higher up in the band. 10M
> just isn't glamorous, some OT hams calling it the "kiddie band." And
> you risk running in to the Ten-Tenners (I am told). ;^)

I scan for the beacons myself but even when they are not coming through, I still scan the band for propagation to areas that just might not have a beacon but is open due to phenomena like E skip.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1657. Re: OT but worth a look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 02:54:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030819225442.23171.00000148@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 75122

In article <3F429966.6DA5BB23@ptt.edu>, Radioman <radio@ptt.edu> writes:

>
>Mars is the BIG bright reddish-orange star that appears to the
>east at about 2230 local time. You CANNOT miss it!
>
>It is worth the look even with binoculars.

It's quite spectacular even when viewed with the naked eye. How much
longer will it be visible?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1658. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 02:54:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030819225442.23171.00000149@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 75127

In article <%4z0b.27620$Vx2.12650271@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
<n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:

>The fact that you can point out bad behavior done in the past does nothing
>to justify further bad behavior today or tomorrow. Instead, it points out
>the need to do better, to set our sights on where we really want to be.
>
>Charles, N5PVL

Charles:

We're here, we're in your face, and we're staying. If you don't like us,
why don't you complain to the ARRL and/or the FCC? I'm sure they'll
be glad to hear from you.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1659. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 02:54:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030819225443.23171.00000150@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 75125

In article <Avs0b.2609$%Y1.334456@newsfep2-gui.server.ntli.net>, "Derek"
<danda95@hotmail.com> writes:

>Superiors My arse, Morse code does not make you a better opperator, I did
>learn it back in 1986 up to 12 words a min but due to family probs could not
>take the test.

Derek:

Another excuse. The "family problems" excuse -- one of the all-time
favourites.

> So why not give the newcomers a helping hand instead of slagging them off
>all the time, Just REMEMBER you was new to the hobby ONCE

Yes, I was. And I was definitely NOT "welcomed" with open arms, offered
tea and crumpet, and made to feel at home at my first few radio club
meetings. In fact, several times I was actually asked what the he** I was
doing there. However, I persisted, gained acceptance by showing my
willingness to learn and advance, and most importantly, I didn't make
excuses for my lack of progress, even though I saw lots of other hams,
usually the life-long Technicians who could never get beyond 5 WPM
code, doing precisely that. I was also able to convince a few of these
complainers that they could learn the code beyond 5 WPM, but that
took a committment to become a CW operator and not just a phone
yakker.

73 de Larry, K3LT
Ex: G0LYW

1660. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 02:54:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030819225444.23171.00000152@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 75123

In article <3F427BDC.1CB4466A@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>> Disclaimer: "LU3LT" is not my real callsign. In fact, it isn't anyone's
>> real callsign!
>
>Larry,
>
>You're just going to have to be less pampas.
>
>Dave K8MN

Dave:

Perhaps Dwight knew what he was talking about. Pampas grass is
pretty nasty stuff, and perhaps, he was insinuating the same about
me. How charming.

http://www.nps.gov/redw/pampas.htm

73 de Larry, K3LT

1661. Another Challenge to Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 02:54:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030819225444.23171.00000151@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 75126

In article <bhue61$384@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> Kim:
>>
>> One hundred percent of my postings provide what you call "literate,
>> logical, and intelligent" arguments for you and others to respond to in
>> the same manner.
>>
>
>Now, Larry, if that were true, then we'd be having intelligent communication
>rather than this blather. You are about as bright as a 2-watt light bulb.
>
>>
>> Yet, you usually just toss dismissive one-liners,
>> or, just a simple "ROFLMAO." You have never demonstrated any
>> capability to produce "literate, logical, or intelligent" commentary in
>> this newsgroup whatsoever.
>>
>
>The reason you have missed it is because you are incapable of recognizing
>anything intelligent, Larry. Like I said you're about as bright as a 2-watt
>lightbulb.
>
>>
>> And it's not just my postings which you
>> seem incapable of dealing with in an intelligent manner. You are
>> universally childish, immature, and just plain dumb in all of your
>> replies to each and every participant in this newsgroup -- and this
>> includes those with which you merely indicate agreement and call
>> it "participation."
>>
>
>You are not worthy to judge my posts, Larry. They are far superior to your
>poor intellect.

Kim:

You are truly amazing. Amazingly predictable, that is. In this last round
of responses, all you've done is prove me right by simply parroting things
I've already said -- about you! No original thought whatsoever. Nothing
new, nothing original. Ever.

>> You are so completely out of your intellectual depth that it is truly
>> a sad thing to witness on a daily basis. Have you no pride, woman?

>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Well, at least you can spell the word "intellectual." Now, could you start
>practicing it? Go ahead, challenge me. I'd like to see something
>intelligent from you for a change. When you do that, I will respond in
>kind...

Ok, Kim, that's easy. Please provide a logical, rational, and convincing argument justifying your call sign, giving proof that it is not demeaning to women, and that it cannot possibly give a negative image of amateur radio operators to the general public, including adults who are concerned about the exposure of young children, particularly young boys, to things which tend to create negative sexual stereotypes.

I hope this is "intelligent" enough for you. Quite frankly, I don't think you can handle it. Prove me wrong, if you can.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1662. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 02:54:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030819225445.23171.00000153@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 75124

In article <bhue5v$384@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>
>I wonder if you realize how incessant your whining is...
>
>Kim W5TIT

As usual, Kim, you stole the words right out from under my fingertips!
What I'd like to know is, when are you going to even make an attempt
to come up with an original thought?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1663. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 02:55:22 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308191855.19a89f50@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75128
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<WNv0b.321$6e5.62519@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> It's also interesting that Mr. Nye points us to the websites of folks
> who are advocating BPL ...
>
> I wonder, is Mr. Nye a consultant to the utilities or BPL manufacturers?

Or another troll.

> I live just outside of Emmaus, PA, (test site #3 in Ed Hare's video).
> While I am currently far enough away from the limited deployment
> that I cannot detect it here at my QTH, I have gone down to the
> area with my FT-817 and can verify that the noise is HORRIBLE.

I'm familiar with Emmaus and drove around the borough today looking
for the stuff with my TS-50 but struck out. Kindly cite an
intersection where the stuff is in use, I'll try again. Also
characterize the signal if you can/will.

> I shudder to think what havoc large-scale deployments would bring.
>
> Despite Mr. Nye's allegations of "FUD" ... the ARRL is right on
> this one.

Not even a discussion.

> Carl - wk3c
>

w3rv

1664. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 03:00:07 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030819230007.05431.00000264@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 75129

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)

>Those "societies" are professional organization, Vippy. Hardly
>relevent to the Amateur Radio service.

Thats right. RF people would benefit by knowing people that are also interested in rf circuits. They would soon find that out that Hams are not interested in that if they went to a few club meetings. So, someone specializing in rf electronics would not benefit from association with Hams.

1665. NTIA Response to FCC BPL NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 03:01:55 UTC
From: Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <DwB0b.496$lw4.322@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75130

Before the

Federal Communications Commission

Washington, D.C. 20554
In the Matter of
Inquiry Regarding Carrier Current Systems,
including Broadband over Power Line Systems
)
)
)
)
)
)

ET Docket No. 03-104

COMMENTS OF THE NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS
AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

The National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), an Executive Branch agency within the Department of Commerce, is the President?s principal adviser on domestic and international telecommunications policy, including policies relating to the nation?s economic and technological advancement in telecommunications.ï¿½ Accordingly, NTIA makes recommendations regarding telecommunications policies and presents Executive Branch views on telecommunications matters to the Congress, the Federal Communications Commission (Commission), and the public.ï¿½ NTIA, through the Office of Spectrum Management, is also responsible for managing the Federal Government?s use of the radio frequency spectrum.ï¿½ NTIA respectfully submits the following comments in response to the Commission?s Notice of Inquiry in the above-captioned proceeding.[1]

I.ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ NTIA SUPPORTS THE COMMISSION?S BPL INQUIRY AND ENCOURAGES THE
COMMISSION TO MOVE FORWARD EXPEDITIOUSLY.

NTIA believes that Broadband over Power Line (BPL) holds great promise as a new source of innovation and competition in the broadband marketplace.ï¿½ It has the potential to open new avenues of Internet access, to enable new and expanded services for utility companies, and to create a new platform for further advances in communications technology.ï¿½ By moving swiftly to examine BPL and to establish appropriate rules for its use, the Commission can provide this emerging industry with a solid foundation upon which to build new services and products that will benefit American consumers and businesses.ï¿½ Thus, NTIA urges the Commission to move forward expeditiously with its BPL

Inquiry.

II.ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ NOTWITHSTANDING BPL?S POTENTIAL BENEFITS, THE COMMISSION MUST ENSURE THAT OTHER COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, ESPECIALLY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, ARE ADEQUATELY PROTECTED FROM UNACCEPTABLE INTERFERENCE.

ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½In tailoring its rules to promote BPL deployment, the Commission
must be certain to provide all communications stakeholders with adequate protections against BPL emissions that may cause unacceptable radio frequency interference.ï¿½ The federal government has extensive operations that potentially could be affected by BPL systems.ï¿½ Indeed, federal government agencies have over eighteen thousand (18,000) frequency assignments in the 1.7 - 80 MHz spectrum in which BPL systems may unintentionally radiate.2 ï¿½ï¿½These assignments accommodate many tens of thousands of receivers operating throughout the United States, in many cases in close proximity to potential sites for ?In-House? and ?Access? BPL systems.[2]ï¿½ The systems that operate in this region of the spectrum provide numerous services, such as national fire emergency communications, federal and non-federal law enforcement communications, emergency operations, search and rescue, aeronautical and maritime communications, and disaster relief communications.ï¿½ Some of the Federal Government systems utilize Automatic Link Establishment (ALE), encryption and other technologies that affect the tolerance to interfering signals.ï¿½ Consequently, NTIA has broad concerns with radiated emission limits and other measures that may be needed to protect these systems.[3]ï¿½

III.ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ NTIA IS LAUNCHING EXTENSIVE MODELING, ANALYSIS, AND ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½
MEASUREMENT EFFORTS FOR BPL AND WE ENCOURAGE THE ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½

systems.ï¿½

ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½NTIA additionally has a substantial interest in BPL authorization
procedures, especially the measurement procedures for ascertaining compliance with radiated emission limits.ï¿½ These procedures must correctly determine compliance without undermining the protective effects of the limits.ï¿½ However, the procedures should not unnecessarily restrict the emission limits or cause service providers to incur undue costs or delays in deployment.ï¿½ The measurement performed by ITS will provide guidelines for development of compliance measurement procedures that NTIA believes are a key factor in ensuring compatibility with federal government systems.ï¿½ A copy of the measurement plan is provided in Appendix A.

ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ NTIA expects to conclude its modeling, analysis, and measurement
efforts by the end of 2003.ï¿½ NTIA intends to submit its findings to the Commission, and we urge the Commission to consider those findings as it moves ahead with successive stages of the BPL proceeding.

IV.ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ CONCLUSION

ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ In summary, NTIA supports the Commission?s efforts to investigate
new technologies that could foster new communications services and bring additional options for Internet access to the American public.ï¿½ NTIA looks forward to working with the Commission and the communications and power industries in developing the appropriate regulatory framework to permit BPL to flourish while protecting federal systems from interference.

ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½

ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ ï¿½ï¿½U.S. Department of Commerce
ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ ï¿½ï¿½Room 4713
ï¿½ï¿½ ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½1401 Constitution Avenue, N.W
ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½Washington, DC 20230
ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ ï¿½ï¿½(202) 482-1816
ï¿½ ï¿½

August 13, 2003

APPENDIX A

Summary of Measurement Plan
for Emissions Radiated by Experimental
Broadband over Power Line Systems

July 18, 2003

1.ï¿½ Introduction

ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ The Federal Communications Commission has issued a Notice of Inquiry1
that requests comments about Broadband over Power Lines (BPL).ï¿½ BPL uses power lines to provide broadband communications services, including Internet access, to homes and offices.ï¿½ The Commission seeks comments on:

1) The potential interference effects of BPL, if any, on authorized spectrum users;

2) Test results from BPL experimental sites;

3) The appropriate measurement procedure for testing emission characteristics for all types of carrier current systems; and

4) Changes that may be needed in Part 15 technical rules and the equipment approval process to foster the development of BPL and to ensure that interference is not caused to other services as a result of this technology.

The BPL Inquiry defines two types of BPL as "Access" and "In-House."ï¿½ Access BPL uses medium voltage power lines to bring broadband access to homes and offices.ï¿½ In-House BPL uses existing electric utility wiring (low voltage lines) to devices within a building.

ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ The following plan describes proposed measurements that will
quantify unknown aspects of BPL signals.ï¿½ The measurements will be conducted at several sites where systems are currently deployed for testing purposes.ï¿½ The objectives of this plan include:

1) Measure the signal power and the co-located background noise power for several locations, radials and relevant bandwidths.

2) Measure the peak, average and quasi-peak levels of the above.

3) Measure the above for both horizontal and vertical polarization in a few locations.

4) Convert the received power to field strength.

5) Measure the peak and average power levels over a day in a few locations to examine the time variability of the received power.

6) Measure the received power along one or more radials from the BPL site to determine the distance from the source to the near-field boundary.

7) Measure the peak and average power levels of BPL signal harmonics and intermodulation products at frequencies up to 1,000 MHz.

ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ The technical descriptions of BPL systems that will be examined are
based on information supplied by the system operator. ï¿½Certain technical details of the systems will likely be considered proprietary information by the system operator, and will be treated appropriately by NTIA.

ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ The measurement setup is shown in Figure 1.ï¿½ Equipment will be
calibrated before the measurements are made. ï¿½An antenna, positioned 10 meters above the ground on the Radio Spectrum Measurement System (RSMS)-4 vehicle2 and 2 meters above the ground on a tripod, will be used to measure the received power over a frequency range that extends above the frequencies of the BPL desired, conducted emissions.ï¿½ The signal from the antenna is split into two measurement systems so that simultaneous peak and average power measurements can occur.ï¿½ One of the systems will alternately measure quasi-peak levels.ï¿½ A preselector will be used on each system to prevent an overload condition from occurring and improve the sensitivity.ï¿½ Computers will be used to control the measurement systems and store the data.

Figure 1. ï¿½BPL Measurement Setup.

ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ Measurements using various bandwidths will be made to determine the
characteristics of the BPL signals and their intermodulation and harmonic products. ï¿½An ITS stepped measurement routine will be used to collect peak and average power, as a function of frequency, for 3 kHz and 10 kHz bandwidths below 30 MHz and 10 kHz and 30 kHz above 30 MHz.ï¿½ Quasi-peak measurements also will use the ITS stepped measurement routine with the bandwidth specified for compliance measurements. ï¿½The repetition interval of the BPL signal will be determined from the operator?s technical data that describes the BPL signal.ï¿½ If the data are unavailable, the interval will be determined empirically at the first measurement location.ï¿½ The peak and average power will be measured over the repetition interval.

4.ï¿½ Measurement Procedure

ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ï¿½ Ensure that the antenna's main beam has an unobstructed view of the
BPL source.ï¿½ Photograph the antenna's view of the BPL source. ï¿½Transmit the same, repeatable test signals over the network for each signal measurement.ï¿½ At the first location, examine the BPL signal envelope to confirm or discover the repetition interval.ï¿½ Record the envelope over one period.ï¿½ Start the peak value measurement system.ï¿½ Start the average value measurement system to run

concurrently with the peak value system.ï¿½ Upon completion, switch to the quasi-peak system and perform a stepped measurement.ï¿½ When the measurement system finishes, turn off the BPL signal.ï¿½ Run the three measurements again.

ï¿½ Proceed to the next location and repeat the measurements in the
above paragraph.ï¿½ Generally speaking, most receiving antennas of concern in the 1.7 ? 80 MHz spectrum are vertically polarized so these polarizations will be used.ï¿½ In a few locations, average power measurements will be made using both polarizations, noting that horizontally polarized receiver antennas are also used and propagation effects may depolarize the BPL signals.

ï¿½ The above measurements produce samples of the received power.ï¿½ It is
desirable to increase the time spent recording received power in a given location to examine the time variability of the radiated level.ï¿½ The power should be sampled over an hour's time and a complementary cumulative distribution function (CCDF) calculated.ï¿½ This would yield a better peak value as well as giving an indication of how often other levels occur.ï¿½ Five hourly measurements would produce CCDF graphs to show time variability throughout the day.

ï¿½ The RSMS-4 vehicle will be driven along a road that approximates a
radial from the BPL test site.ï¿½ Signal power will be sampled approximately every wavelength along the route.ï¿½ Several routes and several frequencies will be measured.

ï¿½ Measurements will be made over two-weeks to be coordinated with the
BPL network administrators.

ï¿½ The measurement product will be a report that describes the
measurement methods and presents the graphical results.ï¿½ The first graph will show the signal envelope over one measurement period.ï¿½ The next graph will show the peak received field strength as a function of frequency.ï¿½ The abscissa will contain the BPL frequencies that are receivable by the system.ï¿½ The third graph will show the average field strength as a function of frequency.ï¿½ The fourth graph will show the quasi-peak level as a function of frequency.ï¿½ Several series of these graphs will be produced, one series for each measurement location.ï¿½ In some series, graphs showing two polarizations will be produced.

ï¿½ For a few locations, CCDF graphs will be computed showing the
probability that the signal amplitude does not exceed a threshold.ï¿½ Each graph will show the variations in signal amplitude over each hour that data was collected.

ï¿½ The last set of graphs will show the received signal power as a
function of distance away from the BPL site.ï¿½ An analysis will be performed to

identify a distance beyond which the power decreases at a rate of 1/(r2).

[1]ï¿½ Inquiry Regarding Carrier Current Systems, including Broadband over Power Line Systems, ET Docket 03-104, Notice of Inquiry, FCC 03-100 (released April 28, 2003) (?BPL Inquiry?).

2ï¿½ï¿½ As a result of non-linear elements in the electrical power distribution system, BPL systems may radiate emissions at frequencies substantially higher than the frequencies actually used intentionally within the BPL system.ï¿½ Thus, BPL emissions in spectrum other than 1.7-80 MHz may also be of concern to federal government users.

[2] ï¿½In-House and Access BPL systems are described in more detail in the BPL Inquiry.ï¿½ BPL Inquiry at ï¿½ 2.

[3] ï¿½NTIA recognizes that interference can occur directly via conducted emissions (i.e., signals carried over wires) as opposed to radiated emissions. ï¿½However, conducted emissions limits and the electromagnetic interference problems they prevent are outside of NTIA?s purview. ï¿½Consequently, NTIA will be addressing conducted emissions only in relation to radiated emissions.

[4] ï¿½BPL Inquiry at ï¿½ï¿½ 18-20.

[5] ï¿½Id. ï¿½ 21.

1ï¿½ Inquiry Regarding Carrier Current Systems, including Broadband over Power Line Systems, ET Docket 03-104, Notice of Inquiry, FCC 03-100 (released. April 28, 2003) (?BPL Inquiry?).

2ï¿½ The NTIA RSMS is a mobile, self-contained computer-controlled radio-receiving system capable of many measurement scenarios over a broad range of frequencies.

--
Best Regards, Keith AOL IM:kilowattradio
NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
"Give SCO $699 for using Linux or the Penguin gets it."

1666. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 03:25:36 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhupl8$inb@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75131

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030819225443.23171.00000150@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <Avs0b.2609$%Y1.334456@newsfep2-gui.server.ntli.net>, "Derek"
> <danda95@hotmail.com> writes:
>
> >Superiors My arse, Morse code does not make you a better opperator, I did
> >learn it back in 1986 up to 12 words a min but due to family probs could
not
> >take the test.
>
> Derek:
>
> Another excuse. The "family problems" excuse -- one of the all-time
> favourites.
>
> > So why not give the newcomers a helping hand instead of slagging them
off
> >all the time, Just REMEMBER you was new to the hobby ONCE
>
> Yes, I was. And I was definitely NOT "welcomed" with open arms, offered
> tea and crumpet, and made to feel at home at my first few radio club
> meetings. In fact, several times I was actually asked what the he** I was
> doing there. However, I persisted, gained acceptance by showing my
> willingness to learn and advance, and most importantly, I didn't make
> excuses for my lack of progress, even though I saw lots of other hams,
> usually the life-long Technicians who could never get beyond 5 WPM
> code, doing precisely that. I was also able to convince a few of these
> complainers that they could learn the code beyond 5 WPM, but that
> took a committment to become a CW operator and not just a phone
> yakker.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> Ex: G0LYW
>
>

Larry had to start his own club...

Kim W5TIT

1667. Re: Another Challenge to Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 03:28:54 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhupre$b9n@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75132

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030819225444.23171.00000151@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <bhue61$384@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Kim:
> >>
> >> One hundred percent of my postings provide what you call "literate,
> >> logical, and intelligent" arguments for you and others to respond to in
> >> the same manner.
> >>
> >
> >Now, Larry, if that were true, then we'd be having intelligent
communication
> >rather than this blather. You are about as bright as a 2-watt light
bulb.
> >
> >>
> >> Yet, you usually just toss dismissive one-liners,
> >> or, just a simple "ROFLMAO." You have never demonstrated any
> >> capability to produce "literate, logical, or intelligent" commentary in
> >> this newsgroup whatsoever.
> >>
> >
> >The reason you have missed it is because you are incapable of recognizing
> >anything intelligent, Larry. Like I said you're about as bright as a
2-watt
> >lightbulb.
> >
> >>
> >> And it's not just my postings which you
> >> seem incapable of dealing with in an intelligent manner. You are
> >> universally childish, immature, and just plain dumb in all of your
> >> replies to each and every participant in this newsgroup -- and this
> >> includes those with which you merely indicate agreement and call
> >> it "participation."
> >>
> >
> >You are not worthy to judge my posts, Larry. They are far superior to
your
> >poor intellect.
>
> Kim:

>
> You are truly amazing. Amazingly predictable, that is. In this last
round
> of responses, all you've done is prove me right by simply parroting things
> I've already said -- about you! No original thought whatsoever. Nothing
> new, nothing original. Ever.
>
> >> You are so completely out of your intellectual depth that it is truly
> >> a sad thing to witness on a daily basis. Have you no pride, woman?
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >Well, at least you can spell the word "intellectual." Now, could you
start
> >practicing it? Go ahead, challenge me. I'd like to see something
> >intelligent from you for a change. When you do that, I will respond in
> >kind...
>
> Ok, Kim, that's easy. Please provide a logical, rational, and convincing
> argument justifying your call sign, giving proof that it is not demeaning
> to women, and that it cannot possibly give a negative image of amateur
> radio operators to the general public, including adults who are concerned
> about the exposure of young children, particularly young boys, to things
> which tend to create negative sexual stereotypes.
>

You are too wrapped up in disliking my callsign, Larry. It is not for me to
prove anything about it to you. I like it and that is as logical as it can
get.

>
> I hope this is "intelligent" enough for you. Quite frankly, I don't think
you
> can handle it. Prove me wrong, if you can.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Kim W5TIT

1668. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 03:30:35 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhupui$blg@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75133

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030819225445.23171.00000153@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <bhue5v$384@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >
> >I wonder if you realize how incessant your whining is...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> As usual, Kim, you stole the words right out from under my fingertips!
> What I'd like to know is, when are you going to even make an attempt
> to come up with an original thought?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

So. You realize how incessant your whining is. And you still do it. Well,
so much for wasting time.

Kim W5TIT

1669. Re: Another Challenge to Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 03:31:41 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhuq0k$nb8@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75134

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030819225444.23171.00000151@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <bhue61$384@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Kim:
> >>
> >> One hundred percent of my postings provide what you call "literate,
> >> logical, and intelligent" arguments for you and others to respond to in
> >> the same manner.
> >>
> >
> >Now, Larry, if that were true, then we'd be having intelligent
communication
> >rather than this blather. You are about as bright as a 2-watt light
bulb.
> >
> >>
> >> Yet, you usually just toss dismissive one-liners,
> >> or, just a simple "ROFLMAO." You have never demonstrated any
> >> capability to produce "literate, logical, or intelligent" commentary in
> >> this newsgroup whatsoever.
> >>
> >
> >The reason you have missed it is because you are incapable of recognizing
> >anything intelligent, Larry. Like I said you're about as bright as a
2-watt
> >lightbulb.
> >
> >>
> >> And it's not just my postings which you
> >> seem incapable of dealing with in an intelligent manner. You are
> >> universally childish, immature, and just plain dumb in all of your
> >> replies to each and every participant in this newsgroup -- and this
> >> includes those with which you merely indicate agreement and call
> >> it "participation."
> >>
> >
> >You are not worthy to judge my posts, Larry. They are far superior to
your
> >poor intellect.
>
> Kim:

>
> You are truly amazing. Amazingly predictable, that is. In this last
round
> of responses, all you've done is prove me right by simply parroting things
> I've already said -- about you! No original thought whatsoever. Nothing
> new, nothing original. Ever.
>
> >> You are so completely out of your intellectual depth that it is truly
> >> a sad thing to witness on a daily basis. Have you no pride, woman?
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >Well, at least you can spell the word "intellectual." Now, could you
start
> >practicing it? Go ahead, challenge me. I'd like to see something
> >intelligent from you for a change. When you do that, I will respond in
> >kind...
>
> Ok, Kim, that's easy. Please provide a logical, rational, and convincing
> argument justifying your call sign, giving proof that it is not demeaning
> to women, and that it cannot possibly give a negative image of amateur
> radio operators to the general public, including adults who are concerned
> about the exposure of young children, particularly young boys, to things
> which tend to create negative sexual stereotypes.
>
> I hope this is "intelligent" enough for you. Quite frankly, I don't think
you
> can handle it. Prove me wrong, if you can.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I got one for you, Larry. Here we go: the next time I see something logical
and intellectual from you, I'll respond, OK?

Kim W5TIT

1670. Re: Wiseman worshiper Whines

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 03:34:36 UTC
From: Nemmind <"I'm Not Roger"@comnos.pam>
Message-ID: <bhuq8f$s55$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75135

"Stagger Lee" <SLee@houston-hunks.com> wrote in message
news:87087099.54654783@houston-hunks.com...
On Tue, 19 Aug 2003 12:49:09 +0000 (UTC), "Anonymous" Sender wrote:
> In article <89185761.767067889@houston-hunks.com>
> SLee@houston-hunks.com (Stagger Lee) wrote:
> > I have been
> > enjoying almost a year of Wiseman-free Usenet, ever since you got
> > kicked off of both Altopia and Ovis.
>
>
> Wrong dickhead, Wiseman cancelled both accounts.

Oh yeah. Uh huh. Uh huh.

> > Your love poem to Pam Hoffer,

> That fatassed bitch? Bwhahahahahahahahahahahaha..I wonder if Lemons
> still lets her give him blowjobs in the server room.

You seem to have intimate knowledge of the Ovis employees. Was Lemons
the one who wrote to you and told you that your Ovis account had been
terminated?

>
> > the President of Ovis, was doubtless a strong influence in your
> > departure from Ovis, and the silence which ensued last September was
> > pure joy.
>
> Not unlike the silence after your ass was kicked off of altopia for
spamming the newsgroups.

Oh yeah. Uh huh. Uh huh. Can you read the Path header of this post,
Woger? I didn't think so.

>
> > Now the window licker returns,
>
> Now, Hammy, you don't want me to post your numerous DUI records, do you?

As usual, Woger takes wild guesses at my identity. He's been trying
for three years, but has failed every time. You'd think that he would
finally learn, but that's simply beyond his capacity.

I do have to praise you, Roger, on your trip to New Delhi during 2001.
For several weeks the Indian newspapers were full of stories about
the monkey man. Good work on getting back home undetected.

See http://www.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/asiapcf/south/05/17/india.monkeyman
for a story about Woger's escapades.

/./././././././

Wogie takes shots in the dark and makes what he thinks are "educated"
guesses. To date he hasn't been right yet, which gives cause to doubt his
veracity on anything else he has claimed.
For instance, Roger claimed he was once married. To what? He claimed he has
a couple of grown kids, too. If this is so one has to wonder if his kids
live in trees or are subterranean dwellers.
It is doubtful that Rogie has EVER been involved with any walking, talking,
intelligent woman of any species much less had one agree to marry him. He
WAS adopted, after all.
Perhaps this is why he takes occasional sabbaticals to India. The monkeys
aren't too awfully choosy.....
By the way, Stagger. What ever happened to Arf! Arf! He (or she) has nil
been heard from for almost a year now.

1671. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 03:44:38 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F42EEAF.27861B6C@earthlink.net>
Source record: 75136

Vshah101 wrote:
>
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>
> >Those "societies" are professional organization, Vippy. Hardly
> >relevent to the Amateur Radio service.
>
> Thats right. RF people would benefit by knowing people that are also interested
> in rf circuits. They would soon find that out that Hams are not interested in
> that if they went to a few club meetings. So, someone specializing in rf
> electronics would not benefit from association with Hams.

How is it that you keep attempting to sell this idea when there is ample
evidence to the contrary?

I personally know hams who build transmitters and receivers. I know
hams who build amplifiers, power supplies, preamps, converters,
transverters, antenna tuners and test equipment. I've built most of
those things myself.

Aside from those items, I've built antennas which include, verticals,
dipoles, quads, yagis, inverted "L's" and omega-matched towers. I'm not
unique.

Why the persistence in playing the fool when the facts prove you wrong?

Among your numerous erroneous claims are:

1. Hams are all old.

2. Hams are all fat.

3. Hams are all male.

4. Hams aren't interested in anything technical.

5. Hams go on trips and spend all of their time operating radios.

6. Hams are anti-social.

Among the things we've been able to glean from admissions you've made in
follow up posts:

1. You seem to have trouble adjusting to American society.

2. You attend radio club meetings and attempt to set the agenda.
You are disappointed when other members do what they want to do and
dismiss your ideas.

3. You go on outings which have a specified purpose and are disillusioned when those participating stick to the specified purpose.

4. You don't like what and how much others eat or the frequency with which they eat.

5. It upsets you that amateur radio gatherings don't seem to be a particularly good venue for meeting eligible women.

6. Being around older people bothers you.

7. You believe that amateur radio should be a playground from electrical engineers.

8. You don't accept anyone's word that "ham radio" and "amateur radio" are one and the same.

9. You'd have us believe that someone can copy morse at 13 wpm but forget how to copy at 5 wpm.

I've been willing to give you a little slack because you obviously weren't raised in this culture. I've been willing to overlook some of the things you've written about amateur radio because you're an obvious newcomer to it. There are limits to my tolerance. You've been corrected quite a number of times on some of your mistaken beliefs but you persist in repeating those mistakes.

Dave K8MN

1672. Hey, Stagger!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 03:46:09 UTC
From: Nemmind <"I'm Not Roger"@comnos.pam>
Message-ID: <bhuqu2ten0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75137

Hey, Stagger Lee. If you hear of the wherabouts of Arf Arf, will you have
him post a note to let us fans know of his whereabouts?
He used to post quite often to flame_fest but he is nowhere to be found of
late. Seems to me that way back then the two of you were almost as thick as
brothers. What happened to Arf?

1673. Re: BPL?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 03:50:23 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <3eC0b.101366$LI.30000@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 75138

Dick,

50 years from now I doubt I'll care :) .... poor statement, perhaps ...
Seriously, I'm worried about our kids and grandkids. It does not look
pretty.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:9829b709.0308171701.7a29c99a@posting.google.com...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<HZC%a.943$qE6.913@news02.roc.ny>...
> > What *might* prove interesting is some emergency where communications
can't
> > get through due to interference. Then the high power lawyers step up to
the
> > plate and see if they can do to the power company involved what was done
to
> > big tobacco. Of course, by then the damage will be done. Let someone
win a
> > billion dollars and then see what happens with BPL. I'm not pushing
amateur
> > radio here; I simply see radio communications (fire, police, aircraft,
etc.)
> > as more reliable than cell phones.
>
>
> BPL, if allowed, will put several states' statewide public service
> agency radio system out of business, teo include California, which
> also has a low VHF statewide radio system. So much for protection from
> part 15 interference!
>
> It is also difficult to call 20 police
> > cars individually when you need a rapid response to a large problem as
> > opposed to just pressing the button on a radio transmitter. I am very
> > rapidly learning to dislike the present administration a *lot*.
>
>
> If they ram BPL through in the face of massive negative evidence
> there'll
> be a whole lot of people feeling much more than just dislike!
>
>
> An

> > interesting aside with the power companies; Wall Street doesn't like
them
> > generating power. They simply want to buy power and resell it at a
profit.
> > Where is this power supposed to come from?
>
>
>
> Do you ever get the feeling that Wall Street is more *the* problem
> than the solution to our problems? The bean counters are in absolute
> control and The Bottom Line rules. No matter who or what gets hurt,
> nor how badly. If they have to send all our good jobs and
> manufacturing offshore and rely on capitol gains to rake in all that
> stock gain and profit, they'll do it in a heartbeat, regardless of
> what it does to the country.
>
>
>
> With all manufacturing jobs
> > going offshore and no one interested in actually building (or
generating)
> > anything ... well, I'll bet 50 years down the road they'll be teaching
> > courses in business schools about what *not* to do. And these will be
the
> > years referred to in the books.
> >
>
>
>
> Assuming it stays glued together another 50 years.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/19/03

1674. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 03:56:08 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <4kC0b.15593$Kx1.242615@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75139
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhrp8e$5mo$1@slb6.atl.mindspring.net...
> "Steve Terry" <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote in message
> news:BwX%a.15151$yl6.5469@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net...
> > "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> > news:je70kvs4jshf5e3cj133rjggltkdaphoco@4ax.com...
> > > On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 18:34:42 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > >We don't have a colonial view on anybody. We made that mistake with
> the
> > > >Phillipines and Puerto Rico. And we still can't get rid of Puerto
> Rico.
> > >
> > > And the US Virgin Islands. And Guantanamo Bay. And Guam. And
> > > numerous other Pacific islands (many of which were used for nuclear
> > > testing).
> > > 73 de G3NYY
> > > Walt Davidson
> > >
> > Not forgetting what was British Honduras, and all the unsinkable aircraft
> > carriers like RAF Lakenheath and hundreds of other countries airfields
> around
> > the world
> > Steve Terry
>
> Poor Steve. Feeling sorry for yourselves? Perhaps we could give you
> Liberia to make you feel better, wat say mate?
> Dan/W4NTI
>
No thanks, you've already taken and given it away once already.

Americans Are staunch believers in Democracy, for themselves.

That's why I want to be one, like the Roman empire, it's much better
inside being a citizen, than outside and a slave.

"Bloody Romans what have they ever done for us". ;-)

Steve Terry

1675. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 04:01:44 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <kpC0b.15596$Kx1.242811@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75140
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

<lucifer@eternal-flames.gov> wrote in message
news:48i3kv0mf939pt6ttb11kinjk45ouf28ee@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 18 Aug 2003 18:59:44 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> pausing to cast envious glances at those
> who had mastered the skill of reading without moving their lips,
> wrote:
>
> >Poor Steve. Feeling sorry for yourselves? Perhaps we could give you
> >Liberia to make you feel better, wat say mate?
>
> Would you be interested in swapping Death Valley for Chippenham?
>
That would be a poor swap, there's more life in death valley

How about a swap for Fleetwood nr Blackpool, Lancs ?
Anything over a Buck 50 would be more than acceptable,
and we'll chuck the pier in free.
You can park it next to the Queen Mary.
But transportation costs are down to you

Steve Terry

1676. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 04:09:19 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <twC0b.15598$Kx1.243070@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75141
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhrp5e$2na$1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:je70kvs4jshf5e3cj133rjggltkdaphoco@4ax.com...
> > On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 18:34:42 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
<snip>
> Yes I missed the US Virgin Islands. They are a protectorite and remain so
> WILLINGLY. As for Gitmo. We LEASED that fair and square. And the lease is
> STILL VALID>
>
Only cos it would start World War 3 to get you out.

Mr Castro the landlord served a notice to quit on you,
but you threatened to shoot the bailiffs !

I've been to Key West, lovely place, but a shame civilisation ends there.

Steve Terry

1677. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 04:17:33 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <bEC0b.15601$Kx1.243083@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75142
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhrpgvajl1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> "Steve Terry" <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote in message
> news:ReX%a.15145$yl6.1259@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:bhp28lmnn1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> > > "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> > > news:vd3ujv8tu6ft9t47vk49364nrqm24knl08@4ax.com...
> > > > On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 04:39:40 +0100, "Steve Terry"
> > > > <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote:
> > > > >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > >news:bhgsoi$9nq$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
> > <snip>
> > It's worrying, if the British are supposed to be Americas conscience,
> > what would they get up to without us ! ;-(
> > Steve Terry
>
> Got a point there Steve. But I hate to tell you.....we have outgrown King
> George.
> Dan/W4NTI
>
But not Burger King ;-)

Steve Terry

1678. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 04:21:39 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <2IC0b.15603$Kx1.242965@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75143
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"paul s" <paulslinux@REMOVESPAMhotmail.comKILLER> wrote in message
news:pan.2003.08.18.15.35.10.632485@REMOVESPAMhotmail.comKILLER...
> On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 18:15:00 -0500, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> > news:vd3ujv8tu6ft9t47vk49364nrqm24knl08@4ax.com...
> >> On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 04:39:40 +0100, "Steve Terry"
> >> <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote:
> >> >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:bhgsoi$9nq$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
<snip>
> Have they found any WMDs yet?? Nope. Are they likely to?? I don't
> think so.
> Paul S
>
They are there somewhere, they must be, we sold them to him.

Probably put on the back of heavy trucks and shipped out to
Syria / Iran / Jordan, take your pick which.

Steve Terry

1679. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 04:30:26 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <iQC0b.15605$Kx1.243073@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75144
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhrq1uiqp1@slb3.atl.mindspring.net...
> "paul s" <paulslinux@REMOVESPAMhotmail.comKILLER> wrote in message
> news:pan.2003.08.18.15.35.10.632485@REMOVESPAMhotmail.comKILLER...
> > On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 18:15:00 -0500, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > > "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> > > news:vd3ujv8tu6ft9t47vk49364nrqm24knl08@4ax.com...
> > >> On Sun, 17 Aug 2003 04:39:40 +0100, "Steve Terry"
> > >> <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote:
> > >> >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> > >> >news:bhgsoi$9nq$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net...
<snip>
> Have you forgotten 9/11? We haven't. They have declared WAR on the USA and
> westerners in general, in case your too damn stupid to know that by now.
> Bitch and moan all you want. We WILL TAKE CARE OF BUSINESS. And we will
> even cover your sorry ass doing it.
> Dan/W4NTI
>
Saddam and the Ba'ath party declared war on the US ?
I know Americans are reputed not to be strong on Geography,
but that's taking the biscuit.

Sure the US have done the world a favour getting rid of him,
but to claim it was in response to a declaration of war is just Nuts !

Steve Terry

1680. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 04:37:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6873AB.2484E%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75145

"N2EY" wrote:
>
>> wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>> Cry Whinner CRY. All you (snip)
>
> Y'know, Dwight, it's kinda surreal to read
> somebody lambasting others about "effort"
> who won't even turn on the spellchecker,
> let alone look at grammar, punctuation
> and capitalization.....

Yep, if nothing else, at least Larry is literate.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1681. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 04:41:06 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <e3D0b.15608$Kx1.243184@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75146
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
news:bhrq65pkd1@slb9.atl.mindspring.net...
> "Sam" <super@heterodyne.fs???d.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:MPG.19ab0bcc80718283989680@news.freeserve.co.uk...
> > In article <bhp519dlp1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net>,
> > w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com says...
> > > Then I suggest you check with mother England. EH.
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > Do you still have compulsory blood tests before marriage over there to
> > prevent the in-breeding?
> > Super Sam
>
> Nope.
> Dan/W4NTI
>
Ahhh well that's where you're going wrong, deregulation can be a dangerous thing

Dubbya Bush is a case in point, clear example of inbreeding

Whereas we put our genetic mistakes in asylums, or somewhere
where they can't do any damage, such as making them leaders of the Conservative
party

Steve Terry

1682. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 04:53:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030820005319.21713.00000363@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 75147

sniped of no value
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

1683. Plagiarized posts (Was:Re: Wiseman's "Dictionary"....)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 05:00:21 UTC
From: Anonymous Sender <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com>
Message-ID: <a5cb2afbb372b1b029e725f0ca975520@remailer.metacolo.com>
Source record: 75148

In article <bhp7iq$o0v$0@pita.alt.net>
"Ed Norton" <haaaynorton@comnos.pam> wrote:

Wrong, fucktard....you still downloading kiddie porn?

>
> These are only a few of the <plagiarized post flushed>

These have already been lamed out, fatass.....they weren't very effective when prisonbitch Paris did them......had to get a new altopia account after getting booted from there, did you, fucktard? Did you enjoy explaining those illegal activities to the federal agents?

1684. Re: OT but worth a look

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 05:01:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F430109.6040008@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75149

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <3F429966.6DA5BB23@ptt.edu>, Radioman <radio@ptt.edu> writes:
>
>
>>Mars is the BIG bright reddish-orange star that appears to the
>>east at about 2230 local time. You CANNOT miss it!
>>
>>It is worth the look even with binoculars.
>
>
> It's quite spectacular even when viewed with the naked eye. How much
> longer will it be visible?

It will continue getting closer until next week, then slowly go back to it's normal smaller size as viewed from earth. So the show will continue for more than a month from now.

I was out again with some friends tonight. It was even better than last night. The air was more steady, and the planet gave up good details, with the Ice cap plainly visible, and plenty of surface markings. It is strange, but the dark surfaces are blue against the red normal color.

I am really going to get sleep deprived over the next several weeks.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

1685. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 05:06:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB687A6A.24850%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75150

"WA8ULX" wrote:
>
> Cry Whinner CRY. All you CBplussers have left,
> is your useless attempts to try and Justify
> your Welfare Status as Hams. All we want to
> be is an Equal to you real Hams, seems to be
> all you guys can come up with. Guess what
> Dwight, it will never happen.You guys have got
> what you wanted a Dumb Down Service with no
> effort required. So stop your Damn Whinning
> and get to the back of the Bus where you
> belong.

If you and Larry are examples of what a real ham is, then I have no problem with being considered something else. And, observing your rudeness and demonstrated ignorance, I have no desire to be your equal. Finally, I don't ride on a bus - there are too many like Larry driving them and too many like you riding as passengers.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1686. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 05:22:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F4305E0.2010408@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75051

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F428D0C.5040309@psu.edu...
>
>>PCTA's haven't done enough proper marketing of their product IMO.
>
>
> It's really HARD to market a product that few want ... that's why the PCTA's
> feel the need for a government-sponsored support system.
>
>
>>NCI pettition is all opinion.
>
>
> No ... the NCI petition is loaded with the facts about how any legitimate
> need for a government-mandated Morse test evaporated years ago, how
> the FCC has determined that it does not comport with the purpose of the
> ARS, how the test serves no regulatory purpose, how it doesn't "make for
> a better, more well-behaved, more technically competent operator, etc., etc.
>
> The petition is chock-full of facts ...

Well, that's your opinion anyhow! 8^)

But seriously, if I could offer some advice. It is okay to have an
opinion. You have your's and I have mine.

It's even okay to try to turn your opinion into the law of the land. If
enough people agree, it will happen.

But there is a mistake of hubris in believing that ones own personal
opinion is fact.

> [snipped the rest because I refuse to get drawn into unrelated debates
> about privs vs. license class, etc. that have nothing to do with the Morse
> test issue ...]

Probably a good idea...

- Mike KB3EIA -

1687. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 05:45:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6883A7.24852%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75052

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> Belittling ham radio? Moi??? Hmmm, you may
>> have a point there. Now that ham radio
>> licensing requirements in the U.S. have been
>> reduced to insignificance, (snip)
>
>
> I wonder if you realize how incessant your
> whining is...

At this point, I don't think Larry can think of anything else, Kim. I've been reading his negative garbage for four or five years now. The same subjects (code, licensing requirements, and newer hams) are almost always the focus of his messages and those messages are almost always filled with delusions about his own self-importance and insults towards others.

I don't know if Larry thinks he's being funny or if he really believes the hatred he spews. Whatever the case, I'm getting real darn tired of it. If he continues with ridicule that includes me as a target, I'm not going to continue to sit back and say nothing.

If the majority of respondents in this newsgroup side with him, making him the de facto spokesperson for ham radio and the higher license classes, then perhaps this isn't an activity I wish to continue participating in.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1688. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 06:26:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB688D4E.24856%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75053

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> "Derek" writes:
>>
>> So why not give the newcomers a helping hand
>> instead of slagging them off all the time, Just
>> REMEMBER you was new to the hobby ONCE.
>
> Yes, I was. And I was definitely NOT "welcomed"
> with open arms, offered tea and crumpet, and
> made to feel at home at my first few radio club
> meetings. In fact, several times I was actually
> asked what the he** I was doing there. (snip)

Were you publicly ridiculed, Larry? Did people sit around those club meetings you went to talking about how superior they were and how inferior your were? I strongly suspect anything they said to you or about you can't possibly compare to the negative garbage you've posted in this newsgroup about today's newcomers.

At this point, newcomers aren't asking to be welcomed with open arms - that appears to be far too much to ask in this community. Instead, we're simply asking you to tone down the hateful rhetoric.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1689. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 06:33:32 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bhvt8d$3mo7h$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75068

"DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:9829b709.0308191027.4a22c0cc@posting.google.com...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bht4k0$2t36o$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > > Yep, I considered it, then rejected it as inaccurate. Nocoders aren't
> > > about
> > > to dole out $34 per year for *nothing* That's exactly what most of
> > > then see
> > > of value to them in ARRL membership, since they really aren't into ham
> > > radio
> > > beyond their HT, and have no use for al the many ARRL "bennies".
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Gee... I have more than just the "HT" as you elude to and still don't
> > believe in the value of the membership at the rates it currently is now.
> > Other than a really expensive magazine subscription, these "bennies" as
you
> > elude to have yet to be proven.
>
>
>
> What I Said!

So let's hear about these alleged 'bennies" Dick!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

1690. Re: Code / No Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 06:35:53 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bhvt8e$3mo7h$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75069

C'mon Charles,

Don't you realize, some people just are not happy unless they are bitching about someone. And the others are the kind that like to watch others bitch. Why do you think talk shows like Jerry Springer etc. do so well? This is just another version in a different form. Do you honestly think that an actual intelligent debate over a topic could actually occur here?

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:gFn0b.27165$Vx2.12494241@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> I don't have any strong preference about the Code / No Code issue, but I
> have a well developed opinion about the group of hams who have endlessly
> repeated the same tired flamewar crapola for years on this newsgroup, over
> the Code / No Code issue.
>
> Less than a dozen "hams" have used this issue as an excuse to turn this
> newsgroup into a running flame war that has gone on for years, much to the
> detriment of the hobby. People look at this newsgroup to see what hams are
> like - and what they see would reflect poorly on any hobby.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>

1691. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 07:01:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB689571.24858%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75054

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:

> Oh, yeah. Now, there's some intellect for ya...

Did you notice anything noteworthy about this thread, Kim? It mainly consists of those like Larry (the pro-code troublemakers) maliciously nominating people without code skills. These guys, specifically Larry, claim the no-code crowd is always the ones attacking them, while they're simply defending themselves with the rhetoric they spew. Instead, what is seen here is an example of the real truth - Larry and his ilk targeting specific people in the hopes of dragging them into an argument and the no-code crowd not nominating anyone in the hopes of avoiding an argument. It does say a lot about the character of the two groups, doesn't it?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1692. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 08:54:26 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhvctp$27v@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75055

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB6883A7.24852%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >>
> >> Belittling ham radio? Moi??? Hmmm, you may
> >> have a point there. Now that ham radio
> >> licensing requirements in the U.S. have been
> >> reduced to insignificance, (snip)
> >
> >
> > I wonder if you realize how incessant your
> > whining is...
>
>
> At this point, I don't think Larry can think of anything else, Kim. I've
> been reading his negative garbage for four or five years now. The same
> subjects (code, licensing requirements, and newer hams) are almost always
> the focus of his messages and those messages are almost always filled with
> delusions about his own self-importance and insults towards others.
>
> I don't know if Larry thinks he's being funny or if he really believes
the
> hatred he spews. Whatever the case, I'm getting real darn tired of it. If
he
> continues with ridicule that includes me as a target, I'm not going to
> continue to sit back and say nothing.
>
> If the majority of respondents in this newsgroup side with him, making
him
> the de facto spokesperson for ham radio and the higher license classes,
then
> perhaps this isn't an activity I wish to continue participating in.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Oh goodness, Dwight! That's a lot said right there. BUT, it's *in spite
of* the likes of Larry that I like being in the hobby/service of ham radio.
And, believe me, Larry really believes what he is saying. He's a desperate,

lonely, little man--and his delusions are all he's got.

Oh, and by the way. Look real close at who is actually communicating with him on an intellectual level. Nada. Zip. There are people in this newsgroup who get communicated with, and there are people in this newsgroup who get communicated to. Larry is in the latter. For all the times I've pissed people off, across the board, there are still times when threads have been maintained for a good length of time that involved intellectual debate. Same for you. Same for any of us "antagonizers" as we are affectionately called.

But, not for Larry, not for a couple of others. Larry isn't "spewing" anything that sticks; his kind of logic and reasoning are quite in the minority in ham radio.

Kim W5TIT

1693. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 08:55:39 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bhvd01$9hi@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75056

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB689571.24858%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> > Oh, yeah. Now, there's some intellect for ya...
>
>
> Did you notice anything noteworthy about this thread, Kim? It mainly
> consists of those like Larry (the pro-code troublemakers) maliciously
> nominating people without code skills. These guys, specifically Larry,
claim
> the no-code crowd is always the ones attacking them, while they're simply
> defending themselves with the rhetoric they spew. Instead, what is seen
here
> is an example of the real truth - Larry and his ilk targeting specific
> people in the hopes of dragging them into an argument and the no-code
crowd
> not nominating anyone in the hopes of avoiding an argument. It does say a
> lot about the character of the two groups, doesn't it?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Yep. You got it...

Kim W5TIT

1694. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 10:03:37 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <ZHH0b.27854$Vx2.12762579@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75057

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030819225442.23171.00000149@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <%4z0b.27620$Vx2.12650271@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>,
"charlesb"
> <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:
>
> >The fact that you can point out bad behavior done in the past does
nothing
> >to justify further bad behavior today or tomorrow. Instead, it points out
> >the need to do better, to set our sights on where we really want to be.
> >
> >Charles, N5PVL
>
> Charles:
>
> We're here, we're in your face, and we're staying. If you don't like us,
> why don't you complain to the ARRL and/or the FCC? I'm sure they'll
> be glad to hear from you.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Sorry Larry, you must have gotten your wires crossed. I was talking to the few responsible, intelligent hams on the ng who actually care about the hobby. I'm not really talking to the mastur-debators here who are putting a bad reflection on the hobby, knowing that they (you) do not really care.

If they (you) cared, they (you) would be going so far out of your way to display ham radio's ass in public.

Charles, N5PVL

1695. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 11:24:22 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <GTI0b.514$6e5.71609@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75058
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:nJB0b.503$lw4.53@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> Hey don't tell us what you think, tell the FCC with their ECFS.
> It doesn't matter since NTIA says that BPL is OK

NTIA is studying BPL vis a vis USG HF ops ... the same sort of
ops that relegated us to 5 spot channels at 5 MHz instead of a band.

From talking with the folks there who are looking into it, they seem
just as concerned as we should be.

Carl - wk3c

1696. Re: NTIA Response to FCC BPL NOI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 11:43:20 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <s9J0b.515$6e5.71989@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75065

This is the "commerce" side of NTIA talking ... the spectrum management folks are hard at work evaluating how this will negatively affect USG systems, including homeland security ... this story's not over yet.

I believe (and hope) that when their testing is done, NTIA will express serious concerns and ask for significant protection from radiated emissions from BPL ... perhaps to the point that it becomes inviable ...

Carl - wk3c

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:DwB0b.496$lw4.322@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> Before the
>
> Federal Communications Commission
>
> Washington, D.C. 20554
> In the Matter of
> Inquiry Regarding Carrier Current Systems,
> including Broadband over Power Line Systems
>)
>)
>)
>)
>)
>)
>
> ET Docket No. 03-104
>
> COMMENTS OF THE NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS
> AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION
>
> The National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), an
> Executive Branch agency within the Department of Commerce, is the President?s
> principal adviser on domestic and international telecommunications policy,
> including policies relating to the nation?s economic and technological
> advancement in telecommunications. Accordingly, NTIA makes recommendations
> regarding telecommunications policies and presents Executive Branch views on
> telecommunications matters to the Congress, the Federal Communications
> Commission (Commission), and the public. NTIA, through the Office of Spectrum
> Management, is also responsible for managing the Federal Government?s use

of
> the radio frequency spectrum. NTIA respectfully submits the following
> comments in response to the Commission?s Notice of Inquiry in the
> above-captioned proceeding.[1]
>
> I. NTIA SUPPORTS THE COMMISSION?S BPL INQUIRY AND ENCOURAGES THE
> COMMISSION TO MOVE FORWARD EXPEDITIOUSLY.
>
> NTIA believes that Broadband over Power Line (BPL) holds great promise as
a
> new source of innovation and competition in the broadband marketplace. It
has
> the potential to open new avenues of Internet access, to enable new and
> expanded services for utility companies, and to create a new platform for
> further advances in communications technology. By moving swiftly to
examine
> BPL and to establish appropriate rules for its use, the Commission can
provide
> this emerging industry with a solid foundation upon which to build new
> services and products that will benefit American consumers and businesses.
> Thus, NTIA urges the Commission to move forward expeditiously with its BPL
> Inquiry.
>
> II. NOTWITHSTANDING BPL?S POTENTIAL BENEFITS, THE COMMISSION MUST
> ENSURE THAT OTHER COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, ESPECIALLY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
> OPERATIONS, ARE ADEQUATELY PROTECTED FROM UNACCEPTABLE INTERFERENCE.
>
> In tailoring its rules to promote BPL deployment, the Commission
> must be certain to provide all communications stakeholders with adequate
> protections against BPL emissions that may cause unacceptable radio
frequency
> interference. The federal government has extensive operations that
> potentially could be affected by BPL systems. Indeed, federal government
> agencies have over eighteen thousand (18,000) frequency assignments in the
1.7
> - 80 MHz spectrum in which BPL systems may unintentionally radiate.2 These
> assignments accommodate many tens of thousands of receivers operating
> throughout the United States, in many cases in close proximity to
potential
> sites for ?In-House? and ?Access? BPL systems.[2] The systems that operate
in
> this region of the spectrum provide numerous services, such as national
fire
> emergency communications, federal and non-federal law enforcement
> communications, emergency operations, search and rescue, aeronautical and
> maritime communications, and disaster relief communications. Some of the
> Federal Government systems utilize Automatic Link Establishment (ALE),
> encryption and other technologies that affect the tolerance to interfering
> signals. Consequently, NTIA has broad concerns with radiated emission
limits

> and other measures that may be needed to protect these systems.[3]
>
> III. NTIA IS LAUNCHING EXTENSIVE MODELING, ANALYSIS, AND
> MEASUREMENT EFFORTS FOR BPL AND WE ENCOURAGE THE
> COMMISSION TO CONSIDER OUR FINDINGS AS IT MOVES
> FORWARD IN THE BPL PROCEEDING.
>
> In the inquiry, the Commission requests comment on how the Part 15
> rules should be tailored to ensure that existing radio services are
protected
> from harmful interference.[4] The Commission?s inquiry also requests
comment
> on the measurement methods to be used for BPL systems.[5]
>
> NTIA has initiated modeling and analyses that address the
> interfering potential of BPL technology and the radiated emission limits
> needed to preclude unacceptable interference to federal government
systems.
> This effort includes research of relevant technical studies and
measurement
> efforts that have been performed throughout the world as well as
regulatory
> approaches taken for BPL (e.g., carrier current systems) by other
countries.
> NTIA?s Institute for Telecommunication Sciences (ITS) is also commencing
> extensive measurements of experimental BPL systems. The measurements are
> designed to define the local ambient noise environment and reveal the most
> important BPL radiated emission characteristics for use in NTIA?s modeling
and
> analysis efforts. Based on the results of this effort, NTIA will recommend
> radiated emission limits and other operational restrictions for BPL
systems
> that are necessary to preclude unacceptable interference to federal
government
> systems.
>
> NTIA additionally has a substantial interest in BPL authorization
> procedures, especially the measurement procedures for ascertaining
compliance
> with radiated emission limits. These procedures must correctly determine
> compliance without undermining the protective effects of the limits.
However,
> the procedures should not unnecessarily restrict the emission limits or
cause
> service providers to incur undue costs or delays in deployment. The
> measurement performed by ITS will provide guidelines for development of
> compliance measurement procedures that NTIA believes are a key factor in
> ensuring compatibility with federal government systems. A copy of the
> measurement plan is provided in Appendix A.
>

> NTIA expects to conclude its modeling, analysis, and measurement
> efforts by the end of 2003. NTIA intends to submit its findings to the
> Commission, and we urge the Commission to consider those findings as it
moves
> ahead with successive stages of the BPL proceeding.
>
> IV. CONCLUSION
>
> In summary, NTIA supports the Commission?s efforts to investigate
> new technologies that could foster new communications services and bring
> additional options for Internet access to the American public. NTIA looks
> forward to working with the Commission and the communications and power
> industries in developing the appropriate regulatory framework to permit
BPL to
> flourish while protecting federal systems from interference.
>
>
> Respectfully submitted,
> Nancy J. Victory
> Assistant Secretary for
> Communications and Information
>
> Fredrick R. Wentland
> Associate Administrator
> Office of Spectrum Management
>
> Thomas Sullivan
> Edward Drocella
> Electronics Engineers
> Office of Spectrum Management
> Kathy Smith
> Chief Counsel
>
> National Telecommunications and
> Information Administration
>
> U.S. Department of Commerce
> Room 4713
> 1401 Constitution Avenue, N.W
> Washington, DC 20230
> (202) 482-1816
>
>
> August 13, 2003
>
>
> APPENDIX A
>
> Summary of Measurement Plan
> for Emissions Radiated by Experimental

> Broadband over Power Line Systems
>
> July 18, 2003
>
> 1. Introduction
>
> The Federal Communications Commission has issued a Notice of Inquiry1
> that requests comments about Broadband over Power Lines (BPL). BPL uses
power
> lines to provide broadband communications services, including Internet
access,
> to homes and offices. The Commission seeks comments on:
>
> 1) The potential interference effects of BPL, if any, on authorized
spectrum
> users;
>
> 2) Test results from BPL experimental sites;
>
> 3) The appropriate measurement procedure for testing emission
characteristics
> for all types of carrier current systems; and
>
> 4) Changes that may be needed in Part 15 technical rules and the equipment
> approval process to foster the development of BPL and to ensure that
> interference is not caused to other services as a result of this
technology.
>
> The BPL Inquiry defines two types of BPL as "Access" and "In-House."
Access BPL
> uses medium voltage power lines to bring broadband access to homes and
offices.
> In-House BPL uses existing electric utility wiring (low voltage lines) to
> devices within a building.
>
> The following plan describes proposed measurements that will
> quantify unknown aspects of BPL signals. The measurements will be
conducted at
> several sites where systems are currently deployed for testing purposes.
The
> objectives of this plan include:
>
> 1) Measure the signal power and the co-located background noise power for
> several locations, radials and relevant bandwidths.
>
> 2) Measure the peak, average and quasi-peak levels of the above.
>
> 3) Measure the above for both horizontal and vertical polarization in a
few
> locations.

>
> 4) Convert the received power to field strength.
>
> 5) Measure the peak and average power levels over a day in a few locations
to
> examine the time variability of the received power.
>
> 6) Measure the received power along one or more radials from the BPL site
to
> determine the distance from the source to the near-field boundary.
>
> 7) Measure the peak and average power levels of BPL signal harmonics and
> intermodulation products at frequencies up to 1,000 MHz.
>
> The technical descriptions of BPL systems that will be examined are
> based on information supplied by the system operator. Certain technical
details
> of the systems will likely be considered proprietary information by the
system
> operator, and will be treated appropriately by NTIA.
>
> The measurement setup is shown in Figure 1. Equipment will be
> calibrated before the measurements are made. An antenna, positioned 10
meters
> above the ground on the Radio Spectrum Measurement System (RSMS)-4
vehicle2 and
> 2 meters above the ground on a tripod, will be used to measure the
received
> power over a frequency range that extends above the frequencies of the BPL
> desired, conducted emissions. The signal from the antenna is split into
two
> measurement systems so that simultaneous peak and average power
measurements can
> occur. One of the systems will alternately measure quasi-peak levels. A
> preselector will be used on each system to prevent an overload condition
from
> occurring and improve the sensitivity. Computers will be used to control
the
> measurement systems and store the data.
>
> Figure 1. BPL Measurement Setup.
>
> Measurements using various bandwidths will be made to determine the
> characteristics of the BPL signals and their intermodulation and harmonic
> products. An ITS stepped measurement routine will be used to collect peak
and
> average power, as a function of frequency, for 3 kHz and 10 kHz bandwidths
below
> 30 MHz and 10 kHz and 30 kHz above 30 MHz. Quasi-peak measurements also
will

> use the ITS stepped measurement routine with the bandwidth specified for
> compliance measurements. The repetition interval of the BPL signal will be
> determined from the operator?s technical data that describes the BPL
signal. If
> the data are unavailable, the interval will be determined empirically at
the
> first measurement location. The peak and average power will be measured
over
> the repetition interval.
>
> 4. Measurement Procedure
>
> Ensure that the antenna's main beam has an unobstructed view of the
> BPL source. Photograph the antenna's view of the BPL source. Transmit the
> same, repeatable test signals over the network for each signal
measurement. At
> the first location, examine the BPL signal envelope to confirm or discover
the
> repetition interval. Record the envelope over one period. Start the peak
value
> measurement system. Start the average value measurement system to run
> concurrently with the peak value system. Upon completion, switch to the
quasi-peak
> system and perform a stepped measurement. When the measurement system
finishes,
> turn off the BPL signal. Run the three measurements again.
>
> Proceed to the next location and repeat the measurements in the
> above paragraph. Generally speaking, most receiving antennas of concern in
the
> 1.7 ? 80 MHz spectrum are vertically polarized so these polarizations will
be
> used. In a few locations, average power measurements will be made using
both
> polarizations, noting that horizontally polarized receiver antennas are
also
> used and propagation effects may depolarize the BPL signals.
>
> The above measurements produce samples of the received power. It is
> desirable to increase the time spent recording received power in a given
> location to examine the time variability of the radiated level. The power
> should be sampled over an hour's time and a complementary cumulative
> distribution function (CCDF) calculated. This would yield a better peak
value
> as well as giving an indication of how often other levels occur. Five
hourly
> measurements would produce CCDF graphs to show time variability throughout
the
> day.
>

> The RSMS-4 vehicle will be driven along a road that approximates a
> radial from the BPL test site. Signal power will be sampled approximately
every
> wavelength along the route. Several routes and several frequencies will be
> measured.
>
> Measurements will be made over two-weeks to be coordinated with the
> BPL network administrators.
>
> The measurement product will be a report that describes the
> measurement methods and presents the graphical results. The first graph
will
> show the signal envelope over one measurement period. The next graph will
show
> the peak received field strength as a function of frequency. The abscissa
will
> contain the BPL frequencies that are receivable by the system. The third
graph
> will show the average field strength as a function of frequency. The
fourth
> graph will show the quasi-peak level as a function of frequency. Several
series
> of these graphs will be produced, one series for each measurement
location. In
> some series, graphs showing two polarizations will be produced.
>
> For a few locations, CCDF graphs will be computed showing the
> probability that the signal amplitude does not exceed a threshold. Each
graph
> will show the variations in signal amplitude over each hour that data was
> collected.
>
> The last set of graphs will show the received signal power as a
> function of distance away from the BPL site. An analysis will be performed
to
> identify a distance beyond which the power decreases at a rate of 1/(r2).
>
> [1] Inquiry Regarding Carrier Current Systems, including Broadband over
Power
> Line Systems, ET Docket 03-104, Notice of Inquiry, FCC 03-100 (released
April
> 28, 2003) (?BPL Inquiry?).
>
> 2 As a result of non-linear elements in the electrical power distribution
> system, BPL systems may radiate emissions at frequencies substantially
higher
> than the frequencies actually used intentionally within the BPL system.
Thus,
> BPL emissions in spectrum other than 1.7-80 MHz may also be of concern to
> federal government users.

>
> [2] In-House and Access BPL systems are described in more detail in the
BPL
> Inquiry. BPL Inquiry at ï¿½ 2.
>
> [3] NTIA recognizes that interference can occur directly via conducted
> emissions (i.e., signals carried over wires) as opposed to radiated
emissions.
> However, conducted emissions limits and the electromagnetic interference
> problems they prevent are outside of NTIA?s purview. Consequently, NTIA
will be
> addressing conducted emissions only in relation to radiated emissions.
>
> [4] BPL Inquiry at ï¿½ï¿½ 18-20.
>
> [5] Id. ï¿½ 21.
>
> 1 Inquiry Regarding Carrier Current Systems, including Broadband over
Power
> Line Systems, ET Docket 03-104, Notice of Inquiry, FCC 03-100 (released.
April
> 28, 2003) (?BPL Inquiry?).
>
> 2 The NTIA RSMS is a mobile, self-contained computer-controlled
radio-receiving
> system capable of many measurement scenarios over a broad range of
frequencies.
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith AOL IM:kilowattradio
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> "Give SCO $699 for using Linux or the Penguin gets it."

1697. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 11:43:21 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <t9J0b.516$6e5.71989@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75064

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F4305E0.2010408@adelphia.net...
>
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3F428D0C.5040309@psu.edu...
> >
> >>PCTA's haven't done enough proper marketing of their product IMO.
> >
> >
> > It's really HARD to market a product that few want ... that's why the
PCTA's
> > feel the need for a government-sponsored support system.
> >
> >
> >>NCI pettition is all opinion.
> >
> >
> > No ... the NCI petition is loaded with the facts about how any
legitimate
> > need for a government-mandated Morse test evaporated years ago, how
> > the FCC has determined that it does not comport with the purpose of the
> > ARS, how the test serves no regulatory purpose, how it doesn't "make for
> > a better, more well-behaved, more technically competent operator, etc.,
etc.
> >
> > The petition is chock-full of facts ...
>
> Well, that's your opinion anyhow! 8^)
>
> But seriously, if I could offer some advice. It is okay to have an
> opinion. You have your's and I have mine.
>
> It's even okay to try to turn your opinion into the law of the land. If
> enough people agree, it will happen.
>
> But there is a mistake of hubris in believing that ones own personal
> opinion is fact.

How can citing FCC statements from public documents and quoting
law be considered "one's own personal opinion" ... again, the Petition
is "chock-full" of FACTS.

> > [snipped the rest because I refuse to get drawn into unrelated debates
> > about privs vs. license class, etc. that have nothing to do with the
Morse
> > test issue ...]
>
> Probably a good idea...

Not NCI's charter issue ... don't want to get mired in those rat holes.

Carl - wk3c

1698. Yet Another Anti-Amateur Radio "LennieRant" Unravelled.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 12:02:05 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308200402.3185848c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75059

Other than the obvious idiocy of Lennie's rants, one need but mark time and watch the media to find the REAL truth.

The following items were cited in the September "CQ" magazine in the "Public Service" column by Mr. Bob Josuweit, WA3PZO.

On page 25: The topic is the Amateur Radio Spectrum Protection Act which is on the Hill for approval.

In sworn testimony before Congress, Mr. Edmond Thomas, the Chief Engineer for the FCC's Office of Engineering and Technology stated "I must not fail to mention the contributions of amatuer radio operators to public safety. The ham radio community has offered invaluable service to, and as, first responders in natural disasters, emergency situations and other crisis events."

Further testimony was offered by Dr. Norman Jacknis of New York. He is the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Information Technology of Westchester County, NY: "In the first hours following the attack of September 11th 2001, the only way we could coordinatethe sharing of firefighting, Medical Examiner (and) health and Information resources with New York officials was through the highly trained, volunteer amateur radio (ham) operators. This was a result of the fact that normal commercial communications services were unavailable. There was no other single, common communications medium, except the Amateur Radio Service. This irreplaceable resource must be protected against incursion by other interests."

Nothing quite like "disinterested parties" (read that "non-participants" in the Amteur Radio Service itself) make such absolute statements on the public record.

Let's all sit back and watch Dr. Spin Master (Lennie the Lame) try and dance the Misdirection Shuffle on this one. It ought to be a hoot!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1699. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 12:27:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308200427.7abb82c5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75060

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308191415.13ca05e2@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308190430.2d0fdbde@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308182146.31736474@posting.google.com>...
> > > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4125A2.8070100@psu.edu>...

> > Well...You KNOW who I nominate:
> >
> > For his pages long recitings of his CV...
> >
> > For his frequent retelling of how he "worked DX" in a 1950's-era
> > Army radio station...
>
> What would you call long distance communications?

Closed circuit communications. "Working DX" is an Amateur term,
applied to Amateur practice, involving radio communication between
Amateur Radio stations. His Army nets worked specific stations on
specific frequencies at specific times with overwhelming power and
resources. An idiot could complete a contact with that much
power...Ooooops...an idiot DID complete those contacts...forgive me...

> > For his frequent demeaning of not only individual Amateurs, but
> > of the Amateur Service as a whole...
>
> I'm an individual amateur and a member of the ARS as a whole. I don't
> "feel" demeaned. There is some truth in Len's observation of the ARS.
> Accept it.

There's very LITTLE truth.

And you're one of those who, just like Lennie, demonstrate a very
poor understanding of those same Amateur practices, so I am very
UNIMPRESSED about how you feel about his sleights.

> > For his frequent attempts to associate himself with Soldiers who
> > died in combat for the purpose of improving his own "reputation"...
>
> If you served, you are associated with soldiers who died in combat.
> That's just the way it is, and no amaount of running away from it will
> disassociate you from them. Yet there are those who never served and
> claim "military experience." That is disgusting.

Many of my fellow Marines have fallen in combat. That is true. I honor them and wish they never had to be called upon to make that sacrifice, but they did.

UNLIKE Lennie, however, I have never tried to link myself to those Marines (or any other servicemember, for that matter) in such a way as to insinuate that I was somehow part and parcel of that sacrifice for my own benefit or "reputation".

THAT is disgusting.

BTW, other than Mark Morgan, to WHOM do you refer as "never served"...The nature of just about everyone's (regulars, that is...) military or government service here is well documented.

> > For countless lies, mistruths (especially that one about "get my
> > Extra Lite out of the box...) and use of profanity and insults...
>
> We have all desired things which we have not achieved.

Ahhhhhh....too true. But then none of us here have "not achieved" anything for which we were so otherwise eminently qualified, now have we...?!?! Of if anyone has, they are not making an issue of it!

> > The envelope pleeeeeeease! (drom roll ensuses....)
> >
> > Leonard H. "Lennie the Liar" Anderson!
> >
> > Respectfully submitted,
>
> Obviously disrespectfully submitted.

How "obviously"..?!?! Is anything I said untrue...?!?!

> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> At least you didn't start a new thread over it.

Nope...someone else did...But JUST FOR YOU, Brain, I started another one with yet another unravelling of your Rear Area War Hero's rants...That being how allegedly "unimportant" Amateur Radio is in the overall scheme of the radio world.

Seems he doesn't have the full appreciation of the pulse of the radio world as he alledges...Not that any of "us" didn't know already.

Steve, K4YZ

1700. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 12:34:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308200434.31dfbb0a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75061

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<BB689571.24858%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> > Oh, yeah. Now, there's some intellect for ya...
>
>
> Did you notice anything noteworthy about this thread, Kim? It mainly
> consists of those like Larry (the pro-code troublemakers) maliciously
> nominating people without code skills. These guys, specifically Larry, claim
> the no-code crowd is always the ones attacking them, while they're simply
> defending themselves with the rhetoric they spew. Instead, what is seen here
> is an example of the real truth - Larry and his ilk targeting specific
> people in the hopes of dragging them into an argument and the no-code crowd
> not nominating anyone in the hopes of avoiding an argument. It does say a
> lot about the character of the two groups, doesn't it?

So far, Dwight, I ahve yet to see anything that is not true.

Furthermore, it is the "no code" crowd (really only two or three
people) who keep making "code testing" debates out of EVERY subject
brought to this forum.

For example, NO ONE who is "pro code" made an issue of the code
at all. We simply (and so far accurately) pointed out the rantings of
a few.

Kim and you both hold strong opinions, but I would not put either
of you in contention for a nomination!

73

Steve, K4YZ

1701. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 12:39:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308200439.56672408@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75062

"Derek" <danda95@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<cGb0b.131$5S2.87@newsfep3-gui.server.ntli.net>...
> What makes you all better operators it HAS been removed, so if you do not
> like it why don't you take up knitting or something. or stop all the
> bickering If the truth is known a lot of us have come up from the CB ranks
> over the years

Uhhhhhh...Derek, Old Man...it has NOT been "removed".

The text of S25.5 was changed so as to allow specific
administrations to determine wether or not to require code testing.

As of today it is still the law of the land in the United States,
and shall continue to be so until the FCC acts on the pending
petitions to remove it. I have no doubt it will be removed, but the
rulemaking process must and will be followed.

And rather than "take up knitting", may I recommend a remedial
English Composition course for you?

Steve, K4YZ

1702. Why lllllllloser lllllllllardasss lloyd is interested in Wiseman "Dic"....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 12:44:13 UTC
From: Anonymous Sender <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com>
Message-ID: <d8bc9e384a46e7610a3350d5d85b0536@remailer.metacolo.com>
Source record: 75063

In article <bhqs2f$b8f$0@pita.alt.net>
"Lloyd" <Lloyd@lloydszplace.org> wrote:
>
>
>
> "Ed Norton" <haaaynorton@comnos.pam> wrote in message
> news:bhp7iq$o0v$0@pita.alt.net...

<Lenny Anderson trying to hide>
> >
>
> ROTFLMAO !!!!!!!!!!!!!!
>
> Lloyd

Shut the fuck up, fired mental illness and depression pizza fatass.....now go slit your fucking wrists.

1703. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 13:09:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308200509.190cedae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75066

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308191450.13503deb@posting.google.com>...
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4137D2.6060003@psu.edu>...
> > Thanks for the link to your proposal, Carl.
> >
> >
> > A question though. I notice that the proposal to drop element one is
> > there, but why doesn't the proposal rename the other elements so that
> > they are in sequence?
> >
> > I've been around enough of these sort of documents to know that sooner
> > or later it will have to be changed.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> I dunno, Mike. Were you around during the last restructuring? The
> NPRM was the most amateurish piece of literature I've ever seen from a
> government agency. The R/O was the second most. Left more questions
> than answers. Of course, there was a lot of interference from the
> ARRL in the process, so...

"Interference"...?!?!

So participation in the rulemaking process is
"interference"...?!?! Or is that just the people or organizations you
don't agree with, Brain?

Steve, K4YZ

1704. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 13:12:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308200512.764d3dab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75067

dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308191651.8926164@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308191353.513c1301@posting.google.com>...
> > dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308191024.3b7bf204@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308190441.177ddf8f@posting.google.com>...
> > > > dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308181824.3c5e5a2e@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308181437.61fe6a6c@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308140938.e2260e1@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > > Some of us have given it real thought, and have posted ideas. But the
> > > > > > > mantra has always been that eliminating the code test would solve
> > > > > > > everything.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > No-code isn't a religion. No Mantra.
> > > > >
> > > > > What??? No "Hoops"??? No "unnecessary requirements"?? No
> > > > > "Unjustified bogus BOHICA thingies"?? No "Morsedits" holding
> > > > > back the intelligentsia?? No "If it wasn't for that dastardly
> > > > > Morris code test I'd take my rightful place on HF??
> > > >
> > > > No mantra.
> > >
> > > Then the term has no meaning.
> >
> > Much like your posts.
> >
> > > > > > No Mantra???? Get back to your village!
> > > >
> > > > You miss me?
> > >
> > > Hammer>>>>>nail = NO MISS
> >
> > Sounds like a big blood blister to me.
>
> You *do* often act like one.

You just want me under your thumb.

1705. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 13:42:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F437AA8.1030104@psu.edu>
Source record: 75070

```
Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F4305E0.2010408@adelphia.net...
>
>>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>>>news:3F428D0C.5040309@psu.edu...
>>>
>>>
>>>>PCTA's haven't done enough proper marketing of their product IMO.
>>>
>>>
>>>It's really HARD to market a product that few want ... that's why the
>>
> PCTA's
>
>>>feel the need for a government-sponsored support system.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>NCI pettition is all opinion.
>>>
>>>
>>>No ... the NCI petition is loaded with the facts about how any
>>
> legitimate
>
>>>need for a government-mandated Morse test evaporated years ago, how
>>>the FCC has determined that it does not comport with the purpose of the
>>>ARS, how the test serves no regulatory purpose, how it doesn't "make for
>>>a better, more well-behaved, more technically competent operator, etc.,
>>
> etc.
>
>>>The petition is chock-full of facts ...
>>
>>Well, that's your opinion anyhow! 8^)
>>
>>But seriously, if I could offer some advice. It is okay to have an
>>opinion. You have your's and I have mine.
>>
>>It's even okay to try to turn your opinion into the law of the land. If
```

>>enough people agree, it will happen.
>>
>>But there is a mistake of hubris in believing that ones own personal
>>opinion is fact.
>
>
> How can citing FCC statements from public documents and quoting
> law be considered "one's own personal opinion" ... again, the Petition
> is "chock-full" of FACTS.

Sure, there are facts in it, but the core assumptions are opinions.
Take any paragraph that has "we believe" in it.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1706. Re: The stuff of FUD

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 13:57:16 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <O-6dnUQuzrfx496iU-KYgw@crocker.com>
Source record: 75071
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Agent Smith" <th@t.other.george.sucks.com> wrote in message
news:3ff6666b.4278809718@feadnread...
> On 19 Aug 2003 19:55:22 -0700, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
> >
> > I'm familiar with Emmaus and drove around the borough today looking
> > for the stuff with my TS-50 but struck out. Kindly cite an
> > intersection where the stuff is in use, I'll try again. Also
> > characterize the signal if you can/will.
>
> Such 'powerful' interference that even someone who knows where it
> is supposed to be can't find it? <g>
>
> Sounds like the stuff of FUD to me. <g>

ah, but all he knows is that it is supposed to be in town somewhere. these tests may only cover a mile or two along one road. and as k1rfi found they aren't always on... and then again, could they have thrown in a placebo??? a claimed test area where they really didn't put it in just to see how many complaints they get?

1707. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 13:58:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F437E6F.7070101@psu.edu>
Source record: 75072

Brian wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4137D2.6060003@psu.edu>...
>
>>Thanks for the link to your proposal, Carl.
>>
>>
>>A question though. I notice that the proposal to drop element one is
>>there, but why doesn't the proposal rename the other elements so that
>>they are in sequence?
>>
>>I've been around enough of these sort of documents to know that sooner
>>or later it will have to be changed.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> I dunno, Mike. Were you around during the last restructuring?

nope.

> The
> NPRM was the most amateurish piece of literature I've ever seen from a
> government agency. The R/O was the second most. Left more questions
> than answers. Of course, there was a lot of interference from the
> ARRL in the process, so...

Hmm, too bad. Hard to imagine having an element 2, 3, and 4, but no
element 1. It would make good joke material, or maybe the start of a
legend. "The ghost of Element 1" 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

1708. Re: dual band radios that transmit frs channels

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 16:07:36 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F439CC8.83F329F9@ptt.edu>
Source record: 75073

> Which is perfectly legal. The FCC has no jurisdiction
> over personal property, so you can use your personal
> radio, which is your personal property, any way you
> desire. Our local ham radio club boasts a membership
> of over 300. At least half the membership have modified
> ham gear, which they use on Fam Radio, GMRS, Business
> band, CB, etc. One member has an air conditioning repair
> business, and his trucks use two meters to communicate.

One has to believe that you have never read Part 97 (or 95).
Or if you did, you read it while drunk.

1709. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 16:19:13 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F439F81.10500@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 75164
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> It's also interesting that Mr. Nye points us to the websites of folks
> who are advocating BPL ...
>
> I wonder, is Mr. Nye a consultant to the utilities or BPL manufacturers?

Yep, obviously a paid misinformant.

1710. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 17:30:21 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308200930.6e2c0e9d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75074

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<t9J0b.516$6e5.71989@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F4305E0.2010408@adelphia.net...

> > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > > news:3F428D0C.5040309@psu.edu...

> > >>PCTA's haven't done enough proper marketing of their product IMO.

Agreed! That has changed since the creation of FISTS, btw.

> > > It's really HARD to market a product that few want ...

What product do you refer to, Carl?

Morse code USE is second only to SSB on amateur HF. Contest
participation in Morse is growing while SSB participation is flat.
There are more Morse related products and suppliers now than in the
past 30-35 years.

And hams are USING the mode, even as you read this.

Perhaps the "product that few want" is technical knowhow. Most hams
nowadays use manufactured equipment. Some build kits. A very few
homebrew from scratch.

When I was first licensed 36 years ago, homebrew and kit stations were
common. Today homebrew stations are extremely rare.

> > > that's why the PCTA's feel the need for a government-sponsored support system.

You mean the written tests being a "government-sponsored support
system" for homebrewing? Because that's what a lot of the content of
those tests really is.

Which do you think is more common - hams who use Morse code or hams
who use 100% homebrew equipment?
>
> > >>NCI pettition is all opinion.

No, it's not.

It's a mixture of facts and opinions about what should be done to
change the rules.
> > >
> > > No ... the NCI petition is loaded with the facts about how any
> > > legitimate

> > > need for a government-mandated Morse test evaporated years ago,

That's an opinion, not a fact.

> > > how
> > > the FCC has determined that it does not comport with the purpose of the
> > > ARS,

The fact is that the FCC wrote an opinion.

> > > how the test serves no regulatory purpose,

Another FCC opinion.

> > > how it doesn't "make for
> > > a better, more well-behaved, more technically competent operator, etc.,
> > > etc.

More opinions.
> > >
> > > The petition is chock-full of facts ...
> >
> > Well, that's your opinion anyhow! 8^)

No, it's true. Lots of facts. Also lots of interpretations of those
facts and opinions.

For example, Morse use by other radio services has all but
disappeared. That's a plain and simple fact.

Some say that since other services hardly ever use it, there's no need
for hams to have a test for it. That's an opinion, not a fact.

Many hams use Morse - that's a fact.

It makes sense to have a basic skill test for the mode - that's an
opinion.

Etc.

> > But seriously, if I could offer some advice. It is okay to have an
> > opinion. You have your's and I have mine.
> >
> > It's even okay to try to turn your opinion into the law of the land. If
> > enough people agree, it will happen.

Most laws are just that - codified opinion about what should and
should not be done.

For example - the passing grade on Element 2 is what...74%? Why not
80%? Or 70%? Or even 90%?

The passing grade is simply an OPINION codified into law. Last week I
took a 10 question test for work where the passing grade was 100%. No
wrong answers allowed. In the OPINION of the people giving the test,
100% was the minimum grade that would insure that we knew the

material. (Yes, I passed.)
> >
> > But there is a mistake of hubris in believing that ones own personal
> > opinion is fact.

I gotta remember that one. Wasn't there a story about a guy named
Canute?
>
> How can citing FCC statements from public documents and quoting
> law be considered "one's own personal opinion" ... again, the Petition
> is "chock-full" of FACTS.

It is also "chock-full" of opinions.
>
> > > [snipped the rest because I refuse to get drawn into unrelated debates
> > > about privs vs. license class, etc. that have nothing to do with the
> > > Morse test issue ...]

Like "no setasides for legacy modes"....;-)

73 de Jim, N2EY

1711. One can use legally the HF bands in USA without CW exam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 17:55:47 UTC
From: Fritz Wuehler <fritz@rodent.frell.eu.org>
Message-ID: <aa0a8472b464818f50c0c794605af40e@remailer.frell.eu.org>
Source record: 75075

Since August, 4th 2003, the ON1 in
Belgium (CEPT-class B license) can get a
ON4 call (CEPT-class A license) only by
paying a higher tax and without passing
a CW test (only 3 days delay to obtain
that).
Once they have got the ON4 call, they
can ask the right to use the HF bands in
USA with their "fake" CEPT-class A
license (due to the agreement between
CEPT and USA).
And on the HF bands, impossible to distinguish a old "true" ON4 from a new
"fake" ON4.

And who are the loosers in this story ?
American technicians waiting for the abolishment of CW in USA !

There is probably something in the US
legal texts saying that an american
citizen cant have less rights than
a foreign visitor in USA, so use that
to ask the abolishment of Morse in USA.

1712. Re: Another Challenge to Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 18:03:17 UTC
From: Kevin Muenzler <wb5rue@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3f43b84c$1_8@127.0.0.1>
Source record: 75076

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bhupre$b9n@library1.airnews.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > Ok, Kim, that's easy. Please provide a logical, rational, and
convincing
> > argument justifying your call sign, giving proof that it is not
demeaning
> > to women, and that it cannot possibly give a negative image of amateur
> > radio operators to the general public, including adults who are
concerned
> > about the exposure of young children, particularly young boys, to things
> > which tend to create negative sexual stereotypes.
> >
>
> You are too wrapped up in disliking my callsign, Larry. It is not for me
to
> prove anything about it to you. I like it and that is as logical as it
can
> get.

So does that mean that since my call is WB5RUE I should have to prove that I
am built like a road?

For those of you who missed that, "Rue" is the French word for road.

Kevin, WB5RUE

1713. BPL Reply Comments

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 19:15:20 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <cNP0b.576$6e5.77071@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75077

TODAY is the deadline for filing Reply Comments with the
FCC on "BPL."

You have until midnight to file electronically via the FCC's
ECFS (Electronic Comment Filing System)
http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/ecfs/

Prepare your document as MS Word or Adobe .pdf
and follow the directions, using the "Submit a Filing"
link in the upper right of the above-linked page.

The "Proceeding Number" is "03-104" (without the quotes).

You can upload your Word or .pdf file by browsing to it
after you fill in the required "cover sheet" information, or
you can type in "informal comments" in the edit box (but
informal comments don't get the same attention as formal
ones ...)

For an example of the correct format, or if you're just
interested in seeing what I filed, you view a .pdf of my
Reply Comments (filed today) at my personal web
page.

Consider filing ... but keep it polite and don't "flame" the
FCC ... that will do more harm than good.

73,

--
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
Grid Square FN20fm
http://home.ptd.net/~wk3c

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, IEEE Standards Association
Chair, IEEE 802.18 Radio Regulatory Technical Advisory Group
Chair-elect, Wi-Fi Alliance Regulatory Committee
Co-Chair, Wi-Fi Alliance Legislative Committee
Member, QCWA (31424)
Member, ARRL
Member, TAPR
Member, The SETI League

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

1714. Re: The stuff of FUD

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 19:23:30 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <SUP0b.578$6e5.77672@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75078
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"Agent Smith" <th@t.other.george.sucks.com> wrote in message
news:3ff6666b.4278809718@feadnread...
> On 19 Aug 2003 19:55:22 -0700, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
> >
> > I'm familiar with Emmaus and drove around the borough today looking
> > for the stuff with my TS-50 but struck out. Kindly cite an
> > intersection where the stuff is in use, I'll try again. Also
> > characterize the signal if you can/will.
>
> Such 'powerful' interference that even someone who knows where it
> is supposed to be can't find it? <g>

I had NO problem finding it, but I had the advantage that Ed Hare had
told me where to look, knowing that I live not far away.

The fact that the deployment is limited makes it hard(er) to find if
you don't know where to look ... and lots of the wiring in that area
is underground, which makes it sort of a "best case scenario" ... with
more overhead wiring, it would be a lot worse (though it's awful in
the deployment area as it is ...)

Listen to Ed Hare's video on the ARRL website ... I can assure you
that Ed wouldn't "doctor" things even if the ARRL tried to tell him
to do so (not that I believe or am insinuating that they would).

If the trash you hear on the video for Test Area #3 (Emmaus) doesn't
bother you - especially considering it's a "best case" sort of situation
with a limited deployment - then you obviously don't give a damn about
amateur radio.

Carl - wk3c

1715. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 19:46:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308201146.24111221@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75079

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F437E6F.7070101@psu.edu>...
> Brian wrote:
> > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4137D2.6060003@psu.edu>...
> >
> >>Thanks for the link to your proposal, Carl.
> >>
> >>
> >>A question though. I notice that the proposal to drop element one is
> >>there, but why doesn't the proposal rename the other elements so that
> >>they are in sequence?
> >>
> >>I've been around enough of these sort of documents to know that sooner
> >>or later it will have to be changed.
> >>
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >
> > I dunno, Mike. Were you around during the last restructuring?
>
> nope.
>
> > The
> > NPRM was the most amateurish piece of literature I've ever seen from a
> > government agency. The R/O was the second most. Left more questions
> > than answers. Of course, there was a lot of interference from the
> > ARRL in the process, so...
>
> Hmm, too bad. Hard to imagine having an element 2, 3, and 4, but no
> element 1. It would make good joke material, or maybe the start of a
> legend. "The ghost of Element 1" 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Sounds perfect for a Wouff Hong initiation rite. You might want to
suggest it to Hiram.

1716. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 19:51:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308201151.6e72a5c8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75080

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308200509.190cedae@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308191450.13503deb@posting.google.com>...
> > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4137D2.6060003@psu.edu>...
> > > Thanks for the link to your proposal, Carl.
> > >
> > >
> > > A question though. I notice that the proposal to drop element one is
> > > there, but why doesn't the proposal rename the other elements so that
> > > they are in sequence?
> > >
> > > I've been around enough of these sort of documents to know that sooner
> > > or later it will have to be changed.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> > I dunno, Mike. Were you around during the last restructuring? The
> > NPRM was the most amateurish piece of literature I've ever seen from a
> > government agency. The R/O was the second most. Left more questions
> > than answers. Of course, there was a lot of interference from the
> > ARRL in the process, so...
>
> "Interference"...?!?!
>
> So participation in the rulemaking process is
> "interference"...?!?! Or is that just the people or organizations you
> don't agree with, Brain?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Wrong-O Steve-O.

It is interference when the ARRL is asked by the FCC to make a
proposal, refuses to do so because they cannot find leadership via a
poll, then want to get involved in the making of the NPRM prior to it
being released and prior to the comment period.

The were given an opportunity to lead in the restructuring. They
abdicated.

1717. Re: Code / No Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 19:52:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308201152.7bc36cd3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75081

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bhvt8e$3mo7h$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> C'mon Charles,
>
> Don't you realize, some people just are not happy unless they are bitching
> about someone. And the others are the kind that like to watch others bitch.
> Why do you think talk shows like Jerry Springer etc. do so well? This is
> just another version in a different form. Do you honestly think that an
> actual intelligent debate over a topic could actually occur here?

I told PCTA Kurt on here years ago, "a happy sailor is a bitching sailor."

1718. NOxxx INTERNATIONAL to build urgently

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 19:55:16 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <5daafb5b173884a22f9524e219aa0094@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 75082

```
NGI : No Government Intl.
NAI : No Administration Intl.
NJI : No Jews Intl.
NPI : No Palestinian Intl.
NBI : No Black Intl.
NGI : No Gay Intl.

and finally :

NCBI : No CB Intl.

All that is necessary to improve the life on the Earth.
```

1719. Re: dual band radios that transmit frs channels

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 19:58:14 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <FMacnbD81r5KT96iU-KYgg@crocker.com>
Source record: 75083

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@tinytennanuts.net> wrote in message
news:bhvummchl0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> "Leon M" <lmlstine30002@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:1061308815.514456@newshost03.voicenet.com...
> >
> > "Paul Jordan" <pauljordan@gci.net> wrote in message
> > news:vjlcpvm3mlss83@corp.supernews.com...
> > > Why would someone with an amateur license and a fine radio want to
talk
> > to
> > > kids with walkie (frs) talkies in the first place??
> >
> > In my case I go camping with the wife and kids alot.
> > I found my Alinco mobile rig (when "opened up" via
> > "the mod" would TX with full power in the FRS & GMRS
> > band(s). This is handy when I have to leave the campsite
> > and if I have 2 call the wife from the quikie-mart a
> > couple miles down the road from the campsite on
> > her Motorola FRS.
> >
>
> Which is perfectly legal. The FCC has no jurisdiction
> over personal property, so you can use your personal
> radio, which is your personal property, any way you
> desire. Our local ham radio club boasts a membership
> of over 300. At least half the membership have modified
> ham gear, which they use on Fam Radio, GMRS, Business
> band, CB, etc. One member has an air conditioning repair
> business, and his trucks use two meters to communicate.
>
> Lloyd
>
>
this one hits about 9.9 on the toll-o-meter!

1720. The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 20:59:52 UTC
From: Derek <danda95@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <1RR0b.515$5U2.350423@newsfep1-win.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75088

` The Amateur's Code
The Radio Amateur is

CONSIDERATE...never knowingly operates in such a way as to lessen the pleasure of others.

LOYAL...offers loyalty, encouragement and support to other amateurs, local clubs, and the American Radio Relay League, through which Amateur Radio in the United States is represented nationally and internationally.

PROGRESSIVE...with knowledge abreast of science, a well-built and efficient station and operation above reproach.

FRIENDLY...slow and patient operating when requested; friendly advice and counsel to the beginner; kindly assistance, cooperation and consideration for the interests of others. These are the hallmarks of the amateur spirit.

BALANCED...radio is an avocation, never interfering with duties owed to family, job, school or community.

PATRIOTIC...station and skill always ready for service to country and community.

--The original Amateur's Code was written by Paul M. Segal, W9EEA, in 1928.

This was taken off the ARRL website its a pity some don't read it instead of slagging of others

this is a copy of a reply I got from another post
Gee, I guess "Derek" has a point! I was a CB'er for a whole six months --
and that was seven years before I became a ham! However, "Derek,"
I'm not going away! You're going to have to deal with me and those like
me from now on! So don't get any ideas about being "equal" to your
20 WPM code tested, Extra-class SUPERIORS!!!

73 de Larry, K3LT
This is way too easy...

Larry read the lines LOYAL and FRIENDLY obviously the American code is a Load of B**L***S to you

1721. Re: Code / No Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 21:02:16 UTC
From: An Metet <anmetet@liberty.gmsociety.org>
Message-ID: <cdd3b0aad07d12ad152c8d9778203bbd@aonymous.poster>
Source record: 75084

In article <bhvt8e$3mo7h$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote:
>
>
> C'mon Charles,
>
> Don't you realize, some people just are not happy unless they are bitching
> about someone. And the others are the kind that like to watch others bitch.
> Why do you think talk shows like Jerry Springer etc. do so well? This is
> just another version in a different form. Do you honestly think that an
> actual intelligent debate over a topic could actually occur here?
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
> news:gFn0b.27165$Vx2.12494241@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > I don't have any strong preference about the Code / No Code issue, but I
> > have a well developed opinion about the group of hams who have endlessly
> > repeated the same tired flamewar crapola for years on this newsgroup, over
> > the Code / No Code issue.
> >
> > Less than a dozen "hams" have used this issue as an excuse to turn this
> > newsgroup into a running flame war that has gone on for years, much to the
> > detriment of the hobby. People look at this newsgroup to see what hams are
> > like - and what they see would reflect poorly on any hobby.
> >
> > Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> >
> >

But code IS necessary.

1722. Whats up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 21:15:10 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <yxR0b.3232$sV.1949@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75085

Can anyone see this?

Dan/W4NTI

1723. Troll on the loose

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 21:16:47 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F43E53F.7AD925A0@ptt.edu>
Source record: 75086

Without Jews, this country would be broke. Thank Greenspan today!!!

Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer wrote:
>
> NGI : No Government Intl.
> NAI : No Administration Intl.
> NJI : No Jews Intl.
> NPI : No Palestinian Intl.
> NBI : No Black Intl.
> NGI : No Gay Intl.
>
> and finally :
>
> NCBI : No CB Intl.
>
> All that is necessary to improve the life on the Earth.

F'ing troll

1724. Re: Whats up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 21:22:49 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F43E6A9.BF219D9C@ptt.edu>
Source record: 75087

5 by 9

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> Can anyone see this?
>
> Dan/W4NTI

1725. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 21:44:14 UTC
From: "J. D. Beischel" <jduffy@zoomtown.com>
Message-ID: <3f43ebab$0$13108$a04e5680@nnrp.fuse.net>
Source record: 75089
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Jim,

What electric utility do you work for? Or maybe it is the equipment manufacturer that sells the interface devices and equipment to the utility? Where they are testing BPL in Cincinnati, there is S9 noise and you can't get rid of it.

Duffy

"Jim Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message news:98434152.45867878@pavillage.net...
> On Tue, 19 Aug 2003 14:47:06 -0000, David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote:
> >
> > "Jim Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
> > news:98434152.65867878@pavillage.net...
> > > The claim that BPL will seriously and negatively impact amateur radio
> > > is simply fear, uncertainty, and doubt (FUD) spread by the ARRL. That
> > > organization needs to justify its existence, and the BPL issue is a
> > > convenient way for it to show its activism. The ARRL has apparently
> > > followed the path of other self-justifying organizations such as NOW
> > > and the NAACP.
> > >
> > > Unfortunately, the technically unsophisticated do not recognize the
> > > difference between coherent and non-coherent noise, and this makes it
> > > easy for the ARRL to spread its FUD. But the fact is that, if BPL
> > > signals are heard at all, they are coherent (have a predictable phase
> > > and amplitude) and therefore can be completely removed at the
> >
> > if they are predictable then they must be constant, if they are constant
> > then they can't carry data, doesn't make much sense to me.
>
> You clearly haven't become acquainted with the mathematical definition
> of "coherent," which doesn't demaind a constant signal at all. What
> it DOES demand is either a sharply peaked or a periodic
> autocorrelation function -- properties which enable engineers to come
> up with predictive filters.
>
> > > receiver. This can be done in many ways, most of which amount to
> > > nulling the BPL signals by introducing an identical signal which is
> > > 180 degrees out of phase with the original. As a matter of fact, most
> >
> > now, just where do you propose getting this out of phase signal? true,
> > there are devices out there now that can do this, but they are fussy and
> > must be constantly adjusted as you change frequency or switch antennas.

and
> > they also have problems with overloading and distortion.
> >
> > > current HF transceivers have what they call a "noise reduction" option
> > > already built into them which uses the nulling method to accomplish
> > > its goal. Therefore, many amateurs and SWLers already have the needed
> >
> > sorry, not with this type of signal. the common noise reduction
processors
>
> Sorry, but that's not right. The Icom 746PRO for example, has two
> noise reduction functions, one of which samples slightly out-of-band
> signals to come up with a time-varying estimate of the values to be
> subtracted from the in-band signals. There is no need for the signal
> to be constant with respect to time. The second noise reduction
> function is directed at impulse noise and is a traditional noise
> blanker.
>
> In any case, you are missing the main point of the original post, and
> that was that the ARRL FUD conveniently ignores the coherent nature of
> BPL leakage signals -- a property which makes them far less formidable
> than the ARRL articles would lead you to believe.

1726. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 22:07:01 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308201407.3e73d9e8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75090

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<BB65BC75.2471C%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>...
> "WA3IYC" wrote:
> >
> > That 52,990 "increase" is not all new license
> > issues. (snip)
> >
> > (snip) How "code proficient" any amateur is
> > cannot be determined from license class alone.
>
> Of course, Jim. I clearly stated my numbers were a "rough estimate."
>
What I was getting at is that a test is just one data point. There are
hams who passed 20 per once-upon-a-time who would be hard pressed to
pass Element 1 today. And there are hams whose testing never exceeded
5 wpm who have gone far beyond 20 wpm. Etc.

And the same thing applies to the writtens.

They're all just one data point, often decades old.

> > The important point is that the number of US hams
> > is growing at a slow rate. Restructuring did not
> > result in a big change in growth. (snip)
>
> True. However, to make something out of that, one has to eliminate all
> factors outside restructuring.

Agreed! There are all sorts of factors - cost of equipment, antenna
restrictions, RFI concerns, even competing radio services. Not too
many years ago, it was common to encounter hams who had gotten
licenses for the express purpose of "honeydew" communications. Today
almost all of them have cellphones.

> In my last message, I hinted at factors such
> as the attitude of current operators towards those new to ham radio.

I hope you mean "the attitude of *some* current operators...."

> Today's
> new operator faces more ridicule and harassment than perhaps any new
> operator in the history of this activity.

I don't know about that. Around here, and everywhere else I've lived
since becoming a ham 36 years ago, newcomers of all ages, sizes,
genders, ethnicities, etc., are welcomed and encouraged, as a general
rule.

Yes, there are a few sourpusses with negative addytoods. They've been around forever. I can recall comments that Novices were "not real hams" and that my homebrew CW rigs were "not real radios", etc., etc., ad infinitum. Ol' W2OY was well known for his misanthropic "no kids, no lids, no space cadets" tirades. Oddly enough, most of those folks are not hams anymore, but I am. bwaahaahaa....

If you look for and listen to the naysayers and sourpusses, it just encourages them.

> And lets face it, that new
> operator is not likely going to invite friends or family members to join
> after an negative exchange with Larry in this newsgroup (or someone like him
> here or elsewhere).

Sure.

But are folks like that the rule or the exception?

> Clearly, the attitude of current operators has a role to
> play in the lackluster growth of ham radio today, perhaps even far more than
> restructuring at this point.
>
True - but consider also the attitudes expressed by a very few newcomers towards experienced amateurs. Should we welcome a newcomer who says all hams are fat and that no EE with self-respect would use Morse code? How about one who insults others' employment, technical knowledge, education, ethnicity, appearance, age, and name?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1727. Re: Whats up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 23:00:31 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030820190031.25228.00000370@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 75091

>Can anyone see this?
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Yea dan its working

1728. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 23:03:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030820190318.25228.00000371@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 75092

>Larry read the lines LOYAL and FRIENDLY obviously the American code is a
>Load of B**L***S to you

That crap is nothing but BS, it died when Ham Radio was converted into CB

1729. Re: Whats up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-20 23:59:35 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <HXT0b.102086$jU.76622@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 75093

See what?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:yxR0b.3232$sV.1949@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Can anyone see this?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/19/03

1730. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 01:33:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308201733.7f1288a9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75095

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308200930.6e2c0e9d@posting.google.com>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<t9J0b.516$6e5.71989@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F4305E0.2010408@adelphia.net...
>
> > > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > > > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > > > news:3F428D0C.5040309@psu.edu...
>
> > > >>PCTA's haven't done enough proper marketing of their product IMO.
>
> Agreed! That has changed since the creation of FISTS, btw.
>
> > > > It's really HARD to market a product that few want ...
>
> What product do you refer to, Carl?
>
> Morse code USE is second only to SSB on amateur HF.

Reminds me of the movie "Deer Hunter." A POW is made to engage in a
game of russian roulette by the existing government. Later, when
"free," the former POW stills enjoys playing a game of russian
roulette.

1731. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 01:35:47 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <TIV0b.1098$6e5.83201@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75094
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

I am fortunate that I am far enough from the Emmaus, PA "pilot"
area that PP&L is running (Test Site #3 on Ed Hare's video on
the ARRL web page) that I'm not noticing interference here from
that small deployment.

However, if I go down off the hill into the deployment area, the
noise is HORRIBLE throughout the HF bands ...

The ARRL is not spreading FUD about Access BPL ... it's
the truth and I've heard it for myself.

Carl - wk3c

"J. D. Beischel" <jduffy@zoomtown.com> wrote in message
news:3f43ebab$0$13108$a04e5680@nnrp.fuse.net...
> Jim,
>
> What electric utility do you work for? Or maybe it is the equipment
> manufacturer that sells the interface devices and equipment to the
utility?
> Where they are testing BPL in Cincinnati, there is S9 noise and you can't
> get rid of it.
>
> Duffy
>
> "Jim Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
> news:98434152.45867878@pavillage.net...
> > On Tue, 19 Aug 2003 14:47:06 -0000, David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
wrote:
> > >
> > > "Jim Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
> > > news:98434152.65867878@pavillage.net...
> > > > The claim that BPL will seriously and negatively impact amateur
radio
> > > > is simply fear, uncertainty, and doubt (FUD) spread by the ARRL.
That
> > > > organization needs to justify its existence, and the BPL issue is a
> > > > convenient way for it to show its activism. The ARRL has apparently
> > > > followed the path of other self-justifying organizations such as NOW
> > > > and the NAACP.
> > > >
> > > > Unfortunately, the technically unsophisticated do not recognize the
> > > > difference between coherent and non-coherent noise, and this makes
it

> > > > easy for the ARRL to spread its FUD. But the fact is that, if BPL
> > > > signals are heard at all, they are coherent (have a predictable
phase
> > > > and amplitude) and therefore can be completely removed at the
> > > >
> > > if they are predictable then they must be constant, if they are
constant
> > > then they can't carry data, doesn't make much sense to me.
> > >
> > You clearly haven't become acquainted with the mathematical definition
> > of "coherent," which doesn't demaind a constant signal at all. What
> > it DOES demand is either a sharply peaked or a periodic
> > autocorrelation function -- properties which enable engineers to come
> > up with predictive filters.
> > >
> > > > receiver. This can be done in many ways, most of which amount to
> > > > nulling the BPL signals by introducing an identical signal which is
> > > > 180 degrees out of phase with the original. As a matter of fact,
most
> > > >
> > > now, just where do you propose getting this out of phase signal?
true,
> > > there are devices out there now that can do this, but they are fussy
and
> > > must be constantly adjusted as you change frequency or switch
antennas.
> and
> > > they also have problems with overloading and distortion.
> > > >
> > > > current HF transceivers have what they call a "noise reduction"
option
> > > > already built into them which uses the nulling method to accomplish
> > > > its goal. Therefore, many amateurs and SWLers already have the
needed
> > > >
> > > sorry, not with this type of signal. the common noise reduction
> processors
> > >
> > Sorry, but that's not right. The Icom 746PRO for example, has two
> > noise reduction functions, one of which samples slightly out-of-band
> > signals to come up with a time-varying estimate of the values to be
> > subtracted from the in-band signals. There is no need for the signal
> > to be constant with respect to time. The second noise reduction
> > function is directed at impulse noise and is a traditional noise
> > blanker.
> > >
> > In any case, you are missing the main point of the original post, and
> > that was that the ARRL FUD conveniently ignores the coherent nature of
> > BPL leakage signals -- a property which makes them far less formidable
> > than the ARRL articles would lead you to believe.

>
>

1732. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 01:47:50 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308201747.3ea252f3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75096

brianburke@juno.com (
> > > > Hammer>>>>>nail = NO MISS
> > >
> > > Sounds like a big blood blister to me.
> >
> > You *do* often act like one.
>
> You just want me under your thumb.

As always, you're out in left field dangling. *I* don't want you at all, anywhere, under any circumstances. You're so clueless you'd be dangerous to be around.

1733. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 01:58:48 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308201758.3f381cb1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75097

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308191350.26a4101e@posting.google.com>...
> dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308181910.3e87545d@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote
> > >
> > > As for eHam, I'm sorry but I've never heard of them.
>
> >
> > Well,well... Who was that satirest who used to write a column
> > entitled "Pardon, your slip is showing"?
>
> Never heard of him, either.
>
> > I just read in another venue, this from a OT ham who was first
> > licensed morehan a half-century ago..
> > ---------
> > "review on eHam.net, a ham radio grand central station which I
> > financially support, although that is optional.."
> > ---------
>
> I thought QRZ and AC6V were the Grand Central Station and Yankee
> Stadium of amateur radio.
>
> > So we can easily see why it is you "never heard of it". You've been
> > sorta distracted for the past couple decades, what with dodging all
> > those hoops and such.
>
> Poor little DICK, still requiring other people to accept his version
> of life.

Brian:
There's 'life', then there's your perception of life. Most readers here know
too well that the two are not congruent.

Perhaps there's still time for you to learn the difference.

1734. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 02:03:05 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030820220305.21761.00000283@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 75098

From: "Derek" danda95@hotmail.com

>The Amateur's Code
>The Radio Amateur is
>CONSIDERATE
>LOYAL
>PROGRESSIVE
>FRIENDLY
>BALANCED
>PATRIOTIC

Is this in the FCC regulations? If not, it is just a recommendation and therefore has no valid basis to be followed, or to be identified as "The Amateur's Code".

1735. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 02:29:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F442ED3.6070002@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75099

Vshah101 wrote:
> From: "Derek" danda95@hotmail.com
>
>
>>The Amateur's Code
>>The Radio Amateur is
>>CONSIDERATE
>>LOYAL
>>PROGRESSIVE
>>FRIENDLY
>>BALANCED
>>PATRIOTIC
>
>
> Is this in the FCC regulations? If not, it is just a recommendation and
> therefore has no valid basis to be followed, or to be identified as "The
> Amateur's Code".

I though it was in the rules somewhere..... ;^P

- Mike KB3EIA -

1736. Re: Another Challenge to Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 02:58:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030820225823.02537.00000113@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75154

In article <3f43b84c$1_8@127.0.0.1>, "Kevin Muenzler" <wb5rue@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>So does that mean that since my call is WB5RUE I should have to prove that I
>am built like a road?
>
>For those of you who missed that, "Rue" is the French word for road.
>
>Kevin, WB5RUE

Kevin:

Not at all.

Kim came into this newsgroup sporting her inane, suggestive call sign,
which is demeaning to all YL hams and gives a negative image to them,
and expected all of us to love it, and her, for being so clever. She even
went so far as to E-mail to Riley Hollingsworth in an attempt to get him
to endorse it. All she got for her trouble is a warning that it has the
potential to take the ARS "...one step closer to extinction." Ever since
then, all she's done as far as participation in this newsgroup is throw
one-liner agreements with the NCTA's, plus long quotes of what others
have said with a "ROFLMAO" as her only commentary, and called it
good. Whenever I call her on the carpet for it, all she can do is make
a feeble attempt to throw insults. Your callsign is perfectly OK; hers
is an absurdity.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1737. Re: Another Challenge to Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 02:58:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030820225824.02537.00000114@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75152

In article <bhuq0k$nb8@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> Ok, Kim, that's easy. Please provide a logical, rational, and convincing
>> argument justifying your call sign, giving proof that it is not demeaning
>> to women, and that it cannot possibly give a negative image of amateur
>> radio operators to the general public, including adults who are concerned
>> about the exposure of young children, particularly young boys, to things
>> which tend to create negative sexual stereotypes.
>>
>> I hope this is "intelligent" enough for you. Quite frankly, I don't think
>you
>> can handle it. Prove me wrong, if you can.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>I got one for you, Larry. Here we go: the next time I see something logical
>and intellectual from you, I'll respond, OK?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

You haven't responded to anything ANYONE has said that is "logical and
intellectual," so why should you start now? You'll just do what you always
do, such as with my "challenge" offered in this thread. You'll simply
dismiss it, without making an effort to take it seriously. No, AFAIC, there
is never going to be a "next time" as far as YOU'RE concerned. You
cannot handle me, and you know it; therefore, you simply run home to
Momma whenever the going gets rough. Care to prove me wrong?
Respond to my challenge. It's as simple as that.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1738. Re: Another Challenge to Kim

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 02:58:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030820225825.02537.00000115@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75155

In article <bhupre$b9n@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> Ok, Kim, that's easy. Please provide a logical, rational, and convincing
>> argument justifying your call sign, giving proof that it is not demeaning
>> to women, and that it cannot possibly give a negative image of amateur
>> radio operators to the general public, including adults who are concerned
>> about the exposure of young children, particularly young boys, to things
>> which tend to create negative sexual stereotypes.
>>
>
>You are too wrapped up in disliking my callsign, Larry. It is not for me to
>prove anything about it to you. I like it and that is as logical as it can
>get.
>
>>
>> I hope this is "intelligent" enough for you. Quite frankly, I don't think
>>you can handle it. Prove me wrong, if you can.

Kim:

Well, since you didn't accept my challenge, I guess I was right about
you, again (as usual)!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1739. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 02:58:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030820225825.02537.00000116@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75157

In article <1RR0b.515$5U2.350423@newsfep1-win.server.ntli.net>, "Derek"
<danda95@hotmail.com> writes:

>
>This was taken off the ARRL website its a pity some don't read it instead of
>slagging of others
>
>this is a copy of a reply I got from another post
>Gee, I guess "Derek" has a point! I was a CB'er for a whole six months --
>and that was seven years before I became a ham! However, "Derek,"
>I'm not going away! You're going to have to deal with me and those like
>me from now on! So don't get any ideas about being "equal" to your
>20 WPM code tested, Extra-class SUPERIORS!!!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>This is way too easy...
>
>Larry read the lines LOYAL and FRIENDLY obviously the American code is a
>Load of B**L***S to you

Derek:

No, it's just that YOU are! BTW, this is Usenet, NOT Amateur Radio.
Amateur Radio is something that's done over the air, not over the
internet. The Radio Amateur's Code doesn't apply here. Here in rrap,
if you behave like a whining, complaining little child, you'll get clobbered
right between the eyes. On the air, all I'd do is simply QSY. You seem
to be sorely lacking in situational awareness.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1740. Re: Whats up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 02:58:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030820225826.02537.00000117@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75100

In article <yxR0b.3232$sV.1949@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>Can anyone see this?
>
>Dan/W4NTI

I don't know -- are they supposed to?

73 de Larry, K3LT

1741. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 02:58:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030820225826.02537.00000118@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75156

In article <BB688D4E.24856%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>I strongly suspect anything they said to you or about you can't >possibly compare to the negative garbage you've posted in this newsgroup >about today's newcomers.

Dwight:

Oh, you mean the TRUTH? Sorry if it's so inconvenient for you!

> At this point, newcomers aren't asking to be welcomed with open arms - >that appears to be far too much to ask in this community. Instead, we're >simply asking you to tone down the hateful rhetoric.

I see. Now telling the truth about the dumbed-down, technically-disinclined, skills-challenged individuals now being attracted to ham radio is considered to be "hateful rhetoric." Typical liberal response. Yawn! Nothing new here!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1742. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 02:58:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030820225827.02537.00000119@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75151

In article <bhupui$blg@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:

>> >I wonder if you realize how incessant your whining is...
>> >
>> >Kim W5TIT
>>
>> As usual, Kim, you stole the words right out from under my fingertips!
>> What I'd like to know is, when are you going to even make an attempt
>> to come up with an original thought?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>So. You realize how incessant your whining is. And you still do it. Well,
>so much for wasting time.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

This is way too easy. Every time I make a point about you, you go ahead and provide the proof! Of course, Dwight isn't much of a challenge, either. Yawn!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1743. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 02:58:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030820225828.02537.00000120@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75153

In article <BB6883A7.24852%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

> I don't know if Larry thinks he's being funny or if he really believes the >hatred he spews. Whatever the case, I'm getting real darn tired of it. If he >continues with ridicule that includes me as a target, I'm not going to >continue to sit back and say nothing.

Dwight:

By all means, feel free to say something about it. We're waiting...
>
> If the majority of respondents in this newsgroup side with him, making him >the de facto spokesperson for ham radio and the higher license classes, then >perhaps this isn't an activity I wish to continue participating in.

Hey, don't let the door hit you in the ass on your way out!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1744. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 02:58:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030820225829.02537.00000121@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75158

In article <bhvctp$27v@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>Oh goodness, Dwight! That's a lot said right there. BUT, it's *in spite
>of* the likes of Larry that I like being in the hobby/service of ham radio.
>And, believe me, Larry really believes what he is saying. He's a desperate,
>lonely, little man--and his delusions are all he's got.
>
>Oh, and by the way. Look real close at who is actually communicating with
>him on an intellectual level. Nada. Zip.

Kim:

I'm sorry, dear. I didn't know that you thought that your one-liners
showing sucking-up agreement, and your "ROFLMAO's" constituted
"communicating on an intellectual level." I guess I'll have to view
these in a different light, or at least one which matches my expectations
of today's dumbed-down hams such as yourself!

>There are people in this
>newsgroup who get communicated with, and there are people in this newsgroup
>who get communicated to. Larry is in the latter.

And the sad part is folks, Kim actually believes this! Well, it probably
makes her feel good about herself for a few minutes, so let's just let
her have her little fantasy!

>For all the times I've
>pissed people off, across the board, there are still times when threads have
>been maintained for a good length of time that involved intellectual debate.
>Same for you. Same for any of us "antagonizers" as we are affectionately
>called.

That's right. Kim is loved and respected in this NG, and I'm not! Make
sure you got that clear, Dwight! After all, being loved and respected in
this NG means something to Kim!

>But, not for Larry, not for a couple of others. Larry isn't "spewing"
>anything that sticks; his kind of logic and reasoning are quite in the
>minority in ham radio.

And Kim is in solid agreement with whatever she considers to be the
"majority." That way, she doesn't have to take the heat for taking any
kind of unpopular stand on anything. And from what I've seen of Kim's
abilities in this NG, I think that's the way she should go.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1745. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 03:32:20 UTC
From: Derek <danda95@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <z6X0b.1514$tS2.1603172@newsfep2-win.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75159

These are Amateurs askinging questions Larry about Amateur Radio
I would not talk to you on the air Larry because you are nothing but a
F**cking bighead arsehole

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030820225825.02537.00000116@mb-m23.aol.com...
> In article <1RR0b.515$5U2.350423@newsfep1-win.server.ntli.net>, "Derek"
> <danda95@hotmail.com> writes:
>
> >
> >This was taken off the ARRL website its a pity some don't read it instead
of
> >slagging of others
> >
> >this is a copy of a reply I got from another post
> >Gee, I guess "Derek" has a point! I was a CB'er for a whole six
months --
> >and that was seven years before I became a ham! However, "Derek,"
> >I'm not going away! You're going to have to deal with me and those like
> >me from now on! So don't get any ideas about being "equal" to your
> >20 WPM code tested, Extra-class SUPERIORS!!!
> >
> >73 de Larry, K3LT
> >This is way too easy...
> >
> >Larry read the lines LOYAL and FRIENDLY obviously the American code
is a
> >Load of B**L***S to you
>
> Derek:
>
> No, it's just that YOU are! BTW, this is Usenet, NOT Amateur Radio.
> Amateur Radio is something that's done over the air, not over the
> internet. The Radio Amateur's Code doesn't apply here. Here in rrap,
> if you behave like a whining, complaining little child, you'll get
clobbered
> right between the eyes. On the air, all I'd do is simply QSY. You seem
> to be sorely lacking in situational awareness.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

1746. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 03:43:53 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F443FF8.905@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75160

Derek wrote:

>These are Amateurs asking questions Larry about Amateur Radio
>I would not talk to you on the air Larry because you are nothing but a
>F**cking bighead arsehole
>
>
Larry doesn't operate phone anyway.... :-)

1747. Re: Whats up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 03:49:57 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F444163.3080302@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75161

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>Can anyone see this?
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>
>
Got some QSB here....

1748. Re: The stuff of FUD

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 04:06:15 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308202006.1ee7388e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75162
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

"David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:<O-6dnUQuzrfx496iU-KYgw@crocker.com>...
> "Agent Smith" <th@t.other.george.sucks.com> wrote in message
> news:3ff6666b.4278809718@feadnread...
> > On 19 Aug 2003 19:55:22 -0700, Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > I'm familiar with Emmaus and drove around the borough today looking
> > > for the stuff with my TS-50 but struck out. Kindly cite an
> > > intersection where the stuff is in use, I'll try again. Also
> > > characterize the signal if you can/will.
> > >
> > Such 'powerful' interference that even someone who knows where it
> > is supposed to be can't find it? <g>
> > >
> > Sounds like the stuff of FUD to me. <g>
>
> ah, but all he knows is that it is supposed to be in town somewhere. these
> tests may only cover a mile or two along one road. and as k1rfi found they
> aren't always on... and then again, could they have thrown in a placebo??? a
> claimed test area where they really didn't put it in just to see how many
> complaints they get?

Turns out I did locate it on my first pass but was not sure what BPL
sounded like so I kept sniffing around the town yesterday. It's only
in a specfic area in the town so I restricted my listening today to
that area once Carl alerted me to the details offline. What I heard
today can't possibly be the "fullbore" BPL others have described.
They're definitely playing with it.

w3rv

1749. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 04:17:08 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB69C070.2493C%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75163

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> I hope you mean "the attitude of *some* current
> operators...."

The attitudes of all operators, good or bad, are factors to some extent. However, one person with a bad attitude can often overwhelm several with more positive attitudes.

> I don't know about that. Around here, and
> everywhere else I've lived since becoming a ham
> 36 years ago, newcomers of all ages, sizes,
> genders, ethnicities, etc., are welcomed and
> encouraged, as a general rule.
>
> Yes, there are a few sourpusses with negative
> addytoods. They've been around forever. I can recall
> comments that Novices were "not real hams" and that
> my homebrew CW rigs were "not real radios", etc.,
> etc., ad infinitum. Ol' W2OY was well known for his
> misanthropic "no kids, no lids, no space cadets"
> tirades. Oddly enough, most of those folks are not
> hams anymore, but I am. bwaahaahaa....

Probably all true, but the overall nastiness seems to have increased dramatically (perhaps due to the internet, but there nonetheless).

> If you look for and listen to the naysayers and
> sourpusses, it just encourages them.

I wish it was that easy. For example, I've tried hard to ignore Larry's messages. However, since he posts so much, he is almost impossible to ignore. Even if I ignore the messages he posts, I endlessly run into replies to his messages. In the end, the only clear way to completely get away from his nonsense is to leave this newsgroup (an occasional break from this newsgroup is probably not a bad idea anyway).

> True - but consider also the attitudes expressed
> by a very few newcomers towards experienced
> amateurs. (snip)

Most often posted after a run in with Larry or his ilk. My message to Larry was obviously filled with anger, which is not my normal response to even the most outrageous messages in this newsgroup. But, after enough of his garbage, it took that just to let off some steam.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1750. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 04:49:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030821004920.12117.00000211@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 75165

>In the end, the only clear way to completely get away from
>his nonsense is to leave this newsgroup (an occasional break from this
>newsgroup is probably not a bad idea anyway).
>

Good, your leaving, might I suggest you go back to cb.rec. At least there you
will be able to talk to your kind of people.

1751. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 04:57:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB69C9E5.2493E%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75166

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:

> I see. Now telling the truth about the
> dumbed-down, technically-disinclined,
> skills-challenged individuals now being
> attracted to ham radio is considered to
> be "hateful rhetoric." Typical liberal
> response. Yawn! Nothing new here!

Larry, you really need to get off the "liberal" nonsense. Your attitudes about code are more liberal than most and your attitudes towards others are more akin to that of the deep woods redneck than that of a conservative.

Your desire for government protection of code testing to maintain your delusions of status is not unlike the liberal seeking protection for welfare state-like government benefits for other situations.

And, if you don't know what a deep woods redneck is (a deep woods redneck is not the typical redneck), and how their attitudes are similar to yours, watch the movie "Deliverance."

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1752. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 05:21:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB69CF81.24940%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75167

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" wrote:

> (snip) Furthermore, it is the "no code"
> crowd (really only two or three people)
> who keep making "code testing" debates
> out of EVERY subject brought to this
> forum.
>
> For example, NO ONE who is "pro code"
> made an issue of the code at all. We
> simply (and so far accurately) pointed
> out the rantings of a few.

Steve, you obviously didn't notice that the people Larry nominated are those he most often targets with his code debate ramblings. By mentioning those people here, his ultimate goal was to bring that debate here. After all, the main reason he disagrees with those people, hence his nomination here, is their opposition to his position on code. Therefore, any response to his nomination of those people had to include something about the code debate.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1753. Re: N8WWM, rain reported again.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 05:23:54 UTC
From: sideband <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net>
Message-ID: <KHY0b.28451$Vx2.13031489@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75168
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Where exactly in Michigan? It's a large state, looking at it from a 2M perspective....

Oh, by the way, I just found out that in the 1830's, a war.. that's right.. a war was fought between Ohio and Michigan over possession of Toledo.

Michigan won.

-SSB

Pirate Operators of RRCB UNITE! NOW! wrote:

> gw@webhideout.com (gw) wrote in message
>
>>well the point is , is that if this continues to go the way it
>>is.......the hamsters are going to be faced with a large segment of cb
>>types who behave like cb types on the ham bands.........and to a large
>>extent this is already going on.....but they have only themselves to
>>blame
>
>
>
> Got that right. if your in Michigan, tune to 147.140 N8KD Repeater
> (The SMART Repeater) and you'll hear all the Extra Class and No-Code
> Tech CB'ers you ever want to hear... Best to listen during morning and
> evening drive times.
>
> Pure LIDVille Man..
>
> -Me

1754. Re: N8WWM, rain reported again.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 05:26:01 UTC
From: sideband <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net>
Message-ID: <JJY0b.28453$Vx2.13032350@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75169
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Keith:

Tried to raise ya on your local machine there when I was picking up at
Campbells early last week.. Guess you been busy. BTW, that truckstop
off 6/20... Sheesh.. used to be a really nice place.

-SSB

Keith Hosman wrote:

>
> Huh, I've been too busy with work to even fire up any of the radios other
> than sometimes the ARES traffic nets and SKYWARN. The SKYWARN net takes
> place on one of his old haunts the .375 machine which is the one mentioned
> the last time he was on the RAIN report.
>
> 73 de Keith
>
> p.s. I see that you had some flooding out your way hope your place made it
> ok. We had a tornado touch down here this afternoon plus 3 other sightings
> which did not touch down. Going to be a busy evening :/
> --
> --
> KC8TCQ
>
> "No matter where you go, There you are"
>
>

1755. 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 05:51:16 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030821015116.12265.00000257@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 75170

The 30 Steps below will help all New Hams, it will also help you to find others just like yourself. These 30 steps should also be added to the present writtens.

Step One: Use as many "Q" signals as possible. Yes, I know they were invented solely for CW and are totally inappropriate for two meter FM, but they are fun and entertaining. They keep people guessing as to what you really meant. I.E. "I'm going to QSY to the phone." Can you really change frequencies to the phone? QSL used to mean, "I am acknowledging receipt", but now it appears to mean, "yes" or "OK". I guess I missed it when the ARRL changed the meaning. It is also best to use "OK" and "QSL" together. Redundancy is the better part of Lid-dom.
Step Two: Never laugh when you can say "HI HI". No one will ever know you aren't a long time CW rag-chewer if you don't tell them. They'll think you've been on since the days of Marconi.

Step Three: Utilize an alternative vocabulary. Use words like "destinated" and "negatory". It's OK to make up your own words here. I.E. "Yeah Tom, I "pheelbart zaphonix" occasionally myself."

Step Four: Always say "XX4XXX" (Insert your own call) "for I.D." As mentioned in Step One, anything that creates redundancy is always encouraged. That's why we have the Department of Redundancy Department. (Please note that you can follow your call with "for identification purposes" instead of "for I.D." While taking longer to say, it is worth more "LID points".

Step Five: The better the copy on two meter FM, the more you should use phonetics. Names should be especially used if they are short or common ones. I.E. "My name is Al... Alpha Lima" or "Jack.. Juliet Alpha Charlie Kilo." If at all possible use the less common HF phonetics "A4SM... America, Number Four, Sugar Mexico." And for maximum "LID points", make up unintelligible phonetics. "My name is Bob... Billibong Oregano Bumperpool."

Step Six: Always give the calls of yourself and everyone who is (or has been) in the group, whether they are still there or not. While this has been unnecessary for years, it is still a great memory test. You may also use "and the group" if you are an "old timer" or just have a bad memory. Extra points for saying everyone's call and then clearing in a silly way "K2PKK, Chow, Chow."

Step Seven: Whenever possible, use the wrong terminology. It keeps people guessing. Use "modulation" when you mean "deviation", and vice-versa.

Step Eight: If someone asks for a break, always finish your turn, taking as long as possible before turning it over. Whenever possible, pass it around a few times first. This will discourage the breaker, and if it is an emergency,

encourage him to switch to another repeater and not bother you.

Step Nine: Always ask involved questions of the person who is trying to sign out. Never let him get by with just a "yes" or "no" answer. Make it a question that will take him a long time to answer.

Step Ten: The less you know on a subject, the more you should speculate about it in the roundtable. Also the amount of time you spend on the subject should be inversely proportionate to your knowledge of the subject even though you have no damn clue.

Step Eleven: Always make sure you try to communicate with only a handheld and a rubber duck antenna. Also, make sure you work through a repeater that you can hear very well, but it cannot hear you. This will put out a kind of "LID mating call": "Well, Joe, I can hear the repeater just fine here. I wonder why it can't hear me?" You will score maximum LID points if you are mobile, and with the radio lying in the passenger seat.

Step Twelve: If you hear two amateurs start a conversation, wait until they are twenty seconds into their contact, and then break in to make a call, or better yet to use the auto-patch. Make sure you keep the repeater tied up for at least three minutes. This way, once the two have re-established contact, they won't even remember what they were talking about.

Step Thirteen: You hear someone on the repeater giving directions to a visiting amateur. Even if the directions are good, make sure you break in with your own "alternate route but better way to get there" version. This is most effective with several other "would-be LIDs", each giving a different route. By the time the visiting amateur unscrambles all the street names whizzing by in his mind, he should have moved out of the range of the repeater. This keeps you from having to stick around to help the guy get back out of town, later.

Step Fourteen: If an annoying station is bothering you, make sure your other "LID" buddies have a "coded" frequency list. Even though "CODES" are strictly forbidden on Amateur Radio, it's really neat to practice "James Bond" tactics.

Step Fifteen: Always use the National Calling Frequency for general conversations. The more uninteresting, the longer you should use it. Extra points are awarded if you have recently move from an adjacent frequency for no reason. Make sure when DX is "rolling" in on 52.525 that you hang out there and talk to your friends five miles down the road about the good old CB days!

Step Sixteen: Make sure that if you have a personal problem with someone, you should voice your opinion in a public forum, especially a net. Make sure you give their name, call, and any other identifying remarks. For maximum points, make sure the person in question is not on the repeater, or not available.

Step Seventeen: Make sure you say the first few words of each transmission twice, especially if it is the same thing each time. Like "roger, roger" or "fine business, fine business". I cannot stress enough about encouraging redundancy.

Step Eighteen: If you hear a conversation on a local repeater, break in and ask how each station is receiving you. Of course they will only see the signal of the repeater you are using, but it's that magic moment when you can find a fellow "LID", and get the report. Extra points are awarded if you are using a base station, and the repeater is less than twenty-five air miles from you.

Step Nineteen: Use the repeater for an hour or two at a time, preventing others from using it. Better yet, do it on a daily basis. Your quest is to make people so sick of hearing your voice every time they turn on their radio, they'll move to another frequency. This way you'll lighten the load on the repeater, leaving even more time for you to talk on it.

Step Twenty: See just how much flutter you can generate by operating at handheld power levels too far away from the repeater. Engage people in conversations when you know they wont be able to copy half of what your saying. Even when they say your uncopyable, continue to string them along by making further transmissions. See just how frustrated you can make the other amateur before he finally signs off in disgust.

Step Twenty One: Use lots of radio jargon. After all, it makes you feel important using words ordinary people don't say. Who cares if it makes you sound like you just fell off Channel 19 on the citizen's Band? Use phrases such as "Roger on that", "10-4", "I'm on the side", "Your making the trip" and "Negatory on that".

Step Twenty Two: Use excessive microphone gain. See just how loud you can make your audio. Make sure the audio gain is so high that other amateurs can hear any bugs crawling on your floor. If mobile, make sure the wind noise is loud enough that others have to strain to pick your words out from all the racket.

Step Twenty Three: Start every transmission with the word "Roger" or "QSL". Sure, you don't need to acknowledge that you received the other transmission in full. After all, you would simply ask for a repeat if you missed something. But consider it your gift to the other amateur to give him solace every few seconds that his transmissions are being received.

Step Twenty Four: When looking for a contact on a repeater, always say your "listening" or "monitoring" multiple times. I've always found that at least a half dozen times or so is good. Repeating your multiple "listening" ID's every 10 to 15 seconds is even better. Those people who didn't want to talk to you will eventually call you, hoping you'll go away after you have finally made a contact.

Step Twenty Five: Always use a repeater, even if you can work the other station easily on simplex ... especially if you can make the contact on simplex. The coverage of the repeater you use should be inversely proportional to your distance from the other station.

Step Twenty Six: When on repeaters using courtesy tones, you should always say "over". Courtesy tones are designed to let everyone know when you have unkeyed but don't let that stop you. Say "over", "back to you" or "go ahead". It serves no useful purpose but don't worry, it's still fun!

Step Twenty Seven: Use the repeater's autopatch for frivolous routine calls... especially during morning or evening commute times. While pulling into the neighborhood, call home to let them know you'll be there in two minutes.... or, call your spouse to complain about the bad day you had at work. After all, the club has "measured rate" service on their phone line so they get charged for each autopatch call. Your endeavor is to make so many patches in a year that you cost the club at least $20 in phone bills. That way you'll feel you got your money's worth for your dues!

Step Twenty Eight: Never say "My name is ....." It makes you sound human. If at all possible, use one of the following phrases: a) "The personal here is ..." b) "The handle here is..."

Step Twenty Nine: Use "73" and "88" incorrectly. Both are already considered plural, but add a "s" to the end anyway. Say "73's" or "88's". Who cares if it means "best regards" and "love and kisses." Better yet, say "seventy thirds"! (By the way, seventy thirds equals about 23.3).

Step Thirty: If the repeater is off the air for service, complain about the fact that it was off the air as soon as it's turned back on. Act as though your entire day has been ruined because the repeater wasn't available when you wanted to use it. Even thought you have never paid a penny to help out with the upkeep of it.

1756. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 05:56:59 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030821015659.00545.00000125@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 75172

In article <3F437E6F.7070101@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> Hard to imagine having an element 2, 3, and 4, but no
>element 1.

Not really!

Back before restructuring, we had the following elements (IIRC):

1A - 5 wpm code
1B - 13 wpm code
1C - 20 wpm code
2 - Novice written
3A - Tech written
3B - General written
4A - Advanced written
4B - Extra written

Before March 21, 1987, the Tech and General used the same written, called Element 3. When they split that into two separate tests, the names were changed to 3A and 3B. A similar split took place back in 1967 when the Extra written (Element 4) was split into Advanced and Extra.

Etc.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1757. Re: The stuff of FUD

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 05:57:00 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030821015700.00545.00000126@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 75171

In article <SUP0b.578$6e5.77672@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>The fact that the deployment is limited makes it hard(er) to find if
>you don't know where to look ... and lots of the wiring in that area
>is underground, which makes it sort of a "best case scenario" ... with
>more overhead wiring, it would be a lot worse (though it's awful in
>the deployment area as it is ...)

Indeed! Even if the underground wiring doesn't radiate much, each house's
wiring will.

It's also possible that the test areas are not running 24/7.
>
>Listen to Ed Hare's video on the ARRL website ...

I did. It's scary. Even with a little antenna it's S9+ noise all over the place
- from ONE site.

>If the trash you hear on the video for Test Area #3 (Emmaus) doesn't
>bother you - especially considering it's a "best case" sort of situation
>with a limited deployment - then you obviously don't give a damn about
>amateur radio.
>
WELL SAID!

IIRC, the test sites meet current Part 15 levels. And the BPL folks want those
levels RAISED because the current levels require too many repeaters.

One major reason aerial lines are so lossy at RF is that they radiate! How
about that!

--

The whole BPL thing is kinda like an industry saying they want to build a new
plant that will spew out large amounts of avoidable pollution - while their
competitors are not allowed to. The industry says they're not going to put
pollution controls on their plant. Instead, they say, if the dirty air bothers
anyone, those who are bothered should simply wear a gas mask.

My comments and reply comments are filed - how about YOU?

73 de Jim, N2EY

1758. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 10:16:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308210216.66eb92e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75173

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308200427.7abb82c5@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308191415.13ca05e2@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308190430.2d0fdbde@posting.google.com>...
> > > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308182146.31736474@posting.google.com>...
> > > > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4125A2.8070100@psu.edu>...
>
> > > Well...You KNOW who I nominate:
> > >
> > > For his pages long recitings of his CV...
> > >
> > > For his frequent retelling of how he "worked DX" in a 1950's-era
> > > Army radio station...
> >
> > What would you call long distance communications?
>
> Closed circuit communications. "Working DX" is an Amateur term,

No, it isn't. It has application is other radio services, used as Len
described.

> applied to Amateur practice, involving radio communication between
> Amateur Radio stations. His Army nets worked specific stations on
> specific frequencies at specific times with overwhelming power and
> resources. An idiot could complete a contact with that much
> power...Ooooops...an idiot DID complete those contacts...forgive me...

Now you're calling DoD communications idiotic? You really don't like
the military much, do you?

Why would you want Army communications to get through only some of the
time?

Have you never heard of "Peace through superior firepower?"

> > > For his frequent demeaning of not only individual Amateurs, but
> > > of the Amateur Service as a whole...
> >
> > I'm an individual amateur and a member of the ARS as a whole. I don't
> > "feel" demeaned. There is some truth in Len's observation of the ARS.
> > Accept it.
>
> There's very LITTLE truth.

There's more there than you want to admit.

> And you're one of those who, just like Lennie, demonstrate a very
> poor understanding of those same Amateur practices, so I am very
> UNIMPRESSED about how you feel about his sleights.

You are singularly unimpressive.

> > > For his frequent attempts to associate himself with Soldiers who
> > > died in combat for the purpose of improving his own "reputation"...
> >
> > If you served, you are associated with soldiers who died in combat.
> > That's just the way it is, and no amaount of running away from it will
> > disassociate you from them. Yet there are those who never served and
> > claim "military experience." That is disgusting.
>
> Many of my fellow Marines have fallen in combat. That is true. I
> honor them and wish they never had to be called upon to make that
> sacrifice, but they did.

And I would assume that some have fallen since your departure as well.

> UNLIKE Lennie, however, I have never tried to link myself to
> those Marines (or any other servicemember, for that matter) in such a
> way as to insinuate that I was somehow part and parcel of that
> sacrifice for my own benefit or "reputation".
>
> THAT is disgusting.

Why do you continually distance yourself from your military heritage?

> BTW, other than Mark Morgan, to WHOM do you refer as "never
> served"...The nature of just about everyone's (regulars, that is...)
> military or government service here is well documented.

Brian Kelly/W3RV.

> > > For countless lies, mistruths (especially that one about "get my
> > > Extra Lite out of the box...) and use of profanity and insults...
> >
> > We have all desired things which we have not achieved.
>
> Ahhhhhh....too true. But then none of us here have "not
> achieved" anything for which we were so otherwise eminently qualified,
> now have we...?!?! Of if anyone has, they are not making an issue of
> it!

Point.

> > > The envelope pleeeeeeease! (drom roll ensuses....)
> > >
> > > Leonard H. "Lennie the Liar" Anderson!
> > >
> > > Respectfully submitted,
> >

> > Obviously disrespectfully submitted.
>
> How "obviously"..?!?! Is anything I said untrue...?!?!

Amazingly, everyone has their own version of "the truth." Yet, truth
and disrespect are not the same thing.

> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > At least you didn't start a new thread over it.
>
> Nope...someone else did...But JUST FOR YOU, Brain, I started
> another one with yet another unravelling of your Rear Area War Hero's
> rants...That being how allegedly "unimportant" Amateur Radio is in the
> overall scheme of the radio world.

Congratulations. You are so easy to manipulate.

> Seems he doesn't have the full appreciation of the pulse of the
> radio world as he alledges...Not that any of "us" didn't know already.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

What did he say that was untrue?

1759. Re: Whats up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 10:23:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308210223.14a6e641@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75174

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<yxR0b.3232$sV.1949@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> Can anyone see this?
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Read you Lima Charlie. How you me, over?

1760. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 10:29:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308210229.7d6626eb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75175

dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308201758.3f381cb1@posting.google.com>...

> Brian:
> There's 'life', then there's your perception of life. Most readers here know
> too well that the two are not congruent.
>
> Perhaps there's still time for you to learn the difference.

DICK, I'm talking about you, not "most readers."

1761. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 10:36:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308210236.75544da6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75176

dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308201747.3ea252f3@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (
> > > > > > Hammer>>>>>nail = NO MISS
> > > > >
> > > > > Sounds like a big blood blister to me.
> > > >
> > > You *do* often act like one.
> > >
> > You just want me under your thumb.
>
> As always, you're out in left field dangling. *I* don't want you at all,
> anywhere, under any circumstances.

Yet here you are.

You're so clueless you'd be dangerous
> to be around.

Yet here you are.

You appear to have an unnatural attraction to me.

1762. lloyd Whines

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 12:25:32 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <ce743e125b27809408f8aea3d7a19eb4@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 75177
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

In article <bhqs6o$bk7$0@pita.alt.net>
"Lloyd" <Lloyd@lloydszplace.org> wrote:
>
> Yes, it must be VERY lonely! LOL!!!!

Says the FATASS Lloyd, who at almost 30 years old hasn't gotten his first piece of ass...
lol

1763. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 13:03:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F44C323.20902@psu.edu>
Source record: 75178

WA3IYC wrote:
> In article <3F437E6F.7070101@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>Hard to imagine having an element 2, 3, and 4, but no
>>element 1.
>
>
> Not really!
>
> Back before restructuring, we had the following elements (IIRC):
>
> 1A - 5 wpm code
> 1B - 13 wpm code
> 1C - 20 wpm code
> 2 - Novice written
> 3A - Tech written
> 3B - General written
> 4A - Advanced written
> 4B - Extra written

hmmmm, I don't know about you, but I really like to have the numbers
line up.

> Before March 21, 1987, the Tech and General used the same written, called
> Element 3. When they split that into two separate tests, the names were changed
> to 3A and 3B. A similar split took place back in 1967 when the Extra written
> (Element 4) was split into Advanced and Extra.
>
> Etc.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Where you posting from, Jim?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1764. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 13:19:13 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <lF31b.1178$6e5.90346@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75179

I suspect that when the FCC eliminates "Element 1" they will (editorially)
renumber the elements.

Carl - wk3c

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:3F44C323.20902@psu.edu...
> WA3IYC wrote:
> > In article <3F437E6F.7070101@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
> >
> >
> > >>Hard to imagine having an element 2, 3, and 4, but no
> > >>element 1.
> >
> >
> > > Not really!
> >
> > > Back before restructuring, we had the following elements (IIRC):
> >
> > > 1A - 5 wpm code
> > > 1B - 13 wpm code
> > > 1C - 20 wpm code
> > > 2 - Novice written
> > > 3A - Tech written
> > > 3B - General written
> > > 4A - Advanced written
> > > 4B - Extra written
>
> hmmmm, I don't know about you, but I really like to have the numbers
> line up.
>
> > Before March 21, 1987, the Tech and General used the same written,
called
> > Element 3. When they split that into two separate tests, the names were
changed
> > to 3A and 3B. A similar split took place back in 1967 when the Extra
written
> > (Element 4) was split into Advanced and Extra.
> >
> > Etc.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Where you posting from, Jim?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

>
>

1765. Re: Hey, Stagger!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 13:20:05 UTC
From: lcs Mixmaster Remailer <mix@anon.lcs.mit.edu>
Message-ID: <20030821132005.25621.qmail@nym.alias.net>
Source record: 75180
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

In article
"Nemmind" wrote:
>
>
> Hey, Stagger Lee. If you hear of the wherabouts of Arf Arf, will you have
> him post a note to let us fans know of his whereabouts?
> He used to post quite often to flame_fest but he is nowhere to be found of
> late. Seems to me that way back then the two of you were almost as thick as
> brothers. What happened to Arf?

Yeah, Davey wants to include you in a three way with his lover bertie garcia.

1766. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 13:20:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F44C708.3070109@psu.edu>
Source record: 75181

WA8ULX wrote:
> The 30 Steps below will help all New Hams, it will also help you to find others
> just like yourself. These 30 steps should also be added to the present
> writtens.

<snip>

Where did you get this Bruce? I wouldn't mind posting this on our club webpages.

- Mike KB3EIA

1767. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 13:25:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F44C82D.70006@psu.edu>
Source record: 75182

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> I suspect that when the FCC eliminates "Element 1" they will (editorially)
> renumber the elements.

I sure hope so, Carl! Stuff like that drives me crazy!

yea.. I know.. I'm already there..

- Mike KB3EIA -

1768. Re: Whats up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 14:01:37 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308210601.cca8fa5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75183

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<yxR0b.3232$sV.1949@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> Can anyone see this?
>
> Dan/W4NTI

No copy here OM, it's that BPL stuff again.

w3rv

1769. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 15:11:46 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F44E132.1020204@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 75214

WA8ULX wrote:
> The 30 Steps below will help all New Hams, it will also help you to find others
> just like yourself. These 30 steps should also be added to the present
> writtens.

LOL!! Very good.

1770. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 15:13:46 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F44E1AA.3030103@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 75215

Jim Hampton wrote:
> This actually is quite good and applies to the old timers as well. I have
> one question if anyone remembers back to around 1959. The guy who got me
> *really* interested in amateur radio was Russ, W2ZS. I met him around 1959
> or possibly 1960 and remember him making contacts when I was invited into
> his shack. I do remember folks back when using "the handle here is ...".
> My question is did that start with CB or did CB pick it up from amateurs
> originally? It seems (at least back then) more like the Southern "y'all
> come again real soon". Sort of folksy and warm if grammatically incorrect.

The term "handle" was used by hams long before cber's were ever
allowed to screw up the radio spectrum.

1771. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 15:18:17 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F44E2B9.E91D1B27@ptt.edu>
Source record: 75184

HI HI!!! <VBG>

Really. all hams should see themselves in that, one way or another.
While I'm not as guilty as most, I've done some of those things.

I posted this to a small list. I left your headers intact, except
AOL. Didn't want to embarrass you with that.

1772. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 15:41:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030821114110.21828.00000271@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 75185

>I posted this to a small list. I left your headers intact, except
>AOL. Didn't want to embarrass you with that.

Doesnt bother me, wouldnt embarass me either.

1773. Re: BPL Reply Comments

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 15:46:04 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308210746.58ccf049@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75186

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<cNP0b.576$6e5.77071@nnrp1.ptd.net>...

> For an example of the correct format, or if you're just
> interested in seeing what I filed, you view a .pdf of my
> Reply Comments (filed today) at my personal web
> page.

Carl,

I read yours.

GOOD JOB.

We disagree on many things but if BPL is implemented on a wide scale
those disagreements will all be moot points.

Last time I looked the comment total was approaching 5000.

Maybe it will be enough to convince the FCC that, as you wrote,

"Access BPL is a bad idea".

Thanks

73 de Jim, N2EY

1774. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 19:23:17 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308211123.3a9fd9b2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75187

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308210236.75544da6@posting.google.com>...
> dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308201747.3ea252f3@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (
> > > > > > > Hammer>>>>>nail = NO MISS
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Sounds like a big blood blister to me.
> > > > >
> > > > > You *do* often act like one.
> > > >
> > > > You just want me under your thumb.
> > >
> > As always, you're out in left field dangling. *I* don't want you at all,
> > anywhere, under any circumstances.
>
> Yet here you are.
>
> You're so clueless you'd be dangerous
> > to be around.
>
> Yet here you are.

Nooooo, big guy- YOU'RE there. *I'm* here, many hundreds of fortunate
miles from 'there'. That's **GOOD!!**

>
> You appear to have an unnatural attraction to me.

Ignorance does hold a certain fascination. You're a real headshaker!

1775. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 19:31:46 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308211131.66e895d8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75188

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308210229.7d6626eb@posting.google.com>...
> dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308201758.3f381cb1@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Brian:
> > There's 'life', then there's your perception of life. Most readers here know
> > too well that the two are not congruent.
> >
> > Perhaps there's still time for you to learn the difference.
>
> DICK, I'm talking about you, not "most readers."

As per your usual, you have no idea what you're talking about.

1776. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 19:37:53 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308211137.305e7ab7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75189

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308210219.498c241c@posting.google.com>...
> dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308191658.6c52916b@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Those pointy caps need no further introduction nor accessories.
>
> Apparently, they do. You might want to have QST feature them in an
> article and explain how they are different from ceramic and
> electrolytic caps.

I'll just suggest you as a reference.

1777. Re: Code / No Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 19:45:12 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0308211145.5e6cb236@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75190

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<gFn0b.27165$Vx2.12494241@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> I don't have any strong preference about the Code / No Code issue, but I
> have a well developed opinion about the group of hams who have endlessly
> repeated the same tired flamewar crapola for years on this newsgroup, over
> the Code / No Code issue.
>
> Less than a dozen "hams" have used this issue as an excuse to turn this
> newsgroup into a running flame war that has gone on for years, much to the
> detriment of the hobby. People look at this newsgroup to see what hams are
> like - and what they see would reflect poorly on any hobby.

What a hypocrite.

You have been doing virtually the same crap on
rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc for years... debating endlessly and
meaninglessly... bringing up a need to revive long dead HF-based PBBS
systems, and denouncing any attempts at modernization.

So - what brings you over here? Is it the fact that your ilk has run
everyone off rradm, and that you've got nobody to argue with there
anymore? (they've all moved on to more productive forums and
applications).

You and that kook from Oregon are just as thick-skulled as these
CODE-obsessed fruits... you BELONG here.

- Stewart

1778. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 20:52:15 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <vkac7v7notcu29@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 75191

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in
news:20030821015116.12265.00000257@mb-m20.aol.com:

> The 30 Steps below will help all New Hams, it will also help you to
> find others just like yourself. These 30 steps should also be added to
> the present writtens.

I think they already are!

KB7ADL

1779. Re: WA3MOJ CLAIMS "NEVER SAID I WAS WA3MOJ"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 21:07:18 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030821170718.659$Lh@newsreader.com>
Source record: 75192
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Cool Breeze" <space@c.com> wrote:
> Gee,,KC8LDO Lelnad denies all involvment, then lies to the world about
> his bignet account.
>
Did he tell you that in an email?

--
GO# 40

1780. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 22:20:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <6Bb1b.5518$sV.3307@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75193

These are keepers. Especially like item 19. That one applies to HF as
well.

Beep

Dan/W4NTI

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030821015116.12265.00000257@mb-m20.aol.com...
> The 30 Steps below will help all New Hams, it will also help you to find
others
> just like yourself. These 30 steps should also be added to the present
> writtens.
>
>
> Step One: Use as many "Q" signals as possible. Yes, I know they were
invented
> solely for CW and are totally inappropriate for two meter FM, but they are
fun
> and entertaining. They keep people guessing as to what you really meant.
I.E.
> "I'm going to QSY to the phone." Can you really change frequencies to the
> phone? QSL used to mean, "I am acknowledging receipt", but now it appears
to
> mean, "yes" or "OK". I guess I missed it when the ARRL changed the
meaning. It
> is also best to use "OK" and "QSL" together. Redundancy is the better part
of
> Lid-dom.
> Step Two: Never laugh when you can say "HI HI". No one will ever know you
> aren't a long time CW rag-chewer if you don't tell them. They'll think
you've
> been on since the days of Marconi.
>
> Step Three: Utilize an alternative vocabulary. Use words like "destinated"
and
> "negatory". It's OK to make up your own words here. I.E. "Yeah Tom, I
> "pheelbart zaphonix" occasionally myself."
>
> Step Four: Always say "XX4XXX" (Insert your own call) "for I.D." As
mentioned
> in Step One, anything that creates redundancy is always encouraged. That's
why
> we have the Department of Redundancy Department. (Please note that you can
> follow your call with "for identification purposes" instead of "for I.D."

While
> taking longer to say, it is worth more "LID points".
>
> Step Five: The better the copy on two meter FM, the more you should use
> phonetics. Names should be especially used if they are short or common
ones.
> I.E. "My name is Al... Alpha Lima" or "Jack.. Juliet Alpha Charlie Kilo."
If at
> all possible use the less common HF phonetics "A4SM... America, Number
Four,
> Sugar Mexico." And for maximum "LID points", make up unintelligible
phonetics.
> "My name is Bob... Billibong Oregano Bumperpool."
>
> Step Six: Always give the calls of yourself and everyone who is (or has
been)
> in the group, whether they are still there or not. While this has been
> unnecessary for years, it is still a great memory test. You may also use
"and
> the group" if you are an "old timer" or just have a bad memory. Extra
points
> for saying everyone's call and then clearing in a silly way "K2PKK, Chow,
> Chow."
>
> Step Seven: Whenever possible, use the wrong terminology. It keeps people
> guessing. Use "modulation" when you mean "deviation", and vice-versa.
>
> Step Eight: If someone asks for a break, always finish your turn, taking
as
> long as possible before turning it over. Whenever possible, pass it around
a
> few times first. This will discourage the breaker, and if it is an
emergency,
> encourage him to switch to another repeater and not bother you.
>
> Step Nine: Always ask involved questions of the person who is trying to
sign
> out. Never let him get by with just a "yes" or "no" answer. Make it a
question
> that will take him a long time to answer.
>
> Step Ten: The less you know on a subject, the more you should speculate
about
> it in the roundtable. Also the amount of time you spend on the subject
should
> be inversely proportionate to your knowledge of the subject even though
you
> have no damn clue.
>
> Step Eleven: Always make sure you try to communicate with only a handheld

and a
> rubber duck antenna. Also, make sure you work through a repeater that you
can
> hear very well, but it cannot hear you. This will put out a kind of "LID
mating
> call": "Well, Joe, I can hear the repeater just fine here. I wonder why it
> can't hear me?" You will score maximum LID points if you are mobile, and
with
> the radio lying in the passenger seat.
>
> Step Twelve: If you hear two amateurs start a conversation, wait until
they are
> twenty seconds into their contact, and then break in to make a call, or
better
> yet to use the auto-patch. Make sure you keep the repeater tied up for at
least
> three minutes. This way, once the two have re-established contact, they
won't
> even remember what they were talking about.
>
> Step Thirteen: You hear someone on the repeater giving directions to a
visiting
> amateur. Even if the directions are good, make sure you break in with your
own
> "alternate route but better way to get there" version. This is most
effective
> with several other "would-be LIDs", each giving a different route. By the
time
> the visiting amateur unscrambles all the street names whizzing by in his
mind,
> he should have moved out of the range of the repeater. This keeps you from
> having to stick around to help the guy get back out of town, later.
>
> Step Fourteen: If an annoying station is bothering you, make sure your
other
> "LID" buddies have a "coded" frequency list. Even though "CODES" are
strictly
> forbidden on Amateur Radio, it's really neat to practice "James Bond"
tactics.
>
> Step Fifteen: Always use the National Calling Frequency for general
> conversations. The more uninteresting, the longer you should use it. Extra
> points are awarded if you have recently move from an adjacent frequency
for no
> reason. Make sure when DX is "rolling" in on 52.525 that you hang out
there and
> talk to your friends five miles down the road about the good old CB days!
>
> Step Sixteen: Make sure that if you have a personal problem with someone,
you

> should voice your opinion in a public forum, especially a net. Make sure
you
> give their name, call, and any other identifying remarks. For maximum
points,
> make sure the person in question is not on the repeater, or not available.
>
> Step Seventeen: Make sure you say the first few words of each transmission
> twice, especially if it is the same thing each time. Like "roger, roger"
or
> "fine business, fine business". I cannot stress enough about encouraging
> redundancy.
>
> Step Eighteen: If you hear a conversation on a local repeater, break in
and ask
> how each station is receiving you. Of course they will only see the signal
of
> the repeater you are using, but it's that magic moment when you can find a
> fellow "LID", and get the report. Extra points are awarded if you are
using a
> base station, and the repeater is less than twenty-five air miles from
you.
>
> Step Nineteen: Use the repeater for an hour or two at a time, preventing
others
> from using it. Better yet, do it on a daily basis. Your quest is to make
people
> so sick of hearing your voice every time they turn on their radio, they'll
move
> to another frequency. This way you'll lighten the load on the repeater,
leaving
> even more time for you to talk on it.
>
> Step Twenty: See just how much flutter you can generate by operating at
> handheld power levels too far away from the repeater. Engage people in
> conversations when you know they wont be able to copy half of what your
saying.
> Even when they say your uncopyable, continue to string them along by
making
> further transmissions. See just how frustrated you can make the other
amateur
> before he finally signs off in disgust.
>
> Step Twenty One: Use lots of radio jargon. After all, it makes you feel
> important using words ordinary people don't say. Who cares if it makes you
> sound like you just fell off Channel 19 on the citizen's Band? Use phrases
such
> as "Roger on that", "10-4", "I'm on the side", "Your making the trip" and
> "Negatory on that".
>
> Step Twenty Two: Use excessive microphone gain. See just how loud you can

make
> your audio. Make sure the audio gain is so high that other amateurs can
hear
> any bugs crawling on your floor. If mobile, make sure the wind noise is
loud
> enough that others have to strain to pick your words out from all the
racket.
>
> Step Twenty Three: Start every transmission with the word "Roger" or
"QSL".
> Sure, you don't need to acknowledge that you received the other
transmission in
> full. After all, you would simply ask for a repeat if you missed
something. But
> consider it your gift to the other amateur to give him solace every few
seconds
> that his transmissions are being received.
>
> Step Twenty Four: When looking for a contact on a repeater, always say
your
> "listening" or "monitoring" multiple times. I've always found that at
least a
> half dozen times or so is good. Repeating your multiple "listening" ID's
every
> 10 to 15 seconds is even better. Those people who didn't want to talk to
you
> will eventually call you, hoping you'll go away after you have finally
made a
> contact.
>
> Step Twenty Five: Always use a repeater, even if you can work the other
station
> easily on simplex ... especially if you can make the contact on simplex.
The
> coverage of the repeater you use should be inversely proportional to your
> distance from the other station.
>
> Step Twenty Six: When on repeaters using courtesy tones, you should always
say
> "over". Courtesy tones are designed to let everyone know when you have
unkeyed
> but don't let that stop you. Say "over", "back to you" or "go ahead". It
serves
> no useful purpose but don't worry, it's still fun!
>
> Step Twenty Seven: Use the repeater's autopatch for frivolous routine
calls...
> especially during morning or evening commute times. While pulling into the
> neighborhood, call home to let them know you'll be there in two
minutes.... or,

> call your spouse to complain about the bad day you had at work. After all,
the
> club has "measured rate" service on their phone line so they get charged
for
> each autopatch call. Your endeavor is to make so many patches in a year
that
> you cost the club at least $20 in phone bills. That way you'll feel you
got
> your money's worth for your dues!
>
> Step Twenty Eight: Never say "My name is ....." It makes you sound human.
If at
> all possible, use one of the following phrases: a) "The personal here is
..."
> b) "The handle here is..."
>
> Step Twenty Nine: Use "73" and "88" incorrectly. Both are already
considered
> plural, but add a "s" to the end anyway. Say "73's" or "88's". Who cares
if it
> means "best regards" and "love and kisses." Better yet, say "seventy
thirds"!
> (By the way, seventy thirds equals about 23.3).
>
> Step Thirty: If the repeater is off the air for service, complain about
the
> fact that it was off the air as soon as it's turned back on. Act as though
your
> entire day has been ruined because the repeater wasn't available when you
> wanted to use it. Even thought you have never paid a penny to help out
with the
> upkeep of it.
>

1781. Re: WA3MOJ CLAIMS "NEVER SAID I WAS WA3MOJ"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 22:27:48 UTC
From: Cool Breeze <space@c.com>
Message-ID: <XvmdnZJ3uLjs2tiiU-KYgg@comcast.com>
Source record: 75194
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030821170718.659$Lh@newsreader.com...
> "Cool Breeze" <space@c.com> wrote:
> > Gee,,KC8LDO Lelnad denies all involvment, then lies to the world about
> > his bignet account.
> >
> Did he tell you that in an email?

why you attributing that to me? Twisty made the comment.

1782. Re: AP Article on Hams and NE Power Grid Failure

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 22:28:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <9lb1b.5531$sV.3952@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75195

Good publicity.

Dan/W4NTI

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:bhtt5t02c0a@enews4.newsguy.com...
>
http://story.news.yahoo.com/news?tmpl=story&u=/ap/20030819/ap_on_hi_te/black
out_ham_radio_1
>
> http://tinyurl.com/kiml
>
> HARTFORD, Conn. - When technology failed on a massive scale last week,
some
> old-fashioned broadcasting stepped into the breach as ham radio operators
took
> to the airwaves to reach emergency workers.
>
> --
> The Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
> http://www.kilowatt-radio.org/
> ..it does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an
> irate, tireless minority to set brush fires in people's
> minds. --Samuel Adams

1783. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 22:28:32 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030821182832.21906.00001279@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 75196

>These are keepers. Especially like item 19. That one applies to HF as
>well.
>
>Beep
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Well Dan I figured someone needed to describe the present situation in Ham Radio. Now if the FCC was smart, they would just test the New Guys on the 30 Steps and be done with it.

1784. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 22:50:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <01c1b.5554$sV.2030@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75197
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:2qj3kv4tgvbqatnhjmu9ik1kqq07d7juko@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 18 Aug 2003 18:54:27 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >No my dear sir I am not acting like that idiot. I am simply trying to
state
> >that since this country is at WAR. And those you feel so tender toward
ARE
> >trying to KILL every American they can. THen then are indeed ENEMIES in
a
> >time of WAR. And deserve NO QUARTER, NO TRIAL, perhaps a military
tribunal
> >and then we shoot them.
>
> If they are "enemies in a time of war", then they should be treated as
> Prisoners of War in accordance with the terms of the Geneva
> Convention. Your President has denied that they are Prisoners of War,
> because he is well aware that the terms of the Convention are being
> flagrantly breached.
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

So what Walt? Your type talkes about the 'rights' of the raghead
murderers. How about the rights of the 9 to 5 innocent victim of the
raghead murders?

You dont seem to understand how this country reacted to 9/11. And I think I
know why. Your country and Europe in general is used to being totally
destroyed, or at least nearly, every century or so. Its normal to you. Not
to us. We in the USA actually believed we were safe from that sort of crap.

Well we now know we are not. We have just been rudely awakened into the
real world. Lucky for us we have the means to AVENGE it all.

We are dangerous now. You better believe it. But I think, or should I say,
hope we will not 'overdue' it. But I assure you we will not allow this
terrorism to stand. We will defend ourselves. And if that requires a
'pre-emptive first strike' then it shall be. Keep that in mind. We are not
walking away from this.

Dan/W4NTI

1785. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 22:51:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <W1c1b.5555$sV.4038@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75198
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

He said " the major combat phase of the war is over". I disagree, but who
am I to argue?

Dan/W4NTI

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f41e74b_3@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> I thought that the Bush Baby had said the war was over?
>
> Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:bhrp2fuft1@slb5.atl.mindspring.net...
> > I am simply trying to state
> > that since this country is at WAR.
>
>

1786. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 22:54:25 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <B4c1b.5559$sV.4699@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75199
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

<lucifer@eternal-flames.gov> wrote in message
news:48i3kv0mf939pt6ttb11kinjk45ouf28ee@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 18 Aug 2003 18:59:44 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> pausing to cast envious glances at those
> who had mastered the skill of reading without moving their lips,
> wrote:
>
> >Poor Steve. Feeling sorry for yourselves? Perhaps we could give you
> >Liberia to make you feel better, wat say mate?
>
> Would you be interested in swapping Death Valley for Chippenham?
>

I'm not sure...let me check with the two residents there.

Dan/W4NTI

1787. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 22:58:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <n8c1b.5560$sV.1550@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75200
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Mr. Bernard Shaw was quite correct, you know when he was discussing the
Americans and the Brits.
"The same people, seperated by a common language".

But I love them anyway.

Dan/W4NTI

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bht4jv$2t36o$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Hey Dan,
>
> Maybe that would explain the whole teeth issue over there? :)
>
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> > > What a pity, Steve. We could do with more knowledge about the effects
of
> > > in-breeding.
> > > --
> > > Ged
> >
> > Then I suggest you check with mother England. EH.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
>

1788. Re: Whats up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 23:07:44 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <4hc1b.5571$sV.1701@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75201

Yea Yea Yea.....finally got it sorted out. I'm back as the guy with the knife fingers says.

Dan/W4NTI

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message news:d22b54c3.0308210601.cca8fa5@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:<yxR0b.3232$sV.1949@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > Can anyone see this?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> No copy here OM, it's that BPL stuff again.
>
> w3rv

1789. Re: Yet Another Anti-Amateur Radio "LennieRant" Unravelled.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 23:10:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Ljc1b.5573$sV.3265@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75202

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0308200402.3185848c@posting.google.com...
> Other than the obvious idiocy of Lennie's rants, one need but mark
> time and watch the media to find the REAL truth.
>
> The following items were cited in the September "CQ" magazine in
> the "Public Service" column by Mr. Bob Josuweit, WA3PZO.
>
> On page 25: The topic is the Amateur Radio Spectrum Protection
> Act which is on the Hill for approval.
>
> In sworn testimony before Congress, Mr. Edmond Thomas, the Chief
> Engineer for the FCC's Office of Engineering and Technology stated "I
> must not fail to mention the contributions of amatuer radio operators
> to public safety. The ham radio community has offered invaluable
> service to, and as, first responders in natural disasters, emergency
> situations and other crisis events."
>
> Further testimony was offered by Dr. Norman Jacknis of New York.
> He is the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Information
> Technology of Westchester County, NY: "In the first hours following
> the attack of September 11th 2001, the only way we could coordinatethe
> sharing of firefighting, Medical Examiner (and) health and Information
> resources with New York officials was through the highly trained,
> volunteer amateur radio (ham) operators. This was a result of the
> fact that normal commercial communications services were unavailable.
> There was no other single, common communications medium, except the
> Amateur Radio Service. This irreplaceable resource must be protected
> against incursion by other interests."
>
> Nothing quite like "disinterested parties" (read that
> "non-participants" in the Amteur Radio Service itself) make such
> absolute statements on the public record.
>
> Let's all sit back and watch Dr. Spin Master (Lennie the Lame)
> try and dance the Misdirection Shuffle on this one. It ought to be a
> hoot!
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Thanks for that Steve. In the 'fun' here on USENET we sometimes forget that
ham radio is indeed more than general chit chat on the bands.

I hope we are remembered by our 'caretakers' the FCC in this BPL problem.

Dan/W4NTI

1790. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 23:12:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030821191256.11022.00000119@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 75203

In article <f45722ac.0308210216.66eb92e9@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0308200427.7abb82c5@posting.google.com>...
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0308191415.13ca05e2@posting.google.com>...
>> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>news:<5c01b95b.0308190430.2d0fdbde@posting.google.com>...
>> > > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0308182146.31736474@posting.google.com>...
>> > > > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:<3F4125A2.8070100@psu.edu>...
>>
>> > > Well...You KNOW who I nominate:
>> > >
>> > > For his pages long recitings of his CV...
>> > >
>> > > For his frequent retelling of how he "worked DX" in a 1950's-era
>> > > Army radio station...
>> >
>> > What would you call long distance communications?
>>
>> Closed circuit communications. "Working DX" is an Amateur term,
>
>No, it isn't. It has application is other radio services, used as Len
>described.

Brian, go easy on Steamy. He doesn't know about all the hundreds
of communication carrier companies that were doing point-to-point
radio communications before he was born. He doesn't know that
militaries around the world were using radio for primary long-distance
communications before he was born. He just doesn't know.

"DX" as a term/phrase, came from commercial communications folks
standing for "distance." It used a very long time ago as a kind of
morse code shorthand. Steamy just doesn't know about that.

>> applied to Amateur practice, involving radio communication between
>> Amateur Radio stations. His Army nets worked specific stations on
>> specific frequencies at specific times with overwhelming power and
>> resources. An idiot could complete a contact with that much
>> power...Ooooops...an idiot DID complete those contacts...forgive me...
>
>Now you're calling DoD communications idiotic? You really don't like

>the military much, do you?

Steamy never did any communications while in the military...other than talking on the telephone. :-)

>Why would you want Army communications to get through only some of the
>time?

It's painfully obvious, Brian. Steamy hates me. I served in the US Army so, naturally to him, anything Army is subject to hatred, villification, and denigration.

Steamy never did any primary communications while in the USMC. Naturally he resents that anyone else did.

Steamy cannot possibly understand the importance of primary comm needs of an area command or that it must continue to be available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, all year long. Back before the DSN and optical fiber lines and communications satellites, the primary long-distance communication medium was HF radio. Army radio ADA served the all-branch Far East Command in the early 1950s and never failed...even during a 3-hour solar flare in 1955 that disrupted the longest circuites...the shorter ones continued to operate uninterrupted.

"Overwhelming power" must be the 4 KW PEP Western Electric LD-T2, all of 6 db higher than maximum legal US amateur RF output. It could be the old Press Wireless 15 KW CW (but always used FSK TTY), the 40 KW Collins-made AN/FRT-22 didn't arrive until 1955. All that plus a small airfield containing the wire antennas helped "Get The Message Through" 24/7. The thousands who were assigned to ADA didn't have much choice but to make sure the communications got through. It did.

>Have you never heard of "Peace through superior firepower?"

Steamy can only think of the hymnal about Montezuma and Tripoli.

Steamy is a mighty macho marine morseman, far superior to ordinary folk. He is a regular Atilla the Ham. :-)

>> > > For his frequent demeaning of not only individual Amateurs, but
>> > > of the Amateur Service as a whole...
>> >
>> > I'm an individual amateur and a member of the ARS as a whole. I don't
>> > "feel" demeaned. There is some truth in Len's observation of the ARS.
>> > Accept it.
>>
>> There's very LITTLE truth.
>
>There's more there than you want to admit.

Steamy can't handle real truth.

>> And you're one of those who, just like Lennie, demonstrate a very
>> poor understanding of those same Amateur practices, so I am very

>> UNIMPRESSED about how you feel about his sleights.
>
>You are singularly unimpressive.

Steamy is louder than any BPL QRM in here. :-)

>> > > For his frequent attempts to associate himself with Soldiers who
>> > > died in combat for the purpose of improving his own "reputation"...
>> >
>> > If you served, you are associated with soldiers who died in combat.
>> > That's just the way it is, and no amaount of running away from it will
>> > disassociate you from them. Yet there are those who never served and
>> > claim "military experience." That is disgusting.
>>
>> Many of my fellow Marines have fallen in combat. That is true. I
>> honor them and wish they never had to be called upon to make that
>> sacrifice, but they did.
>
>And I would assume that some have fallen since your departure as well.

Some of them probably fell while staggering back from the NCO club.

>> UNLIKE Lennie, however, I have never tried to link myself to
>> those Marines (or any other servicemember, for that matter) in such a
>> way as to insinuate that I was somehow part and parcel of that
>> sacrifice for my own benefit or "reputation".
>>
>> THAT is disgusting.
>
>Why do you continually distance yourself from your military heritage?

Steamy is hell bent on doing anything he can to say bad things about
his "enemies." He tries to turn around statements I say so that they
are pejoratives.

Fact is, long ago I served in the US Army and was assigned to a Signal
Battalion that had 19 casualties (all killed) on July 1, 1950, in Korea.
They and the four USAF crew members were on a TDY under direct
orders from General MacArthur's headquarters to help improve the
communications in Korea during the first two weeks of the Korean War.
In the next six years there would be four more members of that Signal
Battalion who became casualties of the Korean War and the Korean
Truce (which is still in effect, the War never being officially over). I've
stood retreat for those 19 and the billet where I was in for nearly two
years was renamed for one of the casualties, Cpl Elmer Hardy. Hardy
Barracks still exists today in Tokyo, much reduced in size, but still
holding the offices of the Pacific Stars & Stripes military newspaper.

Steamy's concept of "honor" only applies to whatever and whomever He
"honors." He cannot comprehend anyone else honoring their old
military unit or even knowing details of that unit. Such seems to be an
abomination with him.

Steamy, and some others, are resentful and some probably envious that anyone else had any primary communications tasks over HF a half century ago. He still lives in a fantasy world of amateurism where ONLY amateur radio has "conquered" HF and ALL radio communications is rated and gauged by amateur recreational and hobby activities on HF radio. That is a terribly elitist...and very false...viewpoint. All it shows is his
ignorance of the larger world of commercial and government radio.

Steamy can't admit to such ignorance. To do so would be to "lose face" and he would disgrace his personal opinion by such admission. He MUST keep up the image of the "expert," the "pioneer of HF radio" through amateurism of the 1930s. Such is a substitute for his terminated military career. He glories in the rank, status, privilege of amateur extra and looks
down on all not achieving his personal stature...typical of those who have not achieved much rank, status, or privileges in real life.

I will be glad and honored to link my name with my old Signal Battalion anytime, anywhere. That Battalion still exists in spirit today as the 78th Signal Service Battalion, Camp Zama, Japan, under the command of the 516th Signal Brigade headquartered at Fort Shafter, Hawaii, and attached to the US Army Pacific as its main communications provider.

>> > > The envelope pleeeeeeease! (drom roll ensuses....)
>> > >
>> > > Leonard H. "Lennie the Liar" Anderson!
>> > >
>> > > Respectfully submitted,
>> >
>> > Obviously disrespectfully submitted.
>>
>> How "obviously"..?!?! Is anything I said untrue...?!?!
>
>Amazingly, everyone has their own version of "the truth." Yet, truth
>and disrespect are not the same thing.

Steamy has his Fantasy. He can change the "truth" in that Fantasy to be whatever he wants. It pleasures him greatly to heap abuse on those who have made it in the real world and done more than he was able to do.

>
>> > > Steve, K4YZ
>> >
>> > At least you didn't start a new thread over it.
>>
>> Nope...someone else did...But JUST FOR YOU, Brain, I started
>> another one with yet another unravelling of your Rear Area War Hero's
>> rants...That being how allegedly "unimportant" Amateur Radio is in the
>> overall scheme of the radio world.
>
>Congratulations. You are so easy to manipulate.

Heh heh...Steamy still hasn't given any details of his own claims to
honor and glory of "seven hostile actions." He never will. :-)

>> Seems he doesn't have the full appreciation of the pulse of the
>> radio world as he alledges...Not that any of "us" didn't know already.
>>
>> Steve, K4YZ
>
>What did he say that was untrue?

Steamy is still wrapped up in his Fantasy.

I've had a full working career in radio-electronics and that is archived in
records other than "Google." My military record is archived at NARA in
St. Louis and Eugene Rosenbaum, N2JTV, served in my Signal Battalion
at the same time I did. Gene is also in retirement from a career at FAA
but very much alive. My colleague at Rocketdyne and manager at RCA
is Jim Hall, KD6JG. A good friend is Al Walston, W6MJN, who was
Best Man at my wedding. I've been in contact with Jim Brendage, a
civilian engineer at ADA and a former USAF NCO who served at ADA's
old transmitter site after the USAF took over all HF comm in 1963. The
callsign of the US Army Pacific Headquarters (Hawaii) is still ADA.

According to Steamy, all those statements are "lies." Despite their real
world existance, Steamy doesn't want to admit their truth. He calls
anything I say a "lie." It's just not worth it to attempt discussion with a
psychotic.

Some else in here who used to quote an old baseball player is fond of
repeating "It ain't braggin' if ya done it." I did it. I don't have to
brag.

Leonard H. Anderson
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

1791. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 23:18:52 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hjzkcwh.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75204

On 16 Aug 2003 08:44:00 -0700, N2EY wrote:

>What did it take - six weeks? Not really long at all. Plus there was
>always the chance FCC would have simply dumped Element 1 on its own,
>instead of doing the whole NPRM thing.

Bill Cross (FCC) was heard to mumble that he wasn't sure that the
FCC could do so "on its own", so SOMEONE had to percuss the
pendulum, right ???

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1792. Re: FCC EFCS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 23:18:52 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hjzi5vd.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75205

On 16 Aug 2003 20:58:01 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>clutch@lycos.com wrote in message news:<vjtca9aplvrl94@corp.supernews.com>...
>> I went to the Fcc website to file comments on bpl and got this
>> message:
>>
>> The ECFS system will be unavailable for scheduled maintenance from
>> Saturday Agugust 16th, 2003 until Monsday August 18th, 2003.
>>
>> Check the spelling, makes you wonder what is going on there.
>>
>> Wes
>
>Musta been written by the same two part time FCC summer interns (in
>D.C. on their Green Cards) who wrote that astoundingly cogent
>masterpiece of English composition NPRM which in the end resulted in
>the elimination of the 20 & 13 wpm code tests.

No doubt it was written by the IT Branch's "system janitor" ("wear
that badge proudly, son...") who, like myself at times, pounds the
keys and hits "save" by reflex before brain is engaged to either
re-read it or run it through the spell checker.

I plead guilty to the same sometimes.

This message was checked, although you should see some timgz that
ghet threw the spelle checka.........

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1793. Re: ARRL FUD about BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 23:43:38 UTC
From: wn6bdb@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <fda4618.0308211543.59c912f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75206
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

One wonders why he would bother to post his message here where he is
certain to get negative if not hostile responses.
Perhaps he's tuning his argument for some future, more important,
forum.
Steve

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > It's also interesting that Mr. Nye points us to the websites of folks
> > who are advocating BPL ...
> >
> > I wonder, is Mr. Nye a consultant to the utilities or BPL manufacturers?
>
>
> Yep, obviously a paid misinformant.

1794. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 23:45:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F4559B1.2090801@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75207

Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> Steve, you obviously didn't notice that the people Larry nominated are
> those he most often targets with his code debate ramblings. By mentioning
> those people here, his ultimate goal was to bring that debate here. After
> all, the main reason he disagrees with those people, hence his nomination
> here, is their opposition to his position on code. Therefore, any response
> to his nomination of those people had to include something about the code
> debate.

Well, Dwight, you can nominate Larry if you like! It's a free group,
and this little bit of fun is open to anyone. Do you want to nominate him?

Besides, we have all NCT's nominated already, so some others need
nominated.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1795. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-21 23:47:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F455A5E.30208@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75208

Brian wrote:

>
> There's more there than you want to admit.

Brian, we intend to have the debates *after* the nominations are
closed. Do you have a nomination? We have to try to keep up with California.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1796. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 01:21:01 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <1ee1b.105565$RG6.94042@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 75209

This actually is quite good and applies to the old timers as well. I have one question if anyone remembers back to around 1959. The guy who got me *really* interested in amateur radio was Russ, W2ZS. I met him around 1959 or possibly 1960 and remember him making contacts when I was invited into his shack. I do remember folks back when using "the handle here is ...". My question is did that start with CB or did CB pick it up from amateurs originally? It seems (at least back then) more like the Southern "y'all come again real soon". Sort of folksy and warm if grammatically incorrect.

I've heard many of the points you mention. I just avoid the issue on the air. While I agree with your points, there is no point in turning a repeater into a flame-fest :))

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/19/03

1797. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 01:23:10 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F45707B.7050604@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75210

WA8ULX wrote:

>
>Step Three: Utilize an alternative vocabulary. Use words like "destinated" and
>"negatory". It's OK to make up your own words here. I.E. "Yeah Tom, I
>"pheelbart zaphonix" occasionally myself."
>
>
Well, I hope you do that in the privacy of your own bedroom.....

>
>Step Five: The better the copy on two meter FM, the more you should use
>phonetics. Names should be especially used if they are short or common ones.
>I.E. "My name is Al... Alpha Lima" or "Jack.. Juliet Alpha Charlie Kilo." If at
>all possible use the less common HF phonetics "A4SM... America, Number Four,
>Sugar Mexico." And for maximum "LID points", make up unintelligible phonetics.
>"My name is Bob... Billibong Oregano Bumperpool."
>
>
This is "Knife Two Experiment Herb Xyzilphone" :-)

>
>Step Eleven: Always make sure you try to communicate with only a handheld and a
>rubber duck antenna. Also, make sure you work through a repeater that you can
>hear very well, but it cannot hear you. This will put out a kind of "LID mating
>call": "Well, Joe, I can hear the repeater just fine here. I wonder why it
>can't hear me?" You will score maximum LID points if you are mobile, and with
>the radio lying in the passenger seat.
>
Well, some machines are alligators (deaf receiver but powerful transmitter).
A few are "rabbits" (sensitive receiver but wimpy transmitter).

>
>Step Eighteen: If you hear a conversation on a local repeater, break in and ask
>how each station is receiving you. Of course they will only see the signal of
>the repeater you are using, but it's that magic moment when you can find a
>fellow "LID", and get the report. Extra points are awarded if you are using a
>base station, and the repeater is less than twenty-five air miles from you.
>
This isn't as stupid as it first sounds. You are really asking how the
repeater's receiver is
hearing you. Maybe you just repaired your rig or antenna, and need to
know if it was
a success. As the repeater can't tell you, because it's not a human,
you ask the humans

who are hearing the repeater's output cleanly how you are doing.

>
>
>Step Twenty One: Use lots of radio jargon. After all, it makes you feel
>important using words ordinary people don't say. Who cares if it makes you
>sound like you just fell off Channel 19 on the citizen's Band? Use phrases such
>as "Roger on that", "10-4", "I'm on the side", "Your making the trip" and
>"Negatory on that".
>
Takes a bit of time to unlearn CB habits.

>
>
>Step Twenty Five: Always use a repeater, even if you can work the other station
>easily on simplex ... especially if you can make the contact on simplex. The
>coverage of the repeater you use should be inversely proportional to your
>distance from the other station.
>
Especially if it's the most popular machine in town.....

>
>
>
>Step Twenty Nine: Use "73" and "88" incorrectly. Both are already considered
>plural, but add a "s" to the end anyway. Say "73's" or "88's". Who cares if it
>means "best regards" and "love and kisses." Better yet, say "seventy thirds"!
>(By the way, seventy thirds equals about 23.3).
>
>
I've heard "3's and 8's."

>
>

1798. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 03:04:42 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <ELf1b.1378$L15.137@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75211
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:01c1b.5554$sV.2030@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:2qj3kv4tgvbqatnhjmu9ik1kqq07d7juko@4ax.com...
> > On Mon, 18 Aug 2003 18:54:27 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
<snip>
> > If they are "enemies in a time of war", then they should be treated as
> > Prisoners of War in accordance with the terms of the Geneva
> > Convention. Your President has denied that they are Prisoners of War,
> > because he is well aware that the terms of the Convention are being
> > flagrantly breached.
> > 73 de G3NYY
> > Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com
>
> So what Walt? Your type talkes about the 'rights' of the raghead
> murderers. How about the rights of the 9 to 5 innocent victim of the
> raghead murders?
>
You don't seem to be able to distinguish one raghead from another ?
>
> You dont seem to understand how this country reacted to 9/11.
>
That's patronising, many of us know only too well how 9/11 was reached
as a reaction from some of the ragheads to years of US foreign policy
in the middle east supporting Israel in any, and all it's activities.
The US simply reaped what it sowed
>
> And I think I know why. Your country and Europe in general is used to being
totally
> destroyed, or at least nearly, every century or so. Its normal to you. Not
> to us. We in the USA actually believed we were safe from that sort of crap.
>
Yes I noticed that illusion when I was in NY only days before 9/11,
you had no concept of building security.
Whereas we here after suffering over 30 years of IRA terrorism
finance by US citizens have had to learn proper and effective security.
Not once in Manhattan did I have my bag or myself searched
>
> Well we now know we are not. We have just been rudely awakened into the
> real world. Lucky for us we have the means to AVENGE it all.
>

The real world that the US has helped to create, has visited you.
>
> We are dangerous now.
>
Always have been
>
> You better believe it.
>
Unfortunately do
>
> But I think, or should I say, hope we will not 'overdue' it.
>
You will, you always do.
>
> But I assure you we will not allow this terrorism to stand.
>
Which / whose particular terrorism is that then ?
>
> We will defend ourselves. And if that requires a
> 'pre-emptive first strike' then it shall be. Keep that in mind.
> We are not walking away from this.
> Dan/W4NTI
>
Are you Jewish ? you seem to have that sort of righteous tone

Steve Terry

1799. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 03:12:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308211912.1f292b47@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75212

dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308211131.66e895d8@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308210229.7d6626eb@posting.google.com>...
> > dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308201758.3f381cb1@posting.google.com>...
> >
> > > Brian:
> > > There's 'life', then there's your perception of life. Most readers here know
> > > too well that the two are not congruent.
> > >
> > > Perhaps there's still time for you to learn the difference.
> >
> > DICK, I'm talking about you, not "most readers."
>
> As per your usual, you have no idea what you're talking about.

Then why did I start the sentence with "DICK?"

1800. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 03:21:21 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <f%f1b.591$MS5.10485@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75213
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:n8c1b.5560$sV.1550@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Mr. Bernard Shaw was quite correct, you know when he was discussing the
> Americans and the Brits.
> "The same people, seperated by a common language".
> But I love them anyway.
> Dan/W4NTI
>
I love American wimin, apart from the Dutch, i've not known any others
so willing to drop their knickers so quickly.

(Translation English in to American)
(knickers = panties)

BTW G.B. Shaw was Irish, and the quote was from Churchill

Steve Terry

1801. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 03:44:37 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bi43gp$jbc@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75216

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308211912.1f292b47@posting.google.com...
> dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308211131.66e895d8@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308210229.7d6626eb@posting.google.com>...
> > > dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308201758.3f381cb1@posting.google.com>...
> > >
> > > > Brian:
> > > > There's 'life', then there's your perception of life. Most readers
here know
> > > > too well that the two are not congruent.
> > > >
> > > > Perhaps there's still time for you to learn the difference.
> > >
> > > DICK, I'm talking about you, not "most readers."
> >
> > As per your usual, you have no idea what you're talking about.
>
> Then why did I start the sentence with "DICK?"

I think it's kind of a way of admitting he's a nothing and a nobody... :o

Kim W5TIT

1802. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 03:58:23 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <zxg1b.106122$xw.55311@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 75217

I rather suspected so. 1959 was only a few years after cb was started and
Russ was never a cber.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:3F44E1AA.3030103@mailcity.moc...
>
>
> Jim Hampton wrote:
> > This actually is quite good and applies to the old timers as well. I
have
> > one question if anyone remembers back to around 1959. The guy who got
me
> > *really* interested in amateur radio was Russ, W2ZS. I met him around
1959
> > or possibly 1960 and remember him making contacts when I was invited
into
> > his shack. I do remember folks back when using "the handle here is
...".
> > My question is did that start with CB or did CB pick it up from amateurs
> > originally? It seems (at least back then) more like the Southern "y'all
> > come again real soon". Sort of folksy and warm if grammatically
incorrect.
>
> The term "handle" was used by hams long before cber's were ever
> allowed to screw up the radio spectrum.
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/19/03

1803. New Zealand 1.2Ghz band...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 04:00:15 UTC
From: webphoto@drunk.co.nz
Message-ID: <6c2ccfe2.0308212000.319b2e1b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75218

Does anyone know the usage of the 1.2Ghz band in NZ?? Is it for general use?

Cheers

1804. Photo of Wiseman?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 04:26:40 UTC
From: Norm Stenger <"No ISP"@pamz.com>
Message-ID: <bi461vqaq0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75219

alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest

Is this the Roger Wiseman we know and love?

1805. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 04:50:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6B19C1.249ED%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75220

"WA8ULX" wrote:
>
> Good, your leaving, might I suggest you go
> back to cb.rec. At least there you will be
> able to talk to your kind of people.

My kind of people? Do you mean people like yourself? I see you've posted a few messages in the CB newsgroup (well over 100 according to Google). Most of my messages there were cross-posted to rec.radio.cb from messages posted elsewhere, but most of yours were posted directly in that newsgroup.

In fact, the first message I ever saw from you was in that newsgroup. If I remember correctly, you were talking about the big tube-type linear amp you were using with the 10 meter radio you had modified to use on the frequencies in and above the CB band. Perhaps I'm mistaken, but I certainly don't think so.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1806. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 04:56:29 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hjzvpo2.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75221

On Thu, 21 Aug 2003 09:03:31 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:

>hmmmm, I don't know about you, but I really like to have the numbers
>line up.

So do I, but if it's a choice of dropping the code test NOW and
leaving a hole where Element 1 used to be to be dealt with at some
future date, or futzing around for months with a total reorganization
of test elements, privileges, band segments, etc via a series of NPRMs
in a taffy-pull that will make r.r.a.p. look like a sedate cricket match,
I take the former every time.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1807. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 05:15:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6B1F90.249EF%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75222

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> (snip) We have to try to keep up with California.

Have you noticed even the press has had a hard time keeping a straight face when talking about the California recall vote? First, we have a midget who insists he's the protest vote. Then, we have oversized guy who still can't say his name properly after living in the country for decades. And then we have a cross-dresser certain to bring a new sense of fashion consciousness to the job. And we can go on and on. This is turning out to be one of the wackiest elections I've ever seen.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1808. Re: BPL Reply Comments

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 06:38:04 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308212238.65bad6ae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75223

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<cNP0b.576$6e5.77071@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> TODAY is the deadline for filing Reply Comments with the
> FCC on "BPL."
>
> You have until midnight to file electronically via the FCC's
> ECFS (Electronic Comment Filing System)
> http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/ecfs/
>
> Prepare your document as MS Word or Adobe .pdf
> and follow the directions, using the "Submit a Filing"
> link in the upper right of the above-linked page.
>
> The "Proceeding Number" is "03-104" (without the quotes).
>
> You can upload your Word or .pdf file by browsing to it
> after you fill in the required "cover sheet" information, or
> you can type in "informal comments" in the edit box (but
> informal comments don't get the same attention as formal
> ones ...)

The process couldn't be any easier.

> For an example of the correct format, or if you're just
> interested in seeing what I filed, you view a .pdf of my
> Reply Comments (filed today) at my personal web
> page.

Excellent submittal Carl, nice job, you covered a lot of territory
appropriately. I absolutely agree with all 26 of your points. Let's
hope the FCC is listening this time.

And thanks for your inputs on the specifics of the Emmaus BPL test
area. Made my second foray into Emmaus considerably more
easier/productive than my first pass.

> Consider filing ... but keep it polite and don't "flame" the
> FCC ... that will do more harm than good.
>
> 73,
>
> --
> Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c

I'm compelled to point out to any and all who might be surfing this
thread that what you're seeing here is three long-term hardcore

antagonists in the RRAP PCTA/NCTA code test wars laying that crap aside and putting our shoulders to the same wheel when a *real* ham radio policy problems shows up.

w3rv

1809. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 10:43:15 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030822064315.21457.00000141@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 75225

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hjzkcwh.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 16 Aug 2003 08:44:00 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>
>>What did it take - six weeks? Not really long at all. Plus there was
>>always the chance FCC would have simply dumped Element 1 on its own,
>>instead of doing the whole NPRM thing.
>
> Bill Cross (FCC) was heard to mumble that he wasn't sure that the
> FCC could do so "on its own", so SOMEONE had to percuss the
> pendulum, right ???
>
Aw geez - the "expert agency" doesn't even know what it can and cannot do? No
wonder we have to battle BPL and the homogeniztion of broadcast media.

Sheesh.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1810. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 10:43:16 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030822064316.21457.00000143@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 75227

In article <3F44C323.20902@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>hmmmm, I don't know about you, but I really like to have the numbers
>line up.

Apparently it didn't bother FCC for decades. But then again, they often focus
on the wrong things.
>
>> Before March 21, 1987, the Tech and General used the same written, called
>> Element 3. When they split that into two separate tests, the names were
>changed
>> to 3A and 3B. A similar split took place back in 1967 when the Extra
>written
>> (Element 4) was split into Advanced and Extra.
>>
>> Etc.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Where you posting from, Jim?

Home, as usual.

There are three screen names on this account. One is used by other(s), one is
my call and this one is a "universal spare" based on my old call. For some
reason AOL is having trouble with NG access on my other screen name so I
switched over to this one for a while.

But I'm still me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1811. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 10:43:16 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030822064316.21457.00000142@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 75228

In article <BB69C070.2493C%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> I hope you mean "the attitude of *some* current
>> operators...."
>
> The attitudes of all operators, good or bad, are factors to some extent.
>However, one person with a bad attitude can often overwhelm several with
>more positive attitudes.

I hear ya!

>> I don't know about that. Around here, and
>> everywhere else I've lived since becoming a ham
>> 36 years ago, newcomers of all ages, sizes,
>> genders, ethnicities, etc., are welcomed and
>> encouraged, as a general rule.
>>
>> Yes, there are a few sourpusses with negative
>> addytoods. They've been around forever. I can recall
>> comments that Novices were "not real hams" and that
>> my homebrew CW rigs were "not real radios", etc.,
>> etc., ad infinitum. Ol' W2OY was well known for his
>> misanthropic "no kids, no lids, no space cadets"
>> tirades. Oddly enough, most of those folks are not
>> hams anymore, but I am. bwaahaahaa....
>
> Probably all true, but the overall nastiness seems to have increased
>dramatically (perhaps due to the internet, but there nonetheless).

If that's true, you have to admit that the overall nastiness has increased on both sides.

>> If you look for and listen to the naysayers and
>> sourpusses, it just encourages them.

> I wish it was that easy. For example, I've tried hard to ignore Larry's
>messages. However, since he posts so much, he is almost impossible to
>ignore. Even if I ignore the messages he posts, I endlessly run into replies
>to his messages. In the end, the only clear way to completely get away from
>his nonsense is to leave this newsgroup (an occasional break from this
>newsgroup is probably not a bad idea anyway).

A problem only if you take them seriously.
>
>> True - but consider also the attitudes expressed
>> by a very few newcomers towards experienced
>> amateurs. (snip)
>
> Most often posted after a run in with Larry or his ilk. My message to
>Larry was obviously filled with anger, which is not my normal response to
>even the most outrageous messages in this newsgroup. But, after enough of
>his garbage, it took that just to let off some steam.

I'm not talking about you, Dwight. I'm talking about those on the other side
who do the same things.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1812. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 10:43:17 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030822064317.21457.00000144@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 75226

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hjzvpo2.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On Thu, 21 Aug 2003 09:03:31 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>hmmmm, I don't know about you, but I really like to have the numbers
>>line up.
>
> So do I, but if it's a choice of dropping the code test NOW and
> leaving a hole where Element 1 used to be to be dealt with at some
> future date, or futzing around for months with a total reorganization
> of test elements, privileges, band segments, etc via a series of NPRMs
> in a taffy-pull that will make r.r.a.p. look like a sedate cricket match,
> I take the former every time.
>

I'm afraid we're gonna get the taffy-pull/furball anyway, though. By inaction,
FCC has opened the floodgates to a zillion petitions on everyhting under the
sun. Which will then be smooshed into an NPRM, and finally maybe some rules
changes that have little resemblance to said NPRM.

Maybe somewhere in there that stupid BPL idea will get squelched.

No offense, Phil, but the fact that we even have to fight as bad an idea as BPL
has caused my respect for a certain "expert agency" to all but disappear.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1813. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 10:43:18 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030822064318.21457.00000145@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 75224

In article <d22b54c3.0308141417.dceda51@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0308140907.15375f60@posting.google.com>...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
>news:<d22b54c3.0308140144.174576e6@posting.google.com>...
>
>>
>> > Very tight window of opportunity. There
>> > was another window of opportunity around Thanksgiving weekend which is
>> > when I took both of my early tests. I guess the Test Room had
>> > different operating hours then. Or maybe I just sed to hell with
>> > school those two mornings and done the do.
>>
>> It was prolly kids like you and King George who caused FCC to change
>> the rules in '54 so that all Novices and Techs were done by mail,
>> regardless of distance.....
>
>I woudn't bet on that, more than likely that move was made to (a) make
>life easier for folks like Dan and his Mom and (b) keep us beginners
>from cluttering up the FCC office on test days.
>
That's what I mean - the kids who would clog up the test room.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1814. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 10:43:19 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030822064319.21457.00000146@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 75229

In article <d22b54c3.0308140833.131a602b@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030813222030.18497.00002062@mb-m05.aol.com>...
>> In article <bheddp$240$1@slb2.atl.mindspring.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
>> <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >But you know Jim even if they did prepare, A LOT FAILED, it was really
>an
>> >exercise in who could overcome the nerves.
>>
>> My sources tell me that the pass rate has been about 2/3 for years and
>years. I
>> don't know how true that is. I do know that it's a good thing the exam
>sessions
>> are more accessible than in those times.
>
>There was another side to that coin, "access abuse". We had a nitwit
>who took the Novice test at least four times. Each time he took the
>test his score went up a bit. He figgered that if he took it often
>enough he'd eventually pass. Which he did.

Yeah, but he had to space them out. Today he could take a test over and over
the same day.
>
>> For my money, the *best* system was that of the late '70s and very early
>> '80s.
>> FCC examiners did all the testing and exam preparing, and there were office
>> sessions. BUT, if a ham group could guarantee a certain number of folks
>> wanting
>> tests (I think the quororm/minyan was 10) then FCC would send out an
>> examiner.
>> Most big hamfests had the FCC "traveling road show" giving exams.
>>
>> Reagan's budget cuts ended all that.
>
>Din do any good. There's a piece in one of his autobiographies about
>the day he got a report on how, after all his attempts to reduce the
>gummint head count, the head count was up 10% from the previous year.

What a dumass. Head count doan matter, it's $$ that matters.

>Whereupon he went off on what has been described as probably the most
>"colorful" half hour rant to ever originate in the Oval Office.

>Followed by an admotion to his successors in that office to not expect
>to have any control of the gummint, "It has a #$@!xF# life of it's
>own!"

Well, DUH, Ronnie!

Now we have AHHnold, Gary Coleman, and a porn star among the candidates for governor of the "Golden State" and its ever-rising budget shortfall. They're doing it for the Gipper.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

1815. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 11:16:11 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030822071611.12631.00000460@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 75230

In article <R6u0b.307$6e5.61829@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0308190905.c27e8a4@posting.google.com...
>> I think you meant "rationale"
>>
>> And here it is:
>>
>> 1) Morse code is widely used in the ARS, particularly HF/MF amateur
>> radio.
>
>So??? That use is purely a matter of choice ...

The point is that it makes sense to test for things that *hams* actually do.
Some folks, like yourself, insist on pointing out that *other* services have
all but abandoned use of Morse code. So???

Should that fact make hams not want to use it, or be tested for it?

> those who chose to use
>Morse should have the freedom of choice to learn it and to so ...

Agreed!

And those who choose to other things should have the freedom of choice to learn
it and do so...

>however,
>at the same time, those who are not interested in using Morse should not
>be forced to learn it in order to gain HF privileges ...

Nobody is "forced". It's a test requirement, just like the stuff in the
writtens.

Would you agree with this statement:

however, at the same time, those who are not interested in building radios
should not be forced to learn how they work in order to gain amateur radio
privileges ...

>> 2) Knowledge of morse code can only be measured by a practical skill
>> test.
>
>Excuse me ... I think you mean "proficiency in " not "knowledge of" ...

No, I mean "knowledge of". Skills are a form of knowledge, as are facts and
concepts. Perhaps it would be better to write "practical knowledge"

For example, consider base 10 natural number arithmetic

"2 + 2 = 4" is a fact.

"Addition is a mathematical operation in which two numbers are combined to get a third number which is never less than either of the first two numbers" is a concept.

The ability to add numbers rapidly without reference to a lookup table, calculator or pencil and paper is a skill.

The Morse test which is Element 1 tests the skill of receiving Morse code at a very basic level.

>those are important distinctions ...

See above.

>I have no problem with test questions
>on the theory of OOK Morse ("What's the necessary bw for x wpm?"
>"What are "key-clicks" and how can they be prevented?" etc.)

Those are fact and concept questions.

>But a
>proficiency requirement as a condition of access to HF is totally out of
>line.

Element 1 is in no way a test of "proficiency". It's a skill test at a very basic level. To call it a proficiency test is to demonstrate ignorance of the word proficiency.

>> 3) Morse code offers unique advantages to the radio amateur, but these
>> advantages are only available if Morse code skills are learned.
>
>Other modes also offer "unique advantages" ...

Yup - but not like Morse.

For example, how many hams do you know who use homebrew SSB stations on the amateur HF bands? Would you recommend that a beginner in radio build such a station as a first project?

> those advantages are in
>the eye of the beholder and largely subjective ... those who believe that
>it is advantageous to learn/use Morse will do so ... those who don't should
>not be forced.

Then let's not force people to learn pother stuff they're not interested in. There's a lot more Morse operation going on today than large scale homebrewing...
>
>> 4) All of the above support the Basis and Purposes of the ARS.
>
>The FCC disagrees ...

Yet they wouldn't include a sunset clause back in 2000 and they're making all of us go through an NPRM cycle all over again. If FCC thinks there really is "no regulatory purpose" to a code test, WHY are they dragging their feet and doing the whole circus AGAIN?

FCC also thinks BPL is a good idea, even though you, W1RFI, and many others have produced piles of evidence that it is unarguably a very very BAD idea. Heck, any "expert agency" that would even consider such a nutty porposal doesn't deserve the title "expert".

You've heard the stuff yourself, from a test location where the lines were BURIED. Did it take you more than 30 seconds to come to the conclusion that widespread deployment of access BPL is simply nuts? I bet 3 seconds was enough.

Yet FCC continues to allow testing and evaluation, and entertains the possibility of RAISING part 15 levels! Some "experts"!

I won't even get into the homogenization of broadcasting thing, where Congress is in the process of slapping Mike Powell's hand and saying "NO! BAD IDEA!!"

The mere fact that FCC does something doesn't make it right - just legal.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1816. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 11:16:51 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bi4u0n$mgu@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75231

"WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030822064317.21457.00000144@mb-m10.aol.com...
> In article <xnfcneeyarg.hjzvpo2.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
> <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:
>
> >On Thu, 21 Aug 2003 09:03:31 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> >>hmmmm, I don't know about you, but I really like to have the numbers
> >>line up.
> >
> > So do I, but if it's a choice of dropping the code test NOW and
> > leaving a hole where Element 1 used to be to be dealt with at some
> > future date, or futzing around for months with a total reorganization
> > of test elements, privileges, band segments, etc via a series of NPRMs
> > in a taffy-pull that will make r.r.a.p. look like a sedate cricket
match,
> > I take the former every time.
> >
>
> I'm afraid we're gonna get the taffy-pull/furball anyway, though. By
inaction,
> FCC has opened the floodgates to a zillion petitions on everyhting under
the
> sun. Which will then be smooshed into an NPRM, and finally maybe some
rules
> changes that have little resemblance to said NPRM.
>
> Maybe somewhere in there that stupid BPL idea will get squelched.
>
> No offense, Phil, but the fact that we even have to fight as bad an idea
as BPL
> has caused my respect for a certain "expert agency" to all but disappear.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

The life and times of financial struggle in the US=a greater threat from and
support of commercial interests in radio spectrum.

Kim W5TIT

1817. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 12:32:43 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030822083243.06138.00000276@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 75233

> My kind of people?

Yes your kind of people

> If I
>remember correctly, you were talking about the big tube-type linear amp you
>were using with the 10 meter radio you had modified to use on the
>frequencies in and above the CB band.

Pure BS and you know it

1818. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 12:34:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030822083450.06138.00000277@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 75234

>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

PS, get to the back of the Bus where you and your kind belong.

1819. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 12:35:42 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <y6o1b.1859$6e5.104776@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75232

"WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030822071611.12631.00000460@mb-m28.aol.com...
> Would you agree with this statement:
>
> however, at the same time, those who are not interested in building radios
> should not be forced to learn how they work in order to gain amateur radio
> privileges ...

No ... because, even if you don't build your own radios, you are responsible
for their proper operation. How could you possibly know something was
wrong if you had no knowledge of how the radio worked?

This is an interference control issue ... a technical matter ... and
knowledge
of this IS required in order to be competent to operate a station in full
compliance with the rules.

> >> 2) Knowledge of morse code can only be measured by a practical skill
> >> test.
> >
> >Excuse me ... I think you mean "proficiency in " not "knowledge of" ...
>
> No, I mean "knowledge of". Skills are a form of knowledge, as are facts
and
> concepts. Perhaps it would be better to write "practical knowledge"

No, it's proficiency that the test measures ... proficiency in decoding
Morse
in one's head at some specified speed. And that's ALL it is according to
the FCC (see the "No Code Technician" decision from 1990 and the R&O
in 98-143 ... you'll see EXACTLY that in both documents).

> The Morse test which is Element 1 tests the skill of receiving Morse code
at a
> very basic level.

Exactly, it measures a specific level of proficiency.

>
> Element 1 is in no way a test of "proficiency". It's a skill test at a
very
> basic level. To call it a proficiency test is to demonstrate ignorance of
the
> word proficiency.

Proficiency is measured against some "yardstick" ... in the case of Morse,
the FCC has (currently) determined the yardstick to be 5 wpm.

You can argue all you want, but that's the way it is ...

> Yet they wouldn't include a sunset clause back in 2000

True ... they didn't include a sunset clause.

> and they're making all of us go through an NPRM cycle all over again.

How the FCC will handle this is yet to be determined ...

> If FCC thinks there really is
> "no regulatory purpose" to a code test, WHY are they dragging their feet
and
> doing the whole circus AGAIN?

See my last sentence ...

[snipped unrelated discussion of BPL]

Carl - wk3c

1820. Re: BPL Reply Comments

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 12:47:17 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <pho1b.1862$6e5.104627@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75235

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308212238.65bad6ae@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<cNP0b.576$6e5.77071@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > TODAY is the deadline for filing Reply Comments with the
> > FCC on "BPL."
> >
> > You have until midnight to file electronically via the FCC's
> > ECFS (Electronic Comment Filing System)
> > http://www.fcc.gov/cgb/ecfs/
> >
> > Prepare your document as MS Word or Adobe .pdf
> > and follow the directions, using the "Submit a Filing"
> > link in the upper right of the above-linked page.
> >
> > The "Proceeding Number" is "03-104" (without the quotes).
> >
> > You can upload your Word or .pdf file by browsing to it
> > after you fill in the required "cover sheet" information, or
> > you can type in "informal comments" in the edit box (but
> > informal comments don't get the same attention as formal
> > ones ...)
>
> The process couldn't be any easier.
>
> > For an example of the correct format, or if you're just
> > interested in seeing what I filed, you view a .pdf of my
> > Reply Comments (filed today) at my personal web
> > page.
>
> Excellent submittal Carl, nice job, you covered a lot of territory
> appropriately. I absolutely agree with all 26 of your points. Let's
> hope the FCC is listening this time.

Thanks ... glad you liked it.

> And thanks for your inputs on the specifics of the Emmaus BPL test
> area. Made my second foray into Emmaus considerably more
> easier/productive than my first pass.

No problem ... glad to help.

> > Consider filing ... but keep it polite and don't "flame" the
> > FCC ... that will do more harm than good.
> >

> > 73,
> >
> > --
> > Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
>
>
> I'm compelled to point out to any and all who might be surfing this
> thread that what you're seeing here is three long-term hardcore
> antagonists in the RRAP PCTA/NCTA code test wars laying that crap
> aside and putting our shoulders to the same wheel when a *real* ham
> radio policy problems shows up.
>
> w3rv

While Brian and I (and others) may disagree on the Morse issue, that
is no reason that we can't work cordially and cooperatively on important
issues where we are "on the same page."

73,
--
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
Grid Square FN20fm
http://home.ptd.net/~wk3c

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International
Fellow, The Radio Club of America
Senior Member, IEEE
Member, IEEE Standards Association
Chair, IEEE 802.18 Radio Regulatory Technical Advisory Group
Chair-elect, Wi-Fi Alliance Regulatory Committee
Co-Chair, Wi-Fi Alliance Legislative Committee
Member, QCWA (31424)
Member, ARRL
Member, TAPR
Member, The SETI League

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
<http://www.nocode.org>

1821. Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 13:38:46 UTC
From: Cindy W <CindyW@tampafastisp.net>
Message-ID: <bi56bt$8jb$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75236
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

There is worldwide packet radio activity on
27540 kHz. Which qsy to 6890 at night. I know
of some people in the Tampa area who operate on
this frequency and have qso'd other packet stations
in the U.S. as well as worldwide DX. Alfa-Delta
domestic call signs & Rapert International calls are
being used on the frequency. Does anybody know
the policy and protocol for hobby packet ops?

tnx,
Cindy W
Worldwide #3815 friendly op endorsement

1822. Wiseman worshiper Whines from altopia for the moment

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 14:22:11 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <61cab5533302a36b8340494f5827f623@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 75237
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

In article
"Nemmind" whined:

Why are you posting anon, goatblower?

> "Stagger Lee" wrote in message
> news:87087099.54654783@houston-hunks.com...
> On Tue, 19 Aug 2003 12:49:09 +0000 (UTC), "Anonymous" Sender wrote:
> > In article <89185761.767067889@houston-hunks.com>
> > SLee@houston-hunks.com (Stagger Lee) wrote:
> > > I have been
> > > enjoying almost a year of Wiseman-free Usenet, ever since you got
> > > kicked off of both Altopia and Ovis.
> >
> >
> > Wrong dickhead, Wiseman cancelled both accounts.
>
> Oh yeah. Uh huh. Uh huh.

Looks like you are pulling things out of bertie's glory hole again, High-el.

> > > Your love poem to Pam Hoffer,
>
> That fatassed bitch? Bwhahahahahahahahahahahaha..I wonder if Lemons
> still lets her give him blowjobs in the server room.
>
> You seem to have intimate knowledge of the Ovis employees. Was Lemons
> the one who wrote to you and told you that your Ovis account had been
> terminated?

No, dumbfuck, Wiseman cancelled his account after telling fatass hoffer to fuck off over the phone.

> >
> > > the President of Ovis, was doubtless a strong influence in your
> > > departure from Ovis, and the silence which ensued last September was
> > > pure joy.
> >
> > Not unlike the silence after your ass was kicked off of altopia for
> spamming the newsgroups.
>
> Oh yeah. Uh huh. Uh huh. Can you read the Path header of this post,
> Woger? I didn't think so.

How was your chat with the feds? You know you were turned in.

> >
> > > Now the window licker returns,
> >
> > Now, Hammy, you don't want me to post your numerous DUI records, do you?
>
> As usual,

As usual, you are afraid.

> /././/././././
>
> Wogie takes shots in the dark

Come by, I'll take more than just shots in the dark.

> and makes what he thinks are "educated"
> guesses. To date he hasn't been right yet, which gives cause to doubt his
> veracity on anything else he has claimed.

Lenny Anderson.....failed engineer.

> For instance, Roger claimed he was once married. To what? He claimed he has
> a couple of grown kids, too. If this is so one has to wonder if his kids
> live in trees or are subterranean dwellers.

While your kids are still being sodomized by you, eh goatblower?

> It is doubtful that Rogie has EVER been involved with any walking, talking,
> intelligent woman of any species much less had one agree to marry him. He
> WAS adopted, after all.

..while you were aborted.

> Perhaps this is why he takes occasional sabbaticals to India. The monkeys
> aren't too awfully choosy.....

Yeah look what you had to mail-order for a wife.

> By the way, Stagger. What ever happened to Arf! Arf! He (or she) has nil
> been heard from for almost a year now.

SPANKed..FATASS. And lllllardass llllloyd davies should concentrate on his upcoming marriage to Rosie Palmer.

1823. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 14:54:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <H8q1b.1874$6e5.106297@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75238
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sounds like totally illegal activity to me ... if I were you, I
would not expect help here and would be prepared to duck
for cover as the flames erupt ...

Carl - wk3c

"Cindy W" <CindyW@tampafastisp.net> wrote in message
news:bi56bt$8jb$0@pita.alt.net...
> There is worldwide packet radio activity on
> 27540 kHz. Which qsy to 6890 at night. I know
> of some people in the Tampa area who operate on
> this frequency and have qso'd other packet stations
> in the U.S. as well as worldwide DX. Alfa-Delta
> domestic call signs & Rapert International calls are
> being used on the frequency. Does anybody know
> the policy and protocol for hobby packet ops?
>
> tnx,
> Cindy W
> Worldwide #3815 friendly op endorsement
>
>
>

1824. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 16:04:25 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <1-KdnRoFfd2UotuiXTWJhA@crocker.com>
Source record: 75239
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Cindy W" <CindyW@tampafastisp.net> wrote in message
news:bi5eggnpg0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> news:10577-3F462E45-34@storefull-2318.public.lawson.webtv.net...
> From: wk3cqth@wk3c.com (Carl R. Stevenson)
> >Sounds like totally illegal activity to me ... if I
>
> >were you, I would not expect help here and
>
> >would be prepared to duck for cover as the
>
> >flames erupt ...
>
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> _
> The "flames" you speak of usually originate from the guilty
> themselves..you know,,the ones that protesteth too much or the ones
> seeking assumed status or power over another...
>
>
> Which is exacly why young kids are turned off by ham
> radio. I once took a group of young black kids to a
> local ham radio club meeting. All the old white men
> ignored the kids or made rude remarks. These same
> frustrated old white men then wonder why the hobby
> is rapidly going the way of the horse & buggy.
>

troll meter is pegged on this one!

1825. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 16:07:05 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F463FA9.CE2B3DE2@ptt.edu>
Source record: 75240
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

youre troll meter is out of whack, must have been golden screwdrivered

> troll meter is pegged on this one!

1826. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 16:30:24 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Ayr1b.106452$UF5.64104@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 75241
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Amateur radio isn't going the way of the horse and buggy, but you make a point about the members of some amateur clubs. You're probably better off meeting a few amateurs on an individual basis and getting your own group up and running. Other than that, despite the efforts of some, amateur radio continues to grow. There are so many modes and people to work that the grumps can't cover even a majority of bases :)) Even CB has its' own small groups that enjoy each others company - say the bunny hunters, the avid DXers and so on. The difference is that very few (if any) CBers have so little to do that they simply flame the newsgroups.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim

"Cindy W" <CindyW@tampafastisp.net> wrote in message
news:bi5eggnpg0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> news:10577-3F462E45-34@storefull-2318.public.lawson.webtv.net...
> From: wk3cqth@wk3c.com (Carl R. Stevenson)
> >Sounds like totally illegal activity to me ... if I
>
> >were you, I would not expect help here and
>
> >would be prepared to duck for cover as the
>
> >flames erupt ...
>
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> _
> The "flames" you speak of usually originate from the guilty
> themselves..you know,,the ones that protesteth too much or the ones
> seeking assumed status or power over another...
>
>
> Which is exacly why young kids are turned off by ham
> radio. I once took a group of young black kids to a
> local ham radio club meeting. All the old white men
> ignored the kids or made rude remarks. These same
> frustrated old white men then wonder why the hobby
> is rapidly going the way of the horse & buggy.
>
> Cindy W
>

>
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/19/03

1827. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 16:44:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F464873.3070801@psu.edu>
Source record: 75242

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
>>(snip) We have to try to keep up with California.
>
>
>
> Have you noticed even the press has had a hard time keeping a straight
> face when talking about the California recall vote? First, we have a midget
> who insists he's the protest vote. Then, we have oversized guy who still
> can't say his name properly after living in the country for decades. And
> then we have a cross-dresser certain to bring a new sense of fashion
> consciousness to the job. And we can go on and on. This is turning out to be
> one of the wackiest elections I've ever seen.

This is something no one wins. First we have a power grab by the
Repub's who have figured out that in any election, it will be possible
to get enough names on a petition to force a recall. I hope they realize
they opend a Pandora's box, and for what? Governing a state that they
were partially involved in making a major mess?
They are so desperate to get someone in office, that they are trying to
elect a Republican who is more like a Democrat than anything else.

The Dems, instead of fielding a smart team in case the recalll comes,
have put together a list of clowns that are a true embarassment to
democracy, leaving the one serious contender with the election plan from
hell, that is to vote for no recall, but vote for me in case there is.

To think that the next Gov. there might be elected with only a few
percent of the vote.

Makes me proud I'm a registered Independent.

I wonder if there is going to be a recall on the governer elected in
the recall vote... if there is a recall....

- Mike KB3EIA -

1828. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 16:56:05 UTC
From: Ham Dat Am <HDA@pork.com>
Message-ID: <GWr1b.11141$S_.3167@fed1read01>
Source record: 75243
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Cindy -- you have to understand you asked a question about illegal CB operation and Hams are very much against ANY illegal operations on any band. Kinda like asking an atheist question in a Catholic Church.

Go to rec.radio.cb --- you will get sympathy there and also probably bad mouthed about illegal operations. But perhaps you didn't know it was illegal -- now you do.

Read FCC rules at URL:
http://wireless.fcc.gov/services/personal/cb/

As far as your visit to the club meeting -- here in Southern California we have a youth group of young Hams under the age of 18, about 20 of them. We have donated lots of equipment to their schools, given them free books, make a point to welcome them to the repeaters and club meetings. All ethnic groups and genders are represented. They had a table and setup at Field Day just for the youth group at the GOTA station. They meet each Thurs eve for a net on one of our repeaters. Some are involved in Emergency Communications. We treat all Hams the same, young, old, green or blue. Maybe you live in an area where the converse is true.

So your comments are like --- this cat is green -- so all cats are reen --- too generalized.

And your comment about "Old White men" is racist and stupid, as you too will be old someday. Sooner than you think.

Ask yourself a question "When did I start to hate Old Folks ??"
The ones that Tom Brokaw termed "The Greatest Generation".
The ones who made this country the great nation it is.

You have a tough act to follow and off to bad start -- lets hope in the long run -- you are up to the task of being also a great generation.

End Of SoapBox

OVER

"Cindy W" <CindyW@tampafastisp.net> wrote in message
news:bi5eggnpg0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> news:10577-3F462E45-34@storefull-2318.public.lawson.webtv.net...
> From: wk3cqth@wk3c.com (Carl R. Stevenson)
> >Sounds like totally illegal activity to me ... if I
>

> >were you, I would not expect help here and
>
> >would be prepared to duck for cover as the
>
> >flames erupt ...
>
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> _
> The "flames" you speak of usually originate from the guilty
> themselves..you know,,the ones that protesteth too much or the ones
> seeking assumed status or power over another...
>
>
> Which is exacly why young kids are turned off by ham
> radio. I once took a group of young black kids to a
> local ham radio club meeting. All the old white men
> ignored the kids or made rude remarks. These same
> frustrated old white men then wonder why the hobby
> is rapidly going the way of the horse & buggy.
>
> Cindy W
>
>
>
>
>

1829. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 16:59:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F464BF2.8050504@psu.edu>
Source record: 75244

Phil Kane wrote:
> On Thu, 21 Aug 2003 09:03:31 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>>hmmmm, I don't know about you, but I really like to have the numbers
>>line up.
>
>
> So do I, but if it's a choice of dropping the code test NOW and
> leaving a hole where Element 1 used to be to be dealt with at some
> future date, or futzing around for months with a total reorganization
> of test elements, privileges, band segments, etc via a series of NPRMs
> in a taffy-pull that will make r.r.a.p. look like a sedate cricket match,
> I take the former every time.

When you put it that way, yes. Bu I expect that there will be lots of that taffy pulling, when we have a former President of NCI espousing his terrible proposed changes, while Carl's method would work without making a mess. But the FCC has to weigh both. There will probably be even more proposals as time goes on.

And since many of the statement I've seen from them talk about their desire to remove regulations, I wonder what the final outcome might be. In an extreme (admittedly unlikely) outcome, we may not have to worry about the numbering of the elements. There may be no elements. But I see a possibility of there being only one element after the dust settles.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1830. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 17:10:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F464EA0.1050004@psu.edu>
Source record: 75245
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Cindy W wrote:
> x-no-archive: yes
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> news:10577-3F462E45-34@storefull-2318.public.lawson.webtv.net...
> From: wk3cqth@wk3c.com (Carl R. Stevenson)
>
>>Sounds like totally illegal activity to me ... if I
>
>
>>were you, I would not expect help here and
>
>
>>would be prepared to duck for cover as the
>
>
>>flames erupt ...
>
>
>>Carl - wk3c
>
>
> _
> The "flames" you speak of usually originate from the guilty
> themselves..you know,,the ones that protesteth too much or the ones
> seeking assumed status or power over another...
>
>
> Which is exacly why young kids are turned off by ham
> radio. I once took a group of young black kids to a
> local ham radio club meeting. All the old white men
> ignored the kids or made rude remarks. These same
> frustrated old white men then wonder why the hobby
> is rapidly going the way of the horse & buggy.

WOW! We went from an illegal activity to the reason why people are
scared away from Ham radio?

It isn't a very good debate technique, but you have made the best
stretch of an argument I've ever seen.

My hat is off to you!

But, to answer your paragraph, why would anyone take a group of kids to
an amateur club meeting? It's a completely different environment than

they would be comfortable in. And there is usually business to take care of at a meeting that would be mind numbing for kids to listen to, like finances, membership issues, etc. If you really wanted to get them interested, you would get a few amateurs to meet with the kids on the kids turf, like a classroom, the local YMCA, places like that. The kids would be comfortable, only hams who ar interested in public outreach would be involved, and a program could be put together that would keep the kids involved and interactive.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1831. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 17:25:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F465214.4040907@psu.edu>
Source record: 75246
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ham Dat Am wrote:
> Cindy -- you have to understand you asked a question about illegal CB
> operation and Hams are very much against ANY illegal operations on any band.
> Kinda like asking an atheist question in a Catholic Church.
>
> Go to rec.radio.cb --- you will get sympathy there and also probably bad
> mouthed about illegal operations. But perhaps you didn't know it was
> illegal -- now you do.
>
> Read FCC rules at URL:
> http://wireless.fcc.gov/services/personal/cb/
>
> As far as your visit to the club meeting -- here in Southern California we
> have a youth group of young Hams under the age of 18, about 20 of them. We
> have donated lots of equipment to their schools, given them free books, make
> a point to welcome them to the repeaters and club meetings. All ethnic
> groups and genders are represented. They had a table and setup at Field Day
> just for the youth group at the GOTA station. They meet each Thurs eve for a
> net on one of our repeaters. Some are involved in Emergency Communications.
> We treat all Hams the same, young, old, green or blue. Maybe you live in an
> area where the converse is true.
>
> So your comments are like --- this cat is green -- so all cats are
> reen --- too generalized.
>
> And your comment about "Old White men" is racist and stupid, as you too
> will be old someday. Sooner than you think.

Oh, I don't think Cindy will ever be an old white man! 8^)

> Ask yourself a question "When did I start to hate Old Folks ??"
> The ones that Tom Brokaw termed "The Greatest Generation".
> The ones who made this country the great nation it is.

Old white guys are a legitimate target - and I hope to someday be an old
white guy.

1832. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 17:35:18 UTC
From: Ham Dat Am <HDA@pork.com>
Message-ID: <qvs1b.11142$S_.8706@fed1read01>
Source record: 75247
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Bravo well sed! Ditto
Maybe like taking the kids to a Lions or Rotory meeting.
zzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzzz

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F464EA0.1050004@psu.edu...
>
> But, to answer your paragraph, why would anyone take a group of kids to
> an amateur club meeting? It's a completely different environment than
> they would be comfortable in. And there is usually business to take care
> of at a meeting that would be mind numbing for kids to listen to, like
> finances, membership issues, etc. If you really wanted to get them
> interested, you would get a few amateurs to meet with the kids on the
> kids turf, like a classroom, the local YMCA, places like that. The kids
> would be comfortable, only hams who ar interested in public outreach
> would be involved, and a program could be put together that would keep
> the kids involved and interactive.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

1833. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 17:41:40 UTC
From: Ham Dat Am <HDA@pork.com>
Message-ID: <pBs1b.11143$S_.4538@fed1read01>
Source record: 75248
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F465214.4040907@psu.edu...>
>
> Old white guys are a legitimate target - and I hope to someday be an old
> white guy.
>
Don't tell that to an old Marine who fought on Iwo Jima

1834. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 17:54:01 UTC
From: Ham Dat Am <HDA@pork.com>
Message-ID: <_Ms1b.11144$S_.6158@fed1read01>
Source record: 75249
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

FYI Cindy From FCC URL:

http://wireless.fcc.gov/services/personal/cb/operations/#equipment
You must use an FCC certificated CB transmitter at your CB station. You can identify an FCC certificated transmitter by the certification label placed on it by the manufacturer.

> Cindy W
>
>
>
>
>

1835. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 17:59:53 UTC
From: Cool Breeze <space@c.com>
Message-ID: <i-Kcnets0bEB9duiXTWJhg@comcast.com>
Source record: 75256
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Cindy W" <CindyW@tampafastisp.net> wrote in message
news:bi5eggnpg0@pita.alt.net...

> Which is exacly why young kids are turned off by ham
> radio. I once took a group of young black kids to a
> local ham radio club meeting. All the old white men
> ignored the kids or made rude remarks. These same
> frustrated old white men then wonder why the hobby
> is rapidly going the way of the horse & buggy.
>
> Cindy W

Cindy, take that group of young Black kids and turn to CB Super Bowl
channel 6 get them 10 kw amplifiers and they will fit right in....

1836. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 18:13:29 UTC
From: Ham Dat Am <HDA@pork.com>
Message-ID: <d3t1b.11149$S_.1131@fed1read01>
Source record: 75250
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ah come on Tom -- we all know CB is a legal hobby, but as I read the rules for the Citizen Band --- there is no provision for Packet Radio on the 27 MHz band as Cindy asked.

CB Rules:
[Code of Federal Regulations]
[Title 47, Volume 5]
[Revised as of October 1, 2002]
From the U.S. Government Printing Office via GPO Access
[CITE: 47CFR95.412]

[Page 529-530]

TITLE 47--TELECOMMUNICATION

COMMISSION (CONTINUED)

PART 95--PERSONAL RADIO SERVICES--Table of Contents

Subpart D--Citizens Band (CB) Radio Service

Sec. 95.412 (CB Rule 12) What communications may be transmitted?

(a) You may use your CB station to transmit two-way plain language communications. Two-way plain language communications are communications without codes or coded messages. Operating signals such as ``ten codes'' are not considered codes or coded messages. You may transmit two-way plain language communications only to other CB stations, to units of your own CB station or to authorized government stations on CB frequencies about--
(1) Your personal or business activities or those of members of your immediate family living in your household;
(2) Emergencies (see CB Rule 18, Sec. 95.418);
(3) Traveler assistance (see CB Rule 18, Sec. 95.418); or
(4) Civil defense activities in connection with official tests or drills conducted by, or actual emergencies announced by, the civil defense agency with authority over the area in which your station is located.
(b) You may use your CB station to transmit a tone signal only when the signal is used to make contact or to continue communications. (Examples

[[Page 530]]

of circuits using these signals are tone operated squelch and selective calling circuits.) If the signal is an audible tone, it must last no

longer than 15 seconds at one time. If the signal is a subaudible tone,
it may be transmitted continuously only as long as you are talking.
(c) You may use your CB station to transmit one-way communications
(messages which are not intended to establish communications between two
or more particular CB stations) only for emergency communications,
traveler assistance, brief tests (radio checks) or voice paging.

So I ask you --- where does it say Packet radio is permissable on the CB
band. In fact it sez:
You may use your CB station to transmit two-way plain language
communications. PERIOD

">
> You are mistaken. CB radio is a legal hobby and so
> is packet radio.
>
> Tom
>
>
>

1837. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 18:16:29 UTC
From: Ham Dat Am <HDA@pork.com>
Message-ID: <16t1b.11150$S_.10886@fed1read01>
Source record: 75251
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Then I hope the guy who sold you the radio pays the fine when the FCC nails
you -- and don't kid yourself -- they will.
Don't believe me -- see URL:
http://webtruckstop.com/forum/_forum/0000029f.htm

"Tom" <Tom@cbpacketcluborg.net> wrote in message
news:bi5lrc$5q0$0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> "Ham Dat Am" <HDA@pork.com> wrote in message
> news:_Ms1b.11144$S_.6158@fed1read01...
> > FYI Cindy From FCC URL:
> >
> > http://wireless.fcc.gov/services/personal/cb/operations/#equipment
> > You must use an FCC certificated CB transmitter at your CB station. You
> can
> > identify an FCC certificated transmitter by the certification label
placed
> > on it by the manufacturer.
> >
> >
> > > Cindy W
> > >
> > >
> > >
>
> I cant fine a FCC certraficate on my radio.
> Could you hep me fine it? The guy i bought the
> radio from is a ham an he says CB hobby radio is
> legal and he do packet all the time. The radio is
> made in China and has all channels and freeband
> extra channels. where is the FCC certraficate?
>
> thanks and seven-thirds
> Tom on 27680 worldwide
>
>
>

1838. NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 18:28:06 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308221028.605a3cbf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75252

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<y6o1b.1859$6e5.104776@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030822071611.12631.00000460@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > Would you agree with this statement:
> >
> > however, at the same time, those who are not interested in building radios
> > should not be forced to learn how they work in order to gain amateur radio
> > privileges ...
>
> No ... because, even if you don't build your own radios, you are responsible
> for their proper operation.

Do you think every ham understands how their radios work? Do you think
the tests even begin to measure the things a ham needs to know to
determine if a radio is working properly?

> How could you possibly know something was
> wrong if you had no knowledge of how the radio worked?

By how it behaves. And by how other hams tell you it sounds, or
doesn't sound.
>
> This is an interference control issue ... a technical matter ... and
> knowledge
> of this IS required in order to be competent to operate a station in full
> compliance with the rules.

Do you really think even the Extra test measures that knowledge?
Particularly given the extremely wide range of technologies that a ham
is authorized to use?

Example: New Ham buys old rig, which requires tuning up. Even though
in perfect operating order, said rig can be mistuned by the unknowing
to produce all sorts of spurious responses. Current tests say nothing
about proper method of dipping and loading, grid drive, audio gain,
etc. Heck, most current EEs couldn't get the thing to work without
help.

But FCC trusts that New Ham will seek out a manual, read up, get help
from Old Hams, and be a responsible licensee even though the tests
didn't cover 1% of how his new/old rig works. FCC trusts that New Ham
will educate him/herself on the technology used and not cause
interference. So why should New Ham be forced to jump through a
written test hoop and learn things he/she won't use? Answer: Because
some folks think he/she should have to. And for no other reason.

> > >> 2) Knowledge of morse code can only be measured by a practical skill
> > >> test.
> > >
> > >Excuse me ... I think you mean "proficiency in " not "knowledge of" ...
> >
> > No, I mean "knowledge of". Skills are a form of knowledge, as are facts
> and
> > concepts. Perhaps it would be better to write "practical knowledge"
>
> No, it's proficiency that the test measures

That's a skill.

> ... proficiency in decoding Morse
> in one's head at some specified speed.

5 wpm. Which is not "proficient" by any stretch of the imagination.

> And that's ALL it is according to
> the FCC (see the "No Code Technician" decision from 1990 and the R&O
> in 98-143 ... you'll see EXACTLY that in both documents).

Sure. But just because FCC says it does not make it true.
>
> > The Morse test which is Element 1 tests the skill of receiving Morse code
> > at a very basic level.
>
> Exactly, it measures a specific level of proficiency.

"Proficiency" starts at 10 wpm.

> > Element 1 is in no way a test of "proficiency". It's a skill test at a
> > very
> > basic level. To call it a proficiency test is to demonstrate ignorance of
> > the
> > word proficiency.
>
> Proficiency is measured against some "yardstick" ... in the case of Morse,
> the FCC has (currently) determined the yardstick to be 5 wpm.
> You can argue all you want, but that's the way it is ...

Sure. But just because FCC says it does not make it true.
>
> > Yet they wouldn't include a sunset clause back in 2000
>
> True ... they didn't include a sunset clause.

Which means they were not 100% convinced. Otherwise why do the whole
thing all over again?
>
> > and they're making all of us go through an NPRM cycle all over again.
>
> How the FCC will handle this is yet to be determined ...

So far it looks like NPRM time. As more and more proposals/petitions
roll in, and old ones remain unresolved, the ARRL forecast of two
years begins to look reasonable.
>
> > If FCC thinks there really is
> > "no regulatory purpose" to a code test, WHY are they dragging their feet
> > and doing the whole circus AGAIN?
>
> See my last sentence ...

We'll see. Not even 2 months since WRC-03, and the summer is not even
over yet. FCC could, upon review of the petitions, say "Yeah, we went
through this 3 years ago, nothing's changed, bye-bye Element 1".
>
> [snipped unrelated discussion of BPL]

Not unrelated at all. But I understand why you snipped it.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1839. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 18:48:49 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <lAt1b.1909$6e5.107905@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75253
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Cindy W" <CindyW@tampafastisp.net> wrote in message
news:bi5eggnpg0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> news:10577-3F462E45-34@storefull-2318.public.lawson.webtv.net...
> From: wk3cqth@wk3c.com (Carl R. Stevenson)
> >Sounds like totally illegal activity to me ... if I
>
> >were you, I would not expect help here and
>
> >would be prepared to duck for cover as the
>
> >flames erupt ...
>
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> _
> The "flames" you speak of usually originate from the guilty
> themselves..you know,,the ones that protesteth too much or the ones
> seeking assumed status or power over another...

I was simply commenting on the apparent illegallity of the sort
of operations that you described ... not something that hams
condone ... and warning you that you might get flamed.
(Note that I was polite ...)

> Which is exacly why young kids are turned off by ham
> radio. I once took a group of young black kids to a
> local ham radio club meeting. All the old white men
> ignored the kids or made rude remarks. These same
> frustrated old white men then wonder why the hobby
> is rapidly going the way of the horse & buggy.
>
> Cindy W

There is simply no excuse for the sort of behavior that
you describe in your last paragraph above ... I can assure
you that it would NOT happen at the local club of which
I am a member.

You *are* correct that there are too many hams who are
not open to, and often disparage, newcomers or "would-be's.
That IS a significant problem in bringing in the newcomers
and, particularly, younger folks who represent the future of

ham radio. On this point we agree 100%.

Carl - wk3c

1840. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 18:51:06 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <uCt1b.1910$6e5.107724@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75254
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:1-KdnRoFfd2UotuiXTWJhA@crocker.com...
>
> "Cindy W" <CindyW@tampafastisp.net> wrote in message
> news:bi5eggnpg0@pita.alt.net...
> > x-no-archive: yes
> > "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> > news:10577-3F462E45-34@storefull-2318.public.lawson.webtv.net...
> > From: wk3cqth@wk3c.com (Carl R. Stevenson)
> > >Sounds like totally illegal activity to me ... if I
> >
> > >were you, I would not expect help here and
> >
> > >would be prepared to duck for cover as the
> >
> > >flames erupt ...
> >
> > >Carl - wk3c
> >
> > _
> > The "flames" you speak of usually originate from the guilty
> > themselves..you know,,the ones that protesteth too much or the ones
> > seeking assumed status or power over another...
> >
> >
> > Which is exacly why young kids are turned off by ham
> > radio. I once took a group of young black kids to a
> > local ham radio club meeting. All the old white men
> > ignored the kids or made rude remarks. These same
> > frustrated old white men then wonder why the hobby
> > is rapidly going the way of the horse & buggy.
> >
>
> troll meter is pegged on this one!

Dave,

I disagree ... while I would discourage the apparently illegal packet
activity that Cindy described, I am forced by personal observation to
agree substantially with her assessment of how *many* (not all, but
enough to make a negative impact) treat kids and newcomers ...

Carl - wk3c

1841. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 18:55:27 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <zGt1b.1912$6e5.108152@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75255
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F464EA0.1050004@psu.edu...
>
> But, to answer your paragraph, why would anyone take a group of kids to
> an amateur club meeting? It's a completely different environment than
> they would be comfortable in. And there is usually business to take care
> of at a meeting that would be mind numbing for kids to listen to, like
> finances, membership issues, etc. If you really wanted to get them
> interested, you would get a few amateurs to meet with the kids on the
> kids turf, like a classroom, the local YMCA, places like that. The kids
> would be comfortable, only hams who ar interested in public outreach
> would be involved, and a program could be put together that would keep
> the kids involved and interactive.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

I think that getting kids involved with local ham clubs is an excellent
idea.
It will socialize them with the older, more experienced hams that can
"elmer" them, show them that there is order and organization, expose
them to programs and activities, etc.

The KEY is finding the RIGHT ham club that will treat the kids the way
they be deserve to be treated as the future of amateur radio, not a club
that will shun and ridicule them as Cindy has described.

Carl - wk3c

1842. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 19:49:13 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Zsu1b.1916$6e5.108587@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75257

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F464BF2.8050504@psu.edu...
> Phil Kane wrote:
> > On Thu, 21 Aug 2003 09:03:31 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> >
> >>hmmmm, I don't know about you, but I really like to have the numbers
> >>line up.
> >
> >
> > So do I, but if it's a choice of dropping the code test NOW and
> > leaving a hole where Element 1 used to be to be dealt with at some
> > future date, or futzing around for months with a total reorganization
> > of test elements, privileges, band segments, etc via a series of NPRMs
> > in a taffy-pull that will make r.r.a.p. look like a sedate cricket
match,
> > I take the former every time.
>
>
> When you put it that way, yes. Bu I expect that there will be lots of
> that taffy pulling, when we have a former President of NCI espousing his
> terrible proposed changes,

What are you talking about above? If you're refering to W5YI, he
may have made/not made some PERSONAL comments in the NCVEC
meeting, but as far as I can read, they did not get into the NCVEC
petition ...

> while Carl's method would work without making a mess.
By this, I take it you mean NCI's petition ... we appreciate your kind
words of support. :-)

> But the FCC has to weigh both. There will probably be even more
> proposals as time goes on.
>
> And since many of the statement I've seen from them talk about their
> desire to remove regulations, I wonder what the final outcome might be.
> In an extreme (admittedly unlikely) outcome, we may not have to worry
> about the numbering of the elements. There may be no elements. But I see
> a possibility of there being only one element after the dust settles.

The FCC is NOT going to abandon amateur testing ... they can't under
the ITU Radio Regulations ... in fact, there is an ITU Recommenation
on the qualifications of amateurs that is mentioned, though not in a
mandatory

way, in the newly-revised Article 25 ... it's there as "good advice/guidance to administrations" ...

Carl - wk3c

1843. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 19:51:13 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F467431.5030403@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75258
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Tom wrote:

>
> You are mistaken. CB radio is a legal hobby and so
>is packet radio.
>
>
>
But not packet on CB.

1844. FCC 'lookup' website??????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 19:51:57 UTC
From: kc5cqa@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <utsckvk42oqafcb6ms6t8cutgs7v5bnt9o@4ax.com>
Source record: 75259

I am looking for the FCC website where they have info
about 'ticket renewal'???? thanks cl.

1845. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 20:01:41 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F4676A4.1010001@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75261

WA3IYC wrote:

>No, I mean "knowledge of". Skills are a form of knowledge, as are facts and
>concepts. Perhaps it would be better to write "practical knowledge"
>
>For example, consider base 10 natural number arithmetic
>
>"2 + 2 = 4" is a fact.
>
>"Addition is a mathematical operation in which two numbers are combined to get
>a third number which is never less than either of the first two numbers" is a
>concept.
>
>
Not quite. What if the numbers are 2 and -8? Negative numbers are
valid numbers.....
Mathematicians have fun with this sort of thing. Called "proofs", which
I never did
really understand in calculus class anyway.

1846. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 20:04:20 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F467744.1030909@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75262

Phil Kane wrote:

>On 16 Aug 2003 08:44:00 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>
>
>
>>What did it take - six weeks? Not really long at all. Plus there was
>>always the chance FCC would have simply dumped Element 1 on its own,
>>instead of doing the whole NPRM thing.
>>
>>
>
> Bill Cross (FCC) was heard to mumble that he wasn't sure that the
> FCC could do so "on its own", so SOMEONE had to percuss the
> pendulum, right ???
>
>--
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>
>
Which the FCC didn't lose much sleep over, as they knew someone would file
a petition for rule making on it anyway. So that issue goes away
nicely, which
pleases bureaucrats endlessly.

1847. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 20:06:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Klu1b.1920$6e5.108499@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75260

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0308221028.605a3cbf@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<y6o1b.1859$6e5.104776@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > "WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030822071611.12631.00000460@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > > Would you agree with this statement:
> > >
> > > however, at the same time, those who are not interested in building
radios
> > > should not be forced to learn how they work in order to gain amateur
radio
> > > privileges ...
> >
> > No ... because, even if you don't build your own radios, you are
responsible
> > for their proper operation.
>
> Do you think every ham understands how their radios work?

No. Do I think that every ham *should* have at least a basic,
fundmental idea of how their radios work? Hell yes. (that is
my personal view)

> Do you think
> the tests even begin to measure the things a ham needs to know to
> determine if a radio is working properly?

They are certainly a step in the right direction ... but since this is
beyond the NCI Petition's scope and NCI's agenda, I don't
want to debate it in this context ...

[snip of written test related stuff as OT for this thread]

> > > >> 2) Knowledge of morse code can only be measured by a practical
skill
> > > >> test.
> > > >
> > > >Excuse me ... I think you mean "proficiency in " not "knowledge of"
...
> > >
> > > No, I mean "knowledge of". Skills are a form of knowledge, as are
facts
> > and
> > > concepts. Perhaps it would be better to write "practical knowledge"
> >

> > No, it's proficiency that the test measures
>
> That's a skill.
>
> > ... proficiency in decoding Morse
> > in one's head at some specified speed.
>
> 5 wpm. Which is not "proficient" by any stretch of the imagination.

In your view ... 5 wpm proficiency was what the FCC determined
to be adequate to satisfy its obligations under the *old* ITU Radio
Regs. NOW the ITU Radio Regs don't require any Morse test
at all and the FCC is free to eliminate that unnecessary element that
they have ALREADY determined "does not comport with the purpose
of the ARS" and "serves no regulatory purpose."

> > And that's ALL it is according to
> > the FCC (see the "No Code Technician" decision from 1990 and the R&O
> > in 98-143 ... you'll see EXACTLY that in both documents).
>
> Sure. But just because FCC says it does not make it true.

I hate to be the one to tell you this, but it's what the FCC says that
COUNTS.

> > > The Morse test which is Element 1 tests the skill of receiving Morse
code
> > > at a very basic level.
> > >
> > Exactly, it measures a specific level of proficiency.
>
> "Proficiency" starts at 10 wpm.

That's absurd ... proficiency is a relative term that must be quantified.
One can be proficient at a variety of levels in any activity requiring
some sort of acquired skill.

> > > Yet they wouldn't include a sunset clause back in 2000
> > >
> > True ... they didn't include a sunset clause.
>
> Which means they were not 100% convinced.

No, they stated that they would not presuppose the outcome of
a WRC and were uncertain when the matter would be considered
by a WRC ... they did NOT indicate any doubt or "waffling" on their
"does not comport with the purpose of the ARS" and "serves no
regulatory purpose determinations.

> Otherwise why do the whole thing all over again?
> >
> > > and they're making all of us go through an NPRM cycle all over again.
> > >

> > How the FCC will handle this is yet to be determined ...
>
> So far it looks like NPRM time. As more and more proposals/petitions
> roll in, and old ones remain unresolved, the ARRL forecast of two
> years begins to look reasonable.

We shall see ... hopefully the FCC will have the courage and wisdom
to save a LOT of their valuable, limited resources and spare the ham
community another two years of crap and just get it over with.

> > > If FCC thinks there really is
> > > "no regulatory purpose" to a code test, WHY are they dragging their
feet
> > > and doing the whole circus AGAIN?
> >
> > See my last sentence ... [refering to "How the FCC will handle this
> > is yet to be determined ..."]

> We'll see. Not even 2 months since WRC-03, and the summer is not even
> over yet. FCC could, upon review of the petitions, say "Yeah, we went
> through this 3 years ago, nothing's changed, bye-bye Element 1".

It takes time for the government to do anything ... we're still in the
pre-dawn
stages of a regulatory day ... but that doesn't mean it's going to take 2
years
either ...

> > [snipped unrelated discussion of BPL]
>
> Not unrelated at all. But I understand why you snipped it.

BPL is unrelated to the Morse test issue, but I *did* file Reply
Comments on BPL ... in fact, at the risk of being accused of
boasting a bit, I got a very gracious e-mail from someone high
up at ARRL HQ complimenting me on them and thanking me for
corroborating Ed Hare's field test observations ...

73,
Carl - wk3c

1848. Re: FCC 'lookup' website??????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 20:14:05 UTC
From: Ham Dat Am <HDA@pork.com>
Message-ID: <iQu1b.11159$S_.8222@fed1read01>
Source record: 75263

<kc5cqa@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:utsckvk42oqafcb6ms6t8cutgs7v5bnt9o@4ax.com...
> I am looking for the FCC website where they have info
> about 'ticket renewal'???? thanks cl.

To renew -- see ARRL Site URL:
http://www.arrl.org/fcc/forms.html

Callsign look up -- updated daily and "Yesterdays Transactions"
http://www.wm7d.net/fcc_uls/

FCC Callsign Lookup URL:
http://wireless2.fcc.gov/UlsApp/UlsSearch/searchLicense.jsp

1849. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 20:28:57 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308221228.5888fa2a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75264

A thought just occurred to me......

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<y6o1b.1859$6e5.104776@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030822071611.12631.00000460@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > Would you agree with this statement:
> >
> > however, at the same time, those who are not interested in building radios
> > should not be forced to learn how they work in order to gain amateur radio
> > privileges ...
>
> No ... because, even if you don't build your own radios, you are responsible
> for their proper operation. How could you possibly know something was
> wrong if you had no knowledge of how the radio worked?

I'm responsible for the proper operation of any motor vehicles I
operate, but I'm not required to know how they work. Or pass any exams
on how they work, even to build or repair my own vehicles.
>
> This is an interference control issue ... a technical matter ... and
> knowledge
> of this IS required in order to be competent to operate a station in full
> compliance with the rules.

Motor vehicle operation is a life-and-death public safety issue, and
an environmental issue. It's certainly a technical matter. Yet there
is no exam for technical knowledge of motor vehicle operation. There
IS a skill test, though....

Some states require that vehicles pass periodic inspections - but not
all states. And even in states that have inspection (like
Pennsylvania), a lot can go wrong between inspections. PA inspections
are annual, and a car that was perfectly fine at inspection time can
have all kinds of things go wrong in a year. Tires and brakes wear
out, shocks fail, fluids leak, alignment goes out, etc., etc. Yet PA
DMV trusts us to keep our vehicles in shape even though we are not
tested on how they work.

Most people nowadays don't build their own cars and most hams nowadays
don't build their own rigs.

73 de Jim, N2EY

1850. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 21:11:00 UTC
From: A Radar led news thug <newbury66@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <mFv1b.2047$L15.1338@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75265
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

<lucifer@eternal-flames.gov> wrote in message
news:smdbkvcu36ceijsr23ek3dngldsvj0qc5t@4ax.com...
> On Thu, 21 Aug 2003 22:54:25 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> pausing to cast envious glances at those who had
> mastered the skill of reading without moving their lips, wrote:
>
> >> Would you be interested in swapping Death Valley for Chippenham?
> >>
> > >I'm not sure...let me check with the two residents there.
>
> We have a reptile in the Chippenham area who would just love the warm,
> dry environment of Death Valley.
>
> Nick.

Careful Nick, reptiles have feelings too

1851. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 21:36:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <J1w1b.29882$Vx2.13535134@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75266

"WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030822064317.21457.00000144@mb-m10.aol.com...
> No offense, Phil, but the fact that we even have to fight as bad an idea
as BPL
> has caused my respect for a certain "expert agency" to all but disappear.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Whoever said the FCC was an "expert agency"???

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1852. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 21:49:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Ndw1b.807$O03.575@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75267

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F45707B.7050604@ix.netcom.com...

> >Step Twenty Nine: Use "73" and "88" incorrectly. Both are already
considered
> >plural, but add a "s" to the end anyway. Say "73's" or "88's". Who cares
if it
> >means "best regards" and "love and kisses." Better yet, say "seventy
thirds"!
> >(By the way, seventy thirds equals about 23.3).
> >
> >
> I've heard "3's and 8's."
>
> >
> >
>

Which comes directly from CB.

Dan/W4NTI

1853. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 21:51:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <8fw1b.29885$Vx2.13538140@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75268

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:KIu1b.1920$6e5.108499@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0308221028.605a3cbf@posting.google.com...
> > "Proficiency" starts at 10 wpm.
>
> That's absurd ... proficiency is a relative term that must be quantified.
> One can be proficient at a variety of levels in any activity requiring
> some sort of acquired skill.
>

We might consider the arguments presented in the book "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy". The author had done extensive study on Morse code teaching methods, learning abilities, etc. His definition of proficiency is along the lines of what level must a person obtain to prevent forgetting it. Basically his research showed that those who achieved 13wpm did not forget the code even if they did not use it. They would get "rusty" so to speak and their speed would fall off if they did not use it but they would not forget it. Once they resumed using it, their speed would fairly quickly climb back to their previous level. That would seem like a reasonable definition.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1854. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 21:55:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <yjw1b.865$O03.129@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75269
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Steve Terry" <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote in message
news:ELf1b.1378$L15.137@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:01c1b.5554$sV.2030@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
> > news:2qj3kv4tgvbqatnhjmu9ik1kqq07d7juko@4ax.com...
> > > On Mon, 18 Aug 2003 18:54:27 -0500, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > > <w4nti@NOSPAMmindspring.com> wrote:
> <snip>
> > > If they are "enemies in a time of war", then they should be treated as
> > > Prisoners of War in accordance with the terms of the Geneva
> > > Convention. Your President has denied that they are Prisoners of War,
> > > because he is well aware that the terms of the Convention are being
> > > flagrantly breached.
> > > 73 de G3NYY
> > > Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com
> >
> > So what Walt? Your type talkes about the 'rights' of the raghead
> > murderers. How about the rights of the 9 to 5 innocent victim of the
> > raghead murders?
> >
> You don't seem to be able to distinguish one raghead from another ?
> >
> > You dont seem to understand how this country reacted to 9/11.
> >
> That's patronising, many of us know only too well how 9/11 was reached
> as a reaction from some of the ragheads to years of US foreign policy
> in the middle east supporting Israel in any, and all it's activities.
> The US simply reaped what it sowed
> >
> > And I think I know why. Your country and Europe in general is used to
being
> totally
> > destroyed, or at least nearly, every century or so. Its normal to you.
Not
> > to us. We in the USA actually believed we were safe from that sort of
crap.
> >
> Yes I noticed that illusion when I was in NY only days before 9/11,
> you had no concept of building security.
> Whereas we here after suffering over 30 years of IRA terrorism

> finance by US citizens have had to learn proper and effective security.
> Not once in Manhattan did I have my bag or myself searched
> >
> > Well we now know we are not. We have just been rudely awakened into the
> > real world. Lucky for us we have the means to AVENGE it all.
> >
> The real world that the US has helped to create, has visited you.
> >
> > We are dangerous now.
> >
> Always have been
> >
> > You better believe it.
> >
> Unfortunately do
> >
> > But I think, or should I say, hope we will not 'overdue' it.
> >
> You will, you always do.
> >
> > But I assure you we will not allow this terrorism to stand.
> >
> Which / whose particular terrorism is that then ?
> >
> > We will defend ourselves. And if that requires a
> > 'pre-emptive first strike' then it shall be. Keep that in mind.
> > We are not walking away from this.
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> Are you Jewish ? you seem to have that sort of righteous tone
>
> Steve Terry
>
>
>
>
>

Why is it when someone stands up and is willing to be counted a comment like 'are you Jewish' is made? And no I am not Jewish. I am an AMERICAN and damn proud of it.

Dan/W4NTI

1855. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 21:57:57 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Flw1b.895$O03.188@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75270
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:j0jbkvk1u2vqg26u07acg9i5rcsiiblqim@4ax.com...
> On Thu, 21 Aug 2003 22:50:36 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >So what Walt? Your type talkes about the 'rights' of the raghead
> >murderers. How about the rights of the 9 to 5 innocent victim of the
> >raghead murders?
>
> And then *I* am accused of racism!!!!! LOL. Zionists take note.
>
> > We in the USA actually believed we were safe from that sort of crap.
>
> Time to wake up and smell the coffee, OM.
>
> A large part of your problem is that you just can't seem to accept
> that there are people in this world who just don't like you or what
> you stand for.
>
> >We are dangerous now.
>
> Very! As demonstrated by your rantings. I sincerely hope your
> bellicose attitude is not typical of the USA citizenry in general.
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

It is to a large part old boy. Ask the Japs what happened when they did
their sneak attack. Ask Germany how it liked those B17 daylight raids.
Piss us off and its hell to pay.

Dan/W4NTI

1856. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 21:58:09 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Rlw1b.29886$Vx2.13539503@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75271
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Tom" <Tom@cbpacketcluborg.net> wrote in message
news:bi5lfm$56c$0@pita.alt.net...
>
>
> You are mistaken. CB radio is a legal hobby and so
> is packet radio.
>

Both are legal but combining packet with CB is NOT legal. Also US law limits CB communications to LOCAL use only although propagation makes it possible to communicate world wide. You are not allowed to make cross country or out of country contacts on CB.

Actually given the fact that we are in the trough of the sunspot cycle, long distance communications on the CB band will be rather rare for the next few years.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1857. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 22:02:48 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <cqw1b.29888$Vx2.13541022@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75272
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:zGt1b.1912$6e5.108152@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F464EA0.1050004@psu.edu...
> >
> > But, to answer your paragraph, why would anyone take a group of kids to
> > an amateur club meeting? It's a completely different environment than
> > they would be comfortable in. And there is usually business to take care
> > of at a meeting that would be mind numbing for kids to listen to, like
> > finances, membership issues, etc. If you really wanted to get them
> > interested, you would get a few amateurs to meet with the kids on the
> > kids turf, like a classroom, the local YMCA, places like that. The kids
> > would be comfortable, only hams who ar interested in public outreach
> > would be involved, and a program could be put together that would keep
> > the kids involved and interactive.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
> I think that getting kids involved with local ham clubs is an excellent
> idea.
> It will socialize them with the older, more experienced hams that can
> "elmer" them, show them that there is order and organization, expose
> them to programs and activities, etc.
>
> The KEY is finding the RIGHT ham club that will treat the kids the way
> they be deserve to be treated as the future of amateur radio, not a club
> that will shun and ridicule them as Cindy has described.
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

Not only that but if the group is larger than two or three, it would be very wise to arrange it with the club in advance so that they can set aside some time from the business meeting to welcome the kids and have material prepared to show them some of the marvels of ham radio. Just springing a batch of kids on the club is not the best way to introduce the kids to the club and vice versa.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1858. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 22:10:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <dxw1b.958$O03.622@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75273
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Cindy W" <CindyW@tampafastisp.net> wrote in message
news:bi5eggnpg0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> news:10577-3F462E45-34@storefull-2318.public.lawson.webtv.net...
> From: wk3cqth@wk3c.com (Carl R. Stevenson)
> >Sounds like totally illegal activity to me ... if I
>
> >were you, I would not expect help here and
>
> >would be prepared to duck for cover as the
>
> >flames erupt ...
>
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> _
> The "flames" you speak of usually originate from the guilty
> themselves..you know,,the ones that protesteth too much or the ones
> seeking assumed status or power over another...
>
>
> Which is exacly why young kids are turned off by ham
> radio. I once took a group of young black kids to a
> local ham radio club meeting. All the old white men
> ignored the kids or made rude remarks. These same
> frustrated old white men then wonder why the hobby
> is rapidly going the way of the horse & buggy.
>
> Cindy W
>
>
>
>
>

Not up to us 'old white men' to handle you and your problem. I just
forwarded your initial message to the FCC. I hope they find it interesting.

Don't like that? Too bad.

Dan/W4NTI

1859. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 22:32:17 UTC
From: mcdu_pkearn_lsk4@cockpit.eircom.12wpm.co.uk.net
Message-ID: <3f4699a8.8623935@news1.eircom.net>
Source record: 75274
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

On Fri, 22 Aug 2003 04:21:21 +0100, "Steve Terry"
<g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote:

>BTW G.B. Shaw was Irish, and the quote was from Churchill

in the same way that a successful Scottish Athelete in British
whereas an unsuccessful Scottish Athlete is Scottish.

1860. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 22:48:27 UTC
From: Ged <ged65@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk>
Message-ID: <z7uXIpH72pR$EwYx@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk>
Source record: 75275
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

In message <Flw1b.895$O03.188@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get.rid.invalid> writes
>It is to a large part old boy. Ask the Japs what happened when they did
>their sneak attack. Ask Germany how it liked those B17 daylight raids.
>Piss us off and its hell to pay.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>

I guess the Vietnamese and Somalis whipped yer arses because you just
weren't pissed off enough eh?

(Standby for the usual Republican answer of 'we weren't allowed to win
by the politicians')
--
Ged

1861. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 22:53:06 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <m9x1b.29906$Vx2.13552840@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75276
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F467431.5030403@ix.netcom.com...
> Tom wrote:
>
> > You are mistaken. CB radio is a legal hobby and so
> >is packet radio.
> >
> But not packet on CB.

This is true in the U.S., but in other parts of the world CB packet is completely legal, and very popular. FBB BBS software was altered about eight or nine years ago to make it usable with CB callsigns, because of that popularity.

There are dozens of European CB packet web-sites... Where have all you guys been the last decade or so?

If it was legal here in the U.S., it would be popular here, too. Personally, I do not see any harm in it, but the law is the law. It can't be done here in the U.S., but we cannot assume that everybody in this newsgroup is in the U.S.. For some of the readers here, CB packet is a legal, legitimate hobby.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

1862. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 23:21:03 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030822192103.041$z8@newsreader.com>
Source record: 75277
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> Not up to us 'old white men' to handle you and your problem. I just
> forwarded your initial message to the FCC. I hope they find it
> interesting.
>
> Don't like that? Too bad.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
I'm sure they need another good laugh from you, twit.

--
GO #40

1863. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 23:46:11 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030822194611.12501.00001689@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 75278

In article <3F4676A4.1010001@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>WA3IYC wrote:
>
>>No, I mean "knowledge of". Skills are a form of knowledge, as are facts and
>>concepts. Perhaps it would be better to write "practical knowledge"
>>
>>For example, consider base 10 natural number arithmetic
>>
>>"2 + 2 = 4" is a fact.
>>
>>"Addition is a mathematical operation in which two numbers are combined to
>get
>>a third number which is never less than either of the first two numbers" is
>a
>>concept.
>>
>>
>Not quite.

Yes, quite. "Base 10 natural number arithmetic" does not include negative
numbers.

>What if the numbers are 2 and -8? Negative numbers are
>valid numbers.....

Not in the arithmetic of natural numbers...

Now if you want to talk about real numbers, or integers, or rational numbers...

>Mathematicians have fun with this sort of thing. Called "proofs", which
>I never did really understand in calculus class anyway.
>
Ah yes..

73 de Jim, N2EY

1864. Re: Code / No Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 23:48:15 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <3Zx1b.30208$Vx2.13566803@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75279

"stewart" <horseshoe7@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:5f4fe4c2.0308211145.5e6cb236@posting.google.com...
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<gFn0b.27165$Vx2.12494241@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > I don't have any strong preference about the Code / No Code issue, but I
> > have a well developed opinion about the group of hams who have endlessly
> > repeated the same tired flamewar crapola for years on this newsgroup,
over
> > the Code / No Code issue.
> >
> > Less than a dozen "hams" have used this issue as an excuse to turn this
> > newsgroup into a running flame war that has gone on for years, much to
the
> > detriment of the hobby. People look at this newsgroup to see what hams
are
> > like - and what they see would reflect poorly on any hobby.
>
> What a hypocrite.
>
> You have been doing virtually the same crap on
> rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc for years... debating endlessly and
> meaninglessly... bringing up a need to revive long dead HF-based PBBS
> systems, and denouncing any attempts at modernization.

The "modernization" that Stewart speaks about... Where is that, I wonder?
Where is that modern "replacement" for packet that I used to keep hearing
about from the TAPR folks? I don't hear much about that particular vapor
system any more, these days. That's a shame, because it was "just around the
corner", waiting on "critical mass" for years and years and years, there...

Still waiting, Stewart? I think most of your buddies have lost patience and
given up.

I responded to anti-ham types on (rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc) who wanted
to move packet radio off of radio and onto the Internet, a stupid idea that
ultimately showed no positive result. I ALWAYS argue with really stupid
ideas like that, Stewart.

To see what real hams who actually use radio are doing digital these days,
see the "Network" page at USPN: http://www.uspacket.net

To see what was accomplished by "hams" such as yourself, Stewart, take a
good long look at a blank sheet of paper. You might as well, because you
sure don't have any network to show.

With the recent upsurge in interest in emergency communications, packet is once again coming into it's own as an integral part of amateur radio. One universal feature among the largest, most sucessful packet radio networks in the U.S. today is that they have studiously ignored TAPR and it's failed paradigm for years. They just go ahead and use packet radio networking to save property and lives, while the TAPR folks remain so out of touch that they will not even admit that those networks exist.

"Packet radio is dead" is TAPR's message to U.S. hams... (See the last TAPR PSR) Again, to see what hams who actually use radio are doing digital these days, see the "Network" page at USPN.

All across the U.S., hams are dusting off old TNC's or buying new ones, starting up new packet networks or upgrading the capabilities of what they have. For several years now, packet has been growing once again here in the U.S., including one network in the northeast that has put up over 140 nodes in just the last few years.

Anybody who thinks packet is "dead" is just plain out of touch. Instead of being all sour-grapey about TAPR's failure, why not celebrate the way that U.S. hams are once again building up a great packet net, Stewart? If you can't beat us, why not join us?

Charles Brabham, N5PVL
Director: USPacket.Net
n5pvl@uspacket.net
http://www.uspaqcket.net

1865. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-22 23:54:53 UTC
From: Ham Dat Am <HDA@pork.com>
Message-ID: <i3y1b.12829$S_.6013@fed1read01>
Source record: 75280
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

However the original poster Cindy indicated she was in Tampa, FL and her
e-mail address substantiates that.

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:m9x1b.29906$Vx2.13552840@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3F467431.5030403@ix.netcom.com...
> > Tom wrote:
> >
> > > You are mistaken. CB radio is a legal hobby and so
> > >is packet radio.
> > >
> > But not packet on CB.
>
> This is true in the U.S., but in other parts of the world CB packet is
> completely legal, and very popular. FBB BBS software was altered about
eight
> or nine years ago to make it usable with CB callsigns, because of that
> popularity.
>
> There are dozens of European CB packet web-sites... Where have all you
guys
> been the last decade or so?
>
> If it was legal here in the U.S., it would be popular here, too.
Personally,
> I do not see any harm in it, but the law is the law. It can't be done here
> in the U.S., but we cannot assume that everybody in this newsgroup is in
the
> U.S.. For some of the readers here, CB packet is a legal, legitimate
hobby.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

1866. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 00:30:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F46B5BF.6010001@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75281

N2EY wrote:
> A thought just occurred to me......
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<y6o1b.1859$6e5.104776@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>
>>"WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20030822071611.12631.00000460@mb-m28.aol.com...
>>
>>>Would you agree with this statement:
>>>
>>>however, at the same time, those who are not interested in building radios
>>>should not be forced to learn how they work in order to gain amateur radio
>>>privileges ...
>>
>>No ... because, even if you don't build your own radios, you are responsible
>>for their proper operation. How could you possibly know something was
>>wrong if you had no knowledge of how the radio worked?
>
>
> I'm responsible for the proper operation of any motor vehicles I
> operate, but I'm not required to know how they work.

If I were responsible for the drivers exams, you would be..

Or pass any exams
> on how they work, even to build or repair my own vehicles.

If I were responsible for the drivers exams, you would be...

>>This is an interference control issue ... a technical matter ... and
>>knowledge
>>of this IS required in order to be competent to operate a station in full
>>compliance with the rules.

>
> Motor vehicle operation is a life-and-death public safety issue, and
> an environmental issue. It's certainly a technical matter. Yet there
> is no exam for technical knowledge of motor vehicle operation. There
> IS a skill test, though....

If I were... oh heck you know....

> Some states require that vehicles pass periodic inspections - but not
> all states. And even in states that have inspection (like
> Pennsylvania), a lot can go wrong between inspections. PA inspections

> are annual, and a car that was perfectly fine at inspection time can
> have all kinds of things go wrong in a year. Tires and brakes wear
> out, shocks fail, fluids leak, alignment goes out, etc., etc. Yet PA
> DMV trusts us to keep our vehicles in shape even though we are not
> tested on how they work.
>
> Most people nowadays don't build their own cars and most hams nowadays
> don't build their own rigs.

If..... At any rate, I would have the prospective driver change a tire, check their oil, do all kinds of stuff that prove they know something about the vehicle they are driving. There would even be test questions about how an engine works.

I suppose that's hazing, or why should they learn that. They can just call AAA on their cell.

Remind me to tell y'all about the night I darn near froze to death (seriously) waiting for AAA to get me out of a vehicle breakdown. Fortunately, a fellow ham ended up saving my cute butt.

- Mike KB3EIA -

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

1867. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 00:35:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <XEy1b.1662$O03.637@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75282
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

<lucifer@eternal-flames.gov> wrote in message
news:kc5dkvgn8d1011e179cdfoudficnd40bi7@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 22 Aug 2003 21:57:57 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> pausing to cast envious glances at those who had
> mastered the skill of reading without moving their lips, wrote:
>
> >It is to a large part old boy. Ask the Japs what happened when they did
> >their sneak attack. Ask Germany how it liked those B17 daylight raids.
> >Piss us off and its hell to pay.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Of course where you went wrong, was in confining the raids to Germany.
> Why didn't you turn France into one giant used-car lot at the same
> time? Then there's a place called Cardiff.
>
> Nick.
>

Probably because that whining DeGaulle had Ike's ear.

Dan/W4NTI

1868. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 00:37:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <vHy1b.1665$O03.387@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75283
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Ged" <ged65@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk> wrote in message
news:z7uXIpH72pR$EwYx@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk...
> In message <Flw1b.895$O03.188@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get.rid.invalid> writes
> >It is to a large part old boy. Ask the Japs what happened when they did
> >their sneak attack. Ask Germany how it liked those B17 daylight raids.
> >Piss us off and its hell to pay.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> I guess the Vietnamese and Somalis whipped yer arses because you just
> weren't pissed off enough eh?
>
> (Standby for the usual Republican answer of 'we weren't allowed to win
> by the politicians')
> --
> Ged

I don't really see where the Vietnamese and the Somalies 'whipped our
arses'. What I remember happening is the US Government WIMPED OUT before
we won. Neither situation was worth a damn. But don't blame the soldiers
for the actions of NIXON, KISSENGER and CLINTON.

Dan/W4NTI

1869. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 00:39:25 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <1Jy1b.1666$O03.28@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75284
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:eq6dkvse9e9pfkvvb9tustel1jsjnv0u18@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 22 Aug 2003 21:57:57 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >It is to a large part old boy. Ask the Japs what happened when they did
> >their sneak attack. Ask Germany how it liked those B17 daylight raids.
> >Piss us off and its hell to pay.
>
> It will not be long before middle America starts to become pissed off
> about your little adventure in Iraq, now that the body bags are coming
> home week after week.
>
> As I said, it's turning into another Vietnam. How many years did
> *that* escapade drag on for?
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

I must say Walt that you may indeed be right about this turning into another
VN. But let me ask you Walt....how much time did you put in the bush?

Dan/W4NTI

1870. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 00:41:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <XKy1b.1669$O03.1215@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75285
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Don't confuse them with the facts.

Dan/W4NTI

"Ham Dat Am" <HDA@pork.com> wrote in message
news:i3y1b.12829$S_.6013@fed1read01...
> However the original poster Cindy indicated she was in Tampa, FL and her
> e-mail address substantiates that.
>
>
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
> news:m9x1b.29906$Vx2.13552840@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > news:3F467431.5030403@ix.netcom.com...
> > > Tom wrote:
> > >
> > > > You are mistaken. CB radio is a legal hobby and so
> > > >is packet radio.
> > > >
> > > But not packet on CB.
> > >
> > This is true in the U.S., but in other parts of the world CB packet is
> > completely legal, and very popular. FBB BBS software was altered about
> eight
> > or nine years ago to make it usable with CB callsigns, because of that
> > popularity.
> >
> > There are dozens of European CB packet web-sites... Where have all you
> guys
> > been the last decade or so?
> >
> > If it was legal here in the U.S., it would be popular here, too.
> Personally,
> > I do not see any harm in it, but the law is the law. It can't be done
here
> > in the U.S., but we cannot assume that everybody in this newsgroup is in
> the
> > U.S.. For some of the readers here, CB packet is a legal, legitimate
> hobby.
> >
> > Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> >
> >

> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

1871. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 00:42:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <JLy1b.1672$O03.1295@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75286
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030822192103.041$z8@newsreader.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > Not up to us 'old white men' to handle you and your problem. I just
> > forwarded your initial message to the FCC. I hope they find it
> > interesting.
> >
> > Don't like that? Too bad.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> I'm sure they need another good laugh from you, twit.
>
> --
> GO #40

QRZ ??? who was the little twit there ??? QRZ ???

Dan/W4NTI

1872. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 00:45:03 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <JOy1b.2273$L15.1495@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75287
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"class_a_zpk_12wpm" <mcdu_pkearn_lsk4@cockpit.eircom.12wpm.co.uk.net> wrote in
message news:3f4699a8.8623935@news1.eircom.net...
> On Fri, 22 Aug 2003 04:21:21 +0100, "Steve Terry"
> <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote:
>
> >BTW G.B. Shaw was Irish, and the quote was from Churchill
>
> in the same way that a successful Scottish Athelete in British
> whereas an unsuccessful Scottish Athlete is Scottish.
>
and an unsuccessful Welsh one is only to be expected ;-)

Steve Terry

1873. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and RequirementsBut

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 00:48:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F46B9FD.9010608@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75288

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F464BF2.8050504@psu.edu...
>
>>Phil Kane wrote:
>>
>>>On Thu, 21 Aug 2003 09:03:31 -0400, Mike Coslo wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>hmmmm, I don't know about you, but I really like to have the numbers
>>>>line up.
>>>
>>>
>>> So do I, but if it's a choice of dropping the code test NOW and
>>> leaving a hole where Element 1 used to be to be dealt with at some
>>> future date, or futzing around for months with a total reorganization
>>> of test elements, privileges, band segments, etc via a series of NPRMs
>>> in a taffy-pull that will make r.r.a.p. look like a sedate cricket
>>
> match,
>
>>> I take the former every time.
>>
>>
>>When you put it that way, yes. Bu I expect that there will be lots of
>>that taffy pulling, when we have a former President of NCI espousing his
>>terrible proposed changes,
>
>
> What are you talking about above? If you're refering to W5YI, he
> may have made/not made some PERSONAL comments in the NCVEC
> meeting, but as far as I can read, they did not get into the NCVEC
> petition ...

Yes, he did, Carl. Man oh man you are paranoid! Even when I note that your ideas are sound, you have to complain! Yes, they *are* his personal opinions, and yes he *is* a former Prez of your organization.

I'm not trying to pick a fight with you, Carl. Just pointing out what people have said and proposed. And though I differ with you on some tings, I have chosen to ignore those differences.

>>while Carl's method would work without making a mess.
>
> By this, I take it you mean NCI's petition ... we appreciate your kind
> words of support. :-)
>
>
>>But the FCC has to weigh both. There will probably be even more
>>proposals as time goes on.
>>
>>And since many of the statement I've seen from them talk about their
>>desire to remove regulations, I wonder what the final outcome might be.
>>In an extreme (admittedly unlikely) outcome, we may not have to worry
>>about the numbering of the elements. There may be no elements. But I see
>>a possibility of there being only one element after the dust settles.
>
>
> The FCC is NOT going to abandon amateur testing ... they can't under
> the ITU Radio Regulations ... in fact, there is an ITU Recommenation
> on the qualifications of amateurs that is mentioned, though not in a
> mandatory
> way, in the newly-revised Article 25 ... it's there as "good advice/guidance
> to administrations" ...

But there could end up being *one* test, no?

An commision that would seriously consider the technically bankrupt
technology of BPL would be most capable of such a thing.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1874. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 00:52:35 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030822205235.462$gQ@newsreader.com>
Source record: 75289
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20030822192103.041$z8@newsreader.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > Not up to us 'old white men' to handle you and your problem. I just
> > > forwarded your initial message to the FCC. I hope they find it
> > > interesting.
> > >
> > > Don't like that? Too bad.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > I'm sure they need another good laugh from you, twit.
> >
> > --
> > GO #40
>
> QRZ ??? who was the little twit there ??? QRZ ???
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
That's easy:

W4NTI
DANIEL L JESWALD
89 WILDMAN RD
ANNISTON AL 36201
USA

--
GO #40

1875. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 00:53:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308221653.27ace07a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75290

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308221028.605a3cbf@posting.google.com>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<y6o1b.1859$6e5.104776@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > "WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030822071611.12631.00000460@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > > Would you agree with this statement:
> > >
> > > however, at the same time, those who are not interested in building radios
> > > should not be forced to learn how they work in order to gain amateur radio
> > > privileges ...
> > >
> > No ... because, even if you don't build your own radios, you are responsible
> > for their proper operation.
>
> Do you think every ham understands how their radios work? Do you think
> the tests even begin to measure the things a ham needs to know to
> determine if a radio is working properly?

Do you think that you could submit questions to the QPC concerning
those things that a ham needs to know?

And so it degenerates into a Morse Code argument again. Knowledge and
skill in Morse (Farnsworth) will keep your radio working properly.

> > > >> 2) Knowledge of morse code can only be measured by a practical skill
> > > >> test.
> > > >
> > > >Excuse me ... I think you mean "proficiency in " not "knowledge of" ...
> > >
> > > No, I mean "knowledge of". Skills are a form of knowledge, as are facts
> and
> > > concepts. Perhaps it would be better to write "practical knowledge"
> > >
> > No, it's proficiency that the test measures
>
> That's a skill.
>
> > ... proficiency in decoding Morse
> > in one's head at some specified speed.
>
> 5 wpm. Which is not "proficient" by any stretch of the imagination.

Its the new standard, albeit probably short lived.

> > And that's ALL it is according to
> > the FCC (see the "No Code Technician" decision from 1990 and the R&O
> > in 98-143 ... you'll see EXACTLY that in both documents).
>
> Sure. But just because FCC says it does not make it true.

Ditto the ARRL.

> > > The Morse test which is Element 1 tests the skill of receiving Morse code
> > > at a very basic level.
> >
> > Exactly, it measures a specific level of proficiency.
>
> "Proficiency" starts at 10 wpm.

Where is Morse proficiency defined? Where is Morse defined?

1876. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 00:53:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F46BB32.8040206@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75291
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Ham Dat Am wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F465214.4040907@psu.edu...>
>
>>Old white guys are a legitimate target - and I hope to someday be an old
>>white guy.
>>
>
> Don't tell that to an old Marine who fought on Iwo Jima

I was just thinking that being old was better than the alternative! 8^)

And well, white guys of eurpean descent are kind of the target(and supposed cause of all ills) these day, old or young are the target these days, no?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1877. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 00:56:29 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <sZy1b.2275$L15.1592@newsfep4-winn.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75292
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

<lucifer@eternal-flames.gov> wrote in message
news:kc5dkvgn8d1011e179cdfoudficnd40bi7@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 22 Aug 2003 21:57:57 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> pausing to cast envious glances at those who had
> mastered the skill of reading without moving their lips, wrote:
>
> >It is to a large part old boy. Ask the Japs what happened when they did
> >their sneak attack. Ask Germany how it liked those B17 daylight raids.
> >Piss us off and its hell to pay.
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Of course where you went wrong, was in confining the raids to Germany.
> Why didn't you turn France into one giant used-car lot at the same
> time?
>
You can take a Frenchman out of Vichy, but you can't take Vichy out of a
Frenchman
>
> Then there's a place called Cardiff.
> Nick.
>
Caardeif could do with a US invasion, all that US aid would more than welcome.
Of course each truck and hummer would have to have an armed guard,
to stop the locals nicking the wheels.

Steve Terry

1878. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 01:01:27 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <H1z1b.30280$Vx2.13587368@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75294
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ham Dat Am" <HDA@pork.com> wrote in message
news:i3y1b.12829$S_.6013@fed1read01...
> However the original poster Cindy indicated she was in Tampa, FL and her
> e-mail address substantiates that.
>

Well then, it looks like Cindy's just going to have to find something legal to do. If she really likes packet, I'd recommend that she get her ham ticket and participate in the fine amateur packet radio activity that goes on in Florida. They have over 50 SEDAN nodes there if she is into public service and emergency communications, and there is also a great ROSE network there.

Trying to do packet on CB freqs in Florida will just get her in trouble, to no particular purpose.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

1879. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 01:01:28 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <H1z1b.30281$Vx2.13587473@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75293
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:JLy1b.1672$O03.1295@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>
> QRZ ??? who was the little twit there ??? QRZ ???

I don't pay much attention to anybody who claims to be a ham but won't show
a callsign. They're almost always anti-ham trolls.

Charles, N5PVL

1880. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 01:05:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F46BDF7.90803@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75295
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F464EA0.1050004@psu.edu...
>
>>But, to answer your paragraph, why would anyone take a group of kids to
>>an amateur club meeting? It's a completely different environment than
>>they would be comfortable in. And there is usually business to take care
>>of at a meeting that would be mind numbing for kids to listen to, like
>>finances, membership issues, etc. If you really wanted to get them
>>interested, you would get a few amateurs to meet with the kids on the
>>kids turf, like a classroom, the local YMCA, places like that. The kids
>>would be comfortable, only hams who ar interested in public outreach
>>would be involved, and a program could be put together that would keep
>>the kids involved and interactive.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> I think that getting kids involved with local ham clubs is an excellent
> idea.
> It will socialize them with the older, more experienced hams that can
> "elmer" them, show them that there is order and organization, expose
> them to programs and activities, etc.
>
> The KEY is finding the RIGHT ham club that will treat the kids the way
> they be deserve to be treated as the future of amateur radio, not a club
> that will shun and ridicule them as Cindy has described.

I think that the best approach is to get with the kids at a level that they can relate to. And a club meeting is not always the right place. There is business to attend to, and that is a necessary evil which can turn a kid off really quickly. It can turn a lot of other people off also.

In our club, the board tries to do as much business as possible during the separate board meetings. But we still have to bring a surprising number of issues before the membership.

Now that being said, if someone wanted to bring a number of students to a club meeting, we would probably come up with some program to keep them entertained and interactive.

What is interesting to a group of Older folk is probably not going to be interesting to a group of teenagers, save for a narrow overlap.

The other thing I would be interested in knowing is the other side of the story. Did Ms Cindy just show up with the kids in tow? Did the hams, if they knew she was coming, do nothiing special for them? There are enough unanswered questions that I must go on the evidence presented, and that is the illegal packet suggestion, and the odd race related comment. Perhaps Cindy can elaborate.......

- Mike KB3EIA -

1881. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 01:08:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F46BEA1.1060303@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75296
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

charlesb wrote:
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3F467431.5030403@ix.netcom.com...
>
>>Tom wrote:
>>
>>
>>> You are mistaken. CB radio is a legal hobby and so
>>>is packet radio.
>>>
>>
>>But not packet on CB.
>
>
> This is true in the U.S., but in other parts of the world CB packet is
> completely legal, and very popular. FBB BBS software was altered about eight
> or nine years ago to make it usable with CB callsigns, because of that
> popularity.
>
> There are dozens of European CB packet web-sites... Where have all you guys
> been the last decade or so?

I don't pay much attention to US CB, I'm not about to study the
European version.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1882. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 01:11:30 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030822211130.739$hs@newsreader.com>
Source record: 75297
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:JLy1b.1672$O03.1295@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> >
> > QRZ ??? who was the little twit there ??? QRZ ???
>
> I don't pay much attention to anybody who claims to be a ham but won't
> show a callsign. They're almost always anti-ham trolls.
>
> Charles, N5PVL
>
Why do you cross post your drivel to rec.radio.cb then, brainiak?

--
GO #40

1883. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 01:37:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F46C557.6080301@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75298
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
>
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> news:JLy1b.1672$O03.1295@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>>>
>>> QRZ ??? who was the little twit there ??? QRZ ???
>>
>> I don't pay much attention to anybody who claims to be a ham but
>> won't show a callsign. They're almost always anti-ham trolls.
>>
>> Charles, N5PVL
>>
>
> Why do you cross post your drivel to rec.radio.cb then, brainiak?
>
Because the original message was there and in rrap, and I was
responding to a person tha tI think posted from there.

- Mike KB3EIA -

1884. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 01:58:37 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308221758.3b0e65ff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75299

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<J1w1b.29882$Vx2.13535134@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030822064317.21457.00000144@mb-m10.aol.com...
> > No offense, Phil, but the fact that we even have to fight as bad an idea
> as BPL
> > has caused my respect for a certain "expert agency" to all but disappear.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> Whoever said the FCC was an "expert agency"???
>

I realize that may seem strange to anyone who hasn't been around
radio regulation for as long as a few decades, but the FCC is indeed,
as the final authority, *the* expert agency. And have often been so
considered by various courts when faced with challenges to some of
their actions.

Dick

1885. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 02:02:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030822220214.25815.00002373@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 75300

In article <z6X0b.1514$tS2.1603172@newsfep2-win.server.ntli.net>, "Derek" <danda95@hotmail.com> writes:

>These are Amateurs askinging questions Larry about Amateur Radio
>I would not talk to you on the air Larry because you are nothing but a
>F**cking bighead arsehole

Derek:

How charming. In any event, looking for me on the HF phone bands would prove to be an exercise in futility. I don't work HF phone, and haven't done so for many years.

73 de Larry, K3LT
First Place, 2003 ARRL RTTY Roundup
Low Power, Single-Operator (Delaware Section)

1886. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 02:02:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030822220215.25815.00002374@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 75301

In article <BB69C9E5.2493E%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
>> I see. Now telling the truth about the
>> dumbed-down, technically-disinclined,
>> skills-challenged individuals now being
>> attracted to ham radio is considered to
>> be "hateful rhetoric." Typical liberal
>> response. Yawn! Nothing new here!
>
>
> Larry, you really need to get off the "liberal" nonsense. Your attitudes
>about code are more liberal than most and your attitudes towards others are
>more akin to that of the deep woods redneck than that of a conservative.

Dwight:

As usual, you don't know what you're talking about. Liberals want to have the world handed to them on a silver platter, without having to work to earn their own way. This is the perfect description of the NCTA -- they want full HF privileges, without being bothered to learn a useful communications skill like the Morse code. Therefore, they whine about the code testing requirements, making all their usual strawman arguments about the code being "obsolete" yada, yada, yada, ad nauseum, and they've finally been accommodated by the Liberal Elite at the ARRL and the FCC, who wish not to offend anyone by maintaining anything like traditional, high standards.

> Your desire for government protection of code testing to maintain your
>delusions of status is not unlike the liberal seeking protection for welfare
>state-like government benefits for other situations.

I'm not an anarchist, Dwight. I believe that government has a role in our society, and maintaining standards in the ARS, an activity in which citizens are given the privilege of making use of the valuable and finate resource known as the RF spectrum, makes sense to me. The "government protection" whine is just another NCTA strawman. I prefer to think of it as the government "protecting" the whole ARS, not just the Morse code and it's testing requirement. This is a valid and essential role for the government, but one which will undoubtedly be dropped simply for the convenience of the bureaucrats involved.

> And, if you don't know what a deep woods redneck is (a deep woods redneck
>is not the typical redneck), and how their attitudes are similar to yours,
>watch the movie "Deliverance."

I have been referred to as a "Yankee Redneck," and that is a term which
I feel is probably closer to the truth. Yankees are strong-willed,
independent,
and opinionated people. "Rednecks," of any region, are usually tough,
self-reliant, moral and decent people. Therefore, I'll accept this
description,
while taking exception to the "Deep Woods" angle, since I have all of my
teeth, don't drink homemade corn liquor, and don't have intimate relations
with first cousins. If any of these were true, then I'd be residing in Sussex
County, Delaware, and not Kent County, which is where I live.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1887. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 03:35:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030822233527.25815.00002377@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 75304

In article <BB6B1F90.249EF%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>
> Have you noticed even the press has had a hard time keeping a straight
>face when talking about the California recall vote? First, we have a midget
>who insists he's the protest vote. Then, we have oversized guy who still
>can't say his name properly after living in the country for decades. And
>then we have a cross-dresser certain to bring a new sense of fashion
>consciousness to the job. And we can go on and on. This is turning out to be
>one of the wackiest elections I've ever seen.

Dwight:

As it happens, Ahnold Schwartzenegger may be the best choice to be the next Governor of Cally-Forney-Ah. While he does espouse some political idealogy more in line with liberals than most Republicans would care for, he doesn't see the answer to everything to be raising taxes and expanding government. All the "whacky" candidates are on the ballot simply to grab their 15 minutes; Ahnold (that's MISTER Schwartzenegger to you) actually has a good chance of being elected if Gov. Davis is, in fact, recalled.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1888. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 03:35:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030822233528.25815.00002379@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 75302

In article <bi5lfm$56c$0@pita.alt.net>, "Tom" <Tom@cbpacketcluborg.net> writes:

> You are mistaken. CB radio is a legal hobby and so
>is packet radio.
>
>Tom

Tom:

Cindy's problem is, Packet is not legal on CB! It is authorized on some
of the MURS frequencies, however, so that may possibly be another
outlet for her digital mode experimentation.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1889. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 03:35:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030822233528.25815.00002378@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 75303

In article <BB69CF81.24940%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>Steve, you obviously didn't notice that the people Larry nominated are
>those he most often targets with his code debate ramblings. By mentioning
>those people here, his ultimate goal was to bring that debate here. After
>all, the main reason he disagrees with those people, hence his nomination
>here, is their opposition to his position on code. Therefore, any response
>to his nomination of those people had to include something about the code
>debate.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dwight:

Don't look now, but this ENTIRE newsgroup is a place where the code/no-code debate is on-topic, all day, 24/7/365. In each and every thread created, there can, and most likely will, be content related to the code test debate. BTW, I have no problem with the fact that there are people who oppose my position on code testing. What I do have a problem with are people like you who obviously can't handle any kind of disagreement, and want to get people like me to shut up so you can exist in a totally uncomplicated, unchallenged environment. If you don't like it, you know what to do, and watch out for that door!

73 de Larry, K3LT

1890. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 03:35:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030822233529.25815.00002380@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 75305

In article <bi5eggnpg0@pita.alt.net>, "Cindy W" <CindyW@tampafastisp.net>
writes:

>Which is exacly why young kids are turned off by ham
>radio. I once took a group of young black kids to a
>local ham radio club meeting. All the old white men
>ignored the kids or made rude remarks. These same
>frustrated old white men then wonder why the hobby
>is rapidly going the way of the horse & buggy.
>
>Cindy W

Cindy:

My advise to you would be to simply ignore the "old white men."
If you want to get kids involved in amateur radio, I would seek out
some of the younger, more open-minded members of the local
ham radio clubs and ask if they could mentor your group, with
the goal of starting your own radio club geared toward younger
people. This way, they could get started off on the right foot, and
you will not be inhibited by the parochial attitudes you have
experienced in the past.

Keep in mind that once some of these kids get licensed, they
will undoubtedly wish to operate on the local ham repeaters in
your area. It would be a big help if they (the kids) were able to
communicate in good, proper, standard English, without any
"urbanized" speech patterns or language which could cause them
to run into problems being accepted on the air. This is not to
say that their cultural differences cause them to deserve any
kind of negative reaction, just that it would be more helpful to
them in the long run to realize that success in our society
requires them to adopt and adhere to some of the more mainstream
cultural standards. If they are determined to make a point of
their "black" culture in their on-the-air presence, you will definitely
find yourself up against more of the same kind of reaction you
found at the club meeting. However, if these kids are polite,
well-spoken, display proper manners in general and good on-the-air
operating manners in particular, they will most certainly receive
the kind of treatment they expect and deserve.

One more thing -- don't ignore the Morse code. Kids really love it,
and consider the challenge of learning the code and using it to be
interesting and fun. Most of the whining and complaining about
learning the code has traditionally come from middle-aged white
men who simply can't be bothered to learn a useful communications

skill, and just want to pick up a microphone and talk. You and your kids can run rings around these old timers. You're already going in the right direction with your interest in Packet Radio, the thing you need to do now is to get your operation within the limits of what is legal within the Amateur Radio service, and get your kids motivated and involved. You will be amazed at how fast they will learn, if steered in the proper direction. There is nothing about being a particular skin color which affects intelligence, in spite of any "Bell Curve" crapola you may have heard about. These kids will prove this to the world, if only given the proper leadership.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1891. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 04:11:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hk1pzb3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75306

On 22 Aug 2003 10:43:17 GMT, WA3IYC wrote:

>No offense, Phil, but the fact that we even have to fight as bad an
>idea as BPL has caused my respect for a certain "expert agency" to all
>but disappear.

I hate to admit it, but my own loss of respect for the policy,
administrative, and in some regards technical decisions being made
by the top brass of said "expert agency" was one of the reasons that
this "expert" and many others are no longer with said "agency".

My mentor in climbing the legal ladder just hit the retirement
rolls, and a good protege of mine is heading for same at the end of
next month. They feel the same way.

After a while when one plays in manure one can't get rid of the
smell....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

Retired and loving every minute of it....
Work was getting in the way of my hobbies

1892. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 04:11:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hk1rpf6.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75307

On 22 Aug 2003 10:43:15 GMT, WA3IYC wrote:

>Aw geez - the "expert agency" doesn't even know what it can and
>cannot do? No wonder we have to battle BPL and the homogeniztion of
>broadcast media.

Hey, after I retired I was in a meeting of the Wireless Communications Alliance, a Silicon Valley group of technical development and marketing people in the early days of "wireless internet".

The "guest speaker"was an FCC Bureau Chief, who admitted that she didn't know how from where the FCC gets jurisdiction over radio transmissions from a US-registered aircraft "way up in the sky" in international airspace.

I had to teach her basic Communications Act law....

Lest I be accused of being a Republican-basher, it was just as bad in recent years with Democratic appointees and leadership.

>Sheesh.

You are so right.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1893. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 04:11:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hk1qor4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75308

On Fri, 22 Aug 2003 21:36:41 GMT, Dee D. Flint wrote:

>> No offense, Phil, but the fact that we even have to fight as bad an
>> idea as BPL has caused my respect for a certain "expert agency" to all
>> but disappear.

>Whoever said the FCC was an "expert agency"???

It is, Dee, it really is, in spite of what we see concerning the
amateur service.

You probably haven't been around here long enough to have caught one
of my occasional rants that the FCC should have been broken into
three agencies because that's how it acts: the politicos who have
no understanding of technological issues, the "scientists" and
"economists" who understand their own specialties but can't relate it
to the real world, and the "real" FCC working troops, the "highway
patrol of the airwaves".

I was in the latter, and it was the other two that I lost respect
for, and eventually the stupid decisions of the other two came to
infect the third.

There are still some good folks left, but they are few and far
between (but at least I know who they are when I have to deal with
them).

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1894. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and RequirementsBut

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 04:11:41 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hk1r6w5.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75309

On Sat, 23 Aug 2003 00:48:47 GMT, Mike Coslo wrote:

>But there could end up being *one* test, no?
>
>An commision that would seriously consider the technically bankrupt
>technology of BPL would be most capable of such a thing.

They are being considered by two entirely different processors with
entirely different agendas and outside pressures.

BPL will be well briefed to the "Eighth Floor" Commission sanctum
folks by the time that the Commission has to look at it, and the
decisions at the Commission level will be industry-political, not
technological.

Ham testing, OTOH, will be decided at the Division Chief level, two
levels below the Commission, and will be rubber-stamped by the
Bureau Chief (one level below) as well as by the Commission.

That's the real world.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

1895. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 05:12:55 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0308222112.3b7505a1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75310
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<dxw1b.958$O03.622@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Cindy W" <CindyW@tampafastisp.net> wrote in message
> news:bi5eggnpg0@pita.alt.net...
> > x-no-archive: yes
> > "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> > news:10577-3F462E45-34@storefull-2318.public.lawson.webtv.net...
> > From: wk3cqth@wk3c.com (Carl R. Stevenson)
> > >Sounds like totally illegal activity to me ... if I
>
> > >were you, I would not expect help here and
>
> > >would be prepared to duck for cover as the
>
> > >flames erupt ...
>
> > >Carl - wk3c
> >
> > _
> > The "flames" you speak of usually originate from the guilty
> > themselves..you know,,the ones that protesteth too much or the ones
> > seeking assumed status or power over another...
> >
> >
> > Which is exacly why young kids are turned off by ham
> > radio. I once took a group of young black kids to a
> > local ham radio club meeting. All the old white men
> > ignored the kids or made rude remarks. These same
> > frustrated old white men then wonder why the hobby
> > is rapidly going the way of the horse & buggy.
> >
> > Cindy W
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
> Not up to us 'old white men' to handle you and your problem. I just
> forwarded your initial message to the FCC. I hope they find it interesting.
>
> Don't like that? Too bad.
>

> Dan/W4NTI

whew!!!! another fink.....man that makes me have this incredible
compunction to go take a test ....

1896. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and RequirementsBut

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 05:37:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030823013706.15923.00000196@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 75311

In article <3F46B9FD.9010608@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

> An commision that would seriously consider the technically bankrupt
>technology of BPL would be most capable of such a thing.

"BPL?" I don't think the FCC ever took any sides on the Brass Pounder
League. Those guys had "BPL" first...a long time ago.

LHA

1897. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 05:37:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030823013708.15923.00000197@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 75314

In article <f45722ac.0308221653.27ace07a@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0308221028.605a3cbf@posting.google.com>...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<y6o1b.1859$6e5.104776@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> > "WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20030822071611.12631.00000460@mb-m28.aol.com...
>> > > Would you agree with this statement:
>> > >
>> > > however, at the same time, those who are not interested in building
>radios
>> > > should not be forced to learn how they work in order to gain amateur
>radio
>> > > privileges ...
>> >
>> > No ... because, even if you don't build your own radios, you are
>responsible
>> > for their proper operation.
>>
>> Do you think every ham understands how their radios work? Do you think
>> the tests even begin to measure the things a ham needs to know to
>> determine if a radio is working properly?
>
>Do you think that you could submit questions to the QPC concerning
>those things that a ham needs to know?

Reverend Jim always blames nasty ol' FCC.

>And so it degenerates into a Morse Code argument again. Knowledge and
>skill in Morse (Farnsworth) will keep your radio working properly.

It must be that morsemanship is to technological measurement of
transmitter performance as the laying-on of hands is to modern
medicine. :-)

>
>> > > >> 2) Knowledge of morse code can only be measured by a practical skill
>> > > >> test.
>> > > >
>> > > >Excuse me ... I think you mean "proficiency in " not "knowledge of"
>...
>> > >
>> > > No, I mean "knowledge of". Skills are a form of knowledge, as are facts
>> and

>> > > concepts. Perhaps it would be better to write "practical knowledge"
>> >
>> > No, it's proficiency that the test measures
>>
>> That's a skill.
>>
>> > ... proficiency in decoding Morse
>> > in one's head at some specified speed.
>>
>> 5 wpm. Which is not "proficient" by any stretch of the imagination.
>
>Its the new standard, albeit probably short lived.
>
>> > And that's ALL it is according to
>> > the FCC (see the "No Code Technician" decision from 1990 and the R&O
>> > in 98-143 ... you'll see EXACTLY that in both documents).
>>
>> Sure. But just because FCC says it does not make it true.
>
>Ditto the ARRL.
>
>> > > The Morse test which is Element 1 tests the skill of receiving Morse
>code
>> > > at a very basic level.
>> >
>> > Exactly, it measures a specific level of proficiency.
>>
>> "Proficiency" starts at 10 wpm.
>
>Where is Morse proficiency defined? Where is Morse defined?

A couple of REALLY old-timer morsemen tell me that even 20 WPM
is kid stuff. REAL proficiency starts at 40 WPM and goes on up.

Don't sweat the technical stuff...morsemanship will do ALL. It is the
magic wand, the talisman of the occult, the ONLY thing needed in
the year 2003 to "make a radio work properly." :-)

Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service

Has a nice ring to it.

All those Brass Pounder Leaguers ought to file and request an NPRM
for just changing the ARS title and drop all written tests, keeping only
a morse test...at 40 WPM, of course.

LHA

1898. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 05:37:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030823013710.15923.00000199@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 75312

In article <pBs1b.11143$S_.4538@fed1read01>, "Ham Dat Am" <HDA@pork.com>
writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>news:3F465214.4040907@psu.edu...>
>>
>> Old white guys are a legitimate target - and I hope to someday be an old
>> white guy.
>>
>Don't tell that to an old Marine who fought on Iwo Jima

Sorry, 1950 and afterwards doesn't count... :-)

LHA

1899. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 05:37:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030823013710.15923.00000198@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 75318

In article <c2356669.0308221028.605a3cbf@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<y6o1b.1859$6e5.104776@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> "WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
>> news:20030822071611.12631.00000460@mb-m28.aol.com...
>> > Would you agree with this statement:
>> >
>> > however, at the same time, those who are not interested in building
>radios
>> > should not be forced to learn how they work in order to gain amateur
>radio
>> > privileges ...
>>
>> No ... because, even if you don't build your own radios, you are
>responsible
>> for their proper operation.
>
>Do you think every ham understands how their radios work?

Few do.

>Do you think
>the tests even begin to measure the things a ham needs to know to
>determine if a radio is working properly?

The FCC no longer devises the license exam test questions and it no longer requires a minimum number of questions on specific topics within the minimum number of written test questions per class.

Address your complaints about written exam question content to the VEC Question Pool Committee.

>> How could you possibly know something was
>> wrong if you had no knowledge of how the radio worked?
>
>By how it behaves. And by how other hams tell you it sounds, or
>doesn't sound.

HAR! Another reducto ad absurdum commentary! :-)

If (as you said earlier) hams don't have any grasp of technical matters, how can they possibly judge the quality of signals? :-)

Listening to an AM or SSB signal with an FM receiver doesn't yield much information on that AM or SSB signal, does it? How about judging

signal quality of FM on an AM receiver? Does slope detection yield
"quality" of signal that way?

On most modern HF transceivers, the 3rd harmonic has the strongest
content of RF. The 3rd harmonic of 3.5 to 4.0 MHz is 10.5 to 12 MHz
and there aren't many "ham listening frequencies" there, are there?

Hams tend to give "signal reports" as 5-9-9 regardless of actual
lower values...it's the buddy-thing to do to fellow hams, right?

>> This is an interference control issue ... a technical matter ... and
>> knowledge
>> of this IS required in order to be competent to operate a station in full
>> compliance with the rules.
>
>Do you really think even the Extra test measures that knowledge?
>Particularly given the extremely wide range of technologies that a ham
>is authorized to use?

Hello? Want to improve written test content and quality? Go talk
at the VEC QPC and bitch at them...

>Example: New Ham buys old rig, which requires tuning up. Even though
>in perfect operating order, said rig can be mistuned by the unknowing
>to produce all sorts of spurious responses. Current tests say nothing
>about proper method of dipping and loading, grid drive, audio gain,
>etc. Heck, most current EEs couldn't get the thing to work without
>help.

BFD. Did that 50 years ago, not even an EE then. Rather OLD
rigs then, some of them. :-)

>But FCC trusts that New Ham will seek out a manual, read up, get help
>from Old Hams, and be a responsible licensee even though the tests
>didn't cover 1% of how his new/old rig works. FCC trusts that New Ham
>will educate him/herself on the technology used and not cause
>interference. So why should New Ham be forced to jump through a
>written test hoop and learn things he/she won't use? Answer: Because
>some folks think he/she should have to. And for no other reason.

Has the FCC *EVER* stated such a position? I don't think so.

The FCC does NOT specify the various content of written questions
on ANY written element...ONLY the total number.

See VEC QPC......

>> > >> 2) Knowledge of morse code can only be measured by a practical skill
>> > >> test.
>> > >
>> > >Excuse me ... I think you mean "proficiency in " not "knowledge of" ...
>> >
>> > No, I mean "knowledge of". Skills are a form of knowledge, as are facts
>> and

>> > concepts. Perhaps it would be better to write "practical knowledge"
>>
>> No, it's proficiency that the test measures
>
>That's a skill.
>
>> ... proficiency in decoding Morse
>> in one's head at some specified speed.
>
>5 wpm. Which is not "proficient" by any stretch of the imagination.

I don't think that 20 WPM morse is "proficient," based on some old-
timers I know/knew. Kid stuff.

>> And that's ALL it is according to
>> the FCC (see the "No Code Technician" decision from 1990 and the R&O
>> in 98-143 ... you'll see EXACTLY that in both documents).
>
>Sure. But just because FCC says it does not make it true.

But...what YOU say determines what is "truth" and "untruth."

Of course. :-)

>> > The Morse test which is Element 1 tests the skill of receiving Morse code
>> > at a very basic level.
>>
>> Exactly, it measures a specific level of proficiency.
>
>"Proficiency" starts at 10 wpm.

Nope. 40 WPM. 20 WPM is kid stuff according to some REAL old-timer
morsemen.

>> > Element 1 is in no way a test of "proficiency". It's a skill test at a
>> > very
>> > basic level. To call it a proficiency test is to demonstrate ignorance of
>> > the
>> > word proficiency.
>>
>> Proficiency is measured against some "yardstick" ... in the case of Morse,
>> the FCC has (currently) determined the yardstick to be 5 wpm.
>> You can argue all you want, but that's the way it is ...
>
>Sure. But just because FCC says it does not make it true.

You can bet your NAL that what the FCC is *TRUE* is very much true
if you get NAiLed.

>> > Yet they wouldn't include a sunset clause back in 2000
>>
>> True ... they didn't include a sunset clause.
>

>Which means they were not 100% convinced. Otherwise why do the whole
>thing all over again?

I think it's called "proceedure of law" or suchlike.

>> > and they're making all of us go through an NPRM cycle all over again.
>>
>> How the FCC will handle this is yet to be determined ...
>
>So far it looks like NPRM time. As more and more proposals/petitions
>roll in, and old ones remain unresolved, the ARRL forecast of two
>years begins to look reasonable.

Whatever you forecast is always "reasonable" and anything else is
unreasonable. Ho hum.

>> > If FCC thinks there really is
>> > "no regulatory purpose" to a code test, WHY are they dragging their feet
>> > and doing the whole circus AGAIN?
>>
>> See my last sentence ...
>
>We'll see. Not even 2 months since WRC-03, and the summer is not even
>over yet. FCC could, upon review of the petitions, say "Yeah, we went
>through this 3 years ago, nothing's changed, bye-bye Element 1".

The FCC hasn't said that yet. Or do you have "insider information" that
even Phil K. doesn't have?

>> [snipped unrelated discussion of BPL]
>
>Not unrelated at all. But I understand why you snipped it.

Try to stay with the program. Note Subject heading and "NCI Petition
for Rulemaking." NCI hasn't taken any position on Broadband over
Power Lines (BPL), only on Brass Pounder Leagues (also BPL).
Do you understand the difference?

LHA

1900. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 05:37:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030823013711.15923.00000200@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 75317

In article <20030822064316.21457.00000143@mb-m10.aol.com>, wa3iyc@aol.com (WA3IYC) writes:

>There are three screen names on this account. One is used by other(s), one is
>my call and this one is a "universal spare" based on my old call. For some
>reason AOL is having trouble with NG access on my other screen name so I
>switched over to this one for a while.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...the same person who made disparaging remarks about
"why would anyone have more than one screen name?"

Strange, isn't it, hypocrites seem to wind up biting themselves...

LHA

1901. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 05:37:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030823013712.15923.00000201@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 75315

In article <c2356669.0308221228.5888fa2a@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>A thought just occurred to me......

Not a "thought" but rather another limp rerun of the same old procode stuff.

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<y6o1b.1859$6e5.104776@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> "WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
>> news:20030822071611.12631.00000460@mb-m28.aol.com...
>> > Would you agree with this statement:
>> >
>> > however, at the same time, those who are not interested in building
>radios
>> > should not be forced to learn how they work in order to gain amateur
>radio
>> > privileges ...
>>
>> No ... because, even if you don't build your own radios, you are
>responsible
>> for their proper operation. How could you possibly know something was
>> wrong if you had no knowledge of how the radio worked?
>
>I'm responsible for the proper operation of any motor vehicles I
>operate, but I'm not required to know how they work. Or pass any exams
>on how they work, even to build or repair my own vehicles.

This is a rather absurd comparison. In normal debate it is called by the formal name of "reducto ad absurdum," a Latin phrase meaning it is "reduced to an absurdity."

Perhaps Pennsylvania has very lax driver license examinations, but California and Illinois and Washington all require prospective driver licensees to demonstrate knowledge of basic operating functions of a vehicle...as well as actual operation of that vehicle on the streets.

>> This is an interference control issue ... a technical matter ... and
>> knowledge
>> of this IS required in order to be competent to operate a station in full
>> compliance with the rules.
>
>Motor vehicle operation is a life-and-death public safety issue, and
>an environmental issue. It's certainly a technical matter.

What is "technical" about operating a motor vehicle? Why do you use the term "certainly a technical matter?" It is no more "technical" than operating a CB radio or an amateur radio.

Radios can't carry you over the streets and highways to a physical destination.

>Yet there
>is no exam for technical knowledge of motor vehicle operation. There
>IS a skill test, though....

Make up your mind. You just said that motor vehicle operation CERTAINLY IS A TECHNICAL MATTER. Now you say it is just a "skill test."

>Some states require that vehicles pass periodic inspections - but not
>all states. And even in states that have inspection (like
>Pennsylvania), a lot can go wrong between inspections. PA inspections
>are annual, and a car that was perfectly fine at inspection time can
>have all kinds of things go wrong in a year. Tires and brakes wear
>out, shocks fail, fluids leak, alignment goes out, etc., etc. Yet PA
>DMV trusts us to keep our vehicles in shape even though we are not
>tested on how they work.

...and it's very easy in Pennsylvania to KILL someone using a motor vehicle. Been there, seen that happen.

Now you want everyone to believe that driver's licenses are just like amateur radio licenses?

Whatever it is you are on, you should stop taking it...

LHA

1902. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 05:37:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030823013713.15923.00000202@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 75313

In article <3F464873.3070801@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> "Mike Coslo" wrote:
>>
>>>(snip) We have to try to keep up with California.
>>
>> Have you noticed even the press has had a hard time keeping a straight
>> face when talking about the California recall vote? First, we have a midget
>> who insists he's the protest vote. Then, we have oversized guy who still
>> can't say his name properly after living in the country for decades. And
>> then we have a cross-dresser certain to bring a new sense of fashion
>> consciousness to the job. And we can go on and on. This is turning out to be
>> one of the wackiest elections I've ever seen.
>
> This is something no one wins. First we have a power grab by the
>Repub's who have figured out that in any election, it will be possible
>to get enough names on a petition to force a recall. I hope they realize
>they opend a Pandora's box, and for what? Governing a state that they
>were partially involved in making a major mess?
> They are so desperate to get someone in office, that they are trying to

>elect a Republican who is more like a Democrat than anything else.

The special election in regards to recalling the Governor of the state of
California has nothing whatsoever to do with amateur radio.

If you are not a registered voter in California, then you have no cause to
carry on as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on
California politics.

One of the accepted candidates for the ballot in the special election in
California is a Grass Valley resident, Jim Weir. Jim Weir has posted
in here a few times. Ask him if his candidacy has anything to do with
amateur radio policy.

LHA

1903. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 05:37:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030823013714.15923.00000203@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 75316

In article <1ee1b.105565$RG6.94042@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>This actually is quite good and applies to the old timers as well. I have
>one question if anyone remembers back to around 1959. The guy who got me
>*really* interested in amateur radio was Russ, W2ZS. I met him around 1959
>or possibly 1960 and remember him making contacts when I was invited into
>his shack. I do remember folks back when using "the handle here is ...".
>My question is did that start with CB or did CB pick it up from amateurs
>originally? It seems (at least back then) more like the Southern "y'all
>come again real soon". Sort of folksy and warm if grammatically incorrect.

The term "handle" goes back before 1900 and is attributed mainly to
westerners, particularly cowboys. Etymologically in English, a
general form of handle is something that allows grasping an object.
So, one could "grasp" (understand or know) someone if they gave
you their name...hence, "my handle is Jim" (or whatever name).

Class C and D Citizens Band (the 11m variety) wasn't created until
1958 and the "my handle is..." phrase goes back well over a half
century before that in parts of the USA.

LHA.

1904. And then....

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 06:27:30 UTC
From: Les Locklear <NotMe@pamz.com>
Message-ID: <bi71gf$3pe$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75319

And then there is the photo of Wiseman on alt.morons.....
Not for children to see.

1905. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 07:18:52 UTC
From: Derek <danda95@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <wzE1b.48$M23.21285@newsfep1-win.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75320

Good

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030822220214.25815.00002373@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <z6X0b.1514$tS2.1603172@newsfep2-win.server.ntli.net>, "Derek"
> <danda95@hotmail.com> writes:
>
> >These are Amateurs askinging questions Larry about Amateur Radio
> >I would not talk to you on the air Larry because you are nothing but a
> >F**cking bighead arsehole
>
> Derek:
>
> How charming. In any event, looking for me on the HF phone bands
> would prove to be an exercise in futility. I don't work HF phone, and
> haven't done so for many years.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> First Place, 2003 ARRL RTTY Roundup
> Low Power, Single-Operator (Delaware Section)
>
>
>

1906. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 11:20:32 UTC
From: Ged <ged65@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk>
Message-ID: <wMxSjCCA40R$EwLE@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk>
Source record: 75321
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

In message <vHy1b.1665$O03.387@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get.rid.invalid> writes
>
>"Ged" <ged65@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk> wrote in message
>news:z7uXIpH72pR$EwYx@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk...
>> I guess the Vietnamese and Somalis whipped yer arses because you just
>> weren't pissed off enough eh?
>>
>> (Standby for the usual Republican answer of 'we weren't allowed to win
>> by the politicians')
>> --
>> Ged
>
>I don't really see where the Vietnamese and the Somalies 'whipped our
>arses'. What I remember happening is the US Government WIMPED OUT before
>we won. Neither situation was worth a damn. But don't blame the soldiers
>for the actions of NIXON, KISSENGER and CLINTON.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Yes, I was correct. We got the usual Republican answer....

--
Ged

1907. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 11:28:05 UTC
From: Merl Turkin <Terk@astroburp.net>
Message-ID: <bi7j45$bh4$0@216.221.129.15>
Source record: 75322

On Thu, 21 Aug 2003 18:20:50 -0400, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> These are keepers. Especially like item 19. That one applies to HF as
> well.
>
> Beep
>
> Dan/W4NTI

(snip)

I like item 31:

"Make sure when you reply to a usenet post that you quote the entire
message you're replying to instead of just a small relevant portion of it."

1908. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 11:34:49 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <gR6dnWWJMefLzNqiXTWJgA@crocker.com>
Source record: 75323
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:uCt1b.1910$6e5.107724@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:1-KdnRoFfd2UotuiXTWJhA@crocker.com...
> >
> > "Cindy W" <CindyW@tampafastisp.net> wrote in message
> > news:bi5egg$npg$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > x-no-archive: yes
> > > "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> > > news:10577-3F462E45-34@storefull-2318.public.lawson.webtv.net...
> > > From: wk3cqth@wk3c.com (Carl R. Stevenson)
> > > >Sounds like totally illegal activity to me ... if I
> > >
> > > >were you, I would not expect help here and
> > >
> > > >would be prepared to duck for cover as the
> > >
> > > >flames erupt ...
> > >
> > > >Carl - wk3c
> > >
> > > _
> > > The "flames" you speak of usually originate from the guilty
> > > themselves..you know,,the ones that protesteth too much or the ones
> > > seeking assumed status or power over another...
> > >
> > >
> > > Which is exacly why young kids are turned off by ham
> > > radio. I once took a group of young black kids to a
> > > local ham radio club meeting. All the old white men
> > > ignored the kids or made rude remarks. These same
> > > frustrated old white men then wonder why the hobby
> > > is rapidly going the way of the horse & buggy.
> > >
> >
> > troll meter is pegged on this one!
>
> Dave,
>
> I disagree ... while I would discourage the apparently illegal packet
> activity that Cindy described, I am forced by personal observation to
> agree substantially with her assessment of how *many* (not all, but
```

> enough to make a negative impact) treat kids and newcomers ...
>
> Carl - wk3c
>
look closely, its been an almost perfect troll... she sent one initial message, and one reply with the comments on the club meeting, and the thread now has dozens of messages. she also knew enough to post it to two conflicting news groups, thus dragging both sides of the argument into the fray.... give the nest a kick and sit back and watch the hornets fly, an almost perfect troll!

1909. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 11:48:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308230348.9b37fd9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75324

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030822220214.25815.00002373@mb-m07.aol.com>...

> Derek:
>
> How charming. In any event, looking for me on the HF phone bands
> would prove to be an exercise in futility. I don't work HF phone, and
> haven't done so for many years.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> First Place, 2003 ARRL RTTY Roundup
> Low Power, Single-Operator (Delaware Section)

Thank goodness there are places for the rabble rousers to congregate
other than fone.

1910. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 12:23:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <h1J1b.30394$Vx2.13732761@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75325

"DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:9829b709.0308221758.3b0e65ff@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<J1w1b.29882$Vx2.13535134@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030822064317.21457.00000144@mb-m10.aol.com...
> > > No offense, Phil, but the fact that we even have to fight as bad an
idea
> > as BPL
> > > has caused my respect for a certain "expert agency" to all but
disappear.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> >
> > Whoever said the FCC was an "expert agency"???
> >
>
> I realize that may seem strange to anyone who hasn't been around
> radio regulation for as long as a few decades, but the FCC is indeed,
> as the final authority, *the* expert agency. And have often been so
> considered by various courts when faced with challenges to some of
> their actions.
>
> Dick

Yes they are the final authority but that does not make them an "expert".
Even a court ruling does not make you an expert. In addition, the courts
are ruling on the legality of the action not necessarily whether the action
is correct in an engineering or technical sense.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1911. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 12:31:59 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <39J1b.30396$Vx2.13734541@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75326

"Harry Hacker" <HHH@harryhohohacker.org> wrote in message
news:bi7lmu$kn6$0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:xnfcneeyarg.hk1rpf6.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> > On 22 Aug 2003 10:43:15 GMT, WA3IYC wrote:
> >
> > >Aw geez - the "expert agency" doesn't even know what it can and
> > >cannot do? No wonder we have to battle BPL and the homogeniztion of
> > >broadcast media.
> >
> > Hey, after I retired I was in a meeting of the Wireless Communications
> > Alliance, a Silicon Valley group of technical development and
> > marketing people in the early days of "wireless internet".
> >
> > The "guest speaker"was an FCC Bureau Chief, who admitted that she
> > didn't know how from where the FCC gets jurisdiction over radio
> > transmissions from a US-registered aircraft "way up in the sky" in
> > international airspace.
> >
>
> This "guest speaker" was a graduate of
> Harvard Law School and held professional degrees in
> engineering. The only thing she lacked was
> membership in the "Old Guard" of white males.
>
>

It is unacceptable when any person, male or female does NOT know their job.
By the way I am female and have no problem with the "Old Guard" of white
males as you call them. The reason that I don't have a problem is because I
EARNED my job be being sure I was qualified and had the proper training for
it.

It is especially unaccetable that this individual with a law degree did not
know from whence the FCC derived its jurisdiction.

> > I had to teach her basic Communications Act law....
>
> Sounds like you are bitter that women had broken
> the "Glass Ceiling," in an agency that was for so long and
> one of the last to be dominated by white males.
>

Phil Kane has every right to be upset that a person did not know their job. As a female myself, I am offended that this women had a job for which she was not qualified as she may have gotten the job simply because she was female. Such incompetence reflects badly on all women. I broke the so-called and non-existent "Glass Ceiling" decades ago by knowing my field and continueing to stay up to date in that field. When you do that, such ceilings don't exist.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1912. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 12:55:47 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <sJKdnU2i2Mrm-dqiU-KYgw@crocker.com>
Source record: 75328
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<snip a bunch of stuff>
>
>
The more I look at this thread the more it looks like the 'almost' perfect troll. note that Cindy made one posting to start it to two conflicting groups, one of which is known to be hostile to the discussed activity. She already knew the frequencies, times, other operators, and apparently had enough equipment to monitor said activity, which should have been enough to answer her question without having to post to these groups. And after the first, and surprisingly civil reply, she hopped in with both feet on a totally unrelated topic to attack ham operators and label them not only as judgmental hypocrites, but also as racist old white men... then she disappeared.

If she could have done both with a single message it might have qualified as a perfect troll, but now I can only give it a 9 out of 10 on the troll-o-meter.

1913. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 12:56:05 UTC
From: BH <none@nonexrayanon.com>
Message-ID: <bi7o7o$qi6$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75327

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hjzkcwh.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 16 Aug 2003 08:44:00 -0700, N2EY wrote:
>
> >What did it take - six weeks? Not really long at all. Plus there was
> >always the chance FCC would have simply dumped Element 1 on its own,
> >instead of doing the whole NPRM thing.
>
> Bill Cross (FCC) was heard to mumble that he wasn't sure that the
> FCC could do so "on its own", so SOMEONE had to percuss the
> pendulum, right ???
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
Trolling again Phil?

1914. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 13:48:22 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F4770A6.5030604@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 75374
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

gw wrote:

>
>
>
> whew!!!! another fink........man that makes me have this incredible
> compunction to go take a test ....

Don't bother, you couldn't pass it, "doncha know". What a turd.

1915. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 13:53:31 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F4771DB.70802@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 75375

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> Make up your mind. You just said that motor vehicle operation
> CERTAINLY IS A TECHNICAL MATTER. Now you say it is just a
> "skill test."

My wife can drive just fine, that definitely proves that driving
is NOT a technical matter.

1916. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 14:05:50 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bi7s9l$pis@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 75329

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030822233529.25815.00002380@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <bi5eggnpg0@pita.alt.net>, "Cindy W"
<CindyW@tampafastisp.net>
> writes:
>
> >Which is exacly why young kids are turned off by ham
> >radio. I once took a group of young black kids to a
> >local ham radio club meeting. All the old white men
> >ignored the kids or made rude remarks. These same
> >frustrated old white men then wonder why the hobby
> >is rapidly going the way of the horse & buggy.
> >
> >Cindy W
>
> Cindy:
>
> My advise to you would be to simply ignore the "old white men."
> If you want to get kids involved in amateur radio, I would seek out
> some of the younger, more open-minded members of the local
> ham radio clubs and ask if they could mentor your group, with
> the goal of starting your own radio club geared toward younger
> people.
>

Based on the very things Larry says below, I suspect, Cindy, that he is also one of the "old white men." His meaning in the statement above is probably more like, "with the goal of starting your own radio club geared toward those kind of people." Larry's said some very questionable things in the past, although they weren't all that "questionable" to a lot of us. We knew right where he stood.

>
> This way, they could get started off on the right foot, and
> you will not be inhibited by the parochial attitudes you have
> experienced in the past.
>

In other words, since your presence in these "other areas" leads to such distress, on *your* behalf of course, Cindy and friends, then it would probably be best if you just stay away from the mainstream folks.

>
> Keep in mind that once some of these kids get licensed, they
> will undoubtedly wish to operate on the local ham repeaters in

> your area. It would be a big help if they (the kids) were able to
> communicate in good, proper, standard English, without any
> "urbanized" speech patterns or language which could cause them
> to run into problems being accepted on the air.
>

Oh, so classic. These kids can speak in any way they wish--as long as people LIKE LARRY are not around! Gosh, Cindy, maybe you should just give up altogether and make folks like that real happy. (You know I am being sarchastic, I hope).

>
> This is not to
> say that their cultural differences cause them to deserve any
> kind of negative reaction, just that it would be more helpful to
> them in the long run to realize that success in our society
> requires them to adopt and adhere to some of the more mainstream
> cultural standards.
>

If I wasn't trying to be so patient here, my blood would be boiling. Oh, never mind, it is boiling and, Larry, you are pompous, bigoted jerk. But you knew that. "Cultural differences" have nothing to do with your concern--only your own ignorance.

>
> If they are determined to make a point of
> their "black" culture in their on-the-air presence, you will definitely
> find yourself up against more of the same kind of reaction you
> found at the club meeting.
>

Yeah, don't you get it, Cindy, the way "they" act is a definite sign of indignance to us white folks. It has nothing to do with the fact that they *ARE* black, you understand.

>
> However, if these kids are polite,
> well-spoken, display proper manners in general and good on-the-air
> operating manners in particular, they will most certainly receive
> the kind of treatment they expect and deserve.
>

Yeah, Cindy. Be sure that you teach these black kids how to say "yes sir" to Larry. They wouldn't, of course, be saying anything like "no sir" because that would not be polite. And, be sure you get that white accent up into them before the ever get on the air--or they won't meet Mastah Larrah's standards of being well-spoken. God forbid that he try to STRETCH HIS HUMANNESS in any way to understand someone ON THEIR OWN TERMS.

>
> One more thing -- don't ignore the Morse code. Kids really love it,
> and consider the challenge of learning the code and using it to be

> interesting and fun.
>

Yeah, Cindy, and if Mastah Larrah can't tell if they're black, he'll be able to communicate with them. Ya see, Mastah Larrah can only communicate with beeping because as soon as he opens his arrogant, bigoted, cracker-white mouth, people turn their backs on him.

>
> Most of the whining and complaining about
> learning the code has traditionally come from middle-aged white
> men who simply can't be bothered to learn a useful communications
> skill, and just want to pick up a microphone and talk. You and your
> kids can run rings around these old timers. You're already going
> in the right direction with your interest in Packet Radio, the thing
> you need to do now is to get your operation within the limits of
> what is legal within the Amateur Radio service, and get your kids
> motivated and involved.
>

And remember Cindy, that nothing Mastah Larrah has said YET has anything to do with the R&R of ham radio--only with his own bigoted attitude. Yep, keep those little black folks over theyah on the digital modes, Cindy. Mastah Larrah don't need none 'o that black culture or accent or attitude stuff on HIS ham radio.

>
> You will be amazed at how fast they will
> learn, if steered in the proper direction. There is nothing about
> being a particular skin color which affects intelligence, in spite of
> any "Bell Curve" crapola you may have heard about. These kids
> will prove this to the world, if only given the proper leadership.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

He had to get that one in there, Cindy. You see how antiquated his reference point is. And, that is the world Mastah Larrah lives in. He just doesn't realize that he is a Mastah to nothing.

Kim W5TIT
I apologize that there are people like that, Cindy. You help those kids get on the air, if that's what they want. And let them know that if people can't handle the way they wish to communicate, then that is not their (the kids') problem. When they are on a repeater, or a frequency, it is "theirs" anyway. Besides, I would hope we've gotten beyond the attitudes of folks like Larry enough so that anyone on the air is someone to communicate with.

1917. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 14:10:46 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bi7sit$cuu@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 75330

```
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:h1J1b.30394$Vx2.13732761@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:9829b709.0308221758.3b0e65ff@posting.google.com...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:<J1w1b.29882$Vx2.13535134@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > "WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20030822064317.21457.00000144@mb-m10.aol.com...
> > > > No offense, Phil, but the fact that we even have to fight as bad an
> idea
> > > as BPL
> > > > has caused my respect for a certain "expert agency" to all but
> disappear.
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > > >
> > >
> > > Whoever said the FCC was an "expert agency"???
> > >
> >
> > I realize that may seem strange to anyone who hasn't been around
> > radio regulation for as long as a few decades, but the FCC is indeed,
> > as the final authority, *the* expert agency. And have often been so
> > considered by various courts when faced with challenges to some of
> > their actions.
> >
> > Dick
>
> Yes they are the final authority but that does not make them an "expert".
> Even a court ruling does not make you an expert. In addition, the courts
> are ruling on the legality of the action not necessarily whether the
action
> is correct in an engineering or technical sense.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

But, Dick doesn't get things like that, Dee.

Kim W5TIT
```

1918. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 14:13:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6CEF25.24A7C%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75331

"WA3IYC" wrote:

> A problem only if you take them seriously.

I used to not take them seriously. However, after I start hearing what is written here repeated outside this newsgroup, it is perhaps time to start taking the stuff written here more seriously. A lot of people, far more than perhaps some imagine, read this newsgroup. Absent an alternative viewpoint, they have no reason not to believe what they read here, and repeat it elsewhere. Enough of this and the entire image of this radio service is dragged down - which is exactly what I think is going on now.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1919. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 14:35:17 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bi7u0s$9ts@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 75332

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB6CEF25.24A7C%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "WA3IYC" wrote:
>
> > A problem only if you take them seriously.
>
>
> I used to not take them seriously. However, after I start hearing what
is
> written here repeated outside this newsgroup, it is perhaps time to start
> taking the stuff written here more seriously. A lot of people, far more
than
> perhaps some imagine, read this newsgroup. Absent an alternative
viewpoint,
> they have no reason not to believe what they read here, and repeat it
> elsewhere. Enough of this and the entire image of this radio service is
> dragged down - which is exactly what I think is going on now.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

You're right, Dwight. If Riley Hollingsworth's words that he spoke to many groups, many times are correct, then ham radio is dead--or is dying a slow death. I know and have heard the very conversations you speak of. When I first heard talk like that on the air when I got my ticket, I was shocked because I didn't think it was allowed.

There's a repeater here in Dallas. During the last Presidential campaign and election, the hate spewed on that repeater was horrifying--and that is not an overreaction. I heard things like that Democrats were the equivalent of people who "let" things like Hitler happen and, believe me, that is mild. That is why Larry remarks about my callsign--or anyone else's for that matter--are such a damned joke. My callsign has nothing to do with the destruction of the ARS. It is people like Larry and his attitudes that are destroying the ARS. In Larry's mind, it's probably my fault because he has to be so hateful toward me because of my callsign :)

Kim W5TIT

1920. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 15:03:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030823110310.28386.00000412@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 75333

>Enough of this and the entire image of this radio service is
>dragged down - which is exactly what I think is going on now.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET

Damn its working.

1921. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 15:06:31 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030823110631.28386.00000413@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 75334

> I heard things like that Democrats were the equivalent
>of people who "let" things like Hitler happen and, believe me, that is mild.

And your point is

> It is people like Larry and his attitudes that are
>destroying the ARS. I

No, its people like you , and all this Damned Dumbing Down that is destroying
Ham Radio.

1922. Re: N8WWM, rain reported again.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 15:38:26 UTC
From: Keith Hosman <logdshr-remove-@bnnorth.net>
Message-ID: <5WL1b.9454$Ly2.1467272@cletus.bright.net>
Source record: 75335
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"sideband" <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net> wrote in message
news:JJY0b.28453$Vx2.13032350@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
| Keith:
|
| Tried to raise ya on your local machine there when I was picking up at
| Campbells early last week.. Guess you been busy. BTW, that truckstop
| off 6/20... Sheesh.. used to be a really nice place.
|
| -SSB
|

Should have called my cell, sometimes I am away from the rig, heck I live
about 5 min from that truck stop, used to work there, and yes it really has
gone to hell.

73 de Keith
--
KC8TCQ
Tune in next week when Ohio floats away.

1923. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 16:05:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6D0981.24A80%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75336

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart writes:
>
>> Larry, you really need to get off the "liberal"
>> nonsense. Your attitudes about code are more
>> liberal than most and your attitudes towards others
>> are more akin to that of the deep woods redneck
>> than that of a conservative.
>
> As usual, you don't know what you're talking about.
> Liberals want to have the world handed to them on a
> silver platter, without having to work to earn their
> own way. This is the perfect description of the
> NCTA -- they want full HF privileges, without being
> bothered to learn a useful communications skill like
> the Morse code. (snip)

And conservatives want to end big government. More specifically, conservatives want to end unnecessary government rules which exist only to benefit the interests of a certain special interest group. While you and your ilk (a special interest group) have an interest in maintaining code testing to reinforce your self-perceived status, code testing itself is unnecessary today for anything outside that. Therefore, those seeking to end code testing are more compatible with conservative views, while those seeking to maintain code testing to reinforce status are more compatible with liberal views.

> I'm not an anarchist, Dwight. I believe that
> government has a role in our society, and
> maintaining standards in the ARS, an activity
> in which citizens are given the privilege of
> making use of the valuable and finate resource
> known as the RF spectrum, makes sense to me.

Well, that's big of you. The question now is which standards (necessary or unnecessary), which you answer in the next few sentences.

> The "government protection" whine is just
> another NCTA strawman. I prefer to think of
> it as the government "protecting" the whole ARS,
> not just the Morse code and it's testing
> requirement. (snip)

Then you support unnecessary government requirements. Code testing serves no real purpose today, either as a means of insuring communications support

to those outside Ham Radio or as a means to keep riff-raft out of Ham Radio (you were able to get in). As such, it exists solely to maintain your own delusions of status and I don't think the government should be maintaining rules just so you can help yourself feel important.

> (snip) "Rednecks," of any region, are usually tough,
> self-reliant, moral and decent people. (snip)

You fail that test in many ways. A redneck doesn't need government rules to be "self-reliant" and your attitudes towards others are certainly not "decent" or "moral." And, based on your old web page pictures, you clearly don't look that tough. So, failing that test, we have to look elsewhere for someone similar to you. And, looking solely at attitudes towards others, only the deep woods redneck springs to mind.

These people (deep woods rednecks) don't like anybody outside kin or clan, and just barely, though not always, tolerate neighbors. Does this sound familiar, Larry? I don't know what you do with your kin, so I won't go there. However, speaking solely of Ham Radio, you don't like anyone outside your pro-code testing clan, and just barely, though not always, tolerate those outside the code testing debate.

Of course, this is only a perception. Since you obviously have a different perception of yourself, we're never going to agree. As such, I'll drop the comparative speculation at this point.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1924. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 16:17:26 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <qsM1b.20$EC4.4820@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75337

"Nancy D Fell" <ndf@overxback.org> wrote in message
news:bi7nro$pp5$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> The FCC has a long history of suppressing the advancement
> of females and minorities.
>
> Nancy

Really? I'm at the FCC often enough to have a permanent
photo ID "Frequent Visitor" badge ...

Have you noticed that the Chairman is a black man?

Did you know that there's a female Commissioner?
(And that she's not the first?)

In fact, I deal on a regular basis, professionally, with many, many
"minorities" and women who hold high positions in the FCC.

How do you propose to reconcile all of this against your statement
above, Nancy???

Carl - wk3c

1925. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 16:26:24 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F4795AF.1040907@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75338

>>>
>>>
>>Do you think every ham understands how their radios work?
>>
>>
>
> Few do.
>
At what level of expertise do you need here? Simple concepts on how
superheterodynes
work (block level diagrams) or precise knowledge on RF analog chip design?

>
>
>
>>Do you think
>>the tests even begin to measure the things a ham needs to know to
>>determine if a radio is working properly?
>>
>>
>
> The FCC no longer devises the license exam test questions and it no
> longer requires a minimum number of questions on specific topics within
> the minimum number of written test questions per class.
>
> Address your complaints about written exam question content to the
> VEC Question Pool Committee.
>
>
At least enough knowledge to spot gross problems.

>
>
>>>How could you possibly know something was
>>>wrong if you had no knowledge of how the radio worked?
>>>
>>>
>>By how it behaves. And by how other hams tell you it sounds, or
>>doesn't sound.
>>
>>
>
> HAR! Another reducto ad absurdum commentary! :-)
>
> If (as you said earlier) hams don't have any grasp of technical matters,

> how can they possibly judge the quality of signals? :-)
>
> Listening to an AM or SSB signal with an FM receiver doesn't yield much
> information on that AM or SSB signal, does it? How about judging
> signal quality of FM on an AM receiver? Does slope detection yield
> "quality" of signal that way?
>
Come on, few hams are that stupid. First thing I check is to see that
I have the right receive
mode enabled. "Oh, I had LSB enabled for 20 meters, no wonder everyone
sounded screwed
up".

>
> On most modern HF transceivers, the 3rd harmonic has the strongest
> content of RF. The 3rd harmonic of 3.5 to 4.0 MHz is 10.5 to 12 MHz
> and there aren't many "ham listening frequencies" there, are there?
>
More than the fundamental? Modern radios rarely have a failure in this
that is not obvious
in other areas of performance.

>
> Hams tend to give "signal reports" as 5-9-9 regardless of actual
> lower values...it's the buddy-thing to do to fellow hams, right?
>
>
"Everyone is "59" on my meter..." :-)

>
>
>
>>>
>>>
>>Do you really think even the Extra test measures that knowledge?
>>Particularly given the extremely wide range of technologies that a ham
>>is authorized to use?
>>
We do put some faith in the quality of our manufactured equipment. Like
if the
harmonics are really down 60 dB or if our rigs are leaking harmonics
only 55 dB
down. But we should be able to spot a gross deficency (like something
broke).
Not necessairly be able to repair it ourselves, but be able to spot the
problem and
take the bad equipment out of service.

>>
>>
>

> Hello? Want to improve written test content and quality? Go talk
> at the VEC QPC and bitch at them...
>
>
>
>>Example: New Ham buys old rig, which requires tuning up. Even though
>>in perfect operating order, said rig can be mistuned by the unknowing
>>to produce all sorts of spurious responses. Current tests say nothing
>>about proper method of dipping and loading, grid drive, audio gain,
>>etc. Heck, most current EEs couldn't get the thing to work without
>>help.
>>
>>
>
> BFD. Did that 50 years ago, not even an EE then. Rather OLD
> rigs then, some of them. :-)
>
Issue is a new ham trying to use the old rig as "plug and play" like a
new rig.
He has to RTFM.

>
>
>
>
>>But FCC trusts that New Ham will seek out a manual, read up, get help
>>
>>
>>from Old Hams, and be a responsible licensee even though the tests
>
>
>>didn't cover 1% of how his new/old rig works. FCC trusts that New Ham
>>will educate him/herself on the technology used and not cause
>>interference. So why should New Ham be forced to jump through a
>>written test hoop and learn things he/she won't use? Answer: Because
>>some folks think he/she should have to. And for no other reason.
>>
>>
>
> Has the FCC *EVER* stated such a position? I don't think so.
>
> The FCC does NOT specify the various content of written questions
> on ANY written element...ONLY the total number.
>
> See VEC QPC......
>
I think the FCC does has some specifications on the material to be
tested. And on the quality
of the wrong answers on a multiple choice test. You can't ask "the
voltage across a 1 ohm

resistor at 1 amp is: a) bananas, b) New Jersey c) 1 volt d) a can of beer."

>>>
>>>
>>Sure. But just because FCC says it does not make it true.
>>
>>
>
>
>
The FCC does the licenses, and they decide what they care about in
deciding if
an applicant gets a license or not.

>
>
>
>>>>The Morse test which is Element 1 tests the skill of receiving Morse code
>>>>at a very basic level.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Exactly, it measures a specific level of proficiency.
>>>
>>>
>>"Proficiency" starts at 10 wpm.
>>
Well, the tests are done "Farnsworth" style, ie, fast code characters
spaced at 5 WPM
rate. Idea is to get people to learn the sounds of the characters
instead of thinking of
the dits and dahs and deducing the character. Less time wasted getting
proficient at
code if one chooses to.

>>
>>
>
> Nope. 40 WPM. 20 WPM is kid stuff according to some REAL old-timer
> morsemen.
>
>
>
>>>>Element 1 is in no way a test of "proficiency". It's a skill test at a
>>>>very
>>>>basic level. To call it a proficiency test is to demonstrate ignorance of
>>>>the
>>>>word proficiency.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>Proficiency is measured against some "yardstick" ... in the case of Morse,
>>>the FCC has (currently) determined the yardstick to be 5 wpm.

>>>You can argue all you want, but that's the way it is ...
>>>
>>>
>>Sure. But just because FCC says it does not make it true.
>>
>>
>
> You can bet your NAL that what the FCC is *TRUE* is very much true
> if you get NAiLed.
>
Well, the FCC isn't going to NAiL you for being only able to do 7WPM
instead of 20
in the extra CW subband (really the extra data subband). Actually, I
think we should
informally keep the novice subbands as beginner Morse code users and
have informally
reserve the extra subbands for people who can do high speed Morse. Used
to be and
likely still is that expert morse men rove the novice subbands looking
to elmer the newbies.

>
>
>
>>>>Yet they wouldn't include a sunset clause back in 2000
>>>>
>>>>
>>>True ... they didn't include a sunset clause.
>>>
>>>
>>Which means they were not 100% convinced. Otherwise why do the whole
>>thing all over again?
>>
>>
>
> I think it's called "proceedure of law" or suchlike.
>
>
>
>
>>>>and they're making all of us go through an NPRM cycle all over again.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>How the FCC will handle this is yet to be determined ...
>>>
>>>
>>So far it looks like NPRM time. As more and more proposals/petitions
>>roll in, and old ones remain unresolved, the ARRL forecast of two
>>years begins to look reasonable.
>>

>>
>
> Whatever you forecast is always "reasonable" and anything else is
> unreasonable. Ho hum.
>
Well yeah. The trick is to be aware that one has a clue. I don't
always have the clues,
but hopefully I'm aware when I am clueless.

>
>
>
>
>>>>If FCC thinks there really is
>>>>"no regulatory purpose" to a code test, WHY are they dragging their feet
>>>>and doing the whole circus AGAIN?
>>>>
>>>>
>>>See my last sentence ...
>>>
>>>
>>We'll see. Not even 2 months since WRC-03, and the summer is not even
>>over yet. FCC could, upon review of the petitions, say "Yeah, we went
>>through this 3 years ago, nothing's changed, bye-bye Element 1".
>>
>>
>
> The FCC hasn't said that yet. Or do you have "insider information" that
> even Phil K. doesn't have?
>
>
Takes time for the brearucracy to turn its wheels. You think ham radio
issues like this
are at the top of the FCC's list of burning issues? I doubt it.

1926. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 16:32:59 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6D0FD4.24A82%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75339

"Len Over 21" wrote:

> The special election in regards to recalling the
> Governor of the state of California has nothing
> whatsoever to do with amateur radio. (snip)

Since when is that a major concern? Read back over this newsgroup. During the last presidential election, several thousand messages were posted on that subject alone. In fact, just about every major event happening in the world recently has been discussed in this newsgroup at some point (and more than a few minor events). The California recall vote is certainly not going to be an exception to that.

> If you are not a registered voter in California,
> then you have no cause to carry on as if you were
> nor have you any authority whatsoever on
> California politics.

Nonsense. What happens in this country, anywhere in this country, is of interest to any American. What happens in California, or any other state, has an impact on the rest of the nation. So, while it is true those outside the state don't vote in California, that clearly doesn't prevent them from commenting on the subject.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1927. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 16:51:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6D1423.24A84%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75340

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> As it happens, Ahnold Schwartzenegger may be the best
> choice to be the next Governor of Cally-Forney-Ah.
> While he does espouse some political idealogy more
> in line with liberals than most Republicans would
> care for, he doesn't see the answer to everything to
> be raising taxes and expanding government. (snip)

Why does that not surprise me one little bit, Larry? Arnold seems to fit right into your concepts of conservatism - liberal on most issues with enough conservative rhetoric to make him the least objectionable candidate. If conservatives aren't willing to vote conservative, no wonder conservative issues are slowly losing ground in this country.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1928. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 16:59:23 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6D1600.24A86%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75341

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:

> Don't look now, but this ENTIRE newsgroup is a
> place where the code/no-code debate is on-topic,
> all day, 24/7/365.

Tell it to Steve. He was the one complained about that, not me.

> What I do have a problem with are people like
> you who obviously can't handle any kind of
> disagreement (snip)

First, there isn't any real disagreement - only your endless rhetoric about a subject (code testing) that is quickly dying. Second, I have no problems with a simple disagreement, just a problem with those who don't know how to disagree in a civilized manner. You, Larry, either never knew how to disagree in a civilized manner or have lost sight of that ability.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1929. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 17:18:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308230918.6fd15c29@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75342

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bi43gp$jbc@library1.airnews.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0308211912.1f292b47@posting.google.com...
> > dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
> news:<9829b709.0308211131.66e895d8@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
> news:<f45722ac.0308210229.7d6626eb@posting.google.com>...
> > > > dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
> news:<9829b709.0308201758.3f381cb1@posting.google.com>...
> > > >
> > > > > Brian:
> > > > > There's 'life', then there's your perception of life. Most readers
> here know
> > > > > too well that the two are not congruent.
> > > > >
> > > > > Perhaps there's still time for you to learn the difference.
> > > >
> > > > DICK, I'm talking about you, not "most readers."
> > >
> > > As per your usual, you have no idea what you're talking about.
> >
> > Then why did I start the sentence with "DICK?"
>
> I think it's kind of a way of admitting he's a nothing and a nobody... :o
>
> Kim W5TIT

Perhaps subconsciously.

In the year 2525, if man is still alive...

...an alien scientist will start reading DICK's r.r.a.p. postings and
declare, "Captain, I find it quite illogical. This specimen is a
nothing and a nobody, but believes he is a giant. Fascinating!"

1930. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 17:23:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308230923.1faff3c9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75343
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<vHy1b.1665$O03.387@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Ged" <ged65@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:z7uXIpH72pR$EwYx@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk...
> > In message <Flw1b.895$O03.188@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> > Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get.rid.invalid> writes
> > >It is to a large part old boy. Ask the Japs what happened when they did
> > >their sneak attack. Ask Germany how it liked those B17 daylight raids.
> > >Piss us off and its hell to pay.
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> > I guess the Vietnamese and Somalis whipped yer arses because you just
> > weren't pissed off enough eh?
> >
> > (Standby for the usual Republican answer of 'we weren't allowed to win
> > by the politicians')
> > --
> > Ged
>
> I don't really see where the Vietnamese and the Somalies 'whipped our
> arses'. What I remember happening is the US Government WIMPED OUT before
> we won. Neither situation was worth a damn. But don't blame the soldiers
> for the actions of NIXON, KISSENGER and CLINTON.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Dan, as I recall, Nixon didn't open up Vietnam, and Clinton didn't
open up Somalia. I don't think Kissinger had much to do with either.
But he did figure out how to get OPEC organized, have an oil embargo,
then jack up the price of oil so they could buy US armaments.

1931. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 17:33:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308230933.6ad1de2f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75344

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<8fw1b.29885$Vx2.13538140@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:KIu1b.1920$6e5.108499@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> >
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > news:c2356669.0308221028.605a3cbf@posting.google.com...
> > > "Proficiency" starts at 10 wpm.
> >
> > That's absurd ... proficiency is a relative term that must be quantified.
> > One can be proficient at a variety of levels in any activity requiring
> > some sort of acquired skill.
> >
>
> We might consider the arguments presented in the book "The Art and Skill of
> Radiotelegraphy".

Why?

The author had done extensive study on Morse code
> teaching methods, learning abilities, etc.

Cool. Who is the author, what is his callsign? And what is the
copyright date?

I'll bet he wrote it long after the code began to wane in any (every)
radio service.

His definition of proficiency is
> along the lines of what level must a person obtain to prevent forgetting it.
> Basically his research showed that those who achieved 13wpm did not forget
> the code even if they did not use it. They would get "rusty" so to speak
> and their speed would fall off if they did not use it but they would not
> forget it. Once they resumed using it, their speed would fairly quickly
> climb back to their previous level. That would seem like a reasonable
> definition.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dee, you might want to suggest this as the definition of "Morse
Proficiency" to the FCC.

You might also want them to define Morse Code as it has some how
slipped out of Title 47. Hey, while they're at it, ask them to define
how to compute "Words per Minute," and Farnsworth.

1932. This NG -- The Good, The Bad, And The Ugly

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 17:44:00 UTC
From: Au Contraire <AC@opinion.com>
Message-ID: <AJN1b.14908$S_.12924@fed1read01>
Source record: 75345

"Master of the universe and supreme ruler of all living beings (and I have permission to be so from ny wife)" <john.smith@micro$oft.com> WROTE:
> Traditionally radio amateurs with more experience would help those with
> less. No ridicule. No begging. No temper tantrums.
> So what has happened? Or is it just this british newgroup?
> BR MOTU

Nope -- the NG's over here in the USA have also been invaded with the lawless, the renegades, the profane, the angry, with numerous personal attacks, political agendas, condescending attacks on lower license Hams, and incredible Off Topic junk. Some just keep beating up on their adversaries over and over again for YEARS -- wish they would just quit it and send personal e-mail. But guess they want the world to see their sputterings.

When a forum is free and unmoderated -- the 0.0001 % junkies of the world invade it. Fortunately mostly -- the subject tells the content -- so just ignore those posts. But in all news groups -- some people keep a subject such as VSWR and change the content so it has nothing to do with VSWR.

OH well it is free and some good stuff comes out of it all.

If you read the NG's for a while -- you will know who the 0.0001% are -- and you can filter em out or just plain ignore them.

Unfortunately, many of the 99.9999% of the decent hams don't bother with the NG's

So on NG's -- here you will find the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly.

This ought to stir up a hornets nest from the Bad and Ugly -- flame away chaps.

"Master of the universe and supreme ruler of all living beings (and I have permission to be so from ny wife)" <john.smith@micro$oft.com> wrote in message news:1GL1b.20991$mU6.33614@newsb.telia.net...
> Hi all,
>
> Interesting that this particular hamradio newsgroup is so full of anger.
> People are slagging off each other and poking each-other in the eyes all the
> time. What ever happened to the "spirit of amateur radio" where all are
> equal? In the 60's I was told that Brian Rix, Prince Charles and Tony
> Higginbottom were all radio amateurs. I believe that Brian Rix is dead,
> Prince Charles is still a ham, but now the patron of UK hamradio. Tony never
> did manage to keep a job and the last I heard he was the doorman at a cheap

> London.
>
> But the point is that they all used the wireless sets and talked to others
> as equals. No-one looked down on Tony and called him a "lesser-class
idiot"
> because he was low socially. Charles was never refered to a "your
highness".
> Today when I look at the posting on this newsgroup I see people regarding
> present, or ex, CBers as lower class radio amateurs. G3s sometimes think
> themselves of a higher social status when int he presence of M3s.
>
> BULLSHIT!
>
> I still regard everyone as being equal. It matters not whether their exam
> contained "Draw an Inverted Hartley oscillator using a triode valve", or
> "Which of these four options A, B, C & D is not a letter of the phonetic
> alphabet?". It matters not who knows how many dits there are in a dah. I
> thought the object of the licence was self education of the licensee in
> radio communications, not petty bickering and poking fun at people.
> Traditionally radio amateurs with more experience would help those with
> less. No ridicule. No begging. No temper tantrums.
>
> So what has happened? Or is it just this british newgroup?
>
> BR MOTU
>
>

1933. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 18:05:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030823140507.23171.00000217@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 75346

In article <3F4795AF.1040907@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>>>
>>>Do you think every ham understands how their radios work?
>>
>> Few do.
>>
>At what level of expertise do you need here? Simple concepts on how
>superheterodynes
>work (block level diagrams) or precise knowledge on RF analog chip design?

My take on the general level of expertise can be reduced to:

"A transmitter sends out signals and a receiver receives them."

:-)

Or, when questioned on something more specific, the pointing to a large
stack of old QSTs and some Handbooks, "I got all the techie smarts I
need right THERE, I took my TEST long ago and don't have to learn
nuthin!"

>>>Do you think
>>>the tests even begin to measure the things a ham needs to know to
>>>determine if a radio is working properly?
>>>
>> The FCC no longer devises the license exam test questions and it no
>> longer requires a minimum number of questions on specific topics within
>> the minimum number of written test questions per class.
>>
>> Address your complaints about written exam question content to the
>> VEC Question Pool Committee.
>>
>At least enough knowledge to spot gross problems.

"Gross problems?"

Address bitching about "today's technical test dumbing-down" to the
VEC QPC.

Meanwhile, continue to operate solely in the ham bands (on HF, there
are no other real ham bands) and forget about interfering with any other
radio services. That's not a "ham problem" anyway, is it?

>>>>How could you possibly know something was
>>>>wrong if you had no knowledge of how the radio worked?

>>>>
>>>By how it behaves. And by how other hams tell you it sounds, or
>>>doesn't sound.
>>
>> HAR! Another reducto ad absurdum commentary! :-)
>>
>> If (as you said earlier) hams don't have any grasp of technical matters,
>> how can they possibly judge the quality of signals? :-)
>>
>> Listening to an AM or SSB signal with an FM receiver doesn't yield much
>> information on that AM or SSB signal, does it? How about judging
>> signal quality of FM on an AM receiver? Does slope detection yield
>> "quality" of signal that way?
>>
>Come on, few hams are that stupid.

I've met some. A few of those were morsemen, too! :-)

>First thing I check is to see that I have the right receive
>mode enabled. "Oh, I had LSB enabled for 20 meters, no wonder everyone
>sounded screwed up".

Nu?

My hearing is not special but it is absurdly easy to spot a wrong-sideband
SSB receive mode by EAR, not having to check any panel controls...

>> On most modern HF transceivers, the 3rd harmonic has the strongest
>> content of RF. The 3rd harmonic of 3.5 to 4.0 MHz is 10.5 to 12 MHz
>> and there aren't many "ham listening frequencies" there, are there?
>>
>More than the fundamental?

Of the HARMONICS, the 3rd is MOST LIKELY to be the strongest
HARMONIC.

Don't try to get into nit-picky arguments over parts of sentences.

The third harmonic of 3.5 to 4.0 MHz transmissions doesn't fall into any
"ham bands" on HF so it is extremely unlikely that any other amateur
would have any listening capability in that part of HF.

>Modern radios rarely have a failure in this
>that is not obvious in other areas of performance.

That's a very nice blanket statement which is so much phlogiston, a
perfect rationale to absolve oneself from any need to know anything
technical. From experience in lots of "modern radios" designed and
built for far harsher environments than amateur radio, that's BUNK.

The Mean Time Between Failures (MTBF) of "modern radios" is FAR
BETTER now than at any time in the past, especially after the solid-
state era was entered. A couple of orders of magnitude BETTER.

"Modern radios" just haven't reached the perfection level yet.

>> Hams tend to give "signal reports" as 5-9-9 regardless of actual
>> lower values...it's the buddy-thing to do to fellow hams, right?
>>
>"Everyone is "59" on my meter..." :-)

Of course. Every ham signal is always perfect everywhere. Uh huh.

>>>Do you really think even the Extra test measures that knowledge?
>>>Particularly given the extremely wide range of technologies that a ham
>>>is authorized to use?
>>>
>We do put some faith in the quality of our manufactured equipment. Like if
the
>harmonics are really down 60 dB or if our rigs are leaking harmonics only 55
dB
>down. But we should be able to spot a gross deficency (like something broke).
>Not necessairly be able to repair it ourselves, but be able to spot the
problem and
>take the bad equipment out of service.

Not a problem. Just read the QST Equipment Reviews and BELIEVE them.
Don't bother with trying to measure anything yourself. Forget theory,
forget
having to learn anything, forget it all, just adjust those paddles and beep
away. Equipment Reviews wouldn't LIE to anyone, would they? After all,
HAMS did the testing, right? If specifications are printed on real paper
with
real ink, they are absolutely withoutadoubt "honest" and faithful to all
hams.

Do ALL the "technical discussions about performance" based on SOMEONE
ELSE's measurements. Argue the fine points of what SOMEONE ELSE
wrote. Never challenge any specifications printed on real paper with real
ink...if a ham did it, it is beyond criticsm. There's no point in doing it
yourself unless you have all the "credentials" and have been a ham for
decades...NOT doing a lot except USING the radios.

If you swiped a credit card for $2000 or so for an all-mode, all-everything
super-special, esthetically-gorgeous, ham whiz-bang, do NOT question
ANY of the manufacturer's specifications. Accept it on FAITH. You "got
what you paid for," right?

>> Hello? Want to improve written test content and quality? Go talk
>> at the VEC QPC and bitch at them...

No arguments on that? :-)

>>>Example: New Ham buys old rig, which requires tuning up. Even though
>>>in perfect operating order, said rig can be mistuned by the unknowing
>>>to produce all sorts of spurious responses. Current tests say nothing
>>>about proper method of dipping and loading, grid drive, audio gain,
>>>etc. Heck, most current EEs couldn't get the thing to work without

>>>help.
>>
>> BFD. Did that 50 years ago, not even an EE then. Rather OLD
>> rigs then, some of them. :-)
>>
>Issue is a new ham trying to use the old rig as "plug and play" like a
>new rig. He has to RTFM.

Nope. All that is necessary is skill and proficiency at morse code.
And being able to subtly tune in a signal in ways that professionals
couldn't possibly do.

>>>didn't cover 1% of how his new/old rig works. FCC trusts that New Ham
>>>will educate him/herself on the technology used and not cause
>>>interference. So why should New Ham be forced to jump through a
>>>written test hoop and learn things he/she won't use? Answer: Because
>>>some folks think he/she should have to. And for no other reason.
>>
>> Has the FCC *EVER* stated such a position? I don't think so.
>>
>> The FCC does NOT specify the various content of written questions
>> on ANY written element...ONLY the total number.
>>
>> See VEC QPC......
>>
>I think the FCC does has some specifications on the material to be
>tested.

The FCC specifies the number of questions on every written test
element. Beyond that the ENTIRETY of the written test questions
and answers is left solely up to the VEC QPC.

The FCC has "final cut" on the written elements (final approval) but
that is rather pro forma.

>And on the quality
>of the wrong answers on a multiple choice test. You can't ask "the
>voltage across a 1 ohm
>resistor at 1 amp is: a) bananas, b) New Jersey c) 1 volt d) a can of beer."

Complain to the VEC QPC if you have a problem with that.

>>>Sure. But just because FCC says it does not make it true.
>>
>The FCC does the licenses, and they decide what they care about in
>deciding if an applicant gets a license or not.

No kidding?!? :-)

The FCC hasn't "cared much" anywhichway since the small but slight
change in Part 97 a few years ago when the VEC QPC got the WHOLE
magilla on written element questions and answers.

>>>"Proficiency" starts at 10 wpm.
>>>
>Well, the tests are done "Farnsworth" style, ie, fast code characters spaced
at 5 WPM
>rate. Idea is to get people to learn the sounds of the characters instead of
thinking of
>the dits and dahs and deducing the character. Less time wasted getting
proficient at
>code if one chooses to.

There you have it...MORSEMANSHIP is the MOST IMPORTANT factor in
amateur radio operations below 30 MHz!!!

According to some, anyway...

>> You can bet your NAL that what the FCC is *TRUE* is very much true
>> if you get NAiLed.
>>
>Well, the FCC isn't going to NAiL you for being only able to do 7WPM instead
of 20
>in the extra CW subband (really the extra data subband). Actually, I think we
should
>informally keep the novice subbands as beginner Morse code users and have
informally
>reserve the extra subbands for people who can do high speed Morse. Used to be
and
>likely still is that expert morse men rove the novice subbands looking to
elmer the newbies.

Morsemanship uber alles in the year 2003!

There are NO "novice class" amateur radio licenses issued in
USA amateur radio. Are you going to keep space on a
"reservation" for all those missing indians or what?

How about we keep all those Morsemen Chiefs on their elite little
EM spectrum reservations, maybe have dude ranches where
youngsters can all attend to learn the Old Ways of Morse?

All those old Morse Chiefs have been giving us "lip" on their
morsemanship, now we can give them "lip service" by keeping
them all on their EM reservations. Everyone can be happy, the
Chiefs can brag up a storm, recite the old Maxims, and keep the
religion of morse alive in their peyote-fueled fantasies about radio.

>>>We'll see. Not even 2 months since WRC-03, and the summer is not even
>>>over yet. FCC could, upon review of the petitions, say "Yeah, we went
>>>through this 3 years ago, nothing's changed, bye-bye Element 1".
>>
>> The FCC hasn't said that yet. Or do you have "insider information" that
>> even Phil K. doesn't have?
>>
>Takes time for the brearucracy to turn its wheels. You think ham radio issues
like this

>are at the top of the FCC's list of burning issues? I doubt it.

I'm not worried. It took TWENTY-FOUR YEARS to make a
dent in the "40m problem" and that isn't resolved yet.

All those Morse Chiefs are big and important...mouth-wise. They've
beeped for so long that they won't hesitate to send smoke signals
to the Great (Black and) White Father in Washington to Keep The
Morse Faith. [the Forestry Service may have to send tanker planes
to help control all the smoke and fire...]

All should strive to protect and serve the standards and practices of
the 1930s' radio in this new millennium. Keep the morse faith.

beep, beep

LHA

1934. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 19:15:44 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <A3P1b.30$EC4.6548@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75347

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F4795AF.1040907@ix.netcom.com...
>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>Do you think every ham understands how their radios work?
> >
> > Few do.
> >
> At what level of expertise do you need here? Simple concepts on how
> superheterodynes work (block level diagrams) or precise knowledge
> on RF analog chip design?

My *personal* view is that the former (basic block diagram level
understanding)
should be the minimum. More detailed knowledge is something that folks can
and should, ideally, strive for ... however, RF chip design is an area for
the pros
... hams can't fab RF chips in their workshops ... BUT, they CAN "fab" all
sorts
of interesting things with FPGAs and other programmable logic devices - with
affordable "eval" boards and inexpensive (sometimes free) software.

A few years ago (at work, I admit, but I could just as easily have done it
at home, as I have the tools) I designed an all-digital (I mean nothing but
gates) modem for orthogonal BFSK that performs within 1.2 dB of
theoretical ideal, yet was coded in VHDL and synthesized into an FPGA
for the proof of concept model. While the VHDL was later re-targeted
into a custom ASIC along with some other stuff, the cost of an FPGA that
would be more than capable has come down to the point where home
experimenters and "cottage industry shops" catering to the amateur market
(which is, comparatively, a "niche market") could use this method of
producing all sorts of useful stuff.

So, to sumarize, my *personal* view is that block diagram understanding
is a minimum "entry level". More than that is "a good thing" and should
be a goal. Not every ham is going to be/can be an RF engineer, nor do
they need to be, but the overall average level of technical knowledge
could, in my *personal* opinion, be increased if ham radio was focused
a *bit* more on the radio/electronics and a bit less on "operating,"

73,
Carl - wk3c

1935. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 19:45:48 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bi8g75$gaf@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 75348

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB6D0981.24A80%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
>
> And, based on your old web page pictures, you clearly
> don't look that tough.
>

heh heh "old"? The current proves that out. Ya know? Larry's had this fun
little game of poking for me being a "fat" lady. He ought to take a look at
that photo of himself! <GRIN>

Kim W5TIT

1936. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 19:59:00 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F47C782.2000506@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75349

>
>
> Morsemanship uber alles in the year 2003!
>
> There are NO "novice class" amateur radio licenses issued in
> USA amateur radio. Are you going to keep space on a
> "reservation" for all those missing indians or what?
>
What about all of us "extra-lite" licensees? We only need 5wpm
nowadays, and if
I want to QSO Larry, I would want to have some skill. Besides I said
"informally"
so if nobody's on at the current time, other hams can fire up other
modes on the
empty frequencies.

>
> How about we keep all those Morsemen Chiefs on their elite little
> EM spectrum reservations, maybe have dude ranches where
> youngsters can all attend to learn the Old Ways of Morse?
>
As morse only requires a small bandwidth, those "reservations" wouldn't
be much of
a burden.....

>
>
>

1937. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 22:18:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <vKR1b.4826$8i2.3193@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75350

"Merl Turkin" <Terk@astroburp.net> wrote in message
news:bi7j45$bh4$0@216.221.129.15...
> On Thu, 21 Aug 2003 18:20:50 -0400, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > These are keepers. Especially like item 19. That one applies to HF as
> > well.
> >
> > Beep
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
>
> (snip)
>
> I like item 31:
>
> "Make sure when you reply to a usenet post that you quote the entire
> message you're replying to instead of just a small relevant portion of
it."

I like item 32:

Make sure when you reply to a usenet post that you don't quote the entire
message, as you are wasting everyones time. Assuming of course they are
smart enough to look at the previous post.

1938. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 22:21:57 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <9OR1b.4831$8i2.3803@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75351
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308230923.1faff3c9@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<vHy1b.1665$O03.387@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Ged" <ged65@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk> wrote in message
> > news:z7uXIpH72pR$EwYx@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk...
> > > In message <Flw1b.895$O03.188@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> > > Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get.rid.invalid> writes
> > > >It is to a large part old boy. Ask the Japs what happened when they
did
> > > >their sneak attack. Ask Germany how it liked those B17 daylight
raids.
> > > >Piss us off and its hell to pay.
> > > >
> > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > I guess the Vietnamese and Somalis whipped yer arses because you just
> > > weren't pissed off enough eh?
> > >
> > > (Standby for the usual Republican answer of 'we weren't allowed to win
> > > by the politicians')
> > > --
> > > Ged
> >
> > I don't really see where the Vietnamese and the Somalies 'whipped our
> > arses'. What I remember happening is the US Government WIMPED OUT
before
> > we won. Neither situation was worth a damn. But don't blame the
soldiers
> > for the actions of NIXON, KISSENGER and CLINTON.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Dan, as I recall, Nixon didn't open up Vietnam, and Clinton didn't
> open up Somalia. I don't think Kissinger had much to do with either.
> But he did figure out how to get OPEC organized, have an oil embargo,
> then jack up the price of oil so they could buy US armaments.

Of course they didn't OPEN UP VN or Somalia. I was refering to who ENDED it
and HOW. As for Kissinger he was a MAJOR part of how we wimped out to the
North Vietnamese, allowed them to keep troops in the South while we turned

tail and let the South Vietnamese swing at the end of the rope we tied.

No arguement of Mr. K. and his deals later on.

Dan/W4NTI

1939. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 22:24:30 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <yQR1b.4834$8i2.2572@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75352
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

<lucifer@eternal-flames.gov> wrote in message
news:rtefkv4dbcsc7fmjh88mps5uf3pddctm68@4ax.com...
> On 23 Aug 2003 10:23:35 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) pausing to
> cast envious glances at those who had mastered the skill of reading
> without moving their lips, wrote:
>
> >Dan, as I recall, Nixon didn't open up Vietnam, and Clinton didn't
> >open up Somalia. I don't think Kissinger had much to do with either.
> >But he did figure out how to get OPEC organized, have an oil embargo,
> >then jack up the price of oil so they could buy US armaments.
>
> No. In Vietnam it was the lily-livered liberals in the Johnson
> administration who who more concerned with the views of the campus
> pinko's, than with doing what needed to be done.
>
> So you had a typical half-assed attempt at beating VC, instead of
> turning the whole place into a scrapyard.
>
> Old Nick

Well put.....don't forget Mrs. LBJ and her interest in Bell Hellicopters and
of course the 'construction company'.

Actually tho if one wants to be technical. Nixon is partly responsible
also. He was the VP when Ike sent in the first 'advisors'. But thats a
bit of a stretch.

Dan/W4NTI

1940. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 22:25:24 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <oRR1b.4837$8i2.617@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75353
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:pe2ekvghmfm1feqta7uua8j8qb2tfjrmns@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 23 Aug 2003 00:39:25 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >I must say Walt that you may indeed be right about this turning into
another
> >VN. But let me ask you Walt....how much time did you put in the bush?
>
> A bird in the bunk is worth two in the bush!
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

Just another REMF eh?

Dan/W4NTI

1941. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 22:27:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <uTR1b.4838$8i2.4070@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75354
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:H1z1b.30281$Vx2.13587473@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:JLy1b.1672$O03.1295@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> >
> > QRZ ??? who was the little twit there ??? QRZ ???
>
> I don't pay much attention to anybody who claims to be a ham but won't
show
> a callsign. They're almost always anti-ham trolls.
>
> Charles, N5PVL
>
>

Yep.

Dan/W4NTI

1942. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 22:29:18 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <2VR1b.4840$8i2.2693@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75355
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F46C557.6080301@adelphia.net...
> Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
> >
> >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >> news:JLy1b.1672$O03.1295@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >>
> >>>
> >>> QRZ ??? who was the little twit there ??? QRZ ???
> >>
> >> I don't pay much attention to anybody who claims to be a ham but
> >> won't show a callsign. They're almost always anti-ham trolls.
> >>
> >> Charles, N5PVL
> >>
> >
> > Why do you cross post your drivel to rec.radio.cb then, brainiak?
> >
> Because the original message was there and in rrap, and I was
> responding to a person tha tI think posted from there.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Don't worry about Moparholic. This is his usual troll. Tries to stir it up, then bitches because its cross posted. He probably cross posted it anyway.

It don't mean nothin man.

Dan/W4NTI

1943. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 22:30:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <iWR1b.4841$8i2.2913@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75356
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F46BB32.8040206@adelphia.net...
> Ham Dat Am wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3F465214.4040907@psu.edu...>
> >
> >>Old white guys are a legitimate target - and I hope to someday be an old
> >>white guy.
> >>
> >
> > Don't tell that to an old Marine who fought on Iwo Jima
>
> I was just thinking that being old was better than the alternative! 8^)
>
> And well, white guys of eurpean descent are kind of the target(and
> supposed cause of all ills) these day, old or young are the target these
> days, no?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

What the Marine was saying....is some of us 'old white guys' that are
targets....can fire back.

Dan/W4NTI

1944. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 22:33:54 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <mZR1b.4843$8i2.3132@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75357
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Ronny" <Y432@cbronnieincorg.net> wrote in message
news:bi6hit$5ln$0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> Where have all you old farts been? Nevermind,
> 99% of you don't have the slightest idea what exists
> in the spectrum outside the ham bands.
> 27540 khz & 6890 khz have been standard CB
> packet comms calling freqs. for well over a decade.
> And yes, there is extensive CB packet activity in the
> U.S. What do you think, just cause somebody is not
> a ham op means that they don't know anything about
> packet? oh horrors, some CB ops even run
> slow scan TV. Get with the times you old fools.
>
> Ronny
>
>
>
>

No, Ronny....what YOU DO NOT UNDERSTAND is WE DON"T GIVE A RATS ASS WHAT A
CBer in ANY COUNTRY DOES. Is that CLEAR?

Dan/W4NTI

1945. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 22:36:22 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <G%R1b.4845$8i2.1766@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75358

"Ronny" <Y432@cbronnieincorg.net> wrote in message
news:bi6i3o$6js$0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> news:15831-3F465D3C-73@storefull-2315.public.lawson.webtv.net...
> From: HDA@pork.com (Ham Dat Am)
> >Cindy -- you have to understand you asked a
>
> >question about illegal CB operation and Hams
>
> >are very much against ANY illegal operations
>
> >on any band.
>
>
> That is such a myopic bullshit remark.
>
>
> >Kinda like asking an atheist question in a
>
> >Catholic Church.
>
>
>
> Even your analogy is poor.
>
>
> >Go to rec.radio.cb --- you will get sympathy
>
> >there and also probably bad mouthed about
>
> >illegal operations.
>
>
> Only by those ot unlike yourself who feel that all hammies are saints.
>
> > But perhaps you didn't know it was illegal --
>
> >now you do.
>
>
> And perhaps you didn't know many hammies break the law,,,AND
> freeband,,,now you do. For proof, merely check the rainreport and
> compare the number of hammies getting popped compared to the number of

> cbers. Therefore, Your statement "Hams are very much against illegal
> operations" falls completely apart when subjected to the facts supplied
> by the FCC.
>
>
>
>
>

One thing about it.....Ya just cain't fix stupid !!

Ya can take the boy out of CB....but ya cain't take the CB outta the boy.

Dan/W4NTI

1946. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 22:41:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <84S1b.4848$8i2.1283@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75359
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ronny" <Y432@cbronnieincorg.net> wrote in message
news:bi6ib1$70h$0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> news:28313-3F46ABFC-44@storefull-2312.public.lawson.webtv.net...
> > >Not up to us 'old white men' to handle you and
> > >your problem.
> >
> >
> >
> > You're right,,,you're too busy looking for a life.
> >
> >
> >
> > >I just forwarded your initial
> >
> > >message to the FCC. I hope they find it
> >
> > >interesting.
> >
> >
> >
> > Forward mine, Dan. I freeband AND DX on eleven meter all the time.
> > Riley has been hounded by so many of you clowns forwarding usenet posts
> > to him that you've made the genuine complaints concerning actual harm
> > and behavior so much harder to follow up. It's amazing one can live to
> > be as "old" as you and learn so little
> >
> >
> >
> > >Don't like that?
> >
> >
> > You're years late and hundereds of complaints to short.
> >
> > > Too bad.
> >
> >
> > LOL.....you have issues. I also do 60 in a 55 at times. Hey
> > Dan,,,forward that to the Highway Patrol,
> >
> >
> >

> > >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
>

Sorry Ronny, you are confused. I never said I was sending it to Riley.

I said I was sending it to the FCC.

Oh and BTW you don't think enforcement cares or can catch anyone of you packet racket fools? Ask the guy in Miami how much his equipment cost that was taken by the Federal Marshalls a few years back.

Caught up to him right in the middle of that packet burst to the Frency BBS.

You people are idiots. Why don't you just get your 'hammie' license and do it legal? Miss the thrill of never knowing when there will be a knock on the door?

Im right...you people are IDIOTS.

Dan/W4NTI

1947. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 22:45:51 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <z8S1b.4851$8i2.2534@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75360

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030822233529.25815.00002380@mb-m07.aol.com...
> In article <bi5eggnpg0@pita.alt.net>, "Cindy W"
<CindyW@tampafastisp.net>
> writes:
>
> >Which is exacly why young kids are turned off by ham
> >radio. I once took a group of young black kids to a
> >local ham radio club meeting. All the old white men
> >ignored the kids or made rude remarks. These same
> >frustrated old white men then wonder why the hobby
> >is rapidly going the way of the horse & buggy.
> >
> >Cindy W
>
> Cindy:
>
> My advise to you would be to simply ignore the "old white men."
> If you want to get kids involved in amateur radio, I would seek out
> some of the younger, more open-minded members of the local
> ham radio clubs and ask if they could mentor your group, with
> the goal of starting your own radio club geared toward younger
> people. This way, they could get started off on the right foot, and
> you will not be inhibited by the parochial attitudes you have
> experienced in the past.
>
> Keep in mind that once some of these kids get licensed, they
> will undoubtedly wish to operate on the local ham repeaters in
> your area. It would be a big help if they (the kids) were able to
> communicate in good, proper, standard English, without any
> "urbanized" speech patterns or language which could cause them
> to run into problems being accepted on the air. This is not to
> say that their cultural differences cause them to deserve any
> kind of negative reaction, just that it would be more helpful to
> them in the long run to realize that success in our society
> requires them to adopt and adhere to some of the more mainstream
> cultural standards. If they are determined to make a point of
> their "black" culture in their on-the-air presence, you will definitely
> find yourself up against more of the same kind of reaction you
> found at the club meeting. However, if these kids are polite,
> well-spoken, display proper manners in general and good on-the-air
> operating manners in particular, they will most certainly receive
> the kind of treatment they expect and deserve.
>

> One more thing -- don't ignore the Morse code. Kids really love it,
> and consider the challenge of learning the code and using it to be
> interesting and fun. Most of the whining and complaining about
> learning the code has traditionally come from middle-aged white
> men who simply can't be bothered to learn a useful communications
> skill, and just want to pick up a microphone and talk. You and your
> kids can run rings around these old timers. You're already going
> in the right direction with your interest in Packet Radio, the thing
> you need to do now is to get your operation within the limits of
> what is legal within the Amateur Radio service, and get your kids
> motivated and involved. You will be amazed at how fast they will
> learn, if steered in the proper direction. There is nothing about
> being a particular skin color which affects intelligence, in spite of
> any "Bell Curve" crapola you may have heard about. These kids
> will prove this to the world, if only given the proper leadership.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Well said Larry. As I was reading your comments I was thinking over the years I have known 'black' operators on ham radio. And you know what? I can't think of but 1 that acted like a jerk. He is long gone now.

Check out the OMISS group. They have been around for decades. And are good examples of what you were talking about.

We had a guy here in the South. His name was John. He always was mobile and we called him 'mobile John'. He was black. And welcomed wherever he went. A fine gentleman and a great amateur operator.

Dan/W4NTI

1948. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 22:50:24 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <QcS1b.4853$8i2.3159@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75361

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bi7s9l$pis@library2.airnews.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030822233529.25815.00002380@mb-m07.aol.com...
> > In article <bi5eggnpg0@pita.alt.net>, "Cindy W"
> <CindyW@tampafastisp.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Which is exacly why young kids are turned off by ham
> > >radio. I once took a group of young black kids to a
> > >local ham radio club meeting. All the old white men
> > >ignored the kids or made rude remarks. These same
> > >frustrated old white men then wonder why the hobby
> > >is rapidly going the way of the horse & buggy.
> > >
> > >Cindy W
> >
> > Cindy:
> >
> > My advise to you would be to simply ignore the "old white men."
> > If you want to get kids involved in amateur radio, I would seek out
> > some of the younger, more open-minded members of the local
> > ham radio clubs and ask if they could mentor your group, with
> > the goal of starting your own radio club geared toward younger
> > people.
> >
>
> Based on the very things Larry says below, I suspect, Cindy, that he is
also
> one of the "old white men." His meaning in the statement above is
probably
> more like, "with the goal of starting your own radio club geared toward
> those kind of people." Larry's said some very questionable things in the
> past, although they weren't all that "questionable" to a lot of us. We
knew
> right where he stood.
>
> >
> > This way, they could get started off on the right foot, and
> > you will not be inhibited by the parochial attitudes you have
> > experienced in the past.
> >
>
> In other words, since your presence in these "other areas" leads to such

> distress, on *your* behalf of course, Cindy and friends, then it would
> probably be best if you just stay away from the mainstream folks.
>
> >
> > Keep in mind that once some of these kids get licensed, they
> > will undoubtedly wish to operate on the local ham repeaters in
> > your area. It would be a big help if they (the kids) were able to
> > communicate in good, proper, standard English, without any
> > "urbanized" speech patterns or language which could cause them
> > to run into problems being accepted on the air.
> >
>
> Oh, so classic. These kids can speak in any way they wish--as long as
> people LIKE LARRY are not around! Gosh, Cindy, maybe you should just give
> up altogether and make folks like that real happy. (You know I am being
> sarchastic, I hope).
>
> >
> > This is not to
> > say that their cultural differences cause them to deserve any
> > kind of negative reaction, just that it would be more helpful to
> > them in the long run to realize that success in our society
> > requires them to adopt and adhere to some of the more mainstream
> > cultural standards.
> >
>
> If I wasn't trying to be so patient here, my blood would be boiling. Oh,
> never mind, it is boiling and, Larry, you are pompous, bigoted jerk. But
> you knew that. "Cultural differences" have nothing to do with your
> concern--only your own ignorance.
>
> >
> > If they are determined to make a point of
> > their "black" culture in their on-the-air presence, you will definitely
> > find yourself up against more of the same kind of reaction you
> > found at the club meeting.
> >
>
> Yeah, don't you get it, Cindy, the way "they" act is a definite sign of
> indignance to us white folks. It has nothing to do with the fact that
they
> *ARE* black, you understand.
>
> >
> > However, if these kids are polite,
> > well-spoken, display proper manners in general and good on-the-air
> > operating manners in particular, they will most certainly receive
> > the kind of treatment they expect and deserve.
> >
>

> Yeah, Cindy. Be sure that you teach these black kids how to say "yes sir"
> to Larry. They wouldn't, of course, be saying anything like "no sir"
> because that would not be polite. And, be sure you get that white accent
up
> into them before the ever get on the air--or they won't meet Mastah
Larrah's
> standards of being well-spoken. God forbid that he try to STRETCH HIS
> HUMANNESS in any way to understand someone ON THEIR OWN TERMS.
>
> >
> > One more thing -- don't ignore the Morse code. Kids really love it,
> > and consider the challenge of learning the code and using it to be
> > interesting and fun.
> >
>
> Yeah, Cindy, and if Mastah Larrah can't tell if they're black, he'll be
able
> to communicate with them. Ya see, Mastah Larrah can only communicate with
> beeping because as soon as he opens his arrogant, bigoted, cracker-white
> mouth, people turn their backs on him.
>
> >
> > Most of the whining and complaining about
> > learning the code has traditionally come from middle-aged white
> > men who simply can't be bothered to learn a useful communications
> > skill, and just want to pick up a microphone and talk. You and your
> > kids can run rings around these old timers. You're already going
> > in the right direction with your interest in Packet Radio, the thing
> > you need to do now is to get your operation within the limits of
> > what is legal within the Amateur Radio service, and get your kids
> > motivated and involved.
> >
>
> And remember Cindy, that nothing Mastah Larrah has said YET has anything
to
> do with the R&R of ham radio--only with his own bigoted attitude. Yep,
keep
> those little black folks over theyah on the digital modes, Cindy. Mastah
> Larrah don't need none 'o that black culture or accent or attitude stuff
on
> HIS ham radio.
>
> >
> > You will be amazed at how fast they will
> > learn, if steered in the proper direction. There is nothing about
> > being a particular skin color which affects intelligence, in spite of
> > any "Bell Curve" crapola you may have heard about. These kids
> > will prove this to the world, if only given the proper leadership.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT

> >
>
> He had to get that one in there, Cindy. You see how antiquated his
> reference point is. And, that is the world Mastah Larrah lives in. He
just
> doesn't realize that he is a Mastah to nothing.
>
> Kim W5TIT
> I apologize that there are people like that, Cindy. You help those kids
get
> on the air, if that's what they want. And let them know that if people
> can't handle the way they wish to communicate, then that is not their (the
> kids') problem. When they are on a repeater, or a frequency, it is
"theirs"
> anyway. Besides, I would hope we've gotten beyond the attitudes of folks
> like Larry enough so that anyone on the air is someone to communicate
with.
>
>

Cindy,

I would like to apologize to you for Kim. As you can see by her callsign, she is somewhat, shall we say...disturbed?

She and Larry don't get along very well. And Twit....er Tit, er Kim seems to think what he says is directed at her ALL THE TIME.

She is in need of a couch and a cold towel.

Have a good day.

Dan/W4NTI

1949. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 22:53:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ofS1b.4857$8i2.115@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75362
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:gR6dnWWJMefLzNqiXTWJgA@crocker.com...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:uCt1b.1910$6e5.107724@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> >
> > "David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:1-KdnRoFfd2UotuiXTWJhA@crocker.com...
> > >
> > > "Cindy W" <CindyW@tampafastisp.net> wrote in message
> > > news:bi5egg$npg$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > x-no-archive: yes
> > > > "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:10577-3F462E45-34@storefull-2318.public.lawson.webtv.net...
> > > > From: wk3cqth@wk3c.com (Carl R. Stevenson)
> > > > >Sounds like totally illegal activity to me ... if I
> > > >
> > > > >were you, I would not expect help here and
> > > >
> > > > >would be prepared to duck for cover as the
> > > >
> > > > >flames erupt ...
> > > >
> > > > >Carl - wk3c
> > > >
> > > > _
> > > > The "flames" you speak of usually originate from the guilty
> > > > themselves..you know,,the ones that protesteth too much or the ones
> > > > seeking assumed status or power over another...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Which is exacly why young kids are turned off by ham
> > > > radio. I once took a group of young black kids to a
> > > > local ham radio club meeting. All the old white men
> > > > ignored the kids or made rude remarks. These same
> > > > frustrated old white men then wonder why the hobby
> > > > is rapidly going the way of the horse & buggy.
> > > >
> > >
> > > troll meter is pegged on this one!
> >
> > Dave,
> >
```

> > I disagree ... while I would discourage the apparently illegal packet
> > activity that Cindy described, I am forced by personal observation to
> > agree substantially with her assessment of how *many* (not all, but
> > enough to make a negative impact) treat kids and newcomers ...
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
> >
> look closely, its been an almost perfect troll... she sent one initial
> message, and one reply with the comments on the club meeting, and the
thread
> now has dozens of messages. she also knew enough to post it to two
> conflicting news groups, thus dragging both sides of the argument into the
> fray.... give the nest a kick and sit back and watch the hornets fly, an
> almost perfect troll!
>
>
>

So what?? At one time or another the entire USENET is one big TROLL...so
what ?

It brings up interesting conversation. What else is there to discuss? The
wx, the rig. If you don't like reading it, and you consider it a
troll...don't.

Dan/W4NTI

1950. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-23 23:20:33 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <WuKdnSg9q4Iwa9qiU-KYgw@crocker.com>
Source record: 75363
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:ofS1b.4857$8i2.115@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:gR6dnWWJMefLzNqiXTWJgA@crocker.com...
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > news:uCt1b.1910$6e5.107724@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > >
> > > "David Robbins" <k1ttt@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > > news:1-KdnRoFfd2UotuiXTWJhA@crocker.com...
> > > >
> > > > "Cindy W" <CindyW@tampafastisp.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:bi5egg$npg$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > > x-no-archive: yes
> > > > > "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:10577-3F462E45-34@storefull-2318.public.lawson.webtv.net...
> > > > > From: wk3cqth@wk3c.com (Carl R. Stevenson)
> > > > > >Sounds like totally illegal activity to me ... if I
> > > > >
> > > > > >were you, I would not expect help here and
> > > > >
> > > > > >would be prepared to duck for cover as the
> > > > >
> > > > > >flames erupt ...
> > > > >
> > > > > >Carl - wk3c
> > > > >
> > > > > _
> > > > > The "flames" you speak of usually originate from the guilty
> > > > > themselves..you know,,the ones that protesteth too much or the
ones
> > > > > seeking assumed status or power over another...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Which is exacly why young kids are turned off by ham
> > > > > radio. I once took a group of young black kids to a
> > > > > local ham radio club meeting. All the old white men
> > > > > ignored the kids or made rude remarks. These same
> > > > > frustrated old white men then wonder why the hobby
> > > > > is rapidly going the way of the horse & buggy.
> > > > >
> > > >
```

> > > > troll meter is pegged on this one!
> > >
> > > Dave,
> > >
> > > I disagree ... while I would discourage the apparently illegal packet
> > > activity that Cindy described, I am forced by personal observation to
> > > agree substantially with her assessment of how *many* (not all, but
> > > enough to make a negative impact) treat kids and newcomers ...
> > >
> > > Carl - wk3c
> > >
> > look closely, its been an almost perfect troll... she sent one initial
> > message, and one reply with the comments on the club meeting, and the
> thread
> > now has dozens of messages. she also knew enough to post it to two
> > conflicting news groups, thus dragging both sides of the argument into
the
> > fray.... give the nest a kick and sit back and watch the hornets fly, an
> > almost perfect troll!
> >
> >
> >
>
> So what?? At one time or another the entire USENET is one big TROLL...so
> what ?
>
> It brings up interesting conversation. What else is there to discuss?
The
> wx, the rig. If you don't like reading it, and you consider it a
> troll...don't.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
did i say i didn't like reading it... heck i just read 9 replies from you
added to this thread in 26 minutes. sure kept you busy for a while. and
gave me a couple good laughs in the process. what else is a troll good for
if not a few laughs.

1951. Re: This NG -- The Good, The Bad, And The Ugly

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 00:12:51 UTC
From: Betty Boopski <flymooney3002@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1061684290.138632@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 75364

"Au Contraire" <AC@opinion.com> wrote in message
news:AJN1b.14908$S_.12924@fed1read01...
> So on NG's -- here you will find the Good, the Bad, and the Ugly.

Here's an example of the "amusing". (..direct from
the 20 Meter Missionary Phone Patch and Bank Wire
Transfer Net)

http://www.geocities.com/pastorjass/

1952. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 01:10:02 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308231710.3ab5fe84@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75365

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<h1J1b.30394$Vx2.13732761@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:9829b709.0308221758.3b0e65ff@posting.google.com...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:<J1w1b.29882$Vx2.13535134@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > "WA3IYC" <wa3iyc@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20030822064317.21457.00000144@mb-m10.aol.com...
> > > > No offense, Phil, but the fact that we even have to fight as bad an
> idea
> as BPL
> > > > has caused my respect for a certain "expert agency" to all but
> disappear.
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > > >
> > >
> > > Whoever said the FCC was an "expert agency"???
> > >
> >
> > I realize that may seem strange to anyone who hasn't been around
> > radio regulation for as long as a few decades, but the FCC is indeed,
> > as the final authority, *the* expert agency. And have often been so
> > considered by various courts when faced with challenges to some of
> > their actions.
> >
> > Dick
>
> Yes they are the final authority but that does not make them an "expert".
> Even a court ruling does not make you an expert. In addition, the courts
> are ruling on the legality of the action not necessarily whether the action
> is correct in an engineering or technical sense.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

I think you missed the point, Dee. FCC is the expert agency simply
because they are the final authority, or the final authority has
deferred to tnem as the expert agency. Nobody said they're right. See
N2EY's recent post on the subject.

Dick

1953. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 01:10:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hk3c669.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75366

On Sat, 23 Aug 2003 08:29:55 -0400, TRE wrote:

>> Sounds like you are bitter that women had broken
>> the "Glass Ceiling," in an agency that was for so long and
>> one of the last to be dominated by white males.
>
> Shhhhhhhh, I heard she was even a "REPUBLICAN."

Wrong. She was a "I have no clue as to her party and care less" in
a Democratic administration.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1954. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 01:10:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hk3bpg7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75367

On Sat, 23 Aug 2003 07:55:52 -0400, Harry Hacker wrote:

> Please share with us which "expert' earned the nick
>"The West Coast Loose Cannon"

He had the initials JM, took early retirement when the rest of us
did, and has been deceased for about 5 years.

May he rest in peace.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1955. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 01:10:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hk3c3i8.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75369

On Sat, 23 Aug 2003 08:12:59 -0400, Harry Hacker wrote:

>> The "guest speaker"was an FCC Bureau Chief, who admitted that she
>> didn't know how from where the FCC gets jurisdiction over radio
>> transmissions from a US-registered aircraft "way up in the sky" in
>> international airspace.
>>
>
> This "guest speaker" was a graduate of Harvard Law School and
> held professional degrees in engineering. The only thing she lacked
> was membership in the "Old Guard" of white males.

Wrong on two of the three. She was not a Harvard Law grad, she did
not have ANY technical education or degrees. She was not a member
of the "Old Guard" of white males because God made her female and
she did come from "outside" and therefore didn't know what she was
'sposed to if she held that position nor did she bother to learn.
She was more interested in establishing cell networks and auctioning
off spectrum.

>> I had to teach her basic Communications Act law....
>
> Sounds like you are bitter that women had broken
>the "Glass Ceiling," in an agency that was for so long and
>one of the last to be dominated by white males.

I am bitter that someone is appointed a Bureau Chief who is
ignorant in the basic jurisdiction and authority of the agency.

One of the people I worked with and for at the agency whom I
respected the most was a "minority" lady - a "lady" in every sense
of the word - who came from "outside" and learned comm law very
quickly. She passed through the non-existent "glass ceiling" at the
agency very rapidly, served several years at a high position inm the
agency, and today holds a very high non-political career position in
another Federal agency, which she certainly EARNED.

'Bye "Harry".....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1956. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 01:10:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hk3dczb.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75368

On Sat, 23 Aug 2003 16:17:26 GMT, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>Have you noticed that the Chairman is a black man?

As was his predecessor (Bill Kennard).
>
>Did you know that there's a female Commissioner?
>(And that she's not the first?)

The first (Frieda Hennock) served about 45 years ago, IIRC. Since
that time, it was rare that one of the Commissioners wasn't a woman.

>In fact, I deal on a regular basis, professionally, with many, many
>"minorities" and women who hold high positions in the FCC.

And I worked for and greatly respected several of the same..... and
my "deputy" throughout all the years was a first-generation "minority",
(sorry, Nancy, God made him male) and one of the sharpest FCC engineers
is a Vietnamese refuge who at age 11 escaped being sunk by pirates when
his family fled Vietnam for America.

So much for generalities.

>How do you propose to reconcile all of this against your statement
>above, Nancy???

Yup.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1957. What API had to say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 01:16:11 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0308231716.5a805f76@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75370

http://www.attbi.com/News/TECHNOLOGY//XML/1700_High_Tech/5e56d6d0-6707-402f-a367-839da477c572.html

1958. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 01:25:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hk3fbvc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75371

On Sat, 23 Aug 2003 10:03:54 -0400, D. Feldstein wrote:

>Chairman Reed Hundt, an internationally recognized
>authority on Communications Law, was instrumental
>in dismantling the Old White Guard at the Commission
>and appointing minorities & women to management
>positions in the commission.
>
>D. Feldstein
>
> ***The below space is reserved for Phil to bad
> mouth Reed Hundt***

Reed Hundt didn't have the first clue on what communication law was, is, or should be, as evidenced by how he raped the Field Operations Bureau - the only hope that the agency had in preserving regulatory compliance enforcement - while building up a very ineffective Cable Bureau mired in words and theories that amounted to political mumbo-jumbo. His field prior to coming to the Commission was anti-trust and his appointment by Clinton had all the earmarks of redemption of some political IOU.

He was, and is, all politics, as has been every chairman since Mad Man Mark Fowler, certainly up to and including the present one. His "internationally recognized authority" status and value as a partner in his Chicago big-fee law firm is in the political and industry contacts that he can make, not in knowledge of or insight into what proper communications regulatory law should be. The monitoring techs that he RIFfed (with the exception of one particular one) know more about the realities of communication regulatory compliance than he did.

And that's my personal opinion based on being there......

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

1959. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 01:29:47 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@nospam.bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <GlU1b.6255$lq.463@fe04.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 75372

Der Code des Bewunderers der Amateurfunker ist CONSIDERATE... funktioniert nie bewu&#65533;t in solch einer Weise hinsichtlich vermindern das Vergn&#65533;gen von anderen. Loyal... bietet Loyalit&#65533;t, Ermutigung und Unterst&#65533;tzung anderen Bewunderern, lokale Vereine und die amerikanische Radiorelais-Liga an, durch die laienhafter Radio in den Vereinigten Staaten national und international dargestellt wird. Progressist... mit Wissen nebeneinander der Wissenschaft, der well-built und leistungsf&#65533;higen Station und des Betriebes &#65533;ber Vorwurf. Freundlich... verlangsamen Sie und geduldiges Funktionieren, wenn Sie verlangt werden; freundlicher Rat und Ratschl&#65533;ge zum Anf&#65533;nger; freundlich Unterst&#65533;tzung, Mitarbeit und Betrachtung f&#65533;r die Interessen von anderen. Diese sind die Stempel des laienhaften Geistes. BALANCED... Radio ist eine Berufung und behindert nie die Aufgaben, die Familie, Job, Schule oder Gemeinschaft verdankt werden. Patriotische... Station und F&#65533;higkeit immer bereit zum Service zum Land und zur Gemeinschaft.
"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030820220305.21761.00000283@mb-m01.aol.com...
> From: "Derek" danda95@hotmail.com
>
> >The Amateur's Code
> >The Radio Amateur is
> >CONSIDERATE
> >LOYAL
> >PROGRESSIVE
> >FRIENDLY
> >BALANCED
> >PATRIOTIC
>
> Is this in the FCC regulations? If not, it is just a recommendation and
> therefore has no valid basis to be followed, or to be identified as "The
> Amateur's Code".
>

1960. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 01:44:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308231744.65961c0d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75373
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<9OR1b.4831$8i2.3803@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0308230923.1faff3c9@posting.google.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<vHy1b.1665$O03.387@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "Ged" <ged65@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk> wrote in message
> > > news:z7uXIpH72pR$EwYx@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk...
> > > > In message <Flw1b.895$O03.188@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> > > > Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get.rid.invalid> writes
> > > > >It is to a large part old boy. Ask the Japs what happened when they
> did
> > > > >their sneak attack. Ask Germany how it liked those B17 daylight
> raids.
> > > > >Piss us off and its hell to pay.
> > > > >
> > > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > I guess the Vietnamese and Somalis whipped yer arses because you just
> > > > weren't pissed off enough eh?
> > > >
> > > > (Standby for the usual Republican answer of 'we weren't allowed to win
> > > > by the politicians')
> > > > --
> > > > Ged
> > >
> > > I don't really see where the Vietnamese and the Somalies 'whipped our
> > > arses'. What I remember happening is the US Government WIMPED OUT
> before
> > > we won. Neither situation was worth a damn. But don't blame the
> soldiers
> > > for the actions of NIXON, KISSENGER and CLINTON.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > Dan, as I recall, Nixon didn't open up Vietnam, and Clinton didn't
> > open up Somalia. I don't think Kissinger had much to do with either.
> > But he did figure out how to get OPEC organized, have an oil embargo,
> > then jack up the price of oil so they could buy US armaments.
>
> Of course they didn't OPEN UP VN or Somalia. I was refering to who ENDED it

> and HOW. As for Kissinger he was a MAJOR part of how we wimped out to the
> North Vietnamese, allowed them to keep troops in the South while we turned
> tail and let the South Vietnamese swing at the end of the rope we tied.

Were you there?

> No arguement of Mr. K. and his deals later on.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Well, it was 1973 and with the withdrawal from VN, we had to start
selling arms to someone.

1961. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 02:05:39 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@Lloydsandernet.org>
Message-ID: <bi96gg$bn8$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75376

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hk3c669.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sat, 23 Aug 2003 08:29:55 -0400, TRE wrote:
>
> >> Sounds like you are bitter that women had broken
> >> the "Glass Ceiling," in an agency that was for so long and
> >> one of the last to be dominated by white males.
> > >
> > > Shhhhhhhh, I heard she was even a "REPUBLICAN."
> >
> > Wrong. She was a "I have no clue as to her party and care less" in
> > a Democratic administration.
> >
> > --
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> >
> >

Oh my, Phil sounds angwy. Poor wittle Phil.

Lloyd

1962. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 02:07:59 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@Lloydsandernet.org>
Message-ID: <bi96kqcij0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75377

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hk3fbvc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sat, 23 Aug 2003 10:03:54 -0400, D. Feldstein wrote:
>
> >Chairman Reed Hundt, an internationally recognized
> >authority on Communications Law, was instrumental
> >in dismantling the Old White Guard at the Commission
> >and appointing minorities & women to management
> >positions in the commission.
> >
> >D. Feldstein
> >
> > ***The below space is reserved for Phil to bad
> > mouth Reed Hundt***
>
> Reed Hundt didn't have the first clue on what communication law was,
> is, or should be, as evidenced by how he raped the Field Operations
> Bureau - the only hope that the agency had in preserving regulatory
> compliance enforcement - while building up a very ineffective Cable
> Bureau mired in words and theories that amounted to political
> mumbo-jumbo. His field prior to coming to the Commission was
> anti-trust and his appointment by Clinton had all the earmarks of
> redemption of some political IOU.
>
> He was, and is, all politics, as has been every chairman since Mad
> Man Mark Fowler, certainly up to and including the present one. His
> "internationally recognized authority" status and value as a partner
> in his Chicago big-fee law firm is in the political and industry
> contacts that he can make, not in knowledge of or insight into what
> proper communications regulatory law should be. The monitoring
> techs that he RIFfed (with the exception of one particular one) know
> more about the realities of communication regulatory compliance than
> he did.
>
> And that's my personal opinion based on being there......
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
>
Tsk Tsk Tsk, Did mean ole Mr Hundt make you
angwy Phil ?
ROTFLMAO !!!!!!!!!!

Lloyd

1963. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 02:09:57 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@Lloydsandernet.org>
Message-ID: <bi96og$dc8$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75378

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hk3dczb.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sat, 23 Aug 2003 16:17:26 GMT, Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >Have you noticed that the Chairman is a black man?
>
> As was his predecessor (Bill Kennard).
> >
> >Did you know that there's a female Commissioner?
> >(And that she's not the first?)
>
> The first (Frieda Hennock) served about 45 years ago, IIRC. Since
> that time, it was rare that one of the Commissioners wasn't a woman.
>
> >In fact, I deal on a regular basis, professionally, with many, many
> >"minorities" and women who hold high positions in the FCC.
>
> And I worked for and greatly respected several of the same..... and
> my "deputy" throughout all the years was a first-generation "minority",
> (sorry, Nancy, God made him male) and one of the sharpest FCC engineers
> is a Vietnamese refuge who at age 11 escaped being sunk by pirates when
> his family fled Vietnam for America.
>
> So much for generalities.
>
> >How do you propose to reconcile all of this against your statement
> >above, Nancy???
>
> Yup.....
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
Uh huh, suuuuuuuuuuurrrrre Phil
I think mean old Mr Hundt still makes you angwy.

Lloyd

1964. Roger's World

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 02:15:23 UTC
From: Nobody Likes Roger <MeEither@pamz.com>
Message-ID: <bi973sfgb0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75379
Cross-posted to: alt.flame,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Yet another photo of Wiseman in alt.morons and in
alt.radio.scanner.flame_fest.
Look closely. Can you determine which one is Roger and why do you think so?

1965. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 02:16:22 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@Lloydsandernet.org>
Message-ID: <bi974hfjb0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75380

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hk3c3i8.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sat, 23 Aug 2003 08:12:59 -0400, Harry Hacker wrote:
>
> >> The "guest speaker"was an FCC Bureau Chief, who admitted that she
> >> didn't know how from where the FCC gets jurisdiction over radio
> >> transmissions from a US-registered aircraft "way up in the sky" in
> >> international airspace.
> >>
> > > This "guest speaker" was a graduate of Harvard Law School and
> > > held professional degrees in engineering. The only thing she lacked
> > > was membership in the "Old Guard" of white males.
>
> Wrong on two of the three. She was not a Harvard Law grad, she did
> not have ANY technical education or degrees. She was not a member
> of the "Old Guard" of white males because God made her female and
> she did come from "outside" and therefore didn't know what she was
> 'sposed to if she held that position nor did she bother to learn.
> She was more interested in establishing cell networks and auctioning
> off spectrum.
>
> >> I had to teach her basic Communications Act law....
> > >
> > > Sounds like you are bitter that women had broken
> > >the "Glass Ceiling," in an agency that was for so long and
> > >one of the last to be dominated by white males.
>
> I am bitter that someone is appointed a Bureau Chief who is
> ignorant in the basic jurisdiction and authority of the agency.
>
> One of the people I worked with and for at the agency whom I
> respected the most was a "minority" lady - a "lady" in every sense
> of the word - who came from "outside" and learned comm law very
> quickly. She passed through the non-existent "glass ceiling" at the
> agency very rapidly, served several years at a high position inm the
> agency, and today holds a very high non-political career position in
> another Federal agency, which she certainly EARNED.
>
> 'Bye "Harry".....
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>

>

Oh my, look everyone, little Phil is really angwy now!
Mean ole Mr Hundt has really gotten Phil's dander up.
Errrrr, say Phil, where is YOUR web page & where are
any books you have authored???? Huh?
Mr Hundt is an accomplished & successful author.
Here's his web page, take a look. Mr Hundt has grown
in stature since leaving the commission. A fine gentleman
indeed! Perhaps he got tired of rolling around in the
filth of the FCC.
www.reedhundt.com

hahahahah ROTFLMAO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Lloyd

1966. Re: Contact the FCC and Tell Them to get rid of CW Test and Requirements

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 02:20:08 UTC
From: Harry Hacker <none@noneharckhars.net>
Message-ID: <bi97bj$h1k$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75381

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hk3bpg7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sat, 23 Aug 2003 07:55:52 -0400, Harry Hacker wrote:
>
> > Please share with us which "expert' earned the nick
> >"The West Coast Loose Cannon"
>
> He had the initials JM, took early retirement when the rest of us
> did, and has been deceased for about 5 years.
>
> May he rest in peace.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

BZZZZZZZZZTTT! Wrong answer.

1967. Re: Have I got this right? GMRS...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 02:35:46 UTC
From: Al <Hickory@smokeybbqho.com>
Message-ID: <bi988v$o0l$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75382

"M. G. Devour" <mdevour@eskimo.com> wrote in message
news:bi5nqq$q8h$1@eskinews.eskimo.com...
> I just bought a pair of Motorola Talkabout GMRS/FRS radios in a cheapo
> bundle pack from Sam's Club, just to have on hand in case we ever need
some
> short range communications.
>
> The 22 channels are:
>
> 1-7: shared FRS and GMRS simplex
> 8-14; FRS only
> 15-22: GMRS only
>
> According to bandplan charts I found online and the channel frequency
table
> in the manual, channels 15-22 are in fact a mix of GMRS repeater input and
> output frequencies, meaning that any simplex operation with this radio on
> those channels could cause interference with nearby repeater users.
>
> So, on the "shared" channels 1-7 I'll need a license or else will be
> bootleg, because the radio uses GMRS power levels and modulation.
>
> On channels 8-14 I'll be using straight FRS and legal even without
license?
>
> Channels 15-22 are basically useless anywhere repeaters might be in use,
> given the radio cannot operate split to take advantage of them, even if
the
> repeater operators permited it?
>
> So, in type-accepting these radios, the FCC is bolluxing up the accepted
> GMRS bandplan. Who created that bandplan, the FCC or user groups or what?
> Just curious.
>
> At present the FCC will still take my money for a license, yes? And, of
> course, they have about as much manpower committed to stopping the
> unlicensed and improper operation caused by these cheap radios as they did
> to police CB back in the 70's?
>
> Of course it comes down to the question of whether to license or not. It'd
> be a waste of 75 bucks if next year the FCC threw up their hands at all
the
> problems *they* caused and stopped issuing licenses. If I only use the FRS
> channels, I've got a couple of cheap 7-channel FRS radios. <shrug>

>
> Most folks that buy these cheapie bundles won't go to the bother of
figuring
> this stuff out. So they're going to keep messing things up for the
> foreseeable future. With all that, just how much is left of the GMRS
> community, if there was one? Is there anyplace where GMRS folks gather
> online? It'd be nice to hear what they have to say.
>
> Thanks for your comments or answers to my questions.
>
> Mike D.
>
>
>

1968. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 02:38:55 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@nospam.bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <woV1b.8451$99.8368@fe03.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 75383

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030823013710.15923.00000198@mb-m12.aol.com...
>
> On most modern HF transceivers, the 3rd harmonic has the strongest
> content of RF. The 3rd harmonic of 3.5 to 4.0 MHz is 10.5 to 12 MHz
> and there aren't many "ham listening frequencies" there, are there?
>
For most modulated sine waves, the 3rd harmonic is usually the strongest
harmonic although it depends upon several factors. Generally, the odd
harmonic components add and the negative components subtract with modulated
sine waves. Having said that, most modern rigs that produce FCC quality
signals will filter such harmonics several 10's of dB rendering reception
almost impossible except in the near field. I thought I needed to correct
this BS, that emanates from someone who claims to understand modern amateur
technology theory. Hams transmitting signals of any significance on 12MHz
will not be hams for long.

de KR4AJ

1969. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 02:58:45 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0308231858.c0eb859@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75384
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

> You *are* correct that there are too many hams who are
> not open to, and often disparage, newcomers or "would-be's.
> That IS a significant problem in bringing in the newcomers
> and, particularly, younger folks who represent the future of
> ham radio. On this point we agree 100%.

If there is *one* such ham, that is too many, but you seem to suggest that the problem is widespread. On that notion we disagree 100%.

For every curmudgeon who disparages newcomers there are thousands who actively welcome them. Check out www.mnyarc.org. It was formed by members of our club, originally as a club sponsored Explorer Post, and has grown into a standalone group fully dedicated to nurturing youth-oriented amateur radio in our area. Hamfest Minnesota, also sponsored by our club, has a policy of free admission to hams aged 17 and under. These are just a couple of examples right in my neighborhood. Maybe you just live in a bad neighborhood.

73, de Hans, K0HB

1970. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 03:32:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F4831D3.6040505@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75385

Nancy D Fell wrote:

> The FCC has a long history of suppressing the advancement
> of females and minorities.

You do have the citations for this?

- Mike KB3EIA -

1971. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 03:34:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <vnW1b.31341$Vx2.13957154@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75386

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308230933.6ad1de2f@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<8fw1b.29885$Vx2.13538140@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > news:KIu1b.1920$6e5.108499@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > > news:c2356669.0308221028.605a3cbf@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Proficiency" starts at 10 wpm.
> > >
> > > That's absurd ... proficiency is a relative term that must be
quantified.
> > > One can be proficient at a variety of levels in any activity requiring
> > > some sort of acquired skill.
> > >
> >
> > We might consider the arguments presented in the book "The Art and Skill
of
> > Radiotelegraphy".
>
> Why?
>

Re-read the following sentence as it states why.

> The author had done extensive study on Morse code
> > teaching methods, learning abilities, etc.
>
> Cool. Who is the author, what is his callsign? And what is the
> copyright date?
>

Since I've given the title of the book, surely you can do the research
yourself for that data. Hint, it's available as a free download off the
internet so you can find it with any search engine. However the fourth
edition is copyrighted 2003 and is by William G. Pierpont, N0HFF.

> I'll bet he wrote it long after the code began to wane in any (every)
> radio service.
>
> His definition of proficiency is
> > along the lines of what level must a person obtain to prevent forgetting
it.
> > Basically his research showed that those who achieved 13wpm did not

forget
> > the code even if they did not use it. They would get "rusty" so to
speak
> > and their speed would fall off if they did not use it but they would not
> > forget it. Once they resumed using it, their speed would fairly quickly
> > climb back to their previous level. That would seem like a reasonable
> > definition.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Dee, you might want to suggest this as the definition of "Morse
> Proficiency" to the FCC.
>

The FCC can define it anyway they like for their regulatory activities. The author's definition is one that works in the real world, i.e. the point at which the person is at little risk of forgetting the training.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1972. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 03:45:47 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <LxW1b.31344$Vx2.13960472@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75387

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030820220305.21761.00000283@mb-m01.aol.com...
> From: "Derek" danda95@hotmail.com
>
> >The Amateur's Code
> >The Radio Amateur is
> >CONSIDERATE
> >LOYAL
> >PROGRESSIVE
> >FRIENDLY
> >BALANCED
> >PATRIOTIC
>
> Is this in the FCC regulations? If not, it is just a recommendation and
> therefore has no valid basis to be followed, or to be identified as "The
> Amateur's Code".
>

No it's not FCC regulations just good manners and operating practice. What on earth do you have against good manners and operating practices.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1973. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 05:05:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6DC067.24AC6%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75388

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> You're right, Dwight. If Riley Hollingsworth's
> words that he spoke to many groups, many times
> are correct, then ham radio is dead--or is dying
> a slow death. (snip)
>
> (snip) It is people like Larry and his attitudes
> that are destroying the ARS. In Larry's mind, it's
> probably my fault because he has to be so hateful
> toward me because of my callsign :)

You would think these people would know better. This type of endless negative rhetoric from members would bring down any organization, from the local church group to the worse prison gang. Even if one doesn't agree with that premise, most would agree it certainly doesn't help or improve anything. If people care about Ham Radio, they need to start speaking out against some of the most destructive behavior. Debate is fine, but there is a huge difference between honest debate and hateful rhetoric. I think even Larry knows he has stepped over that line.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1974. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 05:06:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030824010600.22081.00000159@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 75389

In article <BB6D0FD4.24A82%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
>> The special election in regards to recalling the
>> Governor of the state of California has nothing
>> whatsoever to do with amateur radio. (snip)
>
> Since when is that a major concern?

There are plenty of OTHER newsgroups for political arguments, Dwight.

Neither morse code nor amateur radio is on the special election concerning recall of the elected Governor of California.

This newsgroup is about AMATEUR RADIO POLICY.

>Read back over this newsgroup. During
>the last presidential election, several thousand messages were posted on
>that subject alone.

Oh, my, that makes it "right," does it? I don't think so...

>In fact, just about every major event happening in the
>world recently has been discussed in this newsgroup at some point (and more
>than a few minor events). The California recall vote is certainly not going
>to be an exception to that.

"Dissed," not discussed, Dwight.

There's been a whole lot of spleen-venting by a lot of ignorant keyboard rattlers concerning "world geopolitics," all done by those who don't have a good clue as to what they are about.

>> If you are not a registered voter in California,
>> then you have no cause to carry on as if you were
>> nor have you any authority whatsoever on
>> California politics.
>
> Nonsense. What happens in this country, anywhere in this country, is of
>interest to any American. What happens in California, or any other state,
>has an impact on the rest of the nation.

Nonsense...to the easterners who never considered California as ever belonging to the union. :-)

There's NO amateur radio in the special recall election in California.

>So, while it is true those outside
>the state don't vote in California, that clearly doesn't prevent them from
>commenting on the subject.

I'm aware. :-)

I'm also aware of the provincial bigotry of easterners and enviousness
of the most populous state in the USA (about 1 in 8 Americans live
here) and the fact that California's budget ranks 5th through 7th
(depending on standards) of world NATIONS.

Just the same, there is NOTHING about amateur radio in the special
recall election in California. Nothing.

Go bitch about something non-amateur elsewhere...

LHA

1975. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 05:13:44 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6DC23C.24AC8%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75390

"WA8ULX" wrote:

> Damn its working.

Bruce, I realize your agenda is to drive Ham Radio right into the ground. Why you would want to do so is beyond me. Perhaps your messages in the CB newsgroup offer a hint - you're really a CB'er with some type of grudge against Ham Radio operators.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1976. Re: This NG -- The Good, The Bad, And The Ugly

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 05:27:14 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6DC562.24ACA%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75391

"Au Contraire" wrote:

>> (snip) So what has happened? Or is it just this
>> british newgroup?

Good grief, you mean this stuff goes on in the UK newsgroups also. Since I'm planning an extended visit to the UK soon (end of next year), that is a truly depressing.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

1977. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 12:09:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030824080918.14587.00002082@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 75392

>Perhaps your messages in the CB
>newsgroup offer a hint - you're really a CB'er with some type of grudge
>against Ham Radio operators.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Your so full of it, produce the message, oh mighty CBplusser.

1978. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 12:48:34 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Cu22b.100$EC4.18513@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75393
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"K0HB" <k0hb@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:e79dbd9b.0308231858.c0eb859@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
>
> > You *are* correct that there are too many hams who are
> > not open to, and often disparage, newcomers or "would-be's.
> > That IS a significant problem in bringing in the newcomers
> > and, particularly, younger folks who represent the future of
> > ham radio. On this point we agree 100%.
>
> If there is *one* such ham, that is too many, but you seem to suggest
> that the problem is widespread. On that notion we disagree 100%.
>
> For every curmudgeon who disparages newcomers there are thousands who
> actively welcome them. Check out www.mnyarc.org. It was formed by
> members of our club, originally as a club sponsored Explorer Post, and
> has grown into a standalone group fully dedicated to nurturing
> youth-oriented amateur radio in our area. Hamfest Minnesota, also
> sponsored by our club, has a policy of free admission to hams aged 17
> and under. These are just a couple of examples right in my
> neighborhood. Maybe you just live in a bad neighborhood.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans,

I have seen/heard it from SoCal to Florida to New England ...
over many years ...

However, I did not intend to imply that all/most/a large majority
of hams are that way ... just WAY too many are (although we
agree that even *one* is "too many," my experience is that there
are a LOT more than that ...

Perhaps folks are just friendlier overall up in your neck of
the woods?

Carl - wk3c

1979. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 12:52:12 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030824085212.21678.00000479@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 75394

>However, I did not intend to imply that all/most/a large majority
>of hams are that way ... just WAY too many are (although we
>agree that even *one* is "too many," my experience is that there
>are a LOT more than that ...

Well Hell Karl you need to start No Meanies International.

1980. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 13:05:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308240505.1e5802fe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75395

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<LxW1b.31344$Vx2.13960472@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030820220305.21761.00000283@mb-m01.aol.com...
> > From: "Derek" danda95@hotmail.com
> >
> > >The Amateur's Code
> > >The Radio Amateur is
> > >CONSIDERATE
> > >LOYAL
> > >PROGRESSIVE
> > >FRIENDLY
> > >BALANCED
> > >PATRIOTIC
> >
> > Is this in the FCC regulations? If not, it is just a recommendation and
> > therefore has no valid basis to be followed, or to be identified as "The
> > Amateur's Code".
> >
>
> No it's not FCC regulations just good manners and operating practice. What
> on earth do you have against good manners and operating practices.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Actually, Riley has stated that not following a local gentleman's agreement band plan was poor amateur practice and is enforceable. So items not specifically spelled out in the regulations may be enforceable depending who's at the FCC on any particular day.

I think we can introduce questions to the QPC about the Amateur's Code.

1981. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 13:07:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030824090719.02716.00000272@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75396

>Bruce is classic CB riffraff

Hey Dumb Ass, I have never been on CB, well thats not true. I have been on 2 Meter FM which is the same as 11 Meters.

1982. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 13:20:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308240520.3b903c24@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75397

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<vnW1b.31341$Vx2.13957154@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0308230933.6ad1de2f@posting.google.com...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:<8fw1b.29885$Vx2.13538140@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > > news:KIu1b.1920$6e5.108499@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > > >
> > > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > > > news:c2356669.0308221028.605a3cbf@posting.google.com...
> > > > > "Proficiency" starts at 10 wpm.
> > > >
> > > That's absurd ... proficiency is a relative term that must be
> quantified.
> > > > One can be proficient at a variety of levels in any activity requiring
> > > > some sort of acquired skill.
> > > >
> > >
> > > We might consider the arguments presented in the book "The Art and Skill
> of
> > > Radiotelegraphy".
> >
> > Why?
> >
>
> Re-read the following sentence as it states why.
>
> > The author had done extensive study on Morse code
> > > teaching methods, learning abilities, etc.
> >
> > Cool. Who is the author, what is his callsign? And what is the
> > copyright date?
> >
>
> Since I've given the title of the book, surely you can do the research
> yourself for that data. Hint, it's available as a free download off the
> internet so you can find it with any search engine. However the fourth
> edition is copyrighted 2003 and is by William G. Pierpont, N0HFF.
>
> > I'll bet he wrote it long after the code began to wane in any (every)
> > radio service.
> >
> > His definition of proficiency is

> > > along the lines of what level must a person obtain to prevent forgetting
> it.
> > > Basically his research showed that those who achieved 13wpm did not
> forget
> > > the code even if they did not use it. They would get "rusty" so to
> speak
> > > and their speed would fall off if they did not use it but they would not
> > > forget it. Once they resumed using it, their speed would fairly quickly
> > > climb back to their previous level. That would seem like a reasonable
> > > definition.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> > Dee, you might want to suggest this as the definition of "Morse
> > Proficiency" to the FCC.
> >
>
> The FCC can define it anyway they like for their regulatory activities. The
> author's definition is one that works in the real world, i.e. the point at
> which the person is at little risk of forgetting the training.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dee, wow, that's great. I love these little trips down memory lane.
And to hell with the FCC and their role in regulating amateur radio.
They don't define Morse Code but should, they don't define WPM rate
but should, then they require a pass/fail Morse Exam that excludes
otherwise qualified citizens from access to HF radio. And the VEC's
substitute a Farnsworth Exam where Morse is specified.

Letting the FCC define something "any way they" want is a recipe for
disaster.

1983. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 13:35:41 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308240535.4289bd32@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75398

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030824010600.22081.00000159@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <BB6D0FD4.24A82%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" wrote:
> >
> >> The special election in regards to recalling the
> >> Governor of the state of California has nothing
> >> whatsoever to do with amateur radio. (snip)
> >
> > Since when is that a major concern?
>
> There are plenty of OTHER newsgroups for political arguments, Dwight.

But we like THIS one ya Putz. So we'll continue to post whatever we
want to post. Right here. Any time. No matter what. Particularly no
matter what you post.

> Neither morse code nor amateur radio is on the special election
> concerning recall of the elected Governor of California.
>
> This newsgroup is about AMATEUR RADIO POLICY.

Ya mean like your endless megabytes of snoozer posts about your '50s
Army RTTY crap have been about HAM RADIO POLICY Putz? Or how 'bout we
get into how your complete lack of credentials in ham radio
"qualifies" you to spout off about ham radio policy?

> >Read back over this newsgroup. During
> >the last presidential election, several thousand messages were posted on
> >that subject alone.
>
> Oh, my, that makes it "right," does it? I don't think so...

The cold hard nut of the matter is that nobody gives a rat's ass what
you think is "right" or "wrong". In fact that's an oxymoron in itself.
You're just an outsider around here Putz.

> >In fact, just about every major event happening in the
> >world recently has been discussed in this newsgroup at some point (and more
> >than a few minor events). The California recall vote is certainly not going
> >to be an exception to that.
>
> "Dissed," not discussed, Dwight.

It's neither Putz, it's just entertaining as hell. As in one more
unlimited source of La-la Land guffaws n' giggles. It's kinda grim
elsewhere, we all need a bit of comic relief so La-la Land comes up
with another one. Quite timely actually.

> There's been a whole lot of spleen-venting by a lot of ignorant keyboard
> rattlers concerning "world geopolitics," all done by those who don't have
> a good clue as to what they are about.

And of course you do know, you're the Henry KIssingeer & Colin Powell
of RRAP. More humor from La-la Land.

> >> If you are not a registered voter in California,
> >> then you have no cause to carry on as if you were
> >> nor have you any authority whatsoever on
> >> California politics.
> >
> > Nonsense. What happens in this country, anywhere in this country, is of
> >interest to any American. What happens in California, or any other state,
> >has an impact on the rest of the nation.
>
> Nonsense...to the easterners who never considered California as ever
> belonging to the union. :-)

For damned good reasons too, and you're a good illustration.

Every country has pulled one monumental blooper of another. Swiping
La-la Land from the Mexicans was one of ours. I vote we give it back.
I think there are others who will agree.

> There's NO amateur radio in the special recall election in California.

Jim Weir gave up his ham license did he ya PUTZ?

> >So, while it is true those outside
> >the state don't vote in California, that clearly doesn't prevent them from
> >commenting on the subject.
>
> I'm aware. :-)
>
> I'm also aware of the provincial bigotry of easterners and enviousness

Bwaaahaha! No further comment req'd!

> of the most populous state in the USA (about 1 in 8 Americans live
> here) and the fact that California's budget ranks 5th through 7th
> (depending on standards) of world NATIONS.

It's also been established that around one out of eight in any
generalized population is a kook. Lotta ramifications in that with
respect to La-la Land and YOU, ya PUTZ.

> Just the same, there is NOTHING about amateur radio in the special
> recall election in California. Nothing.
>

> Go bitch about something non-amateur elsewhere...

Since you're not a ham why don't you follow you own "instructions" and take your bitching about HAM RADIO POLICY somewhere else?

Hey Putz, you're missing a golden opportunity to exercise your all-encompassing skills, experience and expertise on EVERYTHING. You need to climb aboard one of the candidate's campaign organizations and do your do. I'm thinking you'd be the perfect public relations spinmeister for the Midget & Bimbo slate. You'd fit.

> LHA

w3rv

1984. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 13:35:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308240535.3b26afb6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75399

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030821191256.11022.00000119@mb-m14.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0308210216.66eb92e9@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

> Brian, go easy on Steamy. He doesn't know about all the hundreds
> of communication carrier companies that were doing point-to-point
> radio communications before he was born. He doesn't know that
> militaries around the world were using radio for primary long-distance
> communications before he was born. He just doesn't know.

Sure he does. Someone here has a hard time "accepting" things,
Lennie, and it isn't me.

> Steamy never did any communications while in the military...other than
> talking on the telephone.

Sorry. Incorrect.

> It's painfully obvious, Brian. Steamy hates me. I served in the US Army
> so, naturally to him, anything Army is subject to hatred, villification, and
> denigration.

I ahte liars and people who try to use somoen else's military
service to make themselves look good. That would include you and Mark
Morgan.

> Steamy never did any primary communications while in the USMC. Naturally
> he resents that anyone else did.

Sorry. Incorrect.

> Steamy can only think of the hymnal about Montezuma and Tripoli.
>
> Steamy is a mighty macho marine morseman, far superior to ordinary
> folk. He is a regular Atilla the Ham.

Thanks for once again re-proving that "Do As I Say Not Do As I
Do" is a persnal credo of yours, Lennie.

> Steamy can't handle real truth.

Sure I can. You are liar, an antagonist, and a creep.

See...I took that pretty well, I think.

>> Many of my fellow Marines have fallen in combat. That is true.
I
> >> honor them and wish they never had to be called upon to make that

> >> sacrifice, but they did.
> >
> >And I would assume that some have fallen since your departure as well.
>
> Some of them probably fell while staggering back from the NCO club.

Ahhhh yes...Lennie once again shows that "honoring" Veteans is a
one way street for him. I bet Lennie's REAL "nicname" is "Diode".

> Steamy is hell bent on doing anything he can to say bad things about
> his "enemies." He tries to turn around statements I say so that they
> are pejoratives.

If you were truly an "enemy", Lennie, wwe'd not be having this
conversation.

I don't have to say bad things about you. You do enough to prove
anything

> Steamy's concept of "honor" only applies to whatever and whomever He
> "honors." He cannot comprehend anyone else honoring their old
> military unit or even knowing details of that unit. Such seems to be an
> abomination with him.

You have no "honor", Anderscum, save for yourself and your ego.

> Steamy, and some others, are resentful and some probably envious that
> anyone else had any primary communications tasks over HF a half
> century ago.

Envious...Of something you did 50 years ago..?!?!

BBBWWWHAHAHA

> Heh heh...Steamy still hasn't given any details of his own claims to
> honor and glory of "seven hostile actions." He never will.

Not here and certainly not for you, Your Putziness.

THERE'S where the "envy" lays.

> According to Steamy, all those statements are "lies." Despite their real
> world existance, Steamy doesn't want to admit their truth. He calls
> anything I say a "lie."

Nope...just the things that aren't true, Lennie...Which in YOUR
case is almost anything that exceeds the discussion of THEORETICAL
matters.

>It's just not worth it to attempt discussion with a psychotic.

Then stop muttering to yourself and maybe the voices will go away.

> Some else in here who used to quote an old baseball player is fond of
> repeating "It ain't braggin' if ya done it." I did it. I don't have to
> brag.

Sure you do. It's the ONLY way you can own up to ANYTHING in
this NG...INCLUDING your assertion that you were getting licensed,
among others.

> Leonard H. Anderson
> retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person

Who, other than Mrs Lennie, cares?

Putz!

steve, K4YZ

1985. Re: What API had to say

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 13:41:59 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308240541.1a3fa27a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75400

k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB) wrote in message
news:<e79dbd9b.0308231716.5a805f76@posting.google.com>...
> http://www.attbi.com/News/TECHNOLOGY//XML/1700_High_Tech/5e56d6d0-6707-402f-a367-839da477c572.html

Tally Ho! 'Tis almost enough to get me interested in RACES . . .

w3rv

1986. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 13:43:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308240543.14bacc44@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75401

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030824010600.22081.00000159@mb-m17.aol.com>...

> This newsgroup is about AMATEUR RADIO POLICY.

Dwight, Lennie makes this assertion when it becomes obvious that
he's been bested, especially by someone he considers below his social
station.

Lennie will rant on and on about Japan, his days as an "enginer",
and his stellar career as a "contributing editor" of a magazine that
wwent belly-up.

> >Read back over this newsgroup. During
> >the last presidential election, several thousand messages were posted on
> >that subject alone.
>
> Oh, my, that makes it "right," does it? I don't think so...

And what give YOU the right, Mr. Anderscum, to demand that Dwight
make the content conform to YOUR specifications?

You, you lying sack of buffalo excrement, are the one who is
constantly calling Dave Heil and Larry Roll all sorts of names for
allegedly doing the same thing, yet here YOU are VERY obviously NOT
living up to your own rhetoric...

Again...

> Go bitch about something non-amateur elsewhere...

THAT was inspiring, Lennie. Why is it alright for YOU to make
such demands, yet you'll rant on for days if anyone else even hints
that YOU should get lost...NON-licensed pogue that you are...?!?!

Usual lying, deceitful, "Do As I Say Not Do As I Do" rhetoric
from the Putzmaster Himself.

Steve, K4YZ

1987. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 14:38:36 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <M542b.31766$Vx2.14083542@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75402

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308240520.3b903c24@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<vnW1b.31341$Vx2.13957154@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0308230933.6ad1de2f@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:<8fw1b.29885$Vx2.13538140@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:KIu1b.1920$6e5.108499@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > > > > news:c2356669.0308221028.605a3cbf@posting.google.com...
> > > > > > "Proficiency" starts at 10 wpm.
> > > > >
> > > > > That's absurd ... proficiency is a relative term that must be
> > quantified.
> > > > > One can be proficient at a variety of levels in any activity
requiring
> > > > > some sort of acquired skill.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > We might consider the arguments presented in the book "The Art and
Skill
> > of
> > > > Radiotelegraphy".
> > >
> > > Why?
> > >
> >
> > Re-read the following sentence as it states why.
> >
> > > The author had done extensive study on Morse code
> > > > teaching methods, learning abilities, etc.
> > >
> > > Cool. Who is the author, what is his callsign? And what is the
> > > copyright date?
> > >
> >
> > Since I've given the title of the book, surely you can do the research
> > yourself for that data. Hint, it's available as a free download off the
> > internet so you can find it with any search engine. However the fourth
> > edition is copyrighted 2003 and is by William G. Pierpont, N0HFF.
> >

> > > I'll bet he wrote it long after the code began to wane in any (every)
> > > radio service.
> > >
> > > His definition of proficiency is
> > > > along the lines of what level must a person obtain to prevent
forgetting
> > it.
> > > > Basically his research showed that those who achieved 13wpm did not
> > forget
> > > > the code even if they did not use it. They would get "rusty" so to
> > speak
> > > > and their speed would fall off if they did not use it but they would
not
> > > > forget it. Once they resumed using it, their speed would fairly
quickly
> > > > climb back to their previous level. That would seem like a
reasonable
> > > > definition.
> > > >
> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> > > Dee, you might want to suggest this as the definition of "Morse
> > > Proficiency" to the FCC.
> > >
> >
> > The FCC can define it anyway they like for their regulatory activities.
The
> > author's definition is one that works in the real world, i.e. the point
at
> > which the person is at little risk of forgetting the training.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Dee, wow, that's great. I love these little trips down memory lane.
> And to hell with the FCC and their role in regulating amateur radio.

You are misconstruing what I said. My objective was to demonstrate that
there has been some research that would allow a rational definition of the
word "proficient" in terms of actually using Morse code. It was not to
encourage people to ignore the FCC and their role.

> They don't define Morse Code but should, they don't define WPM rate
> but should, then they require a pass/fail Morse Exam that excludes
> otherwise qualified citizens from access to HF radio. And the VEC's
> substitute a Farnsworth Exam where Morse is specified.
>

The exam does not exclude anyone who cares to make the effort to learn. And
Farnsworth IS Morse since it relates a letter directly to a sound without
counting dots and dashes. Farnsworth is a method of teaching and learning
Morse that actually helps a person to reach a useable level of ability.

Methods that allow the student to count the dots and dashes (i.e. slow letters) or use "sound alikes" or visual pictures all lead to limiting the student to a low level of achievement. The student must then struggle to break the resulting barrier (usually occuring at about the 10wpm level) often having to "start over" at a higher character speed to do so.

"The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy" has a very thorough discussion of why barriers sometimes occur at certain speeds. The book is geared towards those who want to use the mode rather than those whose goal is passing the test.

> Letting the FCC define something "any way they" want is a recipe for
> disaster.

Again you miscontrued what I wrote. I did not say they should be allowed to define something anyway they want. I said they had the ability to define it the way they want. There is a tremendous difference between the two.

Let me state clearly that I was not trying to define what the regulation should be. I was pointing out a possible basis for hams themselves to use as a mimimum proficiency level.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

1988. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 14:47:15 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F48CFF3.30701@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 75569
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

gw wrote:
>
> well comcast creep my name is gw, gw beckwith sir and i do not know
> those other fine gentlemen but i do appreciate your help on the
> matter......a advanced class turd, if you will,....... living in
> colorado springs ....that should narrow down the pool of likely
> candidates for one bodacious, first class phone phucking......doncha
> know...

That is "an advanced class"....doncha know. Why "doncha" learn
the proper use of English?

1989. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 14:49:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030824104927.21642.00000193@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 75406

In article <bi7u0s$9ts@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>There's a repeater here in Dallas. During the last Presidential campaign
>and election, the hate spewed on that repeater was horrifying--and that is
>not an overreaction. I heard things like that Democrats were the equivalent
>of people who "let" things like Hitler happen and, believe me, that is mild.
>That is why Larry remarks about my callsign--or anyone else's for that
>matter--are such a damned joke. My callsign has nothing to do with the
>destruction of the ARS.

Kim:

Mr. Riley Hollingsworth seems to disagree with you. Have you forgotten
that he said that your call sign has the potential to take the ARS
"...one step closer to extinction"?

> It is people like Larry and his attitudes that are
>destroying the ARS.

I don't see how that's possible, Kim. After all, I'm not the one who
is sporting a callsign which is shamefully demeaning to women in
general, and YL hams in particular. However, you are -- and even
Riley Hollingsworth has said so, and I can't think of anyone who is
more qualified to make that judgment than he is!

>In Larry's mind, it's probably my fault because he has
>to be so hateful toward me because of my callsign :)

It's not hate, Kim. It's concern. Concern for the negative image of
the ARS that you are projecting through the selection of your
callsign, which places amateur radio operators, and particularly YL
hams, in a negative light. If anyone is being "hateful," it is you --
and you are showing this hate toward your fellow hams by demonstrating
a blatant lack of respect for the image of the service.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1990. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 14:49:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030824104928.21642.00000194@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 75403

In article <BB6D0FD4.24A82%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>> If you are not a registered voter in California,
>> then you have no cause to carry on as if you were
>> nor have you any authority whatsoever on
>> California politics.
>
>
> Nonsense. What happens in this country, anywhere in this country, is of
>interest to any American. What happens in California, or any other state,
>has an impact on the rest of the nation. So, while it is true those outside
>the state don't vote in California, that clearly doesn't prevent them from
>commenting on the subject.

Dwight:

You've finally said something that makes sense. California politics are very important to people in every part of the United States, and the world. If all the 50 states were ranked economically along with every other nation in the world, California's economy would be the fourth largest! Over half of the jobs lost in the U.S. in recent years have been lost within the state of California! California politics are of vital interest to every American.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1991. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 14:49:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030824104928.21642.00000195@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 75404

In article <BB6D1600.24A86%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>> What I do have a problem with are people like
>> you who obviously can't handle any kind of
>> disagreement (snip)
>
>
> First, there isn't any real disagreement - only your endless rhetoric
>about a subject (code testing) that is quickly dying. Second, I have no
>problems with a simple disagreement, just a problem with those who don't
>know how to disagree in a civilized manner. You, Larry, either never knew
>how to disagree in a civilized manner or have lost sight of that ability.

Dwight:

I don't behave in an "uncivilized" manner, either in person or in this newsgroup. However, my participation in the code testing debate began as a response to uncivilized statements made by NCTA's, and I continue to respond to their incivility whenever I find it -- which is all too often.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1992. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 14:49:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030824104930.21642.00000196@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 75405

In article <BB6D0981.24A80%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

> And conservatives want to end big government. More specifically,
>conservatives want to end unnecessary government rules which exist only to
>benefit the interests of a certain special interest group. While you and
>your ilk (a special interest group) have an interest in maintaining code
>testing to reinforce your self-perceived status, code testing itself is
>unnecessary today for anything outside that. Therefore, those seeking to end
>code testing are more compatible with conservative views, while those
>seeking to maintain code testing to reinforce status are more compatible
>with liberal views.

Dwight:

You've conveniently failed to take into account the full context of my previous response on the same topic.

>> I'm not an anarchist, Dwight. I believe that
>> government has a role in our society, and
>> maintaining standards in the ARS, an activity
>> in which citizens are given the privilege of
>> making use of the valuable and finite resource
>> known as the RF spectrum, makes sense to me.
>
>
> Well, that's big of you. The question now is which standards (necessary or
>unnecessary), which you answer in the next few sentences.
>
>
>> The "government protection" whine is just
>> another NCTA strawman. I prefer to think of
>> it as the government "protecting" the whole ARS,
>> not just the Morse code and it's testing
>> requirement. (snip)

> Then you support unnecessary government requirements.

No, I don't. However, I don't consider the code testing requirement to be "unnecessary." I consider this requirement to be current, valid, and essential to maintaining the use of this valuable communications skill within the ARS.

>Code testing serves no real purpose today,

Prove it…

>either as a means of insuring communications support
>to those outside Ham Radio

…starting with this…

>or as a means to keep riff-raft out of Ham Radio
>(you were able to get in).

Where have I ever said that it has this effect? I have repeatedly disclaimed this particular theory, usually citing the 20-WPM Extra-class HF Phone reprobates who collect virtually 100% of the NAL's issued to amateur radio operators.

>As such, it exists solely to maintain your own
>delusions of status and I don't think the government should be maintaining
>rules just so you can help yourself feel important.

No, Dwight, that's just your own twisted and, quite frankly, slanderous opinion.

>> (snip) "Rednecks," of any region, are usually tough,
>> self-reliant, moral and decent people. (snip)

> You fail that test in many ways. A redneck doesn't need government rules
>to be "self-reliant" and your attitudes towards others are certainly not
>"decent" or "moral."

If that's how you perceive me, then you're obviously no judge of character.

>And, based on your old web page pictures, you clearly
>don't look that tough.

And just what is that supposed to mean? It looks like you're making the classic mistake of judging a book by it's cover.

>So, failing that test, we have to look elsewhere for
>someone similar to you. And, looking solely at attitudes towards others,
>only the deep woods redneck springs to mind.

Well, I guess you're entitled to your opinion, groundless though it may be.

> These people (deep woods rednecks) don't like anybody outside kin or clan,
>and just barely, though not always, tolerate neighbors.

I haven't had any complaints.

>Does this sound
>familiar, Larry? I don't know what you do with your kin, so I won't go
>there. However, speaking solely of Ham Radio, you don't like anyone outside
>your pro-code testing clan, and just barely, though not always, tolerate
>those outside the code testing debate.

Dwight, you're digging yourself into a deep hole of scurrilous, groundless ad hominem attacks -- something that I've been accused of in the past.

> Of course, this is only a perception.

And, I might add, not a very well-considered one at that.

>Since you obviously have a different
>perception of yourself, we're never going to agree. As such, I'll drop the
>comparative speculation at this point.

That's the most intelligent thing you've said so far in this entire post.
You've obviously had a bad day, so I'll let it go at that.

73 de Larry, K3LT

1993. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 14:53:19 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030824105319.111$qs@newsreader.com>
Source record: 75407
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> "Ronny" <Y432@cbronnieincorg.net> wrote in message
> news:bi6hit$5ln$0@pita.alt.net...
> > x-no-archive: yes
> > Where have all you old farts been? Nevermind,
> > 99% of you don't have the slightest idea what exists
> > in the spectrum outside the ham bands.
> > 27540 khz & 6890 khz have been standard CB
> > packet comms calling freqs. for well over a decade.
> > And yes, there is extensive CB packet activity in the
> > U.S. What do you think, just cause somebody is not
> > a ham op means that they don't know anything about
> > packet? oh horrors, some CB ops even run
> > slow scan TV. Get with the times you old fools.
> >
> > Ronny
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
> No, Ronny....what YOU DO NOT UNDERSTAND is WE DON"T GIVE A RATS ASS WHAT
> A CBer in ANY COUNTRY DOES. Is that CLEAR?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
I'm starting to hear W4NTI on the freeband.

--
GO #40

1994. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 14:54:24 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030824105424.253$u4@newsreader.com>
Source record: 75408
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F46C557.6080301@adelphia.net...
> > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
> > >
> > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > >> news:JLy1b.1672$O03.1295@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >>
> > >>>
> > >>> QRZ ??? who was the little twit there ??? QRZ ???
> > >>
> > >> I don't pay much attention to anybody who claims to be a ham but
> > >> won't show a callsign. They're almost always anti-ham trolls.
> > >>
> > >> Charles, N5PVL
> > >>
> > >
> > > Why do you cross post your drivel to rec.radio.cb then, brainiak?
> > >
> > Because the original message was there and in rrap, and I was
> > responding to a person tha tI think posted from there.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
> Don't worry about Moparholic. This is his usual troll. Tries to stir
> it up, then bitches because its cross posted. He probably cross posted
> it anyway.
>
> It don't mean nothin man.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
I'm starting to hear W4NTI on the freeband.

--
GO #40
```

1995. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 14:56:24 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030824105623.727$vb@newsreader.com>
Source record: 75409
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
jim <3carroll@optonline.net> wrote:
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F46C557.6080301@adelphia.net...
> >
> >>Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> >> > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
> >> >
> >> >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> >> >> news:JLy1b.1672$O03.1295@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >> >>
> >> >>>
> >> >>> QRZ ??? who was the little twit there ??? QRZ ???
> >> >>
> >> >> I don't pay much attention to anybody who claims to be a ham but
> >> >> won't show a callsign. They're almost always anti-ham trolls.
> >> >>
> >> >> Charles, N5PVL
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> > Why do you cross post your drivel to rec.radio.cb then, brainiak?
> >> >
> >>Because the original message was there and in rrap, and I was
> >>responding to a person tha tI think posted from there.
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >
> >
> > Don't worry about Moparholic. This is his usual troll. Tries to stir
> > it up, then bitches because its cross posted. He probably cross
> > posted it anyway.
> >
> > It don't mean nothin man.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> and you continue the xpost.
> it does mean something man.........
>
He doesn't know any better, he even uses his call on the freeband.
```

What a dumbass.

--
GO #40

1996. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 15:21:42 UTC
From: "Chip G." <n.1.m.i.e@myeastern.com>
Message-ID: <240820031121426675%n.1.m.i.e@myeastern.com>
Source record: 75410

In article <20030820190318.25228.00000371@mb-m15.aol.com>, WA8ULX
<wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:

> That crap is nothing but BS, it died when Ham Radio was converted into CB

I've heard this so much on this group. It demonstrates a huge degree of ignorance. First, both Amateur Radio and Citizens Band are radio services. Citizens Band is a non-licensed service. Amateur Radio is a licensed service. Citizens Band is highly limited to frequencies in channels. Amateur Radio has several designated frequency bands with much more operating flexibility. Citizens Band is limited to allowed mode. Amateur Radio not only has a wide array of available modes, but is encouraged to experiment with new modes. Therefore the two are not the same or even remotely similar except that they are both radio services under the guidance of the FCC.

The problem with CB, from my vantage, is that there is too little monitoring and enforcement. At one time before cell phones and my license, I used CB for emergency communication. But I was always embarrassed to turn it on, especially with my wife in the car, because of the reprehensible behavior.

There are some who would argue that Amateur Radio is going the same way. I don't feel that this is true. Amateur Operators have much more organized self enforcement, which is encouraged by the FCC. The FCC itself has also taken some action in the recent past, although argueably more action is needed.

As for the Amateur Code, I think that more hams should make the effort to embrace the code. But there will always be some, like some of the vocal members of this newsgroup, who will choose vulgarities and rudeness over thoughtful discourse. I beg all those of you who care about our bands, our hobby, our fraternity, our most favored radio service, I beg of you to keep civil your tongues and work toward a mutually beneficial solution.

--
--Chip
remove dots in prefix to fix email address

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

1997. Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 15:26:19 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F48D913.5B3798C0@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75411

People are STILL raising hell with Kim W5TIT about her callsign?!?!

How many YEARS is this going to go on??? Jeeeezzzzussscrrrryst!

1998. ARNewsline 1358 - Aug 22 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 15:36:36 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030824113636.28426.00000623@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 75412

Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) Report 1358 - August 22 2003

From the 2003 Huntsville Hamfest and from our studios in New Orleans, this is Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1358 with a release date of Friday, August 22 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. I'm Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, reporting.

We begin this weeks newscast with the sad news that one of the voices so well known to ham radio will be heard no more. This, with word that Amateur Radio Newsline's Vice President and senior anchor Roy Neal, K6DUE, has passed away.

Roy was 82 when he died on Friday, August 15th at a hospital in High Point North Carolina. He had undergone heart valve replacement surgery three days earlier. According to his family, Roy was at peace at the end and did not suffer.

In both the worlds of broadcasting and of Amateur Radio, Roy Neal was a legend. He began his career at WIBG radio in Philadelphia. After military service in World War Two, he returned and helped pioneer the emerging medium called television at station WPTZ. He then joined the National Broadcasting Company where he spent most of his career producing and reporting for Network News. His specialty was science and aerospace.

But to hams, Roy will always be remembered as the person who brought manned Amateur Radio into space through the SAREX and ARISS programs. His close friend and NBC colleague Alan Kaul, W6RCL, joins us later in the newscast with more on Roy's many contributions. (ARNewsline, Philadelphia Broadcast Pioneers)

**

IN THE NEWS: JIM HAYNIE ON BPL

Roys Death came just as the Huntsville Alabama Hamfest was getting underway. One of the major topics hams were talking about is he growing debate over B-P-L or Broadband Over Powerlines. One of the people most concerned is ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP:

--

Jim Haynie, W5JBP: "Broadband Over Powerlines is important, and just as I said on our website - this is bad. This is not good for Amateur Radio and I don't know how we are going to lick it. Quite frankly, and I want to tell you that right now."

--

Haynie made his comments to a packed audience at the hamfest's ARRL Forum. He says the League is doing everything possible to try to convince the FCC to not proceed with rule making B-P-L a reality. (ARNewsline)

**

RESTRUCTURING: HAM RADIO AFTER MORSE CODE

Jim Haynie also shares his thoughts on a subject dear to many hams: Whether Amateur Radio should or should not keep Morse code. Stressing that he speaks for himself and not the League, Haynie says code should be a requirement for the Extra Class license:

--

Jim Haynie, W5JBP: "What if we were to have three classes of licenses? Entry, General and Extra and Entry got phone privileges on he current Novice bands? And that's all.

So we ask questions on the exam about just that. They could only use 100 watts store bought radio equipment. Possibly even a two-year expiration date.

Generals - same thing except no new expiration date. The same privileges they have today. But for Extra we retain the 5 words per minute code requirement."

--

Not everyone agrees with Haynie. Scotty Neustadter, W4WW, is Chairman of the Question Pool Committee for the National Conference of Volunteer Examiners and this is his personal view:

--

Scott Neustadter, W4WW: " This is not your fathers or your grandfathers ham radio. Things have changed. Technology has changed, and I think that - to an extent - that we have to change with them. We have to recognize our history and in no way am I - nor do I know of anyone else ho is advocating any abolition of the right to operate CW on any Amateur band where you can operate it today.

What I do know is that there is a whole lot of people saying that it does not make allot of sense anymore that I require that you be able to do that. I think that's the distinction that we have to keep in mind.

--

While the debate over Morse Code in amateur radio's future goes on _ Jim Haynie points out that what will be decided remains a long way off_perhaps years. (ARNewsline)

**

HAM RADIO HONORS: W6JAY RECEIVES 2003 YHOTY AWARD

As enthusiastic hams began pouring into Huntsville's Von Braun Civic Center Saturday morning _ one of the Hamfest's biggest moments was taking shape. The Huntsville Hamfest is the setting for an exciting yearly event_and that's the presentation of the annual Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham Of The Year Award. This year's winner is 17-year-old Jay Thompson, W6JAY, of Santa Ana, California:

--

Jay Thompson, W6JAY: "When I first started I did not think that thre was allot to do in Amateur Radio, but the longer I am a part of it , I realized that there is much more that I could do. And I know that as much as I have done so far, I know that there is still kore out there for me. So I'll keep trying to acomplish more and maybe Ill become even better at Amateur Radio in the future."
--

CQ Magazine is one of the award's principal underwriters. Editor Rich Moseson, W2VU, says that_while Jay stood above fellow nominees_many other young hams are big achievers, as well:

--

Rich Moseson, W2VU: "Every year we review applications and nominations from a variety of people. The person you see standing here on the stage is not the only really good kid who has done allot. He's just risen the crop a little bit. There are a whole lot of other young people out there in ham radio doing great things, and we congratulate all of them."

--

The Amateur Radio Newsline Young Ham Of The Year Award is in its 17th year. Vertex Standard and CQ Magazine are the Award's principal corporate underwriters.

That's it from the 23003 Huntsville Hamfest. The rest of the newscast will come from our New Orleans studio, but first this. (ARNewsline)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, we are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the 145.600 MHz repeater of the Hiway Amateur Radio Club serving Durban South Africa.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: THE BLACKOUT

Ham radio came to the rescue as cellphone systems totaly failed during the recent North-East blackout. Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, has more:

--

A New York Times article said it this way: When technology failed on a massive scale, some old-fashioned broadcasting stepped into the breach. This, as ham radio operators took to the airwaves to reach emergency workers.

The technology that failed was the North-East power grid that provides electricity to cities like Cleveland, Detroit and New York. This in turn lead to communications failures as numerous cellular telephone sites without generators or battery back-up - went away -- the afternoon of August 14th .

According to an ARRL Bulletin, with cellular systems overloaded or out altogether, the incident turned into a test of Amateur Radio's capabilities to operate without commercial power. The New York City-Long Island Section Emergency Coordinator is Tom Carrubba, KA2D. He estimates that ham radio operators handled 800 to 1,000 messages from Thursday afternoon until early Friday.

Diane Ortiz, K2DO, is the ARRL Public Information Coordinator for the area. She took to the air when power went down in her Suffolk County community. Ortiz called up an informal VHF net. Over the next 20 hours hams passed about 500 pieces of traffic. In addition to handling messages for people stranded in the city, amateurs also relayed other useful information. This included such items as which stores or gas stations were open.

In the Big Apple itself, ARES teams provided communication support for Red Cross Emergency Response Vehicles set up at transportation centers in Manhattan. ARES members also accompanied Emergency Response Vehicles to fire calls. RACES was activated in the greater New York City area after a state of emergency was declared.

Across the Hudson River in New Jersey, a net linked the Red Cross lead chapter N2ARC in Princeton with other chapters. Further to the West, Michigan ARES teams assisted emergency operations centers and the Red Cross.

In Ohio, Section Emergency Coordinator Larry Rain, WD8IHP, reports that all ARES organizations in the Northern tier of the stated were activated.

For millions of people in the Northeast and Midwest, the August 14th power outage took away access to wireless voice, e-mail and the Internet. The failure of the cellular system was especially evident. Nextel Communications spokesman Chris Grandis said that the company needs electricity to power its cell sites, but when you don't have that, it's out of his company's control.

The same held true for virtually every other wireless provider, few of which bother to have emergency power at cellular and wireless Internet sites.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF.

--

The bottom line: The traditional forms of communications failed, but hams were there to lend a hand. (ARRL, NY Times, others)

**

RADIO LAW: FCC DECLINES TO RECONSIDER ITS HUMAN EXPOSURE TO RF RULES

The FCC has declined to open an Inquiry into updating its human exposure to RF signals rules. In particular, the petitioner in this case wanted the Commission to consider possible health hazards not covered by the current rules, including non-thermal effects and the effects of long-term low-level RF exposure.

According to the CGC Communicator the FCC dismissed the petition, arguing that any such evidence should be presented to other, more appropriate expert agencies. The Commission also noted that its current human exposure rules have recently been upheld by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. This, in the face of similar arguments by other petitioners. The complete story is in cybrspace at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/FCC-03-191A1.doc (CGC)

**

WRC'03 FALLOUT: GERMANY GOES CODE FREE

It's another week and another country has joined the no-code revolution. Following Switzerland, the U-K, and Belgium, Germany is the latest country to announce that it is abandoning the Morse code test as a requirement for HF band operation.

According to the website of the German national amateur radio society, the DARC, from the 15th of August radio amateurs in Germany with a CEPT Class 2 license are allowed to use the High Frequency bands using their existing callsigns. Further details were to follow, the website said. (GB2RS)

**

RESCUE RADIO: OREGON HAM RECEIVES HONOR FOR GOING THE EXTRA MILE

Back on this side of the Atlantic, an Oregon ambulance dispatch coordinator, EMT and amateur radio operator has been named a recipient of a "Star of Life" award. This, from the American Ambulance Association.

Scott Waggoner, KC7DHJ, of Clackamas County was nominated for the honor by his co-workers in recognition of the many extra tasks he has undertaken at AMR's headquarters in Portland. Among other things, KC7DHJ was cited for his help in setting up portable repeaters during search and rescue operations, his treatment of minor injuries suffered by firefighters and his overtime work on an American Medical Response

ambulance. (CGC from OregonLive.com)

**

ENFORCEMENT: UNCOORDINATED REPEATERS TAKEN OFF THE AIR

It took three letters and allot of patience on the part of the FCC but a repeater interference problem in Stockton California has been solved. This, as Thomas G. De Lasaux, WA6SEK, removes his repeater from the air.

The matter goes back to September 9, 2002, when the FCC notified De Lasaux that his operation of uncoordinated repeaters on 224.660 and 441.275 MHz was causing interference to coordinated repeaters on the same frequencies in his are. By letter dated May 5, 2003, the FCC informed De Lasaux that the information he submitted in regard to the initial inquirey did not demonstrate coordination for either of the repeaters. Also, that until he was able to demonstrate current coordination, the primary responsibility to prevent interference.

At that time the FCC requested De Lasaux inform the agency within 20 days what steps you were taking to resolve the interference issues. On July 1, 2003, the FCC notified WA6SEK that we had not received a response to the May 5th letter, and enclosed an additional complaint. The July 1 letter afforded De Lasaux an additional 20 days to respond, and stated that if the matter were not resolved by July 25, we would initiate enforcement action against his license.

On July 22nd, De Lasaux notified the Commission that your repeaters operating on 224.660 MHz and 441.275 MHz had been shut down and would remain so. The FCC has now terminated all further action in this matter. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC AFFIRMS $10,000 FINE AGAINST NY PIRATE

The FCC has affirmed a $10,000 fine issued on July 23rd of 2002. This, against the Reverand Yvon Louis in a case the case involves an aleged series of unauthorized FM broadcasts made from Louis' Calvary Tabernacle in Brooklyn, New York.

The FCC says that over the course of several months in 2001, Reverend Louis reportedly transmitted on 93.7 MHz, then switched to 88.1 MHz after getting caught. But it was not over yet. He then used 90.1 MHz after getting caught again, then reverted to 88.1 MHz in open defiance of the FCC order to stay off the air. (FCC, CGC)

**

RADIO HAPPENINGS PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS TO REMOVE CELLULAR ANTENNAS

Bowing to health concerns from parents, sixteen schools operated by the Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn will eliminate cellular antennas mounted atop buildings and church facilities. The on-line edition of the New

York Post reports that one parish stands to lose $18,000 a year in rent money used to offset the school's operating costs as a result of the change. (CGC)

**

COMMUNICATIONS FOR THE HANDICAPPED: BLIND STUDENTS LEARN TO NAVIGATE USING NEW GPS TOOL

A group of blind high school students visiting Catholic University in Washington D.C. recently shouldered specially equipped laptop computers. This, as they navigated about the campus and visited a pizza restaurant led by voice commands and the Global Positioning System.

A $1,000 Global Positioning System add-on to the BrailleNote keypad showed the students that getting around a college campus is suddenly much easier than it used to be. The complete story is on line at www.washtimes.com/business/20030729-093916-2006r.htm (CGC)

**

WITH THE HANDI HAMS: SUMMER CAMP ON THE AIR

Handi Ham station W0EQO, will be on the air during the summer Minnesota Radio Camp from August 23rd through August 30th. You can look for W0EQO on several different bands using CW, single sideband, FM, and digital modes. Also listen in cyberspace for an EchoLink net on Monday evening at 2400 hours GMT. The HandiHams will respond to all QSL requests for all contacts, including EchoLink contacts. (HandiHams)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

INTERNATIONAL - HOLLAND: NEW PREFIXES FOR THE NETHERLANDS

A New call sign prefix went into effect in the Netherlands on August 7th. On the High Frequency bands, the PA, PB, PC, PF, PG and PI prefix callsigns will now be be heard with one, two or three letter suffixes. On VHF and above, the PD, PE and PH are the prefixes, again with one, two or three letter suffixes. For example, the former PBZ0AIU, who sent in this news story, is now PC2A. (PC2A via GB2RS)

**

DX

In D-X, word that GM0GNY, is active as 4K0GNY from an oil drilling and production platform in Azerbaijan. He will be there starting the 20th of August for around a month. Look for him on daily on 40, 20, and 17 meters and QSL as directed on the air. (OPDX)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: A FINAL 73 TO K6DUE

At the beginning of our newscast, we told you about the passing of a member of the Amateur Radio Newsline family. Roy Neal, K6DUE, died August 15th following heart surgery. One of the people who knew Roy best is Alan Kaul, W6RCL. Roy and Alan worked together at NBC News, and on projects benefitting amateur radio. Alan looks at the life of a man who was an institution in American broadcast journalis, as well as a driving force in amateur radio's conquest of space:

--

When Roy Neal, K6DUE, died last week, he was possibly the best-known ham in America. He left an indelible imprint on Amateur Radio.

Roy, more than anyone else, was responsible for getting ham radio aboard manned space craft and each new mission is testament to his legacy. His efforts earned Roy awards from the Dayton Hamvention, they designated him Ham of the Year and from CQ-Magazine, which this year named Roy to the Amateur Radio Hall of Fame. He also received honors from The American Radio Relay League, and other groups and served as chairman of two key AMSAT committees.

Roy was a good guy. He was my friend and colleague at NBC News.

I met Roy in the 1960's when I was working in Seattle and he came to town to report on aerospace giant Boeing. After I moved to Los Angeles and joined NBC News in the 70's, Roy and I collaborated on a lot of news reports.

As a correspondent Roy was best known for his coverage of the U-S Space program _ he was a friend of the original astronauts _ and often reported from both the launch site at Cape Canaverral and NASA Mission Control in Houston.

Not many people know this but Roy was also the author of a book about America's missile system_. called The Ace In The Hole. It was written at the height of the Cold War.

In the 1970's, Roy teamed with television producer Dave Bell, W6AQ, to launch the first of several documentaries about amateur radio. Number One was a 16-minute film, Moving Up to Amateur Radio. Followed a few years later by The World of Amateur Radio. Dave Bell remembers Roy as the ultimate professional:

--

Dave Bell W6AQ: "Of all the on-camera talent that I have known, Roy was the most assured and had the smallest ego of all of them.

He was a true professional when it came to the news. Everything was always true. Everything was straight from the shoulder and there was no compromise.

Roy was one of the old-school news guy. He grew up in the television business and he understood it better than anybody who is working in it today."

--

In the 1980's Roy helped convince NASA to put ham radio in Space aboard a manned flight of the Shuttle. That first ham-astronaut was Owen Garriott, W5LFL, on board STS-9. Garriott's story of the 1st DX-pedition in Orbit was told by Roy in the television documentary Amateur Radio's Newest Frontier.

--

Audio from ARNF: "This is the story of an expedition. The story of STS-9. The Columbia. And these are the explorers: John Young - the commander. Brewster Shaw the shuttle pilot. And the scientists Dr. Ulf Merbold, Byron Lichtenberg, Robert Parker and Dr. Owen Garriott -- an Astronaut who is also Amateur Radio operator W5LFL. This is an expedition to probe the outer limits of science and Amateur Radio's newest frontier.

--

Roy's next project was called SAREX - Shuttle Amateur Radio EX-periment, followed by the New World of Amateur Radio which profiled a new ham, teen-ager Kelly Howard, N6PNY. She's now all grown up, married and has kids of her own. She fondly remembers working with Roy Neal.

--

Kelly Lenhert (ne Howard) N6PNY: It was all so exciting, but it was also overwhelming. But working with Roy made me feel so comfortable. He made me feel competent in what I could do. He took me under his wing and he was really supportive and he got me to do what I needed to do to make the film and bring out the best in me."

--

Roy's last documentary was called Ham Radio in Space. Roy's interest was a natural fit with AMSAT. Roy's close friend AMSAT Vice President Frank Bauer, KA3HDO, thinks of K6DUE as his mentor.

--
Frank Bauer KA3HDO: "One of the things that Roy taught me was how to distill information into basically sound bites, if you will. I remember one time where we had to give a presentation - at Dayton - and we had 20 minutes. I told him that I did no know how he could so that, and he

said: `Frank, if I can do the whole world on the news in 30 seconds, you can do this in 20 minutes.' So Roy taught me a whole lot from an executive perspective because he was a true executive."
--

Another AMSAT officer who worked closely with Roy is Robin Haighton, VE3FRH, the President of AMSAT North America.

--

Robin Haighton VE3FRH: "The space program itself is in good hands, but there is no doubt about it that we will miss that leveling confidence that Roy always brought to the meetings and the discussions. He made friends with everybody. The moment you met him you felt that here was a man you could trust."

--

Other comments have come in from all over the world From New Zealand, the past president of NZART, Jim Meechen ZL2BHF sent his condolences. As have numerous other Newsline listeners. Another of Roy's friends, Bob Heil, K9EID, had this to say.

--

Bob Heil K9EID: "I'm going to miss his spirit. He had a spirit about him that when you heard him on the air, you stopped tuning. This was something special you were listening to. And it wasn't always the tone of his great broadcast voice. It was his spirit. He was always in an up-mode about this hobby."

--

Roy was in the first generation of television newsmen who began their craft after World War Two. He started in Philadelphia and then moved to the West Coast where he helped found the NBC News bureau in Los Angeles. That was during the days of the old John Cameron Swayzee Camel News Caravan.

Roy was at ease in front of a microphone _ and could talk to millions of television viewers as easily as he could talk to the ham across town. On camera, he had the uncanny ability to read to time, precisely to time. When I produced updates for NBC Nightly News and Roy was the on-camera talent, I would time the newscast and tell Roy how long he would have to report the story.

I'd say something like this: "Roy, can you do it in 19 seconds?"

And Roy would always reply, "You know I can old buddy."

Roy liked that phrase "old buddy." He used the phrase to address friends and co-workers for some time. As for the updates - Roy always got them right. He would stop talking just an instant before we'd have to switch back to the network.

By the time he retired in 1986, Roy had worked out of the Los Angeles news bureau for almost 35-years. He'd probably written millions of words, and brought his audience uncountable hours of news and information.

But even in retirement, Roy Neal didn't stop doing what he did best. He was no stranger to listeners of Amateur Radio Newsline who knew him as a tireless volunteer giving freely of his own time to report the latest information -- always signing off in his own stylized way.

--

"This is Roy Neal, K6DUE. Thanks for listening and 73."

--

73, Old Buddy _ I really hate to see you go.

I'm Alan Kaul, W6RCL, reporting for Amateur Radio Newsline.

--

Roy leaves his wife Pat, and sons Mark and David. Services were held August 19th at the Wesley Memorial United Methodist Church in High Point, North Carolina.

In lieu of flowers the family requests that donations in Roy's mame be made to the Astronaut Scholarship Foundation at the Astronaut Hall of Fame. The mailing address is 6225 Vectorspace Blvd, Titusville, Florida, 32780. Please mark your envelope to the attention of Linn Le Blanc.

And this final thought. Yes, we at Newsline have lost a very dear friend. More important -- so has all of Amateur Radio.

73, Roy. None of us will ever forget you. (ARNewsline, W6RCL)

Additional on-line reading:

The Roy Neal Story:
http://www.angelfire.com/tv2/broadcastpioneers/neal/neal.html
ARRL: http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/08/18/101/?nc=1
ARISS: http://www.rac.ca/ariss/
CNN: http://edition.cnn.com/2003/TECH/space/08/19/neal.obit
JSC Amateur Radio Club: http://www.w5rrr.org/sta-pix.html

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I'm Don Wilbanks, AE5DW. Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

1999. Re:Tracking NG Threads Via Google (was Good Christ Almighty)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 15:40:41 UTC
From: Signal In The Noise <SITN@opinion.com>
Message-ID: <Z%42b.15074$S_.4430@fed1read01>
Source record: 75413

Well David -- you can track NG's threads by going to URL:
http://groups.google.com/

Type in the desired callsign or handle

Get your desired information --- as early as Feb 6, 2000

So the answer is at least 3 years !!!

And there were 11,000 Plus posts related to this callsign !!!!!! <---
Exclamation Signs

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F48D913.5B3798C0@ix.netcom.com...
> People are STILL raising hell with Kim W5TIT about her callsign?!?!
>
> How many YEARS is this going to go on??? Jeeeezzzzussscrrrryst!

2000. BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 15:41:04 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F48DC88.28785233@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75414
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Money talks, public service walks- BPL is a certainty.

The "null it out- anyone can do it" argument is crap-
works well in theory, poorly in the field.
Even with excellent nulling, QRP and other weak signal work is finished.
Shortwave DXing is finished.

You have three choices-
Give up radio.
Move far enough into the country to avoid the polluted grid,
"Gorilla warfare-" Power lines that leak out, can also leak IN.
50 watts of broadband noise generator plugged into the nearest socket
would do. Note that I would never advocate anything illegal.....
D.S.

2001. Re: Re:Tracking NG Threads Via Google (was Good Christ Almighty)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 15:53:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <hc52b.31857$Vx2.14105586@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75415

"Signal In The Noise" <SITN@opinion.com> wrote in message
news:Z%42b.15074$S_.4430@fed1read01...
> Well David -- you can track NG's threads by going to URL:
> http://groups.google.com/
>
> Type in the desired callsign or handle
>
> Get your desired information --- as early as Feb 6, 2000
>
> So the answer is at least 3 years !!!
>
> And there were 11,000 Plus posts related to this callsign !!!!!! <---
> Exclamation Signs
>
>
>
> "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3F48D913.5B3798C0@ix.netcom.com...
> > People are STILL raising hell with Kim W5TIT about her callsign?!?!
> >
> > How many YEARS is this going to go on??? Jeeeezzzzussscrrrryst!
>
>

If she had received this as a normal sequential assignment, it's doubtful
that anyone would say much. It's just very puzzling why anyone would
request the call sign.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2002. Re: Re:Tracking NG Threads Via Google (was Good Christ Almighty)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 16:27:49 UTC
From: Signal In The Noise <SITN@opinion.com>
Message-ID: <9I52b.15110$S_.14916@fed1read01>
Source record: 75416

Gosh -- how many folks would look up (on QRZ.com) if W5TIT was a
sequential assignment or vanity callsign (which it is) before making
comments ?????

Further the requestor must have been aware of the connotation -- hence what
better way to seek notoriety ?? So no puzzle at all.

I recall when Jerry got a real "catchy" call -- N6VD (sequentialy) -- did
not bother him a bit.

Then there is N0SEX and N0DX (real Calls) , and several others which are
just a bunch of letters and numbers (or are they?)

Then there are those that are fun to make up -- like IM1NUT, PH&#65533;NY --
DX4U -- 6L6GC -- RG8U
-- SL1M -- P1RTE -- N&#65533;QSL -- DX1S -- WH1M -- L1D -- GR1D --
W&#65533;W -- OZ&#65533;NE -- L&#65533;GUN
N&#65533;QRM W&#65533;RK N&#65533;PE N&#65533;ISY KN&#65533;W -- CH1KEN

The Signal In The Noise

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:hc52b.31857$Vx2.14105586@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Signal In The Noise" <SITN@opinion.com> wrote in message
> news:Z%42b.15074$S_.4430@fed1read01...
> > Well David -- you can track NG's threads by going to URL:
> > http://groups.google.com/
> >
> > Type in the desired callsign or handle
> >
> > Get your desired information --- as early as Feb 6, 2000
> >
> > So the answer is at least 3 years !!!
> >
> > And there were 11,000 Plus posts related to this callsign !!!!!! <---
> > Exclamation Signs
> >
> >
> >
> > "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > news:3F48D913.5B3798C0@ix.netcom.com...
> > > People are STILL raising hell with Kim W5TIT about her callsign?!?!
> > >
> > > How many YEARS is this going to go on??? Jeeeezzzzussscrrrryst!

> >
> >
>
> If she had received this as a normal sequential assignment, it's doubtful
> that anyone would say much. It's just very puzzling why anyone would
> request the call sign.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

2003. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 16:43:12 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <AW52b.112108$3o3.7893383@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 75417
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F48DC88.28785233@ix.netcom.com...
>
> Money talks, public service walks- BPL is a certainty.

Money's the half of it. Ego and politics are the other half. Pols like Michael Powell and Billy Tauzin want credit for sweeping away all those presumably outmoded concerns about RFI so people in rural areas can get the on ramp to the modern hi-speed info superhighway right there in their fusebox.

>
> The "null it out- anyone can do it" argument is crap-
> works well in theory, poorly in the field.
> Even with excellent nulling, QRP and other weak signal work is finished.
> Shortwave DXing is finished.
>
> You have three choices-
> Give up radio.
> Move far enough into the country to avoid the polluted grid,
> "Gorilla warfare-" Power lines that leak out, can also leak IN.
> 50 watts of broadband noise generator plugged into the nearest socket
> would do. Note that I would never advocate anything illegal.....
> D.S.

As a former US President said, "We could do it, but it would be wrong."

I have to wonder how much BPL access would be knocked out by a sparky old ozone generating vacuum cleaner. One room? A few houses?

And let's not forget our old nemisis, the bargain basement switchmode computer power supply. I have one which pumps enough hashy variable frequency hets to overwhelm even strong local broadcast stations on a radio in the same room.

Some thief ran, well -- hobbled, off with my arc welder a few years ago. I never replaced it. Good thing, I now realize.

I kinda doubt electrical interference would cut off somebody's BPL access entirely. I picture the error rate going up and up, and the connection speeds going down and down. Maybe even slower than dial-up. Even worse, the guy who pays for BPL is likely to blame the power company, rather than the real culprit -- the clown who just doesn't give a damn about RFI.

Frank Dresser

2004. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 16:58:31 UTC
From: Michael L Teter <mteter@sumisunsansorg.org>
Message-ID: <biaqqo$s9r$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75418

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hk3fbvc.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sat, 23 Aug 2003 10:03:54 -0400, D. Feldstein wrote:
>
> >Chairman Reed Hundt, an internationally recognized
> >authority on Communications Law, was instrumental
> >in dismantling the Old White Guard at the Commission
> >and appointing minorities & women to management
> >positions in the commission.
> >
> >D. Feldstein
> >
> > ***The below space is reserved for Phil to bad
> > mouth Reed Hundt***
>
> Reed Hundt didn't have the first clue on what communication law was,
> is, or should be, as evidenced by how he raped the Field Operations
> Bureau - the only hope that the agency had in preserving regulatory
> compliance enforcement - while building up a very ineffective Cable
> Bureau mired in words and theories that amounted to political
> mumbo-jumbo. His field prior to coming to the Commission was
> anti-trust and his appointment by Clinton had all the earmarks of
> redemption of some political IOU.
>
> He was, and is, all politics, as has been every chairman since Mad
> Man Mark Fowler, certainly up to and including the present one. His
> "internationally recognized authority" status and value as a partner
> in his Chicago big-fee law firm is in the political and industry
> contacts that he can make, not in knowledge of or insight into what
> proper communications regulatory law should be. The monitoring
> techs that he RIFfed (with the exception of one particular one) know
> more about the realities of communication regulatory compliance than
> he did.
>
> And that's my personal opinion based on being there......
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>

Heard Mr. Hundt speak a while back at an industry
get together, a very impressive individual and speaker,
for sure! Spoke at length about his tenure at the FCC.
What an eye opener! Most noteworthy were his

comments on the resistance to change at a dinasour of
an agency.

Mike Teter, P.E., M.B.A., Ph.D
Sumisunsansorg LTD

2005. Re: Tracking NG Threads Via Google (was Good Christ Almighty)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 17:00:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F48EEFF.3080207@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75419

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Signal In The Noise" <SITN@opinion.com> wrote in message
> news:Z%42b.15074$S_.4430@fed1read01...
>
>>Well David -- you can track NG's threads by going to URL:
>>http://groups.google.com/
>>
>>Type in the desired callsign or handle
>>
>>Get your desired information --- as early as Feb 6, 2000
>>
>>So the answer is at least 3 years !!!
>>
>>And there were 11,000 Plus posts related to this callsign !!!!!! <---
>>Exclamation Signs
>>
>>
>>
>>"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>>news:3F48D913.5B3798C0@ix.netcom.com...
>>
>>>People are STILL raising hell with Kim W5TIT about her callsign?!?!
>>>
>>>How many YEARS is this going to go on??? Jeeeezzzzussscrrrryst!
>>
>>
>
> If she had received this as a normal sequential assignment, it's doubtful
> that anyone would say much. It's just very puzzling why anyone would
> request the call sign.

But, just as with trading messages with a few noteworthy members of the group, no purpose is served discussing it any more.

Kim is a nice enough lady AFAIAC, and beyond that I just look at the situation as a bit of a quirk. Everyone in the newsgroup has one or more.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2006. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 17:03:06 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hk4muth.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75420
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 16:43:12 GMT, Frank Dresser wrote:

>Even worse,
>the guy who pays for BPL is likely to blame the power company, rather than
>the real culprit -- the clown who just doesn't give a damn about RFI.

Aren't they the same in that situation ??

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2007. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 17:04:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F48EFDE.2050204@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75421
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Have any of these Genii given any though of what would happen to bpl during solar event?

Maybe the FCC can serve an enforcement letter to the sun! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

2008. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 17:28:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030824132852.23171.00000250@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 75423

In article <woV1b.8451$99.8368@fe03.atl2.webusenet.com>, "Dan Finn"
<djfinn2@nospam.bellsouth.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030823013710.15923.00000198@mb-m12.aol.com...
>>
>> On most modern HF transceivers, the 3rd harmonic has the strongest
>> content of RF. The 3rd harmonic of 3.5 to 4.0 MHz is 10.5 to 12 MHz
>> and there aren't many "ham listening frequencies" there, are there?
>>
>For most modulated sine waves, the 3rd harmonic is usually the strongest
>*harmonic* although it depends upon several factors. Generally, the odd
>harmonic components add and the negative components subtract with modulated
>sine waves.

Oh my, such interesting math (which wasn't shown)...:-)

That isn't quite the case in any real world OR the theoretical world.

First of all, in the real world, you must be presuming some absolute
zero phase shift for each harmonic to make your statement. That just
doesn't exist.

I can do the numbers on the series formulas for AM, FM, or PM no
problem but so few in here can follow even the beginnings of such that
I won't care to put it in public view...:-)

>Having said that, most modern rigs that produce FCC quality
>signals will filter such harmonics several 10's of dB rendering reception
>almost impossible except in the near field.

Really?!? They work PERFECTLY ACCORDING TO SPECIFICATIONS
ALL THE TIME?!?!?!

That's not a realistic view, but feel free to indulge if you've laid out a
big
plastic for a couple kilodollars worth of transceiver. :-)

That old standby tube output matching circuit, the "Pi-network" is only
good for about 18 db per octave attenuation above cutoff frequency. Not
all modern transceivers have such "lowpass filters" since they rely on
Class B or AB linear amplifiers with rather broadband transformers
matching PA to load.

A typical 100 W RF transceiver has a fundamental power output of +50
dbm. If there is as much as "60 db harmonic attenuation" in it, the
harmonics can be -10 dbm into the load. That's 100 microWatts and

DOES radiate and rather beyond the Near Field...the level is a lot higher
than most "40 db over S9" signals (depending on who assigned what
levels to a local transceiver S meter).

>I thought I needed to correct
>this BS, that emanates from someone who claims to understand modern amateur
>technology theory.

Feel free to do your numbers in public, senior.

Call it all the "BS" you want to. When you can actually MAKE a linear
(of any class) go as low as 40 db down on total harmonic output, I'll be
giving you a round of applause.

>Hams transmitting signals of any significance on 12MHz
>will not be hams for long.

Oh? Were there any recent NALs published at the FCC or ARRL sites
on such things? Let us know, please, I've not seen any of those
concerning out-of-ham-band interference due to harmonic generation.

LHA

2009. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 17:28:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030824132853.23171.00000251@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 75422

In article <3F47C782.2000506@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>> Morsemanship uber alles in the year 2003!
>>
>> There are NO "novice class" amateur radio licenses issued in
>> USA amateur radio. Are you going to keep space on a
>> "reservation" for all those missing indians or what?
>>
>What about all of us "extra-lite" licensees?

I've looked high and low on the FCC website and can't find any
amateur radio "extra-lite" license class.

>We only need 5wpm nowadays, and if
>I want to QSO Larry, I would want to have some skill.

Not an answer.

First of all, you've not established any NEED for a morsemanship test
for the US amateur radio license having below-30-MHz privileges.

I don't know which "Larry" you are talking about, but there's never been
any NEED for "QSO-ing any 'Larry'" in the US amateur radio regulations.

>> How about we keep all those Morsemen Chiefs on their elite little
>> EM spectrum reservations, maybe have dude ranches where
>> youngsters can all attend to learn the Old Ways of Morse?
>>
>As morse only requires a small bandwidth, those "reservations" wouldn't
>be much of a burden.....

True enough. :-)

Let them get burned up and send smoke signals. Electronics runs on
smoke; if the smoke leaks out it won't work. :-)

LHA

2010. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 17:56:18 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0308240956.491c5d6c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75424
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message news:<3F4770A6.5030604@mailcity.moc>...
> gw wrote:
>
> > >
> > >
> > > whew!!!! another fink........man that makes me have this incredible
> > > compunction to go take a test ....
>
> Don't bother, you couldn't pass it, "doncha know". What a turd.

well anyone can obviously go further than you.......i mean......how
come you never went for your general class ham license ......aren't
there any general class guys that sit in as ve's for you to take the
test in beautiful colorado springs john boy?????

2011. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 18:12:12 UTC
From: SD Special Delivery Jones <specialdelivery@c.com>
Message-ID: <YMudnRqQEpiVndSiXTWJiw@comcast.com>
Source record: 75425
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:2VR1b.4840$8i2.2693@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...

> Don't worry about Moparholic. This is his usual troll. Tries to stir it
> up, then bitches because its cross posted. He probably cross posted it
> anyway.
>
> It don't mean nothin man.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Boy, Dan sure sounds like you got him pegged.

2012. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 18:14:01 UTC
From: SD Special Delivery Jones <specialdelivery@c.com>
Message-ID: <cK-cnQX7habondSiXTWJig@comcast.com>
Source record: 75426
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"gw" <gw@webhideout.com> wrote in message
news:235a74db.0308240956.491c5d6c@posting.google.com...
> JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:<3F4770A6.5030604@mailcity.moc>...
> > gw wrote:
> >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > whew!!!! another fink........man that makes me have this incredible
> > > compunction to go take a test ....
> >
> > Don't bother, you couldn't pass it, "doncha know". What a turd.
>
> well anyone can obviously go further than you.......i mean......how
> come you never went for your general class ham license ......aren't
> there any general class guys that sit in as ve's for you to take the
> test in beautiful colorado springs john boy?????

gw,curiousdan,pinhead,icecoldbeer etc etc, you sure are stuoid JJ is an
advanced class which is higher than general, now go wash off, you stink

2013. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 18:14:34 UTC
From: SD Special Delivery Jones <specialdelivery@c.com>
Message-ID: <NKicnaVgUtcLndSiXTWJiA@comcast.com>
Source record: 75427
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030824105319.111$qs@newsreader.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > "Ronny" <Y432@cbronnieincorg.net> wrote in message
> > news:bi6hit$5ln$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > x-no-archive: yes
> > > Where have all you old farts been? Nevermind,
> > > 99% of you don't have the slightest idea what exists
> > > in the spectrum outside the ham bands.
> > > 27540 khz & 6890 khz have been standard CB
> > > packet comms calling freqs. for well over a decade.
> > > And yes, there is extensive CB packet activity in the
> > > U.S. What do you think, just cause somebody is not
> > > a ham op means that they don't know anything about
> > > packet? oh horrors, some CB ops even run
> > > slow scan TV. Get with the times you old fools.
> > >
> > > Ronny
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> > No, Ronny....what YOU DO NOT UNDERSTAND is WE DON"T GIVE A RATS ASS WHAT
> > A CBer in ANY COUNTRY DOES. Is that CLEAR?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> I'm starting to hear W4NTI on the freeband.
>
> --
> GO #40

I see you found someone else to harass Moped. and chase around too.
```

2014. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 18:44:03 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030824144403.103$zw@newsreader.com>
Source record: 75428
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"SD Special Delivery Jones" <specialdelivery@c.com> wrote:
you sure are stuoid JJ
>
You're a fucking moron.

--
GO #40

2015. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 18:45:39 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030824144539.160$64@newsreader.com>
Source record: 75429
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"SD Special Delivery Jones" <specialdelivery@c.com> wrote:
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:2VR1b.4840$8i2.2693@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> > Don't worry about Moparholic. This is his usual troll. Tries to stir
> > it up, then bitches because its cross posted. He probably cross
> > posted it anyway.
> >
> > It don't mean nothin man.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Boy, Dan sure sounds like you got him pegged.
>
The old irony meter is -pegged-. One retard kissing the others ass.

--
GO #40

2016. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 18:53:52 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <4R72b.112264$3o3.7902323@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 75430
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hk4muth.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 16:43:12 GMT, Frank Dresser wrote:
>
> >Even worse,
> >the guy who pays for BPL is likely to blame the power company, rather
than
> >the real culprit -- the clown who just doesn't give a damn about RFI.
>
> Aren't they the same in that situation ??
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>

Partly. The power company doesn't care. The FCC seems lax in Part 15 enforcement, among other things. Certain congressmen seem to think the only impediments to the Jetson way of life are outmoded regulations. The neighbors only think of interference when Tom Brokaw turns green and they blame it on the SWL's random wire antenna.

The only people who give a damn about RFI are the people who use radio.

I'm not an expert on BPL, but I don't have any faith in the FCC's ability to look past a glossy demo and into the real world, either. If I had been invited to the demos, I'd have brought my old vacuum cleaner and my homebuilt PC with the noisy power supply(which, I assume, is good under Part 15 regs. Ha!). I think somebody would give a damn if everyday electrical noisemakers slowed BPL.

Frank Dresser

2017. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 19:06:17 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030824150617.21160.00000406@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 75431

>People are STILL raising hell with Kim W5TIT about her callsign?!?!
>
>How many YEARS is this going to go on??? Jeeeezzzzussscrrrryst!
>
>

Untill the Fat Winch changes her Call

2018. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 19:32:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030824153227.29660.00000206@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 75432

In article <5c01b95b.0308240543.14bacc44@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030824010600.22081.00000159@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>
>> This newsgroup is about AMATEUR RADIO POLICY.
>
> Dwight, Lennie makes this assertion when it becomes obvious that
>he's been bested, especially by someone he considers below his social
>station.

The special recall election in California is NOT about amateur radio.

> Lennie will rant on and on about Japan, his days as an "enginer",
>and his stellar career as a "contributing editor" of a magazine that
>wwent belly-up.

Please use a spellchecker when you become so enraged.

I was an Associate Editor at HAM RADIO magazine, so listed on the "masthead" (listing of staff) every month for two years. HAM RADIO magazine was an independent technically-oriented monthly that was published for TWENTY-TWO YEARS. It got started and survived in competition with QST, CQ, and 73 for over two decades.

There can be no "blame" attributed to the content of HAM RADIO magazine. It was always superior technically to all the others. The fault may lie in the dwindling readership of radio amateurs no longer caring about technical matters or home workshop projects sufficient to attract advertisers and advertising revenue.

HR, CQ, 73 never had the financial backup of a membership organization to keep them afloat when advertising revenue was hard to get. QST survives only because it is basically a membership magazine with the (~12 million) resources of ARRL behind it. The three independents succeeded and stayed in business despite not having such guarantees of demographics to attract advertisers.

I was, and continue to be an electronics design engineer both as professional (paid) and amateur (unpaid).

The fact of the matter is that I've DONE IT, have the documentation and enough witnesses to convince any court except the vigilantee groups who only want to destroy others while spewing forth hate and vomit on those who've done things.

> And what give YOU the right, Mr. Anderscum, to demand that Dwight
>make the content conform to YOUR specifications?
>
> You, you lying sack of buffalo excrement, are the one who is
>constantly calling Dave Heil and Larry Roll all sorts of names for
>allegedly doing the same thing, yet here YOU are VERY obviously NOT
>living up to your own rhetoric...

"Buffalo excrement?!?" :-)

As they say in Silicon Valley, let the "chips" fall where they may...

LHA

2019. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 19:32:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030824153231.29660.00000207@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 75433

In article <5c01b95b.0308240535.3b26afb6@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030821191256.11022.00000119@mb-m14.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0308210216.66eb92e9@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>> Brian, go easy on Steamy. He doesn't know about all the hundreds
>> of communication carrier companies that were doing point-to-point
>> radio communications before he was born. He doesn't know that
>> militaries around the world were using radio for primary long-distance
>> communications before he was born. He just doesn't know.
>
> Sure he does. Someone here has a hard time "accepting" things,
>Lennie, and it isn't me.
>
>> Steamy never did any communications while in the military...other than
>> talking on the telephone.
>
> Sorry. Incorrect.

Show PROOF of your mighty military "communications," big mouth.

You TALK a big story without mentioning ANY details.

You haven't named a single one of the "hostile actions" you claim you were in.

>
>> It's painfully obvious, Brian. Steamy hates me. I served in the US Army
>> so, naturally to him, anything Army is subject to hatred, villification,
and
>> denigration.
>
> I ahte liars and people who try to use somoen else's military
>service to make themselves look good.

You just HATE.

My military service is archived at NARA. Not only that, I have witnesses still alive who were at the same Army radio station I served when I was there. No lies.

You HATE someone else being successful in anything so much that it makes you almost violent. That's a bad mental symptom which needs treatment.

>> Steamy never did any primary communications while in the USMC. Naturally
>> he resents that anyone else did.
>
> Sorry. Incorrect.

It may be "incorrect" but it is more likely quite CORRECT.

You've NEVER stated in any detail what you actually DID in the USMC insofar as radio communications. You conveniently gloss over any details. Anyone who really liked their past work will remember details of it and "talk shop" about it. You never do.

All you talk about is some general phrases (copyable from any little PR booklet) about "warrior skills" and honor and glory...NO DETAILS.

All those generalities and NO DETAILS...sure marks of a bluffer, a con man, trying a selling job on those with no experience in some area.

In short, YOU LIE.

Then you try to say others "lie" when they give details, provide references and have documentation to prove what they say.

>> Steamy can't handle real truth.
>
> Sure I can. You are liar, an antagonist, and a creep.

Antagonist, yes. Liar no.

I've provided details, references, even names of still-living witnesses as proof of what I've done.

You've never tried to confirm anything, have you?

You've rejected a scan of my first First Class Radiotelephone (Commercial) license, not once but four times in e-mail.

You just can't tolerate TRUTH. It upsets the little fabric of LIES you've created about yourself.

> Ahhhh yes...Lennie once again shows that "honoring" Veteans is a
>one way street for him.

I HONOR all who actually served their country honorably.

I don't honor posers or posturers who can only claim generalities and spout gratuitous phrases or are only interested in fantasies of heroic "hostile actions" they were never involved with in reality.

> If you were truly an "enemy", Lennie, wwe'd not be having this
>conversation.

True. I'd be standing, watching a graves registration detail picking up your remains.

> I don't have to say bad things about you. You do enough to prove
>anything

?

>> Steamy's concept of "honor" only applies to whatever and whomever He
>> "honors." He cannot comprehend anyone else honoring their old
>> military unit or even knowing details of that unit. Such seems to be an
>> abomination with him.
>
> You have no "honor", Anderscum, save for yourself and your ego.

Vomiting more bile and hatred, ey?

Not nice. Not even close to any "Amateur's Code," I'd say. :-)

>> Steamy, and some others, are resentful and some probably envious that
>> anyone else had any primary communications tasks over HF a half
>> century ago.
>
> Envious...Of something you did 50 years ago..?!?!
>
>BBBWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAH
AHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!
>! ! ! !

You are envious. Terribly so. There's no other explanation for the hyena
laugh writing...other than another symptom of your growing psychosis.

> And YOUR "operative word" there was "HAD" tasks dealing with HF
>radio...I HAVE dealings with HF radio...And NOT on someone elses'
>dime, either.

Past tense is fine. HF radio is no longer any primary medium for
either national or international radio communications...it has become
secondary to very high speed fiber optic digitally-encoded comm and
geosychronous communications satellites.

That I was actually involved in HF radio communications before your
birth, for three straight years, makes you very tense. It should, you
have NO comparative claims verifiable through documentation or
witnesses to prove your "matching" experience later.

>> I will be glad and honored to link my name with my old Signal Battalion
>> anytime, anywhere. That Battalion still exists in spirit today as the
78th
>> Signal Service Battalion, Camp Zama, Japan, under the command of the
>> 516th Signal Brigade headquartered at Fort Shafter, Hawaii, and attached
>> to the US Army Pacific as its main communications provider.
>
> Your "link", Lennie, will be forever remembered in THIS forum as
>a shameful and scurrilous attempt to USE those men and thier sacrifice
>to make some silly attempt at improving your image in here.

I don't "use" anyone in the military. I was IN the military, doing HF radio
communications, have the documentation and the living witnesses who
were at the same radio station at the same time I served.

I've researched US military records to trace the history of my military unit from its first organization in 1946 to the present day. The Army callsign of ADA has been preserved as the callsign of the Headquarters, US Army Pacific, as important now as it was 50 years ago as the primary communications facitlity of the US Far East Command in Tokyo.

> It's not possible. Every time you enter this forum and start
>that same old spiele again, you reprove the point that you are nothing
>but an NG troll.

Perhaps...certainly so to some who think of US amateur radio as some kind of substitute for a failed military career and must always act as if the HOBBY of amateur radio is some kind of "military" SERVICE requiring an espirit de corps worthy of the USMC. Or BSA.

I'm just trying to advocate the abolishment of morse code testing for any US radio operator license. Instead, I get all this spewing of HATE and VOMIT from certain parties exhibiting classic symptoms of psychoses.

Get some mental help, Steamy.

It may improve your life and will certainly improve the lives of all around you.

LHA

2020. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 19:32:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030824153233.29660.00000208@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 75434

In article <d22b54c3.0308240535.4289bd32@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030824010600.22081.00000159@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> In article <BB6D0FD4.24A82%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart
>> <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:
>>
>> >"Len Over 21" wrote:
>> >
>> >> The special election in regards to recalling the
>> >> Governor of the state of California has nothing
>> >> whatsoever to do with amateur radio. (snip)
>> >
>> > Since when is that a major concern?
>>
>> There are plenty of OTHER newsgroups for political arguments, Dwight.
>
>But we like THIS one ya Putz. So we'll continue to post whatever we
>want to post. Right here. Any time. No matter what. Particularly no
>matter what you post.

So...you think you OWN this newsgroup just by being here, ey? :-)

That's right in line with some of the old, old timers who park on some ham band frequency forever and chase anyone else away by general nastiness.

Sort of like squatter's rights. And so you squat. And squat.

>> Neither morse code nor amateur radio is on the special election
>> concerning recall of the elected Governor of California.
>>
>> This newsgroup is about AMATEUR RADIO POLICY.
>
>Ya mean like your endless megabytes of snoozer posts about your '50s
>Army RTTY crap have been about HAM RADIO POLICY Putz? Or how 'bout we
>get into how your complete lack of credentials in ham radio
>"qualifies" you to spout off about ham radio policy?

The special recall election in California is NOT about ham radio.

Radio is radio. The physics of it doesn't change despite what some old timers squat and poop about "credentials."

>> >Read back over this newsgroup. During
>> >the last presidential election, several thousand messages were posted on

>> >that subject alone.
>>
>> Oh, my, that makes it "right," does it? I don't think so...
>
>The cold hard nut of the matter is that nobody gives a rat's ass what
>you think is "right" or "wrong". In fact that's an oxymoron in itself.
>You're just an outsider around here Putz.

Outside of your elite little core group of Brass Pounder Leaguers,
you don't care anything at all about anyone else's viewpoints and are
determined to subjugate all to your royal views.

Everyone who doesn't agree with or worship your "achievements" are
in what you call "outsiders."

Your own "cold hard nut" seems to be giving you problems. Consult
a real MD to seek a cure.

>> "Dissed," not discussed, Dwight.
>
>It's neither Putz, it's just entertaining as hell. As in one more
>unlimited source of La-la Land guffaws n' giggles. It's kinda grim
>elsewhere, we all need a bit of comic relief so La-la Land comes up
>with another one. Quite timely actually.

Poor baby. Living there in hoagieland with NOTHING happening
and you want to diss the biggest state in the USA. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Typical easterner "we are the center of the universe" thinking. The
sun and the rest of the world revolves around you. [that may be what
causes your dizzyness?]

>And of course you do know, you're the Henry KIssingeer & Colin Powell
>of RRAP. More humor from La-la Land.

Oh, my, more name-calling vomit spewed, now trying for dissing some
notable government movers and shakers.

What has mighty morseman Kellie done that is so worthy of being
"superior" away from mouthing off in newsgroups?

>> Nonsense...to the easterners who never considered California as ever
>> belonging to the union. :-)
>
>For damned good reasons too, and you're a good illustration.
>
>Every country has pulled one monumental blooper of another. Swiping
>La-la Land from the Mexicans was one of ours. I vote we give it back.
>I think there are others who will agree.

Feel free to secede from California any time you want. California can
survive without hoagielanders. :-)

As usual, you mouth off without bothering to check history...but that's
such a common thing you do that it isn't worth trying to correct you.

>> There's NO amateur radio in the special recall election in California.
>
>Jim Weir gave up his ham license did he ya PUTZ?

You would NEVER have known about Jim Weir's registered candidacy
without my mentioning it. :-)

Jim Weir is one of 130 other candidates and he has some "credentials"
in government politics: Eight years with the Nevada County (CA) Board
of Supervisors, according to his public biography.

Does the HOBBY of amateur radio give "credentials" for public office?

I don't think so.

>> I'm also aware of the provincial bigotry of easterners and enviousness
>
>Bwaaahaha! No further comment req'd!

True enough...YOU have gone into vomitus uninterruptus on provincial
bigotry long enough.

>> of the most populous state in the USA (about 1 in 8 Americans live
>> here) and the fact that California's budget ranks 5th through 7th
>> (depending on standards) of world NATIONS.
>
>It's also been established that around one out of eight in any
>generalized population is a kook. Lotta ramifications in that with
>respect to La-la Land and YOU, ya PUTZ.

More provincial bigotry vomit.

Check with your MD...you may have a serious medical condition.

Or see a veterinarian...more fitting the beast within you.

>> Just the same, there is NOTHING about amateur radio in the special
>> recall election in California. Nothing.
>>
>> Go bitch about something non-amateur elsewhere...
>
>Since you're not a ham why don't you follow you own "instructions" and
>take your bitching about HAM RADIO POLICY somewhere else?

I have. This newsgroup turned into a squatter's rights poopy CHAT
ROOM long ago. No debate or discussion really happens in here.

All that seems to go on in here is a bunch of (mentally) old farts
pooping about the joy and majesty of morsemanship and how they
are all so damn superior to professionals due to long tenure in a hobby.

>Hey Putz, you're missing a golden opportunity to exercise your
>all-encompassing skills, experience and expertise on EVERYTHING. You

>need to climb aboard one of the candidate's campaign organizations and
>do your do. I'm thinking you'd be the perfect public relations
>spinmeister for the Midget & Bimbo slate. You'd fit.

Done that, too, but much reduced in effort since the Camelot days of
John F. Kennedy. You've never heard of Peter Ueberroth, have you?
I don't think you do. All you know about is "midgets and bimbos."
That fits. :-)

Now go back to your squatting and pooping in this chat room. Rent a
BobCat to shovel up all that you've left in here just from this message.

LHA

2021. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 19:34:26 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@nospam.bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <he82b.8370$jd.1548@fe02.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 75435

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030824132852.23171.00000250@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <woV1b.8451$99.8368@fe03.atl2.webusenet.com>, "Dan Finn"
> <djfinn2@nospam.bellsouth.net> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030823013710.15923.00000198@mb-m12.aol.com...
> >>
> >> On most modern HF transceivers, the 3rd harmonic has the strongest
> >> content of RF. The 3rd harmonic of 3.5 to 4.0 MHz is 10.5 to 12 MHz
> >> and there aren't many "ham listening frequencies" there, are there?
> >>
> >For most modulated sine waves, the 3rd harmonic is usually the strongest
> >*harmonic* although it depends upon several factors. Generally, the odd
> >harmonic components add and the negative components subtract with
modulated
> >sine waves.
>
> Oh my, such interesting math (which wasn't shown)...:-)

If you do not know this to be true without seeing the math worked out for
you, then you should not be discussing harmonics in a technical context.
>
> That isn't quite the case in any real world OR the theoretical world.

Your saying so does not make your statement true. We are talking technical
issues here which are a matter of common knowledge to the RF community so
your flames are irrelevant.

>
> First of all, in the real world, you must be presuming some absolute
> zero phase shift for each harmonic to make your statement. That just
> doesn't exist.

Oh God...Earth to Len....harmonics *are* phase shifted. If you reduce the
phase shift to zero, then you have eliminated the harmonics, stupid.
>
> I can do the numbers on the series formulas for AM, FM, or PM no
> problem but so few in here can follow even the beginnings of such that
> I won't care to put it in public view...:-)
>
> >Having said that, most modern rigs that produce FCC quality
> >signals will filter such harmonics several 10's of dB rendering reception
> >almost impossible except in the near field.
>

> Really?!? They work PERFECTLY ACCORDING TO SPECIFICATIONS
> ALL THE TIME?!?!?!

Pretty close, most of the time, dummy.

>
> That's not a realistic view, but feel free to indulge if you've laid
out a
> big
> plastic for a couple kilodollars worth of transceiver. :-)
>
> That old standby tube output matching circuit, the "Pi-network" is only
> good for about 18 db per octave attenuation above cutoff frequency.

Since 3dB is half the power, you cut the power in half 6 times. 18dB is not
bad over one octave.

Not
> all modern transceivers have such "lowpass filters" since they rely on
> Class B or AB linear amplifiers with rather broadband transformers
> matching PA to load.

They had better filter it so that you do not have a significant signal at
12MHz when transmitting in the 75 meter band.
>
> A typical 100 W RF transceiver has a fundamental power output of +50
> dbm. If there is as much as "60 db harmonic attenuation" in it, the
> harmonics can be -10 dbm into the load. That's 100 microWatts and
> DOES radiate and rather beyond the Near Field...the level is a lot
higher
> than most "40 db over S9" signals (depending on who assigned what
> levels to a local transceiver S meter).

0.1mW? Hardly a significant signal.

>
> >I thought I needed to correct
> >this BS, that emanates from someone who claims to understand modern
amateur
> >technology theory.
>
> Feel free to do your numbers in public, senior

That would be a rather boring and somewhar ominous excercize to do on a
newsgroup, dummy.
>
> Call it all the "BS" you want to. When you can actually MAKE a linear
> (of any class) go as low as 40 db down on total harmonic output, I'll
be
> giving you a round of applause.
>
> >Hams transmitting signals of any significance on 12MHz
> >will not be hams for long.

>
> Oh? Were there any recent NALs published at the FCC or ARRL sites
> on such things?

Not that I know of. Not for transmitting harmonics on 12MHz using 'modern'
transceivers, as you called them.

Let us know, please, I've not seen any of those
> concerning out-of-ham-band interference due to harmonic generation.

Neither have I. Most NAL's are for in band interference, referred to as QRM.

de KR4AF
>
> LHA

2022. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 19:43:58 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <1A82b.111593$Fu.27962@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 75436

If you read a lot of posts, a number of folks have nothing better to do with their time. :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message news:3F48D913.5B3798C0@ix.netcom.com...
> People are STILL raising hell with Kim W5TIT about her callsign?!?!
>
> How many YEARS is this going to go on??? Jeeeezzzzussscrrrryst!

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/19/03

2023. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 19:47:41 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <xD82b.111594$9w.12100@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 75437
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

David,

Looks like I'm going to have to research some nice linear as well as a decent HF station. I had been looking at a vertical to avoid all of the horizontal lines in the neighborhood, but, on second thought ... 1500 watts horizontally polarized, 50 feet from the power lines might prove interesting :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA
ps - we need a study as to where the biggest ingress will occur :)

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message news:3F48DC88.28785233@ix.netcom.com...
>
> Money talks, public service walks- BPL is a certainty.
>
> The "null it out- anyone can do it" argument is crap-
> works well in theory, poorly in the field.
> Even with excellent nulling, QRP and other weak signal work is finished.
> Shortwave DXing is finished.
>
> You have three choices-
> Give up radio.
> Move far enough into the country to avoid the polluted grid,
> "Gorilla warfare-" Power lines that leak out, can also leak IN.
> 50 watts of broadband noise generator plugged into the nearest socket
> would do. Note that I would never advocate anything illegal.....
> D.S.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/19/03

2024. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 19:55:20 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <IK82b.111596$Dz.40557@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 75438

An interesting note. I do recall having learned American land-line Morse once as a lark and was capable of perhaps 16 words per minute - but I was using a mental look-up table for those characters/numbers that were different from international Morse. The long and short of it is this: I did copy with no errors 40 words per minute of international Morse code in the US Navy in 1967. I used American Morse once only in 1968. I did not use any Morse from 1969 until I retook the amateur extra exam in 1993. I passed, but I have forgotten the American Morse. A few weeks of writing some Morse code programs did pump my speed up just a wee bit on international Morse :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/19/03

2025. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 20:14:06 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308241214.5f31dc94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75439

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308230933.6ad1de2f@posting.google.com>...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<8fw1b.29885$Vx2.13538140@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > news:KIu1b.1920$6e5.108499@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > >
> > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > > news:c2356669.0308221028.605a3cbf@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Proficiency" starts at 10 wpm.
> > >
> > > That's absurd ... proficiency is a relative term that must be quantified.
> > > One can be proficient at a variety of levels in any activity requiring
> > > some sort of acquired skill.
> > >
> >
> > We might consider the arguments presented in the book "The Art and Skill of
> > Radiotelegraphy".
>
> Why?
>
> The author had done extensive study on Morse code
> > teaching methods, learning abilities, etc.
>
> Cool. Who is the author, what is his callsign? And what is the
> copyright date?
>
> I'll bet he wrote it long after the code began to wane in any (every)
> radio service.

There gpes the Brain child on another erroneous tangent. Only in the
ham shacks of NCI members has use of code began to wane within ham
radio. If he'd bother himself to actually check what'seing done *on
the air* he'd soon find that the use of Morse has grown within the
ARS,not waned. All this in spite of the hearfelt wishes and strenuous
actions of him and the likeminded.

"None so blind as those who won't see!"

2026. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 20:18:48 UTC
From: Hans Kohb <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <0535675e33895f7709cb87f3995e5cf4.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 75440
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> Have any of these Genii given any though of what would happen to bpl
> during solar event?

Probably nothing at all. BPL operates on conducted RF, not radiated RF.
A solar event might put a random pulse or two on the grid, but not a
sustained coherent signal which might impair BPL. By the way, BPL would
also care little about random white noise.

73, Hans

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2027. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 20:31:28 UTC
From: Hans K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <6a3b9f5f99a0c4251172ab4c22749681.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 75441

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> If you are not a registered voter in California, then you have no cause to
> carry on as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on
> California politics.
>

That sword cuts in both directions, sir.

If you are not a registered voter in California (licensed operator
in the Amateur Radio Service), then you have no cause to carry on
as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on California
politics (Amateur Radio Service policy).

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2028. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 20:45:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hk4nhyi.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75442

On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 12:58:31 -0400, Michael L Teter wrote:

> Heard Mr. Hundt speak a while back at an industry
>get together, a very impressive individual and speaker,
>for sure!

He could always spew it out by the yard....

He was also good at ignoring or disrespecting those of us in the field who were knowledgeable and involved in enforcing the FCC regulations, even those regs that he himself was pushing through. Perhaps he thought that FCC Regs could be complied with by some magical process.

He came out to San Francisco for "an industry get together" and didn't have the decency to stop by the field office to show his face to the staff members there as other Commissioners and Chairmen usually do - part of having that rank. But his staff bag-carriers sure insisted that the field staff do all sorts of "gofer" and "fetch-it" jobs "for the Chairman", including motorcade security. We didn't mind doing it - that was -our- job - but loyalty, like respect, has got to be a two way street.

>Spoke at length about his tenure at the FCC.

Did you ever hear Dick Wiley speak about -his- tenure at the Commission?

He was the last decent Chairman, excepting for Jim Quello who was a damn good Commissioner and served a very short time as Acting Chairman only because the Prez was too embarassed not to designate him as such just before he retired.

Both of the above knew how to run the Commission to get the work done properly and were very conscious of the fact that it was the technical staff that supported the Commissioners. IIRC Mr. Quello was the last Commissioner to have an Engineering Advisor as a full-time staff assistant.

>What an eye opener! Most noteworthy were his
>comments on the resistance to change at a dinasour of
>an agency.

The changes that he wanted to make (and finally bludgeoned through) were to get the agency out of the technical spectrum management business as its primary function and into the "auction it off to the highest bidder" business as its primary function.

If you consider that as the role of a telecommunications regulatory and spectrum management agency, I feel sorry for your ignorance.

When enough of the pros who believed in proper professional spectrum management finally gave up in disgust, he succeeded. The resulting state of regulatory anarchy on "the airwaves" is the result.

He would have been far more respected if he would have split the agency in two, getting The Congress to place the technical management and enforcement function - which he didn't understand - into an agency such as NTIA (as Canada did with DoC, now IC) and keeping the rest - which apparently he did understand - as a separate entity to play the political and auction games (as Canada does with its CRTC).

>Mike Teter, P.E., M.B.A., Ph.D
>Sumisunsansorg LTD

I got letters too.

Phil Kane, P.E., B.E.E., J.D.....
CSI Telecommunications
Communications Law Center
FCC (retired)

2029. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 21:04:27 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <vL92b.1982$Jh2.1940@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75443

```
"Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:6a3b9f5f99a0c4251172ab4c22749681.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
: "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
:
: >
: > If you are not a registered voter in California, then you have no
cause to
: > carry on as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on
: > California politics.
: >
:
: That sword cuts in both directions, sir.
:
: If you are not a registered voter in California (licensed operator
: in the Amateur Radio Service), then you have no cause to carry on
: as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on California
: politics (Amateur Radio Service policy).
:
: With all kind wishes,
:
: de Hans, K0HB
:

Hansl,

You doesn't has to call him "sir".

72.5, Barney
```

2030. Re: NCI Position for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 21:08:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030824170834.07578.00000131@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 75444

In article <he82b.8370$jd.1548@fe02.atl2.webusenet.com>, "Dan Finn"
<djfinn2@nospam.bellsouth.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030824132852.23171.00000250@mb-m05.aol.com...
>> In article <woV1b.8451$99.8368@fe03.atl2.webusenet.com>, "Dan Finn"
>> <djfinn2@nospam.bellsouth.net> writes:
>>
>> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20030823013710.15923.00000198@mb-m12.aol.com...
>> >>
>> >> On most modern HF transceivers, the 3rd harmonic has the strongest
>> >> content of RF. The 3rd harmonic of 3.5 to 4.0 MHz is 10.5 to 12 MHz
>> >> and there aren't many "ham listening frequencies" there, are there?
>> >>
>> >For most modulated sine waves, the 3rd harmonic is usually the strongest
>> >*harmonic* although it depends upon several factors. Generally, the odd
>> >harmonic components add and the negative components subtract with
>> >modulated sine waves.
>>
>> Oh my, such interesting math (which wasn't shown)...:-)
>
>If you do not know this to be true without seeing the math worked out for
>you, then you should not be discussing harmonics in a technical context.

>Your saying so does not make your statement true. We are talking technical
>issues here which are a matter of common knowledge to the RF community so
>your flames are irrelevant.

>Oh God...Earth to Len....harmonics *are* phase shifted. If you reduce the
>phase shift to zero, then you have eliminated the harmonics, stupid.

I'm not sure where you get this "phase shift reduction to zero" but it
isn't quite like that. Sigh. Read following -

OK, let's get down to basics. From "Electronic Designers' Handbook,"
by Robert W. Landee, Donovan C. Davis, Albert P. Albrecht, 1957,
McGraw-Hill Book Co., Chapter 5, here's the instantaneous voltage
at any point in time of an AM RF waveform:

e(t) = E [1+M Cos(omega_m t)] Sin (omega_c t)

Where:

e(t) = instantaneous RF voltage e at time t
t = Time position, seconds
E = Peak voltage of unmodulated RF carrier

omega_m = radian frequency of modulation
= (2 pi f_m)
f_m = Modulation frequency, Hz
omega_c = radian frequency of RF carrier
= (2 pi f_c)
f_c = Carrier frequency, Hz
M = Modulation factor, range of 0 (none) to 1 (full)

That's not intuitive. By some identities and reforming the AM equation, the following can be found true for a single modulation frequency:

e(t) = E Sin (omega_c t) + [E M / 2]Sin[(omega_c + omega_m) t]
+ [E M / 2]Sin[(omega_c - omega_m) t]

The first term on the right side is the Carrier. The second term group on the right is the Upper Sideband and the third term group (next line) is the Lower Sideband. If, through other means, the Carrier is suppressed and Upper Sideband is suppressed, then a "SSB" Lower Sideband signal is formed and it can be expressed as:

e(t) = [E M / 2] Sin [(omega_c - omega_m) t]

If there were two modulation tones, f_a and f_b, the Lower Sideband SSB equation is then:

e(t) = [E M_a / 2] Sin [(omega_c - omega_a) t] +
[E M_b / 2] Sin [(omega_c - omega_b) t] + ...

where:
M_a = modulation factor for frequency a,
M_b = modulation factor for frequency b
omega_a and omega_b are the radian frequencies of modulation frequencies f_a and f_b

The above can be expanded to include any number of frequencies in the modulation process but they will have the most impact on the distortion caused to e(t) through any amplifier. That distortion will create the same as many modulation frequencies, all harmonically related in frequency and would be a form of "super modulation" of AM or AM on top of the SSB (AM) signal.

There is NO magic cancellation of phase terms as alleged in such AM on top of SSB, just a lot of extra sidebands generated as a result of the distortion. However the distortion sidebands would be at much higher frequencies than the modulation frequencies. Those can be synthesized in seconds using a computer program such as WAVESPEC which I wrote in 1993 and released as Shareware on ZDNet for PCs.

Painter's "Signals, Modulation, and Noise" gives a better description of such AM-on-top-of-AM (or SSB) but I don't have a copy available right now to reference contents.

Landee-Davis-Albrecht take up a whole chapter on modulation
and the derivations to show Carrier-Upper and Lower Sideband
terms which are Real representations of modulation products for
AM and SSB. Distortion in a final power amplifer will result in
AM on top of the AM/SSB signal, creating modulation products
centered around carrier frequency multiples.

The Carrier-Sideband form of AM illustrated above also contains
a clue on how a Phasing method of SSB generation works for
either sideband selection. Do your own math on that...it isn't
part of this non-discussion. :-)

>Pretty close, most of the time, dummy.

No need to vomit nasty names here. I've given you an opening
for discussion on the mathematics of modulation.

>> That old standby tube output matching circuit, the "Pi-network" is only
>> good for about 18 db per octave attenuation above cutoff frequency.
>
>Since 3dB is half the power, you cut the power in half 6 times. 18dB is not
>bad over one octave.

18 db per octave is approximately the cutoff slope of a 3-section
Butterworth-response L-C lowpass filter. Most "Pi-networks" are based
on Butterworth-response values.

>> Not
>> all modern transceivers have such "lowpass filters" since they rely on
>> Class B or AB linear amplifiers with rather broadband transformers
>> matching PA to load.
>
>They had better filter it so that you do not have a significant signal at
>12MHz when transmitting in the 75 meter band.

An L-C filter is not absolutely necessary. What is required basically is
to provide a "clean" signal prior to final power amplification. The final
amplifier can be improved (distortion reduced) by several methods:
negative feedback at RF; envelope detection and feedback to the
modulated carrier source; etc.

>0.1mW? Hardly a significant signal.

"Significant" is a highly subjective word. -10 dbm level is FAR
higher than most received signal values whose carrier level
ranges from -120 dbm (barely above the internal noise level) to
-40 dbm (slammin-home signal of 2.2 mV into a 50 Ohm coax
from antenna).

-10 dbm or 0.1 mW is equal to about 71 mV in the 50 Ohm
coax...30 db higher than -40 dbm or nearly 32 times the
voltage.

>> Feel free to do your numbers in public, senior
>

>That would be a rather boring and somewhar ominous excercize to do on a
>newsgroup, dummy.

American spelling is "exercise." Exercise your word power first.

Is calling others "dummy" instead of showing math "more fun" for you?

>> Let us know, please, I've not seen any of those
>> concerning out-of-ham-band interference due to harmonic generation.
>
>Neither have I. Most NAL's are for in band interference, referred to as QRM.

Then they must not exist, right? :-)

Is that because the FCC and ARRL signs are in opposition and
they cancel one another out? :-)

LHA

2031. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 21:23:44 UTC
From: David <rickets@knac.com>
Message-ID: <65bikvspvm1v2jjh73ti35hi6v2bhi4juc@4ax.com>
Source record: 75445
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Amazing, a scenario where an SWL would move into the city because of
less QRN.

On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 15:41:04 GMT, David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
wrote:

>
>Money talks, public service walks- BPL is a certainty.
>
>The "null it out- anyone can do it" argument is crap-
>works well in theory, poorly in the field.
>Even with excellent nulling, QRP and other weak signal work is finished.
>Shortwave DXing is finished.
>
>You have three choices-
>Give up radio.
>Move far enough into the country to avoid the polluted grid,
>"Gorilla warfare-" Power lines that leak out, can also leak IN.
>50 watts of broadband noise generator plugged into the nearest socket
>would do. Note that I would never advocate anything illegal.....
>D.S.

2032. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 21:36:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Gda2b.9751$8i2.2462@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75446
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F48EFDE.2050204@adelphia.net...
> Have any of these Genii given any though of what would happen to bpl
> during solar event?
>
> Maybe the FCC can serve an enforcement letter to the sun! 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Or how about some high intensity E-skip. 70 over 9 broadband crap
inputing someone elses system. Gotta be fun.

Of course they didn't think it out. If they did it would never have made it
to this stage.

Dan/W4NTI

2033. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 21:37:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Xea2b.9755$8i2.5144@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75447
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:0535675e33895f7709cb87f3995e5cf4.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
> > Have any of these Genii given any though of what would happen to bpl
> > during solar event?
>
> Probably nothing at all. BPL operates on conducted RF, not radiated RF.
> A solar event might put a random pulse or two on the grid, but not a
> sustained coherent signal which might impair BPL. By the way, BPL would
> also care little about random white noise.
>
> 73, Hans
>
>
>
> --
> Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

And what would happen if a thousand breakers tripped and the lights go out
again? Is the conducted RF going to pass through the 'ether' ?

Dan/W4NTI

2034. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 21:41:31 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <fia2b.9762$8i2.2652@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75448
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

```
"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308231744.65961c0d@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<9OR1b.4831$8i2.3803@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0308230923.1faff3c9@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:<vHy1b.1665$O03.387@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > > "Ged" <ged65@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk> wrote in message
> > > > news:z7uXIpH72pR$EwYx@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk...
> > > > > In message <Flw1b.895$O03.188@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get.rid.invalid> writes
> > > > > >It is to a large part old boy. Ask the Japs what happened when
they
> > did
> > > > > > >their sneak attack. Ask Germany how it liked those B17 daylight
> > raids.
> > > > > > >Piss us off and its hell to pay.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > I guess the Vietnamese and Somalis whipped yer arses because you
just
> > > > > > weren't pissed off enough eh?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > (Standby for the usual Republican answer of 'we weren't allowed to
win
> > > > > > by the politicians')
> > > > > > --
> > > > > > Ged
> > > > >
> > > > I don't really see where the Vietnamese and the Somalies 'whipped
our
> > > > arses'. What I remember happening is the US Government WIMPED OUT
> > before
> > > > we won. Neither situation was worth a damn. But don't blame the
> > soldiers
> > > > for the actions of NIXON, KISSENGER and CLINTON.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
```

> > > Dan, as I recall, Nixon didn't open up Vietnam, and Clinton didn't
> > > open up Somalia. I don't think Kissinger had much to do with either.
> > > But he did figure out how to get OPEC organized, have an oil embargo,
> > > then jack up the price of oil so they could buy US armaments.
> >
> > Of course they didn't OPEN UP VN or Somalia. I was refering to who
ENDED it
> > and HOW. As for Kissinger he was a MAJOR part of how we wimped out to
the
> > North Vietnamese, allowed them to keep troops in the South while we
turned
> > tail and let the South Vietnamese swing at the end of the rope we tied.
>
> Were you there?
>
> > No arguement of Mr. K. and his deals later on.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Well, it was 1973 and with the withdrawal from VN, we had to start
> selling arms to someone.

If the question is "was I in VN" the answer is yes.

Dan/W4NTI

2035. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 21:48:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Boa2b.9769$8i2.7652@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75449
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030824105424.253$u4@newsreader.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F46C557.6080301@adelphia.net...
> > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > > > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
> > > >
> > > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
message
> > > >> news:JLy1b.1672$O03.1295@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > >>
> > > >>>
> > > >> QRZ ??? who was the little twit there ??? QRZ ???
> > > >>
> > > >> I don't pay much attention to anybody who claims to be a ham but
> > > >> won't show a callsign. They're almost always anti-ham trolls.
> > > >>
> > > >> Charles, N5PVL
> > > >>
> > > >
> > > > Why do you cross post your drivel to rec.radio.cb then, brainiak?
> > > >
> > > Because the original message was there and in rrap, and I was
> > > responding to a person tha tI think posted from there.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >
> >
> > Don't worry about Moparholic. This is his usual troll. Tries to stir
> > it up, then bitches because its cross posted. He probably cross posted
> > it anyway.
> >
> > It don't mean nothin man.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> I'm starting to hear W4NTI on the freeband.
>
> --
> GO #40

Good for you. Now tape it and send it to Riley.

What a moron.

Dan/W4NTI

2036. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 22:09:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F493770.3030404@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75450
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F48EFDE.2050204@adelphia.net...
>
>>Have any of these Genii given any though of what would happen to bpl
>>during solar event?
>>
>>Maybe the FCC can serve an enforcement letter to the sun! 8^)
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Or how about some high intensity E-skip. 70 over 9 broadband crap
> inputing someone elses system. Gotta be fun.
>
> Of course they didn't think it out. If they did it would never have made it
> to this stage.

BINGO!

The reason that lights and motors work well enough is that they aren't
affected by the junk that gets impressed on the power lines.

And finally, just finally, I wonder exactly HOW the power companies are
going to respond to the problems of their OWN RFI generation?

Lessee, lets look at the enforcement letters from the FCC. Many of them
are to power providers because of equipment that is interfering with
some ham somewhere. It has to get to the enforcement stage, for crying
out loud. So are the Power companies going to replace all those
transfprmers and other power line junk that is spewing out RFI for the
BPL'ers?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2037. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 22:24:13 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F493B02.EABE4A24@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75551

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >People are STILL raising hell with Kim W5TIT about her callsign?!?!
> Untill (sic) the Fat Winch (sic) changes her Call

You're a rude little fella, aren't you?
I think I'll apply for WD1CK, or move overseas and
get PU5SY, then come on here just to raise your blood pressure.

Some children....good grief......

2038. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 23:18:11 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <TIb2b.112514$0v4.8012383@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 75552
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:xD82b.111594$9w.12100@news02.roc.ny...
> David,
>
> Looks like I'm going to have to research some nice linear as well as a
> decent HF station. I had been looking at a vertical to avoid all of the
> horizontal lines in the neighborhood, but, on second thought ... 1500
watts
> horizontally polarized, 50 feet from the power lines might prove
interesting
> :)
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
> ps - we need a study as to where the biggest ingress will occur :)
>
>

Hmmm. I can't imagine any way Ham radio interference would do any good, even if legal. Interference might not have effect it at all. Or it might cause a slowdown the BPL user would attribute to internet congestion. If the BPL user believes interference is casuing a problem with his gee-whiz powerline internet access, he's gonna squak to the power company and maybe the FCC. Face it, radio hobbyists are in no position for poor public relations. There are more people who will be attracted to the bright, shiny promise of BPL than there are radio hobbyists. Considering the numbers, would it be unlikely for the FCC to redefine the interference limits?

I'd be curious to know how vunerable BPL is to interference. I have no doubt the BPL people have run tests, and I'm a little surprised they're not at the front of a webpage somewhere. Ham radio may not have alot of effect. The power lines will only absorb a fraction of what's transmitted, and will probably re-radiate most of that. I would think interference from devices plugged directly into the lines would have the most effect. Like spikey old universal motors and cheap switchmode power supplies.

Politically, it's far better if damaging interference comes from everyday objects around the home. Like the vacuum cleaner, the microwave oven, the kid's computer, etc.

And nothing will help as much as bringing new people into the radio hobby.

Frank Dresser

2039. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-24 23:41:01 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030824194101.06821.00001072@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 75553

>You're a rude little fella, aren't you?

Damn right

>I think I'll apply for WD1CK, or move overseas and
>get PU5SY

Go ahead Morron

2040. Re: NCI filed Petition for Rulemaking Aug. 13

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 00:18:33 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F4955D9.8050807@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75554

>
>
> And I worked for and greatly respected several of the same..... and
> my "deputy" throughout all the years was a first-generation "minority",
> (sorry, Nancy, God made him male) and one of the sharpest FCC engineers
> is a Vietnamese refuge who at age 11 escaped being sunk by pirates when
> his family fled Vietnam for America.
>
>
>
Had to think for a moment what sort of pirates those were. Not the type
that set up unlicensed
broadcast stations......

2041. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 00:28:53 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <biblv0$27b@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75560

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030824104927.21642.00000193@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <bi7u0s$9ts@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >There's a repeater here in Dallas. During the last Presidential campaign
> >and election, the hate spewed on that repeater was horrifying--and that
is
> >not an overreaction. I heard things like that Democrats were the
equivalent
> >of people who "let" things like Hitler happen and, believe me, that is
mild.
> >That is why Larry remarks about my callsign--or anyone else's for that
> >matter--are such a damned joke. My callsign has nothing to do with the
> >destruction of the ARS.
>
> Kim:
>
> Mr. Riley Hollingsworth seems to disagree with you. Have you forgotten
> that he said that your call sign has the potential to take the ARS
> "...one step closer to extinction"?
>

Riley would never have done such a thing, Larry. His message was speaking
in generality. So, no, he never directly said that about my callsign. As
usual, you translated something to a way you wanted it.

> >
> > It is people like Larry and his attitudes that are
> >destroying the ARS.
>
> I don't see how that's possible, Kim. After all, I'm not the one who
> is sporting a callsign which is shamefully demeaning to women in
> general, and YL hams in particular. However, you are -- and even
> Riley Hollingsworth has said so, and I can't think of anyone who is
> more qualified to make that judgment than he is!
>

If you truly believe that about my callsign, Larry--and I don't believe you
do, then you are destroying it as much as anyone else.

> >
> >In Larry's mind, it's probably my fault because he has
> >to be so hateful toward me because of my callsign :)

>
> It's not hate, Kim. It's concern. Concern for the negative image of
> the ARS that you are projecting through the selection of your
> callsign, which places amateur radio operators, and particularly YL
> hams, in a negative light. If anyone is being "hateful," it is you --
> and you are showing this hate toward your fellow hams by demonstrating
> a blatant lack of respect for the image of the service.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

IF for one minute you are concerned about negative images for the ARS, then
you would shut up, Larry.

Kim W5TIT

2042. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 00:31:41 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <biblv1$27b@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75556

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F48D913.5B3798C0@ix.netcom.com...
> People are STILL raising hell with Kim W5TIT about her callsign?!?!
>
> How many YEARS is this going to go on??? Jeeeezzzzussscrrrryst!
>

heh heh, David. It's hilarious, ain't it?

Kim W5TIT

2043. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 00:33:37 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <biblv4$27b@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75559

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308240459.6c2ce541@posting.google.com...
> Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<BB6DC23C.24AC8%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>...
> > "WA8ULX" wrote:
> >
> > > Damn its working.
> >
> >
> > Bruce, I realize your agenda is to drive Ham Radio right into the
ground.
> > Why you would want to do so is beyond me. Perhaps your messages in the
CB
> > newsgroup offer a hint - you're really a CB'er with some type of grudge
> > against Ham Radio operators.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
> Bruce is classic CB riffraff, and is the R.R.A.P. posterboy for the
> Morse Myth that the Morse Exam keeps riffraff out of the Amateur Radio
> Service.

"Bruce" (if that's what you wish to call him--I call him Creep) is classic
riffraff, let CB alone...LOL

Kim W5TIT

2044. Re: NCI Position for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 00:36:44 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@nospam.bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <eLc2b.14463$sm2.8299@fe05.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 75555

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030824170834.07578.00000131@mb-m25.aol.com...
> In article <he82b.8370$jd.1548@fe02.atl2.webusenet.com>, "Dan Finn"
> <djfinn2@nospam.bellsouth.net> writes:
>
> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030824132852.23171.00000250@mb-m05.aol.com...
> >> In article <woV1b.8451$99.8368@fe03.atl2.webusenet.com>, "Dan Finn"
> >> <djfinn2@nospam.bellsouth.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20030823013710.15923.00000198@mb-m12.aol.com...
> >> >>
> >> >> On most modern HF transceivers, the 3rd harmonic has the
strongest
> >> >> content of RF. The 3rd harmonic of 3.5 to 4.0 MHz is 10.5 to 12
MHz
> >> >> and there aren't many "ham listening frequencies" there, are
there?
> >> >>
> >> >For most modulated sine waves, the 3rd harmonic is usually the
strongest
> >> >*harmonic* although it depends upon several factors. Generally, the
odd
> >> >harmonic components add and the negative components subtract with
> >> >modulated sine waves.
> >>
> >> Oh my, such interesting math (which wasn't shown)...:-)
> >
> >If you do not know this to be true without seeing the math worked out for
> >you, then you should not be discussing harmonics in a technical context.
>
> >Your saying so does not make your statement true. We are talking
technical
> >issues here which are a matter of common knowledge to the RF community so
> >your flames are irrelevant.
>
> >Oh God...Earth to Len....harmonics *are* phase shifted. If you reduce the
> >phase shift to zero, then you have eliminated the harmonics, stupid.
>
> I'm not sure where you get this "phase shift reduction to zero" but it
> isn't quite like that. Sigh. Read following -
>
> OK, let's get down to basics. From "Electronic Designers' Handbook,"

> by Robert W. Landee, Donovan C. Davis, Albert P. Albrecht, 1957,
> McGraw-Hill Book Co., Chapter 5, here's the instantaneous voltage
> at any point in time of an AM RF waveform:
>
> e(t) = E [1+M Cos(omega_m t)] Sin (omega_c t)
>
> Where:
>
> e(t) = instantaneous RF voltage e at time t
> t = Time position, seconds
> E = Peak voltage of unmodulated RF carrier
> omega_m = radian frequency of modulation
> = (2 pi f_m)
> f_m = Modulation frequency, Hz
> omega_c = radian frequency of RF carrier
> = (2 pi f_c)
> f_c = Carrier frequency, Hz
> M = Modulation factor, range of 0 (none) to 1 (full)
>
> That's not intuitive. By some identities and reforming the AM
equation,
> the following can be found true for a single modulation frequency:
>
> e(t) = E Sin (omega_c t) + [E M / 2]Sin[(omega_c + omega_m) t]
> + [E M / 2]Sin[(omega_c - omega_m) t]
>
> The first term on the right side is the Carrier. The second term group
> on the right is the Upper Sideband and the third term group (next
> line) is the Lower Sideband. If, through other means, the Carrier is
> suppressed and Upper Sideband is suppressed, then a "SSB"
> Lower Sideband signal is formed and it can be expressed as:
>
> e(t) = [E M / 2] Sin [(omega_c - omega_m) t]
>
> If there were two modulation tones, f_a and f_b, the Lower Sideband
> SSB equation is then:
>
> e(t) = [E M_a / 2] Sin [(omega_c - omega_a) t] +
> [E M_b / 2] Sin [(omega_c - omega_b) t] + ...
>
> where:
> M_a = modulation factor for frequency a,
> M_b = modulation factor for frequency b
> omega_a and omega_b are the radian frequencies of modulation
> frequencies f_a and f_b
>
> The above can be expanded to include any number of frequencies
> in the modulation process but they will have the most impact on
> the distortion caused to e(t) through any amplifier. That distortion
> will create the same as many modulation frequencies, all

> harmonically related in frequency and would be a form of "super
> modulation" of AM or AM on top of the SSB (AM) signal.
>
> There is NO magic cancellation of phase terms as alleged in
> such AM on top of SSB, just a lot of extra sidebands generated
> as a result of the distortion. However the distortion sidebands
> would be at much higher frequencies than the modulation
> frequencies. Those can be synthesized in seconds using a
> computer program such as WAVESPEC which I wrote in 1993
> and released as Shareware on ZDNet for PCs.
>
> Painter's "Signals, Modulation, and Noise" gives a better
> description of such AM-on-top-of-AM (or SSB) but I don't have a
> copy available right now to reference contents.
>
> Landee-Davis-Albrecht take up a whole chapter on modulation
> and the derivations to show Carrier-Upper and Lower Sideband
> terms which are Real representations of modulation products for
> AM and SSB. Distortion in a final power amplifer will result in
> AM on top of the AM/SSB signal, creating modulation products
> centered around carrier frequency multiples.
>
> The Carrier-Sideband form of AM illustrated above also contains
> a clue on how a Phasing method of SSB generation works for
> either sideband selection. Do your own math on that...it isn't
> part of this non-discussion. :-)
>
>
> >Pretty close, most of the time, dummy.
>
> No need to vomit nasty names here. I've given you an opening
> for discussion on the mathematics of modulation.
>
>
> >> That old standby tube output matching circuit, the "Pi-network" is
only
> >> good for about 18 db per octave attenuation above cutoff frequency.
> >
> >Since 3dB is half the power, you cut the power in half 6 times. 18dB is
not
> >bad over one octave.
>
> 18 db per octave is approximately the cutoff slope of a 3-section
> Butterworth-response L-C lowpass filter. Most "Pi-networks" are based
> on Butterworth-response values.
>
> >> Not
> >> all modern transceivers have such "lowpass filters" since they rely
on
> >> Class B or AB linear amplifiers with rather broadband transformers

> >> matching PA to load.
> >
> >They had better filter it so that you do not have a significant signal at
> >12MHz when transmitting in the 75 meter band.
>
> An L-C filter is not absolutely necessary. What is required basically
is
> to provide a "clean" signal prior to final power amplification. The
final
> amplifier can be improved (distortion reduced) by several methods:
> negative feedback at RF; envelope detection and feedback to the
> modulated carrier source; etc.
>
>
> >0.1mW? Hardly a significant signal.
>
> "Significant" is a highly subjective word. -10 dbm level is FAR
> higher than most received signal values whose carrier level
> ranges from -120 dbm (barely above the internal noise level) to
> -40 dbm (slammin-home signal of 2.2 mV into a 50 Ohm coax
> from antenna).
>
> -10 dbm or 0.1 mW is equal to about 71 mV in the 50 Ohm
> coax...30 db higher than -40 dbm or nearly 32 times the
> voltage.
>
> >> Feel free to do your numbers in public, senior
> >
> >That would be a rather boring and somewhar ominous excercize to do on a
> >newsgroup, dummy.
>
> American spelling is "exercise." Exercise your word power first.
>
> Is calling others "dummy" instead of showing math "more fun" for you?
>
>
> >> Let us know, please, I've not seen any of those
> >> concerning out-of-ham-band interference due to harmonic generation.
> >
> >Neither have I. Most NAL's are for in band interference, referred to as
QRM.
>
> Then they must not exist, right? :-)
>
> Is that because the FCC and ARRL signs are in opposition and
> they cancel one another out? :-)
>
> LHA

Len, this is bullcrap, and, it is boring. You have no idea to what the math really means. Sorry, but I will not continue to give you a forum just so that you can 'baffle 'em with bullshit'. That's what you are doing. I doubt that you even have a BSEE, otherwise you would not have to cite the author when explaining what is common electrical engineering text book material (that you have misinterpreted).

de KR4AJ

2045. Re: Re:Tracking NG Threads Via Google (was Good Christ Almighty)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 00:37:46 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <biblv5$27b@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75558

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:hc52b.31857$Vx2.14105586@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Signal In The Noise" <SITN@opinion.com> wrote in message
> news:Z%42b.15074$S_.4430@fed1read01...
> > Well David -- you can track NG's threads by going to URL:
> > http://groups.google.com/
> >
> > Type in the desired callsign or handle
> >
> > Get your desired information --- as early as Feb 6, 2000
> >
> > So the answer is at least 3 years !!!
> >
> > And there were 11,000 Plus posts related to this callsign !!!!!! <---
> > Exclamation Signs
> >
> >
> >
> > "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > news:3F48D913.5B3798C0@ix.netcom.com...
> > > People are STILL raising hell with Kim W5TIT about her callsign?!?!
> > >
> > > How many YEARS is this going to go on??? Jeeeezzzzussscrrrryst!
> >
> >
>
> If she had received this as a normal sequential assignment, it's doubtful
> that anyone would say much. It's just very puzzling why anyone would
> request the call sign.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

The reason I originally got it is quite different than why I keep it.

Kim W5TIT

2046. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 00:38:51 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <biblv6$27b@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75557

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB6DC067.24AC6%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > You're right, Dwight. If Riley Hollingsworth's
> > words that he spoke to many groups, many times
> > are correct, then ham radio is dead--or is dying
> > a slow death. (snip)
> >
> > (snip) It is people like Larry and his attitudes
> > that are destroying the ARS. In Larry's mind, it's
> > probably my fault because he has to be so hateful
> > toward me because of my callsign :)
>
>
> You would think these people would know better. This type of endless
> negative rhetoric from members would bring down any organization, from the
> local church group to the worse prison gang. Even if one doesn't agree
with
> that premise, most would agree it certainly doesn't help or improve
> anything. If people care about Ham Radio, they need to start speaking out
> against some of the most destructive behavior. Debate is fine, but there
is
> a huge difference between honest debate and hateful rhetoric. I think even
> Larry knows he has stepped over that line.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

I don't think Larry cares...

Kim W5TIT

2047. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 00:49:17 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030824204917.25445.00000463@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 75561

>"Bruce" (if that's what you wish to call him--I call him Creep) is classic
>riffraff, let CB alone...LOL
>
>Kim W5TIT

I call you TIT, a FAT CB PIG.

2048. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 01:00:32 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <ldd2b.2825$MS5.48148@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75562
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

<lucifer@eternal-flames.gov> wrote in message
news:rtefkv4dbcsc7fmjh88mps5uf3pddctm68@4ax.com...
> On 23 Aug 2003 10:23:35 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) pausing to
> cast envious glances at those who had mastered the skill of reading
> without moving their lips, wrote:
>
> >Dan, as I recall, Nixon didn't open up Vietnam, and Clinton didn't
> >open up Somalia. I don't think Kissinger had much to do with either.
> >But he did figure out how to get OPEC organized, have an oil embargo,
> >then jack up the price of oil so they could buy US armaments.
>
> No. In Vietnam it was the lily-livered liberals in the Johnson
> administration who who more concerned with the views of the campus
> pinko's, than with doing what needed to be done.
>
> So you had a typical half-assed attempt at beating VC, instead of
> turning the whole place into a scrapyard.
> Old Nick
>
So Gen Macarthy had the right idea, Nuke the N. Koreans in 1951,
win the Korean war (sorry UN policing action). no domino effect.
Then there wouldn't of been a Vietnam, probably still be occupied by the French
?!

Steve Terry

2049. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 01:55:48 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0308241755.50631b1d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75563
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote in message
news:<20030824105424.253$u4@newsreader.com>...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F46C557.6080301@adelphia.net...
> > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > > > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
> > > >
> > > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > >> news:JLy1b.1672$O03.1295@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > >>
> > > >>>
> > > >>> QRZ ??? who was the little twit there ??? QRZ ???
> > > >>
> > > >> I don't pay much attention to anybody who claims to be a ham but
> > > >> won't show a callsign. They're almost always anti-ham trolls.
> > > >>
> > > >> Charles, N5PVL
> > > >>
> > > >
> > > > Why do you cross post your drivel to rec.radio.cb then, brainiak?
> > > >
> > > Because the original message was there and in rrap, and I was
> > > responding to a person tha tI think posted from there.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >
> >
> > Don't worry about Moparholic. This is his usual troll. Tries to stir
> > it up, then bitches because its cross posted. He probably cross posted
> > it anyway.
> >
> > It don't mean nothin man.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> I'm starting to hear W4NTI on the freeband.

well it is no different than john boy running around calling himself
ve1jot...i don't understand how some dude that lives in colorado goes
around calling himself a canadian hamster.....i guess it is a
attempt by some old agitator wantabee to try and shake the dogs of
war, but as is usually the case.....these types of blowhards

always make a mistake and it can be safely said that both , danny boy and johnny boy are two peas in the same pod so to speak.....long on the mouth and short on the ass..... .....doncha know.....

2050. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 01:57:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308241757.6aca9b82@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75564

"Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<6a3b9f5f99a0c4251172ab4c22749681.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > If you are not a registered voter in California, then you have no cause to
> > carry on as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on
> > California politics.
> >
>
> That sword cuts in both directions, sir.

> de Hans, K0HB

Hansl, you almost got it. Len -was- using the back of the blade.

2051. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 02:04:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308241804.1eafeecc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75565

dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308241214.5f31dc94@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308230933.6ad1de2f@posting.google.com>...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<8fw1b.29885$Vx2.13538140@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > > news:KIu1b.1920$6e5.108499@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > > >
> > > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > > > news:c2356669.0308221028.605a3cbf@posting.google.com...
> > > > > "Proficiency" starts at 10 wpm.
> > > >
> > > > That's absurd ... proficiency is a relative term that must be quantified.
> > > > One can be proficient at a variety of levels in any activity requiring
> > > > some sort of acquired skill.
> > > >
> > >
> > > We might consider the arguments presented in the book "The Art and Skill of
> > > Radiotelegraphy".
> >
> > Why?
> >
> > The author had done extensive study on Morse code
> > > teaching methods, learning abilities, etc.
> >
> > Cool. Who is the author, what is his callsign? And what is the
> > copyright date?
> >
> > I'll bet he wrote it long after the code began to wane in any (every)
> > radio service.
>
>
>
> There gpes the Brain child on another erroneous tangent. Only in the
> ham shacks of NCI members has use of code began to wane within ham
> radio. If he'd bother himself to actually check what'seing done *on
> the air* he'd soon find that the use of Morse has grown within the
> ARS,not waned. All this in spite of the hearfelt wishes and strenuous
> actions of him and the likeminded.
>
> "None so blind as those who won't see!"

Poor DICK. Believes his own BS.

2052. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 02:12:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308241812.2572c329@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75566

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<M542b.31766$Vx2.14083542@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0308240520.3b903c24@posting.google.com...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:<vnW1b.31341$Vx2.13957154@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > news:f45722ac.0308230933.6ad1de2f@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:<8fw1b.29885$Vx2.13538140@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:KIu1b.1920$6e5.108499@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:c2356669.0308221028.605a3cbf@posting.google.com...
> > > > > > > "Proficiency" starts at 10 wpm.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > That's absurd ... proficiency is a relative term that must be
> quantified.
> > > > > > One can be proficient at a variety of levels in any activity
> requiring
> > > > > > some sort of acquired skill.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > We might consider the arguments presented in the book "The Art and
> Skill
> of
> > > > > Radiotelegraphy".
> > > > >
> > > > Why?
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > Re-read the following sentence as it states why.
> > >
> > > The author had done extensive study on Morse code
> > > > teaching methods, learning abilities, etc.
> > > >
> > > Cool. Who is the author, what is his callsign? And what is the
> > > copyright date?
> > > >
> > >
> > Since I've given the title of the book, surely you can do the research
> > yourself for that data. Hint, it's available as a free download off the
> > internet so you can find it with any search engine. However the fourth

> > > edition is copyrighted 2003 and is by William G. Pierpont, N0HFF.
> > >
> > > > I'll bet he wrote it long after the code began to wane in any (every)
> > > > radio service.
> > > >
> > > > His definition of proficiency is
> > > > > along the lines of what level must a person obtain to prevent
> forgetting
> it.
> > > > > Basically his research showed that those who achieved 13wpm did not
> forget
> > > > > the code even if they did not use it. They would get "rusty" so to
> speak
> > > > > and their speed would fall off if they did not use it but they would
> not
> > > > > forget it. Once they resumed using it, their speed would fairly
> quickly
> > > > > climb back to their previous level. That would seem like a
> reasonable
> > > > > definition.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > > >
> > > > Dee, you might want to suggest this as the definition of "Morse
> > > > Proficiency" to the FCC.
> > > >
> > >
> > > The FCC can define it anyway they like for their regulatory activities.
> The
> > > author's definition is one that works in the real world, i.e. the point
> at
> > > which the person is at little risk of forgetting the training.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> > Dee, wow, that's great. I love these little trips down memory lane.
> > And to hell with the FCC and their role in regulating amateur radio.
>
> You are misconstruing what I said. My objective was to demonstrate that
> there has been some research that would allow a rational definition of the
> word "proficient" in terms of actually using Morse code. It was not to
> encourage people to ignore the FCC and their role.

Wow, modern day research on Morse Code. Sounds like the ARRL's
research on the 5MHz band.

> > They don't define Morse Code but should, they don't define WPM rate
> > but should, then they require a pass/fail Morse Exam that excludes
> > otherwise qualified citizens from access to HF radio. And the VEC's
> > substitute a Farnsworth Exam where Morse is specified.
> >

>
> The exam does not exclude anyone who cares to make the effort to learn.

Is that your final answer?

And
> Farnsworth IS Morse since it relates a letter directly to a sound without
> counting dots and dashes.

If Farnsworth were Morse Code, it wouldn't be for that reason.

Farnsworth is a method of teaching and learning
> Morse that actually helps a person to reach a useable level of ability.
> Methods that allow the student to count the dots and dashes (i.e. slow
> letters) or use "sound alikes" or visual pictures all lead to limiting the
> student to a low level of achievement. The student must then struggle to
> break the resulting barrier (usually occuring at about the 10wpm level)
> often having to "start over" at a higher character speed to do so.

But the FCC doesn't address learning code. They address examining the
code. And they specify "Morse Code at 5 WPM," not Farnsworth Code at
13-15 WPM.

> "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy" has a very thorough discussion of why
> barriers sometimes occur at certain speeds. The book is geared towards
> those who want to use the mode rather than those whose goal is passing the
> test.

I'm sure it is.

> > Letting the FCC define something "any way they" want is a recipe for
> > disaster.
>
> Again you miscontrued what I wrote. I did not say they should be allowed to
> define something anyway they want. I said they had the ability to define it
> the way they want. There is a tremendous difference between the two.

Who are we kidding? They've had over 90 years to define it.

> Let me state clearly that I was not trying to define what the regulation
> should be. I was pointing out a possible basis for hams themselves to use
> as a mimimum proficiency level.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Why? It just feeds the code bigots.

2053. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 02:20:59 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308241820.5d9126b5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75567

"Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½"
<Grï¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de> wrote in message
news:<vL92b.1982$Jh2.1940@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:6a3b9f5f99a0c4251172ab4c22749681.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> : "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
> :
> : >
> : > If you are not a registered voter in California, then you have no
> cause to
> : > carry on as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on
> : > California politics.
> : >
> :
> : That sword cuts in both directions, sir.
> :
> : If you are not a registered voter in California (licensed operator
> : in the Amateur Radio Service), then you have no cause to carry on
> : as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on California
> : politics (Amateur Radio Service policy).
> :
> : With all kind wishes,
> :
> : de Hans, K0HB
> :
>
> Hansl,
>
> You doesn't has to call him "sir".
>

In fact there's a very strong case to be made that doing so is a gross
injustice to the real Sirs of the world!

2054. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 02:22:18 UTC
From: gw@webhideout.com
Message-ID: <235a74db.0308241822.32b6e4cf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75568
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"SD Special Delivery Jones" <specialdelivery@c.com> wrote in message
news:<cK-cnQX7habondSiXTWJig@comcast.com>...
> "gw" <gw@webhideout.com> wrote in message
> news:235a74db.0308240956.491c5d6c@posting.google.com...
> > JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:<3F4770A6.5030604@mailcity.moc>...
> > > gw wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > whew!!!! another fink........man that makes me have this incredible
> > > > compunction to go take a test ....
> > >
> > > Don't bother, you couldn't pass it, "doncha know". What a turd.
> >
> > well anyone can obviously go further than you.......i mean......how
> > come you never went for your general class ham license ......aren't
> > there any general class guys that sit in as ve's for you to take the
> > test in beautiful colorado springs john boy?????
>
>
> gw,curiousdan,pinhead,icecoldbeer etc etc, you sure are stuoid JJ is an
> advanced class which is higher than general, now go wash off, you stink

well comcast creep my name is gw, gw beckwith sir and i do not know
those other fine gentlemen but i do appreciate your help on the
matter......a advanced class turd, if you will,....... living in
colorado springs ....that should narrow down the pool of likely
candidates for one bodacious, first class phone phucking......doncha
know...

2055. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 02:59:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030824225926.00734.00000489@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 75570

>Like the time you took an exam on a lark.
>

That still bothers you, that I could do that. And after all this time with Free Handout Licenses, you still cant pass it. Dont feel bad your NCI Leader Karl only took a Year to pass it. And of course he will not tell how many times he Flunked it.

2056. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 03:01:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030824230105.08626.00000152@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 75572

In article <3F48DC88.28785233@ix.netcom.com>, David Stinson
<arc5@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>50 watts of broadband noise generator plugged into the nearest socket
>would do. Note that I would never advocate anything illegal.....
>D.S.

David:

Nevertheless, that's precisely what you have just done! Worse than that,
you've left a permanent record of this offense on the internet! I think you'd
better get an extra-thick rug and start praying that nobody actually does
what you said if BPL does come into existence. Do you have any idea
how many lawyers the big electric utilities can afford to get on your case?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2057. "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 03:01:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030824230106.08626.00000153@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 75571

In article <biblv0$27b@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> Kim:
>>
>> Mr. Riley Hollingsworth seems to disagree with you. Have you forgotten
>> that he said that your call sign has the potential to take the ARS
>> "...one step closer to extinction"?
>>
>
>Riley would never have done such a thing, Larry. His message was speaking
>in generality. So, no, he never directly said that about my callsign. As
>usual, you translated something to a way you wanted it.

Kim:

I "translated" the words of Mr. Hollingsworth? Hmmm, let's examine
that concept. I know that this breaks long-standing Usenet/rrap tradition,
but here's the quote:

.....Quoted message begins.....
In article <59B7203A07395FF0.50F2CC864D4ED7FE.54A4CB093D32584C@lp.airnews.net>,
"Kim W5TIT" <kw5tit@hotmail.com> writes:

>Probably more a thoughtful wish of the prefix I wish I'd been able to get.
>Speaking of callsigns, here's Riley's response after I wrote and told him I
>was sorry for bothering him, since the FCC had already spoken on callsigns
>at the Dayton Hamfest (the rest of the email is also with it):
>
>While that's true, just because a person has a right to do something doesn't
>mean it's right to do it on every occasion. While the call sign may fit the
>constitution, for every instance where a parent or uncle or grandparent
>doesn't want a young person to get involved in Ham Radio because of
>something they hear on the bands, then you have taken the ARS one step
>closer to extinction. Then we can sit around and debate what happened to
>all those Amateur frequencies that industry bought at auction---debating, of
>course, on the internet and cellular because that'll be all we have left.
>The first amendment will still be alive and well, just as it is now, tho, if
>that's any consolation.

.....Quoted message ends.....

OK, Kim, did you find the part about taking the ARS "...one step closer
to extinction," or not? If not, which part did I "translate" into that exact
language?

>> > It is people like Larry and his attitudes that are
>> >destroying the ARS.

Don't look now, Kim, but I've never been admonished by Riley
Hollingsworth about doing something which could potentially cause
prospective hams to decide to go fishing instead.

>> I don't see how that's possible, Kim. After all, I'm not the one who
>> is sporting a callsign which is shamefully demeaning to women in
>> general, and YL hams in particular. However, you are -- and even
>> Riley Hollingsworth has said so, and I can't think of anyone who is
>> more qualified to make that judgment than he is!

>If you truly believe that about my callsign, Larry--and I don't believe you
>do, then you are destroying it as much as anyone else.

I do believe that, Kim, but I fail to find any logic in your statement above.
However, that's just you being you.

>> >In Larry's mind, it's probably my fault because he has
>> >to be so hateful toward me because of my callsign :)
>>
>> It's not hate, Kim. It's concern. Concern for the negative image of
>> the ARS that you are projecting through the selection of your
>> callsign, which places amateur radio operators, and particularly YL
>> hams, in a negative light. If anyone is being "hateful," it is you --
>> and you are showing this hate toward your fellow hams by demonstrating
>> a blatant lack of respect for the image of the service.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>IF for one minute you are concerned about negative images for the ARS, then
>you would shut up, Larry.

What am *I* doing to give the ARS a negative image, Kim? My on-the-air
operating is the only thing that matters regarding my "image" as a ham, and
I've never had any complaints. However, Riley Hollingsworth has made it
quite clear that *you* and *your* callsign are definitely a problem. In fact,
a big enough problem to cause him to take the time to compose his
reply to your E-mail. That speaks volumes.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2058. Re: Tracking NG Threads Via Google (was Good Christ Almighty)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 03:06:39 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F497D3E.6010100@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75573

Dee D. Flint wrote:

>If she had received this as a normal sequential assignment, it's doubtful
>that anyone would say much. It's just very puzzling why anyone would
>request the call sign.
>
>
She may be a birdwatcher. Tits are a kind of small bird. If you're
thinking of
something else, well..... ;-)

2059. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 03:07:16 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@nospam.bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <WYe2b.14898$sm2.4215@fe05.atl2.webusenet.com>
Source record: 75574

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F48D913.5B3798C0@ix.netcom.com...
> People are STILL raising hell with Kim W5TIT about her callsign?!?!
>
> How many YEARS is this going to go on??? Jeeeezzzzussscrrrryst!

I think it's hard to keep a-breast of the situation.

de KR4AJ

2060. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 04:21:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6F0767.24B8D%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75575

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> OK, Kim, did you find the part about taking
> the ARS "...one step closer to extinction,"
> or not? If not, which part did I "translate"
> into that exact language?
>
> Don't look now, Kim, but I've never been
> admonished by Riley Hollingsworth about doing
> something which could potentially cause
> prospective hams to decide to go fishing
> instead.

Larry, I seriously doubt Hollingsworth would have said anything if he had known his words would be used as a basis for your harassment of Kim over this subject for several years.

You've never been admonished by Hollingsworth simply because you've never had the guts to tell him what you're doing. So, since Kim was willing to contact Hollingsworth over the choice of her callsign (her behavior), why don't you contact Hollingsworth to ask if he feels your behavior (your use of his words to publicly harass Kim for all this time) has any effect on Ham Radio?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2061. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 04:24:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6F0846.24B8F%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75576

"WA8ULX" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote...
>>
>> Perhaps your messages in the CB newsgroup offer a
>> hint - you're really a CB'er with some type of grudge
>> against Ham Radio operators.
>
>
> Your so full of it, produce the message, (snip)

What message? Obviously, you can't read any better than you can write. I mentioned your messages (plural) in the CB newsgroup, not a specific message.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2062. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 04:29:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6F0960.24B91%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75577

"Brian" wrote:

> Bruce is classic CB riffraff, and is the
> R.R.A.P. posterboy for the Morse Myth that
> the Morse Exam keeps riffraff out of the
> Amateur Radio Service.

Ironic, isn't it? Code didn't keep him out, certainly dispelling that
myth.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2063. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 04:47:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6F0DA3.24B93%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75578

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>> Code testing serves no real purpose today,
>
> Prove itï¿½

Prove it does, Larry. Prove code testing serves a purpose today worthy of a specific government requirement above and beyond all other operating modes. The trends are moving towards the elimination of code testing. If you have a good reason to change that, now is certainly the time to speak up. Nothing you've said so far has been able to change those trends. Endlessly repeating what you've already said hasn't either. So, perhaps you should think of something new to say.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2064. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 04:51:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030825005120.29543.00000513@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 75579

> What message? Obviously, you can't read any better than you can write. I
>mentioned your messages (plural) in the CB newsgroup, not a specific
>message.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

Well than CBplusser produce the PLURAL MESSAGES

2065. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 04:51:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6F0E92.24B95%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75580

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:

> heh heh, David. It's hilarious, ain't it?

Hey, just look at all the free publicity you've gotten from that callsign.
If this keeps up, you'll be famous by the time Larry is finished pointing
out your callsign to everyone.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2066. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 05:02:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6F110D.24B97%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75581

"Len Over 21" wrote:

> Go bitch about something non-amateur elsewhere...

After all the ranting you did in that message, you have the nerve to tell others to go elsewhere? Don't hold your breath. Political discussions are almost a tradition in this newsgroup, and your rants (about the "bigotry of easterners" and so on) certainly isn't going to change that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2067. Re: Tracking NG Threads Via Google (was Good Christ Almighty)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 05:39:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB6F19B1.24B99%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75582

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> If she had received this as a normal sequential
> assignment, it's doubtful that anyone would say
> much. It's just very puzzling why anyone would
> request the call sign.

I can offer a few ideas why she might request it. Years ago (the 60's), part of the women's movement involved the idea that breasts were nothing to be ashamed of - women had them and men had to accept that fact (as many men from that time may fondly remember, this eventually led to women burning their bras).

Later, the women's movement urged women to accept their own bodies as uniquely theirs without placing some type of negative connotation on that. This had to do with the idea that a woman is no less important simply because her body is different than a man's.

Still later, all this evolved into the idea that breasts were a sign of power equal the a man's penis (the phrase "breast power," an alternative to "women's power," came out of that). This had to do with the psychology thinking of the time which said many supposedly male things (guns, missiles, and so on) were actually phallic symbols.

In the end, it may simply be that Kim likes how her callsign sounds.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2068. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 06:34:07 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bid1gl$83013$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75588

> Actually, Riley has stated that not following a local gentleman's
> agreement band plan was poor amateur practice and is enforceable. So
> items not specifically spelled out in the regulations may be
> enforceable depending who's at the FCC on any particular day.

The problem is "WHO'S" gentlemen's band plan?? The Anti Radio Relay
League???

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2069. Re: Whats up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 06:38:05 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bid1gm$83013$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75589

Whatsamatta Dan? Newsgroup server burping again?? :) Happens here once in
a while too....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:yxR0b.3232$sV.1949@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Can anyone see this?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

2070. More countries

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 06:59:39 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93E21E571CF8Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 75583

Switzerland, the UK, Belgium, Germany and Norway have now abolished the code test, and the Netherlands will follow shortly on September 1st. New Zealand have said they will abolish the code test later this year.

2071. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 07:30:47 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <HWi2b.8547$jY2.8275@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75584

David Stinson wrote:

> People are STILL raising hell with Kim W5TIT about her callsign?!?!
>
> How many YEARS is this going to go on??? Jeeeezzzzussscrrrryst!

W5TIT: It's real, and it's spectacular. ($1 to Teri Hatcher)

--

It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

"I think all foreigners should stop interfering in the internal affairs
of Iraq." --Paul Wolfowitz

2072. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 10:53:54 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308250253.2fb10e3d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75585
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<TIb2b.112514$0v4.8012383@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:xD82b.111594$9w.12100@news02.roc.ny...
> > David,
> >
> > Looks like I'm going to have to research some nice linear as well as a
> > decent HF station. I had been looking at a vertical to avoid all of the
> > horizontal lines in the neighborhood, but, on second thought ... 1500
> watts
> > horizontally polarized, 50 feet from the power lines might prove
> interesting
> > :)
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
> > ps - we need a study as to where the biggest ingress will occur :)
> >
> >
>
> Hmmm. I can't imagine any way Ham radio interference would do any good,
> even if legal. Interference might not have effect it at all. Or it might
> cause a slowdown the BPL user would attribute to internet congestion. If
> the BPL user believes interference is casuing a problem with his gee-whiz
> powerline internet access, he's gonna squak to the power company and maybe
> the FCC. Face it, radio hobbyists are in no position for poor public
> relations. There are more people who will be attracted to the bright, shiny
> promise of BPL than there are radio hobbyists. Considering the numbers,
> would it be unlikely for the FCC to redefine the interference limits?
>
> I'd be curious to know how vunerable BPL is to interference. I have no
> doubt the BPL people have run tests, and I'm a little surprised they're not
> at the front of a webpage somewhere.

No sir, the BPL clods have *not* done much if any interfernce testing
wherein lies the underlying reason for whole uproar and is the reason
you can't find info on their "tests" online. It's all explained in
depth and well documented in the ARRL website.

> Ham radio may not have alot of effect.
> The power lines will only absorb a fraction of what's transmitted, and will
> probably re-radiate most of that. I would think interference from devices
> plugged directly into the lines would have the most effect. Like spikey old
> universal motors and cheap switchmode power supplies.

>
> Politically, it's far better if damaging interference comes from everyday
> objects around the home. Like the vacuum cleaner, the microwave oven, the
> kid's computer, etc.
>
> And nothing will help as much as bringing new people into the radio hobby.

By the time that might happen BPL will either have taken over the HF
spectrum or been forgotten as another idiotic and failed dotcom
maneuver.

Far beyond the question of hams interfering with BPL comes the much
more important question of BPL interfering with the long list of
licensed incumbent HF users. Within that group radio hobbyists are
basically bit players. Smart and noisy bit players but nonetheless bit
players. Other users are *not* bit players and them's the folks who I
expect will quietly and decisively torpedo BPL.

>
> Frank Dresser

w3rv

2073. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 11:08:14 UTC
From: Dave Hall <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net>
Message-ID: <3F49EE1E.21C0@worldlynx.net>
Source record: 75586
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> "Ronny" <Y432@cbronnieincorg.net> wrote in message
> news:bi6ib1$70h$0@pita.alt.net...
> > x-no-archive: yes
> > "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> > news:28313-3F46ABFC-44@storefull-2312.public.lawson.webtv.net...
> > > >Not up to us 'old white men' to handle you and
> > > >your problem.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > You're right,,,you're too busy looking for a life.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > >I just forwarded your initial
> > >
> > > >message to the FCC. I hope they find it
> > >
> > > >interesting.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Forward mine, Dan. I freeband AND DX on eleven meter all the time.
> > > Riley has been hounded by so many of you clowns forwarding usenet posts
> > > to him that you've made the genuine complaints concerning actual harm
> > > and behavior so much harder to follow up. It's amazing one can live to
> > > be as "old" as you and learn so little
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > >Don't like that?
> > >
> > >
> > > You're years late and hundereds of complaints to short.
> > >
> > > > Too bad.
> > >
> > >
> > > LOL.....you have issues. I also do 60 in a 55 at times. Hey
> > > Dan,,,forward that to the Highway Patrol,
> > >

> > >
> > >
> > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
> Sorry Ronny, you are confused. I never said I was sending it to Riley.
>
> I said I was sending it to the FCC.
>
> Oh and BTW you don't think enforcement cares or can catch anyone of you
> packet racket fools? Ask the guy in Miami how much his equipment cost that
> was taken by the Federal Marshalls a few years back.
>
> Caught up to him right in the middle of that packet burst to the Frency BBS.
>
> You people are idiots. Why don't you just get your 'hammie' license and do
> it legal? Miss the thrill of never knowing when there will be a knock on
> the door?
>
> Im right...you people are IDIOTS.
>

No, Dan, they're not idiots. An idiot would never be able to put it all together and make it work. What they are are sociopaths. People who break laws for the fun if it. Sort of like extreme sports. The thrill of "getting away with it", and the rush of living on the edge is what fuels the excitement. Why else would someone build a 20 KW mobile radio station? An idiot couldn't pull it off. But someone has to seriously question the motives of those who do.

Getting a ham license would take all of that away. Most of these same people proclaim just how easy it is to get a ham license, yet they also claim that they have no desire to do it. Further proof that they enjoy operating illegally, and showing that they also have an alarming paranoia about the loss of their anonymity, which having a legal call sign would bring.

Dave
"Sandbagger"

2074. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 12:52:09 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030825085209.22043.00000395@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 75587

>Bruce, I've read your postings here year in and year out. There's no
>way you could get 100% on any amateur exam, even with studying. You
>can barely spell your own name.
>
>So, no, you couldn't do that.
>

Still bugs you, I could misspell all these words, score 100%, collect 250 dollars, and your still are not able to pass it. Maybe CW wasnt your weak point, maybe your still waiting for another FREE Handout

2075. Re: Whats up

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 13:25:00 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030825092500.442$Sy@newsreader.com>
Source record: 75590

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> Can anyone see this?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
No.

--
GO #40

2076. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 15:21:25 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0308250721.1dad52cd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75591
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote

>
> And what would happen if a thousand breakers tripped and the lights go out
> again? Is the conducted RF going to pass through the 'ether' ?
>

Uh, don't look now but if "a thousand breakers tripped" the steenking computers won't power up anyhow and it's a moot point.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2077. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 15:26:48 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0308250726.9d7bfba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75592
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote

>
> Or how about some high intensity E-skip.
>

BPL works on conducted signals, not radiated signals. The power grid
is an incredibly poor receiving antenna, so any microvolt-level or
even millivolt-level signal from "out there" won't even show up on the
copper.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
"Reality doesn't care what you believe." -- K0HB

2078. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 16:40:54 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <q_q2b.113965$3o3.7995121@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 75593
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308250253.2fb10e3d@posting.google.com...
> >
> > I'd be curious to know how vunerable BPL is to interference. I have no
> > doubt the BPL people have run tests, and I'm a little surprised they're
not
> > at the front of a webpage somewhere.
>
> No sir, the BPL clods have *not* done much if any interfernce testing
> wherein lies the underlying reason for whole uproar and is the reason
> you can't find info on their "tests" online. It's all explained in
> depth and well documented in the ARRL website.
>
>

When I wrote "vunerable BPL is to interference", I meant how outside sources of interference would effect the performance of BPL. Sorry if I wasn't clear. I still have no doubt the BPL people would test for things like that. I wouldn't expect them to care much about interference, as long as they can fit it into some interpretation of Part 15 regs. Or if they can get the Part 15 regs changed. Or if they don't get caught violating the Part 15 regs. I was wondering if there's any test results explaining how marvelously robust this BPL system is going to be.

If you know where this is all explained in depth and well documented, please point me in that direction.

> >
> > And nothing will help as much as bringing new people into the radio
hobby.
>
> By the time that might happen BPL will either have taken over the HF
> spectrum or been forgotten as another idiotic and failed dotcom
> maneuver.
>

BPL might very well fail. Or it might hang on in a few communities. I have no idea. I'm sure, now that crackpot powerline schemes are here, they will never really go away.

> Far beyond the question of hams interfering with BPL comes the much
> more important question of BPL interfering with the long list of
> licensed incumbent HF users. Within that group radio hobbyists are
> basically bit players. Smart and noisy bit players but nonetheless bit
> players. Other users are *not* bit players and them's the folks who I

> expect will quietly and decisively torpedo BPL.
>
>
> w3rv

Maybe, but much of the utility SW use has gone to sattelites. The bands are far quiter now than they were 30 years ago. Of course, I've got my own crackpot idea. The SW spectrum should be run rather like the way we run the National Parks. Everyone is free to use SW radio, as long as they act in a responsible manner.

If only Boy Scouts could go to Yellowstone, only Boy Scouts would care about Yellowstone.

Frank Dresser

2079. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 20:49:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <9Du2b.12405$8i2.10438@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75594
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Steve Terry" <g4wwk@despammed.com> wrote in message
news:ldd2b.2825$MS5.48148@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net...
> <lucifer@eternal-flames.gov> wrote in message
> news:rtefkv4dbcsc7fmjh88mps5uf3pddctm68@4ax.com...
> > On 23 Aug 2003 10:23:35 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) pausing to
> > cast envious glances at those who had mastered the skill of reading
> > without moving their lips, wrote:
> >
> > >Dan, as I recall, Nixon didn't open up Vietnam, and Clinton didn't
> > >open up Somalia. I don't think Kissinger had much to do with either.
> > >But he did figure out how to get OPEC organized, have an oil embargo,
> > >then jack up the price of oil so they could buy US armaments.
> >
> > No. In Vietnam it was the lily-livered liberals in the Johnson
> > administration who who more concerned with the views of the campus
> > pinko's, than with doing what needed to be done.
> >
> > So you had a typical half-assed attempt at beating VC, instead of
> > turning the whole place into a scrapyard.
> > Old Nick
> >
> So Gen Macarthy had the right idea, Nuke the N. Koreans in 1951,
> win the Korean war (sorry UN policing action). no domino effect.
> Then there wouldn't of been a Vietnam, probably still be occupied by the
French
> ?!
>
> Steve Terry
>
>
>
That is General MacArthur. No, I don't think nuking the Chinks would have
been a good idea...right then. Because we didn't have a tactical jobbers.
And the collateral damage would have been too intense. Later on a couple
well placed 5 kiloton jobbers would have cleaned out a few of em.

We never intended to WIN the Korean war. Out mandate from the UN was to
push the North and later the CHINKS back to their own playpens. We did
this.

As for No VN if the Korean War was won. I disagree also. You see the Frogs
were put back into 'Indo China' at the end of WW2. Because this country
needed their support in the UN against the flowering Communist block. Of
course that made little sense since the ww2 underground of Frogland was

Communist. Whatever.

So the Frogs went back into 'Indo China'. Attempted to re-establish their little rubber empire and pissed of Uncle Ho to the max. Uncle Ho asked the US for help. We told him to piss up a rope. And rest is history as they say.

The Frogs would have got their butts kicked out of there whether we helped them or not. VN was not winnable no matter who or what did what to whom.

Dan/W4NTI

2080. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 20:54:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <VHu2b.12406$8i2.9944@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75595
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F493770.3030404@adelphia.net...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F48EFDE.2050204@adelphia.net...
> >
> >>Have any of these Genii given any though of what would happen to bpl
> >>during solar event?
> >>
> >>Maybe the FCC can serve an enforcement letter to the sun! 8^)
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >
> >
> > > Or how about some high intensity E-skip. 70 over 9 broadband crap
> > > inputing someone elses system. Gotta be fun.
> > >
> > > Of course they didn't think it out. If they did it would never have
made it
> > > to this stage.
>
> BINGO!
>
> The reason that lights and motors work well enough is that they aren't
> affected by the junk that gets impressed on the power lines.
>
> And finally, just finally, I wonder exactly HOW the power companies are
> going to respond to the problems of their OWN RFI generation?
>
> Lessee, lets look at the enforcement letters from the FCC. Many of them
> are to power providers because of equipment that is interfering with
> some ham somewhere. It has to get to the enforcement stage, for crying
> out loud. So are the Power companies going to replace all those
> transfprmers and other power line junk that is spewing out RFI for the
> BPL'ers?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

The power companies are not going to do a damn thing that will cost them
money. I have been fighting with ALA Power for 5 years and still don't have
it ALL gone.

All these complaint letters began with me, BTW. I got the ARRL and Riley involved and they jumped on the bandwagon. But it STILL isn't fixed.

So when they put BPL into this mess there own RFI will trash their new found toy. Can't wait. Gess its gonna be like a snake eating its own tail.

And with their track record it will be fun to watch...As they destroy HF in the process.

Dan/W4NTI

2081. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 21:10:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <VWu2b.12411$8i2.6453@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75596
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"gw" <gw@webhideout.com> wrote in message
news:235a74db.0308241755.50631b1d@posting.google.com...
> Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote in message
news:<20030824105424.253$u4@newsreader.com>...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> > > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3F46C557.6080301@adelphia.net...
> > > > Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > > > > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > >> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
message
> > > > >> news:JLy1b.1672$O03.1295@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > >>
> > > > >>>
> > > > >>> QRZ ??? who was the little twit there ??? QRZ ???
> > > > >>
> > > > >> I don't pay much attention to anybody who claims to be a ham but
> > > > >> won't show a callsign. They're almost always anti-ham trolls.
> > > > >>
> > > > >> Charles, N5PVL
> > > > >>
> > > > >
> > > > > Why do you cross post your drivel to rec.radio.cb then, brainiak?
> > > > >
> > > > Because the original message was there and in rrap, and I was
> > > > responding to a person tha tI think posted from there.
> > > >
> > > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > > >
> > >
> > > Don't worry about Moparholic. This is his usual troll. Tries to
stir
> > > it up, then bitches because its cross posted. He probably cross
posted
> > > it anyway.
> > >
> > > It don't mean nothin man.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > I'm starting to hear W4NTI on the freeband.
>
```

> well it is no different than john boy running around calling himself
> ve1jot...i don't understand how some dude that lives in colorado goes
> around calling himself a canadian hamster..........i guess it is a
> attempt by some old agitator wantabee to try and shake the dogs of
> war, but as is usually the case.........these types of blowhards
> always make a mistake and it can be safely said that both , danny boy
> and johnny boy are two peas in the same pod so to speak........long on
> the mouth and short on the ass..... ......doncha know.......

Who the hell is 'johnny boy' and what makes you think the real W4NTI gives a rats ass about the 'freeband' ?, whatever that is.

Dan/W4NTI

2082. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 21:13:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <NZu2b.12413$8i2.7151@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75597
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"Dave Hall" <nojunk_n3cvj@worldlynx.net> wrote in message
news:3F49EE1E.21C0@worldlynx.net...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > "Ronny" <Y432@cbronnieincorg.net> wrote in message
> > news:bi6ib1$70h$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > x-no-archive: yes
> > > "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> > > news:28313-3F46ABFC-44@storefull-2312.public.lawson.webtv.net...
> > > > >Not up to us 'old white men' to handle you and
> > > > >your problem.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > You're right,,,you're too busy looking for a life.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > >I just forwarded your initial
> > > >
> > > > >message to the FCC. I hope they find it
> > > >
> > > > >interesting.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Forward mine, Dan. I freeband AND DX on eleven meter all the time.
> > > > Riley has been hounded by so many of you clowns forwarding usenet
posts
> > > > to him that you've made the genuine complaints concerning actual
harm
> > > > and behavior so much harder to follow up. It's amazing one can live
to
> > > > be as "old" as you and learn so little
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > >Don't like that?
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > You're years late and hundereds of complaints to short.
> > > >
> > > > > Too bad.
```

> > > >
> > > >
> > > > LOL.....you have issues. I also do 60 in a 55 at times. Hey
> > > > Dan,,,forward that to the Highway Patrol,
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > >Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > Sorry Ronny, you are confused. I never said I was sending it to
Riley.
> >
> > I said I was sending it to the FCC.
> >
> > Oh and BTW you don't think enforcement cares or can catch anyone of you
> > packet racket fools? Ask the guy in Miami how much his equipment cost
that
> > was taken by the Federal Marshalls a few years back.
> >
> > Caught up to him right in the middle of that packet burst to the Frency
BBS.
> >
> > You people are idiots. Why don't you just get your 'hammie' license and
do
> > it legal? Miss the thrill of never knowing when there will be a knock
on
> > the door?
> >
> > Im right...you people are IDIOTS.
> >
>
>
> No, Dan, they're not idiots. An idiot would never be able to put it all
> together and make it work. What they are are sociopaths. People who
> break laws for the fun if it. Sort of like extreme sports. The thrill of
> "getting away with it", and the rush of living on the edge is what fuels
> the excitement. Why else would someone build a 20 KW mobile radio
> station? An idiot couldn't pull it off. But someone has to seriously
> question the motives of those who do.
>
> Getting a ham license would take all of that away. Most of these same
> people proclaim just how easy it is to get a ham license, yet they also
> claim that they have no desire to do it. Further proof that they enjoy
> operating illegally, and showing that they also have an alarming
> paranoia about the loss of their anonymity, which having a legal call
> sign would bring.

>
> Dave
> "Sandbagger"
>
>

I hadn't thought of it that way Dave. But I believe you have hit on it.
Thanks.

Dan/W4NTI

2083. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 21:41:00 UTC
From: Reg Edwards <g4fgq.regp@btinternet.com>
Message-ID: <bidvpc$9au$1@titan.btinternet.com>
Source record: 75598
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

VN was not winnable no matter who or what did what to whom.
>
==========

Is Iraq ?

2084. If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 21:43:24 UTC
From: Disgusted <Noooo@eeee.maillll>
Message-ID: <vkl0nsoogac3c7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 75599
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the SHIT out of them!

2085. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 21:45:36 UTC
From: Reg Edwards <g4fgq.regp@btinternet.com>
Message-ID: <bie020$9qe$1@titan.btinternet.com>
Source record: 75600
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

VN was not winnable no matter who or what did what to whom.
>
==========

The Vietnamese didn't think so.

2086. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 21:50:42 UTC
From: j999w@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030825175042.06619.00000800@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 75451
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Why?

jw
wb9uai

2087. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-25 23:54:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB701A5F.24BE8%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75452

"WA8ULX" wrote:
>
> Well (snip) produce the PLURAL MESSAGES

Bruce, there are over a hundred messages posted by you in the CB newsgroup. I'm certainly not going to post a copy of all those messages here. Any person, including yourself, can do a Google search to see those messages.

You're a CB'er, Bruce. Pointing a finger at others is not going to hide that truth. And, based on your behavior here, you're probably one of the worst type of CB'ers - rude, foul mouthed, no respect for others, using equipment illegally, and so on. Since I don't live in your hometown, I certainly can't prove that - but a leopard rarely changes it's spots. So your behavior here is probably similar to your behavior there.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2088. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 00:02:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <hsx2b.12634$8i2.4531@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75453
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Reg Edwards" <g4fgq.regp@btinternet.com> wrote in message
news:bidvpc$9au$1@titan.btinternet.com...
> VN was not winnable no matter who or what did what to whom.
> >
> ========================
>
> Is Iraq ?
>
>

Depends what you mean by 'winnable'. The way its going now. It don't look
like it.

Dan/W4NTI

2089. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 00:04:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Rtx2b.12635$8i2.12005@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75454
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Reg Edwards" <g4fgq.regp@btinternet.com> wrote in message
news:bie020$9qe$1@titan.btinternet.com...
> VN was not winnable no matter who or what did what to whom.
> >
> ============================
>
> The Vietnamese didn't think so.
>
>

Your preaching to the choir on that one me boy.....I have a good couple years there. And after I figured it out (about 9 months into the mess) I realized it was un-winnable. But I was just a lowly Sergeant.

Dan/W4NTI

2090. Re: Damn Ham I am and Sky Scraping Towers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 00:11:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB701E56.24BEA%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75455

"Keith" wrote:
>
> Phil Thunborg, a licensed amateur radio operator
> from Cedar Hills, is asking the city to change
> its zoning ordinance so he can put up a higher
> tower than is currently allowed. (snip)

The current height limit in Cedar Hills, 45 feet, is obviously way too restrictive. The ordinance would even conflict with the FCC regulations that allow CB antennas to be placed up to 60 feet on a dedicated mast or tower structure, or twenty feet above an existing object taller than 60 feet. Clearly, licensed Amateur Radio operators should have access to antenna structures taller than that. Therefore, in my opinion, Thunborg is correct to ask for a change in the zoning ordinance.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2091. Re: Packet Ops

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 00:11:23 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <LAx2b.12646$8i2.5905@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75456

"none" <none@nonenozeronada.com> wrote in message
news:bie34l$18a$0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> "Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
> news:10513-3F4A62BB-147@storefull-2317.public.lawson.webtv.net...
> >Sorry Ronny, you are confused.
>
>
> Apparently not as confused as you, as my name isn't Ronny.
>
> >I never said I
>
> >was sending it to Riley.
>
> >I said I was sending it to the FCC.
>
>
>
> My apologies, kind sir. Nevertheless, why not send it straight to the
> source?
>
>
> >Oh and BTW you don't think enforcement
>
> >cares or can catch anyone of you packet
>
> >racket fools?
>
>
>
> Of course they don't give a damn about anything that goes down on 27
> MHZ. Most realized that with the FCC abdication of enforcement there.
> The only thing the FCC does is pacify some of you crusty, angry-types
> who complain and complain about other ops until something is done. This
> is a very big difference than the FCC "caring" or patrolling for such
> violations.
>
>
> > Ask the guy in Miami how much his
>
> >equipment cost that was taken by the Federal
>
> >Marshalls a few years back.
>

>
>
> Why? What does the value of the confiscated radio equipment have to
> do with the FCC "caring" about 27 MHZ illegal activity. He was warned
> prior to his problems he self-created. But you may inquire and find you
> will, that the incident you speak of, was a reported incident, not one
> where the FCC was patrolling for scofflaws and merely "happened" upon
> him.
>
>
> >Caught up to him right in the middle of that
>
> >packet burst to the Frency BBS.
>
>
> He deserved it. He was warned.
>
>
> >You people are idiots. Why don't you just get
>
> >your 'hammie' license and do it legal?
>
>
> What does having a license have to do with it?
>
> >The only "idiots" are the ones who continue to
>
> >be of the incorrect and fixated mindset that
>
> >hammies don't freeband or break the law.
>
>
> Again, check the rainreport.
>
>
> >Miss the
>
> >thrill of never knowing when there will be a
>
> >knock on the door?
>
> Has nothing to do with anything you speak.
>
>
> >Im right...you people are IDIOTS.
>
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Idiots are those who fail to comprehend that another may actually
> have differing interests than those of yourself. If you can't understand

> this...you may indeed be another with a call sign expressing the
> peculiar need to undermine his license. Lack of communication and debate
> skill can be illustrated no better than by unprovoked insult. Ironic
> that some, not unlike yourself, hold that a license is the deciding
> factor between good guy/bad guy or idiot/genius, especially when
> difficulty expressing communications without insult that effectively
> convey your message is evident. Are you a member of this "ARRL", too,
> Dan?

Badmouth all you want. Claim all you want. Bottom line is you bootlegging "IDIOTS" are just sicko's. Being a Ham or a member of the ARRL has nothing to do with things. And nothing you say to badmouth the Amateur Radio Service is going th change that. I could care less how many so called hams do freeband. Real hams don't. You can't get that through your heads can you? A bad CBer that happens to have a ham ticket, comes BACK to his roots in illegal CB operation....does not mean squat. As I said...Real hams don't do that.

Dan/W4NTI

>
>

2092. Wisping ho shrieks WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA!!!!!!!!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 00:20:50 UTC
From: lcs Mixmaster Remailer <mix@anon.lcs.mit.edu>
Message-ID: <20030826002050.14699.qmail@nym.alias.net>
Source record: 75457

In article <bh22ll$1rb$0@pita.alt.net>
"PoorWispinghomosexual" <UglyRumprangerHigh-el@anon.com> whined:

Poor lisping homosexual...wants to have a two way pivot session with bass odor high-el...
>
>
> "Stalker Dude" <sdude@in.georgia> wrote in message
> news:gf4bivkba0p8ctqtinkyn4hs83in54npser@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 8 Aug 2003 16:19:58 +0200 (CEST), Tara peed in her Tapioca
> and "PoorWoger" drank it as Tara said:
>
> > "Stalker Dude" <sdude@in.georgia> wimpered:
> > >
> > > On Tue, 5 Aug 2003 11:26:44 -0400, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote:
> > > > Dear Norm:
> > > >
> > > >
> WHAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

What's the matter, too much cuttent going through that bb sized brain stem for you to contemplate anything?

> Awwww....is malcontent Woger sniping again?

Awwww...are you still raping little boys again? That lisp is showing again..cut down on sucking those dog dicks and maybe you'll get rid of it.

>That is SO like him though. Hit and run, hit and run.

Pot kettle black, goatblower High-el. Didn't you learn these kinds of tactics in your stay in' nam? Oh, that's right you were a REMF.

>He can only emerge from under the bridge during low light conditions.

While you still show up with that horrendous body odor that even your Finnish fjuckheaded wife can't cover up when she swipes cologne samples from her cosmetics counter.

>That way Chief Stenger is not so likely to find him.

Awww, poor goatblower, smelly High-el......run to the cops you PUSSY.

2093. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 00:46:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030825204642.27987.00000810@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 75458

> You're a CB'er, Bruce.

You Dip Shit, I have never owned a CB or even operated there. Unless you mean to 2 meter Fm. Yea thats it you mean 2 Meter CB.

2094. Re: Damn Ham I am and Sky Scraping Towers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 01:07:36 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hk73y4n.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75459

On Tue, 26 Aug 2003 00:11:09 GMT, Dwight Stewart wrote:

>"Keith" wrote:
>>
>> Phil Thunborg, a licensed amateur radio operator
>> from Cedar Hills, is asking the city to change
>> its zoning ordinance so he can put up a higher
>> tower than is currently allowed. (snip)
>
>
> The current height limit in Cedar Hills, 45 feet, is obviously way too
>restrictive. The ordinance would even conflict with the FCC regulations that
>allow CB antennas to be placed up to 60 feet on a dedicated mast or tower
>structure, or twenty feet above an existing object taller than 60 feet.
>Clearly, licensed Amateur Radio operators should have access to antenna
>structures taller than that. Therefore, in my opinion, Thunborg is correct
>to ask for a change in the zoning ordinance.

Right on target.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

2095. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 01:12:53 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030825211253.28093.00000987@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 75460

>Bruce, tell it to someone who believes you. Anyone at all.

You just cant face the FACTS

2096. Re: More countries

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 01:18:04 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030825211804.15586.00000492@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 75461

From: Alun Palmer elektros@yahoo.com

>Switzerland, the UK, Belgium, Germany and Norway have now abolished the
>code test, and the Netherlands will follow shortly on September 1st. New
>Zealand have said they will abolish the code test later this year.

When will the US get rid of the code test?

We are lagging behind. Don't take it for granted that the code test willl be
eliminated. We don't have the metric system, which is clearly advantageous.

2097. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 01:23:30 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030825212330.15586.00000493@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 75462

From Charles, N5PVL
> Usenet is too public for airing out our dirty underwear. This repetitious
> code / no code stuff should be moved out of the public eye.

I doubt that many non radio amateurs are aware of anything in "ham" radio, much less the code/no-code discussions.

2098. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 01:38:30 UTC
From: Steve Terry <g4wwk@despammed.com>
Message-ID: <2Ty2b.3648$MS5.64334@newsfep4-glfd.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 75463
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

<lucifer@eternal-flames.gov> wrote in message
news:55cjkvcg889u9kr31rnthp9g2tctrlp0tc@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 25 Aug 2003 02:00:32 +0100, "Steve Terry"
> <g4wwk@despammed.com> pausing to cast envious glances at those who had
> mastered the skill of reading without moving their lips, wrote:
>
> >>
> >So Gen Macarthy had the right idea, Nuke the N. Koreans in 1951,
>
> Sounds good to me... Slap 'em down hard and slap 'em down early.
> Old Nick.
>
Yes I know, "trade is trade"

Steve Terry

2099. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 03:03:24 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <biff8f$ohf@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75473

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB6F0767.24B8D%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > OK, Kim, did you find the part about taking
> > the ARS "...one step closer to extinction,"
> > or not? If not, which part did I "translate"
> > into that exact language?
> >
> > Don't look now, Kim, but I've never been
> > admonished by Riley Hollingsworth about doing
> > something which could potentially cause
> > prospective hams to decide to go fishing
> > instead.
>
>
> Larry, I seriously doubt Hollingsworth would have said anything if he
had
> known his words would be used as a basis for your harassment of Kim over
> this subject for several years.
>

You've got that right, Dwight. I've had the pleasure to meet Riley, to
interview him for a local newsletter, and to speak with him one-on-one when
he spoke here in Texas at HamCom. We met out in the hallway before his
talk. He's too much a gentleman to act like Larry.

>
> You've never been admonished by Hollingsworth simply because you've
never
> had the guts to tell him what you're doing. So, since Kim was willing to
> contact Hollingsworth over the choice of her callsign (her behavior), why
> don't you contact Hollingsworth to ask if he feels your behavior (your use
> of his words to publicly harass Kim for all this time) has any effect on
Ham
> Radio?
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Because Larry knows what would happen...

Kim W5TIT

2100. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 03:04:56 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <biff8g$ohf@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75475

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB6F0E92.24B95%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> > heh heh, David. It's hilarious, ain't it?
>
>
> Hey, just look at all the free publicity you've gotten from that
callsign.
> If this keeps up, you'll be famous by the time Larry is finished pointing
> out your callsign to everyone.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Have you seen the number of lookups for me on QRZ? Keep in mind I haven't
been on the air in over a year now. ROFLMAO...

Kim W5TIT

2101. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 03:10:47 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bifjbk$8bpsd$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75481
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Jim:
Even BEFORE they start this BPL thing, the existing power lines emanate a ton of interference anyways. It is almost impossible for me to listen to anything HF around here because the lines around here are terrible. I can only imagine how much worse it will get with adding the BPL stuff as well. I am definitely a proponent of having the utilities switching (albeit expensive) to buried electrical lines. Only exception might be where the lines need to cross a river etc.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:xD82b.111594$9w.12100@news02.roc.ny...
> David,
>
> Looks like I'm going to have to research some nice linear as well as a
> decent HF station. I had been looking at a vertical to avoid all of the
> horizontal lines in the neighborhood, but, on second thought ... 1500
watts
> horizontally polarized, 50 feet from the power lines might prove
interesting
> :)
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
> ps - we need a study as to where the biggest ingress will occur :)
>
>
> "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3F48DC88.28785233@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> > Money talks, public service walks- BPL is a certainty.
> >
> > The "null it out- anyone can do it" argument is crap-
> > works well in theory, poorly in the field.
> > Even with excellent nulling, QRP and other weak signal work is finished.
> > Shortwave DXing is finished.
> >
> > You have three choices-
> > Give up radio.

> > Move far enough into the country to avoid the polluted grid,
> > "Gorilla warfare-" Power lines that leak out, can also leak IN.
> > 50 watts of broadband noise generator plugged into the nearest socket
> > would do. Note that I would never advocate anything illegal.....
> > D.S.
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/19/03
>
>

2102. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 03:12:10 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <biff8h$ohf@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75474

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030824230106.08626.00000153@mb-m27.aol.com...
> In article <biblv0$27b@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Kim:
> >>
> >> Mr. Riley Hollingsworth seems to disagree with you. Have you forgotten
> >> that he said that your call sign has the potential to take the ARS
> >> "...one step closer to extinction"?
> >>
> >
> >Riley would never have done such a thing, Larry. His message was
speaking
> >in generality. So, no, he never directly said that about my callsign.
As
> >usual, you translated something to a way you wanted it.
>
> Kim:
>
> I "translated" the words of Mr. Hollingsworth? Hmmm, let's examine
> that concept. I know that this breaks long-standing Usenet/rrap
tradition,
> but here's the quote:
>
> ....Quoted message begins.....................
> In article
<59B7203A07395FF0.50F2CC864D4ED7FE.54A4CB093D32584C@lp.airnews.net>,
> "Kim W5TIT" <kw5tit@hotmail.com> writes:
>
> >Probably more a thoughtful wish of the prefix I wish I'd been able to
get.
> >Speaking of callsigns, here's Riley's response after I wrote and told him
I
> >was sorry for bothering him, since the FCC had already spoken on
callsigns
> >at the Dayton Hamfest (the rest of the email is also with it):
> >
> >While that's true, just because a person has a right to do something
doesn't
> >mean it's right to do it on every occasion. While the call sign may fit
the
> >constitution, for every instance where a parent or uncle or grandparent

> >doesn't want a young person to get involved in Ham Radio because of
> >something they hear on the bands, then you have taken the ARS one step
> >closer to extinction. Then we can sit around and debate what happened to
> >all those Amateur frequencies that industry bought at auction---debating,
of
> >course, on the internet and cellular because that'll be all we have left.
> >The first amendment will still be alive and well, just as it is now, tho,
if
> >that's any consolation.
>
> ....Quoted message ends.....................
>
> OK, Kim, did you find the part about taking the ARS "...one step closer
> to extinction," or not? If not, which part did I "translate" into that
exact
> language?
>

Yep, and I am corrected. He does say "you." And, I respectfully disagree
with his observation.

>
> >> > It is people like Larry and his attitudes that are
> >> >destroying the ARS.
>
> Don't look now, Kim, but I've never been admonished by Riley
> Hollingsworth about doing something which could potentially cause
> prospective hams to decide to go fishing instead.
>

Larry, it doesn't take being admonished by anyone to be proven that you have
a bad attitude--and one that is poisonous for the ARS. Your attitude is
more venomous than my callsign--for sure.

> >>
> >> I don't see how that's possible, Kim. After all, I'm not the one who
> >> is sporting a callsign which is shamefully demeaning to women in
> >> general, and YL hams in particular. However, you are -- and even
> >> Riley Hollingsworth has said so, and I can't think of anyone who is
> >> more qualified to make that judgment than he is!
>
> >If you truly believe that about my callsign, Larry--and I don't believe
you
> >do, then you are destroying it as much as anyone else.
>
> I do believe that, Kim, but I fail to find any logic in your statement
above.
> However, that's just you being you.
>

And, I don't think you do believe that.

> >> >In Larry's mind, it's probably my fault because he has
> >> >to be so hateful toward me because of my callsign :)
> >>
> >> It's not hate, Kim. It's concern. Concern for the negative image of
> >> the ARS that you are projecting through the selection of your
> >> callsign, which places amateur radio operators, and particularly YL
> >> hams, in a negative light. If anyone is being "hateful," it is you --
> >> and you are showing this hate toward your fellow hams by demonstrating
> >> a blatant lack of respect for the image of the service.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >IF for one minute you are concerned about negative images for the ARS,
then
> >you would shut up, Larry.
>
> What am *I* doing to give the ARS a negative image, Kim? My on-the-air
> operating is the only thing that matters regarding my "image" as a ham,
and
> I've never had any complaints. However, Riley Hollingsworth has made it
> quite clear that *you* and *your* callsign are definitely a problem. In
fact,
> a big enough problem to cause him to take the time to compose his
> reply to your E-mail. That speaks volumes.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Then, that given, I haven't been on the air for over a year, Larry. And, the only reason Riley made any comment at all about my callsign is that I was big enough to approach him about it. It proves I'm the better person. You can't even own up to your own destructiveness. Why don't you invite comments from Riley on you?

He's much too much a gentleman and scholar to be found responding to the likes of you...

Kim W5TIT

2103. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 03:24:07 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bifjbm$8bpsd$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75482

Maybe she could change it to KB0SOM????

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@nospam.bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:WYe2b.14898$sm2.4215@fe05.atl2.webusenet.com...
>
> "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3F48D913.5B3798C0@ix.netcom.com...
> > People are STILL raising hell with Kim W5TIT about her callsign?!?!
> >
> > How many YEARS is this going to go on??? Jeeeezzzzussscrrrryst!
>
> I think it's hard to keep a-breast of the situation.
>
> de KR4AJ
>
>
>
>

2104. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 03:29:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030825232932.14837.00002521@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 75466

In article <BB6F0767.24B8D%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

> Larry, I seriously doubt Hollingsworth would have said anything if he had >known his words would be used as a basis for your harassment of Kim over >this subject for several years.

Dwight:

If that's the case, then he would have to blame Kim for that outcome, not me. After all, it was Kim who quoted Riley's comments made in a private E-mail in this public newsgroup, thereby making them public domain and subject to being used against her in the future. If I were her, I would not have done that. However, Kim was eager to make the point that she had a legal, Constitutional "right" to choose her call sign, such as it is. In his reply, Mr. Hollingsworth assured Kim that she did, indeed have that "right," but the exercise thereof was potentially harmful to the image of the ARS, to the extent that he predicted that it had the potential to take the ARS "…one step closer to extinction."

Kim's act of hubris, in making the attempt to get a well-known authority to validate her action, has backfired on her in a most inconvenient way. If Mr. Hollingsworth has any objection to the way his words are being utilized, he needs to take that matter up with Kim, not me.

> You've never been admonished by Hollingsworth simply because you've never >had the guts to tell him what you're doing.

Mr. Hollingsworth has the same access to this newsgroup as anyone else. If he wanted to do anything about it, he certainly has the technology to do so. Should he contact me with the request that I desist in using his quote in the manner in which I have been doing, I will certainly comply. However, this would not absolve Kim of her responsibility for introducing Mr. Hollingsworth's words to this public forum.

>So, since Kim was willing to
>contact Hollingsworth over the choice of her callsign (her behavior), why >don't you contact Hollingsworth to ask if he feels your behavior (your use >of his words to publicly harass Kim for all this time) has any effect on Ham >Radio?

For the simple reason that my behavior is not in question here. Kim is not being "harassed." She is merely experiencing the justified reaction to an action she took which is potentially harmful to the image of the ARS, and that is my right -- just as it was Kim's "right" to self-select a call sign with
a vulgar, sexualized, and demeaning connotation which reflects poorly on

YL radio amateurs everywhere. As someone else put it in another posting, if her call sign had been issued as a sequential assignment, then this whole matter would not be at issue. Kim deliberately chose that call sign in order for it to have the effect of generating attention to herself, and to stir up controversy. Well, it worked -- and now she is responsible for any and all consequences appertaining to her action.

As for whether my "behavior" will have any affect on ham radio, I certainly hope so. I happen to be expressing my vehement and determined opposition to an action by a radio amateur which has the potential to do serious damage to the image of the ARS. By doing so, I hope to send the message that behavior such as Kim's is not to be tolerated.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2105. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 03:29:33 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030825232933.14837.00002522@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 75465

In article <BB6F0DA3.24B93%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>>
>>> Code testing serves no real purpose today,
>>
>> Prove itŠ
>
>
> Prove it does, Larry. Prove code testing serves a purpose today worthy of
>a specific government requirement above and beyond all other operating
>modes.

Brian:

I, and my fellow PCTA's, have been doing that for years here on this newsgroup, Fidonet, and in the editorial pages of the ham magazines. Now, it's your turn. I axed YOU to "prove" that "code testing serves no real purpose today." So do it. Provide your "proof," make it convincing, and do it right now -- or you will have just provided "proof" that you don't know what you're talking about!

>The trends are moving towards the elimination of code testing. If you
>have a good reason to change that, now is certainly the time to speak up.

I have "spoken up" about this -- at great length.

>Nothing you've said so far has been able to change those trends.

That's because we have a dumbed-down culture, and one voice cannot change an entire culture. Six years ago, I encouraged Nancy Kott and the FISTS to organize a campaign of "speaking up" which could have easily changed the outcome of the Restructuring NPRM of 1998. That didn't happen. Now, too little too late, she is making a last ditch effort. Well, when the "Zero WPM" NPRM comes out, I will provide my comments, as I did in '98. However, I can't do everyone else's reading, writing, and thinking for them. I had to do that for my alleged "bosses" in the Air Force, and I've decided I'm no longer going to give away my intellectual effort for anyone else to claim as their own. All of my fellow FISTS will have to come up with their own arguments to keep code testing, if that's what they want to do.

>Endlessly
>repeating what you've already said hasn't either. So, perhaps you should
>think of something new to say.

If I am speaking the truth, which I am, then repeating that truth is just as valid as the repetitive, boring, and obnoxious droning of the NCTA.

So, Brian -- are you going to defend your statement, or not?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2106. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 03:29:34 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030825232934.14837.00002523@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 75464

In article <f45722ac.0308241828.20276940@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Larry, do I need to regurge all your "my favorite black on the bus" episodes?

Why not?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2107. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 04:09:44 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F4ADD6E.BCEB381A@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75467

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> ... Do you have any idea
> how many lawyers the big electric utilities can afford to get on your case?

They won't get much, Larry.
Nothing left of my arse but scar tissue....
73 Dave

2108. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 04:11:55 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <f6B2b.34$f57.8@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 75468
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Hans,

Do you think insulated 10 gauge ladder line from a 3 KW tuner plugged into the electric stove outlet might make a good antenna? For experimentation only, of course :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"K0HB" <k0hb@arrl.net> wrote in message news:e79dbd9b.0308250726.9d7bfba@posting.google.com...
>
> BPL works on conducted signals, not radiated signals. The power grid
> is an incredibly poor receiving antenna, so any microvolt-level or
> even millivolt-level signal from "out there" won't even show up on the
> copper.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --
> "Reality doesn't care what you believe." -- K0HB

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/20/03

2109. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 04:15:46 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F4ADED8.AB57BD96@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75469

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >You're a rude little fella, aren't you?
>
> Damn right
>
> >I think I'll apply for WD1CK, or move overseas and
> >get PU5SY
>
> Go ahead Morron

"Morron?" LOL!

2110. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 04:17:42 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F4ADF4D.2D8A8A37@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75470
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Disgusted wrote:
>
> I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the SHIT
> out of them!

You better take four or five- It'll take a lot of beating and
you'll wear them out.

2111. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 04:30:35 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308252030.592e1bc7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75471
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<q_q2b.113965$3o3.7995121@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0308250253.2fb10e3d@posting.google.com...
> > >
> > > I'd be curious to know how vunerable BPL is to interference. I have no
> > > doubt the BPL people have run tests, and I'm a little surprised they're
> not
> > > at the front of a webpage somewhere.
> >
> > No sir, the BPL clods have *not* done much if any interfernce testing
> > wherein lies the underlying reason for whole uproar and is the reason
> > you can't find info on their "tests" online. It's all explained in
> > depth and well documented in the ARRL website.
> >
> >
>
> When I wrote "vunerable BPL is to interference", I meant how outside sources
> of interference would effect the performance of BPL. Sorry if I wasn't
> clear.

No problem, I understood what you meant.

> I still have no doubt the BPL people would test for things like
> that. I wouldn't expect them to care much about interference, as long as
> they can fit it into some interpretation of Part 15 regs. Or if they can
> get the Part 15 regs changed. Or if they don't get caught violating the
> Part 15 regs. I was wondering if there's any test results explaining how
> marvelously robust this BPL system is going to be.
>
> If you know where this is all explained in depth and well documented, please
> point me in that direction.

From http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/08/21/4/?nc=1

"The League also noted that comments in the proceeding so far have
been silent on the interference susceptibility of BPL to ham radio
signal ingress. The League predicted that even as little as 250 mW of
signal induced into overhead power lines some 100 feet from an amateur
antenna could degrade a BPL system or render it inoperative."

I realize that this is not the statement about actual tests run by the
BPL people which you'd like to see, they haven't published *any* test
results at all, but the League technical guys are pretty sharp and I
doubt they'd make a statement like this if that didn't have a good

basis for making it.

> > > And nothing will help as much as bringing new people into the radio
> hobby.
> >
> > By the time that might happen BPL will either have taken over the HF
> > spectrum or been forgotten as another idiotic and failed dotcom
> > maneuver.
> >
>
> BPL might very well fail. Or it might hang on in a few communities. I have
> no idea. I'm sure, now that crackpot powerline schemes are here, they will
> never really go away.

Heh. Yeah, the recent grid debacle is not setting a very good stage
for a huggy kissy relationship between the BPL types and *anybody*
else including the FCC. I've seen some economic analyses of BPL and
from the standpoint of an investor BPL is a big go-nowhere dud.

> > Far beyond the question of hams interfering with BPL comes the much
> > more important question of BPL interfering with the long list of
> > licensed incumbent HF users. Within that group radio hobbyists are
> > basically bit players. Smart and noisy bit players but nonetheless bit
> > players. Other users are *not* bit players and them's the folks who I
> > expect will quietly and decisively torpedo BPL.
> >
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Maybe, but much of the utility SW use has gone to sattelites. The bands are
> far quiter now than they were 30 years ago.

That's quite true. But we can't hear HF listeners and we can't
normally tune some modes but they're out there and apparently in
profusion. We almost didn't get any 60M band at all because certain
feds didn't want hams on "their HF frequencies". I dunno who they are,
those freqs appear dead when ya tune around. But they're there. FBI,
CIA, NSA, FCC, the military?

> Of course, I've got my own
> crackpot idea. The SW spectrum should be run rather like the way we run the
> National Parks.

From a post I launched in RRAP on 8 Feb 2000:

- - - - -

W3RV
"There isn't enough bandwidth in all the HF ham bands combined to pull
off the kinds of ham technology development work we'll see in the
coming years, much of it undoubtedly will be done by nocode computer
jocks on the millimeter bands. Code tests have been a no-counter wrt
to "fostering ham radio as a tehnical hobby" for the past nine years".

>
K4YZ:
>and that HF is for recreation, period.
>
W3RV:
"PRECISELY: If I had my druthers I'd have the regulation of HF ham
radio moved over to the National Park Service and let the geeks screw
around with the FCC."

- - - - -

Heh!

> Everyone is free to use SW radio, as long as they act in a
> responsible manner.

NO WAY!!

> If only Boy Scouts could go to Yellowstone, only Boy Scouts would care about
> Yellowstone.
>
> Frank Dresser

w3rv

2112. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 09:41:11 UTC
From: Ged <ged65@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk>
Message-ID: <r6P0O9C3syS$EwyM@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk>
Source record: 75472
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

In message <9Du2b.12405$8i2.10438@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get.rid.invalid> writes
>The Frogs would have got their butts kicked out of there whether we helped
>them or not. VN was not winnable no matter who or what did what to whom.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

That's the usual Republican excuse to explain wars they didn't win.
If it wasn't 'winnable' how come the Vietcong won?
--
Ged

2113. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 11:14:13 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f4b41b0_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 75476
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Not only was VN winnable, it was won by the party in the
right - the resident Vietnamese resistance against the invading Warmongers.

Not too dissimilar to the Iraq of tomorrow?

Ged <ged65@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk> wrote in message
news:r6P0O9C3syS$EwyM@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk...
> In message <9Du2b.12405$8i2.10438@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get.rid.invalid> writes
> >The Frogs would have got their butts kicked out of there whether we
helped
> >them or not. VN was not winnable no matter who or what did what to whom.
> That's the usual Republican excuse to explain wars they didn't win.
> If it wasn't 'winnable' how come the Vietcong won?

2114. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 11:25:12 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bifg09$14u@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75477

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030825232932.14837.00002521@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <BB6F0767.24B8D%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:
>
> > Larry, I seriously doubt Hollingsworth would have said anything if he
had
> >known his words would be used as a basis for your harassment of Kim over
> >this subject for several years.
>
> Dwight:
>
> If that's the case, then he would have to blame Kim for that outcome, not
> me. After all, it was Kim who quoted Riley's comments made in a
> private E-mail in this public newsgroup, thereby making them public
> domain and subject to being used against her in the future.
>

Being used "against" me? You are hilarious, Larry. I thought you said your
posts were intellectual and logical.

>
> If I were her,
> I would not have done that. However, Kim was eager to make the point
> that she had a legal, Constitutional "right" to choose her call sign, such
as
> it is.
>

Yeah, and you apparently don't like it.

>
> In his reply, Mr. Hollingsworth assured Kim that she did, indeed have
> that "right," but the exercise thereof was potentially harmful to the
image
> of the ARS, to the extent that he predicted that it had the potential to
take
> the ARS ".one step closer to extinction."
>

You'll note, Larry, that by your own post of the words from Riley, he's
quite capable of something you are not: being a gentleman and democratic
about his--"HIS"--personal opinion. Anyone is entitled to their opinion,
Larry, even you. However, you'll also note that Riley never went beyond
making a statement on his own personal opinion.

>
> Kim's act of hubris, in making the attempt to get a well-known authority
> to validate her action, has backfired on her in a most inconvenient way.
> If Mr. Hollingsworth has any objection to the way his words are being
> utilized, he needs to take that matter up with Kim, not me.
>

You dumb-ass, Larry. I did not try to "make" Riley validate anything. You completely missed the point that was done for.

>
> > You've never been admonished by Hollingsworth simply because you've never
> >had the guts to tell him what you're doing.
>
> Mr. Hollingsworth has the same access to this newsgroup as anyone else.
> If he wanted to do anything about it, he certainly has the technology to
> do so. Should he contact me with the request that I desist in using his
> quote in the manner in which I have been doing, I will certainly comply.
> However, this would not absolve Kim of her responsibility for introducing
> Mr. Hollingsworth's words to this public forum.
>

Again, Riley would never request that someone desist anything; while he is offering his own personal opinions. He likely would caution that you are as destructive, if not more than, as I to the ARS. My callsign, in my opinion, is not destructive to the ARS. My opinion is as valid as Riley's, yours, or anyone else's.

> >
> >So, since Kim was willing to
> >contact Hollingsworth over the choice of her callsign (her behavior), why
> >don't you contact Hollingsworth to ask if he feels your behavior (your use
> >of his words to publicly harass Kim for all this time) has any effect on Ham
> >Radio?
>
> For the simple reason that my behavior is not in question here. Kim is not
> being "harassed." She is merely experiencing the justified reaction to an
> action she took which is potentially harmful to the image of the ARS, and
> that is my right
>

You give yourself way too much importance, Larry. I am not experiencing anything but humor at your ignorance and desperate attempt to be right.

>
> -- just as it was Kim's "right" to self-select a call sign
> with
> a vulgar, sexualized, and demeaning connotation which reflects poorly on
> YL radio amateurs everywhere. As someone else put it in another posting,

> if her call sign had been issued as a sequential assignment, then this
> whole matter would not be at issue.
>

More at issue is your destructive attitude toward the ARS by being such an idiot, Larry.

>
> Kim deliberately chose that call sign
> in order for it to have the effect of generating attention to herself, and
to
> stir up controversy. Well, it worked -- and now she is responsible for
> any and all consequences appertaining to her action.
>

That is your interpretation of why I have this callsign, Larry.

>
> As for whether my "behavior" will have any affect on ham radio, I
> certainly hope so. I happen to be expressing my vehement and
> determined opposition to an action by a radio amateur which has the
> potential to do serious damage to the image of the ARS. By doing
> so, I hope to send the message that behavior such as Kim's is not
> to be tolerated.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Good grief, Larry. Your "behavior" is despicable. The only message you send is one of idiocy.

And, I seem to recall that I told you when you had something intelligent and logical to say that you'd see me responding to you. I've seen nothing intelligent and logical yet--and I've given you every opportunity. So, you'll see nothing from me again until you have something intelligent and logical. Every time that is requested, you act like a fly on shit with the callsign issue. Not intellectual, not logical.

You can't do it, can you?

Kim W5TIT

2115. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 11:26:13 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bifg26$9a0@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75478

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F4ADED8.AB57BD96@ix.netcom.com...
> WA8ULX wrote:
> >
> > >You're a rude little fella, aren't you?
> >
> > Damn right
> >
> > >I think I'll apply for WD1CK, or move overseas and
> > >get PU5SY
> >
> > Go ahead Morron
>
> "Morron?" LOL!
>

It's the CB mentality screaming loud and clear, David ;)

Kim W5TIT

2116. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 12:01:46 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <K_H2b.33737$Vx2.14682840@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75479

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030825212330.15586.00000493@mb-m12.aol.com...
> From Charles, N5PVL
> > Usenet is too public for airing out our dirty underwear. This
repetitious
> > code / no code stuff should be moved out of the public eye.
>
> I doubt that many non radio amateurs are aware of anything in "ham" radio,
much
> less the code/no-code discussions.
>

Yes, and that is precisely why our few windows of visibility here on the Internet are so very important. Very few non-hams listen to us on the air, but millions can potentially see what we do on the Internet.

How ham behave off the air, in public and online largely determine how we are viewed by the general public. Eventually, our public behavior and reputation has its affect on what happens in congress and at the FCC.

Discussions like what are seen in this newsgroup should not really be occuring in a newsgroup at all. - They should be moved on to a mailing list. That would in no way limit the discussion or the enjoyment of its participants, but would take it out of the public eye.

There is no advantage to airing our dirty linen this way, particularly when it is not necessary. This discussion was moved once before, and should be moved again for the same reason. It is ugly and obnoxious, reflecting poorly upon the hobby.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2117. Re: Alinco 801 1st HF transceiver with no CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 12:03:39 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826080339.07063.00000394@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 75480

Looks like a Typical CB, just what you guys wanted.

2118. "Unfortunate Responsibility"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 12:20:24 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <cgI2b.33766$Vx2.14686650@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75483

>
> Well, getting a ham license isn't exactly a waste of time, but it does
> carry some responsibilities. Unfortunately for us, one of them is
> abiding by communications law.

I do not consider our obligation as hams to abide by communications law to be "unfortunate"... It strikes me as being essential and beneficial, in no way unfortunate because without that obligation we would quickly go the way of CB, as you say.

People who work to undermine these rules and our obligation to follow them as hams are directly attacking the hobby, attempting to undercut the basis of our legitimacy. Most often, these attacks are based on a stated desire to obtain a "freebee" at other's expense.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2119. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 12:26:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4B520B.4030708@psu.edu>
Source record: 75484
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

K0HB wrote:
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote
>
>
>>Or how about some high intensity E-skip.
>>
>
>
> BPL works on conducted signals, not radiated signals. The power grid
> is an incredibly poor receiving antenna, so any microvolt-level or
> even millivolt-level signal from "out there" won't even show up on the
> copper.

There are probably some tests out there on that.

What is the mode in which solar storms interfere with or knock out
power transmission? Is is some kind of massive DC current thing?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2120. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 12:28:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4B525E.1000106@psu.edu>
Source record: 75485

David Stinson wrote:
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>>... Do you have any idea
>>how many lawyers the big electric utilities can afford to get on your case?
>
>
> They won't get much, Larry.
> Nothing left of my arse but scar tissue....
> 73 Dave

waaaaaay too much information!!!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2121. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 12:54:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308260454.19c25149@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75486

David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3F4ADED8.AB57BD96@ix.netcom.com>...
> WA8ULX wrote:
> >
> > >You're a rude little fella, aren't you?
> >
> > Damn right
> >
> > >I think I'll apply for WD1CK, or move overseas and
> > >get PU5SY
> >
> > Go ahead Morron
>
> "Morron?" LOL!

Exactly! And this is from the guy that said he took the Extra exam on a lark!

Here are the particulars:

1. without studying
2. on a $250 bet from two "cb-plussers"
3. completed in under 8 minutes
drum roll
4. scored 100%

2122. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 13:02:13 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030826090213.949$SA@newsreader.com>
Source record: 75487

```
"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote:
> "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3F4ADED8.AB57BD96@ix.netcom.com...
> > WA8ULX wrote:
> > >
> > > >You're a rude little fella, aren't you?
> > >
> > > Damn right
> > >
> > > >I think I'll apply for WD1CK, or move overseas and
> > > >get PU5SY
> > >
> > > Go ahead Morron
> >
> > "Morron?" LOL!
> >
>
> It's the CB mentality screaming loud and clear, David ;)
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
Do people scream " show us your tits" at the hamfest?

--
GO #40
```

2123. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 13:16:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826091638.02751.00000335@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75488

>Exactly! And this is from the guy that said he took the Extra exam on a
>lark!
>
>Here are the particulars:
>
>1. without studying
>2. on a $250 bet from two "cb-plussers"
>3. completed in under 8 minutes
>drum roll
>4. scored 100%
>
And what bugs Brian the most, is after all this time he still cant pass the
EXTRA.
But what do expect, it took his great Leader Karl, who is the Leader of NCI
well over a year to pass it.
A bunch of Dummies who cant even pass a simple Memorization Test, where no
real knowledge of the subject material is required.

2124. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 13:18:23 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826091823.02751.00000336@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75489

>Do people scream " show us your tits" at the hamfest?
>
>--
>GO #40

You have to be kidding. She hauls them in to the Hamfest, supported by a
FORKLIFT.

2125. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 13:26:49 UTC
From: Ralph Aichinger <ralph@dolphy.pangea.at>
Message-ID: <1061903206.65433@news.liwest.at>
Source record: 75490
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In rec.radio.amateur.policy Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote:

> When I wrote "vunerable BPL is to interference", I meant how outside sources
> of interference would effect the performance of BPL. Sorry if I wasn't

[..]

> If you know where this is all explained in depth and well documented, please
> point me in that direction.

I don`t know the details, but here in Europe several pilot projects
were basically stopped and several larger companies got out of that
technology again, after trying to hype it for several years.

I do not know if this is due to unreliability or due to other factors,
but it *seems* to have worked better in the lab than in the real world.
If enough problems make it too unreliable and/or expensive, this might
be the easiest way out.

There *are* some companies still trying to bring this to market though
(my local utility does).

/ralph

2126. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 14:47:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4B731A.6000509@psu.edu>
Source record: 75491

Hans K0HB wrote:
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>
>> If you are not a registered voter in California, then you have no cause to
>> carry on as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on
>> California politics.
>>
>
>
> That sword cuts in both directions, sir.
>
> If you are not a registered voter in California (licensed operator
> in the Amateur Radio Service), then you have no cause to carry on
> as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on California
> politics (Amateur Radio Service policy).

Game, Set, Match!

Squelch of the week.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2127. Off subject, tv monitor????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 15:34:49 UTC
From: kc5cqa@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <scvmkvgenfscuevfgf5mc6hjjqa2n7t5m2@4ax.com>
Source record: 75492

I would like to use my tv as a monitor for my computer, could you tell me what all is involved? What I have to purchase, hardware/software wise? Thanks in advance. cl 73

2128. Re: More countries

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 15:59:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308260759.3419337@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75493

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030825211804.15586.00000492@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> From: Alun Palmer elektros@yahoo.com
>
> >Switzerland, the UK, Belgium, Germany and Norway have now abolished the
> >code test, and the Netherlands will follow shortly on September 1st. New
> >Zealand have said they will abolish the code test later this year.
>
> When will the US get rid of the code test?
>
> We are lagging behind.

Lagging behind what?

> Don't take it for granted that the code test willl be
> eliminated.

Why?

> We don't have the metric system, which is clearly advantageous.

Which has what to do with Morse Code?

Steve, K4YZ

2129. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 16:04:23 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030826120423.880$RL@newsreader.com>
Source record: 75494

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> >Do people scream " show us your tits" at the hamfest?
> >
> >--
> >GO #40
>
> You have to be kidding. She hauls them in to the Hamfest, supported by a
> FORKLIFT.
>
Oh my, nasty visual..

http://www.geocities.com/picsrfun2003/untitled.bmp

--
GO #40

2130. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 16:08:16 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308260808.14ef5ff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75495

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030824153227.29660.00000206@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0308240543.14bacc44@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030824010600.22081.00000159@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> >
> >> This newsgroup is about AMATEUR RADIO POLICY.
> >
> > Dwight, Lennie makes this assertion when it becomes obvious that
> >he's been bested, especially by someone he considers below his social
> >station.
>
> The special recall election in California is NOT about amateur radio.

Who cares? YOU are the one who is always suggesting OTHERS are
trying to be "moderators", yet here YOU are demanding that someone
change the subject.

Go figure.
>
> > Lennie will rant on and on about Japan, his days as an "enginer",
> >and his stellar career as a "contributing editor" of a magazine that
> >wwent belly-up.
>
> Please use a spellchecker when you become so enraged.

And demanding even more.

> I was an Associate Editor at HAM RADIO magazine...(SNIP)

Yeahyeahyeah...Same old song.

> I was, and continue to be an electronics design engineer both as
> professional (paid) and amateur (unpaid).

But still not a licensed Amateur Radio Operator. The rest, since
by YOUR rules is NOT relevent to Amateur Radio, is moot and should be
taken to another forum.

> The fact of the matter is that I've DONE IT, have the documentation
> and enough witnesses to convince any court except the vigilantee
> groups who only want to destroy others while spewing forth hate and
> vomit on those who've done things.

For the purposes of THIS forum you have yet to do anything except
rant, antagonize and demean those who HAVE "DONE it"...

No FCC Form 660 = No Amateur Radio.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

2131. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 16:21:52 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <AOL2b.2866$v57.2397@nwrdny02.gnilink.net>
Source record: 75496

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB701A5F.24BE8%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "WA8ULX" wrote:
> >
> > Well (snip) produce the PLURAL MESSAGES
>
>
> Bruce, there are over a hundred messages posted by you in the CB
> newsgroup.

At least he posted there under his own name, Dwight. He gets points for
that.

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

2132. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 16:47:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308260847.2ac2c894@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75497

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030824153231.29660.00000207@mb-m24.aol.com>...

> >> Steamy never did any communications while in the military...other than
> >> talking on the telephone.
> >
> > Sorry. Incorrect.
>
> Show PROOF of your mighty military "communications," big mouth.

This "big mouth" doesn't need to recite his previous service over
and over in a newsgroup forum in order to sate his ego, Lennie.

That's YOUR schtick.

> You TALK a big story without mentioning ANY details.

Naaah....No big story, Lennie. I did it, it's in my SRB, and
that's all that counts.

The RRAP back channel folks can ask me if they care to, and I'll
tell them, but you're not invited. You won't play nice in e mail
anyway.

> You haven't named a single one of the "hostile actions" you claim you
> were in.

Because it's irrelevent to this forum. I already invited sonme
to e mail me direct. Brian took me up on some of it.

> >> It's painfully obvious, Brian. Steamy hates me. I served in the US Army
> >> so, naturally to him, anything Army is subject to hatred, villification,
> and
> >> denigration.
> >
> > I ahte liars and people who try to use somoen else's military
> >service to make themselves look good.
>
> You just HATE.

Nope...I hate LIARS. That would be you.

> My military service is archived at NARA. Not only that, I have witnesses
> still alive who were at the same Army radio station I served when I was
> there. No lies.

Except for your attempts to embellish your "service record" in
this forum at the expense of Army KIA's and your assertion of "working

DX" as an Army radio clerk.

I am SO (un)impressed.

> You HATE someone else being successful in anything so much that it
> makes you almost violent. That's a bad mental symptom which needs
> treatment.

Nope. I just love making a fool out of your with your own words.
Actually, it's very sad to see someone who had something once spend
what ought to be his "mentoring years" being so childish and idiotic.

> >> Steamy never did any primary communications while in the USMC. Naturally
> >> he resents that anyone else did.
> >
> > Sorry. Incorrect.
>
> It may be "incorrect" but it is more likely quite CORRECT.

If it makes you sleep better at night, Lennie, you go right on
thinking that.

> You've NEVER stated in any detail what you actually DID in the USMC
> insofar as radio communications. You conveniently gloss over any
> details. Anyone who really liked their past work will remember details of
> it and "talk shop" about it. You never do.

Because what I did in the USMC is, for the most part, irrelevent
in this forum, Lennie.

Unlike you, who MUST reassert his king-of-the-hill personna in
order to have any self respect, I don't need or enjoy such retellings
of my service career for sporting purposes.

If it makes YOU happy, Lennie...go right ahead...Not that any of
the 20 people who have told you that they are sick of hearing it over
and over has deterred you at all...

> All you talk about is some general phrases (copyable from any little PR
> booklet) about "warrior skills" and honor and glory...NO DETAILS.
>
> All those generalities and NO DETAILS...sure marks of a bluffer, a con
> man, trying a selling job on those with no experience in some area.
>
> In short, YOU LIE.

Nope. Sorry.

> Then you try to say others "lie" when they give details, provide references
> and have documentation to prove what they say.

That's because many of the tales YOU tell usually wind up
refuteing whatever it was you were trying to make a point about.

> >> Steamy can't handle real truth.
> >
> > Sure I can. You are liar, an antagonist, and a creep.
>
> Antagonist, yes. Liar no.

Antagonist yes, Liar yes. As much as I know you hate hearing it,
"It's in Google".

> I've provided details, references, even names of still-living witnesses as
> proof of what I've done.
>
> You've never tried to confirm anything, have you?

Hmmmmm...yep....ya wanna go back over your sterling performances
in Pennsylvania?

> You've rejected a scan of my first First Class Radiotelephone (Commercial)
> license, not once but four times in e-mail.

And you sent me "erroneous" e mails. You admitted in this forum
you "erred". You USED an offer of the forwarding of the license, but
you used it as an opportunity for a practical joke.

You won't "use" me again, Lennie. The really SILLY thing is you
did it to several people, ergo creating a pool of folks able to
corroborate MY version of events.

Pretty danged stupid, Lennie.

> You just can't tolerate TRUTH. It upsets the little fabric of LIES you've
> created about yourself.

And those would be...?!?!

> > Ahhhh yes...Lennie once again shows that "honoring" Veteans is a
> >one way street for him.
>
> I HONOR all who actually served their country honorably.

Obviously not.

> I don't honor posers or posturers who can only claim generalities and
> spout gratuitous phrases or are only interested in fantasies of heroic
> "hostile actions" they were never involved with in reality.

Like I said...keep repeating that you yoursoelf over and over,
Lennie.

> > If you were truly an "enemy", Lennie, wwe'd not be having this
> >conversation.
>
> True. I'd be standing, watching a graves registration detail picking
> up your remains.

Uh huh.

> > You have no "honor", Anderscum, save for yourself and your ego.
>
> Vomiting more bile and hatred, ey?
>
> Not nice. Not even close to any "Amateur's Code," I'd say.

Ahhhh...so NOW we know why Lennie refuses to get an Amateur
License! It gives HIM carte blance to be a liar, antagonist, etc etc
etc ! !

> You are envious. Terribly so. There's no other explanation for the hyena
> laugh writing...other than another symptom of your growing psychosis.

"Envious" of you, Lennie? A bitter, shallow shadow of a man who
can't do ANYTHING to "endear" himself to the very community of radio
operators he proposes to lead...?!?!

> > And YOUR "operative word" there was "HAD" tasks dealing with HF
> >radio...I HAVE dealings with HF radio...And NOT on someone elses'
> >dime, either.
>
> Past tense is fine. HF radio is no longer any primary medium for
> either national or international radio communications...it has become
> secondary to very high speed fiber optic digitally-encoded comm and
> geosychronous communications satellites.

If HF was the ONLY part of the spectrum that Amatuer Radio
embraced, you might have an argument. However it is only about 3% of
it, however it seems to consume 100% of your arguments about Amateur
Radio.

Too bad for you, but jsut one more example of how little real
understanding YOU have of Amatuer Radio.

Sucks to be you.

> That I was actually involved in HF radio communications before your
> birth, for three straight years, makes you very tense. It should, you
> have NO comparative claims verifiable through documentation or
> witnesses to prove your "matching" experience later.

Wether you were on discreet channels of HF, VHF or UHF...Army,
civilian or otherwise, and in 1950, 60, 70, or whenever, it has
absolutely NOTHING to do with Amateur Radio. You were essentially a
"wireless teletype" operator, nothing more, nothing less.

> > Your "link", Lennie, will be forever remembered in THIS forum as
> >a shameful and scurrilous attempt to USE those men and thier sacrifice
> >to make some silly attempt at improving your image in here.
>
> I don't "use" anyone in the military.

Yes, you did. You perpetuate the lie again.

> I'm just trying to advocate the abolishment of morse code testing for any
> US radio operator license. Instead, I get all this spewing of HATE and
> VOMIT from certain parties exhibiting classic symptoms of psychoses.

And again you exercise your "licensed practitioner by association"
with your correspondence school shrink wife. You have yet to tell us
which school of psychiatry YOU graduated from, Lennie

> Get some mental help, Steamy.
>
> It may improve your life and will certainly improve the lives of all around
> you.

Hmmmmm...a documented pathological liar asserting another person
needs help...Very cute.

Perhaps if YOU were to take your NON-Amateur Radio related war
stories, NON-Amateur Radio related "CV", and NON-Amatuer Radio related
practice of unlicensed psychiatry to a NON-Amateur Radio related
forum, YOU would be happier.

At least you MIGHT be "relevent".

Steve, K4YZ

2133. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 16:53:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308260853.18fcb4b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75498

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4B731A.6000509@psu.edu>...
> Hans K0HB wrote:
> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >
> >> If you are not a registered voter in California, then you have no cause to
> >> carry on as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on
> >> California politics.
> >>
> >
> >
> > That sword cuts in both directions, sir.
> >
> > If you are not a registered voter in California (licensed operator
> > in the Amateur Radio Service), then you have no cause to carry on
> > as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on California
> > politics (Amateur Radio Service policy).
>
>
> Game, Set, Match!
>
>
> Squelch of the week.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike, you almost got it. Len -was- using the back of the blade.
Maybe if he had used the flat side...

2134. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 17:04:42 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <KqM2b.115721$3o3.8100448@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 75499
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308252030.592e1bc7@posting.google.com...
>
> From http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/08/21/4/?nc=1
>
> "The League also noted that comments in the proceeding so far have
> been silent on the interference susceptibility of BPL to ham radio
> signal ingress. The League predicted that even as little as 250 mW of
> signal induced into overhead power lines some 100 feet from an amateur
> antenna could degrade a BPL system or render it inoperative."
>
> I realize that this is not the statement about actual tests run by the
> BPL people which you'd like to see, they haven't published *any* test
> results at all, but the League technical guys are pretty sharp and I
> doubt they'd make a statement like this if that didn't have a good
> basis for making it.
>

Thanks. I do think interference is going to be a real problem for BPL performance, but ham radio interference will be a very small part of that. I suspect household devices will be far more significant. I wouldn't expect the ARRL to be in a position to test for that, at least in the demo phase. But can be a problem for radio hobbyists if the BPL companies decide to improve thier signal to noise ratio by boosting thier signal. If they do this after they establish BPL service, they can legitimately claim (after they're caught, of course) they are doing it as a service to all their rural voting customers. If this turns into a numbers game between large number of established BPL customers and radio hobbyists, the Part 15 rules may become very flexible.

And if the BPL people don't share their results on how well thier system fares under common everyday line noise, well, it might be a admission by omission.

>
> Heh. Yeah, the recent grid debacle is not setting a very good stage
> for a huggy kissy relationship between the BPL types and *anybody*
> else including the FCC. I've seen some economic analyses of BPL and
> from the standpoint of an investor BPL is a big go-nowhere dud.
>
Almost everybody agrees it's goofy. But it's still around, not because it's technolgically elegant, but because it is seen to fill a need. Maybe a couple of needs. It promises high speed internet access for what would otherwise be higher cost customers. And it might provide a revenue stream

for electric utilities who need to upgrade thier service.

Politicians have a choice. Give the BPL thing a shot, or think about
letting 'em raise rates right now.

>
> That's quite true. But we can't hear HF listeners and we can't
> normally tune some modes but they're out there and apparently in
> profusion. We almost didn't get any 60M band at all because certain
> feds didn't want hams on "their HF frequencies". I dunno who they are,
> those freqs appear dead when ya tune around. But they're there. FBI,
> CIA, NSA, FCC, the military?
>
>
Some of the old utility frequencies near the SW band edges have gone to the
US domestics. But your point is correct. The Feds are holding onto alot of
spectrum. What are they doing with it? Dunno. What do they do with the
vast tracts of federal land? Mostly nothin', it seems. How many
congressmen care?

>
> From a post I launched in RRAP on 8 Feb 2000:
>
> - - - - -
>

[snip]

> K4YZ:
> >and that HF is for recreation, period.
> >
> W3RV:
> "PRECISELY: If I had my druthers I'd have the regulation of HF ham
> radio moved over to the National Park Service and let the geeks screw
> around with the FCC."
>
> - - - - -
[snip]

Sometimes I wonder how many more creative people would use amatuer
radio if amatuer radio could be used in more creative ways. As an
example, Reggie Fessenden played his violin on the first non code
broadcast. Might Blendor inventor Fred Waring have put on a radio
show on his own homebrew transmitter? It's not inconcievable. I've
read that Bo Diddley made his own guitars and amps. Imagine how
many more radio hobbyists there would be now, if Bo was slamming
the strings on SW radio 30 years ago. I'm sure plenty of people
would love to hear Joe Walsh do the same thing today.

If radio were open to the public, there would be thousands more
people who give a damn about radio. And any politican will desire
the support of thousands who give a damn every bit as much as

he desires a snappy wardrobe and a full head of hair.

Frank Dresser

2135. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 17:30:55 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <jPM2b.115745$3o3.8102432@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 75501
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308252030.592e1bc7@posting.google.com...
>
> From http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/08/21/4/?nc=1
>
> "The League also noted that comments in the proceeding so far have
> been silent on the interference susceptibility of BPL to ham radio
> signal ingress. The League predicted that even as little as 250 mW of
> signal induced into overhead power lines some 100 feet from an amateur
> antenna could degrade a BPL system or render it inoperative."
>
> I realize that this is not the statement about actual tests run by the
> BPL people which you'd like to see, they haven't published *any* test
> results at all, but the League technical guys are pretty sharp and I
> doubt they'd make a statement like this if that didn't have a good
> basis for making it.
>

Thanks. I do think interference is going to be a real problem for BPL performance, but ham radio interference will be a very small part of that. I suspect household devices will be far more significant. I wouldn't expect the ARRL to be in a position to test for that, at least in the demo phase. But can be a problem for radio hobbyists if the BPL companies decide to improve thier signal to noise ratio by boosting thier signal. If they do this after they establish BPL service, they can legitimately claim (after they're caught, of course) they are doing it as a service to all their rural voting customers. If this turns into a numbers game between large number of established BPL customers and radio hobbyists, the Part 15 rules may become very flexible.

And if the BPL people don't share their results on how well thier system fares under common everyday line noise, well, it might be a admission by omission.

>
> Heh. Yeah, the recent grid debacle is not setting a very good stage
> for a huggy kissy relationship between the BPL types and *anybody*
> else including the FCC. I've seen some economic analyses of BPL and
> from the standpoint of an investor BPL is a big go-nowhere dud.
>
Almost everybody agrees it's goofy. But it's still around, not because it's technolgically elegant, but because it is seen to fill a need. Maybe a couple of needs. It promises high speed internet access for what would otherwise be higher cost customers. And it might provide a revenue stream

for electric utilities who need to upgrade thier service.

Politicians have a choice. Give the BPL thing a shot, or think about
letting 'em raise rates right now.

>
> That's quite true. But we can't hear HF listeners and we can't
> normally tune some modes but they're out there and apparently in
> profusion. We almost didn't get any 60M band at all because certain
> feds didn't want hams on "their HF frequencies". I dunno who they are,
> those freqs appear dead when ya tune around. But they're there. FBI,
> CIA, NSA, FCC, the military?
>
>
Some of the old utility frequencies near the SW band edges have gone to the
US domestics. But your point is correct. The Feds are holding onto alot of
spectrum. What are they doing with it? Dunno. What do they do with the
vast tracts of federal land? Mostly nothin', it seems. How many
congressmen care?

>
> From a post I launched in RRAP on 8 Feb 2000:
>
> - - - - -
>

[snip]

> K4YZ:
> >and that HF is for recreation, period.
> >
> W3RV:
> "PRECISELY: If I had my druthers I'd have the regulation of HF ham
> radio moved over to the National Park Service and let the geeks screw
> around with the FCC."
>
> - - - - -
[snip]

Sometimes I wonder how many more creative people would use amatuer
radio if amatuer radio could be used in more creative ways. As an
example, Reggie Fessenden played his violin on the first non code
broadcast. Might Blendor inventor Fred Waring have put on a radio
show on his own homebrew transmitter? It's not inconcievable. I've
read that Bo Diddley made his own guitars and amps. Imagine how
many more radio hobbyists there would be now, if Bo was slamming
the strings on SW radio 30 years ago. I'm sure plenty of people
would love to hear Joe Walsh do the same thing today.

If radio were open to the public, there would be thousands more
people who give a damn about radio. And any politican will desire
the support of thousands who give a damn every bit as much as

he desires a snappy wardrobe and a full head of hair.

Frank Dresser

2136. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 17:30:56 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <kPM2b.115746$3o3.8101626@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 75500
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Ralph Aichinger" <ralph@dolphy.pangea.at> wrote in message
news:1061903206.65433@news.liwest.at...
>
> I don`t know the details, but here in Europe several pilot projects
> were basically stopped and several larger companies got out of that
> technology again, after trying to hype it for several years.
>
> I do not know if this is due to unreliability or due to other factors,
> but it *seems* to have worked better in the lab than in the real world.
> If enough problems make it too unreliable and/or expensive, this might
> be the easiest way out.
>
> There *are* some companies still trying to bring this to market though
> (my local utility does).
>
> /ralph

Yeah. As proposed, it might have too many problems to go into widespread use. However, if the biggest problem is their signal to noise ratio, they might fix it by boosting their signal. Let's hope not!

Frank Dresser

2137. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 17:38:47 UTC
From: Web <WebFx27@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <HWM2b.4001$bu.1992496@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 75502
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Sell the Wouff Hong.....become a member with the money and vote them out or run for their offices

Web

"Disgusted" <Noooo@eeee.maillll> wrote in message news:vkl0nsoogac3c7@corp.supernews.com...
>
> I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the SHIT
> out of them!
>
>
>
>

2138. practrical spectrum analyzer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 17:50:39 UTC
From: payam79b@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <1e2005ff.0308260950.376d1cd1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75503

Hi,I am student & curiously want to build a practical ,high frequency spectrum analyzer , I have searched a lot for a one such : GBPPR 0 - 1000 MHz Spectrum Analyzer,
A Spectrum Analyzer for the Radio Amateur By Wes Hayward, W7ZOI, and Terry White, K7TAU & some others ï¿½, according to my location I have some restrictions a bout some parts that they use in their circuits , but I think may poor mans spectrum analyzer is a good chaos because always I can find tv tuner as mixer , I think about four times I have emailed to MURRAY BARLOWE, WA2PZO
(radioguy@hoflink.com) the owner of home page of poormans sa on www.science-workshop.com (Updated 2/26/2003) but he doesn't answare ! has anyone buy recently from it ? does any one see the book or CD of "BUILD YOUR SPECTRUM ANALYZER " THAT IS SELLED ON HIS HOMEPAGE?
I DON'T WANT TO BUY THE KIT , I WANT TO BUY THE book or CD & according to the circuits & the parts I can find here make it,so does that book indicate circuits in detail or only say how do the kits should be connected together ? if so where can I found the circuit of it ?
Any help would be most appreciated.
Payam
Can you email me for reply instead of answering on group ?
payam79b@yahoo.com
thanks!

2139. No Mo Morse -- A view from Europe

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 19:20:42 UTC
From: Gr�mw�tch th� �nfl�pp�bl� <Gr�mw�tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <eqO2b.4788$3E.7@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75504

Posted from G4NJH site http://www.innotts.co.uk/asperges/whatsnew.html

Yes, it's happened after all these years. The Morse Code test required for HF transmitting licences has gone.

Many a tear will be shed that that so hallowed and venerated, equally loved and detested, has been done away with. There will be cries of "shame" but this is the 21st century and it was felt that this was an anachronism.

The recent IARU conference voted to do away with it, and the UK has moved quickly to comply. On the other hand, some countries such as the US will NOT be abolishing it it seems. Why exactly, I do not know. Is it some sort of class prejudice, with privileges carefully maintained or just bureaucracy slow to act.

We shall watch with interest. Meanwhile, remember nothing can stop you USING CW, but you won't need it any more for a UK licence. The plethora of callsigns does not change though. So, welcome to HF. I wonder how many of those who "would not go near HF under any circumstances" will suddenly now change their minds. Or am I just an old cynic??!

--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be construed."

2140. Re: Click to sign petition supporting radio free brattleboro

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 19:41:02 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <iJO2b.4805$3E.4156@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75505

Of course your lawyer is an idiot. If there was an idiot competition, he'd
come in second place. Why second place? Because he's an idiot!

72.5,

Barnabas Grumwitch Overbyte

--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."

"LPFM News" <LPFM@Lpfmnews79.org> wrote in message
news:big5cpuua0@pita.alt.net...
: "DJ UndahCovah" <profile@mail.sit.edu> wrote in message
: news:bhgfk0$h2c$1@xuxa.iecc.com...
: > Brattleboro, Vermont
: >
: > Our local radio station, radio free brattleboro, is currently
: > documenting community support to show the FCC that indeed, we have the
: > "authority to operate" as granted to us by the public, who own the
: > airwaves. We are a non-profit, non-commerical, 10 watt station with a
: > mission to train local citizens in the art of radio broadcasting and
: > the rights and responsibilities inherent to free speech. Our lawyers
: > have advised us that since the FCC has not defined what "authority to
: > operate" is, we can define it as community support. Since we webcast,
: > you are our community too!
: >
: > Please click on this link to read our petition & register your
: > (electronic signature) support for our project.
: >
: > http://www.petitiononline.com/07131998/petition.html
: >
: > Please note that this is for Non-Residents of Brattleboro, VT only,
: > and only one signature can be registered per computer. If you've
: > already signed, please take a few minutes to pass this along to your
: > contacts who care about media reform and continuing to challenge the
: > increasing homogenization of corporate media.
: >
: > You can check out our website at www.rfb.fm where you can access our
: > streaming web signal and look at our program guide. More information
: > on our current struggle to remain on air despite a recent visit by the
: > FCC is available at www.ibrattleboro.com, and by contacting us at
: > rfb@sover.net
: >
: > Thank you,

: >
: > Sara, "DJ Undahcovah"
: >
:
:

2141. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 20:03:30 UTC
From: K7JEB <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net>
Message-ID: <m2P2b.115962$3o3.8112423@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 75506
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

>> Disgusted wrote:
>>
>> I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the SHIT
>> out of them!

> David Stinson replied:
> You better take four or five- It'll take a lot of beating and
> you'll wear them out.

That is not the correct method of applying the
Wouff Hong in any case. I would provide a
detailed description of the act, but it is too
intensely horrific for the delicate sensibilities
of the newsgroup readers.

Jim, K7JEB

2142. Re: Off subject, tv monitor????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 20:12:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4BBF14.1070400@psu.edu>
Source record: 75507

kc5cqa@yahoo.com wrote:
> I would like to use my tv as a monitor for my computer, could you
> tell me what all is involved? What I have to purchase,
> hardware/software wise? Thanks in advance. cl 73

Heh, heh, that is a bit OT in this group!

What I'd suggest is a video board such as one of the Radeon's that have a television output in addition to the SVGA output.

Note that there will be significant degradation compared to a normal computer monitor.

There are outboard devices, but I don't like them as well as the internal ones.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2143. Re: Click to sign petition supporting radio free brattleboro

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 20:19:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4BC0C7.60707@psu.edu>
Source record: 75508

Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½ wrote:
> Of course your lawyer is an idiot. If there was an idiot competition, he'd
> come in second place. Why second place? Because he's an idiot!
>
> 72.5,
>
> Barnabas Grumwitch Overbyte

subgenius?

And where've ya been, Grï¿½mwï¿½tch?

- mike KB3EIA -

2144. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 20:44:15 UTC
From: CW <clinton.magers@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <zEP2b.267374$o%2.121884@sccrnsc02>
Source record: 75509
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I think there is a big panic about something that will probably be a minor annoyance to some. Not a problem to most. Do people seriously think that airports are just going to cease communicating with their planes? How about the military HF network. I can see them now. Sitting around the pentagon saying "forget national security, people have to get their email". Think about it.
"Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message news:kPM2b.115746$3o3.8101626@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Ralph Aichinger" <ralph@dolphy.pangea.at> wrote in message
> news:1061903206.65433@news.liwest.at...
> >
>
> Yeah. As proposed, it might have too many problems to go into widespread
> use. However, if the biggest problem is their signal to noise ratio, they
> might fix it by boosting their signal. Let's hope not!
>
> Frank Dresser
>
>

2145. The technical level of QST increases

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 20:50:06 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <c9a0a4ecaa105536f1ffc46ce3787827@dizum.com>
Source record: 75510

September 2003, page 38 : how to replace
a pilot lamp by a LED and a resistor.
The high technical level of this article
is for CW coders only.

Page 31 is not bad too, the figure 4-A
shows a very sophisticated interface
including 2 resistors, 2 banana plug
sockets and 2 BNC plugs. This article
is reserved for EXTRA operators only.

2146. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 21:17:33 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308261317.1b3d2546@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75511
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet

> If radio were open to the public, there would be thousands more
> people who give a damn about radio. And any politican will desire
> the support of thousands who give a damn every bit as much as
> he desires a snappy wardrobe and a full head of hair.
>

Hey Frank, where'd you ever get the idea that radio *isn't* open to
the public?
I never knew anyone whatever who wanted a ham radio license who was
barred from getting one. There is a small matter of qualifying for it,
of course, as there is in every endeavor where others can and will be
impacted when the licensee knows not which way is up. But it has
always been open to all comers.

Now if you're talking "open" like CB is open, that's a horse of an
entirely different color.

Dick

2147. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 21:19:33 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308261319.5dea6a1d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75512

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308260853.18fcb4b@posting.google.com>...
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4B731A.6000509@psu.edu>...
> > Hans K0HB wrote:
> > > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
> > >
> > >
> > >> If you are not a registered voter in California, then you have no cause to
> > >> carry on as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on
> > >> California politics.
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> > > That sword cuts in both directions, sir.
> > >
> > > If you are not a registered voter in California (licensed operator
> > > in the Amateur Radio Service), then you have no cause to carry on
> > > as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on California
> > > politics (Amateur Radio Service policy).
> >
> >
> > Game, Set, Match!
> >
> >
> > Squelch of the week.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Mike, you almost got it. Len -was- using the back of the blade.
> Maybe if he had used the flat side...

Brian, as usual you didn't quite get it. Len just got the blade stuffed up his nose.

2148. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 21:22:22 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826172222.12079.00000445@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 75513

>Oh my, nasty visual..
>
>http://www.geocities.com/picsrfun2003/untitled.bmp
>
Thats probably her.

2149. Re: Click to sign petition supporting radio free brattleboro

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 21:35:32 UTC
From: Omaha <Omaha@omahakidtrace.net>
Message-ID: <bigjqf$r8t$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75514

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:3F4BC0C7.60707@psu.edu...
>
>
> Gr�mw�tch th� �nfl�pp�bl� wrote:
> > Of course your lawyer is an idiot. If there was an idiot competition,
he'd
> > come in second place. Why second place? Because he's an idiot!
> >
> > 72.5,
> >
> > Barnabas Grumwitch Overbyte
>
> subgenius?
>
>
> And where've ya been, Gr�mw�tch?
>
> - mike KB3EIA -
>

```
Grumwitch is located in or near Omaha, NE

Omaha
```

2150. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 21:49:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308261349.522139f6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75515

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030826091638.02751.00000335@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >Exactly! And this is from the guy that said he took the Extra exam on a
> >lark!
> >
> >Here are the particulars:
> >
> >1. without studying
> >2. on a $250 bet from two "cb-plussers"
> >3. completed in under 8 minutes
> >drum roll
> >4. scored 100%
> >
> And what bugs Brian the most, is after all this time he still cant pass the
> EXTRA.
> But what do expect, it took his great Leader Karl, who is the Leader of NCI
> well over a year to pass it.
> A bunch of Dummies who cant even pass a simple Memorization Test, where no
> real knowledge of the subject material is required.

Bruce, you "morron," I didn't say that you didn't pass the exam.

I only said that your retelling of how you did it is total unadulterated BS.

In other words, you lied.

That is all. Dis-missed.

2151. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 21:54:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308261354.30a28150@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75516
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:<3f4b41b0_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>...
> Not only was VN winnable, it was won by the party in the
> right - the resident Vietnamese resistance against the invading Warmongers.
>
> Not too dissimilar to the Iraq of tomorrow?

Its about time! There's going to be an uprising against the terrorist
infiltrators from Syria and Iran (can I say Saudi)?

2152. Re: practrical spectrum analyzer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 21:59:31 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0308261359.3c10770c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75517

payam79b@yahoo.com (payam) wrote in message
news:<1e2005ff.0308260950.376d1cd1@posting.google.com>...
> Hi,I am student & curiously want to build a practical ,high frequency
> spectrum analyzer , I have searched a lot for a one such : GBPPR 0 -
> 1000 MHz Spectrum Analyzer,

You're in the wrong group! This group only exists to argue about
Morse Code, and Kim's Tits.

> Can you email me for reply instead of answering on group ?

BAAAADDDD Internet etiquette!

- Stewart

2153. Re: practrical spectrum analyzer

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 22:03:47 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4BD943.9FA6EEC4@ptt.edu>
Source record: 75518

> You're in the wrong group! This group only exists to argue about
> Morse Code, and Kim's Tits.

I hope there a nice pair.

2154. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 22:08:54 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030826180854.187$nV@newsreader.com>
Source record: 75519

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> >Oh my, nasty visual..
> >
> >http://www.geocities.com/picsrfun2003/untitled.bmp
> >
> Thats probably her.
>
-Her- called to complain. <g>

--
GO #40

2155. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 22:36:52 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <8iR2b.15156$8i2.14583@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75520
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:he3mkv08ulr846ajkkmkadluievffpvmpf@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 26 Aug 2003 00:04:01 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> > But I was just a lowly Sergeant.
>
> And it sure shows!
> :-)
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

Does it really? And how many years did you put on the bench old boy?

Dan/W4NTI

2156. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 22:38:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <XjR2b.15172$8i2.11371@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75521
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

Im not going to argue that a bit. And I was there. Unfortunatly I wasn't smart enough then to know what I do now. But you Brits are always right, right?

Dan/W4NTI

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message news:3f4b41b0_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> Not only was VN winnable, it was won by the party in the
> right - the resident Vietnamese resistance against the invading Warmongers.
>
> Not too dissimilar to the Iraq of tomorrow?
>
> Ged <ged65@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk> wrote in message
> news:r6P0O9C3syS$EwyM@morpheous.fsnet.co.uk...
> > In message <9Du2b.12405$8i2.10438@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> > Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get.rid.invalid> writes
> > >The Frogs would have got their butts kicked out of there whether we
> helped
> > >them or not. VN was not winnable no matter who or what did what to whom.
> > That's the usual Republican excuse to explain wars they didn't win.
> > If it wasn't 'winnable' how come the Vietcong won?
>
>
>

2157. Re: No Mo Morse -- A view from Europe

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 22:44:35 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <npR2b.5289$bu.2921351@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 75522

"Gr�mw�tch th� �nfl�pp�bl�" <Gr�mw�tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
wrote in message news:eqO2b.4788$3E.7@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Posted from G4NJH site http://www.innotts.co.uk/asperges/whatsnew.html
> I wonder how many of
> those who "would not go near HF under any circumstances" will suddenly now
> change their minds. Or am I just an old cynic??!

That's funny, I posed that question not too long ago. There are a few (Two immediately come to mind.) NCT's who claimed that they could upgrade anytime they chose, but were "entirely satisfied" with 50 MHz and up and really had no use for HF. Wonder how long they'll remain Technicians or will a /AG or /AE magically appear behind their calls all of a sudden?

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

2158. Re: Alinco 801 1st HF transceiver with no CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 22:58:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <1CR2b.15354$8i2.1825@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75523

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030826080339.07063.00000394@mb-m26.aol.com...
> Looks like a Typical CB, just what you guys wanted.

Sure does. Bet Andy will just love it.

Dan/W4NTI

2159. Re: "Unfortunate Responsibility"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 22:59:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <vDR2b.15368$8i2.7074@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75524

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:cgI2b.33766$Vx2.14686650@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > Well, getting a ham license isn't exactly a waste of time, but it does
> > carry some responsibilities. Unfortunately for us, one of them is
> > abiding by communications law.
>
> I do not consider our obligation as hams to abide by communications law to
> be "unfortunate"... It strikes me as being essential and beneficial, in no
> way unfortunate because without that obligation we would quickly go the
way
> of CB, as you say.
>
> People who work to undermine these rules and our obligation to follow them
> as hams are directly attacking the hobby, attempting to undercut the basis
> of our legitimacy. Most often, these attacks are based on a stated desire
to
> obtain a "freebee" at other's expense.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>

Well put.

Dan/W4NTI

2160. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 23:04:40 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826190440.02751.00000372@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75525

> -Her- called to complain. <g>
>
>--
>GO #40

Isnt that ashame

2161. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 23:06:37 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826190637.02751.00000373@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75526

>I only said that your retelling of how you did it is total unadulterated BS.
>
>In other words, you lied.
>

None of its a LIE, its all FACT, you just cant handle the fact that I did it
and you cant.

2162. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 23:07:45 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826190745.02751.00000374@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75527

>Sure I can. Got any?

You have allready heard the FACTS, your problem is you cant handle it.

2163. Re: Alinco 801 1st HF transceiver with no CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 23:10:22 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826191022.02751.00000375@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75528

>Sure does. Bet Andy will just love it.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Of course Dan, but Im sure someone will have to show him how to use it. Did you see that fool now has a GMRS License?

2164. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 23:32:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826193246.02537.00000231@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75529

In article <BB6F110D.24B97%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

> After all the ranting you did in that message, you have the nerve to tell >others to go elsewhere?

Absolutely.

The special election for recall in the state of California does NOT involve amateur radio.

Never did. Won't.

>Don't hold your breath. Political discussions are
>almost a tradition in this newsgroup, and your rants (about the "bigotry of >easterners" and so on) certainly isn't going to change that.

Okay, you must be establishing that this is NOT an amateur radio policy discussion venue, right?

YOU want it to be all about politics, anywhere and everywhere?

There are hundreds of Chat Rooms and other forums for discussion of everything that is NOT about amateur radio. Go there.

LHA

2165. Re: NCI Position for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 23:32:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826193247.02537.00000232@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75530

In article <eLc2b.14463$sm2.8299@fe05.atl2.webusenet.com>, "Dan Finn"
<djfinn2@nospam.bellsouth.net> writes:

>Len, this is bullcrap, and, it is boring.

Heh, I thought you'd say something like that. :-)

>You have no idea to what the math really means.

Yes I do and so did my instructor over 30 years ago. Did a verbatim
oral on the whiteboard to prove the transformation from the simple AM
signal equation to the one that had the three terms for Carrier, Lower
and Upper Sideband components.

Not only that, but the next task on that oral exam was to show how
mixing the AM signal in two parallel paths with quadrature-phased
RF sources would allow selective demodulation of the sidebands.

>Sorry, but I will not continue to give you a forum just so
>that you can 'baffle 'em with bullshit'.

It's not "bullshit." Just a bit of algebra which can translate to radio
hardware values.

>That's what you are doing. I doubt
>that you even have a BSEE, otherwise you would not have to cite the author
>when explaining what is common electrical engineering text book material
>(that you have misinterpreted).

It is normal practice among ALL technical people to reference sources.
That includes PhDs, Nobel Laureates, Masters, and Bachelors.

Nothing was "misinterpreted," Finn. Nothing at all.

The only difference between what I wrote and the original work is the
inability of the Internet medium to allow Greek symbols and, especially,
subscripts and superscripts.

I can carry this a LOT farther just by spending some more typing time.

Harmonic content due to distortion in a not-quite-linear amplifier is one
huge area. That can be combined with the basic AM equation to show
how and how much harmonic content is generated. Did that in the early
1970s for RCA Corporation as part of the special FCC license
documentation required for 1.6 GHz SECANT avionics transmission
(a corporate R&D program).

I COULD do all that typing, but it would be to little avail. You would
simply say "it's a lot of bullshit" and dismiss it without mentioning a

single bit of the mathematical explanation. You would probably continue to do the gratuitous personal denigration...again without considering the subject matter or anything under real discussion.

Meanwhile, I'm still waiting to hear your erudite explantaion that was something about "phase changing will cancel all distortion." :-)

LHA

2166. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 23:49:47 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <vmS2b.34038$Vx2.14836639@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75531

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308260454.19c25149@posting.google.com...
> David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3F4ADED8.AB57BD96@ix.netcom.com>...
> > WA8ULX wrote:
> > >
> > > >You're a rude little fella, aren't you?
> > >
> > > Damn right
> > >
> > > >I think I'll apply for WD1CK, or move overseas and
> > > >get PU5SY
> > >
> > > Go ahead Morron
> >
> > "Morron?" LOL!
>
> Exactly! And this is from the guy that said he took the Extra exam on a
lark!
>
> Here are the particulars:
>
> 1. without studying
> 2. on a $250 bet from two "cb-plussers"
> 3. completed in under 8 minutes
> drum roll
> 4. scored 100%

Got to be stretching the truth. NO ONE is born knowing the band limits and
other FCC regulations. And they do appear on the test. Therefore the
person who said they didn't study is LYING. They had to have read the
material somewhere, somehow at least once. That classifies as studying.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2167. Re: No Mo Morse -- A view from Europe

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 23:53:29 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ZpS2b.34040$Vx2.14837351@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75532

"Grï¿½mwï¿½tch thï¿½ ï¿½nflï¿½ppï¿½blï¿½"
<Grï¿½mwï¿½tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
wrote in message news:eqO2b.4788$3E.7@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> Posted from G4NJH site http://www.innotts.co.uk/asperges/whatsnew.html
> [snip]
> We shall watch with interest. Meanwhile, remember nothing can stop you
USING
> CW, but you won't need it any more for a UK licence. The plethora of
> callsigns does not change though. So, welcome to HF. I wonder how many of
> those who "would not go near HF under any circumstances" will suddenly now
> change their minds. Or am I just an old cynic??!
>

You are not a cynic as you've hit the reality nail squarely on the head.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2168. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-26 23:58:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <duS2b.34043$Vx2.14838457@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75533

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bid1gl$83013$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
> > Actually, Riley has stated that not following a local gentleman's
> > agreement band plan was poor amateur practice and is enforceable. So
> > items not specifically spelled out in the regulations may be
> > enforceable depending who's at the FCC on any particular day.
>
> The problem is "WHO'S" gentlemen's band plan?? The Anti Radio Relay
> League???
>

No need to slam the ARRL. There isn't any other group available to do so. They have the resources to evaluate the common usage of the band, develop it into a band plan, and then to widely disseminate the information so that it is useful to all. What other group can match that? Simple: None. If you want input, join the group and work from within. Don't slam it from without.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2169. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 00:07:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826200719.22785.00000623@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 75534

> NO ONE is born knowing the band limits and
>other FCC regulations. And they do appear on the test.

Not on my TEST

2170. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 00:12:53 UTC
From: wieland@copland.udel.edu
Message-ID: <bigt25$70o$1@copland.udel.edu>
Source record: 75535
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <e79dbd9b.0308250726.9d7bfba@posting.google.com>,
K0HB <k0hb@arrl.net> wrote:
[snip]
> BPL works on conducted signals, not radiated signals. The power grid is
> an incredibly poor receiving antenna, so any microvolt-level or even
> millivolt-level signal from "out there" won't even show up on the
> copper.
>

True that BPL is intended to work on conducted signals. False that the power lines are "incredibly poor" as receiving antennas. Totally untrue. In my town, the city (the city is also our electric distributor) put in an oddball lightning protection which keeps the topwire on every pole at RF ground. The effect is know as "Radio-Free Newark", a place where you need something like my R-75 to get Philadelphia AM stations (we're about 80 miles away from Philly, about 20 miles West of Wilmington, DE).

In fact, some recent ARRL work concerns interference in the other direction, with the power lines receiving. A ham who happens to point a beam at a powerline will slow BPL, and may in fact bring BPL to its knees (bad packets = 100%).

That's going to be REAL fun, with the power company having to work very hard to find the problems their paying customers are mad about, only to complain about it and get back the standard FCC letter about ham interference? The FCC has been pretty unbending about that in the past; if the ham is legal, its YOUR job to keep her out of your equipment, and the cost of your equipment or how much money the interference is costing you don't enter into it.

--

R F Wieland Newark, DE 19711-5323 USA 39.68N 75.74W
Icom R75 Heathkit GR-81 Inverted-L in the attic
Reply to wieland at me dot udel dot edu

2171. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 00:51:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <_fT2b.15971$8i2.3083@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75536
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:susnkvkd8759to0g6lddau48igep3hdefr@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 26 Aug 2003 22:36:52 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >Does it really? And how many years did you put on the bench old boy?
>
> Unlike you, I was not conscripted. We only have professionals in our
> army over here .... we don't rely upon amateur soldiers.
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

You certainly are full of ASSumptions Walt. Why do you assume I was
'conscripted', or as we call it....'drafted' ??

Are you sure? Or are you just talking through your ass again mate?

Dan/W4NTI

2172. Re: Alinco 801 1st HF transceiver with no CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 00:53:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <iiT2b.15973$8i2.2547@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75537

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030826191022.02751.00000375@mb-m23.aol.com...
> >Sure does. Bet Andy will just love it.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> Of course Dan, but Im sure someone will have to show him how to use it.
Did you
> see that fool now has a GMRS License?

No I didn't actually. Next thing we will see him asking how to hook up his
new GMRS 'kicker'.

Dan/W4NTI

2173. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 01:25:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030826212554.06226.00000181@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 75540

In article <f45722ac.0308260457.736cd537@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> In article <f45722ac.0308241828.20276940@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >Larry, do I need to regurge all your "my favorite black on the bus"
>episodes?
>>
>> Why not?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Why not? Because your words are dispicable, that's why.

Brian:

Gee, Brian, don't you think "dispicable" (sic) is a bit strong? I'd just
call them "true."

73 de Larry, K3LT

2174. Re: Off subject, tv monitor????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 01:25:54 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030826212554.06226.00000180@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 75541

In article <scvmkvgenfscuevfgf5mc6hjjqa2n7t5m2@4ax.com>, kc5cqa@yahoo.com writes:

>
> I would like to use my tv as a monitor for my computer, could you
>tell me what all is involved? What I have to purchase,
>hardware/software wise? Thanks in advance. cl 73

Go get yourself an old Commodore 64/128, and you're all set!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2175. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 01:25:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030826212555.06226.00000183@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 75538

In article <biff8g$ohf@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>Have you seen the number of lookups for me on QRZ? Keep in mind I haven't
>been on the air in over a year now. ROFLMAO...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

That's what happens when you look yourself up a couple of dozen
times a day.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2176. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 01:25:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030826212555.06226.00000182@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 75539

In article <20030826091823.02751.00000336@mb-m23.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>You have to be kidding. She hauls them in to the Hamfest, supported by a >FORKLIFT.

TMI, Bruce...TMI! You've just put an ugly image in my head which will haunt me for days!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2177. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 01:53:35 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308261753.6d5a0548@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75542

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in m

be going so far out of your way to
> display ham radio's ass in public.
>

Ham radio has an ASS?? We knew about that W5 showing off her TIT but
so far no ASS has shown up here... You might recheck that one Chuck.

2178. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 01:53:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826215338.28093.00001057@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 75543

>TMI, Bruce...TMI! You've just put an ugly image in my head which will
>haunt me for days!
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

Someone had to do it Larry

2179. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 01:57:20 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308261757.69344b8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75544
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:<m2P2b.115962$3o3.8112423@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> >> Disgusted wrote:
> >>
> >> I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the SHIT
> >> out of them!
>
> > David Stinson replied:
> > You better take four or five- It'll take a lot of beating and
> > you'll wear them out.
>
> That is not the correct method of applying the
> Wouff Hong in any case. I would provide a
> detailed description of the act, but it is too
> intensely horrific for the delicate sensibilities
> of the newsgroup readers.
>

I dunno, Jim, we have some really insensitive induhviduals on here-
Some of them probably wouldn't even notice!

Dick

2180. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 02:02:40 UTC
From: N8KDV <n8kdv@nospam.iserv.net>
Message-ID: <3F4C1140.FC23A9B7@nospam.iserv.net>
Source record: 75545
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Disgusted wrote:

> I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the SHIT
> out of them!

Would someone please make up a set of lyrics please? I imagine something
along the lines of 'If I had a hammer, I'd hammer in the morning....'

2181. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 02:06:46 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bih45n$o81@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 75549

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030826090213.949$SA@newsreader.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote:
> > "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > news:3F4ADED8.AB57BD96@ix.netcom.com...
> > > WA8ULX wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >You're a rude little fella, aren't you?
> > > >
> > > > Damn right
> > > >
> > > > >I think I'll apply for WD1CK, or move overseas and
> > > > >get PU5SY
> > > >
> > > > Go ahead Morron
> > >
> > > "Morron?" LOL!
> > >
> >
> > It's the CB mentality screaming loud and clear, David ;)
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> Do people scream " show us your tits" at the hamfest?
>
> --
> GO #40

Nope. They're pretty darned obvious.

Kim W5TIT

2182. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 02:11:44 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bih45o$o81@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 75548

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030826212555.06226.00000183@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <biff8g$ohf@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >Have you seen the number of lookups for me on QRZ? Keep in mind I
haven't
> >been on the air in over a year now. ROFLMAO...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> That's what happens when you look yourself up a couple of dozen
> times a day.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Not at all, Larry. Ya jealous?

Kim W5TIT

2183. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 02:14:40 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bih45p$o81@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 75550

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030826212555.06226.00000182@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <20030826091823.02751.00000336@mb-m23.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com
> (WA8ULX) writes:
>
> >You have to be kidding. She hauls them in to the Hamfest, supported by a
> >FORKLIFT.
>
> TMI, Bruce...TMI! You've just put an ugly image in my head which will
> haunt me for days!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

ROFLMAO!! Ladies and gents, there's some intellect and logic fer ya...

Gads, Larry. You're getting more and more desperate. Tell ya what, I'll quit responding to your posts *until* I see something logical and intellectual. Go ahead, make my day...

Kim W5TIT

2184. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 02:15:25 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <1vU2b.115284$0v4.8237436@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 75546
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"CW" <clinton.magers@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:zEP2b.267374$o%2.121884@sccrnsc02...
> I think there is a big panic about something that will probably be a minor
> annoyance to some. Not a problem to most. Do people seriously think that
> airports are just going to cease communicating with their planes? How
about
> the military HF network. I can see them now. Sitting around the pentagon
> saying "forget national security, people have to get their email". Think
> about it.

It's my wild ass guess that BPL won't be a big success, but I do think cheating on the BPL power will be a real temptation. Anyway, it will be tough on radio hobbyists in a BPL neighborhood, and it certainly will be heard over a wider region. But, you're probably right. The world isn't coming to an end over this. Brother Stair has been quiet on the whole BPL issue.

Frank Dresser

2185. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 02:15:38 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <evU2b.115285$0v4.8238159@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 75547
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:9829b709.0308261317.1b3d2546@posting.google.com...
> "Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet
>
>
>
>
> Hey Frank, where'd you ever get the idea that radio *isn't* open to
> the public?
> I never knew anyone whatever who wanted a ham radio license who was
> barred from getting one. There is a small matter of qualifying for it,
> of course, as there is in every endeavor where others can and will be
> impacted when the licensee knows not which way is up. But it has
> always been open to all comers.

OK, amateur radio is open to the public. But nearly all amateur radio activity is either contacts between hams or some sort of test. I'm under the impression that amatuers broadcasting what might be considered entertainment programming to the public is banned. Am I wrong about that?

>
> Now if you're talking "open" like CB is open, that's a horse of an
> entirely different color.
>
> Dick

More like pirate radio. I've heard some very entertaining stuff, and I hope to hear alot more. I know that time can be bought on an independent broadcaster, but I'd really like to know why what Alan Maxwell and the other do is illegal. I think hobby broadcasting would bring alot of positive interest to SW radio.

Frank Dresser

2186. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 02:24:48 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB718F28.24C6F%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75601

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> If that's the case, then he would have to
> blame Kim for that outcome, not me. After
> all, it was Kim who quoted Riley's comments
> made in a private E-mail in this public
> newsgroup, thereby making them public domain
> and subject to being used against her in
> the future.

His words here, or posted/published anywhere else, don't provide you with an excuse to use those words in an ongoing smear campaign against Kim or anyone else. I think Hollingsworth would be appalled by your actions.

> For the simple reason that my behavior is
> not in question here.

Your behavior is in question here - by me. So, again, since Kim was willing to contact Hollingsworth over the choice of her callsign (her behavior), why don't you contact Hollingsworth to ask if he feels your behavior (your use of his words to publicly harass Kim for many months) has any effect on Ham Radio?

> Kim is not being "harassed." She is merely
> experiencing the justified reaction to an
> action she took which is potentially harmful
> to the image of the ARS, and that is my
> right -- just as it was Kim's "right" to
> self-select a call sign with a vulgar,
> sexualized, and demeaning connotation which
> reflects poorly on YL radio amateurs
> everywhere. (snip)

Get off your pulpit, Larry. You do not speak for YL radio amateurs. My wife is not offended by Kim's callsign. Instead, she thinks you're stuck in a sexist past - a past where men told women what they could and could not do. That past is gone.

That is two female radio amateurs (Kim and my wife) saying the opposite of what you claim. So exactly where are all those YL radio amateurs you claim are offended by Kim's callsign, Larry?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2187. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong. (wsa: M321I58DNU 09/06/2003)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 02:29:24 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <8IU2b.8259$Nc.5290428@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 75603
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Does anyone believe the bumper sticker that says "United We Stand"?

Here, on this newsgroup, we all sound like a bunch of assholes who hate each other.

And we all sound like a bunch of *hams* who hate each other, if you read this newsgroup.

Why do those people want to kill us? I don't know. But if we fight amongst ourselves, they win. They win by sitting back and watching us self-destruct.

DickCarroll wrote:

> "K7JEB" <k7jeb@arrl.no_spam.net> wrote in message
news:<m2P2b.115962$3o3.8112423@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
>
>>>>Disgusted wrote:
>>>>
>>>>I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the SHIT
>>>>out of them!
>>
>>
>>
>>>David Stinson replied:
>>>You better take four or five- It'll take a lot of beating and
>>>you'll wear them out.
>>
>>That is not the correct method of applying the
>>Wouff Hong in any case. I would provide a
>>detailed description of the act, but it is too
>>intensely horrific for the delicate sensibilities
>>of the newsgroup readers.
>>
>
>
>
> I dunno, Jim, we have some really insensitive induhviduals on here-
> Some of them probably wouldn't even notice!
>
> Dick

2188. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 02:30:07 UTC
From: craigm <none@domain.invalid>
Message-ID: <vko5muqc1p90d4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 75602
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:evU2b.115285$0v4.8238159@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>

> More like pirate radio. I've heard some very entertaining stuff, and I
hope
> to hear alot more. I know that time can be bought on an independent
> broadcaster, but I'd really like to know why what Alan Maxwell and the
other
> do is illegal. I think hobby broadcasting would bring alot of positive
> interest to SW radio.
>
> Frank Dresser
>
>

It may be fun, but keep in mind a few things. 1) It is difficult to control where a signal goes. 2) There are international agreements that help to avoid interference.

Given the above, allowing radio to be a free for all would only serve to promote interference from stations on the same frequency. That interference can detract from people listening to transmissions that are complying with the agreements and laws. Interference can have serious results if it interferes with aircraft or miliraty communications.

Just imagine the shortwave spectrum being used just like the 27 MHz band.

I'd rather have the order that the laws and agreements provide.

craigm

2189. Re: The technical level of QST increases

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 02:34:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826223439.22081.00000219@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 75604

In article <c9a0a4ecaa105536f1ffc46ce3787827@dizum.com>, Nomen Nescio
<nobody@dizum.com> writes:

>September 2003, page 38 : how to replace
>a pilot lamp by a LED and a resistor.
>The high technical level of this article
>is for CW coders only.
>
>Page 31 is not bad too, the figure 4-A
>shows a very sophisticated interface
>including 2 resistors, 2 banana plug
>sockets and 2 BNC plugs. This article
>is reserved for EXTRA operators only.

I am relieved and enlightened that QST is showing such a leap of
technical understanding of the state of the art of electronics!

LHA

2190. Re: More countries

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 02:34:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826223440.22081.00000220@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 75606

In article <5c01b95b.0308260759.3419337@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
>news:<20030825211804.15586.00000492@mb-m12.aol.com>...
>> From: Alun Palmer elektros@yahoo.com
>>
>> >Switzerland, the UK, Belgium, Germany and Norway have now abolished the
>> >code test, and the Netherlands will follow shortly on September 1st. New
>> >Zealand have said they will abolish the code test later this year.
>>
>> When will the US get rid of the code test?
>>
>> We are lagging behind.
>
> Lagging behind what?

Five world nations.

ARRL still refuses to side with the IARU on code testing...even after S25.5 was rewritten and the international "reqirement" for code testing got tossed in the dumpster.

>> Don't take it for granted that the code test willl be
>> eliminated.
>
> Why?
>
>> We don't have the metric system, which is clearly advantageous.
>
> Which has what to do with Morse Code?

The metric system of weights and measures has been legal since 1866 in the United States. By Congressional legislation.

That's 22 years after the first commercial Morse-Vail telegraph system went into service.

That's 19 years before Marconi first tried wireless radio in Switzerland and 20 years before the first actual radio communications was demonstrated and recorded in Italy and Russia.

LHA

2191. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 02:34:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826223443.22081.00000221@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 75608

In article <5c01b95b.0308260847.2ac2c894@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030824153231.29660.00000207@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>
>> >> Steamy never did any communications while in the military...other
>than
>> >> talking on the telephone.
>> >
>> > Sorry. Incorrect.
>>
>> Show PROOF of your mighty military "communications," big mouth.
>
> This "big mouth" doesn't need to recite his previous service over
>and over in a newsgroup forum in order to sate his ego, Lennie.

Because you don't have any.

No proof. Just a lot of hot air, claims that you can't prove, have no witnesses, have no documentation to show.

> That's YOUR schtick.
>
>> You TALK a big story without mentioning ANY details.
>
> Naaah....No big story, Lennie. I did it, it's in my SRB, and
>that's all that counts.

It's only in your fantasy.

Without proof it doesn't exist.

> The RRAP back channel folks can ask me if they care to, and I'll
>tell them, but you're not invited. You won't play nice in e mail
>anyway.

I sent you several copes of some of my proof. You refused to accept it, claiming those same "not nice" comments.

>> You haven't named a single one of the "hostile actions" you claim you
>> were in.
>
> Because it's irrelevent to this forum. I already invited sonme
>to e mail me direct. Brian took me up on some of it.

Radio communications is still radio communications. You didn't do any
in the military, therefore you can only tell stories about it. Your
unproven claims are just fish stories.

You didn't have any "hostile actions" while in the military other than
bar fights.

>> >> It's painfully obvious, Brian. Steamy hates me. I served in the US
>Army
>> >> so, naturally to him, anything Army is subject to hatred,
>villification,
>> and
>> >> denigration.
>> >
>> > I ahte liars and people who try to use somoen else's military
>> >service to make themselves look good.
>>
>> You just HATE.
>
> Nope...I hate LIARS. That would be you.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...looking in the mirror again.

You can't back up anything you did other than amateur radio. No proof
to show anyone, no personal references, nothing.

>> My military service is archived at NARA. Not only that, I have
>witnesses
>> still alive who were at the same Army radio station I served when I was
>> there. No lies.
>
> Except for your attempts to embellish your "service record" in
>this forum at the expense of Army KIA's and your assertion of "working
>DX" as an Army radio clerk.

NOT as a "clerk," you confused story-teller and braggart.

I DO have proof, documentation, and witnesses. You have NONE.

Who is the "liar" now?

> I am SO (un)impressed.

Feel free.

>> You HATE someone else being successful in anything so much that it
>> makes you almost violent. That's a bad mental symptom which needs
>> treatment.
>
> Nope. I just love making a fool out of your with your own words.

Your "love" is just turning into hate.

You don't make a fool of anyone but yourself.

I DO have proof, documentation, witnesses. You have NONE of those
things.

> Actually, it's very sad to see someone who had something once spend
>what ought to be his "mentoring years" being so childish and idiotic.

You are describing yourself, not me.

>> >> Steamy never did any primary communications while in the USMC.
>Naturally
>> >> he resents that anyone else did.
>> >
>> > Sorry. Incorrect.
>>
>> It may be "incorrect" but it is more likely quite CORRECT.
>
> If it makes you sleep better at night, Lennie, you go right on
>thinking that.

I've never had problems sleeping and I AM correct.

You have NO proof, documentation, or witnesses to prove your claims.

>> You've NEVER stated in any detail what you actually DID in the USMC
>> insofar as radio communications. You conveniently gloss over any
>> details. Anyone who really liked their past work will remember details
>of
>> it and "talk shop" about it. You never do.
>
> Because what I did in the USMC is, for the most part, irrelevent
>in this forum, Lennie.

It must be since it did not involve radio communications.

You have no proof of that "USMC radio experience," no documentation,
no witnesses to name.

You can't claim any military radio experience because you never had any.

> Unlike you, who MUST reassert his king-of-the-hill personna in
>order to have any self respect, I don't need or enjoy such retellings
>of my service career for sporting purposes.

Anyone with a little military radio experience would look like a "king of
the hill" to you...who never had any.

What is galling to you is that I actually had such experience and you did
not. You are both envious and resentful.

> If it makes YOU happy, Lennie...go right ahead...Not that any of
>the 20 people who have told you that they are sick of hearing it over
>and over has deterred you at all...

What "20 people?"

Fifty years ago the US military wasn't using morse code modes for
long-distance primary communications on HF radio.

PCTAs such as yourself are very angry over such truth. You should be
because it destroys your fantasy images of morse code saving the day.

>> All you talk about is some general phrases (copyable from any little PR
>> booklet) about "warrior skills" and honor and glory...NO DETAILS.
>>
>> All those generalities and NO DETAILS...sure marks of a bluffer, a con
>> man, trying a selling job on those with no experience in some area.
>>
>> In short, YOU LIE.
>
> Nope. Sorry.

YES. You LIE.

You tell stories, make false claims, and can't prove anything.

No problem in understanding that you LIE.

>> Then you try to say others "lie" when they give details, provide
references
>> and have documentation to prove what they say.
>
> That's because many of the tales YOU tell usually wind up
>refuteing whatever it was you were trying to make a point about.

I've never "refuted" anything. What I've said is documented, proven by
references, actual happenings.

>> >> Steamy can't handle real truth.
>> >
>> > Sure I can. You are liar, an antagonist, and a creep.
>>
>> Antagonist, yes. Liar no.
>
> Antagonist yes, Liar yes. As much as I know you hate hearing it,
>"It's in Google".

That same "Google" has all of YOUR messages as well.

You still haven't offered any proof, documentation, or witnesses to your
mighty military accomplishments.

>> I've provided details, references, even names of still-living witnesses
as
>> proof of what I've done.
>>
>> You've never tried to confirm anything, have you?
>
> Hmmmmm...yep....ya wanna go back over your sterling performances
>in Pennsylvania?

At Naval Air Development Center, Warminster? I have no problem with that. That isn't germane to the newsgroup, though, a number of Pennsylvanians in this newsgroup are upset over it.

Despite what Kellie wanted to twist into his imaginings and resultant attempts at trashing, I was there as an employee of RCA Corporation as a field engineer representative for an RCA R&D project. That was in 1971-1972, three decades ago. The project testing was successful.

>> You've rejected a scan of my first First Class Radiotelephone
>(Commercial)
>> license, not once but four times in e-mail.
>
> And you sent me "erroneous" e mails. You admitted in this forum
>you "erred". You USED an offer of the forwarding of the license, but
>you used it as an opportunity for a practical joke.

The FIRST e-mail attachment was a mistake (admitted) on my part.

The SECOND, THIRD, and FOURTH e-mail attachments were correct.

You REFUSED to accept the second, third, and fourth.

You just can't stand the truth.

> You won't "use" me again, Lennie. The really SILLY thing is you
>did it to several people, ergo creating a pool of folks able to
>corroborate MY version of events.

What "corroboration?" I sent e-mail attachments to others. Except for a Pennsylvania PCTA, those were accepted.

YOU created a trashy "personal web page" on AOL damning me in an attempt to "get even" for your terrible "hurt." Pure libel there. When informed of its existance, AOL SHUT YOUR PAGE DOWN.

AOL didn't have any problem tossing a clear case of libel. Anyone could see the libel there. AOL was fully justified.

> Pretty danged stupid, Lennie.

Nothing "stupid" but YOUR libelous AOL page...and your terribly offended ego hurting so much you can't stand yourself at times. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>
> Perhaps if YOU were to take your NON-Amateur Radio related war
>stories, NON-Amateur Radio related "CV", and NON-Amatuer Radio related
>practice of unlicensed psychiatry to a NON-Amateur Radio related
>forum, YOU would be happier.

I don't practice "psychiatry" anywhere. Like every other engineering undergraduate in 1960s California, I had the required two semesters of psychology.

You are a psychology 101 textbook case of psychosis brought on by a combination of being a control-freak, envy, ego, and unable to

respect anyone who stands up to your bullying tactics and general distortion of everything that doesn't satisfy you personally.

Radio is radio. Electrons, fields and waves work the same regardless of some human legislation creating different kinds of radio services.

You insist on everyone meeting YOUR terms of discussion...if they don't you go into the bullying tactics of personal denigration and insults. That's
a strong indication of the well-established psychosis.

> At least you MIGHT be "relevent".

The subject line of this thread is "The BPL of rrap." You've once again turned it into another forum of HATE directed against another who has differing viewpoints from yours.

You can't let go of that HATE. Another symptom of the psychosis at work. Get mental therapy.

LHA

2192. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 02:34:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826223446.22081.00000222@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 75607

In article <5c01b95b.0308260808.14ef5ff@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
(Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030824153227.29660.00000206@mb-m24.aol.com>...
>> In article <5c01b95b.0308240543.14bacc44@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
>> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20030824010600.22081.00000159@mb-m17.aol.com>...
>> >
>> >> This newsgroup is about AMATEUR RADIO POLICY.
>> >
>> > Dwight, Lennie makes this assertion when it becomes obvious that
>> >he's been bested, especially by someone he considers below his social
>> >station.
>>
>> The special recall election in California is NOT about amateur radio.
>
> Who cares? YOU are the one who is always suggesting OTHERS are
>trying to be "moderators", yet here YOU are demanding that someone
>change the subject.

The special recall election in California is NOT about amateur radio.

>> > Lennie will rant on and on about Japan, his days as an "enginer",
>> >and his stellar career as a "contributing editor" of a magazine that
>> >wwent belly-up.
>>
>> Please use a spellchecker when you become so enraged.
>
> And demanding even more.
>
>> I was an Associate Editor at HAM RADIO magazine...(SNIP)
>
> Yeahyeahyeah...Same old song.

Like it or not (you definitely hate it), I DID do it and the proof is in
over
two years' worth of monthly editions on the masthead beside the table
of contents.

You have no comparative claim.

>
>> I was, and continue to be an electronics design engineer both as

>> professional (paid) and amateur (unpaid).
>
> But still not a licensed Amateur Radio Operator. The rest, since
>by YOUR rules is NOT relevent to Amateur Radio, is moot and should be
>taken to another forum.

Not by "my" rules.

The special recall election in California is NOT about amateur radio.

Why do you keep insisting it is?

> For the purposes of THIS forum you have yet to do anything except
>rant, antagonize and demean those who HAVE "DONE it"...

Tsk, tsk, tsk...you are still looking in a mirror when you say that.

When there are undocumented unproven claims made, they get
commented on for the undocumented unproven claims they are.
Fish stories. Imaginings. Boastful never-was stories. LIES.

> No FCC Form 660 = No Amateur Radio.

This newsgroup is not restricted solely to those who have amateur
radio licenses. It is unmoderated.

If you feel so terribly wronged, you must go to AOL management and
demand that I be barred from accessing an open newsgroup.

Good luck on such demands.

Remember your short 3-day life of LIBEL about another.

LHA

2193. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 02:34:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826223447.22081.00000223@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 75605

In article <3F4B731A.6000509@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Hans K0HB wrote:
>> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>> If you are not a registered voter in California, then you have no cause
>to
>>> carry on as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on
>>> California politics.
>>>
>> That sword cuts in both directions, sir.
>>
>> If you are not a registered voter in California (licensed operator
>> in the Amateur Radio Service), then you have no cause to carry on
>> as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on California
>> politics (Amateur Radio Service policy).
>
> Game, Set, Match!
>
> Squelch of the week.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Hardly. Hansl cut himself shaving...he was preoccupied with shouting
orders into the mirror?

He is welcome to complain to AOL management about my accessing an
unmoderated, open newsgroup.

"Good luck with this one now..."

LHA

2194. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 02:36:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB7191E2.24C71%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75609

"Bert Craig" wrote:

> At least he posted there under his own name,
> Dwight. He gets points for that.

He's so far in the hole on points, awarding points at this point isn't even worth the effort. But, we'll give him credit for that - I won't call him a CB'er in one message. In fact, I've did that today, so his credit is taken care of. ;)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2195. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 02:38:33 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030826223833.29541.00000435@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 75610

> a past where men told women what they could and could not
>do.

You mean you dont, you little sissy

What would be interesting is to find out from KIM WHY she choose that
Callsign, what was her motivation.

2196. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 02:41:57 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB71932A.24C73%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75611

"WA8ULX" wrote:

> (snip) I have never owned a CB or even operated
> there. (snip)

Really? With so many messages posted in the CB newsgroup, I was certain you had an interest in that. Was the equipment too complicated for you to use? Or did the CB'ers run you off because you were simply too rude and too negative even for them?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2197. Re: The technical level of QST increases

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 03:12:20 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <okV2b.867$Dy1.786@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 75612

Probably so as far as the CW community goes; as I understand it, the electronic parts boxes of the no code community only contain

Darkness
Emitting
Arsenide
Diode
Semiconductors

(please forgive the vertical arrangement of the above words rather than the normal horizontal arrangement; I wanted to make sure you understood it :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA
(sorry gang, no real malicious intent here - I just *couldn't* resist that)
<<evil grin>>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/19/03

2198. Re: Off subject, tv monitor????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 03:15:49 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <FnV2b.868$Zz1.324@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 75613

Larry,

I've still got a rat shack color computer 2 :)
Does that count?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA
(ps - still have my Heathkit H8 I put together in winter 76/77) It is
immune to all known internet viruses. With 28 Kilobytes of memory, none of
'em would likely even fit in it :))

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030826212554.06226.00000180@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <scvmkvgenfscuevfgf5mc6hjjqa2n7t5m2@4ax.com>, kc5cqa@yahoo.com
> writes:
>
> >
> > I would like to use my tv as a monitor for my computer, could you
> >tell me what all is involved? What I have to purchase,
> >hardware/software wise? Thanks in advance. cl 73
>
> Go get yourself an old Commodore 64/128, and you're all set!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/19/03

2199. Re: Alinco 801 1st HF transceiver with no CW

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 03:19:19 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <XqV2b.869$%A1.755@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 75614

Almost complete with a "clarifier"! What happened to band A, B, C, D, E, F,
and all of the rest of the alphabet soup?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030826080339.07063.00000394@mb-m26.aol.com...
> Looks like a Typical CB, just what you guys wanted.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/19/03

2200. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 03:27:48 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB719DE3.24C78%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75615

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart writes:
>
>> Brian:

Pay attention, Larry. I'm not Brian.

> I, and my fellow PCTA's, have been doing that for
> years here on this newsgroup, Fidonet, and in the
> editorial pages of the ham magazines. (snip)

No, you've been ranting. If you had proven code testing serves a purpose today worthy of a specific government requirement above and beyond all other operating modes, code testing would not be going away.

> Now, it's your turn. I axed YOU to "prove" that
> "code testing serves no real purpose today." So
> do it. Provide your "proof," make it convincing,
> and do it right now -- or you will have just
> provided "proof" that you don't know what you're
> talking about!

The proof is obvious, Larry. Code has disappeared or is disappearing in all other radio services. Since code testing was established as a license requirement to help maintain a pool of skilled radio operators and code has now virtually disappeared outside ham radio, code testing no longer serves a purpose as a license requirement. Code testing is disappearing exactly because of that.

> That's because we have a dumbed-down culture, and
> one voice cannot change an entire culture. Six
> years ago, (snip)

Ah, the dumbed-down culture myth again. People today are not as dumb as you'd like to think they are, Larry. And they're certainly no dumber than some of those in our generation or in previous generations.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2201. Re: Off subject, tv monitor????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 03:54:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB71A439.24C7A%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75616

"kc5cqa@yahoo.com" wrote:
>
> I would like to use my tv as a monitor for
> my computer, could you tell me what all is
> involved? What I have to purchase, hardware/
> software wise? Thanks in advance. cl 73

If you're planning to use it as a primary monitor, you're not going to be satisfied with the results. Text will be blurry and the colors will often be sharply off. Anyway, there are many products that offer this capability. Most are used by those seeking to use a television for classroom instruction (programs like PowerPoint are used to make presentations that look good on a television). Search around some of the online computer catalogs.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2202. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 04:09:43 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <baW2b.116555$3o3.8156440@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 75617
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"craigm" <none@domain.invalid> wrote in message
news:vko5muqc1p90d4@corp.supernews.com...
>

>
> It may be fun, but keep in mind a few things. 1) It is difficult to
control
> where a signal goes. 2) There are international agreements that help to
> avoid interference.
>
> Given the above, allowing radio to be a free for all would only serve to
> promote interference from stations on the same frequency. That
interference
> can detract from people listening to transmissions that are complying with
> the agreements and laws. Interference can have serious results if it
> interferes with aircraft or miliraty communications.
>
> Just imagine the shortwave spectrum being used just like the 27 MHz band.
>
> I'd rather have the order that the laws and agreements provide.
>
> craigm
>
>
>
>

I suggested legalizing hobby broadcasting for entertainment purposes. Why
couldn't hobby broadcasters could get thier own slice(s) of the spectrum and
operate in a competent way?

Does program content increase interference?

Frank Dresser

2203. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 04:10:26 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030827001026.675$5e@newsreader.com>
Source record: 75618

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote:
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20030826090213.949$SA@newsreader.com...
> > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote:
> > > "David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> > > news:3F4ADED8.AB57BD96@ix.netcom.com...
> > > > WA8ULX wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > >You're a rude little fella, aren't you?
> > > > >
> > > > > Damn right
> > > > >
> > > > > >I think I'll apply for WD1CK, or move overseas and
> > > > > >get PU5SY
> > > > >
> > > > > Go ahead Morron
> > > >
> > > > "Morron?" LOL!
> > > >
> > >
> > > It's the CB mentality screaming loud and clear, David ;)
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > Do people scream " show us your tits" at the hamfest?
> >
> > --
> > GO #40
>
> Nope. They're pretty darned obvious.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
Hence the call.

--
GO #40

2204. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 04:16:10 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030827001610.108$dg@newsreader.com>
Source record: 75619

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> In article <biff8g$ohf@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
> <fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:
>
> >Have you seen the number of lookups for me on QRZ? Keep in mind I
> >haven't been on the air in over a year now. ROFLMAO...
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> That's what happens when you look yourself up a couple of dozen
> times a day.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
Isn't QRZ.com great?

--
GO #40

2205. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 04:36:37 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F4C3554.60709@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75620
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

>
>
>I'm not an expert on BPL, but I don't have any faith in the FCC's ability to
>look past a glossy demo and into the real world, either. If I had been
>invited to the demos, I'd have brought my old vacuum cleaner and my
>homebuilt PC with the noisy power supply(which, I assume, is good under Part
>15 regs. Ha!). I think somebody would give a damn if everyday electrical
>noisemakers slowed BPL.
>
>
Don't know about BPL, but back when they were testing various proposed
broadcast HDTV
transmission standards, one of the devices used in noise tests was
literally an old vacuum cleaner
motor.

2206. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 04:39:06 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F4C35EA.2040102@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75621
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Disgusted wrote:

>I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the SHIT
>out of them!
>
>
>
>
>
>
IIRC the only Wouff Hong in existence is in the ARRL's museum. I doubt
that they'd
let you borrow it......

2207. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 05:17:25 UTC
From: K0HB Master Chief Radioman US Navy <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ac8d9525929c326f3c74e6d3ae139ad5.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 75622

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

>
> Fifty years ago the US military wasn't using morse code modes for
> long-distance primary communications on HF radio.
>

"Fifty years ago" would be the summer of 1953.

In 1960...

... the US Navy was using morse code on HF for the fleet "Fox" broadcast
to all ships at sea 24/7/365.
... the US Navy was using morse code on HF Ship/Shore circuits from all
ships below the size of CA (Heavy Cruiser).
... the US Navy was using morse code on HF for Task Force and Task Group
Commander traffic nets for all forward deployed battle groups.

In 1965...

... the US Navy was using morse code on HF for Ship/Shore circuits from
all ships below the size of DL (Destroyer Leader)
... the US Navy was using morse code on HF for airborne TACAMO
communications to deployed attack submarines
... the US Navy was using morse code on ELF/VLF for communications to
deployed nuclear submarines

In 1970...

... the US Navy still kept morse code circuits active on HF as fallback
for afloat units which might lose their Orestes covered ship shore
capability.

I could go on and on with other examples more recent that fifty years
ago, but I think you get the picture....

....your research on this matter is dismally flawed.

Good luck on this one now.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2208. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 06:05:12 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <sSX2b.16221$8i2.12182@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75623

Dwight Stewart wrote in part:

> Ah, the dumbed-down culture myth again. People today are not as dumb as
> you'd like to think they are, Larry. And they're certainly no dumber than
> some of those in our generation or in previous generations.
>
>

Dear Brian,

You say that only because you'r dumn. DUMN KIDS!

--

It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

"Max Imo" <not@this.com> wrote in alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf: "I suggest
Corry keep his uninformed opinions to a subject he knows something about
(porno, hacking, terrorism?)."

2209. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 06:41:42 UTC
From: Hiram's Wingnut <wingie00002@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1061967021.690128@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 75624
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Disgusted" <Noooo@eeee.maillll> wrote in message
news:vkl0nsoogac3c7@corp.supernews.com...
>
> I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the SHIT
> out of them!

It's MUCH more effective if you DO NOT subscribe
to QST, support their advertisers, and discourage any
potential membersfrom joining. Deprive them of their
dues paying members and watch em' scream. Make sure
you tell the ham stores that you will not patronize them
if they appear in QST or support ARRL, and tell them
why. The days of the Wouff Hong are LONG GONE.
Denying them their primary sources of revenue is FAR
MORE EFFECTIVE!

2210. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 07:45:59 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f4c6c34_2@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 75625
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

The CBer identifies himself every time that he opens his mouth.....

Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:_fT2b.15971$8i2.3083@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> You certainly are full of ASS.....are you just talking through your ass
again mate?

2211. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 09:55:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB71F8BF.24CBC%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75626

"WA8ULX" wrote:

> What would be interesting is to find out
> from KIM WHY she choose that Callsign,
> what was her motivation.

Actually, I believe she has explained that before. So, perhaps you should search through the message archives for the answer. As for myself, since it's really none of my business, I'm not really interested in the reason.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2212. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 09:57:46 UTC
From: Ralph Aichinger <ralph@dolphy.pangea.at>
Message-ID: <1061977060.880638@news.liwest.at>
Source record: 75627
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In rec.radio.amateur.policy CW <clinton.magers@comcast.net> wrote:
> I think there is a big panic about something that will probably be a minor
> annoyance to some. Not a problem to most. Do people seriously think that
> airports are just going to cease communicating with their planes? How about

That is done on VHF, not on HF, AFAIK

> the military HF network. I can see them now. Sitting around the pentagon
> saying "forget national security, people have to get their email". Think
> about it.

BPL chipsets can keep some frequency ranges free from QRM. Somebody in
the german ham newsgroup has looked at it with a spectrum analyzer
or whatever.

And I think military users could change to VHF or UHF, even sat
communications anyway if they wanted. They could also keep BPL
out of special areas. I doubt military users in suburban environments
give a damn about HF.

BPL *is* a real threat.

/ralph

2213. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 10:05:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB71FB07.24CBE%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75628

"Unclaimed Mysteries" wrote:
>
> You say that only because you'r dumn. DUMN KIDS!

Unlike you, I'm certainly smart enough to know how to spell "dumb." And I suspect most kids today, the so-called dumb-downed ones, could spell it also.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2214. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 10:31:33 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <9M%2b.34365$Vx2.14970552@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75629
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Hiram's Wingnut" <wingie00002@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:1061967021.690128@newshost03.voicenet.com...
>
> "Disgusted" <Noooo@eeee.maillll> wrote in message
> news:vkl0nsoogac3c7@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the
SHIT
> > out of them!
>
> It's MUCH more effective if you DO NOT subscribe
> to QST, support their advertisers, and discourage any
> potential membersfrom joining. Deprive them of their
> dues paying members and watch em' scream. Make sure
> you tell the ham stores that you will not patronize them
> if they appear in QST or support ARRL, and tell them
> why. The days of the Wouff Hong are LONG GONE.
> Denying them their primary sources of revenue is FAR
> MORE EFFECTIVE!
>

And while you are at it, don't forget to return your liscense to the FCC!
THAT will teach 'em!

;-)

Charles, N5PVL

2215. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 10:38:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308270238.29394fc2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75630

dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308261319.5dea6a1d@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308260853.18fcb4b@posting.google.com>...
> > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4B731A.6000509@psu.edu>...
> > > Hans K0HB wrote:
> > > > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >> If you are not a registered voter in California, then you have no cause to
> > > >> carry on as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on
> > > >> California politics.
> > > >>
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > That sword cuts in both directions, sir.
> > > >
> > > > If you are not a registered voter in California (licensed operator
> > > > in the Amateur Radio Service), then you have no cause to carry on
> > > > as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on California
> > > > politics (Amateur Radio Service policy).
> > >
> > >
> > > Game, Set, Match!
> > >
> > >
> > > Squelch of the week.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> > Mike, you almost got it. Len -was- using the back of the blade.
> > Maybe if he had used the flat side...
>
> Brian, as usual you didn't quite get it. Len just got the blade stuffed up his nose.

DICK, you almost got it. Len -was- using the back of the blade. Maybe
if he had used the flat side... and slapped you with it.

2216. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 11:09:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308270309.147fc33f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75631

dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308261753.6d5a0548@posting.google.com>...
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in m
>
>
> be going so far out of your way to
> > display ham radio's ass in public.
> >
>
>
> Ham radio has an ASS??

DICK, I know that it confuses you that ham radio's ASS is called DICK,
but the rest of us got used to it a long time ago.

2217. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 13:16:55 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <bb23b.2987$EC4.70224@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 75632

Actually there is *at least* one ASS suffix ... I don't recall the prefix,
but
I've checked it in QRZ ... I can't imagine anyone doing that as a vanity
call, however, and why one would stay with it if it came as a sequential
assignment is beyond me :-)

Carl - wk3c

"DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:9829b709.0308261753.6d5a0548@posting.google.com...
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in m
>
>
> be going so far out of your way to
> > display ham radio's ass in public.
> >
>
>
> Ham radio has an ASS?? We knew about that W5 showing off her TIT but
> so far no ASS has shown up here... You might recheck that one Chuck.

2218. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 13:40:17 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308270540.589b833d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75633

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030826193246.02537.00000231@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <BB6F110D.24B97%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart

> >Don't hold your breath. Political discussions are
> >almost a tradition in this newsgroup, and your rants (about the "bigotry of
> >easterners" and so on) certainly isn't going to change that.
>
> Okay, you must be establishing that this is NOT an amateur radio
> policy discussion venue, right?

What's been established is that you seem to have a double dose of
the "Do What I Say, Not Do What I Do" syndrome this week.

You have posted legions of absolutely NON Amateur Radio related
bilge yet seem to try and force others to not do so...

> YOU want it to be all about politics, anywhere and everywhere?

And you don't?

> There are hundreds of Chat Rooms and other forums for discussion of
> everything that is NOT about amateur radio. Go there.

Go yourself, Lennie. You're NOT an licensed Amateur Radio
operator, have no stake in Amateur Radio, and have absolutely refused
to do anything constructive FOR Amateur radio.

Now, next time you allege that Dave Heil is "barking orders" at
you, don't be surprised if the UPS man at your door delivers a swift
puch in the nose instead. That's what's in style for the two-faced
this season.

Steve, K4YZ

2219. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 13:42:06 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308270542.3b1ec53a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75634

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030826223447.22081.00000223@mb-m17.aol.com>...

> He is welcome to complain to AOL management about my accessing an
> unmoderated, open newsgroup.
>
> "Good luck with this one now..."

Ahhhhhh...It's OK for Lennie to stretch HIS legs in an
"unmoderated, open newsgroup", but anyone else must stick to strcit
standards of discussion.

Uh huh......

Steve, K4YZ

2220. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong. (wsa: M321I58DNU 09/06/2003)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 13:50:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4CB719.4000705@psu.edu>
Source record: 75635
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dave Bushong wrote:
> Does anyone believe the bumper sticker that says "United We Stand"?
>
> Here, on this newsgroup, we all sound like a bunch of assholes who hate
> each other.
>
> And we all sound like a bunch of *hams* who hate each other, if you read
> this newsgroup.
>
> Why do those people want to kill us? I don't know. But if we fight
> amongst ourselves, they win. They win by sitting back and watching us
> self-destruct.

Wow, Dave! That's a stretch. With just a few notable exceptions, most
of us here in rrap enjoy our arguments with each other, and don't take
it too seriously or personally.

Or do you want to tell us just what we should think and say?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2221. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 13:55:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308270555.1e5ac609@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75636

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030826223446.22081.00000222@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0308260808.14ef5ff@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> > Who cares? YOU are the one who is always suggesting OTHERS are
> >trying to be "moderators", yet here YOU are demanding that someone
> >change the subject.
>
> The special recall election in California is NOT about amateur radio.

Again I ask....WHO CARES???

You have absolutely NO RIGHT to suggest that anyone take ANY
discussion to ANY other forum for ANY reason.

YOU have violated that very same "it's not Amateur Radio" clause
so many times it's pathetic...And you're the only one who can't see
how hillarious it is to see YOU suggesting others do so!

> Like it or not (you definitely hate it), I DID do it and the proof is in
> over
> two years' worth of monthly editions on the masthead beside the table
> of contents.
>
> You have no comparative claim.

Let's see....How many magazines have gone toes-up while >>I<< was
an "associate editor"....

Hmmmmm....NONE!

And I served not one but THREE tours in Japan and surrounding
environs,,,Not one, such as yourself.

Granted, I had to work a bit harder than yourself...Can't imagine
too many times that rear-area message clerks have to venture out of
the air conditioning...

> >> I was, and continue to be an electronics design engineer both as
> >> professional (paid) and amateur (unpaid).
> >
> > But still not a licensed Amateur Radio Operator. The rest, since
> >by YOUR rules is NOT relevent to Amateur Radio, is moot and should be
> >taken to another forum.
>
> Not by "my" rules.

>
> The special recall election in California is NOT about amateur radio.
>
> Why do you keep insisting it is?

I didn't say it was. I say you are an idiot for trying to insist
that others discuss non-Amateur topics elsewhere when YOU so
prolifically QRM this newsgroups with your own non-Amateur bilge all
the time.

> > For the purposes of THIS forum you have yet to do anything except
> >rant, antagonize and demean those who HAVE "DONE it"...
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...you are still looking in a mirror when you say that.

I'll ask you to prove it, but then will also heap it on the pile
of unanswered LennieRants.

> > No FCC Form 660 = No Amateur Radio.
>
> This newsgroup is not restricted solely to those who have amateur
> radio licenses. It is unmoderated.
>
> If you feel so terribly wronged, you must go to AOL management and
> demand that I be barred from accessing an open newsgroup.

It's not about your "access". It's about YOUR penchant for going
off on long non-Amateur related threads then trying to "moderate"
someone else into not doing the same.

You are two faced. Most pathological liars are.

> Remember your short 3-day life of LIBEL about another.

It ain't "libel" if it's true.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

2222. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 13:59:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308270559.5a50b81e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75637

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030826223443.22081.00000221@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0308260847.2ac2c894@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

> > The RRAP back channel folks can ask me if they care to, and I'll
> >tell them, but you're not invited. You won't play nice in e mail
> >anyway.
>
> I sent you several copes of some of my proof. You refused to accept
> it, claiming those same "not nice" comments.

As previously stated, you made the mistake of spamming several
folks with the same "mistake", all-the-while claiming to be an
"electronics" expert.

You lied.

> >> You haven't named a single one of the "hostile actions" you claim you
> >> were in.
> >
> > Because it's irrelevent to this forum. I already invited sonme
> >to e mail me direct. Brian took me up on some of it.
>
> Radio communications is still radio communications. You didn't do any
> in the military, therefore you can only tell stories about it. Your
> unproven claims are just fish stories.

No doubt that fishy smell is Mrs. Lennie.

Rest of rant deleted.

You are a liar. You ae unlicensed. You have NO experience from
which to make informed opinions on Amateur Radio related matters.

Now...take Mrs Lennie to the doctor and get that fishy smell
fixed.

Steve, K4YZ

2223. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 14:03:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308270603.7dc89eff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75638

And once again yet another LennieRant is laid to wast by someone who
"was there", who lived it and knows better than the NewsgroupNasty
himself.

"...and the TRUTH shall set you free!"

Watching him try to squirm out of THIS one will be fun!

Steve, K4YZ

"K0HB Master Chief Radioman US Navy" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<ac8d9525929c326f3c74e6d3ae139ad5.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > Fifty years ago the US military wasn't using morse code modes for
> > long-distance primary communications on HF radio.
> >
>
> "Fifty years ago" would be the summer of 1953.
>
> In 1960...
>
> ... the US Navy was using morse code on HF for the fleet "Fox" broadcast
> to all ships at sea 24/7/365.
> ... the US Navy was using morse code on HF Ship/Shore circuits from all
> ships below the size of CA (Heavy Cruiser).
> ... the US Navy was using morse code on HF for Task Force and Task Group
> Commander traffic nets for all forward deployed battle groups.
>
> In 1965...
>
> ... the US Navy was using morse code on HF for Ship/Shore circuits from
> all ships below the size of DL (Destroyer Leader)
> ... the US Navy was using morse code on HF for airborne TACAMO
> communications to deployed attack submarines
> ... the US Navy was using morse code on ELF/VLF for communications to
> deployed nuclear submarines
>
> In 1970...
>
> ... the US Navy still kept morse code circuits active on HF as fallback
> for afloat units which might lose their Orestes covered ship shore
> capability.
>

> I could go on and on with other examples more recent that fifty years
> ago, but I think you get the picture....
>
> ....your research on this matter is dismally flawed.
>
> Good luck on this one now.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

2224. Re: More countries

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 14:05:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308270605.6618547@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75639

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030826223440.22081.00000220@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <5c01b95b.0308260759.3419337@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
> >vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
> >news:<20030825211804.15586.00000492@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> >> From: Alun Palmer elektros@yahoo.com
> >>
> >> >Switzerland, the UK, Belgium, Germany and Norway have now abolished the
> >> >code test, and the Netherlands will follow shortly on September 1st. New
> >> >Zealand have said they will abolish the code test later this year.
> >>
> >> When will the US get rid of the code test?
> >>
> >> We are lagging behind.
> >
> > Lagging behind what?
>
> Five world nations.
>
> ARRL still refuses to side with the IARU on code testing...even after
> S25.5 was rewritten and the international "reqirement" for code testing
> got tossed in the dumpster.

The ARRL has not "refused" anything, Lennie.

Please cite the ARRL policy stating such. A LACK of such cite
will be accepted as yet another baseless LennieRant.

Steve, K4YZ

2225. Re: NCI Position for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 14:09:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308270609.245a106e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75640

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030824170834.07578.00000131@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> In article <he82b.8370$jd.1548@fe02.atl2.webusenet.com>, "Dan Finn"
> <djfinn2@nospam.bellsouth.net> writes:

> >Oh God...Earth to Len....harmonics *are* phase shifted. If you reduce the
> >phase shift to zero, then you have eliminated the harmonics, stupid.
>
> I'm not sure where you get this "phase shift reduction to zero" but it
> isn't quite like that. Sigh. Read following -
>
> OK, let's get down to basics. From "Electronic Designers' Handbook,"
> by Robert W. Landee, Donovan C. Davis, Albert P. Albrecht, 1957,
> McGraw-Hill Book Co., Chapter 5, here's the instantaneous voltage
> at any point in time of an AM RF waveform:
>
> e(t) = E [1+M Cos(omega_m t)] Sin (omega_c t)

Rest deleted. Interesting refresher, but not related to Amater
Radio POLICY, a subject which you, Sir Putzmaster, have been pushing
down others throats lately.

Not that I expected anything different from you. You can't help
yourself.

Steve, K4YZ

2226. Re: Yet Another Anti-Amateur Radio "LennieRant" Unravelled.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 14:12:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308270612.49d4474f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75641

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<Ljc1b.5573$sV.3265@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message

> > Nothing quite like "disinterested parties" (read that
> > "non-participants" in the Amteur Radio Service itself) make such
> > absolute statements on the public record.
> >
> > Let's all sit back and watch Dr. Spin Master (Lennie the Lame)
> > try and dance the Misdirection Shuffle on this one. It ought to be a
> > hoot!
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Thanks for that Steve. In the 'fun' here on USENET we sometimes forget that
> ham radio is indeed more than general chit chat on the bands.
>
> I hope we are remembered by our 'caretakers' the FCC in this BPL problem.

The clue here, Dan, is going to be making sure our
Representitives remember! If they push the subject, the FCC has no
other recourse.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2227. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 14:51:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4CC573.6020601@psu.edu>
Source record: 75642

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> Ah, the dumbed-down culture myth again. People today are not as dumb as
> you'd like to think they are, Larry. And they're certainly no dumber than
> some of those in our generation or in previous generations.
>
Then explain reality TV, Dwight! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

Actually, I don't think that people ae dumbed down compared to whatever mythical time that they were "smart".

I'm told that back in the late '50's, there was a push to teach more science in schools, because the US was way behind in that. There were people complaining how the US wasn't teaching the kids things they should know. Sounds a lot like "dumbed down" theory to me. But now some believe that was some kind of golden age, when the kids were taught right, dadgumit! Nostalgia anyone?

You won't find me espousing "dumbing down" theory even though I'm a pro-coder.

You will find me espousing learning of Morse code and including it in testing because I think it is a useful knowledge. And I'm always in favor of knowledge. (spare me the skill vs knowledge argument, pse).

BUT! the individual tests can be "smartened" or "dumbed". All that is up to us. We decide.

NO test is needed at all to put up a station on the air. We could have an application where we simply give our name, address, and sign a statement that reads that we promise to abide by the rules. We would get a little book of the relevent rules, like when we license a boat and get a safety pamphlet.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2228. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 15:26:18 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4CCD9A.BF7C501D@ptt.edu>
Source record: 75643

> I've checked it in QRZ ... I can't imagine anyone doing that as a vanity
> call, however, and why one would stay with it if it came as a sequential
> assignment is beyond me :-)

It's easy to remember?????? No one forgets an ass

2229. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 15:57:05 UTC
From: CW <clinton.magers@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <lx43b.274934$YN5.187490@sccrnsc01>
Source record: 75644
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Ralph Aichinger" <ralph@dolphy.pangea.at> wrote in message
news:1061977060.880638@news.liwest.at...
> In rec.radio.amateur.policy CW <clinton.magers@comcast.net> wrote:
> > I think there is a big panic about something that will probably be a
minor
> > annoyance to some. Not a problem to most. Do people seriously think that
> > airports are just going to cease communicating with their planes? How
about
>
> That is done on VHF, not on HF, AFAIK

Only within line of light. For longer distances, its all HF. Look up the
frequencies and take a listen. Any time, day or night there is traffic, lots
of it.
>
> > the military HF network. I can see them now. Sitting around the pentagon
> > saying "forget national security, people have to get their email". Think
> > about it.
>
> BPL chipsets can keep some frequency ranges free from QRM. Somebody in
> the German ham newsgroup has looked at it with a spectrum analyzer
> or whatever.
>
> And I think military users could change to VHF or UHF, even sat
> communications anyway if they wanted. They could also keep BPL
> out of special areas. I doubt military users in suburban environments
> give a damn about HF.
>
> BPL *is* a real threat.

There are active military and government frequencies spread throughout the
HF bands, I have, sitting in front of me, two pages worth of active military
frequencies. This does not include FEMA, DEA, ect. Yes, they also use VHF
and satellite but maintain activity on HF for long distance as VHF is line
of sight and satellites are to vulnerable. You can do everything you want to
maintain your chicken little views but some of us know better.

2230. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 16:16:19 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F4CD953.6060303@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 75684

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> I have never stated that any specific YL hams *were* offended by Kim's
> call sign. I have only stated that I agree with Riley Hollingsworth when he
> says that Kim's call sign has the potential to do harm to the image of the ARS,
> and YL hams in general. Kim and your XYL prove absolutely nothing
> with regard to the validity of my objections to her (Kim's) call sign.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

There are a ton of things potentially more harmful and more
likely to bring amateur radio "one step closer to extinction"
than Kim's call sign. However, it is in bad taste and I can't
imagine anyone requesting such a call sign other than to bring
attention to one's self, but then there are those who seem to
seek the lowest common denominator.
I knew one ham couple and the wife's call sign (not requested,
just what was issued) had the last letters DTA. He had a T shirt
made for her that gave the call across the chest with the
phonetics, "Don't Touch Anything".

2231. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 17:07:28 UTC
From: nm5k@wt.net
Message-ID: <25eb70d7.0308270907.6ab7f432@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75645
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3F4C35EA.2040102@ix.netcom.com>...
> Disgusted wrote:
>
> >I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the SHIT
> >out of them!
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> IIRC the only Wouff Hong in existence is in the ARRL's museum. I doubt
> that they'd
> let you borrow it......

One could easily be fabricated from a piece of old wood. "Old plow
handles" etc.. I would not sand the device. It's much more effective
when the splinters are functional. I've heard tell fleet brand enemas
are based on the original Wouff Hong design. Not as glamorous as
machine gun design, but useful none the less. MK

2232. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 17:51:14 UTC
From: Hans Kohb <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <91abb4385c0f0e49bb49ad536db3ac61.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 75646

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message

>
> The fact that you can point out bad behavior done in the past does nothing
> to justify further bad behavior today or tomorrow. Instead, it points out
> the need to do better, to set our sights on where we really want to be.
>

Charles and I have found many reasons to disagree in the past, but on
this matter we are 100% in agreement.

Here on rrap the pro-coders, no-coders, slow-coders, and limp coders
rail on and on about a subject long since put to bed by the regulators,
and the whole meaningless fight takes on a surreal similarity to the
fights between sailboaters and motorboaters, arguing which is more
technically advanced, which can get through when conditions are bad,
which is modern vs. invented in the olden days, etc., etc., etc.

Meanwhile, on the shore a group of commercial developers is plotting to
buy the lake, drain it, and build a strip mall.

Rather than band together to save our hobby, we seem hell-bent on
finding inconsequential and OTBE things to fight about, splintering and
diluting whatever influence we have on regulators and the general
public.

73, de Hans, K0HB
--
Without spectrum, there is no amateur radio.

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2233. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 18:18:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4CF5DC.4030402@psu.edu>
Source record: 75647

Hans Kohb wrote:
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
>
>
>>The fact that you can point out bad behavior done in the past does nothing
>>to justify further bad behavior today or tomorrow. Instead, it points out
>>the need to do better, to set our sights on where we really want to be.
>>
>
>
> Charles and I have found many reasons to disagree in the past, but on
> this matter we are 100% in agreement.
>
> Here on rrap the pro-coders, no-coders, slow-coders, and limp coders
> rail on and on about a subject long since put to bed by the regulators,
> and the whole meaningless fight takes on a surreal similarity to the
> fights between sailboaters and motorboaters, arguing which is more
> technically advanced, which can get through when conditions are bad,
> which is modern vs. invented in the olden days, etc., etc., etc.

There are other topics in here too, Hans. You might want to look into
filters for your newreader so you don't have to read the Morse code test
posts.

> Meanwhile, on the shore a group of commercial developers is plotting to
> buy the lake, drain it, and build a strip mall.

And BPL is one of those topics.

> Rather than band together to save our hobby, we seem hell-bent on
> finding inconsequential and OTBE things to fight about, splintering and
> diluting whatever influence we have on regulators and the general
> public.

And I have filed comments, will contribute money, and will attempt to
get my club to contribute a sizable amount to the BPL fight fund.

It's a big world, with many different issues in it. If I spend some of
my time yipping about Morse code testing, it's my time to waste. And
it's not really wasted - its recreation.

But as a person that can walk and chew gum and take a drink of water at
the same time, I can focus on a number of things at one time.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2234. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 18:41:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308271041.7238e425@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75648

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030820220305.21761.00000283@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> From: "Derek" danda95@hotmail.com
>
> >The Amateur's Code
> >The Radio Amateur is
> >CONSIDERATE
> >LOYAL
> >PROGRESSIVE
> >FRIENDLY
> >BALANCED
> >PATRIOTIC
>
> Is this in the FCC regulations? If not, it is just a recommendation and
> therefore has no valid basis to be followed, or to be identified as "The
> Amateur's Code".

Vippy, you've just been promoted from "Idiot" to "Complete Idiot".

Not that I expected anything less from "Son of Putz".

Steve, K4YZ

2235. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 18:50:32 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4CFD78.480C673@ptt.edu>
Source record: 75649

> Vippy, you've just been promoted from "Idiot" to "Complete Idiot".

Youre village called, there missing they're idiot.

2236. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 19:37:16 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308271137.34471fd3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75650

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308270309.147fc33f@posting.google.com>...
> dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308261753.6d5a0548@posting.google.com>...
> > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in m
> >
> >
> > be going so far out of your way to
> > > display ham radio's ass in public.
> > >
> >
> >
> > Ham radio has an ASS??
>
> DICK, I know that it confuses you that ham radio's ASS is called DICK,
> but the rest of us got used to it a long time ago.

Yeah, yeah, Brian we know....you're helpless to refrain from showing off your
periennial state of confusion. We understand.

2237. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 20:05:53 UTC
From: Ralph Aichinger <ralph@dolphy.pangea.at>
Message-ID: <1062013546.616315@news.liwest.at>
Source record: 75651
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In rec.radio.amateur.policy CW <clinton.magers@comcast.net> wrote:
> There are active military and government frequencies spread throughout the
> HF bands, I have, sitting in front of me, two pages worth of active military
> frequencies. This does not include FEMA, DEA, ect. Yes, they also use VHF
> and satellite but maintain activity on HF for long distance as VHF is line
> of sight and satellites are to vulnerable. You can do everything you want to
> maintain your chicken little views but some of us know better.

As I have written, BPL devices *do* have the possibility to keep out
of *some* HF frequencies AFAIK. Ham radio would not be the first candidate
for this. Air mobile and military users would be more likely to benefit
from it.

And maybe it is a different perspective here in Austria, as our military
has a lot less influence on our society. We've got utilities actively
deploying this stuff, and while it is far from being everywhere, it is
a real threat in some areas. I suppose they could not care less about
implications of BPL for the military. They just do good lobbying,
and they have shown their political influence in many issues in the
past.

Don't count too much on the military. They might just use this as
an excuse to get funding for a new satellite based infrastructure or
other alternatives. Moreover I suppose HF is most valuable to the
military in crisis regions, where there is no BPL anyway ;)

/ralph

2238. Re: Off subject, tv monitor????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 20:16:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Jk83b.13069$jY2.11697@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75652

<kc5cqa@yahoo.com>
> wrote in message news:scvmkvgenfscuevfgf5mc6hjjqa2n7t5m2@4ax.com...
> I would like to use my tv as a monitor for my computer, could you
> tell me what all is involved? What I have to purchase,
> hardware/software wise? Thanks in advance. cl 73

At least one other person noted that the quality of picture
will be much worse than a computer monitor. That's
maybe OK depending on "what application" you want to use a TV
for instead fo a monitor. These days computer monitors
are dirt cheap.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2239. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 21:56:45 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <xO93b.116184$0v4.8326816@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 75653
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Ralph Aichinger" <ralph@dolphy.pangea.at> wrote in message
news:1062013546.616315@news.liwest.at...
> In rec.radio.amateur.policy CW <clinton.magers@comcast.net> wrote:
>
> As I have written, BPL devices *do* have the possibility to keep out
> of *some* HF frequencies AFAIK. Ham radio would not be the first candidate
> for this. Air mobile and military users would be more likely to benefit
> from it.
>
> And maybe it is a different perspective here in Austria, as our military
> has a lot less influence on our society. We've got utilities actively
> deploying this stuff, and while it is far from being everywhere, it is
> a real threat in some areas. I suppose they could not care less about
> implications of BPL for the military. They just do good lobbying,
> and they have shown their political influence in many issues in the
> past.
>
> Don't count too much on the military. They might just use this as
> an excuse to get funding for a new satellite based infrastructure or
> other alternatives. Moreover I suppose HF is most valuable to the
> military in crisis regions, where there is no BPL anyway ;)
>
> /ralph

Will BPL have the same effect on military radio as it has on radio
hobbyists? Don't they have spread spectrum capability which is highly
resistant to interference?

Frank Dresser

2240. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 22:03:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <yU93b.34701$Vx2.15112747@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75654

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB718F28.24C6F%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
>
> That is two female radio amateurs (Kim and my wife) saying the opposite of
> what you claim. So exactly where are all those YL radio amateurs you claim
> are offended by Kim's callsign, Larry?
>

Nor am I offended but I do question the good sense of a person who would pick a designation that would/could lead to misunderstandings and misinterpretations.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2241. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 22:06:01 UTC
From: Brenda Ann <brendad@shinbiro.com>
Message-ID: <bij7nnjvv1@news1.kornet.net>
Source record: 75655
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:xO93b.116184$0v4.8326816@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> Will BPL have the same effect on military radio as it has on radio
> hobbyists? Don't they have spread spectrum capability which is highly
> resistant to interference?
>
> Frank Dresser
>

Thing is, BPL is also spread spectrum.. would not two spread spectrum
systems on the same bands interfere with one another??

2242. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 22:19:49 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <98a3b.116214$0v4.8328749@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 75656
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Brenda Ann" <brendad@shinbiro.com> wrote in message
news:bij7nnjvv1@news1.kornet.net...
>
>
> Thing is, BPL is also spread spectrum.. would not two spread spectrum
> systems on the same bands interfere with one another??
>
>
>
>

I don't know alot about spread spectrum, but it's my impression that the receiver and transmitter are in sync. If the interference doesn't match the expected synchronization, the receiver ignores it. Also, the bandwidth of spread spectrum is so wide that spread spectrum operations would have to overlap, otherwise there would only be a few allowable channels.

But, any spread spectrum experts out there are free to correct me.

Frank Dresser

2243. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 22:24:26 UTC
From: CW <clinton.magers@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <uca3b.278911$uu5.62460@sccrnsc04>
Source record: 75657
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

They probably do but not in widespread use nor is it likely to be. They do also have the capability to replace most of that HF traffic by satellite. They did, at one time, start to scale back the HF ops in favor of satellite but decided that was a bad idea from a reliability standpoint. They do have the satalite capablity but maintain HF to. The military, in any case, is only a part of the government HF operation. If bpl has the capability of not using certain segments of the band, due to the amount of space that would have to be left alone, the bpl spectrum is going to be pretty holy. In any case, I really don't think it is a viable technology, I seriously doubt it will be the major rf disaster that some are saying it will be and I don't think it will last long if it gets off the ground at all.
"Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:xO93b.116184$0v4.8326816@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> Will BPL have the same effect on military radio as it has on radio
> hobbyists? Don't they have spread spectrum capability which is highly
> resistant to interference?
>
> Frank Dresser
>
>

2244. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 23:05:52 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <kPa3b.13256$jY2.3383@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75658
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Walt Davidson" <walt99@tiscali.co.uk> wrote in message
news:2dkokv011ni442tltfb9sj2lpie9bj602l@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 27 Aug 2003 00:51:06 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >You certainly are full of ASSumptions Walt. Why do you assume I was
> >'conscripted', or as we call it....'drafted' ??
> >
> >Are you sure? Or are you just talking through your ass again mate?
>
> I notice you aren't denying it!
> :-)
>
> 73 de G3NYY
>
> --
> Walt Davidson Email: g3nyy @freeuk.com

If I must to pacify your interest. I enlisted right after high school.
During which period the Gulf of Tonkin incident was staged by the LBJ
regime. I spent my time in Vietnam after volunteering for same. I have a
total of 12 years military service. I was discharged and receive disability
for injuries received in VN.

Does that pacify you sufficiently old boy?

Dan/W4NTI

2245. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 23:08:49 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <5Sa3b.13300$jY2.10254@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75659
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

<lucifer@eternal-flames.gov> wrote in message
news:ntopkv8779oavpfimri1iikp0pci1uevka@4ax.com...
> On Tue, 26 Aug 2003 22:38:47 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> pausing to cast envious glances at those who had
> mastered the skill of reading without moving their lips, wrote:
>
> >But you Brits are always right, right?
>
> Not Brit's as a whole Dan. Since that would include those of the
> Irish, Scottish and even Welsh persuasion. Some of those are
> extraordinarily thick - as you've no doubt noticed from the rambling
> nature of their postings in this newsgroup.
>
> Fortunately they are quite easy to identify, as they lack both the
> intelligence gene and the humour gene.
>
> But as for English Brit's.... Yes! It would be true to say that we
> tend to believe in the concept of infallibility. ;-)
>
> Old Nick.

Must be a national problem then. The only 'war' you won lately was the
Falklands. And that with our help. Hip hip old boy.

Dan/W4NTI

2246. Re: The technical level of QST increases

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 23:26:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <i6b3b.13342$jY2.7818@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75660

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030826223439.22081.00000219@mb-m17.aol.com...
> In article <c9a0a4ecaa105536f1ffc46ce3787827@dizum.com>, Nomen Nescio
> <nobody@dizum.com> writes:
>
> >September 2003, page 38 : how to replace
> >a pilot lamp by a LED and a resistor.
> >The high technical level of this article
> >is for CW coders only.
> >
> >Page 31 is not bad too, the figure 4-A
> >shows a very sophisticated interface
> >including 2 resistors, 2 banana plug
> >sockets and 2 BNC plugs. This article
> >is reserved for EXTRA operators only.
>
> I am relieved and enlightened that QST is showing such a leap of
> technical understanding of the state of the art of electronics!
>
> LHA
>
>

I have to agree with you on that one Len over 21. QST and technology parted company years ago. Heck, a new magazine started up because of it, called Ham Radio. Unfortunatly they also folded.

You do of course know that the ARRL also publishes what they call a technical magazine, don't ya? I don't even bother looking at it. I think they should have left technical articles in QST as before.

But then the league has done a lot of things that I don't like.

Dan/W4NTI (life member ARRL)

2247. Re: Yet Another Anti-Amateur Radio "LennieRant" Unravelled.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 23:30:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <wab3b.13349$jY2.6416@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75661

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0308270612.49d4474f@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<Ljc1b.5573$sV.3265@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
>
> > > Nothing quite like "disinterested parties" (read that
> > > "non-participants" in the Amteur Radio Service itself) make such
> > > absolute statements on the public record.
> > >
> > > Let's all sit back and watch Dr. Spin Master (Lennie the Lame)
> > > try and dance the Misdirection Shuffle on this one. It ought to be a
> > > hoot!
> > >
> > > 73
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > Thanks for that Steve. In the 'fun' here on USENET we sometimes forget
that
> > ham radio is indeed more than general chit chat on the bands.
> >
> > I hope we are remembered by our 'caretakers' the FCC in this BPL
problem.
>
> The clue here, Dan, is going to be making sure our
> Representitives remember! If they push the subject, the FCC has no
> other recourse.
>
> 73
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I understand Steve. I figure it will have to go the way congress had to
slap the FCC around and 'revisit' their opinion they just had on
broadcasters and ownership percentage of market.

I have no problem at all in bending my elected members of congress, and
will do so.

Dan/W4NTI

2248. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 23:34:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F4D405D.60208@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75662
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Ralph Aichinger wrote:
> In rec.radio.amateur.policy Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
>
>
>>When I wrote "vunerable BPL is to interference", I meant how outside sources
>>of interference would effect the performance of BPL. Sorry if I wasn't
>
>
> [..]
>
>
>>If you know where this is all explained in depth and well documented, please
>>point me in that direction.
>
>
> I don`t know the details, but here in Europe several pilot projects
> were basically stopped and several larger companies got out of that
> technology again, after trying to hype it for several years.
>
> I do not know if this is due to unreliability or due to other factors,
> but it *seems* to have worked better in the lab than in the real world.
> If enough problems make it too unreliable and/or expensive, this might
> be the easiest way out.

I wonder if the lab has defective transformers that spew out rfi? I wonder if the lab regulary simulates lightning strikes on the lines carrying BPL? I wonder if the labs simulate the sometimes awful antiquated power lines that the signal would have to go over?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2249. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-27 23:47:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F4D435C.20202@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75663

Brian wrote:
> dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308261319.5dea6a1d@posting.google.com>...
>
>>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308260853.18fcb4b@posting.google.com>...
>>
>>>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4B731A.6000509@psu.edu>...
>>>
>>>>Hans K0HB wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> If you are not a registered voter in California, then you have no cause to
>>>>>> carry on as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on
>>>>>> California politics.
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>That sword cuts in both directions, sir.
>>>>>
>>>>>If you are not a registered voter in California (licensed operator
>>>>>in the Amateur Radio Service), then you have no cause to carry on
>>>>>as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on California
>>>>>politics (Amateur Radio Service policy).
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Game, Set, Match!
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Squelch of the week.
>>>>
>>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>Mike, you almost got it. Len -was- using the back of the blade.
>>>Maybe if he had used the flat side...
>>
>>Brian, as usual you didn't quite get it. Len just got the blade stuffed up his nose.
>
>
> DICK, you almost got it. Len -was- using the back of the blade. Maybe
> if he had used the flat side... and slapped you with it.

Lessee, he told me to take the post out of here, and that it was noe of my business because I'm not a registered voter in California.

Let us say that is a valid argument.

So Hans simply substitutes the related words, turning it into what I consider a perfect squelch.

Was Hans not relevent?

It's a good squelch, unless you subscribe to the dictum that that other guy wins, always.

And certainly, I only refer to squelching in the normal sense. Some people are not accepting of squelchification, as it were.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2250. Re: NCI Position for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 00:13:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308271613.7390c888@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75664

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308270609.245a106e@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030824170834.07578.00000131@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> > In article <he82b.8370$jd.1548@fe02.atl2.webusenet.com>, "Dan Finn"
> > <djfinn2@nospam.bellsouth.net> writes:
>
> > >Oh God...Earth to Len....harmonics *are* phase shifted. If you reduce the
> > >phase shift to zero, then you have eliminated the harmonics, stupid.
> >
> > I'm not sure where you get this "phase shift reduction to zero" but it
> > isn't quite like that. Sigh. Read following -
> >
> > OK, let's get down to basics. From "Electronic Designers' Handbook,"
> > by Robert W. Landee, Donovan C. Davis, Albert P. Albrecht, 1957,
> > McGraw-Hill Book Co., Chapter 5, here's the instantaneous voltage
> > at any point in time of an AM RF waveform:
> >
> > e(t) = E [1+M Cos(omega_m t)] Sin (omega_c t)
>
> Rest deleted. Interesting refresher, but not related to Amater
> Radio POLICY, a subject which you, Sir Putzmaster, have been pushing
> down others throats lately.

Len's just been politely tapping you'se guys with the back of the blade.

2251. Re: More countries

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 00:16:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308271616.74013b2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75665

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308270605.6618547@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030826223440.22081.00000220@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> > In article <5c01b95b.0308260759.3419337@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> > (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
> >
> > >vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
> > >news:<20030825211804.15586.00000492@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> > >> From: Alun Palmer elektros@yahoo.com
> > >>
> > >> >Switzerland, the UK, Belgium, Germany and Norway have now abolished the
> > >> >code test, and the Netherlands will follow shortly on September 1st. New
> > >> >Zealand have said they will abolish the code test later this year.
> > >>
> > >> When will the US get rid of the code test?
> > >>
> > >> We are lagging behind.
> > >
> > > Lagging behind what?
> >
> > Five world nations.
> >
> > ARRL still refuses to side with the IARU on code testing...even after
> > S25.5 was rewritten and the international "reqirement" for code testing
> > got tossed in the dumpster.
>
> The ARRL has not "refused" anything, Lennie.

Then they have made a proposal, unlike the last time the FCC asked
them to assume a role of leadership.

> Please cite the ARRL policy stating such. A LACK of such cite
> will be accepted as yet another baseless LennieRant.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Please cite the ARRL proposal suggesting just a smidgen of leadership.

2252. Re: Wind Powered HFpacker

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 00:18:45 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <FTb3b.216292$Oz4.56286@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 75666

Well ya know ya have to have a way of diffusing gas after eating all that
sushi ..(sic ??) ....

73 KI3R Belle Vernon Pa
"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5VH2b.4407$3E.1223@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> http://www.onjapan.net/2003/hamfair/img_0644.jpg
>
> <img src="http://www.onjapan.net/2003/hamfair/img_0644.jpg">
>
>
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith AOL IM:kilowattradio
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> _Give SCO $699 for using Linux or the Penguin gets it._
> Torvalds: _They are smoking crack._

2253. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 00:31:22 UTC
From: Ross Archer <dogbert@mindless.com>
Message-ID: <3F4D4D59.B5A8C6C5@mindless.com>
Source record: 75667
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Brenda Ann wrote:
>
> "Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:xO93b.116184$0v4.8326816@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
> > >
> > > Will BPL have the same effect on military radio as it has on radio
> > > hobbyists? Don't they have spread spectrum capability which is highly
> > > resistant to interference?
> > >
> > > Frank Dresser
> > >
>
> Thing is, BPL is also spread spectrum.. would not two spread spectrum
> systems on the same bands interfere with one another??

Yes, but to a limited degree.

One characteristic which distinguishes a spread-spectrum
(whether frequency-hopping, or direct-sequence) system from
a channelized one, is the gradual way the channel
signal-to-noise ratio can degrade as more stations are added
in the same spectrum space. This "graceful degradation" is
in stark contrast to interference in standard
single-frequency applications, where a collision of two
signals means no link.

Think of two different transmitters sharing the same 1000
frequencies. Each "hops" to a new frequency every few
milliseconds at most. If both systems use different channel
sequences, it's just occasionally that both would land on
the same frequency and interfere with each other. And even
in this case, the total amount of time where they're
mutually interfering is perhaps a millisecond or less. So
the extra signal sharing the frequency has mostly the effect
of making the channel a tiny bit noisier for all users, but
not to blot out other signals.

As you add more and more spread-spectrum stations, the
probability of a "channel collision" of course increases.
However, by carefully choosing the sequences and making sure
they don't accidentally "lock horns" in synch for a while
following the same sequence of frequencies, the quality of
the link degrades slowly with each new station.

I suspect this "graceful degradation" property of spread spectrum is more of a driving force than the potential security and stealth that this system provides. It allows more users to share the same small frequency slice, than would be possible if you just put narrow-band FM equipment and jammed them together as close as possible.

Funny how often unexpected benefits spin off of basic research. Here's to renewing science and basic research. Not everything important to business can be measured in quarterly profits. Our competitors, who seem to get this better than a lot of US companies do, will eat our lunch for us if we don't start thinking long-term again. IBM and HP "get it". It's Congress that we need to wake up next. :)

-- Ross

2254. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 00:54:10 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <Soc3b.1716$H_3.716@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 75668

A recent New York State Math Regents exam results were tossed out because so few students were able to pass the test. Passing the test is required for High School graduation. During pre exam trials of the questions it was found that only 47 percent of those who took the exam could pass the test.

So what does this have to do with CW testing ? Absolutely nothing except for stupidity.

2255. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 00:58:08 UTC
From: CW <clinton.magers@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <Asc3b.277213$YN5.189519@sccrnsc01>
Source record: 75669
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

You're right about that. Unfortunately, the standard business plan is to make as much as you can in the short term and then dump the company. They have no interest in anything that won't pan out in 6 months.
"Ross Archer" <dogbert@mindless.com> wrote in message news:3F4D4D59.B5A8C6C5@mindless.com...
> Our competitors, who seem to get this
> better than a lot of US companies do, will eat our lunch for
> us if we don't start thinking long-term again. IBM and HP
> "get it". It's Congress that we need to wake up next. :)
>
> -- Ross

2256. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 01:50:22 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB72D899.24CF5%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75670

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> Nor am I offended but I do question the good
> sense of a person who would pick a designation
> that would/could lead to misunderstandings and
> misinterpretations.

Clearly, I certainly wouldn't pick such a callsign, and hopefully neither would my wife. But that is just our choice, not a condemnation of Kim's choice. I'm not going to attempt to walk in Kim's shoes, simply because I know little about where she walks. She does, so I'll accept her choice for what it is.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2257. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 01:58:10 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308271758.71e59be0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75671
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"CW" <clinton.magers@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:<uca3b.278911$uu5.62460@sccrnsc04>...
> They probably do but not in widespread use nor is it likely to be. They do
> also have the capability to replace most of that HF traffic by satellite.
> They did, at one time, start to scale back the HF ops in favor of satellite
> but decided that was a bad idea from a reliability standpoint. They do have
> the satalite capablity but maintain HF to. The military, in any case, is
> only a part of the government HF operation.

Right: Didja ever add up the number of published MF/HF freqs just the
Coast Guard and the HF air traffic controllers use?? And those are
just a few of the published gummint-used freqs. Then come who the hell
knows how many unpublished freqs also used by other civil gummint
types.

> If bpl has the capability of not
> using certain segments of the band, due to the amount of space that would
> have to be left alone, the bpl spectrum is going to be pretty holy.

It would be one big hole, "selective BPL interference" is a ridiculous
and completely unworkable concept.

> In any
> case, I really don't think it is a viable technology, I seriously doubt it
> will be the major rf disaster that some are saying it will be and I don't
> think it will last long if it gets off the ground at all.

If it's allowed to get off the ground at all a huge amount of damage
will be done even if it does eventually peter out. The closing the
gate after the cows get out syndrome, etc.

As far as BPL being an RF disaster is concerned I've travelled twice
to one of the BPL pilot areas specifically to listen to the stuff
hands on. Been there, done it myself and I need to tell you that yes
BPL is a potential HF/VHF disaster which needs to be squashed *before*
it even gets off the ground.

Anybody who belives otherwise needs to get off their butts and away
from their keyboards, pack up a rig and actually go listen to stuff
before they spout off about it.

Brian Kelly w3rv

2258. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 02:20:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB72DF8E.24CF7%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75672

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
>> Ah, the dumbed-down culture myth again. People
>> today are not as dumb as you'd like to think they
>> are, Larry. And they're certainly no dumber than
>> some of those in our generation or in previous
>> generations.
>>
> Then explain reality TV, Dwight! 8^)

I shouldn't have to go back and point to some of the crazy things people watched and did in years past. Remember the Village People, Kiss, Disco, the song Muskrat Love, houses filled with incense, chopper motorcycles, the song My Ding-a-Ling, Elton John's sunglasses, and so on.

> Actually, I don't think that people ae dumbed down
> compared to whatever mythical time that they were
> "smart".

I agree. Every generation has had it's moments - both good and bad.

> BUT! the individual tests can be "smartened" or
> "dumbed". All that is up to us. We decide.

But we have to decide within the constraints of the intent of those tests. To do that, we have to understand that intent. Far too many try to view the Ham Radio license exams as some sort of knowledge exam, when they are instead entrance exams into Ham Radio. And Ham Radio is a recreation, not a vocation. The FCC has other exams designed to examine vocational knowledge, as do local colleges and universities. Given those facts, I see no reason to change the existing written exams.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2259. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 02:38:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB72E3D6.24CF9%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75673

"Steve Stone" wrote:

> A recent New York State Math Regents exam results
> were tossed out because so few students were able
> to pass the test. (snip)

I do agree there is a problem that must be addressed. But, sadly, I suspect the root of the problem lies mainly outside the school system. Television jumps immediately to mind. Television has fed children an almost continuous message over the last few decades that smart kids are nerds and dumb kids are cool. With that in mind, there is little reason for kids to make any real effort in school. And, since Americans seem to prefer the television industry's freedoms over better educated children, the problem may never go away.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2260. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 02:57:29 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308271857.45d37aea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75674

Radioman <radio@ptt.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4CFD78.480C673@ptt.edu>...
> > Vippy, you've just been promoted from "Idiot" to "Complete Idiot".
>
>
> Youre village called, there missing they're idiot.

Huh?

I think you meant: "Your village called; they're missing thier
idiot"...or something like that. Even spelled correctly it's had to
ascertain your intent.

Steve, K4YZ

2261. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 03:12:26 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bikntk$a6j@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 75689

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:yU93b.34701$Vx2.15112747@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:BB718F28.24C6F%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> >
> > That is two female radio amateurs (Kim and my wife) saying the opposite
of
> > what you claim. So exactly where are all those YL radio amateurs you
claim
> > are offended by Kim's callsign, Larry?
> >
>
> Nor am I offended but I do question the good sense of a person who would
> pick a designation that would/could lead to misunderstandings and
> misinterpretations.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Dee, to be as succinct with this: there are many things in one's life that can be misinterpreted. While I chose this callsign with a desire borne out of a dare from friends and local hams here; nevertheless I didn't really consider that there would be misunderstandings about my callsign. And, for those whom have come to know me; or who "just know" me by virtue of their having a sort of twisted sense of humor--the callsign has been no big deal.

I've been in casual, contest, and emergency situations with my callsign. It has never, never been degraded, questioned, or commented on over the air--save one time when a passerby happened upon our repeater one day and I introduced myself, our folks and the repeater. He came back with, "well, hello Kim, W5TIT. I am passing through the....what did I just say?" He ended his question in giggles and that was all that was ever said.

To make a long, boring story short, the callsign has had the most inane objections right here in this newsgroup, and nowhere else. There's not a lady ham out there who's ever had anything but a hand covered giggle over this callsign. It's been a great ice breaker and it immediately lets folks know that to know me means to know and understand that I in no way take myself seriously--and there's not much they are going to have done or do that's going to run me off. Simple as that.

That it runs folks like Larry off--for me--is a godsend...

Kim W5TIT

2262. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 03:13:59 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <biknt l$a6j@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 75691

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB72D899.24CF5%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> > Nor am I offended but I do question the good
> > sense of a person who would pick a designation
> > that would/could lead to misunderstandings and
> > misinterpretations.
>
>
> Clearly, I certainly wouldn't pick such a callsign, and hopefully
neither
> would my wife. But that is just our choice, not a condemnation of Kim's
> choice. I'm not going to attempt to walk in Kim's shoes, simply because I
> know little about where she walks. She does, so I'll accept her choice for
> what it is.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Thankee, Dwight. And, that's a typical example of a civil, and normal,
human relationship. There are those of us who can have those.... ;)

Kim W5TIT

2263. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 03:17:17 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bikntm$a6j@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 75690

<Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
news:20030827001610.108$dg@newsreader.com...
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote:
> > In article <biff8g$ohf@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
> > <fahgedit@nomail.net> writes:
> >
> > >Have you seen the number of lookups for me on QRZ? Keep in mind I
> > >haven't been on the air in over a year now. ROFLMAO...
> > >
> > >Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Kim:
> >
> > That's what happens when you look yourself up a couple of dozen
> > times a day.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> Isn't QRZ.com great?
>
> --
> GO #40
>

:-) I 'spose Larry thinks everyone has the same amount of time to waste as
he...

Kim W5TIT

2264. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 03:17:54 UTC
From: dickc58@att.net
Message-ID: <9829b709.0308271917.33103d9b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75675
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:<evU2b.115285$0v4.8238159@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> "DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:9829b709.0308261317.1b3d2546@posting.google.com...
> > "Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > Hey Frank, where'd you ever get the idea that radio *isn't* open to
> > the public?
> > I never knew anyone whatever who wanted a ham radio license who was
> > barred from getting one. There is a small matter of qualifying for it,
> > of course, as there is in every endeavor where others can and will be
> > impacted when the licensee knows not which way is up. But it has
> > always been open to all comers.
>
>
> OK, amateur radio is open to the public. But nearly all amateur radio
> activity is either contacts between hams or some sort of test. I'm under
> the impression that amatuers broadcasting what might be considered
> entertainment programming to the public is banned. Am I wrong about that?
>
>

No, sounds accurate to me.

> >
> > Now if you're talking "open" like CB is open, that's a horse of an
> > entirely different color.
> >
> > Dick
>
> More like pirate radio. I've heard some very entertaining stuff, and I hope
> to hear alot more. I know that time can be bought on an independent
> broadcaster, but I'd really like to know why what Alan Maxwell and the other
> do is illegal. I think hobby broadcasting would bring alot of positive
> interest to SW radio.

As always,it's a $$$$$ thing, of course.

2265. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 03:24:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030827232422.21642.00000256@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 75683

In article <BB719DE3.24C78%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>> Dwight Stewart writes:
>>
>>> Brian:
>
>
> Pay attention, Larry. I'm not Brian.

Dwight:

Sorry, hard to tell you apart. You whiners all look the same to me!

>> I, and my fellow PCTA's, have been doing that for
>> years here on this newsgroup, Fidonet, and in the
>> editorial pages of the ham magazines. (snip)

> No, you've been ranting. If you had proven code testing serves a purpose
>today worthy of a specific government requirement above and beyond all other
>operating modes, code testing would not be going away.

Incorrect. The ARRL and FCC both have a self-serving agenda which
motivates them to "lose" the code testing requirement. I doubt that
there is *anything* I could do or say that could stop it from "going away."

>> Now, it's your turn. I axed YOU to "prove" that
>> "code testing serves no real purpose today." So
>> do it. Provide your "proof," make it convincing,
>> and do it right now -- or you will have just
>> provided "proof" that you don't know what you're
>> talking about!

> The proof is obvious, Larry. Code has disappeared or is disappearing in
>all other radio services.

Unresponsive. We're talking about the Amateur Radio Service here,
nothing else.

>Since code testing was established as a license
>requirement to help maintain a pool of skilled radio operators and code has
>now virtually disappeared outside ham radio, code testing no longer serves a
>purpose as a license requirement. Code testing is disappearing exactly
>because of that.

See above. So far, you've provided zero proof.

>> That's because we have a dumbed-down culture, and
>> one voice cannot change an entire culture. Six
>> years ago, (snip)

> Ah, the dumbed-down culture myth again. People today are not as dumb as
>you'd like to think they are, Larry. And they're certainly no dumber than
>some of those in our generation or in previous generations.

It's no myth, Dwight. Our culture has been stagnated by 50 years
of liberal propaganda in the high schools and universities, the constant
whining of the liberal media, and the "mainstreaming" of any kind
of perversion known to man in the name of "enlightenment." Sorry, but
I have to call it like I see it. It's a dumbed-down culture, pure and simple.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2266. Re: Off subject, tv monitor????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 03:24:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030827232423.21642.00000257@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 75676

In article <FnV2b.868$Zz1.324@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>
>Larry,
>
>I've still got a rat shack color computer 2 :)
>Does that count?

Jim:

That would do nicely.

>73 from Rochester, NY
>Jim AA2QA
>(ps - still have my Heathkit H8 I put together in winter 76/77) It is
>immune to all known internet viruses. With 28 Kilobytes of memory, none of
>'em would likely even fit in it :))

They sure don't make 'em like they used to!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2267. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 03:24:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030827232423.21642.00000259@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 75677

In article <bih45o$o81@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> Kim:
>>
>> That's what happens when you look yourself up a couple of dozen
>> times a day.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Not at all, Larry. Ya jealous?
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

I thought you weren't responding to me anymore. What's up with this, then?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2268. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 03:24:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030827232423.21642.00000258@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 75678

In article <f6B2b.34$f57.8@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Hans,
>
>Do you think insulated 10 gauge ladder line from a 3 KW tuner plugged into
>the electric stove outlet might make a good antenna? For experimentation
>only, of course :)
>
>73 from Rochester, NY
>Jim AA2QA

Jim:

Lemme know when you're going to do this. I want to bring my camcorder.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2269. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 03:24:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030827232424.21642.00000260@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 75681

In article <bih45p$o81@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>ROFLMAO!! Ladies and gents, there's some intellect and logic fer ya...
>
>Gads, Larry. You're getting more and more desperate. Tell ya what, I'll
>quit responding to your posts *until* I see something logical and
>intellectual. Go ahead, make my day...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

You've made that promise many times in the past -- I'm still waiting
for you to honor it!

Rest assured, I'm in no need of any "responses" from you!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2270. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 03:24:25 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030827232425.21642.00000261@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 75682

In article <BB718F28.24C6F%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

> His words here, or posted/published anywhere else, don't provide you with
>an excuse to use those words in an ongoing smear campaign against Kim or
>anyone else. I think Hollingsworth would be appalled by your actions.

Dwight:

Well so far, I haven't heard any complaints from anyone but you.
Objection noted. That doesn't mean I'll desist.

>> For the simple reason that my behavior is
>> not in question here.

> Your behavior is in question here - by me.

However, your "questioning" of my behavior would leave one to suspect your own motivation. Since you object to the majority of my opinions, yet seem unequipped to debate me in an effective manner, one can only conclude that, like all liberals, you just want the opposition (me) to shut up and go away. That's not going to happen, except at my own convenience.

>So, again, since Kim was
>willing to contact Hollingsworth over the choice of her callsign (her
>behavior), why don't you contact Hollingsworth to ask if he feels your
>behavior (your use of his words to publicly harass Kim for many months) has
>any effect on Ham Radio?

Asked and answered.

>> Kim is not being "harassed." She is merely
>> experiencing the justified reaction to an
>> action she took which is potentially harmful
>> to the image of the ARS, and that is my
>> right -- just as it was Kim's "right" to
>> self-select a call sign with a vulgar,
>> sexualized, and demeaning connotation which
>> reflects poorly on YL radio amateurs
>> everywhere. (snip)

> Get off your pulpit, Larry. You do not speak for YL radio amateurs. My
>wife is not offended by Kim's callsign. Instead, she thinks you're stuck in
>a sexist past - a past where men told women what they could and could not
>do. That past is gone.

With all due respect to your XYL, she is not qualified to judge me. She has no idea how I relate to women in person. Moreover, I don't tell ANYONE what they can and cannot do. All I am trying to do is influence Kim to make up her own mind to do the right thing.

> That is two female radio amateurs (Kim and my wife) saying the opposite of >what you claim. So exactly where are all those YL radio amateurs you claim >are offended by Kim's callsign, Larry?

I have never stated that any specific YL hams *were* offended by Kim's call sign. I have only stated that I agree with Riley Hollingsworth when he says that Kim's call sign has the potential to do harm to the image of the ARS, and YL hams in general. Kim and your XYL prove absolutely nothing with regard to the validity of my objections to her (Kim's) call sign.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2271. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 03:24:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030827232426.21642.00000263@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 75679

In article <yU93b.34701$Vx2.15112747@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>> That is two female radio amateurs (Kim and my wife) saying the opposite of
>> what you claim. So exactly where are all those YL radio amateurs you claim
>> are offended by Kim's callsign, Larry?
>>
>
>Nor am I offended but I do question the good sense of a person who would
>pick a designation that would/could lead to misunderstandings and
>misinterpretations.

Dee:

I believe that is precisely what Riley Hollingsworth was addressing in his response to Kim's E-mail. There are certainly some people with bad enough taste and judgment to not be "offended" by Kim's call sign, but that hardly accommodates all possible perceptions. My perception of her call sign is that it was chosen to purposely place a vulgar, sexualized image of YL hams "in the face" of her fellow hams, and worse, the faces of prospective hams who may not share her libertine philosophy regarding the image of the female form, hers in particular. This is supposed to be a family-oriented hobby/service, and I don't believe such an image as Kim is imposing on the whole of the ARS is the correct one. Therefore, unless and until she decides to change her call sign, she will remain the object of my outspoken disapproval. How long this continues is totally up to her.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2272. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 03:24:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030827232426.21642.00000262@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 75680

In article <BB71F8BF.24CBC%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

> Actually, I believe she has explained that before. So, perhaps you should >search through the message archives for the answer. As for myself, since >it's really none of my business, I'm not really interested in the reason.

Dwight:

Actually, it most certainly is the business of any radio amateur who is properly concerned with the image of the ARS. This is supposed to be a family-oriented hobby/service. Mr. Hollingsworth said it most succinctly in his response to Kim when he raised the issue of the possible negative reaction of a parent/grandparent/aunt/uncle who may be considering this hobby for a young child in their life. Kim's callsign most certainly could cause such a person to question the judgment, if not the personal integrity and morality, of radio amateurs in general, through this one bad example.

Throughout my adult life, I've been told that "perception is reality." While I would personally make some allowances for poor choices based on the immature judgment of younger people, Kim is certainly of an age and station in life where such poor judgment is much less likely to be excused. She is the only one who can make this controversy go away. Should she choose not to, she leaves herself open to the criticism of those of us who *are* offended and *do* object to her choice of a Vanity call sign.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2273. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 06:05:43 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <biltpb$auudh$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75701

Although, If you check, I do believe there are some other areas and prefixes
that do have that suffix........ There are some still available, believe it
or not. If they are so "all-fired" offensive, why is the FCC still allowing
them??

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
news:9829b709.0308261753.6d5a0548@posting.google.com...
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in m
>
>
> be going so far out of your way to
> > display ham radio's ass in public.
> >
>
>
> Ham radio has an ASS?? We knew about that W5 showing off her TIT but
> so far no ASS has shown up here... You might recheck that one Chuck.

2274. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 06:09:09 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <biltpd$auudh$13@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75702

"Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:91abb4385c0f0e49bb49ad536db3ac61.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
>
> >
> > The fact that you can point out bad behavior done in the past does
nothing
> > to justify further bad behavior today or tomorrow. Instead, it points
out
> > the need to do better, to set our sights on where we really want to be.
> >
>
> Charles and I have found many reasons to disagree in the past, but on
> this matter we are 100% in agreement.
>
> Here on rrap the pro-coders, no-coders, slow-coders, and limp coders
> rail on and on about a subject long since put to bed by the regulators,
> and the whole meaningless fight takes on a surreal similarity to the
> fights between sailboaters and motorboaters, arguing which is more
> technically advanced, which can get through when conditions are bad,
> which is modern vs. invented in the olden days, etc., etc., etc.

As all the efforts that have been put towards the arguments and other
negative stuff, were put to postive use, maybe the world of amateur radio
around us would not be "coming one step closer to extinction." If those
efforts were put to building amateur radio in general, we would be better
off.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

>
> Meanwhile, on the shore a group of commercial developers is plotting to
> buy the lake, drain it, and build a strip mall.
>
> Rather than band together to save our hobby, we seem hell-bent on
> finding inconsequential and OTBE things to fight about, splintering and
> diluting whatever influence we have on regulators and the general
> public.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> --

> Without spectrum, there is no amateur radio.
>
>
>
>
> --
> Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2275. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 06:11:19 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <biltpe$auudh$14@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75703

It's just that the direction of where people are becoming educated etc. has changed. That is all it is.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>
> Ah, the dumbed-down culture myth again. People today are not as dumb as
> you'd like to think they are, Larry. And they're certainly no dumber than
> some of those in our generation or in previous generations.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

2276. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 06:14:18 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <biltpf$auudh$15@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75704

Just what exactly do you have against breasts Larry?? Any normal, healthy male actually likes them, and sterotypically, the bigger the better from a general consensus!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-. .. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20030826212555.06226.00000182@mb-m19.aol.com...
> In article <20030826091823.02751.00000336@mb-m23.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com
> (WA8ULX) writes:
>
> >You have to be kidding. She hauls them in to the Hamfest, supported by a
> >FORKLIFT.
>
> TMI, Bruce...TMI! You've just put an ugly image in my head which will
> haunt me for days!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

2277. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong. (wsa: M321I58DNU 09/06/2003)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 06:20:44 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <biltph$auudh$16@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75705
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dave Bushong" <dbushong@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:8IU2b.8259$Nc.5290428@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Does anyone believe the bumper sticker that says "United We Stand"?

Look at the title of the newsgroup.... Well, actually it should be
rec.radio.amateur.POLITICS instead, because except in a few rare occasions
where there actually is intelligent debate and/or discussion, it is all
POLITICS!!!!!!!

>
> Here, on this newsgroup, we all sound like a bunch of assholes who hate
> each other.

Some do seriously dislike others but some of us "play well together."

>
> And we all sound like a bunch of *hams* who hate each other, if you read
> this newsgroup.

Probably just catching the newsgroup at the wrong time. Look at
rec.radio.amateur.misc or even alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf right now. It's the "I
know you are, but what am I" childish arguements....

>
> Why do those people want to kill us? I don't know. But if we fight
> amongst ourselves, they win. They win by sitting back and watching us
> self-destruct.
>

Amateur radio will die on its own problems, not from exterior sources, as
the energy to promote and protect the service is definitely not being
utilized that way. This and other newsgroups are a prime example of the
cancer festering on our hobby/service.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2278. Re: Off subject, tv monitor????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 06:25:29 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <biltpi$auudh$17@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75706

Jesus Christ!!! Look around your area as 14 and 15 inch monitors can be had
for as little as five bucks!!!!!!!!!! I bought an really nice 15inch
monitor at a hamfest for five dollars and a decent used 17" for a few over
20 bucks. God, I know hams are cheap/tightwads and all, but come on!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB71A439.24C7A%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "kc5cqa@yahoo.com" wrote:
> >
> > I would like to use my tv as a monitor for
> > my computer, could you tell me what all is
> > involved? What I have to purchase, hardware/
> > software wise? Thanks in advance. cl 73
>
>
> If you're planning to use it as a primary monitor, you're not going to
be
> satisfied with the results. Text will be blurry and the colors will often
be
> sharply off. Anyway, there are many products that offer this capability.
> Most are used by those seeking to use a television for classroom
instruction
> (programs like PowerPoint are used to make presentations that look good on
a
> television). Search around some of the online computer catalogs.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

2279. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 06:32:56 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <biltpj$auudh$18@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75707

Just even one more proof of what I mean. Attempting to control free speech when a differing opinion occurs....
Why should they have exclusive control of the whole amateur community when they only represent (roughly) a quarter of the population?

You keep saying I should join, but why should I?? List specific reasons, backed by facts. Not vague generalities or "big-brother/mafioso-like" reasons? All it is, is a very expensive magazine subscription, so let's not kid ourselves.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >
>
> No need to slam the ARRL. There isn't any other group available to do so.
> They have the resources to evaluate the common usage of the band, develop
it
> into a band plan, and then to widely disseminate the information so that
it
> is useful to all. What other group can match that? Simple: None. If you
> want input, join the group and work from within. Don't slam it from
> without.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

2280. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 07:18:55 UTC
From: Airy R Bean <me@privacy.net>
Message-ID: <3f4dbb9a$1_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com>
Source record: 75685
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

So, you joined an organisation whose specific purpose
is to cause violent hurt to your fellow man, but you were
the one who got hurt?

Sounds like real justice to me.

Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:kPa3b.13256$jY2.3383@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> I was discharged and receive disability
> for injuries received in VN.

2281. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 08:30:55 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <35j3b.14580$jY2.8137@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75686

Dwight Stewart wrote in part:

>
> I shouldn't have to go back and point to some of the crazy things people
> watched and did in years past. Remember the Village People,

There was no ham radio operator character in the Village People. Glaring oversight.

> Kiss,

Upon further review, Kiss rocked sufficiently.

> Disco,

On the one hand, there is a special dung heap in the low-rent section of West Hell reserved for disco. On the other hand, only one thing is more pathetic than an aging hippie, and that's an aging punk. Guilty.

> the
> song Muskrat Love,

Which version: the shambling and unspeakable America original, or the eldritch horror cover by The Captain and Tennille?

> houses filled with incense, chopper motorcycles, the song
> My Ding-a-Ling, Elton John's sunglasses, and so on.
>

Elton John's glasses were actually PHR4CKT4L 4NT3NN4Z. I'm surprised you don't remember this.

--

It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

2282. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 10:16:00 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308280216.5b7ce4ff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75687
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

nm5k@wt.net (Mark Keith) wrote in message
news:<25eb70d7.0308270907.6ab7f432@posting.google.com>...
> Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3F4C35EA.2040102@ix.netcom.com>...
> > Disgusted wrote:
> >
> > >I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the SHIT
> > >out of them!
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > IIRC the only Wouff Hong in existence is in the ARRL's museum. I doubt
> > that they'd
> > let you borrow it......
>
> One could easily be fabricated from a piece of old wood. "Old plow
> handles" etc.. I would not sand the device. It's much more effective
> when the splinters are functional. I've heard tell fleet brand enemas
> are based on the original Wouff Hong design. Not as glamorous as
> machine gun design, but useful none the less. MK

A pointy 2x4 soaked for a week in a bucket of Dave's Insanity Sauce
might get some attention . .

2283. Re: Off subject, tv monitor????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 10:30:26 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308280230.55bf43fe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75688

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<Jk83b.13069$jY2.11697@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> <kc5cqa@yahoo.com>
> > wrote in message news:scvmkvgenfscuevfgf5mc6hjjqa2n7t5m2@4ax.com...
> > I would like to use my tv as a monitor for my computer, could you
> > tell me what all is involved? What I have to purchase,
> > hardware/software wise? Thanks in advance. cl 73
>
> At least one other person noted that the quality of picture
> will be much worse than a computer monitor. That's
> maybe OK depending on "what application" you want to use a TV
> for instead fo a monitor. These days computer monitors
> are dirt cheap.

http://www.staples.com/products/SpotLights/030824/501711/Default.asp

And those are available at everybody's lame neighborhood pens 'n
pencils store. Poke around a bit find 'em for even less.

> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

W3(c)RV

2284. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 12:03:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308280403.245973d6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75692

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308271857.45d37aea@posting.google.com>...
> Radioman <radio@ptt.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4CFD78.480C673@ptt.edu>...
> > > Vippy, you've just been promoted from "Idiot" to "Complete Idiot".
> >
> >
> > Youre village called, there missing they're idiot.
>
> Huh?
>
> I think you meant: "Your village called; they're missing thier
> idiot"...or something like that. Even spelled correctly it's had to
> ascertain your intent.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Sounds like DICK, punctuates like Bruce.

Hmmmm. Twin brothers, different mothers?

2285. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 12:13:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308280413.7ebbc4c1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75693

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3F4D435C.20202@adelphia.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> > dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308261319.5dea6a1d@posting.google.com>...
> >
> >>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308260853.18fcb4b@posting.google.com>...
> >>
> >>>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4B731A.6000509@psu.edu>...
> >>>
> >>>>Hans K0HB wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> If you are not a registered voter in California, then you have no cause to
> >>>>>> carry on as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on
> >>>>>> California politics.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>That sword cuts in both directions, sir.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>If you are not a registered voter in California (licensed operator
> >>>>>in the Amateur Radio Service), then you have no cause to carry on
> >>>>>as if you were nor have you any authority whatsoever on California
> >>>>>politics (Amateur Radio Service policy).
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> Game, Set, Match!
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> Squelch of the week.
> >>>>
> >>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >>>
> >>>Mike, you almost got it. Len -was- using the back of the blade.
> >>>Maybe if he had used the flat side...
> >>
> >>Brian, as usual you didn't quite get it. Len just got the blade stuffed up his nose.
> >
> >
> > DICK, you almost got it. Len -was- using the back of the blade. Maybe

> > if he had used the flat side... and slapped you with it.
>
> Lessee, he told me to take the post out of here, and that it was noe of
> my business because I'm not a registered voter in California.
>
>
> Let us say that is a valid argument.

Let's not because everyone is entitled to their own opinion and
they're entitled to voice it per the articles of the US Constitution.

However, what Len has heard from the rrap peanut gallery is that he
doesn't have a ham license, therefore his opinions are wrong and/or
don't count.

He's playing a little TIT for TAT in his California Voting analogue.

It's really not so hard to see that.

> So Hans simply substitutes the related words, turning it into what I
> consider a perfect squelch.
>
> Was Hans not relevent?

Hans is ocassionally relevant, but not on this ocassion. He's much
better at playing a Master Chief.

> It's a good squelch, unless you subscribe to the dictum that that other
> guy wins, always.

Not at all. Len was just giving a little of it back. Are you not big
enough to accept it?

> And certainly, I only refer to squelching in the normal sense. Some
> people are not accepting of squelchification, as it were.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Squelchification of free speech is now a good thing?

bb

2286. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 12:42:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4DF89C.2090706@psu.edu>
Source record: 75694

Brian wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3F4D435C.20202@adelphia.net>...

>> It's a good squelch, unless you subscribe to the dictum that that other
>>guy wins, always.
>
>
> Not at all. Len was just giving a little of it back. Are you not big
> enough to accept it?

Problem is, Brian, that beyond an inquiry as to what his interest was in ham radio, I never said his opinions don't count. That's someone elses argument. I'm quite neutral on what he posts. Post or don't, no problem.

That's painting with a very broad brush.

> Squelchification of free speech is now a good thing?

Being squelched is not denial of free speech. The choice to respond after being squelched is always there.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2287. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 12:53:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4DFB5F.3060005@psu.edu>
Source record: 75695

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote:

<some snippage>

>>BUT! the individual tests can be "smartened" or
>>"dumbed". All that is up to us. We decide.
>
> But we have to decide within the constraints of the intent of those tests.
> To do that, we have to understand that intent. Far too many try to view the
> Ham Radio license exams as some sort of knowledge exam, when they are
> instead entrance exams into Ham Radio.

I won't disagree with your basic premise, but therin lies danger.

> And Ham Radio is a recreation, not a
> vocation.

And there is the trap! There are many recreations that require some learning to effectively use and enjoy them. Fishing and boating come to mind. I have a boat. I never took a test for its use, although I got a little pamphlet when I got my license. Whenever I bought a fishing license, I got another little pamphlet explaining seasons and creel limits, which are pretty darn analogous to band edges and power limits. But no tests.

>The FCC has other exams designed to examine vocational knowledge,
> as do local colleges and universities. Given those facts, I see no reason to
> change the existing written exams.

Just be on guard, because others do.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2288. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 13:36:23 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0308280536.2d194da0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75696

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

>
> But as a person that can walk and chew gum and take a drink of water at
> the same time, I can focus on a number of things at one time.
>

Then please focus on standing up tall, because I think the point of my
message sailed right over your head.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2289. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 15:26:30 UTC
From: no.em@il.now
Message-ID: <nocode.noham@arrl.net>
Source record: 75697
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <vkl0nsoogac3c7@corp.supernews.com>, Disgusted wrote:
>
>I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the SHIT
>out of them!
>

I have a baseball bat, can I join you? HA

I bailed out of the ARRL 14 years ago when it started to become clear that the Leagues agenda was tending more toward a policy of supporting lower licensing stardards (CB'er Ham). A pool of trained, capable radio operators means something to me and I could no longer stand to be a part of an organization that was moving to disregard that section of Part 97.

It was a life membership too.

2290. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 15:30:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4E200A.3040808@psu.edu>
Source record: 75698

K0HB wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
>
>> But as a person that can walk and chew gum and take a drink of water at
>>the same time, I can focus on a number of things at one time.
>>
>
>
> Then please focus on standing up tall, because I think the point of my
> message sailed right over your head.

Your point seems to be that we are discussing trivial matters, while
the important things go ignored.

If that isn't your point, then clue me in.

Or is this just last-wordism. In that case be my guest.
- Mike KB3EIA -

2291. Re: Firm Date for Germany

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 21:12:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <afu3b.21794$8i2.6721@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75699
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,uk.radio.amateur

"Airy R Bean" <me@privacy.net> wrote in message
news:3f4dbb9a$1_1@mk-nntp-1.news.uk.worldonline.com...
> So, you joined an organisation whose specific purpose
> is to cause violent hurt to your fellow man, but you were
> the one who got hurt?
>
> Sounds like real justice to me.
>
> Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:kPa3b.13256$jY2.3383@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > I was discharged and receive disability
> > for injuries received in VN.
>
>
>

Strange way to look at it Airhead. I joined before there was any hostilities going on Airhead. In fact the Gulf of Tonkin Bullshit was in August of 64. I joined in July of 64. I was in basic training when the 'activities' began. So , no my reason for joining was not to "cause violent hurt to my fellow man".

However I did indeed do that later on.

I joined to do my duty to my country.

You are welcome to your opinions Airhead.

Dan/W4NTI

2292. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong. (was: M321I58DNU 09/06/2003)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 21:24:32 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <kqu3b.10139$Nc.5839702@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 75700
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dave Bushong wrote:
>
>> [...]
>
>
>
> Wow, Dave! That's a stretch. With just a few notable exceptions,
> most of us here in rrap enjoy our arguments with each other, and don't
> take it too seriously or personally.
>
> Or do you want to tell us just what we should think and say?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Wow, Mike! I guess it sounds serious and personal when someone says
"I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the
SHIT out of them!"

I would certainly not presume to tell you what to think; I only ask that
you try *to* think. You might enjoy it.

73,
Dave

2293. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 22:02:58 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB73F4D0.24D3B%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75708

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> Actually, it most certainly is the business
> of any radio amateur who is properly concerned
> with the image of the ARS. This is supposed
> to be a family-oriented hobby/service. Mr.
> Hollingsworth said it most succinctly in his
> response to Kim when he raised the issue of
> the possible negative reaction of a parent/
> grandparent/aunt/uncle who may be considering
> this hobby for a young child in their life.
> Kim's callsign most certainly could cause such
> a person to question the judgment, if not the
> personal integrity and morality, of radio
> amateurs in general, through this one bad
> example. (snip)

Who's really seeking the lowest common denominator, Larry? You seem to be saying that nothing should be mentioned on Ham Radio that might offend or confuse a young child. If we accept that position, all we'd be allowed to talk about is Barney and the Sesame Street characters.

Regardless, most adults today know what a "tit" is and are not offended or confused by the simple mention of it. If a child is, the parent should consider a discussion with them about human sexuality. If they're too young for that discussion, they're probably too young to be talking with adults on the radio or most other places.

If you're offended by Kim's callsign, you need to grow up. The adults of this world are not going to censor their discussions simply to cater to your unusually delicate sensitivities. And, to be honest with you, I wouldn't want to see Ham Radio go in that direction.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2294. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 22:20:42 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F4E8039.4020402@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75709
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

>
>
>
>I bailed out of the ARRL 14 years ago when it started to become clear that the
>Leagues agenda was tending more toward a policy of supporting lower licensing
>stardards (CB'er Ham). A pool of trained, capable radio operators means
>something to me and I could no longer stand to be a part of an organization
>that was moving to disregard that section of Part 97.
>
>
>It was a life membership too.
>
>
I thought the only way to cancel a life membership was to electrocute
yourself
on the power supply of your linear amplifier..... ;-)

2295. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 22:32:37 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bilvrs$cli@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 75710

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030827232423.21642.00000259@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <bih45o$o81@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Kim:
> >>
> >> That's what happens when you look yourself up a couple of dozen
> >> times a day.
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>
> >
> >Not at all, Larry. Ya jealous?
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> I thought you weren't responding to me anymore. What's up with this,
then?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

No. As usual, you read wrong. I said that I would not be responding
unless I saw something intellectual and logical from you. So, uh, you
would agree then that there's been nothing intellectual or logical from you.
Good. We both agree on that. I was just checking.

Kim W5TIT

2296. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 22:39:36 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB73FD5F.24D3D%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75711

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> With all due respect to your XYL, she is not
> qualified to judge me. She has no idea how
> I relate to women in person. (snip)

Since you're basing your objection on how it reflects on women ("a vulgar, sexualized, and demeaning connotation which reflects poorly on YL radio amateurs everywhere"), she is, as a woman, qualified to judge the weight of that argument. She has done so, and feels your argument lacks substance. She is, as a woman, also able to say whether Kim's callsign is offensive to her. She says it is not.

Your argument lacks substance, Larry. Three women have disagreed with your position (my wife, Kim, and Dee). While two of the three have reservations about Kim's callsign (they wouldn't choose it), none find it outright offensive.

Men once used shame and ridicule to force women to comply with their domination. That time has passed, Larry. Women are not ashamed of their bodies anymore, nor are they embarrassed by the mere mention of some part of that body. Would we (men) really want it any other way?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2297. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 22:46:26 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bim0lo$irq@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 75712

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB73F4D0.24D3B%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > Actually, it most certainly is the business
> > of any radio amateur who is properly concerned
> > with the image of the ARS. This is supposed
> > to be a family-oriented hobby/service. Mr.
> > Hollingsworth said it most succinctly in his
> > response to Kim when he raised the issue of
> > the possible negative reaction of a parent/
> > grandparent/aunt/uncle who may be considering
> > this hobby for a young child in their life.
> > Kim's callsign most certainly could cause such
> > a person to question the judgment, if not the
> > personal integrity and morality, of radio
> > amateurs in general, through this one bad
> > example. (snip)
>
>
> Who's really seeking the lowest common denominator, Larry?
>

<GRIN> Larry *is* the lowest common denominator here, Dwight...LOL Know
that saying, "can't see the forest for the trees?"

>
> You seem to be
> saying that nothing should be mentioned on Ham Radio that might offend or
> confuse a young child. If we accept that position, all we'd be allowed to
> talk about is Barney and the Sesame Street characters.
>

I get the oddest vision in my mind when I think of Larry and his incessant
whining about such puritanical thoughts. Know the vision? You know the
one: where a spanking is more the pleasure of the person touching the butt
than anything else? "I'm doing this for your own good" kind of thinking?

>
> Regardless, most adults today know what a "tit" is and are not offended
or
> confused by the simple mention of it.
>

We are dealing here, with someone who is not--no where near--most adults.

>
> If a child is, the parent should
> consider a discussion with them about human sexuality.
>

Man, you got that right.

>
> If they're too young
> for that discussion, they're probably too young to be talking with adults
on
> the radio or most other places.
>

More like if they're too young for that discussion, they probably wouldn't
be able to decipher W5TIT into the word tit.

>
> If you're offended by Kim's callsign, you need to grow up. The adults of
> this world are not going to censor their discussions simply to cater to
your
> unusually delicate sensitivities. And, to be honest with you, I wouldn't
> want to see Ham Radio go in that direction.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Growing up won't be done any time soon. We all know that. Let him have his
fun--that's all this is to him. I can guarantee you that Larry doesn't mind
my callsign one bit. He just likes having the topic to throw around once in
a while. I don't mind it at all; in fact, I may be saving the poor wretch
from complete and awesome boredom!

Kim W5TIT

2298. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong. (wsa: M321I58DNU 09/06/2003)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 22:52:43 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <%lv3b.21975$8i2.14168@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75713
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:biltph$auudh$16@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
> "Dave Bushong" <dbushong@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:8IU2b.8259$Nc.5290428@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > Does anyone believe the bumper sticker that says "United We Stand"?
>
> Look at the title of the newsgroup.... Well, actually it should be
> rec.radio.amateur.POLITICS instead, because except in a few rare occasions
> where there actually is intelligent debate and/or discussion, it is all
> POLITICS!!!!!!!
>
> >
> > Here, on this newsgroup, we all sound like a bunch of assholes who hate
> > each other.
>
> Some do seriously dislike others but some of us "play well together."
>
> >
> > And we all sound like a bunch of *hams* who hate each other, if you read
> > this newsgroup.
>
> Probably just catching the newsgroup at the wrong time. Look at
> rec.radio.amateur.misc or even alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf right now. It's the
"I
> know you are, but what am I" childish arguements....
>
> >
> > Why do those people want to kill us? I don't know. But if we fight
> > amongst ourselves, they win. They win by sitting back and watching us
> > self-destruct.
> >
>
> Amateur radio will die on its own problems, not from exterior sources, as
> the energy to promote and protect the service is definitely not being
> utilized that way. This and other newsgroups are a prime example of the
> cancer festering on our hobby/service.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.

> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>

Oh BS Ryan, you think this bunch of mis fits on USENET has anything in common with the 'real hams' ?? I don't.

I have been here since I got a computer, way back in 1996. Not much has changed. Even some of the same folks are here.

Nothing that goes on here happens on the air. Its a good way to vent and have fun.

In fact I'll bet if you could take a pole you would find most of these folks are not on the air, for whatever reason, and don't care to be. This is their only connection to a enjoyable outlet they can't or won't use any longer. Being on the air and having fun.

Dan/W4NTI

2299. FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 22:53:23 UTC
From: Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <DJv3b.8299$3E.2208@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75714

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi

Enter in the number RM-10787, fill out the address
information and upload or type in your comments on
the elimination of morse code testing as a requirement
to operate on HF.

--
The Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
http://www.kilowatt-radio.org/
..it does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an
irate, tireless minority to set brush fires in people's
minds. --Samuel Adams

2300. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 22:59:43 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <zPv3b.21983$8i2.13364@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75715

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:biltpb$auudh$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Although, If you check, I do believe there are some other areas and
prefixes
> that do have that suffix..... There are some still available, believe
it
> or not. If they are so "all-fired" offensive, why is the FCC still
allowing
> them??
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> "DickCarroll" <dickc58@att.net> wrote in message
> news:9829b709.0308261753.6d5a0548@posting.google.com...
> > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in m
> >
> >
> > be going so far out of your way to
> > > display ham radio's ass in public.
> > >
> >
> >
> > Ham radio has an ASS?? We knew about that W5 showing off her TIT but
> > so far no ASS has shown up here... You might recheck that one Chuck.
>
>

Because in this 'politically correct' age and era they certainly wouldn't
want to be sued by some fruitcake. How would that look to Mr. Powel??

Years ago, BV (before vanity) the FCC would BLOCK FROM ISSUE certain calls
that said things considered offensive. I.E. K4FU, W1WC, (water closet)
(toilet in Europe). ETC.

Dan/W4NTI

2301. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 23:12:40 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <I%v3b.21989$8i2.4432@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75716
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:DJv3b.8299$3E.2208@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi
>
> Enter in the number RM-10787, fill out the address
> information and upload or type in your comments on
> the elimination of morse code testing as a requirement
> to operate on HF.
>
>
> --
> The Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
> http://www.kilowatt-radio.org/
> ..it does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an
> irate, tireless minority to set brush fires in people's
> minds. --Samuel Adams

Thank you so much Keith, here is what I sent.

****

I think the total ellimination of the Morse Code (CW) requirement will prove detrimental to the Amateur Radio Service. I believe it will make it so easy for trash to get into the ARS that it will eventually sound like CB Radio.

The testing has already been reduced to multiple guess. The CW test is a ten question joke. In general you should NOT reduce the requirements ANY MORE.

I base my comments on over 40 years as a FCC licensed Amateur Radio Operater, I presently hold a pre give away EXTRA class license.

Thank You for your time.

Daniel L. Jeswald
W4NTI

2302. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 23:14:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB74056C.24D3F%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75717

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> (snip) Incorrect. The ARRL and FCC both have
> a self-serving agenda which motivates them to
> "lose" the code testing requirement. (snip)

Ah, a grand conspiracy to rid the world of code testing. Absolutely shocking - and total nonsense.

> Unresponsive. We're talking about the Amateur
> Radio Service here, nothing else.

The Amateur Radio Service does not exist, nor has it ever existed, in a vacuum. At least two of our reasons for existing (pool of trained operators and emergency service) lies with those other radio services - radio services outside Ham Radio. Therefore, our rules and regulations must reflect the needs of those other radio services. At one time, those needs included code. That is no longer true. Code testing was once needed. That is no longer true.

> It's no myth, Dwight. Our culture has been
> stagnated by 50 years of liberal propaganda in
> the high schools and universities, the constant
> whining of the liberal media, and the "mainstreaming"
> of any kind of perversion known to man in the name
> of "enlightenment." Sorry, but I have to call it
> like I see it. It's a dumbed-down culture, pure
> and simple.

Larry, it's spelled "dumb-downed" or "dumb downed." And, while I agree with some of your points about the education system, I'm not willing to make blanket statements about an entire culture.

Most schools and universities today are either state owned or state supported. Therefore, to find an answer to the problems with schools, we only have to look as far as our own state representatives. And, since they like the federal education assistance available to them, those representatives are not going to change unless we vote them out and are willing to fund schools locally. I see no effort in either of those directions.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2303. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 23:15:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F4E8D78.7050509@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75718

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> "Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:91abb4385c0f0e49bb49ad536db3ac61.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
>
>>"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
>>
>>
>>>The fact that you can point out bad behavior done in the past does
>>
> nothing
>
>>>to justify further bad behavior today or tomorrow. Instead, it points
>>
> out
>
>>>the need to do better, to set our sights on where we really want to be.
>>>
>>
>>Charles and I have found many reasons to disagree in the past, but on
>>this matter we are 100% in agreement.
>>
>>Here on rrap the pro-coders, no-coders, slow-coders, and limp coders
>>rail on and on about a subject long since put to bed by the regulators,
>>and the whole meaningless fight takes on a surreal similarity to the
>>fights between sailboaters and motorboaters, arguing which is more
>>technically advanced, which can get through when conditions are bad,
>>which is modern vs. invented in the olden days, etc., etc., etc.
>
>
>
> As all the efforts that have been put towards the arguments and other
> negative stuff, were put to postive use, maybe the world of amateur radio
> around us would not be "coming one step closer to extinction." If those
> efforts were put to building amateur radio in general, we would be better
> off.

Yeahh, everyone thinks that. Problem is they want everyone's opinion to
match their own.... And there are plenty of differeing definitions and
opinions of exactly what ppositive is.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2304. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 23:17:36 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <k4w3b.21994$8i2.1396@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75719

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bim0lo$irq@library2.airnews.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:BB73F4D0.24D3B%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> > >
> > > Actually, it most certainly is the business
> > > of any radio amateur who is properly concerned
> > > with the image of the ARS. This is supposed
> > > to be a family-oriented hobby/service. Mr.
> > > Hollingsworth said it most succinctly in his
> > > response to Kim when he raised the issue of
> > > the possible negative reaction of a parent/
> > > grandparent/aunt/uncle who may be considering
> > > this hobby for a young child in their life.
> > > Kim's callsign most certainly could cause such
> > > a person to question the judgment, if not the
> > > personal integrity and morality, of radio
> > > amateurs in general, through this one bad
> > > example. (snip)
> > >
> > >
> > Who's really seeking the lowest common denominator, Larry?
> > >
> >
> <GRIN> Larry *is* the lowest common denominator here, Dwight...LOL Know
> that saying, "can't see the forest for the trees?"
>
> > >
> > You seem to be
> > saying that nothing should be mentioned on Ham Radio that might offend
or
> > confuse a young child. If we accept that position, all we'd be allowed
to
> > talk about is Barney and the Sesame Street characters.
> > >
> >
> I get the oddest vision in my mind when I think of Larry and his incessant
> whining about such puritanical thoughts. Know the vision? You know the
> one: where a spanking is more the pleasure of the person touching the butt
> than anything else? "I'm doing this for your own good" kind of thinking?
>
> > >
> > Regardless, most adults today know what a "tit" is and are not

offended
> or
> > confused by the simple mention of it.
> >
>
> We are dealing here, with someone who is not--no where near--most adults.
>
> >
> > If a child is, the parent should
> > consider a discussion with them about human sexuality.
> >
>
> Man, you got that right.
>
> >
> > If they're too young
> > for that discussion, they're probably too young to be talking with
adults
> on
> > the radio or most other places.
> >
>
> More like if they're too young for that discussion, they probably wouldn't
> be able to decipher W5TIT into the word tit.
>
> >
> > If you're offended by Kim's callsign, you need to grow up. The adults
of
> > this world are not going to censor their discussions simply to cater to
> your
> > unusually delicate sensitivities. And, to be honest with you, I wouldn't
> > want to see Ham Radio go in that direction.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >
>
> Growing up won't be done any time soon. We all know that. Let him have
his
> fun--that's all this is to him. I can guarantee you that Larry doesn't
mind
> my callsign one bit. He just likes having the topic to throw around once
in
> a while. I don't mind it at all; in fact, I may be saving the poor wretch
> from complete and awesome boredom!
>
> Kim W5TIT
>

>

I think most of us on here are adults Kim. We have all heard and all know what a TIT is. I doubt that most of us think your choice of W5TIT for a callsigh is offensive. I think most of us believe it is a pathetic attempt for attention.

I personally believe you are a closet exhibitionist.

Thank you for your time Twit.

Dan/W4NTI

2305. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 23:21:48 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB74073E.24D41%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75720

"Unclaimed Mysteries" wrote:

> There was no ham radio operator character
> in the Village People. Glaring oversight.

LOL. Maybe the Ham Radio was at the WMCA. Anyway, I think you get the point I was trying to make.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2306. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 23:25:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308281525.164ebc11@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75721

dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308271137.34471fd3@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308270309.147fc33f@posting.google.com>...
> > dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308261753.6d5a0548@posting.google.com>...
> > > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in m
> > >
> > > be going so far out of your way to
> > > > display ham radio's ass in public.
> > >
> > > Ham radio has an ASS??
> >
> > DICK, I know that it confuses you that ham radio's ASS is called DICK,
> > but the rest of us got used to it a long time ago.
>
> Yeah, yeah, Brian we know....you're helpless to refrain from showing off your
> periennial state of confusion. We understand.

No confusion here, DICK.

bb

2307. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 23:28:27 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0308281528.78806793@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75722

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

>
> Your point seems to be that we are discussing trivial matters, while
> the important things go ignored.
>
> If that isn't your point, then clue me in.
>

My point has nothing to do with "discussing". My point has to do with our seemingly suicidal desire to fracture our image and marginalize our credibility.

My point is that the Amateur Radio Service exists at the pleasure of public opinion and regulators who are increasingly disconnected from our hobby.

Against that background, rather than band together to save our hobby we seem hell-bent on finding inconsequential and OTBE things to fight about, splintering and diluting whatever influence we have on regulators and the general public.

Morse Code testing is a dead issue, but here in this public forum we continue to poke and prod at it's carcass like a pack of squabbling hyenas with the same old rhetoric which started here over a decade ago.

Maybe I'm mistaken, but I think that's essentially the same notion offered in the message from N5PVL which opened this thread.

73, de Hans, K0HB

2308. Re: The BPL of rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 23:32:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308281532.4be0c459@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75723

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4DF89C.2090706@psu.edu>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3F4D435C.20202@adelphia.net>...
>
> >> It's a good squelch, unless you subscribe to the dictum that that other
> >>guy wins, always.
> >
> > Not at all. Len was just giving a little of it back. Are you not big
> > enough to accept it?
>
> Problem is, Brian, that beyond an inquiry as to what his interest was
> in ham radio, I never said his opinions don't count.

Others have repeatedly.

That's someone
> elses argument. I'm quite neutral on what he posts. Post or don't, no
> problem.
>
> That's painting with a very broad brush.

It helps to use a broad brush when you want to cover a large area.

> > Squelchification of free speech is now a good thing?
>
> Being squelched is not denial of free speech. The choice to respond
> after being squelched is always there.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Unless the squelchers "moderate" the newsgroup as they've brought up before.

2309. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 23:34:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308281534.39b4a1b8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75724

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030826190637.02751.00000373@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >I only said that your retelling of how you did it is total unadulterated BS.
> >
> >In other words, you lied.
>
> None of its a LIE, its all FACT, you just cant handle the fact that I did it
> and you cant.

Lies.

2310. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 23:46:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB740CF0.24D44%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75725

"Mike Coslo" wrote:

> And there is the trap! There are many recreations
> that require some learning to effectively use and
> enjoy them. Fishing and boating come to mind. I
> have a boat. I never took a test for its use,
> although I got a little pamphlet when I got my
> license. (snip)

The difference lies in the use of that recreation. As you know, Ham Radio also serves a purpose outside pure recreation (emergency service, for example). Therefore, the FCC took a more proactive approach, but one that is not that different from other recreations with a more serious side.

Lets take your boat as an example. For pure recreation, you obviously do not need a license or operating exam. However, if you join an organization like the CG Auxiliary with the intent to use that boat for a more serious purpose, you are expected to take courses, pass exams, and maintain the boat to certain standards. The same is true for CAP and other similar mainly recreational activities with a serious side.

Do you follow what I'm saying here? I'm trying to simplify things, while still getting across the point.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2311. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-28 23:58:49 UTC
From: Trs1 <reports@cnn.com>
Message-ID: <bjqtkvgv9da08ltgjp3l1q7k217l16pact@4ax.com>
Source record: 75726
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf

Yep, Sounds like another one of those maggots that want the bands to
be given to someone else. Thats what happens when the bands are quiet.
The FCC gives them to another radio service. So I guess he would have
his Extra Class with a few less bands to operate soon instead of
letting other legit hams use the band to save it.

I will be here in a few years to hear you complain about the loss of
your bands.

Bye for now!

On Thu, 28 Aug 2003 23:12:40 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:DJv3b.8299$3E.2208@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi
>>
>> Enter in the number RM-10787, fill out the address
>> information and upload or type in your comments on
>> the elimination of morse code testing as a requirement
>> to operate on HF.
>>
>>
>> --
>> The Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
>> http://www.kilowatt-radio.org/
>> ..it does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an
>> irate, tireless minority to set brush fires in people's
>> minds. --Samuel Adams
>
>Thank you so much Keith, here is what I sent.
>
>************************************
>
>I think the total ellimination of the Morse Code (CW) requirement will prove
>detrimental to the Amateur Radio Service. I believe it will make it so easy
>for trash to get into the ARS that it will eventually sound like CB Radio.
>
>The testing has already been reduced to multiple guess. The CW test is a
>ten question joke. In general you should NOT reduce the requirements ANY
>MORE.
>

>I base my comments on over 40 years as a FCC licensed Amateur Radio
>Operater, I presently hold a pre give away EXTRA class license.
>
>Thank You for your time.
>
>Daniel L. Jeswald
>W4NTI
>

2312. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 00:08:05 UTC
From: olllllllo@sbcglobal.net
Message-ID: <FPw3b.594$685.522@newssvr22.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75727
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:I%v3b.21989
>I believe it will make it so easy
> for trash to get into the ARS that it will eventually sound like CB Radio.

It's already so easy for trash to get in and turn it
into CB radio. WA8ULX is the poster BOY for
proof of this claim!

73

2313. Re: The technical level of QST increases

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 00:10:10 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308281610.7c10ac59@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75728

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<i6b3b.13342$jY2.7818@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030826223439.22081.00000219@mb-m17.aol.com...
> > In article <c9a0a4ecaa105536f1ffc46ce3787827@dizum.com>, Nomen Nescio
> > <nobody@dizum.com> writes:
> >
> > >September 2003, page 38 : how to replace
> > >a pilot lamp by a LED and a resistor.
> > >The high technical level of this article
> > >is for CW coders only.
> > >
> > >Page 31 is not bad too, the figure 4-A
> > >shows a very sophisticated interface
> > >including 2 resistors, 2 banana plug
> > >sockets and 2 BNC plugs. This article
> > >is reserved for EXTRA operators only.
> >
> > I am relieved and enlightened that QST is showing such a leap of
> > technical understanding of the state of the art of electronics!
> >
> > LHA
> >
> >
>
> I have to agree with you on that one Len over 21. QST and technology parted
> company years ago. Heck, a new magazine started up because of it, called
> Ham Radio. Unfortunatly they also folded.
>
> You do of course know that the ARRL also publishes what they call a
> technical magazine, don't ya? I don't even bother looking at it.

I sure have. Sometime take a peek at QEX and count up the number of
articles written by these "technical genius" nocodes vs. the number of
articles written by coded Extras.

> I think
> they should have left technical articles in QST as before.

Has pros 'n cons. Over the course of a year there's a lot more total
technical meat in the combination of QST and QEX than there ever was
in QST alone.

> But then the league has done a lot of things that I don't like.
>

> Dan/W4NTI (life member ARRL)

W3(c)RV Member ARRL

2314. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 00:24:31 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030828202431.24345.00000134@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 75729

>Lies.
>

What ever CBer.

2315. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 01:01:34 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <OBx3b.35345$Vx2.15393974@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75730

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:biltpj$auudh$18@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Just even one more proof of what I mean. Attempting to control free
speech
> when a differing opinion occurs....
> Why should they have exclusive control of the whole amateur community when
> they only represent (roughly) a quarter of the population?
>
> You keep saying I should join, but why should I?? List specific reasons,
> backed by facts. Not vague generalities or "big-brother/mafioso-like"
> reasons? All it is, is a very expensive magazine subscription, so let's
not
> kid ourselves.
>

They are not trying to control free speech. Show your proof that they are doing so. They establish policies based on the input of their membership as does any other organization. They then carry through on that policy. Naturally not every member agrees with it but if we had to have a unanimous consensus nothing would ever get done. And they have no reason or obligation to pay any attention to the opinions of non-members.

They do not have nor try to have exclusive control of the whole amateur community. Show your proof that they do. They establish goals based on what their membership wants. That is what any organization does. Again they have no reason or obligation to establish their goals based on the opinions of non-members.

You seem to expect them to roll over and adopt YOUR opinion. That's unrealistic. Whether you join or not is your business of course. But unless you are a member, you have no right to expect to control their policies or for them to listen to your opinions and adopt your opinions. If you want to change them, join. If you aren't willing to join, don't expect to change them. That's pretty simple.

I know why I am a member. They can do things that I cannot.
1) Take the current BPL situation. They have the finances and facilities to do the research that I can't afford. That is but one of many things.
2) Product tests/reviews. I can't afford to buy all the test equipment, every new radio, antenna, etc and run my own comparisons.
... and so on.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2316. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong. (was: M321I58DNU 09/06/2003)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 01:23:07 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <bim9trgdl1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 75780
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dave Bushong (dbushong@adelphia.net) writes:
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> Dave Bushong wrote:
>>
>>> [...]
>>
>>
>>
>> Wow, Dave! That's a stretch. With just a few notable exceptions,
>> most of us here in rrap enjoy our arguments with each other, and don't
>> take it too seriously or personally.
>>
>> Or do you want to tell us just what we should think and say?
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
> Wow, Mike! I guess it sounds serious and personal when someone says
> "I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the
> SHIT out of them!"
>
> I would certainly not presume to tell you what to think; I only ask that
> you try *to* think. You might enjoy it.
>
> 73,
> Dave
>

I thought the Wouff Hong was supposed to suggest unspeakable horrors
to the bad operator, but I don't think it has anything to do with beating
anyone up. It's power is so great that nobody wants to mess with it,
so they keep in line.

And how come nobody has mentioned the Rettysnitch in this thread?

Michael VE2BVW

2317. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 01:23:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <CWx3b.22145$8i2.6272@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75731
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf

The bands are QUIET? you say....as in few to no signals? Are your flippin braindead or something? What are you using for a receiver...a super-regen made by Lafayette in the 50s? Or do you even have a antenna?

Quiet you say? I can do twenty qsos an hour just passing out signal reports at 18 wpm on a straight key.

What a joke.

Dan/W4NTI

"Trs1" <reports@cnn.com> wrote in message news:bjqtkvgv9da08ltgjp3l1q7k217l16pact@4ax.com...
> Yep, Sounds like another one of those maggots that want the bands to
> be given to someone else. Thats what happens when the bands are quiet.
> The FCC gives them to another radio service. So I guess he would have
> his Extra Class with a few less bands to operate soon instead of
> letting other legit hams use the band to save it.
>
> I will be here in a few years to hear you complain about the loss of
> your bands.
>
> Bye for now!
>
>
> On Thu, 28 Aug 2003 23:12:40 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:DJv3b.8299$3E.2208@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi
> >>
> >> Enter in the number RM-10787, fill out the address
> >> information and upload or type in your comments on
> >> the elimination of morse code testing as a requirement
> >> to operate on HF.
> >>
> >>
> >> --
> >> The Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
> >> http://www.kilowatt-radio.org/
> >> ..it does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an
> >> irate, tireless minority to set brush fires in people's

> >> minds. --Samuel Adams
> >
> >Thank you so much Keith, here is what I sent.
> >
> >**********
> >
> >I think the total ellimination of the Morse Code (CW) requirement will
prove
> >detrimental to the Amateur Radio Service. I believe it will make it so
easy
> >for trash to get into the ARS that it will eventually sound like CB
Radio.
> >
> >The testing has already been reduced to multiple guess. The CW test is a
> >ten question joke. In general you should NOT reduce the requirements ANY
> >MORE.
> >
> >I base my comments on over 40 years as a FCC licensed Amateur Radio
> >Operater, I presently hold a pre give away EXTRA class license.
> >
> >Thank You for your time.
> >
> >Daniel L. Jeswald
> >W4NTI
> >
>

2318. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 Morse Code Elimination Petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 01:27:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <JZx3b.22149$8i2.12275@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75732

Here are mine Keith;

I think the total ellimination of the Morse Code (CW) requirement will prove detrimental to the Amateur Radio Service. I believe it will make it so easy for trash to get into the ARS that it will eventually sound like CB Radio.

The testing has already been reduced to multiple guess. The CW test is a ten question joke. In general you should NOT reduce the requirements ANY MORE.

I base my comments on over 40 years as a FCC licensed Amateur Radio Operater, I presently hold a pre give away EXTRA class license.

Thank You for your time.

Daniel L. Jeswald
W4NTI

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:E0x3b.8447$3E.4634@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>
> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi
>
> Enter in the number RM-10787, fill out the address
> information and upload or type in your comments on
> the elimination of Morse Code testing as a requirement
> to operate on HF.
>
> Scan of the Original document submitted by Ham Radio operators to eliminate
> all requirements for morse code testing to obtain a Amateur Radio license.
>
http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514683821
>
> --
> The Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
> http://www.kilowatt-radio.org/
> ..it does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an
> irate, tireless minority to set brush fires in people's
> minds. --Samuel Adams

2319. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 02:17:39 UTC
From: Ross Archer <dogbert@mindless.com>
Message-ID: <3F4EB7C3.8F0A0ADF@mindless.com>
Source record: 75733
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> nm5k@wt.net (Mark Keith) wrote in message
news:<25eb70d7.0308270907.6ab7f432@posting.google.com>...
> > Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3F4C35EA.2040102@ix.netcom.com>...
> > > Disgusted wrote:
> > >
> > > >I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the SHIT
> > > >out of them!
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > IIRC the only Wouff Hong in existence is in the ARRL's museum. I doubt
> > > that they'd
> > > let you borrow it......
> >
> > One could easily be fabricated from a piece of old wood. "Old plow
> > handles" etc.. I would not sand the device. It's much more effective
> > when the splinters are functional. I've heard tell fleet brand enemas
> > are based on the original Wouff Hong design. Not as glamorous as
> > machine gun design, but useful none the less. MK
>
> A pointy 2x4 soaked for a week in a bucket of Dave's Insanity Sauce
> might get some attention . .

Depends on whether there are splinters on it to break the
skin and inject the Sauce of Death.
Yowww!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

My friend makes a Habanero chili to die for. No, really die
for. Or at least wish you had. :)

2320. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 02:18:31 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bimd69$ij9@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75734

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:k4w3b.21994$8i2.1396@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:bim0lo$irq@library2.airnews.net...
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:BB73F4D0.24D3B%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> > > "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Actually, it most certainly is the business
> > > > of any radio amateur who is properly concerned
> > > > with the image of the ARS. This is supposed
> > > > to be a family-oriented hobby/service. Mr.
> > > > Hollingsworth said it most succinctly in his
> > > > response to Kim when he raised the issue of
> > > > the possible negative reaction of a parent/
> > > > grandparent/aunt/uncle who may be considering
> > > > this hobby for a young child in their life.
> > > > Kim's callsign most certainly could cause such
> > > > a person to question the judgment, if not the
> > > > personal integrity and morality, of radio
> > > > amateurs in general, through this one bad
> > > > example. (snip)
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Who's really seeking the lowest common denominator, Larry?
> > > >
> > >
> > <GRIN> Larry *is* the lowest common denominator here, Dwight...LOL Know
> > that saying, "can't see the forest for the trees?"
> >
> > >
> > > You seem to be
> > > saying that nothing should be mentioned on Ham Radio that might offend
> or
> > > confuse a young child. If we accept that position, all we'd be allowed
> to
> > > talk about is Barney and the Sesame Street characters.
> > > >
> > >
> > I get the oddest vision in my mind when I think of Larry and his
incessant
> > whining about such puritanical thoughts. Know the vision? You know the
> > one: where a spanking is more the pleasure of the person touching the
```

butt
> > than anything else? "I'm doing this for your own good" kind of
thinking?
> >
> > >
> > > Regardless, most adults today know what a "tit" is and are not
> offended
> > or
> > > confused by the simple mention of it.
> > >
> >
> > We are dealing here, with someone who is not--no where near--most
adults.
> >
> > >
> > > If a child is, the parent should
> > > consider a discussion with them about human sexuality.
> > >
> >
> > Man, you got that right.
> >
> > >
> > > If they're too young
> > > for that discussion, they're probably too young to be talking with
> adults
> > on
> > > the radio or most other places.
> > >
> >
> > More like if they're too young for that discussion, they probably
wouldn't
> > be able to decipher W5TIT into the word tit.
> >
> > >
> > > If you're offended by Kim's callsign, you need to grow up. The
adults
> of
> > > this world are not going to censor their discussions simply to cater
to
> > your
> > > unusually delicate sensitivities. And, to be honest with you, I
wouldn't
> > > want to see Ham Radio go in that direction.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > >
> >

> > Growing up won't be done any time soon. We all know that. Let him have
> his
> > fun--that's all this is to him. I can guarantee you that Larry doesn't
> mind
> > my callsign one bit. He just likes having the topic to throw around
once
> in
> > a while. I don't mind it at all; in fact, I may be saving the poor
wretch
> > from complete and awesome boredom!
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> I think most of us on here are adults Kim. We have all heard and all know
> what a TIT is. I doubt that most of us think your choice of W5TIT for a
> callsigh is offensive. I think most of us believe it is a pathetic
attempt
> for attention.
>
> I personally believe you are a closet exhibitionist.
>
> Thank you for your time Twit.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Don't let your penile dysfunction get in the way.

Kim W5TIT

2321. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 03:00:07 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030828230007.06073.00000113@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 75735

>Don't let your penile dysfunction get in the way.
>
>Kim W5TIT

What a BITCH, dont let your TITs hang on the ground and trip some one

2322. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 03:02:55 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F4EC25E.4070200@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75736

Keith wrote:

>http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi
>
>Enter in the number RM-10787, fill out the address
>information and upload or type in your comments on
>the elimination of morse code testing as a requirement
>to operate on HF.
>
>
>
>
To see the petition for rule making, go to:
http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514683821
I did that so I could see what I'd be commenting on, and be able to make
a sensible
comment.

2323. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 Morse Code Elimination Petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 03:20:59 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F4EC69A.7020806@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75737

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>Here are mine Keith;
>
>
>I think the total elimination of the Morse Code (CW) requirement will prove
>detrimental to the Amateur Radio Service. I believe it will make it so easy
>for trash to get into the ARS that it will eventually sound like CB Radio.
>
>
>
People were predicting the end of the HF world when the hordes of
"extra-lites" and "general-
lites" were unleashed onto HF. After the newbie phase it didn't happen.
Also note that
14.313 happened long before restructuring, and everyone there had passed
at least 13wpm.
And the 2m repeaters in my town are as well behaved now as before the no
code tech.
So I would say the theory that code is a lid filter is not true or so
weak as to not be
worthwhile.

A side effect of the VEC system is that examines can't help but meet
other preexisting
hams, and likely hook up with formal (clubs) or informal groups of hams.
Vs. CB, which
is just "open the box and connect the mic and antenna and go blab on".

2324. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 Morse Code Elimination Petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 03:39:15 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93E5F0812F8BDelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 75738

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:JZx3b.22149$8i2.12275@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

> Here are mine Keith;
>
>
> I think the total ellimination of the Morse Code (CW) requirement will
> prove detrimental to the Amateur Radio Service. I believe it will make
> it so easy for trash to get into the ARS that it will eventually sound
> like CB Radio.
>
> The testing has already been reduced to multiple guess. The CW test is
> a ten question joke. In general you should NOT reduce the requirements
> ANY MORE.
>
> I base my comments on over 40 years as a FCC licensed Amateur Radio
> Operater, I presently hold a pre give away EXTRA class license.
>
> Thank You for your time.
>
> Daniel L. Jeswald
> W4NTI
>
>
>
> "Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:E0x3b.8447$3E.4634@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>>
>>
>> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi
>>
>> Enter in the number RM-10787, fill out the address
>> information and upload or type in your comments on
>> the elimination of Morse Code testing as a requirement
>> to operate on HF.
>>
>> Scan of the Original document submitted by Ham Radio operators to
>> eliminate all requirements for morse code testing to obtain a Amateur
>> Radio license.
>>
> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_doc
> umen t=6514683821
>>
>> --

>> The Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
>> http://www.kilowatt-radio.org/
>> ..it does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an
>> irate, tireless minority to set brush fires in people's minds.
>> --Samuel Adams
>
>

I have filed my comments too, with a copy of the petition I would have
filed if NCVEC had not filed first.

2325. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 03:50:04 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bimihc$h5$0@208.206.142.89>
Source record: 75739

Brian wrote:

> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0308271857.45d37aea@posting.google.com>...
> > Radioman <radio@ptt.edu> wrote in message news:<3F4CFD78.480C673@ptt.edu>...
> > > > Vippy, you've just been promoted from "Idiot" to "Complete Idiot".
> > >
> > >
> > > Youre village called, there missing they're idiot.
> >
> > Huh?
> >
> > I think you meant: "Your village called; they're missing thier
> > idiot"...or something like that. Even spelled correctly it's had to
> > ascertain your intent.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Sounds like DICK, punctuates like Bruce.

,,,,smells like Brian.

2326. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 03:51:11 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F4ECDAE.5080201@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75740
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

N8KDV wrote:

>Disgusted wrote:
>
>
>
>>I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the SHIT
>>out of them!
>>
>>
>
>Would someone please make up a set of lyrics please? I imagine something
>along the lines of 'If I had a hammer, I'd hammer in the morning....'
>
>
>
>
"I'd wouff hong in the morning, wouff hong in the evening,......"

2327. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 04:05:26 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bimje6$1c0$0@208.206.142.89>
Source record: 75741

Brian wrote:

> dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308271137.34471fd3@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308270309.147fc33f@posting.google.com>...
> > > dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308261753.6d5a0548@posting.google.com>...
> > > > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in m
> > > >
> > > > be going so far out of your way to
> > > > > display ham radio's ass in public.
> > > >
> > > > Ham radio has an ASS??
> > >
> > > DICK, I know that it confuses you that ham radio's ASS is called DICK,
> > > but the rest of us got used to it a long time ago.
> >
> > Yeah, yeah, Brian we know....you're helpless to refrain from showing off your
> > periennial state of confusion. We understand.
>
> No confusion here, DICK.

None that you ever recognized, that is.

2328. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 Morse Code Elimination Petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 04:32:36 UTC
From: Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <1306y22r9ituh$.5hu2ypj1bapy.dlg@40tude.net>
Source record: 75742

On Fri, 29 Aug 2003 01:27:05 GMT, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> The testing has already been reduced to multiple guess. The CW test is a
> ten question joke. In general you should NOT reduce the requirements ANY
> MORE.

Well Dan you are talking to the wrong person. I am not in charge of
establishing FCC rules and I can only file comments like everyone else.

--
Ham, SWL and Scanner Radio page http://www.kilowatt-radio.org/
..it does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an
irate, tireless minority to set brush fires in people's
minds. --Samuel Adams

2329. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 04:34:26 UTC
From: Hans K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <c4a6771678b5a0221f9271fbee325279.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 75743

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote

> Enter in the number RM-10787, fill out the address
> information and upload or type in your comments on
> the elimination of morse code testing as a requirement
> to operate on HF.

I have submitted the following comments:

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of)
)
Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's) RM-10787
Amateur Service Rules to eliminate)
Morse code testing.)

To: The Commission

PERSONAL COMMENTS OF HANS BRAKOB, K0HB

OVERVIEW

These comments are submitted in response to the petition of
NCVEC which requests elimination of test Element 1 (Morse Code)
from the Amateur Radio service rules.

I. Discussion:

The instant petition requests the elimination of Element 1
(5WPM Morse code test) from the required test for General
and/or Extra Class licenses in the Amateur Radio service.

I find no persuasive argument for continuation of this test,
and support the petition to discontinue testing new applicants
with Element 1.

I am concerned, however, that other elements of the qualification
tests are not adequate to ensure a high level of expertise in
new applicants to the Amateur Radio service, and propose changes
in the licensing structure to ensure that all 5 points of
CFR 47 paragraph 97.1 (Basis and Purpose) are reasonably addressed
in the qualification process.

II Proposal:

I propose that no new applicants be accepted for the current
license classes and that after some reasonable grace period, no
upgrades be available in the current licensing structure.

A. New License Classes:

I propose that new license applications be available
in two classes, namely "Class B" and "Class A".

The "Class B" license would have an entry-level test (basic
regulations, safety, operating procedures, basic DC and AC
electronics). This class would have full frequency and
mode privileges, power limited to 50W output. The license
would be issued for a period of 10 years, and be non-renewable.
Holders of this license would be required to have 2 years
experience as a licensee (ï¿½time in gradeï¿½) before being
eligible to upgrade to ï¿½Class Aï¿½.

The "Class A" license test would be of a difficulty level
similar to the current Extra class test, and would have
full privileges at power levels up to 1500W, equivalent to
current Extra Class license holders. This license
would be issued permanently without requirement for
renewal.

B. Status of current licensees.

Current licenses could be renewed indefinitely, and would
retain their current operating privileges.

Current Novice, Technician, General, and Advanced class
licensees could up grade to ï¿½Class Aï¿½ at any time.

Respectfully submitted,

H. Hans Brakob, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2330. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 05:22:42 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hkcvr3x.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75744

On Thu, 28 Aug 2003 00:54:10 GMT, Steve Stone wrote:

>A recent New York State Math Regents exam results were tossed out
>because so few students were able to pass the test. Passing the test
>is required for High School graduation. During pre exam trials of the
>questions it was found that only 47 percent of those who took the exam
>could pass the test.

I am a survivor of the New York State Regents' Exams 50+ years ago.
It was a joke, because the last semester of each subject was
devoted to reviewing past Regents' exams and therefore we learned
zippo new during that time except how to pass the exam. And this was
in a high school for nerds.....

>So what does this have to do with CW testing ? Absolutely nothing
>except for stupidity.

Or lousy teaching. I suspect the latter. Kids aren't all born
dumb - most get that way because they're not taught otherwise.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2331. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 05:22:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hkcvzky.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75745

On Thu, 28 Aug 2003 02:20:07 GMT, Dwight Stewart wrote:

>> Then explain reality TV, Dwight! 8^)
>
>
> I shouldn't have to go back and point to some of the crazy things people
>watched and did in years past. Remember the Village People, Kiss, Disco, the
>song Muskrat Love, houses filled with incense, chopper motorcycles, the song
>My Ding-a-Ling, Elton John's sunglasses, and so on.

No, I don't remember those thigs because neither I nor my family
wasted our time or intellect energy on them.

>And Ham Radio is a recreation, not a vocation.

Playing with radio equipment is serious business and should be
regarded as such.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

2332. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 05:22:43 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hkcwwbz.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 75746

On Thu, 28 Aug 2003 23:14:02 GMT, Dwight Stewart wrote:

> The Amateur Radio Service does not exist, nor has it ever existed, in a
>vacuum. At least two of our reasons for existing (pool of trained operators
>and emergency service) lies with those other radio services - radio services
>outside Ham Radio. Therefore, our rules and regulations must reflect the
>needs of those other radio services. At one time, those needs included code.
>That is no longer true. Code testing was once needed. That is no longer
>true.

At one time (admittedly in ancient times) the Navy station that you
were interfering with could/would come onto your frequency and order
you in Morse Code to QRT, so knowledge/proficiency/skill (whichever)
in Morse was essential.

This, too, is no longer the case.

>> It's no myth, Dwight. Our culture has been
>> stagnated by 50 years of liberal propaganda in
>> the high schools and universities, the constant
>> whining of the liberal media, and the "mainstreaming"
>> of any kind of perversion known to man in the name
>> of "enlightenment." Sorry, but I have to call it
>> like I see it. It's a dumbed-down culture, pure
>> and simple.
>
>
> Larry, it's spelled "dumb-downed" or "dumb downed." And, while I
>agree with some of your points about the education system, I'm not
>willing to make blanket statements about an entire culture.

That's OK...anything that is progressive or modern (called "liberal
propaganda" or "whining of the liberal media") or is just plain
different (called "any kind of perversion known to man in the name
of enlightenment") processed through Larry comes out as the cause of
all of society's ills including falling arches, low bit rates,
foreign QRM, garblem CW, warts, and incessent rain.

I've learned to tune it out as a sign of ignorance at the mildest
and bigotry at the worst and get on with my worthwhile, enjoyable,
and very moral "liberal" life.

> Most schools and universities today are either state owned or state
>supported. Therefore, to find an answer to the problems with schools, we
>only have to look as far as our own state representatives. And, since they
>like the federal education assistance available to them, those

>representatives are not going to change unless we vote them out and are
>willing to fund schools locally. I see no effort in either of those
>directions.

A bloody shame both ways - the Feds play their games, the locals
play theirs, and the kids - including my kids in their time - lose
out. Private schools were no better......they just had different
funding ills.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2333. Tower Wars: FL Citizens Protect the kids from evil Ham with lightening attracting tower.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 05:55:49 UTC
From: Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <FVB3b.7963$Jh2.7180@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75747

http://www.marcoeagle.com/03/08/marco/d966153a.htm

| Eight children live on our street, play in the yard and swim in the pool now
| within striking distance of this tower and anything that falls off it.

| Other concerns are blue sky lightning, which strikes from miles away, while
| the kids are playing, and exposure to radio waves powerful enough to reach
| outside the state or country must also radiate within our small back yard. We
| now tell our kids to stay out of the back yard. It's not right.

| Realtors confirm this tower will diminish property values and salability of
| our properties. Mr. Kahn obtained the tower from a nice lady who had to get
| rid of it to sell her property.

--
Best Regards, Keith AOL IM:kilowattradio
NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
Give SCO $699 for using Linux or the Penguin gets it.
Torvalds: _They are smoking crack._

2334. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 06:06:15 UTC
From: "paulfriedman@comcast.net" <p.paulfriedman@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <r3C3b.224176$Oz4.61555@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 75748

Hans:

I am curious why you want the two year "no upgrade" period. I would think such a rule would greatly reduce the appeal of ham radio. It certainly would have caused me to spend my time, effort, and money on another hobby.

73

Paul AB0SI

"Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:c4a6771678b5a0221f9271fbee325279.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote
>
> The "Class B" license would have an entry-level test (basic
> regulations, safety, operating procedures, basic DC and AC
> electronics). This class would have full frequency and
> mode privileges, power limited to 50W output. The license
> would be issued for a period of 10 years, and be non-renewable.
> Holders of this license would be required to have 2 years
> experience as a licensee ("time in grade") before being
> eligible to upgrade to "Class A".

2335. Tower Wars: utah Ham Attacks City Law on Radio Towers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 06:11:45 UTC
From: Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <B8C3b.8889$3E.4700@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75749

http://www.newutah.com/article.php?sid=8922&mode=thread&order=0

|A Cedar Hills resident is seeking an amendment to an ordinance regulating the
|height of radio antennas.

|Philip Thunborg, an amateur radio operator and enthusiast, has been asking for
|a change in the city's ordinance for four months. The issue is the city
|ordinance states a radio antenna can rise no more than 10 feet above the roof
|line of a dwelling.

--
Best Regards, Keith AOL IM:kilowattradio
NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
Give SCO $699 for using Linux or the Penguin gets it.
Torvalds: _They are smoking crack._

2336. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 06:52:34 UTC
From: Babs <NoSpam@nospam.com>
Message-ID: <bimt7h$r7u$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75750
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F4ECDAE.5080201@ix.netcom.com...
N8KDV wrote:

>Disgusted wrote:
>
>
>
>>I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the SHIT
>>out of them!
>>
>>
>
>Would someone please make up a set of lyrics please? I imagine something
>along the lines of 'If I had a hammer, I'd hammer in the morning....'
>
>
>
>
"I'd wouff hong in the morning, wouff hong in the evening,......"

Maybe if you Republicans would sing it MY way the song could go something
like...
"People. People who need Wouff Hongs are the luckiest people in the world.."
Of course I'd throw in my own Babs melody and claim copyright. Then you'd
have to deal with my lawyers and deal with me, The Divine Diva Of All Times.
Babs

2337. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 08:07:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB748267.24DC0%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75751

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:

> (snip) Growing up won't be done any time
> soon. We all know that. Let him have his
> fun--that's all this is to him. I can
> guarantee you that Larry doesn't mind my
> callsign one bit. He just likes having
> the topic to throw around once in a while.
> I don't mind it at all; in fact, I may be
> saving the poor wretch from complete and
> awesome boredom!

I'm just having a little fun also, Kim. Periodic "discussions" with Larry are a great diversion from a boring week. That situation will change this weekend through most of next week and I'll have to reduce my participation in this newsgroup. But, until then, this is a fun distraction.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2338. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 09:13:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB749201.24DC2%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75752

"Phil Kane" wrote:

> A bloody shame both ways - the Feds play
> their games, the locals play theirs, and
> the kids - including my kids in their
> time - lose out. Private schools were no
> better......they just had different
> funding ills.

I noticed you mentioned teachers in another message. If you get a chance, take a trip to your local school sometime. I recently visited several high schools and was impressed with the effort those teachers were putting into their jobs. What was surprising was the behavior of the kids in some classes (not all, some). In some classes, very few were paying attention to anything the teacher said. Instead, they were talking, playing radios, dancing, threatening each other, sleeping, making out (kissing and necking), and so on. They would have never even noticed anything the teacher did to help them learn. I don't see how anyone could possibly learn anything in such an environment.

I talked to several teachers afterwards. According to them, the difference between classes is due to attempts to separate kids that are making an effort from those who are not. In the classes with the better behaved students, the classroom instruction advances at a much quicker rate. In the classes with the kids who are not trying, class size is reduced and the teachers just try to get the kids to absorb anything they're supposed to be learning. Most of those teachers admitted it was nearly a hopeless cause - how do you get kids to learn if they're not at all interested in doing so.

I left with a simply question on my mind - what is causing those kids not to be interested in learning and how can that be changed. If we can answer that, I think 80 to 90 percent of the problem could be solved. And, as mentioned in another message, I suspect the answer lies outside the school system.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2339. Re: Off subject, tv monitor????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 09:22:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB74941A.24DC4%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 75753

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> Jesus Christ!!! Look around your area as 14
> and 15 inch monitors can be had for as little
> as five bucks!!!!!!!!!!! I bought an really
> nice 15inch monitor at a hamfest for five
> dollars and a decent used 17" for a few over
> 20 bucks. God, I know hams are cheap/tightwads
> and all, but come on!

Don't be too hard on him, Ryan. Since it's not really clear what he wants to use it for, perhaps he has a reason for wanting to use a television with his computer. Another possibility is that he's been around long enough to remember when televisions were used with the computers of the time and was wondering if that was still possible today.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2340. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 12:32:34 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <CJH3b.294331$Ho3.41809@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 75754
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

no.em@il.now (Real Ham) wrote in news:nocode.noham@arrl.net:

> I bailed out of the ARRL 14 years ago when it started to become clear
> that the Leagues agenda was tending more toward a policy of supporting
> lower licensing stardards (CB'er Ham). A pool of trained, capable
> radio operators means something to me and I could no longer stand to
> be a part of an organization that was moving to disregard that section
> of Part 97.
>
>
> It was a life membership too.
>

You beat me by 10 years. I bailed out about four years ago. Mine wasn't a life membership, but you didn't loose much considering what the ARRL has become. Still, I miss the technical articles in QST. Now days the technical articles are probably geared to the new style ham like, how to hook an antenna to a rig, or which side of a microphone you should talk into. I was hoping the ghost of Hiram Percy Maxim was still hanging around ol Newington guiding the League in some small secret way. But the ghost is dead.

2341. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 12:34:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308290434.346e7e93@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75755
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

Paul, since the only apparent privelege difference in the two proposed
license classes is 50W, and you could operate any amateur frequency in
any mode, why would that deter you from the ARS?

Brian

"paulfriedman@comcast.net" wrote in message news:...
> Hans:
>
> I am curious why you want the two year "no upgrade" period. I would think
> such a rule would greatly reduce the appeal of ham radio. It certainly would
> have caused me to spend my time, effort, and money on another hobby.
>
> 73
>
> Paul AB0SI
>
>
> "Hans K0HB" wrote in message
> news:c4a6771678b5a0221f9271fbee325279.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > "Keith" wrote
> >
> > The "Class B" license would have an entry-level test (basic
> > regulations, safety, operating procedures, basic DC and AC
> > electronics). This class would have full frequency and
> > mode privileges, power limited to 50W output. The license
> > would be issued for a period of 10 years, and be non-renewable.
> > Holders of this license would be required to have 2 years
> > experience as a licensee ("time in grade") before being
> > eligible to upgrade to "Class A".

2342. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 12:36:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308290436.77c3e0de@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75756

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030825232933.14837.00002522@mb-m03.aol.com>...

> So, Brian -- are you going to defend your statement, or not?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Yes. No. What statement did I make?

2343. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 12:40:06 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <biotmk$b61ma$10@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75804

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030827232426.21642.00000262@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <BB71F8BF.24CBC%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:
>
> > Actually, I believe she has explained that before. So, perhaps you
should
> >search through the message archives for the answer. As for myself, since
> >it's really none of my business, I'm not really interested in the reason.
>
> Dwight:
>
> Actually, it most certainly is the business of any radio amateur who
> is properly concerned with the image of the ARS. This is supposed
> to be a family-oriented hobby/service. Mr. Hollingsworth said it most
> succinctly in his response to Kim when he raised the issue of the
> possible negative reaction of a parent/grandparent/aunt/uncle who may
> be considering this hobby for a young child in their life. Kim's callsign
> most certainly could cause such a person to question the judgment,
> if not the personal integrity and morality, of radio amateurs in general,
> through this one bad example.

I'll say it again, the person uninvolved with amateur radio won't know the
difference whether it was a sequentially or vanity-requested callsign. The
average person would assume the FCC merely assigned it. (Yes, believe it or
not I actually polled people to see their responses the last time this
bullsh*t came up). There is the root of the problem, if you have such a
pissy feeling towards Kim's (and many other potentially offensive by your
apparent standards) the why don't you spend your efforts whining to the FCC
than wasting your time with posts that will not achieve ANY results other
than to get it off your chest and to hear yourself "bellow" in a "electronic
medium."

>
> Throughout my adult life, I've been told that "perception is reality."
> While I would personally make some allowances for poor choices based
> on the immature judgment of younger people, Kim is certainly of an
> age and station in life where such poor judgment is much less likely
> to be excused. She is the only one who can make this controversy
> go away. Should she choose not to, she leaves herself open to the
> criticism of those of us who *are* offended and *do* object to her choice
> of a Vanity call sign.
>

Once again, if the callsign is so offensive, it is the FCC to blame. Any vanity callsign or even if it even was a sequentially assigned that is deemed offensive is their fault. I should have the right to request ANY callsign that is listed as "available" provided I have the initial right to do so by licensure requirements/benefits. If the list is including some of what you refer to as offensive, that is your problem, and the FCC's, not the rest of us.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2344. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 12:40:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <kRH3b.102$EW1.40@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75757

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hkcvzky.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Thu, 28 Aug 2003 02:20:07 GMT, Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> >> Then explain reality TV, Dwight! 8^)

> > I shouldn't have to go back and point to some of the crazy things
people
> >watched and did in years past. Remember the Village People, Kiss, Disco,
the
> >song Muskrat Love, houses filled with incense, chopper motorcycles, the
song
> >My Ding-a-Ling, Elton John's sunglasses, and so on.
>
> No, I don't remember those thigs because neither I nor my family
> wasted our time or intellect energy on them.

Hey, what's wrong with chopper motorcycles...or hot rods, etc?

> >And Ham Radio is a recreation, not a vocation.
>
> Playing with radio equipment is serious business and should be
> regarded as such.

I agree...and
The same is true for auto enthusiasts...be it hot rods, antique cars,
motorcycles, etc. You need a license to participate.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2345. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 12:42:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308290442.38ba2d74@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75758

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bimje6$1c0$0@208.206.142.89>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308271137.34471fd3@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308270309.147fc33f@posting.google.com>...
> > > > dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308261753.6d5a0548@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in m
> > > > >
> > > > > be going so far out of your way to
> > > > > > display ham radio's ass in public.
> > > > >
> > > > > Ham radio has an ASS??
> > > >
> > > > DICK, I know that it confuses you that ham radio's ASS is called DICK,
> > > > but the rest of us got used to it a long time ago.
> > >
> > > Yeah, yeah, Brian we know....you're helpless to refrain from showing off your
> > > periennial state of confusion. We understand.
> >
> > No confusion here, DICK.
>
> None that you ever recognized, that is.

DICK, I recognize you. That's how I put your name in every reply.

2346. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 12:50:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <_ZH3b.108$EW1.14@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75759

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:OBx3b.35345$Vx2.15393974@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:biltpj$auudh$18@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > Just even one more proof of what I mean. Attempting to control free
> speech
> > when a differing opinion occurs....
> > Why should they have exclusive control of the whole amateur community
when
> > they only represent (roughly) a quarter of the population?
> >
> > You keep saying I should join, but why should I?? List specific
reasons,
> > backed by facts. Not vague generalities or "big-brother/mafioso-like"
> > reasons? All it is, is a very expensive magazine subscription, so let's
> not
> > kid ourselves.
> >
>
> They are not trying to control free speech. Show your proof that they are
> doing so. They establish policies based on the input of their membership
as
> does any other organization. They then carry through on that policy.
> Naturally not every member agrees with it but if we had to have a
unanimous
> consensus nothing would ever get done. And they have no reason or
> obligation to pay any attention to the opinions of non-members.
>
> They do not have nor try to have exclusive control of the whole amateur
> community. Show your proof that they do. They establish goals based on
> what their membership wants. That is what any organization does. Again
> they have no reason or obligation to establish their goals based on the
> opinions of non-members.
>
> You seem to expect them to roll over and adopt YOUR opinion. That's
> unrealistic. Whether you join or not is your business of course. But
> unless you are a member, you have no right to expect to control their
> policies or for them to listen to your opinions and adopt your opinions.
If
> you want to change them, join. If you aren't willing to join, don't
expect
> to change them. That's pretty simple.
>

> I know why I am a member. They can do things that I cannot.
> 1) Take the current BPL situation. They have the finances and facilities
> to do the research that I can't afford. That is but one of many things.
> 2) Product tests/reviews. I can't afford to buy all the test equipment,
> every new radio, antenna, etc and run my own comparisons.
> ... and so on.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dee,

Well said!

For all those that complain about ARRL, no one has effectively
started an alternative in all these years. I see ARRL as the best
bang for my buck on most matters of amateur issues. I departed from
ARRL position on the code issue and have been a director of
NCI because of that ONE issue. The point is, that NCI, while
a separate org from ARRL, is not trying to replace ARRL's
role in amateur issues EXCEPT on the code/nocode test issue...
and of late, there's less disparity there then 5 years ago.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2347. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong. (wsa: M321I58DNU 09/06/2003)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 12:58:43 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <biotmm$b61ma$11@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75805
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:%Iv3b.21975$8i2.14168@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:biltph$auudh$16@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> >
> > "Dave Bushong" <dbushong@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:8IU2b.8259$Nc.5290428@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> > > Does anyone believe the bumper sticker that says "United We Stand"?
> >
> > Look at the title of the newsgroup.... Well, actually it should be
> > rec.radio.amateur.POLITICS instead, because except in a few rare
occasions
> > where there actually is intelligent debate and/or discussion, it is all
> > POLITICS!!!!!!!
> >
> > >
> > > Here, on this newsgroup, we all sound like a bunch of assholes who
hate
> > > each other.
> >
> > Some do seriously dislike others but some of us "play well together."
> >
> > >
> > > And we all sound like a bunch of *hams* who hate each other, if you
read
> > > this newsgroup.
> >
> > Probably just catching the newsgroup at the wrong time. Look at
> > rec.radio.amateur.misc or even alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf right now. It's
the
> "I
> > know you are, but what am I" childish arguements....
> >
> > >
> > > Why do those people want to kill us? I don't know. But if we fight
> > > amongst ourselves, they win. They win by sitting back and watching us
> > > self-destruct.
> > >
> >
> > Amateur radio will die on its own problems, not from exterior sources,
as
> > the energy to promote and protect the service is definitely not being

> > utilized that way. This and other newsgroups are a prime example of the
> > cancer festering on our hobby/service.
> >
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> > .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >
> >
>
> Oh BS Ryan, you think this bunch of mis fits on USENET has anything in
> common with the 'real hams' ?? I don't.

It's not my place to say who is a "real ham" but my comments were merely responding to what that guy had observed HERE in Usenet, not on the air. And I still stand by my comments, sometimes the newsgroups are nutty as a Snickers bar and sometimes they are not..... Just depends on when ya catch them.

>
> I have been here since I got a computer, way back in 1996. Not much has
> changed. Even some of the same folks are here.

Same here, but from around 1999. It goes in cycles. That was the main reason of responding to that guy, stuff goes in cycles on here.... Sometimes some quality posting, sometimes garbage.
>

> Nothing that goes on here happens on the air. Its a good way to vent and
> have fun.
>

Pure BS. These people may or may not operate the same way they act in this newsgroup, but there are a ton that act like complete asses, bringing the amateur radio community "one step closer to extinction" on HF. And this is from an overwhelming amount of these people being licensed anywhere from 25-40 years!!!! (The ones that are supposed to be "better hams.")

I will give to ya, on the venting and having fun part. I do agree with that. My sole purpose for participatin in newsgroups whatsoever is two-fold: recreation and education. Certain newsgroups (other than ham radio related as well) provide for some excellent sources of information.

> In fact I'll bet if you could take a pole you would find most of these
folks
> are not on the air, for whatever reason, and don't care to be. This is
> their only connection to a enjoyable outlet they can't or won't use any
> longer. Being on the air and having fun.

Well, Lets just do that!!! See separate post in regard to this.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2348. Ham here and hams on the air?? Its a poll

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 13:03:21 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <biotmo$b61ma$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75806

1. How many hams that participate with some frequency here in this newsgroup operate on the air in the legal ham bands?

2. Which band(s) do you operate? (Modes irrelevant for this poll, just bands or frequency band ranges please.)

3. How frequently do you operate on those bands in Question 2?? Hourly, Daily, Weekly etc.

(Lennie, don't bother responding, We all know you don't have an amateur radio license)

Thanks,
--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2349. Re: Off subject, tv monitor????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 13:30:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4F5569.8030401@psu.edu>
Source record: 75760

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Jesus Christ!!! Look around your area as 14 and 15 inch monitors can be had
> for as little as five bucks!!!!!!!!!!! I bought an really nice 15inch
> monitor at a hamfest for five dollars and a decent used 17" for a few over
> 20 bucks. God, I know hams are cheap/tightwads and all, but come on!

Wow Ryan!

Maybe there is a reason this fellow wants to use a Television as a
monitor. Maybe he is doing a presentation to some people, and needs a
bigger screen. Maybe he wants to play computer games on a big screen TV.
I'm surprised that you have this reaction, after reading previous posts
of yours.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2350. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 Morse Code Elimination Petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 13:44:31 UTC
From: flatulaus encomium <treedogs3@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1062165030.173541@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 75761

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:E0x3b.8447$3E.4634@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>
> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi
>
> Enter in the number RM-10787, fill out the address
> information and upload or type in your comments on
> the elimination of Morse Code testing as a requirement
> to operate on HF.

FINALLY !!!!

It's VERY long past time we eliminate this albatross
hanging about the neck of Amateur Radio, known as
CW. Drop the code and increase the required theory
knowledge to pass in order to offset the same. This is
what should be done. If it were up to me, I would no
longer publish the question pools. One should know their
"techcinal stuff" if they hold a licence. I know people that
have Extra's who can't even explain Ohm's Law! This is
NOT acceptable.

2351. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 13:47:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4F595C.9070304@psu.edu>
Source record: 75762

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Just even one more proof of what I mean. Attempting to control free speech
> when a differing opinion occurs....
> Why should they have exclusive control of the whole amateur community when
> they only represent (roughly) a quarter of the population?

Gee, Ryan. If I make a post with my opinion, and you make a post with a different opinion, is that an attempt to control free speech on your part?

Which begs some questions:

What do those people on this list who believe that a person who disagrees with them is trying to deny them their civil rights want? Do you just want to post with only replies that agree with you? Do you want to extend the same to the other persons posts? Are you trying to control them when you post a message disagreeing with their post?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2352. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 13:55:34 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <biotmp$b61ma$13@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75807

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:OBx3b.35345$Vx2.15393974@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:biltpj$auudh$18@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > Just even one more proof of what I mean. Attempting to control free
> speech
> > when a differing opinion occurs....
> > Why should they have exclusive control of the whole amateur community
when
> > they only represent (roughly) a quarter of the population?
> >
> > You keep saying I should join, but why should I?? List specific
reasons,
> > backed by facts. Not vague generalities or "big-brother/mafioso-like"
> > reasons? All it is, is a very expensive magazine subscription, so let's
> not
> > kid ourselves.
> >
>
> They are not trying to control free speech. Show your proof that they are
> doing so.

They are by virtue of a member attempting to do so. Either a member is or
is not a representative of the arrl.

They establish policies based on the input of their membership as
> does any other organization. They then carry through on that policy.
> Naturally not every member agrees with it but if we had to have a
unanimous
> consensus nothing would ever get done. And they have no reason or
> obligation to pay any attention to the opinions of non-members.

As well as they should not be representing "non-members" either. The ARRL
is responsible for the state of amateur radio it is today, as they have
convinced the FCC that they are the "only voice."

>
> They do not have nor try to have exclusive control of the whole amateur
> community. Show your proof that they do.

Let me dig up a QST magazine.... said it right on the front cover.....

They establish goals based on
> what their membership wants. That is what any organization does. Again
> they have no reason or obligation to establish their goals based on the

> opinions of non-members.

Only if one chooses to request that information beased upon the decision whether or not to join. Its like going to a car dealership and the car salesperson stating that you will be buying a vehicle, but not tell you anything about it.

>
> You seem to expect them to roll over and adopt YOUR opinion. That's
> unrealistic. Whether you join or not is your business of course. But
> unless you are a member, you have no right to expect to control their
> policies or for them to listen to your opinions and adopt your opinions.
If
> you want to change them, join. If you aren't willing to join, don't
expect
> to change them. That's pretty simple.

Never did I state they should roll over to my opinions exclusively, but my opinions are not singular, there are many more that hold the same position on a variety of issues. If they are claiming control of amateur radio as a whole, not just the membership, then my opinion should count in that respect. I can tell you however, there are alot of the opinions I hold that are held by a ton of people with ham licenses.

>
> I know why I am a member. They can do things that I cannot.
> 1) Take the current BPL situation. They have the finances and facilities
> to do the research that I can't afford. That is but one of many things.

Yeah.... they must be the only one's too eh?

> 2) Product tests/reviews. I can't afford to buy all the test equipment,
> every new radio, antenna, etc and run my own comparisons.
> ... and so on.

Again, CQ magazine does that as well. Granted, I will wholeheartedly admit that QST is a decent magazine, even though it is getting thinner and thinner, but it is a good magazine. My only observation is that it should also include some technical material for the newer hams, as not all of us are Extra class electrical/electronics engineers. Although I am above the "simple circuit" stage, I am however not the highest qualified in the electronics side of this hobby. I am man enough to admit I need to learn more.

Again, You keep saying I should join, but why should I?? List specific reasons, backed by facts. Not vague generalities or
"big-brother/mafioso-like" reasons? All it is, is a very expensive magazine subscription, so let's
not kid ourselves. If there are some actual reasons listed, I might consider joining. If not, then that sums it up pretty good.

I can honestly say that you are one of the few people that I have met on here, and I like you as a person. But there is one thing as a fact I know

for sure, we will never agree on is the ARRL. I do not take the ARRL as blind faith, or like a religion. I do not put the ARRL in a position close to god as some put here and elsewhere. I do not consider the arrl like a religion or a church organization as some people equate it to. I will be one of the first people to join if there ever becomes a group like the United States Amateur Radio Association or the National Radio Relay League or any other similar group. (don't know if either of those exist.....) The arrl needs the competition to keep them in check. Hell, Republicrats claim competition is a GOOD thing. (except when it encroaches on "their" businesses.)

Have a great Labor Day Weekend!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2353. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 13:57:04 UTC
From: David <medtools@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <QYI3b.446$Om1.250@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75763
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf

Code is dieing, let it do so with some dignity.
"Trs1" <reports@cnn.com> wrote in message
news:bjqtkvgv9da08ltgjp3l1q7k217l16pact@4ax.com...
> Yep, Sounds like another one of those maggots that want the bands to
> be given to someone else. Thats what happens when the bands are quiet.
> The FCC gives them to another radio service. So I guess he would have
> his Extra Class with a few less bands to operate soon instead of
> letting other legit hams use the band to save it.
>
> I will be here in a few years to hear you complain about the loss of
> your bands.
>
> Bye for now!
>
>
> On Thu, 28 Aug 2003 23:12:40 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:DJv3b.8299$3E.2208@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi
> >>
> >> Enter in the number RM-10787, fill out the address
> >> information and upload or type in your comments on
> >> the elimination of morse code testing as a requirement
> >> to operate on HF.
> >>
> >>
> >> --
> >> The Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
> >> http://www.kilowatt-radio.org/
> >> ..it does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an
> >> irate, tireless minority to set brush fires in people's
> >> minds. --Samuel Adams
> >
> >Thank you so much Keith, here is what I sent.
> >
> >**********
> >
> >I think the total ellimination of the Morse Code (CW) requirement will
prove
> >detrimental to the Amateur Radio Service. I believe it will make it so

easy
> >for trash to get into the ARS that it will eventually sound like CB
Radio.
> >
> >The testing has already been reduced to multiple guess. The CW test is a
> >ten question joke. In general you should NOT reduce the requirements ANY
> >MORE.
> >
> >I base my comments on over 40 years as a FCC licensed Amateur Radio
> >Operater, I presently hold a pre give away EXTRA class license.
> >
> >Thank You for your time.
> >
> >Daniel L. Jeswald
> >W4NTI
> >
>

2354. LABOR DAY WEEKEND

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 13:58:54 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <biotmr$b61ma$14@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75808

I hope that everyone here has a fun and enjoyable and most importantly, a safe Labor Day holiday weekend. I myself will be participating in both the amateur radio safety activities (Carebreaks) and also working the "Boot Drive" with my fire department collecting money for the MDA. Last year we did over 2500 bucks for them doing only one day. We are doing from Friday thru Monday and hope to raise over 5,000 bucks!!!!!!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2355. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 14:00:08 UTC
From: wieland@copland.udel.edu
Message-ID: <binm98rop1@copland.udel.edu>
Source record: 75764
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <xO93b.116184$0v4.8326816@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,
Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote:
[snip]
>
> Will BPL have the same effect on military radio as it has on radio
> hobbyists? Don't they have spread spectrum capability which is highly
> resistant to interference?
>
>Frank Dresser
>
>

Spread-spectrum is highly resistant to narrowband interference. BPL
develops wideband interference. What the military depends on is the
physics that any remote jammer trying to create wideband noise would need
to be immensely powerful, because a wide band of loud-at-a-distance noise
would have to have substantial energy at every frequency. BPL defeats
this by putting the transmitting antenna very near the receiver, so the
noise source need not be powerful to be loud at every frequency.
--

R F Wieland Newark, DE 19711-5323 USA 39.68N 75.74W
Icom R75 Heathkit GR-81 Inverted-L in the attic
Reply to wieland at me dot udel dot edu

2356. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 14:07:52 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Y6J3b.35406$Vx2.15476317@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75766

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:_ZH3b.108$EW1.14@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:OBx3b.35345$Vx2.15393974@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:biltpj$auudh$18@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > > Just even one more proof of what I mean. Attempting to control free
> > speech
> > > when a differing opinion occurs....
> > > Why should they have exclusive control of the whole amateur community
> when
> > > they only represent (roughly) a quarter of the population?
> > >
> > > You keep saying I should join, but why should I?? List specific
> reasons,
> > > backed by facts. Not vague generalities or "big-brother/mafioso-like"
> > > reasons? All it is, is a very expensive magazine subscription, so
let's
> > not
> > > kid ourselves.
> > >
> >
> > They are not trying to control free speech. Show your proof that they
are
> > doing so. They establish policies based on the input of their
membership
> as
> > does any other organization. They then carry through on that policy.
> > Naturally not every member agrees with it but if we had to have a
> unanimous
> > consensus nothing would ever get done. And they have no reason or
> > obligation to pay any attention to the opinions of non-members.
> >
> > They do not have nor try to have exclusive control of the whole amateur
> > community. Show your proof that they do. They establish goals based on
> > what their membership wants. That is what any organization does. Again
> > they have no reason or obligation to establish their goals based on the
> > opinions of non-members.
> >
> > You seem to expect them to roll over and adopt YOUR opinion. That's
> > unrealistic. Whether you join or not is your business of course. But
> > unless you are a member, you have no right to expect to control their

> > policies or for them to listen to your opinions and adopt your opinions.
> If
> > you want to change them, join. If you aren't willing to join, don't
> expect
> > to change them. That's pretty simple.
> >
> > I know why I am a member. They can do things that I cannot.
> > 1) Take the current BPL situation. They have the finances and
facilities
> > to do the research that I can't afford. That is but one of many things.
> > 2) Product tests/reviews. I can't afford to buy all the test
equipment,
> > every new radio, antenna, etc and run my own comparisons.
> > ... and so on.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Dee,
>
> Well said!
>
> For all those that complain about ARRL, no one has effectively
> started an alternative in all these years. I see ARRL as the best
> bang for my buck on most matters of amateur issues. I departed from
> ARRL position on the code issue and have been a director of
> NCI because of that ONE issue. The point is, that NCI, while
> a separate org from ARRL, is not trying to replace ARRL's
> role in amateur issues EXCEPT on the code/nocode test issue...
> and of late, there's less disparity there then 5 years ago.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Although I do not agree with you on the code issue, I do commend you for going out and DOING something rather than sitting back and whining as so many are prone to do. Not only did you join an organization that supported your point of view but you obviously became actively involved since you are one of the directors. I would suspect, however, that you are still a member of the ARRL even though you disagreed on one issue. i.e. You did not expect the ARRL to be a single issue organization.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2357. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 14:08:49 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <binmph$18v$0@208.206.142.86>
Source record: 75765

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bimje6$1c0$0@208.206.142.89>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308271137.34471fd3@posting.google.com>...
> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0308270309.147fc33f@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > dickc58@att.net (DickCarroll) wrote in message
news:<9829b709.0308261753.6d5a0548@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in m
> > > > > >
> > > > > > be going so far out of your way to
> > > > > > display ham radio's ass in public.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Ham radio has an ASS??
> > > > > >
> > > > > DICK, I know that it confuses you that ham radio's ASS is called DICK,
> > > > > but the rest of us got used to it a long time ago.
> > > > >
> > > > Yeah, yeah, Brian we know....you're helpless to refrain from showing off your
> > > > periennial state of confusion. We understand.
> > > >
> > > No confusion here, DICK.
> > >
> > None that you ever recognized, that is.
> >
> DICK, I recognize you. That's how I put your name in every reply.

And now confirmation of the point is complete.

2358. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 14:35:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4F64AE.60704@psu.edu>
Source record: 75767

K0HB wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote
>
>
>> Your point seems to be that we are discussing trivial matters, while
>>the important things go ignored.
>>
>> If that isn't your point, then clue me in.
>>
>
>
> My point has nothing to do with "discussing". My point has to do with
> our seemingly suicidal desire to fracture our image and marginalize
> our credibility.

I wonder just how many people even know about this little corner of the net and our perfidy?

> My point is that the Amateur Radio Service exists at the pleasure of
> public opinion and regulators who are increasingly disconnected from
> our hobby.
>
> Against that background, rather than band together to save our hobby
> we seem hell-bent on finding inconsequential and OTBE things to fight
> about, splintering and diluting whatever influence we have on
> regulators and the general public.

Umm, have you checked the world lately? Seems to be the way everything operates.

> Morse Code testing is a dead issue, but here in this public forum we
> continue to poke and prod at it's carcass like a pack of squabbling
> hyenas with the same old rhetoric which started here over a decade
> ago.

So what?

Here is an idea. Why don't you and the other people who know what we should be discussing make up an agenda and guide the group to better days?

Don't like Morse code issues? Don't get involved in them. Post what you consider relevent, make the group look what it should look like. If you are right, other hams of the proper mind-set will come here and participate. Then the PCTA's will just be part of the noise floor, just like any other newsgroup has. You can't hope for any better than that.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2359. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 14:50:31 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <XKJ3b.120143$3o3.8407082@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 75768
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Robert F Wieland" <wieland@copland.udel.edu> wrote in message
news:binm98rop1@copland.udel.edu...
> In article <xO93b.116184$0v4.8326816@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>,

>
> Spread-spectrum is highly resistant to narrowband interference. BPL
> develops wideband interference. What the military depends on is the
> physics that any remote jammer trying to create wideband noise would need
> to be immensely powerful, because a wide band of loud-at-a-distance noise
> would have to have substantial energy at every frequency. BPL defeats
> this by putting the transmitting antenna very near the receiver, so the
> noise source need not be powerful to be loud at every frequency.
> --
>
> R F Wieland Newark, DE 19711-5323 USA 39.68N 75.74W
> Icom R75 Heathkit GR-81 Inverted-L in the attic
> Reply to wieland at me dot udel dot edu

That's what I'd expect. But I don't know if the BPL system will dirty enough, or close enough to significantly interfere with military communications. I suppose the military has sent people out to take readings like Ed Hare did. Anyway, I'm thinking the biggest threat to BPL isn't outside opposition, but the spikey wideband trash normally found on power lines.

That's it! BPL is a wives' conspiracy to get their husbands to start vacuuming the freakin' carpet!

Frank Dresser

2360. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 14:55:29 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0308290655.556c2d2e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75769
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

"paulfriedman@comcast.net" wrote

> Hans:
>
> I am curious why you want the two year "no upgrade" period. I would think
> such a rule would greatly reduce the appeal of ham radio. It certainly would
> have caused me to spend my time, effort, and money on another hobby.
>

For the same reason that the army doesn't let you "test" directly to
First Sargent from Recruit.

My proposal gives FULL privileges at very modest (but not QRP) power
levels so that a newcomer can learn the ropes right alongside
experienced operators, but at power levels which are safer and also
less likely to trash the band if they overdrive, mistune, or run
defective gear, or make other "newbie" mistakes.

This bears notice --- my proposal doesn't "ghetto-ize" the newcomer to
a few little slices of the band like the current Novice/Tech+
allocations, so the "lack of appeal" isn't restricted operating
privileges, but only a modest power level (and the requirement to
upgrade within 10 years).

73, de Hans, K0HB

2361. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 14:58:22 UTC
From: Hans K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2459ee62a6f0efa423239c8e05539568.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 75770

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

> Paul, since the only apparent privelege difference in the two proposed
> license classes is 50W, and you could operate any amateur frequency in
> any mode, why would that deter you from the ARS?

Brian "gets it" !!!!

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2362. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 15:01:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4F6AB2.50500@psu.edu>
Source record: 75772

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Phil Kane" wrote:
>
>
>>A bloody shame both ways - the Feds play
>>their games, the locals play theirs, and
>>the kids - including my kids in their
>>time - lose out. Private schools were no
>>better......they just had different
>>funding ills.
>
>
>
> I noticed you mentioned teachers in another message. If you get a chance,
> take a trip to your local school sometime. I recently visited several high
> schools and was impressed with the effort those teachers were putting into
> their jobs. What was surprising was the behavior of the kids in some classes
> (not all, some). In some classes, very few were paying attention to anything
> the teacher said. Instead, they were talking, playing radios, dancing,
> threatening each other, sleeping, making out (kissing and necking), and so
> on. They would have never even noticed anything the teacher did to help them
> learn. I don't see how anyone could possibly learn anything in such an
> environment.
>
> I talked to several teachers afterwards. According to them, the difference
> between classes is due to attempts to separate kids that are making an
> effort from those who are not. In the classes with the better behaved
> students, the classroom instruction advances at a much quicker rate. In the
> classes with the kids who are not trying, class size is reduced and the
> teachers just try to get the kids to absorb anything they're supposed to be
> learning. Most of those teachers admitted it was nearly a hopeless cause -
> how do you get kids to learn if they're not at all interested in doing so.
>
> I left with a simply question on my mind - what is causing those kids not
> to be interested in learning and how can that be changed. If we can answer
> that, I think 80 to 90 percent of the problem could be solved. And, as
> mentioned in another message, I suspect the answer lies outside the school
> system.

My take is that the child has to be raised with an expectation that he
or she will indeed do well in school. Many are not raised this way.
Appreciation for the sciences, appreciation for learning and hard work,
all that good stuff.

Diminishing emphasis on "self-esteem" would be a great idea.
Self-esteem should be something earned. One of the strangest things I have seen lately is the bizzare students who have a great sense of self-esteem with absolutely no reason for it. No accomplishments, no education, nothing but feeling really, really good about themselves.

We also have to remember that Students are individuals and mature at different rates. I know many students who seemd to undergo a miraculous change at some point in high school, going from slacker to achiever almost overnight. My own kid underwent such a change right after he got a steady girlfriend, his grades improved, and his whole H.S. experience changed right around, because he started to get a future looking perspective.

Oh, yeah. Get the kids thinking about something other than what's happening 5 minutes from now.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2363. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 15:03:11 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4F6B2F.3090602@psu.edu>
Source record: 75771

Bill Sohl wrote:

>
> Dee,
>
> Well said!
>
> For all those that complain about ARRL, no one has effectively
> started an alternative in all these years.

Fox News?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2364. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 15:08:05 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0308290708.3ccd0bc9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75773

Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<DJv3b.8299$3E.2208@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi
>
> Enter in the number RM-10787, fill out the address
> information and upload or type in your comments on
> the elimination of morse code testing as a requirement
> to operate on HF.

Thanks Keith,

Comments submitted. I hope the FCC is in listening mode. :-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

Egbert C. Craig, Jr. August 29, 2003
WA2SI

Re. RM-10787

To whom it may concern:

Undoubtedly, there will be many comments filed re. this petition.
Therefore, I will be brief and to the point. Although I am not new to
radio and earned my GROL long before my amateur radio license, I am a
relative newcomer to amateur radio. As such, I feel that I can offer
an alternative view to many of the "old timers."

I believe that there is still a very important place for minimal Morse
code proficiency testing in U.S. amateur radio licensing. I've been
told that "proficiency" is the technically correct term, however, I do
not feel 5-wpm represents Morse proficiency. I feel that the current
5-wpm Element 1 test is sufficient to require an individual to learn
the Morse characters so that s/he may then make an educated decision
as to whether or not s/he wishes to pursue CW further.

I would like to dispel two myths that I have repeatedly heard/read in
the argument for dropping Element 1:

ï¿½ The current Element 1 test acts as a filter to keep out Cbers and
other "insufficiently-dedicated" individuals.
ï¿½ The current Element 1 test acts as a deterrent to newcomers to the
hobby/service.

Along with being an amateur radio "newbie," I am also a Cber and
Element 1 did not deter me in any way, shape, or form from upgrading

my license class and earning HF privileges. If during the course of reviewing the comments filed re. RM-10787, this demographic is referred to while supporting the removal of Element 1, please do not include me. This "newbie" wholeheartedly supports the retention of Element 1 testing for the General and Extra license class licenses.

In closing, I would also like to remind those who believe that Morse code testing serves no "regulatory purpose" in amateur radio that there is an intangible quality at stake here too. It is part of our culture and tradition and therefore should not be removed from the curriculum.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Egbert C. Craig, Jr.
WA2SI

2365. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 15:08:09 UTC
From: Hans Kohb <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <59d0f354f7773929aa7944e292c0e427.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 75774

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote

> Then the PCTA's will just be part of the noise floor, just
> like any other newsgroup has.

Who said anything about PCTA's? .... or NCTA's for that matter? A pox
on both their houses.

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2366. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 15:56:20 UTC
From: "Pat St. Jean" <stjeanp@pat-st-jean.com>
Message-ID: <gRidnSZrDb856tKiXTWJkQ@august.net>
Source record: 75775

K0HB <k0hb@arrl.net> wrote:

> My proposal gives FULL privileges at very modest (but not QRP) power
> levels so that a newcomer can learn the ropes right alongside
> experienced operators, but at power levels which are safer and also
> less likely to trash the band if they overdrive, mistune, or run
> defective gear, or make other "newbie" mistakes.

Sounds good to me. Your proposal was a lot more intelligently written
than mine.

And just an FYI, I've worked all continents on PSK31 with less than 50w
output, so it's not going to seriously handicap an operator. In fact,
it'll probably teach them to operate better because they won't have
higher power to compensate for inexperience.

> This bears notice --- my proposal doesn't "ghetto-ize" the newcomer to
> a few little slices of the band like the current Novice/Tech+
> allocations, so the "lack of appeal" isn't restricted operating
> privileges, but only a modest power level (and the requirement to
> upgrade within 10 years).

I like it, and the beauty of it is that the NCVEC proposal, if adopted,
doesn't preclude this kind of modification later.

73 de K0OOK

--
Pat in Lewisville K0OOK '97 XLH 883 (Rocinante)
BS#140 EKIII rides with me
http://www.pat-st-jean.com/~stjeanp All things Pat
http://www.pat-st-jean.com/products.html Software for paper money collectors

2367. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 19:23:44 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308291123.5b5bc0b7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75776

"Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<c4a6771678b5a0221f9271fbee325279.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...

. . . .

> B. Status of current licensees.
>
> Current licenses could be renewed indefinitely, and would
> retain their current operating privileges.
>
> Current Novice, Technician, General, and Advanced class
> licensees could up grade to ?Class A? at any time.
>
> Respectfully submitted,
>
> H. Hans Brakob, K0HB

Overall not bad Hans although I don't agree with the two year
apprenticeship, I think one year would be adequate. The one year
"statute of limitations" certainly worked for us early 75W Novices and
many of us were fully up to speed in much less than a year.

w3(c)rv

2368. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 20:22:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F4FB647.8080208@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75777

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:xnfcneeyarg.hkcvzky.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
>
>>On Thu, 28 Aug 2003 02:20:07 GMT, Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>
>>
>>>>Then explain reality TV, Dwight! 8^)
>>>
>
>>> I shouldn't have to go back and point to some of the crazy things
>>
> people
>
>>>watched and did in years past. Remember the Village People, Kiss, Disco,
>>
> the
>
>>>song Muskrat Love, houses filled with incense, chopper motorcycles, the
>>
> song
>
>>>My Ding-a-Ling, Elton John's sunglasses, and so on.
>>
>> No, I don't remember those thigs because neither I nor my family
>> wasted our time or intellect energy on them.
>
>
> Hey, what's wrong with chopper motorcycles...or hot rods, etc?
>
>
>>>And Ham Radio is a recreation, not a vocation.
>>
>> Playing with radio equipment is serious business and should be
>> regarded as such.
>
>
> I agree...and
> The same is true for auto enthusiasts...be it hot rods, antique cars,
> motorcycles, etc. You need a license to participate.

You mean a drivers license? I was a motorcycle enthusiast for years
before I had a license. And I need no license to put together a hotrod
or antique car. When I was a youngster, I drove a friend to the local

drag strip so he could race his car, even though his license was suspended. After he got it back, I went back to being a passenger.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2369. Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 20:40:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F4FBAA4.6070002@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75778

I'm sitting here listening to our local Echolink repeater.
Someone,apparently in Florida, is Kerchunking our local repeater.

Now THAT is the true power of the internet!

And yesterday at lunchtime, I heard some talk that you should never hear on ham radio. Somone with a funky drunky accent going on about his favorite parts of another guy's anatomy. Shudderrrr.

There just isn't enough control of all the repeaters linked into Echolink for it to be a viable system.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2370. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 20:50:23 UTC
From: Hans K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <eacad3850ffeb31f1fbb0ddc72d5e90d.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 75779

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> I'm sitting here listening to our local Echolink repeater.
> Someone,apparently in Florida, is Kerchunking our local repeater.
>
> Now THAT is the true power of the internet!
>
> And yesterday at lunchtime, I heard some talk that you should never
> hear on ham radio. Somone with a funky drunky accent going on about his
> favorite parts of another guy's anatomy. Shudderrrr.
>
> There just isn't enough control of all the repeaters linked into
> Echolink for it to be a viable system.

Echolink isn't too blame for the incidents you describe.

Control operators are responsible to shut down their machines or
amptutate the offending user when such violatons occur.

Don't blame technology for the failings of those who implement it.

Both of the problems you describe are independent of the fact that
Echolink happens to be involved.

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2371. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 22:39:42 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <biokne$h0f$0@208.207.71.130>
Source record: 75781

Hans K0HB wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
> > I'm sitting here listening to our local Echolink repeater.
> > Someone,apparently in Florida, is Kerchunking our local repeater.
> >
> > Now THAT is the true power of the internet!
> >
> > And yesterday at lunchtime, I heard some talk that you should never
> > hear on ham radio. Somone with a funky drunky accent going on about his
> > favorite parts of another guy's anatomy. Shudderrrr.
> >
> > There just isn't enough control of all the repeaters linked into
> > Echolink for it to be a viable system.
>
> Echolink isn't too blame for the incidents you describe.
>
> Control operators are responsible to shut down their machines or
> amptutate the offending user when such violatons occur.
>
> Don't blame technology for the failings of those who implement it.
>
> Both of the problems you describe are independent of the fact that
> Echolink happens to be involved.

We used to hear the very same apologistic response to the ills of CB/Freeband.....today nobody even bothers to apologize.

Ham radio, we hardly knew ye...

2372. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 23:21:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ieR3b.999$Om1.571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75782

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F4FBAA4.6070002@adelphia.net...
> I'm sitting here listening to our local Echolink repeater.
> Someone,apparently in Florida, is Kerchunking our local repeater.
>
> Now THAT is the true power of the internet!
>
> And yesterday at lunchtime, I heard some talk that you should never
> hear on ham radio. Somone with a funky drunky accent going on about his
> favorite parts of another guy's anatomy. Shudderrrr.
>
> There just isn't enough control of all the repeaters linked into
> Echolink for it to be a viable system.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

No surprise there Mike. No calls, no decency, no license. Access available to anyone that can lie their way in. Yep....what a system.

Dan/W4NTI

2373. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 23:23:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <sfR3b.1000$Om1.699@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75783

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:biokne$h0f$0@208.207.71.130...
>
>
> Hans K0HB wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
> >
> > > I'm sitting here listening to our local Echolink repeater.
> > > Someone,apparently in Florida, is Kerchunking our local repeater.
> > >
> > > Now THAT is the true power of the internet!
> > >
> > > And yesterday at lunchtime, I heard some talk that you should never
> > > hear on ham radio. Somone with a funky drunky accent going on about
his
> > > favorite parts of another guy's anatomy. Shudderrrr.
> > >
> > > There just isn't enough control of all the repeaters linked into
> > > Echolink for it to be a viable system.
> >
> > Echolink isn't too blame for the incidents you describe.
> >
> > Control operators are responsible to shut down their machines or
> > amptutate the offending user when such violatons occur.
> >
> > Don't blame technology for the failings of those who implement it.
> >
> > Both of the problems you describe are independent of the fact that
> > Echolink happens to be involved.
>
> We used to hear the very same apologistic response to the ills of
CB/Freeband.....today
> nobody even bothers to apologize.
>
> Ham radio, we hardly knew ye...
>

Exactly !!

Dan/W4NTI

2374. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 23:24:32 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F4FE0B0.72F60261@ptt.edu>
Source record: 75784

> No surprise there Mike. No calls, no decency, no license. Access available
> to anyone that can lie their way in. Yep....what a system.

I will only do IRLP. At least there's a radio at each end.

It's still fake skip.

2375. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 23:43:32 UTC
From: Hans K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <1713527d374488db3c3cc90930d143f2.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 75785

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> We used to hear the very same apologistic response to the ills of CB/Freeband.....today
> nobody even bothers to apologize.

Whatever the phuck "apologistic" means..... you blame Echolink
technology for the blatant rules violations of some jerkoff who happens
to be using it????

If some jerkoff violates the rules on CW do you blame Morse code???

I used to wonder if you were as backward as you seem. I don't wonder
anymore.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2376. New Ham License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-29 23:47:41 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030829194741.13344.00000122@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 75786

The FCC in its wisdom is about to unleash a New Ham License. Well there will only be 1 License. The Test will be Hard for Many, and easy for others. The Test will only ask for your name and where you live. But the beauty of the New License is that there will only be 2 Modes. The two Modes are CW, or CB, take your pick.

2377. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 00:10:05 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <xXR3b.21672$l41.5280165@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 75787

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F4FBAA4.6070002@adelphia.net...
> I'm sitting here listening to our local Echolink repeater.
> Someone,apparently in Florida, is Kerchunking our local repeater.
>
> Now THAT is the true power of the internet!
>
> And yesterday at lunchtime, I heard some talk that you should never
> hear on ham radio. Somone with a funky drunky accent going on about his
> favorite parts of another guy's anatomy. Shudderrrr.
>
> There just isn't enough control of all the repeaters linked into
> Echolink for it to be a viable system.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
Welcome to Ham Radio of the 21st century!

2378. Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 00:13:54 UTC
From: Krusty <"No Email"@Nospam.comp>
Message-ID: <bioq7v$5lb$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75788

If you hear things on Echolink you dislike, get over it, ignore it, and move on. Echolink is not "real" Amateur radio anyway...it is merely a glorified, huge chat room for those with Amateur radio licenses.
REAL Amateur radio is accomplished by using radios and antennas, not computers and phone lines.

2379. Re: New Ham License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 00:16:25 UTC
From: Krusty <"No Email"@Nospam.comp>
Message-ID: <bioqcm$668$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75789

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030829194741.13344.00000122@mb-m15.aol.com...
The FCC in its wisdom is about to unleash a New Ham License. Well there will
only be 1 License. The Test will be Hard for Many, and easy for others. The
Test will only ask for your name and where you live. But the beauty of the
New
License is that there will only be 2 Modes. The two Modes are CW, or CB,
take
your pick.

They use both on 14.313, do they not?

2380. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 00:26:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F4FEF88.2070100@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75790

Hans K0HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>>I'm sitting here listening to our local Echolink repeater.
>>Someone,apparently in Florida, is Kerchunking our local repeater.
>>
>>Now THAT is the true power of the internet!
>>
>>And yesterday at lunchtime, I heard some talk that you should never
>>hear on ham radio. Somone with a funky drunky accent going on about his
>>favorite parts of another guy's anatomy. Shudderrrr.
>>
>>There just isn't enough control of all the repeaters linked into
>>Echolink for it to be a viable system.
>
>
> Echolink isn't too blame for the incidents you describe.

Not blaming echolink, I'm blaming the people that inhabit it.

> Control operators are responsible to shut down their machines or
> amptutate the offending user when such violatons occur.

But she/he didn't.

> Don't blame technology for the failings of those who implement it.
>
> Both of the problems you describe are independent of the fact that
> Echolink happens to be involved.

CB is not inherently bad either, but I don't care to go there. BTW,
this was much worse than anything I ever heard on CB. YMMV

- Mike KB3EIA -

2381. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 00:34:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F4FF179.5030409@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75791

Hans K0HB wrote:
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
>
>>We used to hear the very same apologistic response to the ills of CB/Freeband.....today
>>nobody even bothers to apologize.
>
>
> Whatever the phuck "apologistic" means..... you blame Echolink
> technology for the blatant rules violations of some jerkoff who happens
> to be using it????

Considering your language here, I'm starting to understand.

> If some jerkoff violates the rules on CW do you blame Morse code???
>
> I used to wonder if you were as backward as you seem. I don't wonder
> anymore.

Hans, would you want your children or grandchildren to listen to that
filth on your radio? It doesn't have any place in the ARS, but it's what
I'm hearing.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2382. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 00:37:22 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F4FF211.2010800@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75792

shephed wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F4FBAA4.6070002@adelphia.net...
>
>>I'm sitting here listening to our local Echolink repeater.
>>Someone,apparently in Florida, is Kerchunking our local repeater.
>>
>>Now THAT is the true power of the internet!
>>
>>And yesterday at lunchtime, I heard some talk that you should never
>>hear on ham radio. Somone with a funky drunky accent going on about his
>>favorite parts of another guy's anatomy. Shudderrrr.
>>
>>There just isn't enough control of all the repeaters linked into
>>Echolink for it to be a viable system.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
> Welcome to Ham Radio of the 21st century!

As far as I can tell - and I don't know all that much abour Echolink,
every repeater operator along the line will be responsible for the
content going over their repeater. These folk better think about what
they are doing.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2383. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 00:38:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F4FF25D.4020103@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75793

Krusty wrote:
> If you hear things on Echolink you dislike, get over it, ignore it, and move
> on. Echolink is not "real" Amateur radio anyway...it is merely a glorified,
> huge chat room for those with Amateur radio licenses.
> REAL Amateur radio is accomplished by using radios and antennas, not
> computers and phone lines.

I agree 100 percent.

Still it is shocking to hear.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2384. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 00:49:29 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030829204929.13386.00000087@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 75794

>REAL Amateur radio is accomplished by using radios and antennas, not
>computers and phone lines.
>

Interesting, my Link on ECHOLink uses Radio and ants.

2385. Re: Ahh, the joy of techno-bigotry!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 00:49:56 UTC
From: Hans K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <abf9456ab6ea1277416156c788ee6207.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 75795

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote

> Hans, would you want your children or grandchildren to listen to that
> filth on your radio? It doesn't have any place in the ARS, but it's what
> I'm hearing.

Of course foul language has no place in the ARS!!!! DUH!!!!!

So you blame EchoLink, FM, repeaters, or do you blame the creeps who
commit the offense?

Good luck on this one now!

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2386. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 00:53:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <MzS3b.1483$Om1.558@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75796

"Radioman" <radio@ptt.edu> wrote in message
news:3F4FE0B0.72F60261@ptt.edu...
> > No surprise there Mike. No calls, no decency, no license. Access
available
> > to anyone that can lie their way in. Yep....what a system.
>
>
> I will only do IRLP. At least there's a radio at each end.
>
> It's still fake skip.

I guess I'm out of touch. When I want to talk on a repeater I just grab my
Amateur Radio Transciever and key the mike button.

Dan/W4NTI

2387. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 00:57:18 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ODS3b.1517$Om1.1282@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75797

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F4FF211.2010800@adelphia.net...
> shephed wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F4FBAA4.6070002@adelphia.net...
> >
> >>I'm sitting here listening to our local Echolink repeater.
> >>Someone,apparently in Florida, is Kerchunking our local repeater.
> >>
> >>Now THAT is the true power of the internet!
> >>
> >>And yesterday at lunchtime, I heard some talk that you should never
> >>hear on ham radio. Somone with a funky drunky accent going on about his
> >>favorite parts of another guy's anatomy. Shudderrrr.
> >>
> >>There just isn't enough control of all the repeaters linked into
> >>Echolink for it to be a viable system.
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >
> > Welcome to Ham Radio of the 21st century!
>
> As far as I can tell - and I don't know all that much abour Echolink,
> every repeater operator along the line will be responsible for the
> content going over their repeater. These folk better think about what
> they are doing.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

Same silly crap about Packet when it was passing 'strange' traffic. What
was done? Nothing.

Dan/W4NTI

2388. Re: New Ham License

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 00:59:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <7GS3b.1539$Om1.36@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75798

"Krusty" <No Email@Nospam.comp> wrote in message
news:bioqcm$668$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030829194741.13344.00000122@mb-m15.aol.com...
> The FCC in its wisdom is about to unleash a New Ham License. Well there
will
> only be 1 License. The Test will be Hard for Many, and easy for others.
The
> Test will only ask for your name and where you live. But the beauty of the
> New
> License is that there will only be 2 Modes. The two Modes are CW, or CB,
> take
> your pick.
>
> They use both on 14.313, do they not?
>
>

You know whats really funny? All this talk about 14.313. Apparantly put
forth by those that have NO RECEIVERS. Or are totally stupid.

The activity on 313 has been seriously reduced. Almost to the point of non
activity.

So what exactly is the point here? What IS the problem with 313???

However, if you are talking about Donnie Dumbass....I agree.

Dan/W4NTI

2389. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 01:01:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <mHS3b.1551$Om1.1519@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75799

"Krusty" <No Email@Nospam.comp> wrote in message
news:bioq7v$5lb$0@pita.alt.net...
> If you hear things on Echolink you dislike, get over it, ignore it, and
move
> on. Echolink is not "real" Amateur radio anyway...it is merely a
glorified,
> huge chat room for those with Amateur radio licenses.
> REAL Amateur radio is accomplished by using radios and antennas, not
> computers and phone lines.
>
>

Oh...so Echo Link is like playing a airplane video game and thinking your a
'real' pilot? Makes sense to me.

Dan/W4NTI

2390. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 01:02:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <iIS3b.1560$Om1.922@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75800

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030829204929.13386.00000087@mb-m15.aol.com...
> >REAL Amateur radio is accomplished by using radios and antennas, not
> >computers and phone lines.
> >
>
> Interesting, my Link on ECHOLink uses Radio and ants.

Then your a 'real ham' till it turns into 'cyber-space'....hmmmmmmmmm

Dan/W4NTI

2391. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 01:04:24 UTC
From: Krusty <"No Email"@Nospam.comp>
Message-ID: <biot6nevv0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75801

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030829204929.13386.00000087@mb-m15.aol.com...
>REAL Amateur radio is accomplished by using radios and antennas, not
>computers and phone lines.
>

Interesting, my Link on ECHOLink uses Radio and ants.

But YOU are still using a computer and phone lines...

2392. Re: Ahh, the joy of techno-bigotry!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 01:04:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F4FF886.9050405@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75802

Hans K0HB wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
>
>>Hans, would you want your children or grandchildren to listen to that
>>filth on your radio? It doesn't have any place in the ARS, but it's what
>>I'm hearing.
>
>
> Of course foul language has no place in the ARS!!!! DUH!!!!!
>
> So you blame EchoLink, FM, repeaters, or do you blame the creeps who
> commit the offense?

Of course I blame the perps. But I still get an idea of what the neighborhood is like when I hear them there.

You want to go there, that's just fine. I'll pass.

And as far as techno-bigotry goes, Echolink isn't very high on the techno-scale.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2393. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 01:07:49 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <FNS3b.13$K75.5@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 75803

> > REAL Amateur radio is accomplished by using radios and antennas, not
> > computers and phone lines.
> >

And only done with CW and spark gap transmitters.

2394. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong. (was: M321I58DNU 09/06/2003)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 01:23:11 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308291723.3937af85@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75809
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote in message
news:<bim9trgdl1@freenet9.carleton.ca>...
> Dave Bushong (dbushong@adelphia.net) writes:
> > Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> >> Dave Bushong wrote:
> >>
> >>> [...]
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> Wow, Dave! That's a stretch. With just a few notable exceptions,
> >> most of us here in rrap enjoy our arguments with each other, and don't
> >> take it too seriously or personally.
> >>
> >> Or do you want to tell us just what we should think and say?
> >>
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >
> > Wow, Mike! I guess it sounds serious and personal when someone says
> > "I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the
> > SHIT out of them!"
> >
> > I would certainly not presume to tell you what to think; I only ask that
> > you try *to* think. You might enjoy it.
> >
> > 73,
> > Dave

. . . what did you say yer callsign is?

> >
>
> I thought the Wouff Hong was supposed to suggest unspeakable horrors
> to the bad operator, but I don't think it has anything to do with beating
> anyone up. It's power is so great that nobody wants to mess with it,
> so they keep in line.
>
> And how come nobody has mentioned the Rettysnitch in this thread?

Because Hashi Hamfisti (?? Help me here!) went undercover and took the
Rettysnitch with him. He's out there. Lurking.

http://www.natradioco.com/rdey/whrsl.htm

>
> Michael VE2BVW

w3rv

2395. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 01:38:23 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bip0ik$tfj@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75812

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:biotmk$b61ma$10@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030827232426.21642.00000262@mb-m01.aol.com...
> > In article <BB71F8BF.24CBC%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart
> > <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:
> >
> > > Actually, I believe she has explained that before. So, perhaps you
> should
> > >search through the message archives for the answer. As for myself,
since
> > >it's really none of my business, I'm not really interested in the
reason.
> >
> > Dwight:
> >
> > Actually, it most certainly is the business of any radio amateur who
> > is properly concerned with the image of the ARS. This is supposed
> > to be a family-oriented hobby/service. Mr. Hollingsworth said it most
> > succinctly in his response to Kim when he raised the issue of the
> > possible negative reaction of a parent/grandparent/aunt/uncle who may
> > be considering this hobby for a young child in their life. Kim's
callsign
> > most certainly could cause such a person to question the judgment,
> > if not the personal integrity and morality, of radio amateurs in
general,
> > through this one bad example.
>
> I'll say it again, the person uninvolved with amateur radio won't know the
> difference whether it was a sequentially or vanity-requested callsign.
The
> average person would assume the FCC merely assigned it. (Yes, believe it
or
> not I actually polled people to see their responses the last time this
> bullsh*t came up). There is the root of the problem, if you have such a
> pissy feeling towards Kim's (and many other potentially offensive by your
> apparent standards) the why don't you spend your efforts whining to the
FCC
> than wasting your time with posts that will not achieve ANY results other
> than to get it off your chest and to hear yourself "bellow" in a
"electronic
> medium."
>

Know why he won't? He kept alluding to the fact that he was going to, or kept inspiring others to do it. So, I wrote. I wrote knowing that Riley would more than likely be the kind of person who probably doesn't appreciate the humor in my callsign, but also knowing that he upholds to the principles of a democracy. And, he did exactly that. He does not like my callsign. But, he doesn't believe it is for the FCC to govern such things.

> >
> > Throughout my adult life, I've been told that "perception is reality."
> > While I would personally make some allowances for poor choices based
> > on the immature judgment of younger people, Kim is certainly of an
> > age and station in life where such poor judgment is much less likely
> > to be excused. She is the only one who can make this controversy
> > go away. Should she choose not to, she leaves herself open to the
> > criticism of those of us who *are* offended and *do* object to her
choice
> > of a Vanity call sign.
> >
>
> Once again, if the callsign is so offensive, it is the FCC to blame. Any
> vanity callsign or even if it even was a sequentially assigned that is
> deemed offensive is their fault. I should have the right to request ANY
> callsign that is listed as "available" provided I have the initial right
to
> do so by licensure requirements/benefits. If the list is including some of
> what you refer to as offensive, that is your problem, and the FCC's, not
the
> rest of us.
>
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>

It's not offensive, in any way. Larry just doesn't like a woman who can think for herself, ergo he doesn't like anything about me. That's all it is. He has no problem at all with my callsign. How could anyone as offensive, crude, rude and belligerent as him have a problem with this callsign?

Kim W5TIT

2396. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 01:41:26 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bip0il$tfj@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75811

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:sfR3b.1000$Om1.699@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:biokne$h0f$0@208.207.71.130...
> >
> >
> > Hans K0HB wrote:
> >
> > > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
> > >
> > > > I'm sitting here listening to our local Echolink repeater.
> > > > Someone,apparently in Florida, is Kerchunking our local repeater.
> > > >
> > > > Now THAT is the true power of the internet!
> > > >
> > > > And yesterday at lunchtime, I heard some talk that you should never
> > > > hear on ham radio. Somone with a funky drunky accent going on about
> his
> > > > favorite parts of another guy's anatomy. Shudderrrr.
> > > >
> > > > There just isn't enough control of all the repeaters linked into
> > > > Echolink for it to be a viable system.
> > >
> > > Echolink isn't too blame for the incidents you describe.
> > >
> > > Control operators are responsible to shut down their machines or
> > > amptutate the offending user when such violatons occur.
> > >
> > > Don't blame technology for the failings of those who implement it.
> > >
> > > Both of the problems you describe are independent of the fact that
> > > Echolink happens to be involved.
> >
> > We used to hear the very same apologistic response to the ills of
> CB/Freeband.....today
> > nobody even bothers to apologize.
> >
> > Ham radio, we hardly knew ye...
> >
>
> Exactly !!
>
> Dan/W4NTI

>
>

I have never heard such whining...

Kim W5TIT

2397. Re: LABOR DAY WEEKEND

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 01:54:22 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <itT3b.23973$yg.9797691@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 75810

Same to you, Ryan...and ditto for all reading. :-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:biotmr$b61ma$14@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> I hope that everyone here has a fun and enjoyable and most importantly, a
> safe Labor Day holiday weekend. I myself will be participating in both
the
> amateur radio safety activities (Carebreaks) and also working the "Boot
> Drive" with my fire department collecting money for the MDA. Last year we
> did over 2500 bucks for them doing only one day. We are doing from Friday
> thru Monday and hope to raise over 5,000 bucks!!!!!!
>
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>
>
>

2398. Re: Ham here and hams on the air?? Its a poll

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 02:17:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F500977.3020703@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75813

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> 1. How many hams that participate with some frequency here in this newsgroup
> operate on the air in the legal ham bands?

Just about every night

> 2. Which band(s) do you operate? (Modes irrelevant for this poll, just
> bands or frequency band ranges please.)

2 meters, 20 meters, 40 meters, 80 meters

> 3. How frequently do you operate on those bands in Question 2?? Hourly,
> Daily, Weekly etc.

Almost daily. less often on 80 and 40 meters.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2399. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 02:32:37 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030829223237.07744.00000084@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 75814

>Interesting, my Link on ECHOLink uses Radio and ants.
>
>But YOU are still using a computer and phone lines...

And Im still using Radios and Ants

2400. Re: Ham here and hams on the air?? Its a poll

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 02:34:55 UTC
From: Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com>
Message-ID: <j3U3b.21377$S_.1676@fed1read01>
Source record: 75815

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:biotmo$b61ma$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> 1. How many hams that participate with some frequency here in this
newsgroup
> operate on the air in the legal ham bands?
>
I do
>
> 2. Which band(s) do you operate? (Modes irrelevant for this poll, just
> bands or frequency band ranges please.)
>
40M thru 6M, 2M, 440, 220, 1.2 Gig
>
>
> 3. How frequently do you operate on those bands in Question 2?? Hourly,
> Daily, Weekly etc.
>
Weekly more or less -- some contests.

Ham call witheld due to hate mail and spamming, but an extra for 25 Years
Lots of awards but won't run out the brag take

> Thanks,
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>
>
>
>
>

2401. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 03:12:06 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <aCU3b.40$FT5.32@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 75816

Mike, you just have to wait for BPL to bring Echo Link into its' own :D

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F4FBAA4.6070002@adelphia.net...
> I'm sitting here listening to our local Echolink repeater.
> Someone,apparently in Florida, is Kerchunking our local repeater.
>
> Now THAT is the true power of the internet!
>
> And yesterday at lunchtime, I heard some talk that you should never
> hear on ham radio. Somone with a funky drunky accent going on about his
> favorite parts of another guy's anatomy. Shudderrrr.
>
> There just isn't enough control of all the repeaters linked into
> Echolink for it to be a viable system.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

2402. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 03:34:20 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bip5vs$6u5$0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 75817

Hans K0HB wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> > We used to hear the very same apologistic response to the ills of CB/Freeband.....today
> > nobody even bothers to apologize.
>
> Whatever the phuck "apologistic" means..... you blame Echolink
> technology for the blatant rules violations of some jerkoff who happens
> to be using it????
>
> If some jerkoff violates the rules on CW do you blame Morse code???
>

I really didn't think of you as being so high up that a point could so easily fly over you.

It *IS* the operators that I lament, Hans. The very same operators you so sincerely wish to gather to ham radio en masse.

>
> I used to wonder if you were as backward as you seem. I don't wonder
> anymore.

There is no doubt remaining-- some of this S**t sincerely needs to be turned around.

2403. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 03:40:04 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bip6ak$6u5$1@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 75818

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Hans K0HB wrote:
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> >
> >
> >>We used to hear the very same apologistic response to the ills of CB/Freeband.....today
> >>nobody even bothers to apologize.
> >
> >
> > Whatever the phuck "apologistic" means..... you blame Echolink
> > technology for the blatant rules violations of some jerkoff who happens
> > to be using it????
>
> Considering your language here, I'm starting to understand.
>
> > If some jerkoff violates the rules on CW do you blame Morse code???
> >
> > I used to wonder if you were as backward as you seem. I don't wonder
> > anymore.
>
> Hans, would you want your children or grandchildren to listen to that
> filth on your radio? It doesn't have any place in the ARS, but it's what
> I'm hearing.

Mike, the goal these days is "protect the system at all costs. ALL costs!"

I'm unconvicned that it's worthwhile.

2404. Re: Ham here and hams on the air?? Its a poll

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 03:58:16 UTC
From: Hans Kohb <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <0fa1ebf9a5b4c750ea44269d90f164f6.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 75819

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote

> 1. How many hams that participate with some frequency here in this newsgroup
> operate on the air in the legal ham bands?

Yes.

> 2. Which band(s) do you operate? (Modes irrelevant for this poll, just
> bands or frequency band ranges please.)

160 thru 10, 6M, 2M, 440, a little microwave (very little!), and I
dabble around with a lowfer beacon during the winter (not really a ham
band, I guess).

> 3. How frequently do you operate on those bands in Question 2?? Hourly,
> Daily, Weekly etc.

Varies with the season. Pretty quiet in the summer, very active in
fall/winter contest season, and daily/weekly during the spring until
fishing opener.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2405. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 04:24:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830002416.23307.00002584@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 75821

In article <biltpf$auudh$15@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Just what exactly do you have against breasts Larry?? Any normal, healthy >male actually likes them, and sterotypically, the bigger the better from a >general consensus!

Ryan:

I have absolutely nothing against breasts! The debate I'm engaged in over Kim's call sign actually has little or nothing to do with breasts, per se.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2406. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 04:24:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830002417.23307.00002585@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 75822

In article <bilvrs$cli@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> Kim:
>>
>> I thought you weren't responding to me anymore. What's up with this,
>then?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>No. As usual, you read wrong. I said that I would not be responding
>*unless* I saw something intellectual and logical from you. So, uh, you
>would agree then that there's been nothing intellectual or logical from you.
>Good. We both agree on that. I was just checking.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

One's opinion of what is "intellectual" and "logical" depends on their
own ability to process those concepts. You have consistently demonstrated
a surprising lack of ability in that particular arena. Therefore, your
evaluations are irrelevant and to be ignored.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2407. Re: Ham here and hams on the air?? Its a poll

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 04:24:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830002417.23307.00002586@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 75825

In article <biotmo$b61ma$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>
>1. How many hams that participate with some frequency here in this newsgroup
>operate on the air in the legal ham bands?

I do.

>2. Which band(s) do you operate? (Modes irrelevant for this poll, just
>bands or frequency band ranges please.)

Primarily 30, 20, 10, and 2 meters.

>3. How frequently do you operate on those bands in Question 2?? Hourly,
>Daily, Weekly etc.

2-meters: Several times a week.

20-meter CW/PSK31: Ditto

10-meters: Rarely (not even weekly, to be more precise)

>(Lennie, don't bother responding, We all know you don't have an amateur
>radio license)

Why should that stop him? It never has in the past!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2408. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 04:24:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830002418.23307.00002588@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 75820

In article <f45722ac.0308290436.77c3e0de@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>
>> So, Brian -- are you going to defend your statement, or not?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Yes. No. What statement did I make?

Brian:

As you were, Airman. My fault for not quoting it!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2409. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 04:24:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830002418.23307.00002587@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 75832

In article <BB74056C.24D3F%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>> It's no myth, Dwight. Our culture has been
>> stagnated by 50 years of liberal propaganda in
>> the high schools and universities, the constant
>> whining of the liberal media, and the "mainstreaming"
>> of any kind of perversion known to man in the name
>> of "enlightenment." Sorry, but I have to call it
>> like I see it. It's a dumbed-down culture, pure
>> and simple.
>
>
> Larry, it's spelled "dumb-downed" or "dumb downed."

Dwight:

In your haste to correct me, you got it wrong both times. It is, in fact, "dumbed-down."

>And, while I agree
>with some of your points about the education system, I'm not willing to make
>blanket statements about an entire culture.

That's OK, at least one of us is willing to do so.

> Most schools and universities today are either state owned or state
>supported. Therefore, to find an answer to the problems with schools, we
>only have to look as far as our own state representatives. And, since they
>like the federal education assistance available to them, those
>representatives are not going to change unless we vote them out and are
>willing to fund schools locally. I see no effort in either of those
>directions.

Sad, but true.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2410. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 04:24:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830002419.23307.00002589@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 75828

In article <3F4CD953.6060303@mailcity.moc>, JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
writes:

>> I have never stated that any specific YL hams *were* offended by Kim's
>> call sign. I have only stated that I agree with Riley Hollingsworth when
>he
>> says that Kim's call sign has the potential to do harm to the image of the
>ARS,
>> and YL hams in general. Kim and your XYL prove absolutely nothing
>> with regard to the validity of my objections to her (Kim's) call sign.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>There are a ton of things potentially more harmful and more
>likely to bring amateur radio "one step closer to extinction"
>than Kim's call sign. However, it is in bad taste and I can't
>imagine anyone requesting such a call sign other than to bring
>attention to one's self, but then there are those who seem to
>seek the lowest common denominator.

JJ:

Yes, indeed.

>I knew one ham couple and the wife's call sign (not requested,
>just what was issued) had the last letters DTA. He had a T shirt
>made for her that gave the call across the chest with the
>phonetics, "Don't Touch Anything".

Well, such a call sign is not offensive on it's face. The problem
with Kim's call is that it is both offensive and "in your face." Any
self-respecting YL who may have been issued a call with the "TIT"
suffix on a sequential basis would have to immediately request
a re-issue. Otherwise, if she voluntarily chose to keep it, then
she would be just as guilty as Kim is for having it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2411. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 04:24:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830002420.23307.00002590@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 75831

In article <bikntk$a6j@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>
>Dee, to be as succinct with this: there are many things in one's life that
>can be misinterpreted. While I chose this callsign with a desire borne out
>of a dare from friends and local hams here; nevertheless I didn't really
>consider that there would be misunderstandings about my callsign. And, for
>those whom have come to know me; or who "just know" me by virtue of their
>having a sort of twisted sense of humor--the callsign has been no big deal.

Kim:

This "admission" just makes your situation worse. Not only is your call sign
ill-considered, it was chosen as a result of a desire to impress your so-called
friends. I suggest you find new friends -- yours don't seem to be doing you
very much good.

>I've been in casual, contest, and emergency situations with my callsign. It
>has never, never been degraded, questioned, or commented on over the
>air--save one time when a passerby happened upon our repeater one day and I
>introduced myself, our folks and the repeater. He came back with, "well,
>hello Kim, W5TIT. I am passing through the....what did I just say?" He
>ended his question in giggles and that was all that was ever said.

He obviously realized that it was just plain silly to attempt to have an
intelligent conversation with someone who would have such a call sign.

>To make a long, boring story short,

That's never been a problem for you before, Kim -- so why should you care
about it now?

>the callsign has had the most inane
>objections right here in this newsgroup, and nowhere else. There's not a
>lady ham out there who's ever had anything but a hand covered giggle over
>this callsign.

They're not laughing with you, Kim -- they're laughing AT you.

>It's been a great ice breaker and it immediately lets folks
>know that to know me means to know and understand that I in no way take
>myself seriously--and there's not much they are going to have done or do
>that's going to run me off. Simple as that.

Obviously, taking yourself a bit more seriously would seem to be well in
order.

>That it runs folks like Larry off--for me--is a godsend...

Does my participation in this newsgroup, and on this topic in particular, indicate to ANYONE that I'm being "run off?" If so, please explain how!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2412. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 04:24:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830002421.23307.00002591@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 75827

In article <BB73FD5F.24D3D%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> With all due respect to your XYL, she is not
>> qualified to judge me. She has no idea how
>> I relate to women in person. (snip)
>
>
> Since you're basing your objection on how it reflects on women ("a vulgar,
>sexualized, and demeaning connotation which reflects poorly on YL radio
>amateurs everywhere"), she is, as a woman, qualified to judge the weight of
>that argument. She has done so, and feels your argument lacks substance. She
>is, as a woman, also able to say whether Kim's callsign is offensive to her.
>She says it is not.

Dwight:

Well, if that's the case, then I guess my "due respect" for your XYL is no longer deserved.

> Your argument lacks substance, Larry. Three women have disagreed with your
>position (my wife, Kim, and Dee). While two of the three have reservations
>about Kim's callsign (they wouldn't choose it), none find it outright
>offensive.
>
> Men once used shame and ridicule to force women to comply with their
>domination. That time has passed, Larry. Women are not ashamed of their
>bodies anymore, nor are they embarrassed by the mere mention of some part of
>that body. Would we (men) really want it any other way?
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

My intention is hardly to "dominate" Kim or any other woman, Dwight. However, I'm curious as to why that thought occurred to you! In reality, Kim's call sign tends to encourage men to think of her in that way, but, then again, that's undoubtedly her intent. Not the kind of behavior I would expect from a married woman and/or a mother, assuming she has any children.

Like all men, I have a very deep appreciation for the female body, and I enjoy the image of an attractive woman as much as anyone else. However, I also have very traditional moral values, and know that the proper place

for such demonstrations of sexuality should be confined to the private lives of committed, monogamous intimate partners. If you think that sounds hopelessly old-fashioned, then thank you, very much!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2413. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 04:24:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830002422.23307.00002592@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 75830

In article <BB73FD5F.24D3D%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> With all due respect to your XYL, she is not
>> qualified to judge me. She has no idea how
>> I relate to women in person. (snip)
>
>
> Since you're basing your objection on how it reflects on women ("a vulgar,
>sexualized, and demeaning connotation which reflects poorly on YL radio
>amateurs everywhere"), she is, as a woman, qualified to judge the weight of
>that argument. She has done so, and feels your argument lacks substance. She
>is, as a woman, also able to say whether Kim's callsign is offensive to her.
>She says it is not.

Dwight:

Well, if that's the case, then I guess my "due respect" for your XYL is no longer deserved.

> Your argument lacks substance, Larry. Three women have disagreed with your
>position (my wife, Kim, and Dee). While two of the three have reservations
>about Kim's callsign (they wouldn't choose it), none find it outright
>offensive.
>
> Men once used shame and ridicule to force women to comply with their
>domination. That time has passed, Larry. Women are not ashamed of their
>bodies anymore, nor are they embarrassed by the mere mention of some part of
>that body. Would we (men) really want it any other way?
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

My intention is hardly to "dominate" Kim or any other woman, Dwight. However, I'm curious as to why that thought occurred to you! In reality, Kim's call sign tends to encourage men to think of her in that way, but, then again, that's undoubtedly her intent. Not the kind of behavior I would expect from a married woman and/or a mother, assuming she has any children.

Like all men, I have a very deep appreciation for the female body, and I enjoy the image of an attractive woman as much as anyone else. However, I also have very traditional moral values, and know that the proper place

for such demonstrations of sexuality should be confined to the private lives of committed, monogamous intimate partners. If you think that sounds hopelessly old-fashioned, then thank you, very much!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2414. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 04:24:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830002423.23307.00002594@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 75826

In article <k4w3b.21994$8i2.1396@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>
>I think most of us on here are adults Kim. We have all heard and all know
>what a TIT is. I doubt that most of us think your choice of W5TIT for a
>callsigh is offensive. I think most of us believe it is a pathetic attempt
>for attention.
>
>I personally believe you are a closet exhibitionist.
>
>Thank you for your time Twit.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Dan:

The problem with Kim is the fact that, like all who follow the popular
culture, she associates "adult" behavior with sexualized behavior. I'm
certainly no prude, but I know that there is a time and place for
everything, and family-oriented activities like amateur radio deserve to
be free from encounters with an "in your face" flaunting of sexuality,
which is what Kim's call sign represents. And yes, it is nothing more
than a sophomoric attempt on her part to call attention to herself in
a manner which I'm sure she thinks is "funny" or "cute," but in reality,
just drags all of us hams "...one step closer to extinction."

73 de Larry, K3LT

2415. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 04:24:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830002423.23307.00002593@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 75829

In article <bim0lo$irq@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

><GRIN> Larry *is* the lowest common denominator here, Dwight...LOL Know
>that saying, "can't see the forest for the trees?"

Kim:

A classic example of the pot calling the kettle black.

>> You seem to be
>> saying that nothing should be mentioned on Ham Radio that might offend or
>> confuse a young child. If we accept that position, all we'd be allowed to
>> talk about is Barney and the Sesame Street characters.

>I get the oddest vision in my mind when I think of Larry and his incessant
>whining about such puritanical thoughts. Know the vision? You know the
>one: where a spanking is more the pleasure of the person touching the butt
>than anything else? "I'm doing this for your own good" kind of thinking?

Kim, YOU'RE the one who just put that image in everyone's mind -- not me.
And in so doing, you've just cemented my position about you and your
call sign firmly into place.

>> Regardless, most adults today know what a "tit" is and are not offended
>or
>> confused by the simple mention of it.
>>
>
>We are dealing here, with someone who is not--no where near--most adults.
>
>>
>> If a child is, the parent should
>> consider a discussion with them about human sexuality.

>Man, you got that right.

Any adult who is attempting to introduce a child to the wonderful world of
amateur radio should properly expect to find an atmosphere which would
not require them to "have a discussion of human sexuality." Moreover, I'm
certain that outside of this newsgroup, you would find more agreement with
that statement than anything you've offered on the subject so far.

>> If they're too young
>> for that discussion, they're probably too young to be talking with adults
>on
>> the radio or most other places.

>>
>
>More like if they're too young for that discussion, they probably wouldn't
>be able to decipher W5TIT into the word tit.

No "deciphering" is required, Kim -- your call sign spells it out in the clear.

>> If you're offended by Kim's callsign, you need to grow up. The adults of
>> this world are not going to censor their discussions simply to cater to
>your
>> unusually delicate sensitivities. And, to be honest with you, I wouldn't
>> want to see Ham Radio go in that direction.
>>
>>
>> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>>
>
>Growing up won't be done any time soon. We all know that. Let him have his
>fun--that's all this is to him. I can guarantee you that Larry doesn't mind
>my callsign one bit. He just likes having the topic to throw around once in
>a while. I don't mind it at all; in fact, I may be saving the poor wretch
>from complete and awesome boredom!

I assure you, Kim, that I don't need to pursue this particular subject to
allay my boredom!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2416. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 04:24:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830002424.23307.00002595@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 75823

In article <bimd69$ij9@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> I think most of us on here are adults Kim. We have all heard and all know
>> what a TIT is. I doubt that most of us think your choice of W5TIT for a
>> callsigh is offensive. I think most of us believe it is a pathetic
>attempt
>> for attention.
>>
>> I personally believe you are a closet exhibitionist.
>>
>> Thank you for your time Twit.
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>>
>>
>
>Don't let your penile dysfunction get in the way.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Once again, you provide conclusive evidence that your mind is intent on
creating a sexualized atmosphere during normal, polite social interchange.
This is what I call the "MTV Mindset." Our popular culture is based on the
philosophy that everything that can be sexualized MUST be, and your
callsign is sending that message loud and clear.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2417. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 04:24:24 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830002424.23307.00002596@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 75824

In article <BB748267.24DC0%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
>> (snip) Growing up won't be done any time
>> soon. We all know that. Let him have his
>> fun--that's all this is to him. I can
>> guarantee you that Larry doesn't mind my
>> callsign one bit. He just likes having
>> the topic to throw around once in a while.
>> I don't mind it at all; in fact, I may be
>> saving the poor wretch from complete and
>> awesome boredom!
>
>
> I'm just having a little fun also, Kim. Periodic "discussions" with Larry
>are a great diversion from a boring week. That situation will change this
>weekend through most of next week and I'll have to reduce my participation
>in this newsgroup. But, until then, this is a fun distraction.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

I'm glad to see that a good time is being had by all. Have a safe and happy Labour Day week end, Dwight!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2418. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 04:24:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830002426.23307.00002597@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 75833

In article <biotmk$b61ma$10@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>> Dwight:
>>
>> Actually, it most certainly is the business of any radio amateur who
>> is properly concerned with the image of the ARS. This is supposed
>> to be a family-oriented hobby/service. Mr. Hollingsworth said it most
>> succinctly in his response to Kim when he raised the issue of the
>> possible negative reaction of a parent/grandparent/aunt/uncle who may
>> be considering this hobby for a young child in their life. Kim's callsign
>> most certainly could cause such a person to question the judgment,
>> if not the personal integrity and morality, of radio amateurs in general,
>> through this one bad example.
>
>I'll say it again, the person uninvolved with amateur radio won't know the
>difference whether it was a sequentially or vanity-requested callsign. The
>average person would assume the FCC merely assigned it.

Ryan:

Well, that may be true, but it is the kind of moral relativism which is causing
our society to plummet straight into the ground on full afterburner.

>(Yes, believe it or
>not I actually polled people to see their responses the last time this
>bullsh*t came up). There is the root of the problem, if you have such a
>pissy feeling towards Kim's (and many other potentially offensive by your
>apparent standards) the why don't you spend your efforts whining to the FCC
>than wasting your time with posts that will not achieve ANY results other
>than to get it off your chest and to hear yourself "bellow" in a "electronic
>medium."

I can't say I disagree with you here, Ryan. However, it is HERE that Kim
started on her campaign to trash up the image of the ARS, and it will be
here that I continue to keep the heat turned up under her feet. On the slight
chance that she may throw in the towel and change her callsign, I could then
take credit for saving her personal image and that of the ARS.

>> Throughout my adult life, I've been told that "perception is reality."
>> While I would personally make some allowances for poor choices based
>> on the immature judgment of younger people, Kim is certainly of an
>> age and station in life where such poor judgment is much less likely
>> to be excused. She is the only one who can make this controversy
>> go away. Should she choose not to, she leaves herself open to the
>> criticism of those of us who *are* offended and *do* object to her choice

>> of a Vanity call sign.
>>
>
>Once again, if the callsign is so offensive, it is the FCC to blame.

Not really. The FCC is a government bureaucracy which must comply with
the demands placed on it by it's liberal, politically-appointed leaders. They
simply cannot impose any kind of "judgment" upon radio amateurs with
regard to call sign selection, since to do so would imply that there are, in
fact, moral absolutes...and that's one thing the government, which cannot
even permit a display of the Ten Commandments in a public building, just
isn't going to do these days. More's the pity.

>Any
>vanity callsign or even if it even was a sequentially assigned that is
>deemed offensive is their fault.

Yes on the sequential assignments, a definite no on the vanity calls.
A Vanity call sign is self-selected by it's recipient; the FCC, as stated
above, is not going to interfere.

>I should have the right to request ANY
>callsign that is listed as "available" provided I have the initial right to
>do so by licensure requirements/benefits.

I totally agree. Moreover, I would add that you have the responsibility to
make your selection one which is acceptable and not damaging to the
image of the ARS. Kim deliberately and willfully violated that concept
for the purpose of being able to flaunt a vulgar, "in your face," expression
of her "individuality."

>If the list is including some of
>what you refer to as offensive, that is your problem, and the FCC's, not the
>rest of us.

No, it is the "problem" of everyone who seeks to uphold some semblance of
traditional moral values in our society.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2419. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 05:14:45 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bipbs5nss0@208.206.142.89>
Source record: 75834

JJ wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> >
> > I have never stated that any specific YL hams *were* offended by Kim's
> > call sign. I have only stated that I agree with Riley Hollingsworth when he
> > says that Kim's call sign has the potential to do harm to the image of the ARS,
> > and YL hams in general. Kim and your XYL prove absolutely nothing
> > with regard to the validity of my objections to her (Kim's) call sign.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> There are a ton of things potentially more harmful and more
> likely to bring amateur radio "one step closer to extinction"
> than Kim's call sign. However, it is in bad taste and I can't
> imagine anyone requesting such a call sign other than to bring
> attention to one's self, but then there are those who seem to
> seek the lowest common denominator.

Which is exactly what Kim exhibited when she chose that callsign. It says far more about her than it ever could about ham radio. The only real damage she does to ham radio is as an embarassment.

2420. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 06:04:40 UTC
From: mezmerized cows <moocowmoo71@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1062223849.210980@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 75835
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Real Ham" <no.em@il.now> wrote in message news:nocode.noham@arrl.net...
> In article <vkl0nsoogac3c7@corp.supernews.com>, Disgusted wrote:

> I bailed out of the ARRL 14 years ago when it started to become clear
that the
> Leagues agenda was tending more toward a policy of supporting lower
licensing
> stardards (CB'er Ham). A pool of trained, capable radio operators
means
> something to me and I could no longer stand to be a part of an
organization
> that was moving to disregard that section of Part 97.
>
> It was a life membership too.

Ham radio started going into the toilet shortly
after Dick Bash published his infamous "study
guides". Later after the ARRL went crying to the
FCC to publish the question pools (to put Dick Bash
out of business because *his books* were out-selling
the ARRL study guides 10 to 1 at hamfests and mail
order) it sealed the "initial cycle of dumbing down" for
Amateur Radio - and we are now where we are today
as a DIRECT result of the same.

All because *one ham* in Alaska managed to singlehandedly
'step on the proverbial toes of a publishing company' in Newington
Conn. and in their response, they decided to not only throw out
the baby with the bathwater, but also rip the tub out of the wall
and toss it out the 2nd story window...

These are the true facts of the matter.

2421. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 06:34:38 UTC
From: Gray Shockley <gray-11@cybercoffee.org>
Message-ID: <0001HW.BB75AFAE00011AEA0EA31CF0@news-south.giganews.com>
Source record: 75836
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Sat, 30 Aug 2003 1:04:40 -0500, mezmerized cows wrote
(in message <1062223849.210980@newshost03.voicenet.com>):

> Ham radio started going into the toilet shortly
> after Dick Bash published his infamous "study
> guides". Later after the ARRL went crying to the
> FCC to publish the question pools (to put Dick Bash
> out of business because *his books* were out-selling
> the ARRL study guides 10 to 1 at hamfests and mail
> order) it sealed the "initial cycle of dumbing down" for
> Amateur Radio - and we are now where we are today
> as a DIRECT result of the same.
>
> All because *one ham* in Alaska managed to singlehandedly
> 'step on the proverbial toes of a publishing company' in Newington
> Conn. and in their response, they decided to not only throw out
> the baby with the bathwater, but also rip the tub out of the wall
> and toss it out the 2nd story window...
>
> These are the true facts of the matter.

That's very sweet but exactly what does it have to do with shortwave
/listening/?

A lot of hams seem to think that SWLers are - automatically - interested in
ham stuff.

I doubt that the hams that crosspost into rec.radio.shortwave realize how
badly they make hams look.

Gray Shockley

Entropy Maintenance Technician
Tao Chemical Company
---
gray-11@cybercoffee.org
http://www.cybercoffee.org/
Vicksburg, Mississippi US

2422. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 11:05:44 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <cy%3b.2929$jJ7.1324@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75837

"Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:1713527d374488db3c3cc90930d143f2.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> > We used to hear the very same apologistic response to the ills of
CB/Freeband.....today
> > nobody even bothers to apologize.
>
> Whatever the phuck "apologistic" means..... you blame Echolink
> technology for the blatant rules violations of some jerkoff who happens
> to be using it????
>

I don't know about that, but I do know that echolink is set up perfectly for identity theft.

It gives CB'ers, FRS enthusiasts, freebanders and those who are merely curious a chance to "join in" the fun of amateur radio without investing in radio equipment or having to study for a liscense.

One web-site had the echolink info conveniently located next to a "callbook" database, for the convenience of those who might need to pick out a callsign so that they can participate.

Just for fun: Try to "Google" "freeband echolink". Lots of interesting links there.

It doesn't take a rocket-scientist to figure out that if you set up "radioless ham radio", it's not going to be particularly good for the hobby.

It doesn't matter whether you are pretending to be using ham radio over the telephone, the Internet, or over those lousy PA systems they have at the hamburger joint's drive-through.... Any way you look at it, the real hams do not have a need to pretend. They just get on the radio.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2423. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 11:11:21 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <tD%3b.2930$YF7.1965@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75838

"Krusty" <No Email@Nospam.comp> wrote in message
news:biot6nevv0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030829204929.13386.00000087@mb-m15.aol.com...
> >REAL Amateur radio is accomplished by using radios and antennas, not
> >computers and phone lines.
> >
>
> Interesting, my Link on ECHOLink uses Radio and ants.
>

What are the ants for? Don't you have any bug-spray?

Sorry - Couldn't help myself.

Charles, N5PVL

2424. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 12:18:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308300418.112063b2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75839

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030830002418.23307.00002588@mb-m29.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0308290436.77c3e0de@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >
> > >> So, Brian -- are you going to defend your statement, or not?
> > >>
> > >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> > >Yes. No. What statement did I make?
>
> Brian:
>
> As you were, Airman. My fault for not quoting it!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Thanks, Sarge.

For a second there, I felt like I was an instrument of national policy again.

bb

2425. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 12:27:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308300427.59169d0b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75840

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030828202431.24345.00000134@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> >Lies.
> >
>
> What ever CBer.

Hah, that's rich coming from you.

2426. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 12:32:01 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030830083201.07600.00000154@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 75841

From: "Hans K0HB"

>II Proposal:
>
> I propose that no new applicants be accepted for the current
> license classes and that after some reasonable grace period, no
> upgrades be available in the current licensing structure.
>
>A. New License Classes:
>
> I propose that new license applications be available
> in two classes, namely "Class B" and "Class A".

You seem to have several "proposals". How did you decide on this latest one?

> The "Class B" license would have an entry-level test (basic
> regulations, safety, operating procedures, basic DC and AC
> electronics). This class would have full frequency and
> mode privileges, power limited to 50W output.

> The "Class A" license test would be of a difficulty level
> similar to the current Extra class test, and would have
> full privileges at power levels up to 1500W, equivalent to
> current Extra Class license holders.

The only difference is power levels? Thats about as absurd as having an
isolated mode test, like CW. In both cases, the testing does not represent the
priveledges granted. Here, you are tested in many areas, and only recieve
higher power levels as a result of being tested in those areas.

>Holders of this license would be required to have 2 years
> experience as a licensee (“time in grade”) before being
> eligible to upgrade to “Class A”.

This is just wrong. Why should someone arbitrarily be held back two years,
regardless of their abilities? For example, someone may have the ability from
commercial and/or academic experience, or throught their own efforts. Such
persons would have the knowledge to be useful right away, but would not be able
to upgrade because they would have to wait two years.

>From: wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig)

>It is part of our
>culture and tradition and therefore should not be removed from the
>curriculum.

Amateur radio is a technical hobby, not a hobby to maintain "culture and
tradition".

2427. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 12:38:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308300438.b8c5b2e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75842

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0308291123.5b5bc0b7@posting.google.com>...
> "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<c4a6771678b5a0221f9271fbee325279.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
>
> . . . .
>
> > B. Status of current licensees.
> >
> > Current licenses could be renewed indefinitely, and would
> > retain their current operating privileges.
> >
> > Current Novice, Technician, General, and Advanced class
> > licensees could up grade to ?Class A? at any time.
> >
> > Respectfully submitted,
> >
> > H. Hans Brakob, K0HB
>
> Overall not bad Hans although I don't agree with the two year
> apprenticeship, I think one year would be adequate. The one year
> "statute of limitations" certainly worked for us early 75W Novices and
> many of us were fully up to speed in much less than a year.
>
> w3(c)rv

Brian, you've got to be kidding. "Fully up to speed" how?

2428. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 12:48:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308300448.3bb14b5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75843

"Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<2459ee62a6f0efa423239c8e05539568.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
> > Paul, since the only apparent privelege difference in the two proposed
> > license classes is 50W, and you could operate any amateur frequency in
> > any mode, why would that deter you from the ARS?
>
> Brian "gets it" !!!!
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans, its quite easy to "get it" when the subject makes sense. Its
all the other nonsensical stuff on here that I don't get.

Paul gave an opinion that I didn't understand, so I asked a question.

Perhaps Paul requires "Extra right out of the box" and cannot be
bothered with "lesser" licenses. Until he replies, we'll never know.

2429. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 12:52:32 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308300452.4395b6d7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75844

Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<DJv3b.8299$3E.2208@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>...
> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/upload_v2.cgi
>
> Enter in the number RM-10787, fill out the address
> information and upload or type in your comments on
> the elimination of morse code testing as a requirement
> to operate on HF.

Keith, I've been unable to find the FCC RM-10787 on their site. Could
you post it here?

Thanks, Brian/N0iMD

2430. AOL pulls Jon Cunningham's web pages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 12:53:49 UTC
From: jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam
Message-ID: <9841241545.65byejon7878@pavillage.net>
Source record: 75845
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave

I guess that Jon finally published one too many porno links or one too many pictures of naked women. His web pages are toast at the time of this posting. They got yanked right along with Lloyd's AOL pages.

Birds of a feather? ...

2431. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 12:56:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308300456.5d3c1f0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75846

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<binmph$18v$0@208.206.142.86>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bimje6$1c0$0@208.206.142.89>...
> > > Brian wrote:

> > > > No confusion here, DICK.
> > >
> > > None that you ever recognized, that is.
> >
> > DICK, I recognize you. That's how I put your name in every reply.
>
> And now confirmation of the point is complete.

DICK, you're confused.

2432. Re: Code / No Code ==

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 13:41:34 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <biq9fo$vg6@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75847

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308300456.5d3c1f0@posting.google.com...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<binmph$18v$0@208.206.142.86>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bimje6$1c0$0@208.206.142.89>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
>
> > > > > No confusion here, DICK.
> > > > >
> > > > None that you ever recognized, that is.
> > >
> > > DICK, I recognize you. That's how I put your name in every reply.
> >
> > And now confirmation of the point is complete.
>
> DICK, you're confused.

Uh, confusion would be an improvement.

Kim W5TIT ;)

2433. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 13:56:43 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030830095643.22707.00000110@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75848

>What are the ants for?

To KEEP CBplussers away

2434. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 13:59:22 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030830095922.22707.00000111@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 75849

>Amateur radio is a technical hobby,

When did that happen? Not as of recent Im sure.

2435. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 14:03:42 UTC
From: Hans K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <d24f34983d4ece74bb85ba3e42de6ad8.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 75850

"Krusty" <"Krusty"> wrote

> Echolink is not "real" Amateur radio anyway...

Let's see now.....

.... I'm on a wilderness lake in the BWCA with my VX-5R, call the 147.24 machine in Ely, bring up the code for my home 444.125 machine 250 miles away in Golden Valley, and chat with my unfortunate friends who are on their way to work in the city.

What's not "real" about that?

73, Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2436. Re: AOL pulls Jon Cunningham's web pages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 14:36:18 UTC
From: jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam
Message-ID: <9841241545.65byejon7373@pavillage.net>
Source record: 75851
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 30 Aug 2003 13:47:23 GMT, Soames123 <soames123@aol.com> wrote:
> - Who'se Jon Cunningham ??

Jon Cunningham is ham radio operator K1TP, and he has had his 14.313
MHz web pages up for quite a long time at http://members.aol.com/jcunham.

On them, he frequently put down Usenet radio posters as beneath contempt,
but he completely overlooked his own tendency of late to post what
many people would think of as porn or links to porn. I guess that AOL
decided to nuke the pages for that same reason.

Truly, pride goeth before a fall ...

2437. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 15:45:06 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <biqgq2mko0@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 75852

charlesb wrote:

> "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:1713527d374488db3c3cc90930d143f2.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> >
> > > We used to hear the very same apologistic response to the ills of
> CB/Freeband.....today
> > > nobody even bothers to apologize.
> >
> > Whatever the phuck "apologistic" means..... you blame Echolink
> > technology for the blatant rules violations of some jerkoff who happens
> > to be using it????
> >
>
> I don't know about that, but I do know that echolink is set up perfectly for
> identity theft.
>
> It gives CB'ers, FRS enthusiasts, freebanders and those who are merely
> curious a chance to "join in" the fun of amateur radio without investing in
> radio equipment or having to study for a liscense.
>
> One web-site had the echolink info conveniently located next to a "callbook"
> database, for the convenience of those who might need to pick out a callsign
> so that they can participate.
>
> Just for fun: Try to "Google" "freeband echolink". Lots of interesting
> links there.
>
> It doesn't take a rocket-scientist to figure out that if you set up
> "radioless ham radio", it's not going to be particularly good for the hobby.
>
> It doesn't matter whether you are pretending to be using ham radio over the
> telephone, the Internet, or over those lousy PA systems they have at the
> hamburger joint's drive-through.... Any way you look at it, the real hams do
> not have a need to pretend. They just get on the radio.

Charlie, don't confuse Hans. He's signed on to the "All will be well if we can only get enough warm bodies into ham radio" scenario.

2438. test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 16:29:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030830122906.14837.00002632@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 75855

test

2439. Re: Ham radio's REAL ememy

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 16:29:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030830122908.14837.00002633@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 75854

In article <20030814001308.01814.00000941@mb-m10.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030813222029.18497.00002061@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> writes:
>
>>In article <20030813181646.02197.00002142@mb-m12.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>>In article <c2356669.0308121219.382a9c33@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>>>(N2EY) writes:
>>>
>>>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>>>news:<20030811200142.15462.00002202@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>>>>
>>>>> Had the no-code-test Technician never been created, US ham
>>>>> radio would have been short by 200K ham licenses by the time of
>>>>> "Reconstruction."
>>>>
>>>>Prove it.
>>>>
>>>>Show proof that 200,000 people would not have gotten US amateur radio
>>>>licenses between February 14, 1991 and April 15, 2000 if the Technician
>>>>class license had never lost its code test.
>>>>
>>>>I don't think you have any proof. Or even any evidence. Just bluster.
>>>
>>> that was an OLD argument in here and you LOST it.
>>
>>How did I "lose" it, Len? Show us some proof of your assertion.
>
> You did.

No, I did not.

> It's all in Google.

Then show us. I don't think you can.

> You just flat-out REFUSED to consider
> the FCC's own database information (as compiled by a PCTA) and
> wanted to hide 9 years worth of New Licensees.

Where? How?

You are simply repeating untruths. That's not rational behavior.

>>> Getting all puffed up and antagonistic won't prove any case for
>>> you on the morse code test. It won't prove any case for your
>>> false interpretation of statistics that was on the AH0A website.
>>
>>The only person I see getting puffed up and antagonistic is you, Len.
>
> Nah.

Yeah.
>
> I'm just poking an old morseman who is blinded to the truth. :-)

You're missing the mark by a mile.
>
>>> You would not accept statistics of a noted PCTA taken from the
>>> FCC public database then and you refuse to accept it now.
>>
>>What are you talking about?
>
> Go back a few years in Google, extract several hundred posts on
> the subject in there.

You do it.

> You will see it.

Show me.

> Anyone would if they wanted
> to endlessly rehash past arguments.

If anyone can see it, why don't you show us?
>
>>In 1991, all Technicians were code tested.
>>
>>In 2000, most Technicians were not code tested.
>>
>>200,000 Technicians who were not code tested in 2000 is somewhere in the
>>ball
>>park. Nobody denies that in 2000 there were a lot of Technicians who had not
>>passed code tests.
>>
>>However, you claimed:
>>
>>"Had the no-code-test Technician never been created, US ham radio would have
>>been short by 200K ham licenses by the time of "Reconstruction.""
>>
>>Reconstruction?
>
> Carpet baggers and all. :-)
>
Then go back where you came from.

>>The only way we'd be "short" 200,000 is if none of the 200,000 got licenses.
>>Did your crystal ball tell you that none of them would have learned the
>code?
>>
>>> There's no point in rehashing an old argument where you LOST.
>>
>>Ah, I see. You're using the Big Lie technique, where you simply claim to
>have
>>"won" without presenting any proof or even any evidence.
>
> Did it all years ago.

Yes, you used the Big Lie technique before.

> You refused to believe any of it then, still do.

What did I refuse to believe? That there were 200,000 Technicians? That's
simply not true.
>
> You need your brain washed. It's too full of dits and dahs.

Are you a Communist, Len? You speak of brainwashing.
>
>>> You won't make any valid "points" in here by repeating "you're
>>> mistaken" and continual refusal to accept FCC database
>>> information.
>>
>>I'm not after "points". Just the facts. But you don't have any facts to back
>>up your claims.
>
> I did, but trying to present FACTS back then was useless when you
> refused to accept them. You still refuse to accept such facts.

I refuse to accept mistakes. You have presented mistakes, not facts.

> Not
> worth the trouble to go back through the past over and over and over
> again.
>
Then why do you do it? You keep repeating your experiences in Japan, which were
way back in the past, over and over and over and over and over and over and
over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over and over
again.

>>You can repeat the same mistakes over and over but they'll still be
>mistakes,
>>Len.
>
> See? There you go once more. You won't accept any truth that is
> against your viewpoint. You call all of such things "mistakes." :-)

Because they are not the truth.

N2EY

2440. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 16:29:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030830122910.14837.00002634@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 75853

In article <3F3BE101.5000802@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>Those of us who did not spend summers at the shore had even more
>>opportunities. Of course there was the 30 day retest wait....

>Did anyone ever get caught showing up say a week early for retest?
> Today you'd
>have computers that could spot it, but back in the old days did they
>bother to check?

I dunno but I bet they did. FCC field offices were usually far enough apart
that you would be going back to the same office, and they could check.

Also, FCC main office processed the 610s, whether you passed or not. They could
easily check if you were still in the waiting period, too.

I don't know anybody who tried to push the retest anyway. The 610, which you
signed, contained a question or statement where you indicated that you met the
various requirements, including such things as not being in the waiting period.
FCC could pull your license for playing games like that. Signing the 610 meant
you agreed to obey ALL the FCC rules, not just some of them or most of them.

I think the real deterrent to stuff like that was the simple fact that in most
hams' minds, cheating on the rules was "simply not done". That doesn't mean
nobody did, just that it was rare.

Why was there a 30 day waiting period? Several reasons:

- it kept people from memorizing the test (FCC did not have that many different
writtens) and helped keep the tests secret

- it encouraged people to be really, really, REALLY ready for the test.
Particularly those lucky enough to live close to an FCC office.

- it reduced the workload of FCC examiners, particularly when the tests were
free.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2441. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 Morse Code Elimination Petition

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 16:58:36 UTC
From: wa3iyc@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030830125836.29660.00000319@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 75856

In article <1062165030.173541@newshost03.voicenet.com>, "flatulaus encomium" <treedogs3@yahoo.com> writes:

>It's VERY long past time we eliminate this albatross
>hanging about the neck of Amateur Radio, known as
>CW.

Do you mean the MODE or the TEST?

>Drop the code

If you mean the code TEST, there's a very good possibility the last remaining vestige of code testing will be eliminated by FCC.

>and increase the required theory
>knowledge to pass in order to offset the same.

I doubt very much that will happen, even though many if not most hams support such a change. Look at the restructuring of 2000 - both code and written tests were reduced dramatically.

>This is
>what should be done. If it were up to me, I would no
>longer publish the question pools.

But it's not up to you. It's up to the FCC, and the only way for the Q&A to be kept secret is for FCC to take over testing and test generation again. How can anyone convince FCC to spend the money and personnel needed to do so after 20+ years of the VEC and QPC systems?

>One should know their
>"techcinal stuff" if they hold a licence. I know people that
>have Extra's who can't even explain Ohm's Law! This is
>NOT acceptable.

Sure. But how to convince FCC that said knowledge is necessary? Look at the enforcement issues FCC deals with in the ARS: failure to ID, cussing, uncoordinated repeaters, jamming....does knowing Ohm's Law (or Morse Code, for that matter) have anything to do with those violations, or preventing them?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2442. Re: BPL *IS* Going to Happen- Get Ready

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 16:59:59 UTC
From: David Moisan <dmoisan@davidmoisan.org>
Message-ID: <irl1lv06612iqgnva462lenvajpmmbhtne@4ax.com>
Source record: 75857
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Wed, 27 Aug 2003 09:57:46 +0000 (UTC), Ralph Aichinger
<ralph@dolphy.pangea.at> wrote:

>And I think military users could change to VHF or UHF, even sat
>communications anyway if they wanted. They could also keep BPL
>out of special areas. I doubt military users in suburban environments
>give a damn about HF.
>

ARINC *has* filed comments. Apparently, one of their receive sites
near San Francisco was severely affected by some Part 15 equipment in
a house nearby. One of their 3 MHz frequencies was rendered unusable.

The NTIA will step up to bat for the military and government HF users.

Take care,

Dave

David Moisan, N1KGH, SKYWARN n1kgh@davidmoisan.org
Invisible Disability: http://www.davidmoisan.org/invisible_disability.html
GE Superradio FAQ: http://www.davidmoisan.org/faqs/superradio/gesr_faq.html
Sangean ATS-909 FAQ: http://www.davidmoisan.org/faqs/sangean/ats909faq.html

2443. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 17:18:07 UTC
From: Hans K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <6c597fa2f3d94aebd1d22fec5447a53d.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 75858

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote

> This is just wrong.

Seems right to me, so that's what I recommended to the FCC.

But of course you are certainly free to make a different recommendation to the FCC, but they don't read rrap. If your recommendation is more persuasive than mine then yours will be adopted and mine will go in the bit bucket. So tell the FCC, don't whine to me.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2444. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 17:27:12 UTC
From: Hans Kohb <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <106783d18499657e7c4c6906b22e7bf5.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 75859

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote

> "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<2459ee62a6f0efa423239c8e05539568.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...

> > Brian "gets it" !!!!
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> Hans, its quite easy to "get it" when the subject makes sense. Its
> all the other nonsensical stuff on here that I don't get.

Damn, Brian, I pay you a compliment and you still get in my case.
What's with that?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2445. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 17:31:59 UTC
From: Hans Kohb <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <1894146ead0aa8ddafaea3d87eac97a1.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 75860

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> Charlie, don't confuse Hans. He's signed on to the "All will be well if we can only get
> enough warm bodies into ham radio" scenario.

It's you that's corn-fused! Where did you cook up that fantasy? I have
stated several times in this newsgroup that I could hardly care less if
the number of hams increases or doesn't increase.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2446. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 17:52:05 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0308300952.614c3636@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75861

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote

>
> Just for fun: Try to "Google" "freeband echolink". Lots of interesting
> links there.
>

Your rationale reminds me of the gun control crowd who would ban
private ownership of handguns because some criminal used a handgun in
a liquor store holdup. Rather than attack the perpetrators you want
to ban the technology for all legitimate users. Welcome to Amerika!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

2447. Re: Shelby CB Fest

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 18:05:44 UTC
From: "&#65533; StormTrooper &#65533;"
Message-ID: <vl1prudu1c8523@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 75862

"Gastonia Fruit Boy" <net@gatsfruitboy.com> wrote in message
news:biq8vh$3qu$0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> Typing from my lap top here at Shelby Hamfest.
>
> What has happened to our hobby? The boneyard
> is full of CB equipment, linear amplifiers, imported CB
> radios capable of operating on any frequency, etc.
> The pirate broadcasters are even here, selling FM
> broadcasting equipment and discussing strategy. Some
> guy is selling GMRS equipment, saying no license is
> required. All sorts of illegal radio and electronic
> equipment for sale. You got to see it to believe it!
>
> The Gastonia Fruit Boy
>
>
>
No Shit. I got there at 7:45 AM, and left at 11:30 AM. Computer shit
everywhere, CB Amps, Modified CB Radios, Public Service HT's, and a shitload
of junk. This was my last trip! Damn, one guy wanted $800.00 for a KW
TS-440S and a Astron PS. This dude must have been on crack!

2448. Re: Ham here and hams on the air?? Its a poll

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 18:19:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030830141920.28496.00000275@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 75863

In article <biotmo$b61ma$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>1. How many hams that participate with some frequency here in this newsgroup
>operate on the air in the legal ham bands?

Count me in
>
>2. Which band(s) do you operate? (Modes irrelevant for this poll, just
>bands or frequency band ranges please.)

80 meters (normally 3500-3550)
40 meters (normally 7000-7050)
20 meters (normally 14000-14050)
>
>3. How frequently do you operate on those bands in Question 2?? Hourly,
>Daily, Weekly etc.
>
Several evenings a week. Also a few domestic contests

73 de Jim, N2EY

2449. Re: AOL pulls Jon Cunningham's web pages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 18:45:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Ug64b.5413$EW1.4148@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75864
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

What a dumb ass. The page is up and alive.

Dan/W4NTI

"Jayne Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
news:9841241545.65byejon7373@pavillage.net...
> On 30 Aug 2003 13:47:23 GMT, Soames123 <soames123@aol.com> wrote:
> > - Who'se Jon Cunningham ??
>
> Jon Cunningham is ham radio operator K1TP, and he has had his 14.313
> MHz web pages up for quite a long time at http://members.aol.com/jcunham.
>
> On them, he frequently put down Usenet radio posters as beneath contempt,
> but he completely overlooked his own tendency of late to post what
> many people would think of as porn or links to porn. I guess that AOL
> decided to nuke the pages for that same reason.
>
> Truly, pride goeth before a fall ...

2450. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 18:46:13 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0308301046.84d1dee@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75865

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<1ee1b.105565$RG6.94042@news02.roc.ny>...
> I do remember folks back when using "the handle here is ...".
> My question is did that start with CB or did CB pick it up from amateurs
> originally? It seems (at least back then) more like the Southern "y'all
> come again real soon". Sort of folksy and warm if grammatically incorrect.
>
The term "handle" goes back to before ham radio. It was commonly use
by hams as an alternative to "name" or "nickname", because often a
"handle" was not related to the person's actual name ("Slim", "The
Duke", etc.) Just a bit of jargon.

And originally the cb term meant the same thing. But over time,
"handle" in cb lingo came to mean something quite different from a
person's name or nickname.
"Handles" were used instead of callsigns as a way of concealing a cb
user's true identity, both from others and the FCC. Thus, they became
the antithesis of callsigns.

And that's why the term has dropped from amateur usage.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2451. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 19:20:46 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <iO64b.2907$qU4.1030@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75866

"Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:1894146ead0aa8ddafaea3d87eac97a1.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
>
> > Charlie, don't confuse Hans. He's signed on to the "All will be well if
we can only get
> > enough warm bodies into ham radio" scenario.
>
> It's you that's corn-fused! Where did you cook up that fantasy? I have
> stated several times in this newsgroup that I could hardly care less if
> the number of hams increases or doesn't increase.
>

Neither one of you guys should confuse me with someone who cares about that
kind of off-topic baloney.

Charles, N5PVL

2452. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 19:50:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <qe74b.5791$EW1.5339@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75867

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0308301046.84d1dee@posting.google.com...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<1ee1b.105565$RG6.94042@news02.roc.ny>...
> > I do remember folks back when using "the handle here is ...".
> > My question is did that start with CB or did CB pick it up from amateurs
> > originally? It seems (at least back then) more like the Southern "y'all
> > come again real soon". Sort of folksy and warm if grammatically
incorrect.
> >
> The term "handle" goes back to before ham radio. It was commonly use
> by hams as an alternative to "name" or "nickname", because often a
> "handle" was not related to the person's actual name ("Slim", "The
> Duke", etc.) Just a bit of jargon.
>
> And originally the cb term meant the same thing. But over time,
> "handle" in cb lingo came to mean something quite different from a
> person's name or nickname.
> "Handles" were used instead of callsigns as a way of concealing a cb
> user's true identity, both from others and the FCC. Thus, they became
> the antithesis of callsigns.
>
> And that's why the term has dropped from amateur usage.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Thanks for setting the record straight Jim. What these CBers can't get straight is that Amateur Radio pre-dates CB radio by many decades. So most, to all, of what CB does is a copy of Ham radio, which the CBers then proceeded to screw up.

Just another example of how CB has, and is ruining ham radio.

Dan/W4NTI

2453. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 19:57:00 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <biqvicsqv0@208.206.142.65>
Source record: 75868

N2EY wrote:

> test

ping!

2454. Re: Ham here and hams on the air?? Its a poll

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 20:12:17 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0308301212.63956ed@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75869

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<biotmo$b61ma$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> 2. Which band(s) do you operate? (Modes irrelevant for this poll, just
> bands or frequency band ranges please.)

40, 20, & 10(Mobile)

> 3. How frequently do you operate on those bands in Question 2?? Hourly,
> Daily, Weekly etc.

Daily...when my wee lad allows. It's my job to put him to sleep so we
lay down with the bottom of 40 playing in the background. Sometimes he
wins and sneaks out into the living room and proudly proclaims to my
XYL "ok, mommy...daddy's night night."

> (Lennie, don't bother responding, We all know you don't have an amateur
> radio license)

Got a little "bite" to ya, eh Ryan? ;-)

> Thanks,

You're welcome.

73 de Bert
WA2SI

2455. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 20:35:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F510ACB.4080504@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75870

charlesb wrote:
> "Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:1894146ead0aa8ddafaea3d87eac97a1.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
>
>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>
>>>Charlie, don't confuse Hans. He's signed on to the "All will be well if
>>
> we can only get
>
>>>enough warm bodies into ham radio" scenario.
>>
>>It's you that's corn-fused! Where did you cook up that fantasy? I have
>>stated several times in this newsgroup that I could hardly care less if
>>the number of hams increases or doesn't increase.
>>
>
>
> Neither one of you guys should confuse me with someone who cares about that
> kind of off-topic baloney.

Echolink's certainly relavent to Amateur radio policy!

- Mike KB3EIA

2456. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 20:35:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F510AFC.5010100@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75871

N2EY wrote:
> test

Lots of QRM, Jim! QRP computer?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2457. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 21:08:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308301308.514281b2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75872

"Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<106783d18499657e7c4c6906b22e7bf5.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
>
> > "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<2459ee62a6f0efa423239c8e05539568.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
>
> > > Brian "gets it" !!!!
> > >
> > > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> > Hans, its quite easy to "get it" when the subject makes sense. Its
> > all the other nonsensical stuff on here that I don't get.
>
> Damn, Brian, I pay you a compliment and you still get in my case.
> What's with that?
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Hans, I didn't mean it that way. I reread my post and see it was a bit short.

Sorry.

2458. Re: AOL pulls Jon Cunningham's web pages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 22:28:02 UTC
From: Archduke Hiram Knickers <funhorns3@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1062282857.420781@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 75873
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jayne Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
news:9841241545.65byejon7373@pavillage.net...
> On 30 Aug 2003 13:47:23 GMT, Soames123 <soames123@aol.com> wrote:
> > - Who'se Jon Cunningham ??
>
> Jon Cunningham is ham radio operator K1TP, and he has had his 14.313
> MHz web pages up for quite a long time at http://members.aol.com/jcunham.
>
> On them, he frequently put down Usenet radio posters as beneath contempt,
> but he completely overlooked his own tendency of late to post what
> many people would think of as porn or links to porn. I guess that AOL
> decided to nuke the pages for that same reason.

His page is back up on AOL as I type this.
http://www.cafeshops.com/tshirtstop/141552

(pfhbbblttt!!!!!!!!!!)

2459. AMRAD comments on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 22:43:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <0M94b.6920$EW1.3460@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75874

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_docu

2460. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-30 22:51:31 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bir9pjdvp0@208.206.142.114>
Source record: 75875

K0HB wrote:

> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Just for fun: Try to "Google" "freeband echolink". Lots of interesting
> > links there.
> >
>
> Your rationale reminds me of the gun control crowd who would ban
> private ownership of handguns because some criminal used a handgun in
> a liquor store holdup. Rather than attack the perpetrators you want
> to ban the technology for all legitimate users. Welcome to Amerika!

And yours seems to be that since we (supposedly) hae the right to bear arms, it's OK to rob liquor stores!

Why not deal with the trouble makers and fnot bother the rest?

2461. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 00:19:32 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030830201932.12300.00000187@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 75876

In article <3F510AFC.5010100@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> test
>
> Lots of QRM, Jim! QRP computer?

AOL trouble. Apparently fixed now.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2462. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 00:28:29 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F51412C.3040109@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75877

Hans K0HB wrote:

>
>If some jerkoff violates the rules on CW do you blame Morse code???
>
>
>
I didn't think that could happen (violating rules on CW). :-)

2463. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 00:33:24 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F514252.1080304@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75878

WA8ULX wrote:

>>REAL Amateur radio is accomplished by using radios and antennas, not
>>computers and phone lines.
>>
>>
>>
>
>Interesting, my Link on ECHOLink uses Radio and ants.
>
>
Yeah. And I know that if I use Echolink on my PC here in NJ USA to
connect to a machine say in Romania, that my voice is being transmitted
on some 2m or 440 freq over there. I just happen to be using a very long
microphone cable..... I've had QSOs with hams in Japan who were mobile.
Guys suprized to hear an American white trash voice on their local
repeater. :-)

2464. Re: Ham here and hams on the air?? Its a poll

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 00:43:00 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F514492.8070606@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75879

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

>1. How many hams that participate with some frequency here in this newsgroup
>operate on the air in the legal ham bands?
>
me.

>
>
>
>2. Which band(s) do you operate? (Modes irrelevant for this poll, just
>bands or frequency band ranges please.)
>
>
Mostly HF, some 80m, 5Mhz, 40m, 20m (favorite band) and a little 10m.
I need a
better antenna for 80 and 5. Haven't been above 50MHz much at all since I
got my "extra lite"....

>
>
>
>3. How frequently do you operate on those bands in Question 2?? Hourly,
>Daily, Weekly etc.
>
>
For myself a few weeks can pass between operating sessions, and then spend
a few hours on the radio (like a contest. I don't compete, but use them
for seeing
how far and what places I can ping).

2465. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 00:49:33 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F51461B.8000306@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75880

>
>
>No surprise there Mike. No calls, no decency, no license. Access available
>to anyone that can lie their way in. Yep....what a system.
>
>
And someone can obtain a ham radio rig and go on the air with a bootleg
call.
Same difference.

2466. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 01:00:28 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <MMb4b.1651$id4.798@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 75881

Hmm ... this makes twice now for me. Once VE7DGL had to get hold of me and used Echo Link - and my HT fired up and I got the needed "heads up". Today, I needed to get hold of Hatton, NI5Y, and he wasn't on the internet. Well, I linked to his machine and he answered via his HT. It does work. There were radios on one end in both instances. :)

Or is DXCC the only thing that counts? I have little use for those folks. I'm sure some are decent, but the one time I wanted to run a phone patch from the US Naval Hospital on Guam and the DX boys thought phone patches shouldn't be allowed on their day ... well ... as I said, I've little use for 'em.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:mHS3b.1551$Om1.1519@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Krusty" <No Email@Nospam.comp> wrote in message
> news:bioq7v$5lb$0@pita.alt.net...
> > If you hear things on Echolink you dislike, get over it, ignore it, and
> move
> > on. Echolink is not "real" Amateur radio anyway...it is merely a
> glorified,
> > huge chat room for those with Amateur radio licenses.
> > REAL Amateur radio is accomplished by using radios and antennas, not
> > computers and phone lines.
> >
> >
>
> Oh...so Echo Link is like playing a airplane video game and thinking your
a
> 'real' pilot? Makes sense to me.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

2467. Re: AOL pulls Jon Cunningham's web pages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 01:03:52 UTC
From: jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam
Message-ID: <9841241545.65byejon8888@pavillage.net>
Source record: 75882
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 30 Aug 2003 18:28:02 -0400, Archduke Hiram Knickers <funhorns3@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
> "Jayne Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
> news:9841241545.65byejon7373@pavillage.net...
> > On 30 Aug 2003 13:47:23 GMT, Soames123 <soames123@aol.com> wrote:
> > > - Who'se Jon Cunningham ??
> >
> > Jon Cunningham is ham radio operator K1TP, and he has had his 14.313
> > MHz web pages up for quite a long time at http://members.aol.com/jcunham.
> >
> > On them, he frequently put down Usenet radio posters as beneath contempt,
> > but he completely overlooked his own tendency of late to post what
> > many people would think of as porn or links to porn. I guess that AOL
> > decided to nuke the pages for that same reason.
>
> His page is back up on AOL as I type this.
> http://www.cafeshops.com/tshirtstop/141552
>
> (pfhbbblttt!!!!!!!!!!)

I was right. AOL *did* have a word with K1TP. From his web page at
the time of this posting (and I quote):

"New Location of As The World Turns.....courtesy of the AOL
police ..." [location snipped]

And Jon has moved so that he can continue to post his drek without
interference.

So "pfhbbblttt!!!!!!!!!!" right back at you, Numbnuts.

Les, Dan and the other ignoramuses could of course be expected to
shoot from the hip and be wrong (as usual). They are sooooo
predictable.

2468. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 01:21:47 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <L4c4b.35589$Vx2.15750925@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75883

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:MMb4b.1651$id4.798@news01.roc.ny...
> Hmm ... this makes twice now for me. Once VE7DGL had to get hold of me
and
> used Echo Link - and my HT fired up and I got the needed "heads up".
Today,
> I needed to get hold of Hatton, NI5Y, and he wasn't on the internet.
Well,
> I linked to his machine and he answered via his HT. It does work. There
> were radios on one end in both instances. :)
>
> Or is DXCC the only thing that counts? I have little use for those folks.
> I'm sure some are decent, but the one time I wanted to run a phone patch
> from the US Naval Hospital on Guam and the DX boys thought phone patches
> shouldn't be allowed on their day ... well ... as I said, I've little use
> for 'em.
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

While I personally am not really interested in Echolink, I think it is an
interesting hybrid. I'm glad that someone worked out the methodology
whether or not I ever make any use of it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2469. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 01:28:34 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <6bc4b.3356$Jw7.1578@newssvr32.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75884

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F51461B.8000306@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >No surprise there Mike. No calls, no decency, no license. Access
available
> >to anyone that can lie their way in. Yep....what a system.
> >
> >
> And someone can obtain a ham radio rig and go on the air with a bootleg
> call.
> Same difference.
>

Hmmmm... Let's put on our thinking caps for a moment, and consider whether there is generally more access to ham rigs, or to Internet capable computers. Which one is easiest and cheapest for potential bootleggers to obtain access to?

Same difference? I don't think so. Echolink is the best thing to happen to bootleggers - ever.

If I were to go where freebander types hang out and leave an informative article about EchoLink, that would be an irresponsible act... It would be irresponsible for me to point out that vulnerability within the hobby, but not nearly so irresponsible as the programmer who created that vulnerability in the first place.

In this day and age, amateurs are more, not less conscious of security issues. EchoLink is a big hole in our security, and most especially should never be utilized for anything even remotely related to emergency communications. As hams, what we have to bring to the table here is independent radio communications. The department of homeland security did not affiliate with the ARRL because of our ability to use the Internet.

One basic of emergency communications is not to develop a dependence on the network that you are there to back up. Using the Internet as a central part of a Ham Radio network (of any type) is like having a plan to use the telephone to report outages in telephone service. The emergency plan works great - until there is an emergency.

Add that to the hundreds, perhaps thousands of hams who instantly gave up on learning more about ham radio in order to upgrade upon discovering EchoLink, and you begin to understand whether EchoLink has had a positive or negative influence upon the hobby.

Sure, lots of hams have enjoyed EchoLink... Lots of drivers would enjoy free six-packs of beer at highway tool-booths too, but that doesn't mean it is a responsible or intelligent thing to do.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2470. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 01:35:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F515134.4020507@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75885

Robert Casey wrote:

>>
>> No surprise there Mike. No calls, no decency, no license. Access
>> available
>> to anyone that can lie their way in. Yep....what a system.
>>
>>
> And someone can obtain a ham radio rig and go on the air with a bootleg
> call. Same difference.

I don't know about you, but unless I'm contesting, I usually look up the callsign. And plenty of others do too. So Mr. Pirate won't go undetected for long. Perhaps Echolink will be the same, perhaps not.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2471. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 01:40:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F515276.4070701@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75886

charlesb wrote:
> "Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> news:3F51461B.8000306@ix.netcom.com...
>
>>>
>>>No surprise there Mike. No calls, no decency, no license. Access
>>
> available
>
>>>to anyone that can lie their way in. Yep....what a system.
>>>
>>>
>>
>>And someone can obtain a ham radio rig and go on the air with a bootleg
>>call.
>>Same difference.
>>
>
>
> Hmmmm... Let's put on our thinking caps for a moment, and consider whether
> there is generally more access to ham rigs, or to Internet capable
> computers. Which one is easiest and cheapest for potential bootleggers to
> obtain access to?
>
> Same difference? I don't think so. Echolink is the best thing to happen
> to bootleggers - ever.
>
> If I were to go where freebander types hang out and leave an informative
> article about EchoLink, that would be an irresponsible act... It would be
> irresponsible for me to point out that vulnerability within the hobby, but
> not nearly so irresponsible as the programmer who created that vulnerability
> in the first place.
>
> In this day and age, amateurs are more, not less conscious of security
> issues. EchoLink is a big hole in our security, and most especially should
> never be utilized for anything even remotely related to emergency
> communications. As hams, what we have to bring to the table here is
> independent radio communications. The department of homeland security did
> not affiliate with the ARRL because of our ability to use the Internet.
>
> One basic of emergency communications is not to develop a dependence on the
> network that you are there to back up. Using the Internet as a central part
> of a Ham Radio network (of any type) is like having a plan to use the
> telephone to report outages in telephone service. The emergency plan works

> great - until there is an emergency.
>
> Add that to the hundreds, perhaps thousands of hams who instantly gave up on
> learning more about ham radio in order to upgrade upon discovering EchoLink,
> and you begin to understand whether EchoLink has had a positive or negative
> influence upon the hobby.
>
> Sure, lots of hams have enjoyed EchoLink... Lots of drivers would enjoy free
> six-packs of beer at highway tool-booths too, but that doesn't mean it is a
> responsible or intelligent thing to do.

And even though I have tried to look into Echolink with an open mind,
in the end, I just don't think of it as a ham type sport - except for
those that just want to talk. And I'm more into the hobby to build
things, contest, and try to stretch my radio legs - not just talk.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2472. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 01:43:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F51531E.4070909@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75887

Robert Casey wrote:
> WA8ULX wrote:
>
>>> REAL Amateur radio is accomplished by using radios and antennas, not
>>> computers and phone lines.
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> Interesting, my Link on ECHOLink uses Radio and ants.
>>
>>
> Yeah. And I know that if I use Echolink on my PC here in NJ USA to
> connect to a machine say in Romania, that my voice is being transmitted
> on some 2m or 440 freq over there. I just happen to be using a very long
> microphone cable..... I've had QSOs with hams in Japan who were mobile.
> Guys suprized to hear an American white trash voice on their local
> repeater. :-)

Another thing I've had trouble with on Echolink is the voice quality.
Everyone except the local guys sound terrible. Very difficult to understand.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2473. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 01:52:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F51552E.2050206@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75888

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:MMb4b.1651$id4.798@news01.roc.ny...
>
>>Hmm ... this makes twice now for me. Once VE7DGL had to get hold of me
>
> and
>
>>used Echo Link - and my HT fired up and I got the needed "heads up".
>
> Today,
>
>>I needed to get hold of Hatton, NI5Y, and he wasn't on the internet.
>
> Well,
>
>>I linked to his machine and he answered via his HT. It does work. There
>>were radios on one end in both instances. :)
>>
>>Or is DXCC the only thing that counts? I have little use for those folks.
>>I'm sure some are decent, but the one time I wanted to run a phone patch
>>from the US Naval Hospital on Guam and the DX boys thought phone patches
>>shouldn't be allowed on their day ... well ... as I said, I've little use
>>for 'em.
>>
>>
>>73 from Rochester, NY
>>Jim AA2QA
>
>
>
> While I personally am not really interested in Echolink, I think it is an
> interesting hybrid. I'm glad that someone worked out the methodology
> whether or not I ever make any use of it.

The methodology is really pretty simple, an internet version of a phone patch.

The ho-hum aspect as I see it is that allowing an HT to patch into the internet is analogous to simply using a telephone. Others may differ, thinking this is some high tech thing to add to the ham arsenal.

In fact, it seems to me that an application would be to allow cell phone users to call a number, patch into the net, and then speak to hams. And since people can bootleg a number so easily, I wouldn't be

surprised if this isn't already happening.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2474. Re: AOL pulls Jon Cunningham's web pages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 01:56:14 UTC
From: jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam
Message-ID: <9841241545.65byeles8888@pavillage.net>
Source record: 75889
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On 31 Aug 2003 01:41:31 GMT, Llgpt <llgpt@aol.com> wrote:
> >Subject: Re: AOL pulls Jon Cunningham's web pages
> >From: jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam (Jayne Nye)
> >Date: 8/30/2003 8:03 PM Central Daylight Time
> >Message-id: <9841241545.65byejon8888@pavillage.net>
> >
> >On Sat, 30 Aug 2003 18:28:02 -0400, Archduke Hiram Knickers
> ><funhorns3@yahoo.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> "Jayne Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
> >> news:9841241545.65byejon7373@pavillage.net...
> >> > On 30 Aug 2003 13:47:23 GMT, Soames123 <soames123@aol.com> wrote:
> >> > > - Who'se Jon Cunningham ??
> >> >
> >> > Jon Cunningham is ham radio operator K1TP, and he has had his 14.313
> >> > MHz web pages up for quite a long time at http://members.aol.com/jcunham.
> >> >
> >> > On them, he frequently put down Usenet radio posters as beneath contempt,
> >> > but he completely overlooked his own tendency of late to post what
> >> > many people would think of as porn or links to porn. I guess that AOL
> >> > decided to nuke the pages for that same reason.
> >>
> >> His page is back up on AOL as I type this.
> >> http://www.cafeshops.com/tshirtstop/141552
> >>
> >> (pfhbbbltttt!!!!!!!!!!)
> >
> >I was right. AOL *did* have a word with K1TP. From his web page at
> >the time of this posting (and I quote):
> >
> >"New Location of As The World Turns.....courtesy of the AOL
> >police ..." [location snipped]
> >
> >And Jon has moved so that he can continue to post his drek without
> >interference.
> >
> >So "pfhbbbltttt!!!!!!!!!!" right back at you, Numbnuts.
> >
> >Les, Dan and the other ignoramuses could of course be expected to
> >shoot from the hip and be wrong (as usual). They are sooooo
> >predictable.
>
> You are mistaken once again Christy, or whatever your name is today. When you

> said it was down, it wasn't. End of story. I "never" said it would be removed.
>
> Get your facts straight asshole.

When I said it was down, it was. The fact that Jon whined to AOL and
got some of his priveleges back doesn't change a thing. The original
post clearly stated "at the time of this posting" so that dipwads like
you couldn't try to spin things.

Get your facts straight asshole. Your lies don't fool anyone in this
news group.

2475. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 02:06:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F515867.400@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75890

> charlesb wrote:

<Some snippage>

>> In this day and age, amateurs are more, not less conscious of security
>> issues. EchoLink is a big hole in our security, and most especially
>> should
>> never be utilized for anything even remotely related to emergency
>> communications. As hams, what we have to bring to the table here is
>> independent radio communications. The department of homeland security did
>> not affiliate with the ARRL because of our ability to use the Internet.

Someone a while back had noted that Echolink would be great in an
emergency. I wonder how many people in the areas hit by the recent
blackout had an internet connection?

>> Add that to the hundreds, perhaps thousands of hams who instantly gave
>> up on learning more about ham radio in order to upgrade upon discovering
>> EchoLink, and you begin to understand whether EchoLink has had a positive or
>> negative influence upon the hobby.

An excellent point, Charles! Oh brave new world........

- Mike KB3EIA -

2476. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 02:32:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <_6d4b.8560$Om1.5657@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75891

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F4FB647.8080208@adelphia.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> > news:xnfcneeyarg.hkcvzky.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> >
> >>On Thu, 28 Aug 2003 02:20:07 GMT, Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>>Then explain reality TV, Dwight! 8^)
> >>>
> >
> >>> I shouldn't have to go back and point to some of the crazy things
> >>
> > people
> >
> >>>watched and did in years past. Remember the Village People, Kiss,
Disco,
> >>
> > the
> >
> >>>song Muskrat Love, houses filled with incense, chopper motorcycles, the
> >>
> > song
> >
> >>>My Ding-a-Ling, Elton John's sunglasses, and so on.
> >>
> >> No, I don't remember those thigs because neither I nor my family
> >> wasted our time or intellect energy on them.
> >
> >
> > Hey, what's wrong with chopper motorcycles...or hot rods, etc?
> >
> >
> >>>And Ham Radio is a recreation, not a vocation.
> >>
> >> Playing with radio equipment is serious business and should be
> >> regarded as such.
> >
> >
> > I agree...and
> > The same is true for auto enthusiasts...be it hot rods, antique cars,
> > motorcycles, etc. You need a license to participate.
>

> You mean a drivers license?

Yes.

> I was a motorcycle enthusiast for years
> before I had a license. And I need no license to put together a hotrod
> or antique car.

True...and you don't need a license to build a ham radio either.

The "operation" of either (hot rod, motorcycle, antique car
or ham radio) all require a license to operate.

> When I was a youngster, I drove a friend to the local
> drag strip so he could race his car, even though his license was
> suspended. After he got it back, I went back to being a passenger.

I can't say all racing requires a license, but most do. I too did some
drag racing in my youth and no one ever asked to see my
license...of course no one ever asked me to see my ham
license either :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2477. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 02:36:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9bd4b.8601$Om1.3803@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75892

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:Y6J3b.35406$Vx2.15476317@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:_ZH3b.108$EW1.14@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:OBx3b.35345$Vx2.15393974@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > > news:biltpj$auudh$18@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > > > Just even one more proof of what I mean. Attempting to control free
> > > speech
> > > > when a differing opinion occurs....
> > > > Why should they have exclusive control of the whole amateur
community
> > when
> > > > they only represent (roughly) a quarter of the population?
> > > >
> > > > You keep saying I should join, but why should I?? List specific
> > reasons,
> > > > backed by facts. Not vague generalities or
"big-brother/mafioso-like"
> > > > reasons? All it is, is a very expensive magazine subscription, so
> let's
> > > not
> > > > kid ourselves.
> > > >
> > >
> > > They are not trying to control free speech. Show your proof that they
> are
> > > doing so. They establish policies based on the input of their
> membership
> > as
> > > does any other organization. They then carry through on that policy.
> > > Naturally not every member agrees with it but if we had to have a
> > unanimous
> > > consensus nothing would ever get done. And they have no reason or
> > > obligation to pay any attention to the opinions of non-members.
> > >
> > > They do not have nor try to have exclusive control of the whole
amateur
> > > community. Show your proof that they do. They establish goals based
on

> > > what their membership wants. That is what any organization does.
Again
> > > they have no reason or obligation to establish their goals based on
the
> > > opinions of non-members.
> > >
> > > You seem to expect them to roll over and adopt YOUR opinion. That's
> > > unrealistic. Whether you join or not is your business of course. But
> > > unless you are a member, you have no right to expect to control their
> > > policies or for them to listen to your opinions and adopt your
opinions.
> > If
> > > you want to change them, join. If you aren't willing to join, don't
> > expect
> > > to change them. That's pretty simple.
> > >
> > > I know why I am a member. They can do things that I cannot.
> > > 1) Take the current BPL situation. They have the finances and
> facilities
> > > to do the research that I can't afford. That is but one of many
things.
> > > 2) Product tests/reviews. I can't afford to buy all the test
> equipment,
> > > every new radio, antenna, etc and run my own comparisons.
> > > ... and so on.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> > Dee,
> >
> > Well said!
> >
> > For all those that complain about ARRL, no one has effectively
> > started an alternative in all these years. I see ARRL as the best
> > bang for my buck on most matters of amateur issues. I departed from
> > ARRL position on the code issue and have been a director of
> > NCI because of that ONE issue. The point is, that NCI, while
> > a separate org from ARRL, is not trying to replace ARRL's
> > role in amateur issues EXCEPT on the code/nocode test issue...
> > and of late, there's less disparity there then 5 years ago.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> Although I do not agree with you on the code issue, I do commend you for
> going out and DOING something rather than sitting back and whining as so
> many are prone to do. Not only did you join an organization that
supported
> your point of view but you obviously became actively involved since you
are

> one of the directors. I would suspect, however, that you are still a
member
> of the ARRL even though you disagreed on one issue. i.e. You did not
expect
> the ARRL to be a single issue organization.

100% correct. Indeed, I am and have been a volunteer in the ARRL
field organization for several years now serving as a "local Gov't liaison"
on matters of local (i.e. country, city, town) ordinances and laws
which do or may impact hams.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

2478. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 02:55:32 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030830225532.13197.00000169@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 75893

>Another thing I've had trouble with on Echolink is the voice quality.
>Everyone except the local guys sound terrible. Very difficult to understand.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Thats strange, just got off Echolink thru my Link, to a freind in Texas. His
Audio sounded perfect as it always does

2479. Re: AMRAD comments on BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 03:10:41 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308301910.6a4f94fa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75894

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<0M94b.6920$EW1.3460@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_docu

This link might work better:

http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/retrieve.cgi?native_or_pdf=pdf&id_document=6514683575

2480. Re: AOL pulls Jon Cunningham's web pages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 03:10:52 UTC
From: Kurt <"No Email"@Nospam.comp>
Message-ID: <birovuprs0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75895
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jayne Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
news:9841241545.65byejon7373@pavillage.net...
On 30 Aug 2003 13:47:23 GMT, Soames123 <soames123@aol.com> wrote:
> - Who'se Jon Cunningham ??

Jon Cunningham is ham radio operator K1TP, and he has had his 14.313
MHz web pages up for quite a long time at http://members.aol.com/jcunham.

On them, he frequently put down Usenet radio posters as beneath contempt,
but he completely overlooked his own tendency of late to post what
many people would think of as porn or links to porn. I guess that AOL
decided to nuke the pages for that same reason.

Truly, pride goeth before a fall ...
.....

"Many" people, or just you?
Truly, twits abound.

2481. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 03:28:39 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830232839.08626.00000283@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 75898

In article <bip0il$tfj@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>I have never heard such whining...
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Of course you have. You can hear yourself talk, can't you?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2482. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 03:28:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830232840.08626.00000284@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 75899

In article <e79dbd9b.0308300952.614c3636@posting.google.com>, k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB) writes:

>Your rationale reminds me of the gun control crowd who would ban
>private ownership of handguns because some criminal used a handgun in
>a liquor store holdup. Rather than attack the perpetrators you want
>to ban the technology for all legitimate users. Welcome to Amerika!
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB

Hansl:

The gun control crowd want to ban handguns (and all other types of firearms, for that matter) because they realize that tens of millions of law-abiding gun owners serve as a very strong deterrent to violent crime, and thus make the average American less dependent on government for their basic security. Armed citizens effectively employ firearms to stop or prevent violent crime over two million times each year, yet the liberal media never reports this fact. The liberal, socialist Democrat ideology depends on our society being essentially broken and wholly dependent on government services, in order to assure the job security of liberal, socialist government bureaucrats, social workers, and most other highly-paid civil servants. They also know that an armed citizenry has the ability to resist government tyranny in the most effective manner possible -- with deadly force. They can't have that, and must abolish that concept any way they can in order to guarantee their own futures. The "technology" of firearms will always be available to criminals -- just take a close look at what is happening in the U.K., Australia, and anywhere else where civil disarmament has been achieved. Violent crime, including gun crime, is increasing, and non-violent property-based crime is off the charts.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2483. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 03:28:40 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830232840.08626.00000285@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 75901

In article <20030830201932.12300.00000187@mb-m20.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>AOL trouble. Apparently fixed now.

Which version of AOL are you using? 5.0 here. Just ordered a hot new computer, and will start it off with 8.0, then download the 9.0 upgrade. I'm one of the first 1,000 original AOL users, and just can't seem to break the habit.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2484. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 03:28:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830232841.08626.00000286@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 75896

In article <20030830122906.14837.00002632@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>test
>

GL IN TEST OM

73 de Larry, K3LT

2485. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 03:28:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830232841.08626.00000287@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 75900

In article <f45722ac.0308300418.112063b2@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Brian:
>>
>> As you were, Airman. My fault for not quoting it!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Thanks, Sarge.
>
>For a second there, I felt like I was an instrument of national policy again.
>
>bb

Brian:

Your welcome. Ah, yes, those were the days. As much as I've grown
to appreciate life outside of the Air Force, I have to admit that I do miss it.
But, odd as this may sound, if I had it to do over again, I think I'd
GO NAVY.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2486. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 03:28:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030830232842.08626.00000288@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 75897

In article <bip0ik$tfj@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>
>Know why he won't? He kept alluding to the fact that he was going to, or
>kept inspiring others to do it. So, I wrote. I wrote knowing that Riley
>would more than likely be the kind of person who probably doesn't appreciate
>the humor in my callsign, but also knowing that he upholds to the principles
>of a democracy. And, he did exactly that. He does not like my callsign.
>But, he doesn't believe it is for the FCC to govern such things.

Kim:

That is quite correct, it's nice to see you finally get something right. The
FCC should not be in the business of controlling which call signs any ham
can or cannot have. That is, and always should be, entirely up to the good
taste and judgment of the individual ham. In your case, you have
demonstrated neither good taste nor good judgment. That's why you're
doing the carpet dance.

>> > Throughout my adult life, I've been told that "perception is reality."
>> > While I would personally make some allowances for poor choices based
>> > on the immature judgment of younger people, Kim is certainly of an
>> > age and station in life where such poor judgment is much less likely
>> > to be excused. She is the only one who can make this controversy
>> > go away. Should she choose not to, she leaves herself open to the
>> > criticism of those of us who *are* offended and *do* object to her
>choice
>> > of a Vanity call sign.
>> >
>>
>> Once again, if the callsign is so offensive, it is the FCC to blame. Any
>> vanity callsign or even if it even was a sequentially assigned that is
>> deemed offensive is their fault. I should have the right to request ANY
>> callsign that is listed as "available" provided I have the initial right
>to
>> do so by licensure requirements/benefits. If the list is including some of
>> what you refer to as offensive, that is your problem, and the FCC's, not
>the
>> rest of us.

>It's not offensive, in any way.

It *is* offensive, Kim -- in virtually EVERY way.

>Larry just doesn't like a woman who can
>think for herself,

That's the only kind of woman I *do* like, Kim. However, you have not demonstrated much of what I'd call "thinking" ability in your choice of a call sign.

>ergo he doesn't like anything about me.

The pity of this whole thing is, Kim, that there just may be some things about you that I do like. However, I can't get past the call sign, or your "in your face" attitude toward it.

>That's all it is. He has no problem at all with my callsign.

Earth to Kim, come in Kim! Yes, Kimmie dear, I DO have a problem with your callsign!

>How could anyone as
>offensive, crude, rude and belligerent as him have a problem with this
>callsign?

Well, you're obviously out of arguments, since the name calling is being dragged out again. You lose!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2487. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 03:41:30 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0308301941.4f4b7659@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75902

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote

>
> Just for fun: Try to "Google" "freeband echolink". Lots of interesting
> links there.
>

Just for fun, I did. Results below. Maybe I used the wrong Google?

73, Hans

Your search - "freeband echolink" - did not match any documents.

Suggestions:
- Make sure all words are spelled correctly.
- Try different keywords.
- Try more general keywords.
Also, you can try Google Answers for expert help with your search.

2488. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 05:02:39 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308302102.41afcb36@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75903

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030830201932.12300.00000187@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> In article <3F510AFC.5010100@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
> >N2EY wrote:
> >> test
> >
> > Lots of QRM, Jim! QRP computer?
>
> AOL trouble. Apparently fixed now.

AOL can't be fixed . . .

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2489. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 05:12:08 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308302112.3349522e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75904

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<qe74b.5791$EW1.5339@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0308301046.84d1dee@posting.google.com...
> > "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:<1ee1b.105565$RG6.94042@news02.roc.ny>...
> > > I do remember folks back when using "the handle here is ...".
> > > My question is did that start with CB or did CB pick it up from amateurs
> > > originally? It seems (at least back then) more like the Southern "y'all
> > > come again real soon". Sort of folksy and warm if grammatically
> incorrect.
> > >
> > The term "handle" goes back to before ham radio. It was commonly use
> > by hams as an alternative to "name" or "nickname", because often a
> > "handle" was not related to the person's actual name ("Slim", "The
> > Duke", etc.) Just a bit of jargon.
> >
> > And originally the cb term meant the same thing. But over time,
> > "handle" in cb lingo came to mean something quite different from a
> > person's name or nickname.
> > "Handles" were used instead of callsigns as a way of concealing a cb
> > user's true identity, both from others and the FCC. Thus, they became
> > the antithesis of callsigns.
> >
> > And that's why the term has dropped from amateur usage.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Thanks for setting the record straight Jim. What these CBers can't get
> straight is that Amateur Radio pre-dates CB radio by many decades. So most,
> to all, of what CB does is a copy of Ham radio, which the CBers then
> proceeded to screw up.
>
> Just another example of how CB has, and is ruining ham radio.

Depends on which ham radio. I don't run into very many of 'em around 14.020.

> Dan/W4NTI

w3(c)RV

2490. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 05:45:24 UTC
From: "paulfriedman@comcast.net" <p.paulfriedman@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <UXf4b.137608$2x.40026@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 75905

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308300448.3bb14b5@posting.google.com...
> "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<2459ee62a6f0efa423239c8e05539568.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote
> >
> > > Paul, since the only apparent privelege difference in the two proposed
> > > license classes is 50W, and you could operate any amateur frequency in
> > > any mode, why would that deter you from the ARS?
> >
> > Brian "gets it" !!!!
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> Hans, its quite easy to "get it" when the subject makes sense. Its
> all the other nonsensical stuff on here that I don't get.
>
> Paul gave an opinion that I didn't understand, so I asked a question.
>
> Perhaps Paul requires "Extra right out of the box" and cannot be
> bothered with "lesser" licenses. Until he replies, we'll never know.

I missed your first message asking "why would that deter you from the ARS?"
Sorry.

Being new to all this (licensed in October of 2001), it is easy for me to
remember my thoughts and feelings prior to being licensed. Here is why it
would have deterred me:
1) Seeing "real" hams being able to run 1500 watts while only being able
to run 50 watts. I would have KNOWN (it doesn't have to be true, I still
would have KNOWN it) that I never would have been able to make a contact.
2) Being treated as a second class citizen -- the Rookie League is not a
fun place to be
3) Basic congenital problem with Time-In-Grade approach. (Please note, I
would not have had a problem with serious theory/operating practice tests as
opposed to the actual Elements 2,3, and 4. I won't have passed them all, I
am sure, but I would not have had a problem with approach.).

Of the above, number 3 would have been the most important to me, I think.
Now that I am licensed, I seldom put out more than 75 watts. Yes, I have an
amplifier, but I checked my log and see that I haven't had it on since early
June (honest). So, experience has showed me how silly 1) above is -- that
does not, however, change how I felt in my pre-licensed days.

I am sure that I am an odd duck -- I never even heard a QSO until after I was licensed (the purest Extra Lite in captivity).

I can understand and accept people thinking that anyone as ignorant as me should not have been granted full privileges. At no time did I say that I DESERVED such privileges -- only that the suggested two class system would have deterred me from entering this great hobby -- perhaps rightly so.

As a purely practical matter, if an approach similar to yours came into existence, I would suggest a 100 watt limit rather than 50 watts. Given that the vast majority of modern transceivers run 100 watts output, enforcing a 50 watt maximum would be problematical at best.

73

Paul AB0SI

2491. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 05:50:44 UTC
From: Tin Monkey <NoSpam@NoSpam.com>
Message-ID: <bis2bmgrv0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75906

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:L4c4b.35589$Vx2.15750925@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:MMb4b.1651$id4.798@news01.roc.ny...
> Hmm ... this makes twice now for me. Once VE7DGL had to get hold of me
and
> used Echo Link - and my HT fired up and I got the needed "heads up".
Today,
> I needed to get hold of Hatton, NI5Y, and he wasn't on the internet.
Well,
> I linked to his machine and he answered via his HT. It does work. There
> were radios on one end in both instances. :)
>
> Or is DXCC the only thing that counts? I have little use for those folks.
> I'm sure some are decent, but the one time I wanted to run a phone patch
> from the US Naval Hospital on Guam and the DX boys thought phone patches
> shouldn't be allowed on their day ... well ... as I said, I've little use
> for 'em.
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

While I personally am not really interested in Echolink, I think it is an
interesting hybrid. I'm glad that someone worked out the methodology
whether or not I ever make any use of it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Yes, it is an interesting mode, but only one of passing amusement.
When inclement WX hits and the phone lines are down it will be back to Ham
Radio the way it always has been. Good old radios and antennas....and for
those with preplannning a Marine battery or two as well.

2492. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 05:58:16 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bis2pohhm0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 75907

Brian Kelly wrote:

> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030830201932.12300.00000187@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> > In article <3F510AFC.5010100@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >N2EY wrote:
> > >> test
> > >
> > > Lots of QRM, Jim! QRP computer?
> >
> > AOL trouble. Apparently fixed now.
>
> AOL can't be fixed . . .
>

Earlier today I stumbled across what might just be an attractive alternative.....

http://www.intergate.com/startpage/

Dick

2493. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 06:04:40 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bis35o$i2u$0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 75908

Brian Kelly wrote:

> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030830201932.12300.00000187@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> > In article <3F510AFC.5010100@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >N2EY wrote:
> > >> test
> > >
> > > Lots of QRM, Jim! QRP computer?
> >
> > AOL trouble. Apparently fixed now.
>
> AOL can't be fixed . . .

Try this one.....

http://www.intergate.com/index.shtml

2494. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 08:29:29 UTC
From: Rodney <NoHamCall@NoSpam.com>
Message-ID: <bisblb$22h$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75909

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030830225532.13197.00000169@mb-m15.aol.com...
>Another thing I've had trouble with on Echolink is the voice quality.
>Everyone except the local guys sound terrible. Very difficult to
understand.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Thats strange, just got off Echolink thru my Link, to a freind in Texas.
His
Audio sounded perfect as it always does

Yes...but you still used your computer and the land lines.....

I guess it beats using the HF rig and a tuner.....easier this way.
Kinda like CB, eh?

2495. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 10:01:55 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <nlj4b.3000$ju.588@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75910

"K0HB" <k0hb@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:e79dbd9b.0308301941.4f4b7659@posting.google.com...
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Just for fun: Try to "Google" "freeband echolink". Lots of interesting
> > links there.
> >
>
> Just for fun, I did. Results below. Maybe I used the wrong Google?
>

Probably just don't know how to use it. My ten-year old son just managed it
just fine. Perhaps you should try again.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2496. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 10:35:54 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <eck4b.3225$Z44.615@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75911

"K0HB" <k0hb@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:e79dbd9b.0308301941.4f4b7659@posting.google.com...
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Just for fun: Try to "Google" "freeband echolink". Lots of interesting
> > links there.
> >
>
> Just for fun, I did. Results below. Maybe I used the wrong Google?

I just managed to duplicate your results. Hans. I had to leave the quotes
around the two words, in order to get it to mess up.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2497. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 10:51:43 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <2rk4b.3226$S64.1905@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75912

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:eck4b.3225$Z44.615@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "K0HB" <k0hb@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:e79dbd9b.0308301941.4f4b7659@posting.google.com...
> > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > Just for fun: Try to "Google" "freeband echolink". Lots of
interesting
> > > links there.
> > >
> >
> > Just for fun, I did. Results below. Maybe I used the wrong Google?

Hans, you appear to disagree with my post about echolink, but you do not offer any counterpoint to the arguements I made... Instead, you seem to be going into "insult and mindless nit-pick" mode. You decided to Troll.

In the future, when you respond to rational, reasonable arguement with a kindergarten level response, I will ignore you, and just figure that you have no arguement. That's pretty well the case here, isn't it Hans?

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2498. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 12:10:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <PAl4b.35613$Vx2.15818197@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75913

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bis35o$i2u$0@208.206.142.70...
>
>
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030830201932.12300.00000187@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> > > In article <3F510AFC.5010100@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >N2EY wrote:
> > > >> test
> > > >
> > > > Lots of QRM, Jim! QRP computer?
> > >
> > > AOL trouble. Apparently fixed now.
> >
> > AOL can't be fixed . . .
>
> Try this one.....
>
>
>
> http://www.intergate.com/index.shtml
>

I tried AOHELL for awhile due to one of their promotions. It wasn't that
great. However, the real problem came when I discontinued service. It took
6 MONTHS to get the billing stopped and corrected after I canceled.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2499. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 13:06:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0308310506.29055350@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75914

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0308301046.84d1dee@posting.google.com>...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<1ee1b.105565$RG6.94042@news02.roc.ny>...
> > I do remember folks back when using "the handle here is ...".
> > My question is did that start with CB or did CB pick it up from amateurs
> > originally? It seems (at least back then) more like the Southern "y'all
> > come again real soon". Sort of folksy and warm if grammatically incorrect.
> >
> The term "handle" goes back to before ham radio. It was commonly use
> by hams as an alternative to "name" or "nickname", because often a
> "handle" was not related to the person's actual name ("Slim", "The
> Duke", etc.) Just a bit of jargon.
>
> And originally the cb term meant the same thing. But over time,
> "handle" in cb lingo came to mean something quite different from a
> person's name or nickname.
> "Handles" were used instead of callsigns as a way of concealing a cb
> user's true identity, both from others and the FCC. Thus, they became
> the antithesis of callsigns.
>
> And that's why the term has dropped from amateur usage.

Not entirely. I picked up the habit of using "handle is Brian" back
when a number of spot 10M AM freqs were functionally the equivalent of
today's neighborhood 2M FM reperaters and I still use it. It's just
ingrained reflex from 'Wayback days and I've never gotten any
"feedback" about it.

As you point out the big difference between ham usage of the term
"handle" and CB usage of the term is in the handle itself. "My handle
is Brian" is obviously my legitimate given name. "The handle here is
Road Snake" is another whole pure CB ballgame.

In defense of the CBers ever since the FCC dropped CB licensing CBers
they don't get FCC callsigns so they can't use 'em like we can ours
even if they wanted to. 'Cept in the case of us 'Wayback licensed
CBers who do have FCC issued callsigns. On those very rare occasions
when I get on 27 Mhz you'd hear "This is KLK 1937, the handle is
Brian" . . . Works fine.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

2500. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 13:19:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831091944.23171.00000402@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 75919

In article <BB72E3D6.24CF9%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>I do agree there is a problem that must be addressed. But, sadly, I >suspect the root of the problem lies mainly outside the school system.

Agreed!

>Television jumps immediately to mind. Television has fed children an almost >continuous message over the last few decades that smart kids are nerds and >dumb kids are cool. With that in mind, there is little reason for kids to >make any real effort in school.

Agreed, and there's more. In general, commercial boradcast TV portrays the following:

- All sorts of conflicts can be resolved, and goals reached, in less than an hour or half-hour.

- 'Dad' is usually loud, outspoken, immature, mistaken, and exercises amazingly poor judgement. But he's lovable and always forgiven. 'Mom' is quieter, stronger, the solver of problems and 'forgiver' of 'Dad'. The 'kids' (when present) are a mixture of the two.

- People of all kinds live in spacious, clean, well-organized homes, yet rarely does anyone need to actually DO anything to keep them that way, or pay for them.

- (This is my favorite) NOBODY *on* TV spends much time actually *watching* TV. Particularly children.

--

One real problem with TV is that it is so totally passive. It requires very little besides one's attention.

>And, since Americans seem to prefer the >television industry's freedoms over better educated children, the problem >may never go away.

Driven by the almighty dollar. I recall that when we were kids, there were all sorts of things that would not be shown on TV. Some of it was ludicrous - we were supposed to believe that Rob and Laura Petrie slept in twin beds? But a lot was geared to make TV G-rated.

Cable TV broke those taboos in the '70s by arguing that since cable was not broadcast and you paid to have it in your home, you retained control. But then broadcast TV copied cable as much as possible to remain "competitive".

Was all this "smart' or "dumb"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2501. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 13:19:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831091945.23171.00000403@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 75915

In article <3F4F6AB2.50500@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>My take is that the child has to be raised with an expectation that he
>or she will indeed do well in school. Many are not raised this way.
>Appreciation for the sciences, appreciation for learning and hard work,
>all that good stuff.

Which starts at home.

> Diminishing emphasis on "self-esteem" would be a great idea.
>Self-esteem should be something earned. One of the strangest things I
>have seen lately is the bizzare students who have a great sense of
>self-esteem with absolutely no reason for it. No accomplishments, no
>education, nothing but feeling really, really good about themselves.

The problem is that the terms "self-esteem" has obtained political correctness
while "self-confidence" is sadly neglected. Yet what kids need is the latter.
And there's only one way to get real self-confidence: by doing things.
>
> We also have to remember that Students are individuals and mature at
>different rates. I know many students who seemd to undergo a miraculous
>change at some point in high school, going from slacker to achiever
>almost overnight. My own kid underwent such a change right after he got
>a steady girlfriend, his grades improved, and his whole H.S. experience
>changed right around, because he started to get a future looking
>perspective.

Agreed, and there's even more: Different people mature at different rates in
diferent areas.
>
> Oh, yeah. Get the kids thinking about something other than what's
>happening 5 minutes from now.
>
Not just the kids.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2502. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 13:19:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831091946.23171.00000404@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 75918

In article <1062223849.210980@newshost03.voicenet.com>, "mezmerized cows" <moocowmoo71@yahoo.com> writes:

>Ham radio started going into the toilet shortly
>after Dick Bash published his infamous "study
>guides".

And FCC declined to go after him for what was clearly an illegal activity.

>Later after the ARRL went crying to the
>FCC to publish the question pools

When did that happen? Reference please. Publishing the question pools became necessary to create the VEC system.

>(to put Dick Bash
>out of business because *his books* were out-selling
>the ARRL study guides 10 to 1 at hamfests and mail
>order) it sealed the "initial cycle of dumbing down" for
>Amateur Radio - and we are now where we are today
>as a DIRECT result of the same.

When did that happen? Reference please.

>All because *one ham* in Alaska managed to singlehandedly
>'step on the proverbial toes of a publishing company' in Newington
>Conn. and in their response, they decided to not only throw out
>the baby with the bathwater, but also rip the tub out of the wall
>and toss it out the 2nd story window...

Alaska?

What was this ham's call?

>These are the true facts of the matter.

References?

The facts that I have seen documented are these:

1) In the 1970s, Mr. Bash gathered information by asking people who had just taken ham exams to tell him what they remembered. By doing this over time and with many people, he was able to reconstruct a close facsimile the actual then-current FCC exams without ever seeing them or copying them.

2) FCC was aware of Bash's activities and methods but chose, wt the highest levels, not to prosecute him.

3) Some prospective hams bought "Bash books" because they perceived it to be an easier way to pass the written tests.

4) In the early 1980s, (about a decade after the appearance of the first Bash books) FCC created the VEC and QPC systems, and turned over testing for amateur licenses to them. This was done primarily to save FCC money and time, because they could get volunteer hams to do work previously done by paid FCC personnel.

5) The VE fees collected go to pay for expenses (postage, duplication, facility rental, etc.).

73 de Jim, N2EY

2503. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 13:19:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831091947.23171.00000406@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 75916

In article <20030830232840.08626.00000285@mb-m27.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20030830201932.12300.00000187@mb-m20.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>AOL trouble. Apparently fixed now.
>
>Which version of AOL are you using? 5.0 here.

7.0 here. I really liked 6.0 but it is not friendly with the network environment here (Win95 machine and WinXP machine networked through a crossover cable) so it was 7.0 to get things working.

The problem was not in my computer, because other screen names worked perfectly and only one of my 3 screen names had the problem.

All fixed now, tnx AOL.

>Just ordered a hot
>new computer, and will start it off with 8.0, then download the 9.0
>upgrade.

How hot?

>I'm one of the first 1,000 original AOL users, and just can't
>seem to break the habit.

Exactly what AOL counts on. Can't blame 'em, it's sound marketing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2504. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 13:19:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831091947.23171.00000405@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 75917

In article <BB72DF8E.24CF7%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>Remember the Village People, Kiss, Disco, the
>song Muskrat Love, houses filled with incense, chopper motorcycles, the song
>My Ding-a-Ling, Elton John's sunglasses, and so on.

Dave Barry's Book of Bad Songs comes to mind....

>> Actually, I don't think that people ae dumbed down
>> compared to whatever mythical time that they were
>> "smart".

There are many different kinds of intelligence. And education. For me, the fundamental questions is something like: Is the person/activity/education/institution productive or destructive? (IOW, does it help people or hurt them?)

> I agree. Every generation has had it's moments - both good and bad.

And the term "generation" is deceiving. At the same time the above sillinesses were commonplace, others of the same "generation" were doing great things.

>> BUT! the individual tests can be "smartened" or
>> "dumbed". All that is up to us. We decide.

To a certain extent. Nobody has yet come up with a way to convince FCC to go back to doing the testing themselves. In fact, all suggestions to improve the writtens were rejected by FCC back in 1999.

We can submit more and more questions to FCC for the question pools, but FCC retains the right to dump those it doesn't like.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2505. Re: 30 Steps for all New Hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 14:19:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831101948.25815.00002558@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 75920

In article <d22b54c3.0308310506.29055350@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> And originally the cb term meant the same thing. But over time,
>> "handle" in cb lingo came to mean something quite different from a
>> person's name or nickname.
>> "Handles" were used instead of callsigns as a way of concealing a cb
>> user's true identity, both from others and the FCC. Thus, they became
>> the antithesis of callsigns.
>>
>> And that's why the term has dropped from amateur usage.
>
>Not entirely.

Pretty much, though.

>I picked up the habit of using "handle is Brian" back
>when a number of spot 10M AM freqs were functionally the equivalent of
>today's neighborhood 2M FM reperaters and I still use it. It's just
>ingrained reflex from 'Wayback days and I've never gotten any
>"feedback" about it.

Because you don;t use it in an attempt to conceal your identity.
>
>As you point out the big difference between ham usage of the term
>"handle" and CB usage of the term is in the handle itself. "My handle
>is Brian" is obviously my legitimate given name. "The handle here is
>Road Snake" is another whole pure CB ballgame.

10-4
>
>In defense of the CBers ever since the FCC dropped CB licensing CBers
>they don't get FCC callsigns so they can't use 'em like we can ours
>even if they wanted to.

Which FCC did because the cb users were not using callsigns for the most part anyway, long before the rules changed. "Handles" rather than callsigns were common with a significant part of the cb crowd around here well before 1970.

>'Cept in the case of us 'Wayback licensed
>CBers who do have FCC issued callsigns. On those very rare occasions
>when I get on 27 Mhz you'd hear "This is KLK 1937, the handle is
>Brian" . . . Works fine.

Ayup.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

2506. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 14:41:48 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bit1cl$nmb@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75921

"K0HB" <k0hb@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:e79dbd9b.0308301941.4f4b7659@posting.google.com...
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote
>
> >
> > Just for fun: Try to "Google" "freeband echolink". Lots of interesting
> > links there.
> >
>
> Just for fun, I did. Results below. Maybe I used the wrong Google?
>
> 73, Hans
>
>
>
> Your search - "freeband echolink" - did not match any documents.
>
> Suggestions:
> - Make sure all words are spelled correctly.
> - Try different keywords.
> - Try more general keywords.
> Also, you can try Google Answers for expert help with your search.

Hans:

You enclosed your search criteria with quotation marks. If you'll conduct a
search without the quotation marks, the following results are had (HTML
encoding removed):

Ham Radio Forum :: View topic - Siltronix 1011d
... than a hidden attempt to market a radio for 11 meter"freeband" users and
...
www.hamforum.com/viewtopic.php?t=327 - 22k - Cached - Similar pages

Ham Radio Forum :: View topic - power stick
... low SWR for regular legal 40 channel and the "freeband" channels as
they ...
www.hamforum.com/viewtopic.php?t=338 - 24k - Cached - Similar pages
[More results from www.hamforum.com]

MORE
... I personally know hams who still prefer to freeband with their Rangers
... by the art
of keyboards, the internet, USB and Ethernet connections, Echolink, IRLP,
and ...
w5htw.home.att.net/HAM_RADIO_TODAY/ COMMENTS/MORE/more.html - 55k - Cached -

Similar pages

eHam.net Articles
... The whole CB/Freeband fight is just prejudice. It's just the same as ebonics. ... I even
thought of starting a CW net on Echolink for codeless Techs to operate. ...
www.eham.net/articles/4591 - 101k - Cached - Similar pages

eHam.net Articles
... about Iraq after we had already attacked!) Check out the article on "let's let unlicensed
folks use Echolink" here on ... No freeband like guys with no code techs. ...
www.eham.net/articles/4854 - 101k - Cached - Similar pages
[More results from www.eham.net]

In order to show you the most relevant results, we have omitted some entries very similar to the 5 already displayed.
If you like, you can repeat the search with the omitted results included.

2507. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 14:45:17 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bit1j5$40q@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75922

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:2rk4b.3226$S64.1905@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
> news:eck4b.3225$Z44.615@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "K0HB" <k0hb@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:e79dbd9b.0308301941.4f4b7659@posting.google.com...
> > > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote
> > >
> > > >
> > > > Just for fun: Try to "Google" "freeband echolink". Lots of
> interesting
> > > > links there.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Just for fun, I did. Results below. Maybe I used the wrong Google?
>
> Hans, you appear to disagree with my post about echolink, but you do not
> offer any counterpoint to the arguements I made... Instead, you seem to be
> going into "insult and mindless nit-pick" mode. You decided to Troll.
>
> In the future, when you respond to rational, reasonable arguement with a
> kindergarten level response, I will ignore you, and just figure that you
> have no arguement. That's pretty well the case here, isn't it Hans?
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>

Good grief, Charles. All Hans did was tell you that he tried a search and posted the results he got. If you can extrapolate a disagreement from the post that Hans submitted, I suggest to you that you were dearly searching for one...

Kim W5TIT

2508. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 15:20:39 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bit3lg$9s2@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75923

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030831091944.23171.00000402@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <BB72E3D6.24CF9%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:
>
> . . . [snipped for length]
> Cable TV broke those taboos in the '70s by arguing that since cable was
not
> broadcast and you paid to have it in your home, you retained control. But
then
> broadcast TV copied cable as much as possible to remain "competitive".
>
> Was all this "smart' or "dumb"?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Smart or dumb. Likely as not, that cannot be answered so succinctly. I think to some degree the type of programming available today far exceeds what is needed. For example, how much reality TV do we really "need"? BUT, the primary responsibility for what happens in the home is still the family--right?

For the politics of it all, I like that, at least so far (and that comment belies another discussion altogether) we live in a country where "anything" goes. But with that comes the responsibility of family and, beyond that, community. I think society in a transitional phase, where everyone is beginning to realize that we all have a responsibility to help see that our youth are raised with good attitudes, strong independence, and a willingness to recognize and overcome challenges, rather than to succumb to them. In the home, in schools, and in our civic and religious organizations, we all come together and decide--collectively--how best to do that. Of course, this isn't as obvious as it seems, but I think it happens by "osmosis."

It always makes me nervous when we start disliking the media around us enough to support, indeed call for, its censorship--in any form or another. I'd rather have the capability to decide for myself, my family, and my community, what is OK and what we need to use to learn from.

What was acceptable yesteryear is the norm today and, to some degree, that is OK. I shudder to think that women would be put back into a time when they weren't allowed the commonality with men as they are today. And, after all, the media helped aid in the progress for women. I shudder to think of a time when Ozzie and Harriet (parents who were so blind they couldn't see their children behind their backs) were considered the norm for family life.

Today, we deal with each other on real levels and parents recognize that--darn it all--kids for the most part are going to be tempted to the unthinkable. We don't need TV to teach us that, it is a reality.

For an extreme, take the example of the movie (if we can call it that) "Jackass." I never heard of this MTV show until the movie came out. While I was horrified to see some of the things this crew of folk get themselves into; it seems that it's hard to turn off or "put down." I like that this is available--politically speaking--and, it would be completely forbidden in my home if I'd had small children. To know that it's there and to know that some youth may be influenced to believe that things like that are OK, is the tool by which we learn to teach. MTV did not make people like that--they are out there. Without the exposure of the show, we'd never know it, right? It's always hard to debate in print--but hopefully you'll get what it is I'm trying to interpret.

Smart or dumb. Both. But it's all about capability to me. I like flexibility. I would not want the alternative: someone or something making the decisions as to smart or dumb.

Kim W5TIT

2509. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 15:31:07 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831113107.07600.00000191@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 75924

>Yes...but you still used your computer and the land lines.....
>

And I also used an IC-706 with a Vertical Ant, and a Alinco DJ541 it also has an Antenna.

2510. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 15:31:47 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831113147.07600.00000192@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 75925

```
>.easier this way.
>Kinda like CB, eh?
>

No where near to CB
```

2511. OT: Trojan Help

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 15:46:24 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F52183B.9BDA4F7B@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 75926
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Computer Guys:
I have an obvious trojan on my system.
Win98. All the latest security updates.
Even when my system is "desktop" with all inet stuff off,
it keeps pinging my DSL connection about once a second.
The latest Norton update,
Ad-Aware 6, Trojan scan etc. don't find it.
Nothing unusual in my RUN folders in the registry.
Nothing unusual in the "alt-ctl-del" window.

Is there a utility somewhere that can show me what
the heck program is running this ping, so I can kill it??
Please reply off the list if you can help.
Thanks, Dave S.

2512. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 16:04:21 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bit67d$gal@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75928

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030831091947.23171.00000405@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <BB72DF8E.24CF7%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >Remember the Village People, Kiss, Disco, the
> >song Muskrat Love, houses filled with incense, chopper motorcycles, the
song
> >My Ding-a-Ling, Elton John's sunglasses, and so on.
>
> Dave Barry's Book of Bad Songs comes to mind....
>
> >> Actually, I don't think that people ae dumbed down
> >> compared to whatever mythical time that they were
> >> "smart".
>

One of my favorite songs when I was a teen-ager is Pleasant Valley Sunday:

The local rock group down the street
Is trying hard to learn their song
Seranade the weekend squire, who just came out to mow his lawn

Another Pleasant Valley Sunday
Charcoal burning everywhere
Rows of houses that are all the same
And no one seems to care

See Mrs. Gray she's proud today because her roses are in bloom
Mr. Green he's so serene, He's got a t.v. in every room

Another Pleasant Valley Sunday
Here in status symbol land
Mothers complain about how hard life is
And the kids just don't understand

Creature comfort goals
They only numb my soul and make it hard for me to see
My thoughts all seem to stray, to places far away
I need a change of scenery

Ta Ta Ta...

Another Pleasant Valley Sunday
Charcoal burning everywhere
Another Pleasant Valley Sunday
Here in status symbol land

Another Pleasant Valley Sunday

That song was a completely anti-social, anti-success song, according to my parents, grandparents, etc. Yet, quite prophetic when looking back now.

Kim W5TIT

2513. Re: OT: Trojan Help

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 16:04:45 UTC
From: Edward Knobloch <e.knobloch@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <3F521C9C.5020806@verizon.net>
Source record: 75927

Hi, Dave

I would install Zone Alarm first. The upper right of the Zone Alarm
control panel shows which programs are actively connected
to the communications port. With Zone alarm, you can set
the permissions for each of the programs that try to access the net.

Also, install "Spy Bot Search and Destroy",
I found it did a much better job than Ad-Aware in finding
spyware that was causing instability on my system.

Some of the trojans out there will disable Norton
anti-virus if the trojan is on your machine before
you got the Norton update for that particular trojan.
I would install Avg Free anti-virus,
from Grisoft.com, and run its anti-virus search.
(On my machine, it takes about 20 minutes, vs. 2 hours
for a Norton anti-virus search.) Sometimes, it's
better to have a "brand X" anti-Virus available,
since the bad guys won't bother trying to defeat it.

73,
Ed k4pf

David Stinson wrote:
> Computer Guys:
> I have an obvious trojan on my system.
> Win98. All the latest security updates.
> Even when my system is "desktop" with all inet stuff off,
> it keeps pinging my DSL connection about once a second.
> The latest Norton update,
> Ad-Aware 6, Trojan scan etc. don't find it.
> Nothing unusual in my RUN folders in the registry.
> Nothing unusual in the "alt-ctl-del" window.
>
> Is there a utility somewhere that can show me what
> the heck program is running this ping, so I can kill it??
> Please reply off the list if you can help.
> Thanks, Dave S.

2514. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 16:06:02 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bit6ai$5fj@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75929

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030831091947.23171.00000406@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <20030830232840.08626.00000285@mb-m27.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >In article <20030830201932.12300.00000187@mb-m20.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >(N2EY)
> >writes:
> >
> >>AOL trouble. Apparently fixed now.
> >
> >Which version of AOL are you using? 5.0 here.
>
> 7.0 here. I really liked 6.0 but it is not friendly with the network
> environment here (Win95 machine and WinXP machine networked through a
crossover
> cable) so it was 7.0 to get things working.
>
> The problem was not in my computer, because other screen names worked
perfectly
> and only one of my 3 screen names had the problem.
>
> All fixed now, tnx AOL.
>
> >Just ordered a hot
> >new computer, and will start it off with 8.0, then download the 9.0
> >upgrade.
>
> How hot?
>
> >I'm one of the first 1,000 original AOL users, and just can't
> >seem to break the habit.
>
> Exactly what AOL counts on. Can't blame 'em, it's sound marketing.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Sound marketing would be someone finding a use for all the junk mail AOL has created over the past couple of decades... Maybe like softening the CDs of today and making candy dishes out of them?

Kim W5TIT

2515. More Classic Wisdom from Kim, W5TIT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 16:10:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030831121047.12300.00000204@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 75930

Just another day on the newsgroup, and Kim offers up her usual dose of succinct, logically correct, and convincing repartee:

> DICK, you're confused.

Uh, confusion would be an improvement.

Kim W5TIT ;)

I have never heard such whining...

Kim W5TIT

No. As usual, you read wrong. I said that I would not be responding *unless* I saw something intellectual and logical from you. So, uh, you would agree then that there's been nothing intellectual or logical from you. Good. We both agree on that. I was just checking.

Kim W5TIT

:-) I 'spose Larry thinks everyone has the same amount of time to waste as he...

Kim W5TIT

Not at all, Larry. Ya jealous?

Kim W5TIT

ROFLMAO!! Ladies and gents, there's some intellect and logic fer ya...

Gads, Larry. You're getting more and more desperate. Tell ya what, I'll quit responding to your posts *until* I see something logical and intellectual. Go ahead, make my day...

Kim W5TIT

Actually, that last one was one of her better efforts. The "Dirty Harry" quote was a particularly refreshing change in her usually dull rhetoric, or does she just think that she has a pair of "44 Magnums?"

73 de Larry, K3LT

2516. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 16:21:12 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <Yfp4b.3019$_Y.2360@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 75931

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bit1j5$40q@library1.airnews.net...
>
> Good grief, Charles. All Hans did was tell you that he tried a search and
> posted the results he got. If you can extrapolate a disagreement from the
> post that Hans submitted, I suggest to you that you were dearly searching
> for one...
>
> Kim W5TIT

Yes, it's true. I have come to know Hans over the years.

Charles, N5PVL

2517. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 16:42:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308310842.7b52b33f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75932

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030830232841.08626.00000287@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0308300418.112063b2@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> Brian:
> >>
> >> As you were, Airman. My fault for not quoting it!
> >>
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >Thanks, Sarge.
> >
> >For a second there, I felt like I was an instrument of national policy again.
> >
> >bb
>
> Brian:
>
> Your welcome. Ah, yes, those were the days. As much as I've grown
> to appreciate life outside of the Air Force, I have to admit that I do miss it.
> But, odd as this may sound, if I had it to do over again, I think I'd
> GO NAVY.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, my 1st and 5th duty assignemnts were Army, and my 6th was Navy.
And the Meteorology Tech schools were all four services combined.

Not much play in school from the Army, however, as part of the 1947
agreement when we took away their airplanes was that the USAF would
continue providing wx support. Then the Army discovered the
helicopter and that started the mission creep. Thirty percent of AF
weather personnel are assigned to the Army.

And during my turn in the barrel, I thanked my lucky stars I was Air
Force. The USN was better to their people than the Army, but not
much.

2518. Re: OT: Trojan Help

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 17:09:35 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bita4fmka0@208.206.142.88>
Source record: 75933
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

David Stinson wrote:

> Computer Guys:
> I have an obvious trojan on my system.
> Win98. All the latest security updates.
> Even when my system is "desktop" with all inet stuff off,
> it keeps pinging my DSL connection about once a second.
> The latest Norton update,
> Ad-Aware 6, Trojan scan etc. don't find it.
> Nothing unusual in my RUN folders in the registry.
> Nothing unusual in the "alt-ctl-del" window.
>
> Is there a utility somewhere that can show me what
> the heck program is running this ping, so I can kill it??
> Please reply off the list if you can help.
> Thanks, Dave S.

Dave you might try what I did last week to rid my system of Lovesan/Blaster..

go to (www.mcafee.com) and download "Stinger" from the upper right portion of their homepage. It scans and removes 30of the latest viruses/worms.

Worked for me.

gud luck

Dick

2519. Re: More Classic Wisdom from Kim, W5TIT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 17:12:44 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bitaacmka1@208.206.142.88>
Source record: 75934

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Actually, that last one was one of her better efforts. The "Dirty Harry"
> quote was a particularly refreshing change in her usually dull rhetoric,
> or does she just think that she has a pair of "44 Magnums?"

.22 shorts would be far more like it.

Larry, as long as you continue dialog with her she'll keep driveling it out...

2520. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 17:24:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308310924.14edaa5a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75935
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

```
"paulfriedman@comcast.net" wrote in message news:...
> "Brian" wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0308300448.3bb14b5@posting.google.com...
> > "Hans K0HB" wrote in message
> news:<2459ee62a6f0efa423239c8e05539568.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > > "Brian" wrote
> > >
> > > > Paul, since the only apparent privelege difference in the two proposed
> > > > license classes is 50W, and you could operate any amateur frequency in
> > > > any mode, why would that deter you from the ARS?
> > >
> > > Brian "gets it" !!!!
> > >
> > > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> > Hans, its quite easy to "get it" when the subject makes sense. Its
> > all the other nonsensical stuff on here that I don't get.
> >
> > Paul gave an opinion that I didn't understand, so I asked a question.
> >
> > Perhaps Paul requires "Extra right out of the box" and cannot be
> > bothered with "lesser" licenses. Until he replies, we'll never know.
>
> I missed your first message asking "why would that deter you from the ARS?"
> Sorry.
>
> Being new to all this (licensed in October of 2001), it is easy for me to
> remember my thoughts and feelings prior to being licensed. Here is why it
> would have deterred me:
> 1) Seeing "real" hams being able to run 1500 watts while only being able
> to run 50 watts. I would have KNOWN (it doesn't have to be true, I still
> would have KNOWN it) that I never would have been able to make a contact.

I cannot understand that. All the amateur literature is chock full of
examples of QRP operations where worldwide contacts take place using
mere milliwatts.

FWIW, I've never run more than 100 watts from my home station on HF.

> 2) Being treated as a second class citizen -- the Rookie League is not a
> fun place to be

Tell me about it, but I think the times have changed. Lotsa OF's here
are whimsical about their rookie days.
```

But you didn't start as an Extra, did you?

In 1987 when I became a ham, we were called Novices. We were shuttled to bands of little or no CW activity (ghettos) to somehow learn from each other. There was little or no activity at the tail end of the Novice Era.

Technician was the consolation prize for passing the General exam but flunking the 13 wpm code.

Today, Technician is the starting point, and I don't consider the label Technician to be the equivalent of "Rookie League." Novice, however, always smacked of "Rookie."

With Hans proposal, the new hams are mainstreamed and can easily learn from some highly seasoned operators.

> 3) Basic congenital problem with Time-In-Grade approach. (Please note, I
> would not have had a problem with serious theory/operating practice tests as
> opposed to the actual Elements 2,3, and 4. I won't have passed them all, I
> am sure, but I would not have had a problem with approach.).

If you're a bright guy and the "serious theory/operating" tests, you would have passed -providing- the QP continues to be published. If not, then you'd find the Extra ranks occupied by mostly electronic technicians and engineers.

> Of the above, number 3 would have been the most important to me, I think.
> Now that I am licensed, I seldom put out more than 75 watts. Yes, I have an
> amplifier, but I checked my log and see that I haven't had it on since early
> June (honest).

I believe you.

So, experience has showed me how silly 1) above is -- that
> does not, however, change how I felt in my pre-licensed days.

True. And this is the argument that I use with the current Morse Code exam being administered. It is not Morse Code, it is Farnsworth at 13-15 WPM, not the Morse at the specified 5wpm.

The OF's here say that the testee can request the old Morse exam and not take it Farnsworth styled. I say they don't even know the difference, so how could they?

> I am sure that I am an odd duck -- I never even heard a QSO until after I
> was licensed (the purest Extra Lite in captivity).

Don't fool yourself. There were lots of "Code-Tape Extras" in days gone by.

> I can understand and accept people thinking that anyone as ignorant as me
> should not have been granted full privileges. At no time did I say that I
> DESERVED such privileges -- only that the suggested two class system would
> have deterred me from entering this great hobby -- perhaps rightly so.
>

> As a purely practical matter, if an approach similar to yours came into
> existence, I would suggest a 100 watt limit rather than 50 watts. Given that
> the vast majority of modern transceivers run 100 watts output, enforcing a
> 50 watt maximum would be problematical at best.

There are technical reasons that Hans suggested the 50W maximum.
Safety. And you'll recall from the exams that you took, that beyond
50W on Ten meters, you'd have to accomplish the calculations for RF
safety. 100W would require the safety calculations to be tested as
well. That is a clear cut-off/point of distinction to me.

To be honest, on HF, the Japanese market is full of 10W transceivers
made specifically for their 10W license, and I would not object to 10W
being the standard on HF and 50W on VHF+ for the limited license.

Given a 50W limit and 100W transceivers being a virtual standard, I
can see more than a little room for abuse. But in the great scheme of
things, that's a 3db abuse and probably hardly enforceable.

> 73
>
> Paul AB0SI

Paul, you have a good discussion and the most important point was your
pre-license days impressions of the service. The ARRL would be wise
to pay attention to the image that interested newcomers have to our
service/hobby. And the naming of the license class is but one
argument that has been discussed here previously.

73, Brian

2521. Re: AOL pulls Jon Cunningham's web pages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 17:35:47 UTC
From: Mom <WashYourHands@NotMe.com>
Message-ID: <bitbllpiq0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75936
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"GM" <melzer@not.relevant> wrote in message
news:m2n3lvgui5tmudn6rd2u54jisdmias6ofp@4ax.com...
On Sat, 30 Aug 2003 22:10:52 -0500, "Kurt" <No Email@Nospam.comp> wrote:

>
>"Jayne Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
>news:9841241545.65byejon7373@pavillage.net...
>On 30 Aug 2003 13:47:23 GMT, Soames123 <soames123@aol.com> wrote:
>> - Who'se Jon Cunningham ??
>
>Jon Cunningham is ham radio operator K1TP, and he has had his 14.313
>MHz web pages up for quite a long time at http://members.aol.com/jcunham.
>
>On them, he frequently put down Usenet radio posters as beneath contempt,
>but he completely overlooked his own tendency of late to post what
>many people would think of as porn or links to porn. I guess that AOL
>decided to nuke the pages for that same reason.
>
>Truly, pride goeth before a fall ...
>.................
>
>"Many" people, or just you?
>Truly, twits abound.
>

You are a troll. You post from alt.net and usenetserver.com. You
aren't fooling anyone. We are taking this newsgroup back and nothing
you can do will stop that.

//

..and you are a cowardly old man and nothing you can do will stop that,
either.

2522. Re: AOL pulls Jon Cunningham's web pages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 17:36:28 UTC
From: Mom <WashYourHands@NotMe.com>
Message-ID: <bitbmuplr0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75937
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"GM" <melzer@not.relevant> wrote in message
news:uan3lv44pu9pn0a8i467gh8qvltbq1mpkb@4ax.com...
On 30 Aug 2003 14:36:18 GMT, jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam (Jayne Nye) wrote:

>On 30 Aug 2003 13:47:23 GMT, Soames123 <soames123@aol.com> wrote:
>> - Who'se Jon Cunningham ??
>
>Jon Cunningham is ham radio operator K1TP, and he has had his 14.313
>MHz web pages up for quite a long time at http://members.aol.com/jcunham.
>
>On them, he frequently put down Usenet radio posters as beneath contempt,
>but he completely overlooked his own tendency of late to post what
>many people would think of as porn or links to porn. I guess that AOL
>decided to nuke the pages for that same reason.
>
>Truly, pride goeth before a fall ...

You are a troll. You post from alt.net and usenetserver.com. You
aren't fooling anyone. We are taking this newsgroup back and nothing
you can do will stop that.

//
..and you are a cowardly old man and nothing you can do will stop that,
either.

2523. Re: AOL pulls Jon Cunningham's web pages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 17:37:39 UTC
From: Mom <WashYourHands@NotMe.com>
Message-ID: <bitbp5pou0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75938
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"GM" <melzer@not.relevant> wrote in message
news:9bn3lvcv6ng0hfapv89tv4l6mpa2o06tat@4ax.com...
On 31 Aug 2003 01:03:52 GMT, jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam (Jayne Nye) wrote:

>On Sat, 30 Aug 2003 18:28:02 -0400, Archduke Hiram Knickers
<funhorns3@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>> "Jayne Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
>> news:9841241545.65byejon7373@pavillage.net...
>> > On 30 Aug 2003 13:47:23 GMT, Soames123 <soames123@aol.com> wrote:
>> > > - Who'se Jon Cunningham ??
>> >
>> > Jon Cunningham is ham radio operator K1TP, and he has had his 14.313
>> > MHz web pages up for quite a long time at
http://members.aol.com/jcunham.
>> >
>> > On them, he frequently put down Usenet radio posters as beneath
contempt,
>> > but he completely overlooked his own tendency of late to post what
>> > many people would think of as porn or links to porn. I guess that AOL
>> > decided to nuke the pages for that same reason.
>>
>> His page is back up on AOL as I type this.
>> http://www.cafeshops.com/tshirtstop/141552
>>
>> (pfhbbbltttt!!!!!!!!!!)
>
>I was right. AOL *did* have a word with K1TP. From his web page at
>the time of this posting (and I quote):
>
>"New Location of As The World Turns.....courtesy of the AOL
>police ..." [location snipped]
>
>And Jon has moved so that he can continue to post his drek without
>interference.
>
>So "pfhbbbltttt!!!!!!!!!!" right back at you, Numbnuts.
>
>Les, Dan and the other ignoramuses could of course be expected to
>shoot from the hip and be wrong (as usual). They are sooooo
>predictable.

You are a troll. You post from alt.net and usenetserver.com. You
aren't fooling anyone. We are taking this newsgroup back and nothing

you can do will stop that.

//
..and you are a cowardly old man and nothing you can do will stop that,
either.

2524. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 18:19:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831141937.29660.00000359@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 75939

In article <bit67d$gal@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>Subject: Re: For those that are against the morse removal
>From: "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
>Date: Sun, 31 Aug 2003 11:04:21 -0500
>
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030831091947.23171.00000405@mb-m05.aol.com...
>> In article <BB72DF8E.24CF7%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart
>> <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:
>>
>> >Remember the Village People, Kiss, Disco, the
>> >song Muskrat Love, houses filled with incense, chopper motorcycles, the
>> >song
>> >My Ding-a-Ling, Elton John's sunglasses, and so on.
>>
>> Dave Barry's Book of Bad Songs comes to mind....
>>
>> >> Actually, I don't think that people ae dumbed down
>> >> compared to whatever mythical time that they were
>> >> "smart".
>
>One of my favorite songs when I was a teen-ager is Pleasant Valley Sunday:

Pseudo-performed by the Monkees
>
>The local rock group down the street
>Is trying hard to learn their song
>Seranade the weekend squire, who just came out to mow his lawn
>
>Another Pleasant Valley Sunday
>Charcoal burning everywhere
>Rows of houses that are all the same
>And no one seems to care
>
>See Mrs. Gray she's proud today because her roses are in bloom
>Mr. Green he's so serene, He's got a t.v. in every room
>
>Another Pleasant Valley Sunday
>Here in status symbol land
>Mothers complain about how hard life is
>And the kids just don't understand
>
>Creature comfort goals

>They only numb my soul and make it hard for me to see
>My thoughts all seem to stray, to places far away
>I need a change of scenery
>
>Ta Ta Ta...
>
>Another Pleasant Valley Sunday
>Charcoal burning everywhere
>Another Pleasant Valley Sunday
>Here in status symbol land
>
>Another Pleasant Valley Sunday
>
>That song was a completely anti-social, anti-success song, according to my
>parents, grandparents, etc.

Good heavens, it was from a "manufactured" music group that was about a saccharine as could be imagined at the time.

The song is really an anti-conformity ditty, loosely derived from Malvina Reynolds' "Little Boxes" and others of that ilk.

>Yet, quite prophetic when looking back now.

How?

--

The Monkees' did give us at least one legitimate decent song, although not directly. "I'm A Believer" was a throwaway of 30+ years ago until Smash Mouth covered it for the film "Shrek" and showed what could be done with that material in talented hands.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2525. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 18:19:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831141939.29660.00000360@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 75940

In article <bit3lg$9s2@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> Cable TV broke those taboos in the '70s by arguing that since cable was
>>not
>> broadcast and you paid to have it in your home, you retained control. But
>>then
>> broadcast TV copied cable as much as possible to remain "competitive".
>>
>> Was all this "smart' or "dumb"?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY

>Smart or dumb.

??

Perhaps you meant "smart *and* dumb"....

>Likely as not, that cannot be answered so succinctly.

Aye.

> I
>think to some degree the type of programming available today far exceeds
>what is needed. For example, how much reality TV do we really "need"?

About 1% of what's out there, I'd say.

>BUT,
>the primary responsibility for what happens in the home is still the
>family--right?

RIGHT.

But as far as TV goes, I'd say "the primary responsibility for what is on TV is
the viewing audience". To a very large extent, the folks in charge of
programming put on what people actually decide to watch, not what they say they
want to watch. How long do you think "Survivor" would last with low ratings?

The only "reality TV" I found halfway worth watching were the PBS series "1900
House" "1940 House" "Frontier House" etc. Most of which were actually BBC
productions.

>For the politics of it all, I like that, at least so far (and that comment
>belies another discussion altogether) we live in a country where "anything"
>goes.

Actually, "anything" doesn't go in American TV culture. Explicit violence is all over the place, in many different forms, but explicit sex is another matter entirely. Even on cable.

>But with that comes the responsibility of family and, beyond that,
>community. I think society in a transitional phase, where everyone is
>beginning to realize that we all have a responsibility to help see that our
>youth are raised with good attitudes, strong independence, and a willingness
>to recognize and overcome challenges, rather than to succumb to them. In
>the home, in schools, and in our civic and religious organizations, we all
>come together and decide--collectively--how best to do that.

WELL SAID, Kim!

And the first step is a common set of core values, which means "anything doesn't go"

>Of course,
>this isn't as obvious as it seems, but I think it happens by "osmosis."

On that point I must disagree. What we get by osmosis is a mish-mash of conflicting values.
>
>It always makes me nervous when we start disliking the media around us
>enough to support, indeed call for, its censorship--in any form or another.
>I'd rather have the capability to decide for myself, my family, and my
>community, what is OK and what we need to use to learn from.

I'd say it depends what form the censorship takes. I say that we vote with our wallets. What we buy and watch controls the market far more effectively.
>
>What was acceptable yesteryear is the norm today and, to some degree, that
>is OK. I shudder to think that women would be put back into a time when
>they weren't allowed the commonality with men as they are today.

Not just women but all sorts of folks. Look at all the changes in the past 50 years, from the end of that "separate but equal" nonsense to truth in advertising and equality of opportunity and housing.

Take just one concept - say, the idea that all citizens should have the right to vote regardless of race. 50 years ago it was considered "liberal" by some and "radical" by others. Now it's mainstream.

>And, after
>all, the media helped aid in the progress for women. I shudder to think of
>a time when Ozzie and Harriet (parents who were so blind they couldn't see
>their children behind their backs) were considered the norm for family life.

Actually, I don't think anybody who was really raising a family in the Ozzie/Beaver/Donna Reed days thought those shows were a totally accurate reflection of their reality. No more so than "Family Ties" or "All In The Family" were, in their time. They were simply stories.

In fact, almost all "domestic comedies" derive from a single source: Jackie Gleason's "Honeymooners" sketches of over 50 years ago. Look at them carefully

and they are almost all variations on that theme.

(The other classics are the "ensemble comedies" which are not family-based.
Their source are the '70s shows "Barney Miller" and "WKRP in Cincinnati")

>Today, we deal with each other on real levels and parents recognize
>that--darn it all--kids for the most part are going to be tempted to the
>unthinkable. We don't need TV to teach us that, it is a reality.

True, but it would be nice if TV wasn't trying to tell us those things were
"normal" or "OK".
>
>For an extreme, take the example of the movie (if we can call it that)
>"Jackass." I never heard of this MTV show until the movie came out. While
>I was horrified to see some of the things this crew of folk get themselves
>into; it seems that it's hard to turn off or "put down."

I've heard of it. Involves people doing incredibly stupid stuff.

>I like that this
>is available--politically speaking--and, it would be completely forbidden in
>my home if I'd had small children.

Ah, hold on a sec...

How "small"? 5 years old? 10 years old? 15 years old?

And how are you going to control what goes on in your house 24/7 if you're not
there all the time?

>To know that it's there and to know that
>some youth may be influenced to believe that things like that are OK, is the
>tool by which we learn to teach. MTV did not make people like that--they
>are out there. Without the exposure of the show, we'd never know it, right?

Wrong.

We don't need real-life examples of stupidity to teach us what can happen. And
the message sometimes gets inverted, because the stupid ones often survive.

One of the main differences between human and animal thought is that (most)
humans can deal in abstractions and future possibilities without having to
actually see things go wrong. I *know*, for instance, that playing with
gasoline is extremely dangerous even though I've never been burned by a
gasoline fire.

>It's always hard to debate in print--but hopefully you'll get what it is I'm
>trying to interpret.
>
>Smart or dumb. Both. But it's all about capability to me. I like
>flexibility. I would not want the alternative: someone or something making
>the decisions as to smart or dumb.
>
On that last point we agree. And I'll offer another observation: The right to

such freedom carries with it the responsibility to make intelligent choices and develop sound values. The two cannot be separated, even though many people focus on the first and ignore the second.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2526. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 18:19:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831141940.29660.00000361@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 75941

In article <bit6ai$5fj@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>Sound marketing would be someone finding a use for all the junk mail AOL has
>created over the past couple of decades...

Dang right!

In fact, I'd call it genius.

I recall when AOL sent out there stuff on a floppy. Which was at least worth
something 'cause you could erase and reuse it.

>Maybe like softening the CDs of
>today and making candy dishes out of them?
>
I LIKE it!!

I use 'em for coasters, leveling furniture, craft projects, etc.

21st century clay pigeons, anyone?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2527. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 18:36:26 UTC
From: "paulfriedman@comcast.net" <p.paulfriedman@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <Ker4b.141065$2x.40682@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 75942
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

"Brian" wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0308310924.14edaa5a@posting.google.com...
> "paulfriedman@comcast.net" wrote in message
news:...

> > 1) Seeing "real" hams being able to run 1500 watts while only being
able
> > to run 50 watts. I would have KNOWN (it doesn't have to be true, I still
> > would have KNOWN it) that I never would have been able to make a
contact.
>
> I cannot understand that. All the amateur literature is chock full of
> examples of QRP operations where worldwide contacts take place using
> mere milliwatts.

Please pardon the large deletetions, but the message was geting l-o-n-g.

I always assume anyone "pushing" an activilty is doing so through
rose-colored glasses. The ARRL obviously wants new hams. The ARRL telling me
I could "work the world" with a few watts was taken with a kilo or three of
salt. Interstingly enough (well, to me, at least), the inforamtion on QRP I
read only reinforced this. It seemed that QRP was the Gold Standard -- so
telling me that one could do all sorts of great things at low power was
equivilent as tellig me that Tiger Woods can hit straight drives 350 yards.
That's nice -- but what does it have to do with me?

If my thoughts about this were at all typical, we have to do a better job of
educating and convincing maybe-wanna-bes. I admit that I have no idea if my
concerns here weere typical or not. I came from a totally non-technical
background. The idea that I could talk around the world on less power than
used by the bulb in my reading lamp was impossible to accept.

> > 2) Being treated as a second class citizen -- the Rookie League is
not a
> > fun place to be
>
> Tell me about it, but I think the times have changed. Lotsa OF's here
> are whimsical about their rookie days.

Ya, well, folks talk fondly of their boot camp days, too. .

>
> But you didn't start as an Extra, did you?

Yes, I did. If I was offered the opportunity for full previldges, it seemed
silly not to take advantage of the opportunity. The attraction of ham radio

was working the world, so entering as a Technician simply didn't appeal to me. I studied code as well as General and Extra material (The Tech exam didn't require any study -- one can pass that with simple common sense. A fair number of the questions seem the equivilent to "Someone is using your favoirte frequency. You should: A) Crank up the power and blast the bozo B) Report him to Homeland Security C) Find a free frequency D) Vote Republican").

>
> In 1987 when I became a ham, we were called Novices. We were shuttled
> to bands of little or no CW activity (ghettos) to somehow learn from
> each other. There was little or no activity at the tail end of the
> Novice Era.
>
> Technician was the consolation prize for passing the General exam but
> flunking the 13 wpm code.
>
> Today, Technician is the starting point, and I don't consider the
> label Technician to be the equivalent of "Rookie League." Novice,
> however, always smacked of "Rookie."

See above for my comments.

> With Hans proposal, the new hams are mainstreamed and can easily learn
> from some highly seasoned operators.

Most hams I have met on the air have been remarkably considerate and friendly. The bozo to human ratio is lower (MUCH lower) here than in my other hobby of tournament bridge. Unfortunately, the ratio is not nearly as good in some of the ham newsgroups (this group included, I am afraid). I started reading all the rec.radio.amateur newsgroups as soon as I become interested in ham radio. Without exaggeration, I came very close to discarding the idea of getting my license because of some of the attitudes I saw here. I think this might be a more serious problem in hurting recruiting than is realized. Ditto the forums on QRZ, EHAM, et al.

> > 3) Basic congenital problem with Time-In-Grade approach. (Please
note, I
> > would not have had a problem with serious theory/operating practice
tests as
> > opposed to the actual Elements 2,3, and 4. I won't have passed them all,
I
> > am sure, but I would not have had a problem with approach.).
>
> If you're a bright guy and the "serious theory/operating" tests, you
> would have passed -providing- the QP continues to be published. If
> not, then you'd find the Extra ranks occupied by mostly electronic
> technicians and engineers.

Unless the deregulation mania passes, Question Pools are going to continue. If the idea is focussed on learning, I can not think of a worse approach. My goal, I admit, was passing the Elements -- the QP made it clear to me that

the ONLY purpose of the Elements was to pass them and forget them. I do disagree with you, Brian, that one would need to be an EE to pass a meaningful Extra exam.

> > Of the above, number 3 would have been the most important to me, I think.
> > Now that I am licensed, I seldom put out more than 75 watts. Yes, I have an
> > amplifier, but I checked my log and see that I haven't had it on since early
> > June (honest).
>
> I believe you.
>
> So, experience has showed me how silly 1) above is -- that
> > does not, however, change how I felt in my pre-licensed days.
>
> True. And this is the argument that I use with the current Morse Code
> exam being administered. It is not Morse Code, it is Farnsworth at
> 13-15 WPM, not the Morse at the specified 5wpm.
>
> The OF's here say that the testee can request the old Morse exam and
> not take it Farnsworth styled. I say they don't even know the
> difference, so how could they?

Intersting. I didn't know that was an option.

>
> > I am sure that I am an odd duck -- I never even heard a QSO until after I
> > was licensed (the purest Extra Lite in captivity).
>
> Don't fool yourself. There were lots of "Code-Tape Extras" in days
> gone by.
>
> > I can understand and accept people thinking that anyone as ignorant as me
> > should not have been granted full privileges. At no time did I say that I
> > DESERVED such privileges -- only that the suggested two class system would
> > have deterred me from entering this great hobby -- perhaps rightly so.
> >
> > As a purely practical matter, if an approach similar to yours came into
> > existence, I would suggest a 100 watt limit rather than 50 watts. Given that
> > the vast majority of modern transceivers run 100 watts output, enforcing a
> > 50 watt maximum would be problematical at best.
>
> There are technical reasons that Hans suggested the 50W maximum.

> Safety. And you'll recall from the exams that you took, that beyond
> 50W on Ten meters, you'd have to accomplish the calculations for RF
> safety. 100W would require the safety calculations to be tested as
> well. That is a clear cut-off/point of distinction to me.

Ten meters? Oh ya, I remember 10 meters from the good old days of last
summer when it was open. Silly jokes aside, I understand and
appreciate the safety consideration. An exclllent point.

> To be honest, on HF, the Japanese market is full of 10W transceivers
> made specifically for their 10W license, and I would not object to 10W
> being the standard on HF and 50W on VHF+ for the limited license.

Also intersting. Perhaps the same would happen here if Hans' proposal became
operative. If so, it would certainly make sense.

>
> Given a 50W limit and 100W transceivers being a virtual standard, I
> can see more than a little room for abuse. But in the great scheme of
> things, that's a 3db abuse and probably hardly enforceable.
>
> > 73
> >
> > Paul AB0SI
>
> Paul, you have a good discussion and the most important point was your
> pre-license days impressions of the service. The ARRL would be wise
> to pay attention to the image that interested newcomers have to our
> service/hobby. And the naming of the license class is but one
> argument that has been discussed here previously.
>
> 73, Brian

Thanks for the interesting exchange.

73, Paul

2528. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 19:00:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F524604.8050607@adelphia.net>
Source record: 75943

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bis35o$i2u$0@208.206.142.70...
>
>>
>>Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>>
>>>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>>
> news:<20030830201932.12300.00000187@mb-m20.aol.com>...
>
>>>>In article <3F510AFC.5010100@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
>>>
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>
>>>>writes:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>N2EY wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>>test
>>>>>
>>>>> Lots of QRM, Jim! QRP computer?
>>>>
>>>>AOL trouble. Apparently fixed now.
>>>
>>>AOL can't be fixed . . .
>>
>>Try this one.....
>>
>>
>>
>>http://www.intergate.com/index.shtml
>>
>
>
> I tried AOHELL for awhile due to one of their promotions. It wasn't that
> great. However, the real problem came when I discontinued service. It took
> 6 MONTHS to get the billing stopped and corrected after I canceled.

I signed up for one of their specials a few years ago. X numbers of
hours per month, and some fee when you go over it. I wasn't paying much
attention because the bills came on a credit card bill and my XYL pays

them immediately. After a few months, she asked me why the AOL bill was like 90 dollars each month. All I could figure out was that they were charging me their "extra rate" for every second I was on line.

Plus the service was slow due to the little ads they graciously sent me, the browser didn't really work, and I was cut off a lot. Finally I tried to terminate my account, and they had all kinds of weird stipulations that stood in the way of ending the account. Just trying to find the number to call took a lot of time online.

After I switch to a new provider, I was deluged by "We want you back" mail. Maybe if they put enough effort into keeping me happy in the first place, they wouldn't have to put the effort into getting me back.

Other than that, I just love A*L.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2529. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 20:19:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831161950.00545.00000332@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 75944

In article <3F51461B.8000306@ix.netcom.com>, Robert Casey
<wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> writes:

>>No surprise there Mike. No calls, no decency, no license. Access available
>>to anyone that can lie their way in. Yep....what a system.
>>
>>
>And someone can obtain a ham radio rig and go on the air with a bootleg
>call.
>Same difference.
>
Not really!

First off, once you get beyond the HT or magmount-on-the-filing-cabinet stage,
it's a lot more trouble to set up a ham station.

Second (and this is the biggie) the only way for a bootlegger to avoid lots of
negative attention from other hams is to act legitimate.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2530. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 20:19:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831161950.00545.00000331@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 75945

In article <BB73FD5F.24D3D%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> With all due respect to your XYL, she is not
>> qualified to judge me. She has no idea how
>> I relate to women in person. (snip)

All we know is what we read here...

> Since you're basing your objection on how it reflects on women ("a vulgar,
>sexualized, and demeaning connotation which reflects poorly on YL radio
>amateurs everywhere"), she is, as a woman, qualified to judge the weight of
>that argument. She has done so, and feels your argument lacks substance. She
>is, as a woman, also able to say whether Kim's callsign is offensive to her.
>She says it is not.

That "as a woman" stuff is just reverse ad hominem.
>
> Your argument lacks substance, Larry.

That's different than saying the gender of the person judging makes a difference.

>Three women have disagreed with your
>position (my wife, Kim, and Dee). While two of the three have reservations
>about Kim's callsign (they wouldn't choose it), none find it outright
>offensive.
>
Or worthy of prohibition.

> Men once used shame and ridicule to force women to comply with their
>domination.

some men did those things, and worse. Some men still do.

>That time has passed, Larry.

Yeah, those dang "liberals" demanding equal rights and such....

>Women are not ashamed of their
>bodies anymore, nor are they embarrassed by the mere mention of some part of
>that body.

Some women are, some aren't. Does anyone think Kim's mind is going to be changed by Larry's opposition?

Some things are inappropriate for ham radio - doesn't mean they're anything to be ashamed of.

>Would we (men) really want it any other way?
>
some men obviously do...

What's interesting is that Larry publicizes Kim's call here, drawing greater attention to it than anyone else.

Also interesting that the W6 version of Kim's call has been held by someone with the first name Michael (!) since at least 1978 (it's in the 1979 callbook, which was printed in late 1978...) So FCC has alowed such calls for at least 24 years if not more.

73 de Jim, N2EY (sequentially issued 1977)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2531. For Vippy's Benefit...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 20:30:44 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0308311230.4fe39678@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75946

Vipul Shah, (VShah101@aol.com) keeps insisting certain activities
don't exist in Amateur Radio.

And just like his mentor, Lennie the Lame, facts keep unravelling
his rants.

Case in point: http://www.remote.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/08/30/100/?nc=1

Enjoy, Vippy.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2532. Re: AOL pulls Jon Cunningham's web pages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 21:05:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Gqt4b.11996$EW1.4665@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75947
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jayne Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
news:9841241545.65byejon8888@pavillage.net...
> On Sat, 30 Aug 2003 18:28:02 -0400, Archduke Hiram Knickers
<funhorns3@yahoo.com> wrote:
> >
> > "Jayne Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
> > news:9841241545.65byejon7373@pavillage.net...
> > > On 30 Aug 2003 13:47:23 GMT, Soames123 <soames123@aol.com> wrote:
> > > > - Who'se Jon Cunningham ??
> > >
> > > Jon Cunningham is ham radio operator K1TP, and he has had his 14.313
> > > MHz web pages up for quite a long time at
http://members.aol.com/jcunham.
> > >
> > > On them, he frequently put down Usenet radio posters as beneath
contempt,
> > > but he completely overlooked his own tendency of late to post what
> > > many people would think of as porn or links to porn. I guess that AOL
> > > decided to nuke the pages for that same reason.
> >
> > His page is back up on AOL as I type this.
> > http://www.cafeshops.com/tshirtstop/141552
> >
> > (pfhbbblttt!!!!!!!!!!)
>
> I was right. AOL *did* have a word with K1TP. From his web page at
> the time of this posting (and I quote):
>
> "New Location of As The World Turns.....courtesy of the AOL
> police ..." [location snipped]
>
> And Jon has moved so that he can continue to post his drek without
> interference.
>
> So "pfhbbblttt!!!!!!!!!!" right back at you, Numbnuts.
>
> Les, Dan and the other ignoramuses could of course be expected to
> shoot from the hip and be wrong (as usual). They are sooooo
> predictable.
>
When you posted that his page was down I had just came off of that page at
the AOL URL. So if you want to continue with your LIE. That is your
choice.

I simply stated it was still there. And it was. SO stick it up your arse.

And as for 'porn'. If you consider a picture of a very lovely woman, undressed, in a NON SEXUAL pose pornographic......you need help.

Dan/W4NTI

2533. Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 21:09:12 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0308311309.44c88748@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75948

I found this comment on eham.net:
"I hold the OLD ADVANCED license and it is a matter of prestidge. I had to have 13 wpm to get to this level and now they want to do away with ALL CW? Keep at least the 5 wpm.
It is too easy to pass a written exam. The code kept the CB crowd from gaining acess to our bands. "

Is this for real? Are there REALLY people with Advanced licenses who refuse to upgrade to Amateur Extra SIMPLY because they feel the need to prove they passed the 13 wpm exam? I know it's a free country, and there are also many Advanced licensees who decide that the extra privileges aren't worth going to the trouble of studying up and going to the VE session, but I find this hard to believe.

Anyone who thinks Morse Code is that important should try OPERATING high-speed Morse Code and participate in Morse Code contests. All the Advanced license proves is that you passed 13 wpm and the other exam requirements years ago. It says nothing about what you have been doing since. People who want to brag about their Morse Code proficiency can do so much less obnoxiously by actually USING it on the air.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
usenet@@@@@jasonhsu.com

2534. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 21:50:41 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bitqgp$oh8@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75949

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030831141937.29660.00000359@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <bit67d$gal@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
>
> The song is really an anti-conformity ditty, loosely derived from Malvina
> Reynolds' "Little Boxes" and others of that ilk.
>
> >Yet, quite prophetic when looking back now.
>
> How?
>

Oh, I think many today--even me--are quite involved and disolved with keeping ourselves happy with material things. While I am not a keep up with the Jones' kind of person (i.e., unaffected by "status" symbols), I do find amusement in "things" more than I used to. I used to be happy just to watch ants...

Kim W5TIT

2535. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 21:56:30 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bitqro$tuo@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75950

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030831141940.29660.00000361@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <bit6ai$5fj@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >Sound marketing would be someone finding a use for all the junk mail AOL
has
> >created over the past couple of decades...
>
> Dang right!
>
> In fact, I'd call it genius.
>
> I recall when AOL sent out there stuff on a floppy. Which was at least
worth
> something 'cause you could erase and reuse it.
>
> >Maybe like softening the CDs of
> >today and making candy dishes out of them?
> >
> I LIKE it!!
>
> I use 'em for coasters, leveling furniture, craft projects, etc.
>
> 21st century clay pigeons, anyone?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I laughed hysterically when I saw this, Jim!! Man, they'd make great ones.
What's a "real" clay pigeon made of? Reason I ask is, that shooting skeet
with CDs would be putting an awful lot of plastic into our dear mother
earth.

Kim W5TIT

2536. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 22:12:52 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Epu4b.69075$yg.22462392@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 75951

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0308311309.44c88748@posting.google.com...
> Is this for real? Are there REALLY people with Advanced licenses who
> refuse to upgrade to Amateur Extra SIMPLY because they feel the need
> to prove they passed the 13 wpm exam? I know it's a free country, and
> there are also many Advanced licensees who decide that the extra
> privileges aren't worth going to the trouble of studying up and going
> to the VE session, but I find this hard to believe.

Believe it, Jason.

> Anyone who thinks Morse Code is that important should try OPERATING
> high-speed Morse Code and participate in Morse Code contests. All the
> Advanced license proves is that you passed 13 wpm and the other exam
> requirements years ago. It says nothing about what you have been
> doing since. People who want to brag about their Morse Code
> proficiency can do so much less obnoxiously by actually USING it on
> the air.

It's a free country, relax. Some do both and after all...passing the 13-wpm
test IS an accomplishment and something worthy of being proud of.

> Jason Hsu, AG4DG
> usenet@@@@@jasonhsu.com

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

2537. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 22:19:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831181947.29660.00000362@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 75952

In article <bitqgp$oh8@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030831141937.29660.00000359@mb-m24.aol.com...
>> In article <bit67d$gal@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
>> writes:
>>
>>
>> The song is really an anti-conformity ditty, loosely derived from Malvina
>> Reynolds' "Little Boxes" and others of that ilk.
>>
>> >Yet, quite prophetic when looking back now.
>>
>> How?
>
>Oh, I think many today--even me--are quite involved and disolved with
>keeping ourselves happy with material things. While I am not a keep up with
>the Jones' kind of person (i.e., unaffected by "status" symbols), I do find
>amusement in "things" more than I used to. I used to be happy just to watch
>ants...
>
Ah - good explanation! And observation...

Here's another one for ya...

From 1972-1976 I attended a large urban university. The big thing back then
was "nonconformity" to the rules of the "establishment", particularly in
manners of slang, clothes and haircut.

After a while, though, it became clear that we'd simply traded one form of
conformity for another, and that we "nonconformists" pretty much dressed alike,
talked alike, and had similar haircuts.

The university gave us more than schooling - we were actually educated, often
by experiences that seemed minor at the time.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2538. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 22:43:57 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <NSu4b.12211$EW1.2121@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75953

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030831181947.29660.00000362@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <bitqgp$oh8@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030831141937.29660.00000359@mb-m24.aol.com...
> >> In article <bit67d$gal@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >>
> >> The song is really an anti-conformity ditty, loosely derived from
Malvina
> >> Reynolds' "Little Boxes" and others of that ilk.
> >>
> >> >Yet, quite prophetic when looking back now.
> >>
> >> How?
> >>
> >Oh, I think many today--even me--are quite involved and disolved with
> >keeping ourselves happy with material things. While I am not a keep up
with
> >the Jones' kind of person (i.e., unaffected by "status" symbols), I do
find
> >amusement in "things" more than I used to. I used to be happy just to
watch
> >ants...
> >
> Ah - good explanation! And observation...
>
> Here's another one for ya...
>
> From 1972-1976 I attended a large urban university. The big thing back
then
> was "nonconformity" to the rules of the "establishment", particularly in
> manners of slang, clothes and haircut.
>
> After a while, though, it became clear that we'd simply traded one form of
> conformity for another, and that we "nonconformists" pretty much dressed
alike,
> talked alike, and had similar haircuts.
>
> The university gave us more than schooling - we were actually educated,

often
> by experiences that seemed minor at the time.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>
>
Far out Dude !!!

Dan/W4NTI

2539. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 22:59:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831185938.24456.00000213@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 75954

> Some do both and after all...passing the 13-wpm
>test IS an accomplishment and something worthy of being proud of.
>
>> Jason Hsu, AG4DG

Which the No-Code Knuckle Draggers will never be able to do. This alone will
keep them always as second rate Hams with CB, being there main accomplishment

2540. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 23:13:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831191350.29815.00000342@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 75955

In article <bitqro$tuo@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> I use 'em for coasters, leveling furniture, craft projects, etc.
>>
>> 21st century clay pigeons, anyone?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I laughed hysterically when I saw this, Jim!!

Then I succeeded in my attempt.

> Man, they'd make great ones.

The satisfaction factor alone.....

>What's a "real" clay pigeon made of?

ummmmm....clay? Specifically, I think they are dried but not fired so the
pieces will disintegrate into the soil...

>Reason I ask is, that shooting skeet
>with CDs would be putting an awful lot of plastic into our dear mother
>earth.
>
Ugh. Bad idea.

Here's a practical use for them: Put them under candles, shiny side up. They
reflect the loight and some heat, and protect your table/cloth from dripping
wax.

And a practical joke use: Make up a real-looking CD label that says "HOT XXX
PHOTOS" or some such, stick it on the AOL CD, and leave it around where someone
will swipe it and try to view it.

bwaahaaahaaa.....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2541. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 23:13:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831191350.29815.00000341@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 75956

In article <f7d9a152.0308311309.44c88748@posting.google.com>,
jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:

>I found this comment on eham.net:
>"I hold the OLD ADVANCED license and it is a matter of prestidge. I
>had to have 13 wpm to get to this level and now they want to do away
>with ALL CW? Keep at least the 5 wpm.
>It is too easy to pass a written exam. The code kept the CB crowd from
>gaining acess to our bands. "

The fact of the matter is that simply having an Advanced is not proof of code
speed. Since 1990, medical waivers were available for 13 and 20 wpm.
>
>Is this for real? Are there REALLY people with Advanced licenses who
>refuse to upgrade to Amateur Extra SIMPLY because they feel the need
>to prove they passed the 13 wpm exam?

There are some misguided folks who think that, but in fact it's not a proof of
code speed any more than my Extra is proof of 20 per.

>I know it's a free country, and
>there are also many Advanced licensees who decide that the extra
>privileges aren't worth going to the trouble of studying up and going
>to the VE session, but I find this hard to believe.

If somebody wants to know my code skills and technical knowledge, I don't point
to a license test I took in 1970. Instead, I just show 'em.

>Anyone who thinks Morse Code is that important should try OPERATING
>high-speed Morse Code and participate in Morse Code contests.

We do! 13 wpm isn't high speed, tho.

>All the
>Advanced license proves is that you passed 13 wpm and the other exam
>requirements years ago.

Not even that. Medical waivers, etc.

>It says nothing about what you have been
>doing since. People who want to brag about their Morse Code
>proficiency can do so much less obnoxiously by actually USING it on
>the air.

No need to brag. Just show 'em.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2542. Re: AOL pulls Jon Cunningham's web pages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-08-31 23:49:47 UTC
From: jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam
Message-ID: <9841241545.65byedan8888@pavillage.net>
Source record: 75957
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 31 Aug 2003 21:05:42 GMT, Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@getridofthismindspring.com> wrote:
>
> When you posted that his page was down I had just came off of that page at
> the AOL URL. So if you want to continue with your LIE. That is your
> choice.

The time of my post: 30 Aug 2003 12:53:49 GMT

The time of your post: 30 Aug 2003 18:45:08 GMT (proof is in Message-ID:
<Ug64b.5413$EW1.4148@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>)

So, Dan, you lying sack of shit, you posted your claim almost six
hours later! By then, Jon had plenty of time to whine and to beg AOL
for a reprieve.

The pages were down at the time I said they were. You came late (and
uninformed) to the discussion, blazing away with your cap pistols.

And as to the pornographic nature, or lack thereof, of Jon's Penny
pictures, he was in violation of AOL's TOS simply by posting nudity,
and he knew it. AOL in general sucks, and its college kid, part time
employees will kill an account or some web pages at the drop of a hat.

Anyone who goes ahead and uses AOL as an ISP anyway deserves what they
get. I have no sympathy for them at all.

2543. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 00:10:38 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <biu33i$v3i@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75958

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030831181947.29660.00000362@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <bitqgp$oh8@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030831141937.29660.00000359@mb-m24.aol.com...
> >> In article <bit67d$gal@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> >> writes:
> >>
> >>
> >> The song is really an anti-conformity ditty, loosely derived from
Malvina
> >> Reynolds' "Little Boxes" and others of that ilk.
> >>
> >> >Yet, quite prophetic when looking back now.
> >>
> >> How?
> >>
> >Oh, I think many today--even me--are quite involved and disolved with
> >keeping ourselves happy with material things. While I am not a keep up
with
> >the Jones' kind of person (i.e., unaffected by "status" symbols), I do
find
> >amusement in "things" more than I used to. I used to be happy just to
watch
> >ants...
> >
> Ah - good explanation! And observation...
>
> Here's another one for ya...
>
> From 1972-1976 I attended a large urban university. The big thing back
then
> was "nonconformity" to the rules of the "establishment", particularly in
> manners of slang, clothes and haircut.
>
> After a while, though, it became clear that we'd simply traded one form of
> conformity for another, and that we "nonconformists" pretty much dressed
alike,
> talked alike, and had similar haircuts.
>
> The university gave us more than schooling - we were actually educated,

often
> by experiences that seemed minor at the time.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Absolutely!! I was one "of those" (nonconformists). Actually, I still concentrate on being so--it doesn't come naturally any more <GRIN>. If everyone is planting roses, I'll plant petunias. If all women like diamonds, I like opals (and that is actually the truth).

Anyway, you're right about the more we tried to be different, the more we were the same. Uh, but we were the same together ;)

Kim W5TIT

2544. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 00:15:09 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <biu33j$v3i@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 75959

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030831191350.29815.00000342@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <bitqro$tuo@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >> I use 'em for coasters, leveling furniture, craft projects, etc.
> >>
> >> 21st century clay pigeons, anyone?
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >I laughed hysterically when I saw this, Jim!!
>
> Then I succeeded in my attempt.
>
> > Man, they'd make great ones.
>
> The satisfaction factor alone.....
>
> >What's a "real" clay pigeon made of?
>
> ummmmm....clay? Specifically, I think they are dried but not fired so the
> pieces will disintegrate into the soil...
>
> >Reason I ask is, that shooting skeet
> >with CDs would be putting an awful lot of plastic into our dear mother
> >earth.
> >
> Ugh. Bad idea.
>
> Here's a practical use for them: Put them under candles, shiny side up.
They
> reflect the loight and some heat, and protect your table/cloth from
dripping
> wax.
>
> And a practical joke use: Make up a real-looking CD label that says "HOT
XXX
> PHOTOS" or some such, stick it on the AOL CD, and leave it around where
someone
> will swipe it and try to view it.
>
> bwaahaaahaaa.....

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

ROFLMAO!!! Hey, use them for gift tags! Make up a label, place it onto the AOL CD, and use a pretty ribbon to tie between the package and the hole of the CD.

Hmmmmm, this could really get interesting (they could also be used against those wall mounted candle holders, carried in the pocket on a hike (they'd reflect light and work for signaling really well). Let's see...they could be strung onto a mobile and used as a bird attractant for the bird bath...

I'll stop, I gotta go get stuff to do the smoked brisket for tomorrow!

Kim W5TIT

2545. Re: For Vippy's Benefit...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 00:19:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831201930.07578.00000282@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 75960

In article <5c01b95b.0308311230.4fe39678@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>Vipul Shah, (VShah101@aol.com) keeps insisting certain activities
>don't exist in Amateur Radio.
>
> And just like his mentor,

(Leonard Anderson)

>facts keep unravelling his rants.
>
> Case in point:
>http://www.remote.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/08/30/100/?nc=1

Of course. Looks like a lot of fun. Note the thinness of many of the contestants, too.

But do you really think either of those you seek to convince will admit they were mistaken?
>
Particularly when you and the ARRL are the messengers?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2546. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 00:19:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831201930.07578.00000281@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 75961

In article <biotmp$b61ma$13@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>news:OBx3b.35345$Vx2.15393974@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>>
>> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
>> news:biltpj$auudh$18@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>> > Just even one more proof of what I mean. Attempting to control free
>> > speech
>> > when a differing opinion occurs....
>> > Why should they have exclusive control of the whole amateur community
>> > when
>> > they only represent (roughly) a quarter of the population?
>> >
>> > You keep saying I should join, but why should I?? List specific
>> > reasons,
>> > backed by facts. Not vague generalities or "big-brother/mafioso-like"
>> > reasons? All it is, is a very expensive magazine subscription, so let's
>> > not
>> > kid ourselves.
>> >
>>
>> They are not trying to control free speech. Show your proof that they are
>> doing so.
>
>They are by virtue of a member attempting to do so. Either a member is or
>is not a representative of the arrl.

I'm not sure what you're saying, Ryan.

I don't agree with all ARRL policies, but I don't see ARRL trying to control my
free speech. Sure, it would be great if all members agreed on all issues but
that's simply not going to happen unless there's a mechanism like NCI has to
eliminate those who disagree.

Yes, ARRL says they represent their membership - just like your congresscritter
says he preresents his/her constituents. Does your congressperson agree with
you on every single issue?
>
>> They establish policies based on the input of their membership as
>> does any other organization. They then carry through on that policy.
>> Naturally not every member agrees with it but if we had to have a
>> unanimous
>> consensus nothing would ever get done. And they have no reason or

>> obligation to pay any attention to the opinions of non-members.
>
>As well as they should not be representing "non-members" either.

Yet nonmembers get the benefit of ARRL actions.

>The ARRL
>is responsible for the state of amateur radio it is today, as they have
>convinced the FCC that they are the "only voice."

Where do you get that idea? Read the Report and Order for the 2000
restructuring - FCC addresses many groups and individuals' positions, not just
ARRL's.
>
>>
>> They do not have nor try to have exclusive control of the whole amateur
>> community. Show your proof that they do.
>
>Let me dig up a QST magazine.... said it right on the front cover.....

What does it say?

>> They establish goals based on
>> what their membership wants. That is what any organization does. Again
>> they have no reason or obligation to establish their goals based on the
>> opinions of non-members.
>
>Only if one chooses to request that information beased upon the decision
>whether or not to join. Its like going to a car dealership and the car
>salesperson stating that you will be buying a vehicle, but not tell you
>anything about it.

Not at all. You can ask Hq for their policy. You can email your director. I
betcha if you emailed your director and asked his/her view on some issue, and
mentioned you were considering joining, you'd get an answer.

On the codetest issue, ARRL has been procodetest for a long time because that
has been the position of the majority of the membership. Maybe that's changed,
maybe it hasn't, but would you expect ARRL to go with the minority position?

>> You seem to expect them to roll over and adopt YOUR opinion. That's
>> unrealistic. Whether you join or not is your business of course. But
>> unless you are a member, you have no right to expect to control their
>> policies or for them to listen to your opinions and adopt your opinions.
>>If
>> you want to change them, join. If you aren't willing to join, don't
>>expect
>> to change them. That's pretty simple.
>
>Never did I state they should roll over to my opinions exclusively, but my
>opinions are not singular, there are many more that hold the same position
>on a variety of issues. If they are claiming control of amateur radio as a
>whole, not just the membership, then my opinion should count in that

>respect. I can tell you however, there are alot of the opinions I hold that
>are held by a ton of people with ham licenses.

Sure. And there are a ton of people who hold different opinions. That's the
nature of the game.
>
>> I know why I am a member. They can do things that I cannot.
>> 1) Take the current BPL situation. They have the finances and facilities
>> to do the research that I can't afford. That is but one of many things.
>
>Yeah.... they must be the only one's too eh?

Who else is doing what W1RFI & Co. did? A 121 page engineering analysis of the
impact of BPL on typical amateur stations, including measurements and
observations of actual installations, put together on short notice. Betcha Ed
wasn't working 40 hour weeks to put that baby together.

And if ya think BPL is an HF-only problem, note that it goes as high as 80 MHz
on fundamentals, and that outfits like Cingular are concerned about
interference from harmonics messing up their 800+ MHz services.
>
>> 2) Product tests/reviews. I can't afford to buy all the test equipment,
>> every new radio, antenna, etc and run my own comparisons.
>> ... and so on.
>
>Again, CQ magazine does that as well.

Not the way ARRL does it. I've been to the ARRL lab, inside the screen room,
talked to the folks who do the testing. They buy actual production units
through regular channels and beat the #$%^& out of them in the lab. The
Extended Report (available to members only) goes even farther than the mag
report.

Does CQ even have a lab?

>Granted, I will wholeheartedly admit
>that QST is a decent magazine, even though it is getting thinner and
>thinner, but it is a good magazine.

I've got every QST from the late 1920s to today, and they are getting fatter.

> My only observation is that it should
>also include some technical material for the newer hams, as not all of us
>are Extra class electrical/electronics engineers. Although I am above the
>"simple circuit" stage, I am however not the highest qualified in the
>electronics side of this hobby. I am man enough to admit I need to learn
>more.

The point of QST is the new and novel. The Handbook and other publications are
for the standard practices. There's also QEX.
>
>Again, You keep saying I should join, but why should I?? List specific
>reasons, backed by facts. Not vague generalities or

>"big-brother/mafioso-like" reasons?

OK, here ya go:

1) Like it or not, ARRL is the only general-purpose membership org we hams have in the USA. No other group is going to step up to the plate on issues like BPL, CC&Rs, PRB-1, product testing, etc. You may not see those issues as affecting you, but in the long run they affect all of us.

Heck, I remember a time when major manufacturers would put out ham gear with known shortcomings because they knew nobody would really put the stuff to a real test. Not any more!

2) One of the things that has kept ham radio going all these years is the presence of strong national societies. The FCC and ITU have no vested interest in keeping amateur radio alive and healthy. ARRL does.

>All it is, is a very expensive magazine
>subscription, so let's
>not kid ourselves.

How much is it - $39 a year, single year? How much is CQ or any other mag? How much are most small-circulation non-industry publications?

>If there are some actual reasons listed, I might
>consider joining. If not, then that sums it up pretty good.
>
>I can honestly say that you are one of the few people that I have met on
>here, and I like you as a person. But there is one thing as a fact I know
>for sure, we will never agree on is the ARRL. I do not take the ARRL as
>blind faith, or like a religion.

Nor do I. Some of their positions are downright bizarre.

>I do not put the ARRL in a position close
>to god as some put here and elsewhere. I do not consider the arrl like a
>religion or a church organization as some people equate it to. I will be
>one of the first people to join if there ever becomes a group like the
>United States Amateur Radio Association or the National Radio Relay League
>or any other similar group. (don't know if either of those exist.....)

Over the years there have been groups which tried to be an ARRL alternative. None ever got more than a few thousand members, and all quietly disappeared after a few years, usually because they could not achieve critical mass.

Heck, how big is NCI - 4000 members, worldwide, with a mandate to disappear when code testing does? How about NCVEC - can anyone join and elect policy makers?

>The
>arrl needs the competition to keep them in check. Hell, Republicrats claim
>competition is a GOOD thing. (except when it encroaches on "their"
>businesses.)
>

Right - and so we have the airline industry tottering on the verge of bankruptcy even with megabuck bailouts, the telecom industry bubble, the Enron mess, the Northeast blackout....

73 de Jim, N2EY
>Have a great Labor Day Weekend!
>
>

2547. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 01:03:45 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <RVw4b.12334$EW1.2877@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75962

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:biu33i$v3i@library1.airnews.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030831181947.29660.00000362@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > In article <bitqgp$oh8@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20030831141937.29660.00000359@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > >> In article <bit67d$gal@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> > >> writes:
> > >>
> > >>
> > >> The song is really an anti-conformity ditty, loosely derived from
> Malvina
> > >> Reynolds' "Little Boxes" and others of that ilk.
> > >>
> > >> >Yet, quite prophetic when looking back now.
> > >>
> > >> How?
> > >
> > >Oh, I think many today--even me--are quite involved and disolved with
> > >keeping ourselves happy with material things. While I am not a keep up
> with
> > >the Jones' kind of person (i.e., unaffected by "status" symbols), I do
> find
> > >amusement in "things" more than I used to. I used to be happy just to
> watch
> > >ants...
> > >
> > Ah - good explanation! And observation...
> >
> > Here's another one for ya...
> >
> > From 1972-1976 I attended a large urban university. The big thing back
> then
> > was "nonconformity" to the rules of the "establishment", particularly in
> > manners of slang, clothes and haircut.
> >
> > After a while, though, it became clear that we'd simply traded one form
of
> > conformity for another, and that we "nonconformists" pretty much dressed

> alike,
> > talked alike, and had similar haircuts.
> >
> > The university gave us more than schooling - we were actually educated,
> often
> > by experiences that seemed minor at the time.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> Absolutely!! I was one "of those" (nonconformists). Actually, I still
> concentrate on being so--it doesn't come naturally any more <GRIN>. If
> everyone is planting roses, I'll plant petunias. If all women like
> diamonds, I like opals (and that is actually the truth).
>
> Anyway, you're right about the more we tried to be different, the more we
> were the same. Uh, but we were the same together ;)
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think so. Or perhaps
you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower child? Now thats a
real probabliity.

"Make love not War"

"War is dangerous to all living things"

etc.

Dan/W4NTI

2548. Re: AOL pulls Jon Cunningham's web pages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 01:05:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <hXw4b.12336$EW1.8669@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 75963
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Jayne Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
news:9841241545.65byedan8888@pavillage.net...
> On Sun, 31 Aug 2003 21:05:42 GMT, Dan/W4NTI
<w4nti@getridofthismindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > When you posted that his page was down I had just came off of that page
at
> > the AOL URL. So if you want to continue with your LIE. That is your
> > choice.
>
> The time of my post: 30 Aug 2003 12:53:49 GMT
>
> The time of your post: 30 Aug 2003 18:45:08 GMT (proof is in Message-ID:
> <Ug64b.5413$EW1.4148@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>)
>
> So, Dan, you lying sack of shit, you posted your claim almost six
> hours later! By then, Jon had plenty of time to whine and to beg AOL
> for a reprieve.
>
> The pages were down at the time I said they were. You came late (and
> uninformed) to the discussion, blazing away with your cap pistols.
>
> And as to the pornographic nature, or lack thereof, of Jon's Penny
> pictures, he was in violation of AOL's TOS simply by posting nudity,
> and he knew it. AOL in general sucks, and its college kid, part time
> employees will kill an account or some web pages at the drop of a hat.
>
> Anyone who goes ahead and uses AOL as an ISP anyway deserves what they
> get. I have no sympathy for them at all.

This coming from a fictious name and ID. What a flippin
looooooosssssseeeerrrr

Dan/W4NTI

2549. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 01:19:01 UTC
From: Hans Kohb <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <fd92705f1fef435cebffda7645da681e.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 75964

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote

> Is this for real? Are there REALLY people with Advanced licenses who
> refuse to upgrade to Amateur Extra SIMPLY because they feel the need
> to prove they passed the 13 wpm exam? I know it's a free country, and
> there are also many Advanced licensees who decide that the extra
> privileges aren't worth going to the trouble of studying up and going
> to the VE session, but I find this hard to believe.
>
> People who want to brag about their Morse Code
> proficiency can do so much less obnoxiously by actually USING it on
> the air.

Jason,

Do you have a point? All I could find in your jeremiad was a desire to
ridicule people who have a different opinion than yours.

73, de Hans, K0HB
(Who never took the Advanced test, went from Conditional to Amateur
Extra.)

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2550. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 01:27:03 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030831212703.14837.00002657@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 75965

In article <20030831091947.23171.00000406@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>
>All fixed now, tnx AOL.
>
>>Just ordered a hot
>>new computer, and will start it off with 8.0, then download the 9.0
>>upgrade.
>
>How hot?

Jim:

Well, it's paid for, if that's what you mean! OOOOHHH, you mean
performance-wise.

2.66 GHz P4, 1 GB RAM, top-of-the-line Intel DDR 400 MHz motherboard,
DVDRW/CDROM drive and another CDROM drive, 1.44 MB floppy drive,
6 USB ports, 2 cereal ports (one for Wheeties, one for Grape Nuts), and
a USR V.92 EXTERNAL USB modem. O/S will be Windoze XP. Oh,
40 GB Western Digital hard drive. It's being put together by a local
computer firm called Kehtron Computer, which has a good rep in this area
and offers the advantage of being local, so if anything goes wrong, I can
just bring it back with a bottle of ketchup and mustard and say, "Luncheon
is served, boys!"

>>I'm one of the first 1,000 original AOL users, and just can't
>>seem to break the habit.
>
>Exactly what AOL counts on. Can't blame 'em, it's sound marketing.

It certainly seems to have worked on me!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2551. Re: OT: Trojan Help

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 01:38:03 UTC
From: Gregg <nospam@unknown.org>
Message-ID: <%px4b.41512$_5.704707@news1.telusplanet.net>
Source record: 75966
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
www.debian.org

--
Gregg
*Perhaps it's useful, even if it can't be SPICE'd*
Visit the GeeK Zone - http://geek.scorpiorising.ca
```

2552. Re: For Vippy's Benefit...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 02:20:13 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831222013.26794.00000162@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 75967

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)

>Vipul Shah, (VShah101@aol.com) keeps insisting certain activities
>don't exist in Amateur Radio.

<link to a direction finding contest given>

In any group base there will be many aspects supported. In Ham radio, certain trends are there that would not be there if there was a truly random distribution. A trend is a trend, not 100% that the activity does not exist.

From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>Of course. Looks like a lot of fun. Note the thinness of many of the
>contestants, too.

People that participate in Amateur Radio Direction Finding would tend to be thinner than most Hams because this is a physical activity. That's consistent with what I have been saying before. Less Hams are interested in that and a greater percentage of Hams are overweight.

However, you must not be looking at the same photos I am looking at. It does not support the thinness claim. And one female looks like a male, which you would not know unless you saw the picture caption. Sorry. I hate to comment on people's weight, but you brought it up.

>But do you really think either of those you seek to convince will admit they
>were mistaken?

In any group base there will be many aspects supported. In Ham radio, certain trends are there that would not be there if there was a truly random distribution.

When you look at club activities, newsletters, QST and other publications, one can plainly see which activities the great majority of Hams are interested in.

>Particularly when you and the ARRL are the messengers?

The ARRL is generally more balanced than the typical Ham. They have to be.

2553. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 02:34:33 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831223433.26794.00000163@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 75968

From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu)

>Is this for real? Are there REALLY people with Advanced licenses who
>refuse to upgrade to Amateur Extra SIMPLY because they feel the need
>to prove they passed the 13 wpm exam? I know it's a free country, and
>there are also many Advanced licensees who decide that the extra
>privileges aren't worth going to the trouble of studying up and going
>to the VE session, but I find this hard to believe.

Its too bad that all some people care about is code speed and not the technical
material.

So, Jason, how are you doing? My time has passed, but I wish you luck. Although
you seem to be misguided and support Morse code, something I don't feel would
be interesting or worth it. There should be more support of the technical
aspects, something only a small percentage of Hams seem to be interested in.

2554. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 02:41:23 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030831224123.26794.00000166@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 75969

From: "Tin Monkey"

>When inclement WX hits and the phone lines are down it will be back to Ham
>Radio the way it always has been. Good old radios and antennas....and for
>those with preplannning a Marine battery or two as well.

How often has your fantasy been played out? Can you give examples where YOU
encountered that?

2555. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 02:45:00 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bivcp0$cb0s1$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75986

> The
> > average person would assume the FCC merely assigned it. (Yes, believe
it
> or
> > not I actually polled people to see their responses the last time this
> > bullsh*t came up). There is the root of the problem, if you have such a
> > pissy feeling towards Kim's (and many other potentially offensive by
your
> > apparent standards) the why don't you spend your efforts whining to the
> FCC
> > than wasting your time with posts that will not achieve ANY results
other
> > than to get it off your chest and to hear yourself "bellow" in a
> "electronic
> > medium."
> >
>
> Know why he won't? He kept alluding to the fact that he was going to, or
> kept inspiring others to do it. So, I wrote. I wrote knowing that Riley
> would more than likely be the kind of person who probably doesn't
appreciate
> the humor in my callsign, but also knowing that he upholds to the
principles
> of a democracy. And, he did exactly that. He does not like my callsign.
> But, he doesn't believe it is for the FCC to govern such things.

Well, I have said it before, and I will say it again, if the FCC is making any specific callsigns available that are allegedly deemed "offensive" then they are the ones that are responsible for that callsign. The efforts to get those callsigns blocked/banned/removed etc. falls on them as long as they are the governing body over amateur radio. It's just that simple.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2556. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 03:01:46 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bivcp1$cb0s1$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75987

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030830002426.23307.00002597@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <biotmk$b61ma$10@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >> Dwight:
> >>
> >> Actually, it most certainly is the business of any radio amateur who
> >> is properly concerned with the image of the ARS. This is supposed
> >> to be a family-oriented hobby/service. Mr. Hollingsworth said it most
> >> succinctly in his response to Kim when he raised the issue of the
> >> possible negative reaction of a parent/grandparent/aunt/uncle who may
> >> be considering this hobby for a young child in their life. Kim's
callsign
> >> most certainly could cause such a person to question the judgment,
> >> if not the personal integrity and morality, of radio amateurs in
general,
> >> through this one bad example.
> >
> >I'll say it again, the person uninvolved with amateur radio won't know
the
> >difference whether it was a sequentially or vanity-requested callsign.
The
> >average person would assume the FCC merely assigned it.
>
> Ryan:
>
> Well, that may be true, but it is the kind of moral relativism which is
causing
> our society to plummet straight into the ground on full afterburner.

And it started long before Kim was even born for that matter......

>
> >(Yes, believe it or
> >not I actually polled people to see their responses the last time this
> >bullsh*t came up). There is the root of the problem, if you have such a
> >pissy feeling towards Kim's (and many other potentially offensive by your
> >apparent standards) the why don't you spend your efforts whining to the
FCC
> >than wasting your time with posts that will not achieve ANY results other
> >than to get it off your chest and to hear yourself "bellow" in a
"electronic
> >medium."
>

> I can't say I disagree with you here, Ryan. However, it is HERE that Kim
> started on her campaign to trash up the image of the ARS, and it will be
> here that I continue to keep the heat turned up under her feet. On the
slight
> chance that she may throw in the towel and change her callsign, I could
then
> take credit for saving her personal image and that of the ARS.

Right, and this is not ham radio, it is merely a discussion group relating
to amateur radio in some fashion or another.....

>
> >> Throughout my adult life, I've been told that "perception is reality."
> >> While I would personally make some allowances for poor choices based
> >> on the immature judgment of younger people, Kim is certainly of an
> >> age and station in life where such poor judgment is much less likely
> >> to be excused. She is the only one who can make this controversy
> >> go away. Should she choose not to, she leaves herself open to the
> >> criticism of those of us who *are* offended and *do* object to her
choice
> >> of a Vanity call sign.
> >>
> >
> >Once again, if the callsign is so offensive, it is the FCC to blame.
>
> Not really. The FCC is a government bureaucracy which must comply with
> the demands placed on it by it's liberal, politically-appointed leaders.
They
> simply cannot impose any kind of "judgment" upon radio amateurs with
> regard to call sign selection, since to do so would imply that there are,
in
> fact, moral absolutes...and that's one thing the government, which cannot
> even permit a display of the Ten Commandments in a public building, just
> isn't going to do these days. More's the pity.

The FCC is the issuing body that gives the licenses out to recipients who
have met the requirements for each license class at the time of issuance.
Unless some other governmental organization is the one actually issuing the
licenses and maintaining the callsign database, they ARE responsible. Write
to your congress or senatorperson to get the FCC to remove the list of what
callsigns you deem offensive. After all, the majority of the congress and
senate ARE Republicans now.

>
> >Any
> >vanity callsign or even if it even was a sequentially assigned that is
> >deemed offensive is their fault.
>
> Yes on the sequential assignments, a definite no on the vanity calls.
> A Vanity call sign is self-selected by it's recipient; the FCC, as stated
> above, is not going to interfere.

Pure BS.... the FCC has people on their staff that can manage a database,
it's that simple. Remove the ones that are not "acceptable.

>
> >I should have the right to request ANY
> >callsign that is listed as "available" provided I have the initial right
to
> >do so by licensure requirements/benefits.
>
> I totally agree. Moreover, I would add that you have the responsibility
to
> make your selection one which is acceptable and not damaging to the
> image of the ARS. Kim deliberately and willfully violated that concept
> for the purpose of being able to flaunt a vulgar, "in your face,"
expression
> of her "individuality."

I guess that is all a matter of perception. I would actually have to see
real proof that it really has damaged the ARS, other that a perception of a
few people here....

>
> >If the list is including some of
> >what you refer to as offensive, that is your problem, and the FCC's, not
the
> >rest of us.
>
> No, it is the "problem" of everyone who seeks to uphold some semblance of
> traditional moral values in our society.
>

Define which moral values. Different groups have different values that they
deem to be of the utmost importance. That is a different subject
all-together though.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2557. Re: Ahh, the joy of techno-bigotry!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 03:07:11 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bivcp3$cb0s1$10@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75988

First to blame are the offenders obviously, Second to blame are the Control Operators that are supposed to be monitoring the damned thing to catch it before it gets out of hand. It's just that simple.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:abf9456ab6ea1277416156c788ee6207.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote
>
> > Hans, would you want your children or grandchildren to listen to that
> > filth on your radio? It doesn't have any place in the ARS, but it's what
> > I'm hearing.
>
> Of course foul language has no place in the ARS!!!! DUH!!!!!
>
> So you blame EchoLink, FM, repeaters, or do you blame the creeps who
> commit the offense?
>
> Good luck on this one now!
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>
>
> --
> Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2558. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 03:16:44 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bivcp4$cb0s1$11@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75989

Mike,

I do believe it does serve some purpose..... I have a friend that goes to Arizona every winter due to him and his wife's health issues and he does not have much there to use for equipment. He and I chat via Echolink on a regular basis on the link point connected where he is at. I also have developed some friendships with the people that frequent that access point (simplex access point, not a repeater one) as well. He is a 30+ year Extra class licensee so he CAN operate just about anywhere but only has 2m/70cm access when he goes there.

In this case it is a very productive use of the system. In this particular circumstance we would never be able to communicate if it wasn't for the system. Other than a little experimentation with it at first, I have not used it for much more than to communicate with him though.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
> And even though I have tried to look into Echolink with an open mind,
> in the end, I just don't think of it as a ham type sport - except for
> those that just want to talk. And I'm more into the hobby to build
> things, contest, and try to stretch my radio legs - not just talk.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

2559. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 03:26:06 UTC
From: Andy Noetzel <"No Email"@NotzelMe.com>
Message-ID: <biue8g$c3f$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75970

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030831224123.26794.00000166@mb-m26.aol.com...
From: "Tin Monkey"

>When inclement WX hits and the phone lines are down it will be back to Ham
>Radio the way it always has been. Good old radios and antennas....and for
>those with preplannning a Marine battery or two as well.

How often has your fantasy been played out? Can you give examples where YOU
encountered that?

>Actually, and if you were not trying to play "lawyer", this is less a
fantasy than a real-life occurrence. I have often had our power fail during
inclement WX and it is not all that unusual for an ice storm to down area
telephone lines.
I agree with the post and while I do not maintain more than one marine
battery I do have one. All but one of my rigs are capable of being hooked to
this battery in times of power outages. I have had several occasions to do
just that...use the battery.
And by the way. Who in the heck are YOU to ask that someone give YOU
examples of when THEY used a marine battery for emergency comms?

2560. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 03:39:47 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bivcp6$cb0s1$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75990

Hell, I work for a private university, and it is one of the "bastions" of republican thought; "do as I say, not do as I do." It promotes the lifestyle of the little rich brats that have been raised with the thinking of "it's not what you know, but who you know." Forget achieving based on merits or achievements.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> > Most schools and universities today are either state owned or state
> >supported. Therefore, to find an answer to the problems with schools, we
> >only have to look as far as our own state representatives. And, since
they
> >like the federal education assistance available to them, those
> >representatives are not going to change unless we vote them out and are
> >willing to fund schools locally. I see no effort in either of those
> >directions.
>
> Sad, but true.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

2561. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 03:41:48 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bivcp7$cb0s1$13@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75991

It does if you equate the suffix of TIT to an anatomical body part.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030830002416.23307.00002584@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <biltpf$auudh$15@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Just what exactly do you have against breasts Larry?? Any normal, healthy
> >male actually likes them, and sterotypically, the bigger the better from
a
> >general consensus!
>
> Ryan:
>
> I have absolutely nothing against breasts! The debate I'm engaged in
> over Kim's call sign actually has little or nothing to do with breasts,
> per se.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

2562. Re: Ham here and hams on the air?? Its a poll

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 03:43:45 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bivcp8$cb0s1$14@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75992

LMFAO!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Ryan

> >(Lennie, don't bother responding, We all know you don't have an amateur
> >radio license)
>
> Why should that stop him? It never has in the past!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

2563. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 03:44:45 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <biuf8u$pvs@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 75971

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:RVw4b.12334$EW1.2877@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think so. Or perhaps
> you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower child? Now thats a
> real probabliity.
>
>
> "Make love not War"
>
> "War is dangerous to all living things"
>
> etc.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Do you have to practice at being an asshole, Dan, or does it come that
naturally?

Kim W5TIT

2564. Re: Ham here and hams on the air?? Its a poll

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 03:45:42 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bivcp9$cb0s1$15@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75993

Thanks to all that responded and helped me to prove that the majority of
regulars here DO IN FACT operate on the air as well as participate here.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F514492.8070606@ix.netcom.com...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> >1. How many hams that participate with some frequency here in this
newsgroup
> >operate on the air in the legal ham bands?
> >
> me.
>
> >
> >
> >
> >2. Which band(s) do you operate? (Modes irrelevant for this poll, just
> >bands or frequency band ranges please.)
> >
> >
> Mostly HF, some 80m, 5Mhz, 40m, 20m (favorite band) and a little 10m.
> I need a
> better antenna for 80 and 5. Haven't been above 50MHz much at all since
I
> got my "extra lite"....
>
> >
> >
> >
> >3. How frequently do you operate on those bands in Question 2?? Hourly,
> >Daily, Weekly etc.
> >
> >
> For myself a few weeks can pass between operating sessions, and then spend
> a few hours on the radio (like a contest. I don't compete, but use them
> for seeing
> how far and what places I can ping).
>

2565. Re: LABOR DAY WEEKEND

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 03:48:58 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bivcpa$cb0s1$16@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75994

Just an update, we (as of Sunday night so far) raised $2900 and still have
Monday to collect. We already blew away last year's amount, and hopefully
can raise another 500 or more tomorrow!

Got a wicked sunburn on the face out of all of this though..... :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:itT3b.23973$yg.9797691@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> Same to you, Ryan...and ditto for all reading. :-)
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:biotmr$b61ma$14@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > I hope that everyone here has a fun and enjoyable and most importantly,
a
> > safe Labor Day holiday weekend. I myself will be participating in both
> the
> > amateur radio safety activities (Carebreaks) and also working the "Boot
> > Drive" with my fire department collecting money for the MDA. Last year
we
> > did over 2500 bucks for them doing only one day. We are doing from
Friday
> > thru Monday and hope to raise over 5,000 bucks!!!!!!
> >
> >
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> > .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

2566. Re: Off subject, tv monitor????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 03:51:27 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bivcpb$cb0s1$17@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75995

You are partially right Dwight, if he is using an old computer like a Commodore 64 or similar from that era, but if he is using any PC from the old XT/AT days till now, there are a ton of monitors out there are dirt cheap if looking for the old monochrome ones and the VGA/SVGA monitors can be found really cheaply as well.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB74941A.24DC4%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
> >
> > Jesus Christ!!! Look around your area as 14
> > and 15 inch monitors can be had for as little
> > as five bucks!!!!!!!!!! I bought an really
> > nice 15inch monitor at a hamfest for five
> > dollars and a decent used 17" for a few over
> > 20 bucks. God, I know hams are cheap/tightwads
> > and all, but come on!
>
>
> Don't be too hard on him, Ryan. Since it's not really clear what he
wants
> to use it for, perhaps he has a reason for wanting to use a television
with
> his computer. Another possibility is that he's been around long enough to
> remember when televisions were used with the computers of the time and was
> wondering if that was still possible today.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

2567. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 04:11:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0308312011.6536f423@posting.google.com>
Source record: 75972

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030831185938.24456.00000213@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> > Some do both and after all...passing the 13-wpm
> >test IS an accomplishment and something worthy of being proud of.
> >
> >> Jason Hsu, AG4DG
>
> Which the No-Code Knuckle Draggers will never be able to do. This alone will
> keep them always as second rate Hams with CB, being there main accomplishment

Jason, meet Bruce Bunion, WA8ULX. He's one of the originators of the
"I won't upgrade" Advanced Operators Club. What's his most recent
claim to fame? Run his call on QRZ and see.

2568. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 04:35:30 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0309010426380.3565@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 75973

On Sun, 31 Aug 2003, N2EY wrote:
> In article <f7d9a152.0308311309.44c88748@posting.google.com>,
> jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:
>
> >I found this comment on eham.net:
> >"I hold the OLD ADVANCED license and it is a matter of prestidge. I
> >had to have 13 wpm to get to this level and now they want to do away
> >with ALL CW? Keep at least the 5 wpm.
> >It is too easy to pass a written exam. The code kept the CB crowd from
> >gaining acess to our bands. "
>
> The fact of the matter is that simply having an Advanced is not proof of code
> speed. Since 1990, medical waivers were available for 13 and 20 wpm.

Although true, the fact of a waiver is in the FCC's database (there's a field for it). As an excuse not to upgrade to extra, it's probably one of the lamest ideas around. Upon upgrade, one will still have the "prior class held" field that will say advanced, so with the combination of these two data fields, we will know that a person once held an advanced class license WITHOUT the medical waiver and thus officially passed the 13wpm code element. [Whether or not the person actually took the test or just paid for his license will generally never be known!]

To me, the statement is more typical of some advanced class sourpuss who failed to take advantage of the transitional rule back in 2000 and obtain credit for the easier element 4B than the current element 4. Granted that was only for a 3.5 month window...

What surprises me is this: There are still some people (the August 30 session I did had two such people) who are coming in for their pre-87-tech to general no test upgrades, 3+ years after the rules change went into effect....

> >Is this for real? Are there REALLY people with Advanced licenses who
> >refuse to upgrade to Amateur Extra SIMPLY because they feel the need
> >to prove they passed the 13 wpm exam?
>
> There are some misguided folks who think that, but in fact it's not a proof of
> code speed any more than my Extra is proof of 20 per.

When it is known that a medical waiver wasn't used, it is (for pre April 19, 2000 extras).

> >I know it's a free country, and
> >there are also many Advanced licensees who decide that the extra
> >privileges aren't worth going to the trouble of studying up and going
> >to the VE session, but I find this hard to believe.

>
> If somebody wants to know my code skills and technical knowledge, I don't point
> to a license test I took in 1970. Instead, I just show 'em.
>
> >Anyone who thinks Morse Code is that important should try OPERATING
> >high-speed Morse Code and participate in Morse Code contests.
>
> We do! 13 wpm isn't high speed, tho.
>
> >All the
> >Advanced license proves is that you passed 13 wpm and the other exam
> >requirements years ago.
>
> Not even that. Medical waivers, etc.
>
> > ...

2569. Re: Off subject, tv monitor????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 04:35:59 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bivcpc$cb0s1$18@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75996

Well, he didn't specify exact intentions, so I did what any PCTA would do;
generalize without knowing all of the facts!
But I still stand by the statement in regards to the low cost of regular
monitors.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F4F5569.8030401@psu.edu...
>
>
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > Jesus Christ!!! Look around your area as 14 and 15 inch monitors can be
had
> > for as little as five bucks!!!!!!!!!!! I bought an really nice 15inch
> > monitor at a hamfest for five dollars and a decent used 17" for a few
over
> > 20 bucks. God, I know hams are cheap/tightwads and all, but come on!
>
> Wow Ryan!
>
> Maybe there is a reason this fellow wants to use a Television as a
> monitor. Maybe he is doing a presentation to some people, and needs a
> bigger screen. Maybe he wants to play computer games on a big screen TV.
> I'm surprised that you have this reaction, after reading previous posts
> of yours.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

2570. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 04:37:50 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bivcpe$cb0s1$19@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75997

They make great little frisbee's and with a dremel tool, wicked versions of
those "chinese throwing stars" as well.

I wonder how many other uses people have found for them???

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bit6ai$5fj@library1.airnews.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030831091947.23171.00000406@mb-m05.aol.com...
> > In article <20030830232840.08626.00000285@mb-m27.aol.com>,
> yodoc@aol.comnospam
> > (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
> >
> > >In article <20030830201932.12300.00000187@mb-m20.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> > >(N2EY)
> > >writes:
> > >
> > >>AOL trouble. Apparently fixed now.
> > >
> > >Which version of AOL are you using? 5.0 here.
> >
> > 7.0 here. I really liked 6.0 but it is not friendly with the network
> > environment here (Win95 machine and WinXP machine networked through a
> crossover
> > cable) so it was 7.0 to get things working.
> >
> > The problem was not in my computer, because other screen names worked
> perfectly
> > and only one of my 3 screen names had the problem.
> >
> > All fixed now, tnx AOL.
> >
> > >Just ordered a hot
> > >new computer, and will start it off with 8.0, then download the 9.0
> > >upgrade.
> >
> > How hot?
> >
> > >I'm one of the first 1,000 original AOL users, and just can't
> > >seem to break the habit.

> >
> > Exactly what AOL counts on. Can't blame 'em, it's sound marketing.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Sound marketing would be someone finding a use for all the junk mail AOL
has
> created over the past couple of decades... Maybe like softening the CDs
of
> today and making candy dishes out of them?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

2571. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 04:38:47 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bivcpf$cb0s1$20@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75998

I have seen AOL recently and Win XP and there is becoming a striking
similarity to the two.......

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0308302102.41afcb36@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030830201932.12300.00000187@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> > In article <3F510AFC.5010100@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >N2EY wrote:
> > >> test
> > >
> > > Lots of QRM, Jim! QRP computer?
> >
> > AOL trouble. Apparently fixed now.
>
> AOL can't be fixed . . .
>
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY

2572. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 04:42:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030901004218.14837.00002664@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 75974

In article <f45722ac.0308310842.7b52b33f@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>And during my turn in the barrel, I thanked my lucky stars I was Air
>Force. The USN was better to their people than the Army, but not
>much.

Brian:

Don't get me wrong, I had a great time in the Air Force, and have no regrets over my choice of a military career. However, you brushed up against part of my "problem" with the Air Force. I think that they are TOO good to their people, if that's possible. My last couple of years (the ones at Dover AFB) were made miserable by a bunch of whining, complaining, non-working Senior Airmen who didn't want to do anything but take two-hour lunch breaks, get their weekends off, get their 30 days leave exactly when they wanted it, and get paid every two weeks. Doing the job wasn't even on their Top 10 list of priorities. Of course, my job as a 9-level MSgt in a Superintendent slot was to make sure they were doing that job. So, whenever I dared to crack the whip a bit, they went around me to our CMSgt Squadron Ops Superintendent, who had the ever-popular "open door policy." Their complaints would end up with me being called on his carpet, whereupon I'd usually tell him that when they came in as a result of his open door policy, I'd much prefer it if he'd slam the door in their faces! Well, this got me a reputation of not being a "people person," since this Chief thought it was every supervisor's job to know the right buttons to push to get people to work. When I was an Airman, nobody had to push any buttons on me. I was always at work on time, early, in fact, with a clean, sharp-looking uniform, haircut, spit-polished shoes you could use as a shaving mirror, and my head full of all the technical information about my job I'd just learned from my CDC's. I was a great Airman, and continued to be right up to the day I retired. However, in my entire career as a supervisor (which, since I was always promoted way ahead of my alleged "peers," started at a mere 3 years TIS) I've only a small handful of Airmen who were anything like me. The rest were all the whining, needy, lazy, unmotivated, indifferent No-Coder type. When they weren't goofing off on the job, they were getting into trouble in the dorms and off-base, making my life miserable sorting them out at all hours of the night.

Now, the Navy always had a much different attitude toward discipline than the Air Force. A Navy Chief wields true power over his people, and usually isn't second-guessed or undermined by his senior Chiefs or officers. I have to say that in the many times I've worked with the Navy,

I've always been impressed with their Enlisted personnel. I'd never met one who wasn't able to address me correctly by rank -- but I'm sure that if the typical A1C were to encounter a Navy Petty Officer First Class in a professional situation, he'd probably call him or her "Sarge."

Navy Enlisted people have always seemed to have their acts together much better than Airmen, and I guess that's because they're all a lot closer to actual combat conditions than most Airmen ever get on a day-to-day basis. Things may have changed a bit since I've retired, what with the constant involvement in real-world combat situations these days. At least, I hope so.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2573. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 04:43:05 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bivcpg$cb0s1$21@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 75999

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F4F595C.9070304@psu.edu...
>
>
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > Just even one more proof of what I mean. Attempting to control free
speech
> > when a differing opinion occurs....
> > Why should they have exclusive control of the whole amateur community
when
> > they only represent (roughly) a quarter of the population?
>
>
> Gee, Ryan. If I make a post with my opinion, and you make a post with a
> different opinion, is that an attempt to control free speech on your part?

Only if the "you shouldn't say that" is the theme of the message. If it is
handled like a debate that is a bit different.....

>
> Which begs some questions:
>
> What do those people on this list who believe that a person who
> disagrees with them is trying to deny them their civil rights want? Do
> you just want to post with only replies that agree with you? Do you
> want to extend the same to the other persons posts? Are you trying to
> control them when you post a message disagreeing with their post?
>

I guess it would depend on how it is handled.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2574. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 05:01:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901010119.19477.00000269@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 75975

>Jason, meet Bruce Bunion, WA8ULX. He's one of the originators of the
>"I won't upgrade" Advanced Operators Club. What's his most recent
>claim to fame? Run his call on QRZ and see.

I may have said that, but when I could collect $250.00 on a BET to upgrade I did. But dont worry Brian I still have not used the EXTRA Privilages.
By the way Jason, Brian is one of the Weenies who couldnt make it above Tech untill the Welfare upgrade came out. He also claimed the CW was the only thing that was holding him back from Upgrading. And that the Written Test were no problem. After a year he still cant pass the EXTRA. Hes waiting for the next give away so he can upgrade.

2575. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 05:46:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030901014611.14837.00002666@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 75976

In article <f45722ac.0308312011.6536f423@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>
>Jason, meet Bruce Bunion, WA8ULX. He's one of the originators of the
>"I won't upgrade" Advanced Operators Club. What's his most recent
>claim to fame? Run his call on QRZ and see.

Brian:

It seems like Bruce Beynon is doing OK for a guy who's 305 years old!

OH, I get it now. Bunion. I guess Kim would say, ROFLMTO!!!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2576. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 06:45:54 UTC
From: Rodger Dodger <TenFour@LGoodBuddy.com>
Message-ID: <biupv6$3e1$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75977

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:biuf8u$pvs@library2.airnews.net...
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:RVw4b.12334$EW1.2877@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think so. Or perhaps
> you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower child? Now thats a
> real probabliity.
>
>
> "Make love not War"
>
> "War is dangerous to all living things"
>
> etc.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Do you have to practice at being an asshole, Dan, or does it come that
naturally?

Kim W5TIT
>>>
Kim. You really are an insufferable cunt.
Do you work at being so or is this just another of your inherent personality
quirks?

2577. FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 06:46:47 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <biuq0n$2rg$0@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 75978

It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....

http://www.eham.net/articles/6371

Enjoy!

2578. Re: AOL pulls Jon Cunningham's web pages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 06:55:05 UTC
From: Rodger Dodger <TenFour@LGoodBuddy.com>
Message-ID: <biuqgb$4ma$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 75979
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:hXw4b.12336$EW1.8669@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...

"Jayne Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
news:9841241545.65byedan8888@pavillage.net...
> On Sun, 31 Aug 2003 21:05:42 GMT, Dan/W4NTI
<w4nti@getridofthismindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > When you posted that his page was down I had just came off of that page
at
> > the AOL URL. So if you want to continue with your LIE. That is your
> > choice.
>
> The time of my post: 30 Aug 2003 12:53:49 GMT
>
> The time of your post: 30 Aug 2003 18:45:08 GMT (proof is in Message-ID:
> <Ug64b.5413$EW1.4148@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>)
>
> So, Dan, you lying sack of shit, you posted your claim almost six
> hours later! By then, Jon had plenty of time to whine and to beg AOL
> for a reprieve.
>
> The pages were down at the time I said they were. You came late (and
> uninformed) to the discussion, blazing away with your cap pistols.
>
> And as to the pornographic nature, or lack thereof, of Jon's Penny
> pictures, he was in violation of AOL's TOS simply by posting nudity,
> and he knew it. AOL in general sucks, and its college kid, part time
> employees will kill an account or some web pages at the drop of a hat.
>
> Anyone who goes ahead and uses AOL as an ISP anyway deserves what they
> get. I have no sympathy for them at all.
.....
.....
And one must surmise that it was because of crybabies such as yourself who
went whining to AOL that the page was censored.
I guess that Hell Hath No Fury such as a twinky, overly sensitive, Ham
operator who has been scorned on Jon's page.
Come on...face it. The photo of the naked gal with sand all over her
backside was just a ruse...one of you crybabies went whining to AOL because
Jon poked fun at you.
Will the real crybaby please stand up?

2579. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 07:08:11 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <biur8r$6ac$0@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 75980

N2EY wrote:

> In article <bitqro$tuo@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >> I use 'em for coasters, leveling furniture, craft projects, etc.
> >>
> >> 21st century clay pigeons, anyone?
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >I laughed hysterically when I saw this, Jim!!
>
> Then I succeeded in my attempt.
>
> > Man, they'd make great ones.
>
> The satisfaction factor alone.....
>
> >What's a "real" clay pigeon made of?
>
> ummmmm....clay? Specifically, I think they are dried but not fired so the
> pieces will disintegrate into the soil...
>

Actually they're made of pine pitch. Very brittle & easily broken. They are toxic to hogs so you can't run a hog farm successfully on a former skeet range!

>
> >Reason I ask is, that shooting skeet
> >with CDs would be putting an awful lot of plastic into our dear mother
> >earth.
> >
> Ugh. Bad idea.
>
> Here's a practical use for them: Put them under candles, shiny side up. They
> reflect the loight and some heat, and protect your table/cloth from dripping
> wax.
>

OR sue one for the dial on your homebrew rig!

>
> And a practical joke use: Make up a real-looking CD label that says "HOT XXX
> PHOTOS" or some such, stick it on the AOL CD, and leave it around where someone
> will swipe it and try to view it.

>
> bwaahaaahaaa.....

You're plain onery!

2580. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 07:11:09 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <biured$6ac$1@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 75981

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:biu33i$v3i@library1.airnews.net...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030831181947.29660.00000362@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > > In article <bitqgp$oh8@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > >news:20030831141937.29660.00000359@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > > >> In article <bit67d$gal@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> > <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> > > >> writes:
> > > >>
> > > >>
> > > >> The song is really an anti-conformity ditty, loosely derived from
> > Malvina
> > > >> Reynolds' "Little Boxes" and others of that ilk.
> > > >>
> > > >> >Yet, quite prophetic when looking back now.
> > > >>
> > > >> How?
> > > >
> > > >Oh, I think many today--even me--are quite involved and disolved with
> > > >keeping ourselves happy with material things. While I am not a keep up
> > with
> > > >the Jones' kind of person (i.e., unaffected by "status" symbols), I do
> > find
> > > >amusement in "things" more than I used to. I used to be happy just to
> > watch
> > > >ants...
> > > >
> > > Ah - good explanation! And observation...
> > >
> > > Here's another one for ya...
> > >
> > > From 1972-1976 I attended a large urban university. The big thing back
> > then
> > > was "nonconformity" to the rules of the "establishment", particularly in
> > > manners of slang, clothes and haircut.
> > >
> > > After a while, though, it became clear that we'd simply traded one form

> of
> > > conformity for another, and that we "nonconformists" pretty much dressed
> > alike,
> > > talked alike, and had similar haircuts.
> > >
> > > The university gave us more than schooling - we were actually educated,
> > often
> > > by experiences that seemed minor at the time.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> >
> > Absolutely!! I was one "of those" (nonconformists). Actually, I still
> > concentrate on being so--it doesn't come naturally any more <GRIN>. If
> > everyone is planting roses, I'll plant petunias. If all women like
> > diamonds, I like opals (and that is actually the truth).
> >
> > Anyway, you're right about the more we tried to be different, the more we
> > were the same. Uh, but we were the same together ;)
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think so. Or perhaps
> you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower child? Now thats a
> real probabliity.

Hey, she'e the one who wanted to go to Woodstock back when, but her mother wouldn't let her because she was too young. Pity!

2581. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 07:12:20 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <biurgk$6ac$2@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 75982

Hans Kohb wrote:

>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> (Who never took the Advanced test, went from Conditional to Amateur
> Extra.)

That's exactly what I did.

Dick

2582. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 07:25:35 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bius9f$86g$0@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 75983

Sri...you will be referrred to this URL :

http://www.qsl.net/n1ea/FIST_FCC_Petition_8-30-303.pdf

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:

> It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
>
> http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
>
> Enjoy!

2583. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 07:39:44 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <biut40$9iu$0@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 75984

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <f45722ac.0308310842.7b52b33f@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >And during my turn in the barrel, I thanked my lucky stars I was Air
> >Force. The USN was better to their people than the Army, but not
> >much.
>
> Brian:
>
> Don't get me wrong, I had a great time in the Air Force, and have no
> regrets over my choice of a military career. However, you brushed up
> against part of my "problem" with the Air Force. I think that they are
> TOO good to their people, if that's possible.

I remember being on TDY at Darmstadt, Germany in the early 60's where we were attached to an AF station for rations The.first morning, in the chow line the airman in the line ahead of me ordered up a cheese omelet! I nearly fell out! Never heard of such a thing in the military in those days, outside the AF at least. In the Army you got eggs, fried.

BTW, those guys at that detachment were listening to the Russkies ---on CW! Most of them wore their headphones to chow, like doctor wears his stethoscope.

In he army then, the way the troops were treated was largely up to the local commanders. If an officer got too friendly with his troops he'd usually wind up being reassigned.

2584. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 11:46:09 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <5kG4b.2951$UG.1973@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 75985

We had a power outage recently in the Northeast. The Echolink connection to a local 2 meter repeater was down because the RoadRunner cable system has no battery backup in these parts.

--

>> Remove "zz" from e-mail address to direct reply. <<

"Vshah101" <vshah101@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030831224123.26794.00000166@mb-m26.aol.com...
> From: "Tin Monkey"
>
> >When inclement WX hits and the phone lines are down it will be back to Ham
> >Radio the way it always has been. Good old radios and antennas....and for
> >those with preplannning a Marine battery or two as well.
>
> How often has your fantasy been played out? Can you give examples where YOU
> encountered that?
>
>

2585. Re: OT: Trojan Help

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 12:12:31 UTC
From: Fred Garvin <Garvin@Truss.net>
Message-ID: <bivd3f$8ru$4@216.221.129.15>
Source record: 76000

On Sun, 31 Aug 2003 21:38:03 -0400, Gregg wrote:

> www.debian.org

;)

2586. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 12:25:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901082513.15462.00002628@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 76002

In article <Pine.LNX.4.56.0309010426380.3565@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>On Sun, 31 Aug 2003, N2EY wrote:
>> In article <f7d9a152.0308311309.44c88748@posting.google.com>,
>> jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:
>>
>> >I found this comment on eham.net:
>> >"I hold the OLD ADVANCED license and it is a matter of prestidge. I
>> >had to have 13 wpm to get to this level and now they want to do away
>> >with ALL CW? Keep at least the 5 wpm.
>> >It is too easy to pass a written exam. The code kept the CB crowd from
>> >gaining acess to our bands. "
>>
>> The fact of the matter is that simply having an Advanced is not proof of
>> code
>> speed. Since 1990, medical waivers were available for 13 and 20 wpm.
>
>Although true, the fact of a waiver is in the FCC's database (there's a field
>for it).

True - but you have to dig up the database and know what to look for. The
license itself doesn't show waiver status, IIRC.

>As an excuse not to upgrade to extra, it's probably one of the
>lamest ideas around.

Agreed!

> Upon upgrade, one will still have the "prior class held" field
>that will say advanced, so with the combination of these two data fields, we
>will know that a person once held an advanced class license WITHOUT the
>medical
>waiver and thus officially passed the 13wpm code element.

Not in all cases. Look me up in the data base - no entry for "former license
class", even though I was Advanced from 1968 to 1970 (old 2 year waiting
period)

>[Whether or not
>the
>person actually took the test or just paid for his license will generally
>never
>be known!]
>
"just paid for his license"?

>To me, the statement is more typical of some advanced class sourpuss who
>failed
>to take advantage of the transitional rule back in 2000 and obtain credit for
>the easier element 4B than the current element 4. Granted that was only for
>a
>3.5 month window...

Maybe. But I think current Element 4 is no harder than old Element 4B.

>What surprises me is this: There are still some people (the August 30
>session
>I did had two such people) who are coming in for their pre-87-tech to general
>no test upgrades, 3+ years after the rules change went into effect....

I'm not surprised. Many hams I know do not follow the rules changes anywhere near as closely as some of us do. Look at restructuring - out of over 678,000 hams, FCC got 2200 or so comments.

Some folks are just finding out what the changes mean. And with 10 year renewals, folks who don't move around have very little interaction with FCC license procedures. The facts are often twisted in the retelling, too. Look at the misunderstanding about Element 1 and Technicians....
>
>> >Is this for real? Are there REALLY people with Advanced licenses who
>> >refuse to upgrade to Amateur Extra SIMPLY because they feel the need
>> >to prove they passed the 13 wpm exam?
>>
>> There are some misguided folks who think that, but in fact it's not a proof
>of
>> code speed any more than my Extra is proof of 20 per.
>
>When it is known that a medical waiver wasn't used, it is (for pre April 19,
>2000 extras).

But you need more info that just the fact that the person holds a certain license class.

>
>> >I know it's a free country, and
>> >there are also many Advanced licensees who decide that the extra
>> >privileges aren't worth going to the trouble of studying up and going
>> >to the VE session, but I find this hard to believe.
>>
>> If somebody wants to know my code skills and technical knowledge, I don't
>point
>> to a license test I took in 1970. Instead, I just show 'em.
>>
>> >Anyone who thinks Morse Code is that important should try OPERATING
>> >high-speed Morse Code and participate in Morse Code contests.
>>
>> We do! 13 wpm isn't high speed, tho.
>>
>> >All the

>> >Advanced license proves is that you passed 13 wpm and the other exam
>> >requirements years ago.
>>
>> Not even that. Medical waivers, etc.
>>
>> > ...
>

Fun fact:

From May 14 2000 to July 31, 2003, the number of Advanceds dropped from 99,782 to 83,141. That includes upgrades to Extra and dropouts. Only a 17% decline in over three years.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2587. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 12:25:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 76001

In article <biured$6ac$1@208.206.142.103>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Subject: Re: For those that are against the morse removal
>From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
>Date: 1 Sep 2003 07:11:09 GMT
>
>
>
>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
>> "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
>> news:biu33i$v3i@library1.airnews.net...
>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20030831181947.29660.00000362@mb-m24.aol.com...
>> > > In article <bitqgp$oh8@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
>> <fahgedit@nomail.net>
>> > > writes:
>> > >
>> > > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > > >news:20030831141937.29660.00000359@mb-m24.aol.com...
>> > > >> In article <bit67d$gal@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
>> > <fahgedit@nomail.net>
>> > > > >> writes:
>> > > > >>
>> > > > >>
>> > > > >> The song is really an anti-conformity ditty, loosely derived from
>> > Malvina
>> > > > >> Reynolds' "Little Boxes" and others of that ilk.
>> > > > >>
>> > > > >> >Yet, quite prophetic when looking back now.
>> > > > >>
>> > > > >> How?
>> > > > >
>> > > > >Oh, I think many today--even me--are quite involved and disolved with
>> > > > >keeping ourselves happy with material things. While I am not a keep
>up
>> > with
>> > > > >the Jones' kind of person (i.e., unaffected by "status" symbols), I do
>> > find
>> > > > >amusement in "things" more than I used to. I used to be happy just to
>> > watch
>> > > > >ants...
>> > > > >
>> > > > >

>> > > Ah - good explanation! And observation...
>> > >
>> > > Here's another one for ya...
>> > >
>> > > From 1972-1976 I attended a large urban university. The big thing back
>> > then
>> > > was "nonconformity" to the rules of the "establishment", particularly
>in
>> > > manners of slang, clothes and haircut.
>> > >
>> > > After a while, though, it became clear that we'd simply traded one form
>> of
>> > > conformity for another, and that we "nonconformists" pretty much
>dressed
>> > alike,
>> > > talked alike, and had similar haircuts.
>> > >
>> > > The university gave us more than schooling - we were actually educated,
>> > often
>> > > by experiences that seemed minor at the time.
>> > >
>> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> > Absolutely!! I was one "of those" (nonconformists). Actually, I still
>> > concentrate on being so--it doesn't come naturally any more <GRIN>. If
>> > everyone is planting roses, I'll plant petunias. If all women like
>> > diamonds, I like opals (and that is actually the truth).

But you're still planting flowers, and liking jewelry. Same difference.

>> > Anyway, you're right about the more we tried to be different, the more we
>> > were the same. Uh, but we were the same together ;)

Groovy, baby!

>> Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think so. Or perhaps
>> you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower child? Now thats a
>> real probabliity.

Bummer, man! Why such a downer?
>
>Hey, she'e the one who wanted to go to Woodstock back when, but her mother
>wouldn't let her because she was too young. Pity!
>
Woodstock? Let's see, that was late summer 1969, when Kim was 15 if memory
serves. I don't think a responsible parent would let their 15-year-old go to
such a "happening".

Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock never actually
got there due to traffic snarls. Some of the performers had to be helicoptered
in and out, and some never made it. The whole event was such a mess that large
outdoor festivals basically disappeared afterwards because nobody with half a

brain would issue the necessary permits. (Altamont drove the final nail in that coffin).

Counterculture? Check this out: The promoters who put on the Woodstock festival lost big piles of money on the concert. The whole thing was too big for them to control - early on they even lost the ability to collect admission. There was even talk of civil suits over huge unpaid expenses BUT....

The promoters had done one smart thing: They owned the rights to almost all recordings (film and sound) made at the festival. So they made a documentary movie and record album for very little money, and made back all their losses and millions more. Good old capitalism...

Remember the song "Woodstock", made famous by Crosby Stills Nash and Young? It was actually written by Joni Mitchell (who also performed the first version). Buit Mitchell was not at the Woodstock festival at all!

The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon. That's what I think of first when that time is mentioned.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2588. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 13:50:29 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <F8l4b.3185$i93.632@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76003

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bivcp4$cb0s1$11@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Mike,
>
> I do believe it does serve some purpose..... I have a friend that goes to
> Arizona every winter due to him and his wife's health issues and he does
not
> have much there to use for equipment. He and I chat via Echolink on a
> regular basis on the link point connected where he is at. I also have
> developed some friendships with the people that frequent that access point
> (simplex access point, not a repeater one) as well. He is a 30+ year
Extra
> class licensee so he CAN operate just about anywhere but only has 2m/70cm
> access when he goes there.
>
> In this case it is a very productive use of the system. In this
particular
> circumstance we would never be able to communicate if it wasn't for the
> system. Other than a little experimentation with it at first, I have not
> used it for much more than to communicate with him though.

You could say the same things if your friend had been using a cell-phone or
regular telephone, Ryan.

You most especially could say the same things if they had been using ICQ or
any other form of Internet chat.

The fact that people use Echolink to successfully communicate does not
magically make the Internet connection "ham radio". An important
distinction to keep in mind is that our hobby is not called "Amateur
Communication", where any form of communication will serve but rather
"Amateur Radio", where the focus is solely upon radio communications.

The ARRL inadvertently created some confusion about this with thier
"communicator" promotions, a few years back.

The fact that your friends have decided to slow down and reduce the audio
quality of thier Internet chat by hanging a radio on one end or the other
does not make that Internet communication "Ham Radio"... It just means that
they are willing to put up with reduced performance in thier chat
activities, in order to have a "ham radio simulator" at one end or the
other.

In the end, Echolink serves as an excuse not to use radio to communicate "as
a ham", as in the case with your friends. It also very often serves as an
excuse not to learn more about the hobby and upgrade, as in the case of the

hundreds, perhaps thousands of hams who instantly dropped plans to upgrade, or even to buy a radio upon discovering Echolink. Echolink devotees are just brimming over with excuses, but none of those excuses change the fact that Echolink is an Internet chat, not ham radio.

Just for fun: Remember "Hands across America"? It was some kind of a wierd promotion where they tried to get people to join hands in a solid chain, coast to coast! There were some unexpected difficulties in mountanous and desert areas that could have easily been foreseen, but anyway:

Imagine a chain of people, coast to coast, passing along a note like we used to do in school, but this note goes from New York to Los Angeles, California!

The original note is written down from a message heard on a handy-talky from a New York repeater.

They pass the note, thousands of people passing it hand-to-hand across the whole U.S. and finally at the end, the note is read into the microphone of another H/T, tuned to a repeater in Los Angeles.

Headline: "Hams use handy-talkies to communicate from New York to Los Angeles!"

I believe it would be stretching things just a bit too much to call it an "amateur radio" communication, don't you?

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

2589. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 13:55:51 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bivj2d$3t3@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76004

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bivcp1$cb0s1$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
> Define which moral values. Different groups have different values that
they
> deem to be of the utmost importance. That is a different subject
> all-together though.
>
>
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>

Here is what I think is an excellent parody:

We could (hopefully) all agree that all crime is "offensive." All crime is offensive because, well, it is against the law. However, I (me, personally) disagree that the growth and use of marijuana for personal use is OK, and should not be against the law. Even so, I understand and agree that anyone caught growing, carrying or using should "pay the crime." Yet, I will support a goal aimed at the decriminalization of marijuana for personal use.

That's more than I intended to say, but my point is: we could all agree that something is offensive. I do not agree that my callsign is offensive. We could all agree that some moral values are deemed to be of the utmost importance. I do not agree that my callsign is morally incorrect; therefore, my callsign does not commit offense to any morals.

Kim W5TIT

2590. Re: GALAXY-RANGER SERVICE MANUAL--2nd EDITION

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 13:56:58 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <FMOcnVKEot6szc6iXTWJiA@crocker.com>
Source record: 76005

"Radio One" <523@xnvillagemon.org> wrote in message
news:bivgh5$1th$0@pita.alt.net...

is another cb troll posting to a group that has in the past been obviously anti-cb... especially modified cb. if you think their products or those on other web sites violate fcc rules send your info per the following:

FCC CONSUMER ALERT

Federal Communications Commission

Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau

445 12th Street, SW Washington, DC 20554

1-888-CALL-FCC (voice)

1-888-835-5322 (TTY)

www.fcc.gov/cgb

UNAUTHORIZED EQUIPMENT SOLD ON INTERNET AND IN PUBLICATIONS

The Federal Communications Commission receives hundreds of complaints about alleged illegal (non-FCC certified) equipment being offered for sale on the Internet or in publications. The Commission is monitoring this situation carefully and requests your assistance. If you have any information about illegal or uncertified equipment being offered for sale, please forward it to the FCC. Useful information for the FCC includes:

* An original advertisement or Web address where the illegal equipment is

being advertised or offered for sale with the types of equipment about which

the allegations are being made, highlighted.

* If it is a Web-auction we will need the name of the auction site, the exact

item number, and auction opening and closing dates.

* Name and address of the individual or business offering the item(s) for sale.

* Complainant's name and telephone number in the event follow-up is necessary.

This information can remain confidential, if requested.

* Specifically, why you think the equipment is not in compliance with FCC rules.

* Number of pieces or types of equipment about which the allegations are being

made (one piece, five pieces, how many models, etc.).

Information can be mailed to the FCC at the address below or e-mailed to fccinfo@fcc.gov.

###

To receive information on this and other FCC consumer topics through the

Commission's electronic subscriber service, click on

www.fcc.gov/cgb/emailservice.html

2591. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 14:08:43 UTC
From: Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com>
Message-ID: <Lpl4b.22832$S_.1947@fed1read01>
Source record: 76006

Au Contraire
Echolink is an Internet chat FOR Amateur Radio Operators
And anything that allows communication between Hams gotta be OK.
Just another communication vehicle
Get over it!

I never use it but can easily understand why it can be of value to others.
And that from a 25 Year extra class ham.
Hey CW, SSB, RTTY, PSK31, Packet, NTS, IRLP, EchoLink, Phone Patch, et al --
communicate communicate is da word.

Signal In The Noise But MDS

SNIP Da Rationale
Echolink devotees are just
> brimming over with excuses, but none of those excuses change the fact that
> Echolink is an Internet chat, not ham radio.
>

2592. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 14:22:10 UTC
From: Hans Kohb <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <b309ce148a7d07e18fe1e709110785b7.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 76007

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

>
> http://www.qsl.net/n1ea/FIST_FCC_Petition_8-30-303.pdf
>

Perhaps FISTS should consider sending this in as a comment to be
considered with RM-10787, rather than a separate petition.

If FCC grants the "no Morse test" petition, then it is unlikely to roll
back that decision at a later date.

73, Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

2593. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 14:26:29 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bivkrr$5oi@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76008

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <biured$6ac$1@208.206.142.103>, "Dick Carroll;"
<dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> >> "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> >> news:biu33i$v3i@library1.airnews.net...
> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:20030831181947.29660.00000362@mb-m24.aol.com...
> >> > > In article <bitqgp$oh8@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> >> <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> >> > > writes:
> >> > >
> >> > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> > >news:20030831141937.29660.00000359@mb-m24.aol.com...
> >> > > >> In article <bit67d$gal@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> >> > <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> >> > > >> writes:
> >> > > >>
> >> > > >>
> >> > > >> The song is really an anti-conformity ditty, loosely derived
from
> >> > Malvina
> >> > > >> Reynolds' "Little Boxes" and others of that ilk.
> >> > > >>
> >> > > >> >Yet, quite prophetic when looking back now.
> >> > > >>
> >> > > >> How?
> >> > > >
> >> > > >Oh, I think many today--even me--are quite involved and disolved
with
> >> > > >keeping ourselves happy with material things. While I am not a
keep
> >up
> >> > with
> >> > > >the Jones' kind of person (i.e., unaffected by "status" symbols),
I do
> >> > find
> >> > > >amusement in "things" more than I used to. I used to be happy
just to

> >> > watch
> >> > > >ants...
> >> > > >
> >> > > Ah - good explanation! And observation...
> >> > >
> >> > > Here's another one for ya...
> >> > >
> >> > > From 1972-1976 I attended a large urban university. The big thing
back
> >> > then
> >> > > was "nonconformity" to the rules of the "establishment",
particularly
> >in
> >> > > manners of slang, clothes and haircut.
> >> > >
> >> > > After a while, though, it became clear that we'd simply traded one
form
> >> of
> >> > > conformity for another, and that we "nonconformists" pretty much
> >dressed
> >> > alike,
> >> > > talked alike, and had similar haircuts.
> >> > >
> >> > > The university gave us more than schooling - we were actually
educated,
> >> > often
> >> > > by experiences that seemed minor at the time.
> >> > >
> >> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >> >
> >> > Absolutely!! I was one "of those" (nonconformists). Actually, I
still
> >> > concentrate on being so--it doesn't come naturally any more <GRIN>.
If
> >> > everyone is planting roses, I'll plant petunias. If all women like
> >> > diamonds, I like opals (and that is actually the truth).
>
> But you're still planting flowers, and liking jewelry. Same difference.
>

Yeah, but I like to think that I'm being a bit of a renegade. Actually, I don't like things all the same. Remember the good 'ol "Neighborhood Association" debates that have come and gone here? I'm against them, for whatever purpose; and would be so very, very depressed if I ever have to live "in" one.

And, as for jewelery. That is a going joke in my family. I love jewelery. Even used to work at Ed Levin Jewelers long ago. Love to get it as a present. Don't spend much time shopping for it or being distracted by it, though, if set against the rest of my female population. A couple of years ago I asked for, and received, one of those standing jewelery chests. It's

about half full. Every once in a while I'll spend an hour or two taking all my pretties out and looking at them. LOL But, save on rare occasions, you'll not find me with a piece on--not even my wedding band. Just don't like the feeling of anything around me, I guess.

> >> >
> >> > Anyway, you're right about the more we tried to be different, the more we
> >> > were the same. Uh, but we were the same together ;)
>
> Groovy, baby!
>

Gads!!! That's so funny. I never got into the beatniky-hippie kind of lingo. Heck, I don't think I could even be classified as a true hippie--I am just a couple of years too late fer it.

> >> Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think so. Or perhaps
> >> you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower child? Now thats a
> >> real probabliity.
>
> Bummer, man! Why such a downer?
> >

Some folks can be no other way.

> >Hey, she'e the one who wanted to go to Woodstock back when, but her mother
> >wouldn't let her because she was too young. Pity!
> >
> Woodstock? Let's see, that was late summer 1969, when Kim was 15 if memory
> serves. I don't think a responsible parent would let their 15-year-old go to
> such a "happening".
>

Yep, 14 though. And, you're right. I had friends whose parents were much more lenient than mine who went. I was going with them. Until I asked my parents...LOL

> Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock never actually
> got there due to traffic snarls. Some of the performers had to be helicoptered
> in and out, and some never made it. The whole event was such a mess that large
> outdoor festivals basically disappeared afterwards because nobody with half a
> brain would issue the necessary permits. (Altamont drove the final nail in that

> coffin).
>

It was much nicer watching from the news on it. As "free" as I liked to think of myself back then, I am pretty sure I would definitely have been bummed at the rain, mud, and so darned many freaks.

> Counterculture? Check this out: The promoters who put on the Woodstock festival
> lost big piles of money on the concert. The whole thing was too big for them to
> control - early on they even lost the ability to collect admission. There was
> even talk of civil suits over huge unpaid expenses BUT....
>

I think there was more than talk. Did Yeager/Yager/Yeger (however his name is spelled) think there was loads to be had in a suit and begin the process until it was explained to him the debaucle of the whole thing?

> The promoters had done one smart thing: They owned the rights to almost all
> recordings (film and sound) made at the festival. So they made a documentary
> movie and record album for very little money, and made back all their losses
> and millions more. Good old capitalism...
>

Bought the album. You know, the one with the little kid on it? <GRIN>
It's the only album where I've heard Joan singing the song "Sweet Sir Gallahad" ('least I think that's the name of it) and gosh I like that song.

> Remember the song "Woodstock", made famous by Crosby Stills Nash and Young? It
> was actually written by Joni Mitchell (who also performed the first version).
> Buit Mitchell was not at the Woodstock festival at all!
>
> The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon. That's
> what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Yeah, Summer 1970 saw the tragedy at Kent State...the beginning of the end.

By the way, I'd have guessed you were an old hippie, Jim. At least there's still a few left upholding the original ideals. I gave up.

Kim W5TIT

2594. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 14:30:42 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bivl3p$qu6@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76009

Parody? Not sure I meant to use that word...but anyway, you get the point!

Kim W5TIT

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bivj2d$3t3@library1.airnews.net...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:bivcp1$cb0s1$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> >
> > Define which moral values. Different groups have different values that
> they
> > deem to be of the utmost importance. That is a different subject
> > all-together though.
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> > .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >
> >
>
> Here is what I think is an excellent parody:
>
> We could (hopefully) all agree that all crime is "offensive." All crime
is
> offensive because, well, it is against the law. However, I (me,
personally)
> disagree that the growth and use of marijuana for personal use is OK, and
> should not be against the law. Even so, I understand and agree that
anyone
> caught growing, carrying or using should "pay the crime." Yet, I will
> support a goal aimed at the decriminalization of marijuana for personal
use.
>
> That's more than I intended to say, but my point is: we could all agree
that
> something is offensive. I do not agree that my callsign is offensive. We
> could all agree that some moral values are deemed to be of the utmost
> importance. I do not agree that my callsign is morally incorrect;
> therefore, my callsign does not commit offense to any morals.
>

> Kim W5TIT
>
>

2595. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 14:55:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309010655.5a2eedea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76011

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030830232840.08626.00000284@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <e79dbd9b.0308300952.614c3636@posting.google.com>, k0hb@arrl.net
> (K0HB) writes:
>
> >Your rationale reminds me of the gun control crowd who would ban
> >private ownership of handguns because some criminal used a handgun in
> >a liquor store holdup. Rather than attack the perpetrators you want
> >to ban the technology for all legitimate users. Welcome to Amerika!
> >
> >With all kind wishes,
> >
> >de Hans, K0HB
>
> Hansl:
>
> The gun control crowd want to ban handguns (and all other types of
> firearms, for that matter) because they realize that tens of millions of
> law-abiding gun owners serve as a very strong deterrent to violent
> crime, and thus make the average American less dependent on
> government for their basic security.

The libs call people dependant on government "constituents."

Armed citizens effectively employ
> firearms to stop or prevent violent crime over two million times each
> year, yet the liberal media never reports this fact.

Right. They just focus on how many US soldiers are killed in Iraq
each day. They never mention how many of the bad guys we get.

The liberal,
> socialist Democrat ideology

As implemented by FDR...

Hey, FWIW, the original writing of the National Firearms Act of 1934
DID ban all handguns.

depends on our society being essentially
> broken and wholly dependent on government services, in order to
> assure the job security of liberal, socialist government bureaucrats,
> social workers, and most other highly-paid civil servants. They also
> know that an armed citizenry has the ability to resist government
> tyranny in the most effective manner possible -- with deadly force.
> They can't have that, and must abolish that concept any way they

> can in order to guarantee their own futures. The "technology" of
> firearms will always be available to criminals -- just take a close look
> at what is happening in the U.K., Australia, and anywhere else where
> civil disarmament has been achieved. Violent crime, including gun
> crime, is increasing, and non-violent property-based crime is off
> the charts.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

2596. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 14:59:39 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bivmq2$hrp@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76012

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030831141939.29660.00000360@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <bit3lg$9s2@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >> Cable TV broke those taboos in the '70s by arguing that since cable was
> >>not
> >> broadcast and you paid to have it in your home, you retained control.
But
> >>then
> >> broadcast TV copied cable as much as possible to remain "competitive".
> >>
> >> Was all this "smart' or "dumb"?
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> >Smart or dumb.
>
> ??
>
> Perhaps you meant "smart *and* dumb"....
>

No. I meant to repeat from you what I was going to comment on.

> >
> >Likely as not, that cannot be answered so succinctly.
>
> Aye.
>
> > I
> >think to some degree the type of programming available today far exceeds
> >what is needed. For example, how much reality TV do we really "need"?
>
> About 1% of what's out there, I'd say.
>

heh heh! I am not so sure even that!

> >
> >BUT,
> >the primary responsibility for what happens in the home is still the
> >family--right?
>

> RIGHT.
>
> But as far as TV goes, I'd say "the primary responsibility for what is on
TV is
> the viewing audience". To a very large extent, the folks in charge of
> programming put on what people actually decide to watch, not what they say
they
> want to watch. How long do you think "Survivor" would last with low
ratings?
>

Agreed. By virtue of that-the family.

>
> The only "reality TV" I found halfway worth watching were the PBS series
"1900
> House" "1940 House" "Frontier House" etc. Most of which were actually BBC
> productions.
>

Never saw it. I get stuck watching those remodeling shows...LOL And, my
husband and I have been remodeling.

> >
> >For the politics of it all, I like that, at least so far (and that
comment
> >belies another discussion altogether) we live in a country where
"anything"
> >goes.
>
> Actually, "anything" doesn't go in American TV culture. Explicit violence
is
> all over the place, in many different forms, but explicit sex is another
matter
> entirely. Even on cable.
>

Well, explicit maybe. BUT a few network shows sure have pushed the limit!

> >
> >But with that comes the responsibility of family and, beyond that,
> >community. I think society in a transitional phase, where everyone is
> >beginning to realize that we all have a responsibility to help see that
our
> >youth are raised with good attitudes, strong independence, and a
willingness
> >to recognize and overcome challenges, rather than to succumb to them. In
> >the home, in schools, and in our civic and religious organizations, we
all
> >come together and decide--collectively--how best to do that.
>
> WELL SAID, Kim!

>

Core values. The only thing that scares me about that is it's being done during the current administration. And, I don't like what I see happening to my USA under the current administration. For instance, and this is just a for instance, the attitude of "if you aren't for us, you're against us." While on the surface that is a logical statement; it is no more than an attempt to label and beguile anyone who is "against" something that someone is for.

>
> And the first step is a common set of core values, which means "anything
> doesn't go"
>
> >Of course,
> >this isn't as obvious as it seems, but I think it happens by "osmosis."
>
> On that point I must disagree. What we get by osmosis is a mish-mash of
> conflicting values.
> >

Well, it goes back to something you said, maybe even in another thread, not sure now. You said to me, "but you are still planting flowers and liking jewelery." I think, for the most part, if we collectively (as a society) begin to turn a path together toward, say, child pornography being wrong: there will be all kinds of different ways that it is wrong and there will be all kinds of definitions for what child pornography is. But, the common goal--the moral ground--is that it is wrong. I personally don't care if someone goes out and rips the head off a child pornographer. I wouldn't do it, but I secretly be saying "YEAH" to the person who did.

That was too much digression. I think we all, by osmosis, begin to learn to react collectively when it is recognized--somehow--that something ain't right. Only problem is, we then tend to get wrapped up in being disgusted about each others' reactions and definitions...LOL

> >
> >It always makes me nervous when we start disliking the media around us
> >enough to support, indeed call for, its censorship--in any form or
another.
> >I'd rather have the capability to decide for myself, my family, and my
> >community, what is OK and what we need to use to learn from.
>
> I'd say it depends what form the censorship takes. I say that we vote with
our
> wallets. What we buy and watch controls the market far more effectively.
> >

Definitely. Our personal commitment and actions are the best way to have it. What I meant by censorship is a governmental body.

> >
> >What was acceptable yesteryear is the norm today and, to some degree,
that
> >is OK. I shudder to think that women would be put back into a time when
> >they weren't allowed the commonality with men as they are today.
>
> Not just women but all sorts of folks. Look at all the changes in the past
50
> years, from the end of that "separate but equal" nonsense to truth in
> advertising and equality of opportunity and housing.
>
> Take just one concept - say, the idea that all citizens should have the
right
> to vote regardless of race. 50 years ago it was considered "liberal" by
some
> and "radical" by others. Now it's mainstream.
>

Good example.

> >
> >And, after
> >all, the media helped aid in the progress for women. I shudder to think
of
> >a time when Ozzie and Harriet (parents who were so blind they couldn't
see
> >their children behind their backs) were considered the norm for family
life.
>
> Actually, I don't think anybody who was really raising a family in the
> Ozzie/Beaver/Donna Reed days thought those shows were a totally accurate
> reflection of their reality. No more so than "Family Ties" or "All In The
> Family" were, in their time. They were simply stories.
>

Thank goodness! But, the kids of today, when they watch those shows really
do think those shows are reflecting reality and--to some degree--they were.
The moms of yesteryear wanted nothing more than to believe that their
children were sweet and innocent. And, believe me, we were far, far from
sweet and innocent. We weren't the monsters the mothers of yesteryear would
have thought us, for sure, but we also weren't sweet and innocent.

>
> In fact, almost all "domestic comedies" derive from a single source:
Jackie
> Gleason's "Honeymooners" sketches of over 50 years ago. Look at them
carefully
> and they are almost all variations on that theme.
>

I haven't watched an old show in a long, long time. Hey, remember the
character of Fonzie? Now, in true life, a person like that would have been
sneered and jeered at--and certainly would not have had the endearment he

had on that show.

>
> (The other classics are the "ensemble comedies" which are not
family-based.
> Their source are the '70s shows "Barney Miller" and "WKRP in Cincinnati")
>

ROFLMAO...I am not so sure WKRP was very far off base. I've been in too
many corporate meetings...LOL

> >
> >Today, we deal with each other on real levels and parents recognize
> >that--darn it all--kids for the most part are going to be tempted to the
> >unthinkable. We don't need TV to teach us that, it is a reality.
>
> True, but it would be nice if TV wasn't trying to tell us those things
were
> "normal" or "OK".
> >

That's where it is up to the family to know what is on TV, what the kids are
watching (and ideally what should be being watched as a family), and to
dispel the rumors that may be inspired by those shows. I think the kids are
getting pretty darned astute, though. All of society is getting more astute
since Sep 11 when, really, for the first time in this country we have had to
deal with "ourselves."

> >
> >For an extreme, take the example of the movie (if we can call it that)
> >"Jackass." I never heard of this MTV show until the movie came out.
While
> >I was horrified to see some of the things this crew of folk get
themselves
> >into; it seems that it's hard to turn off or "put down."
>
> I've heard of it. Involves people doing incredibly stupid stuff.
>

Stupid and harmful to themselves--and others.

> >
> >I like that this
> >is available--politically speaking--and, it would be completely forbidden
in
> >my home if I'd had small children.
>
> Ah, hold on a sec...
>
> How "small"? 5 years old? 10 years old? 15 years old?
>

You know what? I think a very young child--up to say 3--is just looking at motion on the screen. I don't think they are going to formulate an opinion one way or the other. From 3 to, say, 6, they can be "reasoned" with and told that a movie is pretend, is a comedy, whatever. But, from then on, I think one has to deal with the fact that what is watched may be revered, tried, appreciated, etc. So, from 6 up.

>
> And how are you going to control what goes on in your house 24/7 if you're not
> there all the time?
>

I'm not stupid enough to think I could. THAT is why, rather than censorship, it is up to "us" to know what is available, not to fool ourselves into thinking we can control most kids into not watching such stuff, and to reinforce good principles, be siffer than stiff about wrong-doings and not let a darned thing get past us. In other words--be the moms and dads of yesteryears, but with the blinders off. And, I agree wholeheartedly with beating the crap out of a kid for something really wrong (but my definition of "beating the crap out of" is to haul off and whack them good and hard with a belt).

> >
> >To know that it's there and to know that
> >some youth may be influenced to believe that things like that are OK, is the
> >tool by which we learn to teach. MTV did not make people like that--they
> >are out there. Without the exposure of the show, we'd never know it, right?
>
> Wrong.
>
> We don't need real-life examples of stupidity to teach us what can happen. And
> the message sometimes gets inverted, because the stupid ones often survive.
>

No, what I meant is: those idiots that made that show. It isn't the "acts" they are doing that is the offensive part. It is the fact that *they believed it was OK to make a movie and "brag" about **doing** things like that* that is offensive. We let what they believed to be correct, right from the top down. The producers, directors, funders, and people that bought tickets and now, rent the movie.

>
> One of the main differences between human and animal thought is that (most)
> humans can deal in abstractions and future possibilities without having to
> actually see things go wrong. I *know*, for instance, that playing with
> gasoline is extremely dangerous even though I've never been burned by a
> gasoline fire.

>

How did/do you know that for the first time, though?

> >
> >It's always hard to debate in print--but hopefully you'll get what it is
I'm
> >trying to interpret.
> >
> >Smart or dumb. Both. But it's all about capability to me. I like
> >flexibility. I would not want the alternative: someone or something
making
> >the decisions as to smart or dumb.
> >
> On that last point we agree. And I'll offer another observation: The right
to
> such freedom carries with it the responsibility to make intelligent
choices and
> develop sound values. The two cannot be separated, even though many people
> focus on the first and ignore the second.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Absolutely.

Kim W5TIT

2597. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 14:59:50 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <G9J4b.178$vj4.28635@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76010

"Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:b309ce148a7d07e18fe1e709110785b7.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/n1ea/FIST_FCC_Petition_8-30-303.pdf
> >
>
> Perhaps FISTS should consider sending this in as a comment to be
> considered with RM-10787, rather than a separate petition.
>
> If FCC grants the "no Morse test" petition, then it is unlikely to roll
> back that decision at a later date.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

And, the FCC upheld its R&O in 98-143, denying all petitions
for reconsideration asking for reinstatement of higher speed
Morse tests.

Carl - wk3c

2598. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 15:00:54 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <GaJ4b.36464$Vx2.16005165@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76013

"Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:b309ce148a7d07e18fe1e709110785b7.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/n1ea/FIST_FCC_Petition_8-30-303.pdf
> >
>
> Perhaps FISTS should consider sending this in as a comment to be
> considered with RM-10787, rather than a separate petition.
>
> If FCC grants the "no Morse test" petition, then it is unlikely to roll
> back that decision at a later date.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB

I suspect that this will work equally as well as a comment since the FCC will be required to weigh all the diverging and conflicting petitions that have already been submitted to come up with whatever ruling they may decide to put out. There are now at least seven different petitions filed although not all are yet open to comments. The fact that it is a petition may even give it more weight than just a comment.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2599. Re: More Classic Wisdom from Kim, W5TIT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 15:02:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309010702.677e2d9f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76014

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bitaacmka1@208.206.142.88>...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > Actually, that last one was one of her better efforts. The "Dirty Harry"
> > quote was a particularly refreshing change in her usually dull rhetoric,
> > or does she just think that she has a pair of "44 Magnums?"
>
> .22 shorts would be far more like it.
>
> Larry, as long as you continue dialog with her she'll keep driveling it out...

Why would she think she had a pair of 44 Magnums, when Dirty Harry
only had one? And just how do you go about shooting 22 shorts in a 44
Magnum?

I figured you being from Missouri that you might know something about
firearms. No wonder MO cannot get a concealed carry bill to pass.

2600. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 15:03:49 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901110349.05806.00000285@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 76016

>And, the FCC upheld its R&O in 98-143, denying all petitions
>for reconsideration asking for reinstatement of higher speed
>Morse tests.
>
>Carl - wk3c

Does NCI I have the latest 10 Codes out yet?

2601. Re: For Vippy's Benefit...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 15:04:13 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309010704.b24867d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76015

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030831222013.26794.00000162@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
>
> >Vipul Shah, (VShah101@aol.com) keeps insisting certain activities
> >don't exist in Amateur Radio.
>
> <link to a direction finding contest given>
>
> In any group base there will be many aspects supported. In Ham radio, certain
> trends are there that would not be there if there was a truly random
> distribution. A trend is a trend, not 100% that the activity does not exist.
>
> From: n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> >Of course. Looks like a lot of fun. Note the thinness of many of the
> >contestants, too.
>
> People that participate in Amateur Radio Direction Finding would tend to be
> thinner than most Hams because this is a physical activity. That's consistent
> with what I have been saying before. Less Hams are interested in that and a
> greater percentage of Hams are overweight.
>
> However, you must not be looking at the same photos I am looking at. It does
> not support the thinness claim. And one female looks like a male, which you
> would not know unless you saw the picture caption. Sorry. I hate to comment on
> people's weight, but you brought it up.
>
> >But do you really think either of those you seek to convince will admit they
> >were mistaken?
>
> In any group base there will be many aspects supported. In Ham radio, certain
> trends are there that would not be there if there was a truly random
> distribution.
>
> When you look at club activities, newsletters, QST and other publications, one
> can plainly see which activities the great majority of Hams are interested in.
>
> >Particularly when you and the ARRL are the messengers?

This could have been "delivered" with a preceeding trumpet blast
and angels on unicorns and Vippy wouldn't admit it.

Steve, K4YZ

2602. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 15:08:08 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <shJ4b.2983$ut1.1889@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 76017

Jason,

W2NSD comes to mind ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0308311309.44c88748@posting.google.com...
> I found this comment on eham.net:
> "I hold the OLD ADVANCED license and it is a matter of prestidge. I
> had to have 13 wpm to get to this level and now they want to do away
> with ALL CW? Keep at least the 5 wpm.
> It is too easy to pass a written exam. The code kept the CB crowd from
> gaining acess to our bands. "
>
> Is this for real? Are there REALLY people with Advanced licenses who
> refuse to upgrade to Amateur Extra SIMPLY because they feel the need
> to prove they passed the 13 wpm exam? I know it's a free country, and
> there are also many Advanced licensees who decide that the extra
> privileges aren't worth going to the trouble of studying up and going
> to the VE session, but I find this hard to believe.
>
> Anyone who thinks Morse Code is that important should try OPERATING
> high-speed Morse Code and participate in Morse Code contests. All the
> Advanced license proves is that you passed 13 wpm and the other exam
> requirements years ago. It says nothing about what you have been
> doing since. People who want to brag about their Morse Code
> proficiency can do so much less obnoxiously by actually USING it on
> the air.
>
> Jason Hsu, AG4DG
> usenet@@@@@jasonhsu.com

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

2603. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 15:09:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309010709.259f9fbc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76018

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030831224123.26794.00000166@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> From: "Tin Monkey"
>
> >When inclement WX hits and the phone lines are down it will be back to Ham
> >Radio the way it always has been. Good old radios and antennas....and for
> >those with preplannning a Marine battery or two as well.
>
> How often has your fantasy been played out? Can you give examples where YOU
> encountered that?

Newy York, September 11th, 2001.

The Midwest floods in the 90's.

Any number of hurricaines in the last 50 years in the Gulf States
and Atlantic Coast.

Need more, Vippy?

Steve, K4YZ

2604. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 15:13:05 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <5mJ4b.2984$Jg1.168@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 76019

Jim,

I found my old 2nd class commercial telegraph ticket. Would that support the no medical waivers? Of course, does that prove I could still do 20 words per minute (which is the question you have been asking; good question indeed). Gad, I've got but about two weeks and my license expires. Now to go search the FCC website ... :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030901082513.15462.00002628@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <Pine.LNX.4.56.0309010426380.3565@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:
>
> >On Sun, 31 Aug 2003, N2EY wrote:
> >> In article <f7d9a152.0308311309.44c88748@posting.google.com>,
> >> jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:
> >>
> >> >I found this comment on eham.net:
> >> >"I hold the OLD ADVANCED license and it is a matter of prestidge. I
> >> >had to have 13 wpm to get to this level and now they want to do away
> >> >with ALL CW? Keep at least the 5 wpm.
> >> >It is too easy to pass a written exam. The code kept the CB crowd from
> >> >gaining acess to our bands. "
> >>
> >> The fact of the matter is that simply having an Advanced is not proof of
> >> code
> >> speed. Since 1990, medical waivers were available for 13 and 20 wpm.
> >
> >Although true, the fact of a waiver is in the FCC's database (there's a field
> >for it).
>
> True - but you have to dig up the database and know what to look for. The
> license itself doesn't show waiver status, IIRC.
>
> >As an excuse not to upgrade to extra, it's probably one of the
> >lamest ideas around.
>
> Agreed!
>
> > Upon upgrade, one will still have the "prior class held" field

> >that will say advanced, so with the combination of these two data fields,
we
> >will know that a person once held an advanced class license WITHOUT the
> >medical
> >waiver and thus officially passed the 13wpm code element.
>
> Not in all cases. Look me up in the data base - no entry for "former
license
> class", even though I was Advanced from 1968 to 1970 (old 2 year waiting
> period)
>
>
> >[Whether or not
> >the
> >person actually took the test or just paid for his license will generally
> >never
> >be known!]
> >
> "just paid for his license"?
>
> >To me, the statement is more typical of some advanced class sourpuss who
> >failed
> >to take advantage of the transitional rule back in 2000 and obtain credit
for
> >the easier element 4B than the current element 4. Granted that was only
for
> >a
> >3.5 month window...
>
> Maybe. But I think current Element 4 is no harder than old Element 4B.
>
> >What surprises me is this: There are still some people (the August 30
> >session
> >I did had two such people) who are coming in for their pre-87-tech to
general
> >no test upgrades, 3+ years after the rules change went into effect....
>
> I'm not surprised. Many hams I know do not follow the rules changes
anywhere
> near as closely as some of us do. Look at restructuring - out of over
678,000
> hams, FCC got 2200 or so comments.
>
> Some folks are just finding out what the changes mean. And with 10 year
> renewals, folks who don't move around have very little interaction with
FCC
> license procedures. The facts are often twisted in the retelling, too.
Look at
> the misunderstanding about Element 1 and Technicians....
> >

> >> >Is this for real? Are there REALLY people with Advanced licenses who
> >> >refuse to upgrade to Amateur Extra SIMPLY because they feel the need
> >> >to prove they passed the 13 wpm exam?
> >>
> >> There are some misguided folks who think that, but in fact it's not a
proof
> >of
> >> code speed any more than my Extra is proof of 20 per.
> >
> >When it is known that a medical waiver wasn't used, it is (for pre April
19,
> >2000 extras).
>
> But you need more info that just the fact that the person holds a certain
> license class.
>
> >
> >> >I know it's a free country, and
> >> >there are also many Advanced licensees who decide that the extra
> >> >privileges aren't worth going to the trouble of studying up and going
> >> >to the VE session, but I find this hard to believe.
> >>
> >> If somebody wants to know my code skills and technical knowledge, I
don't
> >point
> >> to a license test I took in 1970. Instead, I just show 'em.
> >>
> >> >Anyone who thinks Morse Code is that important should try OPERATING
> >> >high-speed Morse Code and participate in Morse Code contests.
> >>
> >> We do! 13 wpm isn't high speed, tho.
> >>
> >> >All the
> >> >Advanced license proves is that you passed 13 wpm and the other exam
> >> >requirements years ago.
> >>
> >> Not even that. Medical waivers, etc.
> >>
> >> > ...
> >
>
> Fun fact:
>
> From May 14 2000 to July 31, 2003, the number of Advanceds dropped from
> 99,782 to 83,141. That includes upgrades to Extra and dropouts. Only a 17%
> decline in over three years.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

2605. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 15:14:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309010714.57227d2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76020

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030831223433.26794.00000163@mb-m26.aol.com>...

> So, Jason, how are you doing? My time has passed, but I wish you luck. Although
> you seem to be misguided and support Morse code, something I don't feel would
> be interesting or worth it. There should be more support of the technical
> aspects, something only a small percentage of Hams seem to be interested in.

You'd best go back and re-read his post, Vipul.

You're so far off-base a third string relief pitcher would nail
you out without a hiccup...

Of course half-cocked, knee-jerk responses are what we've come to
expect from you...

Steve, K4YZ

2606. Re: NCVEC Position on Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 15:19:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901111912.12631.00000691@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 76023

In article <cuvyxnansvbet.hj0ml7i.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 02 Aug 2003 12:27:10 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>Then please explain why there are so many NALs for violations
>>committed using voice modes, and so few for violations using Morse
>>code or data modes. Maybe it's not the TEST but the MODE that has an
>>effect?
>
> The days when the monitoring stations would catch ham operators 2
> or 3 kHz outside the band edge (especially in contests) are gone
> forever. "Cruising" is no longer a daily activity.
>
Not the point. How big of a problem do we have with hams using CW straying outdie the band edges at any time? Compare that to problems with hams using voice modes and jamming, cussing, failing to ID, etc.

Yes, the op is ultimately responsible, that's a given. But the fact remains that there are orders of magnitude difference in violations...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2607. Re: Good Heavens...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 15:19:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901111913.12631.00000692@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 76022

In article <biltpf$auudh$15@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Any normal, healthy
>male actually likes them, and sterotypically, the bigger the better from a
>general consensus!

Not really. The discerning choose quality over quantity. Example: Who is more
attractive, Demi Moore or Rosanne Barr?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2608. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 15:19:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901111914.12631.00000693@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 76021

In article <biu33j$v3i@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>Hey, use them for gift tags! Make up a label, place it onto the
>AOL CD, and use a pretty ribbon to tie between the package and the hole of
>the CD.

Cool!
>
>Hmmmmm, this could really get interesting (they could also be used against
>those wall mounted candle holders, carried in the pocket on a hike (they'd
>reflect light and work for signaling really well).

They work really well for signalling if ya know Morse Code...

> Let's see...they could
>be strung onto a mobile and used as a bird attractant for the bird bath...

And the squirrel feeder...
>
>I'll stop, I gotta go get stuff to do the smoked brisket for tomorrow!

yummm....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2609. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 15:24:37 UTC
From: Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com>
Message-ID: <VwJ4b.22842$S_.4285@fed1read01>
Source record: 76024

What a dumb thread -- hey it is their license -- they can upgrade, keep it the same, let it expire, whatever.

I know a lot of advanced licensees that are perfectly happy where they are and don't need to give any dumb rationale for their decisions.

Also know lots of Hams who are extra class and keep the old 2X2 advanced call because they like it or have gotten very used to it.

--
73 From The Signal In The Noise
Caveat Lector Ya All
-->

2610. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 15:28:19 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <nAJ4b.95532$yg.27318285@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 76025

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bius9f$86g$0@208.206.142.103...
> Sri...you will be referrred to this URL :
>
> http://www.qsl.net/n1ea/FIST_FCC_Petition_8-30-303.pdf

I hope the entire membership comments in some form or fashion.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI
FISTS# 9384

2611. Re: More Classic Wisdom from Kim, W5TIT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 15:46:43 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bivpl3$i65$0@208.206.142.114>
Source record: 76026

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bitaacmka1@208.206.142.88>...
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > > Actually, that last one was one of her better efforts. The "Dirty Harry"
> > > quote was a particularly refreshing change in her usually dull rhetoric,
> > > or does she just think that she has a pair of "44 Magnums?"
> >
> > .22 shorts would be far more like it.
> >
> > Larry, as long as you continue dialog with her she'll keep driveling it out...
>
> Why would she think she had a pair of 44 Magnums, when Dirty Harry
> only had one? And just how do you go about shooting 22 shorts in a 44
> Magnum?

Hey Brian- You can always rent a clue if you can't come up with one any other
way!

>
>
> I figured you being from Missouri that you might know something about
> firearms.

As usual your calculations are very defective. I daresay I have you bested in that
category, also..

> No wonder MO cannot get a concealed carry bill to pass.

What, you don't stay abreast with such developments, when your posts indicate a confidence
in
your knowlege that simply isn't justified?

The legislature passed it, with a substantial margin, but it was vetoed by our version of
Gray Davis a couple months ago. And the referendum a couple years ago passed substantially
except in metropolitian areas where "those" who already carry, regardless, surely don't
want
to see the opposition legally armed. The same areas' voter rolls also appear strangely
similia,r to a large extent, to their cemetary marker data. Or did, until a certain GOP
senator got the Federal Elections Commission involved.

2612. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 15:50:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F536B2F.9010003@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76027

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Mike,
>
> I do believe it does serve some purpose..... I have a friend that goes to
> Arizona every winter due to him and his wife's health issues and he does not
> have much there to use for equipment. He and I chat via Echolink on a
> regular basis on the link point connected where he is at. I also have
> developed some friendships with the people that frequent that access point
> (simplex access point, not a repeater one) as well. He is a 30+ year Extra
> class licensee so he CAN operate just about anywhere but only has 2m/70cm
> access when he goes there.
>
> In this case it is a very productive use of the system. In this particular
> circumstance we would never be able to communicate if it wasn't for the
> system. Other than a little experimentation with it at first, I have not
> used it for much more than to communicate with him though.

There is always a use for technologies, good and bad. That someone
could keep in touch with a friend via Echolink is a good thing.

Let's hope that the repeater owners can clean tings up.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2613. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 15:53:27 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bivq1n$j00$0@208.206.142.114>
Source record: 76028

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> "Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:b309ce148a7d07e18fe1e709110785b7.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > http://www.qsl.net/n1ea/FIST_FCC_Petition_8-30-303.pdf
> > >
> >
> > Perhaps FISTS should consider sending this in as a comment to be
> > considered with RM-10787, rather than a separate petition.
> >
> > If FCC grants the "no Morse test" petition, then it is unlikely to roll
> > back that decision at a later date.
> >
> > 73, Hans, K0HB
>
> I suspect that this will work equally as well as a comment since the FCC
> will be required to weigh all the diverging and conflicting petitions that
> have already been submitted to come up with whatever ruling they may decide
> to put out. There are now at least seven different petitions filed although
> not all are yet open to comments. The fact that it is a petition may even
> give it more weight than just a comment.

It seems a near-certainty that all the pending petitions will be rolled into a single NPRM, eventually. That's the way FCC has nearly always handled such a situation.

Dick

2614. Re: Good Heavens...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 16:47:43 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bivt7fojs0@208.206.142.114>
Source record: 76029

N2EY wrote:

> In article <biltpf$auudh$15@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Any normal, healthy
> >male actually likes them, and sterotypically, the bigger the better from a
> >general consensus!
>
> Not really. The discerning choose quality over quantity. Example: Who is more
> attractive, Demi Moore or Rosanne Barr?

Prrecisely, the very factor that makes it curious that Kim should have selected her callsign. (Her photo was on QRZ until she took it off).

2615. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 17:04:40 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 76030

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:b309ce148a7d07e18fe1e709110785b7.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > http://www.qsl.net/n1ea/FIST_FCC_Petition_8-30-303.pdf
> > >
> >
> > Perhaps FISTS should consider sending this in as a comment to be
> > considered with RM-10787, rather than a separate petition.
> >
> > If FCC grants the "no Morse test" petition, then it is unlikely to roll
> > back that decision at a later date.
> >
> > 73, Hans, K0HB
>
> And, the FCC upheld its R&O in 98-143, denying all petitions
> for reconsideration asking for reinstatement of higher speed
> Morse tests.

And they got NO input from FISTS that round at all, either. It didn't seem likely that FCC would go so far as they did, thus there was no movement within the organization. And not many members commented individually. This time WILL be different!

As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI. Comments from members will be numerous, and after all, FCC officials have said they want "us" to let them know what we want in the way of restructuring rules! That's what they'll get!

Maybe if FISTS had commented en masse last time it might have some effect on the outcome, given FCC comments noted above. It remains to be seen, of course.

Dick W0EX, FISTS #3939

2616. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 18:07:29 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj01t1$4ll$0@208.206.142.74>
Source record: 76031

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:b309ce148a7d07e18fe1e709110785b7.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> >
> > >
> > > http://www.qsl.net/n1ea/FIST_FCC_Petition_8-30-303.pdf
> > >
> >
> > Perhaps FISTS should consider sending this in as a comment to be
> > considered with RM-10787, rather than a separate petition.
> >
> > If FCC grants the "no Morse test" petition, then it is unlikely to roll
> > back that decision at a later date.
> >
> > 73, Hans, K0HB
>
> And, the FCC upheld its R&O in 98-143, denying all petitions
> for reconsideration asking for reinstatement of higher speed
> Morse tests.

OBTW, Carl, here's a partial copy of W3BE's comments on the NCVEC
petition to drop all code testing. I assume you know who W3BE is...

(For those who don't recognize the callsign, W3BE is John Johnston, retired
former chief of the Amateur and Citizen's Division, FCC. He's also a current member of the
NCVEC, who filed the petition otwhich he is responding.)

COMMENTS TO THE PETITION

I concur generally with the above referenced petition (ï¿½the Petitionï¿½) filed by the
National Conference of Volunteer Examiner Coordinators (ï¿½NCVECï¿½) with one critical
(exception). This exception is discussed below.
On March 15, 2004, I will have held an amateur service license grant from the Federal
Communications Commission for one-half century. I have held the top rank Amateur Extra
Class operator license for almost 40 years.

A telegraphy skill requirement for an Amateur Extra Class operator license grant should
continue.
As stated in the Petition, manual telegraphy continues to be an important communication
mode in the amateur service. For some 90 years, passing a test in the international Morse
code has been a fundamental requirement for an amateur operator license in the United
States. The need to bring and end to a telegraphy skill requirement for the beginner

Technician Plus Class operator and the intermediate level General Class operator is an issue separate from the need for telegraphy skill by an Amateur Extra Class operator. This top class of operator license recognizes the grantee as being a true expert in all phases of the amateur service. Such an expert must be able to send and receive messages in the international Morse code. A ï¿½telegraphy-challenged expert amateur operatorï¿½ would
be an oxymoron, indeed!

Just for your information and enlightenment!

To make a prediction, I believe his comments will carry a lot of weight with current FCC staff.

73, Dick W0EX, FISTS #3939

2617. Re: More Classic Wisdom from Kim, W5TIT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 18:26:59 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bj02uo$21g@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76033

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309010702.677e2d9f@posting.google.com...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bitaacmka1@208.206.142.88>...
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > > Actually, that last one was one of her better efforts. The "Dirty
Harry"
> > > quote was a particularly refreshing change in her usually dull
rhetoric,
> > > or does she just think that she has a pair of "44 Magnums?"
> >
> > .22 shorts would be far more like it.
> >
> > Larry, as long as you continue dialog with her she'll keep driveling it
out...
>
> Why would she think she had a pair of 44 Magnums, when Dirty Harry
> only had one? And just how do you go about shooting 22 shorts in a 44
> Magnum?
>
> I figured you being from Missouri that you might know something about
> firearms. No wonder MO cannot get a concealed carry bill to pass.

MO. The Show-Me-State. If he'd look, I haven't responded to one of Larry's
posts in the past 2- 2 1/2 days or so. And, still, Larry continues... ;)

Kim W5TIT

2618. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 18:30:05 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <NeM4b.25283$l41.7201952@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 76032

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:j_G4b.4531$tw6.461@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> The same old Morse code is necessary for ham radio HF operation
> line of thinking. There is nothing that prevents anyone from
> learning Morse code if the FCC drops the Morse code test & requirement
> for General and Extra Class license holders so their petition is
> silly.
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith AOL IM:kilowattradio
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
>

Nice CB page you have there.
I guess you are the future of Ham Radio?

God help us all.....

2619. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 18:33:33 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bj03b3$sve@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76034

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030901111914.12631.00000693@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <biu33j$v3i@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >Hey, use them for gift tags! Make up a label, place it onto the
> >AOL CD, and use a pretty ribbon to tie between the package and the hole
of
> >the CD.
>
> Cool!
> >
> >Hmmmmm, this could really get interesting (they could also be used
against
> >those wall mounted candle holders, carried in the pocket on a hike
(they'd
> >reflect light and work for signaling really well).
>
> They work really well for signalling if ya know Morse Code...
>

That too, but they'd work just fine to be found by air if ya just keep flashing. Same for CW. Just keep beeping and beeping and beeping and, anyone who knows something's up (and that would be nearly anyone with any capability of reasoning) will hunt the signal down :o

> >
> > Let's see...they could
> >be strung onto a mobile and used as a bird attractant for the bird
bath...
>
> And the squirrel feeder...
> >
> >I'll stop, I gotta go get stuff to do the smoked brisket for tomorrow!
>
> yummm....
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Oh, man. Yummmm is right. Let's see: roasted zuchinni, pineapple, and hatch peppers; smoked brisket and Ekrich brand sausage; baked potatoes encrusted with garlic, salt, and rosemary; roasted purple onion; steamed corn-on-the-cob; and iced tea.

The Hatch peppers are done, and doggone are they good!

Kim W5TIT

2620. Re: More Classic Wisdom from Kim, W5TIT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 18:35:41 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bj03f3$5ou@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76035

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bivpl3$i65$0@208.206.142.114...
>
>
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bitaacmka1@208.206.142.88>...
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > > Actually, that last one was one of her better efforts. The "Dirty
Harry"
> > > > quote was a particularly refreshing change in her usually dull
rhetoric,
> > > > or does she just think that she has a pair of "44 Magnums?"
> > >
> > > .22 shorts would be far more like it.
> > >
> > > Larry, as long as you continue dialog with her she'll keep driveling
it out...
> >
> > Why would she think she had a pair of 44 Magnums, when Dirty Harry
> > only had one? And just how do you go about shooting 22 shorts in a 44
> > Magnum?
>
> Hey Brian- You can always rent a clue if you can't come up with one any
other
> way!
>
>

Translation: even he doesn't quite understand what he meant by that.

Ever see how Dick is too chicken shit to try to match intelligence with me?
I've beat him a few times...and he doesn't dare continue...

Kim W5TIT

2621. Re: Good Heavens...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 18:38:55 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bj03l5$ige@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76036

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bivt7fojs0@208.206.142.114...
>
>
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <biltpf$auudh$15@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan,
KC8PMX"
> > <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> > >
> > >Any normal, healthy
> > >male actually likes them, and sterotypically, the bigger the better
from a
> > >general consensus!
> > >
> > Not really. The discerning choose quality over quantity. Example: Who is
more
> > attractive, Demi Moore or Rosanne Barr?
>
> Prrecisely, the very factor that makes it curious that Kim should have
selected her
> callsign. (Her photo was on QRZ until she took it off).
>
>

Yes, yes it was. And, it was a shot of me smiling at my darlin' hubby while I was driving us off to the race track. Funny thing is, Larry (and because of Larry, Dick) thinks I was fat in the photo. Little do they know that when that photo was taken, I was about 140 lbs., and gorgeous to beat! I'm still gorgeous, but I'm....90 lbs. heavier now.

Just proves that Larry and Dick don't know a good woman when they see one. It also proves they're pretty darned shallow. I've been 118 for the better part of my life and I was the same then as I am now.

Kim W5TIT

2622. Re: Good Heavens...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 18:45:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901144526.14517.00000368@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 76037

>I've been 118 for the better
>part of my life and I was the same then as I am now.
>

What in one TIT

2623. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 19:19:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901151942.29660.00000372@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 76038

In article <5mJ4b.2984$Jg1.168@news01.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>I found my old 2nd class commercial telegraph ticket.

I've still got my 1970 Extra document.

>Would that support
>the no medical waivers?

Bingo.

>Of course, does that prove I could still do 20
>words per minute (which is the question you have been asking; good question
>indeed).

'zactly.

> Gad, I've got but about two weeks and my license expires. Now to
>go search the FCC website ... :)
>
You can renew online or do what I did: download the PDF for the Form 605, fill
it out and drop in the mail.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2624. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 19:55:29 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <RuN4b.214$vj4.34373@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76039

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:GaJ4b.36464$Vx2.16005165@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
>
> I suspect that this will work equally as well as a comment since the FCC
> will be required to weigh all the diverging and conflicting petitions that
> have already been submitted to come up with whatever ruling they may
decide
> to put out. There are now at least seven different petitions filed
although
> not all are yet open to comments. The fact that it is a petition may even
> give it more weight than just a comment.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Having not seen a public notice from the FCC on ANY of the petitions,
it would appear that NONE of them are formally open for comment.

If I missed an official FCC public notice, I'd appreciate it if someone
could tell me the date it was released. (I check the "Daily Digest" and
the Federal Register daily ... though it's possible I could have overlooked
one ...)

Carl - wk3c

2625. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 19:57:23 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <DwN4b.215$vj4.34065@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76040

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
>
> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.

How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?

Carl - wk3c

2626. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 20:04:45 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901160445.28589.00000470@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 76042

>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>
>Carl - wk3c
>

How many Cbplussers International, I mean NCI are Members?

2627. Re: J Cunningham and discusting new web page dildoe pic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 20:11:20 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <IJN4b.25298$l41.7265545@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 76041

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:870170897.156756757@taranews.net...
> Jon has a forged pic of Senator Hillary Clinton holding up a dildoe on
> his new web pages. That is dispicable and makes ham radio ops look
> bad. No wonder AOL kicked him off. I wonder what Clinton's office
> will do now that they have been emailed about it at the location
> http://clinton.senate.gov/email_form.html. I used to like Jon Jon but
> not after he went bad. someone needs to straiten him out. send mail
> to Hillarys web sight now!

The only mail I will send the bull dyke is one asking her to please get the
fuck out of my country!

2628. Re: More Classic Wisdom from Kim, W5TIT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 20:38:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309011238.762717dd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76043

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bivpl3$i65$0@208.206.142.114>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bitaacmka1@208.206.142.88>...
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > > Actually, that last one was one of her better efforts. The "Dirty Harry"
> > > > quote was a particularly refreshing change in her usually dull rhetoric,
> > > > or does she just think that she has a pair of "44 Magnums?"
> > >
> > > .22 shorts would be far more like it.
> > >
> > > Larry, as long as you continue dialog with her she'll keep driveling it out...
> >
> > Why would she think she had a pair of 44 Magnums, when Dirty Harry
> > only had one? And just how do you go about shooting 22 shorts in a 44
> > Magnum?
>
> Hey Brian- You can always rent a clue if you can't come up with one any other
> way!

Hey DICK, I got a clue that you're just being a dirty old man.

> > I figured you being from Missouri that you might know something about
> > firearms.
>
> As usual your calculations are very defective. I daresay I have you bested in that
> category, also..

Drilling 7/8" holes in the rooftops of police cruisers doesn't make
you a combat arms expert.

> > No wonder MO cannot get a concealed carry bill to pass.
>
> What, you don't stay abreast with such developments, when your posts indicate a
confidence in
> your knowlege that simply isn't justified?

Stay abreast? Har de har. You've no choice but to stay aDICK.

> The legislature passed it, with a substantial margin, but it was vetoed by our version of
> Gray Davis a couple months ago. And the referendum a couple years ago passed
substantially
> except in metropolitian areas where "those" who already carry, regardless, surely don't

want
> to see the opposition legally armed. The same areas' voter rolls also appear strangely
> similia,r to a large extent, to their cemetary marker data. Or did, until a certain GOP
> senator got the Federal Elections Commission involved.

And so you still have no law, DICK.

73, bb

2629. Re: More Classic Wisdom from Kim, W5TIT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 20:39:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309011239.20989d9f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76044

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:<bj02uo$21g@library1.airnews.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309010702.677e2d9f@posting.google.com...
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:<bitaacmka1@208.206.142.88>...
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > > Actually, that last one was one of her better efforts. The "Dirty
> Harry"
> > > > quote was a particularly refreshing change in her usually dull
> rhetoric,
> > > > or does she just think that she has a pair of "44 Magnums?"
> > >
> > > .22 shorts would be far more like it.
> > >
> > > Larry, as long as you continue dialog with her she'll keep driveling it
> out...
> >
> > Why would she think she had a pair of 44 Magnums, when Dirty Harry
> > only had one? And just how do you go about shooting 22 shorts in a 44
> > Magnum?
> >
> > I figured you being from Missouri that you might know something about
> > firearms. No wonder MO cannot get a concealed carry bill to pass.
>
> MO. The Show-Me-State. If he'd look, I haven't responded to one of Larry's
> posts in the past 2- 2 1/2 days or so. And, still, Larry continues... ;)
>
> Kim W5TIT

Persistent.

2630. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 20:44:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309011244.7aaf0c47@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76045

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030901111914.12631.00000693@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <biu33j$v3i@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> >Hey, use them for gift tags! Make up a label, place it onto the
> >AOL CD, and use a pretty ribbon to tie between the package and the hole of
> >the CD.
>
> Cool!
> >
> >Hmmmmm, this could really get interesting (they could also be used against
> >those wall mounted candle holders, carried in the pocket on a hike (they'd
> >reflect light and work for signaling really well).
>
> They work really well for signalling if ya know Morse Code...

Typical eyes rolled back PCTA response.

I wonder what Paul Revere used to signal with?

I wonder if Paul knew Morse Code?

2631. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 20:51:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309011251.3ada241b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76046

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<biuq0n$2rg$0@208.206.142.103>...
> It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
>
>
> http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
>
>
> Enjoy!

I thought that FISTS sold themselves as a non-political club?

2632. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 20:51:39 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <vjO4b.36492$Vx2.16058631@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76047

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:RuN4b.214$vj4.34373@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> Having not seen a public notice from the FCC on ANY of the petitions,
> it would appear that NONE of them are formally open for comment.
>
> If I missed an official FCC public notice, I'd appreciate it if someone
> could tell me the date it was released. (I check the "Daily Digest" and
> the Federal Register daily ... though it's possible I could have
overlooked
> one ...)
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

The ARRL website has direct links.

http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/08/29/2/?nc=1
FCC Invites Comments on Six Morse Code-Related Petitions

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2633. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 21:02:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309011302.46d195b5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76048

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > "Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:b309ce148a7d07e18fe1e709110785b7.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> > >
> > > >
> > > > http://www.qsl.net/n1ea/FIST_FCC_Petition_8-30-303.pdf
> > > >
> > >
> > > Perhaps FISTS should consider sending this in as a comment to be
> > > considered with RM-10787, rather than a separate petition.
> > >
> > > If FCC grants the "no Morse test" petition, then it is unlikely to roll
> > > back that decision at a later date.
> > >
> > > 73, Hans, K0HB
> >
> > And, the FCC upheld its R&O in 98-143, denying all petitions
> > for reconsideration asking for reinstatement of higher speed
> > Morse tests.
>
> And they got NO input from FISTS that round at all, either. It didn't seem likely that
> FCC would go so far as they did, thus there was no movement within the organization. And
> not many members commented individually. This time WILL be different!

Why? FISTS isn't a political action club. At least it says it isn't.

> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI. Comments from
> members will be numerous, and after all, FCC officials have said they want "us" to let
> them know what we want in the way of restructuring rules! That's what they'll get!

That's why I don't rely on the ARRL to make my comments for me, even
though they would like to be my only voice.

> Maybe if FISTS had commented en masse last time it might have

...had... (as in the past tense)

some effect on the outcome,
> given FCC comments noted above. It remains to be seen, of course.
>
> Dick W0EX, FISTS #3939

Best of luck.

2634. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 21:19:50 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901171950.23307.00002666@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 76049

In article <DwN4b.215$vj4.34065@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
>>
>> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
>
>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>
Lots and lots.

How many *US* licensees are members of NCI, Carl?

btw, the FISTS member list is online.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2635. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 21:32:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309011332.6c782d2f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76050

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com>...

> Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock never actually
> got there due to traffic snarls.

I especially like the ones who claimed they were both at Woodstock and
in Vietnam. They probably saw both movies.

> The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon. That's
> what I think of first when that time is mentioned.

I was 11. I remember selling flower seeds door to door to earn a West
Ben fishing pole. And my Dad getting orders to Thailand.

So what has all this do do with code?

2636. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 22:05:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309011405.579aeef0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76051

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<biut40$9iu$0@208.206.142.68>...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > In article <f45722ac.0308310842.7b52b33f@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >And during my turn in the barrel, I thanked my lucky stars I was Air
> > >Force. The USN was better to their people than the Army, but not
> > >much.
> >
> > Brian:
> >
> > Don't get me wrong, I had a great time in the Air Force, and have no
> > regrets over my choice of a military career. However, you brushed up
> > against part of my "problem" with the Air Force. I think that they are
> > TOO good to their people, if that's possible.
>
> I remember being on TDY at Darmstadt, Germany in the early 60's where we were attached
> to an AF station for rations The.first morning, in the chow line the airman in the line
> ahead of me ordered up a cheese omelet! I nearly fell out!

I hope you ordered the omelet.

Never heard of such a thing
> in the military in those days, outside the AF at least. In the Army you got eggs, fried.

Did the Army ever serve a meal w/o gravy?

> BTW, those guys at that detachment were listening to the Russkies ---on CW! Most of them
> wore their headphones to chow, like doctor wears his stethoscope.
>
> In he army then, the way the troops were treated was largely up to the local commanders.
> If an officer got too friendly with his troops he'd usually wind up being reassigned.

Kind of like Extras and everyone else.

2637. Re: AOL pulls Jon Cunningham's web pages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 22:05:49 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <1pP4b.18904$Om1.8820@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76052
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Rodger Dodger" <TenFour@LGoodBuddy.com> wrote in message
news:biuqgb$4ma$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:hXw4b.12336$EW1.8669@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Jayne Nye" <jnye41@pavillage.netno.spam> wrote in message
> news:9841241545.65byedan8888@pavillage.net...
> > On Sun, 31 Aug 2003 21:05:42 GMT, Dan/W4NTI
> <w4nti@getridofthismindspring.com> wrote:
> > >
> > > When you posted that his page was down I had just came off of that
page
> at
> > > the AOL URL. So if you want to continue with your LIE. That is your
> > > choice.
> >
> > The time of my post: 30 Aug 2003 12:53:49 GMT
> >
> > The time of your post: 30 Aug 2003 18:45:08 GMT (proof is in
Message-ID:
> > <Ug64b.5413$EW1.4148@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>)
> >
> > So, Dan, you lying sack of shit, you posted your claim almost six
> > hours later! By then, Jon had plenty of time to whine and to beg AOL
> > for a reprieve.
> >
> > The pages were down at the time I said they were. You came late (and
> > uninformed) to the discussion, blazing away with your cap pistols.
> >
> > And as to the pornographic nature, or lack thereof, of Jon's Penny
> > pictures, he was in violation of AOL's TOS simply by posting nudity,
> > and he knew it. AOL in general sucks, and its college kid, part time
> > employees will kill an account or some web pages at the drop of a hat.
> >
> > Anyone who goes ahead and uses AOL as an ISP anyway deserves what they
> > get. I have no sympathy for them at all.
>
.....
> .....
> And one must surmise that it was because of crybabies such as yourself who
> went whining to AOL that the page was censored.
> I guess that Hell Hath No Fury such as a twinky, overly sensitive, Ham

> operator who has been scorned on Jon's page.
> Come on...face it. The photo of the naked gal with sand all over her
> backside was just a ruse...one of you crybabies went whining to AOL
because
> Jon poked fun at you.
> Will the real crybaby please stand up?
>
>

By jove...I believe you got it matey.

Dan/W4NTI

2638. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 22:10:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <CtP4b.18940$Om1.12769@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76053

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bivcp6$cb0s1$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Hell, I work for a private university, and it is one of the "bastions" of
> republican thought; "do as I say, not do as I do." It promotes the
> lifestyle of the little rich brats that have been raised with the thinking
> of "it's not what you know, but who you know." Forget achieving based on
> merits or achievements.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> > > Most schools and universities today are either state owned or state
> > >supported. Therefore, to find an answer to the problems with schools,
we
> > >only have to look as far as our own state representatives. And, since
> they
> > >like the federal education assistance available to them, those
> > >representatives are not going to change unless we vote them out and are
> > >willing to fund schools locally. I see no effort in either of those
> > >directions.
> >
> > Sad, but true.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
>

Dang...thats really hard to believe. A 'republican university' taught by
tenured 60s flower children. Wow.....guess those Hippies really did turn
into Yuppies after all.

Dan/W4NTI

2639. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 22:12:26 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <evP4b.18952$Om1.5551@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76054

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:biuf8u$pvs@library2.airnews.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:RVw4b.12334$EW1.2877@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think so. Or
perhaps
> > you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower child? Now thats
a
> > real probabliity.
> >
> >
> > "Make love not War"
> >
> > "War is dangerous to all living things"
> >
> > etc.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> Do you have to practice at being an asshole, Dan, or does it come that
> naturally?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

You bring out the best in me Kim.

Dan/W4NTI

2640. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 22:19:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <aCP4b.18994$Om1.17299@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76055

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030901004218.14837.00002664@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <f45722ac.0308310842.7b52b33f@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >And during my turn in the barrel, I thanked my lucky stars I was Air
> >Force. The USN was better to their people than the Army, but not
> >much.
>
> Brian:
>
> Don't get me wrong, I had a great time in the Air Force, and have no
> regrets over my choice of a military career. However, you brushed up
> against part of my "problem" with the Air Force. I think that they are
> TOO good to their people, if that's possible. My last couple of years
> (the ones at Dover AFB) were made miserable by a bunch of whining,
> complaining, non-working Senior Airmen who didn't want to do anything
> but take two-hour lunch breaks, get their weekends off, get their 30
> days leave exactly when they wanted it, and get paid every two weeks.
> Doing the job wasn't even on their Top 10 list of priorities. Of course,
> my job as a 9-level MSgt in a Superintendent slot was to make sure
> they were doing that job. So, whenever I dared to crack the whip a
> bit, they went around me to our CMSgt Squadron Ops Superintendent,
> who had the ever-popular "open door policy." Their complaints would
> end up with me being called on his carpet, whereupon I'd usually tell
> him that when they came in as a result of his open door policy, I'd
> much prefer it if he'd slam the door in their faces! Well, this got me a
> reputation of not being a "people person," since this Chief thought it was
> every supervisor's job to know the right buttons to push to get people
> to work. When I was an Airman, nobody had to push any buttons
> on me. I was always at work on time, early, in fact, with a clean,
> sharp-looking uniform, haircut, spit-polished shoes you could use as
> a shaving mirror, and my head full of all the technical information about
> my job I'd just learned from my CDC's. I was a great Airman, and
> continued to be right up to the day I retired. However, in my entire
> career as a supervisor (which, since I was always promoted way ahead
> of my alleged "peers," started at a mere 3 years TIS) I've only a small
> handful of Airmen who were anything like me. The rest were all the
> whining, needy, lazy, unmotivated, indifferent No-Coder type. When
> they weren't goofing off on the job, they were getting into trouble in the
> dorms and off-base, making my life miserable sorting them out at
> all hours of the night.
>
> Now, the Navy always had a much different attitude toward discipline

> than the Air Force. A Navy Chief wields true power over his people, and
> usually isn't second-guessed or undermined by his senior Chiefs or
> officers. I have to say that in the many times I've worked with the Navy,
> I've always been impressed with their Enlisted personnel. I'd never
> met one who wasn't able to address me correctly by rank -- but I'm
> sure that if the typical A1C were to encounter a Navy Petty Officer
> First Class in a professional situation, he'd probably call him or her
> "Sarge."
>
> Navy Enlisted people have always seemed to have their acts together
> much better than Airmen, and I guess that's because they're all a lot
> closer to actual combat conditions than most Airmen ever get on a
> day-to-day basis. Things may have changed a bit since I've retired,
> what with the constant involvement in real-world combat situations
> these days. At least, I hope so.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Good show Larry. I really enjoy it when you provide a proper 'front end allignment' to those that keep asking for it.

I can agree with your comments about both the AF and the ARMY, since I served in both.

My main observation of the Army is they had a much lower IQ than the standard AF type. And the Army had a bunch more 'micky mouse' to deal with. But from what I've seen in the last decade or so the Army is looking a whole lot better than when I was in.

In the AF you had a job and you did that job. In the Army you did whatever job some dumbass said for you to do.

I never made it to the Navy. The mickey mouse ended my zest to travel.

Dan/W4NTI

2641. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 22:22:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <SEP4b.19005$Om1.14637@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76056

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:biured$6ac$1@208.206.142.103...
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > news:biu33i$v3i@library1.airnews.net...
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20030831181947.29660.00000362@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > > > In article <bitqgp$oh8@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> > <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> > > > writes:
> > > >
> > > > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > >news:20030831141937.29660.00000359@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > > > >> In article <bit67d$gal@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> > > <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> > > > >> writes:
> > > > >>
> > > > >>
> > > > >> The song is really an anti-conformity ditty, loosely derived from
> > > Malvina
> > > > >> Reynolds' "Little Boxes" and others of that ilk.
> > > > >>
> > > > >> >Yet, quite prophetic when looking back now.
> > > > >>
> > > > >> How?
> > > > >
> > > > >Oh, I think many today--even me--are quite involved and disolved
with
> > > > >keeping ourselves happy with material things. While I am not a
keep up
> > > with
> > > > >the Jones' kind of person (i.e., unaffected by "status" symbols), I
do
> > > find
> > > > >amusement in "things" more than I used to. I used to be happy just
to
> > > watch
> > > > >ants...
> > > > >
> > > > Ah - good explanation! And observation...
> > > >
```

> > > > Here's another one for ya...
> > > >
> > > > From 1972-1976 I attended a large urban university. The big thing
back
> > > then
> > > > was "nonconformity" to the rules of the "establishment",
particularly in
> > > > manners of slang, clothes and haircut.
> > > >
> > > > After a while, though, it became clear that we'd simply traded one
form
> > of
> > > > conformity for another, and that we "nonconformists" pretty much
dressed
> > > alike,
> > > > talked alike, and had similar haircuts.
> > > >
> > > > The university gave us more than schooling - we were actually
educated,
> > > often
> > > > by experiences that seemed minor at the time.
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > > >
> > >
> > > Absolutely!! I was one "of those" (nonconformists). Actually, I
still
> > > concentrate on being so--it doesn't come naturally any more <GRIN>.
If
> > > everyone is planting roses, I'll plant petunias. If all women like
> > > diamonds, I like opals (and that is actually the truth).
> > >
> > > Anyway, you're right about the more we tried to be different, the more
we
> > > were the same. Uh, but we were the same together ;)
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think so. Or
perhaps
> > you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower child? Now thats
a
> > real probabliity.
>
> Hey, she'e the one who wanted to go to Woodstock back when, but her mother
wouldn't let
> her because she was too young. Pity!
>

>

My point exactly.

Dan/W4NTI

2642. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 22:25:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <5HP4b.19013$Om1.5560@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76057

```
"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <biured$6ac$1@208.206.142.103>, "Dick Carroll;"
<dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >Subject: Re: For those that are against the morse removal
> >From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
> >Date: 1 Sep 2003 07:11:09 GMT
> >
> >
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> >> "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> >> news:biu33i$v3i@library1.airnews.net...
> >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:20030831181947.29660.00000362@mb-m24.aol.com...
> >> > > In article <bitqgp$oh8@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> >> <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> >> > > writes:
> >> > >
> >> > > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> > > >news:20030831141937.29660.00000359@mb-m24.aol.com...
> >> > > >> In article <bit67d$gal@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> >> > <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> >> > > > >> writes:
> >> > > > >>
> >> > > > >>
> >> > > > >> The song is really an anti-conformity ditty, loosely derived
from
> >> > Malvina
> >> > > > >> Reynolds' "Little Boxes" and others of that ilk.
> >> > > > >>
> >> > > > >> >Yet, quite prophetic when looking back now.
> >> > > > >>
> >> > > > >> How?
> >> > > > >
> >> > > > >Oh, I think many today--even me--are quite involved and disolved
with
> >> > > > >keeping ourselves happy with material things. While I am not a
keep
> >up
> >> > with
```

> >> > > >the Jones' kind of person (i.e., unaffected by "status" symbols),
I do
> >> > find
> >> > > >amusement in "things" more than I used to. I used to be happy
just to
> >> > watch
> >> > > >ants...
> >> > > >
> >> > > Ah - good explanation! And observation...
> >> > >
> >> > > Here's another one for ya...
> >> > >
> >> > > From 1972-1976 I attended a large urban university. The big thing
back
> >> > then
> >> > > was "nonconformity" to the rules of the "establishment",
particularly
> >in
> >> > > manners of slang, clothes and haircut.
> >> > >
> >> > > After a while, though, it became clear that we'd simply traded one
form
> >> of
> >> > > conformity for another, and that we "nonconformists" pretty much
> >dressed
> >> > alike,
> >> > > talked alike, and had similar haircuts.
> >> > >
> >> > > The university gave us more than schooling - we were actually
educated,
> >> > often
> >> > > by experiences that seemed minor at the time.
> >> > >
> >> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >> >
> >> > Absolutely!! I was one "of those" (nonconformists). Actually, I
still
> >> > concentrate on being so--it doesn't come naturally any more <GRIN>.
If
> >> > everyone is planting roses, I'll plant petunias. If all women like
> >> > diamonds, I like opals (and that is actually the truth).
>
> But you're still planting flowers, and liking jewelry. Same difference.
>
> >> > Anyway, you're right about the more we tried to be different, the
more we
> >> > were the same. Uh, but we were the same together ;)
>
> Groovy, baby!
>

> >> Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think so. Or
perhaps
> >> you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower child? Now
thats a
> >> real probabliity.
>
> Bummer, man! Why such a downer?
> >
> >Hey, she'e the one who wanted to go to Woodstock back when, but her
mother
> >wouldn't let her because she was too young. Pity!
> >
> Woodstock? Let's see, that was late summer 1969, when Kim was 15 if memory
> serves. I don't think a responsible parent would let their 15-year-old go
to
> such a "happening".
>
> Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock never
actually
> got there due to traffic snarls. Some of the performers had to be
helicoptered
> in and out, and some never made it. The whole event was such a mess that
large
> outdoor festivals basically disappeared afterwards because nobody with
half a
> brain would issue the necessary permits. (Altamont drove the final nail in
that
> coffin).
>
> Counterculture? Check this out: The promoters who put on the Woodstock
festival
> lost big piles of money on the concert. The whole thing was too big for
them to
> control - early on they even lost the ability to collect admission. There
was
> even talk of civil suits over huge unpaid expenses BUT....
>
> The promoters had done one smart thing: They owned the rights to almost
all
> recordings (film and sound) made at the festival. So they made a
documentary
> movie and record album for very little money, and made back all their
losses
> and millions more. Good old capitalism...
>
> Remember the song "Woodstock", made famous by Crosby Stills Nash and
Young? It
> was actually written by Joni Mitchell (who also performed the first
version).
> Buit Mitchell was not at the Woodstock festival at all!

>
> The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon.
That's
> what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

In the summer of 69 I was mellowing out in a Klong House in Bangkok
Thailand.

Dan/W4NTI

2643. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 22:32:22 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <WNP4b.19059$Om1.6426@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76058

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bivkrr$5oi@library1.airnews.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > In article <biured$6ac$1@208.206.142.103>, "Dick Carroll;"
> <dixie@townsqr.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >
> > >> "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > >> news:biu33i$v3i@library1.airnews.net...
> > >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >> > news:20030831181947.29660.00000362@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > >> > > In article <bitqgp$oh8@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> > >> <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> > >> > > writes:
> > >> > >
> > >> > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >> > >news:20030831141937.29660.00000359@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > >> > >> In article <bit67d$gal@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> > >> <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> > >> > >> writes:
> > >> > >>
> > >> > >>
> > >> > >> The song is really an anti-conformity ditty, loosely derived
> from
> > >> > Malvina
> > >> > >> Reynolds' "Little Boxes" and others of that ilk.
> > >> > >>
> > >> > >> >Yet, quite prophetic when looking back now.
> > >> > >>
> > >> > >> How?
> > >> > >
> > >> > >Oh, I think many today--even me--are quite involved and disolved
> with
> > >> > >keeping ourselves happy with material things. While I am not a
> keep
> > >up
> > >> > with
> > >> > >the Jones' kind of person (i.e., unaffected by "status"
symbols),
> I do

> > >> > find
> > >> > > >amusement in "things" more than I used to. I used to be happy
> just to
> > >> > watch
> > >> > > >ants...
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > Ah - good explanation! And observation...
> > >> > >
> > >> > > Here's another one for ya...
> > >> > >
> > >> > > From 1972-1976 I attended a large urban university. The big
thing
> back
> > >> > then
> > >> > > was "nonconformity" to the rules of the "establishment",
> particularly
> > >in
> > >> > > manners of slang, clothes and haircut.
> > >> > >
> > >> > > After a while, though, it became clear that we'd simply traded
one
> form
> > >> of
> > >> > > conformity for another, and that we "nonconformists" pretty much
> > >dressed
> > >> > alike,
> > >> > > talked alike, and had similar haircuts.
> > >> > >
> > >> > > The university gave us more than schooling - we were actually
> educated,
> > >> > often
> > >> > > by experiences that seemed minor at the time.
> > >> > >
> > >> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >> >
> > >> > Absolutely!! I was one "of those" (nonconformists). Actually, I
> still
> > >> > concentrate on being so--it doesn't come naturally any more <GRIN>.
> If
> > >> > everyone is planting roses, I'll plant petunias. If all women like
> > >> > diamonds, I like opals (and that is actually the truth).
> >
> > But you're still planting flowers, and liking jewelry. Same difference.
> >
>
> Yeah, but I like to think that I'm being a bit of a renegade. Actually, I
> don't like things all the same. Remember the good 'ol "Neighborhood
> Association" debates that have come and gone here? I'm against them, for
> whatever purpose; and would be so very, very depressed if I ever have to
> live "in" one.

>
> And, as for jewelery. That is a going joke in my family. I love
jewelery.
> Even used to work at Ed Levin Jewelers long ago. Love to get it as a
> present. Don't spend much time shopping for it or being distracted by it,
> though, if set against the rest of my female population. A couple of
years
> ago I asked for, and received, one of those standing jewelery chests.
It's
> about half full. Every once in a while I'll spend an hour or two taking
all
> my pretties out and looking at them. LOL But, save on rare occasions,
> you'll not find me with a piece on--not even my wedding band. Just don't
> like the feeling of anything around me, I guess.
>
> > >> >
> > >> > Anyway, you're right about the more we tried to be different, the
> more we
> > >> > were the same. Uh, but we were the same together ;)
> >
> > Groovy, baby!
> >
>
> Gads!!! That's so funny. I never got into the beatniky-hippie kind of
> lingo. Heck, I don't think I could even be classified as a true hippie--I
> am just a couple of years too late fer it.
>
> > >> Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think so. Or
> perhaps
> > >> you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower child? Now
> thats a
> > >> real probabliity.
> >
> > Bummer, man! Why such a downer?
> > >
>
> Some folks can be no other way.
>
> > >Hey, she'e the one who wanted to go to Woodstock back when, but her
> mother
> > >wouldn't let her because she was too young. Pity!
> > >
> > Woodstock? Let's see, that was late summer 1969, when Kim was 15 if
memory
> > serves. I don't think a responsible parent would let their 15-year-old
go
> to
> > such a "happening".
> >
>

> Yep, 14 though. And, you're right. I had friends whose parents were much
> more lenient than mine who went. I was going with them. Until I asked my
> parents...LOL
>
> > Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock never
> actually
> > got there due to traffic snarls. Some of the performers had to be
> helicoptered
> > in and out, and some never made it. The whole event was such a mess that
> large
> > outdoor festivals basically disappeared afterwards because nobody with
> half a
> > brain would issue the necessary permits. (Altamont drove the final nail
in
> that
> > coffin).
> >
>
> It was much nicer watching from the news on it. As "free" as I liked to
> think of myself back then, I am pretty sure I would definitely have been
> bummed at the rain, mud, and so darned many freaks.
>
> > Counterculture? Check this out: The promoters who put on the Woodstock
> festival
> > lost big piles of money on the concert. The whole thing was too big for
> them to
> > control - early on they even lost the ability to collect admission.
There
> was
> > even talk of civil suits over huge unpaid expenses BUT....
> >
>
> I think there was more than talk. Did Yeager/Yager/Yeger (however his
name
> is spelled) think there was loads to be had in a suit and begin the
process
> until it was explained to him the debaucle of the whole thing?
>
> > The promoters had done one smart thing: They owned the rights to almost
> all
> > recordings (film and sound) made at the festival. So they made a
> documentary
> > movie and record album for very little money, and made back all their
> losses
> > and millions more. Good old capitalism...
> >
>
> Bought the album. You know, the one with the little kid on it? <GRIN>
> It's the only album where I've heard Joan singing the song "Sweet Sir
> Gallahad" ('least I think that's the name of it) and gosh I like that

song.
>
> > Remember the song "Woodstock", made famous by Crosby Stills Nash and
> Young? It
> > was actually written by Joni Mitchell (who also performed the first
> version).
> > Buit Mitchell was not at the Woodstock festival at all!
> >
> > The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon.
> That's
> > what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Yeah, Summer 1970 saw the tragedy at Kent State...the beginning of the
end.
>
> By the way, I'd have guessed you were an old hippie, Jim. At least
there's
> still a few left upholding the original ideals. I gave up.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Good to see she admitted she wasn't really a hippie.

Oh and did you mean you were AT Kent State in May of 70, or just heard or
watched it in the news?

Reason Im asking is that I was there the night before it happened. Just
curious.

Dan/W4NTI

2644. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 22:36:14 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901183614.10745.00000278@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 76059

>Reason Im asking is that I was there the night before it happened. Just
>curious.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Hey Dan brings back Memories, did you ever hang out at RAYS. Man we had some
Wild times there.

2645. Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 22:38:20 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <wTP4b.19097$Om1.18571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76060

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309011332.6c782d2f@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
> > Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock never
actually
> > got there due to traffic snarls.
>
> I especially like the ones who claimed they were both at Woodstock and
> in Vietnam. They probably saw both movies.
>
> > The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon.
That's
> > what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
>
> I was 11. I remember selling flower seeds door to door to earn a West
> Ben fishing pole. And my Dad getting orders to Thailand.
>
> So what has all this do do with code?

My my Brian....how is it so hard for you to figure a person could be a
veteran of VN and be at Kent State also? You really must be a dumb ass.

I was at Kent State visiting my cousin the evening before the shootings.
The national guard had blocked the streets and the kids were running up and
down the street throwing rocks, etc.

I had my military ID checked by the Guard on my way out of town. The next
day the shootings occured. (I was in-active reserve status).

I was discharged in 1968. I went back to Thailand as a civilian and
returned stateside in December of 69. My original home is Alliance, Ohio.
Thats about 34 miles South of Kent, Ohio.

You can now wipe the slobber off your chin.

Dan/W4NTI

2646. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 22:41:22 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj0huiaqa0@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 76061

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
> >
> > As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
>
> How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?

Many times the number of *US* NCI members, Carl.

2647. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 22:43:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F53CBDD.2040704@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76062

N2EY wrote:
> In article <DwN4b.215$vj4.34065@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>
>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
>>
>>> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
>>
>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>>
>
> Lots and lots.
>
> How many *US* licensees are members of NCI, Carl?
>
> btw, the FISTS member list is online.

I've given it a read. It sounds pretty good, I agree with it for the most part, and it is doomed. Won't happen. Not in a million years.

It's not the way we are heading.

How do you justify a trained group of communicators that are versed in a mode that is as useful and needed as CW is? There isn't an emergency right now.

It's not the way we are heading.

Perhaps some day they will see the value, just like all the people who build houses in flood plains - Hey, those areas are dry 99.5 percent of the time!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2648. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 22:46:04 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj0i7caqa1@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 76063

Brian wrote:

> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030901111914.12631.00000693@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > In article <biu33j$v3i@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Hey, use them for gift tags! Make up a label, place it onto the
> > >AOL CD, and use a pretty ribbon to tie between the package and the hole of
> > >the CD.
> >
> > Cool!
> > >
> > >Hmmmmm, this could really get interesting (they could also be used against
> > >those wall mounted candle holders, carried in the pocket on a hike (they'd
> > >reflect light and work for signaling really well).
> >
> > They work really well for signalling if ya know Morse Code...
>
> Typical eyes rolled back PCTA response.
>
> I wonder what Paul Revere used to signal with?
>
> I wonder if Paul knew Morse Code?

Of course not, dummy... but where do ya suppose Sam got the idea?

2649. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 22:48:12 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj0ibcaqa2@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 76064

N2EY wrote:

> In article <DwN4b.215$vj4.34065@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
> >>
> >> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
> >
> >How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
> >
> Lots and lots.
>
> How many *US* licensees are members of NCI, Carl?
>
> btw, the FISTS member list is online.

Of course the NCI member list is online too....isn't it? ISN'T IT???

2650. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 22:49:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F53CD56.4090303@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76065

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
>
>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
>>
>>> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
>>
>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>
>
> Many times the number of *US* NCI members, Carl.

It doesn't take a majority to win an issue, Dick. All it takes is an
irate minority that is prepared to be loud and active.

What do they do for an encore?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2651. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 22:52:12 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj0iisaqa3@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 76066

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:bivcp6$cb0s1$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > Hell, I work for a private university, and it is one of the "bastions" of
> > republican thought; "do as I say, not do as I do." It promotes the
> > lifestyle of the little rich brats that have been raised with the thinking
> > of "it's not what you know, but who you know." Forget achieving based on
> > merits or achievements.
> >
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> > .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >
> > > > Most schools and universities today are either state owned or state
> > > >supported. Therefore, to find an answer to the problems with schools,
> we
> > > >only have to look as far as our own state representatives. And, since
> > they
> > > >like the federal education assistance available to them, those
> > > >representatives are not going to change unless we vote them out and are
> > > >willing to fund schools locally. I see no effort in either of those
> > > >directions.
> > >
> > > Sad, but true.
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> >
> >
> >
> Dang...thats really hard to believe. A 'republican university' taught by
> tenured 60s flower children. Wow.....guess those Hippies really did turn
> into Yuppies after all.

Yep. Crippled and often brain-dead ones, but Yuppies not the less.

2652. No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 23:00:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F53CFE7.8020506@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76067

Hey clones!

Go to:

http://news.yahoo.com/

and follow the technology link to "Car that can park itself put on sale by Toyota". I'd put the actual link in but it's waay too long for a single line on a post.

There is no further need to include a parking test in the examination for Drivers licenses. Now that a car can park itself, why should anyone have to learn how to do it. Imagine how much more cellphone time and makeup application time this will give people!

- Mike KB3EIA - out!

President, NPTI

"Dedicated to taking driving into the future"

2653. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 23:12:49 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <RnQ4b.19315$Om1.12297@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76068

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:biuq0n$2rg$0@208.206.142.103...
> It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
>
>
>
>
> http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
>
>
> Enjoy!
>

Excellent.

Dan/W4NTI

2654. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 23:19:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <duQ4b.19362$Om1.5272@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76069

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:j_G4b.4531$tw6.461@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> On 1 Sep 2003 07:25:35 GMT,
> Dick Carroll; in <bius9f$86g$0@208.206.142.103> wrote:
> > Sri...you will be referrred to this URL :
> >
> > http://www.qsl.net/n1ea/FIST_FCC_Petition_8-30-303.pdf
> >
> >
> >
> > "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
> >
> >> It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
> >>
> >> http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
> >>
> >> Enjoy!
> >
>
> The same old Morse code is necessary for ham radio HF operation
> line of thinking. There is nothing that prevents anyone from
> learning Morse code if the FCC drops the Morse code test & requirement
> for General and Extra Class license holders so their petition is
> silly.
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith AOL IM:kilowattradio
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> _Give SCO $699 for using Linux or the Penguin gets it._
> Torvalds: _They are smoking crack._

No Keith, it is not silly. You are just one of those that are too lazy to
learn, and want to change the whole license structure to accomidate you.

Dan/W4NTI

2655. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 23:26:39 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901192639.01893.00000382@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 76070

In article <bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>And they got NO input from FISTS that round at all, either. It didn't seem
>likely that FCC would go so far as they did, thus there was no movement within
>the organization.

There's also the fact that there was an ARRL proposal on the table, as well as
others.

>And not many members commented individually.

I did.

>This time WILL be different!

Oyez!

To many folks, reduction in the code tests was one thing, but total elimination
is quite another. Note too that many hams are/were of the opinion "reduce the
code, expand the written" but what we got was reduction across the board.

> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.

Over 10,000 last time I looked. And FISTS started with #1. Of course not all
the numbers are active - dues are $15/year.

>Comments from
>members will be numerous, and after all, FCC officials have said they want
>"us" to let
>them know what we want in the way of restructuring rules! That's what they'll
>get!
>
> Maybe if FISTS had commented en masse last time it might have some effect
> on the outcome,
>given FCC comments noted above. It remains to be seen, of course.
>
Exactly. Maybe code test retention is the majority position today, as it was in
1998-1999 (judging by comments) Or maybe the majority has shifted. Maybe FCC
will go with the majority opinion this time, which it did not do in 1999.

It should be noted that the FISTS petition addresses more than the issue of
code testing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

FISTS #4360

2656. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 23:35:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <MIQ4b.19457$Om1.10718@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76071

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309011251.3ada241b@posting.google.com...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<biuq0n$2rg$0@208.206.142.103>...
> > It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
> >
> >
> > http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
> >
> >
> > Enjoy!
>
>
> I thought that FISTS sold themselves as a non-political club?

How is sending in a petition a political act? Does that mean when NCI sent in a petition it was political? Or perhaps they were simply following proceedures. Duuuuuuuuu

Dan/W4NTI

2657. Re: More Classic Wisdom from Kim, W5TIT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 23:38:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <eMQ4b.19478$Om1.10783@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76072

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bj03f3$5ou@library1.airnews.net...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bivpl3$i65$0@208.206.142.114...
> >
> >
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:<bitaacmka1@208.206.142.88>...
> > > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > Actually, that last one was one of her better efforts. The "Dirty
> Harry"
> > > > > quote was a particularly refreshing change in her usually dull
> rhetoric,
> > > > > or does she just think that she has a pair of "44 Magnums?"
> > > >
> > > > .22 shorts would be far more like it.
> > > >
> > > > Larry, as long as you continue dialog with her she'll keep
driveling
> it out...
> > >
> > > Why would she think she had a pair of 44 Magnums, when Dirty Harry
> > > only had one? And just how do you go about shooting 22 shorts in a 44
> > > Magnum?
> >
> > Hey Brian- You can always rent a clue if you can't come up with one
any
> other
> > way!
> >
> >
>
> Translation: even he doesn't quite understand what he meant by that.
>
> Ever see how Dick is too chicken shit to try to match intelligence with
me?
> I've beat him a few times...and he doesn't dare continue...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Or, more likely, he is tired of the same ole drivel from you...eh?

Dan/W4NTI

2658. Re: Good Heavens...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 23:43:29 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <BQQ4b.19505$Om1.17375@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76073

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030901144526.14517.00000368@mb-m12.aol.com...
> >I've been 118 for the better
> >part of my life and I was the same then as I am now.
> >
>
> What in one TIT

As they say down here...what a hawg.

Dan/W4NTI

2659. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-01 23:51:29 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F53DB7F.8040504@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 76074

D. Stussy wrote:

>On Sun, 31 Aug 2003, N2EY wrote:
>
>
>>In article <f7d9a152.0308311309.44c88748@posting.google.com>,
>>jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:
>>
>>
>>
>>>I found this comment on eham.net:
>>>"I hold the OLD ADVANCED license and it is a matter of prestidge. I
>>>had to have 13 wpm to get to this level and now they want to do away
>>>with ALL CW? Keep at least the 5 wpm.
>>>It is too easy to pass a written exam. The code kept the CB crowd from
>>>gaining acess to our bands. "
>>>
>>>
>>The fact of the matter is that simply having an Advanced is not proof of code
>>speed. Since 1990, medical waivers were available for 13 and 20 wpm.
>>
>>
>
>Although true, the fact of a waiver is in the FCC's database (there's a field
>for it). As an excuse not to upgrade to extra, it's probably one of the lamest
>ideas around. Upon upgrade, one will still have the "prior class held" field
>that will say advanced, so with the combination of these two data fields, we
>will know that a person once held an advanced class license WITHOUT the medical
>waiver and thus officially passed the 13wpm code element. [Whether or not the
>person actually took the test or just paid for his license will generally never
>be known!]
>
>To me, the statement is more typical of some advanced class sourpuss who failed
>to take advantage of the transitional rule back in 2000 and obtain credit for
>the easier element 4B than the current element 4. Granted that was only for a
>3.5 month window...
>
>What surprises me is this: There are still some people (the August 30 session
>I did had two such people) who are coming in for their pre-87-tech to general
>no test upgrades, 3+ years after the rules change went into effect....
>
>
>
>>>Is this for real? Are there REALLY people with Advanced licenses who

>>>refuse to upgrade to Amateur Extra SIMPLY because they feel the need
>>>to prove they passed the 13 wpm exam?
>>>
>>>
>>There are some misguided folks who think that, but in fact it's not a proof of
>>code speed any more than my Extra is proof of 20 per.
>>
>>
>
>When it is known that a medical waiver wasn't used, it is (for pre April 19,
>2000 extras).
>
>
>
Oh good! I got my extra on April 15, 2000 so I beat that deadline. :-)

2660. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 00:18:10 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bj0o54$69j@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76076

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:evP4b.18952$Om1.5551@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:biuf8u$pvs@library2.airnews.net...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:RVw4b.12334$EW1.2877@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think so. Or
> perhaps
> > > you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower child? Now
thats
> a
> > > real probabliity.
> > >
> > >
> > > "Make love not War"
> > >
> > > "War is dangerous to all living things"
> > >
> > > etc.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Do you have to practice at being an asshole, Dan, or does it come that
> > naturally?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> You bring out the best in me Kim.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

That's a given, Dan. We all know you're an asshole. That wasn't the
question. The question is do you have to practice?

Kim W5TIT
```

2661. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 00:21:02 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bj0o55$69j@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76075

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:5HP4b.19013$Om1.5560@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > In article <biured$6ac$1@208.206.142.103>, "Dick Carroll;"
> <dixie@townsqr.com>
> > writes:
> >
> > >Subject: Re: For those that are against the morse removal
> > >From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
> > >Date: 1 Sep 2003 07:11:09 GMT
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >
> > >> "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > >> news:biu33i$v3i@library1.airnews.net...
> > >> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >> > news:20030831181947.29660.00000362@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > >> > > In article <bitqgp$oh8@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> > >> <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> > >> > > writes:
> > >> > >
> > >> > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >> > >news:20030831141937.29660.00000359@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > >> > > >> In article <bit67d$gal@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim"
> > >> <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> > >> > > >> writes:
> > >> > > >>
> > >> > > >>
> > >> > > >> The song is really an anti-conformity ditty, loosely derived
> from
> > >> Malvina
> > >> > > >> Reynolds' "Little Boxes" and others of that ilk.
> > >> > > >>
> > >> > > >> >Yet, quite prophetic when looking back now.
> > >> > > >>
> > >> > > >> How?
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > >Oh, I think many today--even me--are quite involved and disolved
> with
> > >> > > >keeping ourselves happy with material things. While I am not a

> keep
> > >up
> > >> > with
> > >> > > >the Jones' kind of person (i.e., unaffected by "status"
symbols),
> I do
> > >> > find
> > >> > > >amusement in "things" more than I used to. I used to be happy
> just to
> > >> > watch
> > >> > > >ants...
> > >> > > >
> > >> > > Ah - good explanation! And observation...
> > >> > >
> > >> > > Here's another one for ya...
> > >> > >
> > >> > > From 1972-1976 I attended a large urban university. The big
thing
> back
> > >> > then
> > >> > > was "nonconformity" to the rules of the "establishment",
> particularly
> > >in
> > >> > > manners of slang, clothes and haircut.
> > >> > >
> > >> > > After a while, though, it became clear that we'd simply traded
one
> form
> > >> of
> > >> > > conformity for another, and that we "nonconformists" pretty much
> > >dressed
> > >> > alike,
> > >> > > talked alike, and had similar haircuts.
> > >> > >
> > >> > > The university gave us more than schooling - we were actually
> educated,
> > >> > often
> > >> > > by experiences that seemed minor at the time.
> > >> > >
> > >> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >> >
> > >> > Absolutely!! I was one "of those" (nonconformists). Actually, I
> still
> > >> > concentrate on being so--it doesn't come naturally any more <GRIN>.
> If
> > >> > everyone is planting roses, I'll plant petunias. If all women like
> > >> > diamonds, I like opals (and that is actually the truth).
> >
> > But you're still planting flowers, and liking jewelry. Same difference.
> >

> > >> > Anyway, you're right about the more we tried to be different, the
> more we
> > >> > were the same. Uh, but we were the same together ;)
> >
> > Groovy, baby!
> >
> > >> Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think so. Or
> perhaps
> > >> you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower child? Now
> thats a
> > >> real probabliity.
> >
> > Bummer, man! Why such a downer?
> > >
> > >Hey, she'e the one who wanted to go to Woodstock back when, but her
> mother
> > >wouldn't let her because she was too young. Pity!
> > >
> > Woodstock? Let's see, that was late summer 1969, when Kim was 15 if
memory
> > serves. I don't think a responsible parent would let their 15-year-old
go
> to
> > such a "happening".
> >
> > Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock never
> actually
> > got there due to traffic snarls. Some of the performers had to be
> helicoptered
> > in and out, and some never made it. The whole event was such a mess that
> large
> > outdoor festivals basically disappeared afterwards because nobody with
> half a
> > brain would issue the necessary permits. (Altamont drove the final nail
in
> that
> > coffin).
> >
> > Counterculture? Check this out: The promoters who put on the Woodstock
> festival
> > lost big piles of money on the concert. The whole thing was too big for
> them to
> > control - early on they even lost the ability to collect admission.
There
> was
> > even talk of civil suits over huge unpaid expenses BUT....
> >
> > The promoters had done one smart thing: They owned the rights to almost
> all
> > recordings (film and sound) made at the festival. So they made a

> documentary
> > movie and record album for very little money, and made back all their
> losses
> > and millions more. Good old capitalism...
> >
> > Remember the song "Woodstock", made famous by Crosby Stills Nash and
> Young? It
> > was actually written by Joni Mitchell (who also performed the first
> version).
> > Buit Mitchell was not at the Woodstock festival at all!
> >
> > The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon.
> That's
> > what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> In the summer of 69 I was mellowing out in a Klong House in Bangkok
> Thailand.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

And what were you defending, Dan? You should remember, because your actions here make me seem to think you've lost the reason you went to war.

Kim W5TIT

2662. Re: OT: Trojan Help

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 00:22:08 UTC
From: donut <none@none.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93E9B000A7CE9donut@216.102.43.227>
Source record: 76078
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Gregg <nospam@unknown.org> wrote in
news:%px4b.41512$_5.704707@news1.telusplanet.net:

> www.debian.org

That's a big help. He wants to get rid of a worm, not change OSes.

Linux is just as vulnerable.

http://techrepublic.com.com/5100-6264-5065343.html?tag=crm

2663. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 00:25:10 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bj0o56$69j@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76077

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:wTP4b.19097$Om1.18571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309011332.6c782d2f@posting.google.com...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >
> > > Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock never
> actually
> > > got there due to traffic snarls.
> >
> > I especially like the ones who claimed they were both at Woodstock and
> > in Vietnam. They probably saw both movies.
> >
> > > The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon.
> That's
> > > what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
> >
> > I was 11. I remember selling flower seeds door to door to earn a West
> > Ben fishing pole. And my Dad getting orders to Thailand.
> >
> > So what has all this do do with code?
>
> My my Brian....how is it so hard for you to figure a person could be a
> veteran of VN and be at Kent State also? You really must be a dumb ass.
>
> I was at Kent State visiting my cousin the evening before the shootings.
> The national guard had blocked the streets and the kids were running up
and
> down the street throwing rocks, etc.
>
> I had my military ID checked by the Guard on my way out of town. The next
> day the shootings occured. (I was in-active reserve status).
>
> I was discharged in 1968. I went back to Thailand as a civilian and
> returned stateside in December of 69. My original home is Alliance, Ohio.
> Thats about 34 miles South of Kent, Ohio.
>
> You can now wipe the slobber off your chin.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Good grief, Dan. You're a gorilla thumping your chest... That's a total turn-off.

Kim W5TIT

2664. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 00:58:28 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <UWR4b.36538$Vx2.16091296@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76079

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309011251.3ada241b@posting.google.com...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<biuq0n$2rg$0@208.206.142.103>...
> > It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
> >
> >
> > http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
> >
> >
> > Enjoy!
>
>
> I thought that FISTS sold themselves as a non-political club?

I don't know about that but it is impossible to be non-political and live in
the real world.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2665. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 01:09:13 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Z4S4b.36539$Vx2.16092826@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76080

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F53CFE7.8020506@adelphia.net...
> Hey clones!
>
> Go to:
>
> http://news.yahoo.com/
>
> and follow the technology link to "Car that can park itself put on sale
> by Toyota". I'd put the actual link in but it's waay too long for a
> single line on a post.
>
> There is no further need to include a parking test in the examination
> for Drivers licenses. Now that a car can park itself, why should anyone
> have to learn how to do it. Imagine how much more cellphone time and
> makeup application time this will give people!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA - out!
>
>
> President, NPTI
>
> "Dedicated to taking driving into the future"
>

Yup you got it. Here in Michigan the driving test is two parts. The first part, which you MUST pass before you can take the actual driving section, is parking manuevers. These consist of pulling up within 2 feet of but not over the line, backing into a parking space like those in shopping centers, and parallel parking. These three manuevers count for 8 points. The parallel parking is 5 of those 8. You can only miss 6 points to pass this section. So if you blow parallel parking and make any mistake at all on the others, you fail. Most new drivers have to take the test a minimum of twice. Three times is more typical.

Fail the basically unimportant parking lot maneuvers (these situations can all be avoided in the real world if you want to) and you don't get your license.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
(and parent of a newly licensed driver)

2666. Re: OT: Trojan Help

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 01:11:00 UTC
From: Gregg <nospam@unknown.org>
Message-ID: <E6S4b.62383$ho5.1081772@news2.telusplanet.net>
Source record: 76081
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Behold, donut signaled from keyed 4-1000A filament:

> Gregg <nospam@unknown.org> wrote in
> news:%px4b.41512$_5.704707@news1.telusplanet.net:
>
>> www.debian.org
>
> That's a big help. He wants to get rid of a worm, not change OSes.
>
> Linux is just as vulnerable.
>
> http://techrepublic.com.com/5100-6264-5065343.html?tag=crm

I am serious here.

You can count the number of current *nix/BSD virii/trojans on your
hands and still have fingers left over.

I didn't mentions worms because a *nix worm doesn't exist - probably
never will.

--
Gregg
Perhaps it's useful, even if it can't be SPICE'd
Visit the GeeK Zone - http://geek.scorpiorising.ca

2667. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 01:20:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901212009.21642.00000444@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 76082

In article <20030831212703.14837.00002657@mb-m03.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>OOOOHHH, you mean
>performance-wise.

Yep.
>
>2.66 GHz P4, 1 GB RAM, top-of-the-line Intel DDR 400 MHz motherboard,
>DVDRW/CDROM drive and another CDROM drive, 1.44 MB floppy drive,
>6 USB ports, 2 cereal ports (one for Wheeties, one for Grape Nuts), and
>a USR V.92 EXTERNAL USB modem. O/S will be Windoze XP. Oh,
>40 GB Western Digital hard drive. It's being put together by a local
>computer firm called Kehtron Computer, which has a good rep in this area
>and offers the advantage of being local, so if anything goes wrong, I can
>just bring it back with a bottle of ketchup and mustard and say, "Luncheon
>is served, boys!"

Nice - but what do you need all that computing power for? Sounds like a serious gaming or CAD machine.

>>>I'm one of the first 1,000 original AOL users, and just can't
>>>seem to break the habit.
>>
>>Exactly what AOL counts on. Can't blame 'em, it's sound marketing.
>
>It certainly seems to have worked on me!

And many others!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2668. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 01:20:59 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901212059.21879.00000342@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 76083

>What do they do for an encore?

Put out a list of 10 Codes

2669. ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 01:31:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901213158.20041.00000277@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 76084

ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye. After reading Fists proposal I have decided to send your $39.00 to them instead of you fools. It appears Fist is the only real Group out there that really cares.

2670. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 01:33:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901213338.20041.00000279@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 76085

>Good grief, Dan. You're a gorilla thumping your chest... That's a total
>turn-off.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Damn TIT, your TITS dragging on the ground are a Bigger turn-off

2671. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 02:29:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F5400EC.4000106@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76086

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F53CFE7.8020506@adelphia.net...
>
>>Hey clones!
>>
>>Go to:
>>
>>http://news.yahoo.com/
>>
>>and follow the technology link to "Car that can park itself put on sale
>>by Toyota". I'd put the actual link in but it's waay too long for a
>>single line on a post.
>>
>>There is no further need to include a parking test in the examination
>>for Drivers licenses. Now that a car can park itself, why should anyone
>>have to learn how to do it. Imagine how much more cellphone time and
>>makeup application time this will give people!
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA - out!
>>
>>
>>President, NPTI
>>
>>"Dedicated to taking driving into the future"
>>
>
>
> Yup you got it. Here in Michigan the driving test is two parts. The first
> part, which you MUST pass before you can take the actual driving section, is
> parking manuevers. These consist of pulling up within 2 feet of but not
> over the line, backing into a parking space like those in shopping centers,
> and parallel parking. These three manuevers count for 8 points. The
> parallel parking is 5 of those 8. You can only miss 6 points to pass this
> section. So if you blow parallel parking and make any mistake at all on the
> others, you fail. Most new drivers have to take the test a minimum of
> twice. Three times is more typical.
>
> Fail the basically unimportant parking lot maneuvers (these situations can
> all be avoided in the real world if you want to) and you don't get your
> license.

Ahh, you see? You see? This is a terrible travesty, and is really just
a hazing ritual.

Mind you, NPTI has no objection to a driver actually parallel parking (PP) his or her vehicle, but we think it is an outdated and unecessary thing to have a person actually have to pass a test showing that they can do PP.

Now there is a question about the amount of space that is used up by PP. At this time, NPTI respects the right of those that do PP, but if the People who PP fall significantly, we will have to revisit that question. Certainly if enough people do not PP, that space would be better used by other methods of parking.

Why anyone should be forced to PP is beyond me.

- Mike KB3EIA -

President, NPTI

"Dedicated to taking driving into the future"

2672. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 02:39:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901223918.00545.00000357@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 76087

In article <5HP4b.19013$Om1.5560@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>> The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon.
>> That's what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>In the summer of 69 I was mellowing out in a Klong House in Bangkok
>Thailand.
>
HAW! That's a good one, Dan!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2673. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 02:39:18 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030901223918.00545.00000356@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 76088

In article <bivkrr$5oi@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

(lotta snippage)

>> But you're still planting flowers, and liking jewelry. Same difference.
>
>Yeah, but I like to think that I'm being a bit of a renegade. Actually, I
>don't like things all the same. Remember the good 'ol "Neighborhood
>Association" debates that have come and gone here? I'm against them, for
>whatever purpose; and would be so very, very depressed if I ever have to
>live "in" one.

Same here. But the reason those associations exist is fear - fear that folks
won't keep up their properties in a reasonable manner if there is no mechanism
to force them.

>And, as for jewelery. That is a going joke in my family. I love jewelery.
>Even used to work at Ed Levin Jewelers long ago. Love to get it as a
>present. Don't spend much time shopping for it or being distracted by it,
>though, if set against the rest of my female population. A couple of years
>ago I asked for, and received, one of those standing jewelery chests. It's
>about half full. Every once in a while I'll spend an hour or two taking all
>my pretties out and looking at them. LOL But, save on rare occasions,
>you'll not find me with a piece on--not even my wedding band. Just don't
>like the feeling of anything around me, I guess.

To each his own. I collect radio parts.
>
>> >> > Anyway, you're right about the more we tried to be different, the
>> >> > more we were the same. Uh, but we were the same together ;)

>> Groovy, baby!
>
>Gads!!! That's so funny.

Just an Austin Powers reference.

>I never got into the beatniky-hippie kind of
>lingo. Heck, I don't think I could even be classified as a true hippie--I
>am just a couple of years too late fer it.

So am I.

>> >> Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think so. Or
>> >> perhaps
>> >> you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower child? Now

>> >> thats a
>> >> real probabliity.
>>
>> Bummer, man! Why such a downer?
>
>Some folks can be no other way.

Naw, I think Dan can be a real up guy most of the time. Cool dude.
>

>> Woodstock? Let's see, that was late summer 1969, when Kim was 15 if memory
>> serves. I don't think a responsible parent would let their 15-year-old go
>> to such a "happening".
>
>Yep, 14 though.

All the more reason.

>And, you're right. I had friends whose parents were much
>more lenient than mine who went.

I'd call it "irresponsible" rather than "lenient".

>I was going with them. Until I asked my parents...LOL

Even at that age I knew better.
>
>> Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock never
>> actually got there due to traffic snarls. Some of the performers had to be
>> helicoptered in and out, and some never made it. The whole event was
>> such a mess that large
>> outdoor festivals basically disappeared afterwards because nobody with
>> half a
>> brain would issue the necessary permits. (Altamont drove the final nail in
>> that coffin).
>
>It was much nicer watching from the news on it. As "free" as I liked to
>think of myself back then, I am pretty sure I would definitely have been
>bummed at the rain, mud, and so darned many freaks.

'zactly.

A lot of us were mad that the clueless promoters had ruined the whole festival
scene by their incompetence. Even 30 years later there were problems doing
another one.

Give me the Philadelphia Folk Festival any day. Well managed, excellent acts,
good sound and video, well behaved crowd and it's been held every year since
long before that place in NY. People take their kids and grandkids. No visible
booze or drugs.
>
>> Counterculture? Check this out: The promoters who put on the Woodstock
>> festival

>> lost big piles of money on the concert. The whole thing was too big for
>> them to
>> control - early on they even lost the ability to collect admission. There
>> was
>> even talk of civil suits over huge unpaid expenses BUT....
>>
>
>I think there was more than talk. Did Yeager/Yager/Yeger (however his name
>is spelled) think there was loads to be had in a suit and begin the process
>until it was explained to him the debaucle of the whole thing?

Max Yasgur, now dead, I think. I'm sure he got a piece of the pie. Point was,
they made a mint from the whole "counterculture" aspect of it.
>
>> The promoters had done one smart thing: They owned the rights to almost
>> all
>> recordings (film and sound) made at the festival. So they made a
>> documentary
>> movie and record album for very little money, and made back all their
>> losses
>> and millions more. Good old capitalism...
>>
>
>Bought the album. You know, the one with the little kid on it? <GRIN>
>It's the only album where I've heard Joan singing the song "Sweet Sir
>Gallahad" ('least I think that's the name of it) and gosh I like that song.

Never bought the album - it was so overplayed on FM radio around here there was
no need to. Saw the movie on PBS some years back and was amazed at how awful it
was. But they both made a pile of money. Good ol' cappitalism...
>
>> Remember the song "Woodstock", made famous by Crosby Stills Nash and
>> Young? It
>> was actually written by Joni Mitchell (who also performed the first
>> version).
>> But Mitchell was not at the Woodstock festival at all!

Turns out CSNY had talked her out of going because she was to be a guest on the
Dick Cavett show (remember HIM?) and they said she'd never be back in time. Of
course if she'd gone they'd have given her serious stage time.

Then they got themselves helicoptered in and out of the festival, and crashed
the Cavett show. They wound up being interviewed along with Mitchell, who said
only a few words because, after all, she wasn't there. The look on her face
said it all....
>>
>> The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon.
>> That's what I think of first when that time is mentioned.

>Yeah, Summer 1970 saw the tragedy at Kent State...the beginning of the end.

End of what? Looking back, I'm amazed only four died in the Kent State mess. Days of near-riot conditions, kids throwing rocks and teargas canisters back at National Guardsmen (who were untrained in riot control)? KS was not a nonviolent demonstration.
>
>By the way, I'd have guessed you were an old hippie, Jim.

Not me. I could never afford it. I went to engineering school, remember? I always thought that to build a better world, one had to know how to build things in the first place. So I learned how to do electrical engineering. And I'm still at it.

There's no substitute for actually knowing how to do things, and doing them. Remember the movies "The Magnificent Seven" (actually a remake of "The Seven Samurai"? The farmers (productive people) does not need the bandits (moochers). But the bandits sure need the farmers!

Some good things came out of those times. Those are the things to remember.

>At least there's still a few left upholding the original ideals.

Yeah, baby!

Actually, you might be surprised at how simple my "ideals" really are.

>I gave up.

Not me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2674. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 03:48:31 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309011948.79fe36a0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76092

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309011251.3ada241b@posting.google.com>...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<biuq0n$2rg$0@208.206.142.103>...
> > It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
> >
> >
> > http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
> >
> >
> > Enjoy!
>
>
> I thought that FISTS sold themselves as a non-political club?

Don't use the term "I thought", we all know what that means in your case.

2675. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 03:48:50 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <CqU4b.266$vj4.42671@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76089

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030901171950.23307.00002666@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <DwN4b.215$vj4.34065@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
> >>
> >> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
> >
> >How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
> >
> Lots and lots.

A real specific answer ...

> How many *US* licensees are members of NCI, Carl?

Thousands, and growing every day :-)

> btw, the FISTS member list is online.

If you took the time to look, and it's public, why didn't you answer
my question?

However, we *don't* publish our membership list ... we respect
the privacy of our members and keep the data they give us confidential,
don't sell it to SPAMers, etc. Part of the reason is the abuse that
some PCTAs dish our ... why would we subject our members to
abusive e-mail? (Yes, I get the occasional rant, but that's what
the DEL key is for ... but I'm inherently public because of my
office in the organization.)

Carl - wk3c

2676. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 03:51:15 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <TsU4b.267$vj4.43211@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76090

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F53CBDD.2040704@adelphia.net...
>
> How do you justify a trained group of communicators that are versed in
> a mode that is as useful and needed as CW is? There isn't an emergency
> right now.

It's especially hard when the emergency management agencies have
no use for a cadre of CW ops ... it's not the type of communications
that they want or need.

Just as the CW NTS nets are anachronisms ...

Carl - wk3c

2677. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 03:53:48 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <gvU4b.268$vj4.43554@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76091

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F53CD56.4090303@adelphia.net...
> Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> >
> > >>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > >>news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
> > >>
> > >>> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
> > >>
> > >>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
> > >
> > >
> > > Many times the number of *US* NCI members, Carl.
> >
> > It doesn't take a majority to win an issue, Dick. All it takes is an
> > irate minority that is prepared to be loud and active.

No, what it takes are rational, compelling arguments that support
your position ... NCI had them in the case of WT 98-143, the
PCTAs couldn't come up with ANY (because there are no rational,
compelling arguments for keeping Morse testing).

> What do they do for an encore?

We present more rational, compelling arguments, of course.

Carl - wk3c

2678. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 03:58:21 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309011958.568e1aa9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76095

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bivcpf$cb0s1$20@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> I have seen AOL recently and Win XP and there is becoming a striking
> similarity to the two.......

Perfect combination, XP is another one which can't be fixed. I figger
I'll be running Win2K, Internet Exploder 6 and Eudora 5.3 for another
15 years.

Or until Torvald and the Penquin . . .

w3rv

2679. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 04:00:59 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <%BU4b.270$vj4.43753@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76093

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:MIQ4b.19457$Om1.10718@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309011251.3ada241b@posting.google.com...
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:<biuq0n$2rg$0@208.206.142.103>...
> > > It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
> > >
> > >
> > > http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
> > >
> > >
> > > Enjoy!
> >
> >
> > I thought that FISTS sold themselves as a non-political club?
>
> How is sending in a petition a political act? Does that mean when NCI
sent
> in a petition it was political? Or perhaps they were simply following
> proceedures.

Of course participating in the regulatory process is a "political" thing.

And yes, FIST's position in the past (and IIRC, their charter) was
that they were *not* a politically-oriented group ... just a group that
was supposed to foster the *use* of Morse. And the test is *not*
necessary to use Morse ... someone sending slow as they learn
(voluntarily, because they *want* to) hurts nobody ... even the ARRL
has stated that the best way to learn Morse is on the air. Keeping
people off the air until they learn Morse to some specific level of
proficiency is counter, not just to the ARS as a whole, but to the
professed goal of those who want to keep Morse testing. If they'd
welcome folks whether they could beep or not, they'd stand a better
chance of gaining "recruits" than they do by acting crappy to those who
aren't interested in Morse, trying to keep them off of HF, and then
complaining that they don't "realize the benefits of Morse." After that
sort of treatment, no wonder so many folks aren't interested in Morse
(or ham radio for that matter ...)

Carl - wk3c

2680. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 04:04:33 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <IFU4b.271$vj4.43153@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76094

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:vjO4b.36492$Vx2.16058631@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:RuN4b.214$vj4.34373@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> >
> > Having not seen a public notice from the FCC on ANY of the petitions,
> > it would appear that NONE of them are formally open for comment.
> >
> > If I missed an official FCC public notice, I'd appreciate it if someone
> > could tell me the date it was released. (I check the "Daily Digest" and
> > the Federal Register daily ... though it's possible I could have
> overlooked
> > one ...)
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
> >
>
> The ARRL website has direct links.
>
> http://www.arrl.org/news/stories/2003/08/29/2/?nc=1
> FCC Invites Comments on Six Morse Code-Related Petitions

The ARRL has direct links to (some) of the *petitions* that the
FCC has put into "docket items" on their website.

There is no link to a Public Notice from the FCC, seeking comments
on *any* of the petitions, nor has one been published by the FCC
to the best of my knowledge, and it certainly hasn't been published
in the Federal Register. I follow those sorts of things because I am
involved in radio regulatory matters professionally.

Technically, the FCC hasn't asked for comments yet ...

Carl - wk3c

2681. Re: Good Heavens...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 04:29:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030902002918.12300.00000219@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 76096

In article <20030901111913.12631.00000692@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Not really. The discerning choose quality over quantity. Example: Who is more >attractive, Demi Moore or Rosanne Barr?

Demi Moore, to be sure. Rosanne who?

73 de Larry, K3LT

2682. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 04:29:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030902002918.12300.00000218@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 76097

In article <bivcp7$cb0s1$13@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>
>It does if you equate the suffix of TIT to an anatomical body part.
>

Ryan:

That's precisely what Kim intended her call sign suffix to be equated
to, by her own admission. If she had chosen the call sign W5EYE,
or W5EAR, or W5TOE, we would not be having this debate. However,
she chose W5TIT, which she specifically intended to draw attention
to her allegedly spectacular bosum. Having done so, she has called
attention to her secondary sexual characteristics in a manner which
incites puerile interest, and serves to create an image of herself and
all other YL hams being more in keeping with something in a strip
club than in a wholesome, family-oriented activity such as ham radio.
The impropriety of her self-selected Vanity call sign, and her "in your
face" attitude toward it, clearly reveals her true intent.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2683. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 04:29:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030902002919.12300.00000220@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 76098

In article <20030901212009.21642.00000444@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>Yep.
>>
>>2.66 GHz P4, 1 GB RAM, top-of-the-line Intel DDR 400 MHz motherboard,
>>DVDRW/CDROM drive and another CDROM drive, 1.44 MB floppy drive,
>>6 USB ports, 2 cereal ports (one for Wheeties, one for Grape Nuts), and
>>a USR V.92 EXTERNAL USB modem. O/S will be Windoze XP. Oh,
>>40 GB Western Digital hard drive. It's being put together by a local
>>computer firm called Kehtron Computer, which has a good rep in this area
>>and offers the advantage of being local, so if anything goes wrong, I can
>>just bring it back with a bottle of ketchup and mustard and say, "Luncheon
>>is served, boys!"
>
>Nice - but what do you need all that computing power for? Sounds like a
>serious gaming or CAD machine.

Mainly as a hedge against obsolescence. I tend to keep my computers for around five years -- that's how old my present one is. So I spec 'em to be pretty much maxxed out in terms of current technology, so it will be able to handle whatever I'll throw at it in the next half-decade or so.

>>>>I'm one of the first 1,000 original AOL users, and just can't
>>>>seem to break the habit.
>>>
>>>Exactly what AOL counts on. Can't blame 'em, it's sound marketing.
>>
>>It certainly seems to have worked on me!
>
>And many others!

Yeah, they got a real racket going. Too bad they have such a nice, user-friendly newsreader, or I'd be oudda here in a heartbeat.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2684. Re: OT: Trojan Help

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 04:32:41 UTC
From: Scott Schrader <swschrad@visi.com>
Message-ID: <3F541D69.11793AAA@visi.com>
Source record: 76099
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

the "original" worm, the morris worm, was designed to bite on BSD-based
OS'es, and it hit BSD and derivatives, including SunOS and Ultrix.
Linux has complimentary GNU and OS daemons that have BSD roots. if the
original vulnerability was copied from open source of the late 80s,
there might be an entry for Morris.

please to do your research.

Gregg wrote:
>
> Behold, donut signaled from keyed 4-1000A filament:
>
> > Gregg <nospam@unknown.org> wrote in
> > news:%px4b.41512$_5.704707@news1.telusplanet.net:
> >
> >> www.debian.org
> >
> > That's a big help. He wants to get rid of a worm, not change OSes.
> >
> > Linux is just as vulnerable.
> >
> > http://techrepublic.com.com/5100-6264-5065343.html?tag=crm
>
> I am serious here.
>
> You can count the number of current *nix/BSD virii/trojans on your
> hands and still have fingers left over.
>
> I didn't mentions worms because a *nix worm doesn't exist - probably
> never will.
>
> --
> Gregg
> *Perhaps it's useful, even if it can't be SPICE'd*
> Visit the GeeK Zone - http://geek.scorpiorising.ca

-- If it's a "new economy," why do they want my obsolete old money?

2685. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 04:40:11 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj16vb$ou6$0@208.206.142.111>
Source record: 76100

N2EY wrote:

> In article <5HP4b.19013$Om1.5560@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon.
> >> That's what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> >In the summer of 69 I was mellowing out in a Klong House in Bangkok
> >Thailand.
> >
> HAW! That's a good one, Dan!

What I wanta know is "What's a Klong house?"

2686. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 04:55:18 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj17rmran0@208.206.142.111>
Source record: 76101

Brian Kelly wrote:

> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bivcpf$cb0s1$20@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > I have seen AOL recently and Win XP and there is becoming a striking
> > similarity to the two.......
>
> Perfect combination, XP is another one which can't be fixed.

Worse, Microshaft doesn't *want* it fixed. If they closed all the holes how would they ever check out your
computer when you sign onto their update website?
When you hear that "another security hole has been found in Windows xx" and that Gates et all are scurring to
"fix" it, say "Yeah, Right!" They'll send out a patch that will neutralize that particular vermin, but the main
bang is still as holey as a moth-eaten cotten curtain in a 1940's flophouse.

2687. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 05:51:28 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bj3k9s$f2s35$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76257

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:F8I4b.3185$i93.632@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:bivcp4$cb0s1$11@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > Mike,
> >
> > I do believe it does serve some purpose..... I have a friend that goes
to
> > Arizona every winter due to him and his wife's health issues and he does
> not
> > have much there to use for equipment. He and I chat via Echolink on a
> > regular basis on the link point connected where he is at. I also have
> > developed some friendships with the people that frequent that access
point
> > (simplex access point, not a repeater one) as well. He is a 30+ year
> Extra
> > class licensee so he CAN operate just about anywhere but only has
2m/70cm
> > access when he goes there.
> >
> > In this case it is a very productive use of the system. In this
> particular
> > circumstance we would never be able to communicate if it wasn't for the
> > system. Other than a little experimentation with it at first, I have
not
> > used it for much more than to communicate with him though.
>
> You could say the same things if your friend had been using a cell-phone
or
> regular telephone, Ryan.

Yeah, that is true, but anyone can do that.

>
> You most especially could say the same things if they had been using ICQ
or
> any other form of Internet chat.

You misread the point, the person at the other end in MY specific
circumstance is not on a computer, but a simplex connection. Pretty hard
for me to talk/type to him if he's not connected to the net from a computer,
but from a radio.

>
> The fact that people use Echolink to successfully communicate does not
> magically make the Internet connection "ham radio". An important
> distinction to keep in mind is that our hobby is not called "Amateur
> Communication", where any form of communication will serve but rather
> "Amateur Radio", where the focus is solely upon radio communications.
>

Where the hell did I make that claim that it was ham radio. All I merely
claimed that the only use I saw for it was in the described situation I
presented. Other than that, I don't use it much at all.

> The ARRL inadvertently created some confusion about this with thier
> "communicator" promotions, a few years back.

And that has a direct tie to Echolink in which regard???

>
> The fact that your friends have decided to slow down and reduce the audio
> quality of thier Internet chat by hanging a radio on one end or the other
> does not make that Internet communication "Ham Radio"... It just means
that
> they are willing to put up with reduced performance in thier chat
> activities, in order to have a "ham radio simulator" at one end or the
> other.
>

Again, when the hell did I make the claim that it is "real ham radio?"

> In the end, Echolink serves as an excuse not to use radio to communicate
"as
> a ham", as in the case with your friends. It also very often serves as an
> excuse not to learn more about the hobby and upgrade, as in the case of
the
> hundreds, perhaps thousands of hams who instantly dropped plans to
upgrade,
> or even to buy a radio upon discovering Echolink. Echolink devotees are
just
> brimming over with excuses, but none of those excuses change the fact that
> Echolink is an Internet chat, not ham radio.
>

Again, I never said I was a devotee of the damned thing, you seriously must
have gone off the deep end if you believe and associate all that you have
stated and connecting it with me. Again, I use it about once a month in the
winter months to keep track of my friend, and thats about it.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2688. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 06:02:28 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bj3ka2$f2s35$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76258

Yeah, true. For the most part it is merely an accessory to ham radio, but
not ham radio itself. That pretty much sums up my opinion of it.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>
> There is always a use for technologies, good and bad. That someone
> could keep in touch with a friend via Echolink is a good thing.
>
> Let's hope that the repeater owners can clean tings up.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

2689. Re: LABOR DAY WEEKEND

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 06:11:48 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bj3ka3$f2s35$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76259

Final total..... $3900 and some change..... over 2000 dollars over next
years total, and one hell of a sunburn!

Ryan
"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bivcpa$cb0s1$16@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Just an update, we (as of Sunday night so far) raised $2900 and still have
> Monday to collect. We already blew away last year's amount, and hopefully
> can raise another 500 or more tomorrow!
>
> Got a wicked sunburn on the face out of all of this though..... :)
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:itT3b.23973$yg.9797691@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > Same to you, Ryan...and ditto for all reading. :-)
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
> >
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:biotmr$b61ma$14@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > > I hope that everyone here has a fun and enjoyable and most
importantly,
> a
> > > safe Labor Day holiday weekend. I myself will be participating in
both
> > the
> > > amateur radio safety activities (Carebreaks) and also working the
"Boot
> > > Drive" with my fire department collecting money for the MDA. Last year
> we
> > > did over 2500 bucks for them doing only one day. We are doing from
> Friday
> > > thru Monday and hope to raise over 5,000 bucks!!!!!!
> > >
> > >
> > >

> > > --
> > > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > > FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> > > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. .
..-.
> > > .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

2690. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 06:17:55 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0309020607120.4102@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 76102

On Mon, 1 Sep 2003, N2EY wrote:
> "just paid for his license"?

I certainly don't mean the $12 testing fee (by the ARRL teams, or the equvalent amount for teams under other VEC's).... Yes, some people have probably "bought" their licenses in the past.... There were some VE teams in this area busted about 8 years ago for doing exactly that (supposedly, an extra cost $1k).

> >To me, the statement is more typical of some advanced class sourpuss who
> >failed to take advantage of the transitional rule back in 2000 and obtain
> >credit for the easier element 4B than the current element 4. Granted that
> >was only for a 3.5 month window...
>
> Maybe. But I think current Element 4 is no harder than old Element 4B.

I disagree. All the "hard" questions in the current Element 4 came from the Element 4A part of the former tests. The former Element 4B was much easier than 4A.

> >What surprises me is this: There are still some people (the August 30
> >session I did had two such people) who are coming in for their pre-87-tech
> >to general no test upgrades, 3+ years after the rules change went into
> >effect....
>
> I'm not surprised. Many hams I know do not follow the rules changes anywhere
> near as closely as some of us do. Look at restructuring - out of over 678,000
> hams, FCC got 2200 or so comments.

Are you in a "high population" area? I am: Southern California. News of rules changes gets around quickly over here... even among the clueless. I agree that there may be places (e.g. midwest, rural farming states) where knowledge of the changes has yet to permeate....

> Some folks are just finding out what the changes mean. And with 10 year
> renewals, folks who don't move around have very little interaction with FCC
> license procedures. The facts are often twisted in the retelling, too. Look at
> the misunderstanding about Element 1 and Technicians....
> >
> >> >Is this for real? Are there REALLY people with Advanced licenses who
> >> >refuse to upgrade to Amateur Extra SIMPLY because they feel the need
> >> >to prove they passed the 13 wpm exam?
> >>
> >> There are some misguided folks who think that, but in fact it's not a
> >> proof of code speed any more than my Extra is proof of 20 per.
> >
> >When it is known that a medical waiver wasn't used, it is (for pre April 19,

> >2000 extras).
>
> But you need more info that just the fact that the person holds a certain
> license class.

I didn't say such wasn't true. All I said is that for some, such is KNOWN.

> Fun fact:
>
> From May 14 2000 to July 31, 2003, the number of Advanceds dropped from
> 99,782 to 83,141. That includes upgrades to Extra and dropouts. Only a 17%
> decline in over three years.

You should probably go back another 29 days to have a good total: Many
upgrades happened in that month you omit.

2691. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 06:35:09 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.56.0309020622240.4102@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 76103

On Mon, 1 Sep 2003, Robert Casey wrote:
> >When it is known that a medical waiver wasn't used, it is (for pre April 19,
> >2000 extras).
>
> Oh good! I got my extra on April 15, 2000 so I beat that deadline. :-)

NOT SO FAST: It was processed on April 18th, not the 15th. However, that is still the day before the first "no-test" upgrades were processed, so we can still tell that you have either a 20wpm extra or a waiver extra (based only on the date - obviously more info needed to know which one of those). The first "restructured" sessions on 4/15/2000 had results processed on April 19th.

Of course, your address change in December 2000 will obscure that fact for most of the callbook users out there... but not me! ;-)

What I fould really obnoxious is that for some test sessions in April 2000, some VEC's had problems when the FCC changed their submission formats slightly (because of the rules change) and some April sessions didn't have results show up until mid-June 2000. It is possible that some 20wpm extras didn't have their licenses issued until AFTER April 18th and by date are indistinguishable from what some in this group called "extra lite."

2692. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 07:36:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB79C130.24F53%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 76104

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> Well, if that's the case, then I guess my "due
> respect" for your XYL is no longer deserved.

She'll do just fine without your concept of respect, Larry.

> (snip) My intention is hardly to "dominate" Kim or
> any other woman, Dwight. However, I'm curious as to
> why that thought occurred to you! In reality, Kim's
> call sign tends to encourage men to think of her in
> that way, but, then again, that's undoubtedly her
> intent. Not the kind of behavior I would expect
> from a married woman and/or a mother, assuming she
> has any children. (snip)

The thought occurred to me because you've spent the last several years trying to sexualize Kim's callsign. I can remember back when I first ran into this discussion. At the time, since I hadn't noticed her callsign before, it took me several messages to figure out what you were talking about. I ignored that discussion and didn't respond to the topic for several more months (many dozens of messages later).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2693. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 07:38:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB79C1AE.24F54%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 76105

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:

> (snip) I assure you, Kim, that I don't need to
> pursue this particular subject to allay my boredom!

Well, that's at least a partial admission of boredom.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2694. Re: The Amateur Code

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 07:38:32 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bj3ka5$f2s35$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76260

```
"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030831201930.07578.00000281@mb-m25.aol.com...
> In article <biotmp$b61ma$13@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> >news:OBx3b.35345$Vx2.15393974@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >>
> >> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> >> news:biltpj$auudh$18@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> >> > Just even one more proof of what I mean. Attempting to control free
> >> > speech
> >> > when a differing opinion occurs....
> >> > Why should they have exclusive control of the whole amateur community
> >> > when
> >> > they only represent (roughly) a quarter of the population?
> >> >
> >> > You keep saying I should join, but why should I?? List specific
> >> > reasons,
> >> > backed by facts. Not vague generalities or
"big-brother/mafioso-like"
> >> > reasons? All it is, is a very expensive magazine subscription, so
let's
> >> > not
> >> > kid ourselves.
> >> >
> >>
> >> They are not trying to control free speech. Show your proof that they
are
> >> doing so.
> >
> >They are by virtue of a member attempting to do so. Either a member is
or
> >is not a representative of the arrl.
>
> I'm not sure what you're saying, Ryan.
>
> I don't agree with all ARRL policies, but I don't see ARRL trying to
control my
> free speech. Sure, it would be great if all members agreed on all issues
but
> that's simply not going to happen unless there's a mechanism like NCI has
to
> eliminate those who disagree.
```

>
> Yes, ARRL says they represent their membership - just like your
congresscritter
> says he preresents his/her constituents. Does your congressperson agree
with
> you on every single issue?
> >
> >> They establish policies based on the input of their membership as
> >> does any other organization. They then carry through on that policy.
> >> Naturally not every member agrees with it but if we had to have a
> >> unanimous
> >> consensus nothing would ever get done. And they have no reason or
> >> obligation to pay any attention to the opinions of non-members.
> >
> >As well as they should not be representing "non-members" either.
>
> Yet nonmembers get the benefit of ARRL actions.

Such as, maybe you will specify, others haven't.

>
> >The ARRL
> >is responsible for the state of amateur radio it is today, as they have
> >convinced the FCC that they are the "only voice."
>
> Where do you get that idea? Read the Report and Order for the 2000
> restructuring - FCC addresses many groups and individuals' positions, not
just
> ARRL's.
> >>
> >> They do not have nor try to have exclusive control of the whole amateur
> >> community. Show your proof that they do.
> >
> >Let me dig up a QST magazine.... said it right on the front cover.....
>
> What does it say?

Am not at home while typing this, but will look at one soon as I get ahold
of one.

>
> >> They establish goals based on
> >> what their membership wants. That is what any organization does.
Again
> >> they have no reason or obligation to establish their goals based on the
> >> opinions of non-members.
> >
> >Only if one chooses to request that information beased upon the decision
> >whether or not to join. Its like going to a car dealership and the car
> >salesperson stating that you will be buying a vehicle, but not tell you
> >anything about it.

>
> Not at all. You can ask Hq for their policy. You can email your director.
I
> betcha if you emailed your director and asked his/her view on some issue,
and
> mentioned you were considering joining, you'd get an answer.
>
> On the codetest issue, ARRL has been procodetest for a long time because
that
> has been the position of the majority of the membership. Maybe that's
changed,
> maybe it hasn't, but would you expect ARRL to go with the minority
position?

The procode test is a minority position? I am in favor for retention of it. Just because I personally do not like it, nor find it useful does not mean I wish it to go away.

>
> >> You seem to expect them to roll over and adopt YOUR opinion. That's
> >> unrealistic. Whether you join or not is your business of course. But
> >> unless you are a member, you have no right to expect to control their
> >> policies or for them to listen to your opinions and adopt your
opinions.
> >>If
> >> you want to change them, join. If you aren't willing to join, don't
> >>expect
> >> to change them. That's pretty simple.
> >
> >Never did I state they should roll over to my opinions exclusively, but
my
> >opinions are not singular, there are many more that hold the same
position
> >on a variety of issues. If they are claiming control of amateur radio as
a
> >whole, not just the membership, then my opinion should count in that
> >respect. I can tell you however, there are alot of the opinions I hold
that
> >are held by a ton of people with ham licenses.
>
> Sure. And there are a ton of people who hold different opinions. That's
the
> nature of the game.
> >

Yeah, but I bet the overwhelming majority wish things would roll back to where it was at least 15-20 years ago, and that is where I think it should return to after seeing how things are after being licensed (not including all participation, just licensure) for 3 years, I think it should be as well. I am sick and tired of people that start (I mean locally at least) saying something, or attempting to get a project going, but hold off as to

"check with the ARRL" for "approval." Think for yourself I say. Only rules I will follow are the FCC's rules.

> >> I know why I am a member. They can do things that I cannot.
> >> 1) Take the current BPL situation. They have the finances and facilities
> >> to do the research that I can't afford. That is but one of many things.
> >
> >Yeah.... they must be the only one's too eh?
>
> Who else is doing what W1RFI & Co. did? A 121 page engineering analysis of the
> impact of BPL on typical amateur stations, including measurements and
> observations of actual installations, put together on short notice. Betcha Ed
> wasn't working 40 hour weeks to put that baby together.
>
> And if ya think BPL is an HF-only problem, note that it goes as high as 80 MHz
> on fundamentals, and that outfits like Cingular are concerned about
> interference from harmonics messing up their 800+ MHz services.

I haven't taken a side one way or another in this whole BPL issue as I am the first to say that I do not have much knowledge nor had the opportunity to review the whole situation, but I would find it hard to believe that the arrl is the only one that has a lab in this big country of ours..... That was the intention to that particular response....

> >
> >> 2) Product tests/reviews. I can't afford to buy all the test equipment,
> >> every new radio, antenna, etc and run my own comparisons.
> >> ... and so on.
> >
> >Again, CQ magazine does that as well.
>
> Not the way ARRL does it. I've been to the ARRL lab, inside the screen room,
> talked to the folks who do the testing. They buy actual production units
> through regular channels and beat the #$%^& out of them in the lab. The
> Extended Report (available to members only) goes even farther than the mag
> report.
>
> Does CQ even have a lab?

Don't know as I have never been to their facilities but the information that they give as well as other publishers is enough for me to either become more interested and research further or to turn away from the product.

>
> >Granted, I will wholeheartedly admit

> >that QST is a decent magazine, even though it is getting thinner and
> >thinner, but it is a good magazine.
>
> I've got every QST from the late 1920s to today, and they are getting
fatter.

I have the past 20 years or so, and since they have been with the 8.5x11"
size format, they have been getting thinner. I have not picked up the past
6-7 months though, as there now is no place to purchase it locally. The
closest location that carries it is Flint, which is about 75 miles away.

>
> > My only observation is that it should
> >also include some technical material for the newer hams, as not all of us
> >are Extra class electrical/electronics engineers. Although I am above
the
> >"simple circuit" stage, I am however not the highest qualified in the
> >electronics side of this hobby. I am man enough to admit I need to learn
> >more.
>
> The point of QST is the new and novel. The Handbook and other publications
are
> for the standard practices. There's also QEX.

I still think that it would be helpful to alot if there was something for
the beginners as well as the expert electronics buffs.

> >
> >Again, You keep saying I should join, but why should I?? List specific
> >reasons, backed by facts. Not vague generalities or
> >"big-brother/mafioso-like" reasons?
>
> OK, here ya go:
>
> 1) Like it or not, ARRL is the only general-purpose membership org we hams
have
> in the USA. No other group is going to step up to the plate on issues like
BPL,
> CC&Rs, PRB-1, product testing, etc. You may not see those issues as
affecting
> you, but in the long run they affect all of us.

Okay... I point well taken for the time being, but I do feel the same way as
Cecil W5DXP does about the whole CC&R issue.

>
> Heck, I remember a time when major manufacturers would put out ham gear
with
> known shortcomings because they knew nobody would really put the stuff to
a
> real test. Not any more!
>

Let me try it in my truck; if it breaks, fix that part better!

> 2) One of the things that has kept ham radio going all these years is the
> presence of strong national societies. The FCC and ITU have no vested
interest
> in keeping amateur radio alive and healthy. ARRL does.
>
> >All it is, is a very expensive magazine
> >subscription, so let's
> >not kid ourselves.
>
> How much is it - $39 a year, single year? How much is CQ or any other mag?
How
> much are most small-circulation non-industry publications?

Right now, I think it is either 2.95-4.95 per month per mag. (QST and CQ
when I can find them) That is what my budget allows for the two magazines
at this time. Until financial circumstances get better, 40 bucks at once
out of the "entertainment" part of my budget, as that is where it would fall
categorically, it too much of a hit at once.

>
> >If there are some actual reasons listed, I might
> >consider joining. If not, then that sums it up pretty good.
> >
> >I can honestly say that you are one of the few people that I have met on
> >here, and I like you as a person. But there is one thing as a fact I
know
> >for sure, we will never agree on is the ARRL. I do not take the ARRL as
> >blind faith, or like a religion.
>
> Nor do I. Some of their positions are downright bizarre.
>
> >I do not put the ARRL in a position close
> >to god as some put here and elsewhere. I do not consider the arrl like a
> >religion or a church organization as some people equate it to. I will
be
> >one of the first people to join if there ever becomes a group like the
> >United States Amateur Radio Association or the National Radio Relay
League
> >or any other similar group. (don't know if either of those exist.....)
>
> Over the years there have been groups which tried to be an ARRL
alternative.
> None ever got more than a few thousand members, and all quietly
disappeared
> after a few years, usually because they could not achieve critical mass.
>
> Heck, how big is NCI - 4000 members, worldwide, with a mandate to
disappear
> when code testing does? How about NCVEC - can anyone join and elect policy
> makers?

Don't know as I do not support NCI nor care to know anything about it,
except it is a single issue group; the morse code issue.

>
> >The
> >arrl needs the competition to keep them in check. Hell, Republicrats
claim
> >competition is a GOOD thing. (except when it encroaches on "their"
> >businesses.)
> >
> Right - and so we have the airline industry tottering on the verge of
> bankruptcy even with megabuck bailouts, the telecom industry bubble, the
Enron
> mess, the Northeast blackout....

Hmmm.... Republicans helping Republicans I see!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2695. Going under the knife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 07:44:04 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bj3kad$f2s35$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76261

To all my friends, combatants, debaters and lurkers here in r.r.a.p,

I will be going under the knife this Tuesday for surgery on my lower back and won't be back for about a week or so. I am quiet sure that I am not going to feel like being in the upright position for the next week (or doing much of anything for that matter) , so everyone have a great week and probably next week I will have a ton of catching up to do.

Hope everyone had safe Labor Day Weekend and catch ya all in a bit,

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

2696. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 07:48:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB79C40F.24F56%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 76106

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:

> I'm glad to see that a good time is being had
> by all. Have a safe and happy Labour Day week
> end, Dwight!

Are you kidding? I busted my tail this last weekend. In addition to moving to a new apartment (and cleaning the old one), I sold an old computer, spent days shopping for a new computer, took my wife's car to the shop (had to get it running well enough to do that), and more. At this point, I darn glad this last weekend is over. I still have a ton to do, but it can be spaced out enough to get a break occasionally.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2697. Re: OT: Trojan Help

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 10:06:44 UTC
From: Gregg <nospam@unknown.org>
Message-ID: <UYZ4b.130983$K44.48678@edtnps84>
Source record: 76107
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Behold, Scott Schrader signaled from keyed 4-1000A filament:

> the "original" worm, the morris worm, was designed to bite on BSD-based
> OS'es, and it hit BSD and derivatives, including SunOS and Ultrix. Linux
> has complimentary GNU and OS daemons that have BSD roots. if the
> original vulnerability was copied from open source of the late 80s,
> there might be an entry for Morris.
>
> please to do your research.

I do.

I also run Firestarter and F-prot.

The fact remains - would you drive a car with thousands of
vulnerabilities, or six?

--
Gregg
Perhaps it's useful, even if it can't be SPICE'd
Visit the GeeK Zone - http://geek.scorpiorising.ca

2698. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 10:11:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030902061116.15462.00002658@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 76110

In article <3F53CBDD.2040704@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <DwN4b.215$vj4.34065@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>>news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
>>>
>>>> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
>>>
>>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>>>
>>
>> Lots and lots.
>>
>> How many *US* licensees are members of NCI, Carl?
>>
>> btw, the FISTS member list is online.
>
>
> I've given it a read. It sounds pretty good, I agree with it for the
>most part, and it is doomed. Won't happen. Not in a million years.
>
> It's not the way we are heading.

Maybe it will make a difference, maybe it won't. But no matter what happens,
there will have been a proposal and a lot of commentary opposing the dropping
of all code tests.
>
> How do you justify a trained group of communicators that are versed in
>a mode that is as useful and needed as CW is? There isn't an emergency
>right now.
>
> It's not the way we are heading.

True - the "fashion" for the past 25+ years has been to reduce the license test
requirements - code *and* written.
>
> Perhaps some day they will see the value, just like all the people who
>build houses in flood plains - Hey, those areas are dry 99.5 percent of
>the time!
>

Let it never be said that there was no opposition.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2699. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 10:11:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030902061117.15462.00002660@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 76108

In article <CqU4b.266$vj4.42671@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030901171950.23307.00002666@mb-m29.aol.com...
>> In article <DwN4b.215$vj4.34065@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>> >news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
>> >>
>> >> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
>> >
>> >How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>> >
>> Lots and lots.
>
>A real specific answer ...

It's as specific as the answer you've given about NCI membership.
>
>> How many *US* licensees are members of NCI, Carl?
>
>Thousands, and growing every day :-)

There ya go.
>
>> btw, the FISTS member list is online.
>
>If you took the time to look, and it's public, why didn't you answer
>my question?

I did answer your question. You want an exact number, you go count 'em.
>
>However, we *don't* publish our membership list ... we respect
>the privacy of our members and keep the data they give us confidential,
>don't sell it to SPAMers, etc.

FISTS doesn't sell anyhting to spammers. But FISTS members aren't ashamed of
their membership, either......

FISTS members can publicly disagree with the FISTS petition and stay members.
(The response from the membership has been overwhelmingly positive, though).
But an NCI member cannot publicly disagree with the NCI petition and stay an
NCI member.

Maybe you don't see any problem with that....

73 de Jim, N2EY

FISTS #4360

2700. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 10:11:17 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030902061117.15462.00002659@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 76109

In article <TsU4b.267$vj4.43211@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:3F53CBDD.2040704@adelphia.net...
>>
>> How do you justify a trained group of communicators that are versed in
>> a mode that is as useful and needed as CW is? There isn't an emergency
>> right now.
>
>It's especially hard when the emergency management agencies have
>no use for a cadre of CW ops ... it's not the type of communications
>that they want or need.

KT4ST has shown that to be untrue. However, with all due respect, Carl, I don't
think you'd be the most effective salesman for the mode...
>
>Just as the CW NTS nets are anachronisms ...
>
What about SSB NTS nets? Are they anachronisms?

A CW NTS net can handle more traffic in less time using less spectrum than an
SSB NTS net. Been there, done that.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2701. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 10:39:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309020239.1fccf006@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76111

"D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> wrote in message
news:<Pine.LNX.4.56.0309020622240.4102@kd6lvw.ampr.org>...
> On Mon, 1 Sep 2003, Robert Casey wrote:
> > >When it is known that a medical waiver wasn't used, it is (for pre April 19,
> > >2000 extras).
> >
> > Oh good! I got my extra on April 15, 2000 so I beat that deadline. :-)
>
> NOT SO FAST: It was processed on April 18th, not the 15th. However, that is
> still the day before the first "no-test" upgrades were processed, so we can
> still tell that you have either a 20wpm extra or a waiver extra

Waiver Extra? This is the part where Dan Finn tackled me and said I
was making fun of disabled people. I wonder how he'll treat your use
of the phrase?

(based only on
> the date - obviously more info needed to know which one of those). The first
> "restructured" sessions on 4/15/2000 had results processed on April 19th.
>
> Of course, your address change in December 2000 will obscure that fact for most
> of the callbook users out there... but not me! ;-)
>
> -----
> What I fould really obnoxious is that for some test sessions in April 2000,
> some VEC's had problems when the FCC changed their submission formats slightly
> (because of the rules change) and some April sessions didn't have results show
> up until mid-June 2000. It is possible that some 20wpm extras didn't have
> their licenses issued until AFTER April 18th and by date are indistinguishable
> from what some in this group called "extra lite."

And what I find obnoxious is that some people here continue to make
the distinction.

2702. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 10:42:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309020242.1303178f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76112

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030901010119.19477.00000269@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> >Jason, meet Bruce Bunion, WA8ULX. He's one of the originators of the
> >"I won't upgrade" Advanced Operators Club. What's his most recent
> >claim to fame? Run his call on QRZ and see.
>
> I may have said that,

You did.

> but when I could collect $250.00 on a BET to upgrade I
> did.

How easily you drop your convictions.

2703. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 10:48:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309020248.5b67480f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76113

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj17rmran0@208.206.142.111>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bivcpf$cb0s1$20@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > > I have seen AOL recently and Win XP and there is becoming a striking
> > > similarity to the two.......
> >
> > Perfect combination, XP is another one which can't be fixed.
>
> Worse, Microshaft doesn't *want* it fixed. If they closed all the holes how would they
ever check out your
> computer when you sign onto their update website?
> When you hear that "another security hole has been found in Windows xx" and that Gates et
all are scurring to
> "fix" it, say "Yeah, Right!" They'll send out a patch that will neutralize that
particular vermin, but the main

Good point.

> bang is still as holey as a moth-eaten cotten curtain in a 1940's flophouse.

Was that your primary residence?

2704. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 10:53:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309020253.1ff93cc1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76114

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj0i7caqa1@208.206.142.83>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030901111914.12631.00000693@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > > In article <biu33j$v3i@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >Hey, use them for gift tags! Make up a label, place it onto the
> > > >AOL CD, and use a pretty ribbon to tie between the package and the hole of
> > > >the CD.
> > >
> > > Cool!
> > > >
> > > >Hmmmmm, this could really get interesting (they could also be used against
> > > >those wall mounted candle holders, carried in the pocket on a hike (they'd
> > > >reflect light and work for signaling really well).
> > >
> > > They work really well for signalling if ya know Morse Code...
> >
> > Typical eyes rolled back PCTA response.
> >
> > I wonder what Paul Revere used to signal with?
> >
> > I wonder if Paul knew Morse Code?
>
> Of course not, dummy... but where do ya suppose Sam got the idea?

He had a dream about the German Enigma machine.

2705. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 11:02:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309020302.15ec55ea@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76115

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030902002918.12300.00000218@mb-m20.aol.com>...

> all other YL hams being more in keeping with something in a strip
> club than in a wholesome, family-oriented activity such as ham radio.

Larry, is this the same wholesome, family oriented activity that your
"friend" has sent QFU on the wholesomest mode in?

How can you remain "friends" with such a person?

What did Riley say when you quizzed him about it?

2706. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 11:10:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309020310.794e075a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76116

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<%BU4b.270$vj4.43753@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:MIQ4b.19457$Om1.10718@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0309011251.3ada241b@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:<biuq0n$2rg$0@208.206.142.103>...
> > > > It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Enjoy!
> > >
> > >
> > > I thought that FISTS sold themselves as a non-political club?
> >
> > How is sending in a petition a political act? Does that mean when NCI
> sent
> > in a petition it was political? Or perhaps they were simply following
> > proceedures.
>
> Of course participating in the regulatory process is a "political" thing.
>
> And yes, FIST's position in the past (and IIRC, their charter) was
> that they were *not* a politically-oriented group ... just a group that
> was supposed to foster the *use* of Morse.

Right. So where NCI is purposely a politically-oriented group, and
behaves accordingly, FISTS is specifically a non-political group who
is now behaving politically.

Why don't we hear any whining about how FISTS has broken with their
charter from the people that are always whining about NCI?

Usual PCTA double-standard?

2707. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 11:20:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309020320.247a2105@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76117

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<wTP4b.19097$Om1.18571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309011332.6c782d2f@posting.google.com...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> >
> > > Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock never
> actually
> > > got there due to traffic snarls.
> >
> > I especially like the ones who claimed they were both at Woodstock and
> > in Vietnam. They probably saw both movies.
> >
> > > The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon.
> That's
> > > what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
> >
> > I was 11. I remember selling flower seeds door to door to earn a West
> > Ben fishing pole. And my Dad getting orders to Thailand.
> >
> > So what has all this do do with code?
>
> My my Brian....how is it so hard for you to figure a person could be a
> veteran of VN and be at Kent State also?

Do you confuse Kent State and Woodstock often?

> You really must be a dumb ass.

Of course it's possible.

> I was at Kent State visiting my cousin the evening before the shootings.
> The national guard had blocked the streets and the kids were running up and
> down the street throwing rocks, etc.
>
> I had my military ID checked by the Guard on my way out of town. The next
> day the shootings occured. (I was in-active reserve status).

Reserves?

> I was discharged in 1968. I went back to Thailand as a civilian

Back to Thailand? When were you there the 1st time? And are you
somehow implying that Thailand and Vietnam are the same place?

and
> returned stateside in December of 69. My original home is Alliance, Ohio.
> Thats about 34 miles South of Kent, Ohio.

Are you related to Bruce Bunion/WA8ULX?

> You can now wipe the slobber off your chin.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

You completely forgot the part about you being at Woodstock and
Vietnam.

And the part about what this has to do with the code.

2708. Re: OT: Trojan Help

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 12:01:34 UTC
From: Chuck Harris <cfharris@erols.com>
Message-ID: <bj20u7$9cv$1@bob.news.rcn.net>
Source record: 76118
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The A number one reason for window's vulnerability to worms,
trojans and viruses is every program runs with "root" privileges.

Only a total fool would run a *nix operating system that way.
There is a 1000 to 1 difference in vulnerability between any
*nix, and windows.

-Chuck

donut wrote:
> Gregg <nospam@unknown.org> wrote in
> news:%px4b.41512$_5.704707@news1.telusplanet.net:
>
>
>>www.debian.org
>
>
> That's a big help. He wants to get rid of a worm, not change OSes.
>
> Linux is just as vulnerable.
>
> http://techrepublic.com.com/5100-6264-5065343.html?tag=crm

2709. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 12:20:56 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309020420.5db419df@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76119

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj17rmran0@208.206.142.111>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bivcpf$cb0s1$20@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > > I have seen AOL recently and Win XP and there is becoming a striking
> > > similarity to the two.......
> >
> > Perfect combination, XP is another one which can't be fixed.
>
> Worse, Microshaft doesn't *want* it fixed. If they closed all the holes how would they
ever check out your
> computer when you sign onto their update website?

Hell will have to freeze tight before I download ANYTHING out of the
Microsloth website. Period.

> When you hear that "another security hole has been found in Windows xx" and that Gates et
all are scurring to
> "fix" it, say "Yeah, Right!" They'll send out a patch that will neutralize that
particular vermin, but the main
> bang is still as holey as a moth-eaten cotten curtain in a 1940's flophouse.

w3rv

2710. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 13:10:34 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030902091034.28373.00000341@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 76120

>How easily you drop your convictions.

How easy it was to take $250 from some Brain Dead CBplussers

2711. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 13:27:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F549AC0.8030406@psu.edu>
Source record: 76121

Caveat Lector wrote:
> Au Contraire
> Echolink is an Internet chat FOR Amateur Radio Operators
> And anything that allows communication between Hams gotta be OK.
> Just another communication vehicle
> Get over it!
>
> I never use it but can easily understand why it can be of value to others.
> And that from a 25 Year extra class ham.
> Hey CW, SSB, RTTY, PSK31, Packet, NTS, IRLP, EchoLink, Phone Patch, et al --
> communicate communicate is da word.

Of course it is of some use. So is a cell phone, a chat room, voice or
text, or an intercom system.

But that doesn't make any of them "Ham Radio."

And I'm only licensed since 1999.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2712. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 13:48:56 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <cd15b.297$vj4.51024@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76122

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030902061117.15462.00002659@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <TsU4b.267$vj4.43211@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> >news:3F53CBDD.2040704@adelphia.net...
> >>
> >> How do you justify a trained group of communicators that are versed in
> >> a mode that is as useful and needed as CW is? There isn't an emergency
> >> right now.
> >
> >It's especially hard when the emergency management agencies have
> >no use for a cadre of CW ops ... it's not the type of communications
> >that they want or need.
>
> KT4ST has shown that to be untrue.

One person's opinion ... and a person who clearly has a pro-Morse bias
from his ham perspective. He's the ONLY EMS person I've EVER heard
from who seriously considered Morse a truly valuable and necessary part
of emergency communications, and I've been involved in emergency
communications for over 25 years.

> However, with all due respect, Carl, I don't
> think you'd be the most effective salesman for the mode...

It's not my job to be a salesman for Morse ... that's up to the people
who like Morse and care to promote its use ... but they shouldn't
insist on a govt. enforced "recruiting program" (which as I have pointed
out is, in my view, actually counter-productive as it turns more against
Morse than it "sells").

> >
> >Just as the CW NTS nets are anachronisms ...
> >
> What about SSB NTS nets? Are they anachronisms?
>
> A CW NTS net can handle more traffic in less time using less spectrum than
an
> SSB NTS net. Been there, done that.

But let's face it ... most of the traffic handled via NTS is 1) of little/no
importance
and 2) much makes use of "coded messages" (sending a canned message number)
that would be of little use in an emergency situation where the situation,

needs,
details would need to be spelled out in some detail.

Sorry, the "Morse is necessary for emergency communications" argument
doesn't
hold water, and the FCC has already realized that.

Carl - wk3c

2713. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 13:51:51 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Xf15b.298$vj4.51310@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76123

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030902061117.15462.00002660@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <CqU4b.266$vj4.42671@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030901171950.23307.00002666@mb-m29.aol.com...
> >> In article <DwN4b.215$vj4.34065@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
> >> >>
> >> >> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of
NCI.
> >> >
> >> >How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
> >> >
> >> Lots and lots.
> >>
> >A real specific answer ...
>
> It's as specific as the answer you've given about NCI membership.

I've explained out committment to our members' privacy. If FISTS
doesn't have the same policy, that's their choice, and thus, you could
have answered my question without breaching any confidence. I can't
do the same because of the committment we have made to our members.

> >> btw, the FISTS member list is online.
> >>
> >If you took the time to look, and it's public, why didn't you answer
> >my question?
>
> I did answer your question. You want an exact number, you go count 'em.

Fine ... I just thought you might actually *know* and could pass along the
info.

Carl - wk3c

2714. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 14:17:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F54A687.4010407@psu.edu>
Source record: 76124

```
Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F53CD56.4090303@adelphia.net...
>
>>Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>
>>>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>>>news:bivu78$rfn$0@208.207.71.142...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
>>>>
>>>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>>>
>>>
>>>Many times the number of *US* NCI members, Carl.
>>
>>It doesn't take a majority to win an issue, Dick. All it takes is an
>>irate minority that is prepared to be loud and active.
>
>
> No, what it takes are rational, compelling arguments that support
> your position ... NCI had them in the case of WT 98-143, the
> PCTAs couldn't come up with ANY (because there are no rational,
> compelling arguments for keeping Morse testing).

>>What do they do for an encore?
>
>
> We present more rational, compelling arguments, of course.

Carl, with all due respect, "rational and compelling arguments" are in
the head of the beholder.

Why do you do people a disservice by suggesting otherwise?

I have read both documents, and find the NCI and FISTS proposals
equally rational and compelling.

In the end, it all comes down to what a person **believes**. And that
is not rational. Not in your case, not in mine. And too much of the
"belief" business and it turns into religion, which some PCTA'ers have
```

been accused of. It all works both ways.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2715. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 14:32:41 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj29m9$vi7$0@208.207.71.176>
Source record: 76125

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj17rmran0@208.206.142.111>...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bivcpf$cb0s1$20@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > > > I have seen AOL recently and Win XP and there is becoming a striking
> > > > similarity to the two.......
> > >
> > > Perfect combination, XP is another one which can't be fixed.
> >
> > Worse, Microshaft doesn't *want* it fixed. If they closed all the holes how would they
ever check out your
> > computer when you sign onto their update website?
> > When you hear that "another security hole has been found in Windows xx" and that Gates
et all are scurring to
> > "fix" it, say "Yeah, Right!" They'll send out a patch that will neutralize that
particular vermin, but the main
>
> Good point.
>
> > bang is still as holey as a moth-eaten cotten curtain in a 1940's flophouse.
>
> Was that your primary residence?

I saw the movie.

2716. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 14:34:16 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj29p8$vi7$1@208.207.71.176>
Source record: 76126

Brian wrote:

> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<wTP4b.19097$Om1.18571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0309011332.6c782d2f@posting.google.com...
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > news:<20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > >
> > > > Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock never
> > actually
> > > > got there due to traffic snarls.
> > >
> > > I especially like the ones who claimed they were both at Woodstock and
> > > in Vietnam. They probably saw both movies.
> > >
> > > > The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon.
> > That's
> > > > what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
> > >
> > > I was 11. I remember selling flower seeds door to door to earn a West
> > > Ben fishing pole. And my Dad getting orders to Thailand.
> > >
> > > So what has all this do do with code?
> >
> > My my Brian....how is it so hard for you to figure a person could be a
> > veteran of VN and be at Kent State also?
>
> Do you confuse Kent State and Woodstock often?
>
> > You really must be a dumb ass.
>
> Of course it's possible.

I'm afraid a poll would show there's very little doubt.

2717. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 14:41:13 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj2a69$141$0@208.207.71.176>
Source record: 76127

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030902061117.15462.00002659@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > In article <TsU4b.267$vj4.43211@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >
> > >"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > >news:3F53CBDD.2040704@adelphia.net...
> > >>
> > >> How do you justify a trained group of communicators that are versed in
> > >> a mode that is as useful and needed as CW is? There isn't an emergency
> > >> right now.
> > >
> > >It's especially hard when the emergency management agencies have
> > >no use for a cadre of CW ops ... it's not the type of communications
> > >that they want or need.
> >
> > KT4ST has shown that to be untrue.
>
> One person's opinion ... and a person who clearly has a pro-Morse bias
> from his ham perspective. He's the ONLY EMS person I've EVER heard
> from who seriously considered Morse a truly valuable and necessary part
> of emergency communications, and I've been involved in emergency
> communications for over 25 years.
>
> > However, with all due respect, Carl, I don't
> > think you'd be the most effective salesman for the mode...
>
> It's not my job to be a salesman for Morse ... that's up to the people
> who like Morse and care to promote its use ... but they shouldn't
> insist on a govt. enforced "recruiting program" (which as I have pointed
> out is, in my view, actually counter-productive as it turns more against
> Morse than it "sells").
>
> > >
> > >Just as the CW NTS nets are anachronisms ...
> > >
> > What about SSB NTS nets? Are they anachronisms?
> >
> > A CW NTS net can handle more traffic in less time using less spectrum than
> an
> > SSB NTS net. Been there, done that.
>

> But let's face it ... most of the traffic handled via NTS is 1) of little/no
> importance
> and 2) much makes use of "coded messages" (sending a canned message number)
> that would be of little use in an emergency situation where the situation,
> needs,
> details would need to be spelled out in some detail.
>
> Sorry, the "Morse is necessary for emergency communications" argument
> doesn't
> hold water, and the FCC has already realized that.
>
> Carl - wk3c

Let's face it- Carl just hates Morse code, despite his many protests to the contrary. It's really not that difficult to understand - after all, he hears all that digital data flying past his ears and the old nternal modem just won't work on it! Ah, the pain! The Frustration! The Agony!

You just can't help sympathyzing with his plight. The ONLY way for him to find relief is to slay that dreaded dragon under the bed.....

2718. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 14:45:07 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj2adj$141$1@208.207.71.176>
Source record: 76128

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030902061117.15462.00002660@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > In article <CqU4b.266$vj4.42671@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >
> > >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >news:20030901171950.23307.00002666@mb-m29.aol.com...
> > >> In article <DwN4b.215$vj4.34065@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> > >>
> > >> >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > >> >news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
> > >> >>
> > >> >> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of
> NCI.
> > >> >
> > >> >How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
> > >> >
> > >> Lots and lots.
> > >
> > >A real specific answer ...
> >
> > It's as specific as the answer you've given about NCI membership.
>
> I've explained out committment to our members' privacy. If FISTS
> doesn't have the same policy, that's their choice, and thus, you could
> have answered my question without breaching any confidence. I can't
> do the same because of the committment we have made to our members.
>

Let's see now, you can't tell us how many US members of NCI there are because that would breach members' privacy. Yeah, Right!

2719. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 14:55:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F54AF53.1040909@psu.edu>
Source record: 76129

N2EY wrote:
> In article <CqU4b.266$vj4.42671@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20030901171950.23307.00002666@mb-m29.aol.com...
>>
>>>In article <DwN4b.215$vj4.34065@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>>>news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
>>>>
>>>>> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
>>>>
>>>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>>>>
>>>
>>>Lots and lots.
>>
>>A real specific answer ...
>
>
> It's as specific as the answer you've given about NCI membership.
>
>>>How many *US* licensees are members of NCI, Carl?
>>
>>Thousands, and growing every day :-)
>
>
> There ya go.
>
>>>btw, the FISTS member list is online.
>>
>>If you took the time to look, and it's public, why didn't you answer
>>my question?
>
>
> I did answer your question. You want an exact number, you go count 'em.
>
>>However, we *don't* publish our membership list ... we respect
>>the privacy of our members and keep the data they give us confidential,

>>don't sell it to SPAMers, etc.
>
>
> FISTS doesn't sell anyhting to spammers. But FISTS members aren't ashamed of
> their membership, either......
>
> FISTS members can publicly disagree with the FISTS petition and stay members.
> (The response from the membership has been overwhelmingly positive, though).
> But an NCI member cannot publicly disagree with the NCI petition and stay an
> NCI member.
>
> Maybe you don't see any problem with that....

I see a problem with it, and I wouldn't join even if I was in favor of
discontinuing the Morse test. I don't hold with organizations that
demand I toe the line in all things. Tolerance of dissent is needed for
a healthy organization or country.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2720. Re: Going under the knife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 15:15:06 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F54B3FA.60509@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 76267

Good luck with the surgery and hope you have a speedy and full
recover.

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> To all my friends, combatants, debaters and lurkers here in r.r.a.p,
>
> I will be going under the knife this Tuesday for surgery on my lower back
> and won't be back for about a week or so. I am quiet sure that I am not
> going to feel like being in the upright position for the next week (or doing
> much of anything for that matter) , so everyone have a great week and
> probably next week I will have a ton of catching up to do.
>

2721. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 15:16:52 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F54B464.2030503@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 76268

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> Mike:
>
> You and your NPTI are just like all the other NPPTA (No Parallel Parking
> Test Agenda) whiners. You just want to dumb-down the driving test so
> that any dummy who is fed up with riding his bicycle can just knock off
> a simple, multiple-guess written test, then get into a Buick and hit the
> road just like us Real Drivers(tm).
>
> I think that not only should Parallel Parking be a requirement on the road
> test for a driver's license, but Parallel Parking Proficiency should be
> demonstrated at a rate of at least 12 Parallel Parkings per hour (pph).
> After all, if you cannot Parallel Park time after time, in a variety of driving
> conditions, then you cannot expect to be able to operate a motor vehicle
> successfully in the typical urban driving environment.
>
> I hold a Class B Commercial Driver's License, and to pass my road test,
> I had to parallel park a 30-foot long bus. I passed my test on the first
> attempt, with a perfect score. Any driver who can't park at least as well
> as I can is nothing more than a lazy, unmotivated, dumbed-down whiner
> who wants the world handed over to him or her on a silver platter, since
> all they have to do is parallel park a Dodge Neon or something similar.
> Of course, now that Toyota has eliminated the need for most drivers to
> parallel park, they'll probably be sending PRM's to the DOT and, with
> enough whining, will get the Parallel Parking test reduced or eliminated
> in the next "restructuring" of the driver's test.
>
> I'm going to start a new organisation called PHISTS -- Parking Has
> Important Status To Safety. We will encourage the use of Parallel
> Parking by sponsoring awards programs for drivers who participate in
> local parallel parking demonstration events. Attending 100 such events
> will earn you your PHISTS Century Award. Other awards programs
> will be announced in the future.
>
> As far as I'm concerned, you NPTI/NPPTA whiners can go fly a kite.
> You will never achieve the status of us Parallel Parking Tested drivers.
> We're better than you, and we can prove it! You couldn't park a Prius
> on a football field!
>
> 73 de Larry, CDL-B

Good one, hang in there Larry.

2722. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 15:43:06 UTC
From: An Metet <anmetet@freedom.gmsociety.org>
Message-ID: <edacb126b69241305ab3dc6b18d017f7@anonymous.poster>
Source record: 76130

In article
wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>Damn TIT, your TITS dragging on the ground are a Bigger turn-off

So are yours.

2723. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 15:56:36 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030902115636.22081.00000337@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 76131

In article <3F5400EC.4000106@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

> Now there is a question about the amount of space that is used up by
>PP. At this time, NPTI respects the right of those that do PP, but if
>the People who PP fall significantly, we will have to revisit that
>question. Certainly if enough people do not PP, that space would be
>better used by other methods of parking.
>
> Why anyone should be forced to PP is beyond me.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>President, NPTI
>
>"Dedicated to taking driving into the future"

Mike:

You and your NPTI are just like all the other NPPTA (No Parallel Parking
Test Agenda) whiners. You just want to dumb-down the driving test so
that any dummy who is fed up with riding his bicycle can just knock off
a simple, multiple-guess written test, then get into a Buick and hit the
road just like us Real Drivers(tm).

I think that not only should Parallel Parking be a requirement on the road
test for a driver's license, but Parallel Parking Proficiency should be
demonstrated at a rate of at least 12 Parallel Parkings per hour (pph).
After all, if you cannot Parallel Park time after time, in a variety of driving
conditions, then you cannot expect to be able to operate a motor vehicle
successfully in the typical urban driving environment.

I hold a Class B Commercial Driver's License, and to pass my road test,
I had to parallel park a 30-foot long bus. I passed my test on the first
attempt, with a perfect score. Any driver who can't park at least as well
as I can is nothing more than a lazy, unmotivated, dumbed-down whiner
who wants the world handed over to him or her on a silver platter, since
all they have to do is parallel park a Dodge Neon or something similar.
Of course, now that Toyota has eliminated the need for most drivers to
parallel park, they'll probably be sending PRM's to the DOT and, with
enough whining, will get the Parallel Parking test reduced or eliminated
in the next "restructuring" of the driver's test.

I'm going to start a new organisation called PHISTS -- Parking Has
Important Status To Safety. We will encourage the use of Parallel
Parking by sponsoring awards programs for drivers who participate in

local parallel parking demonstration events. Attending 100 such events will earn you your PHISTS Century Award. Other awards programs will be announced in the future.

As far as I'm concerned, you NPTI/NPPTA whiners can go fly a kite. You will never achieve the status of us Parallel Parking Tested drivers. We're better than you, and we can prove it! You couldn't park a Prius on a football field!

73 de Larry, CDL-B

2724. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 15:56:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030902115637.22081.00000338@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 76132

In article <BB79C130.24F53%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> Well, if that's the case, then I guess my "due
>> respect" for your XYL is no longer deserved.

> She'll do just fine without your concept of respect, Larry.

Dwight:

Thanks, that's quite reassuring.

>> (snip) My intention is hardly to "dominate" Kim or
>> any other woman, Dwight. However, I'm curious as to
>> why that thought occurred to you! In reality, Kim's
>> call sign tends to encourage men to think of her in
>> that way, but, then again, that's undoubtedly her
>> intent. Not the kind of behavior I would expect
>> from a married woman and/or a mother, assuming she
>> has any children. (snip)

> The thought occurred to me because you've spent the last several years
>trying to sexualize Kim's callsign. I can remember back when I first ran
>into this discussion. At the time, since I hadn't noticed her callsign
>before, it took me several messages to figure out what you were talking
>about. I ignored that discussion and didn't respond to the topic for several
>more months (many dozens of messages later).

Well, Dwight, it's nice to know that after you've been repeatedly smacked upside the haid with the plainly obvious, you eventually get it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2725. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 15:56:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030902115637.22081.00000339@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 76133

In article <BB79C1AE.24F54%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
>> (snip) I assure you, Kim, that I don't need to
>> pursue this particular subject to allay my boredom!
>
>
> Well, that's at least a partial admission of boredom.

Dwight:

Yup. And you're the cause of most of it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2726. Re: Good Christ Almighty...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 15:56:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030902115638.22081.00000340@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 76134

In article <f45722ac.0309020302.15ec55ea@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> all other YL hams being more in keeping with something in a strip
>> club than in a wholesome, family-oriented activity such as ham radio.
>
>Larry, is this the same wholesome, family oriented activity that your
>"friend" has sent QFU on the wholesomest mode in?
>
>How can you remain "friends" with such a person?

Brian:

That was a very long time ago, and I haven't seen that "friend" since
around 1983. I would say that we're not particularly close "friends"
any more.

>What did Riley say when you quizzed him about it?

Nothing, since I didn't. RH wasn't in his present job at the time.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2727. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 15:58:09 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030902115809.28624.00000268@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 76135

>So are yours.

And so is your Mamas

2728. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 16:15:26 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj2fmuaun1@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 76136

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> ".... you've spent the last several years trying to sexualize Kim's callsign.

Dwight you've obviously forever been devoid of a clue, and if this statement doesn't prove it nothing ever could. But it's far beyond obvious anyway.

2729. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 16:30:14 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj2gimfce0@208.207.71.157>
Source record: 76137

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> ... most of the traffic handled via NTS is

> 1) of little/no importance

To whom? And you'd allege that there is no other possibility ? Sure sounds like it. You *should* know that even health and welfare traffic is important to the mission of the ARS, as it not only relieves worried families etc but also gies important exposure to the capabilities and mission of the ARS. Sorry you missed all that.

> and

> 2) much makes use of "coded messages" (sending a canned message number)

> that would be of little use in an emergency situation where the situation,
> needs,
> details would need to be spelled out in some detail.

N onsense bafflegab! Have you ever worked a *real* disaster/emergency of any consequence? Sure doesn't sound like it! And for your edification, the "canned" mesages, right along with prosigns and the many other CW shortcuts merely add significantly to the efficiency of the mode. But of course you can't allow such information out into the public domain, if you can prevent it. BUT, you can't!

>
>
> Sorry, the "Morse is necessary for emergency communications" argument
> doesn't hold water, and the FCC has already realized that.

BS! FCC has never made any statement even close to that, and WE all know it. One NEVER knows in advance what will be needed to deal with any unforseen emergency/disaster. We all know that, and of course you do too, but it works against that enigmatic agenda of yours.

>
>
> Carl - wk3c

2730. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 16:36:38 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj2gumfuh0@208.207.71.157>
Source record: 76138

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F53CBDD.2040704@adelphia.net...
> >
> > How do you justify a trained group of communicators that are versed in
> > a mode that is as useful and needed as CW is? There isn't an emergency
> > right now.
>
> It's especially hard when the emergency management agencies have
> no use for a cadre of CW ops ... it's not the type of communications
> that they want or need.
>

You're saying they would rather have NO communications than to use CW.
Any EMS manager with that attitude should br replaced posthaste.

> Just as the CW NTS nets are anachronisms ...
>
> Carl - wk3c

2731. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 16:44:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309020844.1ce6d7df@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76139

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F54A687.4010407@psu.edu>...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F53CD56.4090303@adelphia.net...
> >
> >>Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >>
> >>>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >>>>news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
> >>>>
> >>>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Many times the number of *US* NCI members, Carl.
> >>
> >>It doesn't take a majority to win an issue, Dick. All it takes is an
> >>irate minority that is prepared to be loud and active.
> >
> >
> > No, what it takes are rational, compelling arguments that support
> > your position ... NCI had them in the case of WT 98-143, the
> > PCTAs couldn't come up with ANY (because there are no rational,
> > compelling arguments for keeping Morse testing).
>
>
>
> >>What do they do for an encore?
> >
> >
> > We present more rational, compelling arguments, of course.
>
>
> Carl, with all due respect, "rational and compelling arguments" are in
> the head of the beholder.

Then the words "rational" and "irrational" have no meaning.

2732. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 16:46:49 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F54C978.8040604@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 76140

Dick Carroll; wrote:

>It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
>
>
>
>
> http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
>
>
>
>
If CW does enjoy a 13 dB advantage over SSB, avid DX hounds will
choose to learn it and use it on their own. No need for a license test.
CW makes for small bandwidth combined with simple equipment.
NASA doesn't use CW with its deep space probes, but they have
fancy equipment on both ends. I mention this in that NASA does the
ultimate in weak signal work, something CW is usually good for on
ham bands with simple equipment and trained operators. But there's
no CW op on the space probe.

Or we could do an "either or": For the extra, pass element 1 or a new
element 5 (a tougher written) with your general license. And for the
general,
either element 1 and the general written, or the general and extra writtens
with your tech license.

2733. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 16:47:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309020847.770ebe86@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76141

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj2a69$141$0@208.207.71.176>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> > Sorry, the "Morse is necessary for emergency communications" argument
> > doesn't
> > hold water, and the FCC has already realized that.
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
>
> Let's face it- Carl just hates Morse code, despite his many protests to the contrary.
> It's really not that difficult to understand - after all, he hears all that digital data
> flying past his ears and the old nternal modem just won't work on it! Ah, the pain! The
> Frustration! The Agony!
>
> You just can't help sympathyzing with his plight. The ONLY way for him to find relief is
> to slay that dreaded dragon under the bed.....

Regardless of what Carl wants or likes or dislikes, you are free to
use Morse at any time (cept on CB and 5MHz).

2734. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 16:49:19 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309020849.28083210@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76142

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj29p8$vi7$1@208.207.71.176>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<wTP4b.19097$Om1.18571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > news:f45722ac.0309011332.6c782d2f@posting.google.com...
> > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > > >
> > > > > Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock never
> actually
> > > > > got there due to traffic snarls.
> > > >
> > > > I especially like the ones who claimed they were both at Woodstock and
> > > > in Vietnam. They probably saw both movies.
> > > >
> > > > > The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon.
> That's
> > > > > what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
> > > >
> > > > I was 11. I remember selling flower seeds door to door to earn a West
> > > > Ben fishing pole. And my Dad getting orders to Thailand.
> > > >
> > > > So what has all this do do with code?
> > >
> > > My my Brian....how is it so hard for you to figure a person could be a
> > > veteran of VN and be at Kent State also?
> >
> > Do you confuse Kent State and Woodstock often?
> >
> > > You really must be a dumb ass.
> >
> > Of course it's possible.
>
> I'm afraid a poll would show there's very little doubt.

Hmmm, you sound like Clinton when he tried to govern the country.

2735. Re: Good Heavens...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 16:54:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309020854.147691a3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76143

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030902002918.12300.00000219@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> In article <20030901111913.12631.00000692@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >Not really. The discerning choose quality over quantity. Example: Who is more
> >attractive, Demi Moore or Rosanne Barr?
>
> Demi Moore, to be sure. Rosanne who?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Too bad he didn't say "Arquette.)

2736. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 18:18:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F54DEF5.9080308@psu.edu>
Source record: 76146

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
>
>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
>>
>>> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
>>
>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>
>
> Many times the number of *US* NCI members, Carl.

Now Dick, how do you know that? No one knows except a person that isn't telling.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2737. Re: OT: Trojan Help

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 18:21:20 UTC
From: Scott Schrader <swschrad@visi.com>
Message-ID: <3F54DFA0.83E24F0A@visi.com>
Source record: 76144
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I, alas, have both. SuSE has no troubles, except for a cockpit error
now and then. BugMagnet 98SE has multiple, but some sites I need
require bloatware that only BugMagnet has. BugMagnet doesn't need
cockpit errors, the factory did that for me :(

Gregg wrote:
>
> Behold, Scott Schrader signaled from keyed 4-1000A filament:
>
> > the "original" worm, the morris worm, was designed to bite on BSD-based
> > OS'es, and it hit BSD and derivatives, including SunOS and Ultrix. Linux
> > has complimentary GNU and OS daemons that have BSD roots. if the
> > original vulnerability was copied from open source of the late 80s,
> > there might be an entry for Morris.
> >
> > please to do your research.
>
> I do.
>
> I also run Firestarter and F-prot.
>
> The fact remains - would you drive a car with thousands of
> vulnerabilities, or six?
>
> --
> Gregg
> *Perhaps it's useful, even if it can't be SPICE'd*
> Visit the GeeK Zone - http://geek.scorpiorising.ca

-- If it's a "new economy," why do they want my obsolete old money?

2738. Re: AOL pulls Jon Cunningham's web pages

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 18:22:07 UTC
From: Madden2K4 <SouthJersey_SWL@-nospam-comcast.net>
Message-ID: <IPidnSwknZVWQsmiU-KYgg@comcast.com>
Source record: 76145
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.shortwave,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mom" <WashYourHands@NotMe.com> wrote in message
news:bitbmuplr0@pita.alt.net...
> //
> ..and you are a cowardly old man and nothing you can do will stop that,
> either.
>
>

Still don't get it huh? I know you fear me after I got COTSE to give you the asskicking you deserve. I'd suggest you knock the shit off before you get me started again.

2739. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 18:32:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F54E23A.8030209@psu.edu>
Source record: 76147

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> I've explained out committment to our members' privacy. If FISTS
> doesn't have the same policy, that's their choice, and thus, you could
> have answered my question without breaching any confidence. I can't
> do the same because of the committment we have made to our members.

Can't you think of a better reason? Let's say there are 5000 members of NCI.

Explain how saying There are 5000 members of NCI is violating anyones privacy.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2740. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 18:56:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F54E7C6.6040802@psu.edu>
Source record: 76148

Brian wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F54A687.4010407@psu.edu>...
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

<some snippage>

>>>We present more rational, compelling arguments, of course.
>>
>>
>>Carl, with all due respect, "rational and compelling arguments" are in
>>the head of the beholder.
>
>
> Then the words "rational" and "irrational" have no meaning.

1. Everyone here thinks they are being rational, unless they are being purposefully non-rational. (say Bruce for example, who is having fun baiting people - and even in his case, take note that when he is starting to be serious his spelling and grammar become correct)

2. You really aren't that far from the truth.

3. Insane people are exempt from all this. But there really aren't that many insane people.

My rationale is that what is or isn't rational is based on the starting assumption or world view.

If your basic assumption is that things should be simplified or to be made easier, then you would agree with a proposal such as the NCI proposal before the FCC. It is rational and compelling from that viewpoint.

If you believe that simplification is not necessary or desirable, you are more likely to find the FISTS proposal rational and compelling.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2741. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 19:01:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F54E8F9.4070207@psu.edu>
Source record: 76149

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <3F5400EC.4000106@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
>
>> Now there is a question about the amount of space that is used up by
>>PP. At this time, NPTI respects the right of those that do PP, but if
>>the People who PP fall significantly, we will have to revisit that
>>question. Certainly if enough people do not PP, that space would be
>>better used by other methods of parking.
>>
>> Why anyone should be forced to PP is beyond me.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>President, NPTI
>>
>>"Dedicated to taking driving into the future"
>
>
> Mike:
>
> You and your NPTI are just like all the other NPPTA (No Parallel Parking
> Test Agenda) whiners. You just want to dumb-down the driving test so
> that any dummy who is fed up with riding his bicycle can just knock off
> a simple, multiple-guess written test, then get into a Buick and hit the
> road just like us Real Drivers(tm).
>
> I think that not only should Parallel Parking be a requirement on the road
> test for a driver's license, but Parallel Parking Proficiency should be
> demonstrated at a rate of at least 12 Parallel Parkings per hour (pph).
> After all, if you cannot Parallel Park time after time, in a variety of driving
> conditions, then you cannot expect to be able to operate a motor vehicle
> successfully in the typical urban driving environment.
>
> I hold a Class B Commercial Driver's License, and to pass my road test,
> I had to parallel park a 30-foot long bus. I passed my test on the first
> attempt, with a perfect score. Any driver who can't park at least as well
> as I can is nothing more than a lazy, unmotivated, dumbed-down whiner
> who wants the world handed over to him or her on a silver platter, since
> all they have to do is parallel park a Dodge Neon or something similar.
> Of course, now that Toyota has eliminated the need for most drivers to
> parallel park, they'll probably be sending PRM's to the DOT and, with
> enough whining, will get the Parallel Parking test reduced or eliminated

> in the next "restructuring" of the driver's test.
>
> I'm going to start a new organisation called PHISTS -- Parking Has
> Important Status To Safety. We will encourage the use of Parallel
> Parking by sponsoring awards programs for drivers who participate in
> local parallel parking demonstration events. Attending 100 such events
> will earn you your PHISTS Century Award. Other awards programs
> will be announced in the future.
>
> As far as I'm concerned, you NPTI/NPPTA whiners can go fly a kite.
> You will never achieve the status of us Parallel Parking Tested drivers.
> We're better than you, and we can prove it! You couldn't park a Prius
> on a football field!

HOWWWWLL! Great Ceasers Ghost Larry! I should have opened this one at
home! Now everyone wants to know what I am laughing hysterically about,
and they are getting to see a grown man cry. Thanks, I needed that!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2742. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 19:09:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F54EAD8.7060602@psu.edu>
Source record: 76150

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <3F5400EC.4000106@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
>
>> Now there is a question about the amount of space that is used up by
>>PP. At this time, NPTI respects the right of those that do PP, but if
>>the People who PP fall significantly, we will have to revisit that
>>question. Certainly if enough people do not PP, that space would be
>>better used by other methods of parking.
>>
>> Why anyone should be forced to PP is beyond me.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>President, NPTI
>>
>>"Dedicated to taking driving into the future"
>
>
> Mike:
>
> You and your NPTI are just like all the other NPPTA (No Parallel Parking
> Test Agenda) whiners. You just want to dumb-down the driving test so
> that any dummy who is fed up with riding his bicycle can just knock off
> a simple, multiple-guess written test, then get into a Buick and hit the
> road just like us Real Drivers(tm).

We have never said anything like that! We support the rest of the
testing procedures. Besides, we must be inclusive, and not turn
potential drivers away because of basic skills.

> I think that not only should Parallel Parking be a requirement on the road
> test for a driver's license, but Parallel Parking Proficiency should be
> demonstrated at a rate of at least 12 Parallel Parkings per hour (pph).
> After all, if you cannot Parallel Park time after time, in a variety of driving
> conditions, then you cannot expect to be able to operate a motor vehicle
> successfully in the typical urban driving environment.

Ha! you and your ilk are always trying to keep people off the roads.
Hazing ritual is all this is.

> I hold a Class B Commercial Driver's License, and to pass my road test,
> I had to parallel park a 30-foot long bus. I passed my test on the first
> attempt, with a perfect score. Any driver who can't park at least as well

> as I can is nothing more than a lazy, unmotivated, dumbed-down whiner
> who wants the world handed over to him or her on a silver platter, since
> all they have to do is parallel park a Dodge Neon or something similar.
> Of course, now that Toyota has eliminated the need for most drivers to
> parallel park, they'll probably be sending PRM's to the DOT and, with
> enough whining, will get the Parallel Parking test reduced or eliminated
> in the next "restructuring" of the driver's test.

That's what NPTI is working toward. Why should people have to learn an
outdated skill like PP? Heck, the next thing you'll want is for people
to want to know how to drive a standard transmission or to know how to
use buggy whips. All you anachronistic types are just holding driving back.

> I'm going to start a new organisation called PHISTS -- Parking Has
> Important Status To Safety. We will encourage the use of Parallel
> Parking by sponsoring awards programs for drivers who participate in
> local parallel parking demonstration events. Attending 100 such events
> will earn you your PHISTS Century Award. Other awards programs
> will be announced in the future.
>
> As far as I'm concerned, you NPTI/NPPTA whiners can go fly a kite.
> You will never achieve the status of us Parallel Parking Tested drivers.
> We're better than you, and we can prove it! You couldn't park a Prius
> on a football field!

Oh yeah? Oh yeah? Oh yeah?

- Mike KB3EIA -

President of NPTI

Taking driving into the future

2743. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 19:57:44 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <YC65b.22622$Om1.2606@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76151

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bj0o54$69j@library1.airnews.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:evP4b.18952$Om1.5551@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > news:biuf8u$pvs@library2.airnews.net...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:RVw4b.12334$EW1.2877@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think so. Or
> > perhaps
> > > > you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower child? Now
> thats
> > a
> > > > real probabliity.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > "Make love not War"
> > > >
> > > > "War is dangerous to all living things"
> > > >
> > > > etc.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Do you have to practice at being an asshole, Dan, or does it come that
> > > naturally?
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > >
> >
> > You bring out the best in me Kim.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> That's a given, Dan. We all know you're an asshole. That wasn't the
> question. The question is do you have to practice?
>

> Kim W5TIT
>

Not any more Twit. I have acheived the highest level possible. Thank you
for noticing.

Dan/W4NTI

>

2744. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 20:02:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <dH65b.22626$Om1.18354@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76152

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bj0o55$69j@library1.airnews.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:5HP4b.19013$Om1.5560@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > > In article <biured$6ac$1@208.206.142.103>, "Dick Carroll;"
> > <dixie@townsqr.com>
> > > writes:
> > >

> > >
> > > The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon.
> > That's
> > > what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > In the summer of 69 I was mellowing out in a Klong House in Bangkok
> > Thailand.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> And what were you defending, Dan? You should remember, because your
actions
> here make me seem to think you've lost the reason you went to war.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

I wasn't fighting anybody Twit. I said I was kicking back in a Klong House
in Bangkok, Thailand. The war was to the West in Vietnam.

Dan/W4NTI

2745. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 20:05:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <cK65b.22630$Om1.2445@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76153

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030901183614.10745.00000278@mb-m29.aol.com...
> >Reason Im asking is that I was there the night before it happened. Just
> >curious.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> Hey Dan brings back Memories, did you ever hang out at RAYS. Man we had
some
> Wild times there.

Don't remember actually. Only went there that one evening. Kent really
wasn't my kind of town.

Dan/W4NTI

2746. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 20:11:41 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <1Q65b.22639$Om1.21237@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76154

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bj0o56$69j@library1.airnews.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:wTP4b.19097$Om1.18571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0309011332.6c782d2f@posting.google.com...
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > news:<20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > >
> > > > Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock
never
> > actually
> > > > got there due to traffic snarls.
> > >
> > > I especially like the ones who claimed they were both at Woodstock and
> > > in Vietnam. They probably saw both movies.
> > >
> > > > The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon.
> > That's
> > > > what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
> > >
> > > I was 11. I remember selling flower seeds door to door to earn a West
> > > Ben fishing pole. And my Dad getting orders to Thailand.
> > >
> > > So what has all this do do with code?
> >
> > My my Brian....how is it so hard for you to figure a person could be a
> > veteran of VN and be at Kent State also? You really must be a dumb ass.
> >
> > I was at Kent State visiting my cousin the evening before the shootings.
> > The national guard had blocked the streets and the kids were running up
> and
> > down the street throwing rocks, etc.
> >
> > I had my military ID checked by the Guard on my way out of town. The
next
> > day the shootings occured. (I was in-active reserve status).
> >
> > I was discharged in 1968. I went back to Thailand as a civilian and
> > returned stateside in December of 69. My original home is Alliance,
Ohio.
> > Thats about 34 miles South of Kent, Ohio.
> >

> > You can now wipe the slobber off your chin.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> Good grief, Dan. You're a gorilla thumping your chest... That's a total
> turn-off.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

I don't agree with that at all Twit. Its not my style. Im just saying the facts, thats all.

Dan/W4NTI

2747. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 20:12:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030902161226.07564.00000274@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 76155

> (say Bruce for example, who is having fun
>baiting people - and even in his case, take note that when he is
>starting to be serious his spelling and grammar become correct)

Mam why did you tell them that. Most of them are to stupid to figure it out on there own, and now you screwed it up. Thanks LOADS

2748. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 20:15:14 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030902161514.07564.00000275@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 76156

>Don't remember actually. Only went there that one evening. Kent really
>wasn't my kind of town.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

I didnt go there much myself, only to the BARS. Lots of easy women like TIT

2749. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 20:16:46 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <OU65b.926$pV1.904@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76157

>
> You completely forgot the part about you being at Woodstock and
> Vietnam.
>

Actually anyone who said they were at Woodstock was really in Bethel.
Woodstock is up the road a piece.

2750. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 20:20:15 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <3Y65b.22651$Om1.9279@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76158

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309020320.247a2105@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<wTP4b.19097$Om1.18571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0309011332.6c782d2f@posting.google.com...
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > news:<20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > >
> > > > Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock
never
> > actually
> > > > got there due to traffic snarls.
> > >
> > > I especially like the ones who claimed they were both at Woodstock and
> > > in Vietnam. They probably saw both movies.
> > >
> > > > The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon.
> > That's
> > > > what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
> > >
> > > I was 11. I remember selling flower seeds door to door to earn a West
> > > Ben fishing pole. And my Dad getting orders to Thailand.
> > >
> > > So what has all this do do with code?
> >
> > My my Brian....how is it so hard for you to figure a person could be a
> > veteran of VN and be at Kent State also?
>
> Do you confuse Kent State and Woodstock often?
>
> > You really must be a dumb ass.
>
> Of course it's possible.
>
> > I was at Kent State visiting my cousin the evening before the shootings.
> > The national guard had blocked the streets and the kids were running up
and
> > down the street throwing rocks, etc.
> >
> > I had my military ID checked by the Guard on my way out of town. The
next
> > day the shootings occured. (I was in-active reserve status).
>

> Reserves?
>
> > I was discharged in 1968. I went back to Thailand as a civilian
>
> Back to Thailand? When were you there the 1st time? And are you
> somehow implying that Thailand and Vietnam are the same place?
>
> and
> > returned stateside in December of 69. My original home is Alliance,
Ohio.
> > Thats about 34 miles South of Kent, Ohio.
>
> Are you related to Bruce Bunion/WA8ULX?
>
> > You can now wipe the slobber off your chin.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> You completely forgot the part about you being at Woodstock and
> Vietnam.
>
> And the part about what this has to do with the code.

I changed the subject header, because it has nothing to do with the 'code'.

You are the one that is confused Brian. I never said a thing about Woodstock and Vietnam and Thailand.

I said I was discharged in 1968. And yes I was in Thailand several times during that period. I was also in Vietnam during that period. In fact, just to make you happy here is a list of countries I was in from November 1965 to April of 1968.

Okinawa
Japan
Phillipines
Taiwan
Thailand
Vietnam

All of which were TDY (Temporary Duty) from Okinawa.

In April of 1967 I went for a full tour to Vietnam, leaving in April of 1968. Went stateside for 3 months and was discharged in July of 1968. Was placed on inactive reserve status for two more years in order to complete my 6 year military commitment.

There is more, but this is pertenant to the discussion.

After returning stateside and dropping by to see my mother I bought a 1 way ticket to Bangkok Thailand. Where I lived in between working in South Vietnam as a civilian contractor. I returned stateside December of 1969.

Any questions Brian?

Dan/W4NTI

2751. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 20:26:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F54FCF1.7000503@psu.edu>
Source record: 76159

WA8ULX wrote:
>>(say Bruce for example, who is having fun
>>baiting people - and even in his case, take note that when he is
>>starting to be serious his spelling and grammar become correct)
>
>
> Mam why did you tell them that. Most of them are to stupid to figure it out on
> there own, and now you screwed it up. Thanks LOADS

Actually, I'd bet they *can't* figure it out even after telling them!

- mike KB3EIA -

2752. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 20:36:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Xa75b.22665$Om1.19738@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76160

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:%BU4b.270$vj4.43753@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:MIQ4b.19457$Om1.10718@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0309011251.3ada241b@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:<biuq0n$2rg$0@208.206.142.103>...
> > > > It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Enjoy!
> > >
> > >
> > > I thought that FISTS sold themselves as a non-political club?
> >
> > How is sending in a petition a political act? Does that mean when NCI
> sent
> > in a petition it was political? Or perhaps they were simply following
> > proceedures.
>
> Of course participating in the regulatory process is a "political" thing.
>
> And yes, FIST's position in the past (and IIRC, their charter) was
> that they were *not* a politically-oriented group ... just a group that
> was supposed to foster the *use* of Morse. And the test is *not*
> necessary to use Morse ... someone sending slow as they learn
> (voluntarily, because they *want* to) hurts nobody ... even the ARRL
> has stated that the best way to learn Morse is on the air. Keeping
> people off the air until they learn Morse to some specific level of
> proficiency is counter, not just to the ARS as a whole, but to the
> *professed* goal of those who want to keep Morse testing. If they'd
> welcome folks whether they could beep or not, they'd stand a better
> chance of gaining "recruits" than they do by acting crappy to those who
> aren't interested in Morse, trying to keep them off of HF, and then
> complaining that they don't "realize the benefits of Morse." After that
> sort of treatment, no wonder so many folks aren't interested in Morse
> (or ham radio for that matter ...)
>

> Carl - wk3c
>
Please explain to the audience then, how, one can have basically no knowledge of Morse, then get on the air and try to improve it? You MUST have a rudimentary knowledge, in otherwords something to work with, before one can proceed.

I think 5 WPM is a fair requirement.

I think total ellimination is equivilant to negotiations with a terrorist organization (NCI).

Dan/W4NTI

2753. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 20:37:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <0c75b.22667$Om1.15237@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76161

```
"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309020310.794e075a@posting.google.com...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<%BU4b.270$vj4.43753@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:MIQ4b.19457$Om1.10718@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > news:f45722ac.0309011251.3ada241b@posting.google.com...
> > > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:<biuq0n$2rg$0@208.206.142.103>...
> > > > > > It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Enjoy!
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > I thought that FISTS sold themselves as a non-political club?
> > > >
> > > > How is sending in a petition a political act? Does that mean when NCI
> > sent
> > > > in a petition it was political? Or perhaps they were simply following
> > > > proceedures.
> > >
> > > Of course participating in the regulatory process is a "political"
thing.
> >
> > And yes, FIST's position in the past (and IIRC, their charter) was
> > that they were *not* a politically-oriented group ... just a group that
> > was supposed to foster the *use* of Morse.
>
> Right. So where NCI is purposely a politically-oriented group, and
> behaves accordingly, FISTS is specifically a non-political group who
> is now behaving politically.
>
> Why don't we hear any whining about how FISTS has broken with their
> charter from the people that are always whining about NCI?
>
> Usual PCTA double-standard?

Not only a dumb ass, but a knee jerk bleeding heart liberal to boot.
```

Dan/W4NTI

2754. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 20:39:37 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030902163937.07457.00000204@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 76162

>Actually, I'd bet they *can't* figure it out even after telling them!
>
> - mike KB3EIA -
>

Your probably right

2755. Re: Good Heavens...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 20:41:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Xf75b.22671$Om1.5277@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76163

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030902002918.12300.00000219@mb-m20.aol.com...
> In article <20030901111913.12631.00000692@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >Not really. The discerning choose quality over quantity. Example: Who is
more
> >attractive, Demi Moore or Rosanne Barr?
>
> Demi Moore, to be sure. Rosanne who?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Rosanne Barr, Twit.......The hug and chalk twins.

Dan/W4NTI

2756. Re: Good Heavens...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 20:42:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <nh75b.22672$Om1.1110@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76164

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309020854.147691a3@posting.google.com...
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030902002918.12300.00000219@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> > In article <20030901111913.12631.00000692@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(N2EY)
> > writes:
> >
> > >Not really. The discerning choose quality over quantity. Example: Who
is more
> > >attractive, Demi Moore or Rosanne Barr?
> >
> > Demi Moore, to be sure. Rosanne who?
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Too bad he didn't say "Arquette.)

This may come as a real surprise to you Brian. But most of us don't respond
as you do. Forgetting to put brain in gear, before opening mouth.

Dan/W4NTI

2757. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 20:44:14 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <yi75b.999$wW1.339@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76165

Thanks, Mike, for a most enjoyable thread. I've needed a good chuckle and this thread provided it. :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

2758. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 20:44:43 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <%i75b.22673$Om1.15801@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76166

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030901213158.20041.00000277@mb-m28.aol.com...
> ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye. After reading Fists proposal
I
> have decided to send your $39.00 to them instead of you fools. It appears
Fist
> is the only real Group out there that really cares.

The ARRL board is in favor of retaining CW on HF.

Dan/W4NTI

2759. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 20:57:31 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F550439.4010304@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 76167

>
>
>>
>>
>>
>
>Yup you got it. Here in Michigan the driving test is two parts. The first
>part, which you MUST pass before you can take the actual driving section, is
>parking manuevers. These consist of pulling up within 2 feet of but not
>over the line, backing into a parking space like those in shopping centers,
>and parallel parking.
>
They don't care specifucally about the ability to park. They just want
you to be
able to demostrate your ability to handle your car to some level of
control. Parking
is a safe way to do that, vs say flying thru a tollgate at highway speed...

2760. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 21:25:14 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj31rq$se2$0@208.207.71.160>
Source record: 76168

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> >
> >>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >>news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
> >>
> >>> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
> >>
> >>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
> >
> >
> > Many times the number of *US* NCI members, Carl.
>
> Now Dick, how do you know that? No one knows except a person that isn't
> telling.

Mike, there's been some discussion ovn the subject in the past that sheds light.

2761. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 21:31:41 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj327t$se2$1@208.207.71.160>
Source record: 76169

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> news:bj0o54$69j@library1.airnews.net...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:evP4b.18952$Om1.5551@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > > news:biuf8u$pvs@library2.airnews.net...
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:RVw4b.12334$EW1.2877@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think so. Or
> > > perhaps
> > > > > you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower child? Now
> > thats
> > > a
> > > > > real probabliity.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > "Make love not War"
> > > > >
> > > > > "War is dangerous to all living things"
> > > > >
> > > > > etc.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Do you have to practice at being an asshole, Dan, or does it come that
> > > > naturally?
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > You bring out the best in me Kim.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> > That's a given, Dan. We all know you're an asshole. That wasn't the

> > question. The question is do you have to practice?
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> Not any more Twit. I have acheived the highest level possible. Thank you
> for noticing.

Yeah, Dan, you know how it is with her. I'm labelled a chicken$h*t because I choose not to engage in a battle of wits with an unarmed female.

2762. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 22:26:54 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <OO85b.22830$Om1.18838@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76170

```
"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bj327t$se2$1@208.207.71.160...
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > news:bj0o54$69j@library1.airnews.net...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:evP4b.18952$Om1.5551@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:biuf8u$pvs@library2.airnews.net...
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
message
> > > > > news:RVw4b.12334$EW1.2877@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think so.
Or
> > > > perhaps
> > > > > > you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower child?
Now
> > > thats
> > > > a
> > > > > > real probabliity.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Make love not War"
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "War is dangerous to all living things"
> > > > > >
> > > > > > etc.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Do you have to practice at being an asshole, Dan, or does it come
that
> > > > > naturally?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
```

> > > >
> > > > You bring out the best in me Kim.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > That's a given, Dan. We all know you're an asshole. That wasn't the
> > > question. The question is do you have to practice?
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> >
> > Not any more Twit. I have acheived the highest level possible. Thank
you
> > for noticing.
>
> Yeah, Dan, you know how it is with her. I'm labelled a chicken$h*t
because I choose not
> to engage in a battle of wits with an unarmed female.
>
Yes...I noticed. But she sure has a lot of opinions. Rarely based on fact,
however.

Dan/W4NTI

2763. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 22:29:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <hR85b.22835$Om1.9168@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76171

"Steve Stone" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in message
news:OU65b.926$pV1.904@news02.roc.ny...
> >
> > You completely forgot the part about you being at Woodstock and
> > Vietnam.
> >
>
> Actually anyone who said they were at Woodstock was really in Bethel.
> Woodstock is up the road a piece.
>
>

The original poster claimed I said I was in Woodstock and Vietnam. I never claimed that. In fact I was in Thailand when the moon landing happened. As I recall that was around the same as Woodstock.

I really didn't care in anycase. I certainly wasn't going to wear my short hair to that place.

Dan/W4NTI

2764. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 22:31:37 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <dT85b.22836$Om1.11709@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76172

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:3Y65b.22651$Om1.9279@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309020320.247a2105@posting.google.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<wTP4b.19097$Om1.18571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > news:f45722ac.0309011332.6c782d2f@posting.google.com...
> > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > news:<20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > > >
> > > > > Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock
> never
> > > actually
> > > > > got there due to traffic snarls.
> > > >
> > > > I especially like the ones who claimed they were both at Woodstock
and
> > > > in Vietnam. They probably saw both movies.
> > > >
> > > > > The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the
moon.
> > > That's
> > > > > what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
> > > >
> > > > I was 11. I remember selling flower seeds door to door to earn a
West
> > > > Ben fishing pole. And my Dad getting orders to Thailand.
> > > >
> > > > So what has all this do do with code?
> > >
> > > My my Brian....how is it so hard for you to figure a person could be a
> > > veteran of VN and be at Kent State also?
> >
> > Do you confuse Kent State and Woodstock often?
> >
> > > You really must be a dumb ass.
> >
> > Of course it's possible.
> >
> > > I was at Kent State visiting my cousin the evening before the
shootings.
> > > The national guard had blocked the streets and the kids were running

up
> and
> > > down the street throwing rocks, etc.
> > >
> > > I had my military ID checked by the Guard on my way out of town. The
> next
> > > day the shootings occured. (I was in-active reserve status).
> >
> > Reserves?
> >
> > > I was discharged in 1968. I went back to Thailand as a civilian
> >
> > Back to Thailand? When were you there the 1st time? And are you
> > somehow implying that Thailand and Vietnam are the same place?
> >
> > and
> > > returned stateside in December of 69. My original home is Alliance,
> Ohio.
> > > Thats about 34 miles South of Kent, Ohio.
> >
> > Are you related to Bruce Bunion/WA8ULX?
> >
> > > You can now wipe the slobber off your chin.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > You completely forgot the part about you being at Woodstock and
> > Vietnam.
> >
> > And the part about what this has to do with the code.
>
> I changed the subject header, because it has nothing to do with the
'code'.
>
> You are the one that is confused Brian. I never said a thing about
> Woodstock and Vietnam and Thailand.
>
> I said I was discharged in 1968. And yes I was in Thailand several times
> during that period. I was also in Vietnam during that period. In fact,
> just to make you happy here is a list of countries I was in from November
> 1965 to April of 1968.
>
> Okinawa
> Japan
> Phillipines
> Taiwan
> Thailand
> Vietnam
>
> All of which were TDY (Temporary Duty) from Okinawa.

>
> In April of 1967 I went for a full tour to Vietnam, leaving in April of
> 1968. Went stateside for 3 months and was discharged in July of 1968.
Was
> placed on inactive reserve status for two more years in order to complete
my
> 6 year military commitment.
>
> There is more, but this is pertenant to the discussion.
>
> After returning stateside and dropping by to see my mother I bought a 1
way
> ticket to Bangkok Thailand. Where I lived in between working in South
> Vietnam as a civilian contractor. I returned stateside December of 1969.
>
> Any questions Brian?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

Addendum;

I forgot to add Cambodia and Laos.

Dan/W4NTI

2765. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 23:00:04 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hklouv3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 76173

"Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote: in message
news:<c4a6771678b5a0221f9271fbee325279.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...

.. . . .

> B. Status of current licensees.
>
> Current licenses could be renewed indefinitely, and would
> retain their current operating privileges.
>
> Current Novice, Technician, General, and Advanced class
> licensees could up grade to ?Class A? at any time.
>
> Respectfully submitted,
>
> H. Hans Brakob, K0HB

A very well thought out and crafted petition, Hans. It makes a lot
of sense.

I'm not sure that the Commission will go for an indefinite-term
license, even though the Comm Act appears to permit the Commission
to set terms of licenses by rule for all classes of stations except
broadcast stations which is set by statute.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2766. Re: Ham here and hams on the air?? Its a poll

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 23:00:05 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hklr5r4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 76174

On Fri, 29 Aug 2003 09:03:21 -0400, Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

>1. How many hams that participate with some frequency here in this newsgroup
>operate on the air in the legal ham bands?

Me, me, me.......

>2. Which band(s) do you operate? (Modes irrelevant for this poll, just
>bands or frequency band ranges please.)

2-m, 440 (monitor several non-ham emergency freqs and marine
safety channels as well)

>3. How frequently do you operate on those bands in Question 2?? Hourly,
>Daily, Weekly etc.

Daily net, weekly net, random QSOs at other times, chit-chat while
mobile. Monitor 2-m ARES/RACES packet MBX operation 24/7.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

2767. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 23:18:47 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <rz95b.36684$Vx2.16264969@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76175

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030902061117.15462.00002660@mb-m06.aol.com...
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> FISTS #4360
>

Well just received my FISTS number and it is 10270. My OMs number is 10271.
So you don't need to count them.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2768. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 23:19:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030902191946.00545.00000362@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 76176

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of September 1, 2003:

Novice - 33,156 (decrease of 16,173)
Technician - 257,830 (increase of 52,436)
Technician Plus - 65,928 (decrease of 62,932)
General - 141,402 (increase of 28,725)
Advanced - 82,931 (decrease of 16,851)
Extra - 104,512 (increase of 25,762)
Total - 685,759 (increase of 10,967)

73 de Jim, N2EY

2769. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 23:40:03 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <4e4a4fa03c59b79d63eb7954a61e4d51@dizum.com>
Source record: 76177

In article
wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>And so is your Mamas

At least my Momma's weren't saggy, cancer-ridden like your Momma's are.

2770. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 23:40:45 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bj39n9$lip@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 76178

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309020320.247a2105@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<wTP4b.19097$Om1.18571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0309011332.6c782d2f@posting.google.com...
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > news:<20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > >
> > > > Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock
never
> > actually
> > > > got there due to traffic snarls.
> > >
> > > I especially like the ones who claimed they were both at Woodstock and
> > > in Vietnam. They probably saw both movies.
> > >
> > > > The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon.
> > That's
> > > > what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
> > >
> > > I was 11. I remember selling flower seeds door to door to earn a West
> > > Ben fishing pole. And my Dad getting orders to Thailand.
> > >
> > > So what has all this do do with code?
> >
> > My my Brian....how is it so hard for you to figure a person could be a
> > veteran of VN and be at Kent State also?
>
> Do you confuse Kent State and Woodstock often?
>
> > You really must be a dumb ass.
>
> Of course it's possible.
>
> > I was at Kent State visiting my cousin the evening before the shootings.
> > The national guard had blocked the streets and the kids were running up
and
> > down the street throwing rocks, etc.
> >
> > I had my military ID checked by the Guard on my way out of town. The
next
> > day the shootings occured. (I was in-active reserve status).
>

> Reserves?
>
> > I was discharged in 1968. I went back to Thailand as a civilian
>
> Back to Thailand? When were you there the 1st time? And are you
> somehow implying that Thailand and Vietnam are the same place?
>
> and
> > returned stateside in December of 69. My original home is Alliance,
Ohio.
> > Thats about 34 miles South of Kent, Ohio.
>
> Are you related to Bruce Bunion/WA8ULX?
>
> > You can now wipe the slobber off your chin.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> You completely forgot the part about you being at Woodstock and
> Vietnam.
>
> And the part about what this has to do with the code.

Some good guys and friends of mine, ex-Navy Seals have taught and drilled it
into me that if someone's bragging, there's some bagging

Kim W5TIT

2771. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 23:47:06 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <_Z95b.36686$Vx2.16269403@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76179

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F550439.4010304@ix.netcom.com...
> >
> >
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Yup you got it. Here in Michigan the driving test is two parts. The
first
> >part, which you MUST pass before you can take the actual driving section,
is
> >parking manuevers. These consist of pulling up within 2 feet of but not
> >over the line, backing into a parking space like those in shopping
centers,
> >and parallel parking.
> >
> They don't care specifucally about the ability to park. They just want
> you to be
> able to demostrate your ability to handle your car to some level of
> control. Parking
> is a safe way to do that, vs say flying thru a tollgate at highway
speed...
>

Maneuvering at slow speed is an entirely different skill set than that required for typical driving speeds. Both must be practiced and one's ability in parking maneuvers will not give any indication of driving ability on the street and vice versa. This happens to be the first place I've ever been where flunking the parallel parking basically leaves you no leeway (it's worth 5 points and you can only miss 6 altogether on the parking lot maneuvers). I haven't yet formed an opinion on whether this is good or bad.

The backing into a parking space seemed an odd requirement, as some places, if you back into the space (in the real world), you can be ticketed. Again haven't decided if this is good or bad.

The pulling up to the line seems eminently reasonable though.

If they wanted to check your ability before risking their necks on the road with the examinee, it might be better to have them drive around a set of pylons at a more normal speed than the ultra-slow parking maneuvers.

Also here in Michigan, the driving tests are no longer administered by the state but by the driving schools. It costs $45 each time you take the test although if you fail, part of that is refunded. The fee is on top of what

you already paid to take the Segment I and Segment II driving classes. For those of you not familiar with Michigan, the schools do not have Driver's Ed classes anymore. They simply coordinate a schedule with a driving school. I forget the fee for taking the class ($200 though rings a bell).

This is substantially different than it was a few years ago. It's also quite different than the state I grew up in and the state where my older daughter got her license.

Anyway, the state made things tougher in an attempt to reduce teen accidents. It's apparently been to short a time to evaluate its effectiveness but preliminary info indicates it may be helping.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2772. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 23:53:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030902195312.07346.00000381@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 76180

In article <3F54E8F9.4070207@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>> As far as I'm concerned, you NPTI/NPPTA whiners can go fly a kite.
>> You will never achieve the status of us Parallel Parking Tested drivers.
>> We're better than you, and we can prove it! You couldn't park a Prius
>> on a football field!
>
>
> HOWWWWLL! Great Ceasers Ghost Larry! I should have opened this one at
>home! Now everyone wants to know what I am laughing hysterically about,
>and they are getting to see a grown man cry. Thanks, I needed that!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Glad to oblige, Mike!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2773. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 23:53:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030902195312.07346.00000379@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 76182

In article <3F54EAD8.7060602@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>> Mike:
>>
>> You and your NPTI are just like all the other NPPTA (No Parallel Parking
>> Test Agenda) whiners. You just want to dumb-down the driving test so
>> that any dummy who is fed up with riding his bicycle can just knock off
>> a simple, multiple-guess written test, then get into a Buick and hit the
>> road just like us Real Drivers(tm).
>
> We have never said anything like that! We support the rest of the
>testing procedures. Besides, we must be inclusive, and not turn
>potential drivers away because of basic skills.

Mike:

Without basic skills like PP, drivers will become mere appliance operators,
totally dependent on the technology in their cars to do their parking for them,
rather than being able to do it themselves under severe, emergency
conditions. PP is a very practical, effective, efficient, and universal way
to park an automobile, but we can't make use of this technique unless
drivers know how to do it. Only a testing requirement will give them the
incentive they need to learn.

>> I think that not only should Parallel Parking be a requirement on the road
>> test for a driver's license, but Parallel Parking Proficiency should be
>> demonstrated at a rate of at least 12 Parallel Parkings per hour (pph).
>> After all, if you cannot Parallel Park time after time, in a variety of
>driving
>> conditions, then you cannot expect to be able to operate a motor vehicle
>> successfully in the typical urban driving environment.
>
> Ha! you and your ilk are always trying to keep people off the roads.
>Hazing ritual is all this is.

Ah, stick it in your ear, you NPTI loser! You're just taking driving
One Step Closer To Extinction. Next thing you're going to do is paint
a big set of boobs on your car, so everyone will be looking at them,
instead of noticing the fact that you're double parked in a yellow zone!
Anyway, I had to do it, so everyone should!

>> I hold a Class B Commercial Driver's License, and to pass my road test,
>> I had to parallel park a 30-foot long bus. I passed my test on the first
>> attempt, with a perfect score. Any driver who can't park at least as well
>> as I can is nothing more than a lazy, unmotivated, dumbed-down whiner
>> who wants the world handed over to him or her on a silver platter, since

>> all they have to do is parallel park a Dodge Neon or something similar.
>> Of course, now that Toyota has eliminated the need for most drivers to
>> parallel park, they'll probably be sending PRM's to the DOT and, with
>> enough whining, will get the Parallel Parking test reduced or eliminated
>> in the next "restructuring" of the driver's test.
>
> That's what NPTI is working toward. Why should people have to learn an
>outdated skill like PP? Heck, the next thing you'll want is for people
>to want to know how to drive a standard transmission or to know how to
>use buggy whips. All you anachronistic types are just holding driving back.

Hey, I'll go one further than that. I think they should be tested in the
proper
procedures for changing a tyre on the highway under severe emergency
conditions.

>> I'm going to start a new organisation called PHISTS -- Parking Has
>> Important Status To Safety. We will encourage the use of Parallel
>> Parking by sponsoring awards programs for drivers who participate in
>> local parallel parking demonstration events. Attending 100 such events
>> will earn you your PHISTS Century Award. Other awards programs
>> will be announced in the future.
>>
>> As far as I'm concerned, you NPTI/NPPTA whiners can go fly a kite.
>> You will never achieve the status of us Parallel Parking Tested drivers.
>> We're better than you, and we can prove it! You couldn't park a Prius
>> on a football field!

> Oh yeah? Oh yeah? Oh yeah?

Izzat so??? Yeah, zat's so!!!

> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>President of NPTI
>
> Taking driving into the future

You mean, taking driving one step closer to extinction, Loser Putz.

73 de Larry, CDL-B
President, PHISTS (Parking Has Important Status To Safety)

2774. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 23:53:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030902195312.07346.00000380@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 76183

In article <%i75b.22673$Om1.15801@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>
>The ARRL board is in favor of retaining CW on HF.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Dan:

Does that also mean they favor retaining code testing for a General or
Extra class license? If so, how hard are they going to work to keep the
current code testing requirement in place?

If the ARRL truly supported code testing, then "Restructuring" would have
come out a whole lot differently, perhaps keeping a 12-WPM test for
Extra. That didn't happen, and it's because the ARRL wants code testing
dropped, for the sake of (hopefully) getting more people licensed and
becoming members. It is their never spoken, hidden agenda.

Supporting "CW" and supporting code testing are two separate and
entirely different things.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2775. Re: Good Heavens...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-02 23:53:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030902195313.07346.00000382@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 76181

In article <Xf75b.22671$Om1.5277@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>> >Not really. The discerning choose quality over quantity. Example: Who is
>more
>> >attractive, Demi Moore or Rosanne Barr?
>>
>> Demi Moore, to be sure. Rosanne who?
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>Rosanne Barr, Twit.......The hug and chalk twins.

OIC. I had forgotten who Rosanne Barr was. I never watched her show.
Don't even really know what it was about. I usually get her confused with
Rosie O'Donnell anyway. Same out-of-control, Kim-like attitude.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2776. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 00:08:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <nia5b.36687$Vx2.16273542@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76184

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030902195312.07346.00000379@mb-m26.aol.com...
> Hey, I'll go one further than that. I think they should be tested in the
> proper
> procedures for changing a tyre on the highway under severe emergency
> conditions.
>

You spent too much time in England. When my tire goes flat on the highway,
I call for help. It's too dangerous to do this on the side of the road,
alone, at night, in the rain (Lions and Tigers and Bears, Oh my). I
couldn't resist!

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2777. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 00:19:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030902201951.08626.00000389@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 76185

In article <Pine.LNX.4.56.0309020607120.4102@kd6lvw.ampr.org>, "D. Stussy"
<kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org> writes:

>On Mon, 1 Sep 2003, N2EY wrote:
>> "just paid for his license"?
>
>I certainly don't mean the $12 testing fee (by the ARRL teams, or the
>equvalent
>amount for teams under other VEC's).... Yes, some people have probably
>"bought" their licenses in the past....

I don't have reliable evidence of any such fraud by either FCC or oldstyle
volunteer examiners (no caps).. Doesn't mean it never happened, just that I've
never seen any.

There *was* a vanity call selling operation that got an FCC employee time in
the Federal pokey (see posts by K2ASP for verification). And many of us
consider what Bash did to have been a rules violation.

One scam that was going on back in FCC days were a few people taking tests for
others. FCC started asking for ID and taking signatures.

>There were some VE teams in this
>area busted about 8 years ago for doing exactly that (supposedly, an extra
cost
>$1k).

omigawd...

I occasionally see enforcement actions in the log where FCC calls people in for
a retest. Some do not show, some do show and fail, some show and pass.
>
>> >To me, the statement is more typical of some advanced class sourpuss who
>> >failed to take advantage of the transitional rule back in 2000 and obtain
>> >credit for the easier element 4B than the current element 4. Granted that
>> >was only for a 3.5 month window...
>>
>> Maybe. But I think current Element 4 is no harder than old Element 4B.
>
>I disagree. All the "hard" questions in the current Element 4 came from the
>Element 4A part of the former tests. The former Element 4B was much easier
>than 4A.

Well, we'll have to agree to disagree on that. But consider this: Old Element
4A was 50 questions and old 4B was 40. Each was graded separately, so if you
were even one short on the allegedly harder 4A, you could not even get to 4B.

New Element 4 is 50 questions from a combined pool. So if old 4A was "hard" and 4B was "easy", then combining the two and reducing the total questions from 90 to 50 effectively dilutes the test.

btw, I passed old 4A in 1968 as a 14 year old in the summer between 8th and 9th grades. Back before Bashbooks and question pools. How hard could it have been?
>
>> >What surprises me is this: There are still some people (the August 30
>> >session I did had two such people) who are coming in for their pre-87-tech
>> >to general no test upgrades, 3+ years after the rules change went into
>> >effect....
>>
>> I'm not surprised. Many hams I know do not follow the rules changes
>>anywhere
>> near as closely as some of us do. Look at restructuring - out of over
>>678,000
>> hams, FCC got 2200 or so comments.
>
>Are you in a "high population" area? I am: Southern California.

Me too: metro Philadelphia. Along the Northeast Corridor, sometimes called Boswash (Boston-to-Washington).

>News of
>rules changes gets around quickly over here... even among the clueless. I
>agree that there may be places (e.g. midwest, rural farming states) where
>knowledge of the changes has yet to permeate....
>
There are a lot of folks who simply haven't gotten the word, tho, or who don't care. How else to explain the relatively small decline in Advanceds?

>> Some folks are just finding out what the changes mean. And with 10 year
>> renewals, folks who don't move around have very little interaction with FCC
>> license procedures. The facts are often twisted in the retelling, too.
>>Look at
>> the misunderstanding about Element 1 and Technicians....
>> >
>> >> >Is this for real? Are there REALLY people with Advanced licenses who
>> >> >refuse to upgrade to Amateur Extra SIMPLY because they feel the need
>> >> >to prove they passed the 13 wpm exam?
>> >>
>> >> There are some misguided folks who think that, but in fact it's not a
>> >> proof of code speed any more than my Extra is proof of 20 per.
>> >
>> >When it is known that a medical waiver wasn't used, it is (for pre April
>19,
>> >2000 extras).
>>
>> But you need more info that just the fact that the person holds a certain
>> license class.
>
>I didn't say such wasn't true. All I said is that for some, such is KNOWN.

>
Sure. Point is, the same can be said for any license class. Just having an
Advanced proves only that the person did 5 wpm once-upon-a-time

>> Fun fact:
>>
>> From May 14 2000 to July 31, 2003, the number of Advanceds dropped from
>> 99,782 to 83,141. That includes upgrades to Extra and dropouts. Only a 17%
>> decline in over three years.
>
>You should probably go back another 29 days to have a good total: Many
>upgrades happened in that month you omit.

The reasons I chose May 14 were:

1) I had those numbers available
2) It is long enough after April 15 that any pre-restructuring applications had
gotten through the FCC "pipeline".

73 de Jim, N2EY

>

2778. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 00:33:01 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bj3d9n$mvo@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 76187

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:OO85b.22830$Om1.18838@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bj327t$se2$1@208.207.71.160...
> >
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> > > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > > news:bj0o54$69j@library1.airnews.net...
> > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:evP4b.18952$Om1.5551@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:biuf8u$pvs@library2.airnews.net...
> > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> message
> > > > > > news:RVw4b.12334$EW1.2877@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think so.
> Or
> > > > > perhaps
> > > > > > > you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower child?
> Now
> > > > thats
> > > > > a
> > > > > > > real probabliity.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Make love not War"
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "War is dangerous to all living things"
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > etc.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Do you have to practice at being an asshole, Dan, or does it
come
> that
> > > > > > naturally?
```

> > > > > >
> > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > You bring out the best in me Kim.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > That's a given, Dan. We all know you're an asshole. That wasn't
the
> > > > > question. The question is do you have to practice?
> > > > >
> > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Not any more Twit. I have acheived the highest level possible. Thank
> you
> > > for noticing.
> > >
> > > Yeah, Dan, you know how it is with her. I'm labelled a chicken$h*t
> because I choose not
> > to engage in a battle of wits with an unarmed female.
> >
> Yes...I noticed. But she sure has a lot of opinions. Rarely based on
fact,
> however.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

And I am sitting here so wowed with your intellect, Dan, that Bo Pilgrim is second on my list of mentors now.

You are filthy, wretched and disgusting. I have never (even in Larry Roll) seen the equivalent to the blabbering garbage that you put forth hear in this newsgroup and it's as simple as that. You're as predictable as Len Anderson, and that makes you pretty damned boring. You spew forth with comments that prove to me that your lacking in social skills and never cared about making up for it.

You have nothing but contempt for fellow human beings and it's because you seriously lack any form of humanity that would cause one to at least consider you worth listening to. You bring about your own sorry ass way of life and bring the rest of the world down for it, indeed dream it up in your little head that it's all "their fault."

Then, you run into a woman of high intellect and your stooped so low for desperation to be able to one upmanship her that you swing into extremely low gear with nothing but name calling. Proving the points I have just observed about you. You are as worthless as dust in a waterless environment. No one here, in my opinion holds a candle to how wretchedly low you really are.

Kim W5TIT

2779. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 00:34:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309021634.2937104a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76186

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<wTP4b.19097$Om1.18571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...

> I was at Kent State visiting my cousin the evening before the shootings.
> The national guard had blocked the streets and the kids were running up and
> down the street throwing rocks, etc.

I was there the day before delivering lunch to my Dad...He was
director of communications for KSUPD at the time. I was at Brown
Junior High when we all got sent home suddenly...I found out about the
shootings when I got home and turned on the scanner.

I later joined the KSU Amateur Radio Club (K8GRA)when I got my
Novice in October of 72...a perk of being the dependent of a campus
employee.

I had a chance to see the damage done by the students to the new
Tower Dormitories on the south side of the campus...It was so new that
some of the rooms still had new plastic on the matresses and it smell
of mothballs...Trashed beyond recognition in some places.

> I was discharged in 1968. I went back to Thailand as a civilian and
> returned stateside in December of 69. My original home is Alliance, Ohio.
> Thats about 34 miles South of Kent, Ohio.

Ravenna...been there? =) (Class of 74)

Score still stands at National Guard 4...KSU Zip.

73

Steve, K4YZ

2780. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 00:43:55 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bj3ddq$a9j@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 76188

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:rz95b.36684$Vx2.16264969@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030902061117.15462.00002660@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > FISTS #4360
> >
>
> Well just received my FISTS number and it is 10270. My OMs number is
10271.
> So you don't need to count them.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>
>

Hmmmm, the ASCII format document with just the list copied and pasted into a MS Word document shows to be 5,193 paragraphs, which would be members--presuming there is one line/paragraph per member. That list is labeled as "Active Members."

Kim W5TIT

2781. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 00:50:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <IVa5b.23150$Om1.22579@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76189

```
"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bj3d9n$mvo@library2.airnews.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:OO85b.22830$Om1.18838@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bj327t$se2$1@208.207.71.160...
> > >
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:bj0o54$69j@library1.airnews.net...
> > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
message
> > > > > news:evP4b.18952$Om1.5551@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:biuf8u$pvs@library2.airnews.net...
> > > > > > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
> > message
> > > > > > > news:RVw4b.12334$EW1.2877@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Oh, now ur claiming to be a 'flower child'? Don't think
so.
> > Or
> > > > > > perhaps
> > > > > > > > you came in after things ended, eh? A wannabee flower
child?
> > Now
> > > > > thats
> > > > > > a
> > > > > > > real probabliity.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Make love not War"
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "War is dangerous to all living things"
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > etc.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
```

> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Do you have to practice at being an asshole, Dan, or does it
> come
> > that
> > > > > > > > naturally?
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > You bring out the best in me Kim.
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > That's a given, Dan. We all know you're an asshole. That wasn't
> the
> > > > > > > question. The question is do you have to practice?
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Not any more Twit. I have acheived the highest level possible.
Thank
> > you
> > > > > for noticing.
> > > >
> > > Yeah, Dan, you know how it is with her. I'm labelled a chicken$h*t
> > because I choose not
> > > to engage in a battle of wits with an unarmed female.
> > >
> > Yes...I noticed. But she sure has a lot of opinions. Rarely based on
> fact,
> > however.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> And I am sitting here so wowed with your intellect, Dan, that Bo Pilgrim
is
> second on my list of mentors now.
>
> You are filthy, wretched and disgusting. I have never (even in Larry
Roll)
> seen the equivalent to the blabbering garbage that you put forth hear in
> this newsgroup and it's as simple as that. You're as predictable as Len
> Anderson, and that makes you pretty damned boring. You spew forth with
> comments that prove to me that your lacking in social skills and never

cared
> about making up for it.
>
> You have nothing but contempt for fellow human beings and it's because you
> seriously lack any form of humanity that would cause one to at least
> consider you worth listening to. You bring about your own sorry ass way
of
> life and bring the rest of the world down for it, indeed dream it up in
your
> little head that it's all "their fault."
>
> Then, you run into a woman of high intellect and your stooped so low for
> desperation to be able to one upmanship her that you swing into extremely
> low gear with nothing but name calling. Proving the points I have just
> observed about you. You are as worthless as dust in a waterless
> environment. No one here, in my opinion holds a candle to how wretchedly
> low you really are.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

At least I did not choose a 'vanity call' such as W4DIK. or equivilant.

Get over it TWIT. You have chosen to place yourself in the situation you
are in. Don't expect others to appreciate it.

Get a life Twit.

Dan/W4NTI

2782. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 00:51:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F553B5C.6080008@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76190

Brian Kelly wrote:
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj17rmran0@208.206.142.111>...
>
>>Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bivcpf$cb0s1$20@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
>>>
>>>>I have seen AOL recently and Win XP and there is becoming a striking
>>>>similarity to the two.......
>>>
>>>Perfect combination, XP is another one which can't be fixed.
>>
>> Worse, Microshaft doesn't *want* it fixed. If they closed all the holes how would they
ever check out your
>>computer when you sign onto their update website?
>
>
> Hell will have to freeze tight before I download ANYTHING out of the
> Microsloth website. Period.

Remember to block them also. On the web, we can "visit" websites we
never go to. Block all the ports you aren't using, and use a wall like
ZoneAlarm AND a proxy server.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2783. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 00:54:23 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <3Za5b.23164$Om1.7097@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76191

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bj39n9$lip@library2.airnews.net...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309020320.247a2105@posting.google.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<wTP4b.19097$Om1.18571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > news:f45722ac.0309011332.6c782d2f@posting.google.com...
> > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > news:<20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > > >
> > > > > Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock
> never
> > > actually
> > > > > got there due to traffic snarls.
> > > >
> > > > I especially like the ones who claimed they were both at Woodstock
and
> > > > in Vietnam. They probably saw both movies.
> > > >
> > > > > The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the
moon.
> > > That's
> > > > > what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
> > > >
> > > > I was 11. I remember selling flower seeds door to door to earn a
West
> > > > Ben fishing pole. And my Dad getting orders to Thailand.
> > > >
> > > > So what has all this do do with code?
> > >
> > > My my Brian....how is it so hard for you to figure a person could be a
> > > veteran of VN and be at Kent State also?
> >
> > Do you confuse Kent State and Woodstock often?
> >
> > > You really must be a dumb ass.
> >
> > Of course it's possible.
> >
> > > I was at Kent State visiting my cousin the evening before the
shootings.
> > > The national guard had blocked the streets and the kids were running
up

> and
> > > down the street throwing rocks, etc.
> > >
> > > I had my military ID checked by the Guard on my way out of town. The
> next
> > > day the shootings occured. (I was in-active reserve status).
> >
> > Reserves?
> >
> > > I was discharged in 1968. I went back to Thailand as a civilian
> >
> > Back to Thailand? When were you there the 1st time? And are you
> > somehow implying that Thailand and Vietnam are the same place?
> >
> > and
> > > returned stateside in December of 69. My original home is Alliance,
> Ohio.
> > > Thats about 34 miles South of Kent, Ohio.
> >
> > Are you related to Bruce Bunion/WA8ULX?
> >
> > > You can now wipe the slobber off your chin.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > You completely forgot the part about you being at Woodstock and
> > Vietnam.
> >
> > And the part about what this has to do with the code.
>
> Some good guys and friends of mine, ex-Navy Seals have taught and drilled
it
> into me that if someone's bragging, there's some bagging
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Tell me TWIT..how is saying where I was bragging? You really are a TWIT
ain't ya?

Dan/W4NTI

2784. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 00:58:28 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <U0b5b.23183$Om1.16712@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76192

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0309021634.2937104a@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<wTP4b.19097$Om1.18571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
> > I was at Kent State visiting my cousin the evening before the shootings.
> > The national guard had blocked the streets and the kids were running up
and
> > down the street throwing rocks, etc.
>
> I was there the day before delivering lunch to my Dad...He was
> director of communications for KSUPD at the time. I was at Brown
> Junior High when we all got sent home suddenly...I found out about the
> shootings when I got home and turned on the scanner.
>
> I later joined the KSU Amateur Radio Club (K8GRA)when I got my
> Novice in October of 72...a perk of being the dependent of a campus
> employee.
>
> I had a chance to see the damage done by the students to the new
> Tower Dormitories on the south side of the campus...It was so new that
> some of the rooms still had new plastic on the matresses and it smell
> of mothballs...Trashed beyond recognition in some places.
>
> > I was discharged in 1968. I went back to Thailand as a civilian and
> > returned stateside in December of 69. My original home is Alliance,
Ohio.
> > Thats about 34 miles South of Kent, Ohio.
>
> Ravenna...been there? =) (Class of 74)
>
> Score still stands at National Guard 4...KSU Zip.
>
> 73
>

Sure been to Ravenna. You know this Kent thing was really a bad deal. I
was a vet of the VN bullshit, but I really had a lot in common with the
'kids'.

When I left out of the Kent area that evening...I told the guard that this
BS about Nixon invading Cambodia was BS. I was in Cambodia re-supplying US
troops in 67. And in Laos too. He was rather shocked. Oh well. Yes
indeed the US Government lied.

Dan/W4NTI

> Steve, K4YZ

2785. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 01:14:52 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bj3f7q$sqa@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 76193

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030901223918.00545.00000356@mb-m02.aol.com...
> In article <bivkrr$5oi@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
> writes:
>
> (lotta snippage)
>
> >> But you're still planting flowers, and liking jewelry. Same difference.
> > >
> > >Yeah, but I like to think that I'm being a bit of a renegade. Actually,
I
> > >don't like things all the same. Remember the good 'ol "Neighborhood
> > >Association" debates that have come and gone here? I'm against them, for
> > >whatever purpose; and would be so very, very depressed if I ever have to
> > >live "in" one.
> >
> > Same here. But the reason those associations exist is fear - fear that
folks
> > won't keep up their properties in a reasonable manner if there is no
mechanism
> > to force them.
> >

Paranoia will destroy ya. Fear is a strong emotion. I'm not so attached to
my property that I'd let fear determine where I live and worry about what
someone else does on theirs. But, I also don't buy my place for
investment--so to speak. I bought my place (with my hubby of course) to
stay. This is the first land and home I've had, and no doubt will be the
last. I plant roots...spent too much time being a Navy brat.

> >
> > >I never got into the beatniky-hippie kind of
> > >lingo. Heck, I don't think I could even be classified as a true
hippie--I
> > >am just a couple of years too late fer it.
> >
> > So am I.
> >

Most people like to romanticize about that period in this country's history.
I don't know how it was here in the Dallas TX area--most people I've talked
to who were around my age and a little older were too busy going to drive-in
movies, necking, getting pregnant and getting married. Not very many
politically motivated debates down here, 'least not the way we used to have
'em at the drop of a hat up there!

But, what little we could do in our little town up north to protest the war, we did. We had a black arm-band day at high school; we had our graffiti on our bookcovers, etc. Not much to do in a little town. I don't remember, though, many folks who were "for" the war--other than our parents. Most of the guys I knew got drafted; most of the gals I knew were saying buy to their guys most of the time. And, the country was in upheaval. I'd not like to go back to those days at all. It was NOT a peaceful time in our history.

The Yippies (now the Yuppies and everyone gets them confused as old hippies; they are not, they were Yippies) dragged the whole thing into violent protests. A true hippie would no more pick up a rock or spit at a cop than the man in the moon. The Yippies were extremists. Now, they're a bunch of pussy sell-outs who bought lock, stock, and barrel into the system they used to say they "hated."

> >
> >Some folks can be no other way.
>
> Naw, I think Dan can be a real up guy most of the time. Cool dude.
> >

I'd thrive at the opportunity to drive past him in a time of need, and I would drive right on by. People like him aren't worth my time, good or bad time at that.

>
> >> Woodstock? Let's see, that was late summer 1969, when Kim was 15 if
memory
> >> serves. I don't think a responsible parent would let their 15-year-old
go
> >> to such a "happening".
> >
> >Yep, 14 though.
>
> All the more reason.
>
> >And, you're right. I had friends whose parents were much
> >more lenient than mine who went.
>
> I'd call it "irresponsible" rather than "lenient".
>

Naw, most of us were pretty grown up in our town. They'd been just as well going at 18 as 14-15. And they were. Most of them had a great time. Then, later, that concert happened up in...where was it--the race track (?) up in NY...OH YEAH, Glen something? Is that it? Well, anyway, by then I had my kids and wouldn't have gone for the best of times.

>
> A lot of us were mad that the clueless promoters had ruined the whole
festival
> scene by their incompetence. Even 30 years later there were problems doing

> another one.
>
> Give me the Philadelphia Folk Festival any day. Well managed, excellent
acts,
> good sound and video, well behaved crowd and it's been held every year
since
> long before that place in NY. People take their kids and grandkids. No
visible
> booze or drugs.
> >

I have a cousin in music that I bet you've seen if you went there. For the sake of her sanity, I'll private email you on that, if you'd like. I'm sure there's some jerk in here that would be incessant toward her if they knew who she was.

> >
> >I think there was more than talk. Did Yeager/Yager/Yeger (however his
name
> >is spelled) think there was loads to be had in a suit and begin the
process
> >until it was explained to him the debaucle of the whole thing?
>
> Max Yasgur, now dead, I think. I'm sure he got a piece of the pie. Point
was,
> they made a mint from the whole "counterculture" aspect of it.
> >

Yeah, he did, as I recall. And, they did too.

>
> >Yeah, Summer 1970 saw the tragedy at Kent State...the beginning of the
end.
>
> End of what? Looking back, I'm amazed only four died in the Kent State
mess.
> Days of near-riot conditions, kids throwing rocks and teargas canisters
back at
> National Guardsmen (who were untrained in riot control)? KS was not a
> nonviolent demonstration.
> >

I think that was when "we" as a counter-culture began realizing that we and "they" had limits and that we had to start growing up with our approach to democracy. The unfortunate thing that happened out of the 60's is that on all campuses today, one must have a "stamp of approval" to organize and post things on the wall. While I'd not like to see the mob mentality as it was, it's a pity that our youth aren't exposed to true, true democracy in action, which, in my opinion, does involve activism. I applaud the TX Democrats who wouldn't give in to the pressures of an immature jerk here, who is called the Governor of this state.

>
> >By the way, I'd have guessed you were an old hippie, Jim.
>
> Not me. I could never afford it.
>

Wow, wonder what part you're speaking of. We all lived with our holey jeans, drove clunkers for cars, partied in fields, etc. LOL Nothing about afording anything with these guys. Let's see, our "swell" of hippies was aged from about 12 to 23-4. We lived in a small town, so big brothers and sisters always had little brothers and sisters with them; and every darned one of us was friends--I do miss that. Heck, my little guy--first born--was at more field parties as a baby than he's ever been to the rest of his life! First day out of the hospital we landed at a celebration near Hedges Lake, in a great big field to welcome Fall and have our last bash before Winter. Oct. 20, 1974. Guess what else we were just getting the chance to celebrate!?

>
> I went to engineering school, remember? I
> always thought that to build a better world, one had to know how to build
> things in the first place. So I learned how to do electrical engineering.
And
> I'm still at it.
>

Well, we had guys who went out of High School into Physics, Liberal Arts, and other Sciences. We loved for them to come home and tell us the tales of college life. Heh heh, my biggest kick back then was seeing Alice Cooper at a Hall on the campus of Plattsburgh, NY.

>
> There's no substitute for actually knowing how to do things, and doing
them.
> Remember the movies "The Magnificent Seven" (actually a remake of "The
Seven
> Samurai"? The farmers (productive people) does not need the bandits
(moochers).
> But the bandits sure need the farmers!
>
> Some good things came out of those times. Those are the things to
remember.
>
> >At least there's still a few left upholding the original ideals.
>
> Yeah, baby!
>
> Actually, you might be surprised at how simple my "ideals" really are.
>
> >I gave up.
>
> Not me.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I don't think I'd be surprised at your ideals at all, Jim. It takes an awful lot to surprise me these days...

Kim W5TIT

2786. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 01:18:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F5541C3.3040403@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76194

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> In article <3F54EAD8.7060602@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>>Mike:
>>>
>>>You and your NPTI are just like all the other NPPTA (No Parallel Parking
>>>Test Agenda) whiners. You just want to dumb-down the driving test so
>>>that any dummy who is fed up with riding his bicycle can just knock off
>>>a simple, multiple-guess written test, then get into a Buick and hit the
>>>road just like us Real Drivers(tm).
>>
>> We have never said anything like that! We support the rest of the
>>testing procedures. Besides, we must be inclusive, and not turn
>>potential drivers away because of basic skills.
>
>
> Mike:
>
> Without basic skills like PP, drivers will become mere appliance operators,
> totally dependent on the technology in their cars to do their parking for them,
> rather than being able to do it themselves under severe, emergency
> conditions. PP is a very practical, effective, efficient, and universal way
> to park an automobile, but we can't make use of this technique unless
> drivers know how to do it. Only a testing requirement will give them the
> incentive they need to learn.

Wrong, you are wrong! And your trying to repress my beliefs is only a
symptom of the great perfidy of the PHISTS conspiracy.

Years ago, I operated vehicles 24/7. I have great experience in
vehicles, more so than the mighty parkmen, the Gods of driving, who
would force theor will on the rest of us! ;^) ;^) ;^)

>
>>>I think that not only should Parallel Parking be a requirement on the road
>>>test for a driver's license, but Parallel Parking Proficiency should be
>>>demonstrated at a rate of at least 12 Parallel Parkings per hour (pph).
>>>After all, if you cannot Parallel Park time after time, in a variety of
>>
>>driving
>>
>>>conditions, then you cannot expect to be able to operate a motor vehicle
>>>successfully in the typical urban driving environment.
>>

>> Ha! you and your ilk are always trying to keep people off the roads.
>>Hazing ritual is all this is.
>
>
> Ah, stick it in your ear, you NPTI loser! You're just taking driving
> One Step Closer To Extinction. Next thing you're going to do is paint
> a big set of boobs on your car, so everyone will be looking at them,
> instead of noticing the fact that you're double parked in a yellow zone!
> Anyway, I had to do it, so everyone should!

HAH! ;^) What I do with my car is my own business!

>
>>>I hold a Class B Commercial Driver's License, and to pass my road test,
>>>I had to parallel park a 30-foot long bus. I passed my test on the first
>>>attempt, with a perfect score. Any driver who can't park at least as well
>>>as I can is nothing more than a lazy, unmotivated, dumbed-down whiner
>>>who wants the world handed over to him or her on a silver platter, since
>>>all they have to do is parallel park a Dodge Neon or something similar.
>>>Of course, now that Toyota has eliminated the need for most drivers to
>>>parallel park, they'll probably be sending PRM's to the DOT and, with
>>>enough whining, will get the Parallel Parking test reduced or eliminated
>>>in the next "restructuring" of the driver's test.
>>
>> That's what NPTI is working toward. Why should people have to learn an
>>outdated skill like PP? Heck, the next thing you'll want is for people
>>to want to know how to drive a standard transmission or to know how to
>>use buggy whips. All you anachronistic types are just holding driving back.
>
>
> Hey, I'll go one further than that. I think they should be tested in the
> proper
> procedures for changing a tyre on the highway under severe emergency
> conditions.
>
>
>>>I'm going to start a new organisation called PHISTS -- Parking Has
>>>Important Status To Safety. We will encourage the use of Parallel
>>>Parking by sponsoring awards programs for drivers who participate in
>>>local parallel parking demonstration events. Attending 100 such events
>>>will earn you your PHISTS Century Award. Other awards programs
>>>will be announced in the future.
>>>
>>>As far as I'm concerned, you NPTI/NPPTA whiners can go fly a kite.
>>>You will never achieve the status of us Parallel Parking Tested drivers.
>>>We're better than you, and we can prove it! You couldn't park a Prius
>>>on a football field!
>>
>
>> Oh yeah? Oh yeah? Oh yeah?
>

>
> Izzat so??? Yeah, zat's so!!!
>
>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>President of NPTI
>>
>> Taking driving into the future
>
>
> You mean, taking driving one step closer to extinction, Loser Putz.

Sure, sure, Larragh. The mighty Parkman runs out of arguments, so
starts the insults! ;^) ;^) ;^) ;^)

> 73 de Larry, CDL-B
> President, PHISTS (Parking Has Important Status To Safety)

- Mike KB3EIA -

President, NPTI

Taking Driving into the future

2787. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 01:23:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F5542BE.2040901@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76195

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
>
>>I'm glad to see that a good time is being had
>>by all. Have a safe and happy Labour Day week
>>end, Dwight!
>
>
>
> Are you kidding? I busted my tail this last weekend. In addition to moving
> to a new apartment (and cleaning the old one), I sold an old computer, spent
> days shopping for a new computer, took my wife's car to the shop (had to get
> it running well enough to do that), and more. At this point, I darn glad
> this last weekend is over. I still have a ton to do, but it can be spaced
> out enough to get a break occasionally.

I know what you mean. I have such a huge list of to-dos during the
summer that I have come to hate summer and most of the holidays.

In addition, I have an Alaska body thermostat. So I've learned to love
the winter.

2788. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 01:51:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309021751.8b3767c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76196

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<3Y65b.22651$Om1.9279@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309020320.247a2105@posting.google.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<wTP4b.19097$Om1.18571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > news:f45722ac.0309011332.6c782d2f@posting.google.com...
> > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > > >
> > > > > Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock
> never
> actually
> > > > > got there due to traffic snarls.
> > > >
> > > > I especially like the ones who claimed they were both at Woodstock and
> > > > in Vietnam. They probably saw both movies.
> > > >
> > > > > The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the moon.
> That's
> > > > > what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
> > > >
> > > > I was 11. I remember selling flower seeds door to door to earn a West
> > > > Ben fishing pole. And my Dad getting orders to Thailand.
> > > >
> > > > So what has all this do do with code?
> > >
> > > My my Brian....how is it so hard for you to figure a person could be a
> > > veteran of VN and be at Kent State also?
> >
> > Do you confuse Kent State and Woodstock often?
> >
> > > You really must be a dumb ass.
> >
> > Of course it's possible.
> >
> > > I was at Kent State visiting my cousin the evening before the shootings.
> > > The national guard had blocked the streets and the kids were running up
> and
> > > down the street throwing rocks, etc.
> > >
> > > I had my military ID checked by the Guard on my way out of town. The
> next

> > > day the shootings occured. (I was in-active reserve status).
> >
> > Reserves?
> >
> > > I was discharged in 1968. I went back to Thailand as a civilian
> >
> > Back to Thailand? When were you there the 1st time? And are you
> > somehow implying that Thailand and Vietnam are the same place?
> >
> > and
> > > returned stateside in December of 69. My original home is Alliance,
> Ohio.
> > > Thats about 34 miles South of Kent, Ohio.
> >
> > Are you related to Bruce Bunion/WA8ULX?
> >
> > > You can now wipe the slobber off your chin.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > You completely forgot the part about you being at Woodstock and
> > Vietnam.
> >
> > And the part about what this has to do with the code.
>
> I changed the subject header, because it has nothing to do with the 'code'.

And you picked up on my comment about Woodstock and Vietnam. But you
commented about Vietnam, Thailand and Kent State.

> You are the one that is confused Brian. I never said a thing about
> Woodstock and Vietnam and Thailand.

You said something about Vietnam, Kent State, and Thailand. For
example, here are your words about Vietnam and Kent State:

```
------------------------------
My my Brian....how is it so hard for you to figure a person could be a
veteran of VN and be at Kent State also?
------------------------------
```

So the only confusion is yours. I hadn't commented on Vietnam AND
Kent State.

And here are your words about Thailand:

```
------------------------------
I went back to Thailand as a civilian
------------------------------
```

The only problem is that the topic was Vietnam and Woodstock.

> I said I was discharged in 1968.

So you did.

> And yes I was in Thailand several times
> during that period.

Again, what has this to do with you being in Vietnam?

> I was also in Vietnam during that period.

And there it is. After all the obfuscation about being in Thailand,
you finally come clean.

In fact,
> just to make you happy here is a list of countries I was in from November
> 1965 to April of 1968.
>
> Okinawa
> Japan
> Phillipines
> Taiwan
> Thailand
> Vietnam

Phillipines, huh?

> All of which were TDY (Temporary Duty) from Okinawa.

I'm familiar with the term.

> In April of 1967 I went for a full tour to Vietnam, leaving in April of
> 1968. Went stateside for 3 months and was discharged in July of 1968. Was
> placed on inactive reserve status for two more years in order to complete my
> 6 year military commitment.

Fascinating.

> There is more, but this is pertenant to the discussion.

No doubt.

> After returning stateside and dropping by to see my mother I bought a 1 way
> ticket to Bangkok Thailand. Where I lived in between working in South
> Vietnam as a civilian contractor. I returned stateside December of 1969.
>
> Any questions Brian?

Did you ever make it to Woodstock?

2789. Re: Vietnam and Kent State, the same movie.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 01:52:49 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309021752.6c803ddd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76197

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<dT85b.22836$Om1.11709@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:3Y65b.22651$Om1.9279@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0309020320.247a2105@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<wTP4b.19097$Om1.18571@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:f45722ac.0309011332.6c782d2f@posting.google.com...
> > > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<20030901082514.15462.00002629@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > > > >
> > > > > > Heck, from all accounts most of those who set out for Woodstock
> never
> actually
> > > > > > got there due to traffic snarls.
> > > > >
> > > > > I especially like the ones who claimed they were both at Woodstock
> and
> > > > > in Vietnam. They probably saw both movies.
> > > > >
> > > > > > The summer of 1969 was when human beings first set foot on the
> moon.
> That's
> > > > > > what I think of first when that time is mentioned.
> > > > >
> > > > > I was 11. I remember selling flower seeds door to door to earn a
> West
> > > > > Ben fishing pole. And my Dad getting orders to Thailand.
> > > > >
> > > > > So what has all this do do with code?
> > > >
> > > My my Brian....how is it so hard for you to figure a person could be a
> > > veteran of VN and be at Kent State also?
> > >
> > Do you confuse Kent State and Woodstock often?
> > >
> > > You really must be a dumb ass.
> > >
> > Of course it's possible.
> > >
> > > I was at Kent State visiting my cousin the evening before the

> shootings.
> > > > The national guard had blocked the streets and the kids were running
> up
> and
> > > > down the street throwing rocks, etc.
> > > >
> > > > I had my military ID checked by the Guard on my way out of town. The
> next
> > > > day the shootings occured. (I was in-active reserve status).
> > >
> > > Reserves?
> > >
> > > > I was discharged in 1968. I went back to Thailand as a civilian
> > >
> > > Back to Thailand? When were you there the 1st time? And are you
> > > somehow implying that Thailand and Vietnam are the same place?
> > >
> > > and
> > > > returned stateside in December of 69. My original home is Alliance,
> Ohio.
> > > > Thats about 34 miles South of Kent, Ohio.
> > >
> > > Are you related to Bruce Bunion/WA8ULX?
> > >
> > > > You can now wipe the slobber off your chin.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > > You completely forgot the part about you being at Woodstock and
> > > Vietnam.
> > >
> > > And the part about what this has to do with the code.
> >
> > I changed the subject header, because it has nothing to do with the
> 'code'.
> >
> > You are the one that is confused Brian. I never said a thing about
> > Woodstock and Vietnam and Thailand.
> >
> > I said I was discharged in 1968. And yes I was in Thailand several times
> > during that period. I was also in Vietnam during that period. In fact,
> > just to make you happy here is a list of countries I was in from November
> > 1965 to April of 1968.
> >
> > Okinawa
> > Japan
> > Phillipines
> > Taiwan
> > Thailand
> > Vietnam

> >
> > All of which were TDY (Temporary Duty) from Okinawa.
> >
> > In April of 1967 I went for a full tour to Vietnam, leaving in April of
> > 1968. Went stateside for 3 months and was discharged in July of 1968.
> Was
> > placed on inactive reserve status for two more years in order to complete
> my
> > 6 year military commitment.
> >
> > There is more, but this is pertenant to the discussion.
> >
> > After returning stateside and dropping by to see my mother I bought a 1
> way
> > ticket to Bangkok Thailand. Where I lived in between working in South
> > Vietnam as a civilian contractor. I returned stateside December of 1969.
> >
> > Any questions Brian?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> >
>
> Addendum;
>
> I forgot to add Cambodia and Laos.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

No Burma, Malaysia, or Australia?

2790. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 02:06:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309021806.300e94e4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76198

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F54E7C6.6040802@psu.edu>...
> Brian wrote:
> > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F54A687.4010407@psu.edu>...
> >
> >>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
>
> <some snippage>
>
>
> >>>We present more rational, compelling arguments, of course.
> >>
> >>
> >>Carl, with all due respect, "rational and compelling arguments" are in
> >>the head of the beholder.
> >
> >
> > Then the words "rational" and "irrational" have no meaning.
>
> 1. Everyone here thinks they are being rational, unless they are being
> purposefully non-rational. (say Bruce for example, who is having fun
> baiting people - and even in his case, take note that when he is
> starting to be serious his spelling and grammar become correct)

Bruce is an stupendous and amazing man.

> 2. You really aren't that far from the truth.

Oh, geez.

> 3. Insane people are exempt from all this. But there really aren't that
> many insane people.

Not even Hinkley?

> My rationale is that what is or isn't rational is based on the starting
> assumption or world view.

Always is.

> If your basic assumption is that things should be simplified or to be
> made easier, then you would agree with a proposal such as the NCI
> proposal before the FCC. It is rational and compelling from that viewpoint.

My basic assumption is there are some things the government should be
doing and there are some things that the government shouldn't be
doing.

We could start with the Constitution of the United States and its Articles, and try to find the rationale for a welfare state.

Brian

2791. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 02:10:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309021810.62a13207@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76199

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<0c75b.22667$Om1.15237@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309020310.794e075a@posting.google.com...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:<%BU4b.270$vj4.43753@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:MIQ4b.19457$Om1.10718@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:f45722ac.0309011251.3ada241b@posting.google.com...
> > > > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:<biuq0n$2rg$0@208.206.142.103>...
> > > > > > It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Enjoy!
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > I thought that FISTS sold themselves as a non-political club?
> > > >
> > > > How is sending in a petition a political act? Does that mean when NCI
> sent
> > > > in a petition it was political? Or perhaps they were simply following
> > > > proceedures.
> > >
> > > Of course participating in the regulatory process is a "political"
> thing.
> > >
> > > And yes, FIST's position in the past (and IIRC, their charter) was
> > > that they were *not* a politically-oriented group ... just a group that
> > > was supposed to foster the *use* of Morse.
> >
> > Right. So where NCI is purposely a politically-oriented group, and
> > behaves accordingly, FISTS is specifically a non-political group who
> > is now behaving politically.
> >
> > Why don't we hear any whining about how FISTS has broken with their
> > charter from the people that are always whining about NCI?
> >
> > Usual PCTA double-standard?
```

>
> Not only a dumb ass, but a knee jerk bleeding heart liberal to boot.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Yep, usual double standard.

2792. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 02:14:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309021814.5a34d00b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76200

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<Xa75b.22665$Om1.19738@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...

> I think total ellimination is equivilant to negotiations with a terrorist
> organization (NCI).
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Talk about a dumb ass. He combines Bruce's stupidity with reckless statements.

2793. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 02:15:26 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <29c5b.158749$2x.44943@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 76251

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in
news:20030901213158.20041.00000277@mb-m28.aol.com:

> ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye. After reading Fists
> proposal I have decided to send your $39.00 to them instead of you
> fools. It appears Fist is the only real Group out there that really
> cares.
>

The ARRL plan is to purge all the good hams from the organization. You're just another one. With fewer good hams in the membership there will be less opposition to the agenda of supporting and pushing policy to further dumb down the Amateur Radio service. Hiram Maxim is turning over in his grave.

Why is there never a wouff Hong around when you really need one?
KB7ADL

2794. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 02:16:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309021816.79a76b3d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76252

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<%i75b.22673$Om1.15801@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030901213158.20041.00000277@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye. After reading Fists proposal
> I
> > have decided to send your $39.00 to them instead of you fools. It appears
> Fist
> > is the only real Group out there that really cares.
>
> The ARRL board is in favor of retaining CW on HF.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Duh! I guess Bruce is the only one who didn't know that.

2795. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 02:19:59 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030902221959.17961.00000547@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 76253

>Talk about a dumb ass. He combines Bruce's stupidity with reckless
>statements.
>

Dumb Ass is someone who lets NCI dictate to them what they can and cant say

2796. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 02:21:53 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030902222153.17961.00000548@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 76256

> I guess Bruce is the only one who didn't know that.
>
>

Not hardly the ARRL is just giving Lip Service.

2797. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 02:22:25 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <Bfc5b.257454$Oz4.67452@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 76254

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20030902191946.00545.00000362@mb-m02.aol.com:

> As of September 1, 2003:
>
> Novice - 33,156 (decrease of 16,173)
> Technician - 257,830 (increase of 52,436)
> Technician Plus - 65,928 (decrease of 62,932)
> General - 141,402 (increase of 28,725)
> Advanced - 82,931 (decrease of 16,851)
> Extra - 104,512 (increase of 25,762)
> Total - 685,759 (increase of 10,967)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Some of those aren't REAL Generals, or Extra's. The number of true Generals and Extra's is actually less than the numbers shown.

Why is there never a Wouff Hong around when you really need one?
KB7ADL

2798. Re: Good Heavens...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 02:22:32 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309021822.3d3a0c1f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76255

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<nh75b.22672$Om1.1110@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309020854.147691a3@posting.google.com...
> > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> news:<20030902002918.12300.00000219@mb-m20.aol.com>...
> > > In article <20030901111913.12631.00000692@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY)
> > > writes:
> > >
> > > >Not really. The discerning choose quality over quantity. Example: Who
> is more
> > > >attractive, Demi Moore or Rosanne Barr?
> > >
> > > Demi Moore, to be sure. Rosanne who?
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> > Too bad he didn't say "Arquette.)
>
> This may come as a real surprise to you Brian.

Actually, no. I'm the one that brought up Roseanne Arquette. I think
she could give Demi a good run.

But most of us don't respond
> as you do.

To each his own. Maybe you go for Roseanne Arquette's brother?

> Forgetting to put brain in gear, before opening mouth.

You're just pissed about confusing the Kent State shootings and
Woodstock. Hey, anyone could have made that mistake.

2799. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 03:01:51 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93EAEA2C18EF2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 76262

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030902061117.15462.00002659@mb-m06.aol.com:

> In article <TsU4b.267$vj4.43211@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>news:3F53CBDD.2040704@adelphia.net...
>>>
>>> How do you justify a trained group of communicators that are versed
>>> in a mode that is as useful and needed as CW is? There isn't an
>>> emergency right now.
>>
>>It's especially hard when the emergency management agencies have
>>no use for a cadre of CW ops ... it's not the type of communications
>>that they want or need.
>
> KT4ST has shown that to be untrue. However, with all due respect, Carl,
> I don't think you'd be the most effective salesman for the mode...
>>
>>Just as the CW NTS nets are anachronisms ...
>>
> What about SSB NTS nets? Are they anachronisms?
>

Yes! NTS is an anachronism, period. Quaint, perhaps charming, but an
anachronism. Sorry.

> A CW NTS net can handle more traffic in less time using less spectrum
> than an SSB NTS net. Been there, done that.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

2800. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 03:03:38 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030902230338.24534.00000376@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 76263

From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" vlfiscus@mcn.net

>With fewer good hams in the membership there will be
>less opposition to the agenda of supporting and pushing policy to further
>dumb down the Amateur Radio service.

How about those Hams that have a narrow focus on Morse code, HF, contesting,
and antennas at the exclusion of other activities.* Furthermore, these same
Hams have little interest in the technical aspect of amateur radio. Now, THATs
dumbing down the amateur radio service.

---
*For example, the person that leaves ARRL (which supports a wide range of
activities) and joins FISTs (which has a narrow focus of activities).

2801. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 03:07:56 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F555B59.70906@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76264

Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL wrote:
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in news:20030902191946.00545.00000362@mb-
> m02.aol.com:
>
>
>>As of September 1, 2003:
>>
>>Novice - 33,156 (decrease of 16,173)
>>Technician - 257,830 (increase of 52,436)
>>Technician Plus - 65,928 (decrease of 62,932)
>>General - 141,402 (increase of 28,725)
>>Advanced - 82,931 (decrease of 16,851)
>>Extra - 104,512 (increase of 25,762)
>>Total - 685,759 (increase of 10,967)
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>
> Some of those aren't REAL Generals, or Extra's. The number of true
> Generals and Extra's is actually less than the numbers shown.

What's a real General or Extra, Vince?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2802. Re: Going under the knife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 03:12:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F555C73.9060000@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76265

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> To all my friends, combatants, debaters and lurkers here in r.r.a.p,
>
> I will be going under the knife this Tuesday for surgery on my lower back
> and won't be back for about a week or so. I am quiet sure that I am not
> going to feel like being in the upright position for the next week (or doing
> much of anything for that matter) , so everyone have a great week and
> probably next week I will have a ton of catching up to do.

Yikes! I'm looking forward to seeing you here again real soon, Ryan.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2803. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 03:25:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030902232544.23450.00000232@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76266

>*For example, the person that leaves ARRL (which supports a wide range of
>activities) and joins FISTs (which has a narrow focus of activities).
>

My interest are varied, but ARRL is doing a lousy job of trying to stop this Dumbing Down. My only reason for joining Fists is they have the guts to tell it like its.

2804. Re: OT: Trojan Help

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 05:14:07 UTC
From: Gregg <nospam@unknown.org>
Message-ID: <zMe5b.64624$ho5.1186509@news2.telusplanet.net>
Source record: 76269
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Behold, Scott Schrader signaled from keyed 4-1000A filament:

> I, alas, have both. SuSE has no troubles, except for a cockpit error
> now and then. BugMagnet 98SE has multiple, but some sites I need
> require bloatware that only BugMagnet has. BugMagnet doesn't need
> cockpit errors, the factory did that for me :(

Gah! I hear ya.

Dumb me bought an HP 3400C scanner and a USRobotics WinModem (that didn't
say WinModem on the box) - both have chipsets as of yet unsupported by
*nix.

--
Gregg
Perhaps it's useful, even if it can't be SPICE'd
Visit the GeeK Zone - http://geek.scorpiorising.ca

2805. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 05:45:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB7AF8C9.24FD4%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 76270

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:

> Yup. And you're the cause of most of it.

Well, you could always take a flying leap off a nearby tall building to end the boredom. Just don't damage anything important, like a passing pedestrian below. ;)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2806. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 05:50:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB7AFA0A.24FD6%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 76271

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:

> Dwight you've obviously forever been devoid
> of a clue, and if this statement doesn't prove
> it nothing ever could. But it's far beyond
> obvious anyway.

Well, Dick, since you're such an expert, why don't you explain what you think I've missed? The only clue I get from the above is that you're again speaking of things you have no idea about.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2807. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 06:02:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB7AFCAF.24FD8%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 76272

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> I know what you mean. I have such a huge list
> of to-dos during the summer that I have come
> to hate summer and most of the holidays.
>
> In addition, I have an Alaska body thermostat.
> So I've learned to love the winter.

Please, lets not talk about the weather. This is the south - the place with months of hot, steamy, days. And this last weekend was certainly no exception. I prefer cooler weather also. I can get ten times the amount of work done and not suffer nearly as much.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2808. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 06:39:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB7B0553.24FDA%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 76273

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> (snip) Diminishing emphasis on "self-esteem"
> would be a great idea. Self-esteem should be
> something earned. One of the strangest things
> I have seen lately is the bizzare students
> who have a great sense of self-esteem with
> absolutely no reason for it. No accomplishments,
> no education, nothing but feeling really,
> really good about themselves. (snip)

There's nothing wrong with a little self-esteem. Instead, as you suggest, the problem is being full of it (and, yes, the double meaning was intended).

But a bigger problem is what they expect from others based on that bloated self-esteem. Too many today expect way too much respect from others, far beyond what is routinely given to just another human being. It's not just a coincidence that he or she "disrespected me" has become a common complaint today. Many feel they don't they have to do anything to earn that extra respect - it should be given just because they're a wonderful human being. Of course, when that extra respect is not forthcoming, they feel cheated.

The schools do a fine job of installing plenty of self-esteem. However, they fail at also making those kids understand than anything beyond basic respect has to be earned - it's not just given because you happen to exist.

> (snip) Oh, yeah. Get the kids thinking about
> something other than what's happening 5 minutes
> from now.

Well, thati¿½s probably trying to achieve a little too much.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2809. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 07:00:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB7B0A34.24FDC%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 76274

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Agreed, and there's more. In general, commercial
> boradcast TV portrays the following:
>
> - All sorts of conflicts can be resolved, and goals
> reached, in less than an hour or half-hour.

Man, you're on top of television with this message, Jim.

> - 'Dad' is usually loud, outspoken, immature, mistaken,
> and exercises amazingly poor judgement. But he's lovable
> and always forgiven. 'Mom' is quieter, stronger, the
> solver of problems and 'forgiver' of 'Dad'. The 'kids'
> (when present) are a mixture of the two.

Yep, we went from "Father Knows Best" to father is an idiot. Something in between is probably more realistic, but television rarely shows realism (even on the "reality" shows).

> - People of all kinds live in spacious, clean, well-
> organized homes, yet rarely does anyone need to actually
> DO anything to keep them that way, or pay for them.

More lack of reality television. And you can go on. For example, you rarely see anyone under a hood trying to get the car started because they have to get to work - perhaps to get away from the bad guys, but rarely to get to work. People roam all over the country, and the world, on television, all without any noticeable income. Where can I get a job like that?

> - (This is my favorite) NOBODY *on* TV spends much time
> actually *watching* TV. Particularly children.

That is so true. I see kids planted in front of a television everywhere I look, except on television.

> Cable TV broke those taboos in the '70s by arguing that
> since cable was not broadcast and you paid to have it
> in your home, you retained control. (snip)

Sadly, other than turning it off, we don't retain control. Even the unexpected commercials are inappropriate at times.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2810. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 07:14:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB7B0DA8.24FDE%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 76275

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>>
>> Yeah, Dan, you know how it is with her. I'm
>> labelled a chicken$h*t because I choose not
>> to engage in a battle of wits with an unarmed
>> female.
>
> Yes...I noticed. But she sure has a lot of
> opinions. Rarely based on fact, however.

Why do those with your views always seek the assurances of others, Dan?
First it was Bruce in the "vhf-uhf" newsgroup, now Dick in this newsgroup.
Perhaps if your views and behavior were more mainstream, you would not have
to seek out the support of others to gain confidence in that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2811. The Top 10 reasons the the University of Central Florida banned the Ham Radio Club.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 07:24:29 UTC
From: Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <NGg5b.7878$Lk5.427@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76276

http://www.qrz.com/cgi-bin/ikonboard.cgi?act=ST&f=3&t=43134

The top 10 reasons the University of Central Florida banned the
Ham Radio club.

10. They needed to make room for all those computer hard drives to hide & store
copyrighted MP3's on.
9. The fraternity needed a bigger room to store their beer kegs in.
8. The UCF staff wanted a better place to watch porn for law students so they
will recognize it when they see it.
7. The liberal UCF professors confused the Amateur Radio club antennas for a
anti-Castro broadcast station.
6. The cheerleading squad thought the radio waves would make metal wired bras
burn their breasts.
5. The football team required another place to hold their gang bangs at.
4. The President of UCF believes the antennas are really controlled by space
aliens and they are used to send him secret messages.
3. Only nerds carry around a free radio communication systems, cool students
carry around $200 digital phones with $100 monthly service fees.
2. The UCF board thinks that radiate means radiation.
1. The UCF board thought it was a SPAM club and knows that no good comes from
people that eat or send SPAM.

The Radio Page Ham, Police Scanner, Shortwave and more.
http://www.kilowatt-radio.org/
..it does not require a majority to prevail, but rather an
irate, tireless minority to set brush fires in people's
minds. --Samuel Adams

2812. Re: OT: Trojan Help

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 08:00:35 UTC
From: Roger Halstead <newsgroups@rogerhalstead.com>
Message-ID: <3s7blvonuvgqdv717ki667fh9hsau4pmg3@4ax.com>
Source record: 76277
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sun, 31 Aug 2003 15:46:24 GMT, David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
wrote:

>Computer Guys:
>I have an obvious trojan on my system.
>Win98. All the latest security updates.
>Even when my system is "desktop" with all inet stuff off,
>it keeps pinging my DSL connection about once a second.
>The latest Norton update,
>Ad-Aware 6, Trojan scan etc. don't find it.
>Nothing unusual in my RUN folders in the registry.
>Nothing unusual in the "alt-ctl-del" window.
>
>Is there a utility somewhere that can show me what
>the heck program is running this ping, so I can kill it??
>Please reply off the list if you can help.
>Thanks, Dave S.

You might try SpyBot search and destroy.
It's free and worth a try.

Roger Halstead (K8RI EN73 & ARRL Life Member)
www.rogerhalstead.com
N833R World's oldest Debonair? (S# CD-2)

2813. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 08:16:36 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <4e8blv8cn71ijca47anitm818uf6hk56og@4ax.com>
Source record: 76278

On Mon, 01 Sep 2003 19:57:23 GMT, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:

>
>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
>>
>> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
>
>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>
>Carl - wk3c

Nearly 10,000.

Not all of them are users of code either. FISTS welcomes anybody,
unlike the NCI where you join "the cause to remove code requirements".

If you prefer to remove the code requirement, no one is forcing you do
unplug your keyer from your radio.

Stacey, AA7YA
FISTS #3857

2814. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 08:23:01 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <909blv8os4s9gtc90jl5va6cv36c18moec@4ax.com>
Source record: 76279

On Tue, 2 Sep 2003 19:43:55 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
wrote:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>news:rz95b.36684$Vx2.16264969@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>>
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> news:20030902061117.15462.00002660@mb-m06.aol.com...
>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>> > FISTS #4360
>> >
>>
>> Well just received my FISTS number and it is 10270. My OMs number is
>10271.
>> So you don't need to count them.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>>
>>
>
>Hmmmm, the ASCII format document with just the list copied and pasted into a
>MS Word document shows to be 5,193 paragraphs, which would be
>members--presuming there is one line/paragraph per member. That list is
>labeled as "Active Members."
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

It works like 10-X International. I've had a 10-X number for 12
years and have remained "inactive" (non-paid member) for 11 years, but
I can exchange 10-X numbers on the air if I so choose. So reading
from the active list is very misleading.

I am however an active member of the FISTS, as you probably already
gathered from perusing the "Active Members" list.

Stacey, AA7YA

2815. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 09:18:03 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <47cblvok749jg2jdevqloelfjv0e6bj6u0@4ax.com>
Source record: 76280

On 1 Sep 2003 07:12:20 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>Hans Kohb wrote:
>
>>
>> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>> (Who never took the Advanced test, went from Conditional to Amateur
>> Extra.)
>
>That's exactly what I did.
>
>Dick

As did my father.

As for me, my Extra class license showed up in the mail a week before
my Advanced licence. This of course was back in 1992, and the FCC was
getting better about issuing licences, instead of the 6 month wait
like I had to go through with the Novice licence.

AA7YA - ex-KB7PKE
(Novice to Extra in 12 months: Novice issued 8/24/92 : Extra issued
8/24/93)

2816. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 09:38:16 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <57dblvs9hkombekofbajvsls9910jhpu6b@4ax.com>
Source record: 76281

On Fri, 29 Aug 2003 20:40:57 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
wrote:

> I'm sitting here listening to our local Echolink repeater.
>Someone,apparently in Florida, is Kerchunking our local repeater.

That's a fact of life, whether a repeater is linked or not.

> Now THAT is the true power of the internet!

What? Kerchunking?

> And yesterday at lunchtime, I heard some talk that you should never
>hear on ham radio. Somone with a funky drunky accent going on about his
>favorite parts of another guy's anatomy. Shudderrrr.

It should have never been heard on your "local Echolink repeater" had
the control operator pulled the plug on the Echolink. This is a fact
of life when you tie a repeater system into an internet connection.
Increasing the chances of it happening more often than not.

> There just isn't enough control of all the repeaters linked into
>Echolink for it to be a viable system.

Sure there is. In your case, a responsible control operator, who
values his/her radio's, and the license attached to the linked
repeater.

2817. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 09:44:57 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <70eblv41m0godfni0d0jjp3tof9o8m6gk6@4ax.com>
Source record: 76282

On Sun, 31 Aug 2003 00:28:29 GMT, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
wrote:

>Hans K0HB wrote:
>
>>
>>If some jerkoff violates the rules on CW do you blame Morse code???
>>
>>
>>
>I didn't think that could happen (violating rules on CW). :-)

He's just trying to find a strawman to burn.

Stacey, AA7YA

2818. Re: Ham here and hams on the air?? Its a poll

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 10:01:46 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <6meblvcq63ejfrholrnsvfjgsfo0r9tmor@4ax.com>
Source record: 76283

On Fri, 29 Aug 2003 09:03:21 -0400, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote:

>1. How many hams that participate with some frequency here in this newsgroup
>operate on the air in the legal ham bands?

Every night. Not on a single frequency though.

>2. Which band(s) do you operate? (Modes irrelevant for this poll, just
>bands or frequency band ranges please.)

10, 15, and 20 meters, and I monitor the active local frequencies on
my 2/440 dual band mobile rig in the shack.

>3. How frequently do you operate on those bands in Question 2?? Hourly,
>Daily, Weekly etc.

Daily and weekly, and during contests, hourly.

2819. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 10:14:47 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <vifblvs1122vnquflqrfpi9gled17o1uvn@4ax.com>
Source record: 76284

On Fri, 22 Aug 2003 21:51:00 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

>We might consider the arguments presented in the book "The Art and Skill of
>Radiotelegraphy". The author had done extensive study on Morse code
>teaching methods, learning abilities, etc. His definition of proficiency is
>along the lines of what level must a person obtain to prevent forgetting it.
>Basically his research showed that those who achieved 13wpm did not forget
>the code even if they did not use it. They would get "rusty" so to speak
>and their speed would fall off if they did not use it but they would not
>forget it. Once they resumed using it, their speed would fairly quickly
>climb back to their previous level. That would seem like a reasonable
>definition.

I can attest to that. Having been without an antenna for nearly a
year some time ago, my speed fell way off, but I retained what each
letter in code was.

Contests are a good way to get the code speed back up to snuff in no
time, if you're "rusty". Of course, the first few hours are a beast,
but by the time the contest is over, you're working QSO's in your
sleep. LOL

Stacey, AA7YA

2820. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 10:26:35 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <jtfblv010bk0gpv19cap9jk0i1o6u9c0ap@4ax.com>
Source record: 76285

On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 14:38:36 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

>The exam does not exclude anyone who cares to make the effort to learn. And
>Farnsworth IS Morse since it relates a letter directly to a sound without
>counting dots and dashes.

Actually the Farnsworth method is Morse Code sent at a constant rate
of speed, 18 WPM actually, yet at lower speeds the spacing between
each character is increased while attaining the same rate of speed of
18 WPM for each character.

By the time one becomes proficient enough to copy Morse Code, counting
out the dits and dahs is moot at best.

Stacey, AA7YA

2821. Re: Going under the knife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 10:47:43 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <jFj5b.141730$yg.39876383@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 76286

Good lucy to you, Ryan. Here's wishing you a speedy recovery. (.- -. -..
.- .--. .-. . - - -.-- -. ..- .-. ... . -.-.-.)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bj3kad$f2s35$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> To all my friends, combatants, debaters and lurkers here in r.r.a.p,
>
> I will be going under the knife this Tuesday for surgery on my lower back
> and won't be back for about a week or so. I am quiet sure that I am not
> going to feel like being in the upright position for the next week (or
doing
> much of anything for that matter) , so everyone have a great week and
> probably next week I will have a ton of catching up to do.
>
> Hope everyone had safe Labor Day Weekend and catch ya all in a bit,
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>

2822. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 11:09:35 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bj4i4s$fem@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76287

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:IVa5b.23150$Om1.22579@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> snip
> >
> > Then, you run into a woman of high intellect and your stooped so low for
> > desperation to be able to one upmanship her that you swing into
extremely
> > low gear with nothing but name calling. Proving the points I have just
> > observed about you. You are as worthless as dust in a waterless
> > environment. No one here, in my opinion holds a candle to how
wretchedly
> > low you really are.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> At least I did not choose a 'vanity call' such as W4DIK. or equivilant.
>
> Get over it TWIT. You have chosen to place yourself in the situation you
> are in. Don't expect others to appreciate it.
>
> Get a life Twit.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

ROFLMAO!!! Get over what? You?! Bwaaaahaahahahhhaaaa

Kim W5TIT

2823. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 11:14:45 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bj4iek$5d3@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76288

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB7AFA0A.24FD6%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> > Dwight you've obviously forever been devoid
> > of a clue, and if this statement doesn't prove
> > it nothing ever could. But it's far beyond
> > obvious anyway.
>
>
> Well, Dick, since you're such an expert, why don't you explain what you
> think I've missed? The only clue I get from the above is that you're again
> speaking of things you have no idea about.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

heh heh heh. Asking Dick to answer an honest question with facts is like
getting Bill Clinton to .... uh, well, never mind.

Kim W5TIT

2824. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 11:20:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030903072005.29660.00000388@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 76289

In article <BB7B0A34.24FDC%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> Agreed, and there's more. In general, commercial
>> boradcast TV portrays the following:
>>
>> - All sorts of conflicts can be resolved, and goals
>> reached, in less than an hour or half-hour.
>
> Man, you're on top of television with this message, Jim.

Thanks - and this is just the short version.
>
>> - 'Dad' is usually loud, outspoken, immature, mistaken,
>> and exercises amazingly poor judgement. But he's lovable
>> and always forgiven. 'Mom' is quieter, stronger, the
>> solver of problems and 'forgiver' of 'Dad'. The 'kids'
>> (when present) are a mixture of the two.

Think how many highly popular long running sitcoms in the past 10-20-30 years fit the above description.

> Yep, we went from "Father Knows Best" to father is an idiot.

Imagine - just try to imagine - the reaction from some quarters if a major network tried to put on a show today with the title "Father Knows Best". You'd think they were glorifying child abuse.

>Something in
>between is probably more realistic, but television rarely shows realism
>(even on the "reality" shows).

And it goes in all sorts of ways. How many dramas have you seen that do not involve the main characters being involved with the law/law enforcement or health care? What % of shows take place outside of NYC/LA/SF/Chicago?
>
>> - People of all kinds live in spacious, clean, well-
>> organized homes, yet rarely does anyone need to actually
>> DO anything to keep them that way, or pay for them.

> More lack of reality television. And you can go on. For example, you
>rarely see anyone under a hood trying to get the car started because they
>have to get to work - perhaps to get away from the bad guys, but rarely to
>get to work. People roam all over the country, and the world, on television,
>all without any noticeable income. Where can I get a job like that?

Where can I get a LIFE like that?
>
>> - (This is my favorite) NOBODY *on* TV spends much time
>> actually *watching* TV. Particularly children.

> That is so true. I see kids planted in front of a television everywhere I
>look, except on television.

Which gives a hint of what the TV writers' "reality" really is.
>
>> Cable TV broke those taboos in the '70s by arguing that
>> since cable was not broadcast and you paid to have it
>> in your home, you retained control. (snip)
>
> Sadly, other than turning it off, we don't retain control. Even the
>unexpected commercials are inappropriate at times.

Which is why I haven't had cable since 1979, and why the sole TV here spends a lot of time off. That's the main weapon of the marketplace.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2825. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 12:20:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309030420.41619481@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76290

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hklouv3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote: in message
news:<c4a6771678b5a0221f9271fbee325279.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
>
> .. . . .
>
> > B. Status of current licensees.
> >
> > Current licenses could be renewed indefinitely, and would
> > retain their current operating privileges.
> >
> > Current Novice, Technician, General, and Advanced class
> > licensees could up grade to ?Class A? at any time.
> >
> > Respectfully submitted,
> >
> > H. Hans Brakob, K0HB
>
> A very well thought out and crafted petition, Hans. It makes a lot
> of sense.
>
> I'm not sure that the Commission will go for an indefinite-term
> license, even though the Comm Act appears to permit the Commission
> to set terms of licenses by rule for all classes of stations except
> broadcast stations which is set by statute.

Phil, how often does the holder of a GROL have to renew? How long is
the renewal term?

Thanks, Brian

2826. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 12:49:05 UTC
From: hiram's cat <eeefrincen4@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1062593747.245315@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 76291

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:29c5b.158749$2x.44943@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in
> news:20030901213158.20041.00000277@mb-m28.aol.com:
>
> > ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye. After reading Fists
> > proposal I have decided to send your $39.00 to them instead of you
> > fools. It appears Fist is the only real Group out there that really
> > cares.
> >
>
> The ARRL plan is to purge all the good hams from the organization.
You're
> just another one. With fewer good hams in the membership there will be
> less opposition to the agenda of supporting and pushing policy to further
> dumb down the Amateur Radio service. Hiram Maxim is turning over in his
> grave.

All the ARRL ever was, is, and ever will be is a
publishing company with a 501(c)3 tax exemption
that wraps itself in fake ivy leaves of academia.
Another typical "non-profit" that milks donations
from suckers with trinkets and who's Corporate
Board and Executive Staff members skim 50%
right-off-the-top for "administrative expenses".
I dropped them, my SCM, and my membership way back
in 1984 and I've never regreted my decision.

2827. Re: OT: Trojan Help

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 13:13:05 UTC
From: Chuck Harris <cfharris@erols.com>
Message-ID: <bj4pghjck1@bob.news.rcn.net>
Source record: 76292
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Hi David,

The utility you seek is called a firewall. It will inform you of any utility that is trying to reach the internet... Even really buggy ones like IE and OE. The best free firewall is from ZoneAlarm. Do a google on "firewall zone alarm" and you will find it with no problem.

When your pet program tries to call home, zone alarm will pop up a screen saying application such and such is asking for internet access allow it? If it is IE, or OE, though you should probably say no, say yes. If it is anything else that you don't recognize, say no.

Once you have identified the application, it is fairly trivial to remove it. Do a search on the application name (eg. wincfg.scr) and delete all occurances. You will also need to search your registry for any entries that have the application's name, and remove them.

If you find your utility programs like regedit, and msconfig start and then dissappear, you will need to go into your window's directories and make renamed copies. (eg. myregedit, and mymsconfig).

Then go into regedit, and search for the application's name, and remove it. And go into msconfig, and look for the application's name in the startup list, and remove it there too.

-Chuck

On Sun, 31 Aug 2003 15:46:24 GMT, David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote:

>Computer Guys:
>I have an obvious trojan on my system.
>Win98. All the latest security updates.
>Even when my system is "desktop" with all inet stuff off,
>it keeps pinging my DSL connection about once a second.
>The latest Norton update,
>Ad-Aware 6, Trojan scan etc. don't find it.
>Nothing unusual in my RUN folders in the registry.
>Nothing unusual in the "alt-ctl-del" window.
>
>Is there a utility somewhere that can show me what
>the heck program is running this ping, so I can kill it??
>Please reply off the list if you can help.
>Thanks, Dave S.

2828. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 15:14:49 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Jzn5b.153384$yg.41094094@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 76293

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309030420.41619481@posting.google.com...
> Phil, how often does the holder of a GROL have to renew? How long is
> the renewal term?
>
> Thanks, Brian

Hi Brian,

I believe I can answer that for you. The GROL is a lifetime license. Once
earned, there is no renewal.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

2829. Re: Going under the knife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 15:16:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <XAn5b.18185$EW1.8798@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76294

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bj3kad$f2s35$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> To all my friends, combatants, debaters and lurkers here in r.r.a.p,
>
> I will be going under the knife this Tuesday for surgery on my lower back
> and won't be back for about a week or so. I am quiet sure that I am not
> going to feel like being in the upright position for the next week (or
doing
> much of anything for that matter) , so everyone have a great week and
> probably next week I will have a ton of catching up to do.
>
> Hope everyone had safe Labor Day Weekend and catch ya all in a bit,
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>

Hope it helps you. See ya when you get back.

Dan/W4NTI

2830. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 15:22:50 UTC
From: "William H. O'Hara, III" <whoohara@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93EB741EC66ADAX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@216.168.3.44>
Source record: 76295

"Steve Stone" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in
news:5kG4b.2951$UG.1973@news01.roc.ny:

> We had a power outage recently in the Northeast. The
> Echolink connection to a local 2 meter repeater was down
> because the RoadRunner cable system has no battery backup
> in these parts.

I've tried to suggest to various TPTB that I have noticed NWS and Skywarn should not rely upon IRLP. NWS in Taunton often calls up Western Mass, which has some nice repeaters linked via IRLP(keep this and drop echolink). However, NWS is using a repeater at the Coastline that relies upon cable internet. I did say to one guy that they should get their own T-1 line for such work.

How is NWS going to communicate when Fabian hits the coast of Eastern Mass and knocks all the power?

I once went without power for 2 weeks. I've done a lot of durations of 1 day or less. Echolink & IRLP are on very unreliable footings.

Bill

2831. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 16:02:31 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj53an$p86$0@208.206.142.94>
Source record: 76296

"S. Hanrahan" wrote:

> On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 14:38:36 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> wrote:
>
> >The exam does not exclude anyone who cares to make the effort to learn. And
> >Farnsworth IS Morse since it relates a letter directly to a sound without
> >counting dots and dashes.
>
> Actually the Farnsworth method is Morse Code sent at a constant rate
> of speed, 18 WPM actually, yet at lower speeds the spacing between
> each character is increased while attaining the same rate of speed of
> 18 WPM for each character.
>
> By the time one becomes proficient enough to copy Morse Code, counting
> out the dits and dahs is moot at best.

That seems to be what they hate about it- they can't count the "dots and dashes"!

2832. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 16:07:16 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj53jk$p86$1@208.206.142.94>
Source record: 76297

Brian wrote:

> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hklouv3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> > "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote: in message
news:<c4a6771678b5a0221f9271fbee325279.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> >
> > .. . . .
> >
> > > B. Status of current licensees.
> > >
> > > Current licenses could be renewed indefinitely, and would
> > > retain their current operating privileges.
> > >
> > > Current Novice, Technician, General, and Advanced class
> > > licensees could up grade to ?Class A? at any time.
> > >
> > > Respectfully submitted,
> > >
> > > H. Hans Brakob, K0HB
> >
> > A very well thought out and crafted petition, Hans. It makes a lot
> > of sense.
> >
> > I'm not sure that the Commission will go for an indefinite-term
> > license, even though the Comm Act appears to permit the Commission
> > to set terms of licenses by rule for all classes of stations except
> > broadcast stations which is set by statute.
>
> Phil, how often does the holder of a GROL have to renew? How long is
> the renewal term?

There wouldn'd even BE a GROL today if it wasn't required for a few obscure operations by international treaty. The FCC would
do away with it in a heartbeat.

2833. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 16:14:40 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj541g$s2f$0@208.206.142.94>
Source record: 76298

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> > Dwight you've obviously forever been devoid
> > of a clue, and if this statement doesn't prove
> > it nothing ever could. But it's far beyond
> > obvious anyway.
>
> Well, Dick, since you're such an expert, why don't you explain what you
> think I've missed? The only clue I get from the above is that you're again
> speaking of things you have no idea about.

Try this, numbnuts-

You said to Larry, in part-

> you've spent the last several years trying to sexualize Kim's callsign....

So you presume that Kim didn't sexualize it when she chose it???

Yep. Truly clueless, that's our boy Dwight.

2834. Re: OT: Trojan Help

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 16:18:18 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj548a$s2f$1@208.206.142.94>
Source record: 76299
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Good advvice. Anyone who hasn't ran Zonealarm will be astounded at how often other computers try -for whatever reasons- to intrude into yours while you're online. Zone Alarm tells you when it happens, and the domain from which they came, tho it isn't that easy to find out where it is since it's the numeric domain code.

Dick

Chuck Harris wrote:

> Hi David,
>
> The utility you seek is called a firewall. It will inform you of any
> utility that is trying to reach the internet... Even really buggy ones
> like IE and OE. The best free firewall is from ZoneAlarm. Do a google
> on "firewall zone alarm" and you will find it with no problem.
>
> When your pet program tries to call home, zone alarm will pop up a
> screen saying application such and such is asking for internet access
> allow it? If it is IE, or OE, though you should probably say no, say
> yes. If it is anything else that you don't recognize, say no.
>
> Once you have identified the application, it is fairly trivial to remove
> it. Do a search on the application name (eg. wincfg.scr) and delete
> all occurances. You will also need to search your registry for
> any entries that have the application's name, and remove them.
>
> If you find your utility programs like regedit, and msconfig start
> and then dissappear, you will need to go into your window's directories
> and make renamed copies. (eg. myregedit, and mymsconfig).
>
> Then go into regedit, and search for the application's name, and remove
> it. And go into msconfig, and look for the application's name in the
> startup list, and remove it there too.
>
> -Chuck
>
> On Sun, 31 Aug 2003 15:46:24 GMT, David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
> wrote:
>
> >Computer Guys:
> >I have an obvious trojan on my system.
> >Win98. All the latest security updates.
> >Even when my system is "desktop" with all inet stuff off,
> >it keeps pinging my DSL connection about once a second.

> >The latest Norton update,
> >Ad-Aware 6, Trojan scan etc. don't find it.
> >Nothing unusual in my RUN folders in the registry.
> >Nothing unusual in the "alt-ctl-del" window.
> >
> >Is there a utility somewhere that can show me what
> >the heck program is running this ping, so I can kill it??
> >Please reply off the list if you can help.
> >Thanks, Dave S.

2835. Re: Going under the knife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 17:00:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309030900.607ce640@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76300

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bj3kad$f2s35$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> To all my friends, combatants, debaters and lurkers here in r.r.a.p,
>
> I will be going under the knife this Tuesday for surgery on my lower back
> and won't be back for about a week or so.

Hope all goes well, Ryan...Been There, Done That, so I can tell
ya it will improve your life!

Just remember, the ONE four-letter word you DON'T want to hear in
the OR is...

"OOPS!"

See ya when ya get back!

73

Steve, K4YZ

2836. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 18:03:45 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj5ae1dcd0@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 76201

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
> >
> > "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
> >>
> >> Yeah, Dan, you know how it is with her. I'm
> >> labelled a chicken$h*t because I choose not
> >> to engage in a battle of wits with an unarmed
> >> female.
> >
> > Yes...I noticed. But she sure has a lot of
> > opinions. Rarely based on fact, however.
>
> Why do those with your views always seek the assurances of others, Dan?
> First it was Bruce in the "vhf-uhf" newsgroup, now Dick in this newsgroup.
> Perhaps if your views and behavior were more mainstream, you would not have
> to seek out the support of others to gain confidence in that.

Dwight, there has never been *anyone* posting on usenet that has been more
full of it--pun definitely intended- than YOU. A regular windbag. And it's all hot.

2837. Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 18:22:58 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86znhlpw8t.fsf_-_@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 76202

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Stacey" == S Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> writes:

[...]

Stacey> Actually the Farnsworth method is Morse Code sent at a
Stacey> constant rate of speed, 18 WPM actually, yet at lower speeds
Stacey> the spacing between each character is increased while
Stacey> attaining the same rate of speed of 18 WPM for each character.

I was under the impression that Farnsworth was a type of spacing but
that the actual numbers weren't relevant -- only that the word speed
is often much less than the character speed. The test I took had a
word speed of five words per minute and a character speed of eighteen
words per minute. The practice files I'm building for my web site
have a word speed of five words per minute and a character speed of
twenty words per minute.

Stacey> By the time one becomes proficient enough to copy Morse Code,
Stacey> counting out the dits and dahs is moot at best.

In my limited experience, I learn more characters faster with
Farnsworth spacing, but I'm concerned that I'm building a lookup table
instead of reflexes. It's the difference between "dahdidah, hmm,
that's K, dahdah, hmm, that's M" and "dahdidah (K) dahdah (M)". I
learned eight or nine characters with Farnsworth spacing, but I can't
repeat the performance at full speed, so I fear that I'm learning
something that won't be useful if I continue to use Farnsworth
spacing.

Stacey> Stacey, AA7YA

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.2 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE/VjGIGPFSfAB/ezgRAovAAJ9oamqHg6aAYcpdWq4jDVgELfiZCwCgrlXJ
Uyg56cgKhn3fR1s/8P81XBM=
=6OG2
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2838. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 18:33:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309031033.2e8137a2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76203

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030901014611.14837.00002666@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0308312011.6536f423@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >
> >Jason, meet Bruce Bunion, WA8ULX. He's one of the originators of the
> >"I won't upgrade" Advanced Operators Club. What's his most recent
> >claim to fame? Run his call on QRZ and see.
>
> Brian:
>
> It seems like Bruce Beynon is doing OK for a guy who's 305 years old!

Bruce isn't doing good for any guy who'se any age. He's pretty much
the lowest common denominator on r.r.a.p.

> OH, I get it now. Bunion.

Yes, "bunion." Jim says he doesn't have any minions.

> I guess Kim would say, ROFLMTO!!!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

You're fast approaching that lowest common denominator yourself.

2839. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 19:57:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F564798.8060609@psu.edu>
Source record: 76204

S. Hanrahan wrote:
> On Fri, 29 Aug 2003 20:40:57 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> wrote:
>
>
>> I'm sitting here listening to our local Echolink repeater.
>>Someone,apparently in Florida, is Kerchunking our local repeater.
>
>
> That's a fact of life, whether a repeater is linked or not.
>
>
>> Now THAT is the true power of the internet!
>
>
> What? Kerchunking?

Yeah, just imagine it. We can kerchunk repeaters all over the world.
Kinda gives me goosebumps to see how far we've come!

>
>> And yesterday at lunchtime, I heard some talk that you should never
>>hear on ham radio. Somone with a funky drunky accent going on about his
>>favorite parts of another guy's anatomy. Shudderrrr.
>
>
> It should have never been heard on your "local Echolink repeater" had
> the control operator pulled the plug on the Echolink. This is a fact
> of life when you tie a repeater system into an internet connection.
> Increasing the chances of it happening more often than not.
>
>
>> There just isn't enough control of all the repeaters linked into
>>Echolink for it to be a viable system.
>
>
> Sure there is. In your case, a responsible control operator, who
> values his/her radio's, and the license attached to the linked
> repeater.

Yes, certainly in principle. Turning off the repeater is always the
option. But in reality, a person cannot keep constant monitoring for
miscreants. And if the repeater is open to the world, the person
responsible will have to keep a 24/7 vigil.

When almost everyone is well behaved to begin with, it isn't much of a problem to begin with.

- Mike KB3EIA

2840. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 21:59:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309031359.54a5d315@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76205

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj53jk$p86$1@208.206.142.94>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hklouv3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> > > "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote: in message
news:<c4a6771678b5a0221f9271fbee325279.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > >
> > > .. . . .
> > >
> > > > B. Status of current licensees.
> > > >
> > > > Current licenses could be renewed indefinitely, and would
> > > > retain their current operating privileges.
> > > >
> > > > Current Novice, Technician, General, and Advanced class
> > > > licensees could up grade to ?Class A? at any time.
> > > >
> > > > Respectfully submitted,
> > > >
> > > > H. Hans Brakob, K0HB
> > >
> > > A very well thought out and crafted petition, Hans. It makes a lot
> > > of sense.
> > >
> > > I'm not sure that the Commission will go for an indefinite-term
> > > license, even though the Comm Act appears to permit the Commission
> > > to set terms of licenses by rule for all classes of stations except
> > > broadcast stations which is set by statute.
> >
> > Phil, how often does the holder of a GROL have to renew? How long is
> > the renewal term?
>
> There wouldn'd even BE a GROL today if it wasn't required for a few obscure operations by
international treaty. The FCC would
> do away with it in a heartbeat.

It would appear that you concur that our resident communications
attorney has led us astray.

2841. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 22:01:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309031401.3732c68d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76206

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:<Jzn5b.153384$yg.41094094@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309030420.41619481@posting.google.com...
> > Phil, how often does the holder of a GROL have to renew? How long is
> > the renewal term?
> >
> > Thanks, Brian
>
> Hi Brian,
>
> I believe I can answer that for you. The GROL is a lifetime license. Once
> earned, there is no renewal.

Bert, you are correct.

2842. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 22:13:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309031413.7249ee70@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76207

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030902221959.17961.00000547@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >Talk about a dumb ass. He combines Bruce's stupidity with reckless
> >statements.
> >
>
> Dumb Ass is someone who lets NCI dictate to them what they can and cant say

So you have no rational argument for the retention of code testing?

2843. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 22:19:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309031419.781071e2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76208

S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<jtfblv010bk0gpv19cap9jk0i1o6u9c0ap@4ax.com>...
> On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 14:38:36 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> wrote:
>
> >The exam does not exclude anyone who cares to make the effort to learn. And
> >Farnsworth IS Morse since it relates a letter directly to a sound without
> >counting dots and dashes.
>
> Actually the Farnsworth method is Morse Code

It is not.

Only at 20 WPM does Farnsworth and Morse use the same character and word rate.

2844. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 22:20:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030903182012.23171.00000464@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 76209

In article <jtfblv010bk0gpv19cap9jk0i1o6u9c0ap@4ax.com>, S. Hanrahan
<aa7ya@hotmail.com> writes:

>On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 14:38:36 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
>wrote:
>
>>The exam does not exclude anyone who cares to make the effort to learn. And
>>Farnsworth IS Morse since it relates a letter directly to a sound without
>>counting dots and dashes.
>
>Actually the Farnsworth method is Morse Code sent at a constant rate
>of speed, 18 WPM actually, yet at lower speeds the spacing between
>each character is increased while attaining the same rate of speed of
>18 WPM for each character.

I think the rate may be 15 wpm, the principle is the same.
>
>By the time one becomes proficient enough to copy Morse Code, counting
>out the dits and dahs is moot at best.

Actually, those taking Element 1 have the option of Farnsworth-spaced Morse at
5 wpm or "regularly spaced" 5 wpm Morse (characters sent at 5 wpm). All VECs
can supply either if requested in advance.

The main reasons Farnsworth spacing is used are:

1) It allows more time between characters to recognize and write down

2) It avoids many of the bad habits such as "counting dits".

btw, W1AW has been sending the slower Morse code practice sessions using
Farnsworth spacing for at least 40 years

73 de Jim, N2EY

2845. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 23:17:46 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj5sqq$2sc$0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 76210

Jack Twilley wrote:

>
> In my limited experience, I learn more characters faster with
> Farnsworth spacing, but I'm concerned that I'm building a lookup table
> instead of reflexes. It's the difference between "dahdidah, hmm,
> that's K, dahdah, hmm, that's M" and "dahdidah (K) dahdah (M)". I
> learned eight or nine characters with Farnsworth spacing, but I can't
> repeat the performance at full speed, so I fear that I'm learning
> something that won't be useful if I continue to use Farnsworth
> spacing.

That's where practice comes in. Learn to recognize the characters, then listen to code off the air or what ever othen non-familiar source you may have available.
Soon you find that you don't use anything like a looktable any more, it just comes in as letters, and then words that you recognize like speech. The more familiar you become, the longer words begin to come through as words, just like the shorter ones did earlier, and so on it goes. You build a Morse vocabulary of words.
But it does take practice.

73, Dick

2846. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 23:18:58 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj5st2$2sc$1@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 76211

Brian wrote:

> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030901014611.14837.00002666@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0308312011.6536f423@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >
> > > >Jason, meet Bruce Bunion, WA8ULX. He's one of the originators of the
> > > >"I won't upgrade" Advanced Operators Club. What's his most recent
> > > >claim to fame? Run his call on QRZ and see.
> >
> > Brian:
> >
> > It seems like Bruce Beynon is doing OK for a guy who's 305 years old!
>
> Bruce isn't doing good for any guy who'se any age. He's pretty much
> the lowest common denominator on r.r.a.p.
>
> > OH, I get it now. Bunion.
>
> Yes, "bunion." Jim says he doesn't have any minions.
>
> > I guess Kim would say, ROFLMTO!!!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> You're fast approaching that lowest common denominator yourself.

You've been there ever since you arrived here.

2847. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 23:21:46 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj5t2a$2sc$2@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 76212

Mike Coslo wrote:

> S. Hanrahan wrote:
> > On Fri, 29 Aug 2003 20:40:57 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> >
> >> I'm sitting here listening to our local Echolink repeater.
> >>Someone,apparently in Florida, is Kerchunking our local repeater.
> >
> >
> > That's a fact of life, whether a repeater is linked or not.
> >
> >
> >> Now THAT is the true power of the internet!
> >
> >
> > What? Kerchunking?
>
> Yeah, just imagine it. We can kerchunk repeaters all over the world.
> Kinda gives me goosebumps to see how far we've come!
>

Man, that's gotta be the neatest 'next thing' to come along in a while-Kerchunking via the net! The sound heard round the world!

2848. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 23:23:10 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj5t4u$2sc$3@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 76213

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj53jk$p86$1@208.206.142.94>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hklouv3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> > > > "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote: in message
news:<c4a6771678b5a0221f9271fbee325279.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > > >
> > > > .. . . .
> > > >
> > > > > B. Status of current licensees.
> > > > >
> > > > > Current licenses could be renewed indefinitely, and would
> > > > > retain their current operating privileges.
> > > > >
> > > > > Current Novice, Technician, General, and Advanced class
> > > > > licensees could up grade to ?Class A? at any time.
> > > > >
> > > > > Respectfully submitted,
> > > > >
> > > > > H. Hans Brakob, K0HB
> > > >
> > > > A very well thought out and crafted petition, Hans. It makes a lot
> > > > of sense.
> > > >
> > > > I'm not sure that the Commission will go for an indefinite-term
> > > > license, even though the Comm Act appears to permit the Commission
> > > > to set terms of licenses by rule for all classes of stations except
> > > > broadcast stations which is set by statute.
> > >
> > > Phil, how often does the holder of a GROL have to renew? How long is
> > > the renewal term?
> >
> > There wouldn'd even BE a GROL today if it wasn't required for a few obscure operations
by international treaty. The FCC would
> > do away with it in a heartbeat.
>
> It would appear that you concur that our resident communications
> attorney has led us astray.

He didn't lead *me* anywhere- I already knew.

2849. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 23:39:26 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309031539.2ce51052@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76214

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309031033.2e8137a2@posting.google.com>...

> You're fast approaching that lowest common denominator yourself.

Spoken like a guy who in indivisible by pi.

Steve, K4YZ

2850. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 23:44:04 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86n0dlphdn.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 76215

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Dick" == Dick Carroll; <dixie@townsqr.com> writes:

Jack> In my limited experience, I learn more characters faster with
Jack> Farnsworth spacing, but I'm concerned that I'm building a lookup
Jack> table instead of reflexes. It's the difference between
Jack> "dahdidah, hmm, that's K, dahdah, hmm, that's M" and "dahdidah
Jack> (K) dahdah (M)". I learned eight or nine characters with
Jack> Farnsworth spacing, but I can't repeat the performance at full
Jack> speed, so I fear that I'm learning something that won't be
Jack> useful if I continue to use Farnsworth spacing.

Dick> That's where practice comes in. Learn to recognize the
Dick> characters, then listen to code off the air or what ever othen
Dick> non-familiar source you may have available. Soon you find that
Dick> you don't use anything like a looktable any more, it just comes
Dick> in as letters, and then words that you recognize like
Dick> speech. The more familiar you become, the longer words begin to
Dick> come through as words, just like the shorter ones did earlier,
Dick> and so on it goes. You build a Morse vocabulary of words. But
Dick> it does take practice.

I do have a couple of questions, though. Which spacing is more
commonly found in "real code" -- full speed or Farnsworth spacing?
When people learn to receive code with Farnsworth spacing, do they
also learn to send with Farnsworth spacing? Those two things have
puzzled me but I haven't found any real answers.

Dick> 73, Dick

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.2 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE/VnzJGPFSfAB/ezgRAmgSAJ9kWL79zA3NPXd1QBCa2DVsKPPe3ACgg0pj
+omyMz+c0Q2ICr/udLl7tUw=
=gbEB
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

2851. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 23:44:12 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309031544.d516785@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76216

"hiram's cat" <eeefrincen4@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<1062593747.245315@newshost03.voicenet.com>...

> All the ARRL ever was, is, and ever will be is a
> publishing company with a 501(c)3 tax exemption
> that wraps itself in fake ivy leaves of academia.
> Another typical "non-profit" that milks donations
> from suckers with trinkets and who's Corporate
> Board and Executive Staff members skim 50%
> right-off-the-top for "administrative expenses".
> I dropped them, my SCM, and my membership way back
> in 1984 and I've never regreted my decision.

Yet another anonymous scumbag with libelous accusations and no
proof to offer.

Considering the IMPROVEMENTS that have occured in the ARRL since
1984, I'd say your departure was beneficial. Lord knows no one here
has missed you.

Back under your rock, worthless troll.

Steve, K4YZ

2852. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 23:44:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309031544.4252f9b5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76217

"hiram's cat" <eeefrincen4@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<1062593747.245315@newshost03.voicenet.com>...

> All the ARRL ever was, is, and ever will be is a
> publishing company with a 501(c)3 tax exemption
> that wraps itself in fake ivy leaves of academia.
> Another typical "non-profit" that milks donations
> from suckers with trinkets and who's Corporate
> Board and Executive Staff members skim 50%
> right-off-the-top for "administrative expenses".
> I dropped them, my SCM, and my membership way back
> in 1984 and I've never regreted my decision.

Yet another anonymous scumbag with libelous accusations and no
proof to offer.

Considering the IMPROVEMENTS that have occured in the ARRL since
1984, I'd say your departure was beneficial. Lord knows no one here
has missed you.

Back under your rock, worthless troll.

Steve, K4YZ

2853. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-03 23:56:54 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <adv5b.37514$Vx2.16469456@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76218

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:86znhlpw8t.fsf_-_@duchess.twilley.org...

In my limited experience, I learn more characters faster with
Farnsworth spacing, but I'm concerned that I'm building a lookup table
instead of reflexes. It's the difference between "dahdidah, hmm,
that's K, dahdah, hmm, that's M" and "dahdidah (K) dahdah (M)". I
learned eight or nine characters with Farnsworth spacing, but I can't
repeat the performance at full speed, so I fear that I'm learning
something that won't be useful if I continue to use Farnsworth
spacing.

It just takes more time than you've put into it so far. Just keep
practicing. Don't add new letters too soon. Over a period of time
gradually increase the word speed, keeping the letter speed where it is.

People tend to have unrealistic expectations on how long it takes to build
the reflexes.

It takes about 30 hours of study for the average and practice to get to a
reliable 5wpm copy. At this point, one's reflexes are still rather slow.
From that point on, is where you start diminishing the space between letters
to get the overall word speed up. To get to 20wpm, the average person will
need about 150 hours of study & practice. However, the Koch method may
enable one to shorten these. The G4FON software incorporates this method.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2854. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 00:03:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Bjv5b.37515$Vx2.16470335@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76219

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309031419.781071e2@posting.google.com...
> S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<jtfblv010bk0gpv19cap9jk0i1o6u9c0ap@4ax.com>...
> > On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 14:38:36 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> > >The exam does not exclude anyone who cares to make the effort to learn.
And
> > >Farnsworth IS Morse since it relates a letter directly to a sound
without
> > >counting dots and dashes.
> >
> > Actually the Farnsworth method is Morse Code
>
> It is not.
>
> Only at 20 WPM does Farnsworth and Morse use the same character and word
rate.

Nowhere is there a definition that says the character rate and word rate MUST be the same for it to be Morse. There is standard spacing and Farnsworth spacing and the variety of spacing that you hear on the air. There are some really fine operators who have near perfect standard spacing but the rest of us vary. That doesn't mean we aren't sending Morse. If you read the manuals on Morse, they give recommended element, character, and word spacings for standard operation but that is all. It does not mandate that the relative spacing meet any particular standard to be considered Morse code.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2855. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 00:24:16 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <QCv5b.37518$Vx2.16474192@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76220

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:86n0dlphdn.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...
I do have a couple of questions, though. Which spacing is more
commonly found in "real code" -- full speed or Farnsworth spacing?
When people learn to receive code with Farnsworth spacing, do they
also learn to send with Farnsworth spacing? Those two things have
puzzled me but I haven't found any real answers.

In the real world, spacing varies all over the map. Of course the W1AW training broadcasts are Farnsworth until they pass the 15wpm level. After that, the character spacing and word spacing are the same. Their bulletins, which are at 18wpm, use standard spacing also. However, these transmissions are computer generated.

On the air, most people seem to automatically adopt a "matching" character and word speed. You get into a rhythm and a comfortable rhythm for sending is when the character speed and word speed match. So no matter what method you used to learn, you generally end up at the "standard" spacing when you send.

Typically a person can send faster than they receive. It's actually quite easy to send up 20wpm even though you may only be able to copy 5wpm. Sending is easier because you know what letter you are going to send! So when you first go on the air, you have to be careful not to send any faster than you can receive. If you don't pay attention, you will instinctively send at an overall word speed that matches the character speed. So if you at been practicing at 15wpm for the character speed, you will most likely send at a 15wpm character and word speed. The operator on the other end will come back at that speed and then you'll have to ask him PSE QRS (please slowdown). By the way, don't be afraid to ask them to slow down. They will understand as they remember when they were beginners. If you want them to send at a specific speed, you can even go PSE QRS 5 (please slowdown to 5wpm).

The more experienced operator will generally slow down for the new guy. If he is using a keyer, he may choose to maintain his character speed and slow the word speed ala Farnsworth. If the new person is still having trouble, he will then also generally slow the characters down a bit. Or he may switch to a straight key to get the speed down in the first place. Or he may go with standard word spacing right off the bat as it is a bit awkward to send fast characters but space out to slow the word speed.

It's nothing to worry about. It will all sort itself out when you get on the air.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2856. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:01:51 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030903210151.17961.00000609@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 76221

>So you have no rational argument for the retention of code testing?
>
>

None that you would understand

2857. Anyone want to take a guess at what this is all about ?? N2FF ARRL election to be contested ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:07:10 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <2fw5b.1608$eF4.740@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76222

From my inbox this evening. Anyone have the real story behind what is going on ?

I am writing to inform you of support that is needed for the Hudson Division Director Frank Fallon, N2FF. It seems that Steve Mendelsohn plans to contest Frank's re-election. Why? Your guess is as good as mine! There is no reason for Frank to be contested since he has been very active in the Hudson Division. Frank has been instrumental in being an advocate for the New York antenna legislation. Currently he is pursuing the same activities in New Jersey. In addition, he played a major role in persuading Congressman Steve Israel to introduce the Amateur Radio Emergency Communications Consistency Act. For those of you who do not know what that is; basically it deals with homeowners associations that ban HAM radio antennas in condominium dwellings, where a HAM is not insulated (via PRB-1) against this threat. Frank has done many other important things for amateur radio. In an age where amateur radio is being challenged more than ever, we need HAMS to volunteer for amateur radio for a change. Where others choose to do nothing and leave it for the next guy, Frank stands and perseveres to thrust amateur radio forward by getting the job done.

When you receive your ballot in the mail sometime towards the end of September, please support Frank Fallon, N2FF. Remember to send it back on a timely basis. Whether you know it or not, Frank IS doing the job for amateurs on some very important issues that threaten the very existence of the future of our hobby. Thanks for your time and support.

2858. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:18:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309031718.463cb4b8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76223

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj53an$p86$0@208.206.142.94>...

> That seems to be what they hate about it- they can't count the "dots and dashes"!

What's to hate about that?

2859. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:20:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030903212000.12501.00002184@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 76224

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hklouv3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

> I'm not sure that the Commission will go for an indefinite-term
> license, even though the Comm Act appears to permit the Commission
> to set terms of licenses by rule for all classes of stations except
> broadcast stations which is set by statute.

Here's a thought: if an operator license has indefinite term, how do SK's ever get reported?

In Japan, operator licenses never expire, even if the operator does. So the JA operator license numbers you see are really the number of licenses ever issued, not the number now active or even alive. They can be canceled, I think, but that takes a lot of paperwork proving that the licensee is, in point of fact, actually and quite completely dead.

JA station licenses. OTOH, do expire and cost money to renew. Thus the great disparity between operator and station license numbers.

Also, when a JA ham upgrades, the old license remains on the records.

Imagine if we did that here in the USA. The license totals would be enormous, and constantly growing! Some of us would show up in the tabulations as many as 5 or 6 times.

hmmmm....

73 de Jim, N2EY

2860. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:21:23 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj642j$j6t$0@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 76226

Jack Twilley wrote:

> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> >>>>> "Dick" == Dick Carroll; <dixie@townsqr.com> writes:
>
> Jack> In my limited experience, I learn more characters faster with
> Jack> Farnsworth spacing, but I'm concerned that I'm building a lookup
> Jack> table instead of reflexes. It's the difference between
> Jack> "dahdidah, hmm, that's K, dahdah, hmm, that's M" and "dahdidah
> Jack> (K) dahdah (M)". I learned eight or nine characters with
> Jack> Farnsworth spacing, but I can't repeat the performance at full
> Jack> speed, so I fear that I'm learning something that won't be
> Jack> useful if I continue to use Farnsworth spacing.
>
> Dick> That's where practice comes in. Learn to recognize the
> Dick> characters, then listen to code off the air or what ever othen
> Dick> non-familiar source you may have available. Soon you find that
> Dick> you don't use anything like a looktable any more, it just comes
> Dick> in as letters, and then words that you recognize like
> Dick> speech. The more familiar you become, the longer words begin to
> Dick> come through as words, just like the shorter ones did earlier,
> Dick> and so on it goes. You build a Morse vocabulary of words. But
> Dick> it does take practice.
>
> I do have a couple of questions, though. Which spacing is more
> commonly found in "real code" -- full speed or Farnsworth spacing?
> When people learn to receive code with Farnsworth spacing, do they
> also learn to send with Farnsworth spacing? Those two things have
> puzzled me but I haven't found any real answers.

I personally like to use a Farnsworth style of sending at lower speeds. It just works
better. You hear all sorts of code out there and get used to most all of it with time,
but the stations sending slower code via a Farnsworth type of spacing are easiest to copy,
just as learning the code via Farnsworth practice makes it easier to learn.
As someone already said, it all comes together at around 20wpm anyway.
But at slower speeds Farnsworth spacing has definite advantages.

Dick

2861. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:24:18 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj6482$j6t$1@208.207.71.147>
Source record: 76228

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309031419.781071e2@posting.google.com...
> > S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:<jtfblv010bk0gpv19cap9jk0i1o6u9c0ap@4ax.com>...
> > > On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 14:38:36 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> > > wrote:
> > >
> > > >The exam does not exclude anyone who cares to make the effort to learn.
> And
> > > >Farnsworth IS Morse since it relates a letter directly to a sound
> without
> > > >counting dots and dashes.
> > >
> > > Actually the Farnsworth method is Morse Code
> >
> > It is not.
> >
> > Only at 20 WPM does Farnsworth and Morse use the same character and word
> rate.
>
> Nowhere is there a definition that says the character rate and word rate
> MUST be the same for it to be Morse. There is standard spacing and
> Farnsworth spacing and the variety of spacing that you hear on the air.
> There are some really fine operators who have near perfect standard spacing
> but the rest of us vary. That doesn't mean we aren't sending Morse. If you
> read the manuals on Morse, they give recommended element, character, and
> word spacings for standard operation but that is all. It does not mandate
> that the relative spacing meet any particular standard to be considered
> Morse code.

Dee, you just destroyed his most reliable rant with one short burst!

2862. Re: Going under the knife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:27:41 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <hyw5b.531$vj4.80543@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76225

Best wishes for a speedy recovery.

73,
Carl - wk3c

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bj3kad$f2s35$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> To all my friends, combatants, debaters and lurkers here in r.r.a.p,
>
> I will be going under the knife this Tuesday for surgery on my lower back
> and won't be back for about a week or so. I am quiet sure that I am not
> going to feel like being in the upright position for the next week (or
doing
> much of anything for that matter) , so everyone have a great week and
> probably next week I will have a ton of catching up to do.
>
> Hope everyone had safe Labor Day Weekend and catch ya all in a bit,
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>

2863. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:29:18 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Ozw5b.532$vj4.79366@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76227

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F54E23A.8030209@psu.edu...
>
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > I've explained out committment to our members' privacy. If FISTS
> > doesn't have the same policy, that's their choice, and thus, you could
> > have answered my question without breaching any confidence. I can't
> > do the same because of the committment we have made to our members.
>
>
> Can't you think of a better reason? Let's say there are 5000 members of
> NCI.
>
> Explain how saying There are 5000 members of NCI is violating anyones
> privacy.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

That's a reasonable approximation ... and growing by leaps and bounds
daily with the Petition and associated publicity.

Carl - wk3c

2864. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:29:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030903212946.18106.00000252@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 76230

>That's a reasonable approximation ... and growing by leaps and bounds
>daily with the Petition and associated publicity.
>
>Carl - wk3c

Bullshit, Prove it.

2865. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:31:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309031731.43ffa3de@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76231

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309010709.259f9fbc@posting.google.com>...
> vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030831224123.26794.00000166@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> > From: "Tin Monkey"
> >
> > >When inclement WX hits and the phone lines are down it will be back to Ham
> > >Radio the way it always has been. Good old radios and antennas....and for
> > >those with preplannning a Marine battery or two as well.
> >
> > How often has your fantasy been played out? Can you give examples where YOU
> > encountered that?
>
> Newy York, September 11th, 2001.
>
> The Midwest floods in the 90's.
>
> Any number of hurricaines in the last 50 years in the Gulf States
> and Atlantic Coast.
>
> Need more, Vippy?
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, don't even try to cash in on Sept 11th unless you were there
and provided emergency communications via amateur radio.

Brian

2866. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:31:35 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <XBw5b.534$vj4.80577@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76229

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F54A687.4010407@psu.edu...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> >>It doesn't take a majority to win an issue, Dick. All it takes is an
> >>irate minority that is prepared to be loud and active.
> >
> >
> > No, what it takes are rational, compelling arguments that support
> > your position ... NCI had them in the case of WT 98-143, the
> > PCTAs couldn't come up with ANY (because there are no rational,
> > compelling arguments for keeping Morse testing).
>
> >>What do they do for an encore?
> >
> >
> > We present more rational, compelling arguments, of course.
>
>
> Carl, with all due respect, "rational and compelling arguments" are in
> the head of the beholder.
>
> Why do you do people a disservice by suggesting otherwise?
>
> I have read both documents, and find the NCI and FISTS proposals
> equally rational and compelling.
>
>
> In the end, it all comes down to what a person **believes**. And that
> is not rational. Not in your case, not in mine. And too much of the
> "belief" business and it turns into religion, which some PCTA'ers have
> been accused of. It all works both ways.

Propping up a "belief system" ("tradition", etc. ... all the things that
keep
things stuck in the past) is NOT a legitimate regulatory purpose or role.

Carl - wk3c

2867. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:38:06 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj651ulab0@208.207.71.146>
Source record: 76234

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F54A687.4010407@psu.edu...
> > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > >>It doesn't take a majority to win an issue, Dick. All it takes is an
> > >>irate minority that is prepared to be loud and active.
> > >
> > >
> > > No, what it takes are rational, compelling arguments that support
> > > your position ... NCI had them in the case of WT 98-143, the
> > > PCTAs couldn't come up with ANY (because there are no rational,
> > > compelling arguments for keeping Morse testing).
> >
> > >>What do they do for an encore?
> > >
> > >
> > > We present more rational, compelling arguments, of course.
> >
> >
> > Carl, with all due respect, "rational and compelling arguments" are in
> > the head of the beholder.
> >
> > Why do you do people a disservice by suggesting otherwise?
> >
> > I have read both documents, and find the NCI and FISTS proposals
> > equally rational and compelling.
> >
> >
> > In the end, it all comes down to what a person **believes**. And that
> > is not rational. Not in your case, not in mine. And too much of the
> > "belief" business and it turns into religion, which some PCTA'ers have
> > been accused of. It all works both ways.
>
> Propping up a "belief system" ("tradition", etc. ... all the things that
> keep
> things stuck in the past) is NOT a legitimate regulatory purpose or role.
>

Neither is government support for a lamebrained attitude that labels "stuck in the past" as a description of radiotelegraphy on ham radio. Try actually tuning around the CW portions and you soon see how current CW is.

Carl, you're beginning to sound like one of the Three Stooges on a stuck record - if anyone her remembers what that is. It's "old" too, but still one of the most effective of descriptives.

2868. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:41:38 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <mLw5b.535$vj4.80841@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76232

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bj2gimfce0@208.207.71.157...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > ... most of the traffic handled via NTS is
>
> > 1) of little/no importance
>
> To whom? And you'd allege that there is no other possibility ? Sure
sounds like it. You
> *should* know that even health and welfare traffic is important to the
> mission of the ARS, as it not only relieves worried families etc but also
gies important
> exposure to the capabilities and mission of the ARS. Sorry you missed all
that.
>
> > and
>
> > 2) much makes use of "coded messages" (sending a canned message number)
>
> > that would be of little use in an emergency situation where the
situation,
> > needs,
> > details would need to be spelled out in some detail.
>
> N onsense bafflegab! Have you ever worked a *real* disaster/emergency of
any consequence?

Yes ... major earthquakes, forest (brush) fires, and the crash of a
commercial airliner
into a residential area in SoCal ... over many years. Hurricanes in
Florida, etc.
Often was NCS ...

> Sure doesn't sound like it! And for your edification, the "canned"
mesages, right along
> with prosigns and the many other CW shortcuts merely add
> significantly to the efficiency of the mode.

ROTFLMAO!!!

> > Sorry, the "Morse is necessary for emergency communications" argument
> > doesn't hold water, and the FCC has already realized that.

>
> BS! FCC has never made any statement even close to that, and WE all know
it.

YES THEY HAVE - from the R&O in WT Docket No. 98-143 ("restructuring")
- read it and weep:

31. We also find unconvincing the argument that telegraphy proficiency is one way to keep amateur radio operators ready to be of service in an emergency. In this regard, we note that most emergency communication today is performed using either voice, data, or video modes. We also note that most amateur radio operators who choose to provide emergency communication do so, according to the amateur radio press, using voice or digital modes of communication, in part, because information can be exchanged much faster using these other modes of communication.[1] Further, we note that in traditional emergency services, such as police, fire, and rescue, there is no requirement that emergency service personnel hold amateur radio licenses or any other license that requires telegraphy proficiency. We conclude, therefore, that telegraphy proficiency is not a significant factor in determining an individual's ability to provide or be prepared to provide emergency communications.

---

[1]See, e.g., The ARRL Letter, Volume 18, Number 7, at 3-4 (use of single side band when Hams Help Staff Colombian Relief Call Center); Volume 17, Number 13 at 3 (VHF repeaters use to assist tornado victims); Volume 18, Number 4 at 1-3 (use of VHF 2 meter repeaters to assist Emergency Operations center after tornado outbreak). See also Worldradio, February, 1999, at 6 (Salvation Army Emergency Team Radio Network (SATERN) maintaining a network of stations on 14.265 MHz during Hurricane Mitch); and Newsline, Issue No. 1129, February 29, 1999 (communications for Colombian earthquake assistance on 14.347 MHz using voice modes.)

> One NEVER knows in advance what will be needed to deal with any unforseen
> emergency/disaster.

That's why one should be prepared with spare gear, good plans, etc. so that one does not have to rely on outdated methods ...

> We all know that, and of course you do too, but it works against that
> enigmatic agenda of yours.

Sorry, Dick, YOU'RE the one with the "enigmatic agenda" ... but the FCC
doesn't
buy it ...

Carl - wk3c

2869. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:42:56 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj65b0lab1@208.207.71.146>
Source record: 76236

Brian wrote:

> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309010709.259f9fbc@posting.google.com>...
> > vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030831224123.26794.00000166@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> > > From: "Tin Monkey"
> > >
> > > >When inclement WX hits and the phone lines are down it will be back to Ham
> > > >Radio the way it always has been. Good old radios and antennas....and for
> > > >those with preplannning a Marine battery or two as well.
> > >
> > > How often has your fantasy been played out? Can you give examples where YOU
> > > encountered that?
> >
> > Newy York, September 11th, 2001.
> >
> > The Midwest floods in the 90's.
> >
> > Any number of hurricaines in the last 50 years in the Gulf States
> > and Atlantic Coast.
> >
> > Need more, Vippy?
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Steve, don't even try to cash in on Sept 11th unless you were there
> and provided emergency communications via amateur radio.
>
> Brian

"Cash in"????? Hey Steve, Brain thinks there's money in ham radio!
Should be prevail on someone to donate him a clue, maybe suggest he read
Part 97 with an eye to actually doing more than mouthing the words?

2870. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:43:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <8Nw5b.536$vj4.80805@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76233

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bj2gumfuh0@208.207.71.157...
>
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F53CBDD.2040704@adelphia.net...
> > >
> > > How do you justify a trained group of communicators that are versed in
> > > a mode that is as useful and needed as CW is? There isn't an emergency
> > > right now.
> >
> > It's especially hard when the emergency management agencies have
> > no use for a cadre of CW ops ... it's not the type of communications
> > that they want or need.
> >
>
> You're saying they would rather have NO communications than to use CW.
> Any EMS manager with that attitude should br replaced posthaste.

NO, I'm saying that they know that there are more efficient, practical modes
available that better meet their needs and that's what they want ... it's up
to US
to be prepared to provide them, not try to sell them on Morse.

Carl - wk3c

2871. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:47:34 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <WQw5b.537$vj4.80805@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76235

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F54C978.8040604@ix.netcom.com...
> Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> >It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
> >
> >
> >
> >
> If CW does enjoy a 13 dB advantage over SSB, avid DX hounds will
> choose to learn it and use it on their own. No need for a license test.
> CW makes for small bandwidth combined with simple equipment.
> NASA doesn't use CW with its deep space probes, but they have
> fancy equipment on both ends. I mention this in that NASA does the
> ultimate in weak signal work, something CW is usually good for on
> ham bands with simple equipment and trained operators. But there's
> no CW op on the space probe.

And plain old binary FSK has a bit more than a 9 dB weak signal advantage
over OOK Morse ... if you slow it down to equivalent data rates ...

More modern digital techniques are even better. Some produce perfect
copy at s/n ratios where even the best CW operator couldn't even detect
the PRESENCE of a CW signal, let alone begin to copy it.

However, Dick and other Morse fanatics insist that those modes aren't
a suitable option because they (dread the thought) require a computer
(and some hardware/software that I'm sure "Shannon doesn't mean squat
Dick" couldn't even begin to understand).

Carl - wk3c

2872. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:49:30 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <KSw5b.538$vj4.80505@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76237

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F54DEF5.9080308@psu.edu...
> Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> >
> > >>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > >>news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
> > >>
> > >>> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
> > >>
> > >>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
> > >
> > >
> > > Many times the number of *US* NCI members, Carl.
> >
> >
> > Now Dick, how do you know that? No one knows except a person that isn't
> > telling.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -

If FISTS has 10k members, they do NOT have "many times the membership
numbers of NCI" ... the numbers would be something that Dick would hate
to imagine in worst twisted nightmare :-)

Carl - wk3c

2873. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:51:18 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <qUw5b.540$vj4.80890@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76238

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:Xa75b.22665$Om1.19738@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...

> I think total ellimination is equivilant to negotiations with a terrorist
> organization (NCI).
>
> Dan/W4NTI

I think that characterization is totally out of line and is equivalent to
the "law of usenet" that goes something like "the first one to equate
the other to Hitler automatically loses the argument."

Carl - wk3c

2874. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:52:37 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <FVw5b.541$vj4.81031@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76239

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030903210151.17961.00000609@mb-m01.aol.com...
> >So you have no rational argument for the retention of code testing?
> >
> >
>
> None that you would understand

I agree with Bruce ... no argument he could possibly present
would be coherent enough for any reasonably rational, intelligent
person to understand. :-)

Carl - wk3c

2875. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:54:38 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <yXw5b.542$vj4.80930@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76240

"Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote in message
news:bj3ddq$a9j@library2.airnews.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:rz95b.36684$Vx2.16264969@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030902061117.15462.00002660@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > > FISTS #4360
> > >
> >
> > Well just received my FISTS number and it is 10270. My OMs number is
> 10271.
> > So you don't need to count them.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >
> >
>
> Hmmmm, the ASCII format document with just the list copied and pasted into
a
> MS Word document shows to be 5,193 paragraphs, which would be
> members--presuming there is one line/paragraph per member. That list is
> labeled as "Active Members."
>
> Kim W5TIT

Interesting tidbit, Kim ...

Looks like Dick's numbers could be a little bit upside down on which
organization
has more members :-)

Carl - wk3c

>
>

2876. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 01:57:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <OZw5b.543$vj4.80999@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76241

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:4e8blv8cn71ijca47anitm818uf6hk56og@4ax.com...
> On Mon, 01 Sep 2003 19:57:23 GMT, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
> >>
> >> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
> >
> >How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
> >
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> Nearly 10,000.
>
> Not all of them are users of code either. FISTS welcomes anybody,
> unlike the NCI where you join "the cause to remove code requirements".
>
> If you prefer to remove the code requirement, no one is forcing you do
> unplug your keyer from your radio.
>
> Stacey, AA7YA
> FISTS #3857

Stacey,

That 10k number seems to fly in the face of facts ... but it really
doesn't matter, because it's the quality of the arguments presented
to the FCC that matters, and the FISTS petition, while well-written,
is lacking in a truly rational regulatory basis for maintaining ANY
Morse test requirement.

Carl - wk3c

2877. Re: Ham here and hams on the air?? Its a poll

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 02:03:20 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <I3x5b.544$vj4.81212@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76242

> On Fri, 29 Aug 2003 09:03:21 -0400, Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> >1. How many hams that participate with some frequency here in this
newsgroup
> >operate on the air in the legal ham bands?

Me, too ...

> >2. Which band(s) do you operate? (Modes irrelevant for this poll, just
> >bands or frequency band ranges please.)

160m-70cm (with higher bands coming soon)

> >3. How frequently do you operate on those bands in Question 2?? Hourly,
> >Daily, Weekly etc.

Frequently (not daily, but frequently as work/travel schedules permit).
Also have backpack portable station 160m-70cm that I take on travel
when it's feasible to arrange permission to operate, if necessary.

Carl - wk3c

2878. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 02:08:05 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <98x5b.545$vj4.81252@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76243

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030902191946.00545.00000362@mb-m02.aol.com...
> These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
>
> As of May 14, 2000:
>
> Novice - 49,329
> Tech - 205,394
> Tech Plus - 128,860
> General - 112,677
> Advanced - 99,782
> Extra - 78,750
> Total - 674,792
>
>
> As of September 1, 2003:
>
> Novice - 33,156 (decrease of 16,173)
> Technician - 257,830 (increase of 52,436)
> Technician Plus - 65,928 (decrease of 62,932)
> General - 141,402 (increase of 28,725)
> Advanced - 82,931 (decrease of 16,851)
> Extra - 104,512 (increase of 25,762)
> Total - 685,759 (increase of 10,967)
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

So ... 54.8158101% of US hams will immediately benefit from
dropping the Morse test (Techs/total of all classes, since Novices
already have 5 wpm credit for life.

Interesting fact ... I'll have to remember that for my comments. Thanks.

Carl - wk3c

2879. Re: Going under the knife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 02:11:58 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Obx5b.1625$n95.1153@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76245

Wish you a speedy recovery, Ryan. Also, like Bert, I hope you get a pretty nurse :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message news:bj3kad$f2s35$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> To all my friends, combatants, debaters and lurkers here in r.r.a.p,
>
> I will be going under the knife this Tuesday for surgery on my lower back
> and won't be back for about a week or so. I am quiet sure that I am not
> going to feel like being in the upright position for the next week (or doing
> much of anything for that matter) , so everyone have a great week and
> probably next week I will have a ton of catching up to do.
>
> Hope everyone had safe Labor Day Weekend and catch ya all in a bit,
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

2880. NCI Petition available on FCC ECFS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 02:14:43 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <nex5b.550$vj4.81352@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76244

No Code International's Petition for Rulemaking to the FCC
was assigned RM-10786 and is now viewable for review and
comments on the FCC's ECFS site at:
http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/comsrch_v2.cgi

(type RM-10786 in the "Proceeding" box at the upper left of
this web page to view the Petition and comments filed to date).
Apparently the "RM number" was assigned last week, along with
others on the same topic, but the Petition itself was not visible
due to some sort of file-linking error. That was corrected late
on September 2nd or early on September 3rd, and comments are
now being accepted by the ECFS.

Also, if you would mention that news on this issue can be
obtained via the "Articles" link on the main NCI web page
at http://www.nocode.org, that would be most appreciated.

73,
Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
Grid Square FN20fm
http://home.ptd.net/~wk3c

NCI-1052
Executive Director, No Code International

Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
http://www.nocode.org

2881. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 02:22:25 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Blx5b.551$vj4.81294@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76246

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bj6482$j6t$1@208.207.71.147...
>
>
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0309031419.781071e2@posting.google.com...
> > > S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:<jtfblv010bk0gpv19cap9jk0i1o6u9c0ap@4ax.com>...
> > > > On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 14:38:36 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> > > > wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >The exam does not exclude anyone who cares to make the effort to
learn.
> > And
> > > > >Farnsworth IS Morse since it relates a letter directly to a sound
> > without
> > > > >counting dots and dashes.
> > > >
> > > > Actually the Farnsworth method is Morse Code
> > >
> > > It is not.
> > >
> > > Only at 20 WPM does Farnsworth and Morse use the same character and
word
> > rate.
> >
> > Nowhere is there a definition that says the character rate and word rate
> > MUST be the same for it to be Morse. There is standard spacing and
> > Farnsworth spacing and the variety of spacing that you hear on the air.
> > There are some really fine operators who have near perfect standard
spacing
> > but the rest of us vary. That doesn't mean we aren't sending Morse. If
you
> > read the manuals on Morse, they give recommended element, character, and
> > word spacings for standard operation but that is all. It does not
mandate
> > that the relative spacing meet any particular standard to be considered
> > Morse code.
>
> Dee, you just destroyed his most reliable rant with one short burst!

Actually, I believe there is an ITU-R Recommendation that specifies
the "International Morse Code" in typical ITU detail.

I will see if I can locate it ...

Carl - wk3c
>

2882. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 02:28:39 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <ip8dlv00kelcermv0lhaoteiv2vjsqr7l4@4ax.com>
Source record: 76247

On 01 Sep 2003 20:04:45 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>>
>>Carl - wk3c
>>
>
>How many Cbplussers International, I mean NCI are Members?

Answering a question with a question is no answer at all.

2883. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 02:35:27 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <i39dlvg6p48t8adepgm7phh89l1lh9d3v7@4ax.com>
Source record: 76248

On 2 Sep 2003 14:41:13 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> news:20030902061117.15462.00002659@mb-m06.aol.com...
>> > In article <TsU4b.267$vj4.43211@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> > <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>> >
>> > >"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>> > >news:3F53CBDD.2040704@adelphia.net...
>> > >>
>> > >> How do you justify a trained group of communicators that are versed in
>> > >> a mode that is as useful and needed as CW is? There isn't an emergency
>> > >> right now.
>> > >
>> > >It's especially hard when the emergency management agencies have
>> > >no use for a cadre of CW ops ... it's not the type of communications
>> > >that they want or need.
>> >
>> > KT4ST has shown that to be untrue.
>>
>> One person's opinion ... and a person who clearly has a pro-Morse bias
>> from his ham perspective. He's the ONLY EMS person I've EVER heard
>> from who seriously considered Morse a truly valuable and necessary part
>> of emergency communications, and I've been involved in emergency
>> communications for over 25 years.
>>
>> > However, with all due respect, Carl, I don't
>> > think you'd be the most effective salesman for the mode...
>>
>> It's not my job to be a salesman for Morse ... that's up to the people
>> who like Morse and care to promote its use ... but they shouldn't
>> insist on a govt. enforced "recruiting program" (which as I have pointed
>> out is, in my view, actually counter-productive as it turns more against
>> Morse than it "sells").
>>
>> > >
>> > >Just as the CW NTS nets are anachronisms ...
>> > >
>> > What about SSB NTS nets? Are they anachronisms?
>> >

>> > A CW NTS net can handle more traffic in less time using less spectrum than
>> an
>> > SSB NTS net. Been there, done that.
>>
>> But let's face it ... most of the traffic handled via NTS is 1) of little/no
>> importance
>> and 2) much makes use of "coded messages" (sending a canned message number)
>> that would be of little use in an emergency situation where the situation,
>> needs,
>> details would need to be spelled out in some detail.
>>
>> Sorry, the "Morse is necessary for emergency communications" argument
>> doesn't
>> hold water, and the FCC has already realized that.
>>
>> Carl - wk3c
>
> Let's face it- Carl just hates Morse code, despite his many protests to the contrary.
>It's really not that difficult to understand - after all, he hears all that digital data
>flying past his ears and the old nternal modem just won't work on it! Ah, the pain! The
>Frustration! The Agony!
>
> You just can't help sympathyzing with his plight. The ONLY way for him to find relief is
>to slay that dreaded dragon under the bed.....

Well, that was a well thought our and logical rebuttal in a falicious
kind of way. If a more logical argument than that can't be made,
don't be suprised if the FCC doesn't agree with your proposal.

2884. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 02:44:27 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <0l9dlvs23bl641ts005rfupn7klt9igf6j@4ax.com>
Source record: 76249

On 02 Sep 2003 01:20:59 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>What do they do for an encore?
>
>Put out a list of 10 Codes

Very effective rebuttal. So, you do have some type of supporting documentation that the group advocates the use of 10 codes, don't you? Otherwise, I would have to think that you are avoiding the central issue and that makes your position look very weak.

2885. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 02:55:52 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <ibadlvc4qalqm6893kdkbnrmbdc516phqr@4ax.com>
Source record: 76250

```
On Tue, 02 Sep 2003 20:37:16 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:f45722ac.0309020310.794e075a@posting.google.com...
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:<%BU4b.270$vj4.43753@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
>> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> > news:MIQ4b.19457$Om1.10718@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> > >
>> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>> > > news:f45722ac.0309011251.3ada241b@posting.google.com...
>> > > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<biuq0n$2rg$0@208.206.142.103>...
>> > > > > It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
>> > > > >
>> > > > >
>> > > > > http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
>> > > > >
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Enjoy!
>> > > >
>> > > >
>> > > > I thought that FISTS sold themselves as a non-political club?
>> > >
>> > > How is sending in a petition a political act? Does that mean when NCI
>> > sent
>> > > in a petition it was political? Or perhaps they were simply following
>> > > proceedures.
>> >
>> > Of course participating in the regulatory process is a "political"
>thing.
>> >
>> > And yes, FIST's position in the past (and IIRC, their charter) was
>> > that they were *not* a politically-oriented group ... just a group that
>> > was supposed to foster the *use* of Morse.
>>
>> Right. So where NCI is purposely a politically-oriented group, and
>> behaves accordingly, FISTS is specifically a non-political group who
>> is now behaving politically.
>>
>> Why don't we hear any whining about how FISTS has broken with their
>> charter from the people that are always whining about NCI?
```

>>
>> Usual PCTA double-standard?
>
>Not only a dumb ass, but a knee jerk bleeding heart liberal to boot.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Another logical rebuttal I see. Is the pro code postion this weak or
does it just attract people who can't make effective rebuttals?

2886. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 02:57:08 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <jfadlvg1oqvcd38e2ambobjthndiio57kb@4ax.com>
Source record: 76301

On 03 Sep 2003 02:19:59 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>Talk about a dumb ass. He combines Bruce's stupidity with reckless
>>statements.
>>
>
>Dumb Ass is someone who lets NCI dictate to them what they can and cant say

How do they do this?

2887. Re: NCI Petition available on FCC ECFS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 02:59:27 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030903225927.03231.00000297@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 76303

>Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
>Grid Square FN20fm
>http://home.ptd.net/~wk3c

Went to his WEB Site, Saw his picture, what a Dork looking character, no wonder he couldnt handle CW.

2888. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 03:00:31 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <3madlv8supb111248rq7ecv6bar9ss4u81@4ax.com>
Source record: 76302

On 04 Sep 2003 01:01:51 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>So you have no rational argument for the retention of code testing?
>>
>>
>
>None that you would understand

Then that would be none at all.

2889. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 03:06:54 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>
Source record: 76304

On 4 Sep 2003 01:38:06 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
>> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>> news:3F54A687.4010407@psu.edu...
>> > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> > > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>> > >>It doesn't take a majority to win an issue, Dick. All it takes is an
>> > >>irate minority that is prepared to be loud and active.
>> > >
>> > >
>> > > No, what it takes are rational, compelling arguments that support
>> > > your position ... NCI had them in the case of WT 98-143, the
>> > > PCTAs couldn't come up with ANY (because there are no rational,
>> > > compelling arguments for keeping Morse testing).
>> >
>> > >>What do they do for an encore?
>> > >
>> > >
>> > > We present more rational, compelling arguments, of course.
>> >
>> >
>> > Carl, with all due respect, "rational and compelling arguments" are in
>> > the head of the beholder.
>> >
>> > Why do you do people a disservice by suggesting otherwise?
>> >
>> > I have read both documents, and find the NCI and FISTS proposals
>> > equally rational and compelling.
>> >
>> >
>> > In the end, it all comes down to what a person **believes**. And that
>> > is not rational. Not in your case, not in mine. And too much of the
>> > "belief" business and it turns into religion, which some PCTA'ers have
>> > been accused of. It all works both ways.
>>
>> Propping up a "belief system" ("tradition", etc. ... all the things that
>> keep
>> things stuck in the past) is NOT a legitimate regulatory purpose or role.
>>
>

> Neither is government support for a lamebrained attitude that labels "stuck in the past"
>as a description of radiotelegraphy on ham radio. Try actually tuning around the CW
>portions and you soon see how current CW is.
>
>Carl, you're beginning to sound like one of the Three Stooges on a stuck record - if
>anyone her remembers what that is. It's "old" too, but still one of the most effective of
>descriptives.

If CW is indeed effective and current, then it will propagate due to its usefulness without regulatory requirement. Judging by how shrill the proponents are, it appears that even they are afraid that it won't show itself to be advantageous enough for people to learn on their own.

On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?

2890. Re: NCI Petition available on FCC ECFS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 03:09:17 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <g5bdlvg64nepk0mj45h260u2gtgh2v4eoj@4ax.com>
Source record: 76305

On 04 Sep 2003 02:59:27 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
>>Grid Square FN20fm
>>http://home.ptd.net/~wk3c
>
>Went to his WEB Site, Saw his picture, what a Dork looking character, no wonder
>he couldnt handle CW.

Judging from the effectiveness of your rebuttals and the logic of your
arguments, code is doomed if you are a poster child for the movement.

2891. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 04:35:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309032035.1d538dab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76306

Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:<86znhlpw8t.fsf_-_@duchess.twilley.org>...

> . . . . . The practice files I'm building for my web site
> have a word speed of five words per minute and a character speed of
> twenty words per minute.
>
> Stacey> By the time one becomes proficient enough to copy Morse Code,
> Stacey> counting out the dits and dahs is moot at best.
>
> In my limited experience, I learn more characters faster with
> Farnsworth spacing, but I'm concerned that I'm building a lookup table
> instead of reflexes. It's the difference between "dahdidah, hmm,
> that's K, dahdah, hmm, that's M" and "dahdidah (K) dahdah (M)". I
> learned eight or nine characters with Farnsworth spacing, but I can't
> repeat the performance at full speed, so I fear that I'm learning
> something that won't be useful if I continue to use Farnsworth
> spacing.

Try it the other way, 12-15 wpm character speeds at 5 wpm.

> Jack Twilley

w3rv

2892. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 06:35:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB7C561A.25039%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 76307

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> You said to Larry, in part-
>
>> you've spent the last several years trying
>> to sexualize Kim's callsign....
>
>
> So you presume that Kim didn't sexualize it
> when she chose it???
>
> Yep. Truly clueless, that's our boy Dwight.

Well, no kidding. I thought Kim's part in all this was pretty obvious to anyone with even a partial clue (which seems to rule you out). Instead, I was talking to Larry about his part in this - the years he's spent trying to sexualize Kim's callsign. Few others have made such an issue out of Kim's callsign. And that has drawn more attention to that callsign than perhaps anything else, even Kim's use of it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2893. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 06:45:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB7C5862.2503B%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 76308

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:

> heh heh heh. Asking Dick to answer an honest
> question with facts is like getting Bill
> Clinton to .... uh, well, never mind.

Well, I'm not going to be too hard on Dick. He missed the fact that I was talking about what Larry had done, not what others had done. Without that understanding, it is easy to see how he could become even more confused.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2894. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 06:59:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB7C5B9F.2503D%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 76309

"N2EY" wrote:

> Which is why I haven't had cable since 1979,
> and why the sole TV here spends a lot of
> time off. That's the main weapon of the
> marketplace.

We had one significant advantage in that area - we lived overseas for many years without much English-language television available. Because of that, we've never developed much of an addiction to television. We have two in the apartment right now (not ours - they came with the place). Neither of those have been on for more than an hour today, and most of that time was the weather channel (a show about a hurricane hitting Texas years ago) while I was putting a new chair together. Right now, the place is blissfully quiet.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2895. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 07:07:22 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB7C5D74.2503F%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 76310

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> Dwight, there has never been *anyone* posting
> on usenet that has been more full of it--pun
> definitely intended- than YOU. A regular
> windbag. And it's all hot.

Dick, did you get out of bed on the wrong side of life this week? If not, what is up with all the negative waste you're posting? If you don't like what I have to say, don't read it. It's ridiculous to sit there complaining about what I say while you obviously continue to read every word of it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

2896. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 10:24:04 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <8pE5b.37558$Vx2.16550752@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76311

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:Blx5b.551$vj4.81294@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> Actually, I believe there is an ITU-R Recommendation that specifies
> the "International Morse Code" in typical ITU detail.
>

Operative word is recommendation, which is exactly what I said.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

2897. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 11:19:18 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <fahgedit@nomail.net>
Message-ID: <bj7796$7h2@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 76312

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB7C561A.25039%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
> >
> > You said to Larry, in part-
> >
> >> you've spent the last several years trying
> >> to sexualize Kim's callsign....
> >
> >
> > So you presume that Kim didn't sexualize it
> > when she chose it???
> >
> > Yep. Truly clueless, that's our boy Dwight.
>
>
> Well, no kidding. I thought Kim's part in all this was pretty obvious to
> anyone with even a partial clue (which seems to rule you out). Instead, I
> was talking to Larry about his part in this - the years he's spent trying
to
> sexualize Kim's callsign. Few others have made such an issue out of Kim's
> callsign. And that has drawn more attention to that callsign than perhaps
> anything else, even Kim's use of it.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Pretty astute of you, Dwight. Since having this callsign I've been on the
air very little.

Kim W5TIT

2898. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 11:30:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030904073002.07346.00000399@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 76316

In article <3F54E23A.8030209@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
>> I've explained out committment to our members' privacy. If FISTS
>> doesn't have the same policy, that's their choice, and thus, you could
>> have answered my question without breaching any confidence. I can't
>> do the same because of the committment we have made to our members.
>
>
> Can't you think of a better reason? Let's say there are 5000 members of

>NCI.

The important question is "how many active US hams" are members. Comparing the total number in one group with the number of active US hams in another is slanted.

>
> Explain how saying There are 5000 members of NCI is violating
> anyones privacy.

Good question! And we're still waiting for an answer.

We're not asking for names or calls, just the number of US licensed hams who are members. Anyone can determine the FISTS numbers. Why is NCI so secretive about theirs - particularly if the numbers don't really matter?

I recall reading here a statement by Carl that those in the minority should learn to take 'no' for an answer and get on with life. (Those are HIS words, not mine).

What if it turned out (as it did in 1998-99) that the NCI position is a minority opinion?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2899. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 11:30:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030904073003.07346.00000400@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 76313

In article <WQw5b.537$vj4.80805@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>news:3F54C978.8040604@ix.netcom.com...
>> Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>
>> >It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> > http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> If CW does enjoy a 13 dB advantage over SSB, avid DX hounds will
>> choose to learn it and use it on their own. No need for a license test.
>> CW makes for small bandwidth combined with simple equipment.
>> NASA doesn't use CW with its deep space probes, but they have
>> fancy equipment on both ends. I mention this in that NASA does the
>> ultimate in weak signal work, something CW is usually good for on
>> ham bands with simple equipment and trained operators. But there's
>> no CW op on the space probe.
>
>And plain old binary FSK has a bit more than a 9 dB weak signal advantage
>over OOK Morse ... if you slow it down to equivalent data rates ...

If you have an optimized receiver and suitable conditions, maybe - depends on
what you determine to be "equivalent data rates".

But hams don't do slow-HF-BFSK. 60 wpm FSK Baudot RTTY is about the most basic
data mode still in use by hams.
>
>More modern digital techniques are even better. Some produce perfect
>copy at s/n ratios where even the best CW operator couldn't even detect
>the PRESENCE of a CW signal, let alone begin to copy it.

That all depends on the equipment in use. Using a receiver optimized for one
mode in an attempt to receive another may or may not be a good idea.
>
What mode do you use most on HF, Carl?

73 de Jim, N2EY

2900. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 11:30:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030904073004.07346.00000401@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 76314

In article <XBw5b.534$vj4.80577@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>Propping up a "belief system" ("tradition", etc. ... all the things that >keep things stuck in the past) is NOT a legitimate regulatory purpose or role.

Then why do have so many rules, regulations and laws protecting historic and natural sites?

Why do we use "English" measurement units instead of metric?

Why are QWERTY keyboards still the standard even though Dvorak has been shown to be superior?

What is and is not " a legitimate regulatory purpose or role" is purely a matter of opinion.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2901. Re: Going under the knife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 11:30:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030904073004.07346.00000402@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 76315

In article <bj3kad$f2s35$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>I will be going under the knife this Tuesday for surgery on my lower back
>and won't be back for about a week or so.

Good luck and get well quick, Ryan!

73 de Jim, N2EY

2902. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 12:16:59 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309040416.69e717e9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76317

Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...

> If CW is indeed effective and current, then it will propagate due to
> its usefulness without regulatory requirement. Judging by how shrill
> the proponents are, it appears that even they are afraid that it won't
> show itself to be advantageous enough for people to learn on their
> own.
>
> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?

That's shrill enough, congratulations.

w3rv

2903. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 12:25:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309040425.2e5fcf99@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76318

Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...

> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?

In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.

2904. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 12:36:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309040436.5010e087@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76319

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<Bjv5b.37515$Vx2.16470335@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309031419.781071e2@posting.google.com...
> > S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:<jtfblv010bk0gpv19cap9jk0i1o6u9c0ap@4ax.com>...
> > > On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 14:38:36 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> > > wrote:
> > >
> > > >The exam does not exclude anyone who cares to make the effort to learn.
> And
> > > >Farnsworth IS Morse since it relates a letter directly to a sound
> without
> > > >counting dots and dashes.
> > >
> > > Actually the Farnsworth method is Morse Code
> >
> > It is not.
> >
> > Only at 20 WPM does Farnsworth and Morse use the same character and word
> rate.
>
> Nowhere is there a definition that says the character rate and word rate
> MUST be the same for it to be Morse.

Then it's not Morse Code.

There is standard spacing and
> Farnsworth spacing and the variety of spacing that you hear on the air.
> There are some really fine operators who have near perfect standard spacing
> but the rest of us vary. That doesn't mean we aren't sending Morse.

It means that we are desparately trying to, except in the case of
DICK/W0EX who purposely sends poor code in order to thwart the
computer code readers.

He should be cited.

If you
> read the manuals on Morse, they give recommended element, character, and
> word spacings for standard operation but that is all.

Recommended?

It does not mandate
> that the relative spacing meet any particular standard to be considered

> Morse code.

So you say that Morse cannot be defined, yet the FCC demands you pass
an exam that has barred people from the medium and high frequencies.
It is whatever you want it to be.

hihi

That doesn't sound like good government to me.

2905. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 12:38:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309040438.5f8802b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76320

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj6482$j6t$1@208.207.71.147>...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0309031419.781071e2@posting.google.com...
> > > S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:<jtfblv010bk0gpv19cap9jk0i1o6u9c0ap@4ax.com>...
> > > > On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 14:38:36 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> > > > wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >The exam does not exclude anyone who cares to make the effort to learn.
> And
> > > > >Farnsworth IS Morse since it relates a letter directly to a sound
> without
> > > > >counting dots and dashes.
> > > >
> > > > Actually the Farnsworth method is Morse Code
> > >
> > > It is not.
> > >
> > > Only at 20 WPM does Farnsworth and Morse use the same character and word
> > rate.
> >
> > Nowhere is there a definition that says the character rate and word rate
> > MUST be the same for it to be Morse. There is standard spacing and
> > Farnsworth spacing and the variety of spacing that you hear on the air.
> > There are some really fine operators who have near perfect standard spacing
> > but the rest of us vary. That doesn't mean we aren't sending Morse. If you
> > read the manuals on Morse, they give recommended element, character, and
> > word spacings for standard operation but that is all. It does not mandate
> > that the relative spacing meet any particular standard to be considered
> > Morse code.
>
> Dee, you just destroyed his most reliable rant with one short burst!

You would like to think that, DICK, but it is to far from the truth.

2906. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 12:45:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309040445.b9de8f7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76321

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj65b0lab1@208.207.71.146>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309010709.259f9fbc@posting.google.com>...
> > > vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030831224123.26794.00000166@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> > > > From: "Tin Monkey"
> > > >
> > > > >When inclement WX hits and the phone lines are down it will be back to Ham
> > > > >Radio the way it always has been. Good old radios and antennas....and for
> > > > >those with preplannning a Marine battery or two as well.
> > > >
> > > > How often has your fantasy been played out? Can you give examples where YOU
> > > > encountered that?
> > >
> > > Newy York, September 11th, 2001.
> > >
> > > The Midwest floods in the 90's.
> > >
> > > Any number of hurricaines in the last 50 years in the Gulf States
> > > and Atlantic Coast.
> > >
> > > Need more, Vippy?
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > Steve, don't even try to cash in on Sept 11th unless you were there
> > and provided emergency communications via amateur radio.
> >
> > Brian
>
> "Cash in"????? Hey Steve, Brain thinks there's money in ham radio!
> Should be prevail on someone to donate him a clue, maybe suggest he read
> Part 97 with an eye to actually doing more than mouthing the words?

Brian thinks DICK is a dumbass.

Steve is guilty of doing what he has accused others of doing, riding
the coattails of those who have fallen before him for prestige and
fame.

2907. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 12:46:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309040446.3f605875@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76322

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj642j$j6t$0@208.207.71.147>...
> Jack Twilley wrote:
>
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> > >>>>> "Dick" == Dick Carroll; <dixie@townsqr.com> writes:
> >
> > Jack> In my limited experience, I learn more characters faster with
> > Jack> Farnsworth spacing, but I'm concerned that I'm building a lookup
> > Jack> table instead of reflexes. It's the difference between
> > Jack> "dahdidah, hmm, that's K, dahdah, hmm, that's M" and "dahdidah
> > Jack> (K) dahdah (M)". I learned eight or nine characters with
> > Jack> Farnsworth spacing, but I can't repeat the performance at full
> > Jack> speed, so I fear that I'm learning something that won't be
> > Jack> useful if I continue to use Farnsworth spacing.
> >
> > Dick> That's where practice comes in. Learn to recognize the
> > Dick> characters, then listen to code off the air or what ever othen
> > Dick> non-familiar source you may have available. Soon you find that
> > Dick> you don't use anything like a looktable any more, it just comes
> > Dick> in as letters, and then words that you recognize like
> > Dick> speech. The more familiar you become, the longer words begin to
> > Dick> come through as words, just like the shorter ones did earlier,
> > Dick> and so on it goes. You build a Morse vocabulary of words. But
> > Dick> it does take practice.
> >
> > I do have a couple of questions, though. Which spacing is more
> > commonly found in "real code" -- full speed or Farnsworth spacing?
> > When people learn to receive code with Farnsworth spacing, do they
> > also learn to send with Farnsworth spacing? Those two things have
> > puzzled me but I haven't found any real answers.
>
> I personally like to use a Farnsworth style of sending at lower speeds. It just works
> better. You hear all sorts of code out there and get used to most all of it with time,
> but the stations sending slower code via a Farnsworth type of spacing are easiest to
copy,
> just as learning the code via Farnsworth practice makes it easier to learn.
> As someone already said, it all comes together at around 20wpm anyway.
> But at slower speeds Farnsworth spacing has definite advantages.
>
> Dick

Since when? You're on record for preferring the banana boat swing.

2908. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 12:49:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309040449.474947c1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76323

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj642j$j6t$0@208.207.71.147>...
> Jack Twilley wrote:
>
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> > >>>>> "Dick" == Dick Carroll; <dixie@townsqr.com> writes:
> >
> > Jack> In my limited experience, I learn more characters faster with
> > Jack> Farnsworth spacing, but I'm concerned that I'm building a lookup
> > Jack> table instead of reflexes. It's the difference between
> > Jack> "dahdidah, hmm, that's K, dahdah, hmm, that's M" and "dahdidah
> > Jack> (K) dahdah (M)". I learned eight or nine characters with
> > Jack> Farnsworth spacing, but I can't repeat the performance at full
> > Jack> speed, so I fear that I'm learning something that won't be
> > Jack> useful if I continue to use Farnsworth spacing.
> >
> > Dick> That's where practice comes in. Learn to recognize the
> > Dick> characters, then listen to code off the air or what ever othen
> > Dick> non-familiar source you may have available. Soon you find that
> > Dick> you don't use anything like a looktable any more, it just comes
> > Dick> in as letters, and then words that you recognize like
> > Dick> speech. The more familiar you become, the longer words begin to
> > Dick> come through as words, just like the shorter ones did earlier,
> > Dick> and so on it goes. You build a Morse vocabulary of words. But
> > Dick> it does take practice.
> >
> > I do have a couple of questions, though. Which spacing is more
> > commonly found in "real code" -- full speed or Farnsworth spacing?
> > When people learn to receive code with Farnsworth spacing, do they
> > also learn to send with Farnsworth spacing? Those two things have
> > puzzled me but I haven't found any real answers.
>
> I personally like to use a Farnsworth style of sending at lower speeds. It just works
> better. You hear all sorts of code out there and get used to most all of it with time,
> but the stations sending slower code via a Farnsworth type of spacing are easiest to
copy,
> just as learning the code via Farnsworth practice makes it easier to learn.
> As someone already said, it all comes together at around 20wpm anyway.
> But at slower speeds Farnsworth spacing has definite advantages.
>
> Dick

Dick, I'm the someone who "said" and you constantly claim I know nothing of Morse.

Farnswoth is the preferred method for learning 20wpm Morse Code.

2909. ! "Oh, IRe: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 13:14:29 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj7drl$6j8$0@208.206.142.101>
Source record: 76324

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bj2gimfce0@208.207.71.157...
> >
> >
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >
> > > ... most of the traffic handled via NTS is
> >
> > > 1) of little/no importance
> >
> > To whom? And you'd allege that there is no other possibility ? Sure
> sounds like it. You
> > *should* know that even health and welfare traffic is important to the
> > mission of the ARS, as it not only relieves worried families etc but also
> gies important
> > exposure to the capabilities and mission of the ARS. Sorry you missed all
> that.
> >
> > > and
> >
> > > 2) much makes use of "coded messages" (sending a canned message number)
> >
> > > that would be of little use in an emergency situation where the
> situation,
> > > needs,
> > > details would need to be spelled out in some detail.
> >
> > N onsense bafflegab! Have you ever worked a *real* disaster/emergency of
> any consequence?
>
> Yes ... major earthquakes, forest (brush) fires, and the crash of a
> commercial airliner
> into a residential area in SoCal ... over many years. Hurricanes in
> Florida, etc.
> Often was NCS ...
>

With a Tech license?...No wonder you couldn't use CW!

>
> > Sure doesn't sound like it! And for your edification, the "canned"
> mesages, right along
> > with prosigns and the many other CW shortcuts merely add

> > significantly to the efficiency of the mode.
>
> ROTFLMAO!!!
>

And THAT is the best response you can muster to facts! Of course you don't KNOW any more than that about how CW actually works on the air!

>
> > > Sorry, the "Morse is necessary for emergency communications" argument
> > > doesn't hold water, and the FCC has already realized that.
> >
> > BS! FCC has never made any statement even close to that, and WE all know
> it.
>
> YES THEY HAVE - from the R&O in WT Docket No. 98-143 ("restructuring")
> - read it and weep:
>
> 31. We also find unconvincing the argument that telegraphy proficiency is
> one way to keep amateur radio operators ready to be of service in an
> emergency. In this regard, we note that most emergency communication today
> is performed using either voice, data, or video modes. We also note that
> most amateur radio operators who choose to provide emergency communication
> do so, according to the amateur radio press, using voice or digital modes of
> communication, in part, because information can be exchanged much faster
> using these other modes of communication.[1] Further, we note that in
> traditional emergency services, such as police, fire, and rescue, there is
> no requirement that emergency service personnel hold amateur radio licenses
> or any other license that requires telegraphy proficiency. We conclude,
> therefore, that telegraphy proficiency is not a significant factor in
> determining an individual's ability to provide or be prepared to provide
> emergency communications.
>

After you and Bill Sohl finished your "ex parte" what else? I'm sure you baffled them with BS just as you try to do here.

The simple fact is that YOUR ENTIRE ARGUEMENT is based solely on technology and nothing else! NOWHERE does it E EAR happen that ham radio
is or is ever likely to need to rely on maximum throughput. The ARS is simply not geared up for that sort of operation and will never be. It's not what hams do -
even YOU, -the promoter extraordinaire of technology- uses WHAT mode on the air? SINGLE SIDEBAND voice! Not a digit in your operation!

"OH, I'm going to get around to building _____ one of these days" wonb't cut it! Either walk the walk or stuff all the talk! Meanwhile hams are using Morse on HF at ever increasing rates, as is clear to anyone interested enough to tune in the lower end of any HF band. And you pass all that right by.

>
> ---
> ----

>
> [1]See, e.g., The ARRL Letter, Volume 18, Number 7, at 3-4 (use of single
> side band when Hams Help Staff Colombian Relief Call Center); Volume 17,
> Number 13 at 3 (VHF repeaters use to assist tornado victims); Volume 18,
> Number 4 at 1-3 (use of VHF 2 meter repeaters to assist Emergency Operations
> center after tornado outbreak). See also Worldradio, February, 1999, at 6
> (Salvation Army Emergency Team Radio Network (SATERN) maintaining a network
> of stations on 14.265 MHz during Hurricane Mitch); and Newsline, Issue No.
> 1129, February 29, 1999 (communications for Colombian earthquake assistance
> on 14.347 MHz using voice modes.)

Nice selective reading list. Not at all comprehensive. And says nothing about any future situation. Of course you presumeto know exactly what anyone will need, where and when, then. Right.

>
>
> > One NEVER knows in advance what will be needed to deal with any unforseen
> > emergency/disaster.
>
> That's why one should be prepared with spare gear, good plans, etc. so that
> one does not have to rely on outdated methods ...
>

Yeah the entire world of ham radio is going to gear up for disaster communications, keep it all ready all the time. Never happen and ANYONE should know it. You use what you find available in whatever circumstances you happen to be caught in when the ship hits the sand. Maybe you'll have access to all that "spare gear" and maybe not. If not, well gee, coulda shouloda woulda, but.......

Plans? You STILL don't know about plans and what happens to the "best laid" of them? HA! It's one thing to be ready to relieve a disaster, quite another to be caught inside one with a desperate need to communicate to the outside.

You're a simple one-demensional CW hater Carl,.. and you clearly will never get over it.. That old Morris code dragon will dog you for the rest of your life.

>
> > We all know that, and of course you do too, but it works against that
> > enigmatic agenda of yours.
>
> Sorry, Dick, YOU'RE the one with the "enigmatic agenda" ... but the FCC
> doesn't
> buy it ...
>
> Carl - wk3c

2910. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 13:31:11 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <pjfelv4ocdi7vhs6plot1edl1nsiv3u583@4ax.com>
Source record: 76325

On 4 Sep 2003 05:16:59 -0700, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:

>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>
>
>>
>> If CW is indeed effective and current, then it will propagate due to
>> its usefulness without regulatory requirement. Judging by how shrill
>> the proponents are, it appears that even they are afraid that it won't
>> show itself to be advantageous enough for people to learn on their
>> own.
>>
>> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>
>That's shrill enough, congratulations.

I guess no answer at all was to be expected since it shows how invalid
the postion is.

2911. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 13:32:36 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <flfelvsgco1mgulsjf7hb7su19rbr52cq6@4ax.com>
Source record: 76326

On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:

>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>
>> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>
>In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.

I was asking about you guys, not what they will do. Afterall, I've
boycotted General and above for about 9 years now because of
antiquated requirements.

2912. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 13:34:57 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <qofelvkpo9q6iaplskqvno7s4jsh076ufd@4ax.com>
Source record: 76327

On 04 Sep 2003 11:30:04 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <XBw5b.534$vj4.80577@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>What is and is not " a legitimate regulatory purpose or role" is purely a
>matter of opinion.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

The passing of regulations outside the scope of the organization. Is
it your contention that the FCC is chartered to be an organization
that was formed to perserve our historic traditions? A cite from the
Communications Act would be nice if that's your postion.

2913. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 13:39:58 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj7fbe$a8m$0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 76328

Brian wrote:

>
> > As someone already said, it all comes together at around 20wpm anyway.
> > But at slower speeds Farnsworth spacing has definite advantages.
> >
> > Dick
>
> Dick, I'm the someone who "said" and you constantly claim I know nothing of Morse.
>
> Farnswoth is the preferred method for learning 20wpm Morse Code.

See Brian? You hang out on here with those of us who DO know long enough, and you're bound to
learn some little something.

2914. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 13:44:39 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj7fk7$b7l$0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 76329

Brian wrote:

> Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>
> > On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> > with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
> > work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>
> In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.

How will you know? You plan on hanging out on the CW bands-with a computer to do your copying- and spying
on CW ops just to see who they aren't talking to?

How very typical a codehater you are! What makes you even suspect that CW operators would hold those CW
operators in another country responsible for irresponsible acts of their government? Logical progression
would have you insisting that we US CW ops will be boycotting each other if and when FCC drops testing!

And you have no idea how stupid you really are!

Get back inside your village!!!

2915. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 13:46:33 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj7fnp$b7l$1@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 76330

Brian wrote:

> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<Bjv5b.37515$Vx2.16470335@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0309031419.781071e2@posting.google.com...
> > > S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:<jtfblv010bk0gpv19cap9jk0i1o6u9c0ap@4ax.com>...
> > > > On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 14:38:36 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> > > > wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >The exam does not exclude anyone who cares to make the effort to learn.
> > And
> > > > >Farnsworth IS Morse since it relates a letter directly to a sound
> > without
> > > > >counting dots and dashes.
> > > >
> > > > Actually the Farnsworth method is Morse Code
> > >
> > > It is not.
> > >
> > > Only at 20 WPM does Farnsworth and Morse use the same character and word
> > rate.
> >
> > Nowhere is there a definition that says the character rate and word rate
> > MUST be the same for it to be Morse.
>
> Then it's not Morse Code.
>
> There is standard spacing and
> > Farnsworth spacing and the variety of spacing that you hear on the air.
> > There are some really fine operators who have near perfect standard spacing
> > but the rest of us vary. That doesn't mean we aren't sending Morse.
>
> It means that we are desparately trying to, except in the case of
> DICK/W0EX who purposely sends poor code in order to thwart the
> computer code readers.

Google it up, youi lying sack. I said it's entirely possible to foil computer copy that way. So you convert that
to what you wish I had said, as you so often do.

2916. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 13:48:47 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj7frv$b7l$2@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 76331

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj65b0lab1@208.207.71.146>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309010709.259f9fbc@posting.google.com>...
> > > > vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030831224123.26794.00000166@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> > > > > From: "Tin Monkey"
> > > > >
> > > > > >When inclement WX hits and the phone lines are down it will be back to Ham
> > > > > >Radio the way it always has been. Good old radios and antennas....and for
> > > > > >those with preplannning a Marine battery or two as well.
> > > > >
> > > > > How often has your fantasy been played out? Can you give examples where YOU
> > > > > encountered that?
> > > >
> > > > Newy York, September 11th, 2001.
> > > >
> > > > The Midwest floods in the 90's.
> > > >
> > > > Any number of hurricaines in the last 50 years in the Gulf States
> > > > and Atlantic Coast.
> > > >
> > > > Need more, Vippy?
> > > >
> > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > >
> > > Steve, don't even try to cash in on Sept 11th unless you were there
> > > and provided emergency communications via amateur radio.
> > >
> > > Brian
> >
> > "Cash in"????? Hey Steve, Brain thinks there's money in ham radio!
> > Should be prevail on someone to donate him a clue, maybe suggest he read
> > Part 97 with an eye to actually doing more than mouthing the words?
>
> Brian thinks DICK is a dumbass.
>

OIn the other hand, Dick and the rest of the world KNOWS that Brian is.

>
> Steve is guilty of doing what he has accused others of doing, riding
> the coattails of those who have fallen before him for prestige and
> fame.

Where did he say *he* was involved in any of those actions??? HE DIDN'T.
HAM RADIO was, you idiotic twerp.

2917. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 13:52:27 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj7g2r$cd3$0@208.207.71.137>
Source record: 76332

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> > heh heh heh. Asking Dick to answer an honest
> > question with facts is like getting Bill
> > Clinton to .... uh, well, never mind.
>
> Well, I'm not going to be too hard on Dick. He missed the fact that I was
> talking about what Larry had done, not what others had done. Without that
> understanding, it is easy to see how he could become even more confused.

Dick didn't miss a thing, Genius. How could Larry have "sexualized" what she had already sexualized long before? Why do you think she chose the callsign in the first place? That is, in the unlikely event that you ever actually think at all, before opening mouth.

2918. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 14:00:13 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <q8helvsb9gtvqibdc33spot1ehk225ag5d@4ax.com>
Source record: 76333

On 4 Sep 2003 13:46:33 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>Brian wrote:
>
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<Bjv5b.37515$Vx2.16470335@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>> > news:f45722ac.0309031419.781071e2@posting.google.com...
>> > > S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<jtfblv010bk0gpv19cap9jk0i1o6u9c0ap@4ax.com>...
>> > > > On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 14:38:36 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
>> > > > wrote:
>> > > > >
>> > > > >The exam does not exclude anyone who cares to make the effort to learn.
>> > And
>> > > > >Farnsworth IS Morse since it relates a letter directly to a sound
>> > without
>> > > > >counting dots and dashes.
>> > > > >
>> > > > Actually the Farnsworth method is Morse Code
>> > > >
>> > > It is not.
>> > >
>> > > Only at 20 WPM does Farnsworth and Morse use the same character and word
>> > rate.
>> >
>> > Nowhere is there a definition that says the character rate and word rate
>> > MUST be the same for it to be Morse.
>>
>> Then it's not Morse Code.
>>
>> There is standard spacing and
>> > Farnsworth spacing and the variety of spacing that you hear on the air.
>> > There are some really fine operators who have near perfect standard spacing
>> > but the rest of us vary. That doesn't mean we aren't sending Morse.
>>
>> It means that we are desparately trying to, except in the case of
>> DICK/W0EX who purposely sends poor code in order to thwart the
>> computer code readers.
>
>Google it up, youi lying sack. I said it's entirely possible to foil computer copy that
way. So you convert that

>to what you wish I had said, as you so often do.

Why would you want to foil computer copy? For you to do the test to make sure that it works and then advocate it's use, you can't really say that wasn't your intention.

2919. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 14:02:29 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <qdhelvggq1mdt2ivckcj5e6jsa0cknfe7k@4ax.com>
Source record: 76334

On 4 Sep 2003 13:52:27 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
>> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>>
>> > heh heh heh. Asking Dick to answer an honest
>> > question with facts is like getting Bill
>> > Clinton to .... uh, well, never mind.
>>
>> Well, I'm not going to be too hard on Dick. He missed the fact that I was
>> talking about what Larry had done, not what others had done. Without that
>> understanding, it is easy to see how he could become even more confused.
>
>Dick didn't miss a thing, Genius. How could Larry have "sexualized" what she had already
>sexualized long before? Why do you think she chose the callsign in the first place? That
>is, in the unlikely event that you ever actually think at all, before opening mouth.

Actually, the last time I subscribed to the ng, TIT's had left the
group and vowed never to return. Things changed I guess.

2920. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 15:23:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F575908.5050002@psu.edu>
Source record: 76336

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F54A687.4010407@psu.edu...
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>>
>>>>It doesn't take a majority to win an issue, Dick. All it takes is an
>>>>irate minority that is prepared to be loud and active.
>>>
>>>
>>>No, what it takes are rational, compelling arguments that support
>>>your position ... NCI had them in the case of WT 98-143, the
>>>PCTAs couldn't come up with ANY (because there are no rational,
>>>compelling arguments for keeping Morse testing).
>>
>>>>What do they do for an encore?
>>>
>>>
>>>We present more rational, compelling arguments, of course.
>>
>>
>>Carl, with all due respect, "rational and compelling arguments" are in
>>the head of the beholder.
>>
>>Why do you do people a disservice by suggesting otherwise?
>>
>>I have read both documents, and find the NCI and FISTS proposals
>>equally rational and compelling.
>>
>>
>>In the end, it all comes down to what a person **believes**. And that
>>is not rational. Not in your case, not in mine. And too much of the
>>"belief" business and it turns into religion, which some PCTA'ers have
>>been accused of. It all works both ways.
>
>
> Propping up a "belief system" ("tradition", etc. ... all the things that
> keep things stuck in the past) is NOT a legitimate regulatory purpose or role.

It isn't propping, it's part of the package. It's no tradition to me,
I'm just a nickle Extra, licensed since 1999. Its the same as learning
math basics and using calculators at the same time. its a basic and

simple method of communication that I BELIEVE is a very good thing to know. You do NOT believe this. You believe that Morse code is an anachronism, and has no place in the education required to be a ham.

I think you may also confuse belief with fact. You'll probably disagree with that also.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2921. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 15:27:43 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309040727.5aa5f2e4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76335

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<98x5b.545$vj4.81252@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030902191946.00545.00000362@mb-m02.aol.com...
> > These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
> > licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:
> >
> > As of May 14, 2000:
> >
> > Novice - 49,329
> > Tech - 205,394
> > Tech Plus - 128,860
> > General - 112,677
> > Advanced - 99,782
> > Extra - 78,750
> > Total - 674,792
> >
> >
> > As of September 1, 2003:
> >
> > Novice - 33,156 (decrease of 16,173)
> > Technician - 257,830 (increase of 52,436)
> > Technician Plus - 65,928 (decrease of 62,932)
> > General - 141,402 (increase of 28,725)
> > Advanced - 82,931 (decrease of 16,851)
> > Extra - 104,512 (increase of 25,762)
> > Total - 685,759 (increase of 10,967)
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> So ... 54.8158101% of US hams will immediately benefit from
> dropping the Morse test (Techs/total of all classes, since Novices
> already have 5 wpm credit for life.

No, they won't. You are mistaken. Math error!

Both Novices and most (but not all!) code-tested Techs have 5 wpm
credit for life. Check Part 97.

> Interesting fact ... I'll have to remember that for my comments. Thanks.
>
You might want to get your facts right before embarrassing yourself,
Carl.

All Tech Pluses, as well as an unknown number of Techs, already have credit for all of the code testing now required. The 257,830 Technicians on the books consist of the following:

- Techs who don't have the credit (never passed the test)
- Techs who don't have the credit (passed the test but let the CSCE expire)
- Techs who have the credit (Tech Pluses who did a post-restructure renewal)
- Techs who have the credit (valid CSCE)
- Techs who have the credit (Novices who did a post-restructure upgrade)

Of these, only the first two groups will "benefit". The rest won't. How many are in each group? You tell us. But remember that for more than three years all Tech Pluses have been renewed as Techs.

You might want to check your math, too. Even if all 257,830 Techs are counted as not having code test credit, 257,830/685,759 is 37.5977....%, not the 54+% you posted.

If we take the number of the first two groups as 210,000, (which is reasonable considering new license issues, renewal and upgrade rates), the percentage drops to less than 31%.

BIG differences from 54%.

You still want to tell FCC that 54.8158101% of US hams will immediately benefit from dropping the Morse test? Be my guest.

Now if the number of US hams who are active NCI members is (let's be generous) 4,000, that's 0.583....%

73 de Jim, N2EY

FISTS #4360

2922. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 15:48:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F575EB6.4060401@psu.edu>
Source record: 76337

```
Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F54DEF5.9080308@psu.edu...
>
>>Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>
>>>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>>>news:bivu78$rfn$0@208.207.71.142...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
>>>>
>>>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>>>
>>>
>>>Many times the number of *US* NCI members, Carl.
>>
>>
>>Now Dick, how do you know that? No one knows except a person that isn't
>>telling.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> If FISTS has 10k members, they do NOT have "many times the membership
> numbers of NCI" ... the numbers would be something that Dick would hate
> to imagine in worst twisted nightmare :-)

I guess we'll never know, though........

- Mike KB3EIA -
```

2923. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 15:56:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F576093.7000604@psu.edu>
Source record: 76338

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:4e8blv8cn71ijca47anitm818uf6hk56og@4ax.com...
>
>>On Mon, 01 Sep 2003 19:57:23 GMT, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>>news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
>>>
>>>> As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
>>>
>>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>>>
>>>Carl - wk3c
>>
>>Nearly 10,000.
>>
>>Not all of them are users of code either. FISTS welcomes anybody,
>>unlike the NCI where you join "the cause to remove code requirements".
>>
>>If you prefer to remove the code requirement, no one is forcing you do
>>unplug your keyer from your radio.
>>
>>Stacey, AA7YA
>>FISTS #3857
>
>
> Stacey,
>
> That 10k number seems to fly in the face of facts ... but it really
> doesn't matter, because it's the quality of the arguments presented
> to the FCC that matters, and the FISTS petition, while well-written,
> is lacking in a truly rational regulatory basis for maintaining ANY
> Morse test requirement.

It's the number that they put forth on their petition. If you can prove
they are not being accurate, that would shut them down pretty well......

And the supreme court yesterday must hav thought that the FCC's
decision process was a tad flawed.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2924. The previous post was a troll

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 16:16:08 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F576548.E9B3D6E2@ptt.edu>
Source record: 76339

Ed Norton wrote:
>
> On 04 Sep 2003 02:59:27 GMT, WA8ULX <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
> > Went to his WEB Site, Saw his picture, what a Dork looking character, no wonder
> > he couldnt handle CW.
>
> Usually, it's the dorky looking guys who *do* love CW. Take a look at
> the picture on http://myrockport.com/world.htm and notice the hands of
> the person who is holding the home-brew keyer. Looks like he never
> washed his hands or trimmed his fingernails in his life. Now *there*
> is a typical CW dork.
>
> Ed Norton
> DoD Sewer Expert

Since you've never used for hands for anything except yourself, you would
have no idea how dirty one's hands can get working with old bike parts.

2925. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 16:21:49 UTC
From: no.em@il.right.now
Message-ID: <xEJ5b.22694$EW1.6205@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76340

In article <5c01b95b.0309031544.d516785@posting.google.com>,
k4yz@aol.com (Steve The dipshit) wrote:

> Considering the IMPROVEMENTS that have occured in the ARRL since
>1984, I'd say your departure was beneficial. Lord knows no one here
>has missed you.
>
> Back under your rock, worthless troll.
>
>Steve, K4YZ

OK DipShit, List the improvements.

2926. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 16:28:59 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj7p8b$54q$0@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 76341

Bob Brock wrote:

> On 04 Sep 2003 11:30:04 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >In article <XBw5b.534$vj4.80577@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> ><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >What is and is not " a legitimate regulatory purpose or role" is purely a
> >matter of opinion.
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> The passing of regulations outside the scope of the organization.

So now YOU are to decide for the FCC the scope of their organization,.

What an(other) idiot!

2927. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 16:33:17 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj7pgd$54q$1@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 76342

Bob Brock wrote:

> On 4 Sep 2003 13:46:33 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >
> >Brian wrote:
> >
> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<Bjv5b.37515$Vx2.16470335@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> >> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:f45722ac.0309031419.781071e2@posting.google.com...
> >> > > S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:<jtfblv010bk0gpv19cap9jk0i1o6u9c0ap@4ax.com>...
> >> > > > On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 14:38:36 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> >> > > > wrote:
> >> > > >
> >> > > > >The exam does not exclude anyone who cares to make the effort to learn.
> >> > And
> >> > > > >Farnsworth IS Morse since it relates a letter directly to a sound
> >> > without
> >> > > > >counting dots and dashes.
> >> > > >
> >> > > > Actually the Farnsworth method is Morse Code
> >> > >
> >> > > It is not.
> >> > >
> >> > > Only at 20 WPM does Farnsworth and Morse use the same character and word
> >> > rate.
> >> >
> >> > Nowhere is there a definition that says the character rate and word rate
> >> > MUST be the same for it to be Morse.
> >>
> >> Then it's not Morse Code.
> >>
> >> There is standard spacing and
> >> > Farnsworth spacing and the variety of spacing that you hear on the air.
> >> > There are some really fine operators who have near perfect standard spacing
> >> > but the rest of us vary. That doesn't mean we aren't sending Morse.
> >>
> >> It means that we are desparately trying to, except in the case of
> >> DICK/W0EX who purposely sends poor code in order to thwart the
> >> computer code readers.
> >

> >Google it up, youi lying sack. I said it's entirely possible to foil computer copy that way. So you convert that
> >to what you wish I had said, as you so often do.
>
> Why would you want to foil computer copy? For you to do the test to
> make sure that it works and then advocate it's use, you can't really
> say that wasn't your intention.

I can't? Who are you to say even what the subject was? The allegation had been made that a computer does a perfectly
acceptable job of copying Morse code which is of course very inaccurate. My remark was one of many possible reasons
for that fact.

Stuff it, Brock. You'r as ignorant as Brian.

2928. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 16:37:08 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj7pnk$54q$2@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 76343

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3F54DEF5.9080308@psu.edu...
> >
> >>Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >>
> >>>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >>>>news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
> >>>>
> >>>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Many times the number of *US* NCI members, Carl.
> >>
> >>
> >>Now Dick, how do you know that? No one knows except a person that isn't
> >>telling.
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >
> > If FISTS has 10k members, they do NOT have "many times the membership
> > numbers of NCI" ... the numbers would be something that Dick would hate
> > to imagine in worst twisted nightmare :-)
>
> I guess we'll never know, though........
>

That's exactly right. He'll never tell because the number is embarassingly small.

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

2929. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 16:41:09 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj7pv5$54q$3@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 76344

Mike Coslo wrote:

> And the supreme court yesterday must hav thought that the FCC's

> decision process was a tad flawed.

Mike, what did I mess yesterday?

73, Dick W0EX

2930. Help on calculations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 16:56:11 UTC
From: Paul <invalid@invalid.--->
Message-ID: <vlerf0k2vkgka0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 76345

For U.S. Extra exam are any formulas or tutorials online? I need help with E5C, E5D, E5E, E9C groups for example. I can barely pass the sample exam now, and would very much like to be able to calculate a few more answers. I can't get a current exam manual by the test time this Saturday. All my radio books are ancient or don't cover this stuff clearly. Thanks.

2931. Re: Help on calculations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 17:05:00 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F5770BC.2F8A4D0B@ptt.edu>
Source record: 76346

Paul wrote:
>
> For U.S. Extra exam are any formulas or tutorials online? I need help
> with E5C, E5D, E5E, E9C groups for example. I can barely pass the sample
> exam now, and would very much like to be able to calculate a few more
> answers. I can't get a current exam manual by the test time this
> Saturday. All my radio books are ancient or don't cover this stuff
> clearly. Thanks.

Did you check your local library? 621.38

2932. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 17:12:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F57727D.8010904@psu.edu>
Source record: 76348

Bob Brock wrote:

>
> If CW is indeed effective and current, then it will propagate due to
> its usefulness without regulatory requirement. Judging by how shrill
> the proponents are, it appears that even they are afraid that it won't
> show itself to be advantageous enough for people to learn on their
> own.

Not the point.

> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?

WOW! After all your posts claiming how poor some members of this
group's arguments are you post that?

- Mike KB3EIA -

2933. Re: Help on calculations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 17:16:22 UTC
From: Paul <invalid@invalid.--->
Message-ID: <vleskrcuum2iaf@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 76347

Radioman wrote:
>
> Paul wrote:
>
>>For U.S. Extra exam are any formulas or tutorials online? I need help
>>with E5C, E5D, E5E, E9C groups for example. I can barely pass the sample
>>exam now, and would very much like to be able to calculate a few more
>>answers. I can't get a current exam manual by the test time this
>>Saturday. All my radio books are ancient or don't cover this stuff
>>clearly. Thanks.
>
>
>
> Did you check your local library? 621.38

Yes, but the version is vintage 1990 and the library branch is way
across town. Would the ARRL 1990 extra class license manual be good
enough in these areas in your opinion? I don't need the exact answers by
exam number, just the appropriate formula.

2934. Re: Help on calculations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 17:20:06 UTC
From: Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com>
Message-ID: <bvK5b.26181$S_.24467@fed1read01>
Source record: 76349

Try URL:
http://www.qsl.net/wa7zcz/area2/t_of_c.html
Lots of formulas there

ALSO
http://users.pandora.be/educypedia/electronics/databankform.htm

Lots more by using google.com

http://www.google.com/
--
73 From The Signal In The Noise
Caveat Lector Ya All
"Paul" <invalid@invalid.---> wrote in message
news:vlerf0k2vkgka0@corp.supernews.com...
> For U.S. Extra exam are any formulas or tutorials online? I need help
> with E5C, E5D, E5E, E9C groups for example. I can barely pass the sample
> exam now, and would very much like to be able to calculate a few more
> answers. I can't get a current exam manual by the test time this
> Saturday. All my radio books are ancient or don't cover this stuff
> clearly. Thanks.
>
>

2935. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 17:21:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F5774B3.5040301@psu.edu>
Source record: 76350

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3F54E23A.8030209@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>
>>>I've explained out committment to our members' privacy. If FISTS
>>>doesn't have the same policy, that's their choice, and thus, you could
>>>have answered my question without breaching any confidence. I can't
>>>do the same because of the committment we have made to our members.
>>
>>
>> Can't you think of a better reason? Let's say there are 5000 members of
>
>
>>NCI.
>
>
> The important question is "how many active US hams" are members. Comparing the
> total number in one group with the number of active US hams in another is
> slanted.
>
>> Explain how saying There are 5000 members of NCI is violating
>>anyones privacy.
>
>
> Good question! And we're still waiting for an answer.

And still waiting. I can't figure out why that is such a troublesome thing.

>
> We're not asking for names or calls, just the number of US licensed hams who
> are members. Anyone can determine the FISTS numbers. Why is NCI so secretive
> about theirs - particularly if the numbers don't really matter?

I'm beginning to formulate an opinion on that. Probably the same one
you are.

> I recall reading here a statement by Carl that those in the minority should
> learn to take 'no' for an answer and get on with life. (Those are HIS words,
> not mine).

That is one of the polite things people say when what they really want
to say "SHUT UP and quit bothering me". Autocratics in action.

But just as it doesn't happen in politics, it doesn't happen here.
Would he have taken his own advice in the early days of NCI.

> What if it turned out (as it did in 1998-99) that the NCI position is a
> minority opinion?

It doesn't take a majority. It takes noise.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2936. Re: Help on calculations

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 17:38:26 UTC
From: Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com>
Message-ID: <nMK5b.26260$S_.10802@fed1read01>
Source record: 76351

Any ARRL handbook will have a multitude of formulas for you
http://www.booksunderreview.com/Recreation/Radio/Amateur/Organizations/ARRL/

Or Check used book stores or local library

P.S. Formulas don't age so any ARRL Handbook ought to do.

--
73 From The Signal In The Noise
Caveat Lector Ya All

==========
"Paul" <invalid@invalid.---> wrote in message
news:vlerf0k2vkgka0@corp.supernews.com...
> For U.S. Extra exam are any formulas or tutorials online? I need help
> with E5C, E5D, E5E, E9C groups for example. I can barely pass the sample
> exam now, and would very much like to be able to calculate a few more
> answers. I can't get a current exam manual by the test time this
> Saturday. All my radio books are ancient or don't cover this stuff
> clearly. Thanks.
>
>

2937. Re: ! "Oh, IRe: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 17:44:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F5779E9.8070205@psu.edu>
Source record: 76352

Dick Carroll; wrote:

> Yeah the entire world of ham radio is going to gear up for disaster communications, keep
> it all ready all the time. Never happen and ANYONE should know it. You use what you find
> available in whatever circumstances you happen to be caught in when the ship hits the
> sand.

Dick you have hit the proverbial nail on it's proverbial head! This sentence should be required reading, and should be tatooed on everyone's eyelids.

Predictions of where disaster will strike are not too accurate. Otherwise we could move people out of the area, and there wouldn't be a problem. Certain areas are more prone to certain types of disasters, but overall, where and when it happens is a random thing.

Will these wonderful methods be available to whatever operator happens to be *in* the area? All the old system did was to ensure the likelyhood of someone on the inside, and someone on the outside are able to talk to each other.

It doesn't say they have to use Morse. What it did ensure was that under some pretty poor conditions, there would be a comms.

> Maybe you'll have access to all that "spare gear" and maybe not. If not, well gee,
> coulda shouloda woulda, but.......

Now this is an interesting thing! Are we to *have* to buy this equipment? And what of the poor ham that didn't have the resources and is caught in the middle of a disaster?

> Plans? You STILL don't know about plans and what happens to the "best laid" of them? HA!
> It's one thing to be ready to relieve a disaster, quite another to be caught inside one
> with a desperate need to communicate to the outside.

They'll use cell phones and Echolink..... you know, modern technology.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2938. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 17:48:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F577ADA.2050100@psu.edu>
Source record: 76353

Bob Brock wrote:
> On 4 Sep 2003 05:16:59 -0700, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:
>
>
>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>>
>>
>>
>>>If CW is indeed effective and current, then it will propagate due to
>>>its usefulness without regulatory requirement. Judging by how shrill
>>>the proponents are, it appears that even they are afraid that it won't
>>>show itself to be advantageous enough for people to learn on their
>>>own.
>>>
>>>On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>>>with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>>>work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>>
>>That's shrill enough, congratulations.
>
>
> I guess no answer at all was to be expected since it shows how invalid
> the postion is.

How's this for an answer? NO!

Provide references where anyone has even proposed such an activity.

2939. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 17:50:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F577B7E.5000507@psu.edu>
Source record: 76354

Bob Brock wrote:
> On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
>
>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>>
>>
>>>On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>>>with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>>>work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>>
>>In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.
>
>
> I was asking about you guys, not what they will do. Afterall, I've
> boycotted General and above for about 9 years now because of
> antiquated requirements.

Your loss, dude.

If you wait long enough, the writtens might go away too.

Hey Carl, here's one of your new guys!

- Mike KB3EIA -

2940. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 17:53:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F577C1B.8070702@psu.edu>
Source record: 76355

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> So ... 54.8158101% of US hams will immediately benefit from
> dropping the Morse test (Techs/total of all classes, since Novices
> already have 5 wpm credit for life.
>
> Interesting fact ... I'll have to remember that for my comments. Thanks.

Don't forget that 300 million or so would benefit if all the
requirements were dropped.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2941. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 18:04:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F577ECA.2090105@psu.edu>
Source record: 76357

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> > And the supreme court yesterday must hav thought that the FCC's
>
>
>>decision process was a tad flawed.
>
>
> Mike, what did I mess yesterday?

The Supremes told the F.C.C. that it's relaxed ruling on how many media outlets one entity (Clear Channel and Fox types) could own was not acceptable.

And as a person that lives in an area where all the AM stations are playing the exact same thing most of the time, I can say it's a bad idea.

And with Fox News bloodying it's nose trying to sue and squelch a satire writer, I am leery of them now too.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2942. Re: NCI Petition available on FCC ECFS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 18:06:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F577F1C.1000909@psu.edu>
Source record: 76358

Ed Norton wrote:
> On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 12:16:08 -0400, Radioman <radio@ptt.edu> wrote:
>
>>Since you've never used for hands for anything except yourself, you would
>>have no idea how dirty one's hands can get working with old bike parts.
>
>
> Struck a chord, eh? Those must have been your dirty-fingernailed
> hands.

Might you mean "Struck a nerve"?

2943. Re: ! "Oh, IRe: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 18:09:20 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <kdL5b.2225$HX1.1410@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76356

-- >
> Now this is an interesting thing! Are we to *have* to buy this
> equipment? And what of the poor ham that didn't have the resources and
> is caught in the middle of a disaster?
>

Some ARES groups have incorporated as not for profits. This allows them to get corporate sponsorship for emergency gear.

A contractor for a local nuke plant hired to make sure the evac drills go smooth told me last year there was no need for amateur radio. They could depend on cell phones for all their field communications during evacuation of the NYC metro area.

No Shit !

2944. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 18:17:10 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj7vj6jsp0@208.207.71.151>
Source record: 76359

Bob Brock wrote:

> On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
> >Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
> >
> >> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> >> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
> >> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
> >
> >In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.
>
> I was asking about you guys, not what they will do. Afterall, I've
> boycotted General and above for about 9 years now because of
> antiquated requirements.

So by your logic I should have, as a VE, boycotted administering no-code Tech tests? You sure demonstrate
where you're coming from.
Welcome to the house of code haters, you fit right in.

2945. Re: Anyone want to take a guess at what this is all about ?? N2FF ARRL election to be contested ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 19:08:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309041108.2331d917@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76360

Steve, key words are "Hudson Division." That is an American Radio
Relay League (ARRL) geopolitical region.

So what you received was a political advertisement for an amateur
radio operator, Frank Fallon/n2FF, who wishes to be reelected to his
post as Director, Hudson Division.

Brian

"Steve Stone" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in message
news:<2fw5b.1608$eF4.740@news02.roc.ny>...
> From my inbox this evening. Anyone have the real story behind what is going
> on ?
>
> ------------------------------
>
> I am writing to inform you of support that is needed for the Hudson Division
> Director Frank Fallon, N2FF. It seems that Steve Mendelsohn plans to
> contest Frank's re-election. Why? Your guess is as good as mine! There is
> no reason for Frank to be contested since he has been very active in the
> Hudson Division. Frank has been instrumental in being an advocate for the
> New York antenna legislation. Currently he is pursuing the same activities
> in New Jersey. In addition, he played a major role in persuading
> Congressman Steve Israel to introduce the Amateur Radio Emergency
> Communications Consistency Act. For those of you who do not know what that
> is; basically it deals with homeowners associations that ban HAM radio
> antennas in condominium dwellings, where a HAM is not insulated (via PRB-1)
> against this threat. Frank has done many other important things for amateur
> radio. In an age where amateur radio is being challenged more than ever, we
> need HAMS to volunteer for amateur radio for a change. Where others choose
> to do nothing and leave it for the next guy, Frank stands and perseveres to
> thrust amateur radio forward by getting the job done.
>
>
>
> When you receive your ballot in the mail sometime towards the
> end of September, please support Frank Fallon, N2FF. Remember to send it
> back on a timely basis. Whether you know it or not, Frank IS doing the job
> for amateurs on some very important issues that threaten the very existence
> of the future of our hobby. Thanks for your time and support.

2946. Re: NCI Petition available on FCC ECFS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 19:35:42 UTC
From: "Carl H." <cherre30002@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1062704249.271566@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 76361

Thanks for the link to RM-10786 Carl.

It is VERY LONG past time we put the
albatross of CW behind us, once and for
all.

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:nex5b.550$vj4.81352@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> No Code International's Petition for Rulemaking to the FCC
> was assigned RM-10786 and is now viewable for review and
> comments on the FCC's ECFS site at:
> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/comsrch_v2.cgi
>
> (type RM-10786 in the "Proceeding" box at the upper left of
> this web page to view the Petition and comments filed to date).

2947. Re: ! "Oh, IRe: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 19:36:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F579457.3080104@psu.edu>
Source record: 76362

Steve Stone wrote:

> Some ARES groups have incorporated as not for profits. This allows them to
> get corporate sponsorship for emergency gear.

When possible, it is a good idea for groups to have equipment at the ready. Mother Nature has this nasty streak in her that seems to favor the unprepared though! ;^)

> A contractor for a local nuke plant hired to make sure the evac drills go
> smooth told me last year there was no need for amateur radio. They could
> depend on cell phones for all their field communications during evacuation
> of the NYC metro area.

Can you imagine? And yet I hear that kind of thing all over. Presumably intelligent people that don't realize that these highly centralized systems are certain to fail when the same conditions that make emergency comms necessary work their damage on those area systems.

The inherently independent, non networked nature of Amateur radio is what gives it it's strength. And sometimes why when all else fails.... corny statement that just happens to be true.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2948. Re: ! "Oh, IRe: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 20:34:34 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj87kq$8o9$0@208.207.71.158>
Source record: 76363

Steve Stone wrote:

> -- >
> > Now this is an interesting thing! Are we to *have* to buy this
> > equipment? And what of the poor ham that didn't have the resources and
> > is caught in the middle of a disaster?
> >
>
> Some ARES groups have incorporated as not for profits. This allows them to
> get corporate sponsorship for emergency gear.
>
> A contractor for a local nuke plant hired to make sure the evac drills go
> smooth told me last year there was no need for amateur radio. They could
> depend on cell phones for all their field communications during evacuation
> of the NYC metro area.

Why, Sure!!! He must have consulted Carl Stevenson.

2949. Re: NCI Petition available on FCC ECFS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 20:39:30 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj87u2$8o9$1@208.207.71.158>
Source record: 76364

"Carl H." wrote:

> Thanks for the link to RM-10786 Carl.
>
> It is VERY LONG past time we put the
> albatross of CW behind us, once and for
> all.

Tsk, tsk. You poor Albatross Anchors. You indeed have my sympathy.
I wouldn't want to be the anchor for any nasty old sea bird, either!

2950. Re: ! "Oh, IRe: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 20:41:40 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj8824$8o9$2@208.207.71.158>
Source record: 76365

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Steve Stone wrote:
>
> > Some ARES groups have incorporated as not for profits. This allows them to
> > get corporate sponsorship for emergency gear.
>
> When possible, it is a good idea for groups to have equipment at the
> ready. Mother Nature has this nasty streak in her that seems to favor
> the unprepared though! ;^)
>
> > A contractor for a local nuke plant hired to make sure the evac drills go
> > smooth told me last year there was no need for amateur radio. They could
> > depend on cell phones for all their field communications during evacuation
> > of the NYC metro area.
>
> Can you imagine? And yet I hear that kind of thing all over. Presumably
> intelligent people that don't realize that these highly centralized
> systems are certain to fail when the same conditions that make emergency
> comms necessary work their damage on those area systems.
>
> The inherently independent, non networked nature of Amateur radio is
> what gives it it's strength. And sometimes why when all else fails....
> corny statement that just happens to be true.

Careful, Mike, you'll have Kandid Carl and his band of high-tech CW-COYOTE hunters dogging your heels!

2951. So much for High Tech!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 20:46:21 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj88atail0@208.207.71.158>
Source record: 76366

Just off the news:

Computer grid operator in Ohio at the beginnining of the Big Blackout, in response to an inquiry::

"Our computers are all acting up, too! We don't even know the status of the stuff around us!"

Yep, lets all put ALL our faith and confidence in Karl and his Komplete Komputerized Kommunications Konsortium!!

2952. Re: Anyone want to take a guess at what this is all about ?? N2FF ARRL election to be contested ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 21:25:09 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <V4O5b.4013$I53.2981@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76367

Ok. I should have guessed it was politics. I try to stay out of that aspect
of amateur radio.

--

>> Remove "zz" from e-mail address to direct reply. <<

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309041108.2331d917@posting.google.com...
> Steve, key words are "Hudson Division." That is an American Radio
> Relay League (ARRL) geopolitical region.
>
> So what you received was a political advertisement for an amateur
> radio operator, Frank Fallon/n2FF, who wishes to be reelected to his
> post as Director, Hudson Division.
>
> Brian
>
>
>
> "Steve Stone" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in message
news:<2fw5b.1608$eF4.740@news02.roc.ny>...
> > From my inbox this evening. Anyone have the real story behind what is
going
> > on ?
> >
> > ------------------------------
> >
> > I am writing to inform you of support that is needed for the Hudson
Division
> > Director Frank Fallon, N2FF. It seems that Steve Mendelsohn plans to
> > contest Frank's re-election. Why? Your guess is as good as mine!
There is
> > no reason for Frank to be contested since he has been very active in the
> > Hudson Division. Frank has been instrumental in being an advocate for
the
> > New York antenna legislation. Currently he is pursuing the same
activities
> > in New Jersey. In addition, he played a major role in persuading
> > Congressman Steve Israel to introduce the Amateur Radio Emergency
> > Communications Consistency Act. For those of you who do not know what
that
> > is; basically it deals with homeowners associations that ban HAM radio
> > antennas in condominium dwellings, where a HAM is not insulated (via

PRB-1)
> > against this threat. Frank has done many other important things for
amateur
> > radio. In an age where amateur radio is being challenged more than
ever, we
> > need HAMS to volunteer for amateur radio for a change. Where others
choose
> > to do nothing and leave it for the next guy, Frank stands and perseveres
to
> > thrust amateur radio forward by getting the job done.
> >
> >
> >
> > When you receive your ballot in the mail sometime towards
the
> > end of September, please support Frank Fallon, N2FF. Remember to send
it
> > back on a timely basis. Whether you know it or not, Frank IS doing the
job
> > for amateurs on some very important issues that threaten the very
existence
> > of the future of our hobby. Thanks for your time and support.

2953. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 21:50:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309041350.68d4ea60@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76368

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj7vj6jsp0@208.207.71.151>...
> Bob Brock wrote:
>
> > On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
> >
> > >Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
> > >
> > >> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> > >> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
> > >> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
> > >
> > >In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.
> >
> > I was asking about you guys, not what they will do. Afterall, I've
> > boycotted General and above for about 9 years now because of
> > antiquated requirements.
>
> So by your logic I should have, as a VE, boycotted administering no-code Tech tests?

DICK, you did. You turned in your VE badge and credentials because
you were upset with the No-Code license.

2954. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 21:54:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309041354.36733aca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76369

Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<flfelvsgco1mgulsjf7hb7su19rbr52cq6@4ax.com>...
> On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
> >Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
> >
> >> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> >> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
> >> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
> >
> >In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.
>
> I was asking about you guys, not what they will do. Afterall, I've
> boycotted General and above for about 9 years now because of
> antiquated requirements.

That's funny. I don't necessarily agree with it, but its funny.

Tell me, do you have any anecdotal stories?

2955. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 22:07:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309041407.27cdb8e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76370

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj7p8b$54q$0@208.206.142.113>...
> Bob Brock wrote:
>
> > On 04 Sep 2003 11:30:04 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
> >
> > >In article <XBw5b.534$vj4.80577@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > ><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> > >What is and is not " a legitimate regulatory purpose or role" is purely a
> > >matter of opinion.
> > >
> > >73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > The passing of regulations outside the scope of the organization.
>
> So now YOU are to decide for the FCC the scope of their organization,.
>
> What an(other) idiot!

So the scope of the FCC is not addressed in Title 34?

And government organizations never abuse their power?

What a FOOL!

2956. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 22:10:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309041410.6a1261b7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76371

no.em@il.right.now (You're an idiot) wrote in message
news:<xEJ5b.22694$EW1.6205@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...

> OK DipShit, List the improvements.

After you post a name and can the profanity.

Steve, K4YZ

2957. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 22:10:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309041410.6443cf0b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76372

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj7pnk$54q$2@208.206.142.113>...

> That's exactly right. He'll never tell because the number is embarassingly small.

But apparently is highly effective.

2958. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 22:11:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309041411.687ef3e3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76373

no.em@il.right.now (You're an idiot) wrote in message
news:<xEJ5b.22694$EW1.6205@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...

> OK DipShit, List the improvements.

After you post a name and can the profanity.

Steve, K4YZ

2959. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 22:11:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309041411.1239211e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76374

no.em@il.right.now (You're an idiot) wrote in message
news:<xEJ5b.22694$EW1.6205@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...

> OK DipShit, List the improvements.

After you post a name and can the profanity.

Steve, K4YZ

2960. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 22:20:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309041420.4b6eac7a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76375

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj7fnp$b7l$1@208.207.71.137>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<Bjv5b.37515$Vx2.16470335@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > news:f45722ac.0309031419.781071e2@posting.google.com...
> > > > S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:<jtfblv010bk0gpv19cap9jk0i1o6u9c0ap@4ax.com>...
> > > > > On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 14:38:36 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> > > > > wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > >The exam does not exclude anyone who cares to make the effort to learn.
> And
> > > > > >Farnsworth IS Morse since it relates a letter directly to a sound
> without
> > > > > >counting dots and dashes.
> > > > >
> > > > > Actually the Farnsworth method is Morse Code
> > > >
> > > > It is not.
> > > >
> > > > Only at 20 WPM does Farnsworth and Morse use the same character and word
> > > rate.
> > >
> > > Nowhere is there a definition that says the character rate and word rate
> > > MUST be the same for it to be Morse.
> >
> > Then it's not Morse Code.
> >
> > There is standard spacing and
> > > Farnsworth spacing and the variety of spacing that you hear on the air.
> > > There are some really fine operators who have near perfect standard spacing
> > > but the rest of us vary. That doesn't mean we aren't sending Morse.
> >
> > It means that we are desparately trying to, except in the case of
> > DICK/W0EX who purposely sends poor code in order to thwart the
> > computer code readers.
>
> Google it up, youi lying sack. I said it's entirely possible to foil computer copy that
way. So you convert that
> to what you wish I had said, as you so often do.

Sorry, DICK. You said much more than that, and your stated goals in amateur radio are quite defective.

2961. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 22:24:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309041424.284a7a9c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76376

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309031544.d516785@posting.google.com>...
> "hiram's cat" <eeefrincen4@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<1062593747.245315@newshost03.voicenet.com>...
>
> > All the ARRL ever was, is, and ever will be is a
> > publishing company with a 501(c)3 tax exemption
> > that wraps itself in fake ivy leaves of academia.
> > Another typical "non-profit" that milks donations
> > from suckers with trinkets and who's Corporate
> > Board and Executive Staff members skim 50%
> > right-off-the-top for "administrative expenses".
> > I dropped them, my SCM, and my membership way back
> > in 1984 and I've never regreted my decision.
>
> Yet another anonymous scumbag with libelous accusations and no
> proof to offer.
>
> Considering the IMPROVEMENTS that have occured in the ARRL since
> 1984, I'd say your departure was beneficial. Lord knows no one here
> has missed you.
>
> Back under your rock, worthless troll.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Wow, Steve.

An anonymous poster posts something you agree with and you act like
best friends. Another anonymous poster posts something you don't
agree with and you go psycho.

Why is that?

2962. Re: Echolink is not REAL Ham ops...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 22:32:33 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309041432.24ea7ecc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76377

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj7frv$b7l$2@208.207.71.137>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj65b0lab1@208.207.71.146>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309010709.259f9fbc@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030831224123.26794.00000166@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> > > > > > From: "Tin Monkey"
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >When inclement WX hits and the phone lines are down it will be back to Ham
> > > > > > >Radio the way it always has been. Good old radios and antennas....and for
> > > > > > >those with preplannning a Marine battery or two as well.

See below:

> > > > > > How often has your fantasy been played out? Can you give examples where YOU
> > > > > > encountered that?

See above:

> > > > >
> > > > > Newy York, September 11th, 2001.
> > > > >
> > > > > The Midwest floods in the 90's.
> > > > >
> > > > > Any number of hurricaines in the last 50 years in the Gulf States
> > > > > and Atlantic Coast.
> > > > >
> > > > > Need more, Vippy?
> > > > >
> > > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > > >
> > > > Steve, don't even try to cash in on Sept 11th unless you were there
> > > > and provided emergency communications via amateur radio.
> > > >
> > > > Brian
> > >
> > > "Cash in"????? Hey Steve, Brain thinks there's money in ham radio!
> > > Should be prevail on someone to donate him a clue, maybe suggest he read
> > > Part 97 with an eye to actually doing more than mouthing the words?
> >

> > Brian thinks DICK is a dumbass.
>
> OIn the other hand, Dick and the rest of the world KNOWS that Brian is.
> >
> > Steve is guilty of doing what he has accused others of doing, riding
> > the coattails of those who have fallen before him for prestige and
> > fame.
>
> Where did he say *he* was involved in any of those actions??? HE DIDN'T.
> HAM RADIO was, you idiotic twerp.

DICK cranium, Vipul asked Steve if he had been personally involved in
emergency comms, and Steve replied with a list of disasters, including
the terrorist attacks on September 11th.

You stand corrected.

2963. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 22:36:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309041436.b5fdf9a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76378

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj7fbe$a8m$0@208.207.71.137>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> >
> > > As someone already said, it all comes together at around 20wpm anyway.
> > > But at slower speeds Farnsworth spacing has definite advantages.
> > >
> > > Dick
> >
> > Dick, I'm the someone who "said" and you constantly claim I know nothing of Morse.
> >
> > Farnswoth is the preferred method for learning 20wpm Morse Code.
>
> See Brian? You hang out on here with those of us who DO know long enough, and you're bound to
> learn some little something.

That's entirely possible.

But what I've learned from you is what a knuckle-head some DICKs are.

2964. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-04 22:40:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <7bP5b.31433$Om1.27890@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76379

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:qUw5b.540$vj4.80890@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:Xa75b.22665$Om1.19738@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> > I think total ellimination is equivilant to negotiations with a
terrorist
> > organization (NCI).
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> I think that characterization is totally out of line and is equivalent to
> the "law of usenet" that goes something like "the first one to equate
> the other to Hitler automatically loses the argument."
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

I understand your point of view Carl. Down heah in Dixie we call that 'eat
up with the dumbass'.

Your NCI organization is nothing but a bunch of whinney crybaby lazy me
generation morons. You know it, and we know it. Now just go off and whine
in your corner.

The truth hurts, eh?

Dan/W4NTI

2965. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 00:20:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030904202020.11891.00000443@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 76380

In article <3F577C1B.8070702@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
>> So ... 54.8158101% of US hams will immediately benefit from
>> dropping the Morse test (Techs/total of all classes, since Novices
>> already have 5 wpm credit for life.
>>
>> Interesting fact ... I'll have to remember that for my comments. Thanks.

Except it's not a fact at all. The correct percentage is about 30%, which is a
little more than half what Carl posted.

> Don't forget that 300 million or so would benefit if all the
>requirements were dropped.
>
Those derned writtens...

73 de Jim, N2EY

2966. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 00:20:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030904202020.11891.00000444@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 76381

In article <flfelvsgco1mgulsjf7hb7su19rbr52cq6@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
<bbrock@i-america.net> writes:

>On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>>
>>> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>>> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>>> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>>
>>In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.
>
>I was asking about you guys, not what they will do.

I don't boycott any ham who follows the rules.

73 de Jim, N2EY

2967. Re: Going under the knife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 01:08:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030904210819.29660.00000475@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 76383

In article <bj3kad$f2s35$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>To all my friends, combatants, debaters and lurkers here in r.r.a.p,
>
>I will be going under the knife this Tuesday for surgery on my lower back
>and won't be back for about a week or so. I am quiet sure that I am not
>going to feel like being in the upright position for the next week (or doing
>much of anything for that matter) , so everyone have a great week and
>probably next week I will have a ton of catching up to do.

Ryan:

I hope that the surgery turns out satisfactorily, and wish you a very
speedy recovery! We'll keep the light on in the window for you. Just
take your time, don't do anything you're not supposed to, and get
well soon!

73 de Larry, K3LT

2968. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 01:08:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030904210820.29660.00000476@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 76384

In article <BB7AF8C9.24FD4%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>, Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
>> Yup. And you're the cause of most of it.
>
>
> Well, you could always take a flying leap off a nearby tall building to
>end the boredom. Just don't damage anything important, like a passing
>pedestrian below. ;)

Dwight:

How charming...but you know what, I don't think I'll do that.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2969. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 01:08:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030904210821.29660.00000477@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 76382

In article <47cblvok749jg2jdevqloelfjv0e6bj6u0@4ax.com>, S. Hanrahan
<aa7ya@hotmail.com> writes:

>
>AA7YA - ex-KB7PKE
>(Novice to Extra in 12 months: Novice issued 8/24/92 : Extra issued
>8/24/93)

Not too shabby. I did it in about 18 months in the early '80's, in spite
of having to walk through waist-deep snow to get to the FCC Field
office, etc. etc.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2970. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 01:08:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030904210821.29660.00000478@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 76385

In article <nia5b.36687$Vx2.16273542@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>
>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20030902195312.07346.00000379@mb-m26.aol.com...
>> Hey, I'll go one further than that. I think they should be tested in the
>> proper
>> procedures for changing a tyre on the highway under severe emergency
>> conditions.
>>
>
>You spent too much time in England.

Dee:

Which of my behaviours would cause to say that, then?

>When my tire

Is that something tired (i.e. lacking in sleep)?

>goes flat on the highway,

That means you probably have a puncture.

>I call for help.

With your Vodafone mobile, undoubtedly!

>It's too dangerous to do this on the side of the road,
>alone, at night, in the rain (Lions and Tigers and Bears, Oh my). I
>couldn't resist!

No problem. All you have to do is make sure you've pulled safely
off the motorway, put out your triangle, then collect the spare,
jack, and lever (pronounced "leever") from the car boot. Hopefully
your wheel nuts won't be corroded. Then, after replacing the flat
tyre with the spare, hopefully you won't be too knackered to
continue with your journey!

73 de Larry, K3LT
Ex: G0LYW
RAF Mildenhall, UK, 1989 - 1991

2971. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 01:08:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030904210823.29660.00000479@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 76386

In article <bj3d9n$mvo@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>> > > > > You bring out the best in me Kim.
>> > > > >
>> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
>> > > > >
>> > > > >
>> > > >
>> > > > That's a given, Dan. We all know you're an asshole. That wasn't
>the
>> > > > question. The question is do you have to practice?
>> > > >
>> > > > Kim W5TIT
>> > > >
>> > >
>> > > Not any more Twit. I have acheived the highest level possible. Thank
>> you
>> > > for noticing.
>> >
>> > Yeah, Dan, you know how it is with her. I'm labelled a chicken$h*t
>> because I choose not
>> > to engage in a battle of wits with an unarmed female.
>> >
>> Yes...I noticed. But she sure has a lot of opinions. Rarely based on
>fact,
>> however.
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI

Kim:

Let's count the number of times you call Dan some kind of name in the
following response.

>And I am sitting here so wowed with your intellect, Dan, that Bo Pilgrim is
>second on my list of mentors now.

There's Number One.

>You are filthy, wretched and disgusting.

Two, Three, and Four.

>I have never (even in Larry Roll)
>seen the equivalent to the blabbering garbage that you put forth hear in
>this newsgroup and it's as simple as that.

Five.

>You're as predictable as Len
>Anderson,

Six. (Comparing anyone to anyone else, especially comparing them to Lennie, is definitely "name calling."

>and that makes you pretty damned boring.

Seven.

>You spew forth with
>comments that prove to me that your lacking in social skills and never cared
>about making up for it.

I'll count that as a double; Eight and Nine.

>You have nothing but contempt for fellow human beings

10.

>and it's because you seriously lack any form of humanity

11.

>You bring about your own sorry ass way of
>life

12. That's enough, an even dozen. We'll stop here.

Now, for the real irony:

>Then, you run into a woman of high intellect

Whom would that be, Kim?

>and your stooped so low for
>desperation to be able to one upmanship her that you swing into extremely
>low gear with nothing but name calling.

And, naturally, you prove your point by indulging in a dozen "name callings" yourself.

>Proving the points I have just observed about you.

Actually, No, Kim, you just proved those exact same points about yourself.

>You are as worthless as dust in a waterless environment.

Gold dust, compared to you, Kim.

>No one here, in my opinion holds a candle to how wretchedly
>low you really are.

Except for the person staring back at you in your bathroom mirror.
POT + KETTLE = BLACK. The only logic you know.

Kim, you are totally out of your depth here. You debase and humiliate yourself with each and every posting you make. I don't know why you have this impulse to continue to prove your abject lack of intellectual maturity, but keep it up. You provide plenty of amusement.

73 de Larry, K3LT

2972. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 01:15:41 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bj8o59$7an@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 76387

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030904202020.11891.00000444@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <flfelvsgco1mgulsjf7hb7su19rbr52cq6@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
> <bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>
> >On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
> >
> >>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> >news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
> >>
> >>> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> >>> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
> >>> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
> >>
> >>In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will
boycott.
> >
> >I was asking about you guys, not what they will do.
>
> I don't boycott any ham who follows the rules.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Exactly. And, I hadn't heard of any attempt to boycott a "country" due to its position on CW. That seems like something that would only get thought up right here in this newsgroup, though! <GRIN>

Anyway, that's taking the whole CW debate just way too far, IMNSHO.

Kim W5TIT

2973. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 01:28:23 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj8orn$ku1$0@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 76388

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj7vj6jsp0@208.207.71.151>...
> > Bob Brock wrote:
> >
> > > On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
> > >
> > > >Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
> > > >
> > > >> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> > > >> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
> > > >> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
> > > >
> > > >In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.
> > >
> > > I was asking about you guys, not what they will do. Afterall, I've
> > > boycotted General and above for about 9 years now because of
> > > antiquated requirements.
> >
> > So by your logic I should have, as a VE, boycotted administering no-code Tech tests?
>
> DICK, you did. You turned in your VE badge and credentials because
> you were upset with the No-Code license.

You really can't get *anything* correct can you? I turned in nothing! I closed down my VE teram in early '94
after we licensed so many other hams who started up their own teans in the region that we had very little
business remaining. At the outset we had the only team in a hundred mile radius. I *did* remark after the last
restructuring that I didn't ntend to participate as a VE after that debacle. So far I haven't, and haven't
needed to.
Get your facts straignt and MAYBE you won't be so prone to spread falsehoods.

2974. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 01:31:15 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj8p13$l1g$0@208.207.71.136>
Source record: 76389

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj7fnp$b7l$1@208.207.71.137>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<Bjv5b.37515$Vx2.16470335@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:f45722ac.0309031419.781071e2@posting.google.com...
> > > > > S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:<jtfblv010bk0gpv19cap9jk0i1o6u9c0ap@4ax.com>...
> > > > > > On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 14:38:36 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> > > > > > wrote:
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >The exam does not exclude anyone who cares to make the effort to learn.
> > And
> > > > > > >Farnsworth IS Morse since it relates a letter directly to a sound
> > without
> > > > > > >counting dots and dashes.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Actually the Farnsworth method is Morse Code
> > > > >
> > > > > It is not.
> > > > >
> > > > > Only at 20 WPM does Farnsworth and Morse use the same character and word
> > > > rate.
> > > >
> > > > Nowhere is there a definition that says the character rate and word rate
> > > > MUST be the same for it to be Morse.
> > >
> > > Then it's not Morse Code.
> > >
> > > There is standard spacing and
> > > > Farnsworth spacing and the variety of spacing that you hear on the air.
> > > > There are some really fine operators who have near perfect standard spacing
> > > > but the rest of us vary. That doesn't mean we aren't sending Morse.
> > >
> > > It means that we are desparately trying to, except in the case of
> > > DICK/W0EX who purposely sends poor code in order to thwart the
> > > computer code readers.
> >
> > Google it up, youi lying sack. I said it's entirely possible to foil computer copy that
way. So you convert that

> > to what you wish I had said, as you so often do.
>
> Sorry, DICK.

You're sorry, all right. NO question about that! A sorry liar!

2975. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 01:51:23 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <v_R5b.268780$Oz4.71087@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 76390

no.em@il.right.now (You're an idiot) wrote in news:xEJ5b.22694$EW1.6205
@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net:

> In article <5c01b95b.0309031544.d516785@posting.google.com>,
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve The dipshit) wrote:
>
>
>> Considering the IMPROVEMENTS that have occured in the ARRL since
>>1984, I'd say your departure was beneficial. Lord knows no one here
>>has missed you.
>>
>> Back under your rock, worthless troll.
>>
>>Steve, K4YZ
>
>
>
> OK DipShit, List the improvements.

I'm sure he won't be able to come up with anything unless he was thinking
of counting raising dues, and pushing for lower standards as
improvements.

KB7ADL

2976. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 02:03:16 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <elrflv4h98fu0mq5nqeivn0851u9bn2oe4@4ax.com>
Source record: 76391

On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 10:00:13 -0400, Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
wrote:

>Why would you want to foil computer copy?

Because no law says you can't.

>For you to do the test to
>make sure that it works and then advocate it's use, you can't really
>say that wasn't your intention.

What if it was? Nothing you can do about it but learn the code.

2977. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 02:44:59 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <h0uflvo2q850i0kanut9ke2uc5p25lg262@4ax.com>
Source record: 76392

On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 13:48:10 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Bob Brock wrote:
>> On 4 Sep 2003 05:16:59 -0700, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>If CW is indeed effective and current, then it will propagate due to
>>>>its usefulness without regulatory requirement. Judging by how shrill
>>>>the proponents are, it appears that even they are afraid that it won't
>>>>show itself to be advantageous enough for people to learn on their
>>>>own.
>>>>
>>>>On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>>>>with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>>>>work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>>>
>>>That's shrill enough, congratulations.
>>
>>
>> I guess no answer at all was to be expected since it shows how invalid
>> the postion is.
>
> How's this for an answer? NO!
>
> Provide references where anyone has even proposed such an activity.

I can't understand why you would want to talk to someone from another
country who had possibly not passed your lid filter, but to each their
own incongruiteis I guess.

Show me where I said that anyone proposed it and I'll consider
documenting it. I'm not in the habit of trying to document things
that I never said and I won't start with you.

2978. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 02:48:02 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <q5uflvcpp1jg158jp6a3vhdrh5dnnn1cm8@4ax.com>
Source record: 76393

On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 13:50:54 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>
>
>Bob Brock wrote:
>> On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>>>
>>>
>>>>On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>>>>with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>>>>work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>>>
>>>In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.
>>
>>
>> I was asking about you guys, not what they will do. Afterall, I've
>> boycotted General and above for about 9 years now because of
>> antiquated requirements.
>
> Your loss, dude.
>
> If you wait long enough, the writtens might go away too.

No, the writen exams have a basis in the real world. Code just has
it's basis as a historical antiquity. I'm more than willing to do
whatever is necessary to prove profiency in radio operation.
>
>
> Hey Carl, here's one of your new guys!

Im sure that this has some type of significance for you, but it's lost
on me.

2979. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 02:48:51 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <hbuflvctog9g00c59pni36g0lhhjfkrmcs@4ax.com>
Source record: 76394

On 4 Sep 2003 18:17:10 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>Bob Brock wrote:
>
>> On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>>
>> >Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>> >
>> >> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>> >> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>> >> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>> >
>> >In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.
>>
>> I was asking about you guys, not what they will do. Afterall, I've
>> boycotted General and above for about 9 years now because of
>> antiquated requirements.
>
>
>
>So by your logic I should have, as a VE, boycotted administering no-code Tech tests? You
>sure demonstrate
>where you're coming from.
>Welcome to the house of code haters, you fit right in.

I'd prefer that it be called the list of long time code haters.

2980. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 02:50:18 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <2euflvoda8esijs8gqhbujjv51o8lvbgkq@4ax.com>
Source record: 76395

On 5 Sep 2003 01:28:23 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>Brian wrote:
>
>> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj7vj6jsp0@208.207.71.151>...
>> > Bob Brock wrote:
>> >
>> > > On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>> > >
>> > > >Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>> > > >
>> > > >> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>> > > >> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>> > > >> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>> > > >
>> > > >In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.
>> > >
>> > > I was asking about you guys, not what they will do. Afterall, I've
>> > > boycotted General and above for about 9 years now because of
>> > > antiquated requirements.
>> >
>> > So by your logic I should have, as a VE, boycotted administering no-code Tech tests?
>>
>> DICK, you did. You turned in your VE badge and credentials because
>> you were upset with the No-Code license.
>
> You really can't get *anything* correct can you? I turned in nothing! I closed down my VE
teram in early '94
>after we licensed so many other hams who started up their own teans in the region that we
had very little
>business remaining. At the outset we had the only team in a hundred mile radius. I *did*
remark after the last
>restructuring that I didn't ntend to participate as a VE after that debacle. So far I
haven't, and haven't
>needed to.
> Get your facts straignt and MAYBE you won't be so prone to spread falsehoods.

So you're upset because I'm the antithesis of what you did? How
quaint...

2981. Re: NCI Petition available on FCC ECFS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 02:50:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F57FA4F.6000805@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76397

Ed Norton wrote:
> On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 14:06:20 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
>>
>>Ed Norton wrote:
>>
>>>On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 12:16:08 -0400, Radioman <radio@ptt.edu> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Since you've never used for hands for anything except yourself, you would
>>>>have no idea how dirty one's hands can get working with old bike parts.
>>>
>>>
>>>Struck a chord, eh? Those must have been your dirty-fingernailed
>>>hands.
>>
>> Might you mean "Struck a nerve"?
>
>
> Nope. Meant what I said. When you learn a bit more about idiomatic
> constructs, THEN you can undertake to correct someone. In the
> meantime, look up the phrase "struck a chord" on Google. You just may
> be enlightened.

So you wanted to elicit an emotional response in Radioman? One done in a positive vein, as is typical of "striking a chord" with someone, instead of an irritating emotional response as in "striking a nerve", is it? Oddly enough, most of your posts don't seem calculated to elicit a positive response.

Pity a smart fella like you has to argue with a dullard such as myself. Better get back to the Mensa folk, who *might* be qualified to talk wit' ya if they acts nice 'n don't get too uppity.

- Mike KB3EIA -

2982. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 02:52:40 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <eguflvc9je3pbt6i92eeqepsqu74ntfl09@4ax.com>
Source record: 76396

On 05 Sep 2003 00:20:20 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <flfelvsgco1mgulsjf7hb7su19rbr52cq6@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
><bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>
>>On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>>
>>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>>news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>>>
>>>> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>>>> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>>>> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>>>
>>>In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.
>>
>>I was asking about you guys, not what they will do.
>
>I don't boycott any ham who follows the rules.

I didn't say that I boycotted any ham. I said that I boycotted a
licensing structure that I disagreed with. I'll QSO with any ham on
any band that we are both licensed to operate on. I even learned
code, but I won't upgrade until the requirement that I disagree with
is removed.

2983. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 02:54:26 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <9kuflv8dnqhehg4gcsk8gkoeehcjdsqp2c@4ax.com>
Source record: 76398

On Thu, 4 Sep 2003 20:15:41 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030904202020.11891.00000444@mb-m11.aol.com...
>> In article <flfelvsgco1mgulsjf7hb7su19rbr52cq6@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
>> <bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>>
>> >On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>> >
>> >>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>> >news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>> >>
>> >>> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>> >>> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>> >>> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>> >>
>> >>In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will
>boycott.
>> >
>> >I was asking about you guys, not what they will do.
>>
>> I don't boycott any ham who follows the rules.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>Exactly. And, I hadn't heard of any attempt to boycott a "country" due to
>its position on CW. That seems like something that would only get thought
>up right here in this newsgroup, though! <GRIN>
>
>Anyway, that's taking the whole CW debate just way too far, IMNSHO.

I simply asked if anyone would consider boycotting no code HF
operators from other countries. Oz is already issuing licenses.
Asking a question is not proposing anything. However, making that
jump in logic is typical of usenet in general.

2984. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 02:56:04 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <tnuflv86119v6urrkv13c0rv4b66cvdl7o@4ax.com>
Source record: 76399

On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 13:12:29 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Bob Brock wrote:
>
>>
>> If CW is indeed effective and current, then it will propagate due to
>> its usefulness without regulatory requirement. Judging by how shrill
>> the proponents are, it appears that even they are afraid that it won't
>> show itself to be advantageous enough for people to learn on their
>> own.
>
> Not the point.
>
>
>
>> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>
> WOW! After all your posts claiming how poor some members of this
>group's arguments are you post that?

Answering a question with a question is no anwer at all.

2985. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 02:57:08 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <gquflvks9oehipvfhpalq06o39u7pue2cs@4ax.com>
Source record: 76400

On 4 Sep 2003 16:28:59 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>Bob Brock wrote:
>
>> On 04 Sep 2003 11:30:04 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>> >In article <XBw5b.534$vj4.80577@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> ><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >What is and is not " a legitimate regulatory purpose or role" is purely a
>> >matter of opinion.
>> >
>> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>> The passing of regulations outside the scope of the organization.
>
>
>
>So now YOU are to decide for the FCC the scope of their organization,.
>
>What an(other) idiot!

Now, I asked you to provide a cite in their charter (the
communications act). You failed to do so. Is there a reason that you
did that?

2986. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 02:58:33 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030904225833.22854.00000342@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 76403

>No, the writen exams have a basis in the real world.

And what Value is that? The present writtens dont test for knowledge

2987. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:00:23 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <pvuflvgd58gquld8a6o467sg6dpp8l3kh8@4ax.com>
Source record: 76401

On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 11:48:06 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>> news:3F54DEF5.9080308@psu.edu...
>>
>>>Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>>
>>>>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>>>>news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
>>>>>
>>>>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>Many times the number of *US* NCI members, Carl.
>>>
>>>
>>>Now Dick, how do you know that? No one knows except a person that isn't
>>>telling.
>>>
>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>> If FISTS has 10k members, they do NOT have "many times the membership
>> numbers of NCI" ... the numbers would be something that Dick would hate
>> to imagine in worst twisted nightmare :-)
>
>
> I guess we'll never know, though........

Would it make you feel better if he threw a number out there or would
you guys simply start attacking the number claimed based on some kind
of 10 code logic?

2988. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:01:45 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <k2vflv4h5hrdk4m2ehkuv4aavhhu0fs20b@4ax.com>
Source record: 76402

On 4 Sep 2003 16:37:08 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>> > news:3F54DEF5.9080308@psu.edu...
>> >
>> >>Dick Carroll; wrote:
>> >>
>> >>>"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>> >>>>news:bivu78rfn0@208.207.71.142...
>> >>>>
>> >>>>
>> >>>>>As you may know, FISTS has many times the membership numbers of NCI.
>> >>>>
>> >>>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>Many times the number of *US* NCI members, Carl.
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>Now Dick, how do you know that? No one knows except a person that isn't
>> >>telling.
>> >>
>> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
>> >
>> >
>> > If FISTS has 10k members, they do NOT have "many times the membership
>> > numbers of NCI" ... the numbers would be something that Dick would hate
>> > to imagine in worst twisted nightmare :-)
>>
>> I guess we'll never know, though.....
>>
>
>That's exactly right. He'll never tell because the number is embarassingly small.
>

Without posting a list, he could clam any number that felt good to him. So, the number would mean nothing withou supporting documentation. What's sad is that you know that and want to harp on a number anyway.

2989. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:03:56 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <47vflvk827hmntr6rr5uttm81rv9kqccdj@4ax.com>
Source record: 76404

On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 22:40:03 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:qUw5b.540$vj4.80890@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>>
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>> news:Xa75b.22665$Om1.19738@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>> > I think total ellimination is equivilant to negotiations with a
>terrorist
>> > organization (NCI).
>> >
>> > Dan/W4NTI
>>
>> I think that characterization is totally out of line and is equivalent to
>> the "law of usenet" that goes something like "the first one to equate
>> the other to Hitler automatically loses the argument."
>>
>> Carl - wk3c
>>
>
>I understand your point of view Carl. Down heah in Dixie we call that 'eat
>up with the dumbass'.
>
>Your NCI organization is nothing but a bunch of whinney crybaby lazy me
>generation morons. You know it, and we know it. Now just go off and whine
>in your corner.
>
>The truth hurts, eh?

Is the truth that you are referring to the fact that other countries
are dropping the code requirement as fast as they can?

2990. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:04:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309041904.313e7337@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76407

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<7bP5b.31433$Om1.27890@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:qUw5b.540$vj4.80890@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> >
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:Xa75b.22665$Om1.19738@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > > I think total ellimination is equivilant to negotiations with a
> terrorist
> > > organization (NCI).
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > I think that characterization is totally out of line and is equivalent to
> > the "law of usenet" that goes something like "the first one to equate
> > the other to Hitler automatically loses the argument."
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
> >
>
> I understand your point of view Carl. Down heah in Dixie we call that 'eat
> up with the dumbass'.

No doubt. Dumb is written all over your post.

> Your NCI organization is nothing but a bunch of whinney crybaby lazy me
> generation morons.

Odd. I think the PCTA are the whiney crybaby generation who think if
it was good enough for their grandpappies, that its good enough for
everyone since.

"I had to learn it, whah, whah, whah."

I'm not buying it.

All we've asked you to come up with was a valid reason to retain the
code exam.

That should be simple enough, right?

> You know it, and we know it. Now just go off and whine
> in your corner.
>
> The truth hurts, eh?

Does it?

2991. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:05:53 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <3avflvoh9662o9nmrbaauj1j8m8lvqmjlp@4ax.com>
Source record: 76405

On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 20:03:16 -0600, S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
wrote:

>On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 10:00:13 -0400, Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
>wrote:
>
>
>>Why would you want to foil computer copy?
>
>Because no law says you can't.
>
>>For you to do the test to
>>make sure that it works and then advocate it's use, you can't really
>>say that wasn't your intention.
>
>What if it was? Nothing you can do about it but learn the code.

I already know that code. My interest in using it, or listening to
is, is non-existant. However, if you tried really hard, you could
probably send it bad enough that I couldn't copy. You would have to
try wouldn't you?

2992. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:07:18 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <6dvflvkdb7n1u2ksv1qvgke4g02jd59vpv@4ax.com>
Source record: 76406

```
On 4 Sep 2003 16:33:17 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>Bob Brock wrote:
>
>> On 4 Sep 2003 13:46:33 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >
>> >Brian wrote:
>> >
>> >> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<Bjv5b.37515$Vx2.16470335@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>> >> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:f45722ac.0309031419.781071e2@posting.google.com...
>> >> > > S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>> >> > news:<jtfblv010bk0gpv19cap9jk0i1o6u9c0ap@4ax.com>...
>> >> > > > On Sun, 24 Aug 2003 14:38:36 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
>> >> > > > wrote:
>> >> > > >
>> >> > > > >The exam does not exclude anyone who cares to make the effort to learn.
>> >> > And
>> >> > > > >Farnsworth IS Morse since it relates a letter directly to a sound
>> >> > without
>> >> > > > >counting dots and dashes.
>> >> > > >
>> >> > > > Actually the Farnsworth method is Morse Code
>> >> > >
>> >> > > It is not.
>> >> > >
>> >> > > Only at 20 WPM does Farnsworth and Morse use the same character and word
>> >> > rate.
>> >> >
>> >> > Nowhere is there a definition that says the character rate and word rate
>> >> > MUST be the same for it to be Morse.
>> >>
>> >> Then it's not Morse Code.
>> >>
>> >> There is standard spacing and
>> >> > Farnsworth spacing and the variety of spacing that you hear on the air.
>> >> > There are some really fine operators who have near perfect standard spacing
>> >> > but the rest of us vary. That doesn't mean we aren't sending Morse.
>> >>
```

>> >> It means that we are desparately trying to, except in the case of
>> >> DICK/W0EX who purposely sends poor code in order to thwart the
>> >> computer code readers.
>> >
>> >Google it up, youi lying sack. I said it's entirely possible to foil computer copy that way. So you convert that
>> >to what you wish I had said, as you so often do.
>>
>> Why would you want to foil computer copy? For you to do the test to
>> make sure that it works and then advocate it's use, you can't really
>> say that wasn't your intention.
>
>I can't? Who are you to say even what the subject was? The allegation had been made that a computer does a perfectly
>acceptable job of copying Morse code which is of course very inaccurate. My remark was one of many possible reasons
>for that fact.
>
>Stuff it, Brock. You'r as ignorant as Brian.

If you send code bad enough, no one can copy it. Your petty attacks
on me go unnoticed. I've been here too long for that petty stuff to
work.
>

2993. test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:08:13 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <66T5b.253$Sm1.155@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 76408

[No readable article body recovered]

2994. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:08:53 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <juuflvotqfg61il3lnmmfr4gv1ra1i9jlp@4ax.com>
Source record: 76409

On Wed, 03 Sep 2003 11:22:58 -0700, Jack Twilley
<jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote:

>In my limited experience, I learn more characters faster with
>Farnsworth spacing, but I'm concerned that I'm building a lookup table
>instead of reflexes. It's the difference between "dahdidah, hmm,
>that's K, dahdah, hmm, that's M" and "dahdidah (K) dahdah (M)". I
>learned eight or nine characters with Farnsworth spacing, but I can't
>repeat the performance at full speed, so I fear that I'm learning
>something that won't be useful if I continue to use Farnsworth
>spacing.

Imagine it's like exercising or setting a goal to enter a marathon.

You don't do 500 push-ups, 100 arm curls, and run 26 miles a day. You
work up to that goal of running and finishing the 26 mile Boston
Marathon, a little at a time, 3 days a week.

It can be done. Takes practice, a lot of practice and patience.

My suggestion is, limit yourself to 3 times a day (if you can fit into
your schedule), every day. That will keep from being overwhelmed and
feeling of frustration at least to a minimum.

It took me a little over 6 months to go from nothing to 20 WPM. I
passed the 20 WPM code before I took the General written exam.

2995. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:11:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309041911.69d1f7c8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76411

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<8pE5b.37558$Vx2.16550752@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:Blx5b.551$vj4.81294@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> >
> > Actually, I believe there is an ITU-R Recommendation that specifies
> > the "International Morse Code" in typical ITU detail.
> >
>
> Operative word is recommendation, which is exactly what I said.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Yet the FCC demands that one passes an exam or be denied access.

Shouldn't they have a definition of what is being examined?

2996. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:12:52 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <tnvflv0qkdrojl53j9ev5j80q885tjve7q@4ax.com>
Source record: 76410

On 05 Sep 2003 02:58:33 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>No, the writen exams have a basis in the real world.
>
>And what Value is that? The present writtens dont test for knowledge

Then what do you think that they test for?

2997. Re: So much for High Tech!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:20:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309041920.7cf0017@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76412

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj88atail0@208.207.71.158>...
> Just off the news:
>
> Computer grid operator in Ohio at the beginnining of the Big Blackout, in response to an
> inquiry::
>
> "Our computers are all acting up, too! We don't even know the status of the stuff around
> us!"
>
> Yep, lets all put ALL our faith and confidence in Karl and his Komplete
> Komputerized Kommunications Konsortium!!

What are you ranting about?

There's a whole spectrum of modes between CW and PSK31 that don't
require computers.

And besides, the power distribution system isn't using amateur radio
anyhow.

Sheesh!

2998. Re: Advanced licensees who refuse to upgrade because of the CW issue

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:24:39 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <u80glv0effkesgots3ir3m6ap71a5lhu0o@4ax.com>
Source record: 76414

On 05 Sep 2003 01:08:21 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Not too shabby. I did it in about 18 months in the early '80's, in spite
>of having to walk through waist-deep snow to get to the FCC Field
>office, etc. etc.

Know what you mean. I drove 100 miles in a blinding snowstorm to get
to the nearest VE session to take my Advanaced and Extra theory
elements.

My father upgraded from conditional to Extra while in college. The
FCC Field Office, was down the street from the college. To do that
today, that's 12 hours round trip.

Stacey, AA7YA

2999. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:28:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <zpT5b.679$vj4.98278@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76413

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:8pE5b.37558$Vx2.16550752@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> news:Blx5b.551$vj4.81294@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> >
> > Actually, I believe there is an ITU-R Recommendation that specifies
> > the "International Morse Code" in typical ITU detail.
> >
>
> Operative word is recommendation, which is exactly what I said.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

"Recommendations" can be mandatory, if they are "incorporated
by reference" in the ITU Radio Regulations ... use of "shall" which
means "must" as opposed to "should" which means "is strongly
encouraged, but not strictly mandatory" or "may" which means
"if you feel like it" (more or less).

Don't try to lecture me on regulatory ... that's what I do for a
living (and for a couple of major industry organizations, plus
NCI)

Carl - wk3c

3000. Re: So much for High Tech!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:30:51 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <lp0glvcd1na8q28hvo368v6reia32dh12e@4ax.com>
Source record: 76415

On 4 Sep 2003 20:20:47 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj88atail0@208.207.71.158>...
>> Just off the news:
>>
>> Computer grid operator in Ohio at the beginnining of the Big Blackout, in response to an
>> inquiry::
>>
>> "Our computers are all acting up, too! We don't even know the status of the stuff around
>> us!"
>>
>> Yep, lets all put ALL our faith and confidence in Karl and his Komplete
>> Komputerized Kommunications Konsortium!!
>
>What are you ranting about?
>
>There's a whole spectrum of modes between CW and PSK31 that don't
>require computers.
>
>And besides, the power distribution system isn't using amateur radio
>anyhow.
>
>Sheesh!

I think that he misses the good ole days when messages were delivered
by the Pony Express. Back then, you didn't have to worry about
traffic jams.

3001. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:34:47 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <rvT5b.680$vj4.98431@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 76416

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030904073003.07346.00000400@mb-m26.aol.com...
> In article <WQw5b.537$vj4.80805@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
> >news:3F54C978.8040604@ix.netcom.com...
> >> Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >>
> >> >It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> If CW does enjoy a 13 dB advantage over SSB, avid DX hounds will
> >> choose to learn it and use it on their own. No need for a license
test.
> >> CW makes for small bandwidth combined with simple equipment.
> >> NASA doesn't use CW with its deep space probes, but they have
> >> fancy equipment on both ends. I mention this in that NASA does the
> >> ultimate in weak signal work, something CW is usually good for on
> >> ham bands with simple equipment and trained operators. But there's
> >> no CW op on the space probe.
> >
> >And plain old binary FSK has a bit more than a 9 dB weak signal advantage
> >over OOK Morse ... if you slow it down to equivalent data rates ...
>
> If you have an optimized receiver and suitable conditions, maybe - depends
on
> what you determine to be "equivalent data rates".

Bits is bits ... same equivlent data rate is pretty clear.

> But hams don't do slow-HF-BFSK. 60 wpm FSK Baudot RTTY is about the most
basic
> data mode still in use by hams.

No, because it works well at higher rates and higher rates are desirable.
BUT, if they *did* slow WAY down to Morse rates, they'd have at
least a 9 dB weak signal advantage over OOK Morse..

> >More modern digital techniques are even better. Some produce perfect
> >copy at s/n ratios where even the best CW operator couldn't even detect
> >the PRESENCE of a CW signal, let alone begin to copy it.
>
> That all depends on the equipment in use. Using a receiver optimized for
one
> mode in an attempt to receive another may or may not be a good idea.
> >
> What mode do you use most on HF, Carl?

I'm playing with the soundcard modes right now ... PSKxx in particular,
helping some friends check out some pretty slick freeware they're
developing.

Come winter after the antenna work is done, I intend to work on designing
some high speed stuff.

Carl - wk3c

3002. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:37:04 UTC
From: "S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <n11glvk2m4vj1tva6pnpdscu1rpsihr9oc@4ax.com>
Source record: 76417

On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 10:02:29 -0400, Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
wrote:

>Actually, the last time I subscribed to the ng, TIT's had left the
>group and vowed never to return. Things changed I guess.

I told myself when she vowed to the group that she'd never return...

"she'll be back".

3003. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:41:16 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030904234116.14331.00000611@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 76418

>Then what do you think that they test for?

Oh I know what they Test for, and it is not knowledge,it is nothing then Memozizing some Q&As that have no meaning to the test taker. The writtens are nothing more than jumping thru hoops

3004. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:44:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030904234403.14331.00000612@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 76419

>Don't try to lecture me on regulatory ... that's what I do for a
>living (and for a couple of major industry organizations, plus
>NCI)
>
>Carl - wk3c
>

Damn, I thought you were some Techno whizz, no wonder it took you over a year to upgrade.

3005. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 03:45:56 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030904234556.14331.00000613@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 76420

>Come winter after the antenna work is done, I intend to work on designing
>some high speed stuff.
>
>Carl - wk

Who are you kidding, you have been claiming this for years.

3006. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 04:09:37 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <j62glvk4duionbd52uc7igls30dnv6mc4m@4ax.com>
Source record: 76421

On 05 Sep 2003 03:41:16 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>Then what do you think that they test for?
>
>Oh I know what they Test for, and it is not knowledge,it is nothing then
>Memozizing some Q&As that have no meaning to the test taker. The writtens are
>nothing more than jumping thru hoops

In other words, since they provide the question pool, you don't think that people have to learn the answers in order to correctly answer the questions? How do you think that they figure out how to fill in the correct answer then?

You weren't provided with an answer sheet where you only had to memorize the correct sequence were you?

I used to train people at a nuclear power plant. The way I did it was to provide the students with a list of objectives, which were usually in the form of questions. I told them up front that when I was finished with the class, I expected to have covered those objectives and that they needed to know the answers. When I wrote the test, you know where the questions came from? Yup, they came from those objectives word for word because that was what I wanted them to learn. So, if they would study those objectives and know the answers to those objectives, they could pass the tests with no problems. We didn't play games with them and train them on objectives and test them on something unrelated. We taught them, they learned what we wanted them to learn and we validated that they had learned it without playing mind games with them by extending the tests beyond the objectives.

That worked very well in a nuclear environment. We maintained a SALP 1 from the NRC during the time frame I was there and I was there for quite a while. Perhaps it's you contention that getting a license to operate a radio is somehow more complex than the nuclear environment, but that's simply not true and anyone who is rational would know that. In both cases, the material is taught and the student learns it or they don't pass the test.

3007. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 04:11:44 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <o53glv0hcrtk27354kt9i01rrbvj1rf7cv@4ax.com>
Source record: 76422

On 05 Sep 2003 03:44:03 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>Don't try to lecture me on regulatory ... that's what I do for a
>>living (and for a couple of major industry organizations, plus
>>NCI)
>>
>>Carl - wk3c
>>
>
>Damn, I thought you were some Techno whizz, no wonder it took you over a year
>to upgrade.

An alternative theory could be that he has a life and that upgrade
wasn't a priority. Some of us do have lives you know. You do know
that don't you?

3008. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 04:50:47 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <fv4glv8o4k58e0vekqnopi6cqr1ua71h6v@4ax.com>
Source record: 76423

On 04 Sep 2003 01:29:46 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>That's a reasonable approximation ... and growing by leaps and bounds
>>daily with the Petition and associated publicity.
>>
>>Carl - wk3c
>
>Bullshit, Prove it.

See, I told you guys that this would happen if any number was claimed. Now, someone wants proof and the only way to proove it is to publish a list of members which NCI won't do. It was like watching two trains going opposite directions on the same track, you guys knew it was going to happen, yet you did everything possible to make it happen.

The question then becomes, why? One possibility is that you thought that a number could be published and no one would say, "Proove it." We all know better than that though. Another possiblity was that it's what you wanted to happen, because when it did happen you could all jump on the "the number is BS bandwagon". The advantage of the "BS bandwagon" is that it moves you away from just how untenable the code requriement position really is and it makes you feel somehow stronger.

I'm sure that there are other reasons that you guys were so adamant about wanting a number that you knew you would disagree with. I'd like to hear them. What are they?

3009. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 05:00:17 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <126glvou1s2rs25313vdjqsj2870q5m5l1@4ax.com>
Source record: 76424

On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 21:37:04 -0600, S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com>
wrote:

>On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 10:02:29 -0400, Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
>wrote:
>
>>Actually, the last time I subscribed to the ng, TIT's had left the
>>group and vowed never to return. Things changed I guess.
>
>I told myself when she vowed to the group that she'd never return...
>
>"she'll be back".

Did she ever really leave?

3010. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 05:12:09 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB7D93F7.25274%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 76425

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:

> Pretty astute of you, Dwight. Since having this
> callsign I've been on the air very little.

Well, get on the air, girl! This is, after all, what this is all about.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3011. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 05:16:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <BB7D94FA.25276%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net>
Source record: 76426

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> How charming...but you know what, I don't think
> I'll do that.

I didn't think you would. After all, things aren't all that boring, are they? And, yes, it was just about as charming as some of the comments you've made over the years. At least I was careful to add a smiley face at the end to make sure you understood it was said in jest.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3012. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 05:28:32 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj96u0rhk0@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 76427

N2EY wrote:

> In article <flfelvsgco1mgulsjf7hb7su19rbr52cq6@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
> <bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>
> >On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
> >
> >>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> >news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
> >>
> >>> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> >>> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
> >>> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
> >>
> >>In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.
> >
> >I was asking about you guys, not what they will do.
>
> I don't boycott any ham who follows the rules.

I don't know anyone who does....except for sojme no-coders posting here!

3013. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 05:30:04 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj970srhk1@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 76428

"S. Hanrahan" wrote:

> On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 10:00:13 -0400, Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Why would you want to foil computer copy?
>
> Because no law says you can't.
>
> >For you to do the test to
> >make sure that it works and then advocate it's use, you can't really
> >say that wasn't your intention.
>
> What if it was? Nothing you can do about it but learn the code.

The guy is a lost cause. He doesn't even understrand that no testing ever need be done.
All it takes is a bit of understanding, which he clearlyh lacks.

3014. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 05:31:26 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj973erhk2@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 76429

Bob Brock wrote:

> On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 13:48:10 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
> >Bob Brock wrote:
> >> On 4 Sep 2003 05:16:59 -0700, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >> >>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> >>>>If CW is indeed effective and current, then it will propagate due to
> >>> >>>>its usefulness without regulatory requirement. Judging by how shrill
> >>> >>>>the proponents are, it appears that even they are afraid that it won't
> >>> >>>>show itself to be advantageous enough for people to learn on their
> >>> >>>>own.
> >>> >>>>
> >>> >>>>On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> >>> >>>>with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
> >>> >>>>work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
> >>>
> >>> >>>That's shrill enough, congratulations.
> >>
> >>
> >> >> I guess no answer at all was to be expected since it shows how invalid
> >> >> the postion is.
> >>
> >> > How's this for an answer? NO!
> >>
> >> > Provide references where anyone has even proposed such an activity.
>
> I can't understand why you would want to talk to someone from another
> country who had possibly not passed your lid filter, but to each their
> own incongruiteis I guess.
>
> Show me where I said that anyone proposed it and I'll consider
> documenting it. I'm not in the habit of trying to document things
> that I never said and I won't start with you.

Yep. Another one of "them". He proposed it but he didn't propose it.

3015. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 05:32:42 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj975qrhk3@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 76430

Bob Brock wrote:

> On 4 Sep 2003 18:17:10 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >
> >Bob Brock wrote:
> >
> >> On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
> >>
> >> >Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
> >> >
> >> >> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> >> >> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
> >> >> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
> >> >
> >> >In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.
> >>
> >> I was asking about you guys, not what they will do. Afterall, I've
> >> boycotted General and above for about 9 years now because of
> >> antiquated requirements.
> >
> >
> >
> >So by your logic I should have, as a VE, boycotted administering no-code Tech tests? You
> >sure demonstrate
> >where you're coming from.
> >Welcome to the house of code haters, you fit right in.
>
> I'd prefer that it be called the list of long time code haters.

Sez it all!

3016. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 05:34:12 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bj978krhk4@208.207.71.144>
Source record: 76431

Bob Brock wrote:

> On 5 Sep 2003 01:28:23 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >
> >Brian wrote:
> >
> >> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj7vj6jsp0@208.207.71.151>...
> >> > Bob Brock wrote:
> >> >
> >> > > On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
> >> > >
> >> > > >Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
> >> > > >
> >> > > >> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> >> > > >> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
> >> > > >> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
> >> > > >
> >> > > >In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.
> >> > >
> >> > > I was asking about you guys, not what they will do. Afterall, I've
> >> > > boycotted General and above for about 9 years now because of
> >> > > antiquated requirements.
> >> >
> >> > So by your logic I should have, as a VE, boycotted administering no-code Tech tests?
> >>
> >> DICK, you did. You turned in your VE badge and credentials because
> >> you were upset with the No-Code license.
> >
> > You really can't get *anything* correct can you? I turned in nothing! I closed down my
VE teram in early '94
> >after we licensed so many other hams who started up their own teans in the region that
we had very little
> >business remaining. At the outset we had the only team in a hundred mile radius. I *did*
remark after the last
> >restructuring that I didn't ntend to participate as a VE after that debacle. So far I
haven't, and haven't
> >needed to.
> > Get your facts straignt and MAYBE you won't be so prone to spread falsehoods.
>
> So you're upset because I'm the antithesis of what you did? How

> quaint...

You're really no brighter than Slim Brian , but that certainly comes as no surprise.

3017. Re: Going under the knife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 10:15:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309050215.25cba13e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76432

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:<Obx5b.1625$n95.1153@news02.roc.ny>...
> Wish you a speedy recovery, Ryan. Also, like Bert, I hope you get a pretty
> nurse :)

I resemble that comment, Jim! =)

73

Steve, K4YZ (LPN)

3018. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 10:19:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030905061916.07346.00000415@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 76433

```
In article <rvT5b.680$vj4.98431@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030904073003.07346.00000400@mb-m26.aol.com...
>> In article <WQw5b.537$vj4.80805@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
>> >news:3F54C978.8040604@ix.netcom.com...
>> >> Dick Carroll; wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >It isn't on the FCC's website yet but you can read it here....
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> > http://www.eham.net/articles/6371
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> If CW does enjoy a 13 dB advantage over SSB, avid DX hounds will
>> >> choose to learn it and use it on their own. No need for a license
>test.
>> >> CW makes for small bandwidth combined with simple equipment.
>> >> NASA doesn't use CW with its deep space probes, but they have
>> >> fancy equipment on both ends. I mention this in that NASA does the
>> >> ultimate in weak signal work, something CW is usually good for on
>> >> ham bands with simple equipment and trained operators. But there's
>> >> no CW op on the space probe.
>> >
>> >And plain old binary FSK has a bit more than a 9 dB weak signal advantage
>> >over OOK Morse ... if you slow it down to equivalent data rates ...
>>
>> If you have an optimized receiver and suitable conditions, maybe - depends
>on
>> what you determine to be "equivalent data rates".
>
>Bits is bits ... same equivlent data rate is pretty clear.

So we'll say 30 wpm plain text.
>
>> But hams don't do slow-HF-BFSK. 60 wpm FSK Baudot RTTY is about the most
>basic
```

>> data mode still in use by hams.
>
>No, because it works well at higher rates and higher rates are desirable.

Sometimes higher rates are desirable.

>BUT, if they *did* slow WAY down to Morse rates, they'd have at
>least a 9 dB weak signal advantage over OOK Morse..

After your mistakes in the "ARS License Numbers" thread, Carl, I tend to be a
bit skeptical about your numbers. 54%, anyone?
>
>> >More modern digital techniques are even better. Some produce perfect
>> >copy at s/n ratios where even the best CW operator couldn't even detect
>> >the PRESENCE of a CW signal, let alone begin to copy it.
>>
>> That all depends on the equipment in use. Using a receiver optimized for
>> one
>> mode in an attempt to receive another may or may not be a good idea.
>> >
>> What mode do you use most on HF, Carl?
>
>I'm playing with the soundcard modes right now ... PSKxx in particular,
>helping some friends check out some pretty slick freeware they're
>developing.

That's nice....guess SSB has it limitations, huh?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3019. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 10:23:49 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309050223.429cc87c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76434

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309041424.284a7a9c@posting.google.com>...

> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309031544.d516785@posting.google.com>...

> > "hiram's cat" <eeefrincen4@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<1062593747.245315@newshost03.voicenet.com>...

> >
> > > All the ARRL ever was, is, and ever will be is a
> > > publishing company with a 501(c)3 tax exemption
> > > that wraps itself in fake ivy leaves of academia.
> > > Another typical "non-profit" that milks donations
> > > from suckers with trinkets and who's Corporate
> > > Board and Executive Staff members skim 50%
> > > right-off-the-top for "administrative expenses".
> > > I dropped them, my SCM, and my membership way back
> > > in 1984 and I've never regreted my decision.
> >
> > Yet another anonymous scumbag with libelous accusations and no
> > proof to offer.
> >
> > Considering the IMPROVEMENTS that have occured in the ARRL since
> > 1984, I'd say your departure was beneficial. Lord knows no one here
> > has missed you.
> >
> > Back under your rock, worthless troll.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> Wow, Steve.
>
> An anonymous poster posts something you agree with and you act like
> best friends. Another anonymous poster posts something you don't
> agree with and you go psycho.

What's "psycho" about it, Brain, or are you simply working off of
the same correspondence school degree that Lennie does?

> Why is that?

Perhaps because the other poster didn't make a lot of assinine
assertions that are not substantiated by facts, Brain.

You may refer to "fact" in Websters to find out what they are,
Brain...You DO seem to have a problem with the concept.

Steve, K4YZ

3020. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 10:30:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309050230.3215356@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76435

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:<v_R5b.268780$Oz4.71087@rwcrnsc54>...

> I'm sure he won't be able to come up with anything unless he was thinking
> of counting raising dues, and pushing for lower standards as
> improvements.

I'll watch while you >>TRY<< to show us where the ARRL has been
"pushing for lower standards as improvements", Vince.

Or shall I heap that expectation on the same pile of unanswered
questions along with all of Lennie's...?!?!

There's the Special Services Clubs, numerous scholarships for
youth and educational programs.

The recent Emergency Services programs that are not only being
funded but RE-approved for even further funding in the Homeland
Defense role bear even further evidence of the support that ARRL has
provided Amateur Radio.

So...Thee's three right off the top of my head. I don't see any
other Amateur "organization" that is promoting these programs as
aggressively as the ARRL.

Steve, K4YZ

3021. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 11:01:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309050301.542914b7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76436

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj8p13$l1g$0@208.207.71.136>...

> You're sorry, all right. NO question about that! A sorry liar!

You're the one not quoting correctly. You're defective.

3022. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 11:09:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309050309.36a98bff@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76438

Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<o53glv0hcrtk27354kt9i01rrbvj1rf7cv@4ax.com>...
> On 05 Sep 2003 03:44:03 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>
> >>Don't try to lecture me on regulatory ... that's what I do for a
> >>living (and for a couple of major industry organizations, plus
> >>NCI)
> >>
> >>Carl - wk3c
> >>
> >
> >Damn, I thought you were some Techno whizz, no wonder it took you over a year
> >to upgrade.
>
> An alternative theory could be that he has a life and that upgrade
> wasn't a priority. Some of us do have lives you know. You do know
> that don't you?

Speaking of no life. Dick is a big-time emergency communicator. Used
to drill 7/8" holes in the rooftops of Missouri's finest. Lives for
the New Madrid earthquake.

But when Hans invited him to join in a QSO using his favorite mode
that he demands everyone else be made to learn, his lame excuse for
not doing so was that he wasn't home at the time. Apparently he can't
go mobile himself.

So much for his emergency skills.

3023. Re: So much for High Tech!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 11:13:08 UTC
From: Emmersom Bigguns <ebigguns@boobs.com>
Message-ID: <8d_5b.10516$3b2.875073@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 76437

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309041920.7cf0017@posting.google.com...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj88atail0@208.207.71.158>...
> > Just off the news:
> >
> > Computer grid operator in Ohio at the beginnining of the Big Blackout,
in response to an
> > inquiry::
> >
> > "Our computers are all acting up, too! We don't even know the status of
the stuff around
> > us!"
> >
> > Yep, lets all put ALL our faith and confidence in Karl and his Komplete
> > Komputerized Kommunications Konsortium!!
>
> What are you ranting about?
>
> There's a whole spectrum of modes between CW and PSK31 that don't
> require computers.
>
> And besides, the power distribution system isn't using amateur radio
> anyhow.
>
> Sheesh!

He's ranting about all the great engineers that are frothing at the mouth to
get into Ham Radio but can't because of the "CW Boogie Man".
Just what we need, more "rocket scientists".

Also, after reading some of the replies to NCI's petition, you people really
need to invest in spell checkers. LOL

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/19/2003

3024. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 11:19:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030905071923.07346.00000416@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 76440

In article <j62glvk4duionbd52uc7igls30dnv6mc4m@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
<bbrock@i-america.net> writes:

>On 05 Sep 2003 03:41:16 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>
>>>Then what do you think that they test for?
>>
>>Oh I know what they Test for, and it is not knowledge,it is nothing then
>>Memozizing some Q&As that have no meaning to the test taker. The writtens
>>are nothing more than jumping thru hoops

Bob,

If you're bothering to argue with Bruce....
>
>In other words, since they provide the question pool, you don't think
>that people have to learn the answers in order to correctly answer the
>questions? How do you think that they figure out how to fill in the
>correct answer then?
>
>You weren't provided with an answer sheet where you only had to
>memorize the correct sequence were you?

The point is that the level of UNDERSTANDING required to pass the writtens
today is a lot less than it would be if the actual Q&A were not made public.
>
>I used to train people at a nuclear power plant. The way I did it was
>to provide the students with a list of objectives, which were usually
>in the form of questions. I told them up front that when I was
>finished with the class, I expected to have covered those objectives
>and that they needed to know the answers. When I wrote the test, you
>know where the questions came from? Yup, they came from those
>objectives word for word because that was what I wanted them to learn.
>So, if they would study those objectives and know the answers to those
>objectives, they could pass the tests with no problems.

OK, fine.

Did they KNOW, from Day 1, that the test they would be taking would consist of
the exact questions and answers you gave them on Day 1?

Was the passing grade 74%?

Was there a penalty for wrong answers?

>We didn't
>play games with them and train them on objectives and test them on

>something unrelated. We taught them, they learned what we wanted them
>to learn and we validated that they had learned it without playing
>mind games with them by extending the tests beyond the objectives.

Nobody's saying the tests should go beyond the stated objectives.
>
>That worked very well in a nuclear environment.

I imagine that the class has a lot of motivation towards safety.

>We maintained a SALP
>1 from the NRC during the time frame I was there and I was there for
>quite a while.

Were the employees tested once at the beginning of their employment at the plant, and never again? Or was continuing education an integral part of that environment?

>Perhaps it's you contention that getting a license to
>operate a radio is somehow more complex than the nuclear environment,
>but that's simply not true and anyone who is rational would know that.

Not a question of complexity.

>In both cases, the material is taught and the student learns it or
>they don't pass the test.

Not all hams take formal classes - in fact, most probably don't.

In the bad old days, the FCC published a study guide that listed, in essay form, the type of questions and typical solutions that would be found on the tests. For example, there were questions about Ohm's Law for a DC circuit and how to solve them. Any prospective ham knew he/she would be expected to know how to solve E = I/R and P = IE problems, resistors in series, parallel and series-parallel, etc. And anybody who had a basic UNDERSTANDING of that stuff would have no problem on those test questions.

But the actual Q&A were not made public. Today, with the actual Q&A in hand, less understanding is required.

That's what bothers some folks.

Consider this: Today, the test for Tech is 35 questions from a published pool. Most of those questions are on regulations, with some operating practices, theory and safety stuff. Yet the license granted for passing that test gives alla amateur privileges above 30 MHz, including the authorization to design, build, repair, align, modify and most of all operate transmitters of up to 1500 W power output on 'meat cooking frequencies' as WK3C puts it. There is no separate safety testing nor ongoing education - someone can get all of the RF exposure questions wrong and still pass.

Do you think that the test and its methods are really adequate for the privileges granted?

FCC does. In fact, back in 2000 they lowered the written requirement for the Tech license by almost half.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3025. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 11:19:24 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030905071924.07346.00000417@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 76439

In article <juuflvotqfg61il3lnmmfr4gv1ra1i9jlp@4ax.com>, S. Hanrahan
<aa7ya@hotmail.com> writes:

>Imagine it's like exercising or setting a goal to enter a marathon.
>
>You don't do 500 push-ups, 100 arm curls, and run 26 miles a day. You
>work up to that goal of running and finishing the 26 mile Boston
>Marathon, a little at a time, 3 days a week.

Exactly - but to finish a marathon takes more than 3x a week practice. Your
basic point is valid, though - marathoners don't start out running anything
like the marathon distance or pace. They work up to it over time.
>
>It can be done. Takes practice, a lot of practice and patience.

And the *right* training.
>
>My suggestion is, limit yourself to 3 times a day (if you can fit into
>your schedule), every day. That will keep from being overwhelmed and
>feeling of frustration at least to a minimum.
>
I'd say the most important training rule (for both Morse and marathoning) is to
have a consistent schedule that is challenging but not frustrating. And to
realize that not every workout is going to be easy or better than the last one.

73 de Jim, N2EY

(veteran of 2 Philadelphia Independence marathons, 20 or so half marathons, and
more 10 milers, 10Ks, and 5 milers than I can recall right now)

3026. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 11:55:21 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bj9tkb$q4a@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76441

```
"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:9kuflv8dnqhehg4gcsk8gkoeehcjdsqp2c@4ax.com...
> On Thu, 4 Sep 2003 20:15:41 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030904202020.11891.00000444@mb-m11.aol.com...
> >> In article <flfelvsgco1mgulsjf7hb7su19rbr52cq6@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
> >> <bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
> >> >
> >> >>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> >> >>news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
> >> >>
> >> >>> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> >> >>> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for
HF
> >> >>> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
> >> >>
> >> >>In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will
> >boycott.
> >> >
> >> >I was asking about you guys, not what they will do.
> >>
> >> I don't boycott any ham who follows the rules.
> >>
> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >
> >Exactly. And, I hadn't heard of any attempt to boycott a "country" due
to
> >its position on CW. That seems like something that would only get
thought
> >up right here in this newsgroup, though! <GRIN>
> >
> >Anyway, that's taking the whole CW debate just way too far, IMNSHO.
>
> I simply asked if anyone would consider boycotting no code HF
> operators from other countries. Oz is already issuing licenses.
> Asking a question is not proposing anything. However, making that
> jump in logic is typical of usenet in general.
```

Well, excuse the observation here: but you asked and was answered, at least by N2EY and by me. Both answers were succinct and without merit for the return you have above--which seems quite defensive and I'm puzzled by why.

So, you simply asked and were quite simply answered.

And, since you were the one who asked the question of such a weird concept you would be observing your own actions with regard to your last sentance.

Kim W5TIT

3027. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 11:58:06 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bj9tph$ug5@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76442

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:tnvflv0qkdrojl53j9ev5j80q885tjve7q@4ax.com...
> On 05 Sep 2003 02:58:33 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>
> >>No, the writen exams have a basis in the real world.
> > >
> > >And what Value is that? The present writtens dont test for knowledge
> >
> > Then what do you think that they test for?

Whether someone can remember correct answers to known questions.

Kim W5TIT

3028. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 11:59:16 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bj9trm$ql8@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76443

"S. Hanrahan" <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:n11glvk2m4vj1tva6pnpdscu1rpsihr9oc@4ax.com...
> On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 10:02:29 -0400, Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
> wrote:
>
> >Actually, the last time I subscribed to the ng, TIT's had left the
> >group and vowed never to return. Things changed I guess.
>
> I told myself when she vowed to the group that she'd never return...
>
> "she'll be back".

Yeah, good play is hard to give up. And, it's great amusement while
working...

Kim W5TIT

3029. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 12:03:30 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bj9u3k$hbt@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76444

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BB7D93F7.25274%stewartx@earthlinkNOSPAM.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> > Pretty astute of you, Dwight. Since having this
> > callsign I've been on the air very little.
>
>
> Well, get on the air, girl! This is, after all, what this is all about.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

heh heh...yeah, I know. There's been one reason or another for not having the equipment connected. Right now, it's been for the last (nearly) two years because of the new truck, having to find where I want the equipment; then having to pause all that while I have some work done, etc.

Never have really talked from the house, except to run a training net, so that's pretty much out of the question. In fact, both of us still wonder why we put up a 70' tower, loaded it up with antennas and don't even have a radio connected in here now. We used to have the HF rig set up and used to use it every night; but haven't done that in nearly four years...maybe longer.

Kim W5TIT

3030. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 12:40:47 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309050440.df8ad29@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76445

Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<fv4glv8o4k58e0vekqnopi6cqr1ua71h6v@4ax.com>...
> On 04 Sep 2003 01:29:46 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>
> >>That's a reasonable approximation ... and growing by leaps and bounds
> >>daily with the Petition and associated publicity.
> >>
> >>Carl - wk3c
> >

[expeletive deleted]
> >Prove it.
>
> See, I told you guys that this would happen if any number was claimed.

No number has been claimed, Bob.

> Now, someone wants proof and the only way to proove it is to publish a
> list of members which NCI won't do.

Then that one person doesn't get his proof.

> It was like watching two trains
> going opposite directions on the same track, you guys knew it was
> going to happen, yet you did everything possible to make it happen.

What ARE you talking about? Ever hear of railroad signal systems?
>
> The question then becomes, why? One possibility is that you thought
> that a number could be published and no one would say, "Proove it."
> We all know better than that though. Another possiblity was that it's
> what you wanted to happen, because when it did happen you could all
> jump on the "the number is BS bandwagon". The advantage of the "BS
> bandwagon" is that it moves you away from just how untenable the code
> requriement position really is and it makes you feel somehow stronger.

Nope. None of the above.

Here's the background:

NCI has been around since about 1996. Some of its staff and supporters
have claimed that the procodetest position is a minority position -
which makes them the majority position. But no proof of same has ever
been offered. There have also been claims that NCI "represents" ham
radio, and that ARRL does not, etc.

Check out this post from the executive director:

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=keV_9.2605%24N5.1476932%40nnrp1.ptd.net&oe=UTF-8&output=gplain

Here's the part I like best:

(Carl, WK3C, writes in an earlier post):
> >And
> >are you going to grouse about "restructuring" for the next 50 years?

(I replied):

> Not me. But isn't it the right of all Americans to complain about their
> government and petition for changes?

(Carl answers):

Yes ... of course ...

> Or is that right reserved only for those who agree with NCI's opinions?

Of course not, but at *some* point, folks in the minority should take "No." for an answer and get on with life ...

(end of quotes)

Gotta love that addytood..."at *some* point, folks in the minority should take "No." for an answer and get on with life ..."

Did NCI "take no for an answer and get on with life" when they turned out to be in the minority of those who commented to FCC on the 2000 restructuring?

Suppose the FCC puts up an NPRM proposing to dump Element 1. And suppose the majority of comments received on the issue say "Keep it". Will NCI "take no for an answer and get on with life"?

Naturally some of us asked how big NCI is, and how fast it was growing, and all we ever got was evasive answers such as "lots and lots", "growing by leaps and bounds", etc.

The only indication those of us on the outside have of NCI's size is the member numbers we've seen. The highest numbers I've seen are below 5000, which means there cannot be more than 5000 members, right?

But there's more! NCI started out with member number #1001, not #0001, so the real size cannot be more than 4000. Why did they start with #1001 instead of #0001? Please don't tell me their computers could not handle low numbers...

On top of that, membership costs nothing and all members are considered "active" unless they specifically request being removed from membership. Which has happened in a few cases that I know of personally. So anyone who joined is carried on NCI's books as a member, no matter what their interest and activity today. FISTS and most other groups like ARRL will drop you from their rolls if you don't send in your renewal, but not NCI.

Despite repeated requests over at least 6 years, NCI refuses to give an actual number of members. Why? All we've asked for is a statement like "As of September 1, 2003, there were XXXX active members of NCI. Of those, YYYY are licensed US hams". We did not ask for a list of names or calls.

All of this makes an NCI-outsider a bit skeptical. If the number of members isn't that big a deal, why all the secrecy about it all these years?

> I'm sure that there are other reasons that you guys were so adamant
> about wanting a number that you knew you would disagree with.

You're taking Bruce's demand for proof and applying it generally. Why?

> I'd
> like to hear them. What are they?

See above.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3031. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 13:03:07 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030905090307.28444.00000681@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 76446

>How do you think that they figure out how to fill in the
>correct answer then?
>

Its called memorizing, no knowledge. If question about the material most wouldnt have a Clue.

>You weren't provided with an answer sheet where you only had to
>memorize the correct sequence were you?

No I wasnt, I knew the Info.

>Perhaps it's you contention that getting a license to
>operate a radio is somehow more complex than the nuclear environment,

No not really, anymore its a waste of time the way the present written is setup.

3032. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 13:07:04 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030905090704.28444.00000682@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 76447

>An alternative theory could be that he has a life and that upgrade
>wasn't a priority.

The correct answer is, the CW wasnt the problem, the Theory was just as big a problem. Would love to know how many time s he failed it .

3033. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 13:13:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030905091326.28444.00000683@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 76448

>See, I told you guys that this would happen if any number was claimed.
>Now, someone wants proof

Of course someone wants proof . Hell anybody can say they have any number of anything, but that doesnt make it so.
Karl and the nuts are going before the FCC claiming they have X number of support, wheres the facts for your support. Or are they just throwing out any number they hink will Impress the FCC.

3034. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 13:36:46 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <q34hlvcgevegergctv8hqktgf5h5mcti9e@4ax.com>
Source record: 76449

On 05 Sep 2003 13:13:26 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>See, I told you guys that this would happen if any number was claimed.
>>Now, someone wants proof
>
>Of course someone wants proof . Hell anybody can say they have any number of
>anything, but that doesnt make it so.

I'm the one who told you that when you were asking for a number. He
told you in advance that he wouldn't publish a member list. Did that
slow you down? No...it didn't. You are your own worst enemy.

> Karl and the nuts are going before the FCC claiming they have X number of
>support, wheres the facts for your support. Or are they just throwing out any
>number they hink will Impress the FCC.

Regulatory agencies are not democracies. They will listen to everyone
and then do as they please. You may not like it, but that's how it
is. I would say that, given some of the larger members of the EU
already dropping the code requrement, the the pro coders have an
uphill battle if they want to make us look like a backwards country
where ham radio is concerned.

3035. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 13:39:15 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <0d4hlvka259gl6c2p0cbo0rbdtgkrv5n99@4ax.com>
Source record: 76450

On 5 Sep 2003 05:40:47 -0700, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<fv4glv8o4k58e0vekqnopi6cqr1ua71h6v@4ax.com>...
>> On 04 Sep 2003 01:29:46 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>>
>> >>That's a reasonable approximation ... and growing by leaps and bounds
>> >>daily with the Petition and associated publicity.
>> >>
>> >>Carl - wk3c
>> >
>
>[expeletive deleted]
>> >Prove it.
>>
>> See, I told you guys that this would happen if any number was claimed.
>
>No number has been claimed, Bob.

From a previous post in this thread:

> Explain how saying There are 5000 members of NCI is violating anyones
> privacy.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

That's a reasonable approximation ... and growing by leaps and bounds
daily with the Petition and associated publicity.

Carl - wk3c

I only made it to your first inaccuracy before I quit reading.

3036. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 13:39:51 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <lg4hlvcvmtl43j8mnrff6a0c461uidp4sm@4ax.com>
Source record: 76451

On 5 Sep 2003 05:31:26 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>Bob Brock wrote:
>
>> On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 13:48:10 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>>
>> >Bob Brock wrote:
>> >> On 4 Sep 2003 05:16:59 -0700, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>> >>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>> >>> >>>
>> >>> >>>
>> >>> >>>
>> >>> >>>>If CW is indeed effective and current, then it will propagate due to
>> >>> >>>>its usefulness without regulatory requirement. Judging by how shrill
>> >>> >>>>the proponents are, it appears that even they are afraid that it won't
>> >>> >>>>show itself to be advantageous enough for people to learn on their
>> >>> >>>>own.
>> >>> >>>>
>> >>> >>>>On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>> >>> >>>>with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>> >>> >>>>work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>> >>> >>>
>> >>> >>>That's shrill enough, congratulations.
>> >>> >>
>> >>> >>
>> >>> >> I guess no answer at all was to be expected since it shows how invalid
>> >>> >> the postion is.
>> >>> >
>> >>> > How's this for an answer? NO!
>> >>> >
>> >>> > Provide references where anyone has even proposed such an activity.
>> >>>
>> >>> I can't understand why you would want to talk to someone from another
>> >>> country who had possibly not passed your lid filter, but to each their
>> >>> own incongruiteis I guess.
>> >>>
>> >>> Show me where I said that anyone proposed it and I'll consider
>> >>> documenting it. I'm not in the habit of trying to document things
>> >>> that I never said and I won't start with you.

>
>
>
>Yep. Another one of "them". He proposed it but he didn't propose it.

Your reading comprehension problem is duly noted.

3037. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 13:54:24 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <vi4hlv4p8a8lvp8p3p059191vae1pfh7dq@4ax.com>
Source record: 76452

On 05 Sep 2003 11:19:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <j62glvk4duionbd52uc7igls30dnv6mc4m@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
><bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>
>>On 05 Sep 2003 03:41:16 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>>
>>>>Then what do you think that they test for?
>>>
>>>Oh I know what they Test for, and it is not knowledge,it is nothing then
>>>Memozizing some Q&As that have no meaning to the test taker. The writtens
>>>are nothing more than jumping thru hoops
>
>Bob,
>
>If you're bothering to argue with Bruce....

I'm beginning to understand him better. :-)
>>
>>In other words, since they provide the question pool, you don't think
>>that people have to learn the answers in order to correctly answer the
>>questions? How do you think that they figure out how to fill in the
>>correct answer then?
>>
>>You weren't provided with an answer sheet where you only had to
>>memorize the correct sequence were you?
>
>The point is that the level of UNDERSTANDING required to pass the writtens
>today is a lot less than it would be if the actual Q&A were not made public.

His contention was the learning was not required. I've shown him
where it is required and a very similar system is used in a validated
educational system.
>>
>>I used to train people at a nuclear power plant. The way I did it was
>>to provide the students with a list of objectives, which were usually
>>in the form of questions. I told them up front that when I was
>>finished with the class, I expected to have covered those objectives
>>and that they needed to know the answers. When I wrote the test, you
>>know where the questions came from? Yup, they came from those
>>objectives word for word because that was what I wanted them to learn.
>>So, if they would study those objectives and know the answers to those
>>objectives, they could pass the tests with no problems.
>
>OK, fine.

>
>Did they KNOW, from Day 1, that the test they would be taking would consist of
>the exact questions and answers you gave them on Day 1?

They did if the believed me when I told them.
>
>Was the passing grade 74%?

For most subjects, 70% was passing. However, after academic training
was completed, the employee was required to pass an ETQS performance
based test prior to certification.
>
>Was there a penalty for wrong answers?

The lost points on the exam...we didn't beat them or anything like
that. ;-)
>
>>We didn't
>>play games with them and train them on objectives and test them on
>>something unrelated. We taught them, they learned what we wanted them
>>to learn and we validated that they had learned it without playing
>>mind games with them by extending the tests beyond the objectives.
>
>Nobody's saying the tests should go beyond the stated objectives.

No amount of academic training is going to make someone proficient at
performing tasks. Only experience actually doing it will make that
happen.
>>
>>That worked very well in a nuclear environment.
>
>I imagine that the class has a lot of motivation towards safety.

Mistakes are not acceptable.
>
>>We maintained a SALP
>>1 from the NRC during the time frame I was there and I was there for
>>quite a while.
>
>Were the employees tested once at the beginning of their employment at the
>plant, and never again? Or was continuing education an integral part of that
>environment?

Academic training and testing was a one time affair. Performance
based retesting was annual.
>
>>Perhaps it's you contention that getting a license to
>>operate a radio is somehow more complex than the nuclear environment,
>>but that's simply not true and anyone who is rational would know that.
>
>Not a question of complexity.
>

>>In both cases, the material is taught and the student learns it or
>>they don't pass the test.
>
>Not all hams take formal classes - in fact, most probably don't.
>
>In the bad old days, the FCC published a study guide that listed, in essay
>form, the type of questions and typical solutions that would be found on the
>tests. For example, there were questions about Ohm's Law for a DC circuit and
>how to solve them. Any prospective ham knew he/she would be expected to know
>how to solve E = I/R and P = IE problems, resistors in series, parallel and
>series-parallel, etc. And anybody who had a basic UNDERSTANDING of that stuff
>would have no problem on those test questions.
>
>But the actual Q&A were not made public. Today, with the actual Q&A in hand,
>less understanding is required.
>
>That's what bothers some folks.

As I said in a previous post in another thread, regulatory agencies
are not democracies. Sometimes they do things that I don't like.
When that happens I have two choices...conform or boycott.
>
>Consider this: Today, the test for Tech is 35 questions from a published pool.
>Most of those questions are on regulations, with some operating practices,
>theory and safety stuff. Yet the license granted for passing that test gives
>alla amateur privileges above 30 MHz, including the authorization to design,
>build, repair, align, modify and most of all operate transmitters of up to 1500
>W power output on 'meat cooking frequencies' as WK3C puts it. There is no
>separate safety testing nor ongoing education - someone can get all of the RF
>exposure questions wrong and still pass.
>
>Do you think that the test and its methods are really adequate for the
>privileges granted?

No I don't. In addition to dropping the code requirement, I would
like to see the academic testing made much harder with a performance
based test included. However, that's not going to happen.
>
>FCC does. In fact, back in 2000 they lowered the written requirement for the
>Tech license by almost half.

See my above comment regarding regulatory agencies. I can see where
they are coming from though. They have limited budget and ham radio
is a very small part of their plate.

3038. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 13:56:29 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <je5hlv4nak5tfn1mt0q6lrn30m7rtj5ojk@4ax.com>
Source record: 76453

On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 06:58:06 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:tnvflv0qkdrojl53j9ev5j80q885tjve7q@4ax.com...
>> On 05 Sep 2003 02:58:33 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>>
>> >>No, the writen exams have a basis in the real world.
>> >
>> >And what Value is that? The present writtens dont test for knowledge
>>
>> Then what do you think that they test for?
>
>Whether someone can remember correct answers to known questions.

Provided that the questions cover the things that you want the person
to know, this isn't an issue.

3039. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 13:58:15 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <sg5hlvs694bq4painrq46qjqfi6tdohdoj@4ax.com>
Source record: 76454

On 5 Sep 2003 05:34:12 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>Bob Brock wrote:
>
>> On 5 Sep 2003 01:28:23 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >
>> >Brian wrote:
>> >
>> >> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj7vj6jsp0@208.207.71.151>...
>> >> > Bob Brock wrote:
>> >> >
>> >> > > On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>> >> > >
>> >> > > >Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>> >> > > > >
>> >> > > > >> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>> >> > > > >> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>> >> > > > >> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>> >> > > > >
>> >> > > > >In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.
>> >> > > >
>> >> > > > I was asking about you guys, not what they will do. Afterall, I've
>> >> > > > boycotted General and above for about 9 years now because of
>> >> > > > antiquated requirements.
>> >> > >
>> >> > > So by your logic I should have, as a VE, boycotted administering no-code Tech
tests?
>> >> >
>> >> > DICK, you did. You turned in your VE badge and credentials because
>> >> > you were upset with the No-Code license.
>> >> >
>> > You really can't get *anything* correct can you? I turned in nothing! I closed down my
VE teram in early '94
>> >after we licensed so many other hams who started up their own teans in the region that
we had very little
>> >business remaining. At the outset we had the only team in a hundred mile radius. I
did remark after the last
>> >restructuring that I didn't ntend to participate as a VE after that debacle. So far I

haven't, and haven't
>> >needed to.
>> > Get your facts straignt and MAYBE you won't be so prone to spread falsehoods.
>>
>> So you're upset because I'm the antithesis of what you did? How
>> quaint...
>
>You're really no brighter than Slim Brian , but that certainly comes as no surprise.

ROTFLMAO.. If you can't present facts, I guess these kind of
responses are to be expected from you. Bear in mind, it doesn't make
your position look strong. In fact the opposite is true.

3040. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 13:59:16 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <6k5hlvc30dnf25s77iv7r9j40e5r1etg6b@4ax.com>
Source record: 76455

On 5 Sep 2003 05:32:42 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>Bob Brock wrote:
>
>> On 4 Sep 2003 18:17:10 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >
>> >Bob Brock wrote:
>> >
>> >> On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>> >> >
>> >> >> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>> >> >> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>> >> >> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>> >> >
>> >> >In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will boycott.
>> >>
>> >> I was asking about you guys, not what they will do. Afterall, I've
>> >> boycotted General and above for about 9 years now because of
>> >> antiquated requirements.
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >So by your logic I should have, as a VE, boycotted administering no-code Tech tests?
You
>> >sure demonstrate
>> >where you're coming from.
>> >Welcome to the house of code haters, you fit right in.
>>
>> I'd prefer that it be called the list of long time code haters.
>
>Sez it all!
>

You're so binary. Take a few courses in logic and decision making.
It would help you immensely.

3041. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 14:01:52 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <in5hlv0a8mu1q5e2jnduh9spt8cqgudi4t@4ax.com>
Source record: 76456

```
On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 06:55:21 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:9kuflv8dnqhehg4gcsk8gkoeehcjdsqp2c@4ax.com...
>> On Thu, 4 Sep 2003 20:15:41 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> >news:20030904202020.11891.00000444@mb-m11.aol.com...
>> >> In article <flfelvsgco1mgulsjf7hb7su19rbr52cq6@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
>> >> <bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>> >> >
>> >> >>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>> >> >news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>> >> >>
>> >> >>> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>> >> >>> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for
>HF
>> >> >>> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>> >> >>
>> >> >>In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will
>> >>boycott.
>> >> >
>> >> >I was asking about you guys, not what they will do.
>> >>
>> >> I don't boycott any ham who follows the rules.
>> >>
>> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >>
>> >
>> >Exactly. And, I hadn't heard of any attempt to boycott a "country" due
>to
>> >its position on CW. That seems like something that would only get
>thought
>> >up right here in this newsgroup, though! <GRIN>
>> >
>> >Anyway, that's taking the whole CW debate just way too far, IMNSHO.
>>
>> I simply asked if anyone would consider boycotting no code HF
>> operators from other countries. Oz is already issuing licenses.
>> Asking a question is not proposing anything. However, making that
```

>> jump in logic is typical of usenet in general.
>
>Well, excuse the observation here: but you asked and was answered, at least
>by N2EY and by me. Both answers were succinct and without merit for the
>return you have above--which seems quite defensive and I'm puzzled by why.
>
>So, you simply asked and were quite simply answered.
>
>And, since you were the one who asked the question of such a weird concept
>you would be observing your own actions with regard to your last sentance.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

OK Kim, show me where I said that I would boycott someone because of
their code status and I'll get back with you. If you can't quote me
saying that, who made the jump in logic will be apparent.

The ball is in your court.

3042. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 14:03:37 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <et5hlv4vlqs0j2koh6ptk3rnvm8brv0tbm@4ax.com>
Source record: 76457

On 05 Sep 2003 13:07:04 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>An alternative theory could be that he has a life and that upgrade
>>wasn't a priority.
>
>The correct answer is, the CW wasnt the problem, the Theory was just as big a
>problem. Would love to know how many time s he failed it .

Why?

3043. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 14:06:19 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <ru5hlv87ts6p6qj5r2ceb6h1mq0c2jb38j@4ax.com>
Source record: 76458

On 5 Sep 2003 05:30:04 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>"S. Hanrahan" wrote:
>
>> On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 10:00:13 -0400, Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Why would you want to foil computer copy?
>>
>> Because no law says you can't.
>>
>> >For you to do the test to
>> >make sure that it works and then advocate it's use, you can't really
>> >say that wasn't your intention.
>>
>> What if it was? Nothing you can do about it but learn the code.
>
>The guy is a lost cause. He doesn't even understrand that no testing ever need be done.
>All it takes is a bit of understanding, which he clearlyh lacks.

You sound like a religous fanatic. Is that your intention or is it
natural? Am I now condemned to no-code hell for eternity? I'm sorry,
but if I could take your chidish commets seriously, I might actually
take a serious look at your position. However, from what I see right
now, you don't have a valid position to look at.

3044. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 14:06:26 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F589862.2080707@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 76528

WA8ULX wrote:
>>Then what do you think that they test for?
>
>
> Oh I know what they Test for, and it is not knowledge,it is nothing then
> Memozizing some Q&As that have no meaning to the test taker. The writtens are
> nothing more than jumping thru hoops

What the heck is "Memozizing"? Man, what a third grade education
will do for you.

3045. Re: So much for High Tech!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 14:34:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F589F09.7010009@psu.edu>
Source record: 76459

Brian wrote:
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj88atail0@208.207.71.158>...
>
>>Just off the news:
>>
>>Computer grid operator in Ohio at the beginnining of the Big Blackout, in response to an
>>inquiry::
>>
>>"Our computers are all acting up, too! We don't even know the status of the stuff around
>>us!"
>>
>>Yep, lets all put ALL our faith and confidence in Karl and his Komplete
>>Komputerized Kommunications Konsortium!!
>
>
> What are you ranting about?
>
> There's a whole spectrum of modes between CW and PSK31 that don't
> require computers.
>
> And besides, the power distribution system isn't using amateur radio
> anyhow.

I think that was his point, Brian!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3046. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 14:36:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F589F89.2090105@psu.edu>
Source record: 76460

Bob Brock wrote:

> I didn't say that I boycotted any ham. I said that I boycotted a
> licensing structure that I disagreed with. I'll QSO with any ham on
> any band that we are both licensed to operate on. I even learned
> code, but I won't upgrade until the requirement that I disagree with
> is removed.

Not very interested in Ham radio eh?

3047. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 14:43:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F58A125.8030005@psu.edu>
Source record: 76461

Bob Brock wrote:
> On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 13:48:10 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
>
>>Bob Brock wrote:
>>
>>>On 4 Sep 2003 05:16:59 -0700, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>If CW is indeed effective and current, then it will propagate due to
>>>>>its usefulness without regulatory requirement. Judging by how shrill
>>>>>the proponents are, it appears that even they are afraid that it won't
>>>>>show itself to be advantageous enough for people to learn on their
>>>>>own.
>>>>>
>>>>>On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>>>>>with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>>>>>work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>>>>
>>>>That's shrill enough, congratulations.
>>>
>>>
>>>I guess no answer at all was to be expected since it shows how invalid
>>>the postion is.
>>
>> How's this for an answer? NO!
>>
>> Provide references where anyone has even proposed such an activity.
>
>
> I can't understand why you would want to talk to someone from another
> country who had possibly not passed your lid filter, but to each their
> own incongruiteis I guess.
>
> Show me where I said that anyone proposed it and I'll consider
> documenting it. I'm not in the habit of trying to document things
> that I never said and I won't start with you.

Lessee, Bob. You qoute me as saying:

>> Provide references where anyone has even proposed such an activity.

And next you ask me:

> Show me where I said that anyone proposed it and I'll consider
> documenting it. I'm not in the habit of trying to document things
> that I never said and I won't start with you.

I wanted to get those two sentences right beside each other so you
could see that I never said you said such a thing.

We play rough in here, but we do expect people to make sense.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3048. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 14:50:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F58A2CC.2070400@psu.edu>
Source record: 76462

Bob Brock wrote:

> I simply asked if anyone would consider boycotting no code HF
> operators from other countries. Oz is already issuing licenses.
> Asking a question is not proposing anything. However, making that
> jump in logic is typical of usenet in general.

Guess you never heard of leading questions, eh? And that is exactly what you're trying to do.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3049. Re: So much for High Tech!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 14:56:03 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F58A403.5D9AA52E@ptt.edu>
Source record: 76463

> I think that he misses the good ole days when messages were delivered
> by the Pony Express. Back then, you didn't have to worry about
> traffic jams.

You just had to watch your step.

3050. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 14:56:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F58A429.60504@psu.edu>
Source record: 76464

Bob Brock wrote:
> On 04 Sep 2003 01:29:46 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>
>
>>>That's a reasonable approximation ... and growing by leaps and bounds
>>>daily with the Petition and associated publicity.
>>>
>>>Carl - wk3c
>>
>>Bullshit, Prove it.
>
>
> See, I told you guys that this would happen if any number was claimed.

What number was claimed? What number is "reasonable approximation?

If you just come in here to vent aimlessly, eventually no one will play
with you.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3051. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 15:25:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F58AAD9.1050404@psu.edu>
Source record: 76465

```
Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> Bob Brock wrote:
>
>
>>On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 13:48:10 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Bob Brock wrote:
>>>
>>>>On 4 Sep 2003 05:16:59 -0700, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>If CW is indeed effective and current, then it will propagate due to
>>>>>>its usefulness without regulatory requirement. Judging by how shrill
>>>>>>the proponents are, it appears that even they are afraid that it won't
>>>>>>show itself to be advantageous enough for people to learn on their
>>>>>>own.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>>>>>>with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>>>>>>work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>>>>>
>>>>>That's shrill enough, congratulations.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I guess no answer at all was to be expected since it shows how invalid
>>>>the postion is.
>>>
>>> How's this for an answer? NO!
>>>
>>> Provide references where anyone has even proposed such an activity.
>>
>>I can't understand why you would want to talk to someone from another
>>country who had possibly not passed your lid filter, but to each their
>>own incongruiteis I guess.
>>
```

>>Show me where I said that anyone proposed it and I'll consider
>>documenting it. I'm not in the habit of trying to document things
>>that I never said and I won't start with you.
>
>
> Yep. Another one of "them". He proposed it but he didn't propose it.
>

Whattya think Dick? This person comes in here, asks incredible slippery slope/leading questions but won't answer them, thinks that "reasonable approximations" are numbers, and then brags about not upgrading because:

From Bob Brock>> Afterall, I've
From Bob Brock>> boycotted General and above for about 9 years now
From Bob Brock>> because of antiquated requirements.

This sounds like one of the principled people that Carl speaks of who won't go beyond technician because they don't believe in the Morse test. Is this typical of Carl's new people?

- Mike KB3EIA

3052. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 15:35:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F58AD2C.2000400@psu.edu>
Source record: 76466

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> Well, excuse the observation here: but you asked and was answered, at least
> by N2EY and by me. Both answers were succinct and without merit for the
> return you have above--which seems quite defensive and I'm puzzled by why.
>
> So, you simply asked and were quite simply answered.
>
> And, since you were the one who asked the question of such a weird concept
> you would be observing your own actions with regard to your last sentance.

Hey Kim

I don't think we can apply the regular rules of logic to this one!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3053. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 15:40:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F58AE6E.9030503@psu.edu>
Source record: 76467

Bob Brock wrote:
> On 5 Sep 2003 05:40:47 -0700, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
>
>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<fv4glv8o4k58e0vekqnopi6cqr1ua71h6v@4ax.com>...
>>
>>>On 04 Sep 2003 01:29:46 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>That's a reasonable approximation ... and growing by leaps and bounds
>>>>daily with the Petition and associated publicity.
>>>>
>>>>Carl - wk3c
>>>>
>>[expeletive deleted]
>>
>>>>Prove it.
>>>
>>>See, I told you guys that this would happen if any number was claimed.
>>
>>No number has been claimed, Bob.
>
>
> From a previous post in this thread:
> --
>
>
>>Explain how saying There are 5000 members of NCI is violating anyones
>>privacy.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> That's a reasonable approximation ... and growing by leaps and bounds
> daily with the Petition and associated publicity.
>
> Carl - wk3c
> --
>
> I only made it to your first inaccuracy before I quit reading.

Hey Bob, what is the numerical value of "a reasonable approximation"?

I can see that you are impressed by accuracy, so let us know!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3054. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 15:50:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F58B0C0.1020209@psu.edu>
Source record: 76468

Bob Brock wrote:

> OK Kim, show me where I said that I would boycott someone because of
> their code status and I'll get back with you. If you can't quote me
> saying that, who made the jump in logic will be apparent.
>
> The ball is in your court.
>

You won't answer anyone elses questions, why should they answer yours.

Gotta play nice, or at least make sense.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3055. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:02:57 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <rnchlvkqnv1rljq8vnvgii9fpo3s4rgcqn@4ax.com>
Source record: 76469

On Fri, 05 Sep 2003 10:56:41 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Bob Brock wrote:
>> On 04 Sep 2003 01:29:46 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>>
>>
>>>>That's a reasonable approximation ... and growing by leaps and bounds
>>>>daily with the Petition and associated publicity.
>>>>
>>>>Carl - wk3c
>>>
>>>Bullshit, Prove it.
>>
>>
>> See, I told you guys that this would happen if any number was claimed.
>
> What number was claimed? What number is "reasonable approximation?
>
> If you just come in here to vent aimlessly, eventually no one will play
>with you.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

If no value was given, why are you guys asking for proof of something
that wasn't said? I do understand though. I asked a question and
that was turned into a postion that needed justifying, so I realize
that there are some serious reading comprehension problems here

I sure hope that some of the people who have replied to me can send
Morse a lot better than they can read english.

3056. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:04:38 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309050804.39f72a5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76471

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<WQw5b.537$vj4.80805@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
. . . .
>
> However, Dick and other Morse fanatics insist that those modes aren't
> a suitable option because they (dread the thought) require a computer

Modes which require a computer to run 'em cut both ways. Having to use
a computer to run the stuff represents a huge increase in station
complexity and the inevitable corresponding decrease in station
reliability. Additionally cost, weight, space, power consumption,
required technical skills and a bunch of other factors also mitigate
against the use of computer-based modes.

Given the mythical average ham who could care less about weak-signal
performances and/or throughput rates. Very few of which show up around
here, least of all in this discussion. So in this sense Dick is right.

> (and some hardware/software that I'm sure "Shannon doesn't mean squat
> Dick" couldn't even begin to understand).
>
> Carl - wk3c

w3rv

3057. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:05:20 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <jtchlvgjjlaqs1gjelehvobealq2bgfdtk@4ax.com>
Source record: 76470

On Fri, 05 Sep 2003 11:25:13 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>
>> Bob Brock wrote:
>>
>>
>>>On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 13:48:10 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Bob Brock wrote:
>>>>
>>>>>On 4 Sep 2003 05:16:59 -0700, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>If CW is indeed effective and current, then it will propagate due to
>>>>>>>its usefulness without regulatory requirement. Judging by how shrill
>>>>>>>the proponents are, it appears that even they are afraid that it won't
>>>>>>>show itself to be advantageous enough for people to learn on their
>>>>>>>own.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>>>>>>>with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>>>>>>>work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>That's shrill enough, congratulations.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>I guess no answer at all was to be expected since it shows how invalid
>>>>>the postion is.
>>>>
>>>> How's this for an answer? NO!
>>>>
>>>> Provide references where anyone has even proposed such an activity.
>>>
>>>I can't understand why you would want to talk to someone from another
>>>country who had possibly not passed your lid filter, but to each their

>>>own incongruiteis I guess.
>>>
>>>Show me where I said that anyone proposed it and I'll consider
>>>documenting it. I'm not in the habit of trying to document things
>>>that I never said and I won't start with you.
>>
>>
>> Yep. Another one of "them". He proposed it but he didn't propose it.
>>
>
> Whattya think Dick? This person comes in here, asks incredible slippery
>slope/leading questions but won't answer them, thinks that "reasonable
>approximations" are numbers, and then brags about not upgrading because:
>
> From Bob Brock>> Afterall, I've
> From Bob Brock>> boycotted General and above for about 9 years now
> From Bob Brock>> because of antiquated requirements.
>
> This sounds like one of the principled people that Carl speaks of who
>won't go beyond technician because they don't believe in the Morse test.
>Is this typical of Carl's new people?

You mean that you don't think that people like me exist? What is a
"Carl's new people?" I'm too old to be new and slavery was aboloshed
over a centruy ago. So, I guess the answer would have to be...no, I'm
not. I'm just me.

3058. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:10:07 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <b5dhlvc3gollql3blfrncegl8v5oj1o9i8@4ax.com>
Source record: 76472

On Fri, 05 Sep 2003 10:43:49 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Bob Brock wrote:
>> On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 13:48:10 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Bob Brock wrote:
>>>
>>>>On 4 Sep 2003 05:16:59 -0700, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>If CW is indeed effective and current, then it will propagate due to
>>>>>>its usefulness without regulatory requirement. Judging by how shrill
>>>>>>the proponents are, it appears that even they are afraid that it won't
>>>>>>show itself to be advantageous enough for people to learn on their
>>>>>>own.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>>>>>>with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>>>>>>work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>>>>>
>>>>>That's shrill enough, congratulations.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I guess no answer at all was to be expected since it shows how invalid
>>>>the postion is.
>>>
>>> How's this for an answer? NO!
>>>
>>> Provide references where anyone has even proposed such an activity.
>>
>>
>> I can't understand why you would want to talk to someone from another
>> country who had possibly not passed your lid filter, but to each their
>> own incongruiteis I guess.
>>
>> Show me where I said that anyone proposed it and I'll consider

>> documenting it. I'm not in the habit of trying to document things
>> that I never said and I won't start with you.
>
> Lessee, Bob. You qoute me as saying:
>
> >> Provide references where anyone has even proposed such an activity.
>
> And next you ask me:
>
> > Show me where I said that anyone proposed it and I'll consider
> > documenting it. I'm not in the habit of trying to document things
> > that I never said and I won't start with you.
>
>
> I wanted to get those two sentences right beside each other so you
>could see that I never said you said such a thing.
>
> We play rough in here, but we do expect people to make sense.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

For the second time. I don't provide references to claims that I never made. You can put it any way that you want it, but until you show me where I made such a claim, I have no need to document its accuracy.

If you're going to "play rough in here," you really need to learn to read a little better and stop asking me to support positions that I never took.

Try again...K?

3059. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:13:26 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <dbdhlvceb2ugtbk821ti68ac9u37megi6f@4ax.com>
Source record: 76473

On Fri, 05 Sep 2003 11:50:24 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Bob Brock wrote:
>
>> OK Kim, show me where I said that I would boycott someone because of
>> their code status and I'll get back with you. If you can't quote me
>> saying that, who made the jump in logic will be apparent.
>>
>> The ball is in your court.
>>
>
>You won't answer anyone elses questions, why should they answer yours.
>
> Gotta play nice, or at least make sense.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I've answered your question twice Mike. Just because you don't like
the answer doesn't mean that it wasn't answered. Tell me, if you can
get enough of your buddies to say that I said something that I didn't
say and ask me to support a postion that I never took, does that mean
that I really did what I didn't do?

Regulatory agencies are really unimpressed with that kind of BS I
hope you guys deal with them much better than you do with people here,
because the first time that you tell them that they said what they
didn't say, it's an ugly sight.

No wonder the code requirement was doomed.

3060. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:15:14 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <hhdhlvkp7rq60ncoei37e6i8ctrmp4vq4e@4ax.com>
Source record: 76474

On Fri, 05 Sep 2003 11:35:08 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
>> Well, excuse the observation here: but you asked and was answered, at least
>> by N2EY and by me. Both answers were succinct and without merit for the
>> return you have above--which seems quite defensive and I'm puzzled by why.
>>
>> So, you simply asked and were quite simply answered.
>>
>> And, since you were the one who asked the question of such a weird concept
>> you would be observing your own actions with regard to your last sentance.
>
>
> Hey Kim
>
>
> I don't think we can apply the regular rules of logic to this one!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

If your regular rules of logic include making up a postion and then
asking someone who didn't support it to justify it, I'd have to agree
with you. All you have to do is show me where I said it. What's the
problem Mike. You're dancing all around it, but you just can't seem
to do.

Why is that?

3061. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:18:07 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <rkdhlv0lk0tcvil6iochr7fnvjha59lapa@4ax.com>
Source record: 76475

On Fri, 05 Sep 2003 10:50:52 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Bob Brock wrote:
>
>> I simply asked if anyone would consider boycotting no code HF
>> operators from other countries. Oz is already issuing licenses.
>> Asking a question is not proposing anything. However, making that
>> jump in logic is typical of usenet in general.
>
> Guess you never heard of leading questions, eh? And that is exactly
>what you're trying to do.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Actually I saw a lot of that when the no-code techs first came on the scene, so precedent is there. Also, this is a usenet group, not direct testimony in a court of law. Believe it or not, I can ask any kind of a question that I want to. However, if you are going to chase me on a postion, you really need to be able to find a postional statement. I've asked for it. You haven't quoted it.

Why is that?

3062. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:19:57 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <7qdhlvkh2c2ca8k005gbk8kg1pm7pmlr2d@4ax.com>
Source record: 76476

On Fri, 05 Sep 2003 10:36:57 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Bob Brock wrote:
>
>> I didn't say that I boycotted any ham. I said that I boycotted a
>> licensing structure that I disagreed with. I'll QSO with any ham on
>> any band that we are both licensed to operate on. I even learned
>> code, but I won't upgrade until the requirement that I disagree with
>> is removed.
>
> Not very interested in Ham radio eh?

Where did I say that Mike. Do you always have this much trouble with
facts?

3063. Re: So much for High Tech!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:20:52 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <4udhlvoe1vs9qnavhlh2o6tnverp6o2jhn@4ax.com>
Source record: 76477

On Fri, 05 Sep 2003 10:56:03 -0400, Radioman <radio@ptt.edu> wrote:

>> I think that he misses the good ole days when messages were delivered
>> by the Pony Express. Back then, you didn't have to worry about
>> traffic jams.
>
>
>You just had to watch your step.

ROTFLMO. Well at least there is someone here who isn't humor
challenged.

3064. When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:26:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030905122650.16646.00000451@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 76479

Going to open up the New CB Ham Bands?

3065. Re: So much for High Tech!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:28:59 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <69ehlv47j8lm56ueqevsledmejik9u0m55@4ax.com>
Source record: 76478

On Fri, 05 Sep 2003 11:13:08 GMT, "Emmersom Bigguns"
<ebigguns@boobs.com> wrote:

>
>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>news:f45722ac.0309041920.7cf0017@posting.google.com...
>> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:<bj88atail0@208.207.71.158>...
>> > Just off the news:
>> >
>> > Computer grid operator in Ohio at the beginnining of the Big Blackout,
>in response to an
>> > inquiry::
>> >
>> > "Our computers are all acting up, too! We don't even know the status of
>the stuff around
>> > us!"
>> >
>> > Yep, lets all put ALL our faith and confidence in Karl and his Komplete
>> > Komputerized Kommunications Konsortium!!
>>
>> What are you ranting about?
>>
>> There's a whole spectrum of modes between CW and PSK31 that don't
>> require computers.
>>
>> And besides, the power distribution system isn't using amateur radio
>> anyhow.
>>
>> Sheesh!
>
>He's ranting about all the great engineers that are frothing at the mouth to
>get into Ham Radio but can't because of the "CW Boogie Man".
>Just what we need, more "rocket scientists".
>
>Also, after reading some of the replies to NCI's petition, you people really
>need to invest in spell checkers. LOL

SPELLING...in every usenet conversation, it's the last dying gasps of
a lost cause.

It goes kind of like..."I can't say anything intelligent, but you
mispelled a word so I have to be right." Posts get the attention that
they deserve.

In your case, it's pretty close to nun.

There, you feel more "right" now?

3066. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:36:18 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjae22gnr0@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 76480

Brian wrote:

> Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<o53glv0hcrtk27354kt9i01rrbvj1rf7cv@4ax.com>...
> > On 05 Sep 2003 03:44:03 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> >
> > >>Don't try to lecture me on regulatory ... that's what I do for a
> > >>living (and for a couple of major industry organizations, plus
> > >>NCI)
> > >>
> > >>Carl - wk3c
> > >>
> > >
> > >Damn, I thought you were some Techno whizz, no wonder it took you over a year
> > >to upgrade.
> >
> > An alternative theory could be that he has a life and that upgrade
> > wasn't a priority. Some of us do have lives you know. You do know
> > that don't you?
>
> Speaking of no life. Dick is a big-time emergency communicator. Used
> to drill 7/8" holes in the rooftops of Missouri's finest. Lives for
> the New Madrid earthquake.
>
> But when Hans invited him to join in a QSO using his favorite mode
> that he demands everyone else be made to learn, his lame excuse for
> not doing so was that he wasn't home at the time. Apparently he can't
> go mobile himself.
>
> So much for his emergency skills.

And it's true, I WASN'T at home-that time. But where were YOU when K0HB, N2EY, W6RCA,
AC6XG, W3RV and
I--Did I forget anyone?- held that nice rrap CW net on 40 meters???

Oh, I almost forgot- you're STILL waiting for a code free license! Right!

As for emergency gear, I have all that in a pair of metal equipment cases, ready to grab
and go, if and
when needed. I'll take along a laptop just in case the need happens to be for a digital
mode. AND my
Vibroplex Iambic paddle for CW.
For power I have a lightweight switchmode AC supply AND an 800 watt inverter. One does need
to be
flexible doesn't one? After all, the need could be for something hightech and digital. But

the
possibility always exists that those needing to communicat from a disaster area will have only modest old
CW available.

One does need to be ready, doesn't one?

So what's YOUR enmergency status,Slim? Do you have "permission" yet?

Dick, W0EX FISTS #3939

3067. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:47:12 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <pefhlvolgug7j057kmh8l12p5ls52jthe2@4ax.com>
Source record: 76481

On 05 Sep 2003 16:26:50 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

> Going to open up the New CB Ham Bands?

They did it a few decades ago when they took 11 meters from the hams
since they didn't use it.

3068. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:49:48 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjaerchpb0@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 76482

Mike Coslo wrote:

> .
>
> We play rough in here, but we do expect people to make sense.

Hey Mike, I hadn't givern it any thought, but you've had most excellent preparation, what with being an
longtime Hockey type! Way to go!

3069. Re: So much for High Tech!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:51:20 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjaeu8hpb1@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 76483

Radioman wrote:

> > I think that he misses the good ole days when messages were delivered
> > by the Pony Express. Back then, you didn't have to worry about
> > traffic jams.
>
> You just had to watch your step.

Har! Har!.. Sometimes this NG is worth it, after all!

3070. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:52:32 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030905125232.18419.00000357@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 76485

>They did it a few decades ago when they took 11 meters from the hams
>since they didn't use it.

Youi missed the operative word "NEW CB HAM BANDS"

3071. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:52:35 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjaf0jhpb2@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 76484

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Bob Brock wrote:
> > On 04 Sep 2003 01:29:46 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> >
> >
> >>>That's a reasonable approximation ... and growing by leaps and bounds
> >>>daily with the Petition and associated publicity.
> >>>
> >>>Carl - wk3c
> >>
> >>Bullshit, Prove it.
> >
> >
> > See, I told you guys that this would happen if any number was claimed.
>
> What number was claimed? What number is "reasonable approximation?
>
> If you just come in here to vent aimlessly, eventually no one will play
> with you.

He's already got me disinterested enough that I stopped opening his posts.

3072. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:53:54 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjaf32hpb3@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 76486

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > Bob Brock wrote:
> >
> >
> >>On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 13:48:10 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Bob Brock wrote:
> >>>
> >>>>On 4 Sep 2003 05:16:59 -0700, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>If CW is indeed effective and current, then it will propagate due to
> >>>>>>its usefulness without regulatory requirement. Judging by how shrill
> >>>>>>the proponents are, it appears that even they are afraid that it won't
> >>>>>>show itself to be advantageous enough for people to learn on their
> >>>>>>own.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> >>>>>>with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
> >>>>>>work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
> >>>>>
> >>>>>That's shrill enough, congratulations.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>I guess no answer at all was to be expected since it shows how invalid
> >>>>>>the postion is.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> How's this for an answer? NO!
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Provide references where anyone has even proposed such an activity.
> >>>>
> >>>>I can't understand why you would want to talk to someone from another
> >>>>country who had possibly not passed your lid filter, but to each their

> >>own incongruiteis I guess.
> >>
> >>Show me where I said that anyone proposed it and I'll consider
> >>documenting it. I'm not in the habit of trying to document things
> >>that I never said and I won't start with you.
> >
> >
> > Yep. Another one of "them". He proposed it but he didn't propose it.
> >
>
> Whattya think Dick? This person comes in here, asks incredible slippery
> slope/leading questions but won't answer them, thinks that "reasonable
> approximations" are numbers, and then brags about not upgrading because:
>
> From Bob Brock>> Afterall, I've
> From Bob Brock>> boycotted General and above for about 9 years now
> From Bob Brock>> because of antiquated requirements.
>
> This sounds like one of the principled people that Carl speaks of who
> won't go beyond technician because they don't believe in the Morse test.
> Is this typical of Carl's new people?

Hammer>>>>>nail...STROKE!

3073. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 16:58:30 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjafbmhpb4@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 76487

Brian Kelly wrote:

> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<WQw5b.537$vj4.80805@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> . . . .
> >
> > However, Dick and other Morse fanatics insist that those modes aren't
> > a suitable option because they (dread the thought) require a computer
>
> Modes which require a computer to run 'em cut both ways. Having to use
> a computer to run the stuff represents a huge increase in station
> complexity and the inevitable corresponding decrease in station
> reliability. Additionally cost, weight, space, power consumption,
> required technical skills and a bunch of other factors also mitigate
> against the use of computer-based modes.
>
> Given the mythical average ham who could care less about weak-signal
> performances and/or throughput rates. Very few of which show up around
> here, least of all in this discussion. So in this sense Dick is right.
>
> > (and some hardware/software that I'm sure "Shannon doesn't mean squat
> > Dick" couldn't even begin to understand).
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
>
> w3rv

Poor ol' Kandid Karl just can't understand that when his ship hits the sand all the
high-tech
Shannonized stuff he can load aboard, fill 'er to the gunnels, mate, won't do him a whit of
good when
the guy on the other end isn't similiarly equipped.

3074. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 17:03:21 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <h9ghlv49at0akiluoaqm6f72pf2skiah5v@4ax.com>
Source record: 76488

On 5 Sep 2003 16:52:35 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>> Bob Brock wrote:
>> > On 04 Sep 2003 01:29:46 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>> >
>> >
>> >>>That's a reasonable approximation ... and growing by leaps and bounds
>> >>>daily with the Petition and associated publicity.
>> >>>
>> >>>Carl - wk3c
>> >>
>> >>Bullshit, Prove it.
>> >
>> >
>> > See, I told you guys that this would happen if any number was claimed.
>>
>> What number was claimed? What number is "reasonable approximation?
>>
>> If you just come in here to vent aimlessly, eventually no one will play
>> with you.
>
>He's already got me disinterested enough that I stopped opening his posts.

Since you can't state, much less support a logical postion, it's
probably best for you if you don't. If you try closing your eyes,
sticking your fingers in your ears, and yelling perhaps it will work
better.

I'll tell you guys why I'm here shortly, but conversing with twits
like you sure isn't it.

3075. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 17:32:36 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309050932.5a81acd7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76489

Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<0d4hlvka259gl6c2p0cbo0rbdtgkrv5n99@4ax.com>...
> On 5 Sep 2003 05:40:47 -0700, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<fv4glv8o4k58e0vekqnopi6cqr1ua71h6v@4ax.com>...
> >> On 04 Sep 2003 01:29:46 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> >>
> >> >>That's a reasonable approximation ... and growing by leaps and bounds
> >> >>daily with the Petition and associated publicity.
> >> >>
> >> >>Carl - wk3c
> >> >
> >
> >[expeletive deleted]
> >> >Prove it.
> >>
> >> See, I told you guys that this would happen if any number was claimed.
> >
> >No number has been claimed, Bob.
>
> From a previous post in this thread:
> --
>
> > Explain how saying There are 5000 members of NCI is violating anyones
> > privacy.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> That's a reasonable approximation ... and growing by leaps and bounds
> daily with the Petition and associated publicity.
>
> Carl - wk3c
> --
>
> I only made it to your first inaccuracy before I quit reading.

What inaccuracy? Carl has not claimed any number. Given his recent
math mistake in "ARS License Numbers", I'm a bit skeptical about
reasonable approximations and leaps and bounds.

Here's the rest of that post. Perhaps you can find some more
inaccuracies.

(repost begins here):

> Now, someone wants proof and the only way to proove it is to publish a
> list of members which NCI won't do.

Then that one person doesn't get his proof.

> It was like watching two trains
> going opposite directions on the same track, you guys knew it was
> going to happen, yet you did everything possible to make it happen.

What ARE you talking about? Ever hear of railroad signal systems?
>
> The question then becomes, why? One possibility is that you thought
> that a number could be published and no one would say, "Proove it."
> We all know better than that though. Another possiblity was that it's
> what you wanted to happen, because when it did happen you could all
> jump on the "the number is BS bandwagon". The advantage of the "BS
> bandwagon" is that it moves you away from just how untenable the code
> requriement position really is and it makes you feel somehow stronger.

Nope. None of the above.

Here's the background:

NCI has been around since about 1996. Some of its staff and supporters
have claimed that the procodetest position is a minority position -
which makes them the majority position. But no proof of same has ever
been offered. There have also been claims that NCI "represents" ham
radio, and that ARRL does not, etc.

Check out this post from the executive director:

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=keV_9.2605%24N5.1476932%40nnrp1.ptd.net&oe=UTF-8&outp
ut=gplain

Here's the part I like best:

(Carl, WK3C, writes in an earlier post):
> >And
> >are you going to grouse about "restructuring" for the next 50 years?

(I replied):

> Not me. But isn't it the right of all Americans to complain about their
> government and petition for changes?

(Carl answers):

Yes ... of course ...

> Or is that right reserved only for those who agree with NCI's opinions?

Of course not, but at *some* point, folks in the minority should take
"No." for an answer and get on with life ...

(end of quotes)

Gotta love that addytood..."at *some* point, folks in the minority should take "No." for an answer and get on with life ..."

Did NCI "take no for an answer and get on with life" when they turned out to be in the minority of those who commented to FCC on the 2000 restructuring?

Suppose the FCC puts up an NPRM proposing to dump Element 1. And suppose the majority of comments received on the issue say "Keep it". Will NCI "take no for an answer and get on with life"?

Naturally some of us asked how big NCI is, and how fast it was growing, and all we ever got was evasive answers such as "lots and lots", "growing by leaps and bounds", etc.

The only indication those of us on the outside have of NCI's size is the member numbers we've seen. The highest numbers I've seen are below 5000, which means there cannot be more than 5000 members, right?

But there's more! NCI started out with member number #1001, not #0001, so the real size cannot be more than 4000. Why did they start with #1001 instead of #0001? Please don't tell me their computers could not handle low numbers...

On top of that, membership costs nothing and all members are considered "active" unless they specifically request being removed from membership. Which has happened in a few cases that I know of personally. So anyone who joined is carried on NCI's books as a member, no matter what their interest and activity today. FISTS and most other groups like ARRL will drop you from their rolls if you don't send in your renewal, but not NCI.

Despite repeated requests over at least 6 years, NCI refuses to give an actual number of members. Why? All we've asked for is a statement like "As of September 1, 2003, there were XXXX active members of NCI. Of those, YYYY are licensed US hams". We did not ask for a list of names or calls.

All of this makes an NCI-outsider a bit skeptical. If the number of members isn't that big a deal, why all the secrecy about it all these years?
>
> I'm sure that there are other reasons that you guys were so adamant
> about wanting a number that you knew you would disagree with.

You're taking Bruce's demand for proof and applying it generally. Why?

> I'd
> like to hear them. What are they?

See above.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3076. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 17:38:02 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309050938.7bafb490@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76490

"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<bj9u3k$hbt@library1.airnews.net>...

> put up a 70' tower, loaded it up with antennas and don't even have a
> radio connected in here now.

I know a ham who did that - put up the tower and antennas when they first moved in and left all of the coax ends coiled in a bucket outside the house. hen they set about doing various move-in projects and did not unpack the rigs right away, nor run the coaxes into the house.

Sure enough, one of the neighbors with Gladys Kravitz syndrome complained about "interference" and such that supposedly happened since the antennas went up. Called FCC as I recall. Ham invited over the neighbor and other interestested parties and showed 'em the coax ends. No more complaints.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3077. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 17:57:03 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309050957.44840ac2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76491

Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<vi4hlv4p8a8lvp8p3p059191vae1pfh7dq@4ax.com>...
> On 05 Sep 2003 11:19:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >In article <j62glvk4duionbd52uc7igls30dnv6mc4m@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
> ><bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
> >
> >>On 05 Sep 2003 03:41:16 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> >>
> >>>>Then what do you think that they test for?
> >>>
> >>>Oh I know what they Test for, and it is not knowledge,it is nothing then
> >>>Memozizing some Q&As that have no meaning to the test taker. The writtens
> >>>are nothing more than jumping thru hoops
> >>
> >>Bob,
> >>
> >>If you're bothering to argue with Bruce....
> >
> > I'm beginning to understand him better. :-)

He's been asked to at least turn his spellchecker on. Refuses. That
tells ya something....
> >>
> >>In other words, since they provide the question pool, you don't think
> >>that people have to learn the answers in order to correctly answer the
> >>questions? How do you think that they figure out how to fill in the
> >>correct answer then?
> >>
> >>You weren't provided with an answer sheet where you only had to
> >>memorize the correct sequence were you?
> >
> >The point is that the level of UNDERSTANDING required to pass the writtens
> >today is a lot less than it would be if the actual Q&A were not made public.
> >
> > His contention was the learning was not required.

Which is obviously an invalid contention. Proved wrong many times.

My contention is different.

> I've shown him
> where it is required and a very similar system is used in a validated
> educational system.

Similar but not equivalent.
> >>
> >>I used to train people at a nuclear power plant. The way I did it was
> >>to provide the students with a list of objectives, which were usually
> >>in the form of questions. I told them up front that when I was
> >>finished with the class, I expected to have covered those objectives
> >>and that they needed to know the answers. When I wrote the test, you
> >>know where the questions came from? Yup, they came from those
> >>objectives word for word because that was what I wanted them to learn.
> >>So, if they would study those objectives and know the answers to those
> >>objectives, they could pass the tests with no problems.
> >
> >OK, fine.
> >
> >Did they KNOW, from Day 1, that the test they would be taking would consist of
> >the exact questions and answers you gave them on Day 1?
>
> They did if the believed me when I told them.

OK, fine.
> >
> >Was the passing grade 74%?
>
> For most subjects, 70% was passing. However, after academic training
> was completed, the employee was required to pass an ETQS performance
> based test prior to certification.

There ya go. Not the same system at all. Passing the written tests was
only the first step. In amateur radio without code tests, it would be
the only step.

> >Was there a penalty for wrong answers?
>
> The lost points on the exam...we didn't beat them or anything like
> that. ;-)

Sorry - "test score penalty". Like in the SATs, where, on 5 choice
multiple guess questions, a right answer is 5 points, a wrong answer
is -1 point, and no answer is 0 points. Eliminates any benefit from
random guessing.

> >>We didn't
> >>play games with them and train them on objectives and test them on
> >>something unrelated. We taught them, they learned what we wanted them
> >>to learn and we validated that they had learned it without playing
> >>mind games with them by extending the tests beyond the objectives.

And the class was how many hours?
> >
> >Nobody's saying the tests should go beyond the stated objectives.
>
> No amount of academic training is going to make someone proficient at
> performing tasks. Only experience actually doing it will make that

> happen.

Bingo! And the closest thing we have to a performance test in amateur
radio is...the Morse code test. What's left of it.

> >>That worked very well in a nuclear environment.
> >
> >I imagine that the class has a lot of motivation towards safety.
>
> Mistakes are not acceptable.

Yet they happen. I live about 100 miles from Three Mile Island.

> >>We maintained a SALP
> >>1 from the NRC during the time frame I was there and I was there for
> >>quite a while.
> >
> >Were the employees tested once at the beginning of their employment at the
> >plant, and never again? Or was continuing education an integral part of that
> >environment?
>
> Academic training and testing was a one time affair. Performance
> based retesting was annual.

There ya go! Continuing education and skill development is an integral
part of that environment.

> >>Perhaps it's you contention that getting a license to
> >>operate a radio is somehow more complex than the nuclear environment,
> >>but that's simply not true and anyone who is rational would know that.
> >
> >Not a question of complexity.
> >
> >>In both cases, the material is taught and the student learns it or
> >>they don't pass the test.
> >
> >Not all hams take formal classes - in fact, most probably don't.
> >
> >In the bad old days, the FCC published a study guide that listed, in essay
> >form, the type of questions and typical solutions that would be found on the
> >tests. For example, there were questions about Ohm's Law for a DC circuit and
> >how to solve them. Any prospective ham knew he/she would be expected to know
> >how to solve E = I/R and P = IE problems, resistors in series, parallel and
> >series-parallel, etc. And anybody who had a basic UNDERSTANDING of that stuff
> >would have no problem on those test questions.
> >
> >But the actual Q&A were not made public. Today, with the actual Q&A in hand,
> >less understanding is required.
> >
> >That's what bothers some folks.
>
> As I said in a previous post in another thread, regulatory agencies

> are not democracies.

Of course!

> Sometimes they do things that I don't like.
> When that happens I have two choices...conform or boycott.

There's a third choice: Work to get them to change their minds and the
rules.
> >
> >Consider this: Today, the test for Tech is 35 questions from a published pool.
> >Most of those questions are on regulations, with some operating practices,
> >theory and safety stuff. Yet the license granted for passing that test gives
> >alla amateur privileges above 30 MHz, including the authorization to design,
> >build, repair, align, modify and most of all operate transmitters of up to 1500
> >W power output on 'meat cooking frequencies' as WK3C puts it. There is no
> >separate safety testing nor ongoing education - someone can get all of the RF
> >exposure questions wrong and still pass.
> >
> >Do you think that the test and its methods are really adequate for the
> >privileges granted?
>
> No I don't.

Nor do I.

> In addition to dropping the code requirement, I would
> like to see the academic testing made much harder with a performance
> based test included. However, that's not going to happen.

Probably not. It will never ever happen if hams don't ask for it,
though.

And you can count on this: Propose harder written tests and other
performance-based tests, and there will be opposition for exactly the
same reasons some people oppose the code tests.
> >
> >FCC does. In fact, back in 2000 they lowered the written requirement for the
> >Tech license by almost half.
>
> See my above comment regarding regulatory agencies. I can see where
> they are coming from though. They have limited budget and ham radio
> is a very small part of their plate.

The FCC does not spend one cent on training hams. Nor do they spend
very much on testing and test generation - volunteer hams do almost
all of that. All FCC does in connection with license testing is
process completed applications after the VEs have done most of the
work, and approve questions generated by the QPC folks.

We could have all better written exams and different performance tests
without it costing FCC anything. But it goes against the fashion. And
the "Smith chart effect" opposition would kick in, guaranteed.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3078. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 17:57:06 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309050957.4f7e38a6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76492

Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<vi4hlv4p8a8lvp8p3p059191vae1pfh7dq@4ax.com>...
> On 05 Sep 2003 11:19:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >In article <j62glvk4duionbd52uc7igls30dnv6mc4m@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
> ><bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
> >
> >>On 05 Sep 2003 03:41:16 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> >>
> >>>>Then what do you think that they test for?
> >>>
> >>>Oh I know what they Test for, and it is not knowledge,it is nothing then
> >>>Memozizing some Q&As that have no meaning to the test taker. The writtens
> >>>are nothing more than jumping thru hoops
> >>
> >>Bob,
> >>
> >>If you're bothering to argue with Bruce....
> >
> > I'm beginning to understand him better. :-)

He's been asked to at least turn his spellchecker on. Refuses. That
tells ya something....
> >>
> >>In other words, since they provide the question pool, you don't think
> >>that people have to learn the answers in order to correctly answer the
> >>questions? How do you think that they figure out how to fill in the
> >>correct answer then?
> >>
> >>You weren't provided with an answer sheet where you only had to
> >>memorize the correct sequence were you?
> >
> >The point is that the level of UNDERSTANDING required to pass the writtens
> >today is a lot less than it would be if the actual Q&A were not made public.
> >
> > His contention was the learning was not required.

Which is obviously an invalid contention. Proved wrong many times.

My contention is different.

> I've shown him
> where it is required and a very similar system is used in a validated
> educational system.

Similar but not equivalent.
> >>
> >>I used to train people at a nuclear power plant. The way I did it was
> >>to provide the students with a list of objectives, which were usually
> >>in the form of questions. I told them up front that when I was
> >>finished with the class, I expected to have covered those objectives
> >>and that they needed to know the answers. When I wrote the test, you
> >>know where the questions came from? Yup, they came from those
> >>objectives word for word because that was what I wanted them to learn.
> >>So, if they would study those objectives and know the answers to those
> >>objectives, they could pass the tests with no problems.
> >
> >OK, fine.
> >
> >Did they KNOW, from Day 1, that the test they would be taking would consist of
> >the exact questions and answers you gave them on Day 1?
>
> They did if the believed me when I told them.

OK, fine.
> >
> >Was the passing grade 74%?
>
> For most subjects, 70% was passing. However, after academic training
> was completed, the employee was required to pass an ETQS performance
> based test prior to certification.

There ya go. Not the same system at all. Passing the written tests was
only the first step. In amateur radio without code tests, it would be
the only step.

> >Was there a penalty for wrong answers?
>
> The lost points on the exam...we didn't beat them or anything like
> that. ;-)

Sorry - "test score penalty". Like in the SATs, where, on 5 choice
multiple guess questions, a right answer is 5 points, a wrong answer
is -1 point, and no answer is 0 points. Eliminates any benefit from
random guessing.

> >>We didn't
> >>play games with them and train them on objectives and test them on
> >>something unrelated. We taught them, they learned what we wanted them
> >>to learn and we validated that they had learned it without playing
> >>mind games with them by extending the tests beyond the objectives.

And the class was how many hours?
> >
> >Nobody's saying the tests should go beyond the stated objectives.
>
> No amount of academic training is going to make someone proficient at
> performing tasks. Only experience actually doing it will make that

> happen.

Bingo! And the closest thing we have to a performance test in amateur
radio is...the Morse code test. What's left of it.

> >>That worked very well in a nuclear environment.
> >
> >I imagine that the class has a lot of motivation towards safety.
>
> Mistakes are not acceptable.

Yet they happen. I live about 100 miles from Three Mile Island.

> >>We maintained a SALP
> >>1 from the NRC during the time frame I was there and I was there for
> >>quite a while.
> >
> >Were the employees tested once at the beginning of their employment at the
> >plant, and never again? Or was continuing education an integral part of that
> >environment?
>
> Academic training and testing was a one time affair. Performance
> based retesting was annual.

There ya go! Continuing education and skill development is an integral
part of that environment.

> >>Perhaps it's you contention that getting a license to
> >>operate a radio is somehow more complex than the nuclear environment,
> >>but that's simply not true and anyone who is rational would know that.
> >
> >Not a question of complexity.
> >
> >>In both cases, the material is taught and the student learns it or
> >>they don't pass the test.
> >
> >Not all hams take formal classes - in fact, most probably don't.
> >
> >In the bad old days, the FCC published a study guide that listed, in essay
> >form, the type of questions and typical solutions that would be found on the
> >tests. For example, there were questions about Ohm's Law for a DC circuit and
> >how to solve them. Any prospective ham knew he/she would be expected to know
> >how to solve E = I/R and P = IE problems, resistors in series, parallel and
> >series-parallel, etc. And anybody who had a basic UNDERSTANDING of that stuff
> >would have no problem on those test questions.
> >
> >But the actual Q&A were not made public. Today, with the actual Q&A in hand,
> >less understanding is required.
> >
> >That's what bothers some folks.
>
> As I said in a previous post in another thread, regulatory agencies

> are not democracies.

Of course!

> Sometimes they do things that I don't like.
> When that happens I have two choices...conform or boycott.

There's a third choice: Work to get them to change their minds and the
rules.
> >
> >Consider this: Today, the test for Tech is 35 questions from a published pool.
> >Most of those questions are on regulations, with some operating practices,
> >theory and safety stuff. Yet the license granted for passing that test gives
> >alla amateur privileges above 30 MHz, including the authorization to design,
> >build, repair, align, modify and most of all operate transmitters of up to 1500
> >W power output on 'meat cooking frequencies' as WK3C puts it. There is no
> >separate safety testing nor ongoing education - someone can get all of the RF
> >exposure questions wrong and still pass.
> >
> >Do you think that the test and its methods are really adequate for the
> >privileges granted?
>
> No I don't.

Nor do I.

> In addition to dropping the code requirement, I would
> like to see the academic testing made much harder with a performance
> based test included. However, that's not going to happen.

Probably not. It will never ever happen if hams don't ask for it,
though.

And you can count on this: Propose harder written tests and other
performance-based tests, and there will be opposition for exactly the
same reasons some people oppose the code tests.
> >
> >FCC does. In fact, back in 2000 they lowered the written requirement for the
> >Tech license by almost half.
>
> See my above comment regarding regulatory agencies. I can see where
> they are coming from though. They have limited budget and ham radio
> is a very small part of their plate.

The FCC does spend one cent on training hams. Nor do they spend very
much on testing and test generation - volunteer hams do almost all of
that. All FCC does in connection with license testing is process
completed applications after the VEs have done most of the work, and
approve questions generated by the QPC folks.

We could have all better written exams and different performance tests
without it costing FCC anything. But it goes against the fashion. And
the "Smith chart effect" opposition would kick in, guaranteed.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3079. Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 19:54:37 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309051154.4ef03806@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76493

The following isn't exactly a new idea, but some may not have seen it yet...

Maybe the way out of the mess is for a Smith Chart test to replace the code test.

Understanding the Smith Chart and being able to use one actually demonstrates several areas of knowledge and skill. Smith Chart tests could consist of interpreting a solved problem on one chart, (the "understanding" test) then solving a different problem on a blank chart (the "solution" test). At first, most hams and wouldbe hams would would simply study the Smith Chart and pass the tests.

But then the trouble would start...

Some hams who had not passed the Smith Chart test might say that those who had passed the test were being "elitist" about their Smith chart skill and knowledge. The term "chartless Extra" would be considered an insult by some, a badge of honor by others.

Some would grumble that since they have no desire to design antenna/transmission line systems, they should not be required to pass a Smith Chart test. They would point out that other services do not have Smith chart testing, and so neither should hams.

Defenders of the tests ("Smithys" or "chartists") would claim that the Smith chart was a "uniquely practical, efficient, and universal" tool for antenna/transmission line work. They would claim to have been "smartened up" by the Chart test requirement. Stories would be recalled about how lives had been saved by hams able to quickly design matching sections to permit using an antenna on a frequency it was not designed for, and would predict dire consequences in the event of widespread disaster.

Those opposed to the test ("Smithless" or "nochartists") would argue that newer, more accurate, less error prone software systems had left the
Smith chart in the dust. "We don't want to use OLD design methods" and "The
Chart is too slow and error prone" would be their rallying cries. Other would
ask "do you have to show slide-rule proficiency before using a calculator?"

There would be testimonials by hams who had worked 300 DXCC countries using QRP and a dipole without any reference to a Smith Chart, and claims of others who "had rote-memorized the Chart and promptly forgot

it all as soon as the test was over". Some would tell stories of new Extras who held Chart-burying ceremonies at the base of their antenna systems (designed without Smith Charts, of course).

Many would claim that young people, used to solving even minor addition problems on computers, had no interest in learning old-fashioned "buggy whip" graphical methods. Some would say that the emphasis on such a timeworn, old fashioned, crude graphical method of solving problems made ham radio look backward and nonprogressive, and was downright embarrassing. Ph.D's in EE would claim that they had designed entire radio communication systems without use of the Smith Chart, yet were kept out of ham radio because of the test.

The arguments would become more heated and insulting over time. Nochartists would point out that the Chart test was discriminatory. For example, blind people could not fulfill the letter of the law in passing the test. Some would claim to be "chart impaired" and unable to pass the test due to inability to do geometry. The question of "chart waivers" would be raised, and much angry invective spewed over "chart fraud" and "open chart pools". There would be a demand that the use of graphical calculators be allowed in the tests.

Chartists would claim that accomodations such as Braille Smith charts met the intent of the law. Old timers ("quillpenners") would recall a time when all charting was done by hand, in ink, on chart paper costing the modern equivalent of several dollars a sheet. (They used ink because they were so confident of doing it right the first time).

The use, or nonuse, of the Chart by military and commercial services would be hotly debated. Some nochartists would claim that the military stopped using the Chart during WW2, while some chartists would claim that the Smith chart plays a crucial role in the modern military.

A popular summer blockbuster movie starring Jodie Foster, Will Smith, Jeff Goldblum and Bill Paxton would have a plot in which alien invaders were detected, then repelled by means of a hastily reactivated surplus Russian over-the-horizon "woodpecker" radar system. The critical plot element would be the heroine's use of the Smith Chart to match the "woodpecker" transmitter to the Arecibo dish. (How the Russian radar wound up in

Puerto Rico would be left unexplained).

The ARRL, Gordon West, and W5YI would be caught in the middle of the debate. From the first, they and others would have marketed a whole line
of Smith chart training aids, including books, videotapes, and software.
W1AW would transmit SSTV programs explaining chart use, and MFJ would market "portable personal chart trainers". Claims of monetary interest in the production of Chart materials would be made and denied. Poorly worded surveys would show a variety of opinions on the issue, but no consensus.

Nochartists would claim that the chartists were just "old f***s" who were supporting the status quo due to "chart chauvinism", and did not understand the realities of the modern age. A few chartists would claim
that the nochartists were just "whiners who were too lazy to even learn
how to hold a compass correctly". The need for "high speed chart tests"
would be debated hotly, many claiming that no time limit should be placed
on the chart test. "One Chart per week satisfies the law" would be their
claim, while skilled chartists would speak of doing 30, 40, even 50 charts per hour, and being able to "see the solution without even making
a mark on the chart".

Eventually the nochartists would organize a group to fight the chart test.

The founders of No Charts International would claim that they had no problem with anyone USING the Chart, just the mandatory test requirement.
"It's not the CHART, it's the TEST" would be a common rallying cry.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3080. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 20:46:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F58F63B.1080101@psu.edu>
Source record: 76494

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>>Bob Brock wrote:
>>
>>>On 04 Sep 2003 01:29:46 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>That's a reasonable approximation ... and growing by leaps and bounds
>>>>daily with the Petition and associated publicity.
>>>>
>>>>Carl - wk3c
>>>>
>>>>Bullshit, Prove it.
>>>
>>>
>>>See, I told you guys that this would happen if any number was claimed.
>>
>> What number was claimed? What number is "reasonable approximation?
>>
>> If you just come in here to vent aimlessly, eventually no one will play
>>with you.
>
>
> He's already got me disinterested enough that I stopped opening his posts.

Yeah, I'll read 'em. But no response. Hard to discuss anything with
that style of argument. So I won't give im the pleasure.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3081. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 21:05:06 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309051305.17994313@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76495

S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<juuflvotqfg61il3lnmmfr4gv1ra1i9jlp@4ax.com>...
> On Wed, 03 Sep 2003 11:22:58 -0700, Jack Twilley
> <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote:
>
>
>
> It took me a little over 6 months to go from nothing to 20 WPM. I
> passed the 20 WPM code before I took the General written exam.

When I "did" my Extra ya had to pass both the writtens and the code
test at the same sitting or wait a month and go back and do *all* of
it all over again. Dinosaur? Who ME?

w3rv

3082. End of CW in CEPT is for october 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 21:20:08 UTC
From: Anonymous Sender <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com>
Message-ID: <d3b8ab3a71281066b8d688d0aea2d48b@remailer.metacolo.com>
Source record: 76496

```
The two CEPT classes will merge in
next october into one class with no
reference to CW. New CEPT texts will be
published at the begining of october.
This information comes from ERO
(European Radiocommunication Office).
```

3083. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 21:45:07 UTC
From: Emmersom Bigguns <ebigguns@boobs.com>
Message-ID: <Dt76b.15859$3b2.1186744@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 76497

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030905122650.16646.00000451@mb-m02.aol.com...
> Going to open up the New CB Ham Bands?

Kaptin Karl and his clones are working on it as we speak!

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/19/2003

3084. Re: So much for High Tech!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 21:49:13 UTC
From: Emmersom Bigguns <ebigguns@boobs.com>
Message-ID: <tx76b.15876$3b2.1189172@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 76498

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:69ehlv47j8lm56ueqevsledmejik9u0m55@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 05 Sep 2003 11:13:08 GMT, "Emmersom Bigguns"
> <ebigguns@boobs.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >news:f45722ac.0309041920.7cf0017@posting.google.com...
> >> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >news:<bj88atail0@208.207.71.158>...
> >> > Just off the news:
> >> >
> >> > Computer grid operator in Ohio at the beginnining of the Big
Blackout,
> >in response to an
> >> > inquiry::
> >> >
> >> > "Our computers are all acting up, too! We don't even know the status
of
> >the stuff around
> >> > us!"
> >> >
> >> > Yep, lets all put ALL our faith and confidence in Karl and his
Komplete
> >> > Komputerized Kommunications Konsortium!!
> >>
> >> What are you ranting about?
> >>
> >> There's a whole spectrum of modes between CW and PSK31 that don't
> >> require computers.
> >>
> >> And besides, the power distribution system isn't using amateur radio
> >> anyhow.
> >>
> >> Sheesh!
> >
> >He's ranting about all the great engineers that are frothing at the mouth
to
> >get into Ham Radio but can't because of the "CW Boogie Man".
> >Just what we need, more "rocket scientists".
> >
> >Also, after reading some of the replies to NCI's petition, you people
really
> >need to invest in spell checkers. LOL

>
> SPELLING...in every usenet conversation, it's the last dying gasps of
> a lost cause.
>
> It goes kind of like..."I can't say anything intelligent, but you
> mispelled a word so I have to be right." Posts get the attention that
> they deserve.
>
> In your case, it's pretty close to nun.
>
> There, you feel more "right" now?

Well Bob,
I will always feel more right for several reasons, most of which are well beyond your ability to comprehend.

By the way, you did very well on your spelling.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/19/2003

3085. Re: NCI Petition available on FCC ECFS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 21:54:07 UTC
From: Emmersom Bigguns <ebigguns@boobs.com>
Message-ID: <3C76b.15895$3b2.1192058@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 76499

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:nex5b.550$vj4.81352@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> No Code International's Petition for Rulemaking to the FCC
> was assigned RM-10786 and is now viewable for review and
> comments on the FCC's ECFS site at:
> http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/prod/ecfs/comsrch_v2.cgi
>
> (type RM-10786 in the "Proceeding" box at the upper left of
> this web page to view the Petition and comments filed to date).
> Apparently the "RM number" was assigned last week, along with
> others on the same topic, but the Petition itself was not visible
> due to some sort of file-linking error. That was corrected late
> on September 2nd or early on September 3rd, and comments are
> now being accepted by the ECFS.
>
> Also, if you would mention that news on this issue can be
> obtained via the "Articles" link on the main NCI web page
> at http://www.nocode.org, that would be most appreciated.
>
> 73,
> Carl R. Stevenson - wk3c
> Grid Square FN20fm
> http://home.ptd.net/~wk3c
> --
> NCI-1052
> Executive Director, No Code International
> --
> Join No Code International! Hams for the 21st Century.
> Help assure the survival and prosperity of ham radio.
> http://www.nocode.org
>

Carl you should have instructed your minions to come up with their own
words, almost all the "pro" replies are the same cut-paste responces.
But after reading through some of the replies where people actually wrote
their own ideas, I can see why you just had the fille in the blanks.

By the way, I did not know that so many (as one person put it) Blectronic
engineers were so oppressed, poor little fellas. :-(

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/19/2003

3086. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 22:16:01 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309051416.4a40d42e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76500

>
> I was under the impression that Farnsworth was a type of spacing but
> that the actual numbers weren't relevant -- only that the word speed
> is often much less than the character speed. The test I took had a
> word speed of five words per minute and a character speed of eighteen
> words per minute. The practice files I'm building for my web site
> have a word speed of five words per minute and a character speed of
> twenty words per minute.
>
> Stacey> By the time one becomes proficient enough to copy Morse Code,
> Stacey> counting out the dits and dahs is moot at best.
>
> In my limited experience, I learn more characters faster with
> Farnsworth spacing, but I'm concerned that I'm building a lookup table
> instead of reflexes. It's the difference between "dahdidah, hmm,
> that's K, dahdah, hmm, that's M" and "dahdidah (K) dahdah (M)". I
> learned eight or nine characters with Farnsworth spacing, but I can't
> repeat the performance at full speed, so I fear that I'm learning
> something that won't be useful if I continue to use Farnsworth
> spacing.

Stick with the tried and proven Jack and just get on with the job like tens if not hundreds of thousands of us have already done. There is no point to reinventing the wheel.

I've sed it before I'll say it again: The W1AW code practice sessions and getting on the air ASAP are the best methods out there for learning the code. The 1AW sessions are reliable, they're not repetitive and you can pace yourself without breaking a sweat depending on your own set of learning curve variables. Yes it's Farnsworth and 1AW Farnworth has obviously worked for decades. Now go copy 1AW 5wpm sessions until you "get it".

I'm not sure I'd advise getting on the air with 5wpm these days but getting on the air with 10wpm absolutely will accelerate your move up the code learning curve. There is nothing which can simulate the experience and stimulation one gets when snagging real CW QSOs early in the code learning process. Nothing. Sweat, sweat, tremble, into the deep end . . Been there, done it and it WORKS. The mix of 1AW and The Deep End worked twice for me and I not only enjoyed all of it but also got to 20wpm+ via logs full of actual QSOs to boot.

And CW contests are lousy code practice.

>
>

> Jack.
> - --

w3rv

3087. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 22:37:55 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <7f86b.700$M55.437@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76501

Heck, Jim,

I know a couple of nurses. All I need do is bribe them to make some copies
of some ekg charts from folks named "Smith". I'm covered. :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

3088. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 22:39:29 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Bg86b.701$Q45.127@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76502

I doubt it will happen. By then, part 15 devices will be allowed 1 KV/M at
30 meters and the whole question will be moot.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030905122650.16646.00000451@mb-m02.aol.com...
> Going to open up the New CB Ham Bands?

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

3089. Re: So much for High Tech!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 22:42:38 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <yj86b.702$o65.116@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76503

Dick,

Perhaps the problem is to get rid of Bill's operating system and go over to "Steve" what's his name? Hopefully, there won't be a problem with tin connectors, poor programming, intermittent connections ... whatever. I know, I don't worry about CW, but the whole thing is out of control anyways. Lemme get another can of beer out of the 'fridge. :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:bj88atail0@208.207.71.158...
> Just off the news:
>
> Computer grid operator in Ohio at the beginnining of the Big Blackout, in response to an
> inquiry::
>
> "Our computers are all acting up, too! We don't even know the status of the stuff around
> us!"
>
> Yep, lets all put ALL our faith and confidence in Karl and his Komplete
> Komputerized Kommunications Konsortium!!
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

3090. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 23:06:21 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <NF86b.37813$Vx2.16845543@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76504

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309040436.5010e087@posting.google.com...
> > It does not mandate
> > that the relative spacing meet any particular standard to be considered
> > Morse code.
>
> So you say that Morse cannot be defined, yet the FCC demands you pass
> an exam that has barred people from the medium and high frequencies.
> It is whatever you want it to be.

Morse code is very clearly defined. Each letter, number, etc has a defined combination of dots and dashes. There is no ambiguity whatsoever. For normal conversational speeds (13wpm to 20wpm), the standard spacing allows one to develop a natural, easy rhythm. For low speed operation (less than 13wpm), it is better to have the letter speed be at least 13 but spaces between the letters. It's actually much easier to copy that way as you hear the letter as a distinct sound rather than counting dashes and dots. On the other hand, high speed ops may choose to change the ratio of the length of dashes to dots as it may be clearer than the "standard" spacing.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3091. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 23:11:19 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <rK86b.37816$Vx2.16846168@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76505

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:flfelvsgco1mgulsjf7hb7su19rbr52cq6@4ax.com...
> On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
> >Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
> >
> >> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> >> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
> >> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
> >
> >In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will
boycott.
>
> I was asking about you guys, not what they will do. Afterall, I've
> boycotted General and above for about 9 years now because of
> antiquated requirements.

This is called cutting off your nose to spite your face. That's a
ridiculous approach as your boycott does absolutely nothing to change the
situation.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3092. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 23:30:22 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <i096b.37820$Vx2.16849116@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76506

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030904210821.29660.00000478@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <nia5b.36687$Vx2.16273542@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >
> >
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >news:20030902195312.07346.00000379@mb-m26.aol.com...
> >> Hey, I'll go one further than that. I think they should be tested in
the
> >> proper
> >> procedures for changing a tyre on the highway under severe emergency
> >> conditions.
> >>
> >
> >You spent too much time in England.
>
> Dee:
>
> Which of my behaviours would cause to say that, then?
>
> >When my tire
>
> Is that something tired (i.e. lacking in sleep)?
>
> >goes flat on the highway,
>
> That means you probably have a puncture.
>
> >I call for help.
>
> With your Vodafone mobile, undoubtedly!
>
> >It's too dangerous to do this on the side of the road,
> >alone, at night, in the rain (Lions and Tigers and Bears, Oh my). I
> >couldn't resist!
>
> No problem. All you have to do is make sure you've pulled safely
> off the motorway, put out your triangle, then collect the spare,
> jack, and lever (pronounced "leever") from the car boot. Hopefully
> your wheel nuts won't be corroded. Then, after replacing the flat
> tyre with the spare, hopefully you won't be too knackered to
> continue with your journey!

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> Ex: G0LYW
> RAF Mildenhall, UK, 1989 - 1991

At one company I worked for we actually kept a cross-reference sheet of English versus American terms for interpreting some of our customers requirements. So at least I know to have a spanner handy for emergencies like this.

Actually today I was pretty "knackered" just coping with the freeway traffic here.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3093. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 23:32:47 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86y8x224m8.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 76507

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Brian" == Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

Jack> In my limited experience, I learn more characters faster with
Jack> Farnsworth spacing, but I'm concerned that I'm building a lookup
Jack> table instead of reflexes. It's the difference between
Jack> "dahdidah, hmm, that's K, dahdah, hmm, that's M" and "dahdidah
Jack> (K) dahdah (M)". I learned eight or nine characters with
Jack> Farnsworth spacing, but I can't repeat the performance at full
Jack> speed, so I fear that I'm learning something that won't be
Jack> useful if I continue to use Farnsworth spacing.

Brian> Stick with the tried and proven Jack and just get on with the
Brian> job like tens if not hundreds of thousands of us have already
Brian> done. There is no point to reinventing the wheel.

One wonders what Mr. (or Ms.) Farnsworth would have said if someone
had told him something like that. There is point in reinventing the
wheel, if one believes they may have found something more efficient.
In this case, I'm not inventing anything -- I am facilitating the
learning of those who prefer full speed and Farnsworth spacing.

Brian> I've sed it before I'll say it again: The W1AW code practice
Brian> sessions and getting on the air ASAP are the best methods out
Brian> there for learning the code. The 1AW sessions are reliable,
Brian> they're not repetitive and you can pace yourself without
Brian> breaking a sweat depending on your own set of learning curve
Brian> variables. Yes it's Farnsworth and 1AW Farnworth has obviously
Brian> worked for decades. Now go copy 1AW 5wpm sessions until you
Brian> "get it".

I've said it before, but perhaps not in this location: my current
location does not permit reception of HF signals. I have tried for
months with multiple antenna setups and have not been successful. I
have very limited VHF reception -- broadcast FM and television
stations do not come in, but I can receive on 2m and 440MHz. I
thought it was bad when I didn't have an HF rig, but it's worse to
have one and not be able to receive anything.

Brian> I'm not sure I'd advise getting on the air with 5wpm these days
Brian> but getting on the air with 10wpm absolutely will accelerate
Brian> your move up the code learning curve. There is nothing which
Brian> can simulate the experience and stimulation one gets when
Brian> snagging real CW QSOs early in the code learning
```

Brian> process. Nothing. Sweat, sweat, tremble, into the deep end
Brian> . . Been there, done it and it WORKS. The mix of 1AW and The
Brian> Deep End worked twice for me and I not only enjoyed all of it
Brian> but also got to 20wpm+ via logs full of actual QSOs to boot.

I'm glad it worked for you. I'm going for the tried and true Koch method of learning the characters at full speed. It might take more time for me to learn them all, but I'll know them, and that will be exciting. I am currently exploring another method of code generating that spits out words from characters that I already know since I'm a little concerned that five-letter groups might shape my learning in a way that won't help with real code. Other than that, though, I'm pretty happy with what I've got.

Brian> And CW contests are lousy code practice.

I agree with you on this. Hopefully by next Field Day I'll be able to participate with CW, but I am concerned that my straight-key efforts will be wasted on the memory keyers out there. Bah.

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.3 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE/WR0nGPFSfAB/ezgRAnw9AJ9Q+MjBOBHMu3/4c2UqD28AVD0/bgCgwCYK
+CsToQwt+3eBYywf9GUcu0U=
=an8p
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

3094. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 23:34:28 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <8496b.37821$Vx2.16849713@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76508

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:h0uflvo2q850i0kanut9ke2uc5p25lg262@4ax.com...
> On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 13:48:10 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
> >Bob Brock wrote:
> >> On 4 Sep 2003 05:16:59 -0700, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >> >>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> >>>>If CW is indeed effective and current, then it will propagate due to
> >>> >>>>its usefulness without regulatory requirement. Judging by how shrill
> >>> >>>>the proponents are, it appears that even they are afraid that it won't
> >>> >>>>show itself to be advantageous enough for people to learn on their
> >>> >>>>own.
> >>> >>>>
> >>> >>>>On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> >>> >>>>with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
> >>> >>>>work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
> >>>
> >>> >>>That's shrill enough, congratulations.
> >>
> >>
> >> >> I guess no answer at all was to be expected since it shows how invalid
> >> >> the postion is.
> >>
> >> > How's this for an answer? NO!
> >>
> >> > Provide references where anyone has even proposed such an activity.
>
> I can't understand why you would want to talk to someone from another
> country who had possibly not passed your lid filter, but to each their
> own incongruiteis I guess.
>
> Show me where I said that anyone proposed it and I'll consider
> documenting it. I'm not in the habit of trying to document things
> that I never said and I won't start with you.
>

Real hams will talk to anyone who is duly licensed under the rules and
regulations of their own governing body. Now if someone proves himself a

lid in the course of QSO, naturally we will bow out but only if the person has demonstrated that he actually is a lid. Besides it's seldom been foreign operators who have been a problem. The problem is right here in this country.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3095. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 23:39:52 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <c996b.37822$Vx2.16850257@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76509

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309041911.69d1f7c8@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<8pE5b.37558$Vx2.16550752@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > news:Blx5b.551$vj4.81294@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > >
> > > Actually, I believe there is an ITU-R Recommendation that specifies
> > > the "International Morse Code" in typical ITU detail.
> > >
> >
> > Operative word is recommendation, which is exactly what I said.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Yet the FCC demands that one passes an exam or be denied access.
>
> Shouldn't they have a definition of what is being examined?

They have defined it as 5wpm. The details are left up to the NCVEC just
like the details of the writtens are left up to the NCVEC.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3096. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-05 23:45:52 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Qe96b.37823$Vx2.16851173@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76510

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:j62glvk4duionbd52uc7igls30dnv6mc4m@4ax.com...
> On 05 Sep 2003 03:41:16 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>
> >>Then what do you think that they test for?
> >
> >Oh I know what they Test for, and it is not knowledge,it is nothing then
> >Memozizing some Q&As that have no meaning to the test taker. The writtens
are
> >nothing more than jumping thru hoops
>
> In other words, since they provide the question pool, you don't think
> that people have to learn the answers in order to correctly answer the
> questions? How do you think that they figure out how to fill in the
> correct answer then?
>

Both the pool AND answers are published.

Let's take a typical question:

What is the length of a dipole for 14.240Mhz?

Now since the questions AND answers are published, the prospective test
taker can simply memorize the numerical answer instead of having to learn
the appropriate equation and how to use that equation. Using the memorize
the numerical answer approach, the new ham has passed the test but is unable
to calculate the dipole that he/she may actually want to build for operating

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3097. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 00:37:22 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjba82$9v7$0@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 76511

Jack Twilley wrote:

>
>
> I've said it before, but perhaps not in this location: my current
> location does not permit reception of HF signals. I have tried for
> months with multiple antenna setups and have not been successful.

Where the heck are you, Jack? I've received HF from many locations, about everywhere I've ever been and tried it. Is it an radio noise environment problem or what? Unless you live in the middle of one of the BPL tryout area I can't imagine not being able to receive W1AW on one of the bands..

Dick

3098. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 00:41:34 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjbaqt$bm1@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76512

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:je5hlv4nak5tfn1mt0q6lrn30m7rtj5ojk@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 06:58:06 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
> >"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> >news:tnvflv0qkdrojl53j9ev5j80q885tjve7q@4ax.com...
> >> On 05 Sep 2003 02:58:33 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> >>
> >> >>No, the writen exams have a basis in the real world.
> >> >
> >> >And what Value is that? The present writtens dont test for knowledge
> >>
> >> Then what do you think that they test for?
> >
> >Whether someone can remember correct answers to known questions.
>
> Provided that the questions cover the things that you want the person
> to know, this isn't an issue.
>

I think it is because retention of the material is minimal when rote
memorizing for a test. I couldn't tell you anything that was on the tests I
took--because the material was not learned, it was memorized. No examples
of application, no scenarios for cause and affect, etc.

Kim W5TIT

3099. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 00:46:51 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjbaqu$bm1@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76513

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:in5hlv0a8mu1q5e2jnduh9spt8cqgudi4t@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 06:55:21 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
> >"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> >news:9kuflv8dnqhehg4gcsk8gkoeehcjdsqp2c@4ax.com...
> >> On Thu, 4 Sep 2003 20:15:41 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:20030904202020.11891.00000444@mb-m11.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <flfelvsgco1mgulsjf7hb7su19rbr52cq6@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
> >> >> <bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
> >> >> >
> >> >> >>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> >> >> >news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott
QSO's
> >> >> >>> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement
for
> >HF
> >> >> >>> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
> >> >> >>
> >> >> >>In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will
> >> >boycott.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >I was asking about you guys, not what they will do.
> >> >>
> >> >> I don't boycott any ham who follows the rules.
> >> >>
> >> >> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> >Exactly. And, I hadn't heard of any attempt to boycott a "country"
due
> >to
> >> >its position on CW. That seems like something that would only get
> >thought
> >> >up right here in this newsgroup, though! <GRIN>
> >> >

> >> >Anyway, that's taking the whole CW debate just way too far, IMNSHO.
> >>
> >> I simply asked if anyone would consider boycotting no code HF
> >> operators from other countries. Oz is already issuing licenses.
> >> Asking a question is not proposing anything. However, making that
> >> jump in logic is typical of usenet in general.
> >
> >Well, excuse the observation here: but you asked and was answered, at
least
> >by N2EY and by me. Both answers were succinct and without merit for the
> >return you have above--which seems quite defensive and I'm puzzled by
why.
> >
> >So, you simply asked and were quite simply answered.
> >
> >And, since you were the one who asked the question of such a weird
concept
> >you would be observing your own actions with regard to your last
sentance.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> OK Kim, show me where I said that I would boycott someone because of
> their code status and I'll get back with you. If you can't quote me
> saying that, who made the jump in logic will be apparent.
>
> The ball is in your court.
>

Hold up there, Bob Brock. SHOW ME where anyone has said you would "boycott someone because of their code status." No one has said a word about you doing that. YOU copped the attitude with the return of Jim's answer to you and my remarks. No where in the above material has Jim or I said a word about you boycotting anything. HOWEVER, in your earnest desire to be the victim, you missed that all Jim or I have done is answer your question, with nothing but sideline remarks back and forth to each other on the topic.

I don't know what ball you've served to my court--I am not playing on a court, I am submitting remarks to a discussion.

Kim W5TIT

3100. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 00:47:49 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjbasn$nal@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76514

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:ru5hlv87ts6p6qj5r2ceb6h1mq0c2jb38j@4ax.com...
> On 5 Sep 2003 05:30:04 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> >
> >
> >"S. Hanrahan" wrote:
> >
> >> On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 10:00:13 -0400, Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >Why would you want to foil computer copy?
> >>
> >> Because no law says you can't.
> >>
> >> >For you to do the test to
> >> >make sure that it works and then advocate it's use, you can't really
> >> >say that wasn't your intention.
> >>
> >> What if it was? Nothing you can do about it but learn the code.
> >
> >The guy is a lost cause. He doesn't even understrand that no testing ever
need be done.
> >All it takes is a bit of understanding, which he clearlyh lacks.
>
> You sound like a religous fanatic. Is that your intention or is it
> natural? Am I now condemned to no-code hell for eternity? I'm sorry,
> but if I could take your chidish commets seriously, I might actually
> take a serious look at your position. However, from what I see right
> now, you don't have a valid position to look at.
>

Well, you understand Dick quite perfectly... ;)

Kim W5TIT

3101. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 00:52:47 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjbb5v$s66@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76515

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F58AAD9.1050404@psu.edu...
> Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > Bob Brock wrote:
> >
> >
> >>On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 13:48:10 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Bob Brock wrote:
> >>>
> >>>>On 4 Sep 2003 05:16:59 -0700, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>If CW is indeed effective and current, then it will propagate due to
> >>>>>its usefulness without regulatory requirement. Judging by how
shrill
> >>>>>the proponents are, it appears that even they are afraid that it
won't
> >>>>>show itself to be advantageous enough for people to learn on their
> >>>>>own.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
> >>>>>with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
> >>>>>work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
> >>>>>
> >>>>>That's shrill enough, congratulations.
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>I guess no answer at all was to be expected since it shows how invalid
> >>>>the postion is.
> >>>
> >>> How's this for an answer? NO!
> >>>
> >>> Provide references where anyone has even proposed such an
activity.

> >>
> >>I can't understand why you would want to talk to someone from another
> >>country who had possibly not passed your lid filter, but to each their
> >>own incongruiteis I guess.
> >>
> >>Show me where I said that anyone proposed it and I'll consider
> >>documenting it. I'm not in the habit of trying to document things
> >>that I never said and I won't start with you.
> >
> >
> > Yep. Another one of "them". He proposed it but he didn't propose it.
> >
>
> Whattya think Dick? This person comes in here, asks incredible slippery
> slope/leading questions but won't answer them, thinks that "reasonable
> approximations" are numbers, and then brags about not upgrading because:
>
> From Bob Brock>> Afterall, I've
> From Bob Brock>> boycotted General and above for about 9 years now
> From Bob Brock>> because of antiquated requirements.
>
> This sounds like one of the principled people that Carl speaks of who
> won't go beyond technician because they don't believe in the Morse test.
> Is this typical of Carl's new people?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA
>

Possibly, Mike. I know you didn't ask me, but I can't help but make the statement that if even so, it would be nice for you to be astute enough not to roll everyone into your neat little package. Bob may be the kind of person you allude to, I don't know; he will have to speak to that with you. But, damned few people who don't like CW have avoided/boycotted higher class licensure until CW went away. In fact, I know no one like that. So, like I said, it would be intellectual of you to keep from using the broad paintbrush. Dick's is glued to his hand, so I don't even consider that he has the intellect to achieve such a lofty goal.

Kim W5TIT

3102. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 00:57:28 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjbbep$u25@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76517

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F58AD2C.2000400@psu.edu...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > Well, excuse the observation here: but you asked and was answered, at
least
> > by N2EY and by me. Both answers were succinct and without merit for the
> > return you have above--which seems quite defensive and I'm puzzled by
why.
> >
> > So, you simply asked and were quite simply answered.
> >
> > And, since you were the one who asked the question of such a weird
concept
> > you would be observing your own actions with regard to your last
sentance.
>
>
> Hey Kim
>
>
> I don't think we can apply the regular rules of logic to this one!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

To respond to you as Spock would: logic and reasoning come from the frame of reference of a mindset--unless learned by scholarly methods. We all express our logic from the perspectives unique to us and if 'ere the two shall agree, far out. However, intellect is generally "out of the box" for us--we are born with it, with more or less of it, or without it.

This one may or may not be very intellectual; however his logic may be flawless from his perspective.

Now, I am going to sit back and watch... ;)

Kim W5TIT

3103. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 00:57:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F593158.5020708@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76516

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>
>>.
>>
>> We play rough in here, but we do expect people to make sense.
>
>
> Hey Mike, I hadn't givern it any thought, but you've had most excellent preparation, what with being an
> longtime Hockey type! Way to go!

We get our educations in the strangest places, sometimes! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3104. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 00:59:18 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjbbi7$bnq@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76518

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:rnchlvkqnv1rljq8vnvgii9fpo3s4rgcqn@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 05 Sep 2003 10:56:41 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
> >Bob Brock wrote:
> >> On 04 Sep 2003 01:29:46 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>>That's a reasonable approximation ... and growing by leaps and bounds
> >>>>daily with the Petition and associated publicity.
> >>>>
> >>>>Carl - wk3c
> >>>
> >>>Bullshit, Prove it.
> >>
> >>
> >> See, I told you guys that this would happen if any number was claimed.
> >
> > What number was claimed? What number is "reasonable approximation?
> >
> > If you just come in here to vent aimlessly, eventually no one will play
> >with you.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> If no value was given, why are you guys asking for proof of something
> that wasn't said? I do understand though. I asked a question and
> that was turned into a postion that needed justifying, so I realize
> that there are some serious reading comprehension problems here
>
> I sure hope that some of the people who have replied to me can send
> Morse a lot better than they can read english.
>

Hmmmmm. As I see it, the only thing Bob's gotten right yet is that he,
indeed, see me say I was leaving the newsgroup; although I'm not sure I said
I would never return...but even so, I'll give him that.

Kim W5TIT

3105. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 01:01:07 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjbblk$9es@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76519

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:hhdhlvkp7rq60ncoei37e6i8ctrmp4vq4e@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 05 Sep 2003 11:35:08 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
> >Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> >> Well, excuse the observation here: but you asked and was answered, at
least
> >> by N2EY and by me. Both answers were succinct and without merit for
the
> >> return you have above--which seems quite defensive and I'm puzzled by
why.
> >>
> >> So, you simply asked and were quite simply answered.
> >>
> >> And, since you were the one who asked the question of such a weird
concept
> >> you would be observing your own actions with regard to your last
sentance.
> >
> >
> > Hey Kim
> >
> >
> > I don't think we can apply the regular rules of logic to this one!
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> If your regular rules of logic include making up a postion and then
> asking someone who didn't support it to justify it, I'd have to agree
> with you. All you have to do is show me where I said it. What's the
> problem Mike. You're dancing all around it, but you just can't seem
> to do.
>
> Why is that?
>

Who said you said it, Bob. Let's start from there. Square one. WHO SAID
you said it?

Kim W5TIT

3106. Bad reception at my house (was Re: Farnsworth spacing)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 01:07:13 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86r82u208u.fsf_-_@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 76520

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Dick" == Dick Carroll; <dixie@townsqr.com> writes:

Jack> I've said it before, but perhaps not in this location: my
Jack> current location does not permit reception of HF signals. I
Jack> have tried for months with multiple antenna setups and have not
Jack> been successful.

Dick> Where the heck are you, Jack? I've received HF from many
Dick> locations, about everywhere I've ever been and tried it. Is it
Dick> an radio noise environment problem or what? Unless you live in
Dick> the middle of one of the BPL tryout area I can't imagine not
Dick> being able to receive W1AW on one of the bands..

I'm in grid square CM88wa, between two very large hills which run for
several miles in a roughly north-south direction. My backyard is
twenty-five feet wide by nine feet deep and it is partially shared
with neighboring units. For political reasons, antennas have to be as
invisible as possible, so the highest I can get is six feet off the
ground and six feet from the house. I was able to construct a dipole
with twelve-foot legs, but I couldn't even get WWV, let alone an
amateur station. In addition, the electrical noise gives me a noise
floor of S7 -- some of which is my fault, as I've got six computers
running at any given time. Sometime this weekend I should make a
recording of what I hear on the bands so people can understand that
reception truly sucks at my house.

Dick> Dick

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.3 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE/WTNGGPFSfAB/ezgRAgneAJwNfhdRniL3vxgxoliupLVrlHbTGQCgvq15
8rGCa/dPlNywvoQBvQZtAlk=
=6kOg
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3107. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 01:19:23 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjbcnt$8ge@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76522

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bjae22gnr0@208.206.142.82...
>
>
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<o53glv0hcrtk27354kt9i01rrbvj1rf7cv@4ax.com>...
> > > On 05 Sep 2003 03:44:03 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> > >
> > > >>Don't try to lecture me on regulatory ... that's what I do for a
> > > >>living (and for a couple of major industry organizations, plus
> > > >>NCI)
> > > >>
> > > >>Carl - wk3c
> > > >>
> > > >
> > > >Damn, I thought you were some Techno whizz, no wonder it took you
over a year
> > > >to upgrade.
> > >
> > > An alternative theory could be that he has a life and that upgrade
> > > wasn't a priority. Some of us do have lives you know. You do know
> > > that don't you?
> >
> > Speaking of no life. Dick is a big-time emergency communicator. Used
> > to drill 7/8" holes in the rooftops of Missouri's finest. Lives for
> > the New Madrid earthquake.
> >
> > But when Hans invited him to join in a QSO using his favorite mode
> > that he demands everyone else be made to learn, his lame excuse for
> > not doing so was that he wasn't home at the time. Apparently he can't
> > go mobile himself.
> >
> > So much for his emergency skills.
>
> And it's true, I WASN'T at home-that time. But where were YOU when K0HB,
N2EY, W6RCA, AC6XG, W3RV and
> I--Did I forget anyone?- held that nice rrap CW net on 40 meters???
>

Ooooo, demmit! I missed something good here. That's what I get for picking
and choosing posts most of the time. Anyway, Brian, did you see a couple of
months ago where I posted the question to Dick about just what it would take

for the establishment of a disaster station for CW operation? As far as I know, he never answered!!!! And, of course, it's because he knew he was getting set up--we all know it would actually take quite a bit to be ready to establish a disaster response CW station--and that was the set up. I was going to ask DICK if he was ready...

Well.....

>
> Oh, I almost forgot- you're STILL waiting for a code free license!
Right!
>
>
> As for emergency gear, I have all that in a pair of metal equipment
cases, ready to grab and go, if and
> when needed. I'll take along a laptop just in case the need happens to be
for a digital mode. AND my
> Vibroplex Iambic paddle for CW.
>

PAH!!!! Grab and go. All of that?! You have got to be kidding...but wait, there's more:

>
> For power I have a lightweight switchmode AC supply AND an 800 watt
inverter. One does need to be
> flexible doesn't one?
>

Oh. OK. So, uh, don't persecute me here because I am lowly slow-code Tech+, but where you gonna get that AC and what if your car is crunched; and/or even when it runs out of gas? And, if you've got all this "stuff" ready to <chuckle> grab and go...and your vehicle is crunched, the trees are down so much that you can't move, or any number of other quite likely situations in a disaster, how will you choose to establish your CW station then, Dick? Really, let's drill it.

>
> After all, the need could be for something hightech and digital. But the
> possibility always exists that those needing to communicat from a disaster
area will have only modest old
> CW available.
>

The higher likelihood, and I think most seasoned EmCom folks will bear me out on this one, is that there will be many low-power talkies available, FRS, and the immediate disaster communications would be through simplex frequencies on 2M and 70cm, along with APRS stations set up and transmitting. Most disasters would have high hope of skilled CW ops for HW traffic, though.

>
> One does need to be ready, doesn't one?

>

Yep. And it doesn't sound like you are. The picture I get in my mind is almost humorous if it weren't so sad. DICK, standing there with his grab and go "stuff," wishing he'd thought to wheel mount those metal equipment cases because they sure are going to be heavy to drag or pick up and carry, with a tree or two down over his vehicle and the power lines dancing all over the place around him...with his metal carrying cases right there...

Oh, the the pain, the pain...

>
> So what's YOUR enmergency status,Slim? Do you have "permission" yet?
>
> Dick, W0EX FISTS #3939
>

He probably would be up, running, established and ready to communicate--WHILE getting the hell away from danger and to a location as directed by the local net.

Kim W5TIT

3108. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 01:19:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F593671.7010600@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76521

N2EY wrote:
> The following isn't exactly a new idea, but some may not have seen it
> yet...
>
> Maybe the way out of the mess is for a Smith Chart test to replace
> the code test.
>
> Understanding the Smith Chart and being able to use one actually
> demonstrates several areas of knowledge and skill. Smith Chart tests
> could consist of interpreting a solved problem on one chart, (the
> "understanding" test) then solving a different problem on a blank
> chart (the "solution" test). At first, most hams and wouldbe hams
> would would simply study the Smith Chart and pass the tests.
>
>
> But then the trouble would start...

Bravo! Funny and relevant.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3109. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 01:21:53 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjbcsi$ba8@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76523

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:h9ghlv49at0akiluoaqm6f72pf2skiah5v@4ax.com...
>
> I'll tell you guys why I'm here shortly, but conversing with twits
> like you sure isn't it.
>

Oh!! Hold me back!! Now he's getting suspenseful!

Kim W5TIT

3110. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 01:24:16 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjbd11$nu4@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76524

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0309050938.7bafb490@posting.google.com...
> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bj9u3k$hbt@library1.airnews.net>...
>
> > put up a 70' tower, loaded it up with antennas and don't even have a
> > radio connected in here now.
>
> I know a ham who did that - put up the tower and antennas when they
> first moved in and left all of the coax ends coiled in a bucket
> outside the house. hen they set about doing various move-in projects
> and did not unpack the rigs right away, nor run the coaxes into the
> house.
>
> Sure enough, one of the neighbors with Gladys Kravitz syndrome
> complained about "interference" and such that supposedly happened
> since the antennas went up. Called FCC as I recall. Ham invited over
> the neighbor and other interestested parties and showed 'em the coax
> ends. No more complaints.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

ROFLMAO!!! N5TIE, down here, name is Robert. Had a neighbor that would raise the roof every time he got on CW. Well, one day she starts complaining. Called him up. He sets his station up to ID every couple of minutes and send a CW call (automatically). Then, he goes over to visit with the neighbor.

heh heh, she never called again.

Kim W5TIT

3111. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 01:27:12 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjbd6h$ram@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76525

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0309051154.4ef03806@posting.google.com...
>
> The founders of No Charts International would claim that they had no
> problem with anyone USING the Chart, just the mandatory test
> requirement.
> "It's not the CHART, it's the TEST" would be a common rallying cry.
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

OHMYGAWD!!!! ROFLMAO!!!

Kim W5TIT

3112. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 01:30:30 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjbdcn$5q5@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76526

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:Qe96b.37823$Vx2.16851173@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> news:j62glvk4duionbd52uc7igls30dnv6mc4m@4ax.com...
> > On 05 Sep 2003 03:41:16 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> >
> > >>Then what do you think that they test for?
> > >
> > >Oh I know what they Test for, and it is not knowledge,it is nothing
then
> > >Memozizing some Q&As that have no meaning to the test taker. The
writtens
> are
> > >nothing more than jumping thru hoops
> >
> > In other words, since they provide the question pool, you don't think
> > that people have to learn the answers in order to correctly answer the
> > questions? How do you think that they figure out how to fill in the
> > correct answer then?
> >
>
> Both the pool AND answers are published.
>
> Let's take a typical question:
>
> What is the length of a dipole for 14.240Mhz?
>
> Now since the questions AND answers are published, the prospective test
> taker can simply memorize the numerical answer instead of having to learn
> the appropriate equation and how to use that equation. Using the memorize
> the numerical answer approach, the new ham has passed the test but is
unable
> to calculate the dipole that he/she may actually want to build for
operating
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

You're right, Dee. That's the point I try to make...I rote memorized for
the test. Now, the argument for the above scenario could also be made that
the instrukshions can be looked up. I've built quite a few antennas. All
of them I used instrukshions for; and they all worked great.

Kim W5TIT

3113. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 01:47:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F593D09.5060805@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76527

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message

>>This sounds like one of the principled people that Carl speaks of who
>>won't go beyond technician because they don't believe in the Morse test.
>>Is this typical of Carl's new people?
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA
>>
>
>
> Possibly, Mike. I know you didn't ask me, but I can't help but make the
> statement that if even so, it would be nice for you to be astute enough not
> to roll everyone into your neat little package.

For the purposes of the group, I don't think it's too bad an idea to
try to find out a few things about this one.

Here is a person that claims to know Morse code, but has refused to
test for it for nine years. This would appear to be the mythical person
that avoids Ham radio because of the evil Morse code (emphasis mine)
that The prez of NCI speaks of.

I say appears to be, because we have a person that comes in here like
gangbusters, manages to annoy a lot of us, and uses argument techniques
mostly designed to p**s us off, not to make a point.

I personally think this person is just a troll, and not a very good
troll either.

> Bob may be the kind of
> person you allude to, I don't know; he will have to speak to that with you.

Hehe, won't happen now.

> But, damned few people who don't like CW have avoided/boycotted higher class
> licensure until CW went away. In fact, I know no one like that.

Correct, and that is a big part of my decision that this is just a
third rate troll.

I like to come in here and have a good disagreement with people, but
his posts do not constitute a good disagreement. You've seen it yourself
- the odd leading questions, the asking of all sorts of quewstions,
followed by a refusal to answer any, and outrageous little things such
as assigning numerical value to non-numerical statements.

All things calculated to get an indignant response.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3114. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 02:51:07 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <r2iilv0ovu97nehjbcn9hpnte7is1p43nn@4ax.com>
Source record: 76529

On 5 Sep 2003 10:57:03 -0700, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<vi4hlv4p8a8lvp8p3p059191vae1pfh7dq@4ax.com>...
>> On 05 Sep 2003 11:19:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>> >In article <j62glvk4duionbd52uc7igls30dnv6mc4m@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
>> ><bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>> >
>> >>On 05 Sep 2003 03:41:16 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

Snipped much agreement only to save badwidth...
>
>We could have all better written exams and different performance tests
>without it costing FCC anything. But it goes against the fashion. And
>the "Smith chart effect" opposition would kick in, guaranteed.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Gosh, I didn't think I'd find anyone here that I was pretty close to
agreement with. You seem to be the exception instead of the rule.

My feeling is that, unless this endless code debate ends sometime, ham
radio cannot move on in the testing area. I'd like to see a person
actually have to operate a radio in the band they are being licensed
for before they can take off by themselves. It could even be their
own radio. I think that they should know what all those nifty buttons
actually do. They should know how to enter into a conversation. A
list of "critical tasks" and "non-critical tasks" should be developed
and a person not be licensed until they can actually show competence
in those tasks. Those are the types of issues that I'd like to see
the ham community discussing rather than the endless code/no-code
debate that detracts from everything else.

All of the name calling and false accusations from both sides makes us
look silly to those who read it. I'm really glad that it will be
ending soon. Perhaps then, we can move on to more important issues.

I'm sure that not everyone will agree with performance based testing
in addition to a written test. However, perhaps a consensus could be
reached.

3115. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 02:56:47 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <8uiilvc9n5ves1oj8qijbp6e4gnd805htu@4ax.com>
Source record: 76530

On 05 Sep 2003 13:03:07 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>How do you think that they figure out how to fill in the
>>correct answer then?
>>
>
>Its called memorizing, no knowledge. If question about the material most
>wouldnt have a Clue.
>
>>You weren't provided with an answer sheet where you only had to
>>memorize the correct sequence were you?
>
>No I wasnt, I knew the Info.
>
>
>
>>Perhaps it's you contention that getting a license to
>>operate a radio is somehow more complex than the nuclear environment,
>
>No not really, anymore its a waste of time the way the present written is
>setup.

If that's the way that you feel, it's a issue that needs to be
addressed. The only issues I've seen talked about in this ng during
the many times that I've subscribed to it is this petty code/no-code
bs that detracts from any real discussion about code testing.

Don't misconsture this as agreement that "no learning" takes place.
However, I will agree that the learning is inadequate in that a
written test or even classroom training adequately prepares a person
to perform tasks without an additional step of hands on experienced
based training and/or testing.

3116. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 02:59:42 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <n8jilvojttb553gj30g7nli4nl0eqh8f8j@4ax.com>
Source record: 76531

On Fri, 05 Sep 2003 23:45:52 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

>
>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:j62glvk4duionbd52uc7igls30dnv6mc4m@4ax.com...
>> On 05 Sep 2003 03:41:16 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>>
>> >>Then what do you think that they test for?
>> >
>> >Oh I know what they Test for, and it is not knowledge,it is nothing then
>> >Memozizing some Q&As that have no meaning to the test taker. The writtens
>are
>> >nothing more than jumping thru hoops
>>
>> In other words, since they provide the question pool, you don't think
>> that people have to learn the answers in order to correctly answer the
>> questions? How do you think that they figure out how to fill in the
>> correct answer then?
>>
>
>Both the pool AND answers are published.
>
>Let's take a typical question:
>
>What is the length of a dipole for 14.240Mhz?
>
>Now since the questions AND answers are published, the prospective test
>taker can simply memorize the numerical answer instead of having to learn
>the appropriate equation and how to use that equation. Using the memorize
>the numerical answer approach, the new ham has passed the test but is unable
>to calculate the dipole that he/she may actually want to build for operating
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Then perhaps the test pool needs to be reviewed and revised to include
the formula. Wouldn't that be more productive for the ham community
than this endless code/no-code drivel? It is something that I would
find myself in agreement with.

3117. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 03:02:01 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <gejilvo4f6tm1pd1e3t7p62tjc9l3u3pmo@4ax.com>
Source record: 76532

On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 20:30:30 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>news:Qe96b.37823$Vx2.16851173@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>>
>> "Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>> news:j62glvk4duionbd52uc7igls30dnv6mc4m@4ax.com...
>> > On 05 Sep 2003 03:41:16 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>> >
>> > >>Then what do you think that they test for?
>> > >
>> > >Oh I know what they Test for, and it is not knowledge,it is nothing
>then
>> > >Memozizing some Q&As that have no meaning to the test taker. The
>writtens
>> are
>> > >nothing more than jumping thru hoops
>> >
>> > In other words, since they provide the question pool, you don't think
>> > that people have to learn the answers in order to correctly answer the
>> > questions? How do you think that they figure out how to fill in the
>> > correct answer then?
>> >
>>
>> Both the pool AND answers are published.
>>
>> Let's take a typical question:
>>
>> What is the length of a dipole for 14.240Mhz?
>>
>> Now since the questions AND answers are published, the prospective test
>> taker can simply memorize the numerical answer instead of having to learn
>> the appropriate equation and how to use that equation. Using the memorize
>> the numerical answer approach, the new ham has passed the test but is
>unable
>> to calculate the dipole that he/she may actually want to build for
>operating
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>
>You're right, Dee. That's the point I try to make...I rote memorized for
>the test. Now, the argument for the above scenario could also be made that

>the instrukshions can be looked up. I've built quite a few antennas. All
>of them I used instrukshions for; and they all worked great.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

What would be wrong with requiring them to build a quarter wave dipole
that is resonate at a specified frequency as part of the test? That
is, if the test were changed to be written and performance based.

3118. Comments to FCC on RM-10787 No Code Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 03:02:30 UTC
From: Dan Finn <djfinn2@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <z5c6b.15$A5.5@bignews2.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 76533

Sorry if this is a duplicate post. Bellsouth changed news servers and I
didn't see this posted the first time:

This comment was submitted to the FCC via their ECFS website tool on
09/01/2003 in respect to RM-10787:

This is to oppose RM-10787, which proposes to eliminate the 5 wpm Morse code
test for amateurs who which to transmit on the "HF" frequency bands (30MHz
and below). These frequencies are a precious resource and Morse code has
proven, time and again, to be the only feasible frequency mode available 1)
that can be useful during emergencies especially when band conditions are
bad 2) for communications with other amateurs in poorer countries than the
USA. Allowing access to these unique frequencies by individuals unfamiliar
with Morse code would result in a structure wherein the Morse-only subbands
would likely be modified to allow voice. In doing so, those individuals
worldwide who wish to communicate via Morse would be deprived of usage of
the common Morse frequencies and be forced to upgrade to mode that they may
not be able to afford, would likely require higher power levels to
communicate, especially on the 40m and 80m bands and result in either voice
communications that are less reliable than CW or digital, which is more
expensive and not generally available in some countries that use Morse
extensively such as the Philippines, India, some parts of Russia, Africa and
even in the case of expeditionary groups in such places as the Antarctic.
Finally, the US still needs to have a stable population of individuals who
can send and receive Morse code in times of communications emergencies and
certain military situations. The current population of such individuals will
suffer attrition rates and almost certainly cease to exist in the future
without the current Morse code requirements for amateur operators. Usage of
these frequencies is a great privilege and knowledge of Morse is a very
small price to pay while our Nation benefits from having a pool of competent
Morse operators. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Respectfully Submitted,

Daniel J. Finn
KR4AJ

3119. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 03:07:28 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <pijilvscl419fdu99637sucn55794r8gcc@4ax.com>
Source record: 76534

On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 19:41:34 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:je5hlv4nak5tfn1mt0q6lrn30m7rtj5ojk@4ax.com...
>> On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 06:58:06 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>> >news:tnvflv0qkdrojl53j9ev5j80q885tjve7q@4ax.com...
>> >> On 05 Sep 2003 02:58:33 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >>No, the writen exams have a basis in the real world.
>> >> >
>> >> >And what Value is that? The present writtens dont test for knowledge
>> >>
>> >> Then what do you think that they test for?
>> >
>> >Whether someone can remember correct answers to known questions.
>>
>> Provided that the questions cover the things that you want the person
>> to know, this isn't an issue.
>>
>
>I think it is because retention of the material is minimal when rote
>memorizing for a test. I couldn't tell you anything that was on the tests I
>took--because the material was not learned, it was memorized. No examples
>of application, no scenarios for cause and affect, etc.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>
So, instead of the continual code/no-code debate, why aren't these
issues discussed here? If the test pool questions are such that the
requred areas of knowledge aren't addressed, changing those questions
(or perhaps the testing itself) would be an outstanding subject to be
discussed here. However, it's not usually discussed because all
threads lead to the code thing.

I have my own view on the code issue and it's not going to change
anymore than anyone else is going to change theirs. Our minds are
made up. However, I think that people on both sides of that
particular issue see areas where they would agree that the actual
testing needs change.

3120. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 03:25:28 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <kikilv41ljggh172fuq727u3geep324s45@4ax.com>
Source record: 76536

On Fri, 05 Sep 2003 23:11:19 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

>
>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:flfelvsgco1mgulsjf7hb7su19rbr52cq6@4ax.com...
>> On 4 Sep 2003 05:25:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>>
>> >Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:<6radlvgq2d19cnp59509154p4n111a5efv@4ax.com>...
>> >
>> >> On a related question, is it pro coders intention to boycott QSO's
>> >> with countries that have already dropped the code requirement for HF
>> >> work? Do you guys refuse to talk to Australians now?
>> >
>> >In the event they have that country confirmed for DXCC, they will
>boycott.
>>
>> I was asking about you guys, not what they will do. Afterall, I've
>> boycotted General and above for about 9 years now because of
>> antiquated requirements.
>
>This is called cutting off your nose to spite your face. That's a
>ridiculous approach as your boycott does absolutely nothing to change the
>situation.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Call it what you like. I weighed the benefit of HF against conforming
with a requirement that I didn't agree with. I felt that by
participating I was helping it to continue. There are a lot of hoops
that I would be willing to jump through to get HF privileges. Code
isn't one of them.

Call it a matter of personal ethics. Upgrading would have been the
easy way out.

3121. Re: Comments to FCC on RM-10787 No Code Proposal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 03:27:36 UTC
From: Emmersom Bigguns <ebigguns@boobs.com>
Message-ID: <luc6b.18458$3b2.1408217@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 76535

Very well done Dan!

"Dan Finn" <djfinn2@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:z5c6b.15$A5.5@bignews2.bellsouth.net...
> Sorry if this is a duplicate post. Bellsouth changed news servers and I
> didn't see this posted the first time:
>
> This comment was submitted to the FCC via their ECFS website tool on
> 09/01/2003 in respect to RM-10787:
>
> This is to oppose RM-10787, which proposes to eliminate the 5 wpm Morse
code
> test for amateurs who which to transmit on the "HF" frequency bands (30MHz
> and below). These frequencies are a precious resource and Morse code has
> proven, time and again, to be the only feasible frequency mode available
1)
> that can be useful during emergencies especially when band conditions are
> bad 2) for communications with other amateurs in poorer countries than the
> USA. Allowing access to these unique frequencies by individuals unfamiliar
> with Morse code would result in a structure wherein the Morse-only
subbands
> would likely be modified to allow voice. In doing so, those individuals
> worldwide who wish to communicate via Morse would be deprived of usage of
> the common Morse frequencies and be forced to upgrade to mode that they
may
> not be able to afford, would likely require higher power levels to
> communicate, especially on the 40m and 80m bands and result in either
voice
> communications that are less reliable than CW or digital, which is more
> expensive and not generally available in some countries that use Morse
> extensively such as the Philippines, India, some parts of Russia, Africa
and
> even in the case of expeditionary groups in such places as the Antarctic.
> Finally, the US still needs to have a stable population of individuals who
> can send and receive Morse code in times of communications emergencies and
> certain military situations. The current population of such individuals
will
> suffer attrition rates and almost certainly cease to exist in the future
> without the current Morse code requirements for amateur operators. Usage
of
> these frequencies is a great privilege and knowledge of Morse is a very
> small price to pay while our Nation benefits from having a pool of
competent
> Morse operators. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this

proposal.
>
> Respectfully Submitted,
>
> Daniel J. Finn
> KR4AJ
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.512 / Virus Database: 309 - Release Date: 8/19/2003

3122. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 03:31:35 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <rbkilvoc2n1catkhl2a9llld2246fd1po5@4ax.com>
Source record: 76537

On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 19:46:51 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>> OK Kim, show me where I said that I would boycott someone because of
>> their code status and I'll get back with you. If you can't quote me
>> saying that, who made the jump in logic will be apparent.
>>
>> The ball is in your court.
>>
>
>Hold up there, Bob Brock. SHOW ME where anyone has said you would "boycott
>someone because of their code status." No one has said a word about you
>doing that. YOU copped the attitude with the return of Jim's answer to you
>and my remarks. No where in the above material has Jim or I said a word
>about you boycotting anything. HOWEVER, in your earnest desire to be the
>victim, you missed that all Jim or I have done is answer your question, with
>nothing but sideline remarks back and forth to each other on the topic.
>
>I don't know what ball you've served to my court--I am not playing on a
>court, I am submitting remarks to a discussion.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

From elsewhere in the thread...

[I said]

> Show me where I said that anyone proposed it and I'll consider
> documenting it. I'm not in the habit of trying to document things
> that I never said and I won't start with you.

[Dick Carroll said]

Yep. Another one of "them". He proposed it but he didn't propose it.

I admit that you may not agree with the above accusation. If so, say
so now and I'll apologize.

3123. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 03:57:18 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <7bmilv4hk4tquftqtqe9hv2ldnmjs23529@4ax.com>
Source record: 76538

On 05 Sep 2003 16:52:32 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>They did it a few decades ago when they took 11 meters from the hams
>>since they didn't use it.
>
>Youi missed the operative word "NEW CB HAM BANDS"

Well, since CB never required a test, I'd have to say that your question makes no sense to me. If you are referring to MURS, FRS, and GMRS, they aren't in the ham bands. Are you proposing testing and incusion of those frquencies into the ham bands?

As near as I can figure out, it's got to be something like that. You do know that hams can use those frequencies too if they get the licenses that may be required. Don't worry, they don't require you to take a test or anything.

I use MURS to keep in touch with my non-ham daughter. My phone at home stays constantly busy and she isn't interested in taking the test. I guess that she too is condemned to no-code/non-ham hell. She seems pretty content with her fate though. She really want's a cell phone, which is also near a ham frequency, but I got her a horse intstead.

3124. Something Around Here to Enjoy Besides the Damned Code Test War

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 04:12:11 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309052012.66cdf59a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76539

http://www.msnbc.com/news/962313.asp?0cv=CB20

w3rv

3125. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 04:21:28 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <9bnilv8q3omrvq3impcbgpbv65dpddjhbu@4ax.com>
Source record: 76540

On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 20:21:53 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:h9ghlv49at0akiluoaqm6f72pf2skiah5v@4ax.com...
>>
>> I'll tell you guys why I'm here shortly, but conversing with twits
>> like you sure isn't it.
>>
>
>Oh!! Hold me back!! Now he's getting suspenseful!
>
>Kim W5TIT

OK Kim, I'll keep you in suspense no more. Whether some like to admit
it or not, the senseless Morse Code debate will soon be history. I'm
here to see if the ham community will then move on to something really
important like revising the written tests and the test pools so that
when someone passes the test, they actually know how to use a radio,
set up or build an antenna, the protocols on the frequencies they are
authouized to use, how to minimize RF exposure and stay within safe
levels. If someone doesn't know what all those buttons do on their
radio, they shouldn't be licensed to use it. If they don't know
enough not to use repeater imputs for simplex operation, they
shouldn't be licensed to use the frequency.

It's my hope that when it is all over with Morse, that the ham
community will address the real important issues and Morse ain't it.
It is at best a scapegoat that hams can argue about while the more
important issues of licensing inept operators is ignored. IMO, the
ham community has some really screwed up priorities and hopefully,
with the endgame for code in sight, they may....just may come to grips
with some real issues.

I'm hopeful, but not expectant.

3126. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 05:31:40 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <1qqilvkqcad3h4706mijluqduucofb8i97@4ax.com>
Source record: 76541

On Sat, 06 Sep 2003 01:47:38 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
wrote:

>Kim W5TIT wrote:
>> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
>
>>>This sounds like one of the principled people that Carl speaks of who
>>>won't go beyond technician because they don't believe in the Morse test.
>>>Is this typical of Carl's new people?
>>>
>>>- Mike KB3EIA
>>>
>>
>>
>> Possibly, Mike. I know you didn't ask me, but I can't help but make the
>> statement that if even so, it would be nice for you to be astute enough not
>> to roll everyone into your neat little package.
>
> For the purposes of the group, I don't think it's too bad an idea to
>try to find out a few things about this one.
>
> Here is a person that claims to know Morse code, but has refused to
>test for it for nine years. This would appear to be the mythical person
>that avoids Ham radio because of the evil Morse code (emphasis mine)
>that The prez of NCI speaks of.

So, frequiencies above 50 MHz is not "ham radio" these days?
>
> I say appears to be, because we have a person that comes in here like
>gangbusters, manages to annoy a lot of us, and uses argument techniques
>mostly designed to p**s us off, not to make a point.

Some people don't like being treated the same way that they treat
others. I've been in and out of here for over six years. Get over
it.
>
> I personally think this person is just a troll, and not a very good
>troll either.

I spent 17 years doing some pretty stupid stuff to comply with the
wishes of a regulatory agency. I got paid good for it and I did it
well. I'm not going to do it for free and of my own free will. If
you don't like it...get over it. Does the thought of someone actually
doing something, or not doing something, simply because they don't
want to bother you that much?

>
>
>> Bob may be the kind of
>> person you allude to, I don't know; he will have to speak to that with you.
>
> Hehe, won't happen now.
>
>> But, damned few people who don't like CW have avoided/boycotted higher class
>> licensure until CW went away. In fact, I know no one like that.

Well, you do now.
>
> Correct, and that is a big part of my decision that this is just a
>third rate troll.

A prime example of piss poor decision making.
>
> I like to come in here and have a good disagreement with people, but
>his posts do not constitute a good disagreement. You've seen it yourself
>- the odd leading questions, the asking of all sorts of quewstions,
>followed by a refusal to answer any, and outrageous little things such
>as assigning numerical value to non-numerical statements.

What's more outrageous is people demanding supporting documentation
for a number that the group says doesn't exist.
>
> All things calculated to get an indignant response.

Whatever trips your trigger guy. I live my life by my standards.

BTW, here is why I learned Morse. Ironic isn't it?

<http://www.google.com/groups?q=code+group:rec.radio.amateur.policy+author:bob+author:brock&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&as_drrb=b&as_mind=12&as_minm=5&as_miny=1981&as_maxd=5&as_maxm=9&as_maxy=2001&selm=34c35790.2985325%40news.his.com&rnum=2>

Over the last couple of years, I have made a few posts about my
feelings that code should not be a requirement for access to HF
frequencies. While I have not changed my mind on that position, I do
have a question/request from the pro-coders in the NG.

Recently an amature radio operator in my area was operated on for a
growth in his throat. The operation left him without a voice and he
has been using Morse Code on one of the local repeaters at about 5
WPM. Because of this, I now want to learn code so that I can
understand what he is saying.

So, would any of you pro-coders like to help a no-code tech upgrade?
I have to warn you in advance that, even after I learn the code, I
will still not support code testing as a requirement for HF access.
This is a personal decison that I am making because I want to do all
that I can to accomadate another person who wants to use amature radio
and this is the only way that he can do it.

Please don't turn this request into part of your never ending debate. The other operator could use packet as an alternative. This is just a personal choice by me. The code should stand or fall on it's own merits. Anyway, does anyone on either side of the debate want to help me learn it? This is a legitimate request. It is not spam and it is not flame-bait. My E-mail address is real...please respond if you have any materials or advice that will help.

3127. BPL coming to Boise in September

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 06:46:29 UTC
From: robkemp90210@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <6114e4af.0309052246.4d1fa1af@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76542

IDACOMM and Ambient Announce Partnership for Deployment of Broadband Over Power Line Technology

http://www.marketwire.com/mw/release_html_b1?release_id=57084

BOISE, ID -- (MARKET WIRE) -- 09/03/2003 -- IDACOMM, Inc., a subsidiary of IDACORP, Inc. (NYSE: IDA), and Ambient Corporation (OTC BB: ABTG) today jointly announced a memorandum of understanding to initiate in early September a pilot test of Broadband over Power Line (BPL) technology at up to 100 residential and commercial locations in Boise, Idaho.

Ambient's technology is designed to facilitate the transmission of data over medium-voltage and low-voltage power lines directly to the end-user's computer. IDACOMM's BPL service will provide broadband Internet access to the power outlets in the home or business participating in the pilot program.

IDACOMM is planning the most complete and sophisticated pilot test of an end-to-end broadband solution conducted to date, according to Matt Collins, IDACOMM's director of BPL deployment. The pilot test will include many aspects of a complete broadband offering not normally associated with BPL technology tests, including subscriber authentication, bandwidth monitoring and control, and advanced services such as video streaming and Voice over Internet Protocol.

"The combination of Ambient's technology and IDACOMM's backoffice systems will create a best-of-breed broadband solution for our subscribers. We look forward to working with Ambient and their technology throughout the pilot program," said Chris Britton, president and chief executive officer of IDACOMM.

John J. Joyce, CEO of Ambient Corporation, stated, "Adding IDACOMM to our fast-growing group of strategic partners brings us one step closer to realizing and accomplishing our strategic plan of commercial deployment of our Power Line Communications technology."

About IDACOMM:

IDACOMM provides fiber optic broadband services for organizations in high technology, manufacturing, distribution, health care, education, and state and local government. Velocitus, a subsidiary of IDACOMM, provides high-speed wireless Internet service. IDACOMM and Velocitus currently serve over 25,000 customers in Idaho, Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Utah, New Mexico, Arizona and Virginia. www.idacomm.com or www.idacomm.com/bpl

About IDACORP:

Boise, Idaho-based IDACORP, formed in 1998, is an energy and technology holding company comprising Idaho Power, a regulated electric utility; Ida-West Energy, an independent manager and developer of power projects; IDACORP Financial, an investment vehicle that makes investments primarily in affordable housing projects; IdaTech, a developer and producer of fully integrated fuel cell systems; IDACOMM, a telecommunications subsidiary providing high-speed Internet access technologies; and IDACORP Energy, a marketer of energy and energy-related products and services.

IDACORP Media Contact:

Jeff Beaman, jbeaman@idacorpinc.com

About Ambient Corporation:

Ambient Corporation (OTC BB: ABTG) is a development stage company engaged in the architecture, design, development, and implementation of a proposed comprehensive high-speed communication infrastructure designed to utilize existing electrical power distribution lines as a communication medium -- Power Line Communication -- PLC.

Ambient Corporation (OTC BB: ABTG) is a publicly traded company incorporated in the United States that focuses on Powerline Communication telephony-related product offerings, Internet and E-Commerce for a variety of exciting new consumer applications, and a basket of utility-related services. www.ambientcorp.com

Ambient Media Contact:

Cecilia Coakley, Rob DudaKeating
Public Relations (973) 966-1100

ccoakley@keatingpr.com / rduda@keatingpr.com
This press release may contain forward-looking statements that involve risks and uncertainties. These statements may differ materially from actual future events or results. Readers are referred to the documents filed by IDACORP, Inc., and Ambient Corporation with the SEC, including the company's most recent report on Form 10-K and 10-Q, which identify important risk factors that could cause actual results to differ from those contained in the forward-looking statements.

Ambient is a trademark of Ambient Corporation registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Contact: Cameron Christian
Phone: 208-388-6802
Email: cechrist@idacomm.com

3128. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1360– September 5 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 08:09:11 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030906040911.18140.00000696@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 76543

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1360– September 5 2003

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1360 with a release date of Friday, September 5th 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Pro-code fights back. A petition to retain Morse code testing is filed with the FCC and others are reportedly on the way. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1360 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESTRUCTURING: PRO CODE PETITION FLED WITH THE FCC

The proponents of retaining Morse testing for all candidates for a United States Amateur License with high frequency operating priveleges are striking back. This, with a petition that not only asks the F-C-C to retain the 5 word per minute C-W exam, but to also require that Extra class pass a 12 word per minute test. And the organization that I sponsoring the measure also wants written exams stiffened as well. Amateur Radio Newsline’s David Black, KB4KCH, has more on this attempt to row against the deregulatory tide:

--

For the past couple of months, more and more countries have been steering toward making amateur radio code-free. That follows the July abolition of Morse code testing by the World Radiocommunications Conference. In the United States, the Federal Communications Commission has before it six petitions essentially seeking to remove Morse code from amateur radio in the U-S. Supporters of the code have been quiet--until now. A group called FISTS--said to be the largest code advocacy organization in the world--is leading an effort to make Morse code a more prominent part of ham radio and the licensing process.

FISTS is an international Morse code preservation society based in the United Kingdom with chapters world-wide. Its stated objective is to further the use of the Morse code in Amateur Radio communications. The group's north American chapter has delivered a detailed rule-making request to the FCC that seeks more than just making sure that Morse code testing is retained.

FISTS asks the Commission to raise the standards in other areas of testing, too. Nancy Kott, WZ8C, is U-S Chapter Manager for FISTS, and is Editor of Worldradio Magazine. She wrote the rule making request. Among the proposals are keeping code as a mandatory testing element for the General and Extra class licenses. General licenses would require 5 words per minute and Extra class

licenses would require 12 word per minute code proficiency.

FISTS says passing a 5 word per minute code test is no hindrance to people wanting to upgrade, and cites the large number of Technician class operators upgrading to General as proof.

FISTS also says that those aiming for the Extra license should be able to demonstrate Morse code skill at 12 words per minute.

Today's written exams are too easy. At least, that's what FISTS seems to suggest in noting that the FCC sought comments before amateur radio's restructuring about whether fewer morse code requirements should be offset by increased technical content on written questions. FISTS notes that nearly every commenter said yes, but the Commission's Report and Order failed to address the issue.

FISTS says the commission has a chance now to make General class written tests equivalent to the Advanced class written tests before restructuring. In other words, go back to the way it was, with tests that are harder and more thorough.

FISTS wants the Extra class exam to be more thorough, as well. It wants the FCC to require written knowledge of circuit design, information theory, digital methods and encoding schemes and software radio. FISTS says candidates for the Extra class ticket need to show a more thorough knowledge of propagation and geophysics than current tests require.

For the Technician class operator, FISTS suggests merging the Technician and Tech-Plus classes and not require a Morse code exam. But FISTS says technical content should be emphasized and should include the digital modes. FISTS advocates extending Technician Class privileges to include digital modes within the current Novice subbands, which it says should be kept. The group says that would let Technician Class operators participate in the explosive growth in digital applications occurring within the Amateur Radio Service on the high frequency bands.

But when it comes to giving Technicians even limited phone privileges on HF, FISTS says no. The group says the rush of upgrades by Technicians to higher classes following restructuring indicates that the barrier between General and Technician classes has already been lowered enough without needing to go any further.

FISTS also suggests one other big change and that involves taking license tests. Right now, if you fail an exam, you can go back and try again at the same session. FISTS is asking the Commission to impose a 24-hour waiting period before being able re-take either a failed written test or a failed code test.
For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm David Black, KB4KCH.

--

There’s 14 pages to the FISTS filing. You can read it on-line at ftp://ftp.qsl.net/pub/n1ea/FIST_FCC_Petition_8-30-303.pdf. As we go to air, no Rule Making designation has been assigned to the FISTS request.

(ARNewsline(tm))

**

RESTRUCTURING: ACA PAPER SUGGESTS TOTAL RESTRUCTURING OF VK HAM RADIO

Meantime, down-under the Australian Communications Authority has surprised that nations ham radio community with a proposal to totally restructure that nations Amateur Radio service. Jim Linton, VK3PC, has the rest of the story.

--
Radical changes are being proposed for the Amateur Service in the just issued ACA discussion paper entitled "A Review of Amateur Service Regulation.” The paper is sure to stimulate debate, particularly its reference to interference experienced by domestic television and radio receivers, and a suggestion that radio amateurs should take full responsibility to resolve these problems.

A major purpose of the paper is to discuss the implementation of the changes arising out of the World Radiocommunications Conference held in Geneva this year. These changes include the end of mandatory Morse code tests for amateur licences, amateur callsigns, third party traffic, communications during disasters, and reciprocal and visitor licensing.

The ACA, as expected, has also taken the opportunity to discuss restructuring of amateur licensing, the regulatory controls and administration of the Amateur Service in Australia. The paper acknowledges the WIA's proposal for a new entry level licence, and the potential for it to replace the current Novice licence. It discusses restructuring of the current system of seven different amateur licence types (five operator, plus repeater and beacon), to create only two operator licence types - Unrestricted and Novice.

On a positive note the paper hints that the removal of Morse code tests for amateur licences may occur earlier than the ACA's current timetable. It states that if there is sufficient public support, the code requirement could be removed prior to its proposed implementation of regulatory changes flowing from its discussion paper in early 2005.

In a controversial proposal, the ACA is to consider the introduction of a "no interference" policy for radio amateurs. It states "The operation of an amateur station, which is essentially a hobby, should not disturb another person's activities, such as television viewing or radio listening, or affect commercial activities." Should the "no interference" policy be introduced, it would be a major shift from the current ACA policy that provides for a shared responsibility between the radio amateur and his neighbour for the resolution of an interference problem.

To make it clear, the ACA explains "This would mean that an amateur must not cause interference to other radiocommunication services. If causing interference to another service, the obligation will be on the amateur to resolve the problem."

--

The Australian Communications Authority has set a deadline of October 31st as the last day for hams to file responses to its discussion paper. The 50-page discussion paper can be downloaded from www.wiavic.org.au/news or www.wia.org.au/vk4 (Q-News)

**

RADIO LAW: THE ACADEMY OF MODEL AERONAUTICS SAYS NO TO BPL

Back here in the United States, word that the Academy of Model Aeronautics is saying no to the introduction of Broadband Over Powerline or B-P-L technology. In Reply Comments to the FCC, the 175,000 member aviation hobby group says that it is concerned that B-P-L deployment could cause harmful interference to users of Radio Controlled systems and pose a safety hazard to aeromodeling equipment and spectators.

In its filing the A-M-A says that Broadband Over Powerline holds the potential to severely interfere with radio controlled models which operate in or near the 27, 50, 72 and 75 MHz bands. All of these fall within the 1 point 7 through 80 MHz spectrum where the FCC proposes to permit B-P-L to operate.

To the A-M-A this means that Broadband Over Powerline may not yield the benign environment the Commission expects. Also, that it could result in an unanticipated negative impact on Radio Controlled operations. And that’s what it has told the FCC. (AMA release)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the North East Oklahoma V-H-F Net serving North Eastern Oklahoma.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RADIO LAW: MARYLAND COUNTY FILES RFI CONTROL APEAL TO FCC

Still with regulatory news, the CGC Communicator reports that Anne Arundel County, Maryland has filed an Application for Review before the full Commission. This, in the hope of reversing an order by the FCC’s Wireless Telecommunications Bureau that prevents the County from entering into the radio frequency interference control business through zoning laws. Laws that could even impact on ham radio, C-B and GMRS operators.

In 2001 Anne Arundel County, Maryland, had enacted legislation requiring that, prior to receiving a County zoning certificate, owners and users of any sort of telecommunications facility had to show that their installation would not degrade or interfere with the County's public safety communications systems. The ordinance also permitted the County to revoke a zoning certificate where degradation or interference was found.

Alarmed, telecommunications providers took the ordanance to the FCC asking that it be overturned. Last July it did just that. It In considering the case, the

Commission found that the challenged provisions of the Anne Arundel County zoning Ordinance infringe on the Commission's exclusive jurisdiction over RFI and are preempted under the doctrine of field preemption. Now the county is upping the antie.

In its pleading, Anne Arundel County maintains that reversal of the Bureau's decision is required because the Order conflicts with a controlling statute of the Communications Act. The County further states that, pending implementation of the Commission's 800 MHz proceeding, the Bureau's decision leaves public safety systems of local governments such as the County's vulnerable and powerless to deal with what it terms as -- quote: " potentially deadly radio frequency interference from wireless systems of commercial mobile radio service providers operating in the 800 MHz band."

The FCC has invited comments on this matter by September 26. More is on-line at the U-R-L featured in this weeks Amateur Radio Newsline printed report.

(DO NOT READ: The complete story in the the FCC website at http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-03-2734A1.doc) (CGC)

**

RESCUE RADIO: CELL PHONE HELPS RESCUE FCC OFFICIAL

A cellular telephone has helped to rescue two men dangling in a gondola buffeted by severe winds near Aspen Colorado. One of them is the chief of the Federal Communications Commission's Wireless Bureau who turned to the phone during an ordeal where he was trapped for more than two hours. Amateur Radio Newsline's Bruce Tennant. K-6PZW, reports:

--

According to news reports John Muleta leaned on the technology he oversees when he and Robert Pepper, an adviser to FCC Chairman Michael Powell, got stuck in the gondola on Monday, August 19th. The two men had used a break in a telecommunications summit to take in the view from atop of 11,000 foot Aspen Mountain.

Their sightseeing trip turned into an ordeal when the tram service abruptly shut down during their return. It stranded Muleta and Pepper n the enclosed gondola part way down the mountain. When help was slow to arrive, Muleta used his cellular phone to call for assistance. But the local service provider provider apparently did not have the latest "enhanced" 911 technology and could not locate him precisely. So Muleta simply directed the rescue effort over the phone.

Once off the mountain Muleta told the press that he was very happy that he had remembered to carry his cellular telephone with him. He added that had he not, that it would have been a much different scenario. This, if they had been trapped all night with the weather getting getting colder.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Bruce Tennant, K6PZW, in Los Angeles.

--

Ironically, just before he left for the trip Muleta told an interviewer that the FCC is looking at ways to accelerate the deployment of Enhamced 911 service. This is the system that uses G-P-S technology to more precisely locate callers. (Published News Reports)

**

ENFORCEMENT: INTERNET SALES BRING LETTER OF INQUIREY

The FCC has sent a letter of inquirey to Randy Owen, N9UOM, of Toma Wisconsin regarding his license renewal application. The Commision is asking Owen about his apparent involvement in the sale of non-certified C-B transcievers and non-certified High Frequency amplifiers over the Internet in 2002. Owen is the owner of Roper Electronics whose website was advertising the merchandise for sale. (FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FORMER HAM WARNED NOT TO CONTACT THE FCC

A brefly licensed former ham has been told not to call the FCC and wait for it to contact him. The agency’s Daryl Duckworth, NN0W, explains:

--

(Duckworth) “Jack Gerritsen of Bell California has recieved a warnng notice about a violation of ex-patrte rules after his license had been set aside. His repeated calls to the offices of Administrative Law Judges is a violation odf the Commission’s rules against ex-parte communications. Ex-parte rules place restrictions on contacts with Commission decision making personel.”

--

Gerritsen’s license and KG6IRO call sign were set aside only days after they were issued back in November of 2001. This after the FCC learned that he had been convicted in California state court of a radio related offense. It also recieved complaints alleging that Gerritsen had been on the ham bands prior to recieving his license. (FCC, RAIN)

**

NAMS IN THE NEWS: 9M2TO WINS UKDXF AZWARD

Some names in the news. The Chiltern DX Club of the U-K DX Foundation has awarded its prestigious 'Local Heroes' Award for 2003 to Tex Izumo, 9M2TO. The club’s awards committee recognized the commitment Izumo has shown in providing many contacts and confirmations with amateurs world-wide on all bands from 160 to 6 metres over a period of many years.

This annual award goes to an operator resident in a DX country who has provided excellent service to the DX community and who maintains a high standard of operating without the benefit of major sponsorship. The award carries a cash prize and a year's honorary membership in the Chiltern DX Club. (GB2RS)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: HAM APPEARS ON TV MOTORCYCLE SPECIAL

Bob Mastrangelo, WA6ZTA, of Thousand Oaks Californis reports that he recently participated in the filming of a motorcycle special that aired August 28th on The Travel Channel. The show is called Revolution on Wheels, and Bob is seen in the beginning riding his yellow Honda Gold Wing and is interviewed about 25 minutes later. Since The Travel Channel does repeat these programs, check local listings to see when it will air again and keep an eye open for WA6ZTA. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: KB4KCH NEW VP OF ARNEWSLINE(TM)

The Board of Directors of the Amateur Radio Newsline has confirmed the appointment of David Black, KB4KCH, of Helena, Alabama, as its Vice President. Black, whom you heard earlier in this newscast will fill out the unexpired term of Roy Neal, K6DUE, who died last month following heart valve surgery.

David Black, KB4KCH, is owner First Frame Video in Birmingham, Alabama. He is also a 20-year veteran of the broadcast television industry. Prior to starting First Frame Video, David worked as a television news reporter and weather anchor at WVTM, the NBC affiliate serving Birmingham, Alabama. KB4KCH also has extensive radio and television experience while working in broadcasting in Texas.

In addition to his reporting and anchoring Amateur Radio Newsline for well over a decade, KB4KCH is active in amateur radio Skywarn and emergency communications. He is past President of the Birmingham Amateur Radio Club and is one of the founders of ALERT Alabama. This is an organization of radio amateurs specializing in Skywarn communications to assist the National Weather Service in the Birmingham area. (ARNewsline (tm))

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today’s radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

VOLUNTEERISM: HCI NEEDS VOLUNTEER SCHEDULES EDITOR

If you are a Shortwave Listener, live on the West Coast and want to edit an S-W-L newsletter, listen up. This one is for you.

Duane Fischer who heads up the Hallicrafters Collectors International needs a volunteer editor who can post the annual schedules of worldwide Shortwave radio stations. The site, located in cyberspace at www.w9wze.org/SWL contains loggings, current news, tidbits and program schedules. If you would like to become the Schedules Editor, please contact Duane as soon as possible at

dfischer@usol.com and tell him you heard about it on the Amateur Radio Newsline. (ASWLC, WDX6AA)

**

HAM RADIO IN SPACE: ARISS PACKET UPDATE

An update to last weeks story on the wayward packet radio system on board the International Space Station. Those of you who were on the air on Sunday, August 24 are aware that the packet system was re-activated around 12:00 UTC. Shortly thereafter, the ARISS team received reports from the general ham community that the packet system was operational.

Over the next 9 hours, many hams around the world sent digital signals through the packet system. But later that day, at around 21:22 U-T-C, the packet system abruptly stopped operating while traveling over the Western part of the U.S.

According to AMSAT's Frank Bauer, KA3HDO, the ARISS team has had several discussions on next steps to get the system back up and running properly. But it may be some time before this can be accomplished. This is because the debug efforts may be delayed further due to the arrival of the Progress 12P re-supply ship which will be keeping the two man crew very busy.

Once time is available, the plan is to have the crew report out on the status of the packet module and then to recycle the power. This should bring the packet system back up. If the system abruptly shuts down again after a few hours the ARISS team will then ask the crew to attach a computer to the packet module, download the current parameters to the ground and reset the module.

Stay tuned. ARISS promises to pass along word of progress as it happens. (AMSAT, ARISS)

**

INTERNATIONAL - AUSTRALIA: NEW BANDSPACE FOR VK HAMS

On the international beat, word than all-Australian radio amateurs will be allowed to operate between 3.776 and 3.800 Mhz effective from the 1st of January 2004. The move follows a proposal put to the Australian Communications Authority by the Wireless Institute of Australia several years ago. (GB2RS)

**

INTERNATIONAL - WORLDWIDE: LIGHTHOUSE WEEKEND A BIG HIT

Meantime, reports from the around the world indicate that there was allot of activity in this years International Lighthouse and Lightship Weekend operating event. Jeramy Boot, of the GB2RS News Service has the details:

--

Mike Dalrymple, GM4SUC, the organiser of the International Lighthouse / Lightship Weekend reports that a record number of stations - 369 - were established at lighthouses and lightships in 48 countries - another record -

over the weekend of the 16th and 17th of August.

The official list of participants can be found on the ILLW website. Next year the event will be on the 21 and 22nd of August 2004, and Mike invites individuals and groups to join in with a weekend of enjoying radio from a lighthouse or lightship.

Jeramy Boot, G4NJH

--

The International Lighthouse website is in cyberspace at http://illw.net. GM4SUC adds that as soon as you have your plans for participatiin in the 2004 Lighthouse Weekend made to let him know. You can contact Mike by e-mail to GM4SUC@compuserve.com (GB2RS)

**

DX

In D-X, word that IN3VZE will be active once more as 7Q7CE from Malawi through the 21st of September. QSL as directed on the air. (GB2RS)

And the K3EOD Contest Team will be active in the September VHF UHF contest September 13th to the 14th. The group consists of W3EFH, K3EGE, WR3P, W2SJ and K3EOD. They will be on all bands from 6 meters RF through visible light using SSB, CW and laser communications. For more information please e-mail k3eod@juno.com (VHF REflector)

Lastly, HL1IWD reports that he will be visiting Honolulu through the 12th of September, and will operate as KH6 stroke KB1AIM on 20 metres, mainly CW. QSL is via HL1IWD. (Modern DX)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: NO MORE USE OF THE WORD E-MAIL IN FRANCE

And finally this week, a note from France where the governmet has said goodbye to the term e-mail in favor of the native language term courriel. A word that linguistically sensitive France is now using to refer to electronic mail in all official documents and hopes that the public will adopt as well.

Frances’ Culture Ministry announced a ban on the use of e-mail in all government ministries, documents, publications or Web sites on July 18th. This, as the latest step to stem what it sees as an incursion of English words into the French language.

Courriel is a contraction of the two words and is a term that has often been used in French speaking Quebec Canada. The ministry's General Commission on Terminology and Neology insists Internet surfers in France are broadly using the term “courrier electronique'' instead of e-mail - a claim some industry experts dispute.

And we thought that you would like to know! (Published reports)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Jeff Clark, K8JAC, Im Jim Meachen, ZL2BHF, saying 73 and we thank you for listening."
Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

3129. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 11:22:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030906072230.05539.00000594@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 76544

In article <r2iilv0ovu97nehjbcn9hpnte7is1p43nn@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
<bbrock@i-america.net> writes:

>On 5 Sep 2003 10:57:03 -0700, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:<vi4hlv4p8a8lvp8p3p059191vae1pfh7dq@4ax.com>...
>>> On 05 Sep 2003 11:19:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>>
>>> >In article <j62glvk4duionbd52uc7igls30dnv6mc4m@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
>>> ><bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>>> >
>>> >>On 05 Sep 2003 03:41:16 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>
>Snipped much agreement only to save badwidth...
>>
>>We could have all better written exams and different performance tests
>>without it costing FCC anything. But it goes against the fashion. And
>>the "Smith chart effect" opposition would kick in, guaranteed.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Gosh, I didn't think I'd find anyone here that I was pretty close to
>agreement with. You seem to be the exception instead of the rule.

Well, there you have it.

>My feeling is that, unless this endless code debate ends sometime, ham
>radio cannot move on in the testing area. I'd like to see a person
>actually have to operate a radio in the band they are being licensed
>for before they can take off by themselves. It could even be their
>own radio.

That works for me!

>I think that they should know what all those nifty buttons
>actually do.

That's a problem, because many rigs have so many features and menus that almost
nobody knows *all* of them. But if you're talking about basic operation and
operating practice, there's no reason it couldn't be done.

>They should know how to enter into a conversation. A
>list of "critical tasks" and "non-critical tasks" should be developed
>and a person not be licensed until they can actually show competence
>in those tasks. Those are the types of issues that I'd like to see

>the ham community discussing rather than the endless code/no-code
>debate that detracts from everything else.

Actually, this very idea was discussed here over 5 years ago. Here's what I proposed:

(BEGIN QUOTE):

It seems to me that just dropping the code test would remove the last vestige of skills testing from the licensing process. Perhaps the code test should be replaced by a real practical operating test.

Such a test could work like this:

Two typical ham rigs are set up so that the operators of each one cannot see or hear each other. The rigs are connected to dummy loads which are located adjacent to each other. (The idea is to permit a "contact" from one rig to the other, without putting much of a signal on the air). The testee and a VE sit at one rig, and another VE sits at the other. The testee is given a sealed envelope and a few minutes to get familiar with the operation of the rig. (The operating instructions for the rig would be available at any time).

When the actual test begins, the testee opens the sealed envelope and a timer is started. Inside the envelope are a set of instructions telling the testee to go to a specific frequency and call the VE at the other rig, make contact, and send the enclosed formal message. The VE at the other end has a similar sealed envelope, but with a different message, which is to be received by the testee.

The idea is to test the actual radio operating skills of the testee under controlled conditions. There would be a time limit, too. (That's what the timer is for). The testee would have the choice of CW, voice or a digital mode for the test.

Time limits and exact instructions would vary with the mode and the class of license being tested. Higher class tests could have shorter time limits, longer messages, and more complicated instructions, such as having to change frequency at a certain point in the contact, having to pick the frequency from a list that includes "wrong choices", etc.

Scoring would be on the basis of mistakes. If a word in the messages is missing or misspelled, that's a mistake. If nonstandard procedure or phonetics are used, each deviation is a mistake. If the time limit is exceeded, each minute over the limit is a mistake. Exceed a certain number of mistakes and the test is failed. Asking for a repeat of a missed word would NOT be a mistake.

Typical exams (but not the exact exams themselves) would be available as study guides. Audiotapes of typical tests could be used for study as well.

Yes, it's a bit more complex than a straight code receiving test, and requires some equipment and two VEs to conduct it. (Perhaps the VE at the testee's position isn't really needed). But it could be done quite easily, and in such a way as to test real operating skills. The rigs used need not have lots of features, and QRP power levels would be more than adequate. Or a "rig simulator" that's really a gussied-up intercom could be used.

Is there any real reason such testing could not be done? Is it expecting too much that a prospective ham be able to pass such a test? I think not!

(END QUOTE)

That description was part of a longer post from June 19, 1998. For the original, see:

http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=1998061910321401.GAA21892%40ladder03.news.aol.com&output=gplain

Note that one of the features of the test is that the person being tested gets to choose the mode used. Those who like Morse best can be tested using that mode, etc.

I reposted the idea a few times but always got the same response from the nocodetest folks: Opposition to the idea of ANY form of practical skills test.

>All of the name calling and false accusations from both sides makes us
>look silly to those who read it.

That's true.

>I'm really glad that it will be ending soon.

You know something we don't? FCC has been extremely slow in acting on various proposals over the past few years. The 2000 restructuring took almost two years, start-to-finish.

Frankly, given the FCC's words in the Report and Order to 98-143 (the restructuring), I'm surprised that Element 1 is still in place. FCC said there was "no regulatory purpose" for code testing *except* meeting the treaty requirement. Treaty requirement is gone. Based on its own logic, FCC now has no reason at all to keep Element 1. Yet they are going through the whole NPRM cycle again. Why? Could it be they have changed their minds?

However the issue is decided, I doubt that all of the name calling and false accusations will stop. You should see some of the names I've been called for daring to disagree with some folks, and for pointing out their mistakes in fact, logic and math.

> Perhaps then, we can move on to more important issues.

Maybe - but given the resistance to my idea of 5+ years ago, I doubt it.
>
>I'm sure that not everyone will agree with performance based testing
>in addition to a written test.

That's an understatement. Google up the responses I got from the above post. Some of 'em aren't pretty.

>However, perhaps a consensus could be reached.

Even if that happens, the FCC then has to be sold on the idea.

--

So what *is* your purpose here, Bob?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3130. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 11:41:21 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <BJj6b.37887$Vx2.16941394@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76545

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:7qdhlvkh2c2ca8k005gbk8kg1pm7pmlr2d@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 05 Sep 2003 10:36:57 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
> >Bob Brock wrote:
> >
> >> I didn't say that I boycotted any ham. I said that I boycotted a
> >> licensing structure that I disagreed with. I'll QSO with any ham on
> >> any band that we are both licensed to operate on. I even learned
> >> code, but I won't upgrade until the requirement that I disagree with
> >> is removed.
> >
> > Not very interested in Ham radio eh?
>
> Where did I say that Mike. Do you always have this much trouble with
> facts?

However refusing to upgrade shows that your hate for code exceeds your love
of ham radio. While it's your choice, it seems pretty silly to me.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3131. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 11:54:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <CVj6b.37889$Vx2.16943181@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76546

"Jack Twilley" <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:86y8x224m8.fsf@duchess.twilley.org...

>I agree with you on this. Hopefully by next Field Day I'll be able to
>participate with CW, but I am concerned that my straight-key efforts
>will be wasted on the memory keyers out there. Bah.

No, it will be just fine. I still use a straight key.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3132. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 12:04:16 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <43k6b.37891$Vx2.16944633@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76547

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:7bmilv4hk4tquftqtqe9hv2ldnmjs23529@4ax.com...
> On 05 Sep 2003 16:52:32 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>
> >>They did it a few decades ago when they took 11 meters from the hams
> >>since they didn't use it.
> >
> >Youi missed the operative word "NEW CB HAM BANDS"
>
> Well, since CB never required a test, I'd have to say that your
> question makes no sense to me. If you are referring to MURS, FRS, and
> GMRS, they aren't in the ham bands. Are you proposing testing and
> incusion of those frquencies into the ham bands?
>

Once upon a time CB didn't even exist and 11 meters was allocated to the
Amateur Radio Service.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3133. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 12:08:42 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <e7k6b.37892$Vx2.16945409@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76548

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:1qqilvkqcad3h4706mijluqduucofb8i97@4ax.com...
> BTW, here is why I learned Morse. Ironic isn't it?
>
>
<http://www.google.com/groups?q=code+group:rec.radio.amateur.policy+author:b
ob+author:brock&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&as_drrb=b&as_mind=12&as_minm=5&a
s_miny=1981&as_maxd=5&as_maxm=9&as_maxy=2001&selm=34c35790.2985325%40news.hi
s.com&rnum=2>
>
> Over the last couple of years, I have made a few posts about my
> feelings that code should not be a requirement for access to HF
> frequencies. While I have not changed my mind on that position, I do
> have a question/request from the pro-coders in the NG.
>
> Recently an amature radio operator in my area was operated on for a
> growth in his throat. The operation left him without a voice and he
> has been using Morse Code on one of the local repeaters at about 5
> WPM. Because of this, I now want to learn code so that I can
> understand what he is saying.
>
> So, would any of you pro-coders like to help a no-code tech upgrade?
> I have to warn you in advance that, even after I learn the code, I
> will still not support code testing as a requirement for HF access.
> This is a personal decison that I am making because I want to do all
> that I can to accomadate another person who wants to use amature radio
> and this is the only way that he can do it.

Ok, here you've said you already know code but now want to learn code. This
is very confusing.

I would be more than happy to help anyone upgrade but no one has ever taken
me up on the offer.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3134. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 13:19:21 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030906091921.14837.00002768@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 76549

In article <Qe96b.37823$Vx2.16851173@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Both the pool AND answers are published.

And how do we convince FCC to change that?
>
>Let's take a typical question:
>
>What is the length of a dipole for 14.240Mhz?

I assume you mean "half wave"...

What kind of half wave dipole? Made of wire or tubing? Of uniform thickness or tapering? In free space or near other objects?

The answer depends on a bunch of things!
>
>Now since the questions AND answers are published, the prospective test
>taker can simply memorize the numerical answer instead of having to learn
>the appropriate equation and how to use that equation. Using the memorize
>the numerical answer approach, the new ham has passed the test but is unable
>to calculate the dipole that he/she may actually want to build for operating
>
Exactly!

Now suppose we rewrite the question to:

"What is the formula for computing the length of a half-wave dipole for 14.240 MHz, if the dipole is made of #10 wire and is in free space?"

The person being tested then memorizes the formula from the choices in the pool but doesn't necessarily know how to use it. Same problem.

For another example, knowing that E = IR and P = EI doesn't guarantee that someone will have the sense to realize that they should not try to use 50 feet of #18 zip cord to connect a 100 watt transceiver to its 13.8 volt power supply.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3135. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 13:19:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030906091922.14837.00002769@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 76550

In article <9bnilv8q3omrvq3impcbgpbv65dpddjhbu@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
<bbrock@i-america.net> writes:

>I'm
>here to see if the ham community will then move on to something really
>important like revising the written tests and the test pools so that
>when someone passes the test, they actually know how to use a radio,
>set up or build an antenna, the protocols on the frequencies they are
>authouized to use, how to minimize RF exposure and stay within safe
>levels.

The test pools are under constant revision. Anyone can submit proposed Q&A to
the QPC for consideration.

> If someone doesn't know what all those buttons do on their
>radio, they shouldn't be licensed to use it.

Then we'd need rig-specific licenses.

And what would you do about homebrew rigs like mine?

>If they don't know
>enough not to use repeater imputs for simplex operation, they
>shouldn't be licensed to use the frequency.

Now that makes sense! But such things are already addressed in the question
pools.

The problem is that what needs to change is the test methodology. By lumping
all of the subjects into a one-size-fits-all written test, prospective hams can
have huge holes in their knowledge and still pass because of strenghts in other
areas. One answer to that is subelements.

The big problem is convincing FCC that testing at such a level is needed. For
more than 25 years, FCC's view towards amateur radio testing is to reduce the
license requirements and make the licenses easier to get, not harder. That's
one of the reasons some folks defend the code test so diligently - they know
that if it goes, it will not be replaced by any other test, nor will the test
methods used for the written be improved.
>
>It's my hope that when it is all over with Morse, that the ham
>community will address the real important issues and Morse ain't it.

Morse will continue to be a major part of amateur radio with or without a test.
The test, however, is symbolic of the changes that have been ongoing for a long
time.

>It is at best a scapegoat that hams can argue about while the more
>important issues of licensing inept operators is ignored. IMO, the
>ham community has some really screwed up priorities and hopefully,
>with the endgame for code in sight, they may....just may come to grips
>with some real issues.
>
>I'm hopeful, but not expectant.
>
I think you will find that the exact same problems will arise in connection with any move to increase license requirements. The "Smith chart solution" post in another thread is only half in jest.

There are already folks like W5YI campaigning for less WRITTEN testing, saying the Tech test is too hard.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3136. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 13:19:23 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030906091923.14837.00002770@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 76551

In article <kikilv41ljggh172fuq727u3geep324s45@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
<bbrock@i-america.net> writes:

> I weighed the benefit of HF against conforming
>with a requirement that I didn't agree with. I felt that by
>participating I was helping it to continue.

How is participating in the test helping the requirement to continue?

>There are a lot of hoops
>that I would be willing to jump through to get HF privileges. Code
>isn't one of them.

To each his own.
>
>Call it a matter of personal ethics. Upgrading would have been the
>easy way out.

Or consider this:

Which do you think is more convincing to FCC as a reason to remove Element 1:

- The person who says "I won't upgrade until that test is removed"

or

- The person who says "I took the test, passed it, yet I think there is no
reason for that test to exist any more."

73 de Jim, N2EY

3137. Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 13:35:54 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <b71720b321f483edfb53ce7de21e4078.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 76552

Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925 new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only 2.3%.

Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3138. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 13:53:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F59E710.50805@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76553

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message

<some snippage>

>>So, would any of you pro-coders like to help a no-code tech upgrade?
>>I have to warn you in advance that, even after I learn the code, I
>>will still not support code testing as a requirement for HF access.
>>This is a personal decison that I am making because I want to do all
>>that I can to accomadate another person who wants to use amature radio
>>and this is the only way that he can do it.
>
>
> Ok, here you've said you already know code but now want to learn code. This
> is very confusing.

Hey Dee

(church lady voice here)

Why.... could it be.....a TROLL?

(church lady voice off)

You have to admit, its a great way to get a response out of a lot of
people - for a while at least. Just disagree with most everybody, and
don't forget to change the story whenver possible.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3139. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 14:03:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309060603.61c24c5b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76554

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj8orn$ku1$0@208.207.71.136>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj7vj6jsp0@208.207.71.151>...

> > > So by your logic I should have, as a VE, boycotted administering no-code Tech tests?
> > >
> > DICK, you did. You turned in your VE badge and credentials because
> > you were upset with the No-Code license.
>
> You really can't get *anything* correct can you? I turned in nothing!

So you're still a VE?

> I closed down my VE teram in early '94

So you're not a VE?

Sheesh! Try to separate your contradictory statements by at least a
few sentences so that people won't get the idea that you're lying
about something.

> after we licensed so many other hams who started up their own teans in the region that we
had very little
> business remaining.

Ah, so you were put out of business by the competition. You've never
revealed this before.

> At the outset we had the only team in a hundred mile radius.

No doubt you were the Big Man at that time.

I *did* remark after the last
> restructuring that I didn't ntend to participate as a VE after that debacle.

Yes, you DID, DICK.

Vindication at last, and by your own post. No need to Google up
anything - your own arrogance will hang you.

But you said more than "I didn't ntend [sic} to participate."

You said that you were disgusted by the NO-Code Technicians that were
testing. They weren't worth your efforts.

So far I haven't, and haven't
> needed to.

Wunnerful. Maybe the new VE's don't make their clients feel unworthy.

> Get your facts straignt and MAYBE you won't be so prone to spread falsehoods.

Hey, I have only used your own words, DICK. Are they not facts?

3140. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 14:23:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309060623.3d291580@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76555

S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<elrflv4h98fu0mq5nqeivn0851u9bn2oe4@4ax.com>...
> On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 10:00:13 -0400, Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
> wrote:
>
>
> >Why would you want to foil computer copy?
>
> Because no law says you can't.
>
> >For you to do the test to
> >make sure that it works and then advocate it's use, you can't really
> >say that wasn't your intention.
>
> What if it was? Nothing you can do about it but learn the code.

Oh, geez. Here's another Morse Elitist that apparently advocates
sending code so piss poorly that it can't be computer copied. Hoo-ah!

3141. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 14:24:53 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <V6m6b.3673$7n3.1352@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76556

"K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:b71720b321f483edfb53ce7de21e4078.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
> new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
> guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> 2.3%.
>
> Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Drop the no-code provision of the Tech license, obviously.

With a 97.7% failure rate, I'd say the new policy is a real loser. - We better drop it fast and return to what worked better in the past.

I predicted something like this, but not to such a degree, when so many of the new no-code techs showed a generalized disrespect for the PART97 regs and the traditions of amateur radio. It was obvious that many of them did not care at all about the hobby. - They just wanted to know what they could get out it, what they could get away with. Many of them spent more time bashing the hobby than anything else. As you have noted, almost none of them went on to progress and advance themselves as hams.

Personally, I think we will be much better off without most of those "hams", and that we should avoid policies that increase membership in this way in the future. We should do as we did in the past, emphasizing quality, not quantity of our membership.

According to your figures Hans, the no-code tech deal did the hobby more harm than good.

Charles, N5PVL

3142. Re: Bad reception at my house (was Re: Farnsworth spacing)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 14:30:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309060630.7ec6ba83@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76557

Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:<86r82u208u.fsf_-_@duchess.twilley.org>...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> >>>>> "Dick" == Dick Carroll; <dixie@townsqr.com> writes:
>
> Jack> I've said it before, but perhaps not in this location: my
> Jack> current location does not permit reception of HF signals. I
> Jack> have tried for months with multiple antenna setups and have not
> Jack> been successful.
>
> Dick> Where the heck are you, Jack? I've received HF from many
> Dick> locations, about everywhere I've ever been and tried it. Is it
> Dick> an radio noise environment problem or what? Unless you live in
> Dick> the middle of one of the BPL tryout area I can't imagine not
> Dick> being able to receive W1AW on one of the bands..
>
> I'm in grid square CM88wa, between two very large hills which run for
> several miles in a roughly north-south direction. My backyard is
> twenty-five feet wide by nine feet deep and it is partially shared
> with neighboring units. For political reasons, antennas have to be as
> invisible as possible, so the highest I can get is six feet off the
> ground and six feet from the house. I was able to construct a dipole
> with twelve-foot legs, but I couldn't even get WWV, let alone an
> amateur station. In addition, the electrical noise gives me a noise
> floor of S7 -- some of which is my fault, as I've got six computers
> running at any given time. Sometime this weekend I should make a
> recording of what I hear on the bands so people can understand that
> reception truly sucks at my house.
>
> Dick> Dick
>
> Jack.

Jack, you must understand something. DICK has been in every
situation, probably including your own. If DICK says he's able to
receive HF everywhere he's -tried-, he implies that you aren't trying
hard enough. In the end, it comes down to CW always getting through.
You're using CW, right?

3143. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 14:31:17 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjcr4v$ud3@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 76559

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:gejilvo4f6tm1pd1e3t7p62tjc9l3u3pmo@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 20:30:30 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
> >
> >You're right, Dee. That's the point I try to make...I rote memorized for
> >the test. Now, the argument for the above scenario could also be made
that
> >the instrukshions can be looked up. I've built quite a few antennas.
All
> >of them I used instrukshions for; and they all worked great.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> What would be wrong with requiring them to build a quarter wave dipole
> that is resonate at a specified frequency as part of the test? That
> is, if the test were changed to be written and performance based.
>

There's nothing at all wrong with having some part of the test be based on
something related to performance--other than CW; comment on that in a
moment--if there could be a generally agreed upon topic. I think
establishing something like a digital station would be more appropriate than
building an antenna, because I think what should be tested is something
everyone will do at one point or another. While not everyone may dabble in
digital, APRS, SSTV, or whatever, everyone will have to establish a radio
set up at some point or another. The best would be a sucessful mobile
installation, but doing testing outside just wouldn't be feasible.

On your latter comment, be careful how you word things in this debate: the
test is performance based right now. It baseed on one's ability to
understand CW, and that is performance.

Kim W5TIT

3144. Re: So much for High Tech!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 14:32:58 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309060632.1283121a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76558

Radioman <radio@ptt.edu> wrote in message news:<3F58A403.5D9AA52E@ptt.edu>...
> > I think that he misses the good ole days when messages were delivered
> > by the Pony Express. Back then, you didn't have to worry about
> > traffic jams.
>
>
> You just had to watch your step.

Not DICK. He's very adept with a shovel.

3145. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 14:37:25 UTC
From: Hans Kohb <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <9c4988e16225e423b3bfddae4537c98f.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 76560

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote

> ..... so many of the new no-code techs showed a
> generalized disrespect for the PART97 regs
> and the traditions of amateur radio.

Pure unadulterated bullshit, old biker! Try a different lure when you
troll, because nobody is gonna bite on this one!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3146. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 14:43:32 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjcrru$8h2@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 76561

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:pijilvscl419fdu99637sucn55794r8gcc@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 19:41:34 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
> >"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> >news:je5hlv4nak5tfn1mt0q6lrn30m7rtj5ojk@4ax.com...
> >> On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 06:58:06 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> >> >news:tnvflv0qkdrojl53j9ev5j80q885tjve7q@4ax.com...
> >> >> On 05 Sep 2003 02:58:33 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> >> >>
> >> >> >>No, the writen exams have a basis in the real world.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >And what Value is that? The present writtens dont test for
knowledge
> >> >>
> >> >> Then what do you think that they test for?
> >> >
> >> >Whether someone can remember correct answers to known questions.
> >>
> >> Provided that the questions cover the things that you want the person
> >> to know, this isn't an issue.
> >>
> >
> >I think it is because retention of the material is minimal when rote
> >memorizing for a test. I couldn't tell you anything that was on the
tests I
> >took--because the material was not learned, it was memorized. No
examples
> >of application, no scenarios for cause and affect, etc.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
> So, instead of the continual code/no-code debate, why aren't these
> issues discussed here?
>

To use Hans' spelling: for crying out phucking loud, Bob. Either you
literally have just decided to pop in and don't read any other time; or you
really are just trolling. This newsgroup runs several, *several* topics at
any given time. You can choose whatever ones you would like and even create

your own. But, you aren't going to change the debate on CW and no one ever will. I just laughed hysterically at another post of yours, where you said, "thank goodness it will all be ending soon." That's ludicrous. You're either young or blissful if you think the CW debate is going to end or go away.

> If the test pool questions are such that the
> requred areas of knowledge aren't addressed, changing those questions
> (or perhaps the testing itself) would be an outstanding subject to be
> discussed here. However, it's not usually discussed because all
> threads lead to the code thing.
>

So? Go find somewhere else to join in. Because if your motivation is to change the cycles that happen here; you may as well give up. Right now, the vociferous CW threads and the thread about my callsign? They happen every time at this time of year. Larry usually brings up the "extinction" debate shortly before the holidays and it ends sometime around Feb-Mar. Hans is returning to the newsgroup after a season of fishing; so you'll see more frequent posts from Brian Kelley (haven't figured that one out yet) and more frequent posts on other topics such as kit building, antenna efficiency, ARRL--good and bad, and all kinds of other subjects. Then, when everyone who has a life in the Spring and Summer months mostly disappears from the newsgroup, you'll see the people here who are always here--and you'll see that those people are mostly those who just plain don't like each other and snipe at all times of year. I've come to enjoy it and have decided to use the newsgroup as training ground for communication methodologies that I use in my employment. Works great--except when I allow myself to go off on some childish throe of insults and derivation into la-la land which, for me, is a great distraction! I have to be pretty darned "professional" during the day and getting down to another level sure is great fun!

> I have my own view on the code issue and it's not going to change
> anymore than anyone else is going to change theirs. Our minds are
> made up. However, I think that people on both sides of that
> particular issue see areas where they would agree that the actual
> testing needs change.
>

And that debate has been had and made many times here; and it's coming up again--Winter is coming.

Kim W5TIT

3147. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 14:46:31 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjcs1h$91t@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 76562

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:rbkilvoc2n1catkhl2a9llld2246fd1po5@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 19:46:51 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
>
> > >> OK Kim, show me where I said that I would boycott someone because of
> > >> their code status and I'll get back with you. If you can't quote me
> > >> saying that, who made the jump in logic will be apparent.
> > >>
> > >> The ball is in your court.
> > >>
> > >
> > >Hold up there, Bob Brock. SHOW ME where anyone has said you would
"boycott
> > >someone because of their code status." No one has said a word about you
> > >doing that. YOU copped the attitude with the return of Jim's answer to
you
> > >and my remarks. No where in the above material has Jim or I said a word
> > >about you boycotting anything. HOWEVER, in your earnest desire to be the
> > >victim, you missed that all Jim or I have done is answer your question,
with
> > >nothing but sideline remarks back and forth to each other on the topic.
> > >
> > >I don't know what ball you've served to my court--I am not playing on a
> > >court, I am submitting remarks to a discussion.
> > >
> > >Kim W5TIT
> > >
>
> From elsewhere in the thread...
>
> [I said]
>
> > Show me where I said that anyone proposed it and I'll consider
> > documenting it. I'm not in the habit of trying to document things
> > that I never said and I won't start with you.
>
> [Dick Carroll said]
>
> Yep. Another one of "them". He proposed it but he didn't propose it.
>
> ---------------------------------------
> I admit that you may not agree with the above accusation. If so, say

> so now and I'll apologize.
>

Nope, I don't. But for goodness sake, don't apologize. Good grief. You've nothing to be apologetic about--'least not the way I see it.

And, for goodness sake again--don't *even* be affected by anything Dick Carroll, Waddles (WA8ULX or whatever), Larry Roll or even Dave Heil says. They're humorous, at best. They all remind me of drunken old rambling men.

Kim W5TIT

3148. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 14:52:07 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjcsc1$68l@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 76563

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:9bnilv8q3omrvq3impcbgpbv65dpddjhbu@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 20:21:53 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
> >"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> >news:h9ghlv49at0akiluoaqm6f72pf2skiah5v@4ax.com...
> >>
> >> I'll tell you guys why I'm here shortly, but conversing with twits
> >> like you sure isn't it.
> >>
> >
> >Oh!! Hold me back!! Now he's getting suspenseful!
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> OK Kim, I'll keep you in suspense no more. Whether some like to admit
> it or not, the senseless Morse Code debate will soon be history. I'm
> here to see if the ham community will then move on to something really
> important like revising the written tests and the test pools so that
> when someone passes the test, they actually know how to use a radio,
> set up or build an antenna, the protocols on the frequencies they are
> authouized to use, how to minimize RF exposure and stay within safe
> levels. If someone doesn't know what all those buttons do on their
> radio, they shouldn't be licensed to use it. If they don't know
> enough not to use repeater imputs for simplex operation, they
> shouldn't be licensed to use the frequency.
>
> It's my hope that when it is all over with Morse, that the ham
> community will address the real important issues and Morse ain't it.
> It is at best a scapegoat that hams can argue about while the more
> important issues of licensing inept operators is ignored. IMO, the
> ham community has some really screwed up priorities and hopefully,
> with the endgame for code in sight, they may....just may come to grips
> with some real issues.
>
> I'm hopeful, but not expectant.
>

This newsgroup is not the place to find intellectual, even-handed debate,
Bob. You're way off base with your concept if you think it is. It just
isn't. QRZ, eHam.net, or others maybe, but not this one...

And, lose the idea that the CW thing is going to die--it's not. If you are
that serious about wanting to change the wheel, then get involved heavily in

the ARRL and W5YI. Use those venues to affect change; but you'd better be willing to take giant baby steps at a time--and I don't think you're that serious. That's not an insult--few people have the fortitude, time, and stamina it takes to turn a wheel. I tried for four years--and most of my free time. Didn't work. Giant baby steps=hugely small steps at a time.

Kim W5TIT

3149. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 14:58:03 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjcsn5$fl2@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 76564

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030906091921.14837.00002768@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <Qe96b.37823$Vx2.16851173@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >Both the pool AND answers are published.
>
> And how do we convince FCC to change that?
> >
> >Let's take a typical question:
> >
> >What is the length of a dipole for 14.240Mhz?
>
> I assume you mean "half wave"...
>
> What kind of half wave dipole? Made of wire or tubing? Of uniform
thickness or
> tapering? In free space or near other objects?
>
> The answer depends on a bunch of things!
> >
> >Now since the questions AND answers are published, the prospective test
> >taker can simply memorize the numerical answer instead of having to learn
> >the appropriate equation and how to use that equation. Using the
memorize
> >the numerical answer approach, the new ham has passed the test but is
unable
> >to calculate the dipole that he/she may actually want to build for
operating
> >
> Exactly!
>
> Now suppose we rewrite the question to:
>
> "What is the formula for computing the length of a half-wave dipole for
14.240
> MHz, if the dipole is made of #10 wire and is in free space?"
>
> The person being tested then memorizes the formula from the choices in the
pool
> but doesn't necessarily know how to use it. Same problem.
>
> For another example, knowing that E = IR and P = EI doesn't guarantee that
> someone will have the sense to realize that they should not try to use 50

feet
> of #18 zip cord to connect a 100 watt transceiver to its 13.8 volt power
> supply.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Thank you. Exactly!

Kim W5TIT

3150. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 15:01:22 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjcstc$50s@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 76565

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309060603.61c24c5b@posting.google.com...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj8orn$ku1$0@208.207.71.136>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj7vj6jsp0@208.207.71.151>...
>
> > > > So by your logic I should have, as a VE, boycotted administering
no-code Tech tests?
> > >
> > > DICK, you did. You turned in your VE badge and credentials because
> > > you were upset with the No-Code license.
> >
> > You really can't get *anything* correct can you? I turned in nothing!
>
> So you're still a VE?
>
> > I closed down my VE teram in early '94
>
> So you're not a VE?
>
> Sheesh! Try to separate your contradictory statements by at least a
> few sentences so that people won't get the idea that you're lying
> about something.
>
> > after we licensed so many other hams who started up their own teans in
the region that we had very little
> > business remaining.
>
> Ah, so you were put out of business by the competition. You've never
> revealed this before.
>
> > At the outset we had the only team in a hundred mile radius.
>
> No doubt you were the Big Man at that time.
>
> I *did* remark after the last
> > restructuring that I didn't ntend to participate as a VE after that
debacle.
>
> Yes, you DID, DICK.
>

> Vindication at last, and by your own post. No need to Google up
> anything - your own arrogance will hang you.
>
> But you said more than "I didn't ntend [sic} to participate."
>
> You said that you were disgusted by the NO-Code Technicians that were
> testing. They weren't worth your efforts.
>
> So far I haven't, and haven't
> > needed to.
>
> Wunnerful. Maybe the new VE's don't make their clients feel unworthy.
>
> > Get your facts straignt and MAYBE you won't be so prone to spread
falsehoods.
>
> Hey, I have only used your own words, DICK. Are they not facts?

ROFLMAO!!!! He's so confused...

Kim W5TIT

3151. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 15:07:53 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjct9j$q01@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 76566

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:V6m6b.3673$7n3.1352@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:b71720b321f483edfb53ce7de21e4078.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
> > new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
> > guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> > not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> > the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> > 2.3%.
> >
> > Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> Drop the no-code provision of the Tech license, obviously.
>
> With a 97.7% failure rate, I'd say the new policy is a real loser. - We
> better drop it fast and return to what worked better in the past.
>
> I predicted something like this, but not to such a degree, when so many of
> the new no-code techs showed a generalized disrespect for the PART97 regs
> and the traditions of amateur radio. It was obvious that many of them did
> not care at all about the hobby. - They just wanted to know what they
could
> get out it, what they could get away with. Many of them spent more time
> bashing the hobby than anything else. As you have noted, almost none of
them
> went on to progress and advance themselves as hams.
>
> Personally, I think we will be much better off without most of those
"hams",
> and that we should avoid policies that increase membership in this way in
> the future. We should do as we did in the past, emphasizing quality, not
> quantity of our membership.
>
> According to your figures Hans, the no-code tech deal did the hobby more
> harm than good.
>
> Charles, N5PVL
>
>

Sigh. How 'bout this: ever consider that a lot of CBers did, indeed, hear of the new requirements (lower CW testing standards) and decide to get into ham radio for....guess what: FM!!!!!???? When I was "into" CB radio, I was barely ever on AM. There's a whole "other" gang of participants out there on CB--and the mentors of that group are mostly hams. The USB/LSB and, alas, FM--yes, illegal but done--part of CB is an area where you'll find people who are courteous, have "gentlemen's" rules that are followed; where people experiment with antenna design and construction; where an "eyeball" meeting is just as likely; etc.

When I was drawn to and got my ticket, you know what the greatest relief was? Being able to turn a radio on and not hear all that hissing, heterodyning, etc.!!! FM is great and that is what I like most about ham radio. HF sucks for all the noise. So, no need/interest to upgrade. And, everyone else was as relieved and impressed with FM also. Listening to HF brings back those days when we had to deal with all that noise. And, it's not a pretty memory.

Kim W5TIT

3152. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 15:19:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F59FB6A.3080609@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76567

charlesb wrote:
> "K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:b71720b321f483edfb53ce7de21e4078.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
>
>>Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
>>new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
>>guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
>>not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
>>the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
>>2.3%.
>>
>>Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?
>>
>>73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
> Drop the no-code provision of the Tech license, obviously.

You raise an interesting point Charles. To test the thesis, it would be nice to have a comparison with the numbers of General and above licensees from the same period.

With the Technician license being so easy to get, many will take the test to become a tech as a passing whiiim or fancy. By the time their license is up for renewal, they are on to something else.

> With a 97.7% failure rate, I'd say the new policy is a real loser. - We
> better drop it fast and return to what worked better in the past.
>
> I predicted something like this, but not to such a degree, when so many of
> the new no-code techs showed a generalized disrespect for the PART97 regs
> and the traditions of amateur radio. It was obvious that many of them did
> not care at all about the hobby. - They just wanted to know what they could
> get out it, what they could get away with. Many of them spent more time
> bashing the hobby than anything else. As you have noted, almost none of them
> went on to progress and advance themselves as hams.
>
> Personally, I think we will be much better off without most of those "hams",
> and that we should avoid policies that increase membership in this way in
> the future. We should do as we did in the past, emphasizing quality, not
> quantity of our membership.
>
> According to your figures Hans, the no-code tech deal did the hobby more
> harm than good.

There are a couple thoughts here.

"Who cares about the retention rate? It's a free country."

Well, how would you like to be a VE, giving up your time and effort on weekends, only to have almost all that work be fro naught? I would not want to do this task unless I thought that most of the students were going to continue.

"We gotta have those numbers".

Your post points out the not-so-subtle difference between quality and quantity. I'll take a good dedicated ham any day over someone who just gets their license on a lark.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3153. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 15:33:04 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <nfvjlvsdp3u5iul7t558lrq79irlqtedh9@4ax.com>
Source record: 76568

On Sat, 06 Sep 2003 12:08:42 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

>
>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:1qqilvkqcad3h4706mijluqduucofb8i97@4ax.com...
>> BTW, here is why I learned Morse. Ironic isn't it?
>>
>>
><http://www.google.com/groups?q=code+group:rec.radio.amateur.policy+author:b
>ob+author:brock&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&as_drrb=b&as_mind=12&as_minm=5&a
>s_miny=1981&as_maxd=5&as_maxm=9&as_maxy=2001&selm=34c35790.2985325%40news.hi
>s.com&rnum=2>
>>
>> Over the last couple of years, I have made a few posts about my
>> feelings that code should not be a requirement for access to HF
>> frequencies. While I have not changed my mind on that position, I do
>> have a question/request from the pro-coders in the NG.
>>
>> Recently an amature radio operator in my area was operated on for a
>> growth in his throat. The operation left him without a voice and he
>> has been using Morse Code on one of the local repeaters at about 5
>> WPM. Because of this, I now want to learn code so that I can
>> understand what he is saying.
>>
>> So, would any of you pro-coders like to help a no-code tech upgrade?
>> I have to warn you in advance that, even after I learn the code, I
>> will still not support code testing as a requirement for HF access.
>> This is a personal decison that I am making because I want to do all
>> that I can to accomadate another person who wants to use amature radio
>> and this is the only way that he can do it.
>
>Ok, here you've said you already know code but now want to learn code. This
>is very confusing.
>
>I would be more than happy to help anyone upgrade but no one has ever taken
>me up on the offer.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

If you had looked at the google link, you would have seen that was a
copy of a post from about 6 years ago. You're a little late.

3154. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 15:33:42 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <ohvjlvs6piivc0m2a0d1g096jf0d4mglf4@4ax.com>
Source record: 76569

On Sat, 06 Sep 2003 13:53:04 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
wrote:

>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>> "Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>
>
><some snippage>
>
>
>>>So, would any of you pro-coders like to help a no-code tech upgrade?
>>>I have to warn you in advance that, even after I learn the code, I
>>>will still not support code testing as a requirement for HF access.
>>>This is a personal decison that I am making because I want to do all
>>>that I can to accomadate another person who wants to use amature radio
>>>and this is the only way that he can do it.
>>
>>
>> Ok, here you've said you already know code but now want to learn code. This
>> is very confusing.
>
>
>Hey Dee
>
>
>(church lady voice here)
>
> Why.... could it be........a TROLL?
>
> (church lady voice off)
>
>You have to admit, its a great way to get a response out of a lot of
>people - for a while at least. Just disagree with most everybody, and
>don't forget to change the story whenver possible.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Damn, a pair so dummies when I don't have anyone to paly cards with.

3155. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 15:41:33 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjcv8o$34h@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 76570

"K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:b5c5ed7b6c2b3526cacde7b8cc34c5ec.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Kim W5TIT" <fahgedit@nomail.net> wrote .
>
> > Anyone who would forsake any communication venue
> > just doesn't have a clue for the value of that venue...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> Does this mean the fact that you forsake the Morse code communications
> venue indicates that you "just don't have a clue for the value of that
> venue"? (Your words, not mine.)
>
> Sunuvagun!
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>

I just discovered this post, Hans. You have a better capability of understanding than what is demonstrated above. I do not, and never have forsaked CW communication. Perhaps you can give me an idea as to how I caused you to think that?

And, please don't get confused with the *testing* requirement, which I don't like; and that I don't like using it. Just because someone doesn't see its merit as a testing element and just because I don't use the mode, does not mean I don't believe in its value. Every area where I have had any influence in emergency communication has always included a venue for *any* form of radio communication, CW included; ATV included; etc.

Kim W5TIT

3156. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 16:15:12 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309060815.23dcc180@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76571

Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:<86y8x224m8.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>...

> Brian> Stick with the tried and proven Jack and just get on with the
> Brian> job like tens if not hundreds of thousands of us have already
> Brian> done. There is no point to reinventing the wheel.
>
> One wonders what Mr. (or Ms.) Farnsworth would have said if someone
> had told him something like that.
> There is point in reinventing the
> wheel, if one believes they may have found something more efficient.
> In this case, I'm not inventing anything -- I am facilitating the
> learning of those who prefer full speed and Farnsworth spacing.

One will get ya ten that Farnsworth was an expert on the subject
BEFORE he/she invented that wheel and took it public. I find the
concept of you, admittedly struggling to get off a notch above ground
zero in this game, "facilitating" the learning process for others just
a tad problematic.

> Brian> variables. Yes it's Farnsworth and 1AW Farnworth has obviously
> Brian> worked for decades. Now go copy 1AW 5wpm sessions until you
> Brian> "get it".
>
> I've said it before, but perhaps not in this location: my current
> location does not permit reception of HF signals. I have tried for
> months with multiple antenna setups and have not been successful. I
> have very limited VHF reception -- broadcast FM and television
> stations do not come in, but I can receive on 2m and 440MHz. I
> thought it was bad when I didn't have an HF rig, but it's worse to
> have one and not be able to receive anything.

Local terrain isn't much an HF stopper so W1AW would be be usable
under normal condx. But per your response to Dick your overriding
problem seems to be noise. Are you on Jones St. in Martinez or in
Walnut Creek? In either case noise in those kinds of very densely
populated QTHs can be mongo. I can sympathize with all of that, I sure
have my share here. So W1AW is a non-solution. But you might try
shutting down all six computers and listen again.

> Brian> . . Been there, done it and it WORKS. The mix of 1AW and The
> Brian> Deep End worked twice for me and I not only enjoyed all of it
> Brian> but also got to 20wpm+ via logs full of actual QSOs to boot.
>
> I'm glad it worked for you. I'm going for the tried and true Koch
> method of learning the characters at full speed. It might take more

> time for me to learn them all, but I'll know them, and that will be
> exciting. I am currently exploring another method of code generating
> that spits out words from characters that I already know since I'm a
> little concerned that five-letter groups might shape my learning in a
> way that won't help with real code.

Copying random five-letter groups is excellent code practice which is why the military has used groups instead of straight text for CW training purposes. Five letter groups at 20wpm is more difficult to copy than is staright text at 20wpm, another factoid which is as old as the hills.

> Other than that, though, I'm
> pretty happy with what I've got.

If it works for you it works.

> Brian> And CW contests are lousy code practice.
>
> I agree with you on this. Hopefully by next Field Day I'll be able to
> participate with CW,

I suggest you get on the air somewhere somehow by hook or crook and get some real experience before you dive into FD. Per previous I have a nasty noise problem too but I now have a nice quiet alternative "escape QTH". I have some lines permanently installed in some big trees in one of my daughters' back yards and pre-fabbed quick-up dipoles for 80/40/20/15. I also have a TS-50 HF mobile xcvr with the CW filter and an FT-847 with an Inrad 400 Hz filter both of which are very compact lightweight portable rigs. Once I get to her place I can be on the air in 15 minutes. Which I do when I just can't stand being off HF any longer. I beep my buns off for hours, get my fill, do some visiting, mooch a dinner and come home in a much better mood than I had the day before. Sorta like FD once a month. Poke around, maybe you have an alternative operating site too.

> but I am concerned that my straight-key efforts
> will be wasted on the memory keyers out there. Bah.

Using a straight key in a contest would kill me if I was running a decent rate. The goofy relics should be outlawed at least in contests except under unusual circumstances. Do yourself a big favor and get yourself decent paddles like a Kent and a cheap MFJ keyer and take it from there. The paddles would work fine with the FD momory keyers. Beyond that real CW contesters don't use any types of mechanical keys, they use keyboards. In the end the means used to generate the output doesn't matter, it's the ears that *always* matter . . .

> Jack.

w3rv

3157. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 16:23:05 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309060823.51fe6de9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76572

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message

. . . .

>
> The founders of No Charts International would claim that they had no
> problem with anyone USING the Chart, just the mandatory test
> requirement.
> "It's not the CHART, it's the TEST" would be a common rallying cry.
>
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

SPAAAAANK!! Right on the money, GAWJUS!

w3rv

3158. Re: Bad reception at my house (was Re: Farnsworth spacing)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 16:29:28 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309060829.c18a490@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76573

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>
> Jack, you must understand something. DICK has been in every
> situation, probably including your own. If DICK says he's able to
> receive HF everywhere he's -tried-, he implies that you aren't trying
> hard enough. In the end, it comes down to CW always getting through.
> You're using CW, right?

Just once try reading the thread before you pounce on the "reply to"
button you dim bulb, he's using 80M moonbounce spread spectrum.

3159. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 16:53:20 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <4io6b.37918$Vx2.16991244@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76574

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030906091921.14837.00002768@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <Qe96b.37823$Vx2.16851173@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >Both the pool AND answers are published.
>
> And how do we convince FCC to change that?
> >
> >Let's take a typical question:
> >
> >What is the length of a dipole for 14.240Mhz?
>
> I assume you mean "half wave"...
>
> What kind of half wave dipole? Made of wire or tubing? Of uniform
thickness or
> tapering? In free space or near other objects?
>
> The answer depends on a bunch of things!

That is of course true but at least knowing the basic formula gives the new
ham a place to start even though there are additional factors that should be
considered.

> >
> >Now since the questions AND answers are published, the prospective test
> >taker can simply memorize the numerical answer instead of having to learn
> >the appropriate equation and how to use that equation. Using the
memorize
> >the numerical answer approach, the new ham has passed the test but is
unable
> >to calculate the dipole that he/she may actually want to build for
operating
> >
> Exactly!
>
> Now suppose we rewrite the question to:
>
> "What is the formula for computing the length of a half-wave dipole for
14.240
> MHz, if the dipole is made of #10 wire and is in free space?"
>
> The person being tested then memorizes the formula from the choices in the
pool

> but doesn't necessarily know how to use it. Same problem.

As above, at least the new ham has a place to start. With the "just memorize the specific answer" approach, he/she has no place to begin.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3160. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 16:55:31 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <7ko6b.37919$Vx2.16991703@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76575

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030906091923.14837.00002770@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <kikilv41ljggh172fuq727u3geep324s45@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
> <bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>
> >Call it a matter of personal ethics. Upgrading would have been the
> >easy way out.
>
> Or consider this:
>
> Which do you think is more convincing to FCC as a reason to remove Element
1:
>
> - The person who says "I won't upgrade until that test is removed"
>
> or
>
> - The person who says "I took the test, passed it, yet I think there is no
> reason for that test to exist any more."
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I'd certainly give a lot more credence to the guy that's done it rather than
the one who hasn't.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3161. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 16:59:29 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309060859.6a16558f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76576

"Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<9c4988e16225e423b3bfddae4537c98f.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote
>
> > ..... so many of the new no-code techs showed a
> > generalized disrespect for the PART97 regs
> > and the traditions of amateur radio.
>
> Pure unadulterated bullshit, old biker! Try a different lure when you
> troll, because nobody is gonna bite on this one!
>
> With all kind wishes,

Bullshit is in the eyes of the beholder Hans, your bullshit is not necessarily global bullshit by any means. I don't agree with some of his post but then again some of it is absolute fact the way I see it. Particularly as it relates to what appears to be the low value the early nocodes placed on their ham tickets vs the renewal rates of coded licensees. Life beyond ham radio has huge volumes of other examples of how little folks value giveaways. N5PV ain't out here by himself on this one, far from it.

> de Hans, K0HB

w3rv

3162. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 17:01:46 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <_po6b.37923$Vx2.16992765@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76577

"K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:b71720b321f483edfb53ce7de21e4078.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
> new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
> guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> 2.3%.
>
> Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>

This is sheer speculation but I would guess that the reason the retention rate is so low is that a lot of the no-code tech licenses were the result of the licensed ham in the family urging family members to get a license so they could stay in touch via 2m as they bog around town since they didn't have to convince the family members to take code. Ten years later, it's a whole different world. There are cheap cell phones that fulfill this need nicely. For use out camping, there are cheap FRS radios. To keep in touch with someone in the next town, there are internet chat capabilities.

In a sense, we have come full circle back to where we will only be able to get and keep those who develop an interest in the radio hobby itself rather than using it for personal communications among family members who are otherwise not interested in radio.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3163. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 17:03:14 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <mro6b.37924$Vx2.16992904@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76578

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F59E710.50805@adelphia.net...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>
>
> <some snippage>
>
>
> >>So, would any of you pro-coders like to help a no-code tech upgrade?
> >>I have to warn you in advance that, even after I learn the code, I
> >>will still not support code testing as a requirement for HF access.
> >>This is a personal decison that I am making because I want to do all
> >>that I can to accomadate another person who wants to use amature radio
> >>and this is the only way that he can do it.
> >
> >
> > Ok, here you've said you already know code but now want to learn code.
This
> > is very confusing.
>
>
> Hey Dee
>
>
> (church lady voice here)
>
> Why.... could it be.....a TROLL?
>
> (church lady voice off)
>
> You have to admit, its a great way to get a response out of a lot of
> people - for a while at least. Just disagree with most everybody, and
> don't forget to change the story whenver possible.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Yes but changing it within the same posting would signify that the troll is
of very low quality. Ought send him back to troll school.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3164. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 17:06:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <6uo6b.37927$Vx2.16993431@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76579

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309060623.3d291580@posting.google.com...
> S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<elrflv4h98fu0mq5nqeivn0851u9bn2oe4@4ax.com>...
> > On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 10:00:13 -0400, Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
> > wrote:
> >
> >
> > >Why would you want to foil computer copy?
> >
> > Because no law says you can't.
> >
> > >For you to do the test to
> > >make sure that it works and then advocate it's use, you can't really
> > >say that wasn't your intention.
> >
> > What if it was? Nothing you can do about it but learn the code.
>
> Oh, geez. Here's another Morse Elitist that apparently advocates
> sending code so piss poorly that it can't be computer copied. Hoo-ah!

Don't need to send it poorly. Only strong code signals under good
propagation conditions can be adequatly copied by the computer anyway. I'm
only mediocre at the code myself but I routinely copy better than the
computer anytime conditions are less than ideal such as with weak signals,
poor propagation, high static, or high interference.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3165. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 17:18:29 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <FFo6b.37929$Vx2.16995167@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76580

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0309060815.23dcc180@posting.google.com...
> Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:<86y8x224m8.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>...
>
> Using a straight key in a contest would kill me if I was running a
> decent rate. The goofy relics should be outlawed at least in contests
> except under unusual circumstances. Do yourself a big favor and get
> yourself decent paddles like a Kent and a cheap MFJ keyer and take it
> from there. The paddles would work fine with the FD momory keyers.
> Beyond that real CW contesters don't use any types of mechanical keys,
> they use keyboards. In the end the means used to generate the output
> doesn't matter, it's the ears that *always* matter . . .
>

Yeah if you are out to win or be a high scorer, you are correct. However if you just want to be a casual contester, a straight key is fine. Also if you are doing the "hunt and pounce" instead of "camping on a frequency," it doesn't make quite as much difference. I like to get out there in a contest and just see what the variety is. I don't intend to make any run at a large number of contacts. The last CW contest I was in, I was quite happy to make 77 contacts and then go do something else.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3166. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 17:21:52 UTC
From: wn6bdb@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <fda4618.0309060921.7f4fbaad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76581

"Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<9c4988e16225e423b3bfddae4537c98f.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote
>
> > ..... so many of the new no-code techs showed a
> > generalized disrespect for the PART97 regs
> > and the traditions of amateur radio.
>
> Pure unadulterated bullshit, old biker! Try a different lure when you
> troll, because nobody is gonna bite on this one!
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Hans, you need to turn off the computer and listen to your radio a
little bit. charlesb is right.
Steve

3167. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 17:25:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F5A18C5.5050909@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76582

```
Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F59E710.50805@adelphia.net...
>
>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>
>>>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>>
>>
>><some snippage>
>>
>>
>>>>So, would any of you pro-coders like to help a no-code tech upgrade?
>>>>I have to warn you in advance that, even after I learn the code, I
>>>>will still not support code testing as a requirement for HF access.
>>>>This is a personal decison that I am making because I want to do all
>>>>that I can to accomadate another person who wants to use amature radio
>>>>and this is the only way that he can do it.
>>>
>>>
>>>Ok, here you've said you already know code but now want to learn code.
>>
> This
>
>>>is very confusing.
>>
>>
>>Hey Dee
>>
>>
>>(church lady voice here)
>>
>>Why.... could it be.........a TROLL?
>>
>>(church lady voice off)
>>
>>You have to admit, its a great way to get a response out of a lot of
>>people - for a while at least. Just disagree with most everybody, and
>>don't forget to change the story whenver possible.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
```

> Yes but changing it within the same posting would signify that the troll is
> of very low quality. Ought send him back to troll school.

Well Dee, when a person does that, they are always right! 8^). I agree
about the troll thing. Or at least send him somewhere.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3168. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 17:38:18 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86fzj924xh.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 76583

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Brian" == Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

[...]

Brian> One will get ya ten that Farnsworth was an expert on the
Brian> subject BEFORE he/she invented that wheel and took it public. I
Brian> find the concept of you, admittedly struggling to get off a
Brian> notch above ground zero in this game, "facilitating" the
Brian> learning process for others just a tad problematic.

Out of curiosity, have you seen the page or are you still blocked on
the concept of a student assisting other students?

[... no HF reception ...]

Brian> Local terrain isn't much an HF stopper so W1AW would be be
Brian> usable under normal condx. But per your response to Dick your
Brian> overriding problem seems to be noise. Are you on Jones St. in
Brian> Martinez or in Walnut Creek? In either case noise in those
Brian> kinds of very densely populated QTHs can be mongo. I can
Brian> sympathize with all of that, I sure have my share here. So W1AW
Brian> is a non-solution. But you might try shutting down all six
Brian> computers and listen again.

I have scheduled a network outage tomorrow for this purpose, and I'm
also planning on pulling the plugs on all major appliances for an hour
or so as well if that doesn't work.

[...]

Brian> Copying random five-letter groups is excellent code practice
Brian> which is why the military has used groups instead of straight
Brian> text for CW training purposes. Five letter groups at 20wpm is
Brian> more difficult to copy than is staright text at 20wpm, another
Brian> factoid which is as old as the hills.

The only problem I have with five-letter groups is that I'd like to
start recognizing words, not letters, if at all possible, and
five-letter groups aren't really conducive to that.

Jack> Other than that, though, I'm pretty happy with what I've got.

Brian> If it works for you it works.

Brian> And CW contests are lousy code practice.

Jack> I agree with you on this. Hopefully by next Field Day I'll be
Jack> able to participate with CW,

Brian> I suggest you get on the air somewhere somehow by hook or crook
Brian> and get some real experience before you dive into FD.

Please do not misunderstand. I have absolutely no intention to have Field Day be my first major CW experience. That's as silly as soloing into Oshkosh, or any combination of "my first major experience in foo" with "a huge event centered around foo". My contest mind-set is "play to have fun, not to win".

Brian> Poke around, maybe you have an alternative operating site too.

I actually have an alternative site where I can string up a 122ft dipole, but it's only six feet off the ground. It does have much better reception than what I have at home, though, and I'm eager to find out how well it performs. However, the alternate site is my mother-in-law's front yard, so I can only use it when she's out of town.

Jack> but I am concerned that my straight-key efforts will be wasted
Jack> on the memory keyers out there. Bah.

Brian> Using a straight key in a contest would kill me if I was
Brian> running a decent rate.

As mentioned above, my goal in contesting is to make as many contacts as I can while still having fun.

Brian> The goofy relics should be outlawed at least in contests except
Brian> under unusual circumstances. Do yourself a big favor and get
Brian> yourself decent paddles like a Kent and a cheap MFJ keyer and
Brian> take it from there.

I built a Ramsey keyer. It didn't work with my Kenwood rig. So I built another and it didn't work either. Turns out that the keyer's method of closing the contacts doesn't work with my particular rig.

Brian> The paddles would work fine with the FD momory keyers. Beyond
Brian> that real CW contesters don't use any types of mechanical keys,
Brian> they use keyboards. In the end the means used to generate the
Brian> output doesn't matter, it's the ears that *always* matter . . .

Which was the original topic, of course.

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.3 (FreeBSD)

```
iD8DBQE/WhuPGPFSfAB/ezgRAn2fAJ9k+mWdGkZNVukxkLva8zVuzzVyxgCcCbbo
Ug59F6y8GUeclY6RGtrCwfY=
=wQAB
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3169. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 17:45:16 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <M2p6b.1100$z33.481@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76584

Kim, Hans was pointing out the large (apparent) numbers of *codeless* techs not renewing their licenses. My guess is that close to 100% of their operation (if, indeed, they did operate) was on FM. As far as the noise on HF, that may be one reason I never cared for contests. I spent time on 40 during the day and 160 in the evening. For the distance, I simply preferred CW. Back in the pre-DSP days, a 250 Hz filter did wonders. Noise? Non-existent.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:bjct9j$q01@library2.airnews.net...
>
> Sigh. How 'bout this: ever consider that a lot of CBers did, indeed, hear
> of the new requirements (lower CW testing standards) and decide to get into
> ham radio for....guess what: FM!!!!!???? When I was "into" CB radio, I was
> barely ever on AM. There's a whole "other" gang of participants out there
> on CB--and the mentors of that group are mostly hams. The USB/LSB and,
> alas, FM--yes, illegal but done--part of CB is an area where you'll find
> people who are courteous, have "gentlemen's" rules that are followed; where
> people experiment with antenna design and construction; where an "eyeball"
> meeting is just as likely; etc.
>
> When I was drawn to and got my ticket, you know what the greatest relief
> was? Being able to turn a radio on and not hear all that hissing,
> heterodyning, etc.!!! FM is great and that is what I like most about ham
> radio. HF sucks for all the noise. So, no need/interest to upgrade. And,
> everyone else was as relieved and impressed with FM also. Listening to HF
> brings back those days when we had to deal with all that noise. And, it's
> not a pretty memory.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

3170. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 18:19:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030906141912.14837.00002772@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 76585

In article <bjct9j$q01@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim " <kimscliff@yahoo.com> writes:

>FM!!!!!????

(snipped for brevity)

That's one reason, Kim, stated in a way that makes a lot of sense.

Here's another:

Even before 1991, a considerable number of hams in this area (metro Philly) were friends and family members of hams who wanted a way to keep in touch while mobile. The most common setup was the 2-careers/kids/cars household, where the radio was used for all sorts of "honeydew" purposes.

This sort of thing was particularly popular on some machines around here because the culture in this area encourages open machines, deference to mobiles and HTs, and wide coverage. Plus there are so many open machines around here that you can usally find one that's not in use.

What really drove that boom was not the dropping of the code test but the availability of inexpensive, small, easy-to-use HTs and mobile rigs. And the proliferation of repeaters,

These folks were hams, all right, but their interest in ham radio was not about radio as an end in itself, but radio as a means to an end. IOW, just a tool to do a job, not the main attraction.

Trouble is, cell phones now fill those roles.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3171. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 18:19:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030906141913.14837.00002773@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 76586

In article <b71720b321f483edfb53ce7de21e4078.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>,
"K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
>new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
>guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
>not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
>the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
>2.3%.

That rate is so low that the methodology needs examining. IOW, how did the
"couple of guys" determine their data?

How did they examine the data for every one of those 1,925 licenses? How did
they deal with name changes, address changes, and the vanity callsign rule
changes?

I'm not saying they were dumb or had an ulterior moive, just that their data
analysis methods need to be examined.

Did they check any other license classes?
>
>Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?

Here's one - track down those who did not reup and find out why.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3172. Persecution of Honest Freeband DXers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 18:40:38 UTC
From: twistedhedwebtvdotnet@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <d891d17c.0309061040.63b66d51@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76587
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I am certain beyond a doubt whatsoever, no one hammie or upperclassmen for that matter would give a rats azz if barefoot DXers employ the unused and abandoned 11 meter frequencies above 40. Yet,,,,,there exists a certain core of pedophialic lid-types that construe a slight overlooking of minor rules as capitol crime. As prime example Frankie,,Davie Hall, WA3MOJ, KC8LDO,Hypocrite N3CJCV,,,,and the remainder of lid posse infer by proxy vote and mental intrusion on my thoughts that there is NO excuse for breaking the law pertaining to the airwaves....according to Hall himself, and Frankenstien,,,to whom communication deficits abound....amends to condone this type behavior he commits in a wanton and willful act of pedophilia-like nature...hmmmm,,,but the same ego-wracked penitents have a problem with 11 meter DX and freebanding. Hyuk! Furthermore,,,this Voob-named loose kennel of lid-induced guardians of federal law-upholders proffer to make inquiries of another man's underwear, shooting cbers, and insults about molesting children. Proof is what these wet faced ARRL Lids cry for,,,,and here I proffer only the truth as evidence of my sincerity,,,,

Message-ID: <3858D1EAE..net>#1/29@worldlynx@hotmail.com0001020@ng-bg1.aol.com
Content-Traace: tw12.nn. (Thu, 16 Dec 1999
06:47:23 nsfeer-Encoding: 7bitr-Encoding: 7bit
References: <385er-Encoding: 7bit83D5A.8AE0584F@hotmail.com>
<19991215233301.20891.00001020@ng-bg1.aol.com>
<UtZYOMvNun+zH9LeKtEjfehQNun+zH9LeKtEjfehQQcbd@4ax.com> Content-Type:
text/plain;
charset=us-aNun+zH9LeKtEjfehQQcbd@4ax.com> Content-Type: text/plain;
charsbace: tw12.nn. (Thu, 16 Dec 1999
06:47:23 candid.com 945353520432043 207.224.84.38et=us-aQcbd@4ax.com>
Content-Type: text/plain;
chabcandid.com 945 207352043.224.84.38rset=us-ascii
X-Trace: tw35204312.nn. (Thu, 16 Dec 1999
06:47:23 MST) Organization: Spew MIME-Version: 1.0
NNTP-Posting-Date: Thu, 16 Dec 1999 06:47:23520433 MST Newsgroups:
rec.radio.cb

Now only degenerate hair lipped lies can induce upon one the required abstinence from my statements,,,,did you miss it, Frankiestein and 'nad? Need to see it again? O, wait a second, your battered ego refuses to cope with the truth,,,,and the truth is exclusive to me. YOUR latchkey abandonded child mindsets prevent you from Davie-son in the mud hen caked communication deficit intuit Lid torn insult flame and troll battery upon which thee that thou I subject you to daily,,,yes daily,,,as one whose DX only barefoot abandoned

assignments in the freeband can attest.

There is much more,,,,the Vancouver feed,,,the pedophilac nature of geo's thoughts,,,,Lelnad's campaign or forges and lies, by the so-named and marked Team voob,,,,I watched C-beams, glitter in the dark near Tannhauser Gate...insult and flame troll bait a scurvy degenerate) isn't exactly conducive to hammie radio,,,and all must be revealed as such.

3173. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 19:02:16 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjdavodsl0@208.207.71.166>
Source record: 76588

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj8orn$ku1$0@208.207.71.136>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj7vj6jsp0@208.207.71.151>...
>
> > > > So by your logic I should have, as a VE, boycotted administering no-code Tech
tests?
> > >
> > > DICK, you did. You turned in your VE badge and credentials because
> > > you were upset with the No-Code license.
> >
> > You really can't get *anything* correct can you? I turned in nothing!
>
> So you're still a VE?
>
> > I closed down my VE teram in early '94
>
> So you're not a VE?
>
> Sheesh! Try to separate your contradictory statements by at least a
> few sentences so that people won't get the idea that you're lying
> about something.
>
> > after we licensed so many other hams who started up their own teans in the region that
we had very little
> > business remaining.
>
> Ah, so you were put out of business by the competition. You've never
> revealed this before.
>
> > At the outset we had the only team in a hundred mile radius.
>
> No doubt you were the Big Man at that time.
>
> I *did* remark after the last
> > restructuring that I didn't ntend to participate as a VE after that debacle.
>
> Yes, you DID, DICK.
>
> Vindication at last, and by your own post. No need to Google up

> anything - your own arrogance will hang you.
>
> But you said more than "I didn't ntend [sic} to participate."
>
> You said that you were disgusted by the NO-Code Technicians that were
> testing. They weren't worth your efforts.
>
> So far I haven't, and haven't
> > needed to.
>
> Wunnerful. Maybe the new VE's don't make their clients feel unworthy.
>
> > Get your facts straignt and MAYBE you won't be so prone to spread falsehoods.
>
> Hey, I have only used your own words, DICK. Are they not facts?

Not the way YOU attempt to twist them Twit! Are you related to Kim by chance?

Let's go through your drippings one at a time here and take a close look...

PLEASE try to see if you can pay attention, OK????

> I closed down my VE team in early '94

So you're not a VE?

Yes Mr Smooth, I still have my credentials all in place. If I wanted to VE tomorrow, all I have to do is show
up and do it.

>Sheesh! Try to separate your contradictory statements by at least a
>few sentences so that people won't get the idea that you're lying
>about something.

What ARE you running on about now??? Is your diahrea of the mouth recurring yet again?

>> after we licensed so many other hams who started up their own teans in the region that we had very little>
business remaining.

>Ah, so you were put out of business by the competition. You've never
revealed this before.

Read it again Village Imbecile, and this time for effect--- WE LICENSED SO MANY HAMS IN THE REGION THAT THEY
STARTED UP MANY OTHER TEAMS. THOSE TEAMS TOOK UP THE SLACK, AND WE FOUND SO FEW TRAVELLING THE DISTANCE TO OUR
SESSIONS THAT WE EVENTUALLY REALIZED WE REALLY DIDN'T NEED TO HOLD THEM SINCE THE OTHER TEAMS WERE FULFILLING
THE NEED.

Got it, or should I send a hammer and chisel for your poor XYL to try to drill it into your granite skull?

> At the outset we had the only team in a hundred mile radius.

No doubt you were the Big Man at that time.

The ONLY team. Does that make it into your germanium cranium?

I *did* remark after the last
> restructuring that I didn't ntend to participate as a VE after that debacle.

Yes, you DID, DICK.

Vindication at last, and by your own post. No need to Google up
anything - your own arrogance will hang you.

Vindication? It's been in google since, over three years now. That decision was about dumping the Extra class
to nothing. It was just too much to expect. Of course that make NO sense to the senseless, like yourse.f

But you said more than "I didn't ntend [sic} to participate."

You said that you were disgusted by the NO-Code Technicians that were
testing. They weren't worth your efforts.

That might be trun in YOUR case, you lying sack, but then you and reality have never occupied the same space
anyway. If I was so disgusted by no code technicians why would I have licensed so many of them into ham radio?
Curses, foiled again! Say when do you plan to ask for permission?

So far I haven't, and haven't
> needed to.

Wunnerful. Maybe the new VE's don't make their clients feel unworthy.

Clients who feel unworthy probably are. It come with the territory for some people. Some of they just can't
understnd that it requires effort to overcome it sometimes.
We see you're one of them.

> Get your facts straignt and MAYBE you won't be so prone to spread falsehoods.

Hey, I have only used your own words, DICK. Are they not facts?

Your interpretation of them never was. But you already know that. Lying is chronic to you.

3174. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 19:08:24 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjdbb8$ei3$0@208.207.71.166>
Source record: 76589

K0HB wrote:

> Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
> new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
> guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> 2.3%.
>
> Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?

Actually I don't believe there's much that can be done. Ham radio will never be competition for the cellphone, which was not nearly so ubiquitous twelve years ago.

What that data proves is that when you make entry into ham radio easy enough there will be lots of people who will get licensed on so mild an interest that it soon evaporates in favor of the Next New Thing that comes along.

3175. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 19:18:16 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjdbto$f0k$0@208.207.71.166>
Source record: 76590

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309060623.3d291580@posting.google.com...
> > S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:<elrflv4h98fu0mq5nqeivn0851u9bn2oe4@4ax.com>...
> > > On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 10:00:13 -0400, Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
> > > wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > >Why would you want to foil computer copy?
> > >
> > > Because no law says you can't.
> > >
> > > >For you to do the test to
> > > >make sure that it works and then advocate it's use, you can't really
> > > >say that wasn't your intention.
> > >
> > > What if it was? Nothing you can do about it but learn the code.
> >
> > Oh, geez. Here's another Morse Elitist that apparently advocates
> > sending code so piss poorly that it can't be computer copied. Hoo-ah!
>
> Don't need to send it poorly. Only strong code signals under good
> propagation conditions can be adequatly copied by the computer anyway. I'm
> only mediocre at the code myself but I routinely copy better than the
> computer anytime conditions are less than ideal such as with weak signals,
> poor propagation, high static, or high interference.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dee, I once made the comment that anyone could send code so poorly that a computer couln't copy it while a human still could. Brainless Brian has contorted and totally distorted that into so many versions that even he can't keep track of them all.

Dick

3176. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 19:23:48 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <8vq6b.3727$K_3.3725@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76591

"Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:9c4988e16225e423b3bfddae4537c98f.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote
>
> > ..... so many of the new no-code techs showed a
> > generalized disrespect for the PART97 regs
> > and the traditions of amateur radio.
>
> Pure unadulterated bullshit, old biker! Try a different lure when you
> troll, because nobody is gonna bite on this one!

No... It was just my opinion on what you presented. You did ask for
opinions.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

3177. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 19:33:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309061133.3cdd9cca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76592

"Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<9c4988e16225e423b3bfddae4537c98f.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote
>
> > ..... so many of the new no-code techs showed a
> > generalized disrespect for the PART97 regs
> > and the traditions of amateur radio.
>
> Pure unadulterated bullshit, old biker! Try a different lure when you
> troll, because nobody is gonna bite on this one!

Sans the profanity, I agree with your assessment on this part of
Charles' comments, Hans, but he's quite correct in another...We went
to all this trouble...For what?

I also agree with his assertion that we need a better quality
Amateur Radio...Not necessarilly more numbers.

The "more numbers" aspect certainly seems to support (and I once
agreed with) the concept that "there's strength in numbers". But
since these licensees ar non-contributing anyway, of what use is it to
"recruit" people who won't stick it out and be of some use?

I certainly take every opportunity to "show off" Amateur Radio to
anyone who's interested, however not everyone wouild make a "good
Ham".

Granted, not everyone is going to be a Maxim, Clark or DeMaw, but
then they don't have to be.

It's worth a thought.

73

Steve, K4YZ

3178. Re: Persecution of Honest Freeband DXers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 20:23:31 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <chgklvk2jiv8mh8ih1im8gdcjbid3akbu0@4ax.com>
Source record: 76593
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

ROTFLMMFAO!!!!

In <d891d17c.0309061040.63b66d51@posting.google.com>,
twistedhedwebtvdotnet@yahoo.com (Twistedhed) wrote:

>I am certain beyond a doubt whatsoever, no one hammie or upperclassmen
>for that matter would give a rats azz if barefoot DXers employ the
>unused and abandoned 11 meter frequencies above 40. Yet,,,,,there
>exists a certain core of pedophialic lid-types that construe a slight
>overlooking of minor rules as capitol crime. As prime example
>Frankie,,Davie Hall, WA3MOJ, KC8LDO,Hypocrite N3CJCV,,,,and the
>remainder of lid posse infer by proxy vote and mental intrusion on my
>thoughts that there is NO excuse for breaking the law pertaining to
>the airwaves....according to Hall himself, and Frankenstien,,,to whom
>communication deficits abound....amends to condone this type behavior
>he commits in a wanton and willful act of pedophilia-like
>nature...hmmmm,,,but the same ego-wracked penitents have a problem
>with 11 meter DX and freebanding. Hyuk! Furthermore,,,this Voob-named
>loose kennel of lid-induced guardians of federal law-upholders proffer
>to make inquiries of another man's underwear, shooting cbers, and
>insults about molesting children. Proof is what these wet faced ARRL
>Lids cry for,,,,and here I proffer only the truth as evidence of my
>sincerity,,,,
>
>
>
>
>
>
>Message-ID: <3858D1EAE..net>#1/29@worldlynx@hotmail.com0001020@ng-bg1.aol.com
>Content-Traace: tw12.nn. (Thu, 16 Dec 1999
>06:47:23 nsfeer-Encoding: 7bitr-Encoding: 7bit
>References: <385er-Encoding: 7bit83D5A.8AE0584F@hotmail.com>
><19991215233301.20891.00001020@ng-bg1.aol.com>
><UtZYOMvNun+zH9LeKtEjfehQNun+zH9LeKtEjfehQQcbd@4ax.com> Content-Type:
>text/plain;
>charset=us-aNun+zH9LeKtEjfehQQcbd@4ax.com> Content-Type: text/plain;
>charsbace: tw12.nn. (Thu, 16 Dec 1999
>06:47:23 candid.com 945353520432043 207.224.84.38et=us-aQcbd@4ax.com>
>Content-Type: text/plain;
>chabcandid.com 945 207352043.224.84.38rset=us-ascii
>X-Trace: tw35204312.nn. (Thu, 16 Dec 1999
>06:47:23 MST) Organization: Spew MIME-Version: 1.0
>NNTP-Posting-Date: Thu, 16 Dec 1999 06:47:23520433 MST Newsgroups:

>rec.radio.cb
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>Now only degenerate hair lipped lies can induce upon one the required
>abstinence from my statements,,,,did you miss it, Frankiestein and
>'nad? Need to see it again? O, wait a second, your battered ego
>refuses to cope with the truth,,,,and the truth is exclusive to me.
>YOUR latchkey abandonded child mindsets prevent you from Davie-son in
>the mud hen caked communication deficit intuit Lid torn insult flame
>and troll battery upon which thee that thou I subject you to
>daily,,,yes daily,,,as one whose DX only barefoot abandoned
>assignments in the freeband can attest.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>There is much more,,,,the Vancouver feed,,,the pedophilac nature of
>geo's thoughts,,,,Lelnad's campaign or forges and lies, by the
>so-named and marked Team voob,,,,I watched C-beams, glitter in the
>dark near Tannhauser Gate...insult and flame troll bait a scurvy
>degenerate) isn't exactly conducive to hammie radio,,,and all must be
>revealed as such.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

3179. Re: Persecution of Honest Freeband DXers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 20:38:19 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309061238.7cc9a31f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76594
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

twistedhedwebtvdotnet@yahoo.com (Twistedhed) wrote in message news:<d891d17c.0309061040.63b66d51@posting.google.com>...

> I am certain beyond a doubt whatsoever, no one hammie or upperclassmen
> for that matter would give a rats azz if barefoot DXers employ the
> unused and abandoned 11 meter frequencies above 40. Yet,,,,,there
> exists a certain core of pedophialic lid-types that construe a slight
> overlooking of minor rules as capitol crime. As prime example
> Frankie,,Davie Hall, WA3MOJ, KC8LDO,Hypocrite N3CJCV...(SNIP)

Whew...If there was ever an arguement for castrating "freebanders", here's the evidence, provided by one of thier own.

Sheeesh.

Steve, K4YZ

3180. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 20:45:54 UTC
From: "Leland C. Scott" <no-spam@junk-mail.net>
Message-ID: <UficnVSzS7Ue2seiXTWJjg@comcast.com>
Source record: 76595

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030905125232.18419.00000357@mb-m13.aol.com.
..
> >They did it a few decades ago when they took 11
meters from the hams
> >since they didn't use it.
>
> Youi missed the operative word "NEW CB HAM
BANDS"

Only a TRUE CBPlusser, or "TROLL", like WA8ULX
would want to know.

>Path:
news5.aus1.giganews.com!firehose2!nntp4!intern1.nn
tp.aus1.giganews.com!>border3.nntp.aus1.giganews.c
om!small1.nntp.aus1.giganews.com!nntp.giganews.com
!>cyclone1.gnilink.net!ngpeer.news.aol.com!audrey-
m2.news.aol.com!not-for-mail
>Lines: 6
>X-Admin: news@aol.com
>From: wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX)
>Newsgroups: alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf
>Date: 31 Aug 2003 18:15:25 GMT
>Organization: AOL http://www.aol.com
>Subject: What freq is good for Freeband on 440
>Message-ID:
<20030831141525.17992.00000209@mb-m25.aol.com>
>Xref: intern1.nntp.aus1.giganews.com
alt.ham-radio.vhf-uhf:38129

> Myself and another person are going on a road
trip in different cars next
>week. We plan on using 440 FM to keep in touch as
we drive along. Since the
>other person doesnt have a License what is good
FREQ on 440 to use. Dont worry
>we will not use any IDs that would tell who we
were. We will be using GE Deltas
>converted to 440 both running about 100 watts and
5 DB Gain antennas. Any Ideas
>on what Freqs I should program into the Radios?

73 de,

Leland C. Scott
KC8LDO

ARRL member
NCI member

"You ask what Morse Code is good for? I'll tell you. Morse
Code is used exclusively by Electronics Based life forms to
communicate amongst themselves using advanced Organic
Digital Signal Processors, running state of the art Artificial
Intelligence Software, to perform the highly complex
transmit encryption, receive decryption and error correction
functions."

3181. Re: Persecution of Honest Freeband DXers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 21:01:46 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030906170146.356$Ao@newsreader.com>
Source record: 76596
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote:
> twistedhedwebtvdotnet@yahoo.com (Twistedhed) wrote in message
> news:<d891d17c.0309061040.63b66d51@posting.google.com>...
>
> > I am certain beyond a doubt whatsoever, no one hammie or upperclassmen
> > for that matter would give a rats azz if barefoot DXers employ the
> > unused and abandoned 11 meter frequencies above 40. Yet,,,,,there
> > exists a certain core of pedophialic lid-types that construe a slight
> > overlooking of minor rules as capitol crime. As prime example
> > Frankie,,Davie Hall, WA3MOJ, KC8LDO,Hypocrite N3CJCV...(SNIP)
>
> Whew...If there was ever an arguement for castrating
> "freebanders", here's the evidence, provided by one of thier own.
>
> Sheeesh.
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>
Does that hook in your mouth hurt much?

--
GO #40

3182. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 23:47:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309061547.7958f8e5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76598

DICK cranium, you've got the attributions all screwed up, you reposted
my stuff about 3 times, and you still lack the brains that God gave
most humans. Which is no surprise.

But go ahead an read my comments to you stream of bile and lies.

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bjdavodsl0@208.207.71.166>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj8orn$ku1$0@208.207.71.136>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj7vj6jsp0@208.207.71.151>...
>
> > > > > So by your logic I should have, as a VE, boycotted administering no-code Tech
tests?
> > > >
> > > > DICK, you did. You turned in your VE badge and credentials because
> > > > you were upset with the No-Code license.
> > >
> > > You really can't get *anything* correct can you? I turned in nothing!
> >
> > So you're still a VE?
> >
> > > I closed down my VE teram in early '94
> >
> > So you're not a VE?
> >
> > Sheesh! Try to separate your contradictory statements by at least a
> > few sentences so that people won't get the idea that you're lying
> > about something.
> >
> > > after we licensed so many other hams who started up their own teans in the region
that we had very little
> > > business remaining.
> >
> > Ah, so you were put out of business by the competition. You've never
> > revealed this before.
> >
> > > At the outset we had the only team in a hundred mile radius.
> >
> > No doubt you were the Big Man at that time.
> >

> > I *did* remark after the last
> > > restructuring that I didn't ntend to participate as a VE after that debacle.
> >
> > Yes, you DID, DICK.
> >
> > Vindication at last, and by your own post. No need to Google up
> > anything - your own arrogance will hang you.
> >
> > But you said more than "I didn't ntend [sic} to participate."
> >
> > You said that you were disgusted by the NO-Code Technicians that were
> > testing. They weren't worth your efforts.
> >
> > So far I haven't, and haven't
> > > needed to.
> >
> > Wunnerful. Maybe the new VE's don't make their clients feel unworthy.
> >
> > > Get your facts straignt and MAYBE you won't be so prone to spread falsehoods.
> >
> > Hey, I have only used your own words, DICK. Are they not facts?
>
> Not the way YOU attempt to twist them Twit! Are you related to Kim by chance?
>
> Let's go through your drippings one at a time here and take a close look...
>
> PLEASE try to see if you can pay attention, OK????
>
> > I closed down my VE team in early '94
>
> So you're not a VE?
>
> Yes Mr Smooth, I still have my credentials all in place. If I wanted to VE tomorrow, all
I have to do is show
> up and do it.
>
> >Sheesh! Try to separate your contradictory statements by at least a
> >few sentences so that people won't get the idea that you're lying
> >about something.
>
> What ARE you running on about now??? Is your diahrea of the mouth recurring yet again?

So you are a VE, but you don't VE. You closed down YOUR team in early
94 only after the restructured Extra which was too much for you to
take???

Forked-tongue! See your lie way below

1994 was after the advent of the No-Code Technician, not the
restructured Extra.

Problem with guys like you is you can't keep your lies straight even
within the same post.

> >> after we licensed so many other hams who started up their own teans in the region that we had very little>
> business remaining.
>
> >Ah, so you were put out of business by the competition. You've never
> revealed this before.
>
> Read it again Village Imbecile, and this time for effect--- WE LICENSED SO MANY HAMS IN THE REGION THAT THEY
> STARTED UP MANY OTHER TEAMS. THOSE TEAMS TOOK UP THE SLACK, AND WE FOUND SO FEW TRAVELLING THE DISTANCE TO OUR
> SESSIONS THAT WE EVENTUALLY REALIZED WE REALLY DIDN'T NEED TO HOLD THEM SINCE THE OTHER TEAMS WERE FULFILLING
> THE NEED.
>
> Got it, or should I send a hammer and chisel for your poor XYL to try to drill it into your granite skull?

Yeh, I read it again. You got put out of business by the competition.

> > At the outset we had the only team in a hundred mile radius.
>
> No doubt you were the Big Man at that time.
>
> The ONLY team. Does that make it into your germanium cranium?
>
> I *did* remark after the last
> > restructuring that I didn't ntend to participate as a VE after that debacle.
>
> Yes, you DID, DICK.
>
> Vindication at last, and by your own post. No need to Google up
> anything - your own arrogance will hang you.
>
> Vindication? It's been in google since, over three years now. That decision was about dumping the Extra class
> to nothing.

No, no, no, no, no!

You quit VEing looooong before the restructuring. Way more than 3
years ago.

Why must you lie about it?

> It was just too much to expect. Of course that make NO sense to the senseless, like yourse.f
>
> But you said more than "I didn't ntend [sic} to participate."
>

> You said that you were disgusted by the NO-Code Technicians that were
> testing. They weren't worth your efforts.
>
> That might be trun in YOUR case, you lying sack,

Couldn't have been. I never was a No-Code Technician no matter how
badly you wanted me to be. You have to hang your hatred of me on
something else. Probably because I catch you in so many lies.

but then you and reality have never occupied the same space
> anyway. If I was so disgusted by no code technicians why would I have licensed so many of
them into ham radio?

You lack logic.

> Curses, foiled again! Say when do you plan to ask for permission?

Dream on.

> So far I haven't, and haven't
> > needed to.
>
> Wunnerful. Maybe the new VE's don't make their clients feel unworthy.
>
> Clients who feel unworthy probably are.

Specially when you're spitting bile on them.

It come with the territory for some people. Some of they just can't
> understnd that it requires effort to overcome it sometimes.
> We see you're one of them.

Yep, you've spit bile on me.

> > Get your facts straignt and MAYBE you won't be so prone to spread falsehoods.
>
> Hey, I have only used your own words, DICK. Are they not facts?
>
> Your interpretation of them never was. But you already know that. Lying is chronic to
you.

The trouble with guys like you is you're not bright enough to keep
your lies straight. If you could, no one would know you were lying.
But today you've proved it beyond any shadow of a doubt.

3183. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 23:51:25 UTC
From: Y letter Y <pjx18cr@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1062892395.54839@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 76597

It's too little, too late Hans.

Years of keeping the CW requirement and
the advent of the Internet as a cheap alternative
to Amateur Radio spelled the end of Amateur
Radio for those who could see the writing on
the wall a VERY long time ago.

Add to that a median-age of 67 Yrs for the US Amateur population does not help
either - we are LITERALLY
dying off.

Finally the outrageous cost of ham gear (HF gear)
is enough to scare off any prospective newcommer.
Who in their right mind wants to spend $2000+
for a Yaesu HF station when for about $400 you can
buy a fully equipped "white box" PC with a 56K
and DSL modem, and be able to interact worldwide
without the use of unsightly dipoles and tri-band beam
antennas...?

Hans, Amateur Radio is **OBSOLETE**.
It's popularity is enjoyed by an extremely small
esoteric sector of the populace, and the general
public looks at us as a curiosity at best.

That is the bottom line .

Ken (ex-W3 circa 1985)

"K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:b71720b321f483edfb53ce7de21e4078.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
> new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
> guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> 2.3%.
>
> Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>
>
>

>
>
>
> --
> Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3184. Puff the magic dragon

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 23:52:23 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309061552.c1498ab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76599

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bjcstc$50s@library2.airnews.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309060603.61c24c5b@posting.google.com...

> > Hey, I have only used your own words, DICK. Are they not facts?
>
> ROFLMAO!!!! He's so confused...
>
> Kim W5TIT

Kim, go back and read the part about how he only stopped VEing in 94
AFTER the restructured Extra came about.

Hihi.

He stopped in 1994 because he hates No-Code Technicians. The
restructured Extra came much, much later.

What's this pea-brain been smoking?

3185. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 23:52:24 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <Yqu6b.4852$Mo5.3409@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76600

Another ham-bashing Troll.

Assuming that he means what he says, the guy must be an utter moron... One of those who thinks that ham radio and the Internet "compete" with each other, as if they were rival communications carriers going after the same market... What a dope!

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

"Y letter Y" <pjx18cr@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:1062892395.54839@newshost03.voicenet.com...
>
> It's too little, too late Hans.
>
> Years of keeping the CW requirement and
> the advent of the Internet as a cheap alternative
> to Amateur Radio spelled the end of Amateur
> Radio for those who could see the writing on
> the wall a VERY long time ago.
>
> Add to that a median-age of 67 Yrs for the US Amateur population does not help
> either - we are LITERALLY
> dying off.
>
> Finally the outrageous cost of ham gear (HF gear)
> is enough to scare off any prospective newcommer.
> Who in their right mind wants to spend $2000+
> for a Yaesu HF station when for about $400 you can
> buy a fully equipped "white box" PC with a 56K
> and DSL modem, and be able to interact worldwide
> without the use of unsightly dipoles and tri-band beam
> antennas...?
>
> Hans, Amateur Radio is **OBSOLETE**.
> It's popularity is enjoyed by an extremely small
> esoteric sector of the populace, and the general
> public looks at us as a curiosity at best.
>
> That is the bottom line .
>
> Ken (ex-W3 circa 1985)
>
> "K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:b71720b321f483edfb53ce7de21e4078.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...

> > Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
> > new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
> > guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> > not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> > the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> > 2.3%.
> >
> > Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > --
> > Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG
>

3186. Re: Persecution of Honest Freeband DXers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 23:55:46 UTC
From: Frank Gilliland <sparky@NOSPAMaimcomm.net>
Message-ID: <fqsklv8m3kitklsl8i032khp939hn8mdk0@4ax.com>
Source record: 76601
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In <5c01b95b.0309061238.7cc9a31f@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve
Robeson, K4CAP) wrote:

>twistedhedwebtvdotnet@yahoo.com (Twistedhed) wrote in message
news:<d891d17c.0309061040.63b66d51@posting.google.com>...
>
>> I am certain beyond a doubt whatsoever, no one hammie or upperclassmen
>> for that matter would give a rats azz if barefoot DXers employ the
>> unused and abandoned 11 meter frequencies above 40. Yet,,,,,there
>> exists a certain core of pedophialic lid-types that construe a slight
>> overlooking of minor rules as capitol crime. As prime example
>> Frankie,,Davie Hall, WA3MOJ, KC8LDO,Hypocrite N3CJCV...(SNIP)
>
> Whew...If there was ever an arguement for castrating
>"freebanders", here's the evidence, provided by one of thier own.
>
> Sheeesh.
>
>Steve, K4YZ

That was just a parody of Twistedhed, but if you have read any of his/her posts
recently, you wouldn't notice any difference.

-----= Posted via Newsfeeds.Com, Uncensored Usenet News =-----
http://www.newsfeeds.com - The #1 Newsgroup Service in the World!
-----== Over 100,000 Newsgroups - 19 Different Servers! =-----

3187. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-06 23:58:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309061558.719166a1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76602

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<6uo6b.37927$Vx2.16993431@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309060623.3d291580@posting.google.com...
> > S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:<elrflv4h98fu0mq5nqeivn0851u9bn2oe4@4ax.com>...
> > > On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 10:00:13 -0400, Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
> > > wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > >Why would you want to foil computer copy?
> > >
> > > Because no law says you can't.
> > >
> > > >For you to do the test to
> > > >make sure that it works and then advocate it's use, you can't really
> > > >say that wasn't your intention.
> > >
> > > What if it was? Nothing you can do about it but learn the code.
> >
> > Oh, geez. Here's another Morse Elitist that apparently advocates
> > sending code so piss poorly that it can't be computer copied. Hoo-ah!
>
> Don't need to send it poorly.

Does anyone have a need to send it poorly (except DICK)?

More importantly, you shouldn't try to send it poorly. You should
send it to the very best of your ability.

But if you send it very poorly with the intention of thwarting machine
copy, what do you think the result will be?

Only strong code signals under good
> propagation conditions can be adequatly copied by the computer anyway. I'm
> only mediocre at the code myself but I routinely copy better than the
> computer anytime conditions are less than ideal such as with weak signals,
> poor propagation, high static, or high interference.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Brian

3188. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 00:35:06 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <_2v6b.1573$cv5.788@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76603

Jim,

We might also check the Social Security Death index .. :)
I check it daily. If my name isn't in there, it's gonna be a good day :))

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030906141913.14837.00002773@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <b71720b321f483edfb53ce7de21e4078.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>,
> "K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
> >new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
> >guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> >not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> >the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> >2.3%.
>
> That rate is so low that the methodology needs examining. IOW, how did the
> "couple of guys" determine their data?
>
> How did they examine the data for every one of those 1,925 licenses? How
did
> they deal with name changes, address changes, and the vanity callsign rule
> changes?
>
> I'm not saying they were dumb or had an ulterior moive, just that their
data
> analysis methods need to be examined.
>
> Did they check any other license classes?
> >
> >Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?
>
> Here's one - track down those who did not reup and find out why.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).

Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

3189. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 00:48:15 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <jfv6b.1574$aq5.373@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76604

Charles,

Don't worry about it. W3 something? We had a guy in a Yahoo group claiming he had built computers whilst most of the folks were still in diapers. He signed an amateur callsign. Hmmm ... a quick check of qrz.com revealed that callsign was *unassigned*. Hmmm .. kinda makes you wonder about the "message", doesn't it :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:Yqu6b.4852$Mo5.3409@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com...
> Another ham-bashing Troll.
>
> Assuming that he means what he says, the guy must be an utter moron... One
> of those who thinks that ham radio and the Internet "compete" with each
> other, as if they were rival communications carriers going after the same
> market... What a dope!
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>
>
> "Y letter Y" <pjx18cr@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:1062892395.54839@newshost03.voicenet.com...
> >
> > It's too little, too late Hans.
> >
> > Years of keeping the CW requirement and
> > the advent of the Internet as a cheap alternative
> > to Amateur Radio spelled the end of Amateur
> > Radio for those who could see the writing on
> > the wall a VERY long time ago.
> >
> > Add to that a median-age of 67 Yrs for the US Amateur population does
not
> help
> > either - we are LITERALLY
> > dying off.
> >
> > Finally the outrageous cost of ham gear (HF gear)
> > is enough to scare off any prospective newcommer.
> > Who in their right mind wants to spend $2000+
> > for a Yaesu HF station when for about $400 you can

> > buy a fully equipped "white box" PC with a 56K
> > and DSL modem, and be able to interact worldwide
> > without the use of unsightly dipoles and tri-band beam
> > antennas...?
> >
> > Hans, Amateur Radio is **OBSOLETE**.
> > It's popularity is enjoyed by an extremely small
> > esoteric sector of the populace, and the general
> > public looks at us as a curiosity at best.
> >
> > That is the bottom line .
> >
> > Ken (ex-W3 circa 1985)

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

3190. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 01:02:10 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bje0ev$g7e@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 76606

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030906141912.14837.00002772@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <bjct9j$q01@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim " <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >FM!!!!!????
>
> (snipped for brevity)
>
> That's one reason, Kim, stated in a way that makes a lot of sense.
>
> Here's another:
>
> Even before 1991, a considerable number of hams in this area (metro
Philly)
> were friends and family members of hams who wanted a way to keep in touch
while
> mobile. The most common setup was the 2-careers/kids/cars household, where
the
> radio was used for all sorts of "honeydew" purposes.
>

You and Jim (Hampton) mentioned this and I had completely forgot about that aspect! And, it was also one of the reasons I so easily got my husband interested--as soon as I began mentioning how neat it would be to stay in touch better than with a mobile phone--which back then was cost prohibitive.

>
> This sort of thing was particularly popular on some machines around here
> because the culture in this area encourages open machines, deference to
mobiles
> and HTs, and wide coverage. Plus there are so many open machines around
here
> that you can usally find one that's not in use.
>
> What really drove that boom was not the dropping of the code test but the
> availability of inexpensive, small, easy-to-use HTs and mobile rigs. And
the
> proliferation of repeaters,
>

I concede, now looking at it that way.

>
> These folks were hams, all right, but their interest in ham radio was not

about
> radio as an end in itself, but radio as a means to an end. IOW, just a
tool to
> do a job, not the main attraction.
>
> Trouble is, cell phones now fill those roles.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Absolutely. Probably one of the biggest reasons we (my dear and I) haven't
been all that driven/motivated to get the equipment back into the vehicles.

Kim W5TIT

3191. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 01:04:43 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bje07b$t4g$0@208.207.71.163>
Source record: 76605

Well, there ya go, Hans. One of your subjects heard from. Any further questions?
Dick

Y letter Y wrote:

> It's too little, too late Hans.
>
> Years of keeping the CW requirement and
> the advent of the Internet as a cheap alternative
> to Amateur Radio spelled the end of Amateur
> Radio for those who could see the writing on
> the wall a VERY long time ago.
>
> Add to that a median-age of 67 Yrs for the US Amateur population does not help
> either - we are LITERALLY
> dying off.
>
> Finally the outrageous cost of ham gear (HF gear)
> is enough to scare off any prospective newcommer.
> Who in their right mind wants to spend $2000+
> for a Yaesu HF station when for about $400 you can
> buy a fully equipped "white box" PC with a 56K
> and DSL modem, and be able to interact worldwide
> without the use of unsightly dipoles and tri-band beam
> antennas...?
>
> Hans, Amateur Radio is **OBSOLETE**.
> It's popularity is enjoyed by an extremely small
> esoteric sector of the populace, and the general
> public looks at us as a curiosity at best.
>
> That is the bottom line .
>
> Ken (ex-W3 circa 1985)
>
> "K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:b71720b321f483edfb53ce7de21e4078.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
> > new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
> > guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> > not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> > the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> > 2.3%.
> >
> > Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?

> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > --
> > Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3192. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 01:17:04 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bje0ug$n9$0@208.207.71.163>
Source record: 76607

OK Brainless dipshit. when you finally get to foaming at themouth so that you can't carry on even an IRRational
conversation time has come to dump you back on your sorry arse into the sewer, from whence ye came...right back with
The TIT, Loosegoose Lennie and Brock the Crock BYE! Stay gone a LONG time !!!

PLONK!

Brian wrote:

> DICK cranium, you've got the attributions all screwed up, you reposted
> my stuff about 3 times, and you still lack the brains that God gave
> most humans. Which is no surprise.
>
> But go ahead an read my comments to you stream of bile and lies.
>
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bjdavodsl0@208.207.71.166>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj8orn$ku1$0@208.207.71.136>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj7vj6jsp0@208.207.71.151>...
> > >
> > > > > > So by your logic I should have, as a VE, boycotted administering no-code Tech
tests?
> > > > >
> > > > > DICK, you did. You turned in your VE badge and credentials because
> > > > > you were upset with the No-Code license.
> > > >
> > > > You really can't get *anything* correct can you? I turned in nothing!
> > >
> > > So you're still a VE?
> > >
> > > I closed down my VE teram in early '94
> > >
> > > So you're not a VE?
> > >
> > > Sheesh! Try to separate your contradictory statements by at least a
> > > few sentences so that people won't get the idea that you're lying
> > > about something.
> > >

> > > > after we licensed so many other hams who started up their own teans in the region that we had very little
> > > > business remaining.
> > >
> > > Ah, so you were put out of business by the competition. You've never
> > > revealed this before.
> > >
> > > > At the outset we had the only team in a hundred mile radius.
> > >
> > > No doubt you were the Big Man at that time.
> > >
> > > I *did* remark after the last
> > > > restructuring that I didn't ntend to participate as a VE after that debacle.
> > >
> > > Yes, you DID, DICK.
> > >
> > > Vindication at last, and by your own post. No need to Google up
> > > anything - your own arrogance will hang you.
> > >
> > > But you said more than "I didn't ntend [sic} to participate."
> > >
> > > You said that you were disgusted by the NO-Code Technicians that were
> > > testing. They weren't worth your efforts.
> > >
> > > So far I haven't, and haven't
> > > > needed to.
> > >
> > > Wunnerful. Maybe the new VE's don't make their clients feel unworthy.
> > >
> > > > Get your facts straignt and MAYBE you won't be so prone to spread falsehoods.
> > >
> > > Hey, I have only used your own words, DICK. Are they not facts?
> >
> > Not the way YOU attempt to twist them Twit! Are you related to Kim by chance?
> >
> > Let's go through your drippings one at a time here and take a close look...
> >
> > PLEASE try to see if you can pay attention, OK????
> >
> > > I closed down my VE team in early '94
> >
> > So you're not a VE?
> >
> > Yes Mr Smooth, I still have my credentials all in place. If I wanted to VE tomorrow, all I have to do is show
> > up and do it.
> >
> > >Sheesh! Try to separate your contradictory statements by at least a
> > >few sentences so that people won't get the idea that you're lying
> > >about something.

> >
> > What ARE you running on about now??? Is your diahrea of the mouth recurring yet again?
>
> So you are a VE, but you don't VE. You closed down YOUR team in early
> 94 only after the restructured Extra which was too much for you to
> take???
>
> Forked-tongue! See your lie way below
>
> 1994 was after the advent of the No-Code Technician, not the
> restructured Extra.
>
> Problem with guys like you is you can't keep your lies straight even
> within the same post.
>
> > >> after we licensed so many other hams who started up their own teans in the region that we had very little>
> > business remaining.
> >
> > >Ah, so you were put out of business by the competition. You've never
> > revealed this before.
> >
> > Read it again Village Imbecile, and this time for effect--- WE LICENSED SO MANY HAMS IN THE REGION THAT THEY
> > STARTED UP MANY OTHER TEAMS. THOSE TEAMS TOOK UP THE SLACK, AND WE FOUND SO FEW TRAVELLING THE DISTANCE TO OUR
> > SESSIONS THAT WE EVENTUALLY REALIZED WE REALLY DIDN'T NEED TO HOLD THEM SINCE THE OTHER TEAMS WERE FULFILLING
> > THE NEED.
> >
> > Got it, or should I send a hammer and chisel for your poor XYL to try to drill it into your granite skull?

3193. Re: Persecution of Honest Freeband DXers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 01:22:43 UTC
From: Alan Strawinski <rec.radio.cb@strawinski.net>
Message-ID: <Xns93EEBAF8F8397recradiocbstrawinski@216.168.3.44>
Source record: 76608
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

twistedhedwebtvdotnet@yahoo.com (Twistedhed) wrote in
news:d891d17c.0309061040.63b66d51@posting.google.com:

> I am certain beyond a doubt whatsoever, no one hammie or upperclassmen
> for that matter would give a rats azz if barefoot DXers employ the
> unused and abandoned 11 meter frequencies above 40. Yet,,,,,there
> exists a certain core of pedophialic lid-types that construe a slight
> overlooking of minor rules as capitol crime. As prime example
> Frankie,,Davie Hall, WA3MOJ, KC8LDO,Hypocrite N3CJCV,,,,and the
> remainder of lid posse infer by proxy vote and mental intrusion on my
> thoughts that there is NO excuse for breaking the law pertaining to
> the airwaves....according to Hall himself, and Frankenstien,,,to whom
> communication deficits abound....amends to condone this type behavior
> he commits in a wanton and willful act of pedophilia-like
> nature...hmmmm,,,but the same ego-wracked penitents have a problem
> with 11 meter DX and freebanding. Hyuk! Furthermore,,,this Voob-named
> loose kennel of lid-induced guardians of federal law-upholders proffer
> to make inquiries of another man's underwear, shooting cbers, and
> insults about molesting children. Proof is what these wet faced ARRL
> Lids cry for,,,,and here I proffer only the truth as evidence of my
> sincerity,,,,

(Score:-1,Flaimbait)

Oh wait...this isn't slashdot. My bad. :)

Sorry, I just couldn't resist.

--
Alan Strawinski
rec.radio.cb@strawinski.net
http://alan.strawinski.net

3194. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 01:26:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309061726.463cff26@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76609

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bjdbto$f0k$0@208.207.71.166>...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0309060623.3d291580@posting.google.com...
> > > S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:<elrflv4h98fu0mq5nqeivn0851u9bn2oe4@4ax.com>...
> > > > On Thu, 04 Sep 2003 10:00:13 -0400, Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
> > > > wrote:
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > >Why would you want to foil computer copy?
> > > >
> > > > Because no law says you can't.
> > > >
> > > > >For you to do the test to
> > > > >make sure that it works and then advocate it's use, you can't really
> > > > >say that wasn't your intention.
> > > >
> > > > What if it was? Nothing you can do about it but learn the code.
> > >
> > > Oh, geez. Here's another Morse Elitist that apparently advocates
> > > sending code so piss poorly that it can't be computer copied. Hoo-ah!
> >
> > Don't need to send it poorly. Only strong code signals under good
> > propagation conditions can be adequatly copied by the computer anyway. I'm
> > only mediocre at the code myself but I routinely copy better than the
> > computer anytime conditions are less than ideal such as with weak signals,
> > poor propagation, high static, or high interference.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Dee, I once made the comment that anyone could send code so poorly that a computer
couln't
> copy it while a human still could. Brainless Brian has contorted and totally distorted
> that into so many versions that even he can't keep track of them all.
>
> Dick

DICK, you said you were going to send badly to thwart No-Coders from copying you.

Did you lie then or are you lying now?

3195. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 01:34:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309061734.5dd8a33c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76610

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bjbasn$nal@library1.airnews.net>...
> "Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> news:ru5hlv87ts6p6qj5r2ceb6h1mq0c2jb38j@4ax.com...

> > You sound like a religous fanatic. Is that your intention or is it
> > natural? Am I now condemned to no-code hell for eternity? I'm sorry,
> > but if I could take your chidish commets seriously, I might actually
> > take a serious look at your position. However, from what I see right
> > now, you don't have a valid position to look at.
> >
>
> Well, you understand Dick quite perfectly... ;)
>
> Kim W5TIT

"Bless me, Hiram, for I have sinned. It has been 14 years since my last CW QSO."

3196. Re: Bad reception at my house (was Re: Farnsworth spacing)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 01:40:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309061740.7bdd6406@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76611

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0309060829.c18a490@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
> >
> > Jack, you must understand something. DICK has been in every
> > situation, probably including your own. If DICK says he's able to
> > receive HF everywhere he's -tried-, he implies that you aren't trying
> > hard enough. In the end, it comes down to CW always getting through.
> > You're using CW, right?
>
> Just once try reading the thread before you pounce on the "reply to"
> button you dim bulb, he's using 80M moonbounce spread spectrum.

No doubt. Were you on the other side of the circuit?

3197. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 01:58:32 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309061758.258348e4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76612

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<c996b.37822$Vx2.16850257@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309041911.69d1f7c8@posting.google.com...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:<8pE5b.37558$Vx2.16550752@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
> > > news:Blx5b.551$vj4.81294@nnrp1.ptd.net...
> > > >
> > > > Actually, I believe there is an ITU-R Recommendation that specifies
> > > > the "International Morse Code" in typical ITU detail.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Operative word is recommendation, which is exactly what I said.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> > Yet the FCC demands that one passes an exam or be denied access.
> >
> > Shouldn't they have a definition of what is being examined?
>
> They have defined it as 5wpm. The details are left up to the NCVEC just
> like the details of the writtens are left up to the NCVEC.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Nonsense. The FCC specified Morse at 5wpm rate. Farnsworth is a
method for learning fast Morse code, thus the characters are sent at
13-15wpm.

Amateur radio and electronics includes many methods of learning, but I
doubt the FCC would allow the answer to the resistor color code to be:
"BAD BOYS RAPE OUR YOUNG GIRLS BUT VIOLET GIVES WILLINGLY," yet it is
a commonly used learning technique.

3198. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 02:06:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309061806.621b7987@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76613

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309050230.3215356@posting.google.com>...
> "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:<v_R5b.268780$Oz4.71087@rwcrnsc54>...
>
> > I'm sure he won't be able to come up with anything unless he was thinking
> > of counting raising dues, and pushing for lower standards as
> > improvements.
>
> I'll watch while you >>TRY<< to show us where the ARRL has been
> "pushing for lower standards as improvements", Vince.

Jim has repeatedly pointed out where the ARRL proposed fewer license
classes and a lower code speed for full priveleges during the last
restructuring, which he always equates with lower standards.

3199. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 02:49:18 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <eh6llvs0vbalhqorumjt26l851mblitcpe@4ax.com>
Source record: 76616

On Sat, 6 Sep 2003 09:46:31 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:rbkilvoc2n1catkhl2a9llld2246fd1po5@4ax.com...
>> On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 19:46:51 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>>
>> >> OK Kim, show me where I said that I would boycott someone because of
>> >> their code status and I'll get back with you. If you can't quote me
>> >> saying that, who made the jump in logic will be apparent.
>> >>
>> >> The ball is in your court.
>> >>
>> >
>> >Hold up there, Bob Brock. SHOW ME where anyone has said you would
>"boycott
>> >someone because of their code status." No one has said a word about you
>> >doing that. YOU copped the attitude with the return of Jim's answer to
>you
>> >and my remarks. No where in the above material has Jim or I said a word
>> >about you boycotting anything. HOWEVER, in your earnest desire to be the
>> >victim, you missed that all Jim or I have done is answer your question,
>with
>> >nothing but sideline remarks back and forth to each other on the topic.
>> >
>> >I don't know what ball you've served to my court--I am not playing on a
>> >court, I am submitting remarks to a discussion.
>> >
>> >Kim W5TIT
>> >
>>
>> From elsewhere in the thread...
>>
>> [I said]
>>
>> > Show me where I said that anyone proposed it and I'll consider
>> > documenting it. I'm not in the habit of trying to document things
>> > that I never said and I won't start with you.
>>
>> [Dick Carroll said]
>>
>> Yep. Another one of "them". He proposed it but he didn't propose it.

>>
>> -------------------------------------
>> I admit that you may not agree with the above accusation. If so, say
>> so now and I'll apologize.
>>
>
>Nope, I don't. But for goodness sake, don't apologize. Good grief. You've
>nothing to be apologetic about--'least not the way I see it.
>
>And, for goodness sake again--don't *even* be affected by anything Dick
>Carroll, Waddles (WA8ULX or whatever), Larry Roll or even Dave Heil says.
>They're humorous, at best. They all remind me of drunken old rambling men.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>
Since I apparently misunderstood you, please accept my apology.

3200. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 02:49:20 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <6j6llv85inntp15ro0l6p3m4habhnd07l8@4ax.com>
Source record: 76615

On Sat, 06 Sep 2003 11:41:21 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

>
>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:7qdhlvkh2c2ca8k005gbk8kg1pm7pmlr2d@4ax.com...
>> On Fri, 05 Sep 2003 10:36:57 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>>
>> >Bob Brock wrote:
>> >
>> >> I didn't say that I boycotted any ham. I said that I boycotted a
>> >> licensing structure that I disagreed with. I'll QSO with any ham on
>> >> any band that we are both licensed to operate on. I even learned
>> >> code, but I won't upgrade until the requirement that I disagree with
>> >> is removed.
>> >
>> > Not very interested in Ham radio eh?
>>
>> Where did I say that Mike. Do you always have this much trouble with
>> facts?
>
>However refusing to upgrade shows that your hate for code exceeds your love
>of ham radio. While it's your choice, it seems pretty silly to me.

Well, if you were me, that would be relevalent...

3201. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 02:49:22 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <ok6llvctdi0jpoep091hve1ur067btr8tb@4ax.com>
Source record: 76614

On 06 Sep 2003 13:19:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <kikilv41ljggh172fuq727u3geep324s45@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
><bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>
>> I weighed the benefit of HF against conforming
>>with a requirement that I didn't agree with. I felt that by
>>participating I was helping it to continue.
>
>How is participating in the test helping the requirement to continue?

Just my personal preference. As I said in another place, I spent too
much time doing useless stuff for a regulatory agency while getting
paid for it. I don't want to do it for free. My life...my choice.
>
>>There are a lot of hoops
>>that I would be willing to jump through to get HF privileges. Code
>>isn't one of them.
>
>To each his own.
>>
>>Call it a matter of personal ethics. Upgrading would have been the
>>easy way out.
>
>Or consider this:
>
>Which do you think is more convincing to FCC as a reason to remove Element 1:
>
>- The person who says "I won't upgrade until that test is removed"
>
>or
>
>- The person who says "I took the test, passed it, yet I think there is no
>reason for that test to exist any more."

No that I think that either one will have an impact on the final
decision, but I'd have to say a combination of both would be most
effective.

3202. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 03:00:26 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <9h7llvkvm4b98intn6bsnh3m70ofje9n29@4ax.com>
Source record: 76617

On Sat, 6 Sep 2003 09:52:07 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:9bnilv8q3omrvq3impcbgpbv65dpddjhbu@4ax.com...
>> On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 20:21:53 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>> >news:h9ghlv49at0akiluoaqm6f72pf2skiah5v@4ax.com...
>> >>
>> >> I'll tell you guys why I'm here shortly, but conversing with twits
>> >> like you sure isn't it.
>> >>
>> >
>> >Oh!! Hold me back!! Now he's getting suspenseful!
>> >
>> >Kim W5TIT
>>
>> OK Kim, I'll keep you in suspense no more. Whether some like to admit
>> it or not, the senseless Morse Code debate will soon be history. I'm
>> here to see if the ham community will then move on to something really
>> important like revising the written tests and the test pools so that
>> when someone passes the test, they actually know how to use a radio,
>> set up or build an antenna, the protocols on the frequencies they are
>> authouized to use, how to minimize RF exposure and stay within safe
>> levels. If someone doesn't know what all those buttons do on their
>> radio, they shouldn't be licensed to use it. If they don't know
>> enough not to use repeater imputs for simplex operation, they
>> shouldn't be licensed to use the frequency.
>>
>> It's my hope that when it is all over with Morse, that the ham
>> community will address the real important issues and Morse ain't it.
>> It is at best a scapegoat that hams can argue about while the more
>> important issues of licensing inept operators is ignored. IMO, the
>> ham community has some really screwed up priorities and hopefully,
>> with the endgame for code in sight, they may....just may come to grips
>> with some real issues.
>>
>> I'm hopeful, but not expectant.
>>
>
>This newsgroup is not the place to find intellectual, even-handed debate,
>Bob. You're way off base with your concept if you think it is. It just

>isn't. QRZ, eHam.net, or others maybe, but not this one...
>
>And, lose the idea that the CW thing is going to die--it's not. If you are
>that serious about wanting to change the wheel, then get involved heavily in
>the ARRL and W5YI. Use those venues to affect change; but you'd better be
>willing to take giant baby steps at a time--and I don't think you're that
>serious. That's not an insult--few people have the fortitude, time, and
>stamina it takes to turn a wheel. I tried for four years--and most of my
>free time. Didn't work. Giant baby steps=hugely small steps at a time.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>
Kim, within a year the only debate in here about CW will be about the
consequences of it no longer being required. The whining will be
terrible for awhile, but like the no-code tech discussions, they will
eventually disappear.

However, you are right about one thing. This is not the place to look
without heavy filtering of those who are incapable of logical
discussion. I think I'll hang around for a while just to watch the
endgame.

3203. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 03:58:39 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <g3bllvkg5fs507r48o78fg5iukgn1vtrcq@4ax.com>
Source record: 76618

On Sat, 06 Sep 2003 17:25:09 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
wrote:

>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>> news:3F59E710.50805@adelphia.net...
>>
>>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>>
>>>>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>>>
>>>
>>><some snippage>
>>>
>>>
>>>>So, would any of you pro-coders like to help a no-code tech upgrade?
>>>>I have to warn you in advance that, even after I learn the code, I
>>>>will still not support code testing as a requirement for HF access.
>>>>This is a personal decison that I am making because I want to do all
>>>>that I can to accomadate another person who wants to use amature radio
>>>>and this is the only way that he can do it.
>>>
>>>
>>>Ok, here you've said you already know code but now want to learn code.
>>>
>> This
>>
>>>is very confusing.
>>>
>>>
>>>Hey Dee
>>>
>>>
>>>(church lady voice here)
>>>
>>>Why.... could it be.....a TROLL?
>>>
>>>(church lady voice off)
>>>
>>>You have to admit, its a great way to get a response out of a lot of
>>>people - for a while at least. Just disagree with most everybody, and
>>>don't forget to change the story whenver possible.
>>>
>>>- Mike KB3EIA -

>>>
>>
>>
>> Yes but changing it within the same posting would signify that the troll is
>> of very low quality. Ought send him back to troll school.
>
>
> Well Dee, when a person does that, they are always right! 8^). I agree
>about the troll thing. Or at least send him somewhere.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I thought that I was dealing with people who had a little knowledge
about the internet and how to click on links. I was mistaken.

Go back to sleep now...

3204. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 04:02:57 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <fabllvcufo6pu42ue1rvh8d5u50h17ofqc@4ax.com>
Source record: 76619

On Sat, 6 Sep 2003 09:31:17 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:gejilvo4f6tm1pd1e3t7p62tjc9l3u3pmo@4ax.com...
>> On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 20:30:30 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >You're right, Dee. That's the point I try to make...I rote memorized for
>> >the test. Now, the argument for the above scenario could also be made
>that
>> >the instrukshions can be looked up. I've built quite a few antennas.
>All
>> >of them I used instrukshions for; and they all worked great.
>> >
>> >Kim W5TIT
>> >
>>
>> What would be wrong with requiring them to build a quarter wave dipole
>> that is resonate at a specified frequency as part of the test? That
>> is, if the test were changed to be written and performance based.
>>
>
>There's nothing at all wrong with having some part of the test be based on
>something related to performance--other than CW; comment on that in a
>moment--if there could be a generally agreed upon topic. I think
>establishing something like a digital station would be more appropriate than
>building an antenna, because I think what should be tested is something
>everyone will do at one point or another. While not everyone may dabble in
>digital, APRS, SSTV, or whatever, everyone will have to establish a radio
>set up at some point or another. The best would be a sucessful mobile
>installation, but doing testing outside just wouldn't be feasible.
>
>On your latter comment, be careful how you word things in this debate: the
>test is performance based right now. It baseed on one's ability to
>understand CW, and that is performance.

Only if they know how to connect the antenna to the radio. ;-)

3205. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 04:12:20 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <ohbllvkq21kf2i0n8trbb9sv2n25vvc459@4ax.com>
Source record: 76620

```
On Sat, 6 Sep 2003 09:43:32 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:pijilvscl419fdu99637sucn55794r8gcc@4ax.com...
>> On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 19:41:34 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>> >news:je5hlv4nak5tfn1mt0q6lrn30m7rtj5ojk@4ax.com...
>> >> On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 06:58:06 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> >> wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>> >> >news:tnvflv0qkdrojl53j9ev5j80q885tjve7q@4ax.com...
>> >> >> On 05 Sep 2003 02:58:33 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >>No, the writen exams have a basis in the real world.
>> >> >> >
>> >> >> >And what Value is that? The present writtens dont test for
>knowledge
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Then what do you think that they test for?
>> >> >
>> >> >Whether someone can remember correct answers to known questions.
>> >>
>> >> Provided that the questions cover the things that you want the person
>> >> to know, this isn't an issue.
>> >>
>> >
>> >I think it is because retention of the material is minimal when rote
>> >memorizing for a test. I couldn't tell you anything that was on the
>tests I
>> >took--because the material was not learned, it was memorized. No
>examples
>> >of application, no scenarios for cause and affect, etc.
>> >
>> >Kim W5TIT
>> >
>> So, instead of the continual code/no-code debate, why aren't these
>> issues discussed here?
>>
>
>To use Hans' spelling: for crying out phucking loud, Bob. Either you
```

>literally have just decided to pop in and don't read any other time; or you
>really are just trolling. This newsgroup runs several, *several* topics at
>any given time. You can choose whatever ones you would like and even create
>your own. But, you aren't going to change the debate on CW and no one ever
>will. I just laughed hysterically at another post of yours, where you said,
>"thank goodness it will all be ending soon." That's ludicrous. You're
>either young or blissful if you think the CW debate is going to end or go
>away.

Anyone who can read the news knows which way code testing is going to
go. The only real question is when. I see that Oz has decided that
they don't have to wait until 2005 to dump it. Gee...what a suprise.
>
>
>>
>> If the test pool questions are such that the
>> requred areas of knowledge aren't addressed, changing those questions
>> (or perhaps the testing itself) would be an outstanding subject to be
>> discussed here. However, it's not usually discussed because all
>> threads lead to the code thing.
>>
>
>So? Go find somewhere else to join in. Because if your motivation is to
>change the cycles that happen here; you may as well give up. Right now, the
>vociferous CW threads and the thread about my callsign? They happen every
>time at this time of year. Larry usually brings up the "extinction" debate
>shortly before the holidays and it ends sometime around Feb-Mar. Hans is
>returning to the newsgroup after a season of fishing; so you'll see more
>frequent posts from Brian Kelley (haven't figured that one out yet) and more
>frequent posts on other topics such as kit building, antenna efficiency,
>ARRL--good and bad, and all kinds of other subjects. Then, when everyone
>who has a life in the Spring and Summer months mostly disappears from the
>newsgroup, you'll see the people here who are always here--and you'll see
>that those people are mostly those who just plain don't like each other and
>snipe at all times of year. I've come to enjoy it and have decided to use
>the newsgroup as training ground for communication methodologies that I use
>in my employment. Works great--except when I allow myself to go off on some
>childish throe of insults and derivation into la-la land which, for me, is a
>great distraction! I have to be pretty darned "professional" during the day
>and getting down to another level sure is great fun!

Oh, I come and go. I have many more parts to my life that are more
pressing sometimes than ham radio or the newsgroup, but I won't go
into them. It sounds like the serious hams who want to discuss real
ham things have lives too.

BTW, the last time that I read anything is this ng was when you posted
your goodbye to the group way back when. You see, this is a newsgroup
that you can leave for months or years and come back exactly where you
left off because the same things are being said over and over again.

Personally, I kinda like your callsign. I hope that you can live up
to it.
>
>>
>> I have my own view on the code issue and it's not going to change
>> anymore than anyone else is going to change theirs. Our minds are
>> made up. However, I think that people on both sides of that
>> particular issue see areas where they would agree that the actual
>> testing needs change.
>>
>
>And that debate has been had and made many times here; and it's coming up
>again--Winter is coming.
>
>Kim W5TIT

So, basically you're saying that the ng is stuck and useless except
for a distraction. That's a shame, but I tend to agree with you.
Still though, I think that if a few hams wanted to discuss stuff that
is actually policy related with regards to enforcement, policy, etc.
it could become a useful group with a lot of filtering.

3206. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 05:00:28 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <MXy6b.5557$hF4.5052@newssvr32.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76621

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bje07b$t4g$0@208.207.71.163...
> Well, there ya go, Hans. One of your subjects heard from. Any further
questions?
> Dick

Anybody can have their post answered by a troll. What, did you think that
Hans was troll trolling, or something?

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

3207. Re: Persecution of Honest Freeband DXers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 05:51:00 UTC
From: Landshark
Message-ID: <8Hz6b.10503$A_1.5659@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76622
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Twistedhed" <twistedhedwebtvdotnet@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:d891d17c.0309061040.63b66d51@posting.google.com...
<Troll fodder snipped>

Yes and again, just like before WA3MOJ has gone to the extent of creating account to harass
, accuse, use foul language, distort things into
his own warped perspective. Troll!

Landshark

--
Try these to learn about newsgroup trolls.

http://www.io.com/~zikzak/troll_thesis.html
http://members.aol.com/intwg/trolls.htm

3208. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 12:54:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <uUF6b.7921$_26.197@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76623

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:

> heh heh...yeah, I know. There's been one reason or
> another for not having the equipment connected. Right
> now, it's been for the last (nearly) two years because
> of the new truck, having to find where I want the
> equipment; then having to pause all that while I have
> some work done, etc.

All petty excuses. Anyway, speaking of trucks, mine was almost stolen last night. I was up late and just happened to look out the door as a guy approached the truck. I watched him as he looked in the window for several seconds and then raised a rock over his head to break the glass. At that point, I shouted for him to get away from the truck. He then ran to a waiting pickup where his friend sped off. Sadly, the tailgate was down on the pickup, so I couldn't see the license plate. Since there has been a string of vehicle thefts around here lately, I called the police and gave them the best description of the vehicle I could. Of course, by the time they got here, the guys were long gone.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3209. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 13:09:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <16G6b.7930$_26.6013@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76624

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> (snip) Sure enough, one of the neighbors with
> Gladys Kravitz syndrome complained about
> "interference" and such that supposedly happened
> since the antennas went up. Called FCC as I recall.
> Ham invited over the neighbor and other interestested
> parties and showed 'em the coax ends. No more
> complaints.

That is funny. Years ago (at a retirement community), the boss suggested I tell everyone my antennas were for television. Sure enough, two days after the largest antenna went up (18 foot wide and 20 foot boom), a female neighbor asked about it. When I told her it was for television, she looked at it, paused for several seconds (obviously thinking), and seriously said I must get really great reception. I almost died laughing (as did the boss when I told him about it). That was my most humorious antenna situation.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3210. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 13:34:10 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjfc5g$989@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76625

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bje0ug$n9$0@208.207.71.163...
> OK Brainless dipshit. when you finally get to foaming at themouth so that
you can't carry on even an IRRational
> conversation time has come to dump you back on your sorry arse into the
sewer, from whence ye came...right back with
> The TIT, Loosegoose Lennie and Brock the Crock BYE! Stay gone a LONG
time !!!
>
> PLONK!
>

ROFLMAO!!! Except DICK has no idea how to actually filter someone. What's
the difference whether he dialogues with a poster through a direct response
or as the result of a RE:re. Good grief, DICK, at least get some balls to
go with...oh, well maybe that's not your namesake...

Kim W5TIT

3211. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 13:45:33 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjfcqt$g6s@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76626

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:uUF6b.7921$_26.197@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> > heh heh...yeah, I know. There's been one reason or
> > another for not having the equipment connected. Right
> > now, it's been for the last (nearly) two years because
> > of the new truck, having to find where I want the
> > equipment; then having to pause all that while I have
> > some work done, etc.
>
>
> All petty excuses. Anyway, speaking of trucks, mine was almost stolen
last
> night. I was up late and just happened to look out the door as a guy
> approached the truck. I watched him as he looked in the window for several
> seconds and then raised a rock over his head to break the glass. At that
> point, I shouted for him to get away from the truck. He then ran to a
> waiting pickup where his friend sped off. Sadly, the tailgate was down on
> the pickup, so I couldn't see the license plate. Since there has been a
> string of vehicle thefts around here lately, I called the police and gave
> them the best description of the vehicle I could. Of course, by the time
> they got here, the guys were long gone.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Oh man.... Well, I've thought about how I would "handle" the robbery of my
truck--it literally took me a lifetime of dreaming to get one; and I really
never thought I would be able to do it. BUT, if it was stolen I would hope
it was totally destroyed beyond being able to be returned and then I would
hope that the extra coverage I am carrying on it would hook me back up.
Kind of like when the house caught on fire...man the insurance company was
10X worse than the damned fire! I'm scared to death of fire again for fear
of what I'll have to go through with the insurance company!!

I told my neighbor that if he ever gets over here with a garden hose to put
the thing out again, I'll choke him. First he took serious risks standing
at an outside window that had blown, not to mention that the "smoke"
(actually fumes as you know) had reached that greenish-yellow phase, where
they can flash-fire at any point and he was standing right in the middle of

it as it war barreling out the window!! He just doesn't realize what could have happened to him...and nothing in my home is worth the life of anyone, nothing.

Kim W5TIT

3212. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 13:51:58 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309070551.6b548f1b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76627

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bje0ug$n9$0@208.207.71.163>...
> OK Brainless dipshit. when you finally get to foaming at themouth so that you can't carry on even an IRRational
> conversation time has come to dump you back on your sorry arse into the sewer, from whence ye came...right back with
> The TIT, Loosegoose Lennie and Brock the Crock BYE! Stay gone a LONG time !!!
>
> PLONK!

Dick, you biggest problem is that you're lazy. You left it up to someone else (me) to keep track of your lies instead of doing it yourself. So don't blame me for you shortcomings. You should have been taking care of business.

And as far as staying gone goes, you're welcome to stay gone just as long as your mean, bile filled heart desires.

Kim, Len, Brock and me aren't going anywhere.

Sayonara, Brian

3213. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 14:12:21 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjfed3$88e@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76628

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:ohbllvkq21kf2i0n8trbb9sv2n25vvc459@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 6 Sep 2003 09:43:32 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
> >
> >To use Hans' spelling: for crying out phucking loud, Bob. Either you
> >literally have just decided to pop in and don't read any other time; or
you
> >really are just trolling. This newsgroup runs several, *several* topics
at
> >any given time. You can choose whatever ones you would like and even
create
> >your own. But, you aren't going to change the debate on CW and no one
ever
> >will. I just laughed hysterically at another post of yours, where you
said,
> >"thank goodness it will all be ending soon." That's ludicrous. You're
> >either young or blissful if you think the CW debate is going to end or go
> >away.
>
> Anyone who can read the news knows which way code testing is going to
> go. The only real question is when. I see that Oz has decided that
> they don't have to wait until 2005 to dump it. Gee...what a suprise.
> >

Bob. You're young, aren't you? I can almost tell that by your optimistic
attitude about the CW issue. You have to realize, Bob, that the CW issue
for the drunken-type ramblers is not a CW issue at all. It's a value
issue--that they value some mysterious talent they see in their ability and
desire to use CW. It isn't about regulations, it isn't about the FCC, it
isn't about whether it is a testing element or not. In their eyes, they
will always be above anyone else not of their ilk. We know that's wrong.
Others who have far more logic and brains and the capacity to think straight
know that's wrong. But, they do not. So, their incessant whining and
arguing and condemning and blaming will go on into eternity, while the rest
of ham radio--the real part--moves on, has fun, helps out, and grows.

> >I have to be pretty darned "professional" during the day
> >and getting down to another level sure is great fun!
>
> Oh, I come and go. I have many more parts to my life that are more
> pressing sometimes than ham radio or the newsgroup, but I won't go
> into them. It sounds like the serious hams who want to discuss real
> ham things have lives too.

>

Absolutely. The only reason I happened upon the newsgroup again is I've been designing and building an MS Access application for use by a company. I am on the computer so much at work that it really isn't a draw here at home. When I was on before, we'd actually just gotten the internet connection, and a second computer so we didn't have to "share" :GRIN: and I would load up the newsgroup while I was cruising around. For this project that I did here, we went out and bought a new computer with Office XP Pro, Office Pro, TurboCAD, Dreamweaver, and Crystal Reports. This MS Access application turned into an all-out total package for the company and it's challenged some of my abilities--which I really dig because it's meant growing some new knowledge and that's never bad!

At any rate, the project is now winding down, save some tweaks and mods. I don't know if I'll keep coming to the newsgroup. I don't have much to do on the computer at home; I'm much more an outside or home decorating person than I am a internet junkie (hubby's the internet junkie). And, heck--now we're looking at new homes so that's bound to keep me distracted. But, like I said, after the shock that there are people who act the way they do here in this newsgroup, it becomes nothing but fun and entertainment to draw them out--well, except for DICK who can't directly respond to anyone who's smarter than he--into a tirade of emotion. The occasional half-serious-to-serious discussion is great.

>
> BTW, the last time that I read anything is this ng was when you posted
> your goodbye to the group way back when. You see, this is a newsgroup
> that you can leave for months or years and come back exactly where you
> left off because the same things are being said over and over again.
>

Oh yeah. You got that right. For those folks whom you depict above, all one need do is imagine the local bar-and-grill/pub, where Johnny and Drake and Chuck have hung forever. One walks in, could be 15 years later, and there they are: still on the same stool, slumped over, arguing the same damned things they've argued for years. Pathetic, I know, but it's no different than watching a car race, not for the winner but to see what accidents we can see.

>
> Personally, I kinda like your callsign. I hope that you can live up
> to it.
> >

I couldn't care less whether you like it or not, Bob. I don't care if anyone else likes it or not. It's personal between and a group of friends and the rest of the world be damned.

> >
> >And that debate has been had and made many times here; and it's coming up
> >again--Winter is coming.

> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> So, basically you're saying that the ng is stuck and useless except
> for a distraction.
>

Absolutely. The only folks you'll ever see in any half-way decent debates in this newsgroup are Jim/N2EY; Brian Kelley; Hans--once in a while; and the occasional visitors who'll bring up something happenstance into this newsgroup and figure out real quick that there's so few serious participants that it's just not worth it.

>
> That's a shame, but I tend to agree with you.
>

Oh, I don't think it's a shame...'least not any more. I kinda like it. I don't know where you work or what have to do for a living but I get plenty of serious, mentally challenging, stressful distractions at work. I think the transition I used to look for here was a seriuos-but-not-mentally-challenging exchange. Well, that's not going to happen ;) so I just shed all the "stuff" and decide to be as basal as I can possibly be--unless there's something that I can contribute to an intellectual discussion. And, let's face it, I'm just not into ham radio for the intellectualism of it so most of those discussions go way up over my head and I am bored to tears with the idea of learning enough about whatever is that's being discussed...!! Reading those discussions is like just looking at the cover of that mag that ARRL puts out--the Techie one.

>
> Still though, I think that if a few hams wanted to discuss stuff that
> is actually policy related with regards to enforcement, policy, etc.
> it could become a useful group with a lot of filtering.
>

That possibility is insidiously redundant, i.e., can happen anywhere. There's nothing stopping you from doing that right here--a new thread--and completely ignoring the posts to it that have nothing to do with the topic and everything to do with one's being on top of their imaginative mountain. You could also start it--well, anywhere.

Kim W5TIT

3214. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 14:47:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309070647.15a1fda6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76629

Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:<86fzj924xh.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>...
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> >>>>> "Brian" == Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:
>
> [...]
>
> Brian> One will get ya ten that Farnsworth was an expert on the
> Brian> subject BEFORE he/she invented that wheel and took it public. I
> Brian> find the concept of you, admittedly struggling to get off a
> Brian> notch above ground zero in this game, "facilitating" the
> Brian> learning process for others just a tad problematic.
>
> Out of curiosity, have you seen the page or are you still blocked on
> the concept of a student assisting other students?

Jack, "students teaching students" is at the core of the FCC's
mandated Novice subbands. I hadn't been aware that Kelly was against
this concept and the implementation of it.

Brian/N0iMD

3215. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 15:33:29 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F5B4FC9.2000809@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 76720

WA8ULX wrote:
>>What the heck is "Memozizing"?
>
>
> I wondered how long it would take you fools to catch that.

Yea right.

3216. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 15:34:38 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F5B500E.6050207@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 76721

Bob Brock wrote:
> On 07 Sep 2003 23:26:53 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>
>
>>To bury his Dipole. He was complaining about how noisy HF was, so I told him
>>if he buried it, that it would stop the Noise. The fool believed me and buried
>>it, I still cant stop laughing., I hate to tell the guy the truth, because now
>>he Brags about how quit his Receiver is.
>
>
> OK...I've got to ask. How in the hell does someone who spells as
> badly as he does send code? Hell, it's hard to tell what he's trying
> to say here, I'd hate like hell to have to try and figure out what he
> was trying to spell during a QSO.
>

Nothing like having a third grade education.

3217. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 16:09:30 UTC
From: Rich M <ye3ahddd@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1062951100.855826@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 76630

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:Yqu6b.4852$Mo5.3409@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com...
> Another ham-bashing Troll.
>
> Assuming that he means what he says, the guy must be an utter moron... One
> of those who thinks that ham radio and the Internet "compete" with each
> other, as if they were rival communications carriers going after the same
> market... What a dope!
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL

I feel he makes an interesting conjecture Charles.

Consider: If one were to set up two PC's with full
internet capability & CD-ROM burners, and six
feet away, two HFham stations with control op's
at a hamfest.

Next you invite 10 young people (14-17 yo) at random who have
no previous exposure to ham radio from the crowd to
choose which items to explore and operate.
Which of these two setup's do you think that
in the end-game, the greater percentage of
young people would choose to bring home if they
had the option to do so?

(My guess is they'll want to download MP3's
from Kazaa or Morpheus instead of calling
CQ on 10 Meters thru a microphone)

3218. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 16:19:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907121927.25815.00002794@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 76631

In article <bje0ev$g7e@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030906141912.14837.00002772@mb-m03.aol.com...
>> In article <bjct9j$q01@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim " <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> writes:
>>
>> >FM!!!!!????
>>
>> (snipped for brevity)
>>
>> That's one reason, Kim, stated in a way that makes a lot of sense.
>>
>> Here's another:
>>
>> Even before 1991, a considerable number of hams in this area (metro
>> Philly)
>> were friends and family members of hams who wanted a way to keep in touch
>> while
>> mobile. The most common setup was the 2-careers/kids/cars household,
>> where the radio was used for all sorts of "honeydew" purposes.
>
>You and Jim (Hampton) mentioned this and I had completely forgot about that
>aspect! And, it was also one of the reasons I so easily got my husband
>interested--as soon as I began mentioning how neat it would be to stay in
>touch better than with a mobile phone--which back then was cost prohibitive.

'zactly. And it's not a new idea, either - back when long distance phone calls
were prohibitively expensive for most people, there were *some* hams whose main
interest was keeping in touch with family members who were all over the country
- or world.

>> This sort of thing was particularly popular on some machines around here
>> because the culture in this area encourages open machines, deference to
>> mobiles
>> and HTs, and wide coverage. Plus there are so many open machines around
>> here that you can usally find one that's not in use.
>>
>> What really drove that boom was not the dropping of the code test but the
>> availability of inexpensive, small, easy-to-use HTs and mobile rigs. And
>> the proliferation of repeaters,
>
>I concede, now looking at it that way.

Nothing to concede, Kim. Your "FM" story is one source of new hams. My "honeydew" story is another. I don't think any trends in amateur radio have a single source/reason.

>> These folks were hams, all right, but their interest in ham radio was not
>> about
>> radio as an end in itself, but radio as a means to an end. IOW, just a
>> tool to do a job, not the main attraction.

>> Trouble is, cell phones now fill those roles.

>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Absolutely. Probably one of the biggest reasons we (my dear and I) haven't
>been all that driven/motivated to get the equipment back into the vehicles.

Exactly. On the one hand, almost everyone sees a cell phone as a "necessity" these days, and the calling plans and good (not great, but good) coverage make them the comm tool of choice 99% of the time. Plus, "installation" consists of putting the charge cord in the cigarette lighter socket.

Putting your ham gear in the truck is a whole different story unless you want to do the lighter socket/magmount thing.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3219. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 16:27:02 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <q%I6b.5385$oK5.5252@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76632

"Rich M" <ye3ahddd@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:1062951100.855826@newshost03.voicenet.com...
>
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
> news:Yqu6b.4852$Mo5.3409@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com...
> > Another ham-bashing Troll.
> >
> > Assuming that he means what he says, the guy must be an utter moron...
One
> > of those who thinks that ham radio and the Internet "compete" with each
> > other, as if they were rival communications carriers going after the
same
> > market... What a dope!
> >
> > Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
> I feel he makes an interesting conjecture Charles.
>
> Consider: If one were to set up two PC's with full
> internet capability & CD-ROM burners, and six
> feet away, two HFham stations with control op's
> at a hamfest.
>
> Next you invite 10 young people (14-17 yo) at random who have
> no previous exposure to ham radio from the crowd to
> choose which items to explore and operate.
> Which of these two setup's do you think that
> in the end-game, the greater percentage of
> young people would choose to bring home if they
> had the option to do so?
>
> (My guess is they'll want to download MP3's
> from Kazaa or Morpheus instead of calling
> CQ on 10 Meters thru a microphone)

- If you can find any teenagers who are not already familiar with that
stuff... Maybe you could find a few in an economically depressed area, might
be worth a try.

Most teenagers I know are already up to speed on the Internet stuff. It's
old hat to them, the kind of stuff they see anywhere and everywhere,
including at school and home.

My guess is that they would show more interest in the ham gear, because at
least it would be something new, that does something different.

Also, a surprising number of teenagers today are seriously interested in public service. They want to do something good. For these teens, ham radio has endless potential and yes it most definitely does excite their interest.

So you can take your "The Internet is more interesting that Ham Radio" attitude, fold it up so that it is all sharp corners, and... Well, I'm sure you figure out something to do with it then.

The only point that anti-ham troll has, Rich, is the one on top of his head.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

3220. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 16:48:13 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F5B6196.3050008@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76633

Rich M wrote:
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
> news:Yqu6b.4852$Mo5.3409@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com...
>
>>Another ham-bashing Troll.
>>
>>Assuming that he means what he says, the guy must be an utter moron... One
>>of those who thinks that ham radio and the Internet "compete" with each
>>other, as if they were rival communications carriers going after the same
>>market... What a dope!
>>
>>Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>
> I feel he makes an interesting conjecture Charles.
>
> Consider: If one were to set up two PC's with full
> internet capability & CD-ROM burners, and six
> feet away, two HFham stations with control op's
> at a hamfest.
>
> Next you invite 10 young people (14-17 yo) at random who have
> no previous exposure to ham radio from the crowd to
> choose which items to explore and operate.
> Which of these two setup's do you think that
> in the end-game, the greater percentage of
> young people would choose to bring home if they
> had the option to do so?
>
> (My guess is they'll want to download MP3's
> from Kazaa or Morpheus instead of calling
> CQ on 10 Meters thru a microphone)

I won't argue with your basic premise, Rich. You are absolutely right.

And if a similar number of adults were chosen, a whole lot of them might get excited at how much porn they could download.

But I don't see that as a good comparison. For most people, computers are a hobby, but not a technical one. Most computers today are sold bundled with pre-setup hardware and software, and all you do is plug them in, get an isp, and off ya go.

Most of these people would not be interested in the amateur radio station even if there were no computer in the same room. They just don't

have the technical interest. You just keep plugging away to catch that 1 in 10 or 100 people that will be interested in the ARS.

If I were to hazard a guess, I wouldn't be surprised if the low retention rate was due to the number of non-technical people who got their technician license, and then had no real interest and therefore no reason to renew their ticket, as they probably hadn't been on the air since soon after they got their license, or as soon as there was general cell phone coverage.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3221. Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 19:45:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309071145.283a7ed8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76634

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bjbcnt$8ge@library1.airnews.net>...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bjae22gnr0@208.206.142.82...

> > And it's true, I WASN'T at home-that time. But where were YOU when K0HB,
> N2EY, W6RCA, AC6XG, W3RV and
> > I--Did I forget anyone?- held that nice rrap CW net on 40 meters???
> >
>
> Ooooo, demmit! I missed something good here. That's what I get for picking
> and choosing posts most of the time.

It was pretty pathetic, Kim. They suckered poor Cecil into meeting up
with them on 40M CW, but treated him just as badly afterward. I would
advise you not to fall for their tricks.

Anyway, Brian, did you see a couple of
> months ago where I posted the question to Dick about just what it would take
> for the establishment of a disaster station for CW operation? As far as I
> know, he never answered!!!!

Yeh, I never saw his reply. I guess if you shake a guy up bad enough,
he starts blurting out all kinds of stuph, like DICK just did..

And, of course, it's because he knew he was
> getting set up--we all know it would actually take quite a bit to be ready
> to establish a disaster response CW station--and that was the set up. I was
> going to ask DICK if he was ready...
>
> Well.....

To hear them talk, you can make an emergency CW station out of a
Wrigley's Spearmint Gum foil wrapper and an old double edge razor
blade.

They lie.

> > Oh, I almost forgot- you're STILL waiting for a code free license!
> Right!
> >

If DICK could use QRZ, he might discern that I've always held a coded
license, but he chooses to remain ignorant.

"Show Me" has no meaning to him.

> > As for emergency gear, I have all that in a pair of metal equipment
> cases, ready to grab and go, if and
> > when needed. I'll take along a laptop just in case the need happens to be
> for a digital mode. AND my
> > Vibroplex Iambic paddle for CW.
>
> PAH!!!! Grab and go. All of that?! You have got to be kidding...but wait,
> there's more:

I wonder where he lifted those transit cases from?

> > For power I have a lightweight switchmode AC supply AND an 800 watt
> inverter. One does need to be
> > flexible doesn't one?
> >
>
> Oh. OK. So, uh, don't persecute me here because I am lowly slow-code
> Tech+, but where you gonna get that AC and what if your car is crunched;
> and/or even when it runs out of gas? And, if you've got all this "stuff"
> ready to <chuckle> grab and go...and your vehicle is crunched, the trees are
> down so much that you can't move, or any number of other quite likely
> situations in a disaster, how will you choose to establish your CW station
> then, Dick? Really, let's drill it.

Yeh, where's his generator, chaing saw, and winch? Or quadrunner?

> > After all, the need could be for something hightech and digital. But the
> > possibility always exists that those needing to communicat from a disaster
> area will have only modest old
> > CW available.
>
> The higher likelihood, and I think most seasoned EmCom folks will bear me
> out on this one, is that there will be many low-power talkies available,
> FRS, and the immediate disaster communications would be through simplex
> frequencies on 2M and 70cm, along with APRS stations set up and
> transmitting. Most disasters would have high hope of skilled CW ops for HW
> traffic, though.

On Guam, we got a little FEMA grant to set up a portable 2M repeater.
Put it in a truch or van and park it on whatever peak you needed it
at.

> > One does need to be ready, doesn't one?
>
> Yep. And it doesn't sound like you are.

Now, now. DICK has done more than most have.

The picture I get in my mind is
> almost humorous if it weren't so sad. DICK, standing there with his grab
> and go "stuff," wishing he'd thought to wheel mount those metal equipment
> cases because they sure are going to be heavy to drag or pick up and carry,
> with a tree or two down over his vehicle and the power lines dancing all
> over the place around him...with his metal carrying cases right there...

>
> Oh, the the pain, the pain...

Oh, the humanity!

> > So what's YOUR enmergency status,Slim? Do you have "permission" yet?
> >
> > Dick, W0EX FISTS #3939
> >
>
> He probably would be up, running, established and ready to
> communicate--WHILE getting the hell away from danger and to a location as
> directed by the local net.
>
> Kim W5TIT

As a husband and father, my primary responsibility is to protect my
family.

3222. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 19:57:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309071157.32f5c786@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76635

Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<pefhlvolgug7j057kmh8l12p5ls52jthe2@4ax.com>...
> On 05 Sep 2003 16:26:50 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>
> > Going to open up the New CB Ham Bands?
>
> They did it a few decades ago when they took 11 meters from the hams
> since they didn't use it.

Buice is always asking silly questions.

For instance, a few years ago Bruce came on here asking if a CBer
married a No-Code Technician, would she still be his sister?

Bruce talks like a CBer, and he used to live near Akron at that time.
There is a female Technician with the same last name in the database
in that area.

So I wonder if he's made an honest woman out of her yet or if he's
just dating her.

3223. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 20:01:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309071201.23a96249@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76636

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0309051154.4ef03806@posting.google.com>...
> The following isn't exactly a new idea, but some may not have seen it
> yet...
>
> Maybe the way out of the mess is for a Smith Chart test to replace
> the code test.

So you still want the Amateur Radio Service to be the exclusive domain
of the Electrical Engineer's?

I don't think that's what the FCC wants, but since the NCVEC can do
any damned thing they want, go ahead and put it to them.

3224. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 20:26:58 UTC
From: "paulfriedman@comcast.net" <p.paulfriedman@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <mwM6b.383690$o%2.172280@sccrnsc02>
Source record: 76637

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309071201.23a96249@posting.google.com...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0309051154.4ef03806@posting.google.com>...
> > The following isn't exactly a new idea, but some may not have seen it
> > yet...
> >
> > Maybe the way out of the mess is for a Smith Chart test to replace
> > the code test.
> > So you still want the Amateur Radio Service to be the exclusive domain
> of the Electrical Engineer's?
>
> I don't think that's what the FCC wants, but since the NCVEC can do
> any damned thing they want, go ahead and put it to them.

I am not an EE or, for that matter, an any-type-E. Majored in History, in fact, with a useful minor in Comparative Religion. Work experience consisted on sitting in an office, drinking bad coffee, attending boring meetings and writing REALLY useful memos (I was high enough in the organization so that I didn't have to read any memos). With that as background ...

I do no think I am brilliant, but I have not found Smith Charts all that difficult. When I learned about them, I found them interesting and potentially useful. Perhaps, just perhaps, the NCVEC thinks selecting for people who find such things a Smith Charts interesting is a reasonable filter for entrance to ham radio. If this be true, perhaps, just perhaps, that's a reasonable filter?

Paul AB0SI

3225. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 21:06:35 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907170635.18140.00000802@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 76638

>Well, since CB never required a test, I'd have to say that your
>question makes no sense to me.

You mean you call the present system a Test get real.

3226. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 21:25:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907172514.05539.00000621@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 76640

In article <b309ce148a7d07e18fe1e709110785b7.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>, "Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
>>
>> http://www.qsl.net/n1ea/FIST_FCC_Petition_8-30-303.pdf
>>
>
>Perhaps FISTS should consider sending this in as a comment to be
>considered with RM-10787, rather than a separate petition.

I think it's better as a separate petition.
>
>If FCC grants the "no Morse test" petition, then it is unlikely to roll
>back that decision at a later date.

Which is why a separate petition is a better idea.

The most likely scenario now is that FCC will continue to receive petitions, assign them RM numbers, and take comments. Doing so takes almost no FCC resources and allows lots of time for ideas to percolate through the process. Perhaps FCC hopes some sort of consensus will be forthcoming.

There are also a couple of petitions from as far back as 2001 or so that are still hanging fire. For example, FCC has not ruled on the ARRL petition to "refarm" the Novice bands.

At some point, the flurry of petitions will slow down, comments taper off, and FC can do one of two things:

1) Create an NPRM (most likely)

2) Change the rules without an NPRM.

I think a lot depends on whether a clear consnesus surfaces from the comments.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3227. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 21:25:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907172515.05539.00000622@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 76639

In article <f45722ac.0309071201.23a96249@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0309051154.4ef03806@posting.google.com>...
>> The following isn't exactly a new idea, but some may not have seen it
>> yet...
>>
>> Maybe the way out of the mess is for a Smith Chart test to replace
>> the code test.
>
>So you still want the Amateur Radio Service to be the exclusive domain
>of the Electrical Engineer's?

Nope. One does not have to be an EE in order to understand, and use, the Smith Chart. Many hams who are not EEs have Smithc Chart knowledge and skill. Many EEs do not.

btw, the plural of "Electrical Engineer" is "Electrical Engineers" not "Electrical Engineer's". "Electrical Engineer's" is the possessive

>I don't think that's what the FCC wants, but since the NCVEC can do
>any damned thing they want, go ahead and put it to them.

NCVEC could not create a separate Smith Chart test without FCC approval. And they could not deviate from multiple-choice format.

It's obvious that irony is not one of your strong points, Brian.

3228. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 21:25:16 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907172516.05539.00000623@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 76641

In article <ok6llvctdi0jpoep091hve1ur067btr8tb@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
<bbrock@i-america.net> writes:

>On 06 Sep 2003 13:19:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>In article <kikilv41ljggh172fuq727u3geep324s45@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
>><bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>>
>>> I weighed the benefit of HF against conforming
>>>with a requirement that I didn't agree with. I felt that by
>>>participating I was helping it to continue.
>>
>>How is participating in the test helping the requirement to continue?
>
>Just my personal preference.

That's different.

>As I said in another place, I spent too
>much time doing useless stuff for a regulatory agency while getting
>paid for it. I don't want to do it for free. My life...my choice.

Of course!

But as far as I can see, taking the test would not help the requirement to
continue.

>>>There are a lot of hoops
>>>that I would be willing to jump through to get HF privileges. Code
>>>isn't one of them.
>>
>>To each his own.
>>>
>>>Call it a matter of personal ethics. Upgrading would have been the
>>>easy way out.
>>
>>Or consider this:
>>
>>Which do you think is more convincing to FCC as a reason to remove Element
>>1:

>>- The person who says "I won't upgrade until that test is removed"
>>
>>or
>>
>>- The person who says "I took the test, passed it, yet I think there is no

>>reason for that test to exist any more."
>
>No that I think that either one will have an impact on the final
>decision, but I'd have to say a combination of both would be most
>effective.

Well, then, we'll have to agree to disagree.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3229. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 21:44:26 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030907174426.016$XQ@newsreader.com>
Source record: 76642

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
> Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> news:<pefhlvolgug7j057kmh8l12p5ls52jthe2@4ax.com>...
> > On 05 Sep 2003 16:26:50 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> >
> > > Going to open up the New CB Ham Bands?
> >
> > They did it a few decades ago when they took 11 meters from the hams
> > since they didn't use it.
>
> Buice is always asking silly questions.
>
> For instance, a few years ago Bruce came on here asking if a CBer
> married a No-Code Technician, would she still be his sister?
>
> Bruce talks like a CBer, and he used to live near Akron at that time.
> There is a female Technician with the same last name in the database
> in that area.
>
> So I wonder if he's made an honest woman out of her yet or if he's
> just dating her.
>
Dunno, but she gives some damn good head at the truck stop.

--
GO #40

3230. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 22:03:20 UTC
From: JRM <VOID@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjga3m$iepbt$1@ID-71985.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76643

On Sunday 07 September 2003 11:09 am, Rich M wrote:

> Consider: If one were to set up two PC's with full
> internet capability & CD-ROM burners, and six
> feet away, two HFham stations with control op's
> at a hamfest.
>
> Next you invite 10 young people (14-17 yo) at random who have
> no previous exposure to ham radio from the crowd to
> choose which items to explore and operate.
> Which of these two setup's do you think that
> in the end-game, the greater percentage of
> young people would choose to bring home if they
> had the option to do so?
>
> (My guess is they'll want to download MP3's
> from Kazaa or Morpheus instead of calling
> CQ on 10 Meters thru a microphone)

Consider: It's 1955 and you set up the 2 ham stations above and 6 feet away
you set up some baseballs, bat's, and gloves.

Next you invite 10 young people (14-17 yo) at random who have
no previous exposure to ham radio from the crowd to
choose which items to explore and operate.
Which of these two setup's do you think that
in the end-game, the greater percentage of
young people would choose to bring home if they
had the option to do so?

Amateur radio is not now or ever has been for "normal" people. It's for the
techie's, geeks and nerds. Where do the young techie's, geeks and nerds
look for information? The Internet. What kind of information will they
find? Almost nothing but bitching.

Really, in all my hobbies that I check out on the net I have never see such
a nasty bunch of adults acting like 8 year olds. I know it's a vocal
minority making the noise but it doesn't leave a good taste in my mouth.

The internet should/could be one of the best things to ever happen to
Amateur radio. And it falls on us to make it happen.

--
John R. Marshall

The Hotrodding Network is Back!
http://www.hotrodding.net

3231. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 22:17:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309071417.59189fd9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76644

"K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<b71720b321f483edfb53ce7de21e4078.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
> new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
> guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> 2.3%.
>
> Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Hans, though it pains me to do so, I would suggest censuring amateurs such as DICK, Larry, Steve, Bruice, Kelly, and Jim as they continually put forth the idea that an amateur that is not versed in Morse is an incomplete amateur. Nevermind that this amateur can do PSK31 and FSTV.

Everyone knows that a picture is worth a thousand words, so if Jim can send a thousand real words (not ARRL numbergrams or Q-signals) in the space of one FSTV image, ... maybe he shouldn't be censured. Just maybe. Get back with me if he passes.

Furthermore they exhibit a throwback mentality, which just annoys me. OK, you've got your marching orders, as far as you can march on a boat. So be off with you, Master Chief.

Brian/N0iMD

3232. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 22:22:15 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907182215.07673.00000837@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 76645

>Dunno, but she gives some damn good head at the truck stop.
>
>--
>GO #40
>

Must be Brians Old Lady

3233. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 22:24:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309071424.3e29947d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76646

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<i096b.37820$Vx2.16849116@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030904210821.29660.00000478@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > In article <nia5b.36687$Vx2.16273542@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> > Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >
> > >
> > >
> > >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > >news:20030902195312.07346.00000379@mb-m26.aol.com...
> > >> Hey, I'll go one further than that. I think they should be tested in
> the
> > >> proper
> > >> procedures for changing a tyre on the highway under severe emergency
> > >> conditions.
> > >>
> > >
> > >You spent too much time in England.
> >
> > Dee:
> >
> > Which of my behaviours would cause to say that, then?
> >
> > >When my tire
> >
> > Is that something tired (i.e. lacking in sleep)?
> >
> > >goes flat on the highway,
> >
> > That means you probably have a puncture.
> >
> > >I call for help.
> >
> > With your Vodafone mobile, undoubtedly!
> >
> > >It's too dangerous to do this on the side of the road,
> > >alone, at night, in the rain (Lions and Tigers and Bears, Oh my). I
> > >couldn't resist!
> >
> > No problem. All you have to do is make sure you've pulled safely
> > off the motorway, put out your triangle, then collect the spare,
> > jack, and lever (pronounced "leever") from the car boot. Hopefully
> > your wheel nuts won't be corroded. Then, after replacing the flat

> > tyre with the spare, hopefully you won't be too knackered to
> > continue with your journey!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > Ex: G0LYW
> > RAF Mildenhall, UK, 1989 - 1991
>
> At one company I worked for we actually kept a cross-reference sheet of
> English versus American terms for interpreting some of our customers
> requirements. So at least I know to have a spanner handy for emergencies
> like this.
>
> Actually today I was pretty "knackered" just coping with the freeway traffic
> here.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Hey Dee, why not just mimeograph the list of Q-codes and and you would
have been perfect copy with whatever nationality you were doing
high-finance with. At least that's what the PCTA tries to pass off as
the truth.

Hi hi!

3234. Re: NCI Petition available on FCC ECFS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 22:27:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309071427.67fa2541@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76647

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj87u2$8o9$1@208.207.71.158>...
> "Carl H." wrote:
>
> > Thanks for the link to RM-10786 Carl.
> >
> > It is VERY LONG past time we put the
> > albatross of CW behind us, once and for
> > all.
>
> Tsk, tsk. You poor Albatross Anchors. You indeed have my sympathy.
> I wouldn't want to be the anchor for any nasty old sea bird, either!

Anchor Steam has quite a following in the beer world. Anchors and
chains have quite a following in the amateur world. You otta be used
to it by now.

3235. Re: End of CW in CEPT is for october 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 22:29:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309071429.6ce76ca0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76648

Anonymous Sender <anonymous@remailer.metacolo.com> wrote in message news:<d3b8ab3a71281066b8d688d0aea2d48b@remailer.metacolo.com>...
> The two CEPT classes will merge in
> next october into one class with no
> reference to CW. New CEPT texts will be
> published at the begining of october.
> This information comes from ERO
> (European Radiocommunication Office).

This will be news to FISTS who proposed a 12wpm CEPT compiant Extra amateur radio license.

Poor Phists, a century behind the power curve.

3236. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 22:46:35 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907184635.17757.00000836@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 76649

>What the heck is "Memozizing"?

I wondered how long it would take you fools to catch that.

3237. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 22:48:57 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907184857.17757.00000837@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 76650

>There are a lot of hoops
>that I would be willing to jump through to get HF privileges. Code
>isn't one of them.

Well no problem you can either stay on 2 Meter CB, or go back to 11 Meters

3238. test. Don't bother to read

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 22:52:39 UTC
From: w4nti@mindspring.com
Message-ID: <3a1dd7cc.0309071452.395d0660@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76651

Just a quick test.

Dan/W4NTI

3239. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 22:59:03 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <WKO6b.38267$Vx2.17245432@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76652

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309071417.59189fd9@posting.google.com...
> "K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<b71720b321f483edfb53ce7de21e4078.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
> > new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
> > guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> > not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> > the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> > 2.3%.
> >
> > Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> Hans, though it pains me to do so, I would suggest censuring amateurs
> such as DICK, Larry, Steve, Bruice, Kelly, and Jim as they continually
> put forth the idea that an amateur that is not versed in Morse is an
> incomplete amateur. Nevermind that this amateur can do PSK31 and
> FSTV.
>
> Everyone knows that a picture is worth a thousand words, so if Jim can
> send a thousand real words (not ARRL numbergrams or Q-signals) in the
> space of one FSTV image, ... maybe he shouldn't be censured. Just
> maybe. Get back with me if he passes.
>
> Furthermore they exhibit a throwback mentality, which just annoys me.
> OK, you've got your marching orders, as far as you can march on a
> boat. So be off with you, Master Chief.
>
> Brian/N0iMD

I doubt that those who dropped out did so because of these people, this newsgroup, or the activities of hams on the air or on the internet. It's unlikely they even know about this newsgroup let alone frequent it. They are probably people who lost interest years ago due to the fact that they were not into radio as a hobby but simply to talk to spouses and children around town. As cell phones became cheap and service improved, there was no reason for these people to continue in the hobby. We probably also lost some due to lack of elmering but if they don't let us know they are out there, we can't find them to elmer. Some of those hams never got even a 2m handheld let alone another radio. They never followed up by joining a club to get more exposure to ham radio and elmering in ham radio.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3240. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:01:16 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907190116.23341.00000413@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76653

>There are already folks like W5YI campaigning for less WRITTEN testing,
>saying
>the Tech test is too hard.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

The whole plan is rather simple, there main goal is to turn it into the license in the Box Concept. Once Cw Testing is gone, the rest is easy.

3241. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:03:13 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907190313.23341.00000414@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76654

>And, for goodness sake again--don't *even* be affected by anything Dick
>Carroll, Waddles (WA8ULX or whatever), Larry Roll or even Dave Heil says.
>They're humorous, at best. They all remind me of drunken old rambling men.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Your TITs Draggin on the ground are not humorous

3242. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:10:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <kVO6b.5087$BG6.3904@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76655

I hate to break it to you fine folks....But.....there is no such thing as a 1/4 wave DIPOLE.

Dan/W4NTI

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message news:fabllvcufo6pu42ue1rvh8d5u50h17ofqc@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 6 Sep 2003 09:31:17 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> wrote:
>
> >"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> >news:gejilvo4f6tm1pd1e3t7p62tjc9l3u3pmo@4ax.com...
> >> On Fri, 5 Sep 2003 20:30:30 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >
> >> >You're right, Dee. That's the point I try to make...I rote memorized for
> >> >the test. Now, the argument for the above scenario could also be made
> >> >that
> >> >the instrukshions can be looked up. I've built quite a few antennas.
> >All
> >> >of them I used instrukshions for; and they all worked great.
> >> >
> >> >Kim W5TIT
> >> >
> >>
> >> What would be wrong with requiring them to build a quarter wave dipole
> >> that is resonate at a specified frequency as part of the test? That
> >> is, if the test were changed to be written and performance based.
> >>
> >
> >There's nothing at all wrong with having some part of the test be based on
> >something related to performance--other than CW; comment on that in a
> >moment--if there could be a generally agreed upon topic. I think
> >establishing something like a digital station would be more appropriate than
> >building an antenna, because I think what should be tested is something
> >everyone will do at one point or another. While not everyone may dabble in
> >digital, APRS, SSTV, or whatever, everyone will have to establish a radio
> >set up at some point or another. The best would be a sucessful mobile
> >installation, but doing testing outside just wouldn't be feasible.
> >

> >On your latter comment, be careful how you word things in this debate:
the
> >test is performance based right now. It baseed on one's ability to
> >understand CW, and that is performance.
>
> Only if they know how to connect the antenna to the radio. ;-)

3243. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:11:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <jWO6b.5088$BG6.1101@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76656

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030907190116.23341.00000413@mb-m19.aol.com...
> >There are already folks like W5YI campaigning for less WRITTEN testing,
> >saying
> >the Tech test is too hard.
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> The whole plan is rather simple, there main goal is to turn it into the
license
> in the Box Concept. Once Cw Testing is gone, the rest is easy.

Maybe if they all use 1/4 wave DIPOLEs, they will be hard to hear. So it
won't matter.

Dan/W4NTI

3244. Re: Something Around Here to Enjoy Besides the Damned Code Test War

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:15:41 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <x_O6b.5096$BG6.2100@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76657

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0309052012.66cdf59a@posting.google.com...
> http://www.msnbc.com/news/962313.asp?0cv=CB20
>
> w3rv

Wonder if the ID will be in MCW?

Dan/W4NTI

3245. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:16:22 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907191622.23306.00000520@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76658

>I hate to break it to you fine folks....But.....there is no such thing as a
>1/4 wave DIPOLE.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Dan dont tell them that, if they keeping using a Quarter Wave Dipole we will never have to listen to them

3246. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:18:02 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907191802.23306.00000522@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76659

>Maybe if they all use 1/4 wave DIPOLEs, they will be hard to hear. So it
>won't matter.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Exactly, better yet tell them to use an 1/8 Wave Ant, they will not know the
difference.

3247. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:20:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <A2P6b.5098$BG6.1359@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76660

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:V6m6b.3673$7n3.1352@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:b71720b321f483edfb53ce7de21e4078.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
> > new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
> > guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> > not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> > the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> > 2.3%.
> >
> > Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> Drop the no-code provision of the Tech license, obviously.
>
> With a 97.7% failure rate, I'd say the new policy is a real loser. - We
> better drop it fast and return to what worked better in the past.
>
> I predicted something like this, but not to such a degree, when so many of
> the new no-code techs showed a generalized disrespect for the PART97 regs
> and the traditions of amateur radio. It was obvious that many of them did
> not care at all about the hobby. - They just wanted to know what they
could
> get out it, what they could get away with. Many of them spent more time
> bashing the hobby than anything else. As you have noted, almost none of
them
> went on to progress and advance themselves as hams.
>
> Personally, I think we will be much better off without most of those
"hams",
> and that we should avoid policies that increase membership in this way in
> the future. We should do as we did in the past, emphasizing quality, not
> quantity of our membership.
>
> According to your figures Hans, the no-code tech deal did the hobby more
> harm than good.
>
> Charles, N5PVL
>
>

I totally agree with you Charles. It is obvious they didn't really care about the ARS.

As far as I'm concerned....GOOD RIDDANCE !!
We don't need quantity. We need quality.

Dan/W4NTI

3248. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:26:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <L8P6b.5106$BG6.2829@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76661

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bjct9j$q01@library2.airnews.net...
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
> news:V6m6b.3673$7n3.1352@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:b71720b321f483edfb53ce7de21e4078.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > > Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted
1,925
> > > new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple
of
> > > guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> > > not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> > > the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> > > 2.3%.
> > >
> > > Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?
> > >
> > > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> > Drop the no-code provision of the Tech license, obviously.
> >
> > With a 97.7% failure rate, I'd say the new policy is a real loser. - We
> > better drop it fast and return to what worked better in the past.
> >
> > I predicted something like this, but not to such a degree, when so many
of
> > the new no-code techs showed a generalized disrespect for the PART97
regs
> > and the traditions of amateur radio. It was obvious that many of them
did
> > not care at all about the hobby. - They just wanted to know what they
> could
> > get out it, what they could get away with. Many of them spent more time
> > bashing the hobby than anything else. As you have noted, almost none of
> them
> > went on to progress and advance themselves as hams.
> >
> > Personally, I think we will be much better off without most of those
> "hams",
> > and that we should avoid policies that increase membership in this way
in
> > the future. We should do as we did in the past, emphasizing quality, not
> > quantity of our membership.

> >
> > According to your figures Hans, the no-code tech deal did the hobby more
> > harm than good.
> >
> > Charles, N5PVL
> >
> >
>
> Sigh. How 'bout this: ever consider that a lot of CBers did, indeed, hear
> of the new requirements (lower CW testing standards) and decide to get
into
> ham radio for....guess what: FM!!!!!???? When I was "into" CB radio, I
was
> barely ever on AM. There's a whole "other" gang of participants out there
> on CB--and the mentors of that group are mostly hams. The USB/LSB and,
> alas, FM--yes, illegal but done--part of CB is an area where you'll find
> people who are courteous, have "gentlemen's" rules that are followed;
where
> people experiment with antenna design and construction; where an "eyeball"
> meeting is just as likely; etc.
>
> When I was drawn to and got my ticket, you know what the greatest relief
> was? Being able to turn a radio on and not hear all that hissing,
> heterodyning, etc.!!! FM is great and that is what I like most about ham
> radio. HF sucks for all the noise. So, no need/interest to upgrade.
And,
> everyone else was as relieved and impressed with FM also. Listening to HF
> brings back those days when we had to deal with all that noise. And, it's
> not a pretty memory.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Sounds like Kim need to operate a cell phone.

Dan/W4NTI

3249. Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:26:53 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907192653.23306.00000523@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76662

To bury his Dipole. He was complaining about how noisy HF was, so I told him if he buried it, that it would stop the Noise. The fool believed me and buried it, I still cant stop laughing., I hate to tell the guy the truth, because now he Brags about how quit his Receiver is.

3250. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:31:01 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <jrfnlvcdu15b4mhjdf7cv4lrq06f4r6scj@4ax.com>
Source record: 76663

On Sun, 07 Sep 2003 23:10:08 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>I hate to break it to you fine folks....But.....there is no such thing as a
>1/4 wave DIPOLE.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&q=1%2F4+wave+dipole

Searched the web for 1/4 wave dipole. Results 1 - 10 of about
39,100. Search took 0.17 seconds

3251. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:31:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907193158.23306.00000525@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76667

>Nor is you lack of basic knowledge regarding antennas.
>

Are you now suggesting TITs, TITs Draggin on the ground are some kind of ANT?

3252. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:32:10 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <5vfnlv80c02m11ra9g8i68maa7uks23329@4ax.com>
Source record: 76664

On 07 Sep 2003 23:03:13 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>And, for goodness sake again--don't *even* be affected by anything Dick
>>Carroll, Waddles (WA8ULX or whatever), Larry Roll or even Dave Heil says.
>>They're humorous, at best. They all remind me of drunken old rambling men.
>>
>>Kim W5TIT
>
> Your TITs Draggin on the ground are not humorous

Nor is you lack of basic knowledge regarding antennas.

3253. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:35:01 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <81gnlvsro0kbqh8700p3an3ghn1ntb6e1l@4ax.com>
Source record: 76665

On 07 Sep 2003 22:48:57 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>There are a lot of hoops
>>that I would be willing to jump through to get HF privileges. Code
>>isn't one of them.
>
>Well no problem you can either stay on 2 Meter CB, or go back to 11 Meters

One would have had to have been on 11 Meters to go back to it. Are
you this stupid in real life? So, when HF goes codless, are you going
to stay there or are you going back to 11 Meters.

3254. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:35:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907193546.23306.00000526@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76669

> So, when HF goes codless, are you going
>to stay there or are you going back to 11 Meters.

Oh no problem, I allready sold all my CBHam Stuff. As far as I am concerned you CBers can have it, cant wait to see how you New CBHAMS deal with BPL.

3255. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:35:59 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <16gnlvg4cdfjmbbi4g15iadfeu9339db10@4ax.com>
Source record: 76666

On 07 Sep 2003 21:06:35 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>Well, since CB never required a test, I'd have to say that your
>>question makes no sense to me.
>
>You mean you call the present system a Test get real.

Based on some of your posts, I'm suprised that you passed it.
>
>
>

3256. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:36:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907193644.23306.00000527@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76670

>Based on some of your posts, I'm suprised that you passed it.
>>

Doesnt surprise me you couldnt

3257. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:38:14 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <9agnlvo7igqtfkavbdh9luljphlaqjfp56@4ax.com>
Source record: 76668

On 07 Sep 2003 23:31:58 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>Nor is you lack of basic knowledge regarding antennas.
>>
>
>Are you now suggesting TITs, TITs Draggin on the ground are some kind of ANT?

No, I'm just telling you that you are ignorant about radio.

3258. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:38:37 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907193837.23306.00000528@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76672

>No, I'm just telling you that you are ignorant about radio.
>
>

Well explain how TITS, TITS draggin on the Ground have anything to do with
radio

3259. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:40:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907194028.23176.00000468@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76675

>I'd hate like hell to have to try and figure out what he
>was trying to spell during a QSO.
>
>

Dont worry you will never have to

3260. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:41:14 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <tmP6b.1732$qA4.1395@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76676

It works, but since you are using an "image" dipole the same number of feet in the air as you buried the dipole, you must remember to tune in the image frequency on receive for it to work :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030907192653.23306.00000523@mb-m19.aol.com...
> To bury his Dipole. He was complaining about how noisy HF was, so I told him
> if he buried it, that it would stop the Noise. The fool believed me and buried
> it, I still cant stop laughing., I hate to tell the guy the truth, because now
> he Brags about how quit his Receiver is.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

3261. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:41:29 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <jegnlvcv62bd1q5v1vo07dsnamlro7omlt@4ax.com>
Source record: 76671

On 07 Sep 2003 23:26:53 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

> To bury his Dipole. He was complaining about how noisy HF was, so I told him
>if he buried it, that it would stop the Noise. The fool believed me and buried
>it, I still cant stop laughing., I hate to tell the guy the truth, because now
>he Brags about how quit his Receiver is.

OK...I've got to ask. How in the hell does someone who spells as
badly as he does send code? Hell, it's hard to tell what he's trying
to say here, I'd hate like hell to have to try and figure out what he
was trying to spell during a QSO.

3262. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:42:06 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907194206.23176.00000469@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76678

>Typical freebander you are.
>

Sorry never been on FREEBAND, is that some Band you CBplussers use?

3263. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:43:03 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <rignlv8vj3rd4ac25ue0odu2qpk2a3i597@4ax.com>
Source record: 76673

On 07 Sep 2003 23:35:46 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>> So, when HF goes codless, are you going
>>to stay there or are you going back to 11 Meters.
>
>Oh no problem, I allready sold all my CBHam Stuff. As far as I am concerned you
>CBers can have it, cant wait to see how you New CBHAMS deal with BPL.

Typical freebander you are.

3264. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:43:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907194310.23176.00000470@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76680

>Allright, I'm convinced that you really are a CB radio operator.
>
>
>

Nope, im what your striving to be.

3265. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:43:56 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <vkgnlvke664cu0m7v2jn2tjp71o76ippjk@4ax.com>
Source record: 76674

On 07 Sep 2003 23:36:44 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>Based on some of your posts, I'm suprised that you passed it.
>>>
>
>Doesnt surprise me you couldnt

Allright, I'm convinced that you really are a CB radio operator.

3266. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:45:40 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <0ognlvkjupbn35gs5jb4hta43hp4oej7dh@4ax.com>
Source record: 76677

On 07 Sep 2003 23:38:37 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>No, I'm just telling you that you are ignorant about radio.
>>
>>
>
>Well explain how TITS, TITS draggin on the Ground have anything to do with
>radio

You posted it, you justify how it falls within the charter of the ng.

3267. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:46:48 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <4qgnlv4gg6u7v7i7bbmkbdrh4tb75inah1@4ax.com>
Source record: 76679

On 07 Sep 2003 23:40:28 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>I'd hate like hell to have to try and figure out what he
>>was trying to spell during a QSO.
>>
>>
>
>Dont worry you will never have to

Thank God. It's had enough trying to figure it out here.

Typical freebander, you are.

3268. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:47:00 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907194700.23176.00000471@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76682

>You posted it, you justify how it falls within the charter of the ng.
>
>
>

So now your trying to tell me that TITs,TITS draggin on the Ground has nothing to do with Radio or Ants. Do you know anything about TITs, TITS draggin on the Ground?

3269. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:47:55 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <ksgnlvkf6maa5fddcgqf64244nqf0d87eh@4ax.com>
Source record: 76681

On 07 Sep 2003 23:42:06 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>Typical freebander you are.
>>
>
>Sorry never been on FREEBAND, is that some Band you CBplussers use?

Don't lie to me now. It's evident in every post that you make.

3270. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:48:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907194826.23176.00000472@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76683

>Thank God. It's had enough trying to figure it out here.

Come on Jr keep up, I thought you were good at this.

3271. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:49:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907194910.23176.00000473@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76684

>Don't lie to me now. It's evident in every post that you make.
>
>

Now how would you know?

3272. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:54:07 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <66hnlvsuoqmhif0nlulf9o4dej4te5uf16@4ax.com>
Source record: 76685

On 07 Sep 2003 23:47:00 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>You posted it, you justify how it falls within the charter of the ng.
>>
>>
>>
>
>So now your trying to tell me that TITs,TITS draggin on the Ground has nothing
>to do with Radio or Ants. Do you know anything about TITs, TITS draggin on the
>Ground?

No actually I don't. Keep going, I'm forwarding all of this to
abuse@aol.com so that they can get a good laugh out of it too.

3273. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:55:13 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <0ahnlv49aulkjv839a4v7ab21kb6blfg74@4ax.com>
Source record: 76686

On 07 Sep 2003 23:43:10 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>Allright, I'm convinced that you really are a CB radio operator.
>>
>>
>>
>
>Nope, im what your striving to be.

Really? Well now I know why I didn't want to get there.

3274. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:55:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907195521.23176.00000475@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76688

>No actually I don't. Keep going, I'm forwarding all of this to
>abuse@aol.com so that they can get a good laugh out of it too.
>

Oh I see, when someone gets the best of you, you go crying, Im going to report
you.
Do you usually Whine and cry for everything you have ever gotten in life, you
little WIMP. Tak your little WIMPY ASS Report and stick it.

3275. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:56:53 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907195653.23176.00000476@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76690

>Really? Well now I know why I didn't want to get there.
>

No the problem is, you were not Man enough to get there. You just wanted to whine like a little Baby and hope the FCC would reward you.

3276. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:58:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907195810.23176.00000477@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76692

>I just accept this as a confession and now you are wanting to know how
>you were found out. Just like GWB, I can't reveal my methods.
>
>
>

Jr. go back to your homework, dont you have classes in the morning?

3277. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:58:43 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <gdhnlv4e3bgbsr2p2f3n68frmsk16bmcgc@4ax.com>
Source record: 76687

On 07 Sep 2003 23:49:10 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>Don't lie to me now. It's evident in every post that you make.
>>
>>
>
>Now how would you know?

I just accept this as a confession and now you are wanting to know how
you were found out. Just like GWB, I can't reveal my methods.

3278. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-07 23:59:23 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <eihnlvs1jenff0h10mr4kf45oefpk5ikcv@4ax.com>
Source record: 76689

On 07 Sep 2003 23:48:26 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>Thank God. It's had enough trying to figure it out here.
>
>Come on Jr keep up, I thought you were good at this.

Good at what?

3279. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 00:00:15 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907200015.23176.00000478@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76693

>ROTFLMAO....
>

Go ahead and LYAO WIMP

3280. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 00:00:40 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <dkhnlvgrollk4tl43snboklqvoh63eg5sc@4ax.com>
Source record: 76691

On 07 Sep 2003 23:55:21 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>No actually I don't. Keep going, I'm forwarding all of this to
>>abuse@aol.com so that they can get a good laugh out of it too.
>>
>
>Oh I see, when someone gets the best of you, you go crying, Im going to report
>you.
> Do you usually Whine and cry for everything you have ever gotten in life, you
>little WIMP. Tak your little WIMPY ASS Report and stick it.

ROTFLMAO....

3281. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 00:02:35 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <vGP6b.1747$8T4.1717@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76694

Brian,

If (just if) you are referring to me, my comment was the cw had virtually no interference and I enjoyed it. I have not been in favor of keeping the cw requirements; I would, however, like to see some exams that might:
1) be slightly (not severely) more difficult.
2) not have the questions and answers published.

PSK31 is one mode that seems to have quite a bit going for it. Personally, I like the idea of any mode (ascii, amtor, rtty, psk, packet) that does not require the intervention of a human to keep the information as close to 100% accurate as possible. A good cw operator would likely be close, voice is more suspect (especially of transcribing difficult names/addresses), but any mode which can keep the human out of it is likely (at least in my opinion) more valuable for certain traffic. Of course, sstv may be invaluable in other areas. No one mode is 'ideal' for all situations.

I could, of course, ask you to send just one frame of fast-scan tv via moonbounce - but, as noted, no one mode is ideal for all situations :)

BTW (and here it comes - I'm putting on the asbestos underwear), I did join NCI a long time ago. I simply cannot justify the necessity of cw. It has been pointed out that in the event of a electromagnetic pulse due to a nuclear blast, most, if not all, modern gear (computers included) would be toasted. Yes, perhaps the tube stuff would survive, but I suspect that would be the least of anyone's problems if they were in the area affected by the emp. Most likely they would not be incoming missiles, they'd be planted somewhere by terrorists and if you were to experience emp, you'd likely be toast seconds later by the blast and nuclear radiation anyways.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309071417.59189fd9@posting.google.com...
>
> Hans, though it pains me to do so, I would suggest censuring amateurs
> such as DICK, Larry, Steve, Bruice, Kelly, and Jim as they continually
> put forth the idea that an amateur that is not versed in Morse is an
> incomplete amateur. Nevermind that this amateur can do PSK31 and
> FSTV.
>
> Everyone knows that a picture is worth a thousand words, so if Jim can
> send a thousand real words (not ARRL numbergrams or Q-signals) in the
> space of one FSTV image, ... maybe he shouldn't be censured. Just
> maybe. Get back with me if he passes.

>
> Furthermore they exhibit a throwback mentality, which just annoys me.
> OK, you've got your marching orders, as far as you can march on a
> boat. So be off with you, Master Chief.
>
> Brian/N0iMD

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

3282. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 00:05:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309071605.4bc8982e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76696

Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:<86fzj924xh.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>...

> Brian> One will get ya ten that Farnsworth was an expert on the
> Brian> subject BEFORE he/she invented that wheel and took it public. I
> Brian> find the concept of you, admittedly struggling to get off a
> Brian> notch above ground zero in this game, "facilitating" the
> Brian> learning process for others just a tad problematic.
>
> Out of curiosity, have you seen the page

What page?

> or are you still blocked on
> the concept of a student assisting other students?

My short form response is that after I graduated from engineering
school I went on to teach undergrad courses in math, physics and
applied mechanics. So I ain't exactly new to topics like how to study
and assisting other students Jack. What I did not do was try to
reinvent tried and proven study methods when I was a freshman huddled
with my buddies studying often into the wee hours.

> [... no HF reception ...]
>
> Brian> Local terrain isn't much an HF stopper so W1AW would be be
> Brian> usable under normal condx. But per your response to Dick your
> Brian> overriding problem seems to be noise. Are you on Jones St. in
> Brian> Martinez or in Walnut Creek? In either case noise in those
> Brian> kinds of very densely populated QTHs can be mongo. I can
> Brian> sympathize with all of that, I sure have my share here. So W1AW
> Brian> is a non-solution. But you might try shutting down all six
> Brian> computers and listen again.
>
> I have scheduled a network outage tomorrow for this purpose, and I'm
> also planning on pulling the plugs on all major appliances for an hour
> or so as well if that doesn't work.

Get anywhere? Ham folklore postulates that 90% of all noise sources go
away when you yank the main breaker at your service entrance.

> Brian> Copying random five-letter groups is excellent code practice
> Brian> which is why the military has used groups instead of straight
> Brian> text for CW training purposes. Five letter groups at 20wpm is
> Brian> more difficult to copy than is staright text at 20wpm, another
> Brian> factoid which is as old as the hills.

>
> The only problem I have with five-letter groups is that I'd like to
> start recognizing words, not letters, if at all possible, and
> five-letter groups aren't really conducive to that.

Random groups for practice are preferable to text particularly at
speeds <10 wpm because anticipating complete words before they're
completed is one of the biggest impediments to learning the code. Not
a good habit to get into early in the game *if* you have access to
groups for practice purposes. Big "if". It takes hundreds of hours
actually operating on the air >18-20 wpm dealing with real-world band
condx to become even reasonably proficient at "conversational CW".

> Brian> I suggest you get on the air somewhere somehow by hook or crook
> Brian> and get some real experience before you dive into FD.
>
> Please do not misunderstand. I have absolutely no intention to have
> Field Day be my first major CW experience. That's as silly as
> soloing into Oshkosh,

Let's not get too dramatic. Besides, folks solo at Oshkosh all the
time. The EAA ties up the runways for only a week, student pilots
still have 51 other weeks to dump into Oshkosh.

> I actually have an alternative site where I can string up a 122ft
> dipole, but it's only six feet off the ground. It does have much
> better reception than what I have at home, though, and I'm eager to
> find out how well it performs.

At only six feet AGL it most likely won't. But at least you'd have
some ears.

> However, the alternate site is my
> mother-in-law's front yard, so I can only use it when she's out of
> town.

You're a good candidate for one of the quick-up portable HF antenna
packages. Run a search on "DK9SQ", I've heard they're pretty decent.
Also check http://www.eham.net/reviews/products/75

> I built a Ramsey keyer. It didn't work with my Kenwood rig.
> So I
> built another and it didn't work either. Turns out that the keyer's
> method of closing the contacts doesn't work with my particular rig.

Dunno anybody who has a Ramsey keyer but both of my MFJ keyers work
fine with every Kenwood rig I've used it with including a TS-950, a
TS-440 FD clunker, my TS-940 and TS-50 and also my Yaesu FT-847 and an
ancient hybrid FT-101.

>
> Jack.

w3rv

3283. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 00:07:15 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <9vhnlv481tai79heacukaufovgamf41auc@4ax.com>
Source record: 76695

On 08 Sep 2003 00:00:15 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>ROTFLMAO....
>>
>
>Go ahead and LYAO WIMP

Why do you feel the sudden need to change the subject? Do you posts violate yous ISP's TOS? Would you be the same way about operation in the ham bands if you were really licensed to operate there?

3284. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 00:19:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907201926.23307.00002797@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 76697

In article <f45722ac.0309071417.59189fd9@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Everyone knows that a picture is worth a thousand words, so if Jim can
>send a thousand real words (not ARRL numbergrams or Q-signals) in the
>space of one FSTV image, ... maybe he shouldn't be censured. Just
>maybe. Get back with me if he passes.

Well, let's see...

Suppose we consider an FSTV image to be composed of 367,500 pixels (525 lines of 700 pixels each - aspect ratio 4/3, NTSC black-and-white). Suppose each pixel contains 8 bits. We'll ignore synchronization and other overhead for the time being.

Then sending one NTSC/FSTV image requires the transfer of at least 2,940,000 bits.

Of course this can be reduced by compression, but compression isn't allowed in the comparison.

Sending 1000 words in Morse requires the transfer of 50,000 bits, allowing 50 bits per word (ITU standard)

Now if we try to use OOK/AM to send those bits through a 250 Hz bandwidth, the 2,940,000 bits of the single FSTV image will take 58.8 times as long to transmit as the 50,000 bits/ 1000 words of Morse will take. Or to put it another way, 58,800 words can be sent in the time it takes to send one FSTV image.

That is, if the playing field is level.

It's self-evident that a radio amateur who has no Morse code skills is not a fully qualified radio amateur, particularly for HF/MF amateur operation. That's a plain and simple fact.

Whether that means a Morse code skills test *must* be part of the licensing process is a matter of opinion.

3285. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 00:49:04 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjgjmt$gam@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76698

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:5vfnlv80c02m11ra9g8i68maa7uks23329@4ax.com...
> On 07 Sep 2003 23:03:13 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>
> >>And, for goodness sake again--don't *even* be affected by anything Dick
> >>Carroll, Waddles (WA8ULX or whatever), Larry Roll or even Dave Heil
says.
> >>They're humorous, at best. They all remind me of drunken old rambling
men.
> >>
> >>Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Your TITs Draggin on the ground are not humorous
>
> Nor is you lack of basic knowledge regarding antennas.
>

Hey, Bob? Just a suggestion. Just filter out this nitwit. Also, I've got it set so that anything with WA8ULX@aol, WA8ULX, ULX, Brucie, or Bruce doesn't come through. So, I miss most of whatever it is he posts. Can't say I miss most of whatever it is he "says" because he doesn't say anything...LOL

Anyway, just a suggestion. I've also done that with Dan, now, too. He's another one that isn't even fun to play with and I hate take advantage of anyone but Larry and DICK.

Kim W5TIT

3286. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 00:58:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907205819.17885.00000795@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 76699

>Why do you feel the sudden need to change the subject?

What subject you Dip

>Do you posts
>violate yous ISP's TOS?

I dont know, and I dont care, do you?

>Would you be the same way about operation in
>the ham bands

Of course

3287. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 01:00:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907210010.17885.00000796@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 76700

>So, I miss most of whatever it is he posts.

Shes just a coward

3288. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 01:07:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F5BD6AB.7070904@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76701

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> I hate to break it to you fine folks....But.....there is no such thing as a
> 1/4 wave DIPOLE.

Sure Dan, come along and spoil the fun! And Bob thinks I'm a dummy! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3289. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 01:21:13 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjgli9put0@208.206.142.108>
Source record: 76702

Brian Kelly wrote:

> Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:<86fzj924xh.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>...
>
> > Brian> One will get ya ten that Farnsworth was an expert on the
> > Brian> subject BEFORE he/she invented that wheel and took it public. I
> > Brian> find the concept of you, admittedly struggling to get off a
> > Brian> notch above ground zero in this game, "facilitating" the
> > Brian> learning process for others just a tad problematic.
> >
> > Out of curiosity, have you seen the page
>
> What page?
>
> > or are you still blocked on
> > the concept of a student assisting other students?
>
> My short form response is that after I graduated from engineering
> school I went on to teach undergrad courses in math, physics and
> applied mechanics. So I ain't exactly new to topics like how to study
> and assisting other students Jack. What I did not do was try to
> reinvent tried and proven study methods when I was a freshman huddled
> with my buddies studying often into the wee hours.
>
> > [... no HF reception ...]
> >
> > Brian> Local terrain isn't much an HF stopper so W1AW would be be
> > Brian> usable under normal condx. But per your response to Dick your
> > Brian> overriding problem seems to be noise. Are you on Jones St. in
> > Brian> Martinez or in Walnut Creek? In either case noise in those
> > Brian> kinds of very densely populated QTHs can be mongo. I can
> > Brian> sympathize with all of that, I sure have my share here. So W1AW
> > Brian> is a non-solution. But you might try shutting down all six
> > Brian> computers and listen again.
> >
> > I have scheduled a network outage tomorrow for this purpose, and I'm
> > also planning on pulling the plugs on all major appliances for an hour
> > or so as well if that doesn't work.
>
> Get anywhere? Ham folklore postulates that 90% of all noise sources go
> away when you yank the main breaker at your service entrance.
>
> > Brian> Copying random five-letter groups is excellent code practice

> > Brian> which is why the military has used groups instead of straight
> > Brian> text for CW training purposes. Five letter groups at 20wpm is
> > Brian> more difficult to copy than is staright text at 20wpm, another
> > Brian> factoid which is as old as the hills.
> >
> > The only problem I have with five-letter groups is that I'd like to
> > start recognizing words, not letters, if at all possible, and
> > five-letter groups aren't really conducive to that.
>
> Random groups for practice are preferable to text particularly at
> speeds <10 wpm because anticipating complete words before they're
> completed is one of the biggest impediments to learning the code. Not
> a good habit to get into early in the game *if* you have access to
> groups for practice purposes. Big "if". It takes hundreds of hours
> actually operating on the air >18-20 wpm dealing with real-world band
> condx to become even reasonably proficient at "conversational CW".
>
> > Brian> I suggest you get on the air somewhere somehow by hook or crook
> > Brian> and get some real experience before you dive into FD.
> >
> > Please do not misunderstand. I have absolutely no intention to have
> > Field Day be my first major CW experience. That's as silly as
> > soloing into Oshkosh,
>
> Let's not get too dramatic. Besides, folks solo at Oshkosh all the
> time. The EAA ties up the runways for only a week, student pilots
> still have 51 other weeks to dump into Oshkosh.
>
> > I actually have an alternative site where I can string up a 122ft
> > dipole, but it's only six feet off the ground. It does have much
> > better reception than what I have at home, though, and I'm eager to
> > find out how well it performs.
>
> At only six feet AGL it most likely won't. But at least you'd have
> some ears.
>
> > However, the alternate site is my
> > mother-in-law's front yard, so I can only use it when she's out of
> > town.
>
> You're a good candidate for one of the quick-up portable HF antenna
> packages. Run a search on "DK9SQ", I've heard they're pretty decent.
> Also check http://www.eham.net/reviews/products/75
>

Maybe a St Louis Vertical?

>
> > I built a Ramsey keyer. It didn't work with my Kenwood rig.
> > So I
> > built another and it didn't work either. Turns out that the keyer's

> > method of closing the contacts doesn't work with my particular rig.
>
> Dunno anybody who has a Ramsey keyer but both of my MFJ keyers work
> fine with every Kenwood rig I've used it with including a TS-950, a
> TS-440 FD clunker, my TS-940 and TS-50 and also my Yaesu FT-847 and an
> ancient hybrid FT-101.

I wonder if he tried reversing the polarity of the keyer's output.

Dick

3290. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 01:33:23 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309071733.193d36b1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76703

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<FFo6b.37929$Vx2.16995167@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...

> > Using a straight key in a contest would kill me if I was running a
> > decent rate. The goofy relics should be outlawed at least in contests
> > except under unusual circumstances. Do yourself a big favor and get
> > yourself decent paddles like a Kent and a cheap MFJ keyer and take it
> > from there. The paddles would work fine with the FD momory keyers.
> > Beyond that real CW contesters don't use any types of mechanical keys,
> > they use keyboards. In the end the means used to generate the output
> > doesn't matter, it's the ears that *always* matter . . .
> >
>
> Yeah if you are out to win or be a high scorer, you are correct.

For better or worse I was "brought up" in that niche. I'm one of these
animals:

http://www.gofrc.org/

> However if
> you just want to be a casual contester, a straight key is fine.

I just have a silly "thing" about straight keys Dee so maybe I'm going
a bit overboard here.

I fiddled with surplus J-38s long before I got serious about actually
taking the Novice test. Every radio kid did that 'Wayback. Eventually
I got to visit an experienced dx contester (which was what I wanted to
become) who used a bug (those guys ALL used bugs) and he let me futz
with his bug "offline" so to speak. Forthwith I immediately got
irrevocably hooked on bugs vs. straight keys. Net result was that the
nite WN3YIK hit the airwaves for the first time it was with a
well-greased, polished and tuned old USN Vibroplex. I've always had a
straight key or two floating around the shack, they're kinda "core ham
objects" and maybe I've had some straight key QSOs but I don't
specifically remember any of 'em.

> Also if you
> are doing the "hunt and pounce" instead of "camping on a frequency," it
> doesn't make quite as much difference. I like to get out there in a
> contest and just see what the variety is. I don't intend to make any run at
> a large number of contacts. The last CW contest I was in, I was quite happy
> to make 77 contacts and then go do something else.

100% on the button, all of it. It's all in what one wants out of a
contest and/or is willing to put into contesting. The simple fact of

the matter is that if it wasn't for the brigades of casual contesters
like you contests simply would not be worth getting into.

>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

w3rv

3291. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 01:36:20 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjgmekrlq0@208.206.142.76>
Source record: 76704

Jim, as you probably know, Johnny Johnston, former longtime head of the Amateur and Citizen's Division at FCC, has stated in his own comments to the NCVEC petition-which he helped to draft- that no amateur not skilled in radiotelgraphy can accurately be considerred an expert, an Extra class. So it looks like NCI is against the very concept. That should come as no surprise, though considering. After all, it's only a "hobby".

Dick

Jim Hampton wrote:

> Brian,
>
> If (just if) you are referring to me, my comment was the cw had virtually no
> interference and I enjoyed it. I have not been in favor of keeping the cw
> requirements; I would, however, like to see some exams that might:
> 1) be slightly (not severely) more difficult.
> 2) not have the questions and answers published.
>
> PSK31 is one mode that seems to have quite a bit going for it. Personally,
> I like the idea of any mode (ascii, amtor, rtty, psk, packet) that does not
> require the intervention of a human to keep the information as close to 100%
> accurate as possible. A good cw operator would likely be close, voice is
> more suspect (especially of transcribing difficult names/addresses), but any
> mode which can keep the human out of it is likely (at least in my opinion)
> more valuable for certain traffic. Of course, sstv may be invaluable in
> other areas. No one mode is 'ideal' for all situations.
>
> I could, of course, ask you to send just one frame of fast-scan tv via
> moonbounce - but, as noted, no one mode is ideal for all situations :)
>
> BTW (and here it comes - I'm putting on the asbestos underwear), I did join
> NCI a long time ago. I simply cannot justify the necessity of cw. It has
> been pointed out that in the event of a electromagnetic pulse due to a
> nuclear blast, most, if not all, modern gear (computers included) would be
> toasted. Yes, perhaps the tube stuff would survive, but I suspect that
> would be the least of anyone's problems if they were in the area affected by
> the emp. Most likely they would not be incoming missiles, they'd be planted
> somewhere by terrorists and if you were to experience emp, you'd likely be
> toast seconds later by the blast and nuclear radiation anyways.
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message

> news:f45722ac.0309071417.59189fd9@posting.google.com...
> >
> > Hans, though it pains me to do so, I would suggest censuring amateurs
> > such as DICK, Larry, Steve, Bruice, Kelly, and Jim as they continually
> > put forth the idea that an amateur that is not versed in Morse is an
> > incomplete amateur. Nevermind that this amateur can do PSK31 and
> > FSTV.
> >
> > Everyone knows that a picture is worth a thousand words, so if Jim can
> > send a thousand real words (not ARRL numbergrams or Q-signals) in the
> > space of one FSTV image, ... maybe he shouldn't be censured. Just
> > maybe. Get back with me if he passes.
> >
> > Furthermore they exhibit a throwback mentality, which just annoys me.
> > OK, you've got your marching orders, as far as you can march on a
> > boat. So be off with you, Master Chief.
> >
> > Brian/N0iMD
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

3292. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 01:38:58 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjgmjirlq1@208.206.142.76>
Source record: 76705

Sometimes 20 dB of attenation is a very good solution to a noise problem.

Dick

Jim Hampton wrote:

> It works, but since you are using an "image" dipole the same number of feet
> in the air as you buried the dipole, you must remember to tune in the image
> frequency on receive for it to work :)
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030907192653.23306.00000523@mb-m19.aol.com...
> > To bury his Dipole. He was complaining about how noisy HF was, so I told
> him
> > if he buried it, that it would stop the Noise. The fool believed me and
> buried
> > it, I still cant stop laughing., I hate to tell the guy the truth, because
> now
> > he Brags about how quit his Receiver is.
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

3293. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 01:49:29 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjgn79$t1n$0@208.206.142.76>
Source record: 76706

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309071417.59189fd9@posting.google.com...
> > "K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:<b71720b321f483edfb53ce7de21e4078.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > > Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
> > > new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
> > > guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> > > not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> > > the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> > > 2.3%.
> > >
> > > Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?
> > >
> > > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> > Hans, though it pains me to do so, I would suggest censuring amateurs
> > such as DICK, Larry, Steve, Bruice, Kelly, and Jim as they continually
> > put forth the idea that an amateur that is not versed in Morse is an
> > incomplete amateur. Nevermind that this amateur can do PSK31 and
> > FSTV.
> >
> > Everyone knows that a picture is worth a thousand words, so if Jim can
> > send a thousand real words (not ARRL numbergrams or Q-signals) in the
> > space of one FSTV image, ... maybe he shouldn't be censured. Just
> > maybe. Get back with me if he passes.
> >
> > Furthermore they exhibit a throwback mentality, which just annoys me.
> > OK, you've got your marching orders, as far as you can march on a
> > boat. So be off with you, Master Chief.
> >
> > Brian/N0iMD
>
> I doubt that those who dropped out did so because of these people, this
> newsgroup, or the activities of hams on the air or on the internet. It's
> unlikely they even know about this newsgroup let alone frequent it. They
> are probably people who lost interest years ago due to the fact that they
> were not into radio as a hobby but simply to talk to spouses and children
> around town. As cell phones became cheap and service improved, there was no
> reason for these people to continue in the hobby. We probably also lost
> some due to lack of elmering but if they don't let us know they are out
> there, we can't find them to elmer. Some of those hams never got even a 2m
> handheld let alone another radio. They never followed up by joining a club

> to get more exposure to ham radio and elmering in ham radio.
>

Nice trhy, Dee, but unfortunately any attempte at using reason with him is futile.
It just confuses him and -what was his word? "Irritates" him, also pi$$es him off that
poeple just can't accept his version of a Perfect Ham Radio. With no Morris code.

3294. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 01:52:11 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjgncb$t1n$1@208.206.142.76>
Source record: 76707

N2EY wrote:

>
>
> It's self-evident that a radio amateur who has no Morse code skills is not a
> fully qualified radio amateur, particularly for HF/MF amateur operation. That's
> a plain and simple fact.

What is it about plain and simple facts that so confuses NCI members?

3295. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 02:23:59 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F5BE83F.8050404@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 76708

Jim Hampton wrote:

>It works, but since you are using an "image" dipole the same number of feet
>in the air as you buried the dipole, you must remember to tune in the image
>frequency on receive for it to work :)
>
>
>
>
No, you need to tune in the negative frequency. (actually there is
negative frequency, when you
demodulate an AM signal the lower sideband ends up being in the negative
domain (below zero).
It sounds just the same as positive frequency when you listen to it.)
;-)

3296. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 02:29:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907222958.23171.00000548@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 76709

In article <jegnlvcv62bd1q5v1vo07dsnamlro7omlt@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
<bbrock@i-america.net> writes:

>OK...I've got to ask. How in the hell does someone who spells as
>badly as he does send code?

Who says Bruce ever sends code?

I've never heard him on the air.

>Hell, it's hard to tell what he's trying
>to say here, I'd hate like hell to have to try and figure out what he
>was trying to spell during a QSO.

He's been asked to use a spellchecker, but refuses.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3297. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 02:38:29 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <cslnlvokdvcphc5frkrs80dktutkj2r70t@4ax.com>
Source record: 76712

On 06 Sep 2003 11:22:30 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <r2iilv0ovu97nehjbcn9hpnte7is1p43nn@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
><bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>
>>On 5 Sep 2003 10:57:03 -0700, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>
>>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>>news:<vi4hlv4p8a8lvp8p3p059191vae1pfh7dq@4ax.com>...
>>>> On 05 Sep 2003 11:19:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>>>
>>>> >In article <j62glvk4duionbd52uc7igls30dnv6mc4m@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
>>>> ><bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>>>> >
>>>> >>On 05 Sep 2003 03:41:16 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>>

>>I think that they should know what all those nifty buttons
>>actually do.
>
>That's a problem, because many rigs have so many features and menus that almost
>nobody knows *all* of them. But if you're talking about basic operation and
>operating practice, there's no reason it couldn't be done.
>
>>They should know how to enter into a conversation. A
>>list of "critical tasks" and "non-critical tasks" should be developed
>>and a person not be licensed until they can actually show competence
>>in those tasks. Those are the types of issues that I'd like to see
>>the ham community discussing rather than the endless code/no-code
>>debate that detracts from everything else.
>
>Actually, this very idea was discussed here over 5 years ago. Here's what I
>proposed:
>
>
>(BEGIN QUOTE):
>
>It seems to me that just dropping the code test would remove the last vestige
>of skills testing from the licensing process. Perhaps the code test should be
>replaced by a real practical operating test.
>
>Such a test could work like this:
>
>Two typical ham rigs are set up so that the operators of each one cannot see or
>hear each other. The rigs are connected to dummy loads which are located

>adjacent to each other. (The idea is to permit a "contact" from one rig to the
>other, without putting much of a signal on the air). The testee and a VE sit at
>one rig, and another VE sits at the other. The testee is given a sealed
>envelope and a few minutes to get familiar with the operation of the rig. (The
>operating instructions for the rig would be available at any time).
>
>When the actual test begins, the testee opens the sealed envelope and a timer
>is started. Inside the envelope are a set of instructions telling the testee to
>go to a specific frequency and call the VE at the other rig, make contact, and
>send the enclosed formal message. The VE at the other end has a similar sealed
>envelope, but with a different message, which is to be received by the testee.
>
>The idea is to test the actual radio operating skills of the testee under
>controlled conditions. There would be a time limit, too. (That's what the timer
>is for). The testee would have the choice of CW, voice or a digital mode for
>the test.
>
>Time limits and exact instructions would vary with the mode and the class of
>license being tested. Higher class tests could have shorter time limits, longer
>messages, and more complicated instructions, such as having to change frequency
>at a certain point in the contact, having to pick the frequency from a list
>that includes "wrong choices", etc.
>
>Scoring would be on the basis of mistakes. If a word in the messages is missing
>or misspelled, that's a mistake. If nonstandard procedure or phonetics are
>used, each deviation is a mistake. If the time limit is exceeded, each minute
>over the limit is a mistake. Exceed a certain number of mistakes and the test
>is failed. Asking for a repeat of a missed word would NOT be a mistake.
>
>Typical exams (but not the exact exams themselves) would be available as study
>guides. Audiotapes of typical tests could be used for study as well.
>
>Yes, it's a bit more complex than a straight code receiving test, and requires
>some equipment and two VEs to conduct it. (Perhaps the VE at the testee's
>position isn't really needed). But it could be done quite easily, and in such a
>way as to test real operating skills. The rigs used need not have lots of
>features, and QRP power levels would be more than adequate. Or a "rig
>simulator" that's really a gussied-up intercom could be used.
>
>Is there any real reason such testing could not be done? Is it expecting too
>much that a prospective ham be able to pass such a test? I think not!
>
>(END QUOTE)
>
>That description was part of a longer post from June 19, 1998. For the
>original, see:
>
>http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=1998061910321401.GAA21892%40ladder03.
>news.aol.com&output=gplain
>

>Note that one of the features of the test is that the person being tested gets
>to choose the mode used. Those who like Morse best can be tested using that
>mode, etc.
>
>I reposted the idea a few times but always got the same response from the
>nocodetest folks: Opposition to the idea of ANY form of practical skills test.

Well, I guess I'm an exception to the rule. I'd support exactly
something along those lines. Have them set up a very simple radio
into dummy loads and actually have a conversation.

>
>>All of the name calling and false accusations from both sides makes us
>>look silly to those who read it.
>
>That's true.
>
>>I'm really glad that it will be ending soon.
>
>You know something we don't? FCC has been extremely slow in acting on various
>proposals over the past few years. The 2000 restructuring took almost two
>years, start-to-finish.
>
>Frankly, given the FCC's words in the Report and Order to 98-143 (the
>restructuring), I'm surprised that Element 1 is still in place. FCC said there
>was "no regulatory purpose" for code testing *except* meeting the treaty
>requirement. Treaty requirement is gone. Based on its own logic, FCC now has no
>reason at all to keep Element 1. Yet they are going through the whole NPRM
>cycle again. Why? Could it be they have changed their minds?
>
>However the issue is decided, I doubt that all of the name calling and false
>accusations will stop. You should see some of the names I've been called for
>daring to disagree with some folks, and for pointing out their mistakes in
>fact, logic and math.
>
>> Perhaps then, we can move on to more important issues.
>
>Maybe - but given the resistance to my idea of 5+ years ago, I doubt it.

I don't know. Although the posts to the ng haven't changed over the
years, people and positions do change. I've had a few people post
dissatisfaction with the knowledge level of the current testing and
they seem to agree that the current tests allow people to be licensed
that don't know protocols or even how to set up and operate the
equipment. Your proposal sounds like a step in the right direction.
>>
>>I'm sure that not everyone will agree with performance based testing
>>in addition to a written test.
>
>That's an understatement. Google up the responses I got from the above post.
>Some of 'em aren't pretty.

>
>>However, perhaps a consensus could be reached.
>
>Even if that happens, the FCC then has to be sold on the idea.

If a consensus was reached in the ham coumunity that testing was inadequate at its current level, would selling the idea to them really be that hard? Afterall, it hams who would have to bear the burden of administering the additional test requirements. I don't think that anyone wants to see people licensed to operate radios who don't know the basics of setting them up and using them within established protocols.

So, how would we go about starting a movement towards perfromance based testing? I would be willing to do what I could to help.

3298. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 02:38:31 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <4pmnlv4n7s3o28fn909n8hhe5l8cjfs13h@4ax.com>
Source record: 76713

On Sun, 7 Sep 2003 09:12:21 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:ohbllvkq21kf2i0n8trbb9sv2n25vvc459@4ax.com...
>> On Sat, 6 Sep 2003 09:43:32 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >To use Hans' spelling: for crying out phucking loud, Bob. Either you
>> >literally have just decided to pop in and don't read any other time; or
>you
>> >really are just trolling. This newsgroup runs several, *several* topics
>at
>> >any given time. You can choose whatever ones you would like and even
>create
>> >your own. But, you aren't going to change the debate on CW and no one
>ever
>> >will. I just laughed hysterically at another post of yours, where you
>said,
>> >"thank goodness it will all be ending soon." That's ludicrous. You're
>> >either young or blissful if you think the CW debate is going to end or go
>> >away.
>>
>> Anyone who can read the news knows which way code testing is going to
>> go. The only real question is when. I see that Oz has decided that
>> they don't have to wait until 2005 to dump it. Gee...what a suprise.
>> >
>
>Bob. You're young, aren't you? I can almost tell that by your optimistic
>attitude about the CW issue. You have to realize, Bob, that the CW issue
>for the drunken-type ramblers is not a CW issue at all. It's a value
>issue--that they value some mysterious talent they see in their ability and
>desire to use CW. It isn't about regulations, it isn't about the FCC, it
>isn't about whether it is a testing element or not. In their eyes, they
>will always be above anyone else not of their ilk. We know that's wrong.
>Others who have far more logic and brains and the capacity to think straight
>know that's wrong. But, they do not. So, their incessant whining and
>arguing and condemning and blaming will go on into eternity, while the rest
>of ham radio--the real part--moves on, has fun, helps out, and grows.

I'm pushing 50, but I like to convince myself that I'm still young.
Once the decision is made, all that will be left will those who
reminice about the good ole days when you couldn't talk on HF if you
didn't know how to not talk on HF.

>
>> >I have to be pretty darned "professional" during the day
>> >and getting down to another level sure is great fun!
>>
>> Oh, I come and go. I have many more parts to my life that are more
>> pressing sometimes than ham radio or the newsgroup, but I won't go
>> into them. It sounds like the serious hams who want to discuss real
>> ham things have lives too.
>>
>
>Absolutely. The only reason I happened upon the newsgroup again is I've
>been designing and building an MS Access application for use by a company.
>I am on the computer so much at work that it really isn't a draw here at
>home. When I was on before, we'd actually just gotten the internet
>connection, and a second computer so we didn't have to "share" :GRIN: and I
>would load up the newsgroup while I was cruising around. For this project
>that I did here, we went out and bought a new computer with Office XP Pro,
>Office Pro, TurboCAD, Dreamweaver, and Crystal Reports. This MS Access
>application turned into an all-out total package for the company and it's
>challenged some of my abilities--which I really dig because it's meant
>growing some new knowledge and that's never bad!
>
>At any rate, the project is now winding down, save some tweaks and mods. I
>don't know if I'll keep coming to the newsgroup. I don't have much to do on
>the computer at home; I'm much more an outside or home decorating person
>than I am a internet junkie (hubby's the internet junkie). And, heck--now
>we're looking at new homes so that's bound to keep me distracted. But, like
>I said, after the shock that there are people who act the way they do here
>in this newsgroup, it becomes nothing but fun and entertainment to draw them
>out--well, except for DICK who can't directly respond to anyone who's
>smarter than he--into a tirade of emotion. The occasional
>half-serious-to-serious discussion is great.
>
>>
>> BTW, the last time that I read anything is this ng was when you posted
>> your goodbye to the group way back when. You see, this is a newsgroup
>> that you can leave for months or years and come back exactly where you
>> left off because the same things are being said over and over again.
>>
>
>Oh yeah. You got that right. For those folks whom you depict above, all
>one need do is imagine the local bar-and-grill/pub, where Johnny and Drake
>and Chuck have hung forever. One walks in, could be 15 years later, and
>there they are: still on the same stool, slumped over, arguing the same
>damned things they've argued for years. Pathetic, I know, but it's no
>different than watching a car race, not for the winner but to see what
>accidents we can see.
>
>>
>> Personally, I kinda like your callsign. I hope that you can live up

>> to it.
>> >
>
>I couldn't care less whether you like it or not, Bob. I don't care if
>anyone else likes it or not. It's personal between and a group of friends
>and the rest of the world be damned.
>
>> >
>> >And that debate has been had and made many times here; and it's coming up
>> >again--Winter is coming.
>> >
>> >Kim W5TIT
>>
>> So, basically you're saying that the ng is stuck and useless except
>> for a distraction.
>>
>
>Absolutely. The only folks you'll ever see in any half-way decent debates
>in this newsgroup are Jim/N2EY; Brian Kelley; Hans--once in a while; and the
>occasional visitors who'll bring up something happenstance into this
>newsgroup and figure out real quick that there's so few serious participants
>that it's just not worth it.
>
>>
>> That's a shame, but I tend to agree with you.
>>
>
>Oh, I don't think it's a shame...'least not any more. I kinda like it. I
>don't know where you work or what have to do for a living but I get plenty
>of serious, mentally challenging, stressful distractions at work. I think
>the transition I used to look for here was a
>seriuos-but-not-mentally-challenging exchange. Well, that's not going to
>happen ;) so I just shed all the "stuff" and decide to be as basal as I can
>possibly be--unless there's something that I can contribute to an
>intellectual discussion. And, let's face it, I'm just not into ham radio
>for the intellectualism of it so most of those discussions go way up over my
>head and I am bored to tears with the idea of learning enough about whatever
>is that's being discussed...!! Reading those discussions is like just
>looking at the cover of that mag that ARRL puts out--the Techie one.
>
>>
>> Still though, I think that if a few hams wanted to discuss stuff that
>> is actually policy related with regards to enforcement, policy, etc.
>> it could become a useful group with a lot of filtering.
>>
>
>That possibility is insidiously redundant, i.e., can happen anywhere.
>There's nothing stopping you from doing that right here--a new thread--and
>completely ignoring the posts to it that have nothing to do with the topic
>and everything to do with one's being on top of their imaginative mountain.

>You could also start it--well, anywhere.

I think I'll thy here for awhile.

3299. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 02:38:34 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <f7nnlv83f1abqelkoitpohqf63mifivadh@4ax.com>
Source record: 76711

On Sun, 7 Sep 2003 19:49:04 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:5vfnlv80c02m11ra9g8i68maa7uks23329@4ax.com...
>> On 07 Sep 2003 23:03:13 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>>
>> >>And, for goodness sake again--don't *even* be affected by anything Dick
>> >>Carroll, Waddles (WA8ULX or whatever), Larry Roll or even Dave Heil
>says.
>> >>They're humorous, at best. They all remind me of drunken old rambling
>men.
>> >>
>> >>Kim W5TIT
>> >
>> > Your TITs Draggin on the ground are not humorous
>>
>> Nor is you lack of basic knowledge regarding antennas.
>>
>
>Hey, Bob? Just a suggestion. Just filter out this nitwit. Also, I've got
>it set so that anything with WA8ULX@aol, WA8ULX, ULX, Brucie, or Bruce
>doesn't come through. So, I miss most of whatever it is he posts. Can't
>say I miss most of whatever it is he "says" because he doesn't say
>anything...LOL
>
>Anyway, just a suggestion. I've also done that with Dan, now, too. He's
>another one that isn't even fun to play with and I hate take advantage of
>anyone but Larry and DICK.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

If I get the feeling that he and his ISP thrive on attention, I'll
filter him. I'm not there yet though.

3300. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 02:38:36 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <g9nnlv4i1jkovq743kt8899vhsnf20a8p9@4ax.com>
Source record: 76710

On 07 Sep 2003 23:58:10 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>I just accept this as a confession and now you are wanting to know how
>>you were found out. Just like GWB, I can't reveal my methods.
>>
>>
>>
>
>Jr. go back to your homework, dont you have classes in the morning?

No, but you may...

3301. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 02:39:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907223924.28408.00000550@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 76714

>He's been asked to use a spellchecker, but refuses.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

I will use a Spell Checker when the No-Coders become proficient at CW

3302. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 02:42:22 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907224222.28408.00000551@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 76715

>No, but you may...
>

Oh I see you have the day off.

3303. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 03:20:26 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <47snlv0m5oqoqc2nq980dapluc8qiiroc2@4ax.com>
Source record: 76716

On 08 Sep 2003 02:29:58 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <jegnlvcv62bd1q5v1vo07dsnamlro7omlt@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
><bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>
>>OK...I've got to ask. How in the hell does someone who spells as
>>badly as he does send code?
>
>Who says Bruce ever sends code?
>
>I've never heard him on the air.
>
>>Hell, it's hard to tell what he's trying
>>to say here, I'd hate like hell to have to try and figure out what he
>>was trying to spell during a QSO.
>
>He's been asked to use a spellchecker, but refuses.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I guess it's time to plonk him. If he can't handle the simple rules
regarding newsgroup charters or AOL's TOS, he's incapable of adding
anything useful to a conversation.

3304. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 03:21:18 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <bctnlv8bl3gfrqifmksvp6j8d78gr260nq@4ax.com>
Source record: 76717

On 08 Sep 2003 02:39:24 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>He's been asked to use a spellchecker, but refuses.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>I will use a Spell Checker when the No-Coders become proficient at CW

Plonked with prejiduce for being a useless twit.

3305. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 03:27:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030907232718.19859.00000649@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 76718

>Plonked with prejiduce for being a useless twit.

I see you are a WIMP, who is either to Lazy or to stupid to learn CW.

3306. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 03:31:39 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <kltnlvo2cocfat4e85r5oefchugs6uq3bc@4ax.com>
Source record: 76719

On Sun, 07 Sep 2003 22:38:34 -0400, Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
wrote:

>On Sun, 7 Sep 2003 19:49:04 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>wrote:

>>Hey, Bob? Just a suggestion. Just filter out this nitwit. Also, I've got
>>it set so that anything with WA8ULX@aol, WA8ULX, ULX, Brucie, or Bruce
>>doesn't come through. So, I miss most of whatever it is he posts. Can't
>>say I miss most of whatever it is he "says" because he doesn't say
>>anything...LOL
>>
>>Anyway, just a suggestion. I've also done that with Dan, now, too. He's
>>another one that isn't even fun to play with and I hate take advantage of
>>anyone but Larry and DICK.
>>
>>Kim W5TIT
>>
>
>If I get the feeling that he and his ISP thrive on attention, I'll
>filter him. I'm not there yet though.

OK...I've changed my mind about wa8... I may have to go to a plonk
with prejuduce mode for awhild. So far there seem to be less than a
dozen posters here that I would care to talk to on radio. As I said,
I've got the kid to take to school, animals to feed, and I'm in the
middle of a move, so I really don't have a lot of time to play with
twits who have nothing productive to say about radio within the
confines for the ng charter.

I've been in rougher ng's and I've found that with proper filtering,
one can usually talk to those who want to carry on sincere
conversation with proper filtering.

3307. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 04:00:14 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030908000014.19936.00000552@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 76722

>Nothing like having a third grade education.
>

Is that what you have?

3308. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 04:50:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309072050.7f227b13@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76723

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030907223924.28408.00000550@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >He's been asked to use a spellchecker, but refuses.
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> I will use a Spell Checker when the No-Coders become proficient at CW

No you won't. You'll be the same ole dumbass you've always been.

3309. Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 04:50:46 UTC
From: well_look@this.now
Message-ID: <bjh1r6$g0i$0@208.206.142.66>
Source record: 76724

>Welcome each and every new ham into the hobby with open arms --
>after all, he's a brother (or she's a sister) who has taken the time
>to study for and pass the written test, even if he doesn't have the
>code.

Ah god...been there and done that. These were guys that were 25
year veterans of cb. They are smart asses...I tried to elmer
hem...they wouldnt listen. They get on the area 2 meter repeaters
and use their cb handles and 10 codes. Most of them are extra class
to make matters worse. They have run all the older hams off the 2
meter band here in wv and east ky. But yes like a fool I welcomed
them into my home. Went to the classes and talked about ham radio
to them. But they are still just hardcore cbers. Its not like this
everywhere in the country but there is enough of this scattered
through the country to give most of us a sign of things to come. No
ham radio will not die or come to an end because of these
types...but this is really what the code-nocode fuss is about. There's
thousands of us that have got a taste of these fools and dont want
any more of them. I dont want to be in the extra portion of any band
and hear 10-4. I dont want some idiot that just came off cb tuning
on top of me and whistling into his mic...but its happening and has
been for the last 2 years since the code was dropped to 5wpm.
Pretty soon the grand daddys of these idiots are going to come off
cb and be on hf with us. Now you can scream about elmering and
all that...but like i said i tried...and these fools are unelmerable.
When they looked at my full wave loop they laughed and said their
cb antennas would work better. One looked at my 2 element 5
band quad at 65 feet and said his moonraker was a better antenna.
Most of them think they know more about radio than a ham thats
been on the air for 35 years. But i guess most you folks are'nt having
to deal with these types and think the rest of us are crazy. Soon
we'll all have to pay the price for most of you wanting to do away
with the code.
Thats it in a nutshell.

3310. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 04:55:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309072055.4f9d0339@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76725

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bjgncb$t1n$1@208.206.142.76>...
> N2EY wrote:
> >
> > It's self-evident that a radio amateur who has no Morse code skills is not a
> > fully qualified radio amateur, particularly for HF/MF amateur operation. That's
> > a plain and simple fact.
>
> What is it about plain and simple facts that so confuses NCI members?

Duh!!!

Why does it have to be "particularly for HF/MF operations?"

Morse is Morse regrdless of frequency, you nincompoots!

3311. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 05:09:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030908010947.18063.00000482@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 76726

>Pretty astute of you, Dwight. Since having this callsign I've been on the
>air very little.
>
>Kim W5TIT

That ashamed of it, eh, Kim?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3312. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 05:10:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309072110.1bc8a43e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76727

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<WKO6b.38267$Vx2.17245432@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309071417.59189fd9@posting.google.com...
> > "K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:<b71720b321f483edfb53ce7de21e4078.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > > Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
> > > new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
> > > guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> > > not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> > > the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> > > 2.3%.
> > >
> > > Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?
> > >
> > > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
> > Hans, though it pains me to do so, I would suggest censuring amateurs
> > such as DICK, Larry, Steve, Bruice, Kelly, and Jim as they continually
> > put forth the idea that an amateur that is not versed in Morse is an
> > incomplete amateur. Nevermind that this amateur can do PSK31 and
> > FSTV.
> >
> > Everyone knows that a picture is worth a thousand words, so if Jim can
> > send a thousand real words (not ARRL numbergrams or Q-signals) in the
> > space of one FSTV image, ... maybe he shouldn't be censured. Just
> > maybe. Get back with me if he passes.
> >
> > Furthermore they exhibit a throwback mentality, which just annoys me.
> > OK, you've got your marching orders, as far as you can march on a
> > boat. So be off with you, Master Chief.
> >
> > Brian/N0iMD
>
> I doubt that those who dropped out did so because of these people, this
> newsgroup, or the activities of hams on the air or on the internet. It's
> unlikely they even know about this newsgroup let alone frequent it.

Since this is their daily bread, I would dare say that DICK, Bruice,
Kelley, Steve, and Jim know about aqnd frequent this news group,
DEEEEEE

They
> are probably people who lost interest years ago

Perhaps, but they must beeeee hurd.

due to the fact that they
> were not into radio as a hobby but simply to talk to spouses and children
> around town.

They've never mentioned children, cept DICK who claims grandchildren.

As cell phones became cheap and service improved, there was no
> reason for these people to continue in the hobby. We probably also lost
> some due to lack of elmering but if they don't let us know they are out
> there, we can't find them to elmer.

No $hit, $hurlock. Ever hurd of the Novice Subbands?

You might as well call them Novices' because that's all the attention
they got.

Some of those hams never got even a 2m
> handheld let alone another radio. They never followed up by joining a club
> to get more exposure to ham radio and elmering in ham radio.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

According to DICK and Kelly, there was more mentoring going on than
you could shake a baton at.

3313. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 05:12:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030908011205.18063.00000483@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 76728

>Actually, the last time I subscribed to the ng, TIT's had left the
>group and vowed never to return. Things changed I guess.
>

No, Bob, that's just Kim being Kim...No integrity or credibility whatsoever!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3314. Re: test. Don't bother to read

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 05:21:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030908012116.18063.00000484@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 76729

>Just a quick test.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

You're getting "testy" in your old age!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3315. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 05:22:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309072122.22ceefda@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76730

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0309071733.193d36b1@posting.google.com>...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<FFo6b.37929$Vx2.16995167@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
>
> > > Using a straight key in a contest would kill me if I was running a
> > > decent rate. The goofy relics should be outlawed at least in contests
> > > except under unusual circumstances. Do yourself a big favor and get
> > > yourself decent paddles like a Kent and a cheap MFJ keyer and take it
> > > from there. The paddles would work fine with the FD momory keyers.
> > > Beyond that real CW contesters don't use any types of mechanical keys,
> > > they use keyboards. In the end the means used to generate the output
> > > doesn't matter, it's the ears that *always* matter . . .
> > >
> >
> > Yeah if you are out to win or be a high scorer, you are correct.
>
> For better or worse I was "brought up" in that niche. I'm one of these
> animals:
>
> http://www.gofrc.org/
>
> > However if
> > you just want to be a casual contester, a straight key is fine.
>
> I just have a silly "thing" about straight keys Dee so maybe I'm going
> a bit overboard here.

If you speakum sum Engrish, it wood be better.

> I fiddled with surplus J-38s long before I got serious about actually
> taking the Novice test. Every radio kid did that 'Wayback.

Probably a lie, but we'll indulge the grate Kelly.

Eventually
> I got to visit an experienced dx contester (which was what I wanted to
> become) who used a bug (those guys ALL used bugs) and he let me futz
> with his bug "offline" so to speak.

Yep, all dx contesters use booogs.

> Forthwith

Not to be confused with Farnsworth.

I immediately got
> irrevocably hooked on bugs vs. straight keys. Net result was that the
> nite WN3YIK hit the airwaves for the first time it was with a
> well-greased, polished and tuned old USN Vibroplex. I've always had a
> straight key or two floating around the shack,

No doubt one of those anti-gravity devises.

> they're kinda "core ham
> objects" and maybe I've had some straight key QSOs but I don't
> specifically remember any of 'em.

Can't remember "core Ham objects," huh?

> > Also if you
> > are doing the "hunt and pounce" instead of "camping on a frequency," it
> > doesn't make quite as much difference. I like to get out there in a
> > contest and just see what the variety is. I don't intend to make any run at
> > a large number of contacts. The last CW contest I was in, I was quite happy
> > to make 77 contacts and then go do something else.

I wonder how David Heil would characterize your inability to stick
with a 7 second QSO?

> 100% on the button, all of it.

On what button? PTT button?

> It's all in what one wants out of a
> contest and/or is willing to put into contesting.

Is it?

The simple fact of
> the matter is that if it wasn't for the brigades of casual contesters
> like you contests simply would not be worth getting into.

Huh? Try that in Engrish sumtime and we'll relook it.

3316. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 05:29:12 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030908012912.18063.00000485@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 76731

>Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB

Hansl:

Yup.

1. - Return U.S. Amateur Radio licensing standards to Pre-Restructuring levels, including 5, 13, and 20 WPM code testing for Novice, Gen/Adv, and Extra-class licenses.

2. Tell the entire NCTA to sod off.

3. Get the ARRL to plow every dime's worth of it's net worth into a national, televised advertising campaign. Get ham radio into the public eye, and stress the FUN, not the public service (i.e. the work and worry).

4. Get the ARRL to enlist the assistance of any and all celebrity hams in the accomplishment of #3 above.

5. Get the ARRL to stop pandering to the Welfare State mentality (related to #1 above.)

73 de Larry, K3LT

3317. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 05:32:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309072132.4b49fc76@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76732
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

"paulfriedman@comcast.net" wrote in message news:...
> "Brian" wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309071201.23a96249@posting.google.com...
> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:...
> > > The following isn't exactly a new idea, but some may not have seen it
> > > yet...
> > >
> > > Maybe the way out of the mess is for a Smith Chart test to replace
> > > the code test.
> > > So you still want the Amateur Radio Service to be the exclusive domain
> > of the Electrical Engineer's?
> >
> > I don't think that's what the FCC wants, but since the NCVEC can do
> > any damned thing they want, go ahead and put it to them.
>
>
> I am not an EE or, for that matter, an any-type-E. Majored in History, in
> fact, with a useful minor in Comparative Religion. Work experience consisted
> on sitting in an office, drinking bad coffee, attending boring meetings and
> writing REALLY useful memos (I was high enough in the organization so that I
> didn't have to read any memos). With that as background ...

If only more people had three hour work schedules...

> I do no think I am brilliant, but I have not found Smith Charts all that
> difficult. When I learned about them, I found them interesting and
> potentially useful. Perhaps, just perhaps, the NCVEC thinks selecting for
> people who find such things a Smith Charts interesting is a reasonable
> filter for entrance to ham radio. If this be true, perhaps, just perhaps,
> that's a reasonable filter?

FILTER? Who the hell thinks a FILTER is necessary or JUSTIFIABLE?

You'se guys Socialists or what?

3318. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 05:40:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309072140.37b6b6d0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76733

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030907172515.05539.00000622@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0309071201.23a96249@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<c2356669.0309051154.4ef03806@posting.google.com>...
> >> The following isn't exactly a new idea, but some may not have seen it
> >> yet...
> >>
> >> Maybe the way out of the mess is for a Smith Chart test to replace
> >> the code test.
> >
> >So you still want the Amateur Radio Service to be the exclusive domain
> >of the Electrical Engineer's?
>
> Nope. One does not have to be an EE in order to understand, and use, the Smith
> Chart. Many hams who are not EEs have Smithc Chart knowledge and skill. Many
> EEs do not.

Name ONE school that teaches Smith Charts that is not an Engineering school.

Just ONE!

> btw, the plural of "Electrical Engineer" is "Electrical Engineers" not
> "Electrical Engineer's". "Electrical Engineer's" is the possessive

So Electrical Engineers want to posess all of Amatuer Radio?

> >I don't think that's what the FCC wants, but since the NCVEC can do
> >any damned thing they want, go ahead and put it to them.
>
> NCVEC could not create a separate Smith Chart test without FCC approval.

Bullshit!

And
> they could not deviate from multiple-choice format.

Bullshit!

> It's obvious that irony is not one of your strong points, Brian.

It is obvious that NCVEC reality is not one of yours.

3319. Re: Persecution of Honest Freeband DXers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 06:13:59 UTC
From: Brainbuster <brainbuster@spamtrap.lineone.net>
Message-ID: <bjh75a$os6$2@news6.svr.pol.co.uk>
Source record: 76734
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote in message
<5c01b95b.0309061238.7cc9a31f@posting.google.com>...
>
> Whew...If there was ever an arguement for castrating
>"freebanders",

Why, can people not use a CB without their nads?

> here's the evidence, provided by one of thier own.

Looks like they fooled you... look at the headers:
That post:

From: twistedhedwebtvdotnet@yahoo.com (Twistedhed)
Subject: Persecution of Honest Freeband DXers
Date: 6 Sep 2003 11:40:38 -0700
Organization: http://groups.google.com/
Message-ID: <d891d17c.0309061040.63b66d51@posting.google.com>
NNTP-Posting-Host: 198.81.26.103
X-Trace: posting.google.com 1062873639 8019 127.0.0.1 (6 Sep 2003 18:40:39
GMT)
X-Complaints-To: groups-abuse@google.com

Now, check the real "Twistedhed:

-
From: twistedhed@webtv.net (Twistedhed)
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: Tue, 2 Sep 2003 16:04:10 -0400 (EDT)
Organization: WebTV Subscriber
Message-ID: <16510-3F54F7BA-259@storefull-2311.public.lawson.webtv.net>
NNTP-Posting-Host: localhost.webtv.net
Mime-Version: 1.0 (WebTV)
-

As you will see, the post did NOT come from Twistedhed, who uses Web TV.
So, who did it come from?
Well, here is another post with a matching IP number and, as with that post,
sent via Google:

-
From: twistyisaliar@yahoo.com (George Is Innocent)
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Subject: Re: New Yahoo Group
Date: 4 Sep 2003 08:12:36 -0700
Organization: http://groups.google.com/

Lines: 67
Message-ID: <932afc6.0309040712.157f13d1@posting.google.com>
NNTP-Posting-Host: 198.81.26.103
X-Trace: posting.google.com 1062688358 20626 127.0.0.1 (4 Sep 2003 15:12:38 GMT)
X-Complaints-To: groups-abuse@google.com
NNTP-Posting-Date: 4 Sep 2003 15:12:38 GMT
-

As you will see, it came from one of the trolls claiming to be "pro-legal", and was done to stir trouble.

You could castrate them, but it won't stop them posting troll messages.

Regards,

Peter.

3320. Re: Something Around Here to Enjoy Besides the Damned Code Test War

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 07:06:33 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309072306.13e0f5f5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76735

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<x_O6b.5096$BG6.2100@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0309052012.66cdf59a@posting.google.com...
> > http://www.msnbc.com/news/962313.asp?0cv=CB20
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Wonder if the ID will be in MCW?

MFMCW.

>
> Dan/W4NTI

w3rv

3321. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 07:50:50 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjhccq$2ts$0@208.206.142.97>
Source record: 76736

well_look@this.now wrote:

> >Welcome each and every new ham into the hobby with open arms --
> >after all, he's a brother (or she's a sister) who has taken the time
> >to study for and pass the written test, even if he doesn't have the
> >code.
>
> Ah god...been there and done that. These were guys that were 25
> year veterans of cb. They are smart asses...I tried to elmer
> hem...they wouldnt listen. They get on the area 2 meter repeaters
> and use their cb handles and 10 codes. Most of them are extra class
> to make matters worse. They have run all the older hams off the 2
> meter band here in wv and east ky. But yes like a fool I welcomed
> them into my home. Went to the classes and talked about ham radio
> to them. But they are still just hardcore cbers. Its not like this
> everywhere in the country but there is enough of this scattered
> through the country to give most of us a sign of things to come. No
> ham radio will not die or come to an end because of these
> types...but this is really what the code-nocode fuss is about. There's
> thousands of us that have got a taste of these fools and dont want
> any more of them. I dont want to be in the extra portion of any band
> and hear 10-4. I dont want some idiot that just came off cb tuning
> on top of me and whistling into his mic...but its happening and has
> been for the last 2 years since the code was dropped to 5wpm.
> Pretty soon the grand daddys of these idiots are going to come off
> cb and be on hf with us. Now you can scream about elmering and
> all that...but like i said i tried...and these fools are unelmerable.
> When they looked at my full wave loop they laughed and said their
> cb antennas would work better. One looked at my 2 element 5
> band quad at 65 feet and said his moonraker was a better antenna.
> Most of them think they know more about radio than a ham thats
> been on the air for 35 years. But i guess most you folks are'nt having
> to deal with these types and think the rest of us are crazy. Soon
> we'll all have to pay the price for most of you wanting to do away
> with the code.
> Thats it in a nutshell.

Hmmmm. This is even more serious that we thought. If even 10% of the new codefree happen to fit this category ham radio is in for a helluva rough ride. And 10% seems to be a lowball figure, at least in many places, judging from this guy's experience.. And the code test WAS the filter for those nasties.
Ah well, Burkey Turkey thinks we don't need no stinkin' filters.
Ya gotta wonder what he thinks the FCC exams ever were. The Welcome wagon?
Oh, I forget. He isn't capable of thinking. Sorry, folks!

3322. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 08:12:10 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309080012.345a61f2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76737

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309070647.15a1fda6@posting.google.com>...
> Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:<86fzj924xh.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>...
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> > >>>>> "Brian" == Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:
> >
> > [...]
> >
> > Brian> One will get ya ten that Farnsworth was an expert on the
> > Brian> subject BEFORE he/she invented that wheel and took it public. I
> > Brian> find the concept of you, admittedly struggling to get off a
> > Brian> notch above ground zero in this game, "facilitating" the
> > Brian> learning process for others just a tad problematic.
> >
> > Out of curiosity, have you seen the page or are you still blocked on
> > the concept of a student assisting other students?
>
> Jack, "students teaching students" is at the core of the FCC's
> mandated Novice subbands. I hadn't been aware that Kelly was against
> this concept and the implementation of it.

That's correct Burke.

Expanding a bit on the subject it's a *helluva* lot more difficult
today for a newbie interested in becoming CW-proficient today than it
was 'wayback. And that includes 5 wpm Extras like Jack. It'll become
even more difficult if/when nocodes gain access to the HF bands on a
broad scale and decide to get into CW. I don't mean "newbie" in any
derogatory sense, I mean anybody coming from any direction entering
the CW learning process. The mandated Novice bands as you put it were
almost a separate service in my mind, slow code galore, every student
booted evey other student along, unbeatable experience as a learning
exercise with fellow students. And it was all on the air too, was not
this lame computerized "imitation radio" crap newbies have to plod
thru today to get up to useful speeds.

Net result of the demise of the Novice bands as an educational
resource is CW newbies today having to flail around on their own per
the pushups Jack is going thru. Us OFs had it *much* easier in
comparison and we had a helluva lot more fun too. The concept and
implementation of the Novice license was one of the best ideas the FCC
ever had and you bet I support it.

> Brian/N0iMD

w3rv

3323. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 08:56:23 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309080056.10ac50ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76738

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bjgli9put0@208.206.142.108>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:

> > You're a good candidate for one of the quick-up portable HF antenna
> > packages. Run a search on "DK9SQ", I've heard they're pretty decent.
> > Also check http://www.eham.net/reviews/products/75
> >
>
> Maybe a St Louis Vertical?

You bet. Nice compact portable package, sets up anywhere in ten
minutes, easy to tune anywhere in the HF spectrum, etc. Short
verticals will deliver the goods rumors to the contrary. Given some
decent operating smarts and patience. A local here has worked well
over 200 countries mobiling with goofy little three foot Hamsticks.

> > Dunno anybody who has a Ramsey keyer but both of my MFJ keyers work
> > fine with every Kenwood rig I've used it with including a TS-950, a
> > TS-440 FD clunker, my TS-940 and TS-50 and also my Yaesu FT-847 and an
> > ancient hybrid FT-101.
>
> I wonder if he tried reversing the polarity of the keyer's output.

Beats me. I've had and/or used a gazillion keyer/rig combinations and
I've never had the kind of problems he's described going back to
cathode keying days. Somethin' ain't right at KC2ELS . . .

> Dick

w3rv

3324. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 09:04:11 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309080104.6362b486@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76739

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309072140.37b6b6d0@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030907172515.05539.00000622@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0309071201.23a96249@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> > >news:<c2356669.0309051154.4ef03806@posting.google.com>...
> > >> The following isn't exactly a new idea, but some may not have seen it
> > >> yet...
> > >>
> > >> Maybe the way out of the mess is for a Smith Chart test to replace
> > >> the code test.
> > >
> > >So you still want the Amateur Radio Service to be the exclusive domain
> > >of the Electrical Engineer's?
> >
> > Nope. One does not have to be an EE in order to understand, and use, the Smith
> > Chart. Many hams who are not EEs have Smithc Chart knowledge and skill. Many
> > EEs do not.
>
> Name ONE school that teaches Smith Charts that is not an Engineering school.
>
> Just ONE!

The ARRL Antenna Book Collitch of Antenna Knowledge. Oops . . I
forgot about your "relationship" with antennas . . .

>
> > btw, the plural of "Electrical Engineer" is "Electrical Engineers" not
> > "Electrical Engineer's". "Electrical Engineer's" is the possessive
>
> So Electrical Engineers want to posess all of Amatuer Radio?
>
> > >I don't think that's what the FCC wants, but since the NCVEC can do
> > >any damned thing they want, go ahead and put it to them.
> >
> > NCVEC could not create a separate Smith Chart test without FCC approval.
>
> Bullshit!
>
> And
> > they could not deviate from multiple-choice format.
>

> Bullshit!

Then explain just why it's bullshit Brainiac.

> > It's obvious that irony is not one of your strong points, Brian.
>
> It is obvious that NCVEC reality is not one of yours.

3325. Re: "...one step closer to extinction."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 09:08:40 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <sGX6b.5596$BG6.2683@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76740

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Oh man.... Well, I've thought about how I would "handle"
> the robbery of my truck--it literally took me a lifetime of
> dreaming to get one; and I really never thought I would be
> able to do it. BUT, if it was stolen I would hope it was
> totally destroyed beyond being able to be returned and
> then I would hope that the extra coverage I am carrying
> on it would hook me back up. (snip)

Mine has full coverage also, but waiting weeks or longer to get any real response from the insurance company would be a nightmare.

Anyway, one pleasent note is that I've found the two guys I saw last night - they're staying right here in this building. This place rents both weekly and monthly suites. They're staying in one of the weekly suites, but had no business at this end of the parking lot (especially that late at night). The vehicles at this end of the parking lot either belong to the company, building staff, or those staying in the two executive suites (I stay in one).

Anyway, I reported all this to the police (they have the license plate number now). They're going to keep an eye on these two to see if they have anything to do with the string of vehicles thefts around here over the last few months.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3326. Re: Persecution of Honest Freeband DXers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 10:59:40 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <bZWdnamNW6q__MGiXTWJhA@crocker.com>
Source record: 76741
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Honest Freeband DXers", is this an oxymoron or just a plain moron??

3327. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 11:07:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030908070728.22044.00000592@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 76742

>No you won't. You'll be the same ole dumbass you've always been.

And you will still be a Dumb Down CBplusser who cant pass the EXTRA

3328. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 12:46:46 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <WS_6b.5685$BG6.396@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76743

WA8ULX wrote:

> To bury his Dipole. He was complaining about how noisy HF was, so I told him
> if he buried it, that it would stop the Noise. The fool believed me and buried
> it, I still cant stop laughing., I hate to tell the guy the truth, because now
> he Brags about how quit his Receiver is.

You are the ANTI-ELMER! AAAAIEEEEEEE!!!!!!!

Corry
--

It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

"I think all foreigners should stop interfering in the internal affairs
of Iraq." --Paul Wolfowitz

3329. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 12:47:58 UTC
From: Unclaimed Mysteries <k4doh@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <2U_6b.5687$BG6.2571@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76744

K0HB wrote:

> Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
> new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
> guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> 2.3%.
>
> Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Better pay.

73 Corry K4DOH

--

It Came From C. L. Smith's Unclaimed Mysteries.
http://www.unclaimedmysteries.net

"I think all foreigners should stop interfering in the internal affairs
of Iraq." --Paul Wolfowitz

3330. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 13:21:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030908092144.10672.00000566@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 76745

>You are the ANTI-ELMER! AAAAIEEEEEEE!!!!!!!
>
>Corry

Thanks for the comment.

3331. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 13:29:55 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F5C8453.7090409@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 76776

WA8ULX wrote:
>>Nothing like having a third grade education.
>>
>
>
> Is that what you have?

That and more and I can spell too. It's a shame they kicked you
out of the third grade, but after all you can't stay in public
school after 21 years of age.

3332. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 13:31:02 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F5C8496.9080302@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 76777

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>
> I did some experimenting along those lines, many years ago. Underground
> actually works, to some degree.. hi.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

I bet it makes your "grounded grid" linear operate better.

3333. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 13:31:49 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F5C84C5.5090408@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 76778

OM wrote:
> x-no-archive: yes
> Ham radio's golden age was the 1950s & early 1960s. It has
> been in a steady decline ever since. The ARRL & the FCC have
> facilitated the decline, for different reasons. If you practiced har
> radio in the 50s-early 60s, then you know what I am saying is
> correct.
>
> OM

Absolutely!

3334. Re: Persecution of Honest Freeband DXers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 14:32:53 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bji3uldkk0@208.206.142.104>
Source record: 76746
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

David Robbins wrote:

> "Honest Freeband DXers", is this an oxymoron or just a plain moron??

A moron on oxygen....we see a number of those here on rrap. All are code haters.

3335. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 15:13:16 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030908111316.19971.00000914@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 76747

>Ham radio's golden age was the 1950s & early 1960s. It has
>been in a steady decline ever since. The ARRL & the FCC have
>facilitated the decline, for different reasons. If you practiced har
>radio in the 50s-early 60s, then you know what I am saying is
>correct.
>
>OM

Your correct

3336. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 15:15:23 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bji6ebjkl0@208.207.71.146>
Source record: 76748

Brian Kelly wrote:

> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309072140.37b6b6d0@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030907172515.05539.00000622@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> > > In article <f45722ac.0309071201.23a96249@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > >news:<c2356669.0309051154.4ef03806@posting.google.com>...
> > > >> The following isn't exactly a new idea, but some may not have seen it
> > > >> yet...
> > > >>
> > > >> Maybe the way out of the mess is for a Smith Chart test to replace
> > > >> the code test.
> > > >
> > > >So you still want the Amateur Radio Service to be the exclusive domain
> > > >of the Electrical Engineer's?
> > >
> > > Nope. One does not have to be an EE in order to understand, and use, the Smith
> > > Chart. Many hams who are not EEs have Smithc Chart knowledge and skill. Many
> > > EEs do not.
> >
> > Name ONE school that teaches Smith Charts that is not an Engineering school.
> >
> > Just ONE!
>
> The ARRL Antenna Book Collitch of Antenna Knowledge. Oops . . I
> forgot about your "relationship" with antennas . . .
>
> >

Not to mention his "relationship" with ham radio in total. All mythical.

>
> > > btw, the plural of "Electrical Engineer" is "Electrical Engineers" not
> > > "Electrical Engineer's". "Electrical Engineer's" is the possessive
> >
> > So Electrical Engineers want to posess all of Amatuer Radio?
> >
> > > >I don't think that's what the FCC wants, but since the NCVEC can do
> > > >any damned thing they want, go ahead and put it to them.
> > >
> > > NCVEC could not create a separate Smith Chart test without FCC approval.

> >
> > Bullshit!
> >
> > And
> > > they could not deviate from multiple-choice format.
> >
> > Bullshit!
>
> Then explain just why it's bullshit Brainiac.
>
>

This'll be more of his usual ducking and dodging since clearly he has not a single clue.
Again. Still.
Forever.

3337. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 15:16:44 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bji6gsjkl1@208.207.71.146>
Source record: 76749

WA8ULX wrote:

> >No you won't. You'll be the same ole dumbass you've always been.
>
> And you will still be a Dumb Down CBplusser who cant pass the EXTRA

What Extra?? There is nothing extra about any ham radio exam these days.
He'll get it given to him, just as he's alwayt wanted.

3338. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 15:20:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030908112050.19971.00000916@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 76750

>What Extra?? There is nothing extra about any ham radio exam these days.
>He'll get it given to him, just as he's alwayt wanted.
>
>

Well of course, thats what hes waiting for. He knows he isnt smart enough to pass even a Dumb Down Test.

3339. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 15:31:20 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <ch17b.6151$yz2.5238@newssvr32.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76751

"Unclaimed Mysteries" <k4doh@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:2U_6b.5687$BG6.2571@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
> Better pay.

Oh come on, now! Cut me a little SLACK!

Hams could never be paid enough for what they do. They're "priceless". - And
that's no joke!

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

3340. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 15:35:34 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F5CA1C6.9E1F98C9@ptt.edu>
Source record: 76752

> On 07 Sep 2003 23:48:26 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>
> >>Thank God. It's had enough trying to figure it out here.
> > >
> > >Come on Jr keep up, I thought you were good at this.
> >
> > Good at what?

The only thing WA8ULX is good at...

...is being a troll.

3341. Re: Dan, WA8ULX is a CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 15:37:53 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F5CA251.1B9EC92E@ptt.edu>
Source record: 76753

> Thanks for trolling.

3342. Re: Dan, WA8ULX is a CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 15:49:16 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030908114916.26759.00000698@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 76754

>> Thanks for trolling.

Ok RADIOMAN, I wasnt going to say who the CBplusser was that buried his Ant,
but let me ask you, have you dug it up yet?

3343. Did you hear about the No-Coder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 15:57:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030908115721.26542.00000644@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 76755

Who wanted better Groundwave propagation, he buried his Ant so it would be closer to the ground.

3344. Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 16:00:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030908120046.26759.00000700@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 76756

Issued there new De-Coder rings yet?

3345. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 16:16:43 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309080816.30f423b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76757

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309072140.37b6b6d0@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030907172515.05539.00000622@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0309071201.23a96249@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> > >news:<c2356669.0309051154.4ef03806@posting.google.com>...
> > >> The following isn't exactly a new idea, but some may not have seen it
> > >> yet...
> > >>
> > >> Maybe the way out of the mess is for a Smith Chart test to replace
> > >> the code test.
> > >
> > >So you still want the Amateur Radio Service to be the exclusive domain
> > >of the Electrical Engineer's?
> >
> > Nope. One does not have to be an EE in order to understand, and use, the Smith
> > Chart. Many hams who are not EEs have Smithc Chart knowledge and skill. Many
> > EEs do not.
>
> Name ONE school that teaches Smith Charts that is not an Engineering school.
>
> Just ONE!

Why?

Smith Chart use is not usually an enginnering school course. It's
something those interested are expected to learn on their own, like
how to use a calculator today, or a slide rule in years gone by.

I learned the Chart from the ARRL Antenna Book, not from EE school.
>
> > btw, the plural of "Electrical Engineer" is "Electrical Engineers" not
> > "Electrical Engineer's". "Electrical Engineer's" is the possessive
>
> So Electrical Engineers want to posess all of Amatuer Radio?

Ask vshah101, that's his mantra.
>
> > >I don't think that's what the FCC wants, but since the NCVEC can do
> > >any damned thing they want, go ahead and put it to them.
> >
> > NCVEC could not create a separate Smith Chart test without FCC approval.

>
> Bullshit!

Yes, that's what your posts are usually full of, Brian.

Part 97 specifically lists the tests for each class of license.

Right now there are three written tests, all multiple choice. And one
code test. No Smith Chart test.
>
> > And
> > they could not deviate from multiple-choice format.
>
> Bullshit!

You really should read Part 97.
>
> > It's obvious that irony is not one of your strong points, Brian.
>
> It is obvious that NCVEC reality is not one of yours.

That's just plain wrong. NCVEC cannot add a Smith Chart test for the
reasons I listed. Read Part 97.

Besides, NCVEC complains that the code test requires too much work
from the VEs and is too stressful on those being tested. I can imagine
what they'd say if they had to supervise and grade a Smith Chart test.

And I can imagine how much you'd complain and argue if a Smith Chart
test were substituted for the code test.

73 de Jim, N2EY

--

today we lost a truly excitable boy - Warren Zevon. RIP.

3346. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 16:18:19 UTC
From: lennie <lenkvtz30004@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1063038391.614410@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 76758

"OM" <OM@fiftieshamradio.net> wrote in message
news:bji3jfdfo0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> Ham radio's golden age was the 1950s & early 1960s. It has
> been in a steady decline ever since. The ARRL & the FCC have
> facilitated the decline, for different reasons. If you practiced Ham
> radio in the 50s-early 60s, then you know what I am saying is
> correct.
>
> OM

Your 100% correct OM :)

Ham radio went straight into the ceramic
robin's egg blue pink toilet in the sky
ever since the ARRL Board bitched and moaned to the
FCC to publish the exam question pool way back in the
early 80's because they desperately wanted to put
Dick Bash and his Bash Study Guides out of business.

In the process they dumbed down ham radio's future
and it's become a glorified CB ever since.

U.B.

3347. Re: Did you hear about the No-Coder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 16:23:10 UTC
From: lennie <lenkvtz30004@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1063048260.935919@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 76762

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030908115721.26542.00000644@mb-m26.aol.com...
> Who wanted better Groundwave propagation, he buried his Ant so it would
be
> closer to the ground.

He wasn't a no-coder. He was an Extra who used
the "official" ARRL study guide and $50 to the VEC.

3348. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 17:44:45 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F5CC00D.9090806@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 76796

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
>
> Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two elements and a
> polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]
>
> A dipole ANTENNA refers to a wire type having two elements of wires,
> balanced-fed from the center with RF voltage in opposition.
>
> The length of this dipole antenna may be ANY length, from near-infinitesimal
> (fractional wavelength) to many wavelengths.
>
> The radiation pattern of the dipole antenna will vary based on many factors:
> length relative to wavelength, distance above ground or other imperfect
> conductor being the two most affecting patterns.

Len is correct, dipole simply means two separate elements (di
means two). A dipole of a certain length will be a half
wavelength at xx frequency, a quarter wavelength at yy
frequency and a full wavelength at zz frequency and so on.

3349. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 17:50:20 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <bjifgs$1ucu$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 76760

K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote:
>Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
>new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
>guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
>not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
>the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
>2.3%.

Somehow the numbers don't seem right, or at least I don't understand
them. For the months of February through June, 2001, when most of these
licenses should have been expiring, the AH0A web site gives these numbers:

Renewals: 7380
Expiries: 2623
Grace Period Renewals: 810
Cancelations: 645

While the 1,880 number might be right, the 1,925 number almost certainly
isn't. The above suggests that about 10,000 Technician licenses came up
for renewal in the 5 month period, or about 2,000 per month. The AH0A
data shows the service has averaged about 1,500 new Tech licenses per
month over the past few years, with the monthly new license total seldom
dropping below 1,000. As the code-free Technician license was reputed
to have more popular in its first few years of existance than later on,
it seems extremely unlikely that there were only 400 new Tech licenses
issued per month between February and July of 1991, especially when
2,000 per month ended up expiring 10 years later.

My guess would be that between 80% and 85% of those licensed as no-code
Techs in that period are still engaged enough to have renewed their license.
This isn't entirely out of line with other license classes. If you picked
a random group of Extra class amateurs (who, I assume, would tend to be older)
only 75% to 80% of them would be around 10 years later.

Dennis Ferguson

3350. Re: Persecution of Honest Freeband DXers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 17:59:50 UTC
From: sideband <AINO8SPAMW@cac.net>
Message-ID: <qs37b.4$nQ.4040@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76761
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I always thought that OxyMoron was Sylvester Stallone with Zits. ::shrug::

-SSB

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> David Robbins wrote:
>
>
>>"Honest Freeband DXers", is this an oxymoron or just a plain moron??
>
>
> A moron on oxygen....we see a number of those here on rrap. All are code haters.
>
>

3351. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 18:00:30 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86brtvb1oh.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 76759

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Brian" == Brian Kelly <kelly@dvol.com> writes:

[... Dick mentioned a St. Louis Vertical ...]

Brian> You bet. Nice compact portable package, sets up anywhere in ten
Brian> minutes, easy to tune anywhere in the HF spectrum, etc. Short
Brian> verticals will deliver the goods rumors to the contrary. Given
Brian> some decent operating smarts and patience. A local here has
Brian> worked well over 200 countries mobiling with goofy little three
Brian> foot Hamsticks.

I'll show it to SWMBO and see what she thinks.

[... Dick wondered if I tried reversing the keyer's polarity ...]

Brian> Beats me. I've had and/or used a gazillion keyer/rig
Brian> combinations and I've never had the kind of problems he's
Brian> described going back to cathode keying days. Somethin' ain't
Brian> right at KC2ELS . . .

I corresponded with Ramsey and they weren't as helpful as I wish they
had been. Someone on Ramsey's BBS emailed me saying they had the
exact same experience and suggested a mod to fix it, but I decided I'd
rather use a straight key.

Brian> w3rv

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.3 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE/XMPDGPFSfAB/ezgRAg1iAKC02hM/FiF7PsmkirfDgXn6v/sr1wCfed0+
dIBgy5qKo8uDuhbw0xkqsUM=
=c8FD
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3352. Re: Dan, WA8ULX is a CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 21:30:39 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F5CF4FF.9DC8EA1A@ptt.edu>
Source record: 76763

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >> Thanks for trolling.
>
> Ok RADIOMAN, I wasnt going to say who the CBplusser was that buried his Ant,
> but let me ask you, have you dug it up yet?

I'm not digging up some schmuck's ground radial unless they pay good.

And now a reply from the next Fred H...

3353. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 21:55:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <uV67b.6628$BG6.945@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76764

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:jrfnlvcdu15b4mhjdf7cv4lrq06f4r6scj@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 07 Sep 2003 23:10:08 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
> mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> >I hate to break it to you fine folks....But.....there is no such thing as
a
> >1/4 wave DIPOLE.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&q=1%2F4+wave+dipole
>
> Searched the web for 1/4 wave dipole. Results 1 - 10 of about
> 39,100. Search took 0.17 seconds

All are SHF/UHF antennas. Your comments below, relative to HF antennas:

> >> What would be wrong with requiring them to build a quarter wave dipole
> >> that is resonate at a specified frequency as part of the test? That
> >> is, if the test were changed to be written and performance based.

Then you build me a 1/4 wave HF dipole. Again, there is no such thing.

A dipole is 1/2wavelength total length. Center fed with 50 to 75 ohm
coaxial cable. Cut to resonance using the formula of 468/Frequency in
Megahertz.

I.E. 468 divided by 7 = 66.857 feet long.

This is the NORMAL meaning of a dipole for the Amateur Radio Service.

You can use all the other off the wall terms you choose. Above is correct
for ARS and should be on the test.

As to making it a performance test. Good idea.

Dan/W4NTI

3354. Re: Dan, WA8ULX is a CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 21:59:23 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030908175923.18140.00000877@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 76765

>I'm not digging up some schmuck's ground radial unless they pay good.
>
>And now a reply from the next Fred H...
>

WHAT, who said anything about Radials.

3355. Re: Something Around Here to Enjoy Besides the Damned Code Test War

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 22:02:23 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <P%67b.6633$BG6.6475@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76766

The proper term is MCW, Modulated Continous Wave. Nothing was mentioned
about Frequency Modulation.

Answer the question NCI bigwig.

Dan/W4NTI

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0309072306.13e0f5f5@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<x_O6b.5096$BG6.2100@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > news:d22b54c3.0309052012.66cdf59a@posting.google.com...
> > > http://www.msnbc.com/news/962313.asp?0cv=CB20
> > >
> > > w3rv
> >
> > Wonder if the ID will be in MCW?
>
> MFMCW.
>
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> w3rv

3356. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 22:13:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <M977b.6643$BG6.345@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76767

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030907192653.23306.00000523@mb-m19.aol.com...
> To bury his Dipole. He was complaining about how noisy HF was, so I told
him
> if he buried it, that it would stop the Noise. The fool believed me and
buried
> it, I still cant stop laughing., I hate to tell the guy the truth, because
now
> he Brags about how quit his Receiver is.

Bet that did 'quit' his receive... hi.

I did some experimenting along those lines, many years ago. Underground
actually works, to some degree.. hi.

Dan/W4NTI

3357. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 22:13:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <wa77b.6644$BG6.4843@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76768

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:tmP6b.1732$qA4.1395@news02.roc.ny...
> It works, but since you are using an "image" dipole the same number of
feet
> in the air as you buried the dipole, you must remember to tune in the
image
> frequency on receive for it to work :)
>
>
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030907192653.23306.00000523@mb-m19.aol.com...
> > To bury his Dipole. He was complaining about how noisy HF was, so I told
> him
> > if he buried it, that it would stop the Noise. The fool believed me and
> buried
> > it, I still cant stop laughing., I hate to tell the guy the truth,
because
> now
> > he Brags about how quit his Receiver is.
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03
>
>

That must be why I could hear it better on my SX-111

Dan/W4NTI

3358. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 22:20:53 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <9h77b.6650$BG6.979@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76769

<well_look@this.now> wrote in message news:bjh1r6$g0i$0@208.206.142.66...
> >Welcome each and every new ham into the hobby with open arms --
> >after all, he's a brother (or she's a sister) who has taken the time
> >to study for and pass the written test, even if he doesn't have the
> >code.
>
>
> Ah god...been there and done that. These were guys that were 25
> year veterans of cb. They are smart asses...I tried to elmer
> hem...they wouldnt listen. They get on the area 2 meter repeaters
> and use their cb handles and 10 codes. Most of them are extra class
> to make matters worse. They have run all the older hams off the 2
> meter band here in wv and east ky. But yes like a fool I welcomed
> them into my home. Went to the classes and talked about ham radio
> to them. But they are still just hardcore cbers. Its not like this
> everywhere in the country but there is enough of this scattered
> through the country to give most of us a sign of things to come. No
> ham radio will not die or come to an end because of these
> types...but this is really what the code-nocode fuss is about. There's
> thousands of us that have got a taste of these fools and dont want
> any more of them. I dont want to be in the extra portion of any band
> and hear 10-4. I dont want some idiot that just came off cb tuning
> on top of me and whistling into his mic...but its happening and has
> been for the last 2 years since the code was dropped to 5wpm.
> Pretty soon the grand daddys of these idiots are going to come off
> cb and be on hf with us. Now you can scream about elmering and
> all that...but like i said i tried...and these fools are unelmerable.
> When they looked at my full wave loop they laughed and said their
> cb antennas would work better. One looked at my 2 element 5
> band quad at 65 feet and said his moonraker was a better antenna.
> Most of them think they know more about radio than a ham thats
> been on the air for 35 years. But i guess most you folks are'nt having
> to deal with these types and think the rest of us are crazy. Soon
> we'll all have to pay the price for most of you wanting to do away
> with the code.
> Thats it in a nutshell.

I think you are absolutely correct. Unfortunatly.

Dan/W4NTI

3359. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 22:30:27 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <7q77b.2559$SI2.1091@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76770

I think about the worst operator back then was W2OY. The limit of his mischief was to come on top of your frequency and call cq. His call went something like "cq cq de w2oy. No lids, kids, space cadets, or school bus riders. Only class a operators on this frequency from w2oy." Whatever one may have thought of him, I never heard him swear and did manage to have a qso with him once (although he hated "wet-bottom boys", which I assumed to mean a reference to calls similar to mine - WB2OSP).

There were no folks playing "radio broadcasting" and any notice from the FCC (even minor ones) caused much consternation.

I think the biggest problem (aside from publishing Q&A manuals) is the almost total lack of enforcement from the FCC.

Certainly, it was fun back in the early 60s. If you wished to chase dx, you could. Sure, it could be frantic, but I doubt you had so many folks ignoring instructions from a dx station. If you wanted to rag chew, no problem. 160 was a most relaxed band. 75 could get really busy at night, but the air wars didn't erupt.

I don't think I can disagree with you on your take.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"OM" <OM@fiftieshamradio.net> wrote in message
news:bji3jfdfo0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> Ham radio's golden age was the 1950s & early 1960s. It has
> been in a steady decline ever since. The ARRL & the FCC have
> facilitated the decline, for different reasons. If you practiced har
> radio in the 50s-early 60s, then you know what I am saying is
> correct.
>
> OM
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

3360. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 22:44:15 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <3D77b.2561$um2.2441@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76771

You have a point, Dick. I wouldn't have a problem retaining CW for the highest class; I just don't see it as *absolutely* necessary for all amateurs.

There are times I think I have a handle on how things should be; then, when I get a question concerning the length of a dipole from an extra class licensee, I begin to really wonder. My own belief (and it is personal opinion) is that all extras could not be renewed at the end of their term. To gain a new extra (and, indeed, any new extra class licensees), the person would have to be certified in emergency communications - including participation in groups. Also, for at least that highest class of license, the question pool and answers should not be published. Questions as to resonant frequency, lengths of dipoles, Ohm's law (and, come on guys, something a little tougher than a simple series or parallel circuit), and such should be randomly generated at each exam (same program made available to VEs, just that each exam would be unique). Answers should be fill in the blank and accurate to 3 places. At least that way we could ensure that at least one group of amateur operator would be helping to justify the existence of all. BTW, I am not certified and would hope to be able to become so sometime in the near future (new job and finally straight days). Once that level was achieved, the license would be renewable provided current participation/certification were to be presented. After age 65, it would be renewable with no further requirements for life.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bjgmekrlq0@208.206.142.76...
> Jim, as you probably know, Johnny Johnston, former longtime head of the
Amateur
> and Citizen's Division at FCC, has stated in his own comments to the NCVEC
> petition-which he helped to draft- that no amateur not skilled in
radiotelgraphy can
> accurately be considerred an expert, an Extra class. So it looks like NCI
is against the
> very concept. That should come as no surprise, though considering. After
all, it's only a
> "hobby".
>
> Dick
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.

Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.514 / Virus Database: 312 - Release Date: 8/28/03

3361. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-08 23:32:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F5D113D.8080103@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76772

N2EY wrote:

> today we lost a truly excitable boy - Warren Zevon. RIP.

Darn! 8^(I've heard his last album is pretty good.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3362. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 00:12:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <AV87b.51$c35.1@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76773

Hey that was a good one.

Dan/W4NTI

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030908120046.26759.00000700@mb-m26.aol.com...
> Issued there new De-Coder rings yet?

3363. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 00:51:17 UTC
From: Craig Davidson <nospam@earthlink.com>
Message-ID: <9u97b.3979$PE6.1299@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76774

charlesb wrote in message ...
>In the end, Echolink serves as an excuse not to use radio to communicate
"as
>a ham", as in the case with your friends. It also very often serves as an
>excuse not to learn more about the hobby and upgrade, as in the case of the
>hundreds, perhaps thousands of hams who instantly dropped plans to upgrade,
>or even to buy a radio upon discovering Echolink. Echolink devotees are
just
>brimming over with excuses, but none of those excuses change the fact that
>Echolink is an Internet chat, not ham radio.
>

Does posting to "rec.radio.amateur.policy" also serve as an excuse not to use ham radio to communicate?

Why does talking over the internet provoke howls of protest from hams who seem to have no problem posting text messages over the internet?

Could it be that you are feeling threatened?

3364. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 01:24:53 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <FZ97b.34869$3b2.3577519@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 76775

Those will ship with the new Yeasucobra 2000.

It's a special package worked out between Yeasu, Cobra, Super America Truck Stops, and NCI.

They are teaming up to offer a new Super HF'er rig that fits nicely into any truck or table top. Covers the entire Ham Radio band, 11 through 160 meters.

The first 1000 units ship with a nice autographed picture of Carl, the guru of modern day Ham Radio.

I can hardly wait!

10-73 y'all!

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message news:20030908120046.26759.00000700@mb-m26.aol.com...
> Issued there new De-Coder rings yet?

3365. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 02:07:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F5D3627.6040104@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76779

Craig Davidson wrote:
> charlesb wrote in message ...
>
>>In the end, Echolink serves as an excuse not to use radio to communicate
>
> "as
>
>>a ham", as in the case with your friends. It also very often serves as an
>>excuse not to learn more about the hobby and upgrade, as in the case of the
>>hundreds, perhaps thousands of hams who instantly dropped plans to upgrade,
>>or even to buy a radio upon discovering Echolink. Echolink devotees are
>
> just
>
>>brimming over with excuses, but none of those excuses change the fact that
>>Echolink is an Internet chat, not ham radio.
>>
>
>
> Does posting to "rec.radio.amateur.policy" also serve as an excuse not to
> use ham radio to communicate?
>
> Why does talking over the internet provoke howls of protest from hams who
> seem to have no problem posting text messages over the internet?
>
> Could it be that you are feeling threatened?

If he relates back to my first postings on the subject, I was sarcastically speaking of an amateurs ability to kerckunk repeaters all over the world.

And it may have been in this thread that I noted listening to one guy, maybe a ham, maybe not, describing to another guy, maybe a ham, maybe not, the things he wanted to do to him, and in graphic detail, just exactly what part of this guys anatomy he found so appealing.

Seriously, I just about puked. I never heard anything like that, and don't want to ever again.

And to say that the control operator just has to "turn off the repeater, well, the horse is out of the barn by that time. Would you like your kids listening to that kind of stuff? Would it make you feel better to know that the repeater was turned off after they heard it?

And in that respect, yes, it appears that Echolink very much indeed resembles internet chat.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3366. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 02:17:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F5D388A.8080307@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76780

JJ wrote:
>
>
> OM wrote:
>
>> x-no-archive: yes
>> Ham radio's golden age was the 1950s & early 1960s. It has
>> been in a steady decline ever since. The ARRL & the FCC have
>> facilitated the decline, for different reasons. If you practiced har
>> radio in the 50s-early 60s, then you know what I am saying is
>> correct.
>>
>> OM
>
>
> Absolutely!

Bummer guys! For me, Ham radio's golden era is right now.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3367. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 02:54:18 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <r3gqlvk4lljcg5702ts7ecs2pfa9ppnaaq@4ax.com>
Source record: 76781

On Mon, 08 Sep 2003 21:55:38 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:jrfnlvcdu15b4mhjdf7cv4lrq06f4r6scj@4ax.com...
>> On Sun, 07 Sep 2003 23:10:08 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
>> mindspring.com> wrote:
>>
>> >I hate to break it to you fine folks....But.....there is no such thing as
>a
>> >1/4 wave DIPOLE.
>> >
>> >Dan/W4NTI
>>
>> http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&q=1%2F4+wave+dipole
>>
>> Searched the web for 1/4 wave dipole. Results 1 - 10 of about
>> 39,100. Search took 0.17 seconds
>
>All are SHF/UHF antennas. Your comments below, relative to HF antennas:

OK, I'll give you that, although a blanket statement that there is no
such thing as a 1/4 wave antenna is equally incorrect.

>
>> >> What would be wrong with requiring them to build a quarter wave dipole
>> >> that is resonate at a specified frequency as part of the test? That
>> >> is, if the test were changed to be written and performance based.
>
>Then you build me a 1/4 wave HF dipole. Again, there is no such thing.
>
>A dipole is 1/2wavelength total length. Center fed with 50 to 75 ohm
>coaxial cable. Cut to resonance using the formula of 468/Frequency in
>Megahertz.
>
>I.E. 468 divided by 7 = 66.857 feet long.
>
>This is the NORMAL meaning of a dipole for the Amateur Radio Service.
>
>You can use all the other off the wall terms you choose. Above is correct
>for ARS and should be on the test.
>
>As to making it a performance test. Good idea.

I agree and my apologies.

3368. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 02:58:45 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <idgqlvcgrca2pcn6ksfr7u6uu0pc198p6n@4ax.com>
Source record: 76782

On Mon, 08 Sep 2003 22:54:18 -0400, Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
wrote:

>OK, I'll give you that, although a blanket statement that there is no
>such thing as a 1/4 wave antenna is equally incorrect.
>>

Should have read, "1/4 wave dipole antenna."

3369. Re: test. Don't bother to read

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 03:03:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030908230323.23307.00002855@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 76783

In article <3a1dd7cc.0309071452.395d0660@posting.google.com>,
w4nti@mindspring.com (Dan/W4NTI) writes:

>Just a quick test.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

You FAILED. Try again in a month...

LHA

3370. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 03:03:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030908230323.23307.00002856@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 76784

In article <kVO6b.5087$BG6.3904@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>I hate to break it to you fine folks....But.....there is no such thing as a
>1/4 wave DIPOLE.

Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two elements and a
polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]

A dipole ANTENNA refers to a wire type having two elements of wires,
balanced-fed from the center with RF voltage in opposition.

The length of this dipole antenna may be ANY length, from near-infinitesimal
(fractional wavelength) to many wavelengths.

The radiation pattern of the dipole antenna will vary based on many factors:
length relative to wavelength, distance above ground or other imperfect
conductor being the two most affecting patterns.

LHA

3371. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 03:03:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030908230324.23307.00002857@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 76785

In article <20030907172514.05539.00000621@mb-m16.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <b309ce148a7d07e18fe1e709110785b7.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>,
>"Hans
>Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
>>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>>
>>>
>>> http://www.qsl.net/n1ea/FIST_FCC_Petition_8-30-303.pdf
>>>
>>
>>Perhaps FISTS should consider sending this in as a comment to be
>>considered with RM-10787, rather than a separate petition.
>
>I think it's better as a separate petition.
>>
>>If FCC grants the "no Morse test" petition, then it is unlikely to roll
>>back that decision at a later date.
>
>Which is why a separate petition is a better idea.
>
>The most likely scenario now is that FCC will continue to receive petitions,
>assign them RM numbers, and take comments. Doing so takes almost no FCC
>resources and allows lots of time for ideas to percolate through the process.
>Perhaps FCC hopes some sort of consensus will be forthcoming.
>
>There are also a couple of petitions from as far back as 2001 or so that are
>still hanging fire. For example, FCC has not ruled on the ARRL petition to
>"refarm" the Novice bands.
>
>At some point, the flurry of petitions will slow down, comments taper off,
>and
>FC can do one of two things:
>
>1) Create an NPRM (most likely)
>
>2) Change the rules without an NPRM.
>
>I think a lot depends on whether a clear consnesus surfaces from the
>comments.

There are currently 7 petitions for Rule Making at the FCC ECFS...RM-
10781 through RM-10787. As of 10 AM Pacific Time on 8 Sep 03, those

seven RMs had a total of 1,101 documents.

The OVERWHELMING CLEAR CONSENSUS that comes from those comments is the abolishment of the morse code test for a US amateur radio license, any class.

LHA

3372. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 03:40:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030908234012.29660.00000537@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 76786

In article <3F5D113D.8080103@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> today we lost a truly excitable boy - Warren Zevon. RIP.
>
> Darn! 8^(I've heard his last album is pretty good.
>
There all pretty good. Ya gotta respect a guy who, diagnosed with terminal lung
cancer and given 2 months to live, keeps going for over a year and releases
such tracks as a cover of Dylan's "Knockin' On Heaven's Door" and "I'll Sleep
When I'm Dead".

But my favorite is "Excitable Boy", which, besides the title track, includes
such classics as:

Werewolves of London
Nighttime in the Switching Yard
Roland the Headless Thompson Gunner

--

A great talent, gone but never forgotten.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3373. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 03:40:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030908234012.29660.00000536@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 76787

In article <bj3f7q$sqa@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030901223918.00545.00000356@mb-m02.aol.com...
>> In article <bivkrr$5oi@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <fahgedit@nomail.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> (lotta snippage)
>>
>> >> But you're still planting flowers, and liking jewelry. Same difference.
>> >
>> >Yeah, but I like to think that I'm being a bit of a renegade. Actually,
>> >I
>> >don't like things all the same. Remember the good 'ol "Neighborhood
>> >Association" debates that have come and gone here? I'm against them, for
>> >whatever purpose; and would be so very, very depressed if I ever have to
>> >live "in" one.
>>
>> Same here. But the reason those associations exist is fear - fear that
>> folks
>> won't keep up their properties in a reasonable manner if there is no
>> mechanism to force them.
>
>Paranoia will destroy ya. Fear is a strong emotion.

"Paranoia strikes deep
Into your life it will creep
It starts when you're always afraid
Step outa line, the men come and take you away..."

>I'm not so attached to
>my property that I'd let fear determine where I live and worry about what
>someone else does on theirs. But, I also don't buy my place for
>investment--so to speak. I bought my place (with my hubby of course) to
>stay. This is the first land and home I've had, and no doubt will be the
>last. I plant roots...spent too much time being a Navy brat.

If that works for you, great!

My point is that the driving force behind HOAs and CC&Rs and such is often a
really bad experience. Or fear of same. All it takes is one bad tenant or
property owner to start a downward trend in a neighborhood. If you ever had to
sell your place for much less than you paid for it because of what your
neighbors did, you might feel a bit different.

Some years back I lived near a street where there was one family who let their property go to heck. Paint peeling, stucco falling off, grass and weeds all over the place. The garage roof caved in. Kids running wild at all hours of the night, loud music and louder cars. Vandalism that could not be proved to be their doing. Police called on a regular basis.

That family simply didn't care, and there was not much anyone could do until they actually broke a law. Which they carefully avoided doing when the police were anywhere near.

Some folks moved away, but many could not, because their mortgages were bigger than their property values. (Their properties were devalued because of that one family).

Then, fortunately, the wild kids began to grow up. They began to realize that they could actually live like civilized human beings if they put forth a little effort. They began to keep regular hours, and to repair the house they'd spent their youth trashing. Property values promptly reached the level of similar neighborhoods in the area.

We were lucky. Many people aren't so lucky.

The idea of HOAs is threefold: First, to spell out in detail what it means to keep a property in shape. Second, to see that it gets done. Third, to keep out people who won't play by the rules.

>> >I never got into the beatniky-hippie kind of
>> >lingo. Heck, I don't think I could even be classified as a true
>> >hippie--I am just a couple of years too late fer it.
>>
>> So am I.
>
>Most people like to romanticize about that period in this country's history.

Some do. I don't.

>I don't know how it was here in the Dallas TX area--most people I've talked
>to who were around my age and a little older were too busy going to drive-in
>movies, necking, getting pregnant and getting married.

In that order!

And doing the first three at the drive in....

>Not very many
>politically motivated debates down here, 'least not the way we used to have
>'em at the drop of a hat up there!
>
>But, what little we could do in our little town up north to protest the war,
>we did. We had a black arm-band day at high school; we had our graffiti on
>our bookcovers, etc. Not much to do in a little town. I don't remember,
>though, many folks who were "for" the war--other than our parents.

In suburban Philly we had all types. Kids who enlisted and kids who went to Canada and everything in between. Often in the same family.

>Most of
>the guys I knew got drafted; most of the gals I knew were saying buy to
>their guys most of the time. And, the country was in upheaval. I'd not
>like to go back to those days at all. It was NOT a peaceful time in our
>history.

Exactly. Things were far more polarized than today.
>
>The Yippies (now the Yuppies and everyone gets them confused as old hippies;
>they are not, they were Yippies) dragged the whole thing into violent
>protests.

"Steal This Book".

>A true hippie would no more pick up a rock or spit at a cop than
>the man in the moon. The Yippies were extremists. Now, they're a bunch of
>pussy sell-outs who bought lock, stock, and barrel into the system they used
>to say they "hated."

We had Ira Einhorn. Asshole extraordinaire. Finally brought to justice.

The whole "hippie" movement was paradoxical in that it was brought about by the
very affluence it rejected. See below.

>> >Some folks can be no other way.
>>
>> Naw, I think Dan can be a real up guy most of the time. Cool dude.

>I'd thrive at the opportunity to drive past him in a time of need, and I
>would drive right on by. People like him aren't worth my time, good or bad
>time at that.

I would help Dan out if I saw him stuck by the side of the road.
>
>> >> Woodstock? Let's see, that was late summer 1969, when Kim was 15 if
>> >>memory
>> >> serves. I don't think a responsible parent would let their 15-year-old
>> >> go to such a "happening".
>> >
>> >Yep, 14 though.
>>
>> All the more reason.
>>
>> >And, you're right. I had friends whose parents were much
>> >more lenient than mine who went.
>>
>> I'd call it "irresponsible" rather than "lenient".
>
>Naw, most of us were pretty grown up in our town.

You (plural collective, not just you personally, Kim) thought you were, anyway.
If you weren't paying your own way 100%, you weren't grown up.

>They'd been just as well
>going at 18 as 14-15. And they were. Most of them had a great time. Then,
>later, that concert happened up in...where was it--the race track (?) up in
>NY...OH YEAH, Glen something? Is that it?

Watkins Glen. Beautiful place.

>Well, anyway, by then I had my kids and wouldn't have gone for the best of
>times.

>> A lot of us were mad that the clueless promoters had ruined the whole
>> festival
>> scene by their incompetence. Even 30 years later there were problems doing
>> another one.
>>
>> Give me the Philadelphia Folk Festival any day. Well managed, excellent
>> acts,
>> good sound and video, well behaved crowd and it's been held every year
>> since
>> long before that place in NY. People take their kids and grandkids. No
>> visible booze or drugs.
>
>I have a cousin in music that I bet you've seen if you went there. For the
>sake of her sanity, I'll private email you on that, if you'd like.

Please do. I'll not repeat what you send. Old folkies like me respect such
privacies.

>I'm sure
>there's some jerk in here that would be incessant toward her if they knew
>who she was.

Not me.
>
btw, I once performed live on stage with Christine Lavin at the Keswick
Theatre.
>
>> >I think there was more than talk. Did Yeager/Yager/Yeger (however his
>> >name
>> >is spelled) think there was loads to be had in a suit and begin the
>> >process
>> >until it was explained to him the debaucle of the whole thing?
>>
>> Max Yasgur, now dead, I think. I'm sure he got a piece of the pie. Point
>> was, they made a mint from the whole "counterculture" aspect of it.
>
>Yeah, he did, as I recall. And, they did too.

So much for counterculture.
>
>> >Yeah, Summer 1970 saw the tragedy at Kent State...the beginning of the
>> >end.
>>

>> End of what? Looking back, I'm amazed only four died in the Kent State
>> mess.
>> Days of near-riot conditions, kids throwing rocks and teargas canisters
>> back at
>> National Guardsmen (who were untrained in riot control)? KS was not a
>> nonviolent demonstration.
>
>I think that was when "we" as a counter-culture began realizing that we and
>"they" had limits and that we had to start growing up with our approach to
>democracy. The unfortunate thing that happened out of the 60's is that on
>all campuses today, one must have a "stamp of approval" to organize and post
>things on the wall. While I'd not like to see the mob mentality as it was,
>it's a pity that our youth aren't exposed to true, true democracy in action,
>which, in my opinion, does involve activism. I applaud the TX Democrats who
>wouldn't give in to the pressures of an immature jerk here, who is called
>the Governor of this state.

There's a big difference between activism and violence. Groups like the
Weathermen and SDS actually worked against the counterculture movement,
ultimately killing it.
>
>> >By the way, I'd have guessed you were an old hippie, Jim.

>> Not me. I could never afford it.

>Wow, wonder what part you're speaking of. We all lived with our holey
>jeans, drove clunkers for cars, partied in fields, etc. LOL Nothing about
>afording anything with these guys. Let's see, our "swell" of hippies was
>aged from about 12 to 23-4. We lived in a small town, so big brothers and
>sisters always had little brothers and sisters with them; and every darned
>one of us was friends--I do miss that. Heck, my little guy--first born--was
>at more field parties as a baby than he's ever been to the rest of his life!
>First day out of the hospital we landed at a celebration near Hedges Lake,
>in a great big field to welcome Fall and have our last bash before Winter.
>Oct. 20, 1974. Guess what else we were just getting the chance to
>celebrate!?

Getting hitched? Turning 20? End of the draft?

The bit about "couldn't afford it" was no joke.

What made the hippie movement possible in the '60s was an economy that offered
lots of basic jobs which required little skill, education or experience. Almost
every business had lots of labor-intensive stuff from file clerking to pumping
gas to manually pricing every can of beans at the Acme. There was little
foreign competition, and the labor unions were so strong that almost all
working people benefited, either directly (by being in a union) or indirectly
(the nonunion shops had to keep the workers happy enough that they wouldn't
unionize). College tuitions back then were dirt cheap, particularly at state
schools. The necessities of life were very inexpensive of you didn't go in for
the fancy stuff.

All that changed in the 1970s. In many ways the '70s had more long-lasting changes than the '60s.

Most of your classic hippies were kids born during and immediately after WW2. (The kids who were in their teens and early 20s in the 1960s were born from 1940 to 1950). They were the leading edge of the baby boom, getting everything new and not having to compete as much as those who came later. The "hippest" ones were almost invariably those who had grown up in comfortable, secure surroundings. They were not worried about the future at all - they were confident that they would be taken care of.

Working class kids rarely became hippies; they were too busy working and/or going to school. They *were* worried about the future, and they had no illusions about being taken care of.

>> I went to engineering school, remember? I
>> always thought that to build a better world, one had to know how to build
>> things in the first place. So I learned how to do electrical engineering.
>> And I'm still at it.
>
>Well, we had guys who went out of High School into Physics, Liberal Arts,
>and other Sciences.

Bah!

Physics is a true science. Liberal Arts isn't. Engineering is about really doing stuff, not just talking about it. "Rocket scientists" did not put men on the moon - rocket engineers did.

"Scientists dream of doing great things. Engineers do them." - Wehrner Von Braun

> We loved for them to come home and tell us the tales of
>college life. Heh heh, my biggest kick back then was seeing Alice Cooper at
>a Hall on the campus of Plattsburgh, NY.

We had the Main Point and the Spectrum and the Electric Factory. Gene Shay on Sunday night. Warren Zevon recording at Sigma Sound. The Philadelphia Orchestra and TLA.

We also had professors of rare talent and ability.

And I had the unique experience, in 1976, of seeing parts of the world's first true electronic digital computer (ENIAC) returned to the place where they had benn built.
>
>> There's no substitute for actually knowing how to do things, and doing
>> them.
>> Remember the movies "The Magnificent Seven" (actually a remake of "The
>> Seven
>> Samurai"? The farmers (productive people) does not need the bandits
>> (moochers). But the bandits sure need the farmers!
>>
>> Some good things came out of those times. Those are the things to

>> remember.
>>
>> >At least there's still a few left upholding the original ideals.
>>
>> Yeah, baby!
>>
>> Actually, you might be surprised at how simple my "ideals" really are.
>>
>> >I gave up.
>>
>> Not me.
>>
>I don't think I'd be surprised at your ideals at all, Jim.

I think you might be.....but then again, maybe not.

>It takes an awful lot to surprise me these days...

What matters is our enjoyment.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3374. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 04:11:34 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309082011.2ad7ad21@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76788

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309072122.22ceefda@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0309071733.193d36b1@posting.google.com>...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<FFo6b.37929$Vx2.16995167@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> >
> > > > Using a straight key in a contest would kill me if I was running a
> > > > decent rate. The goofy relics should be outlawed at least in contests
> > > > except under unusual circumstances. Do yourself a big favor and get
> > > > yourself decent paddles like a Kent and a cheap MFJ keyer and take it
> > > > from there. The paddles would work fine with the FD momory keyers.
> > > > Beyond that real CW contesters don't use any types of mechanical keys,
> > > > they use keyboards. In the end the means used to generate the output
> > > > doesn't matter, it's the ears that *always* matter . . .
> > > >
> > >
> > > Yeah if you are out to win or be a high scorer, you are correct.
> >
> > For better or worse I was "brought up" in that niche. I'm one of these
> > animals:
> >
> > http://www.gofrc.org/
> >
> > > However if
> > > you just want to be a casual contester, a straight key is fine.
> >
> > I just have a silly "thing" about straight keys Dee so maybe I'm going
> > a bit overboard here.
>
> If you speakum sum Engrish, it wood be better.
>
> > I fiddled with surplus J-38s long before I got serious about actually
> > taking the Novice test. Every radio kid did that 'Wayback.
>
> Probably a lie, but we'll indulge the grate Kelly.
>
> Eventually
> > I got to visit an experienced dx contester (which was what I wanted to
> > become) who used a bug (those guys ALL used bugs) and he let me futz
> > with his bug "offline" so to speak.
>
> Yep, all dx contesters use booogs.
>

> > Forthwith
>
> Not to be confused with Farnsworth.
>
> I immediately got
> > irrevocably hooked on bugs vs. straight keys. Net result was that the
> > nite WN3YIK hit the airwaves for the first time it was with a
> > well-greased, polished and tuned old USN Vibroplex. I've always had a
> > straight key or two floating around the shack,
>
> No doubt one of those anti-gravity devises.
>
> > they're kinda "core ham
> > objects" and maybe I've had some straight key QSOs but I don't
> > specifically remember any of 'em.
>
> Can't remember "core Ham objects," huh?
>
> > > Also if you
> > > are doing the "hunt and pounce" instead of "camping on a frequency," it
> > > doesn't make quite as much difference. I like to get out there in a
> > > contest and just see what the variety is. I don't intend to make any run at
> > > a large number of contacts. The last CW contest I was in, I was quite happy
> > > to make 77 contacts and then go do something else.
>
> I wonder how David Heil would characterize your inability to stick
> with a 7 second QSO?
>
> > 100% on the button, all of it.
>
> On what button? PTT button?
>
> > It's all in what one wants out of a
> > contest and/or is willing to put into contesting.
>
> Is it?
>
> The simple fact of
> > the matter is that if it wasn't for the brigades of casual contesters
> > like you contests simply would not be worth getting into.
>
> Huh? Try that in Engrish sumtime and we'll relook it.

You overdosed on yer get-stupid pills again din ya?

3375. Re: test. Don't bother to read

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 04:13:06 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjjk0ihrj0@208.206.142.75>
Source record: 76789

Len Over 21 wrote:

>
> You FAILED. Try again in a month...
>
>

So *that's* why Lennie hates ham radio so!

3376. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 04:13:50 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030909001350.16504.00000674@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 76790

From: well_look@this.now

Anonymous poster. No-one accuses this person of being a coward even after expressing strong biased opinion.

> >Welcome each and every new ham into the hobby with open arms --
>>after all, he's a brother (or she's a sister) who has taken the time
>>to study for and pass the written test, even if he doesn't have the
>>code.

>Ah god...been there and done that. These were guys that were 25
>year veterans of cb. They are smart asses...I tried to elmer
>hem...they wouldnt listen.

Poster provides a reason, not to elmer CBers.

> They get on the area 2 meter repeaters
>and use their cb handles and 10 codes.

Language dielect differences. Nothing wrong with that. Nothing wrong with using 10-4 codes on voice modes, except that its using unnecessary codewords.

> Most of them are extra class
>to make matters worse.

So, they passed the code test. I thought anyone that passed the code test is more respectful, better operators, and more skilled technically. Now you are saying this is not true?

>They have run all the older hams off the 2
>meter band here in wv and east ky.

If all the older hams left, then only the younger ones remained?

> But yes like a fool I welcomed
>them into my home. Went to the classes and talked about ham radio
>to them. But they are still just hardcore cbers. Its not like this
>everywhere in the country but there is enough of this scattered
>through the country to give most of us a sign of things to come.

Ham radio is a technical hobby, NOT a culture. You seem to forget that. Otherwise you would not be referring to licenced amateurs as hardcore cbers.

>No
>ham radio will not die or come to an end because of these
>types...but this is really what the code-nocode fuss is about.

Its about cbers. Really?

>There's
>thousands of us that have got a taste of these fools and dont want
>any more of them. I dont want to be in the extra portion of any band
>and hear 10-4. I dont want some idiot that just came off cb tuning
>on top of me and whistling into his mic...but its happening and has
>been for the last 2 years since the code was dropped to 5wpm.

I don't want to hear dots and dashes. I'd much rather hear conversation.

>Now you can scream about elmering and
>all that...but like i said i tried...and these fools are unelmerable.

Speak normal language like most people. Its not "elmering", its teaching.

And how are you going to attract people with technical interests to the hobby? The people with EE degrees will realize, by your comparison to cbers, that hams like code and dislike technically inclined people. And one with an EE degree is likely to be insulted by what you are saying, and not want to join the hobby.

>When they looked at my full wave loop they laughed and said their
>cb antennas would work better. One looked at my 2 element 5
>band quad at 65 feet and said his moonraker was a better antenna.

I doubt that. You probably made that up. Also, you probably made up the story about how people tuning on top of you increased after the code speed was dropped.

>Soon
>we'll all have to pay the price for most of you wanting to do away
>with the code.

No faith in the individual. What are you, a communist?

> Thats it in a nutshell.

From a nut.

3377. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 04:20:36 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309082020.4f2a12e2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76791

Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote in message
news:<86brtvb1oh.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>...

>
> Brian> You bet. Nice compact portable package, sets up anywhere in ten
> Brian> minutes, easy to tune anywhere in the HF spectrum, etc. Short
> Brian> verticals will deliver the goods rumors to the contrary. Given
> Brian> some decent operating smarts and patience. A local here has
> Brian> worked well over 200 countries mobiling with goofy little three
> Brian> foot Hamsticks.
>
> I'll show it to SWMBO and see what she thinks.

Hee!

> [... Dick wondered if I tried reversing the keyer's polarity ...]
>
> Brian> Beats me. I've had and/or used a gazillion keyer/rig
> Brian> combinations and I've never had the kind of problems he's
> Brian> described going back to cathode keying days. Somethin' ain't
> Brian> right at KC2ELS . . .
>
> I corresponded with Ramsey and they weren't as helpful as I wish they
> had been. Someone on Ramsey's BBS emailed me saying they had the
> exact same experience and suggested a mod to fix it, but I decided I'd
> rather use a straight key.

The brick wall solution: No mods or "tech support" req'd. End of.

>
> Jack.

w3rv

3378. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 04:55:04 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjjmf8$n01$0@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 76792

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <kVO6b.5087$BG6.3904@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >I hate to break it to you fine folks....But.....there is no such thing as a
> >1/4 wave DIPOLE.
>
> Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two elements and a
> polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]

Har har! What a joke The Jokester (still) is! Couldn't even get it right by looking it up!
By his definition a 1/4 ground plane is a dipole! Whatta "Radio Man" he isn't !!!

And, just to repeat the FACT of the matter, **There is no such thing as a 1/4 wave dipole!!!**

3379. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 04:57:04 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjjmj0$n01$1@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 76793

Brian Kelly wrote:

> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309072122.22ceefda@posting.google.com>...
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0309071733.193d36b1@posting.google.com>...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<FFo6b.37929$Vx2.16995167@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > >
> > > > Using a straight key in a contest would kill me if I was running a
> > > > decent rate. The goofy relics should be outlawed at least in contests
> > > > except under unusual circumstances. Do yourself a big favor and get
> > > > yourself decent paddles like a Kent and a cheap MFJ keyer and take it
> > > > from there. The paddles would work fine with the FD momory keyers.
> > > > Beyond that real CW contesters don't use any types of mechanical keys,
> > > > they use keyboards. In the end the means used to generate the output
> > > > doesn't matter, it's the ears that *always* matter . . .
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Yeah if you are out to win or be a high scorer, you are correct.
> > >
> > > For better or worse I was "brought up" in that niche. I'm one of these
> > > animals:
> > >
> > > http://www.gofrc.org/
> > >
> > > However if
> > > you just want to be a casual contester, a straight key is fine.
> > >
> > > I just have a silly "thing" about straight keys Dee so maybe I'm going
> > > a bit overboard here.
> >
> > If you speakum sum Engrish, it wood be better.
> >
> > > I fiddled with surplus J-38s long before I got serious about actually
> > > taking the Novice test. Every radio kid did that 'Wayback.
> >
> > Probably a lie, but we'll indulge the grate Kelly.
> >
> > Eventually
> > > I got to visit an experienced dx contester (which was what I wanted to
> > > become) who used a bug (those guys ALL used bugs) and he let me futz
> > > with his bug "offline" so to speak.
> >

> > Yep, all dx contesters use booogs.
> >
> > > Forthwith
> >
> > Not to be confused with Farnsworth.
> >
> > I immediately got
> > > irrevocably hooked on bugs vs. straight keys. Net result was that the
> > > nite WN3YIK hit the airwaves for the first time it was with a
> > > well-greased, polished and tuned old USN Vibroplex. I've always had a
> > > straight key or two floating around the shack,
> >
> > No doubt one of those anti-gravity devises.
> >
> > > they're kinda "core ham
> > > objects" and maybe I've had some straight key QSOs but I don't
> > > specifically remember any of 'em.
> >
> > Can't remember "core Ham objects," huh?
> >
> > > > Also if you
> > > > are doing the "hunt and pounce" instead of "camping on a frequency," it
> > > > doesn't make quite as much difference. I like to get out there in a
> > > > contest and just see what the variety is. I don't intend to make any run at
> > > > a large number of contacts. The last CW contest I was in, I was quite happy
> > > > to make 77 contacts and then go do something else.
> >
> > I wonder how David Heil would characterize your inability to stick
> > with a 7 second QSO?
> >
> > > 100% on the button, all of it.
> >
> > On what button? PTT button?
> >
> > > It's all in what one wants out of a
> > > contest and/or is willing to put into contesting.
> >
> > Is it?
> >
> > The simple fact of
> > > the matter is that if it wasn't for the brigades of casual contesters
> > > like you contests simply would not be worth getting into.
> >
> > Huh? Try that in Engrish sumtime and we'll relook it.
>
> You overdosed on yer get-stupid pills again din ya?

Doncha think the guys in the white coats took him away? He was really getting on some sort of psycho high.

3380. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 04:59:10 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjjmmu$n01$2@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 76794

Vshah101 wrote:

> From: well_look@this.now
>
> Anonymous poster. No-one accuses this person of being a coward even after
> expressing strong biased opinion.
>
> > >Welcome each and every new ham into the hobby with open arms --
> >>after all, he's a brother (or she's a sister) who has taken the time
> >>to study for and pass the written test, even if he doesn't have the
> >>code.
>
> >Ah god...been there and done that. These were guys that were 25
> >year veterans of cb. They are smart asses...I tried to elmer
> >hem...they wouldnt listen.
>
> Poster provides a reason, not to elmer CBers.
>
> > They get on the area 2 meter repeaters
> >and use their cb handles and 10 codes.
>
> Language dielect differences. Nothing wrong with that. Nothing wrong with using
> 10-4 codes on voice modes, except that its using unnecessary codewords.
>
> > Most of them are extra class
> >to make matters worse.
>
> So, they passed the code test. I thought anyone that passed the code test is
> more respectful, better operators, and more skilled technically. Now you are
> saying this is not true?
>
> >They have run all the older hams off the 2
> >meter band here in wv and east ky.
>
> If all the older hams left, then only the younger ones remained?
>
> > But yes like a fool I welcomed
> >them into my home. Went to the classes and talked about ham radio
> >to them. But they are still just hardcore cbers. Its not like this
> >everywhere in the country but there is enough of this scattered
> >through the country to give most of us a sign of things to come.
>
> Ham radio is a technical hobby, NOT a culture. You seem to forget that.
> Otherwise you would not be referring to licenced amateurs as hardcore cbers.

>
> >No
> >ham radio will not die or come to an end because of these
> >types...but this is really what the code-nocode fuss is about.
>
> Its about cbers. Really?
>
> >There's
> >thousands of us that have got a taste of these fools and dont want
> >any more of them. I dont want to be in the extra portion of any band
> >and hear 10-4. I dont want some idiot that just came off cb tuning
> >on top of me and whistling into his mic...but its happening and has
> >been for the last 2 years since the code was dropped to 5wpm.
>
> I don't want to hear dots and dashes. I'd much rather hear conversation.
>
> >Now you can scream about elmering and
> >all that...but like i said i tried...and these fools are unelmerable.
>
> Speak normal language like most people. Its not "elmering", its teaching.
>
> And how are you going to attract people with technical interests to the hobby?
> The people with EE degrees will realize, by your comparison to cbers, that hams
> like code and dislike technically inclined people. And one with an EE degree is
> likely to be insulted by what you are saying, and not want to join the hobby.
>
> >When they looked at my full wave loop they laughed and said their
> >cb antennas would work better. One looked at my 2 element 5
> >band quad at 65 feet and said his moonraker was a better antenna.
>
> I doubt that. You probably made that up. Also, you probably made up the story
> about how people tuning on top of you increased after the code speed was
> dropped.
>
> >Soon
> >we'll all have to pay the price for most of you wanting to do away
> >with the code.
>
> No faith in the individual. What are you, a communist?
>
> > Thats it in a nutshell.
>
> From a nut.

Man! A view into a window to an empty mind! Scary.

3381. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 05:05:14 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <4rnqlvccnma47et745habitej26ej7u9v0@4ax.com>
Source record: 76795

On 9 Sep 2003 04:55:04 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote:

>
>
>Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>> In article <kVO6b.5087$BG6.3904@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
>> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >I hate to break it to you fine folks....But.....there is no such thing as a
>> >1/4 wave DIPOLE.
>>
>> Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two elements and a
>> polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]
>
> Har har! What a joke The Jokester (still) is! Couldn't even get it right by looking it
>up!
> By his definition a 1/4 ground plane is a dipole! Whatta "Radio Man" he isn't !!!
>
> And, just to repeat the FACT of the matter, **There is no such thing as a 1/4 wave
>dipole!!!**

Plonk. Enough of your lies.

3382. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 09:29:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <j4h7b.1029$c35.195@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76797

"OM" wrote:
>
> Ham radio's golden age was the 1950s & early 1960s. It has
> been in a steady decline ever since. The ARRL & the FCC have
> facilitated the decline, for different reasons. If you practiced har
> radio in the 50s-early 60s, then you know what I am saying is
> correct.

What a bunch of depressing malcontents in this newsgroup. I just read through this newsgroup and if someone isn't crying about the code test, someone else is crying about the written tests. Thrown into all this is endless gripes about ARRL and the FCC. Now, we have someone talking about the "golden" past like we can all just snap our fingers and go back to that supposedly perfect time.

Ham radio is, and will always be, just what you make of it, people. If you choose to focus on the worst aspects of anything, that's all you're going to see. However, I suspect there is as many good things about ham radio today, and as many good people in ham radio today, as there was during any other time period. Regardless, this today is all we have. Either make the best of it or perhaps you should find another hobby.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3383. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 10:07:02 UTC
From: edo <nobody@cryptorebels.net>
Message-ID: <b3129c51ae59fe0a8791a9d573489759@cryptorebels.net>
Source record: 76798

In article <20030907194206.23176.00000469@mb-m19.aol.com>
wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>
> >Typical freebander you are.
> >
>
> Sorry never been on FREEBAND, is that some Band you CBplussers use?

But you've been on the 20 meter band as "Cowboy", haven't you?

3384. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 10:19:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030909061938.12631.00000968@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 76800

In article <20030908230324.23307.00002857@mb-m29.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>There are currently 7 petitions for Rule Making at the FCC ECFS...RM-
> 10781 through RM-10787. As of 10 AM Pacific Time on 8 Sep 03, those
> seven RMs had a total of 1,101 documents.
>
> The OVERWHELMING CLEAR CONSENSUS that comes from those
> comments is the abolishment of the morse code test for a US amateur
> radio license, any class.

Not to anyone who understands what the word "consensus" means. You obviously don't.

However, FCC does not require a consensus in order to make a decision. Nor does FCC have to enact rules that agree with the majority opinion.

Perhaps FCC will remove all code testing for amateur licenses. I would not be at all surprised if they did. Or perhaps FCC will retain some form of code testing for one or more license classes, as has been recommended by W3BE and others. One thing is clear, though: There is no "OVERWHELMING CLEAR CONSENSUS" involved.

3385. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 10:19:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030909061940.12631.00000969@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 76799

In article <f45722ac.0309072055.4f9d0339@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:<bjgncb$t1n$1@208.206.142.76>...
>> N2EY wrote:
>> >
>> > It's self-evident that a radio amateur who has no Morse code skills is
>not a
>> > fully qualified radio amateur, particularly for HF/MF amateur operation.
>That's
>> > a plain and simple fact.
>>
>> What is it about plain and simple facts that so confuses NCI members?
>
>Duh!!!

We know you are confused, Brian.
>
>Why does it have to be "particularly for HF/MF operations?"

Because that's where Morse operation by amateurs is most common.

3386. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 11:03:54 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <usi7b.149$096.131@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76801

"Craig Davidson" <nospam@earthlink.com> wrote in message
news:9u97b.3979$PE6.1299@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
> charlesb wrote in message ...
> >In the end, Echolink serves as an excuse not to use radio to communicate
> "as
> >a ham", as in the case with your friends. It also very often serves as an
> >excuse not to learn more about the hobby and upgrade, as in the case of
the
> >hundreds, perhaps thousands of hams who instantly dropped plans to
upgrade,
> >or even to buy a radio upon discovering Echolink. Echolink devotees are
> just
> >brimming over with excuses, but none of those excuses change the fact
that
> >Echolink is an Internet chat, not ham radio.
> >
>
> Does posting to "rec.radio.amateur.policy" also serve as an excuse not to
> use ham radio to communicate?
>
> Why does talking over the internet provoke howls of protest from hams who
> seem to have no problem posting text messages over the internet?
>
> Could it be that you are feeling threatened?

Bingo! You've got it! Yes, when we post here on the Internet, it has no
effect on our on the air activities - But when some moron uses the Internet
as a substitute for radio *as a part of our on the air activities* then the
hobby is undercut and damaged. Facing this threat, amateurs feel -
threatened !

That was an astute observation you made there, Craig. It is good to see that
you understand the situation, and can point out the problem to others so
clearly.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

3387. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 12:08:12 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <Loj7b.3037$i26.519@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76802

Maybe the FCC monitors this newsgroup, sees all the senseless bashing of ego in the code vs. no code wars and will reassign all amateur frequencies to Clear Channel Communications, Inc for IBOC experiments ?

3388. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 12:20:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309090420.598d4b52@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76803

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0309080104.6362b486@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309072140.37b6b6d0@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030907172515.05539.00000622@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> > > In article <f45722ac.0309071201.23a96249@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > >news:<c2356669.0309051154.4ef03806@posting.google.com>...
> > > >> The following isn't exactly a new idea, but some may not have seen it
> > > >> yet...
> > > >>
> > > >> Maybe the way out of the mess is for a Smith Chart test to replace
> > > >> the code test.
> > > >
> > > >So you still want the Amateur Radio Service to be the exclusive domain
> > > >of the Electrical Engineer's?
> > >
> > > Nope. One does not have to be an EE in order to understand, and use, the Smith
> > > Chart. Many hams who are not EEs have Smithc Chart knowledge and skill. Many
> > > EEs do not.
> >
> > Name ONE school that teaches Smith Charts that is not an Engineering school.
> >
> > Just ONE!
>
>
> The ARRL Antenna Book Collitch of Antenna Knowledge. Oops . .

Ooops is right. Now name one.

I
> forgot about your "relationship" with antennas . . .

You still trying to get me to put up an antenna at your house?

> > > btw, the plural of "Electrical Engineer" is "Electrical Engineers" not
> > > "Electrical Engineer's". "Electrical Engineer's" is the possessive
> >
> > So Electrical Engineers want to posess all of Amatuer Radio?
> >
> > > >I don't think that's what the FCC wants, but since the NCVEC can do
> > > >any damned thing they want, go ahead and put it to them.

> > >
> > > NCVEC could not create a separate Smith Chart test without FCC approval.
> >
> > Bullshit!
> >
> > And
> > > they could not deviate from multiple-choice format.
> >
> > Bullshit!
>
> Then explain just why it's bullshit Brainiac.
>
NCVEC has shown that they can do anything they want.
>
> > > It's obvious that irony is not one of your strong points, Brian.
> >
> > It is obvious that NCVEC reality is not one of yours.

3389. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 13:08:17 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F5DD0C1.2040908@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 76827

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>
>>In article <bjklgo$i83$0@208.206.142.84>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
>>writes:
>>
>>
>>>JJ wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two elements and
>>>>
>>>a
>>>
>>>> polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]
>>>>
>>>> A dipole ANTENNA refers to a wire type having two elements of wires,
>>>> balanced-fed from the center with RF voltage in opposition.
>>>>
>>>> The length of this dipole antenna may be ANY length, from
>>>>
>>>near-infinitesimal
>>>
>>>> (fractional wavelength) to many wavelengths.
>>>>
>>>> The radiation pattern of the dipole antenna will vary based on many
>>>>
>>>factors:
>>>
>>>> length relative to wavelength, distance above ground or other
>>>>
>>>imperfect
>>>
>>>> conductor being the two most affecting patterns.
>>>>
>>>>Len is correct, dipole simply means two separate elements (di
>>>>means two). A dipole of a certain length will be a half
>>>>wavelength at xx frequency, a quarter wavelength at yy

>>>>frequency and a full wavelength at zz frequency and so on.
>>>
>>>OK jj, kindly give us ONE example of a 1/4 wave dipole.....
>>
>> A 40m half-wave dipole used on 80m... :-)
>
>
> I rest my case....

Which means it is still a dipole but since it is being used on
80 meters it is now a 1/4 wavelength dipole.

>

3390. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 13:44:56 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjklgo$i83$0@208.206.142.84>
Source record: 76804

JJ wrote:

> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> >
> >
> > Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two elements and a
> > polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]
> >
> > A dipole ANTENNA refers to a wire type having two elements of wires,
> > balanced-fed from the center with RF voltage in opposition.
> >
> > The length of this dipole antenna may be ANY length, from near-infinitesimal
> > (fractional wavelength) to many wavelengths.
> >
> > The radiation pattern of the dipole antenna will vary based on many factors:
> > length relative to wavelength, distance above ground or other imperfect
> > conductor being the two most affecting patterns.
>
> Len is correct, dipole simply means two separate elements (di
> means two). A dipole of a certain length will be a half
> wavelength at xx frequency, a quarter wavelength at yy
> frequency and a full wavelength at zz frequency and so on.

OK jj, kindly give us ONE example of a 1/4 wave dipole.....

3391. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 13:59:27 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjkmbv$k08$0@208.206.142.84>
Source record: 76805

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> Ham radio is, and will always be, just what you make of it, people.

Well DUHHHHH!! Dwight!

You forgot to mention that follows what FCC
allows *anyone* to make of it.....

3392. Re: Farnsworth spacing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 15:07:29 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309090707.5ab0cdc5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76806

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bjjmj0$n01$1@208.206.142.113>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message

> > >
> > > The simple fact of
> > > > the matter is that if it wasn't for the brigades of casual contesters
> > > > like you contests simply would not be worth getting into.
> > >
> > > Huh? Try that in Engrish sumtime and we'll relook it.
> >
> > You overdosed on yer get-stupid pills again din ya?
>
> Doncha think the guys in the white coats took him away? He was really getting > on some sort of psycho high.

He's completely whacked, I told him not to smoke the stuff they sprayed.

3393. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 15:13:43 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309090713.66856c94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76807
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message news:...
> "paulfriedman@comcast.net" wrote in message news:...
> > "Brian" wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0309071201.23a96249@posting.google.com...
> > > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:...
> > > > The following isn't exactly a new idea, but some may not have seen it
> > > > yet...
> > > >
> > > > Maybe the way out of the mess is for a Smith Chart test to replace
> > > > the code test.
> > > > So you still want the Amateur Radio Service to be the exclusive domain
> > > of the Electrical Engineer's?
> > >
> > > I don't think that's what the FCC wants, but since the NCVEC can do
> > > any damned thing they want, go ahead and put it to them.
> >
> >
> > I am not an EE or, for that matter, an any-type-E. Majored in History, in
> > fact, with a useful minor in Comparative Religion. Work experience consisted
> > on sitting in an office, drinking bad coffee, attending boring meetings and
> > writing REALLY useful memos (I was high enough in the organization so that I
> > didn't have to read any memos). With that as background ...
>
> If only more people had three hour work schedules...
>
> > I do no think I am brilliant, but I have not found Smith Charts all that
> > difficult. When I learned about them, I found them interesting and
> > potentially useful. Perhaps, just perhaps, the NCVEC thinks selecting for
> > people who find such things a Smith Charts interesting is a reasonable
> > filter for entrance to ham radio. If this be true, perhaps, just perhaps,
> > that's a reasonable filter?
>
> FILTER? Who the hell thinks a FILTER is necessary or JUSTIFIABLE?

You're a perfect example of why filters absolutely are necessary.

>
> You'se guys Socialists or what?

3394. hams are ruining amateur radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 15:16:40 UTC
From: radioactivened@aol.com
Message-ID: <ec75bc7d.0309090716.14059635@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76808
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

As much as it pains me I am ashamed of the behavior in rec.radio.cb. Hams like N3CVJ and WA3MOJ are ruining it for all of us. Hall has been geting his cyber ass kicked by twistedhed and how. George is having kaniption fits. Frank is Frank a trolls troll. Not part of the solution is part of the problem. I agree with twist here. He is right on the money these guys have deficits. Hey Twist drop the freeband and you can be a positive force against the scum that ruin radio. Theres one in every crowd. They just happen to like you.

3395. TWISTEDHED POPS A GASKET

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 19:55:17 UTC
From: twistyisaliar@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <932afc6.0309091155.61896213@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76809

```
========================
=================
Subject: More Twistedhed's Blathering
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Author: twistedhed@webtv.net (Twistedhed)
Date: 2001-03-26 17:20:06
in
3741-3A87F5A4-23@storefull-122.iap.bryant.webtv.ne t
twistedhed@webtv.net wrote:
nice forgery Dougie but the headers don't lie. Undoubtedly you don't
understand how the Usenet works so I will explain it to you, my
anonymous acolyte what do you know of my life? The jockstrap you sent
in the mail is a
trophy of your docile worship of me and it hangs proudly above my
mantle
I will never cease pirate CB activity as long as it irks you or
someone
like you. However, as a consolation and to ease your suffering, I will
stay within the confines of the
freeband for now. The saucer men tell me I have a good signal in the
pile
========================
============
```

3396. Re: hams are ruining amateur radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 20:01:34 UTC
From: Curious Dan <lipcutter@eatme.com>
Message-ID: <SIWdnaC3vMI6rMOiXTWJhQ@comcast.com>
Source record: 76810
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

TROLL POST !!!

"radiofun@lidsrlosers.com" <radioactivened@aol.com> wrote in message
news:ec75bc7d.0309090716.14059635@posting.google.com...
> As much as it pains me I am ashamed of the behavior in rec.radio.cb.
> Hams like N3CVJ and WA3MOJ are ruining it for all of us. Hall has been
> geting his cyber ass kicked by twistedhed and how. George is having
> kaniption fits. Frank is Frank a trolls troll. Not part of the
> solution is part of the problem. I agree with twist here. He is right
> on the money these guys have deficits. Hey Twist drop the freeband and
> you can be a positive force against the scum that ruin radio. Theres
> one in every crowd. They just happen to like you.
>

3397. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 21:25:02 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Oyr7b.2727$c35.1711@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76811

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:3F5C8496.9080302@mailcity.moc...
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >
> > I did some experimenting along those lines, many years ago.
Underground
> > actually works, to some degree.. hi.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> I bet it makes your "grounded grid" linear operate better.
>

Only if used with a grid leak.

Dan/W4NTI

3398. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 21:29:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <MCr7b.2735$c35.1397@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76812

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:3F5C84C5.5090408@mailcity.moc...
>
>
> OM wrote:
> > x-no-archive: yes
> > Ham radio's golden age was the 1950s & early 1960s. It has
> > been in a steady decline ever since. The ARRL & the FCC have
> > facilitated the decline, for different reasons. If you practiced har
> > radio in the 50s-early 60s, then you know what I am saying is
> > correct.
> >
> > OM
>
> Absolutely!
>

Unfortunatly I have to agree. Sure the technology has certainly improved. But the quality of the ARS has suffered.

I mean there is basically little to no experimentation going on. I'm sure there is some, such as in the digital and space endeavours, but not much elsewhere. It is a unfortunate situation that the FCC and ARRL and others has allowed the dumbing down of Ham Radio to this point. Its a real shame.

I think the 'fun' has gone away also. I like to contest, but its going away fast. It's not as much 'fun' now with all the MONSTER stations on the air.

I thought of getting back into weak signal V/Uhf work. But I hear that is about dead too.

So I turn on the thousand of bucks radio and long for the old days. Oh well.

Dan/W4NTI

3399. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 21:29:57 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <pDr7b.2736$c35.1032@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76813

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F5D388A.8080307@adelphia.net...
> JJ wrote:
> >
> >
> > OM wrote:
> >
> >> x-no-archive: yes
> >> Ham radio's golden age was the 1950s & early 1960s. It has
> >> been in a steady decline ever since. The ARRL & the FCC have
> >> facilitated the decline, for different reasons. If you practiced har
> >> radio in the 50s-early 60s, then you know what I am saying is
> >> correct.
> >>
> >> OM
> >
> >
> > Absolutely!
>
>
> Bummer guys! For me, Ham radio's golden era is right now.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Well Mike...you can't miss what you never had.

Dan/W4NTI

3400. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 21:47:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030909174739.12631.00000984@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 76816

In article <j4h7b.1029$c35.195@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>"OM" wrote:
>>
>> Ham radio's golden age was the 1950s & early 1960s. It has
>> been in a steady decline ever since. The ARRL & the FCC have
>> facilitated the decline, for different reasons. If you practiced har
>> radio in the 50s-early 60s, then you know what I am saying is
>> correct.
>
>
> What a bunch of depressing malcontents in this newsgroup. I just read
>through this newsgroup and if someone isn't crying about the code test,
>someone else is crying about the written tests. Thrown into all this is
>endless gripes about ARRL and the FCC. Now, we have someone talking about
>the "golden" past like we can all just snap our fingers and go back to that
>supposedly perfect time.
>
> Ham radio is, and will always be, just what you make of it, people. If you
>choose to focus on the worst aspects of anything, that's all you're going to
>see. However, I suspect there is as many good things about ham radio today,
>and as many good people in ham radio today, as there was during any other
>time period. Regardless, this today is all we have. Either make the best of
>it or perhaps you should find another hobby.

Dwight, for some, this newsgroup is their hobby... :-)

LHA

3401. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 21:47:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030909174740.12631.00000985@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 76815

In article <bjklgo$i83$0@208.206.142.84>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>JJ wrote:
>
>> Len Over 21 wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >
>> > Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two elements and
>a
>> > polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]
>> >
>> > A dipole ANTENNA refers to a wire type having two elements of wires,
>> > balanced-fed from the center with RF voltage in opposition.
>> >
>> > The length of this dipole antenna may be ANY length, from
>near-infinitesimal
>> > (fractional wavelength) to many wavelengths.
>> >
>> > The radiation pattern of the dipole antenna will vary based on many
>factors:
>> > length relative to wavelength, distance above ground or other
>imperfect
>> > conductor being the two most affecting patterns.
>>
>> Len is correct, dipole simply means two separate elements (di
>> means two). A dipole of a certain length will be a half
>> wavelength at xx frequency, a quarter wavelength at yy
>> frequency and a full wavelength at zz frequency and so on.
>
>OK jj, kindly give us ONE example of a 1/4 wave dipole.....

A 40m half-wave dipole used on 80m... :-)

LHA

3402. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 21:47:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030909174741.12631.00000986@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 76814

In article <20030909061938.12631.00000968@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030908230324.23307.00002857@mb-m29.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>There are currently 7 petitions for Rule Making at the FCC ECFS...RM-
>> 10781 through RM-10787. As of 10 AM Pacific Time on 8 Sep 03, those
>> seven RMs had a total of 1,101 documents.
>>
>> The OVERWHELMING CLEAR CONSENSUS that comes from those
>> comments is the abolishment of the morse code test for a US amateur
>> radio license, any class.
>
>Not to anyone who understands what the word "consensus" means. You obviously
>don't.

Webster's New World Compact School and Office Dictionary, Prentice-Hall
1989, defines "consensus" as follows:

"1 An opinion held by all or most 2 general agreement esp. in opinion."

An examination, observation, or random sampling of the six RMs that have
Comments will show that MOST of the respondents favor eliminating the
code test. MOST to an overwhelming majority.

Feel free to go into denial of the obvious. Your choice.

>However, FCC does not require a consensus in order to make a decision. Nor
>does FCC have to enact rules that agree with the majority opinion.

Not being an "insider" to the workings of the FCC as you imply, I'll just go
along with the majority opinions on RM-10781 through RM-10787 as I see
them on the public-access FCC ECFS database.

>Perhaps FCC will remove all code testing for amateur licenses. I would not be
>at all surprised if they did. Or perhaps FCC will retain some form of code
>testing for one or more license classes, as has been recommended by W3BE and
>others. One thing is clear, though: There is no "OVERWHELMING CLEAR
>CONSENSUS" involved.

Yes there is. You just can't stand it so you whine and carry on in denial.

Don't make such a scene in public with your denial whining. It spoils your
image as a long-time superior amateur radio person.

LHA

3403. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 22:07:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309091407.742686eb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76817

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0309080816.30f423b@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309072140.37b6b6d0@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030907172515.05539.00000622@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> > > In article <f45722ac.0309071201.23a96249@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > >news:<c2356669.0309051154.4ef03806@posting.google.com>...
> > > >> The following isn't exactly a new idea, but some may not have seen it
> > > >> yet...
> > > >>
> > > >> Maybe the way out of the mess is for a Smith Chart test to replace
> > > >> the code test.
> > > >
> > > >So you still want the Amateur Radio Service to be the exclusive domain
> > > >of the Electrical Engineer's?
> > >
> > > Nope. One does not have to be an EE in order to understand, and use, the Smith
> > > Chart. Many hams who are not EEs have Smithc Chart knowledge and skill. Many
> > > EEs do not.
> >
> > Name ONE school that teaches Smith Charts that is not an Engineering school.
> >
> > Just ONE!
>
> Why?

Can't you?

> Smith Chart use is not usually an enginnering school course.

Didn't say it was. Why does it have to be a course? Why can't it be
ancilliary training?

Did you use the Smith Chart while attending Engineering School?

It's
> something those interested are expected to learn on their own,

Expected by whom?

So why suggest the FCC/VEC test it?

like
> how to use a calculator today, or a slide rule in years gone by.

Or EZ-NEC?

> I learned the Chart from the ARRL Antenna Book, not from EE school.

So EE schools don't even teach it, yet you promote it in the amateur
service?

> > > btw, the plural of "Electrical Engineer" is "Electrical Engineers" not
> > > "Electrical Engineer's". "Electrical Engineer's" is the possessive
> > >
> > So Electrical Engineers want to posess all of Amatuer Radio?
> >
> Ask vshah101, that's his mantra.

The argument is much older than Vipul, and you darned well know it.

> > > >I don't think that's what the FCC wants, but since the NCVEC can do
> > > >any damned thing they want, go ahead and put it to them.
> > > >
> > > NCVEC could not create a separate Smith Chart test without FCC approval.
> > >
> > Bullshit!
> >
> Yes, that's what your posts are usually full of, Brian.
> >
> Part 97 specifically lists the tests for each class of license.

And what of the contents of those tests? Does the FCC mandate what
material is to be tested, or can the NCVEC slip in just about anything
they want, in any quantity they want?

> Right now there are three written tests, all multiple choice. And one
> code test. No Smith Chart test.

Then why must you promote the idea of "No Charts International?"

> > > And
> > > they could not deviate from multiple-choice format.
> > >
> > Bullshit!
> >
> You really should read Part 97.

Not a problem. You should suggest the NCVEC read it.

> > > It's obvious that irony is not one of your strong points, Brian.
> > >
> > It is obvious that NCVEC reality is not one of yours.
> >
> That's just plain wrong. NCVEC cannot add a Smith Chart test for the
> reasons I listed. Read Part 97.

They can slide it in to any existing exam. No questions asked. With
the QP loaded with Smith Chart questions, they could deny access to
any of the 3 license classes.

> Besides, NCVEC complains that the code test requires too much work
> from the VEs and is too stressful on those being tested. I can imagine
> what they'd say if they had to supervise and grade a Smith Chart test.

It would have to be multiple choice, remember???

> And I can imagine how much you'd complain and argue if a Smith Chart
> test were substituted for the code test.

How much?

3404. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 22:16:05 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Fis7b.1$ca3.0@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76818

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:j4h7b.1029$c35.195@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "OM" wrote:
> >
> > Ham radio's golden age was the 1950s & early 1960s. It has
> > been in a steady decline ever since. The ARRL & the FCC have
> > facilitated the decline, for different reasons. If you practiced har
> > radio in the 50s-early 60s, then you know what I am saying is
> > correct.
>
>
> What a bunch of depressing malcontents in this newsgroup. I just read
> through this newsgroup and if someone isn't crying about the code test,
> someone else is crying about the written tests. Thrown into all this is
> endless gripes about ARRL and the FCC. Now, we have someone talking about
> the "golden" past like we can all just snap our fingers and go back to
that
> supposedly perfect time.
>
> Ham radio is, and will always be, just what you make of it, people. If
you
> choose to focus on the worst aspects of anything, that's all you're going
to
> see. However, I suspect there is as many good things about ham radio
today,
> and as many good people in ham radio today, as there was during any other
> time period. Regardless, this today is all we have. Either make the best
of
> it or perhaps you should find another hobby.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

As usual, Dwight slaps some sense into the masses.

Dan/W4NTI

3405. Tower Wars: City Gives in After Protracted Fight w/ Ham Radio Operator

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 22:51:36 UTC
From: Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <YPs7b.5638$Yt.5224@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76819

http://www.zwire.com/site/news.cfm?newsid=10134558&BRD=1914&PAG=461&dept_id=183401&rfi=6
http://tinyurl.com/mspv

The tower is over 100 feet, and a Missouri City ordinance says that the towers must be 35 feet or the owner must get a specific use permit (SUP) to build it higher. In May of 2000 Orin Snook erected a 100-foot antenna support structure at the back of his property, at 3719 Stoney Crest in Missouri City.

--
Best Regards, Keith AOL IM:kilowattradio
NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
Give SCO $699 for using Linux or the Penguin gets it.
Torvalds: _They are smoking crack._

3406. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 23:48:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309091548.744bad7a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76821

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030909061940.12631.00000969@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0309072055.4f9d0339@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >news:<bjgncb$t1n$1@208.206.142.76>...
> >> N2EY wrote:
> >> >
> >> > It's self-evident that a radio amateur who has no Morse code skills is
> not a
> >> > fully qualified radio amateur, particularly for HF/MF amateur operation.
> That's
> >> > a plain and simple fact.
> >>
> >> What is it about plain and simple facts that so confuses NCI members?
> >
> >Duh!!!
>
> We know you are confused, Brian.

"Duh!!!" doens't indicate a lack of confusion

> >Why does it have to be "particularly for HF/MF operations?"
>
> Because that's where Morse operation by amateurs is most common.

If a lack of Morse code skills renders one less than a fully qualified
amateur radio operator, I would think "praticularly for VHF+
operation" would have been more appropriate for the very reason you
gave.

Duh!!! again.

3407. Re: Tower Wars: City Gives in After Protracted Fight w/ Ham Radio Operator

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 23:49:58 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <GGt7b.40570$3b2.4256235@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 76820

That there sure is a nice CB web page you be hav'un there good-buddy!

10-73's!

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:YPs7b.5638$Yt.5224@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
http://www.zwire.com/site/news.cfm?newsid=10134558&BRD=1914&PAG=461&dept_id=183401&rfi=6
> http://tinyurl.com/mspv
>
> The tower is over 100 feet, and a Missouri City ordinance says that the
towers
> must be 35 feet or the owner must get a specific use permit (SUP) to build
it
> higher. In May of 2000 Orin Snook erected a 100-foot antenna support
> structure at the back of his property, at 3719 Stoney Crest in Missouri
City.
>
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith AOL IM:kilowattradio
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> _Give SCO $699 for using Linux or the Penguin gets it._
> Torvalds: _They are smoking crack._

3408. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-09 23:55:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309091555.48478127@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76822

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030908120046.26759.00000700@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> Issued there new De-Coder rings yet?

Why bother? DICK sends code so poorly that it cannot be copied.

3409. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 00:03:19 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjlpo7khb0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 76823

Len Over 21 wrote:

> In article <bjklgo$i83$0@208.206.142.84>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >JJ wrote:
> >
> >> Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>
> >> >
> >> >
> >> > Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two elements and
> >a
> >> > polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]
> >> >
> >> > A dipole ANTENNA refers to a wire type having two elements of wires,
> >> > balanced-fed from the center with RF voltage in opposition.
> >> >
> >> > The length of this dipole antenna may be ANY length, from
> >near-infinitesimal
> >> > (fractional wavelength) to many wavelengths.
> >> >
> >> > The radiation pattern of the dipole antenna will vary based on many
> >factors:
> >> > length relative to wavelength, distance above ground or other
> >imperfect
> >> > conductor being the two most affecting patterns.
> >>
> >> Len is correct, dipole simply means two separate elements (di
> >> means two). A dipole of a certain length will be a half
> >> wavelength at xx frequency, a quarter wavelength at yy
> >> frequency and a full wavelength at zz frequency and so on.
> >
> >OK jj, kindly give us ONE example of a 1/4 wave dipole.....
>
> A 40m half-wave dipole used on 80m... :-)

I rest my case....

3410. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 00:26:41 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030909202641.06150.00000904@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 76824

>Why bother? DICK sends code so poorly that it cannot be copied.
>

Thats not the CODE I was talking about.

3411. Re: hams are ruining amateur radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 00:36:20 UTC
From: Miles <unknown@unlistedspam.com>
Message-ID: <8mu7b.52230$nf3.17603@fed1read07>
Source record: 76825
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

radiofun@lidsrlosers.com wrote:
> As much as it pains me I am ashamed of the behavior in rec.radio.cb.
> Hams like N3CVJ and WA3MOJ are ruining it for all of us. Hall has been
> geting his cyber ass kicked by twistedhed and how. George is having
> kaniption fits. Frank is Frank a trolls troll. Not part of the
> solution is part of the problem. I agree with twist here. He is right
> on the money these guys have deficits. Hey Twist drop the freeband and
> you can be a positive force against the scum that ruin radio. Theres
> one in every crowd. They just happen to like you.

Whatcha mean? This NG sounds almost like I'm listening on my CB radio.
I thought it's all just typical CB'er banter.

3412. Re: hams are ruining amateur radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 00:38:04 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030909203804.355$GN@newsreader.com>
Source record: 76826
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Miles <unknown@unlistedspam.com> wrote:
> radiofun@lidsrlosers.com wrote:
> > As much as it pains me I am ashamed of the behavior in rec.radio.cb.
> > Hams like N3CVJ and WA3MOJ are ruining it for all of us. Hall has been
> > geting his cyber ass kicked by twistedhed and how. George is having
> > kaniption fits. Frank is Frank a trolls troll. Not part of the
> > solution is part of the problem. I agree with twist here. He is right
> > on the money these guys have deficits. Hey Twist drop the freeband and
> > you can be a positive force against the scum that ruin radio. Theres
> > one in every crowd. They just happen to like you.
>
> Whatcha mean? This NG sounds almost like I'm listening on my CB radio.
> I thought it's all just typical CB'er banter.
>
Yea, I've noticed that about rec.radio.amateur.policy too.

--
GO #40

3413. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 01:42:25 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjlvi1$v47$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 76828

JJ wrote:

> Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >
> >>In article <bjklgo$i83$0@208.206.142.84>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
> >>writes:
> >>
> >>
> >>>JJ wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two elements and
> >>>>
> >>>a
> >>>
> >>>>> polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]
> >>>>>
> >>>>> A dipole ANTENNA refers to a wire type having two elements of wires,
> >>>>> balanced-fed from the center with RF voltage in opposition.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> The length of this dipole antenna may be ANY length, from
> >>>>
> >>>near-infinitesimal
> >>>
> >>>>> (fractional wavelength) to many wavelengths.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> The radiation pattern of the dipole antenna will vary based on many
> >>>>
> >>>factors:
> >>>
> >>>>> length relative to wavelength, distance above ground or other
> >>>>
> >>>imperfect
> >>>
> >>>>> conductor being the two most affecting patterns.
> >>>>
> >>>>Len is correct, dipole simply means two separate elements (di

> >>>>means two). A dipole of a certain length will be a half
> >>>>wavelength at xx frequency, a quarter wavelength at yy
> >>>>frequency and a full wavelength at zz frequency and so on.
> >>>
> >>>OK jj, kindly give us ONE example of a 1/4 wave dipole.....
> >>
> >> A 40m half-wave dipole used on 80m... :-)
> >
> >
> > I rest my case....
>
> Which means it is still a dipole but since it is being used on
> 80 meters it is now a 1/4 wavelength dipole.

Do you use your 40 meter dipole on 80 meters, JJ?

3414. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 02:01:51 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309091801.1cfef615@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76829

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030908230323.23307.00002856@mb-m29.aol.com>...

> In article <kVO6b.5087$BG6.3904@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >I hate to break it to you fine folks....But.....there is no such thing as a
> >1/4 wave DIPOLE.
>
> Incorrect. The word "dipole"...(SNIP)

This has WHAT to do with Amateur Radio POLICY, Lennie?

(Your rules...remember?)

Steve, K4YZ

3415. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 02:03:31 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309091803.5d74c996@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76830

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030909174740.12631.00000985@mb-m28.aol.com>...

> A 40m half-wave dipole used on 80m...

This has WHAT to do with Amateur Radio POLICY, Lennie...?!?!

(Remember...YOUR rules...)

Steve, K4YZ

3416. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 02:08:21 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309091808.47812d10@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76831

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030909174741.12631.00000986@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <20030909061938.12631.00000968@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <20030908230324.23307.00002857@mb-m29.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:

> >Perhaps FCC will remove all code testing for amateur licenses. I would not be
> >at all surprised if they did. Or perhaps FCC will retain some form of code
> >testing for one or more license classes, as has been recommended by W3BE and
> >others. One thing is clear, though: There is no "OVERWHELMING CLEAR
> >CONSENSUS" involved.
>
> Yes there is. You just can't stand it so you whine and carry on in denial.
>
> Don't make such a scene in public with your denial whining. It spoils your
> image as a long-time superior amateur radio person.

The denial whining is yours, Lennie. Mostly from not having been
accepted as the expert you perceive yourself as being.

The fact still remains that there is a large number of people in
and out of Amateur Radio who see Morse Code testing as important and
relevent to AMATEUR Radio...Not Military, Public Service or
Commercial...A FACT that YOU seem to have a hard time differentiating.

That difficulty stems from your gross lack of experience IN
Amateur Radio as anything other than an armchair quarterback.

Steve, K4YZ

3417. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 02:19:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030909221940.23171.00000623@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 76832

In article <j4h7b.1029$c35.195@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>Now, we have someone talking about
>the "golden" past like we can all just snap our fingers and go back to that
>supposedly perfect time.
>
1950s & early 1960s, huh? Well, that was a time when surplus was plentiful and cheap, Generals and Conditionals had full privileges, homebrewing was a lot more common and there was reportedly a lot less nonsense on the bands. Anti-antenna CC&Rs were unknown and there was little competition from other electronic avocations.

However, there was a dark side back then:

- the new medium of television brought with it the spectre of TVI. Evn the cleanest rigs often tore up the neighbor's reception something awful, due to fundamental overload or audio rectification. Many sets back then had terrible design flaws like 21 MHz IF strips and inadequate shielding. And just try telling your irate neighbor that his new $500 marvel was not technically perfect...

- Manufactured ham equipment was big, heavy, and expensive. High powered stuff even more so. Let's not even get into the vagaries of tuning up and the damage you could do if you messed up the procedure. The prices in the old mags and catalogs look cheap until you factor inflation. Many folks homebrewed or converted surplus out of sheer necessity. $1000 would buy a nice station back then, when a $5000 annual income was solidly middle class. Figure 20% of your annual gross salary today...

- At the beginning of that "golden" time, "phone" usually meant "AM". (There was some SSB as early as 1933, and lots more after WW2, but AM was still king for a while). AM meant bands full of 6-8 kHz wide signals and heterodynes. AM was simple to implement but not inexpensive even at moderate power due to the modulation power needed. At end of that period, SSB had pretty much taken over HF 'phone. In between, a lot of nastiness had flowed back and forth over which mode was "better".

- The only data mode hams could use was 60 wpm Baudot RTTY, using mechanical teleprinters that were far too expensive for most hams to buy new. MARS and surplus were the usual sources, and once the machine was obtained you needed to build a TU and other interface gear.

- No repeaters. No personal computers. No WARC bands. No legal phone patching. No VE sessions. No true transceivers until the late '50s. No vanity calls for 99% of hams.

- There were only 100,000 US hams at the beginning of that time and 250,000 at the end.

And yet, hams had a lot of fun.

> Ham radio is, and will always be, just what you make of it, people. If you
>choose to focus on the worst aspects of anything, that's all you're going to
>see. However, I suspect there is as many good things about ham radio today,
>and as many good people in ham radio today, as there was during any other
>time period. Regardless, this today is all we have. Either make the best of
>it or perhaps you should find another hobby.

WELL SAID!

I'll add this:

One of the great strengths of amateur radio is that it offers a very wide range of activities to a wide range of people. And one of the great weaknesses of amateur radio is that it offers a very wide range of activities to a wide range of people.

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

3418. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 02:59:29 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030909225929.11891.00000580@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 76836

In article <jegnlvcv62bd1q5v1vo07dsnamlro7omlt@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
<bbrock@i-america.net> writes:

>OK...I've got to ask. How in the hell does someone who spells as
>badly as he does send code? Hell, it's hard to tell what he's trying
>to say here, I'd hate like hell to have to try and figure out what he
>was trying to spell during a QSO.

Bob:

I've been using CW as my primary mode for over 20 years, and Bruce's
spelling seems fairly normal to me. Perhaps the NCTA is on to something
after all -- we should replace the code test with a spelling test! That should
really weed out a lot of troublemakers!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3419. Re: Did you hear about the No-Coder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 02:59:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030909225930.11891.00000581@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 76834

In article <20030908115721.26542.00000644@mb-m26.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>Who wanted better Groundwave propagation, he buried his Ant so it would be >closer to the ground.

Seems pretty reasonable to me. The Navy's been doing it for years on the ELF systems they use to communicate with submarines. Nothing like using a whole planet as part of your antenna system!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3420. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 02:59:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030909225930.11891.00000582@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 76837

In article <7bmilv4hk4tquftqtqe9hv2ldnmjs23529@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
<bbrock@i-america.net> writes:

>
>I use MURS to keep in touch with my non-ham daughter. My phone at
>home stays constantly busy and she isn't interested in taking the
>test. I guess that she too is condemned to no-code/non-ham hell. She
>seems pretty content with her fate though. She really want's a cell
>phone, which is also near a ham frequency, but I got her a horse
>intstead.

Bob:

Your daughter can have full amateur privileges on the VHF and higher
bands without taking a code test. All she has to do is pass a fairly
simple written test to get her Technician-class license, and she can
be happily kerchunking local repeaters and keeping in touch with you
to both your heart's content. Moreover, if she doesn't bother to whine
about not having HF phone privileges because she cannot be bothered
to learn Morse code at a dismally slow 5 WPM, nobody will any
problem with her whatsoever.

However, as a person who appreciates things like bicycles, wood
stoves, manual-gearbox automobiles, and the Morse code, I think
that the horse you bought for your daughter was a very smart
investment!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3421. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 02:59:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030909225931.11891.00000583@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 76838

In article <bjcv8o$34h@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> > Anyone who would forsake any communication venue
>> > just doesn't have a clue for the value of that venue...
>> >
>> > Kim W5TIT
>>
>> Does this mean the fact that you forsake the Morse code communications
>> venue indicates that you "just don't have a clue for the value of that
>> venue"? (Your words, not mine.)
>>
>> Sunuvagun!
>>
>> With all kind wishes,
>>
>> de Hans, K0HB
>>
>>
>>
>
>I just discovered this post, Hans. You have a better capability of
>understanding than what is demonstrated above. I do not, and never have
>forsaked CW communication. Perhaps you can give me an idea as to how I
>caused you to think that?
>
>And, please don't get confused with the *testing* requirement, which I don't
>like; and that I don't like using it. Just because someone doesn't see its
>merit as a testing element and just because I don't use the mode, does not
>mean I don't believe in its value. Every area where I have had any
>influence in emergency communication has always included a venue for *any*
>form of radio communication, CW included; ATV included; etc.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

For someone who has often characterized herself as an intelligent person,
you would appear to have a poor grasp of the meaning and usage of the
word "venue." A "venue" (n.) is a place, a locality, a location for something
to take place. Your incorrect usage of this term would tend to indicate
an inclination toward prolixity. I suggest that you eschew obfuscation
and select less egregiously irrelevant verbiage, lest you be accused
of circumlocution.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3422. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 02:59:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030909225932.11891.00000584@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 76833

Hmmm. Pretty tough test. I've heard of "fill in the blank" tests, but that's usually for the answers, not the question!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3423. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 02:59:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030909225932.11891.00000585@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 76835

In article <bjgjmt$gam@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>
>Anyway, just a suggestion. I've also done that with Dan, now, too. He's
>another one that isn't even fun to play with and I hate take advantage of
>anyone but Larry and DICK.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Don't look now, but you're at a total disadvantage with Dick and myself.
We're mature, intelligent, well-rounded, active amateur radio operators,
and you're not. Therefore, any attempt you may make to "take advantage"
of us will not likely produce anything but your usual gibberish.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3424. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 03:04:46 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjm4di$ebj@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 76839

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bjlvi1$v47$0@208.206.142.91...
>
>
> JJ wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll; wrote:
> > >
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > >>In article <bjklgo$i83$0@208.206.142.84>, "Dick Carroll;"
<dixie@townsqr.com>
> > >>writes:
> > >>
> > >>>JJ wrote:
> > >>>
> > >>>
> > >>>>Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >>>>
> > >>>>
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two
elements and
> > >>>>
> > >>>>a
> > >>>>
> > >>>>> polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> A dipole ANTENNA refers to a wire type having two elements of
wires,
> > >>>>> balanced-fed from the center with RF voltage in opposition.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> The length of this dipole antenna may be ANY length, from
> > >>>>
> > >>>>near-infinitesimal
> > >>>>
> > >>>>> (fractional wavelength) to many wavelengths.
> > >>>>>
> > >>>>> The radiation pattern of the dipole antenna will vary based on
many
> > >>>>
> > >>>>factors:

> > >>>
> > >>>>> length relative to wavelength, distance above ground or other
> > >>>>
> > >>>imperfect
> > >>>
> > >>>>> conductor being the two most affecting patterns.
> > >>>>
> > >>>>Len is correct, dipole simply means two separate elements (di
> > >>>>means two). A dipole of a certain length will be a half
> > >>>>wavelength at xx frequency, a quarter wavelength at yy
> > >>>>frequency and a full wavelength at zz frequency and so on.
> > >>>
> > >>>OK jj, kindly give us ONE example of a 1/4 wave dipole.....
> > >>
> > >> A 40m half-wave dipole used on 80m... :-)
> > >
> > >
> > > I rest my case....
> >
> > Which means it is still a dipole but since it is being used on
> > 80 meters it is now a 1/4 wavelength dipole.
>
> Do you use your 40 meter dipole on 80 meters, JJ?
>

I have used a 40 meter dipole on 80 meters, with a tuner. Actually, it was for MARS nets, so it wasn't quite 80 meter ham bands...but the antenna was first a homemade dipole, then a 40 meter DXCC. Works great.

Kim W5TIT

3425. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 03:19:44 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F5E9850.2030702@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 76840

```
Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> JJ wrote:
>
>
>>Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>
>>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>In article <bjklgo$i83$0@208.206.142.84>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
>>>>writes:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>JJ wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Len Over 21 wrote:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>> Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two elements and
>>>>>>
>>>>>a
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>> polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> A dipole ANTENNA refers to a wire type having two elements of wires,
>>>>>>> balanced-fed from the center with RF voltage in opposition.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The length of this dipole antenna may be ANY length, from
>>>>>>
>>>>>near-infinitesimal
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>> (fractional wavelength) to many wavelengths.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> The radiation pattern of the dipole antenna will vary based on many
>>>>>>
>>>>>factors:
```

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>> length relative to wavelength, distance above ground or other
>>>>>>
>>>>>imperfect
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>> conductor being the two most affecting patterns.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Len is correct, dipole simply means two separate elements (di
>>>>>>means two). A dipole of a certain length will be a half
>>>>>>wavelength at xx frequency, a quarter wavelength at yy
>>>>>>frequency and a full wavelength at zz frequency and so on.
>>>>>
>>>>>OK jj, kindly give us ONE example of a 1/4 wave dipole.....
>>>>
>>>> A 40m half-wave dipole used on 80m... :-)
>>>
>>>
>>>I rest my case....
>>
>>Which means it is still a dipole but since it is being used on
>>80 meters it is now a 1/4 wavelength dipole.
>
>
> Do you use your 40 meter dipole on 80 meters, JJ?

It certainly could be done using a tuner, the point is that a
dipole where each element is approximately 33 feet is a quarter
wave dipole at 80 meters. There is nothing in the books that
states a dipole HAS to be a half wavelength.

3426. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 03:21:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F5E98D8.6030504@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76841

N2EY wrote:
> In article <j4h7b.1029$c35.195@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>Now, we have someone talking about
>>the "golden" past like we can all just snap our fingers and go back to that
>>supposedly perfect time.
>>
>
> 1950s & early 1960s, huh? Well, that was a time when surplus was plentiful and
> cheap, Generals and Conditionals had full privileges, homebrewing was a lot
> more common and there was reportedly a lot less nonsense on the bands.
> Anti-antenna CC&Rs were unknown and there was little competition from other
> electronic avocations.
>
> However, there was a dark side back then:

How about this for a reason, Jim? Many of the people complaining about how good it used to be have been hams for a long time. Some of the youthful enthusiasm has gone away, and now they are perhaps a little bored with it. Plus the creeping crankies start to set in, and you have a ripe field for "It ain't as good as it used to be" syndrome to set in.

Nothing is ever as good as it used to be! And never was.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3427. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 03:24:23 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <3F5E9967.30208@mailcity.moc>
Source record: 76842

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> Hmmm. Pretty tough test. I've heard of "fill in the blank" tests, but
> that's usually for the answers, not the question!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

I think the testing should take the "Johnny Carson Carnak"
approach, give the answer and the test taker must come up with
the correct question.

3428. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 03:29:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F5E9AF4.3000201@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76843

JJ wrote:
>
>
> Len Over 21 wrote:
>
>>
>>
>> Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two elements
>> and a
>> polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]
>>
>> A dipole ANTENNA refers to a wire type having two elements of wires,
>> balanced-fed from the center with RF voltage in opposition.
>>
>> The length of this dipole antenna may be ANY length, from
>> near-infinitesimal
>> (fractional wavelength) to many wavelengths.
>>
>> The radiation pattern of the dipole antenna will vary based on many
>> factors:
>> length relative to wavelength, distance above ground or other
>> imperfect
>> conductor being the two most affecting patterns.
>
>
> Len is correct, dipole simply means two separate elements (di means
> two). A dipole of a certain length will be a half wavelength at xx
> frequency, a quarter wavelength at yy frequency and a full wavelength
> at zz frequency and so on.

Sure enough. a dipole can be anything at all as long as it has those
two separate elements.

But do you think that is what they meant? Is the test going to ask you
to design a dipole that won't work very well?

If I saw that question on a test,(design a quarter wave dipole) I would
assume it was a trick question.

That a quarter length dipole can exist is in no doubt. Most of them are
a quarter length at some frequency. But this was a mistake, and not an
uncommon one. Its okay, people do that once in a while! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3429. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 03:33:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F5E9BC7.9090801@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76844

Dick Carroll; wrote:

> OK jj, kindly give us ONE example of a 1/4 wave dipole.....

As long as you don't insist that it work very well, it can be done.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3430. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 03:35:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F5E9C3C.2060906@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76845

JJ wrote:

>
> Which means it is still a dipole but since it is being used on 80 meters
> it is now a 1/4 wavelength dipole.

How well is it going to work, JJ?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3431. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 03:42:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F5E9DCF.9070307@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76846

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3F5D113D.8080103@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>
>>>today we lost a truly excitable boy - Warren Zevon. RIP.
>>
>> Darn! 8^(I've heard his last album is pretty good.
>>
>
> There all pretty good. Ya gotta respect a guy who, diagnosed with terminal lung
> cancer and given 2 months to live, keeps going for over a year and releases
> such tracks as a cover of Dylan's "Knockin' On Heaven's Door" and "I'll Sleep
> When I'm Dead".
>
> But my favorite is "Excitable Boy", which, besides the title track, includes
> such classics as:
>
> Werewolves of London
> Nighttime in the Switching Yard
> Roland the Headless Thompson Gunner

They played a cut from his new album. Good stuff, though pretty soft
edged for him. You could play it on a folk music show. Understandable
under the circumstances. It's gonna be my next buy.

The only thing I'm surprised about is that no one has mentioned my
favorite Warren Zevon song, "Lawyers, Guns, and Money".

- Mike KB3EIA -

3432. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 03:43:23 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjm6krgen0@208.206.142.67>
Source record: 76847

JJ wrote:

> Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >
> > JJ wrote:
> >
> >
> >>Dick Carroll; wrote:
> >>
> >>>Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>In article <bjklgo$i83$0@208.206.142.84>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
> >>>>writes:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>JJ wrote:
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>Len Over 21 wrote:
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two elements and
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>a
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]
> >>>>>
> >>>>> A dipole ANTENNA refers to a wire type having two elements of wires,
> >>>>> balanced-fed from the center with RF voltage in opposition.
> >>>>>
> >>>>> The length of this dipole antenna may be ANY length, from
> >>>>>
> >>>>near-infinitesimal
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> (fractional wavelength) to many wavelengths.
> >>>>
> >>>> The radiation pattern of the dipole antenna will vary based on many

> >>>>>>
> >>>>>factors:
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>> length relative to wavelength, distance above ground or other
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>imperfect
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>> conductor being the two most affecting patterns.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>Len is correct, dipole simply means two separate elements (di
> >>>>>>means two). A dipole of a certain length will be a half
> >>>>>>wavelength at xx frequency, a quarter wavelength at yy
> >>>>>>frequency and a full wavelength at zz frequency and so on.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>OK jj, kindly give us ONE example of a 1/4 wave dipole.....
> >>>>
> >>>> A 40m half-wave dipole used on 80m... :-)
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>I rest my case....
> >>
> >>Which means it is still a dipole but since it is being used on
> >>80 meters it is now a 1/4 wavelength dipole.
> >
> >
> > Do you use your 40 meter dipole on 80 meters, JJ?
>
> It certainly could be done using a tuner

Sure, by matching the antenna at its maximum impedance point. Even using open wire eeders this isn't a good situation, as you surely know. Mostly you'll get is a lot of arcing inside the tuner.

But LHA said...
>>>>>>> Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two elements and
>>>>>>> polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]

By which criteria any 1/4 wave groudnplane could qualify!

> the point is that a
> dipole where each element is approximately 33 feet is a quarter
> wave dipole at 80 meters. There is nothing in the books that
> states a dipole HAS to be a half wavelength.

"good engineering practice": FCC rules.

3433. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 04:03:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F5EA2BB.5070506@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76848

Erich Voobner wrote:
> x-no-archive: yes
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030909221940.23171.00000623@mb-m05.aol.com...
>
>>In article <j4h7b.1029$c35.195@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
>>Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>Now, we have someone talking about
>>>the "golden" past like we can all just snap our fingers and go back to
>>
> that
>
>>>supposedly perfect time.
>>>
>>
>>1950s & early 1960s, huh? Well, that was a time when surplus was plentiful
>
> and
>
>>cheap, Generals and Conditionals had full privileges, homebrewing was a
>
> lot
>
>>more common and there was reportedly a lot less nonsense on the bands.
>>Anti-antenna CC&Rs were unknown and there was little competition from
>
> other
>
>>electronic avocations.
>>
>>However, there was a dark side back then:
>>
>>- the new medium of television brought with it the spectre of TVI. Evn the
>>cleanest rigs often tore up the neighbor's reception something awful, due
>
> to
>
>>fundamental overload or audio rectification. Many sets back then had
>
> terrible
>
>>design flaws like 21 MHz IF strips and inadequate shielding. And just try

>>telling your irate neighbor that his new $500 marvel was not technically
>>perfect...
>>
>>- Manufactured ham equipment was big, heavy, and expensive. High powered
>
> stuff
>
>>even more so. Let's not even get into the vagaries of tuning up and the
>
> damage
>
>>you could do if you messed up the procedure. The prices in the old mags
>
> and
>
>>catalogs look cheap until you factor inflation. Many folks homebrewed or
>>converted surplus out of sheer necessity. $1000 would buy a nice station
>
> back
>
>>then, when a $5000 annual income was solidly middle class. Figure 20% of
>
> your
>
>>annual gross salary today...
>>
>>- At the beginning of that "golden" time, "phone" usually meant "AM".
>
> (There
>
>>was some SSB as early as 1933, and lots more after WW2, but AM was still
>
> king
>
>>for a while). AM meant bands full of 6-8 kHz wide signals and heterodynes.
>
> AM
>
>>was simple to implement but not inexpensive even at moderate power due to
>
> the
>
>>modulation power needed. At end of that period, SSB had pretty much taken
>
> over
>
>>HF 'phone. In between, a lot of nastiness had flowed back and forth over
>
> which
>

>>mode was "better".
>>
>>- The only data mode hams could use was 60 wpm Baudot RTTY, using
>
> mechanical
>
>>teleprinters that were far too expensive for most hams to buy new. MARS
>
> and
>
>>surplus were the usual sources, and once the machine was obtained you
>
> needed to
>
>>build a TU and other interface gear.
>>
>>- No repeaters. No personal computers. No WARC bands. No legal phone
>
> patching.
>
>>No VE sessions. No true transceivers until the late '50s. No vanity calls
>
> for
>
>>99% of hams.
>>
>>- There were only 100,000 US hams at the beginning of that time and
>
> 250,000 at
>
>>the end.
>>
>>And yet, hams had a lot of fun.
>>
>>
>>> Ham radio is, and will always be, just what you make of it, people. If
>>
> you
>
>>>choose to focus on the worst aspects of anything, that's all you're going
>>
> to
>
>>>see. However, I suspect there is as many good things about ham radio
>>
> today,
>
>>>and as many good people in ham radio today, as there was during any other
>>>time period. Regardless, this today is all we have. Either make the best
>>

> of
>
>>>it or perhaps you should find another hobby.
>>
>>WELL SAID!
>>
>>I'll add this:
>>
>>One of the great strengths of amateur radio is that it offers a very wide
>
> range
>
>>of activities to a wide range of people. And one of the great weaknesses
>
> of
>
>>amateur radio is that it offers a very wide range of activities to a wide
>
> range
>
>>of people.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>>
> Per qrz.com, N2EY d.o.b. April 24, 1954
> N2EY, another in a long line of Bullshitters, who
> "personally" experienced ham radio in the1950s.
> One thing that has never changed in ham radio, the
> hobby has no shortage of bullshitters and wannabes.

So he had to be a ham at that time to know what hams were using?
An interest in history could fit the bill here. He's only a couple
months older than me, and I also knew a lot of what he posted. And I
wasn't a Ham until 1999.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3434. Re: test

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 05:08:53 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjmbl5qjg0@208.206.142.67>
Source record: 76849

JJ wrote:

> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > Hmmm. Pretty tough test. I've heard of "fill in the blank" tests, but
> > that's usually for the answers, not the question!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> I think the testing should take the "Johnny Carson Carnak"
> approach, give the answer and the test taker must come up with
> the correct question.

GREAT idea! That'll force some of them to think!

Submit your petition!

3435. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 05:13:28 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjmbto$r7c$0@208.206.142.67>
Source record: 76850

Mike Coslo wrote:

> JJ wrote:
> >
> >
> > Len Over 21 wrote:
> >
> >>
> >>
> >> Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two elements
> >> and a
> >> polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]
> >>
> >> A dipole ANTENNA refers to a wire type having two elements of wires,
> >> balanced-fed from the center with RF voltage in opposition.
> >>
> >> The length of this dipole antenna may be ANY length, from
> >> near-infinitesimal
> >> (fractional wavelength) to many wavelengths.
> >>
> >> The radiation pattern of the dipole antenna will vary based on many
> >> factors:
> >> length relative to wavelength, distance above ground or other
> >> imperfect
> >> conductor being the two most affecting patterns.
> >
> >
> > Len is correct, dipole simply means two separate elements (di means
> > two). A dipole of a certain length will be a half wavelength at xx
> > frequency, a quarter wavelength at yy frequency and a full wavelength
> > at zz frequency and so on.
>
> Sure enough. a dipole can be anything at all as long as it has those
> two separate elements.
>
> But do you think that is what they meant? Is the test going to ask you
> to design a dipole that won't work very well?
>
> If I saw that question on a test,(design a quarter wave dipole) I would
> assume it was a trick question.
>
> That a quarter length dipole can exist is in no doubt. Most of them are
> a quarter length at some frequency. But this was a mistake, and not an
> uncommon one. Its okay, people do that once in a while! 8^)

>
>

The point is, Why would anyone deliberately construct a 1/4 wave dipole?
Since they woiuldn't for obvious reasons, the fact that a dipole designed for a certain frequency just happens to be 1/4 wavelength at half that frequency doesn't automatically make it a 1/4 wave dipole. An antenna is what it was designed to be, not what some wag-troll declares.

Sure, anyone *could* construct a 1/4 wave dipole, if he was that ignorant. No one does. So there aren't any around.

3436. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 11:06:45 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjn0hk$4p3@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 76851

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bjmbto$r7c$0@208.206.142.67...
>
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> > JJ wrote:
> > >
> > >
> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
> > >
> > >>
> > >> Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two elements
> > >> and a
> > >> polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]
> > >>
> > >> A dipole ANTENNA refers to a wire type having two elements of
wires,
> > >> balanced-fed from the center with RF voltage in opposition.
> > >>
> > >> The length of this dipole antenna may be ANY length, from
> > >> near-infinitesimal
> > >> (fractional wavelength) to many wavelengths.
> > >>
> > >> The radiation pattern of the dipole antenna will vary based on
many
> > >> factors:
> > >> length relative to wavelength, distance above ground or other
> > >> imperfect
> > >> conductor being the two most affecting patterns.
> > >
> > >
> > > Len is correct, dipole simply means two separate elements (di means
> > > two). A dipole of a certain length will be a half wavelength at xx
> > > frequency, a quarter wavelength at yy frequency and a full wavelength
> > > at zz frequency and so on.
> >
> > Sure enough. a dipole can be anything at all as long as it has
those
> > two separate elements.
> >
> > But do you think that is what they meant? Is the test going to
ask you

> > to design a dipole that won't work very well?
> >
> > If I saw that question on a test,(design a quarter wave dipole)
I would
> > assume it was a trick question.
> >
> > That a quarter length dipole can exist is in no doubt. Most of
them are
> > a quarter length at some frequency. But this was a mistake, and not an
> > uncommon one. Its okay, people do that once in a while! 8^)
> >
> >
>
> The point is, Why would anyone deliberately construct a 1/4 wave dipole?
> Since they woiuldn't for obvious reasons, the fact that a dipole designed
for a
> certain frequency just happens to be 1/4 wavelength at half that frequency
doesn't
> automatically make it a 1/4 wave dipole. An antenna is what it was
designed to be, not
> what some wag-troll declares.
>
> Sure, anyone *could* construct a 1/4 wave dipole, if he was that ignorant.
No one does. So
> there aren't any around.
>

Good 'ol DICK and the World of Absolutes.

Kim W5TIT

3437. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 11:32:17 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309100332.49c90a47@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76852

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3F5EA2BB.5070506@adelphia.net>...
> Erich Voobner wrote:

> >>
> >>
> > Per qrz.com, N2EY d.o.b. April 24, 1954
> > N2EY, another in a long line of Bullshitters, who
> > "personally" experienced ham radio in the1950s.
> > One thing that has never changed in ham radio, the
> > hobby has no shortage of bullshitters and wannabes.
>
> So he had to be a ham at that time to know what hams were using?
> An interest in history could fit the bill here. He's only a couple
> months older than me, and I also knew a lot of what he posted. And I
> wasn't a Ham until 1999.

I *was* all over the bands in the early/mid '50s and I'm here to tell
all you newbies what this "Golden Age" BS was actually like in
comparison to the ham radio we have today in one quick broad-brush
capsulization: If I had turn the clock back and "do" ham radio like we
had in those days my ticket would have landed in the dumpster three
decades ago.

'Twas the Medieval Age of radio, a one notch improvement beyond the
Dark Age of radio.

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

w3rv

3438. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 11:43:22 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjn2lt$4bq@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76853

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0309100332.49c90a47@posting.google.com...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3F5EA2BB.5070506@adelphia.net>...
> > Erich Voobner wrote:
>
> > >>
> > >>
> > > Per qrz.com, N2EY d.o.b. April 24, 1954
> > > N2EY, another in a long line of Bullshitters, who
> > > "personally" experienced ham radio in the1950s.
> > > One thing that has never changed in ham radio, the
> > > hobby has no shortage of bullshitters and wannabes.
> >
> > So he had to be a ham at that time to know what hams were using?
> > An interest in history could fit the bill here. He's only a couple
> > months older than me, and I also knew a lot of what he posted. And I
> > wasn't a Ham until 1999.
>
> I *was* all over the bands in the early/mid '50s and I'm here to tell
> all you newbies what this "Golden Age" BS was actually like in
> comparison to the ham radio we have today in one quick broad-brush
> capsulization: If I had turn the clock back and "do" ham radio like we
> had in those days my ticket would have landed in the dumpster three
> decades ago.
>
> 'Twas the Medieval Age of radio, a one notch improvement beyond the
> Dark Age of radio.
>
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> w3rv

Heh heh...my grampaw used to be one of those folks who lived in
yesteryears--all rosey and wonderful. Yep, life sure was a lot better back
then, no highways, no good medical knowledge, etc. And, just as you Brian,
I'm sure there's many who feel just like you do. I feel that way just
thinking about it :o

Kim W5TIT

3439. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 12:52:27 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <f8F7b.5569$wK1.4364@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76854

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bjmbto$r7c$0@208.206.142.67...
>
> The point is, Why would anyone deliberately construct a 1/4 wave dipole?
> Since they woiuldn't for obvious reasons, the fact that a dipole designed
for a
> certain frequency just happens to be 1/4 wavelength at half that frequency
doesn't
> automatically make it a 1/4 wave dipole. An antenna is what it was
designed to be, not
> what some wag-troll declares.
>
> Sure, anyone *could* construct a 1/4 wave dipole, if he was that ignorant.
No one does. So
> there aren't any around.
>

Well now you've let the cat out of the bag, Dick. Somebody had convinced this Troll to use a 1/4 wave dipole, and now here you go, letting them know that they've been snookered.

They just couldn't understand why the radio kept frying its finals and they never could seem to get a good signal out, even when the radio did work.... Now they know why! - And its all your fault!

Party pooper.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

3440. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 14:03:59 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <3pbulvcid1jeopqk39leq9n3oovugrh9jq@4ax.com>
Source record: 76855

On Wed, 10 Sep 2003 12:52:27 GMT, "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
wrote:

>
>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:bjmbto$r7c$0@208.206.142.67...
>>
>> The point is, Why would anyone deliberately construct a 1/4 wave dipole?
>> Since they woiuldn't for obvious reasons, the fact that a dipole designed
>for a
>> certain frequency just happens to be 1/4 wavelength at half that frequency
>doesn't
>> automatically make it a 1/4 wave dipole. An antenna is what it was
>designed to be, not
>> what some wag-troll declares.
>>
>> Sure, anyone *could* construct a 1/4 wave dipole, if he was that ignorant.
>No one does. So
>> there aren't any around.
>>
>
>Well now you've let the cat out of the bag, Dick. Somebody had convinced
>this Troll to use a 1/4 wave dipole, and now here you go, letting them know
>that they've been snookered.
>
>They just couldn't understand why the radio kept frying its finals and they
>never could seem to get a good signal out, even when the radio did work....
>Now they know why! - And its all your fault!
>
>Party pooper.
>
>Charles Brabham, N5PVL

What? Never heard of an antenna tuner?

3441. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 14:10:53 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjnbddmao0@208.206.142.67>
Source record: 76856

Brian Kelly wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3F5EA2BB.5070506@adelphia.net>...
> > Erich Voobner wrote:
>
> > >>
> > >>
> > > Per qrz.com, N2EY d.o.b. April 24, 1954
> > > N2EY, another in a long line of Bullshitters, who
> > > "personally" experienced ham radio in the1950s.
> > > One thing that has never changed in ham radio, the
> > > hobby has no shortage of bullshitters and wannabes.
> >
> > So he had to be a ham at that time to know what hams were using?
> > An interest in history could fit the bill here. He's only a couple
> > months older than me, and I also knew a lot of what he posted. And I
> > wasn't a Ham until 1999.
>
> I *was* all over the bands in the early/mid '50s and I'm here to tell
> all you newbies what this "Golden Age" BS was actually like in
> comparison to the ham radio we have today in one quick broad-brush
> capsulization: If I had turn the clock back and "do" ham radio like we
> had in those days my ticket would have landed in the dumpster three
> decades ago.
>
> 'Twas the Medieval Age of radio, a one notch improvement beyond the
> Dark Age of radio.
>

And of course as it is with most things in life involving humans, conditions required you
to
learn and do, to perform, just to stay even with things.
You went beyond all that to advance, instead of accepting what you were
"given".

With no such natural requirements in place, is it any wonder that so many today lie back
and
complain instead?

3442. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 14:18:51 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjnbsb$n4n$0@208.206.142.67>
Source record: 76857

charlesb wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bjmbto$r7c$0@208.206.142.67...
> >
> > The point is, Why would anyone deliberately construct a 1/4 wave dipole?
> > Since they woiuldn't for obvious reasons, the fact that a dipole designed
> for a
> > certain frequency just happens to be 1/4 wavelength at half that frequency
> doesn't
> > automatically make it a 1/4 wave dipole. An antenna is what it was
> designed to be, not
> > what some wag-troll declares.
> >
> > Sure, anyone *could* construct a 1/4 wave dipole, if he was that ignorant.
> No one does. So
> > there aren't any around.
> >
>
> Well now you've let the cat out of the bag, Dick. Somebody had convinced
> this Troll to use a 1/4 wave dipole, and now here you go, letting them know
> that they've been snookered.
>
> They just couldn't understand why the radio kept frying its finals and they
> never could seem to get a good signal out, even when the radio did work....
> Now they know why! - And its all your fault!
>
> Party pooper.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL

Well Charlie, they probably think that an antenna tuner will solve their ignorance. Heh heh! Maybe they should read the specs on that tuner's
data sheet, then get into the books to see what they're actually attempting to match!

With a little luck they'll get a signal to actually radiate, a little sometimes, between arcs inside that tuner.

Hope it's not the internal autotuner in their high$$ rig!

Dick

3443. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 14:22:43 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <5rculvkb7flv22ns94tofpfqife763sjhp@4ax.com>
Source record: 76858

```
On Wed, 10 Sep 2003 06:06:45 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:bjmbto$r7c$0@208.206.142.67...
>>
>>
>> Mike Coslo wrote:
>>
>> > JJ wrote:
>> > >
>> > >
>> > > Len Over 21 wrote:
>> > >
>> > >>
>> > >>
>> > >> Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two elements
>> > >> and a
>> > >> polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]
>> > >>
>> > >> A dipole ANTENNA refers to a wire type having two elements of
>wires,
>> > >> balanced-fed from the center with RF voltage in opposition.
>> > >>
>> > >> The length of this dipole antenna may be ANY length, from
>> > >> near-infinitesimal
>> > >> (fractional wavelength) to many wavelengths.
>> > >>
>> > >> The radiation pattern of the dipole antenna will vary based on
>many
>> > >> factors:
>> > >> length relative to wavelength, distance above ground or other
>> > >> imperfect
>> > >> conductor being the two most affecting patterns.
>> > >
>> > >
>> > > Len is correct, dipole simply means two separate elements (di means
>> > > two). A dipole of a certain length will be a half wavelength at xx
>> > > frequency, a quarter wavelength at yy frequency and a full wavelength
>> > > at zz frequency and so on.
>> >
>> > Sure enough. a dipole can be anything at all as long as it has
>those
>> > two separate elements.
```

>> >
>> > But do you think that is what they meant? Is the test going to
>ask you
>> > to design a dipole that won't work very well?
>> >
>> > If I saw that question on a test,(design a quarter wave dipole)
>I would
>> > assume it was a trick question.
>> >
>> > That a quarter length dipole can exist is in no doubt. Most of
>them are
>> > a quarter length at some frequency. But this was a mistake, and not an
>> > uncommon one. Its okay, people do that once in a while! 8^)
>> >
>> >
>>
>> The point is, Why would anyone deliberately construct a 1/4 wave dipole?

A better question would be, why would someone buy one and why would
someone build one for sale?

http://www.aerocomm.com/OEM/antennas.htm

http://www.woken.com.tw/abroad/product/antenna/antenna.htm

There are probably about 15,000 more links to 1/4 wave dipoles.
Google shows over 30,000

>> Since they woiuldn't for obvious reasons, the fact that a dipole designed
>for a
>> certain frequency just happens to be 1/4 wavelength at half that frequency
>doesn't
>> automatically make it a 1/4 wave dipole. An antenna is what it was
>designed to be, not
>> what some wag-troll declares.

For HF, you are right, for UHF, well...what can I say?

>>
>> Sure, anyone *could* construct a 1/4 wave dipole, if he was that ignorant.
>No one does. So
>> there aren't any around.

See above. When you make incorrect blanket statements like that, it
make you look....well just plain foolish.

>>
>
>Good 'ol DICK and the World of Absolutes.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Dick's killfiled and his sockpuppet may be soon.

3444. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 14:24:40 UTC
From: "William H. O'Hara, III" <whoohara@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93F269DC8408BAX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@216.168.3.44>
Source record: 76859

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in
news:MXy6b.5557$hF4.5052@newssvr32.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bje07b$t4g$0@208.207.71.163...
>> Well, there ya go, Hans. One of your subjects heard from.
>> Any further
> questions?
>> Dick
>
> Anybody can have their post answered by a troll. What, did
> you think that Hans was troll trolling, or something?
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL

Charles,

You are a troll. Have you started to patrol this
newsgroup in addition to the packet ones? When
anyone asks a question, I love your response.
The "go back to CB" posts are not welcome by anyone,
broadcaster.

I love being accused a troll by the troll when I
told you to knock it off.

Now, more people think that you are a troll. I KF'd
you only in the packet newsgroup. Have fun over here
too.

Bill

3445. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 14:27:57 UTC
From: "William H. O'Hara, III" <whoohara@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93F26A6B043FBAX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@216.168.3.44>
Source record: 76860

> worth into a national, televised advertising campaign. Get
> ham radio into the public eye, and stress the FUN, not the
> public service (i.e. the work and worry).
>
> 4. Get the ARRL to enlist the assistance of any and all
> celebrity hams in the accomplishment of #3 above.
>
> 5. Get the ARRL to stop pandering to the Welfare State
> mentality (related to #1 above.)
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry,

I don't care about what you think. I am tired of trolls
like Charles that respond with hostility to newbie questions
as he often does on the packet newsgroups.

Don't you think it is time to act a little more courteous?
If you don't have anything to say then do not say anything.
Furthermore, if you do not like the amatuer service then
go online to the ULS and resign.

Are you afraid of taking the measly 5 WPM code test over
again, if you change your mind?

Do you drive a truck all day with a wireless connection
and laptop? There are so many vile and wasteful posts
by you in addition to the others. Just cool down for
awhile

Bill

3446. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 15:41:39 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <TCH7b.5595$b82.4745@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76861

Whatever.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

"Moron William H. O'Hara, III" <whoohara@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns93F269DC8408BAX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@216.168.3.44...
> snip<

> You are a troll. Have you started to patrol this
> newsgroup in addition to the packet ones? When
> anyone asks a question, I love your response.
> The "go back to CB" posts are not welcome by anyone,
> broadcaster.
>
> I love being accused a troll by the troll when I
> told you to knock it off.
>
> Now, more people think that you are a troll. I KF'd
> you only in the packet newsgroup. Have fun over here
> too.
>
> Bill

3447. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 16:08:16 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309100808.76e58c45@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76862

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3F5E9DCF.9070307@adelphia.net>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <3F5D113D.8080103@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> > writes:
> >
> >
> >>N2EY wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>today we lost a truly excitable boy - Warren Zevon. RIP.
> >>
> >> Darn! 8^(I've heard his last album is pretty good.
> >>
> >
> > There all pretty good. Ya gotta respect a guy who, diagnosed with terminal lung
> > cancer and given 2 months to live, keeps going for over a year and releases
> > such tracks as a cover of Dylan's "Knockin' On Heaven's Door" and "I'll Sleep
> > When I'm Dead".
> >
> > But my favorite is "Excitable Boy", which, besides the title track, includes
> > such classics as:
> >
> > Werewolves of London
> > Nighttime in the Switching Yard
> > Roland the Headless Thompson Gunner
>
>
> They played a cut from his new album. Good stuff, though pretty soft
> edged for him. You could play it on a folk music show.

I first heard WZ on a folk music show.

> Understandable
> under the circumstances. It's gonna be my next buy.
>
> The only thing I'm surprised about is that no one has mentioned my
> favorite Warren Zevon song, "Lawyers, Guns, and Money".
>
From "Excitable Boy". Also:

"When Johnny Strikes Up the Band"

WZ also wrote songs made famous by others, such as "Poor Poor Pitiful
Me", the best-known version of which was done by Linda Ronstadt.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3448. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 16:20:46 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309100820.3310bc16@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76863

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309091407.742686eb@posting.google.com>...
> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0309080816.30f423b@posting.google.com>...
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309072140.37b6b6d0@posting.google.com>...
> > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030907172515.05539.00000622@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <f45722ac.0309071201.23a96249@posting.google.com>,
> > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > >
> > > > >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > > >news:<c2356669.0309051154.4ef03806@posting.google.com>...
> > > > >> The following isn't exactly a new idea, but some may not have seen it
> > > > >> yet...
> > > > >>
> > > > >> Maybe the way out of the mess is for a Smith Chart test to replace
> > > > >> the code test.
> > > > >
> > > > >So you still want the Amateur Radio Service to be the exclusive domain
> > > > >of the Electrical Engineer's?
> > > >
> > > > Nope. One does not have to be an EE in order to understand, and use, the Smith
> > > > Chart. Many hams who are not EEs have Smithc Chart knowledge and skill. Many
> > > > EEs do not.
> > >
> > > Name ONE school that teaches Smith Charts that is not an Engineering school.
> > >
> > > Just ONE!
> >
> > Why?
>
> Can't you?

Of course I can.

>
> > Smith Chart use is not usually an engineering school course.
>
> Didn't say it was. Why does it have to be a course? Why can't it be
> ancilliary training?

You are full of questions but short on answers.

>
> Did you use the Smith Chart while attending Engineering School?

Why is that important?
>
> > It's
> > something those interested are expected to learn on their own,
>
> Expected by whom?
>
> So why suggest the FCC/VEC test it?

Why not? Are you "Smith Chart impaired"? Do you think it would be too
much of a "burden"?
>
> like
> > how to use a calculator today, or a slide rule in years gone by.
>
> Or EZ-NEC?

I've used both EZNEC and the Smith Chart. I don't think you have.
>
> > I learned the Chart from the ARRL Antenna Book, not from EE school.
>
> So EE schools don't even teach it, yet you promote it in the amateur
> service?

Antennas and RF transmission lines are not dealt with by every EE.
Every ham that gets on the air deals with antennas.

> > > > btw, the plural of "Electrical Engineer" is "Electrical Engineers" not
> > > > "Electrical Engineer's". "Electrical Engineer's" is the possessive
> > >
> > > So Electrical Engineers want to posess all of Amatuer Radio?
> >
> > Ask vshah101, that's his mantra.
>
> The argument is much older than Vipul, and you darned well know it.

I have no idea what argument you mean. And you darned well know it.
>
> > > > > >I don't think that's what the FCC wants, but since the NCVEC can do
> > > > > >any damned thing they want, go ahead and put it to them.
> > > > >
> > > > > NCVEC could not create a separate Smith Chart test without FCC approval.
> > >
> > > Bullshit!
> >
> > Yes, that's what your posts are usually full of, Brian.

And you darned well know it.
> >
> > Part 97 specifically lists the tests for each class of license.
>
> And what of the contents of those tests? Does the FCC mandate what
> material is to be tested, or can the NCVEC slip in just about anything

> they want, in any quantity they want?

You are full of questions and short of answers. Read Part 97.
>
> > Right now there are three written tests, all multiple choice. And one
> > code test. No Smith Chart test.
>
> Then why must you promote the idea of "No Charts International?"

Obviously, you are humor- and irony-impaired, Brian Burke.
>
> > > > And
> > > > they could not deviate from multiple-choice format.
> > >
> > > Bullshit!
> >
> > You really should read Part 97.
>
> Not a problem. You should suggest the NCVEC read it.

You're the one with all the questions and all the time. You ask 'em.
>
> > > > It's obvious that irony is not one of your strong points, Brian.
> > >
> > > It is obvious that NCVEC reality is not one of yours.
> >
> > That's just plain wrong. NCVEC cannot add a Smith Chart test for the
> > reasons I listed. Read Part 97.
>
> They can slide it in to any existing exam.

Not the test I described.

> No questions asked.

FCC must approve every question in the pool.

> With
> the QP loaded with Smith Chart questions, they could deny access to
> any of the 3 license classes.

How? The Smith Chart is not very hard to learn.
>
> > Besides, NCVEC complains that the code test requires too much work
> > from the VEs and is too stressful on those being tested. I can imagine
> > what they'd say if they had to supervise and grade a Smith Chart test.
>
> It would have to be multiple choice, remember???

So it cannot be that hard.
>
> > And I can imagine how much you'd complain and argue if a Smith Chart
> > test were substituted for the code test.

>
> How much?

You demonstrate how much with every post.

3449. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 16:36:51 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309100836.169101ac@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76864

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030909174741.12631.00000986@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <20030909061938.12631.00000968@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <20030908230324.23307.00002857@mb-m29.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> > >
> > >>There are currently 7 petitions for Rule Making at the FCC ECFS...RM-
> > >> 10781 through RM-10787. As of 10 AM Pacific Time on 8 Sep 03, those
> > >> seven RMs had a total of 1,101 documents.
> > >>
> > >> The OVERWHELMING CLEAR CONSENSUS that comes from those
> > >> comments is the abolishment of the morse code test for a US amateur
> > >> radio license, any class.
> > >
> > >Not to anyone who understands what the word "consensus" means. You obviously
> > >don't.
>
> Webster's New World Compact School and Office Dictionary, Prentice-Hall
> 1989, defines "consensus" as follows:
>
> "1 An opinion held by all or most 2 general agreement esp. in opinion."

And the operative definition is #2.
>
> An examination, observation, or random sampling of the six RMs that have
> Comments will show that MOST of the respondents favor eliminating the
> code test. MOST to an overwhelming majority.

Have you tallied all of the comments into categories and computed
percentages of each category? I think not. You are simply relating
your impression of what you saw, and you are not an unbiased observer.

"Consensus" is not the same thing as "majority".
>
> Feel free to go into denial of the obvious. Your choice.

I'll leave denial, whining and complaining to you. You're much better
at it. ;-)
>
> >However, FCC does not require a consensus in order to make a decision. Nor
> >does FCC have to enact rules that agree with the majority opinion.
>
> Not being an "insider" to the workings of the FCC as you imply,

I simply report what FCC has done in the past. FCC did not follow
majority opinion on 98-143. The majority wanted at least two code test
speeds.

> I'll just go
> along with the majority opinions on RM-10781 through RM-10787 as I see
> them on the public-access FCC ECFS database.

So if the majority want to keep code testing, you will shut up and go
away? ;-)

Sounds like a promise from you.

Oh wait, you wrote "opinions on RM-10781 through RM-10787 as I see
them". Which means you can simply deny seeing any opposing comments.
And you will. ;-)
>
> >Perhaps FCC will remove all code testing for amateur licenses. I would not be
> >at all surprised if they did. Or perhaps FCC will retain some form of code
> >testing for one or more license classes, as has been recommended by W3BE and
> >others. One thing is clear, though: There is no "OVERWHELMING CLEAR
> >CONSENSUS" involved.
>
> Yes there is.

No, there isn't.

> You just can't stand it so you whine and carry on in denial.

I'll leave denial, whining and carrying on to you. You're much better
at it.
;-) ;-) ;-)

> Don't make such a scene in public with your denial whining.

Your transference is showing.

> It spoils your image as a long-time superior amateur radio person.

Why are you, who styles himself as a long-time superior nonamateur
radio person, so concerned? You get awfully upset when someone
disagrees with you. You just can't deal with diversity of opinion, or
strong opposition to your cherished views.

3450. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 17:23:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F5F5DF9.8000108@psu.edu>
Source record: 76865

Dick Carroll; wrote:

> The point is, Why would anyone deliberately construct a 1/4 wave dipole?

My best guess is if they made a mistake, and not wanting to admit they were wrong, plowed ahead anyway.

To his good credit, Mr Brock did admit his mistake, I believe. Others seem willing to take up the fight to make themselves look foolish.

And your point about:

"good engineering practice": FCC rules." does indicate that there would be no 1/4 wave dipole question on the exams.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3451. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 17:33:31 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <LfJ7b.137362$Ay2.30485300@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 76866

Jim,

Answer:
1) Click on 'Message'
2) Click on 'Block Sender'
3) Click on 'Yes' to confirm

Works wonders.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0309100836.169101ac@posting.google.com...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030909174741.12631.00000986@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > In article <20030909061938.12631.00000968@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(N2EY)
> > writes:
> >
> > >In article <20030908230324.23307.00002857@mb-m29.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com
> > >(Len Over 21) writes:
> > >
> > >>There are currently 7 petitions for Rule Making at the FCC ECFS...RM-
> > >> 10781 through RM-10787. As of 10 AM Pacific Time on 8 Sep 03,
those
> > >> seven RMs had a total of 1,101 documents.
> > >>
> > >> The OVERWHELMING CLEAR CONSENSUS that comes from those
> > >> comments is the abolishment of the morse code test for a US amateur
> > >> radio license, any class.
> > >
> > >Not to anyone who understands what the word "consensus" means. You
obviously
> > >don't.
> >
> > Webster's New World Compact School and Office Dictionary,
Prentice-Hall
> > 1989, defines "consensus" as follows:
> >
> > "1 An opinion held by all or most 2 general agreement esp. in
opinion."
>

> And the operative definition is #2.
> >
> > An examination, observation, or random sampling of the six RMs that
have
> > Comments will show that MOST of the respondents favor eliminating the
> > code test. MOST to an overwhelming majority.
>
> Have you tallied all of the comments into categories and computed
> percentages of each category? I think not. You are simply relating
> your impression of what you saw, and you are not an unbiased observer.
>
> "Consensus" is not the same thing as "majority".
> >
> > Feel free to go into denial of the obvious. Your choice.
>
> I'll leave denial, whining and complaining to you. You're much better
> at it. ;-)
> >
> > >However, FCC does not require a consensus in order to make a decision.
Nor
> > >does FCC have to enact rules that agree with the majority opinion.
> >
> > Not being an "insider" to the workings of the FCC as you imply,
>
> I simply report what FCC has done in the past. FCC did not follow
> majority opinion on 98-143. The majority wanted at least two code test
> speeds.
>
> > I'll just go
> > along with the majority opinions on RM-10781 through RM-10787 as I
see
> > them on the public-access FCC ECFS database.
>
> So if the majority want to keep code testing, you will shut up and go
> away? ;-)
>
> Sounds like a promise from you.
>
> Oh wait, you wrote "opinions on RM-10781 through RM-10787 as I see
> them". Which means you can simply deny seeing any opposing comments.
> And you will. ;-)
> >
> > >Perhaps FCC will remove all code testing for amateur licenses. I would
not be
> > >at all surprised if they did. Or perhaps FCC will retain some form of
code
> > >testing for one or more license classes, as has been recommended by
W3BE and
> > >others. One thing is clear, though: There is no "OVERWHELMING CLEAR
> > >CONSENSUS" involved.

> >
> > Yes there is.
>
> No, there isn't.
>
> > You just can't stand it so you whine and carry on in denial.
>
> I'll leave denial, whining and carrying on to you. You're much better
> at it.
> ;-) ;-) ;-)
>
> > Don't make such a scene in public with your denial whining.
>
> Your transference is showing.
>
> > It spoils your image as a long-time superior amateur radio person.
>
> Why are you, who styles himself as a long-time superior nonamateur
> radio person, so concerned? You get awfully upset when someone
> disagrees with you. You just can't deal with diversity of opinion, or
> strong opposition to your cherished views.

3452. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 17:44:54 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93F28BBE48EBAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 76867

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in
news:f45722ac.0309091407.742686eb@posting.google.com:

> N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<c2356669.0309080816.30f423b@posting.google.com>...
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>> news:<f45722ac.0309072140.37b6b6d0@posting.google.com>...
>> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>> > news:<20030907172515.05539.00000622@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>> > > In article <f45722ac.0309071201.23a96249@posting.google.com>,
>> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> > >
>> > > >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>> > > >news:<c2356669.0309051154.4ef03806@posting.google.com>...
>> > > >> The following isn't exactly a new idea, but some may not have
>> > > >> seen it yet...
>> > > >>
>> > > >> Maybe the way out of the mess is for a Smith Chart test to
>> > > >> replace the code test.
>> > > >
>> > > >So you still want the Amateur Radio Service to be the exclusive
>> > > >domain of the Electrical Engineer's?
>> > >
>> > > Nope. One does not have to be an EE in order to understand, and
>> > > use, the Smith Chart. Many hams who are not EEs have Smithc Chart
>> > > knowledge and skill. Many EEs do not.
>> >
>> > Name ONE school that teaches Smith Charts that is not an Engineering
>> > school.
>> >
>> > Just ONE!
>>
>> Why?
>
> Can't you?
>
>> Smith Chart use is not usually an enginnering school course.
>
> Didn't say it was. Why does it have to be a course? Why can't it be
> ancilliary training?
>
> Did you use the Smith Chart while attending Engineering School?
>
> It's

>> something those interested are expected to learn on their own,
>
> Expected by whom?
>
> So why suggest the FCC/VEC test it?
>
> like
>> how to use a calculator today, or a slide rule in years gone by.
>
> Or EZ-NEC?
>
>> I learned the Chart from the ARRL Antenna Book, not from EE school.
>
> So EE schools don't even teach it, yet you promote it in the amateur
> service?
>
>> > > btw, the plural of "Electrical Engineer" is "Electrical Engineers"
>> > > not "Electrical Engineer's". "Electrical Engineer's" is the
>> > > possessive
>> >
>> > So Electrical Engineers want to posess all of Amatuer Radio?
>>
>> Ask vshah101, that's his mantra.
>
> The argument is much older than Vipul, and you darned well know it.
>
>> > > >I don't think that's what the FCC wants, but since the NCVEC can
>> > > >do any damned thing they want, go ahead and put it to them.
>> > >
>> > > NCVEC could not create a separate Smith Chart test without FCC
>> > > approval.
>> >
>> > Bullshit!
>>
>> Yes, that's what your posts are usually full of, Brian.
>>
>> Part 97 specifically lists the tests for each class of license.
>
> And what of the contents of those tests? Does the FCC mandate what
> material is to be tested, or can the NCVEC slip in just about anything
> they want, in any quantity they want?
>
>> Right now there are three written tests, all multiple choice. And one
>> code test. No Smith Chart test.
>
> Then why must you promote the idea of "No Charts International?"
>
>> > > And
>> > > they could not deviate from multiple-choice format.
>> >

>> > Bullshit!
>>
>> You really should read Part 97.
>
> Not a problem. You should suggest the NCVEC read it.
>
>> > > It's obvious that irony is not one of your strong points, Brian.
>> >
>> > It is obvious that NCVEC reality is not one of yours.
>>
>> That's just plain wrong. NCVEC cannot add a Smith Chart test for the
>> reasons I listed. Read Part 97.
>
> They can slide it in to any existing exam. No questions asked. With
> the QP loaded with Smith Chart questions, they could deny access to
> any of the 3 license classes.
>
>> Besides, NCVEC complains that the code test requires too much work
>> from the VEs and is too stressful on those being tested. I can imagine
>> what they'd say if they had to supervise and grade a Smith Chart test.
>
> It would have to be multiple choice, remember???
>
>> And I can imagine how much you'd complain and argue if a Smith Chart
>> test were substituted for the code test.
>
> How much?
>

I was certainly taught how to use a Smith chart in engineering school. Not only that, but how to derive the axes mathematically. The latter I have forgotten, but I will never forget how to use one. There again, I went to engineering school in Emgland, where you don't have to do 'English 101' or 'Western Civilization' if you study engineering, hence sufficient time to learn about Smith Charts!

73 de N3KIP

3453. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 17:48:02 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93F28C470DA2Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 76868

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
news:20030909225930.11891.00000582@mb-m11.aol.com:

> In article <7bmilv4hk4tquftqtqe9hv2ldnmjs23529@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
> <bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>
>>
>>I use MURS to keep in touch with my non-ham daughter. My phone at
>>home stays constantly busy and she isn't interested in taking the
>>test. I guess that she too is condemned to no-code/non-ham hell. She
>>seems pretty content with her fate though. She really want's a cell
>>phone, which is also near a ham frequency, but I got her a horse
>>intstead.
>
> Bob:
>
> Your daughter can have full amateur privileges on the VHF and higher
> bands without taking a code test. All she has to do is pass a fairly
> simple written test to get her Technician-class license, and she can
> be happily kerchunking local repeaters and keeping in touch with you
> to both your heart's content. Moreover, if she doesn't bother to whine
> about not having HF phone privileges because she cannot be bothered
> to learn Morse code at a dismally slow 5 WPM, nobody will any
> problem with her whatsoever.
>

And if she waits a little longer, she will have HF anyway!

> However, as a person who appreciates things like bicycles, wood
> stoves, manual-gearbox automobiles, and the Morse code, I think
> that the horse you bought for your daughter was a very smart
> investment!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

3454. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 18:04:02 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309101004.30287e53@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76869

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0309100332.49c90a47@posting.google.com>...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3F5EA2BB.5070506@adelphia.net>...
> > Erich Voobner wrote:
>
> > >>
> > >>
> > > Per qrz.com, N2EY d.o.b. April 24, 1954
> > > N2EY, another in a long line of Bullshitters, who
> > > "personally" experienced ham radio in the1950s.
> > > One thing that has never changed in ham radio, the
> > > hobby has no shortage of bullshitters and wannabes.
> >
> > So he had to be a ham at that time to know what hams were using?
> > An interest in history could fit the bill here. He's only a couple
> > months older than me, and I also knew a lot of what he posted. And I
> > wasn't a Ham until 1999.
>
> I *was* all over the bands in the early/mid '50s and I'm here to tell
> all you newbies what this "Golden Age" BS was actually like in
> comparison to the ham radio we have today in one quick broad-brush
> capsulization: If I had turn the clock back and "do" ham radio like we
> had in those days my ticket would have landed in the dumpster three
> decades ago.

Brian, I hadn't expected you to say something like that. I've heard
Dick comment on being able (or having no choice but) to copy 7 QSOs
simultaneously because of the selectivity of those old rigs.

I wish there had been that much activity when I was willing to go thru
the ordeal.

73, Brian

3455. Re: hams are ruining amateur radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 18:30:48 UTC
From: Train <tra1n@verizon.net>
Message-ID: <s5K7b.29806$ae6.26531@nwrddc01.gnilink.net>
Source record: 76870
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Cross-posted crap.....

"radiofun@lidsrlosers.com" <radioactivened@aol.com> wrote in message
news:ec75bc7d.0309090716.14059635@posting.google.com...
> As much as it pains me I am ashamed of the behavior in rec.radio.cb.
> Hams like N3CVJ and WA3MOJ are ruining it for all of us. Hall has been
> geting his cyber ass kicked by twistedhed and how. George is having
> kaniption fits. Frank is Frank a trolls troll. Not part of the
> solution is part of the problem. I agree with twist here. He is right
> on the money these guys have deficits. Hey Twist drop the freeband and
> you can be a positive force against the scum that ruin radio. Theres
> one in every crowd. They just happen to like you.

3456. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 18:57:32 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <wuK7b.138418$Ay2.30733168@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 76871

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns93F28BBE48EBAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> I was certainly taught how to use a Smith chart in engineering school. Not
> only that, but how to derive the axes mathematically. The latter I have
> forgotten, but I will never forget how to use one. There again, I went to
> engineering school in England, where you don't have to do 'English 101' or
> 'Western Civilization' if you study engineering, hence sufficient time to
> learn about Smith Charts!
>
> 73 de N3KIP

While attending school for aeronautical engineering, one of the prerequisite
courses was English literature...and we were made to suffer! <hihi>

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

3457. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 20:20:24 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0309101220.4737bf9e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76872

These fools are interested in facts... they took the post of a biased individual, based on "a couple guys' research", and RAN WITH IT - never questioning the numbers or the source.

Unbelievable.

These people don't know how to deal with reality. In short - they are completely nuts.

- Stewart

dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) wrote in message news:<bjifgs$1ucu$1@heap.juniper.net>...
> K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote:
> >Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
> >new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
> >guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> >not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> >the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> >2.3%.
>
> Somehow the numbers don't seem right, or at least I don't understand
> them. For the months of February through June, 2001, when most of these
> licenses should have been expiring, the AH0A web site gives these numbers:
>
> Renewals: 7380
> Expiries: 2623
> Grace Period Renewals: 810
> Cancelations: 645
>
> While the 1,880 number might be right, the 1,925 number almost certainly
> isn't. The above suggests that about 10,000 Technician licenses came up
> for renewal in the 5 month period, or about 2,000 per month. The AH0A
> data shows the service has averaged about 1,500 new Tech licenses per
> month over the past few years, with the monthly new license total seldom
> dropping below 1,000. As the code-free Technician license was reputed
> to have more popular in its first few years of existance than later on,
> it seems extremely unlikely that there were only 400 new Tech licenses
> issued per month between February and July of 1991, especially when
> 2,000 per month ended up expiring 10 years later.
>
> My guess would be that between 80% and 85% of those licensed as no-code
> Techs in that period are still engaged enough to have renewed their license.
> This isn't entirely out of line with other license classes. If you picked
> a random group of Extra class amateurs (who, I assume, would tend to be older)

> only 75% to 80% of them would be around 10 years later.
>
> Dennis Ferguson

3458. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 20:27:42 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0309101227.53caa80f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76873

"K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<b71720b321f483edfb53ce7de21e4078.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
> new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
> guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> 2.3%.
>
> Any ideas for increasing the reenlistment rate?
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Sound like COMPLETE BULLSHIT to me. CITE and VERIFY your sources
before posting misleading crap like this

- Stewart
http://groups.yahoo.com/group/MURS-OPEN

3459. Re: schematics wanted - "jamming device"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 21:52:47 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <P2N7b.3750$fd6.298@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 76874

OK, Lloyd, you got me. This post was the result of a problem with a friend (since passed) about 20 or 25 years ago. There was a neighbor (by the lingo, obviously CB) that was coming into here telephone, radio, stereo, and electronic organ. The neighbor in question (yes, I could see the antenna) was perhaps 150 or 200 feet away. Having seen susceptibility in an identical organ (5 watt cb units passing 50 feet away were barely heard; once in a while one would really pound in, which indicated excessive power), I knew the individual in question was likely running in the low hundreds of watts. My take was "ya can't work 'em if ya can't hear 'em". As was pointed out, a Briggs is hard to hide. Well, if he could hear the lawnmower and thought it the source of interference, he'd likely stop over. I'm sure a reasonable chat (no, no fisticuffs) could work things out. Certainly, as I stated, this is *not* recommended. Try and make someone believe that bell wire "accidentally" fell on the sparkplug and the other end just happens to be connected to an insulator. :)

Uh - could I plead "senior moment"?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@wcclhqhox.org> wrote in message
news:bjnh8k$4fl$0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:To86b.704$s75.135@news02.roc.ny...
> > I'd never suggest intentional jamming. Of course, if you happen to have
a
> > gasoline powered lawnmower and a 9 foot section of bell wire happened to
> > land on the spark plug (stripped end on the plug) and the other end on
> some
> > insulator such as a clothes line ... :) That would take out quite a bit
> of
> > spectrum around 27 MHz (likely 4 MHz either side) for reception for a
few
> > blocks. :)
> >
> > Not recommended, of course.
> >
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim
> >
> >
> >

> >
> > "Limitedselection" <limitedselection@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030905131505.17988.00000281@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > > Help!
> > >
> > > I am looking for schematics for circuits to "jam" TV and CB reception.
> > > I am interested in "jamming" reception on my property only, so the
> > "jamming
> > > device" needs to be really low power - only capable of "jamming" an
area
> > about
> > > half the size of a 'small' city block.
> > >
> > > I read about a circuit that transmits white noise from something like
> > 25Mhz to
> > > something like 30Mhz - effectively "jamming" reception. Any pointers?
> > >
> > > I also read of a circuit that used a crystal detector and would only
> "jam"
> > > after detecting a transmission! Anyone have any info on this?
> > >
> > > The closest I have found so far is a reference on Google (dejanews) to
> > > "s_jam.jpg", but there are no pictures there, so I cannot see the
> > schematic.
> > >
> > > Any information, schematics, or pointers to web sites would be greatly
> > > appreciated!
> > >
> > >
> >
> >

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.516 / Virus Database: 313 - Release Date: 9/1/03

3460. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 22:12:00 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309101412.6c56ee92@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76875

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309101004.30287e53@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0309100332.49c90a47@posting.google.com>...
> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3F5EA2BB.5070506@adelphia.net>...
> > > Erich Voobner wrote:
>
> > > >>
> > > >>
> > > > Per qrz.com, N2EY d.o.b. April 24, 1954
> > > > N2EY, another in a long line of Bullshitters, who
> > > > "personally" experienced ham radio in the1950s.
> > > > One thing that has never changed in ham radio, the
> > > > hobby has no shortage of bullshitters and wannabes.
> > >
> > > So he had to be a ham at that time to know what hams were using?
> > > An interest in history could fit the bill here. He's only a couple
> > > months older than me, and I also knew a lot of what he posted. And I
> > > wasn't a Ham until 1999.
> >
> > I *was* all over the bands in the early/mid '50s and I'm here to tell
> > all you newbies what this "Golden Age" BS was actually like in
> > comparison to the ham radio we have today in one quick broad-brush
> > capsulization: If I had turn the clock back and "do" ham radio like we
> > had in those days my ticket would have landed in the dumpster three
> > decades ago.
>
> Brian, I hadn't expected you to say something like that. I've heard
> Dick comment on being able (or having no choice but) to copy 7 QSOs
> simultaneously because of the selectivity of those old rigs.

Believe it. The top gun rcvrs in those days with even half decent
selectivity were built by Collins and cost 7-8 weeks worth of an
average engineer's entire paychecks. Today much better rcvrs are
available for 10-12 *days* worth of his/her paychecks. Radio kids had
it really miserable, it took me a whole summer to earn enough money to
buy a monumental crapper S-40B rcvr from Sears. Seven QSOs at a time?
No problem! Had the same selectivity characteristics as one of today's
$10-20 throwaway pocket AM/FM broadcast rcvrs. Maybe worse. Ya could
hear a dozen or so stations when the band was really cooking, half
were real signals and the other half were images & intermod products.
Then came the drift . . "Golden Days" my ass . . !

> I wish there had been that much activity when I was willing to go thru
> the ordeal.

The Novice bands of those days are about the only aspect of 'wayback
radio I wish we still had.

> 73, Brian

w3rv

3461. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 22:13:45 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjo7jr$rsi@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76876

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:3pbulvcid1jeopqk39leq9n3oovugrh9jq@4ax.com...
> On Wed, 10 Sep 2003 12:52:27 GMT, "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >news:bjmbto$r7c$0@208.206.142.67...
> >>
> >> The point is, Why would anyone deliberately construct a 1/4 wave
dipole?
> >> Since they woiuldn't for obvious reasons, the fact that a dipole
designed
> >for a
> >> certain frequency just happens to be 1/4 wavelength at half that
frequency
> >doesn't
> >> automatically make it a 1/4 wave dipole. An antenna is what it was
> >designed to be, not
> >> what some wag-troll declares.
> >>
> >> Sure, anyone *could* construct a 1/4 wave dipole, if he was that
ignorant.
> >No one does. So
> >> there aren't any around.
> >>
> >
> >Well now you've let the cat out of the bag, Dick. Somebody had convinced
> >this Troll to use a 1/4 wave dipole, and now here you go, letting them
know
> >that they've been snookered.
> >
> >They just couldn't understand why the radio kept frying its finals and
they
> >never could seem to get a good signal out, even when the radio did
work....
> >Now they know why! - And its all your fault!
> >
> >Party pooper.
> >
> >Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
> What? Never heard of an antenna tuner?

Yep, I just don't get it at all. I think they're the ones that got snookered.

Kim W5TIT

3462. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 22:17:17 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjo7qf$8j5@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76877

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bjnbsb$n4n$0@208.206.142.67...
>
>
> charlesb wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bjmbto$r7c$0@208.206.142.67...
> > >
> > > The point is, Why would anyone deliberately construct a 1/4 wave
dipole?
> > > Since they woiuldn't for obvious reasons, the fact that a dipole
designed
> > for a
> > > certain frequency just happens to be 1/4 wavelength at half that
frequency
> > doesn't
> > > automatically make it a 1/4 wave dipole. An antenna is what it was
> > designed to be, not
> > > what some wag-troll declares.
> > >
> > > Sure, anyone *could* construct a 1/4 wave dipole, if he was that
ignorant.
> > No one does. So
> > > there aren't any around.
> > >
> >
> > Well now you've let the cat out of the bag, Dick. Somebody had convinced
> > this Troll to use a 1/4 wave dipole, and now here you go, letting them
know
> > that they've been snookered.
> >
> > They just couldn't understand why the radio kept frying its finals and
they
> > never could seem to get a good signal out, even when the radio did
work....
> > Now they know why! - And its all your fault!
> >
> > Party pooper.
> >
> > Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
> Well Charlie, they probably think that an antenna tuner will solve their
ignorance. Heh

> heh! Maybe they should read the specs on that tuner's
> data sheet, then get into the books to see what they're actually
attempting to match!
>
> With a little luck they'll get a signal to actually radiate, a little
sometimes, between
> arcs inside that tuner.
>
> Hope it's not the internal autotuner in their high$$ rig!
>
> Dick
>
>

Well, DICK, hopefully you can get an antenna to radiate because I'm pretty darned sure nothing else is radiating there.

I have used my DXCC antenna many, many times over the years on MARS nets, with a Yaesu transceiver with automatic tuner. Now, maybe it's not a "constructed" dipole, but it was used nevertheless. Also, what's the big deal with a 1/4 wave dipole? Dipole simply means design of the antenna...granted, usually for 1/2 wave, which, as you know, doesn't require a groundplane. But there is no reason a 1/2 wave dipole could not be constructed.

Also, perhaps you could tell me the resonant frequency of a long-wire antenna? Eh?

Kim W5TIT

3463. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 22:59:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309101459.631262a5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76878

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0309100820.3310bc16@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309091407.742686eb@posting.google.com>...
> > N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0309080816.30f423b@posting.google.com>...
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309072140.37b6b6d0@posting.google.com>...
> > > > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030907172515.05539.00000622@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> > > > > In article <f45722ac.0309071201.23a96249@posting.google.com>,
> > > > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > > > >
> > > > > >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> > > > > >news:<c2356669.0309051154.4ef03806@posting.google.com>...
> > > > > >> The following isn't exactly a new idea, but some may not have seen it
> > > > > >> yet...
> > > > > >>
> > > > > >> Maybe the way out of the mess is for a Smith Chart test to replace
> > > > > >> the code test.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >So you still want the Amateur Radio Service to be the exclusive domain
> > > > > >of the Electrical Engineer's?
> > > > >
> > > > > Nope. One does not have to be an EE in order to understand, and use, the Smith
> > > > > Chart. Many hams who are not EEs have Smithc Chart knowledge and skill. Many
> > > > > EEs do not.
> > > >
> > > > Name ONE school that teaches Smith Charts that is not an Engineering school.
> > > >
> > > > Just ONE!
> > >
> > > Why?
> >
> > Can't you?
>
> Of course I can.
> >
> > > Smith Chart use is not usually an engineering school course.
> >
> > Didn't say it was. Why does it have to be a course? Why can't it be
> > ancilliary training?
>
> You are full of questions but short on answers.

> >
> > Did you use the Smith Chart while attending Engineering School?
>
> Why is that important?
> >
> > > It's
> > > something those interested are expected to learn on their own,
> >
> > Expected by whom?
> >
> > So why suggest the FCC/VEC test it?
>
> Why not? Are you "Smith Chart impaired"? Do you think it would be too
> much of a "burden"?
> >
> > like
> > > how to use a calculator today, or a slide rule in years gone by.
> >
> > Or EZ-NEC?
>
> I've used both EZNEC and the Smith Chart. I don't think you have.
> >
> > > I learned the Chart from the ARRL Antenna Book, not from EE school.
> >
> > So EE schools don't even teach it, yet you promote it in the amateur
> > service?
>
> Antennas and RF transmission lines are not dealt with by every EE.
> Every ham that gets on the air deals with antennas.
>
> > > > > btw, the plural of "Electrical Engineer" is "Electrical Engineers" not
> > > > > "Electrical Engineer's". "Electrical Engineer's" is the possessive
> > > >
> > > > So Electrical Engineers want to posess all of Amatuer Radio?
> > >
> > > Ask vshah101, that's his mantra.
> >
> > The argument is much older than Vipul, and you darned well know it.
>
> I have no idea what argument you mean. And you darned well know it.
> >
> > > > > >I don't think that's what the FCC wants, but since the NCVEC can do
> > > > > >any damned thing they want, go ahead and put it to them.
> > > > >
> > > > > NCVEC could not create a separate Smith Chart test without FCC approval.
> > > >
> > > > Bullshit!
> > >
> > > Yes, that's what your posts are usually full of, Brian.
>

> And you darned well know it.
> > >
> > > Part 97 specifically lists the tests for each class of license.
> >
> > And what of the contents of those tests? Does the FCC mandate what
> > material is to be tested, or can the NCVEC slip in just about anything
> > they want, in any quantity they want?
>
> You are full of questions and short of answers. Read Part 97.
> >
> > > Right now there are three written tests, all multiple choice. And one
> > > code test. No Smith Chart test.
> >
> > Then why must you promote the idea of "No Charts International?"
>
> Obviously, you are humor- and irony-impaired, Brian Burke.
> >
> > > > > And
> > > > > they could not deviate from multiple-choice format.
> > > > >
> > > > Bullshit!
> > > >
> > > You really should read Part 97.
> >
> > Not a problem. You should suggest the NCVEC read it.
>
> You're the one with all the questions and all the time. You ask 'em.
> >
> > > > > It's obvious that irony is not one of your strong points, Brian.
> > > > >
> > > > It is obvious that NCVEC reality is not one of yours.
> > > >
> > > That's just plain wrong. NCVEC cannot add a Smith Chart test for the
> > > reasons I listed. Read Part 97.
> >
> > They can slide it in to any existing exam.
>
> Not the test I described.
>
> > No questions asked.
>
> FCC must approve every question in the pool.
>
> > With
> > the QP loaded with Smith Chart questions, they could deny access to
> > any of the 3 license classes.
>
> How? The Smith Chart is not very hard to learn.
> >
> > > Besides, NCVEC complains that the code test requires too much work

> > > from the VEs and is too stressful on those being tested. I can imagine
> > > what they'd say if they had to supervise and grade a Smith Chart test.
> >
> > It would have to be multiple choice, remember???
>
> So it cannot be that hard.
> >
> > > And I can imagine how much you'd complain and argue if a Smith Chart
> > > test were substituted for the code test.
> >
> > How much?
>
> You demonstrate how much with every post.

You aked why, then you can't deal with the answer.

You say EE schools don't teach the Smith Chart, then you cay you can
name one that does, but then won't.

You say that Smith Charts are easy to learn, and won't keep anyone out
of the Amateur Service, but there are far far fewer Smith Chart users
than Morse Code users, and Morse Code keeps people out of the ARS.

You're acting obtuse. Are you Dave in drag?

3464. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 23:11:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309101511.42ba1650@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76879

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030909202641.06150.00000904@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> >Why bother? DICK sends code so poorly that it cannot be copied.
> >
>
> Thats not the CODE I was talking about.

Of course it wasn't. You were talking about the other CODE. We all knew that.

3465. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 23:45:14 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <eIO7b.1587$zx2.1002@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76880

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0309101412.6c56ee92@posting.google.com...

> >
>
> Believe it. The top gun rcvrs in those days with even half decent
> selectivity were built by Collins and cost 7-8 weeks worth of an
> average engineer's entire paychecks. Today much better rcvrs are
> available for 10-12 *days* worth of his/her paychecks. Radio kids had
> it really miserable, it took me a whole summer to earn enough money to
> buy a monumental crapper S-40B rcvr from Sears. Seven QSOs at a time?
> No problem! Had the same selectivity characteristics as one of today's
> $10-20 throwaway pocket AM/FM broadcast rcvrs. Maybe worse. Ya could
> hear a dozen or so stations when the band was really cooking, half
> were real signals and the other half were images & intermod products.
> Then came the drift . . "Golden Days" my ass . . !
>
>

> w3rv

But, I'll bet, if you think about it.....it made you a better operator. It
was a SKILL you HAD TO LEARN in order to StAY ON THE AIR? Think about it.

Dan/W4NTI

3466. Re: Do Hams get 11 Meters Back

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-10 23:57:59 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <bUO7b.1618$zx2.1309@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76881

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030909225931.11891.00000583@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <bjcv8o$34h@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >> > Anyone who would forsake any communication venue
> >> > just doesn't have a clue for the value of that venue...
> >> >
> >> > Kim W5TIT
> >>
> >> Does this mean the fact that you forsake the Morse code communications
> >> venue indicates that you "just don't have a clue for the value of that
> >> venue"? (Your words, not mine.)
> >>
> >> Sunuvagun!
> >>
> >> With all kind wishes,
> >>
> >> de Hans, K0HB
> >>
> >>
> >>
> > >I just discovered this post, Hans. You have a better capability of
> >understanding than what is demonstrated above. I do not, and never have
> >forsaked CW communication. Perhaps you can give me an idea as to how I
> >caused you to think that?
> >
> >And, please don't get confused with the *testing* requirement, which I
don't
> >like; and that I don't like using it. Just because someone doesn't see
its
> >merit as a testing element and just because I don't use the mode, does
not
> >mean I don't believe in its value. Every area where I have had any
> >influence in emergency communication has always included a venue for
any
> >form of radio communication, CW included; ATV included; etc.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>

> For someone who has often characterized herself as an intelligent person,
> you would appear to have a poor grasp of the meaning and usage of the
> word "venue." A "venue" (n.) is a place, a locality, a location for
something
> to take place. Your incorrect usage of this term would tend to indicate
> an inclination toward prolixity. I suggest that you eschew obfuscation
> and select less egregiously irrelevant verbiage, lest you be accused
> of circumlocution.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Don't bother with TWIT Larry. She probably 'blocked' you too... hi.

Dan/W4NTI

3467. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 00:19:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030910201910.15462.00002889@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 76882

In article <cslnlvokdvcphc5frkrs80dktutkj2r70t@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
<bbrock@i-america.net> writes:

>On 06 Sep 2003 11:22:30 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>In article <r2iilv0ovu97nehjbcn9hpnte7is1p43nn@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
>><bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>>
>>>On 5 Sep 2003 10:57:03 -0700, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>>>
>>>>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>>>news:<vi4hlv4p8a8lvp8p3p059191vae1pfh7dq@4ax.com>...
>>>>> On 05 Sep 2003 11:19:23 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>> >In article <j62glvk4duionbd52uc7igls30dnv6mc4m@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
>>>>> ><bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>>>>> >
>>>>> >>On 05 Sep 2003 03:41:16 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
>>>
>
>>>I think that they should know what all those nifty buttons
>>>actually do.
>>
>>That's a problem, because many rigs have so many features and menus that
>almost
>>nobody knows *all* of them. But if you're talking about basic operation and
>>operating practice, there's no reason it couldn't be done.
>>
>>>They should know how to enter into a conversation. A
>>>list of "critical tasks" and "non-critical tasks" should be developed
>>>and a person not be licensed until they can actually show competence
>>>in those tasks. Those are the types of issues that I'd like to see
>>>the ham community discussing rather than the endless code/no-code
>>>debate that detracts from everything else.
>>
>>Actually, this very idea was discussed here over 5 years ago. Here's what I
>>proposed:
>>
>>
>>(BEGIN QUOTE):
>>
>>It seems to me that just dropping the code test would remove the last
>vestige
>>of skills testing from the licensing process. Perhaps the code test should

>be
>>replaced by a real practical operating test.
>>
>>Such a test could work like this:
>>
>>Two typical ham rigs are set up so that the operators of each one cannot see
>or
>>hear each other. The rigs are connected to dummy loads which are located
>>adjacent to each other. (The idea is to permit a "contact" from one rig to
>the
>>other, without putting much of a signal on the air). The testee and a VE sit
>at
>>one rig, and another VE sits at the other. The testee is given a sealed
>>envelope and a few minutes to get familiar with the operation of the rig.
>(The
>>operating instructions for the rig would be available at any time).
>>
>>When the actual test begins, the testee opens the sealed envelope and a
>timer
>>is started. Inside the envelope are a set of instructions telling the testee
>to
>>go to a specific frequency and call the VE at the other rig, make contact,
>and
>>send the enclosed formal message. The VE at the other end has a similar
>sealed
>>envelope, but with a different message, which is to be received by the
>testee.
>>
>>The idea is to test the actual radio operating skills of the testee under
>>controlled conditions. There would be a time limit, too. (That's what the
>timer
>>is for). The testee would have the choice of CW, voice or a digital mode for
>>the test.
>>
>>Time limits and exact instructions would vary with the mode and the class of
>>license being tested. Higher class tests could have shorter time limits,
>longer
>>messages, and more complicated instructions, such as having to change
>frequency
>>at a certain point in the contact, having to pick the frequency from a list
>>that includes "wrong choices", etc.
>>
>>Scoring would be on the basis of mistakes. If a word in the messages is
>missing
>>or misspelled, that's a mistake. If nonstandard procedure or phonetics are
>>used, each deviation is a mistake. If the time limit is exceeded, each
>minute
>>over the limit is a mistake. Exceed a certain number of mistakes and the
>test
>>is failed. Asking for a repeat of a missed word would NOT be a mistake.

>>
>>Typical exams (but not the exact exams themselves) would be available as
>study
>>guides. Audiotapes of typical tests could be used for study as well.
>>
>>Yes, it's a bit more complex than a straight code receiving test, and
>requires
>>some equipment and two VEs to conduct it. (Perhaps the VE at the testee's
>>position isn't really needed). But it could be done quite easily, and in
>such a
>>way as to test real operating skills. The rigs used need not have lots of
>>features, and QRP power levels would be more than adequate. Or a "rig
>>simulator" that's really a gussied-up intercom could be used.
>>
>>Is there any real reason such testing could not be done? Is it expecting too
>>much that a prospective ham be able to pass such a test? I think not!
>>
>>(END QUOTE)
>>
>>That description was part of a longer post from June 19, 1998. For the
>>original, see:
>>
>>http://groups.google.com/groups?selm=1998061910321401.GAA21892%40ladder03.
>>news.aol.com&output=gplain
>>
>>Note that one of the features of the test is that the person being tested
>gets
>>to choose the mode used. Those who like Morse best can be tested using that
>>mode, etc.
>>
>>I reposted the idea a few times but always got the same response from the
>>nocodetest folks: Opposition to the idea of ANY form of practical skills
>test.
>
>Well, I guess I'm an exception to the rule. I'd support exactly
>something along those lines.

That makes two of us.

>Have them set up a very simple radio
>into dummy loads and actually have a conversation.

Better yet, have them handle a simple message so there is something measurable
and related to public service communication.

>>>All of the name calling and false accusations from both sides makes us
>>>look silly to those who read it.
>>
>>That's true.
>>
>>>I'm really glad that it will be ending soon.

>>
>>You know something we don't? FCC has been extremely slow in acting on
>>various
>>proposals over the past few years. The 2000 restructuring took almost two
>>years, start-to-finish.
>>
>>Frankly, given the FCC's words in the Report and Order to 98-143 (the
>>restructuring), I'm surprised that Element 1 is still in place. FCC said
>>there
>>was "no regulatory purpose" for code testing *except* meeting the treaty
>>requirement. Treaty requirement is gone. Based on its own logic, FCC now
>>has
>>no
>>reason at all to keep Element 1. Yet they are going through the whole NPRM
>>cycle again. Why? Could it be they have changed their minds?
>>
>>However the issue is decided, I doubt that all of the name calling and false
>>accusations will stop. You should see some of the names I've been called for
>>daring to disagree with some folks, and for pointing out their mistakes in
>>fact, logic and math.
>>
>>> Perhaps then, we can move on to more important issues.
>>
>>Maybe - but given the resistance to my idea of 5+ years ago, I doubt it.
>
>I don't know. Although the posts to the ng haven't changed over the
>years, people and positions do change.

Maybe. From what I've seen, there's more change in the posts than in people's
positions.

>I've had a few people post
>dissatisfaction with the knowledge level of the current testing and
>they seem to agree that the current tests allow people to be licensed
>that don't know protocols or even how to set up and operate the
>equipment.

Agreed! But I have also seen lots of stuff in the other direction. Check out
the flak I'm getting from the irony-impaired over the "Smith Chart Test" post.

The people that need convincing are the FCC, and from their actions over the
past 25+ years it looks to me like they are not about to improve the written
tests.

>Your proposal sounds like a step in the right direction.

Thanks - but I imagine that W5YI and NCVEC would oppose it even more bitterly
than the code test.

>>>I'm sure that not everyone will agree with performance based testing
>>>in addition to a written test.
>>

>>That's an understatement. Google up the responses I got from the above post.
>>Some of 'em aren't pretty.
>>
>>>However, perhaps a consensus could be reached.
>>
>>Even if that happens, the FCC then has to be sold on the idea.
>
>If a consensus was reached in the ham coumunity that testing was
>inadequate at its current level, would selling the idea to them really
>be that hard?

Probably - but I doubt we'd ever get a consensus anyway. FCC is into deregulation; their actions speak louder than words.

>Afterall, it hams who would have to bear the burden of
>administering the additional test requirements.

And they complain loudest of all. Look at the NCVEC petition - they talk about the code tests being a burden on the VEs. Huh? Play the tape, check the answer sheets for 7 or more correct fillins or 25 correct characters. If that's a "burden", what do you think NCVEC will say about having to have an actual simulated QSO?

>I don't think that
>anyone wants to see people licensed to operate radios who don't know
>the basics of setting them up and using them within established
>protocols.

You'll get no argument from me on that idea, but you WILL get one from other folks over whose protocols should be followed and what constitutes following them.

>So, how would we go about starting a movement towards perfromance
>based testing? I would be willing to do what I could to help.

You could start by writing up a petition to the FCC suggesting replacement of the code test with an operating skills test. Use my description if you want, modiufy it, whatever. There are 8 petitions now, what could one more hurt?

The big stumbling blocks that I see are:

- NCVEC will have a fit.
- Some hams will too.
- You need an objective testing and marking method that minimizes the need for VE judgement
- You need to convince FCC that we really *need* this sort of test, and that serious problems will result without it. (That's the toughest part.)

Good luck!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3468. Re: Horseshit7 sez bullshit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 01:48:10 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0309101748.5c864fb8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76883

horseshit7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote

> Sound like COMPLETE BULLSHIT to me.

http://www.earth2.net/fcc/petition/

Argue with them, not with me.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3469. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 02:19:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030910221909.23307.00002924@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 76884

In article <3F5E98D8.6030504@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <j4h7b.1029$c35.195@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
>> Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>Now, we have someone talking about
>>>the "golden" past like we can all just snap our fingers and go back to that
>>>supposedly perfect time.
>>>
>>
>> 1950s & early 1960s, huh? Well, that was a time when surplus was plentiful
>and
>> cheap, Generals and Conditionals had full privileges, homebrewing was a lot
>> more common and there was reportedly a lot less nonsense on the bands.
>> Anti-antenna CC&Rs were unknown and there was little competition from other
>> electronic avocations.
>>
>> However, there was a dark side back then:
>
> How about this for a reason, Jim?

I take it you mean "why some folks call it a golden age"...

> Many of the people complaining about
>how good it used to be have been hams for a long time.

I've got 36 years next month.

>Some of the
>youthful enthusiasm has gone away, and now they are perhaps a little
>bored with it.

Not me. I'm looking forward to the next 36 years.

>Plus the creeping crankies start to set in, and you have
>a ripe field for "It ain't as good as it used to be" syndrome to set in.

I think *most* humans have a built-in memory mechanism that tends to remember
the good things more than the bad ones. (Otherwise most women would never have
a second child!) Also, we know how the past turned out, while we don't know how
the future will. So there's a natural tendency to pretty up the past.

That doesn't mean that all eras are the same. Maybe it really WAS a "golden
age". Certainly some things in ham radio were better back then. And some things

are better now. We can learn a lot from those times. The good things can be preserved and the bad things improved.

> Nothing is ever as good as it used to be! And never was.

"The good old days weren't always good
Tomorrow's not as bad as it seems" - Billy Joel

"And the seasons, they go round and round
And the painted ponies go up and down
We're captive on the carousel of time
We can't return, we can only look
Behind to to where we came
And go round and round and round in the Circle Game" - Joni Mitchell

73 de Jim, N2EY

3470. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 02:46:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030910224658.14837.00002895@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 76886

In article <Xns93F28C470DA2Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>> Bob:
>>
>> Your daughter can have full amateur privileges on the VHF and higher
>> bands without taking a code test. All she has to do is pass a fairly
>> simple written test to get her Technician-class license, and she can
>> be happily kerchunking local repeaters and keeping in touch with you
>> to both your heart's content. Moreover, if she doesn't bother to whine
>> about not having HF phone privileges because she cannot be bothered
>> to learn Morse code at a dismally slow 5 WPM, nobody will any
>> problem with her whatsoever.

>And if she waits a little longer, she will have HF anyway!

That's the good 'ole American Spirit! Just wait until everything is
dumbed-down to your level, and it's yours! Perhaps the FCC
should be called in to consult on Florida's ballot system!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3471. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 02:46:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030910224659.14837.00002896@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 76885

In article <Xns93F26A6B043FBAX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@216.168.3.44>, "William H. O'Hara, III" <whoohara@yahoo.com> writes:

>Larry,
>
>I don't care about what you think.

Bill:

I see. Well, that's usually a good start to a thoroughly useless posting, but I'll play along...

>I am tired of trolls
>like Charles that respond with hostility to newbie questions
>as he often does on the packet newsgroups.

If you're tired of it, then don't expose yourself to it. Nobody is forcing you to read this, or any other, newsgroup on Usenet. I will be here, posting as I see fit, for as long as it pleases me to do so.

>Don't you think it is time to act a little more courteous?

I don't recall having any problems with courtesy.

>If you don't have anything to say then do not say anything.

Good advice which you seem loath to take for yourself.

>Furthermore, if you do not like the amatuer service then
>go online to the ULS and resign.

Why bother? It would be easier to simply allow my ticket to lapse, if that were my intent -- which it is not. Sorry.

>Are you afraid of taking the measly 5 WPM code test over
>again, if you change your mind?

Is Kim Walker, W5TIT, afraid of making a fool of herself with her call sign? Same answer.

>Do you drive a truck all day with a wireless connection
>and laptop? There are so many vile and wasteful posts
>by you in addition to the others. Just cool down for
>awhile

No, I just type fast. And while I appreciate your concern for my body temperature, I think I'm doing just fine, thanks.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3472. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 04:28:16 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93F34AD49AEFelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 76887

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
news:20030910224659.14837.00002896@mb-m03.aol.com:

> In article <Xns93F26A6B043FBAX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@216.168.3.44>,
> "William H. O'Hara, III" <whoohara@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>Larry,
>>
>>I don't care about what you think.
>
> Bill:
>
> I see. Well, that's usually a good start to a thoroughly useless
> posting, but I'll play along...
>
>>I am tired of trolls
>>like Charles that respond with hostility to newbie questions as he
>>often does on the packet newsgroups.
>
> If you're tired of it, then don't expose yourself to it. Nobody
> is forcing you to read this, or any other, newsgroup on
> Usenet. I will be here, posting as I see fit, for as long as it
> pleases me to do so.
>
>>Don't you think it is time to act a little more courteous?
>
> I don't recall having any problems with courtesy.
>
>>If you don't have anything to say then do not say anything.
>
> Good advice which you seem loath to take for yourself.
>
>>Furthermore, if you do not like the amatuer service then go online to
>>the ULS and resign.
>
> Why bother? It would be easier to simply allow my ticket to
> lapse, if that were my intent -- which it is not. Sorry.
>
>>Are you afraid of taking the measly 5 WPM code test over again, if you
>>change your mind?
>
> Is Kim Walker, W5TIT, afraid of making a fool of herself with
> her call sign? Same answer.
>

>>Do you drive a truck all day with a wireless connection
>>and laptop? There are so many vile and wasteful posts
>>by you in addition to the others. Just cool down for awhile
>
> No, I just type fast. And while I appreciate your concern for
> my body temperature, I think I'm doing just fine, thanks.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
>

What's with the title of this thread? This is ham radio, not the army!

3473. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 04:35:38 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bjqv2t$mddbp$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76915

I still am curious why the "middle" code test speed was set at
thirteen..... Why not 12 or 14????

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

>
> If the ARRL truly supported code testing, then "Restructuring" would have
> come out a whole lot differently, perhaps keeping a 12-WPM test for
> Extra. That didn't happen, and it's because the ARRL wants code testing
> dropped, for the sake of (hopefully) getting more people licensed and
> becoming members. It is their never spoken, hidden agenda.
>

3474. Re: Horseshit7 sez bullshit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 04:41:36 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjoue0sjg0@208.206.142.68>
Source record: 76888

K0HB wrote:

> horseshit7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote
>
> > Sound like COMPLETE BULLSHIT to me.
>
> http://www.earth2.net/fcc/petition/
>
> Argue with them, not with me.
>
> With all kind wishes,
>
> de Hans, K0HB

Nicer than usual no-code page, Hans. It's empty!

3475. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 04:58:22 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bjqv2v$mddbp$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76916

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:Qe96b.37823$Vx2.16851173@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> news:j62glvk4duionbd52uc7igls30dnv6mc4m@4ax.com...
> > On 05 Sep 2003 03:41:16 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> >
> > >>Then what do you think that they test for?
> > >
> > >Oh I know what they Test for, and it is not knowledge,it is nothing
then
> > >Memozizing some Q&As that have no meaning to the test taker. The
writtens
> are
> > >nothing more than jumping thru hoops
> >
> > In other words, since they provide the question pool, you don't think
> > that people have to learn the answers in order to correctly answer the
> > questions? How do you think that they figure out how to fill in the
> > correct answer then?
> >
>
> Both the pool AND answers are published.
>
> Let's take a typical question:
>
> What is the length of a dipole for 14.240Mhz?
>

Of what wavelength???? That is an important factor in the equation.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3476. Re: For those that are against the morse removal

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 05:29:52 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bjqv30$mddbp$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76918

Dan,
If your response here is to me and not Larry, you are way off the mark.
The ones here are the ones that were dodging the draft by either using their republican friends influence somehow/someway or staying stateside in the guard. More of the "who ya know" syndrome. Maybe some of the lower level employees were, but the upper management are definitely not the "flower child" type.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

(snippage)
> >
> >
>
> Dang...thats really hard to believe. A 'republican university' taught by
> tenured 60s flower children. Wow.....guess those Hippies really did turn
> into Yuppies after all.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

3477. Re: Going under the knife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 05:43:09 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bjqv32$mddbp$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76917

Thanks for all of the wonderful responses and I am definitely feeling alot
better. I am not back to 100% but getting there over the next couple of
weeks or so.

I had corrective surgery to repair a problem in my lower back as a result of
being in a car accident in 1997. Thank god it isn't vertebrae related.
According to the doc, I shouldn't have any more problems as long as this
heals properly.

Thanks again,
--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030904210819.29660.00000475@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <bj3kad$f2s35$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >To all my friends, combatants, debaters and lurkers here in r.r.a.p,
> >
> >I will be going under the knife this Tuesday for surgery on my lower back
> >and won't be back for about a week or so. I am quiet sure that I am not
> >going to feel like being in the upright position for the next week (or
doing
> >much of anything for that matter) , so everyone have a great week and
> >probably next week I will have a ton of catching up to do.
>
> Ryan:
>
> I hope that the surgery turns out satisfactorily, and wish you a very
> speedy recovery! We'll keep the light on in the window for you. Just
> take your time, don't do anything you're not supposed to, and get
> well soon!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

3478. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 05:54:05 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bjqv33$mddbp$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76919

"Rich M" <ye3ahddd@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:1062951100.855826@newshost03.voicenet.com...
>
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
> news:Yqu6b.4852$Mo5.3409@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com...
> > Another ham-bashing Troll.
> >
> > Assuming that he means what he says, the guy must be an utter moron...
One
> > of those who thinks that ham radio and the Internet "compete" with each
> > other, as if they were rival communications carriers going after the
same
> > market... What a dope!
> >
> > Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
> I feel he makes an interesting conjecture Charles.
>
> Consider: If one were to set up two PC's with full
> internet capability & CD-ROM burners, and six
> feet away, two HFham stations with control op's
> at a hamfest.

Depends.... Apparently hams here as well as in the real world think that
every single person is aware of ham radio and has a basic understanding of
it. I would think that it may actually attract a few more people just
because it is something new they haven't seen before. The fact that it is
yet another "device" that can be connected to a PC might offer some intrigue
as well.

>
> Next you invite 10 young people (14-17 yo) at random who have
> no previous exposure to ham radio from the crowd to
> choose which items to explore and operate.
> Which of these two setup's do you think that
> in the end-game, the greater percentage of
> young people would choose to bring home if they
> had the option to do so?
>

Probably the burning setup, only because they could immediately use the
system that night, whereas it would be a minimum of at least 2-4 weeks or
more before they could use the other system, at least to transmit.
Reception needs no license.

My only main issue with these questions above, as a whole is, which group of 14-17 year olds are you referring to?? There is clear demographical differences in the teenage age groups. There are some clearly that should be immediately shipped to prison to save the justice system some time and at the extreme other end there are some who will be our next Nobel prize winners, and alot of different types in between.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3479. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 08:05:47 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bjqv34$mddbp$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76920

Larry,

This is sort of what I have been saying all along. There are plenty of people out there that might be interested, (regardless of the state of testing methods and requirements) but are unaware that amateur radio even exists!!!!
Of course the argument that "kids" are running to internet is true. Ya can't run to something if you didn't know it existed in the first place......

I don't know if they should plow every dime, but there definitely needs to be a good percentage of the annual budget for PROMOTION, or a good offense to use a sports term. The other funds other than expenses of doing business, should obviously be for defense, i.e methods of alerting FCC officials as well as elected members of the congress and senate as they DO have influence on the various departments/commisions etc. including the FCC.

This should not only be an ARRL effort but it should also extend to other organizations as well as on the immediate local level. I have said it before and I will say it again, I bet for somewhere under $100,000, I (or others) could make wonderful PSA commercial, and even a full 30 minute show that could be place on a medium that could be aired over radio and television, make enough copies of these to get to the radio and television stations, and cover the cost of shipping to them as well for that amount. 100 grand is a smaller chunk of change, looking at the big picture. Radio and television are REQUIRED to air a certain percentage of these PSA's of their broadcast day.

>
> 3. Get the ARRL to plow every dime's worth of it's net worth into a national,
> televised advertising campaign. Get ham radio into the public eye, and stress
> the FUN, not the public service (i.e. the work and worry).
>

Excellent idea. And using a good cross-section of existing celebrity hams, as well as getting other people that are celebrities involved and licensed as well would be a good thing too.

> 4. Get the ARRL to enlist the assistance of any and all celebrity hams in the
> accomplishment of #3 above.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX

FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3480. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 08:11:57 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bjqv35$mddbp$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76922

Yeah, that might be true if you have HF capability........

> I've sed it before I'll say it again: The W1AW code practice sessions
> and getting on the air ASAP are the best methods out there for
> learning the code. The 1AW sessions are reliable, they're not
> repetitive and you can pace yourself without breaking a sweat
> depending on your own set of learning curve variables. Yes it's
> Farnsworth and 1AW Farnworth has obviously worked for decades. Now go
> copy 1AW 5wpm sessions until you "get it".
>
>
> w3rv

3481. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 08:22:55 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bjqv37$mddbp$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76921

And you have my sympathy..... that is a scary proposition now a days, especially in the Metro area!!!!!!!! Already licensed drivers are insane on the roadways down there in the "flatlands" of Michigan, and add a kid with limited experience, wow!

> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> (and parent of a newly licensed driver)
>

3482. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 08:25:07 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bjqv38$mddbp$10@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76923

How many cases are there where you can parallel park anyways, except for in
bigger cities??

Ryan KC8PMX
Confirmed Parallel Parker and Proud! I had to learn, so do you!!!!!!

> Why anyone should be forced to PP is beyond me.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> President, NPTI
>
> "Dedicated to taking driving into the future"
>

3483. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 08:27:56 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bjqv39$mddbp$11@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76924

Wow, there's at least one thing we are equal and agree upon Larry!!!!! :) :)

Ryan KC8PMX
MI-Chauffers and Emergency Vehicle Permit holder
Confirmed Parallel Parker And Proud!

> As far as I'm concerned, you NPTI/NPPTA whiners can go fly a kite.
> You will never achieve the status of us Parallel Parking Tested drivers.
> We're better than you, and we can prove it! You couldn't park a Prius
> on a football field!
>
> 73 de Larry, CDL-B
>

3484. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 08:30:03 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bjqv3a$mddbp$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76925

Yeah Larry, now with my back injury and the head injury I have now when I fell out of my chair laughing so hard reading that, and hit my head, I look like a war victim now!!!!!!! :)

Great Googely Moogely!!!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030902195312.07346.00000381@mb-m26.aol.com...
> In article <3F54E8F9.4070207@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
> >> As far as I'm concerned, you NPTI/NPPTA whiners can go fly a kite.
> >> You will never achieve the status of us Parallel Parking Tested
drivers.
> >> We're better than you, and we can prove it! You couldn't park a Prius
> >> on a football field!
> >
> >
> > HOWWWWLL! Great Ceasers Ghost Larry! I should have opened this one at
> >home! Now everyone wants to know what I am laughing hysterically about,
> >and they are getting to see a grown man cry. Thanks, I needed that!
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Glad to oblige, Mike!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
>

3485. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 08:33:25 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bjqv3b$mddbp$13@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76926

Yeah... the way they drive on 96, 94, 696, 75 and other highways down there, I would too! The only thing I DON'T miss about living in the Detroit metro area where I grew up, is the traffic and of course those really long asphalt parking lots they put in the city around 7am and 5pm every day.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:nia5b.36687$Vx2.16273542@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030902195312.07346.00000379@mb-m26.aol.com...
> > Hey, I'll go one further than that. I think they should be tested in
the
> > proper
> > procedures for changing a tyre on the highway under severe emergency
> > conditions.
> >
>
> You spent too much time in England. When my tire goes flat on the
highway,
> I call for help. It's too dangerous to do this on the side of the road,
> alone, at night, in the rain (Lions and Tigers and Bears, Oh my). I
> couldn't resist!
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

3486. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 08:40:56 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bjqv3c$mddbp$14@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76927

For the type of programs I need to use, Win98 or maybe even Win2000 is MORE
than adequate for my needs.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0309011958.568e1aa9@posting.google.com...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bivcpf$cb0s1$20@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > I have seen AOL recently and Win XP and there is becoming a striking
> > similarity to the two.......
>
> Perfect combination, XP is another one which can't be fixed. I figger
> I'll be running Win2K, Internet Exploder 6 and Eudora 5.3 for another
> 15 years.
>
> Or until Torvald and the Penquin . . .
>
> w3rv

3487. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 09:29:44 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <cgX7b.1176$G_.1020@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76889

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030910224659.14837.00002896@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <Xns93F26A6B043FBAX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@216.168.3.44>, "William
H.
> O'Hara, III" <whoohara@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >Larry,
> >
> >I don't care about what you think.
>

Larry, ask the troll about my "broadcasting", if you want a giggle. The guys at rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc all got a good laugh out of this individual's ranting over there, but finally it got old and we ran him off - apparently to roost again over here.

If his behavior at the other news group is any guide, he will not move on until he has been thoroughly humiliated, setting himself up as the butt of public ridicule here.

Well, I say the sooner it starts, the sooner it will be over and we'll be rid of one more troll. Ask the guy about my "broadcasting" career... That ought to get him off to a good start.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

3488. Re: ARRL Policy Shift?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 10:03:27 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <PLX7b.1180$L01.640@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76890

My general rule is: If they can't or won't display a callsign, they are trolls.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

"Roger" <Roger@lavenderladsfruits.net> wrote in message news:bjpga3$um8$0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> Information from source inside ARRL indicates their
> membership numbers are falling rapidly. In an effort to
> bolster their failing membership numbers, ARRL will begin
> targeting the huge numbers of CB hobby type operators, who
> are generally referred to as "freebanders." ARRL will also
> extend a friendly hand to Unlicensed Low Power FM hobbyists.
> Look for future articles and adverstising aimed at these two
> untapped large audiences of potential ARRL members.
>
> Roger
>
>
>

3489. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 10:24:57 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309110224.47fc3080@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76891

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030910224658.14837.00002895@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <Xns93F28C470DA2Felektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >> Bob:
> >>
> >> Your daughter can have full amateur privileges on the VHF and higher
> >> bands without taking a code test. All she has to do is pass a fairly
> >> simple written test to get her Technician-class license, and she can
> >> be happily kerchunking local repeaters and keeping in touch with you
> >> to both your heart's content. Moreover, if she doesn't bother to whine
> >> about not having HF phone privileges because she cannot be bothered
> >> to learn Morse code at a dismally slow 5 WPM, nobody will any
> >> problem with her whatsoever.
> >
> >And if she waits a little longer, she will have HF anyway!
> >
> That's the good 'ole American Spirit! Just wait until everything is
> dumbed-down to your level, and it's yours!

Uh, Larry . . Alun is a Brit. Like Cornwallis was a Brit (so doan
expect much in the way of the American Spirit there) . .

Like Oliver Cromwell was a Brit. Like Bertrand Russel was a Brit. Like
Clement Atlee was a Brit. The ultimate "class-leveling" socialists and
propagators of the dumb-down syndrome . .

> Perhaps the FCC
> should be called in to consult on Florida's ballot system!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

w3rv

3490. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 12:19:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030911081910.12631.00001025@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 76892

In article <eIO7b.1587$zx2.1002@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>But, I'll bet, if you think about it.....it made you a better operator. It >was a SKILL you HAD TO LEARN in order to StAY ON THE AIR? Think about it.

'zactly. No other option. The Novice was not supposed to be a permanent license. That's why it had so few privileges and was so focused,

And the old Novice had another feature - it was a one-time one year license until 1967, when it became two years. Which meant that you either upgraded before the license ran out or you were off the air. The Novice year/2 years was a big learning time. Lotta incentive!

In fact, one of the reasons FCC gave us incentive licensing was that they perceived a drop off in learning after the Novice year.

Most sensible newbies in those times had at least a receiver and antenna set up and working before they went for the Novice exam. They'd spent serious time listening to hams on the air before ever taking a test. They knew which bands were best at various times of day and year simply from observation. They developed a lot of operating skills and knowledge of operating practices before ever getting a transmitter.

When the Novice became 5 year renewable, that incentive went away.

We're not going to get the mfrs. to stop making IC-706s and start making S-40s, so what's the solution?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3491. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 12:19:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030911081911.12631.00001026@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 76893

In article <f45722ac.0309101459.631262a5@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>You aked why, then you can't deal with the answer.

You did not answer the questions I asked, so there's no reason for me to answer
the questions you asked.

You are full of questions and short of answers.
>
>You say EE schools don't teach the Smith Chart, then you cay you can
>name one that does, but then won't.

You did not answer the questions I asked, so there's no reason for me to answer
the questions you asked.

You are full of questions and short of answers.
>
>You say that Smith Charts are easy to learn,

How do you know they are not?

Antennas and RF transmission lines are not dealt with by every EE.
Every ham that gets on the air deals with antennas.

>and won't keep anyone out of the Amateur Service,

Show me where I claimed that.

>but there are far far fewer Smith Chart users
>than Morse Code users,

How do you know?

>and Morse Code keeps people out of the ARS.

How does it do that? How does a code keep people from becoming hams?
>
>You're acting obtuse.

Obviously, you are humor- and irony-impaired, Brian Burke.

>Are you Dave in drag?

You are full of questions and short of answers.

You're just getting back what you give.

Got that end fed antenna up yet?

3492. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 14:47:07 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309110647.d058537@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76894

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<eIO7b.1587$zx2.1002@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0309101412.6c56ee92@posting.google.com...
>
> > >
> >
> > Believe it. The top gun rcvrs in those days with even half decent
> > selectivity were built by Collins and cost 7-8 weeks worth of an
> > average engineer's entire paychecks. Today much better rcvrs are
> > available for 10-12 *days* worth of his/her paychecks. Radio kids had
> > it really miserable, it took me a whole summer to earn enough money to
> > buy a monumental crapper S-40B rcvr from Sears. Seven QSOs at a time?
> > No problem! Had the same selectivity characteristics as one of today's
> > $10-20 throwaway pocket AM/FM broadcast rcvrs. Maybe worse. Ya could
> > hear a dozen or so stations when the band was really cooking, half
> > were real signals and the other half were images & intermod products.
> > Then came the drift . . "Golden Days" my ass . . !
> >
> >
>
> > w3rv
>
> But, I'll bet, if you think about it.....it made you a better operator. It
> was a SKILL you HAD TO LEARN in order to StAY ON THE AIR? Think about it.

There's an element of truth in that I guess but there are much younger
ops out there today who are real hotshots and who didn't go thru the
masochistic nonsense us OFs had to put up with.

The biggest benefit I got out of participating in that scene was to
pointedly drive home my need to acquire an education which I could
leverage into a higher than average income. So that I could eventually
afford Collins gear. Which is exactly what I did. Incentives in ham
radio did *not* start with Incentive Licensing in 1968 . . .

>
> Dan/W4NTI

w3rv

3493. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 15:15:57 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309110715.543e6db6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76895

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93F28BBE48EBAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...

>
> I was certainly taught how to use a Smith chart in engineering school. Not
> only that, but how to derive the axes mathematically. The latter I have
> forgotten, but I will never forget how to use one. There again, I went to
> engineering school in Emgland, where you don't have to do 'English 101' or
> 'Western Civilization' if you study engineering, hence sufficient time to
> learn about Smith Charts!

I really hate to bust yer bubble again Alun but Smith Charts and all
the rest of the artifact nomograph "solvers" were already stale about
the time you popped out of school. Didja also have a course in slide
rule operations too? I'll bet you did, dinya?

Looks to me like you were obsolete when you graduated. Here's today's
"Smith Charts" Alun.

http://home.t-online.de/home/weberconnect/csmith2.htm

http://rf.rfglobalnet.com/software_modeling/software/2/102.htm

> 73 de N3KIP

w3rv

3494. Re: Horseshit7 sez bullshit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 15:16:08 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0309110716.23474738@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76896

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> Nicer than usual no-code page, Hans. It's empty!

Then your browser must be broken. I just went there and copied the
material quoted below. (This is just the first few paragraphs of the
proposal --- I am not endorsing the proposal, but found the
"re-enlistment rate" information troubling.)

73, Hans, K0HB

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554
In the Matter of
Rulemaking under Part 97 of
the Communications Act of 1934,
as amended, to Revise License
Classes, Privileges, and
Examination Requirements Related
to the Amateur Radio Service

Docket No._____

To: The Commission
PETITION FOR RULEMAKING
Submitted by:
Robert G. Rightsell, AE4FA
Post Office Box 1492
Lexington, SC 29071-1492
ae4fa@logicsouth.com ,

Harry A. M. Kholer, N0PU
9125 Arvin Place
St Louis, Mo 63123
harry@earth2.net ,

Petitioners.

---
1. Introduction

This petition addresses the following areas with respect to the
Amateur Radio Service: 1. Consolidation of license classes;
2. Frequency and Mode Privilege reallocation; and
3. Examination Requirements.

Petitioners have designed this Petition with the goal of reducing the Commission's workload and streamlining the Commission's record-keeping requirements, as well as those of Volunteer Examiner Coordinators, Volunteer Examiners, licensees, and candidates for license.

Petitioners suggest that implementation of these proposals would provide encouragement to all Amateur Radio Service licensees to take advantage of educational opportunities and individual experimentation, thus further enhancing their ability to contribute to the radio art.

2. Background and Discussion

2.1 Consolidation of License Classes

Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925 new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. Petitioners' research shows that 1,880 of those licenses have not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only 2.3%.

Petitioners' further research using the Universal Licensing System search function was blocked because licenses are shown as 'active' until the expiration of the grace period, and there is no provision for search using multiple date parameters. However, based on this limited data, one of two conclusions may be reached. Either the no-code licensing provision did not attract individuals with any depth of interest in radio communications, or the lack of access to frequencies below 30MHz frustrated those newly licensed individuals to the point of giving up. Given either interpretation, Petitioners suggest the no-code Technician experiment did in fact attract larger numbers of people, as was initially hoped, but apparently did not offer sufficient opportunity for them to expand their knowledge and skills, nor did these individuals bring long-term benefit to the Amateur Radio Service.

On December 30, 1999 Report and Order, the Commission stated, 'We observe that the primary difference between the Advanced Class operator license and the Amateur Extra Class operator license is not the difficulty of the Amateur Extra Class written examination but, rather, the 20 wpm telegraphy examination which, as we explain below, we are eliminating as a requirement to obtain the Amateur Extra Class operator license. We also agree with NCVEC that the difference in authorized frequency privileges between the Advanced Class operator license and the Amateur Extra Class operator license is minimal and does not alone warrant maintaining two separate license classes in the future.'

The Commission declined, at that time, to 'undertake a comprehensive restructuring of the amateur service operating privileges and frequencies' until the amateur community reached consensus.

The Commission also left orphaned the Novice class amateur radio license.

Petitioners suggest there is overwhelming consensus in the amateur community that these two orphaned classes should be integrated back into the mainstream of the amateur community.

2.2 Frequency and Mode Privilege reallocation

On December 30, 1999 the Commission released its Report and Order revising the Amateur Radio Service license structure and International Morse code testing requirements. The Commission declined, at that time, to 'undertake a comprehensive restructuring of the amateur service operating privileges and frequencies' until the amateur community reached consensus.

As stated in 2.1 Petitioners suggest there is overwhelming consensus in the amateur community to merge the two orphaned classes. This action will streamline the Commission's record keeping needs and simplify the maintenance of frequency and mode privilege allocations.

Upon merging the Novice and Technician as well as the Advanced and Amateur Extra license classes, considering the ITU action and the growing consensus among the Amateur community, given the no-code VHF only Technician experiment has attracted far fewer dedicated, long term operators than desired, and noting that a significant number of new entrants into the Amateur Radio Service have a strong interest in new technologies and digital modes, it seems only reasonable to modify the frequency and mode allocations for the new, consolidated, Technician class.

Petitioners have examined the history of U.S. frequency allocation. It appears that the Commission has always tried to protect the new, inexperienced, operators from their own lack of experience by putting their privileges away from the band edges and by limiting them in power output. Examples of this are the Novice allocations on 80, 40, and 15 meters and the Novice and Technician Plus allocations on the 10-meter Band. Since the HF spectrum is the area in which international communications are prevalent, these allocations minimized the possibility of interference to other services. The amateur community generally agrees this procedure is in the best interest of the Amateur Radio Service.

2.3 Examination Requirements

On December 30, 1999 the Commission released its Report and Order revising the Amateur Radio Service license structure and International Morse code testing requirements. At that time, the Commission reduced the telegraphy examinations from three elements to one, and set the number of written examination questions required at 35 for Technician, 35 for General, and 50 for Extra, and left to the National Council of Volunteer Examiner Coordinators (NCVEC) the task of the specific mix and makeup of written examination tests.

The Commission did, however, encourage the Amateur Service to strive to 'attract technically inclined persons, particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to learn and to prepare themselves in

the areas where the United States needs expertise.'

Further, the Commission specifically addressed its desire to 'provide an incentive for licensees to continue the educational opportunities offered by amateur radio as The American Radio Relay League, Inc. (ARRL) requests, will continue to provide an incentive for amateur radio operators to advance their communication and technical skills,' and to encourage individuals in the Amateur Service to become 'trained operators, technicians, and electronic experts.' The Commission also said, 'In reaching this decision, we note that one of the fundamental purposes underlying our Part 97 rules is to accommodate the amateur radio operator's proven ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio art.?'

The ITU has, in its 2003 Conference, left to individual administrations whether candidates for the Amateur Radio Service should demonstrate proficiency in International Morse code.

The ITU also adopted the following new language in Provision 25.6: 'Administrations shall verify the operational and technical qualifications of any person wishing to operate an amateur station. Guidance for standards of competence may be found in the most recent version of Recommendation ITU-R M.1544.'

There has been great debate in the amateur community over the retention of code testing. Petitioners observe that, in most of these discussions, the issue of technical competence arises as a major point. There appear to be three groups in these discussions, one which advocates complete elimination of code testing. A majority of this group either advocates increasing the difficulty of written elements or concedes that it is necessary. A second group advocates nothing short of retaining code testing as a 'make or break' element. Most members of this group agree the current written test elements are seriously deficient. The third falls in the middle ground on the code issue. Amateurs in this group also agree that the written testing elements should be enhanced to adequately assess a candidate's knowledge and ability.

Based on these observations, Petitioners see a need for continued International Morse code testing, but do not believe code testing should be the main determining factor. Similarly, Petitioners see a need for more comprehensive written examinations.

Petitioners have attempted to objectively analyze activity levels for the various modes in three categories, International Morse code (CW), Phone (primarily SSB), and Digital (all types) on the high frequency bands. The complete study, prepared by Mr. Walter B. Fair, W5ALT, is included with his permission as Attachment A. The following paragraph in the conclusion section of this report should be noted:

"Based on the analyses presented below, it appears that the CW issue in ham radio is often based on emotion rather than fact. The data do

not indicate an overall decrease in CW activity. The argument being used by CW opponents that CW is dying seems to have no merit. On the other hand, the argument that relaxing the CW test requirement to 5 WPM would lead to the destruction of the Amateur Radio Service does not seem to have merit, either. The data show that when the code testing was relaxed in 2000, CW activity remained stable in the following years. Therefore, if more newer hams started using SSB, the same percentage also started using CW. I interpret that to mean that most hams will use the mode that meets their objectives, whether it is CW or not. Of course, there will always be vocal minorities in both the pro and con CW camps."

Petitioners suggest as a single mode of operation International Morse code is alive, well, and apparently used by a large portion of the Amateur Community. Especially in light of the major role the CW mode plays in international communications, Petitioners suggest that eliminating International Morse code testing altogether would be a tremendous disservice to the U.S. amateur community.

Following the elimination of Amateur Radio Service testing at Commission Field Offices, the concept of Certificate of Successful Completion of Examination (CSCE) was introduced. The system of CSCEs is now pervasive, and presents a significant paperwork and record-keeping burden on Volunteer Examiner Coordinators, Volunteer Examiners, licensees, and candidates for license.

3. Scope of Proposals

3.1 Consolidation of license classes

3.1.1 As per paragraph 2.1, Petitioners suggest it is time to consolidate the Novice and Technician and Technician Plus licenses into one Technician license. This would allow the Commission to simplify record keeping and bring the orphaned Novice licensees back into the Commission's license progression scheme. The upgrade procedure would be automatic immediately and the new license issued at the normal renewal time.

3.1.2 As per paragraph 2.1, Petitioners further suggest it is time to consolidate the Advanced and Amateur Extra licenses. This would also simplify the Commissions record keeping and upgrade these operators who have all passed examination elements with requirements higher than, or equal to those required today. The upgrade procedure would be automatic immediately and the new license issued at the normal renewal time.

3.2 Frequency, Power, and Mode Privilege reallocation;

3.2.1 Petitioners recommend that the newly revised Technician license should have privileges as outlined in paragraph 4.2 below. This allows in general:

. 1. 80 meters: CW and data privileges on 3600 though 3750 kHz. This is an increase of 100 kHz of bandwidth and the addition of data modes to the present Novice allocation.
2. 40 meters: CW and data privileges on 7100 through 7150 kHz. This adds data modes to the existing Novice allocations.

3. 15 meters: CW and data privileges on 21100 through 21200 kHz. This adds data modes to the existing Novice frequency allocations.

4. 10 meters: CW and data privileges on 28100 through 28300 kHz. This represents no change to the existing Novice and Technician Plus allocations.

5. 10 meters: CW and Voice privileges on 28300 through 28600 kHz. This is an increase of 100 kHz of bandwidth to the existing Novice and Technician Plus allocations.

6. Above 30 Mhz: All frequencies, modes, and power levels as contained in the current regulations.

3.2.2 Petitioners recommend that power limitations be placed on the newly consolidated Technician Class in the same fashion as has been historically imposed on the lowest beginner class of operator license in the allocated HF frequencies. This limitation protects other users of the HF spectrum from inadvertent errors commonly made by the inexperienced operator. Petitioners recommend a 200 Watt limit for the Technician class license on all frequencies below 30 Mhz as indicated in paragraph 4.2.3.

3.2.3 Petitioners recommend, upon merging the Advanced and Amateur Extra license classes, that the newly revised Amateur Extra class be assigned all those privileges allowed the present Amateur Extra class license.

3.3 Examination Requirements

3.3.1 As per paragraph 2.3, Petitioners suggest it is time to review and make certain changes to the Element 1 (International Morse code) testing requirement. In light of the ITU's actions it is indeed time to regard the International Morse code as another mode of operation equal to but of no greater importance than any other mode. As demonstrating competence in other modes is not necessary to gain access the HF frequencies, it occurs to the Petitioners that it is time to remove this as an absolute requirement. Petitioners suggest, however, that International Morse code testing should be continued as part of the overall license examination for good reason, as discussed in Section 2.3.3.

3.3.2 It is believed by the Petitioners that the International Morse code remains a viable, valuable, and popular mode. See the discussion in 2.3 above. When all else fails in emergency circumstances, International Morse code remains as the only useable option. CW is also an "International Language", by which, peoples of the world who have differing spoken languages can communicate efficiently.

Petitioners note that written examinations for all classes include questions designed to ascertain a candidate's knowledge of various modes. This petition proposes that, while written examination questions are sufficient to evaluate a license candidate's familiarity with the basic concepts of other modes, such testing is not sufficient for International Morse code.

Petitioners recommend that testing of International Morse code be continued but that such testing should be integrated into the overall test score in a more equitable fashion. It is recommended that the Element 1 test should be scored such that the longest string of continuous characters should be counted (with numbers and punctuation being weighted as two characters) and such count, up to a maximum of 24, should be then divided by two and the result added to the score of the written examination. This test would be available to all candidates for every class of license.

3.3.3 As per paragraph 2.3 it is further believed by Petitioners that is time to increase the number of written test items required to successfully indicate competence at all license levels.

Petitioners have analyzed current and previous question pools developed by the NCVEC and found that the current examinations do not assess candidates' required knowledge of technical matters and the Commission Rules and Regulations as thoroughly as in the past. This due, in large measure, to the limitation of actual test question numbers for Technician and General at 35, and for Amateur Extra at 50. To its credit, the NCVEC has responded to this limitation by greatly expanding the number of questions in each question pool.

Petitioners suggest the actual test questions, however, have been significantly more slanted toward procedures, and less toward technical competence and regulations. This is due to the limitation on the number of actual examination questions.

Petitioners present the following examples:

. 1. Individuals who achieved the 1997 Technician license had passed two written examination elements totaling 65 questions, of which fifteen (23%) were in the area of Commission Rules. Technicians today encounter a total of just 35 written examination questions, only five (14%) of which are in the Commission Rules category. All five may be answered incorrectly, plus four more in other areas, and the candidate will still achieve a passing score.
2. Of the 65 total questions in the Novice and Technician examinations in 1997, there were four questions dealing with propagation. In the current 35 question Technician examination, there are only two.

3. The Novice and Technician examinations in 1997, combined, had ten questions (15%) dealing with electronic theory and components. The current Technician examination has just three (8%).

4. A person achieving a General class license in 1998 encountered a total of 95 test questions. Of those, nineteen were in the Commission Rules category. A person-achieving General today faces 70 questions, eleven of which fall in that category.

5. The cumulative examinations necessary for a General class license in 1998 contained seven questions dealing with propagation. The cumulative examinations necessary for General today contain only five propagation questions.

6. The 95 questions leading to a General class license in 1998 included thirteen (13%) on electronic theory and components. The 70 questions leading to General today include only six (8%).

Petitioners' comparative research of prior question pools was incomplete because neither the NCVEC nor, apparently, any of its entities maintain them as archive material. Fortunately, some of the question pools of interest were recovered from non-official sources. Future studies undertaken as part of rule making proceedings would benefit from their prolonged availability.

The increasing complexity of the radio art, combined with the elimination of Novice and Advanced licenses, have outstripped the ability of a 35 question examination for Technician and General, and a 50 question examination for Amateur Extra to sufficiently evaluate a candidate's operational and technical qualifications. Petitioners suggest that increasing both the number of questions required for each class and the minimum passing scores, as well as assuring a technical and regulatory focus are reasonable solutions. The testing requirements as outlined below would restore the number of examination questions and the number of required correct answers to an approximation of the pre-April 15, 2000 requirements for Technician, General, and Amateur Extra licenses.

Petitioners have observed a widespread recognition in the amateur community that the current examination structure allows individuals who learn published question and answer material quickly to rapidly advance in license class without gaining real understanding of the underlying material. Therefore, this proposal incorporates a requirement for minimum experience in each class of license prior to advancing to the next. Petitioners suggest this will provide practical experience, encourage experimentation and help develop well trained operators, technicians, and electronic experts.

3.3.4 Petitioners suggest it is incumbent on the Commission to mandate the specific mix of topics, number of questions, and minimum passing requirement for all Amateur Radio Service written examinations. It is not, however, necessary at this time for the Commission to develop the actual question pools. This task could very well remain in the hands of the NCVEC.

Petitioners recommend a written test length of forty-four questions for the Technician license (each question scored as two points) and

eighty-eight questions for the General and Amateur Extra license (each question having a value of one point), with questions to be divided into six categories as indicated in paragraph 4.3.

The final score for the license examination would be the sum of the Element 1 exam and the score on the written portion giving a total possible of 100 points. A total cumulative score of 75 points would be the minimum passing grade. This method of integrating the Element 1 test and the written examination allows two paths for progression within the Amateur Radio Service; first, for the technically talented individual to obtain an amateur license in the upper levels of the service without the absolute necessity of learning the International Morse code and second, the more traditionally skilled communicator to receive credit for his extended capabilities, thus bringing into balance the mandates of 47CFR97.1.

3.3.5 Given the composite nature of the examinations suggested by Petitioners, there would no longer be a need to issue CSCEs, and to continue their issuance would in fact be impractical.

3.3.6 Petitioners recognize there have been thousands of CSCE documents issued by VEs and that the holders of these documents should be credited for the hard work the CSCE represents. Petitioners recommend that the holder of an Element 1 CSCE issued prior to the date of the Commission's Order in this matter be credited with 12 points in lieu of the Element 1 examination. Petitioners further recommend the holder of an element 3 or 4 CSCE issued prior to the date of the Commission's Order in this matter be credited with 65 points in lieu of the respective examination.

3.3.7 Petitioners have analyzed the existing testing procedure and believe this proposal offers the most balanced and seamless integration approach possible. Considering the following scenarios, it will be seen that it offers more options for individuals to enter the Amateur Radio Service while assuring the individual has the knowledge necessary to properly control a radio station with minimum opportunity for causing interference to other services.

Candidates scoring the maximum 12 points in the Element 1 portion of the composite examination will need 63 additional points to obtain a license. For the Technician license this would require 32 out of the possible 44 questions. This would be 72.7% correct necessary to pass. For the General or Amateur Extra, it would require 63 out of the possible 88 questions, or 71.5% correct to pass. Both figures indicate that the candidate has at least minimum knowledge to properly control an amateur station and should be eligible for a license.

Candidates scoring a zero in the Element 1 portion of the composite examination will need 75 additional points to obtain a license. For the Technician license this would require 38 out of the possible 44 questions, or 86.3% correct to pass. For the General or Amateur Extra, the minimum correct would be 75 out of the possible 88 questions, or

85.2% correct to pass. Both figures indicate that the candidate has a superior knowledge to properly control an amateur station and, though he does not demonstrate any skill with International Morse code, should be eligible for a license.

In the case of a CSCE Element 3 holder, the candidate has two options; he may take the Element 1 portion of the composite examination and add the score of this exam to his allowed 65 points for a total score. Should this candidate fail to obtain the minimum necessary 10 points, he may elect to take the new Element 3 portion of the composite examination and use the sum of the scores on the Element 1 and the Element 3 portions to qualify for a license.

3495. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 15:42:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F6097D4.7000506@psu.edu>
Source record: 76897

Alun Palmer wrote:

> I was certainly taught how to use a Smith chart in engineering school. Not
> only that, but how to derive the axes mathematically. The latter I have
> forgotten, but I will never forget how to use one. There again, I went to
> engineering school in Emgland, where you don't have to do 'English 101' or
> 'Western Civilization' if you study engineering, hence sufficient time to
> learn about Smith Charts!

So English Engineers are better than American ones because they don't
have to learn anything but "necessary things".

I can see why you don't like Morse code.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3496. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 15:47:14 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F609902.7040103@psu.edu>
Source record: 76898

Brian Kelly wrote:

> I really hate to bust yer bubble again Alun but Smith Charts and all
> the rest of the artifact nomograph "solvers" were already stale about
> the time you popped out of school. Didja also have a course in slide
> rule operations too? I'll bet you did, dinya?

Now ya did it Brian! I will always have a soft spot for slide rules. Of course they are obsolete, but when I got my first slide rule, it took math out of the abstract and put it in the real world for me.

I was in the last class at our school that was trained in their use. I kind of miss the engineer's sixshooter on my belt! ;^)

Where d'ya put the batteries in those things anyhow?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3497. Re: Horseshit7 sez bullshit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 16:06:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjq6i4$528$0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 76899

K0HB wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
>
> > Nicer than usual no-code page, Hans. It's empty!
>
> Then your browser must be broken.

No, just modestly secured. I hae no problem accessing most pages including FCC's.
If someone wants to demand an insecure browser to access their site I'll pass and
just read about it elsewhere. Here, in this case since you've posted it.

> I just went there and copied the
> material quoted below. (This is just the first few paragraphs of the
> proposal --- I am not endorsing the proposal, but found the
> "re-enlistment rate" information troubling.)
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB
>
> Before the
> FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
> Washington, D.C. 20554
> In the Matter of
> Rulemaking under Part 97 of
> the Communications Act of 1934,
> as amended, to Revise License
> Classes, Privileges, and
> Examination Requirements Related
> to the Amateur Radio Service
>
> Docket No._____
>
> To: The Commission
> PETITION FOR RULEMAKING
> Submitted by:
> Robert G. Rightsell, AE4FA
> Post Office Box 1492
> Lexington, SC 29071-1492
> ae4fa@logicsouth.com ,
>
> Harry A. M. Kholer, N0PU
> 9125 Arvin Place
> St Louis, Mo 63123
> harry@earth2.net ,

>
> Petitioners.
>
>
> ---
> 1. Introduction
>
> This petition addresses the following areas with respect to the
> Amateur Radio Service: 1. Consolidation of license classes;
> 2. Frequency and Mode Privilege reallocation; and
> 3. Examination Requirements.
>
> Petitioners have designed this Petition with the goal of reducing the
> Commission's workload and streamlining the Commission's record-keeping
> requirements, as well as those of Volunteer Examiner Coordinators,
> Volunteer Examiners, licensees, and candidates for license.
>
> Petitioners suggest that implementation of these proposals would
> provide encouragement to all Amateur Radio Service licensees to take
> advantage of educational opportunities and individual experimentation,
> thus further enhancing their ability to contribute to the radio art.
>
> 2. Background and Discussion
>
> 2.1 Consolidation of License Classes
>
> Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted
> 1,925 new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions.
> Petitioners' research shows that 1,880 of those licenses have not been
> renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond the two
> year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only 2.3%.
>
> Petitioners' further research using the Universal Licensing System
> search function was blocked because licenses are shown as 'active'
> until the expiration of the grace period, and there is no provision
> for search using multiple date parameters. However, based on this
> limited data, one of two conclusions may be reached. Either the
> no-code licensing provision did not attract individuals with any depth
> of interest in radio communications, or the lack of access to
> frequencies below 30MHz frustrated those newly licensed individuals to
> the point of giving up. Given either interpretation, Petitioners
> suggest the no-code Technician experiment did in fact attract larger
> numbers of people, as was initially hoped, but apparently did not
> offer sufficient opportunity for them to expand their knowledge and
> skills, nor did these individuals bring long-term benefit to the
> Amateur Radio Service.
>
> On December 30, 1999 Report and Order, the Commission stated, 'We
> observe that the primary difference between the Advanced Class
> operator license and the Amateur Extra Class operator license is not

> the difficulty of the Amateur Extra Class written examination but,
> rather, the 20 wpm telegraphy examination which, as we explain below,
> we are eliminating as a requirement to obtain the Amateur Extra Class
> operator license. We also agree with NCVEC that the difference in
> authorized frequency privileges between the Advanced Class operator
> license and the Amateur Extra Class operator license is minimal and
> does not alone warrant maintaining two separate license classes in the
> future.'
>
> The Commission declined, at that time, to 'undertake a comprehensive
> restructuring of the amateur service operating privileges and
> frequencies' until the amateur community reached consensus.
>
> The Commission also left orphaned the Novice class amateur radio
> license.
>
> Petitioners suggest there is overwhelming consensus in the amateur
> community that these two orphaned classes should be integrated back
> into the mainstream of the amateur community.
>
> 2.2 Frequency and Mode Privilege reallocation
>
> On December 30, 1999 the Commission released its Report and Order
> revising the Amateur Radio Service license structure and International
> Morse code testing requirements. The Commission declined, at that
> time, to 'undertake a comprehensive restructuring of the amateur
> service operating privileges and frequencies' until the amateur
> community reached consensus.
>
> As stated in 2.1 Petitioners suggest there is overwhelming consensus
> in the amateur community to merge the two orphaned classes. This
> action will streamline the Commission's record keeping needs and
> simplify the maintenance of frequency and mode privilege allocations.
>
> Upon merging the Novice and Technician as well as the Advanced and
> Amateur Extra license classes, considering the ITU action and the
> growing consensus among the Amateur community, given the no-code VHF
> only Technician experiment has attracted far fewer dedicated, long
> term operators than desired, and noting that a significant number of
> new entrants into the Amateur Radio Service have a strong interest in
> new technologies and digital modes, it seems only reasonable to modify
> the frequency and mode allocations for the new, consolidated,
> Technician class.
>
> Petitioners have examined the history of U.S. frequency allocation. It
> appears that the Commission has always tried to protect the new,
> inexperienced, operators from their own lack of experience by putting
> their privileges away from the band edges and by limiting them in
> power output. Examples of this are the Novice allocations on 80, 40,
> and 15 meters and the Novice and Technician Plus allocations on the

> 10-meter Band. Since the HF spectrum is the area in which
> international communications are prevalent, these allocations
> minimized the possibility of interference to other services. The
> amateur community generally agrees this procedure is in the best
> interest of the Amateur Radio Service.
>
> 2.3 Examination Requirements
>
> On December 30, 1999 the Commission released its Report and Order
> revising the Amateur Radio Service license structure and International
> Morse code testing requirements. At that time, the Commission reduced
> the telegraphy examinations from three elements to one, and set the
> number of written examination questions required at 35 for Technician,
> 35 for General, and 50 for Extra, and left to the National Council of
> Volunteer Examiner Coordinators (NCVEC) the task of the specific mix
> and makeup of written examination tests.
>
> The Commission did, however, encourage the Amateur Service to strive
> to 'attract technically inclined persons, particularly the youth of
> our country, and encourage them to learn and to prepare themselves in
> the areas where the United States needs expertise.'
>
> Further, the Commission specifically addressed its desire to 'provide
> an incentive for licensees to continue the educational opportunities
> offered by amateur radio as The American Radio Relay League, Inc.
> (ARRL) requests, will continue to provide an incentive for amateur
> radio operators to advance their communication and technical skills,'
> and to encourage individuals in the Amateur Service to become 'trained
> operators, technicians, and electronic experts.' The Commission also
> said, 'In reaching this decision, we note that one of the fundamental
> purposes underlying our Part 97 rules is to accommodate the amateur
> radio operator's proven ability to contribute to the advancement of
> the radio art.?'
>
> The ITU has, in its 2003 Conference, left to individual
> administrations whether candidates for the Amateur Radio Service
> should demonstrate proficiency in International Morse code.
>
> The ITU also adopted the following new language in Provision 25.6:
> 'Administrations shall verify the operational and technical
> qualifications of any person wishing to operate an amateur station.
> Guidance for standards of competence may be found in the most recent
> version of Recommendation ITU-R M.1544.'
>
> There has been great debate in the amateur community over the
> retention of code testing. Petitioners observe that, in most of these
> discussions, the issue of technical competence arises as a major
> point. There appear to be three groups in these discussions, one which
> advocates complete elimination of code testing. A majority of this
> group either advocates increasing the difficulty of written elements

> or concedes that it is necessary. A second group advocates nothing
> short of retaining code testing as a 'make or break' element. Most
> members of this group agree the current written test elements are
> seriously deficient. The third falls in the middle ground on the code
> issue. Amateurs in this group also agree that the written testing
> elements should be enhanced to adequately assess a candidate's
> knowledge and ability.
>
> Based on these observations, Petitioners see a need for continued
> International Morse code testing, but do not believe code testing
> should be the main determining factor. Similarly, Petitioners see a
> need for more comprehensive written examinations.
>
> Petitioners have attempted to objectively analyze activity levels for
> the various modes in three categories, International Morse code (CW),
> Phone (primarily SSB), and Digital (all types) on the high frequency
> bands. The complete study, prepared by Mr. Walter B. Fair, W5ALT, is
> included with his permission as Attachment A. The following paragraph
> in the conclusion section of this report should be noted:
>
> "Based on the analyses presented below, it appears that the CW issue
> in ham radio is often based on emotion rather than fact. The data do
> not indicate an overall decrease in CW activity. The argument being
> used by CW opponents that CW is dying seems to have no merit. On the
> other hand, the argument that relaxing the CW test requirement to 5
> WPM would lead to the destruction of the Amateur Radio Service does
> not seem to have merit, either. The data show that when the code
> testing was relaxed in 2000, CW activity remained stable in the
> following years. Therefore, if more newer hams started using SSB, the
> same percentage also started using CW. I interpret that to mean that
> most hams will use the mode that meets their objectives, whether it is
> CW or not. Of course, there will always be vocal minorities in both
> the pro and con CW camps."
>
> Petitioners suggest as a single mode of operation International Morse
> code is alive, well, and apparently used by a large portion of the
> Amateur Community. Especially in light of the major role the CW mode
> plays in international communications, Petitioners suggest that
> eliminating International Morse code testing altogether would be a
> tremendous disservice to the U.S. amateur community.
>
> Following the elimination of Amateur Radio Service testing at
> Commission Field Offices, the concept of Certificate of Successful
> Completion of Examination (CSCE) was introduced. The system of CSCEs
> is now pervasive, and presents a significant paperwork and
> record-keeping burden on Volunteer Examiner Coordinators, Volunteer
> Examiners, licensees, and candidates for license.
>
> 3. Scope of Proposals
>

> 3.1 Consolidation of license classes
>
> 3.1.1 As per paragraph 2.1, Petitioners suggest it is time to
> consolidate the Novice and Technician and Technician Plus licenses
> into one Technician license. This would allow the Commission to
> simplify record keeping and bring the orphaned Novice licensees back
> into the Commission's license progression scheme. The upgrade
> procedure would be automatic immediately and the new license issued at
> the normal renewal time.
>
> 3.1.2 As per paragraph 2.1, Petitioners further suggest it is time to
> consolidate the Advanced and Amateur Extra licenses. This would also
> simplify the Commissions record keeping and upgrade these operators
> who have all passed examination elements with requirements higher
> than, or equal to those required today. The upgrade procedure would be
> automatic immediately and the new license issued at the normal renewal
> time.
>
> 3.2 Frequency, Power, and Mode Privilege reallocation;
>
> 3.2.1 Petitioners recommend that the newly revised Technician license
> should have privileges as outlined in paragraph 4.2 below. This allows
> in general:
>
> . 1. 80 meters: CW and data privileges on 3600 though 3750 kHz. This
> is an increase of 100 kHz of bandwidth and the addition of data modes
> to the present Novice allocation.
> 2. 40 meters: CW and data privileges on 7100 through 7150 kHz. This
> adds data modes to the existing Novice allocations.
>
> 3. 15 meters: CW and data privileges on 21100 through 21200 kHz. This
> adds data modes to the existing Novice frequency allocations.
>
> 4. 10 meters: CW and data privileges on 28100 through 28300 kHz. This
> represents no change to the existing Novice and Technician Plus
> allocations.
>
> 5. 10 meters: CW and Voice privileges on 28300 through 28600 kHz. This
> is an increase of 100 kHz of bandwidth to the existing Novice and
> Technician Plus allocations.
>
> 6. Above 30 Mhz: All frequencies, modes, and power levels as contained
> in the current regulations.
>
>
> 3.2.2 Petitioners recommend that power limitations be placed on the
> newly consolidated Technician Class in the same fashion as has been
> historically imposed on the lowest beginner class of operator license
> in the allocated HF frequencies. This limitation protects other users
> of the HF spectrum from inadvertent errors commonly made by the

> inexperienced operator. Petitioners recommend a 200 Watt limit for the
> Technician class license on all frequencies below 30 Mhz as indicated
> in paragraph 4.2.3.
>
> 3.2.3 Petitioners recommend, upon merging the Advanced and Amateur
> Extra license classes, that the newly revised Amateur Extra class be
> assigned all those privileges allowed the present Amateur Extra class
> license.
>
> 3.3 Examination Requirements
>
> 3.3.1 As per paragraph 2.3, Petitioners suggest it is time to review
> and make certain changes to the Element 1 (International Morse code)
> testing requirement. In light of the ITU's actions it is indeed time
> to regard the International Morse code as another mode of operation
> equal to but of no greater importance than any other mode. As
> demonstrating competence in other modes is not necessary to gain
> access the HF frequencies, it occurs to the Petitioners that it is
> time to remove this as an absolute requirement. Petitioners suggest,
> however, that International Morse code testing should be continued as
> part of the overall license examination for good reason, as discussed
> in Section 2.3.3.
>
> 3.3.2 It is believed by the Petitioners that the International Morse
> code remains a viable, valuable, and popular mode. See the discussion
> in 2.3 above. When all else fails in emergency circumstances,
> International Morse code remains as the only useable option. CW is
> also an "International Language", by which, peoples of the world who
> have differing spoken languages can communicate efficiently.
> Petitioners note that written examinations for all classes include
> questions designed to ascertain a candidate's knowledge of various
> modes. This petition proposes that, while written examination
> questions are sufficient to evaluate a license candidate's familiarity
> with the basic concepts of other modes, such testing is not sufficient
> for International Morse code.
>
> Petitioners recommend that testing of International Morse code be
> continued but that such testing should be integrated into the overall
> test score in a more equitable fashion. It is recommended that the
> Element 1 test should be scored such that the longest string of
> continuous characters should be counted (with numbers and punctuation
> being weighted as two characters) and such count, up to a maximum of
> 24, should be then divided by two and the result added to the score of
> the written examination. This test would be available to all
> candidates for every class of license.
>
> 3.3.3 As per paragraph 2.3 it is further believed by Petitioners that
> is time to increase the number of written test items required to
> successfully indicate competence at all license levels.
>

> Petitioners have analyzed current and previous question pools
> developed by the NCVEC and found that the current examinations do not
> assess candidates' required knowledge of technical matters and the
> Commission Rules and Regulations as thoroughly as in the past. This
> due, in large measure, to the limitation of actual test question
> numbers for Technician and General at 35, and for Amateur Extra at 50.
> To its credit, the NCVEC has responded to this limitation by greatly
> expanding the number of questions in each question pool.
>
> Petitioners suggest the actual test questions, however, have been
> significantly more slanted toward procedures, and less toward
> technical competence and regulations. This is due to the limitation on
> the number of actual examination questions.
>
> Petitioners present the following examples:
>
> . 1. Individuals who achieved the 1997 Technician license had passed
> two written examination elements totaling 65 questions, of which
> fifteen (23%) were in the area of Commission Rules. Technicians today
> encounter a total of just 35 written examination questions, only five
> (14%) of which are in the Commission Rules category. All five may be
> answered incorrectly, plus four more in other areas, and the candidate
> will still achieve a passing score.
> 2. Of the 65 total questions in the Novice and Technician examinations
> in 1997, there were four questions dealing with propagation. In the
> current 35 question Technician examination, there are only two.
>
> 3. The Novice and Technician examinations in 1997, combined, had ten
> questions (15%) dealing with electronic theory and components. The
> current Technician examination has just three (8%).
>
> 4. A person achieving a General class license in 1998 encountered a
> total of 95 test questions. Of those, nineteen were in the Commission
> Rules category. A person-achieving General today faces 70 questions,
> eleven of which fall in that category.
>
> 5. The cumulative examinations necessary for a General class license
> in 1998 contained seven questions dealing with propagation. The
> cumulative examinations necessary for General today contain only five
> propagation questions.
>
> 6. The 95 questions leading to a General class license in 1998
> included thirteen (13%) on electronic theory and components. The 70
> questions leading to General today include only six (8%).
>
>
> Petitioners' comparative research of prior question pools was
> incomplete because neither the NCVEC nor, apparently, any of its
> entities maintain them as archive material. Fortunately, some of the
> question pools of interest were recovered from non-official sources.

> Future studies undertaken as part of rule making proceedings would
> benefit from their prolonged availability.
>
> The increasing complexity of the radio art, combined with the
> elimination of Novice and Advanced licenses, have outstripped the
> ability of a 35 question examination for Technician and General, and a
> 50 question examination for Amateur Extra to sufficiently evaluate a
> candidate's operational and technical qualifications. Petitioners
> suggest that increasing both the number of questions required for each
> class and the minimum passing scores, as well as assuring a technical
> and regulatory focus are reasonable solutions. The testing
> requirements as outlined below would restore the number of examination
> questions and the number of required correct answers to an
> approximation of the pre-April 15, 2000 requirements for Technician,
> General, and Amateur Extra licenses.
>
> Petitioners have observed a widespread recognition in the amateur
> community that the current examination structure allows individuals
> who learn published question and answer material quickly to rapidly
> advance in license class without gaining real understanding of the
> underlying material. Therefore, this proposal incorporates a
> requirement for minimum experience in each class of license prior to
> advancing to the next. Petitioners suggest this will provide practical
> experience, encourage experimentation and help develop well trained
> operators, technicians, and electronic experts.
>
> 3.3.4 Petitioners suggest it is incumbent on the Commission to mandate
> the specific mix of topics, number of questions, and minimum passing
> requirement for all Amateur Radio Service written examinations. It is
> not, however, necessary at this time for the Commission to develop the
> actual question pools. This task could very well remain in the hands
> of the NCVEC.
>
> Petitioners recommend a written test length of forty-four questions
> for the Technician license (each question scored as two points) and
> eighty-eight questions for the General and Amateur Extra license (each
> question having a value of one point), with questions to be divided
> into six categories as indicated in paragraph 4.3.
>
> The final score for the license examination would be the sum of the
> Element 1 exam and the score on the written portion giving a total
> possible of 100 points. A total cumulative score of 75 points would be
> the minimum passing grade. This method of integrating the Element 1
> test and the written examination allows two paths for progression
> within the Amateur Radio Service; first, for the technically talented
> individual to obtain an amateur license in the upper levels of the
> service without the absolute necessity of learning the International
> Morse code and second, the more traditionally skilled communicator to
> receive credit for his extended capabilities, thus bringing into
> balance the mandates of 47CFR97.1.

>
> 3.3.5 Given the composite nature of the examinations suggested by
> Petitioners, there would no longer be a need to issue CSCEs, and to
> continue their issuance would in fact be impractical.
>
> 3.3.6 Petitioners recognize there have been thousands of CSCE
> documents issued by VEs and that the holders of these documents should
> be credited for the hard work the CSCE represents. Petitioners
> recommend that the holder of an Element 1 CSCE issued prior to the
> date of the Commission's Order in this matter be credited with 12
> points in lieu of the Element 1 examination. Petitioners further
> recommend the holder of an element 3 or 4 CSCE issued prior to the
> date of the Commission's Order in this matter be credited with 65
> points in lieu of the respective examination.
>
> 3.3.7 Petitioners have analyzed the existing testing procedure and
> believe this proposal offers the most balanced and seamless
> integration approach possible. Considering the following scenarios, it
> will be seen that it offers more options for individuals to enter the
> Amateur Radio Service while assuring the individual has the knowledge
> necessary to properly control a radio station with minimum opportunity
> for causing interference to other services.
>
> Candidates scoring the maximum 12 points in the Element 1 portion of
> the composite examination will need 63 additional points to obtain a
> license. For the Technician license this would require 32 out of the
> possible 44 questions. This would be 72.7% correct necessary to pass.
> For the General or Amateur Extra, it would require 63 out of the
> possible 88 questions, or 71.5% correct to pass. Both figures indicate
> that the candidate has at least minimum knowledge to properly control
> an amateur station and should be eligible for a license.
>
> Candidates scoring a zero in the Element 1 portion of the composite
> examination will need 75 additional points to obtain a license. For
> the Technician license this would require 38 out of the possible 44
> questions, or 86.3% correct to pass. For the General or Amateur Extra,
> the minimum correct would be 75 out of the possible 88 questions, or
> 85.2% correct to pass. Both figures indicate that the candidate has a
> superior knowledge to properly control an amateur station and, though
> he does not demonstrate any skill with International Morse code,
> should be eligible for a license.
>
> In the case of a CSCE Element 3 holder, the candidate has two options;
> he may take the Element 1 portion of the composite examination and add
> the score of this exam to his allowed 65 points for a total score.
> Should this candidate fail to obtain the minimum necessary 10 points,
> he may elect to take the new Element 3 portion of the composite
> examination and use the sum of the scores on the Element 1 and the
> Element 3 portions to qualify for a license.

3498. Re: slide rules (was: Could This Be The Solution?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 16:12:34 UTC
From: "paulfriedman@comcast.net" <p.paulfriedman@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <N918b.415225$YN5.279999@sccrnsc01>
Source record: 76900

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F609902.7040103@psu.edu...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > I really hate to bust yer bubble again Alun but Smith Charts and all
> > the rest of the artifact nomograph "solvers" were already stale about
> > the time you popped out of school. Didja also have a course in slide
> > rule operations too? I'll bet you did, dinya?
>
> Now ya did it Brian! I will always have a soft spot for slide rules. Of
> course they are obsolete, but when I got my first slide rule, it took
> math out of the abstract and put it in the real world for me.
>
> I was in the last class at our school that was trained in their use. I
> kind of miss the engineer's sixshooter on my belt! ;^)
>
>
> Where d'ya put the batteries in those things anyhow?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Well said! I still have my log tables book (that's logarithms for the young folks). Remarkably useless now-a-days.

I worked in the insurance industry and used to enjoy driving young, visiting actuaries crazy. They would ask a question on the data presented and rather than bang something out on my computer or programmable calculator (both of which I used at all times EXCEPT when a newbie actuary was present), I'd whip out my slapstick. As my eyesight become worse, so did the resulting answers. <grin>

Paul AB0SI

3499. Re: ARRL Policy Shift?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 16:22:30 UTC
From: Hans Kohb <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <d0eaa9f0e9fedb2091c93bdd02660110.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 76901

"Roger" <Roger@lavenderladsfruits.net> wrote

> Information from source inside ARRL indicates their
> membership numbers are falling rapidly. In an effort to
> bolster their failing membership numbers, ARRL will begin
> targeting the huge numbers of CB hobby type operators, who
> are generally referred to as "freebanders." ARRL will also
> extend a friendly hand to Unlicensed Low Power FM hobbyists.
> Look for future articles and adverstising aimed at these two
> untapped large audiences of potential ARRL members.
>
> Roger

The Armenian judges gave this a 9.8 on the Olympic Troll-O-Meter, but
they were over-ruled by the umpires in instant replay, who award it a
1.4.

The Armenian judges lodged a formal protest!

It was sufficiently trollish, of course, but way too obvious.
It was poorly written, poorly executed, and was so incredibly
lame as to lack the true drawing power of a really masterful
troll.

Maybe as high as a 1.6 for the intense stupidity of the
premise, but a 9.8? Never!

The Armenian judges tear their hair out, throw their balalaikas
down in dismay, and perform the traditional Armenian Dismay Chant!

They demand a recount!

73, de Hans, K0HB
--

Reality does not care what you believe. -K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3500. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 16:23:11 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309110823.40369a16@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76902

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309091548.744bad7a@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030909061940.12631.00000969@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > In article <f45722ac.0309072055.4f9d0339@posting.google.com>,
> > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > >news:<bjgncb$t1n$1@208.206.142.76>...
> > >> N2EY wrote:
> > >> >
> > >> > It's self-evident that a radio amateur who has no Morse code skills is
> not a
> > >> > fully qualified radio amateur, particularly for HF/MF amateur operation.
> That's
> > >> > a plain and simple fact.
> > >>
> > >> What is it about plain and simple facts that so confuses NCI members?
> > >
> > >Duh!!!
> >
> > We know you are confused, Brian.
>
> "Duh!!!" doens't indicate a lack of confusion

My point exactly.

We know you are confused, Brian.
>
> > >Why does it have to be "particularly for HF/MF operations?"
> >
> > Because that's where Morse operation by amateurs is most common.
>
> If a lack of Morse code skills renders one less than a fully qualified
> amateur radio operator,

It does. Get over it.

So does lack of a lot of other skills.

> I would think "praticularly for VHF+
> operation" would have been more appropriate for the very reason you
> gave.

That makes no sense at all.

We know you are confused, Brian.
>
> Duh!!! again.

Exactly. You keep proving my point for me. Thanks.

3501. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 16:28:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309110828.357e8f31@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76903

dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) wrote in message
news:<bjifgs$1ucu$1@heap.juniper.net>...
> K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote:
> >Between February 14, 1991 and July 5, 1991, the Commission granted 1,925
> >new Technician class licenses under the no-code provisions. A couple of
> >guys have done research which shows that 1,880 of those licenses have
> >not been renewed or upgraded to a higher class license and are beyond
> >the two year grace period. That equates to a retention rate of only
> >2.3%.
>
> Somehow the numbers don't seem right, or at least I don't understand
> them. For the months of February through June, 2001, when most of these
> licenses should have been expiring, the AH0A web site gives these numbers:
>
> Renewals: 7380
> Expiries: 2623
> Grace Period Renewals: 810
> Cancelations: 645
>
> While the 1,880 number might be right, the 1,925 number almost certainly
> isn't. The above suggests that about 10,000 Technician licenses came up
> for renewal in the 5 month period, or about 2,000 per month. The AH0A
> data shows the service has averaged about 1,500 new Tech licenses per
> month over the past few years, with the monthly new license total seldom
> dropping below 1,000. As the code-free Technician license was reputed
> to have more popular in its first few years of existance than later on,
> it seems extremely unlikely that there were only 400 new Tech licenses
> issued per month between February and July of 1991, especially when
> 2,000 per month ended up expiring 10 years later.
>
> My guess would be that between 80% and 85% of those licensed as no-code
> Techs in that period are still engaged enough to have renewed their license.
> This isn't entirely out of line with other license classes. If you picked
> a random group of Extra class amateurs (who, I assume, would tend to be older)
> only 75% to 80% of them would be around 10 years later.

All very reasonable, Dennis. The petitioners do not explain how they
derived their data.

Depending on how they traced each licensee, there are many sources of
error. For example, how did they deal with changes in callsign,
address and license class? How did they deal with name changes (many
women change their names when their marital status changes)? How did
they deal with the Tech/Tech plus confusion of the 1991-94 period?
Etc.

This petition needs to be challenged.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3502. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 17:30:32 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309110930.fc9fdf1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76904

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030911081910.12631.00001025@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <eIO7b.1587$zx2.1002@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >But, I'll bet, if you think about it.....it made you a better operator. It
> >was a SKILL you HAD TO LEARN in order to StAY ON THE AIR? Think about it.
>
> 'zactly. No other option. The Novice was not supposed to be a permanent
> license. That's why it had so few privileges and was so focused,
>
> And the old Novice had another feature - it was a one-time one year license
> until 1967, when it became two years.

Had to. You waited 6 months for your license and you couldn't operate
til it arrived.

3503. Re: slide rules (was: Could This Be The Solution?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 17:39:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F60B353.3080908@psu.edu>
Source record: 76905

paulfriedman@comcast.net wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F609902.7040103@psu.edu...
>
>>Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>>
>>>I really hate to bust yer bubble again Alun but Smith Charts and all
>>>the rest of the artifact nomograph "solvers" were already stale about
>>>the time you popped out of school. Didja also have a course in slide
>>>rule operations too? I'll bet you did, dinya?
>>
>>Now ya did it Brian! I will always have a soft spot for slide rules. Of
>>course they are obsolete, but when I got my first slide rule, it took
>>math out of the abstract and put it in the real world for me.
>>
>>I was in the last class at our school that was trained in their use. I
>>kind of miss the engineer's sixshooter on my belt! ;^)
>>
>>
>>Where d'ya put the batteries in those things anyhow?
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Well said! I still have my log tables book (that's logarithms for the young
> folks). Remarkably useless now-a-days.
>
> I worked in the insurance industry and used to enjoy driving young, visiting
> actuaries crazy. They would ask a question on the data presented and rather
> than bang something out on my computer or programmable calculator (both of
> which I used at all times EXCEPT when a newbie actuary was present), I'd
> whip out my slapstick. As my eyesight become worse, so did the resulting
> answers. <grin>

HAH! I never thought about that!

But ythey could be remarkably fast, even if you did lose the numbers
far to the right of th decimal point.

3504. Go Numorse!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 18:49:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F60C3C6.7040801@psu.edu>
Source record: 76906

I don't do much in the way of Morse CW on the air. Much of the reason for this has been due to some difficulties I have, but enough about that.

As a personal challenge, I've decided to see if I can bring my Morse speed up quite a bit. I started with the ARRL code CD's that I bought a few years back when I wanted to first learn Morse CW.

Would you believe that after two years I still have those CD's memorized? I couldn't believe it - I remembered exactly the letters and words they were using. So in the end, I don't know if I'd recommend the CD's, except to those that have a real quick pickup of Morse, and how do you know that until you try?

So I tried NuMorse. Great program! I've been working with it for a few weeks now, and have gotten my speed up to around ten WPM, 13 on a good day. Soon I'll be ready to *really* do Morse CW. I intend to get up to 20 wpm before I get on the air. just because I expect to slow down under real over the air conditions.

NuMorse sends out pseudo random groups that can't be memorized. It will also make up QSO's or load texfile QSO's that you can load into it. Anyone know of a good source for these?

My only criticism of the program is that the prosigns are a little awkward, requiring use of the shift key which can slow you down a bit.

Still I would rate the program as 9.5 out of 10.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3505. Re: Horseshit7 sez bullshit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 19:47:59 UTC
From: horseshoe7@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <5f4fe4c2.0309111147.30327e8d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76907

k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB) wrote in message
news:<e79dbd9b.0309101748.5c864fb8@posting.google.com>...
> horseshit7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote
>
> > Sound like COMPLETE BULLSHIT to me.
>
> http://www.earth2.net/fcc/petition/
>
> Argue with them, not with me.

They aren't posting this BS on the Internet (as far as I'm aware).

Anyway, even if this 2.3% retention rate number were somehow
right(which it obviously isn't), they would still be basically
meaningless without comparing similarly derived "retention rates" for
the other 4 or 5 classes of operators.

The research and any conclusions derived from these "isolated No-Code
Technician numbers", are obviously "Junk Science".

- Stewart

3506. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 20:18:52 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <MM48b.873$%G3.544@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76908

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030911081910.12631.00001025@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <eIO7b.1587$zx2.1002@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >But, I'll bet, if you think about it.....it made you a better operator.
It
> >was a SKILL you HAD TO LEARN in order to StAY ON THE AIR? Think about
it.
>
> 'zactly. No other option. The Novice was not supposed to be a permanent
> license. That's why it had so few privileges and was so focused,
>
> And the old Novice had another feature - it was a one-time one year
license
> until 1967, when it became two years. Which meant that you either upgraded
> before the license ran out or you were off the air. The Novice year/2
years was
> a big learning time. Lotta incentive!
>
> In fact, one of the reasons FCC gave us incentive licensing was that they
> perceived a drop off in learning after the Novice year.
>
> Most sensible newbies in those times had at least a receiver and antenna
set up
> and working before they went for the Novice exam. They'd spent serious
time
> listening to hams on the air before ever taking a test. They knew which
bands
> were best at various times of day and year simply from observation. They
> developed a lot of operating skills and knowledge of operating practices
before
> ever getting a transmitter.
>
> When the Novice became 5 year renewable, that incentive went away.
>
> We're not going to get the mfrs. to stop making IC-706s and start making
S-40s,
> so what's the solution?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

That was the beginning of the 'dumbing down' process. We can thank Dick Bash for his books on really tearing a hole in the fabric of the service.

Then when Heathkit folded its tent and went away was the final blow to the golden age of ham radio.

From that point on it has been downhill, more and more bitching and moaning about the code requirement. Making the test easier....more numbers. etc. etc.

What is the answer Jim? Danged if I know. But what I do know is I am going to return to my roots in ham radio. While I can still do so physically, where gentlemen and ladies still exist and where I feel welcome. That place is safe from the infringement of morons and clowns.

And you know where that is.

Dan/W4NTI

3507. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 20:22:12 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <UP48b.875$%G3.607@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76909

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309110930.fc9fdf1@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030911081910.12631.00001025@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > In article <eIO7b.1587$zx2.1002@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> > <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >But, I'll bet, if you think about it.....it made you a better operator.
It
> > >was a SKILL you HAD TO LEARN in order to StAY ON THE AIR? Think
about it.
> >
> > 'zactly. No other option. The Novice was not supposed to be a permanent
> > license. That's why it had so few privileges and was so focused,
> >
> > And the old Novice had another feature - it was a one-time one year
license
> > until 1967, when it became two years.
>
> Had to. You waited 6 months for your license and you couldn't operate
> til it arrived.

You are so full of mis-information Brian, have you considered a lobotomy to
remove the tumor?

The wait from taking the test until it came in the mail was 6 to 8 weeks.
That was the 'official' time the FCC gave you when that question was asked.

It sometimes made it in 4. It took mine 6 1/2 weeks.

Dan/W4NTI

3508. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 20:24:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <%R48b.877$%G3.809@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76910

```
"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0309110647.d058537@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<eIO7b.1587$zx2.1002@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> > news:d22b54c3.0309101412.6c56ee92@posting.google.com...
> >
> > > >
> > >
> > > Believe it. The top gun rcvrs in those days with even half decent
> > > selectivity were built by Collins and cost 7-8 weeks worth of an
> > > average engineer's entire paychecks. Today much better rcvrs are
> > > available for 10-12 *days* worth of his/her paychecks. Radio kids had
> > > it really miserable, it took me a whole summer to earn enough money to
> > > buy a monumental crapper S-40B rcvr from Sears. Seven QSOs at a time?
> > > No problem! Had the same selectivity characteristics as one of today's
> > > $10-20 throwaway pocket AM/FM broadcast rcvrs. Maybe worse. Ya could
> > > hear a dozen or so stations when the band was really cooking, half
> > > were real signals and the other half were images & intermod products.
> > > Then came the drift . . "Golden Days" my ass . . !
> > >
> > >
> >
> > > w3rv
> >
> > But, I'll bet, if you think about it.....it made you a better operator.
It
> > was a SKILL you HAD TO LEARN in order to StAY ON THE AIR? Think about
it.
>
> There's an element of truth in that I guess but there are much younger
> ops out there today who are real hotshots and who didn't go thru the
> masochistic nonsense us OFs had to put up with.
>
> The biggest benefit I got out of participating in that scene was to
> pointedly drive home my need to acquire an education which I could
> leverage into a higher than average income. So that I could eventually
> afford Collins gear. Which is exactly what I did. Incentives in ham
> radio did *not* start with Incentive Licensing in 1968 . . .
>
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
```

Thats right, my incentive was in 1961 when my mother paid for my ticket to Pittsburg PA and went along to take my General test.

"We ain't doing this again Danny, you better pass it the first time". I did. At age 14.

Dan/W4NTI

> w3rv

3509. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 20:55:49 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309111255.644e65c6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76911

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309110930.fc9fdf1@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030911081910.12631.00001025@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > In article <eIO7b.1587$zx2.1002@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >But, I'll bet, if you think about it.....it made you a better operator. It
> > >was a SKILL you HAD TO LEARN in order to StAY ON THE AIR? Think about it.
> >
> > 'zactly. No other option. The Novice was not supposed to be a permanent
> > license. That's why it had so few privileges and was so focused,
> >
> > And the old Novice had another feature - it was a one-time one year license
> > until 1967, when it became two years.
>
> Had to.

Had to what?

> You waited 6 months for your license and you couldn't operate
> til it arrived.

Six weeks, not six months.

In the time between passing the test and getting the license, I built
my first transmitter and power supply from junk parts and bought a
crystal for it. Hooked up the TR switch and got everything ready.
Already had the receiver and antenna. When the license arrived I was
ready to go.

3510. Re: Go Numorse!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 21:31:53 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0309111331.7654d706@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76912

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F60C3C6.7040801@psu.edu>...
> I don't do much in the way of Morse CW on the air. Much of the reason
> for this has been due to some difficulties I have, but enough about that.
>
> As a personal challenge, I've decided to see if I can bring my Morse
> speed up quite a bit. I started with the ARRL code CD's that I bought a
> few years back when I wanted to first learn Morse CW.
>
> Would you believe that after two years I still have those CD's
> memorized? I couldn't believe it - I remembered exactly the letters and
> words they were using. So in the end, I don't know if I'd recommend the
> CD's, except to those that have a real quick pickup of Morse, and how do
> you know that until you try?
>
> So I tried NuMorse. Great program! I've been working with it for a few
> weeks now, and have gotten my speed up to around ten WPM, 13 on a good
> day. Soon I'll be ready to *really* do Morse CW. I intend to get up to
> 20 wpm before I get on the air. just because I expect to slow down under
> real over the air conditions.
>
> NuMorse sends out pseudo random groups that can't be memorized. It will
> also make up QSO's or load texfile QSO's that you can load into it.
> Anyone know of a good source for these?
>
> My only criticism of the program is that the prosigns are a little
> awkward, requiring use of the shift key which can slow you down a bit.
>
> Still I would rate the program as 9.5 out of 10.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Kewl beans, Mike. I too used the ARRL CD's and while they initially
served their purpose, one does tend to memorize the groups. Anytime
you want to subject your ears to some ear-punishing <hihi> slo-code,
drop me an e-mail and we'll set up a sked. Jim, N2EY, and I recently
had a nice CW QSO on 40 and "three land" comes in pretty well here.
Thanks for the recommendation and take care. :-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

3511. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 21:57:29 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309111357.4ccc9f8d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76913

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309110930.fc9fdf1@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030911081910.12631.00001025@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > In article <eIO7b.1587$zx2.1002@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >But, I'll bet, if you think about it.....it made you a better operator. It
> > >was a SKILL you HAD TO LEARN in order to StAY ON THE AIR? Think about it.
> >
> > 'zactly. No other option. The Novice was not supposed to be a permanent
> > license. That's why it had so few privileges and was so focused,
> >
> > And the old Novice had another feature - it was a one-time one year license
> > until 1967, when it became two years.
>
> Had to. You waited 6 months for your license and you couldn't operate
> til it arrived.

Six weeks.

3512. Re: BPL: 1st Experimental License Issued

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 22:37:17 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030911183717.07383.00001051@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 76914

>WD2XEQ AMBIENT CORPORATION 0118-EX-PL-2003
>
>New experimental to operate in 1.7-88 MHz for testing power line carrier
>systems. Fixed: States of NY and MA

Its about time.

3513. BPL: 1st Experimental License Issued

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 23:30:02 UTC
From: Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <_z78b.8931$Yt.7886@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76928

WD2XEQ AMBIENT CORPORATION 0118-EX-PL-2003

New experimental to operate in 1.7-88 MHz for testing power line carrier
systems. Fixed: States of NY and MA

http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-238762A1.pdf

--
Best Regards, Keith AOL IM:kilowattradio
NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
Give SCO $699 for using Linux or the Penguin gets it.
Torvalds: _They are smoking crack._

3514. Re: Did you hear about the No-Coder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-11 23:39:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309111539.18876afc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76929

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030908115721.26542.00000644@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> Who wanted better Groundwave propagation, he buried his Ant so it would be
> closer to the ground.

Nope, never hear that one.

But I did hear about the No-Code Tech that married her CBer brother.
How is your sister?

3515. Re: slide rules (was: Could This Be The Solution?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 00:23:18 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309111623.47ff3047@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76930
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

"paulfriedman@comcast.net" wrote in message news:...
> "Mike Coslo" wrote in message
> news:3F609902.7040103@psu.edu...
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > > I really hate to bust yer bubble again Alun but Smith Charts and all
> > > the rest of the artifact nomograph "solvers" were already stale about
> > > the time you popped out of school. Didja also have a course in slide
> > > rule operations too? I'll bet you did, dinya?
> >
> > Now ya did it Brian! I will always have a soft spot for slide rules. Of
> > course they are obsolete,

We never had courses on either slide rule or log tables "operations".
We had to pick 'em up on the fly on our own. Some of the guys learned
to use 'em in high school. During the first couple weeks of class
there were a lotta guys huddled in groups in the cafeteria trying to
figure the things out. I never did learn to use more than maybe 8-10
of the 21 scales on my bamboo Post. That was a NICE slipstick and I
still have it.

> but when I got my first slide rule, it took
> > math out of the abstract and put it in the real world for me.

I never considered that but in looking back you're right.

> > I was in the last class at our school that was trained in their use. I
> > kind of miss the engineer's sixshooter on my belt! ;^)

The engineering students' full dress uniform (the physics majors
weren't far behind) also included a pocket protector full of whatever
ya could jam into it, a worn-out rumpled corduroy jacket and a
beat-to-crap briecase . . The uniform definitely differentiated the
engineers from the business administration weenies.

> > Where d'ya put the batteries in those things anyhow?

> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
> Well said! I still have my log tables book (that's logarithms for the young
> folks). Remarkably useless now-a-days.

Whatta pain THEY were!!

> I worked in the insurance industry and used to enjoy driving young, visiting
> actuaries crazy. They would ask a question on the data presented and rather
> than bang something out on my computer or programmable calculator (both of
> which I used at all times EXCEPT when a newbie actuary was present)

I've pulled that one. I'm waiting for the opportunities to spring it
on a nephew and a grandson.

> I'd
> whip out my slapstick. As my eyesight become worse, so did the resulting
> answers.
>
> Paul AB0SI

w3rv

3516. Re: What is a Ham Radio Operator?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 00:31:10 UTC
From: JRM <VOID@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjr4ag$lsiem$1@ID-71985.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 76931

On Thursday 11 September 2003 06:00 pm, Keith wrote:

> http://www.zwire.com/site/news.cfm?newsid=10107919&BRD=2256&PAG=461&dept_id=455823&rfi=6
> http://tinyurl.com/n2b8
>
> Unless you know a "ham addict" or amateur radios have affected you
> personally in some way, chances are you know very little about their
> operations or their operators.
>

Thats a sad first comment

--
John R. Marshall

The Hotrodding Network is Back!
http://www.hotrodding.net

3517. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 00:36:19 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309111636.5e022daa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76932

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030911081910.12631.00001025@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <eIO7b.1587$zx2.1002@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >But, I'll bet, if you think about it.....it made you a better operator. It
> >was a SKILL you HAD TO LEARN in order to StAY ON THE AIR? Think about it.
>
> 'zactly. No other option. The Novice was not supposed to be a permanent
> license. That's why it had so few privileges and was so focused,
>
> And the old Novice had another feature - it was a one-time one year license
> until 1967, when it became two years. Which meant that you either upgraded
> before the license ran out or you were off the air. The Novice year/2 years was
> a big learning time. Lotta incentive!
>
> In fact, one of the reasons FCC gave us incentive licensing was that they
> perceived a drop off in learning after the Novice year.
>
> Most sensible newbies in those times had at least a receiver and antenna set up
> and working before they went for the Novice exam. They'd spent serious time
> listening to hams on the air before ever taking a test. They knew which bands
> were best at various times of day and year simply from observation. They
> developed a lot of operating skills and knowledge of operating practices before
> ever getting a transmitter.
>
> When the Novice became 5 year renewable, that incentive went away.
>
> We're not going to get the mfrs. to stop making IC-706s and start making S-40s,
> so what's the solution?

Merge the Novice and Tech Plus classes into a new class and give the
new class the privileges of both. Along with moving what are now the
HF Novice bands down to the XX.025s with a 100-200W max power out.
Wouldn't hurt anything and it might work.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3518. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 00:40:52 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <oC88b.1116$%G3.184@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76933

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bjqv2t$mddbp$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> I still am curious why the "middle" code test speed was set at
> thirteen..... Why not 12 or 14????
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> >
> > If the ARRL truly supported code testing, then "Restructuring" would
have
> > come out a whole lot differently, perhaps keeping a 12-WPM test for
> > Extra. That didn't happen, and it's because the ARRL wants code testing
> > dropped, for the sake of (hopefully) getting more people licensed and
> > becoming members. It is their never spoken, hidden agenda.
> >
>
>
>

Because, for most people, the speed of 13 WPM meant you could ACTUALLY COPY
Morse Code.

For most folks, up to about 12 WPM you could copy it and NOT actually know
it.

Most countries in the world required 12 WPM. The US Military only wanted 10
Groups per minute. Groups meaning 5 letter 'groups' in a 1 minute period.

That help?

Dan/W4NTI

3519. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 00:42:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <2E88b.1119$%G3.116@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76934

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bjqv2v$mddbp$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:Qe96b.37823$Vx2.16851173@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> > news:j62glvk4duionbd52uc7igls30dnv6mc4m@4ax.com...
> > > On 05 Sep 2003 03:41:16 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> > >
> > > >>Then what do you think that they test for?
> > > >
> > > >Oh I know what they Test for, and it is not knowledge,it is nothing
> then
> > > >Memozizing some Q&As that have no meaning to the test taker. The
> writtens
> > are
> > > >nothing more than jumping thru hoops
> > >
> > > In other words, since they provide the question pool, you don't think
> > > that people have to learn the answers in order to correctly answer the
> > > questions? How do you think that they figure out how to fill in the
> > > correct answer then?
> > >
> >
> > Both the pool AND answers are published.
> >
> > Let's take a typical question:
> >
> > What is the length of a dipole for 14.240Mhz?
> >
>
> Of what wavelength???? That is an important factor in the equation.
>
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>
>

>
>
>
>

Congratulations you have just proven you have NO CONCEPT of what was asked.

Does 468 divided by Frequency in Mhz mean anything to you?

Dan/W4NTI

3520. Re: Going under the knife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 00:44:26 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <KF88b.1120$%G3.200@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76935

Good luck...but, get ready for a life of pain.

Dan/W4NTI

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bjqv32$mddbp$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Thanks for all of the wonderful responses and I am definitely feeling alot
> better. I am not back to 100% but getting there over the next couple of
> weeks or so.
>
> I had corrective surgery to repair a problem in my lower back as a result
of
> being in a car accident in 1997. Thank god it isn't vertebrae related.
> According to the doc, I shouldn't have any more problems as long as this
> heals properly.
>
> Thanks again,
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030904210819.29660.00000475@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > In article <bj3kad$f2s35$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> > <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> >
> > >To all my friends, combatants, debaters and lurkers here in r.r.a.p,
> > >
> > >I will be going under the knife this Tuesday for surgery on my lower
back
> > >and won't be back for about a week or so. I am quiet sure that I am
not
> > >going to feel like being in the upright position for the next week (or
> doing
> > >much of anything for that matter) , so everyone have a great week and
> > >probably next week I will have a ton of catching up to do.
> >
> > Ryan:
> >
> > I hope that the surgery turns out satisfactorily, and wish you a very
> > speedy recovery! We'll keep the light on in the window for you. Just
> > take your time, don't do anything you're not supposed to, and get
> > well soon!

> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
>

3521. Re: Did you hear about the No-Coder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 00:46:47 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030911204647.14153.00000967@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 76936

>But I did hear about the No-Code Tech that married her CBer brother.
>How is your sister?
>

I think you were think of yourself

3522. Re: schematics wanted - "jamming device"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 01:23:12 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F611FFE.2030506@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 76937

Lloyd wrote:

>x-no-archive: yes
>"Limitedselection" <limitedselection@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030905131505.17988.00000281@mb-m24.aol.com...
>
>
>>Help!
>>
>>I am looking for schematics for circuits to "jam" TV and CB reception.
>>I am interested in "jamming" reception on my property only, so the
>>
>>
>"jamming
>
>
>>device" needs to be really low power - only capable of "jamming" an area
>>
>>
>about
>
>
>>half the size of a 'small' city block.
>>
>>
>>
>
>
>
Have him subscribe to BPL service. That will trash the spectrum from DC
to light....

3523. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 01:48:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030911214828.23171.00000685@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 76940

In article <bjqv35$mddbp$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Yeah, that might be true if you have HF capability........

All you need is a simple CW receiver and an antenna. W1AW runs the legal limit
into serious antennas; it should pound into MI on 80 and 40 with no problem.

>> I've sed it before I'll say it again: The W1AW code practice sessions
>> and getting on the air ASAP are the best methods out there for
>> learning the code. The 1AW sessions are reliable, they're not
>> repetitive and you can pace yourself without breaking a sweat
>> depending on your own set of learning curve variables. Yes it's
>> Farnsworth and 1AW Farnworth has obviously worked for decades. Now go
>> copy 1AW 5wpm sessions until you "get it".

Hope you are feeling better, Ryan.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3524. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 01:48:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030911214829.23171.00000686@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 76939

In article <bjqv2t$mddbp$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>I still am curious why the "middle" code test speed was set at
>thirteen..... Why not 12 or 14????

FCC decision in 1936.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3525. Re: Horseshit7 sez bullshit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 01:53:47 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0309111753.78320904@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76942

horseshoe7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote in message
news:<5f4fe4c2.0309111147.30327e8d@posting.google.com>...
> k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB) wrote in message
news:<e79dbd9b.0309101748.5c864fb8@posting.google.com>...
> > horseshit7@yahoo.com (stewart) wrote
> >
> > > Sound like COMPLETE BULLSHIT to me.
> >
> > http://www.earth2.net/fcc/petition/
> >
> > Argue with them, not with me.
>
> They aren't posting this BS on the Internet

Of course they're posting it. See the link above! Duh?

I'm not defending (or attacking) their research, but given their numbers I'm simply asking the obvious question "What can we do to improve the retention rate?" Even if they're off by a factor of 10 (23% reenlistment rate) we obviously ought to be examing this troubling issue. (Of course, you can opt to blow it all off by labeling it as BS, but that strikes me as a lazy cowards way out.)

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

3526. Re: What is a Ham Radio Operator?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 01:57:08 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <UJ98b.49839$3b2.5792601@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 76938

From the article:
"The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) licenses all hams in the United States. Getting a "D" on a multiple-choice test and paying about six dollars is all it takes."

Damn sad, and funny Mr. Kilowattradiocbgoodbuddy posts this article.

That folks is the sad, future of Amateur Radio thanks to NCI and their gang of retarded thugs.

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:S778b.8704$PE6.4772@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
http://www.zwire.com/site/news.cfm?newsid=10107919&BRD=2256&PAG=461&dept_id=455823&rfi=6
> http://tinyurl.com/n2b8
>
> Unless you know a "ham addict" or amateur radios have affected you
> personally in some way, chances are you know very little about their
> operations or their operators.
>
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith AOL IM:kilowattradio
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> _Give SCO $699 for using Linux or the Penguin gets it._
> Torvalds: _They are smoking crack._

3527. Re: BPL: 1st Experimental License Issued

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 01:58:52 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <wL98b.49840$3b2.5793786@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 76941

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030911183717.07383.00001051@mb-m27.aol.com...
> >WD2XEQ AMBIENT CORPORATION 0118-EX-PL-2003
> >
> >New experimental to operate in 1.7-88 MHz for testing power line carrier
> >systems. Fixed: States of NY and MA
>
> Its about time.

Might as well, NCI and the ARRL are working on giving licenses to the
retarded masses anyway.

3528. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 02:06:26 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <CS98b.1840$nQ.703083@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76943

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bjqv2v$mddbp$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:Qe96b.37823$Vx2.16851173@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> > news:j62glvk4duionbd52uc7igls30dnv6mc4m@4ax.com...
> > > On 05 Sep 2003 03:41:16 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> > >
> > > >>Then what do you think that they test for?
> > > >
> > > >Oh I know what they Test for, and it is not knowledge,it is nothing
> then
> > > >Memozizing some Q&As that have no meaning to the test taker. The
> writtens
> > are
> > > >nothing more than jumping thru hoops
> > >
> > > In other words, since they provide the question pool, you don't think
> > > that people have to learn the answers in order to correctly answer the
> > > questions? How do you think that they figure out how to fill in the
> > > correct answer then?
> > >
> >
> > Both the pool AND answers are published.
> >
> > Let's take a typical question:
> >
> > What is the length of a dipole for 14.240Mhz?
> >
>
> Of what wavelength???? That is an important factor in the equation.
>
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...

As you know from studying for your Technician license (and the material also
appears in the General study guide), you can calculate the length of your

half-wave dipole directly knowing only the frequency. The equation is:

Length in feet = 468 divided by the frequency in megahertz.

Also from these same study guides, you can calculate the wavelength by the following equation.

Wavelength in meters = 300 divided by the frequency in megahertz
(of course if you wish you can then convert the answer to feet).

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3529. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 02:22:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030911222208.07346.00000566@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 76944

In article <MM48b.873$%G3.544@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030911081910.12631.00001025@mb-m28.aol.com...
>> In article <eIO7b.1587$zx2.1002@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>"Dan/W4NTI"
>> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >But, I'll bet, if you think about it.....it made you a better operator.
>It
>> >was a SKILL you HAD TO LEARN in order to StAY ON THE AIR? Think about
>it.
>>
>> 'zactly. No other option. The Novice was not supposed to be a permanent
>> license. That's why it had so few privileges and was so focused,
>>
>> And the old Novice had another feature - it was a one-time one year
>license
>> until 1967, when it became two years. Which meant that you either upgraded
>> before the license ran out or you were off the air. The Novice year/2
>years was
>> a big learning time. Lotta incentive!
>>
>> In fact, one of the reasons FCC gave us incentive licensing was that they
>> perceived a drop off in learning after the Novice year.
>>
>> Most sensible newbies in those times had at least a receiver and antenna
>set up
>> and working before they went for the Novice exam. They'd spent serious
>time
>> listening to hams on the air before ever taking a test. They knew which
>bands
>> were best at various times of day and year simply from observation. They
>> developed a lot of operating skills and knowledge of operating practices
>before
>> ever getting a transmitter.
>>
>> When the Novice became 5 year renewable, that incentive went away.
>>
>> We're not going to get the mfrs. to stop making IC-706s and start making
>S-40s,
>> so what's the solution?
>>

>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>That was the beginning of the 'dumbing down' process. We can thank Dick
>Bash for his books on really tearing a hole in the fabric of the service.

Yup. And FCC refused to go after him, even though Phil Kane and others had the goods on the guy.
>
>Then when Heathkit folded its tent and went away was the final blow to the
>golden age of ham radio.

Ikensu killed Heathkit and others. When a TS-520 cost about $600 complete, who was gonna pay over $500 for an HW-101 and power supply?
>
>From that point on it has been downhill, more and more bitching and moaning
>about the code requirement. Making the test easier....more numbers. etc.
>etc.
>
>What is the answer Jim?

Comments to the FCC, for one thing. Comments for what we want and against what we don't. On every petition, proposal, RM, NPRM, NOI or whatever alphabet soup comes along. ECFS makes it easy. Maybe we won't win but they will not be able to say there was no opposition.

Setting an example is another. Walk the talk. Build the rigs, put up the antennas, keep the bands hopping. Write articles for QST and other mags. Give talks at ham clubs. Do a station on FD for the local club. Etc.

>Danged if I know. But what I do know is I am
>going to return to my roots in ham radio. While I can still do so
>physically, where gentlemen and ladies still exist and where I feel
>welcome. That place is safe from the infringement of morons and clowns.
>
>And you know where that is.
>
Sure. It's a place I never left.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3530. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 02:23:27 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93F3E3A7EB9E6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 76945

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0309110715.543e6db6@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns93F28BBE48EBAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>
>
>>
>> I was certainly taught how to use a Smith chart in engineering school.
>> Not only that, but how to derive the axes mathematically. The latter I
>> have forgotten, but I will never forget how to use one. There again, I
>> went to engineering school in Emgland, where you don't have to do
>> 'English 101' or 'Western Civilization' if you study engineering,
>> hence sufficient time to learn about Smith Charts!
>
> I really hate to bust yer bubble again Alun but Smith Charts and all
> the rest of the artifact nomograph "solvers" were already stale about
> the time you popped out of school. Didja also have a course in slide
> rule operations too? I'll bet you did, dinya?
>
> Looks to me like you were obsolete when you graduated. Here's today's
> "Smith Charts" Alun.
>
> http://home.t-online.de/home/weberconnect/csmith2.htm
>
> http://rf.rfglobalnet.com/software_modeling/software/2/102.htm
>
>
>> 73 de N3KIP
>
> w3rv
>

Smith charts still work. And no, the last time I used a slide rule was in
high school. So, I am perhaps 5-10 years younger than you think.

3531. Re: Go Numorse!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 02:45:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6133A2.8060006@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76946

Bert Craig wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F60C3C6.7040801@psu.edu>...
>
>>I don't do much in the way of Morse CW on the air. Much of the reason
>>for this has been due to some difficulties I have, but enough about that.
>>
>> As a personal challenge, I've decided to see if I can bring my Morse
>>speed up quite a bit. I started with the ARRL code CD's that I bought a
>>few years back when I wanted to first learn Morse CW.
>>
>> Would you believe that after two years I still have those CD's
>>memorized? I couldn't believe it - I remembered exactly the letters and
>>words they were using. So in the end, I don't know if I'd recommend the
>>CD's, except to those that have a real quick pickup of Morse, and how do
>>you know that until you try?
>>
>> So I tried NuMorse. Great program! I've been working with it for a few
>>weeks now, and have gotten my speed up to around ten WPM, 13 on a good
>>day. Soon I'll be ready to *really* do Morse CW. I intend to get up to
>>20 wpm before I get on the air. just because I expect to slow down under
>>real over the air conditions.
>>
>> NuMorse sends out pseudo random groups that can't be memorized. It will
>>also make up QSO's or load texfile QSO's that you can load into it.
>>Anyone know of a good source for these?
>>
>> My only criticism of the program is that the prosigns are a little
>>awkward, requiring use of the shift key which can slow you down a bit.
>>
>> Still I would rate the program as 9.5 out of 10.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> Kewl beans, Mike. I too used the ARRL CD's and while they initially
> served their purpose, one does tend to memorize the groups. Anytime
> you want to subject your ears to some ear-punishing <hihi> slo-code,
> drop me an e-mail and we'll set up a sked. Jim, N2EY, and I recently
> had a nice CW QSO on 40 and "three land" comes in pretty well here.
> Thanks for the recommendation and take care. :-)

Sure thing! I'll keep folks posted on my progress and we'll set things
up soon.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3532. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 03:05:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F61383C.8000906@adelphia.net>
Source record: 76947

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> How many cases are there where you can parallel park anyways, except for in
> bigger cities??

For all that matter, I can always pay someone to paralell park if I
absolutely had to!

> Ryan KC8PMX
> Confirmed Parallel Parker and Proud! I had to learn, so do you!!!!!!

HAH! more of that hazing attitude! You PP'ers will be the ruination of
driving!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3533. Re: BPL: 1st Experimental License Issued

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 03:20:35 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030911232035.23450.00000603@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 76948

>Might as well, NCI and the ARRL are working on giving licenses to the
>retarded masses anyway.
>

Thats my point, let the Knuckle Draggers have HF, then they can compete with BPL. I mean lets face it, NCI and the other Morrons claim that all the Tech whizzards are just waiting to get into Ham Radio, so let them deal with BPL.

3534. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 04:01:41 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <bjrgf5mnb1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 76949

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> To bury his Dipole. He was complaining about how noisy HF was, so I told
> him
> if he buried it, that it would stop the Noise. The fool believed me and
> buried
> it, I still cant stop laughing., I hate to tell the guy the truth,
> because now he Brags about how quit his Receiver is.

There's some truth in that. Wasn't there research done on buried
antennas some decades ago? I believe the antennas were encased in
insulation so that there was no direct contact with the soil.

Jeff KH6O
--
Operations Specialist 1st, U.S. Coast Guard
Mathematics Lecturer, University of Hawaii System

3535. Re: ARRL Policy Shift?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 04:30:08 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@att.net>
Message-ID: <kZb8b.135833$0v4.9929250@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 76950

Hi Gang,
If you go back in previous issue(s) of QST (when they were reporting such things) and read excerpts from K1ZZ'ss report to the ARRL BoD on his vision of the future, you will find that what Roger reports should be no surprise, particularly for the CBers, FRS/ GMRSers, SWLers REACTers, etc. I suppose you could frame this as enlarging the tent to get more in the tent or something like that. The Newington crowd has to do this to support those six figure incomes, overseas junkets, expense accounts, etc.

73,
Clay N4AOX

"Roger" <Roger@lavenderladsfruits.net> wrote in message news:bjpga3$um8$0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> Information from source inside ARRL indicates their
> membership numbers are falling rapidly. In an effort to
> bolster their failing membership numbers, ARRL will begin
> targeting the huge numbers of CB hobby type operators, who
> are generally referred to as "freebanders." ARRL will also
> extend a friendly hand to Unlicensed Low Power FM hobbyists.
> Look for future articles and adverstising aimed at these two
> untapped large audiences of potential ARRL members.
>
> Roger
>
>
>

3536. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 05:09:40 UTC
From: Hans Kohb <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <23340ef8c0f36832979d5f2d70c241e4.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 76951

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

> When I was drawn to and got my ticket, you know what the greatest relief
> was? Being able to turn a radio on and not hear all that hissing,
> heterodyning, etc.!!! FM is great and that is what I like most about ham
> radio. HF sucks for all the noise.

Well, I feel exactly the opposite. To me, FM is boring, but hidden in
all that noise and hissing on HF are the reasons I love ham radio.
Reasons like John, 9M2GV, an expat Brit running a rubber plantation
overlooking the Mallacca Straits. Reasons like Sparky, W3UBM/MM making
the Pacific runs on the rusty old SS Manderson Victory. Reasons
like working K0IR (as VK0IR) on three modes and five bands from
Heard Island, almost at the antipode on the low side of the
freckles-del-Sol. In other words, picking out an almost ghostly
signal from the molecular noise of the universe and finding a
friend, a kindred soul playing exhuberantly in the ether. FM sucks
for all the silence.

YMMV.

73, de Hans, K0HB
Grand Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3537. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 05:23:52 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <bjrl98$r89$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 76953

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>I hate to break it to you fine folks....But.....there is no such
>thing as a 1/4 wave DIPOLE.

then

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> Searched the web for 1/4 wave dipole. Results 1 - 10 of about
> 39,100. Search took 0.17 seconds

So Bob, go ahead and build a "1/4 wave dipole" and tell us how it performs!

"Dipole" *is* defined as half-wave, for within any half-wave segment, there are two (di-) voltage/current poles. You cannot have a "1/4 wave dipole." When that term is used (such as in your Google search), they're really refering to each of the two elements as being 1/4 wave-length each, and 1/4 * 2 = 1/2.

73, Jeff KH6O
--
Operations Specialist 1st, U.S. Coast Guard
Mathematics Lecturer, University of Hawaii System

3538. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 05:27:22 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <bjrlfqrcc1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 76952

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?

Geez, talk about a page from history! It was years ago that I
posed almost the same question to you, Carl, except I asked
"How many members of NCI are licensed" to which you replied,
"It doesn't matter..."

73, Jeff KH6O
--
Operations Specialist 1st, U.S. Coast Guard
Mathematics Lecturer, University of Hawaii System

3539. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 05:33:25 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <bjrlr5rpo1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 76954

Len Over 21 <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
> Incorrect. The word "dipole" refers to anything with two elements and a
> polarity. [a "monopole" is a single element with no polarity]

It refers to the number of current or voltage poles, not the number of
elements. Thus, "dipole" automatically refers to "half-wavelength."

No 73 for you, Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist 1st, U.S. Coast Guard
Mathematics Lecturer, University of Hawaii System

3540. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 08:54:19 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjs1gs$i7k@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 76955

"Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:23340ef8c0f36832979d5f2d70c241e4.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>
> > When I was drawn to and got my ticket, you know what the greatest relief
> > was? Being able to turn a radio on and not hear all that hissing,
> > heterodyning, etc.!!! FM is great and that is what I like most about
ham
> > radio. HF sucks for all the noise.
>
>
> Well, I feel exactly the opposite. To me, FM is boring, but hidden in
> all that noise and hissing on HF are the reasons I love ham radio.
> Reasons like John, 9M2GV, an expat Brit running a rubber plantation
> overlooking the Mallacca Straits. Reasons like Sparky, W3UBM/MM making
> the Pacific runs on the rusty old SS Manderson Victory. Reasons
> like working K0IR (as VK0IR) on three modes and five bands from
> Heard Island, almost at the antipode on the low side of the
> freckles-del-Sol. In other words, picking out an almost ghostly
> signal from the molecular noise of the universe and finding a
> friend, a kindred soul playing exhuberantly in the ether. FM sucks
> for all the silence.
>
> YMMV.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> Grand Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke
>
>

You definitely have a point with the exhilaration of a long-distance
contact--especially if they are willing to slow down long enough to get into
a ragchew! But, these days--for someone like me anyway--the "contact" can
be had over the internet. If we're talking pleasure contacts--those where
we take some time to "get to know" someone--internet definitely takes the
upper hand for me. If we're talking necessity radio--that part where
communication necessity comes into play--ham radio has it hands down.

Kim W5TIT

3541. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 10:13:07 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <T_g8b.1232$3i5.709@newssvr32.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76956

"Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:23340ef8c0f36832979d5f2d70c241e4.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
>
> Well, I feel exactly the opposite. To me, FM is boring, but hidden in
> all that noise and hissing on HF are the reasons I love ham radio.
> Reasons like John, 9M2GV, an expat Brit running a rubber plantation
> overlooking the Mallacca Straits. Reasons like Sparky, W3UBM/MM making
> the Pacific runs on the rusty old SS Manderson Victory. Reasons
> like working K0IR (as VK0IR) on three modes and five bands from
> Heard Island, almost at the antipode on the low side of the
> freckles-del-Sol. In other words, picking out an almost ghostly
> signal from the molecular noise of the universe and finding a
> friend, a kindred soul playing exhuberantly in the ether. FM sucks
> for all the silence.
>

I like that!

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

3542. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 10:19:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030912061912.22081.00000518@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 76957

In article <23340ef8c0f36832979d5f2d70c241e4.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>, "Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>hidden in
>all that noise and hissing on HF are the reasons I love ham radio.
>Reasons like John, 9M2GV, an expat Brit running a rubber plantation
>overlooking the Mallacca Straits. Reasons like Sparky, W3UBM/MM making
>the Pacific runs on the rusty old SS Manderson Victory. Reasons
>like working K0IR (as VK0IR) on three modes and five bands from
>Heard Island, almost at the antipode on the low side of the
>freckles-del-Sol. In other words, picking out an almost ghostly
>signal from the molecular noise of the universe and finding a
>friend, a kindred soul playing exhuberantly in the ether.

But...but Hans, we've been told repeatedly that "better modes and modulations" have made all that "antiquated, horse and buggy" "electronic paintball war" stuff "obsolete". The "professionals" don't do any of that - who are we to stand against "progress"?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3543. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 10:19:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030912061912.22081.00000517@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 76958

In article <d22b54c3.0309110224.47fc3080@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> That's the good 'ole American Spirit! Just wait until everything is
>> dumbed-down to your level, and it's yours!
>
>Uh, Larry . . Alun is a Brit. Like Cornwallis was a Brit (so doan
>expect much in the way of the American Spirit there) . .
>
>Like Oliver Cromwell was a Brit. Like Bertrand Russel was a Brit. Like
>Clement Atlee was a Brit.

Like William Penn was a Brit. Like Winston Churchill was a Brit. Like Margaret Thatcher is a Brit. Like J.K. Rowling is a Brit.

Like Tony Blair is a Brit.

>The ultimate "class-leveling" socialists and
>propagators of the dumb-down syndrome . .
>
Funny, I've never met one of those...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3544. Re: BPL: 1st Experimental License Issued

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 10:54:04 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309120254.22de3c66@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76959

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030911183717.07383.00001051@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> >WD2XEQ AMBIENT CORPORATION 0118-EX-PL-2003
> >
> >New experimental to operate in 1.7-88 MHz for testing power line carrier
> >systems. Fixed: States of NY and MA
>
> Its about time.

About time for WHAT?!

Note that WD2XEN will be operating in 144-148 Mhz in Dallas too.

w3rv

3545. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 11:26:20 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309120326.26ca5a71@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76960

"Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<23340ef8c0f36832979d5f2d70c241e4.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>
> > When I was drawn to and got my ticket, you know what the greatest relief
> > was? Being able to turn a radio on and not hear all that hissing,
> > heterodyning, etc.!!! FM is great and that is what I like most about ham
> > radio. HF sucks for all the noise.
>
>
> Well, I feel exactly the opposite. To me, FM is boring, but hidden in
> all that noise and hissing on HF are the reasons I love ham radio.
> Reasons like John, 9M2GV, an expat Brit running a rubber plantation
> overlooking the Mallacca Straits. Reasons like Sparky, W3UBM/MM making
> the Pacific runs on the rusty old SS Manderson Victory. Reasons
> like working K0IR (as VK0IR) on three modes and five bands from
> Heard Island, almost at the antipode on the low side of the
> freckles-del-Sol. In other words, picking out an almost ghostly
> signal from the molecular noise of the universe and finding a
> friend, a kindred soul playing exhuberantly in the ether.

BINGO! . . . they can't be "bothered" . . "Viva le Rubber Duckie!"
BAH!

> FM sucks
> for all the silence.

Creeping phenomenon around here: 2M SSB. Turns out 2M "simplex SSB" is
often beating the area coverages of the machines. Whatta big surprise.
Typical exchange when a machine drops into one of it's BS levels: "OK,
George let's get outta this nonsense, take it 145.XXX." No roger
beeps, no machine politics, no duckie operators, real radio.

> YMMV.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> Grand Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke

w3rv

3546. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 11:38:56 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309120338.77e58fc3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76961

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93F3E3A7EB9E6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0309110715.543e6db6@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns93F28BBE48EBAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >
> >
> >>
> >> I was certainly taught how to use a Smith chart in engineering school.
> >> Not only that, but how to derive the axes mathematically. The latter I
> >> have forgotten, but I will never forget how to use one. There again, I
> >> went to engineering school in Emgland, where you don't have to do
> >> 'English 101' or 'Western Civilization' if you study engineering,
> >> hence sufficient time to learn about Smith Charts!
> >
> > I really hate to bust yer bubble again Alun but Smith Charts and all
> > the rest of the artifact nomograph "solvers" were already stale about
> > the time you popped out of school. Didja also have a course in slide
> > rule operations too? I'll bet you did, dinya?
> >
> > Looks to me like you were obsolete when you graduated. Here's today's
> > "Smith Charts" Alun.
> >
> > http://home.t-online.de/home/weberconnect/csmith2.htm
> >
> > http://rf.rfglobalnet.com/software_modeling/software/2/102.htm
> >
> >
> >> 73 de N3KIP
> >
> > w3rv
> >
>
> Smith charts still work. And no, the last time I used a slide rule was in
> high school. So, I am perhaps 5-10 years younger than you think.

The world was blessed with your codeless presence on Nov 11 1957.
Handheld calculators rendered slide rules obsolete when you were
14-15. Are you still using Leydon jars for capacitors Alun?

w3rv

3547. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 11:46:20 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309120346.3432b203@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76962

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bjqv35$mddbp$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> Yeah, that might be true if you have HF capability........

Can't argue with that. But as Jim points out it doesn't take much of a
radio and antenna to at least listen on HF. What's the show-stopper in
your case?

> > I've sed it before I'll say it again: The W1AW code practice sessions
> > and getting on the air ASAP are the best methods out there for
> > learning the code. The 1AW sessions are reliable, they're not
> > repetitive and you can pace yourself without breaking a sweat
> > depending on your own set of learning curve variables. Yes it's
> > Farnsworth and 1AW Farnworth has obviously worked for decades. Now go
> > copy 1AW 5wpm sessions until you "get it".
> >
> >
> > w3rv

w3rv

3548. Re: Horseshit7 sez bullshit

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 12:19:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030912081913.12501.00002346@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 76963

In article <e79dbd9b.0309111753.78320904@posting.google.com>, k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB) writes:

>I'm not defending (or attacking) their research, but given their
>numbers I'm simply asking the obvious question "What can we do to
>improve the retention rate?"

The first thing is to understand why folks drop out.

If, as some have speculated, a lot of folks became hams 10-12 years ago for honeydo purposes, and now they have cell phones, there's not much we can do.

OTOH, if they're dropping out because of, say, the written tests being too hard, we can petition FCC to fix that.

But first we need to know why. Some will say "the code test" in a knee-jerk reaction - without any proof.

>Even if they're off by a factor of 10
>(23% reenlistment rate) we obviously ought to be examing this
>troubling issue.

You're assuming that there is some credibility in their computations. I say there is none. Suppose they are off by a factor of 40 - the renewal rate then would be 92%.

>(Of course, you can opt to blow it all off by
>labeling it as BS, but that strikes me as a lazy cowards way out.)

Or you can take bad stats as gospel without examining their process.

They claim there were less than 2000 new Techs issued in 5 months. That does not compute at all, given the numbers of new Techs issued over the past 5 years or so (close to 2000 per month).

At the time of restructuring there were something like 200,000 Techs. That was 110 months after the Tech lost its code test, but before any of them expired. Works out to an average of 1800 per month. And the renewal rate is a lot higher than 23% per the AH0A site numbers. AH0A tells how his data is gathered.

It strikes me that calling it "a troubling issue" without knowing how the data was gathered is simply not responsible.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3549. Re: slide rules (was: Could This Be The Solution?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 12:19:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030912081915.12501.00002347@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 76964
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

In article , kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>"paulfriedman@comcast.net" wrote in message
>news:...
>> "Mike Coslo" wrote in message
>> news:3F609902.7040103@psu.edu...
>> > Brian Kelly wrote:
>> >
>> > > I really hate to bust yer bubble again Alun but Smith Charts and all
>> > > the rest of the artifact nomograph "solvers" were already stale about
>> > > the time you popped out of school. Didja also have a course in slide
>> > > rule operations too? I'll bet you did, dinya?
>> >
>> > Now ya did it Brian! I will always have a soft spot for slide rules. Of
>> > course they are obsolete,
>
>We never had courses on either slide rule or log tables "operations".
>We had to pick 'em up on the fly on our own. Some of the guys learned
>to use 'em in high school.

Like me. Graduated high school in 1972.

>During the first couple weeks of class
>there were a lotta guys huddled in groups in the cafeteria trying to
>figure the things out. I never did learn to use more than maybe 8-10
>of the 21 scales on my bamboo Post. That was a NICE slipstick and I
>still have it.

oh mama
>
>> but when I got my first slide rule, it took
>> > math out of the abstract and put it in the real world for me.
>
>I never considered that but in looking back you're right.

And besides the slide rule, there were various forms of specialized "lightning
calculators". At one time ARRL sold a several different types for solving LC
problems, designing coils, power/resistance, etc. I still have and use one of
the later-model slide rule LC ones for tuned-circuit work. Gives an eagle-eye
view of effects ("if I use a 140 pf variable instad of 100, I'll be able to
reach 2 MHz...").
>
>> > I was in the last class at our school that was trained in their use. I
>> > kind of miss the engineer's sixshooter on my belt! ;^)

>
>The engineering students' full dress uniform (the physics majors
>weren't far behind) also included a pocket protector full of whatever
>ya could jam into it, a worn-out rumpled corduroy jacket and a
>beat-to-crap briecase . . The uniform definitely differentiated the
>engineers from the business administration weenies.
>
And other wannabees. In my day it was only slightly different. Denim replaced
corduroy and the briefcase was often a backpack. Mine was an old Bulletin
delivery bag.

>> > Where d'ya put the batteries in those things anyhow?
>
>> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>> >
>>
>> Well said! I still have my log tables book (that's logarithms for the young
>> folks). Remarkably useless now-a-days.
>
>Whatta pain THEY were!!

Amen.
>
>> I worked in the insurance industry and used to enjoy driving young,
>> visiting
>> actuaries crazy. They would ask a question on the data presented and rather
>> than bang something out on my computer or programmable calculator (both of
>> which I used at all times EXCEPT when a newbie actuary was present)
>
>I've pulled that one. I'm waiting for the opportunities to spring it
>on a nephew and a grandson.

Years ago I learned to do basic math to 2 decimal places in me head. Saved a
lot of fiddling. Refined it when I started running so I could figure out time
splits on the fly. Still amazes the unwashed multitudes.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3550. OT: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 12:33:00 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0309120433.48e36421@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76965

Hi all,

I'm curious. If I make a mistake during a QSO, what is the correct way
to get back on track. Do I:

1. Send 6 or 7 dits or an extra long dah?
-and-
2. Do I resume at the character or do I repeat the entire word?

Also, I heard a "shave and a haircut, two bits" at the end of a QSO
the other night. When is that appropriate?

Thanks. :-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

3551. Re: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 13:12:40 UTC
From: Tobias <tobias@ntlworld.com>
Message-ID: <9Cj8b.215$et5.352262@newsfep1-win.server.ntli.net>
Source record: 76966

8dits and resume the word !.
"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0309120433.48e36421@posting.google.com...
> Hi all,
>
> I'm curious. If I make a mistake during a QSO, what is the correct way
> to get back on track. Do I:
>
> 1. Send 6 or 7 dits or an extra long dah?
> -and-
> 2. Do I resume at the character or do I repeat the entire word?
>
> Also, I heard a "shave and a haircut, two bits" at the end of a QSO
> the other night. When is that appropriate?
>
> Thanks. :-)
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

3552. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 13:27:32 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <a6h3mvgn20268k3ohhei7c8p7o1bmkpf5b@4ax.com>
Source record: 76967

On 12 Sep 2003 05:23:52 GMT, jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman)
wrote:

>
>"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>>I hate to break it to you fine folks....But.....there is no such
>>thing as a 1/4 wave DIPOLE.
>
>then
>
>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>> Searched the web for 1/4 wave dipole. Results 1 - 10 of about
>> 39,100. Search took 0.17 seconds
>
>So Bob, go ahead and build a "1/4 wave dipole" and tell us how it
>performs!
>
>"Dipole" *is* defined as half-wave, for within any half-wave segment,
>there are two (di-) voltage/current poles. You cannot have a "1/4
>wave dipole." When that term is used (such as in your Google search),
>they're really refering to each of the two elements as being 1/4 wave-
>length each, and 1/4 * 2 = 1/2.
>
>73, Jeff KH6O

So, the 1/2 wave dipoles sold on the same pages are really full wave
dipoles, of are you saying that they use 1/4 and 1/2 wave
interchangeably when talking about the same antennas? Are you
really proposing that manufactuers don't know the difference between
1/4 wave and 1/2 wave dipole?

Or are you simply saying that your mind is so closed to the idea that
people would be making, selling, and buying something that you don't
know about, so it can't really be so?

I think it's the latter. However, since you say that when they talk
about a 1/4 wave antenna that they actually mean a 1/2 wave dipole,
I'm sure that with that very large database, you will have no problems
at all showing me some supporting documentation for your assertion.
Simply saying, "It ain't so." isn't enough.

I've already admitted that my use of 1/4 wave dipole in reference to
HF antennas was in error. Let's see how long it takes the, "there is
no such thing as a 1/4 wave dipole" crowd to admit their mistake.

I find it amazing that I made a mistake in a post about license testing/policy and have admitted my mistake, yet people continue to spam the ng about it.

If you can't accept the fact that people build, sell, and buy 1/4 wave dipoles for use in UHF, get over it. Just don't try to make stuff up and post it.

3553. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 13:49:56 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0309120549.8ce0b40@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76968

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
> In article <23340ef8c0f36832979d5f2d70c241e4.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>, "Hans
> Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >hidden in
> >all that noise and hissing on HF are the reasons I love ham radio.
> >Reasons like John, 9M2GV, an expat Brit running a rubber plantation
> >overlooking the Mallacca Straits. Reasons like Sparky, W3UBM/MM making
> >the Pacific runs on the rusty old SS Manderson Victory. Reasons
> >like working K0IR (as VK0IR) on three modes and five bands from
> >Heard Island, almost at the antipode on the low side of the
> >freckles-del-Sol. In other words, picking out an almost ghostly
> >signal from the molecular noise of the universe and finding a
> >friend, a kindred soul playing exhuberantly in the ether.
>
> But...but Hans, we've been told repeatedly that "better modes and modulations"
> have made all that "antiquated, horse and buggy" "electronic paintball war"
> stuff "obsolete". The "professionals" don't do any of that - who are we to
> stand against "progress"?

Jim,

Your point escapes me. (Maybe you're just trolling?)

My enjoyment of amateur radio is independent of the particular mode I
happen to be using at the time, and my quote above is equally true
regardless whether the mode-du-jour is antique or progressive. And, OBTW,
it's called Amateur Radio.

With all kind wishes,

Hans, K0HB

3554. Re: OT: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 14:02:32 UTC
From: Hans Kohb <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <16d8d667a2d24dc7f98efb3a0197175a.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 76969

Eight dits is the prosign for "error". I usually go back and repeat the last correctly sent word, and proceed from there. That's mostly a procedural habit from my days as a Navy radioman.

The "shave and a haircut" ending is appropriate any time it feels right to you. Probably wouldn't be appreciated in a DX pileup or on a run-QRG in a contest, but otherwise it's just an informal "parting greeting".

73, de Hans, K0HB
dit dit

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3555. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 14:44:03 UTC
From: "William H. O'Hara, III" <whoohara@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93F46D273FCB7AX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@216.168.3.44>
Source record: 76970

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in
news:cgX7b.1176$G_.1020@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com:

> Larry, ask the troll about my "broadcasting", if you want a
> giggle. The guys at rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc all got
> a good laugh out of this individual's ranting over there,
> but finally it got old and we ran him off - apparently to
> roost again over here.

Let's go about my "BS" again. You're the troll. I invite
anyone to look at the lack of civil behaviour extended by
you on a repeated basis in the packet newsgroups. You also
don't know jack about me from QRZ database record as you
would like to purport.

You refuse to listen to others and insult people routinely.
Give it a break.

As usual you try to move away from the real issue. The lack
of ham behaviour and civility on this list.

> If his behavior at the other news group is any guide, he
> will not move on until he has been thoroughly humiliated,
> setting himself up as the butt of public ridicule here.

This is laughable. Hate-monger accusing of others of being
childish. Broadcaster, give it a rest.

> Well, I say the sooner it starts, the sooner it will be
> over and we'll be rid of one more troll. Ask the guy about
> my "broadcasting" career... That ought to get him off to a

Well, just refer them to your QRZ post. Since you are very
interested in being part of the PD then you should join them.
Your setup fails to pass 97.113b. We're still waiting for
someone to catch up with you. The section implies for amateur
radio to provide communications at an emergency as a LAST
RESORT. You want to provide news to police departments
via your packet broadcast system on a regular basis. Heck, I
know broadcast in this terminology does not necessarily imply
broadcast. However, your application is a broadcast to the
public. 97.111b6 does not cut dice for you.

Bill

3556. The Chosen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 14:46:31 UTC
From: K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <9b590f5e564adc3cc2ce5ff0ead6e71b.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 76971
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

The Wise Ones live in the depths of the D, E, and F-Layers, and in the servers at Google.com. They are the descendants of the Gods. I personally subscribe to the theory they are the children of Thor Heyerdahl, the Viking god of Thunder and Balsawood Raft Dxpeditions. But that's another story.

The Wise Ones control everything that happens on the air and on this list, but they can't police every pileup or every newsgroup by themselves, so every morning, just before daylight over Katmandu, the Wise Ones select the "Mostest Intellegentest DXer" in their layer and convey upon him the title INFLICTOR OF HIGHER MORAL HARANGUES. This title and its duties last until the following dawn on Bouvet, if someone is there to observe the sunrise. Otherwise your duties end when WA2MOE gets tired of your crap and sends his lawyers with a gag order.

If you are ever chosen you will know because a representative of the Wise Ones will anoint your temples with oil from a forty year old bottle of Dr. Guano, collected on Ocean Island by VR1L in 1963. For that day you will be known as The Chosen. Your duties will be to seek out those that don't do things the way you do them (in other words, the right way.) When you find them, it will be your duty to correct them.

Think about it...too wide, too weak, too slow, too fast, what's your call dammit, wrong VFO, rotten fist, poor pileup control, wrong band, wrong QSL route, you timed out the repeater, wrong lingo, not enough green stamps, you're in the DX window, no-coders not allowed, coders suck, ... They're all yours.

When you find these wayward ones, you will lumber onto their frequency, stand up in your operating chair and shout, I AM SMARTER THAN YOU, SHUT UP AND LISTEN. You will now have the wayward one's undivided attention. He will think about this very briefly, then yield to your superior intellect. He will be very receptive to your thoughts and point of view.

Lecture him and proceed to the next wrong doer.

Now for the sad part of this tale. There are pretenders and charlatans out there who try to usurp the rightful powers of The Chosen. To you villainous few, I say beware. The Wise Ones also created BAWA (Baddest Ass Whats Around). No matter how bad you are, BAWA has the ability to be badder. You will know when you start your lecture and Bawa yells back, "You're a jerk, but I'm a bigger one. LET'S ESCALATE".

And you will have no choice.

But soon BAWA will tire of you and sink your little balsa boat. As you slip under the surface you will yell, "BUT I WAS RIGHT, DAMMIT" and you will once again prove the ancient mariners axiom -- AN OPEN MOUTH TAKES ON WATER.

dit dit

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

3557. Re: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 14:52:28 UTC
From: Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com>
Message-ID: <L4l8b.123207$kP.103236@fed1read03>
Source record: 76972

>> Also, I heard a "shave and a haircut, two bits" at the end of a QSO
> > the other night. When is that appropriate ??

Military Ops of yore wud use this at signoff -- a cutie type of thing.
Some Hams use it at the sign off -- one op sending all but dit dit, the
other finishing it.
Some shorten it up with just dit dit. Both sending.

Also military phone ops wud press PTT twice quickly (no voice) as a signoff.
Double clutch -- woosh woosh. A few Hams do this, leaving newbies scratching
their head.

Not good Mil practice - but we did it any way, probably confused the
enemy -- hi hi. Perhaps some code buster spending months trying to figure
out what was "shave and a haircut, two bits"

The 8 dits is an error character, then resume with the goofed up word, for
more characters common and obscure -- see URL:
http://ac6v.com/morseaids.htm#INT

--
73 From The Signal In The Noise
Caveat Lector Ya All

> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:b7d1465c.0309120433.48e36421@posting.google.com...
> > Hi all,
> >
> > I'm curious. If I make a mistake during a QSO, what is the correct way
> > to get back on track. Do I:
> >
> > 1. Send 6 or 7 dits or an extra long dah?
> > -and-
> > 2. Do I resume at the character or do I repeat the entire word?
> >
> > Also, I heard a "shave and a haircut, two bits" at the end of a QSO
> > the other night. When is that appropriate?
> >
> > Thanks. :-)
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
>
>

3558. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 14:58:46 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F61DF26.3010806@psu.edu>
Source record: 76973

Jeffrey Herman wrote:
> "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
>>I hate to break it to you fine folks....But.....there is no such
>>thing as a 1/4 wave DIPOLE.
>
>
> then
>
> "Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>
>>Searched the web for 1/4 wave dipole. Results 1 - 10 of about
>>39,100. Search took 0.17 seconds
>
>
> So Bob, go ahead and build a "1/4 wave dipole" and tell us how it
> performs!
>
> "Dipole" *is* defined as half-wave, for within any half-wave segment,
> there are two (di-) voltage/current poles. You cannot have a "1/4
> wave dipole." When that term is used (such as in your Google search),
> they're really refering to each of the two elements as being 1/4 wave-
> length each, and 1/4 * 2 = 1/2.

I did the same search. You don't get anywhere as many hits (104) when searching on 1/4 wave dipole. Interestingly enough, you get some where people are asking if a poster *really* meant 1/2 wave dipole. If you just type in 1/4 wave dipole, you'll get hits on 1/4 1/4 wave. 1/4 wave dipole, wave, and dipole. I don't doubt that you could get around 39,000 hits with that broad a search.

At best, it is a misnomer, at worst, a pretty poor antenna.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3559. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 15:04:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F61E072.3060508@psu.edu>
Source record: 76976

Jeffrey Herman wrote:
> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>
>
> Geez, talk about a page from history! It was years ago that I
> posed almost the same question to you, Carl, except I asked
> "How many members of NCI are licensed" to which you replied,
> "It doesn't matter..."

Jeffrey, the answer is "thousands, and growing every day."

It's too bad that a person that refuses to give out even the basic numbers of devotees decides to ask for a numerical breakdown of a rival groups numbers.

Assuming his accounting methods are acceptable, the answer is thousands, and growing every day.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3560. Re: ARRL Policy Shift?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 15:05:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjsnc5$kr3$0@208.206.142.71>
Source record: 76974

Yep, it was reported as a part of "long range planning by the BOD" or some such.

Clay N4AOX wrote:

> Hi Gang,
> If you go back in previous issue(s) of QST (when they were reporting
> such things) and read excerpts from K1ZZ'ss report to the ARRL BoD on his
> vision of the future, you will find that what Roger reports should be no
> surprise, particularly for the CBers, FRS/ GMRSers, SWLers REACTers, etc. I
> suppose you could frame this as enlarging the tent to get more in the tent
> or something like that. The Newington crowd has to do this to support
> those six figure incomes, overseas junkets, expense accounts, etc.
>
> 73,
> Clay N4AOX
>
> "Roger" <Roger@lavenderladsfruits.net> wrote in message
> news:bjpga3$um8$0@pita.alt.net...
> > x-no-archive: yes
> > Information from source inside ARRL indicates their
> > membership numbers are falling rapidly. In an effort to
> > bolster their failing membership numbers, ARRL will begin
> > targeting the huge numbers of CB hobby type operators, who
> > are generally referred to as "freebanders." ARRL will also
> > extend a friendly hand to Unlicensed Low Power FM hobbyists.
> > Look for future articles and adverstising aimed at these two
> > untapped large audiences of potential ARRL members.
> >
> > Roger
> >
> >
> >

3561. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 15:07:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F61E12B.1080808@psu.edu>
Source record: 76977

Brian Kelly wrote:

> The world was blessed with your codeless presence on Nov 11 1957.
> Handheld calculators rendered slide rules obsolete when you were
> 14-15. Are you still using Leydon jars for capacitors Alun?

Come on, Brian! He's sans cw. That's the wave of the future. No Leyden for him!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3562. Re: The Chosen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 15:10:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F61E1E7.4030703@psu.edu>
Source record: 76978
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

K0HB wrote:
> The Wise Ones live in the depths of the D, E, and F-Layers, and in the
> servers at Google.com. They are the descendants of the Gods. I
> personally subscribe to the theory they are the children of Thor
> Heyerdahl, the Viking god of Thunder and Balsawood Raft Dxpeditions. But
> that's another story.

<snip>

I thought absinth was outlawed!... 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

3563. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 15:15:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjsnto$m13$0@208.206.142.71>
Source record: 76975

Hans Kohb wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>
> > When I was drawn to and got my ticket, you know what the greatest relief
> > was? Being able to turn a radio on and not hear all that hissing,
> > heterodyning, etc.!!! FM is great and that is what I like most about ham
> > radio. HF sucks for all the noise.
>
> Well, I feel exactly the opposite. To me, FM is boring, but hidden in
> all that noise and hissing on HF are the reasons I love ham radio.
> Reasons like John, 9M2GV, an expat Brit running a rubber plantation
> overlooking the Mallacca Straits. Reasons like Sparky, W3UBM/MM making
> the Pacific runs on the rusty old SS Manderson Victory. Reasons
> like working K0IR (as VK0IR) on three modes and five bands from
> Heard Island, almost at the antipode on the low side of the
> freckles-del-Sol. In other words, picking out an almost ghostly
> signal from the molecular noise of the universe and finding a
> friend, a kindred soul playing exhuberantly in the ether. FM sucks
> for all the silence.
>
> YMMV.

My mileage does not vary in the least, Hans. And this is a large part of what separates the.....

Oh well, probably enough has already been written on the subject.

BTW, I think the last time I turned on my linear amp was when I worked that etherial signal from the other side of the planet, VK0IR, on a near-dead 20 meter CW band. Their response to my 100 watt calls was "didi dum dum didi", and "QRZ?"

Running 1400 watts out, the recognition was immediate.

Dick

3564. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 15:20:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjso8p$m13$1@208.206.142.71>
Source record: 76979

Brian Kelly wrote:

> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bjqv35$mddbp$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > Yeah, that might be true if you have HF capability........
>
> Can't argue with that. But as Jim points out it doesn't take much of a
> radio and antenna to at least listen on HF. What's the show-stopper in
> your case?
>

Desire, obviously

> > > I've sed it before I'll say it again: The W1AW code practice sessions
> > > and getting on the air ASAP are the best methods out there for
> > > learning the code. The 1AW sessions are reliable, they're not
> > > repetitive and you can pace yourself without breaking a sweat
> > > depending on your own set of learning curve variables. Yes it's
> > > Farnsworth and 1AW Farnworth has obviously worked for decades. Now go
> > > copy 1AW 5wpm sessions until you "get it".
> > >
> > >
> > > w3rv
>
> w3rv

3565. Re: The Chosen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 15:36:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjsp58$o8l$0@208.206.142.71>
Source record: 76980
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

K0HB wrote:

> The Wise Ones live in the depths of the D, E, and F-Layers, and in the
> servers at Google.com. They are the descendants of the Gods. I
> personally subscribe to the theory they are the children of Thor
> Heyerdahl, the Viking god of Thunder and Balsawood Raft Dxpeditions. But
> that's another story.
>
> The Wise Ones control everything that happens on the air and on this
> list, but they can't police every pileup or every newsgroup by
> themselves, so every morning, just before daylight over Katmandu, the
> Wise Ones select the "Mostest Intellegentest DXer" in their layer and
> convey upon him the title INFLICTOR OF HIGHER MORAL HARANGUES. This
> title and its duties last until the following dawn on Bouvet, if someone
> is there to observe the sunrise. Otherwise your duties end when WA2MOE
> gets tired of your crap and sends his lawyers with a gag order.
>
> If you are ever chosen you will know because a representative of the
> Wise Ones will anoint your temples with oil from a forty year old bottle
> of Dr. Guano, collected on Ocean Island by VR1L in 1963. For that day
> you will be known as The Chosen. Your duties will be to seek out those
> that don't do things the way you do them (in other words, the right
> way.) When you find them, it will be your duty to correct them.
>
> Think about it...too wide, too weak, too slow, too fast, what's your
> call dammit, wrong VFO, rotten fist, poor pileup control, wrong band,
> wrong QSL route, you timed out the repeater, wrong lingo, not enough
> green stamps, you're in the DX window, no-coders not allowed, coders
> suck, ... They're all yours.
>
> When you find these wayward ones, you will lumber onto their frequency,
> stand up in your operating chair and shout, I AM SMARTER THAN YOU, SHUT
> UP AND LISTEN. You will now have the wayward one's undivided attention.
> He will think about this very briefly, then yield to your superior
> intellect. He will be very receptive to your thoughts and point of view.
>
> Lecture him and proceed to the next wrong doer.
>
> Now for the sad part of this tale. There are pretenders and charlatans
> out there who try to usurp the rightful powers of The Chosen. To you
> villainous few, I say beware. The Wise Ones also created BAWA (Baddest
> Ass Whats Around). No matter how bad you are, BAWA has the ability to be
> badder. You will know when you start your lecture and Bawa yells back,

> "You're a jerk, but I'm a bigger one. LET'S ESCALATE".
>
> And you will have no choice.
>
> But soon BAWA will tire of you and sink your little balsa boat. As you
> slip under the surface you will yell, "BUT I WAS RIGHT, DAMMIT" and you
> will once again prove the ancient mariners axiom -- AN OPEN MOUTH TAKES
> ON WATER.
>
> dit dit
>
> de Hans, K0HB
>

Gotta love it!!!

3566. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 15:41:17 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <xOl8b.1567$Bs4.79@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 76981

"William H. O'Hara, III" <whoohara@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns93F46D273FCB7AX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@216.168.3.44...
> "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in
> news:cgX7b.1176$G_.1020@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com:
>
>
> Well, just refer them to your QRZ post. Since you are very
> interested in being part of the PD then you should join them.
> Your setup fails to pass 97.113b. We're still waiting for
> someone to catch up with you. The section implies for amateur
> radio to provide communications at an emergency as a LAST
> RESORT. You want to provide news to police departments
> via your packet broadcast system on a regular basis. Heck, I
> know broadcast in this terminology does not necessarily imply
> broadcast. However, your application is a broadcast to the
> public. 97.111b6 does not cut dice for you.

Real rational-sounding guy, huh? He just naturally assumes that everybody here shares his mental problems and has studiously followed all his past rants on other newsgroups.

I think they call his condition - "meglomania" ?

William refers to an article describing how non-hams can monitor ham radio transmissions in order to obtain info during an emergency. His claims are ridiculous of course, particularly his assertion that it is illegal for non-hams to monitor ham radio transmissions, but if you would like to look at what he's ranting about and judge for yourself, go to the "Library" page at USPN http://www.uspacket.net and read the article: "Emergency Digital Communications - Another Angle".

No, I didn't bring William in here as a "ringer" to give me an excuse to mention USPN, or the articles there. Though is true that he has worked over the last year to help publicize USPN, he has done so on his own, with no expectation of compensation (real or implied) from USPN for his efforts.

So though William may be a few bricks short of a full load, he has not let his disability keep him from making a contribution in his own special way. For that, he has the thanks and appreciation of the folks at USPN. It is this spirit of volunteerism and mutual support that makes the hobby great.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

3567. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 15:58:53 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309120758.35bbdf8c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76982

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0309111636.5e022daa@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030911081910.12631.00001025@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > In article <eIO7b.1587$zx2.1002@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >But, I'll bet, if you think about it.....it made you a better operator. It
> > >was a SKILL you HAD TO LEARN in order to StAY ON THE AIR? Think about it.
> >
> > 'zactly. No other option. The Novice was not supposed to be a permanent
> > license. That's why it had so few privileges and was so focused,
> >
> > And the old Novice had another feature - it was a one-time one year license
> > until 1967, when it became two years. Which meant that you either upgraded
> > before the license ran out or you were off the air. The Novice year/2 years was
> > a big learning time. Lotta incentive!
> >
> > In fact, one of the reasons FCC gave us incentive licensing was that they
> > perceived a drop off in learning after the Novice year.
> >
> > Most sensible newbies in those times had at least a receiver and antenna set up
> > and working before they went for the Novice exam. They'd spent serious time
> > listening to hams on the air before ever taking a test. They knew which bands
> > were best at various times of day and year simply from observation. They
> > developed a lot of operating skills and knowledge of operating practices before
> > ever getting a transmitter.
> >
> > When the Novice became 5 year renewable, that incentive went away.
> >
> > We're not going to get the mfrs. to stop making IC-706s and start making S-40s,
> > so what's the solution?
>
> Merge the Novice and Tech Plus classes into a new class and give the
> new class the privileges of both. Along with moving what are now the
> HF Novice bands down to the XX.025s with a 100-200W max power out.
> Wouldn't hurt anything and it might work.

Sounds good but doesn't go far enough.

How about this:

1) Three classes of license: Basic, Intermediate, Full (change the
names if you don't like them - Third, Second, First, Novice,
General, Extra, whatever)

2) HF/MF bands split into subbands by mode and split again by license class. Some bands may be split by mode only. Bottom of each band is CW only, middle is CW/digital, top is phone/image. Percentage division about 20%/30%/50% (varies with band). "Digital" includes digital voice modes if bandwidth under 1 kHz.

3) "Basic" license test is simple 20-25 question exam on regs, procedures, and safety. Very little technical and RF exposure stuff. Main objective is to keep Basics out of trouble. Basics get 200-50 watts on HF/MF and 25 watts or so on VHF/UHF (power level is below the point where RF exposure evaluation required). Modes are CW, analog voice, PSK31, RTTY and many of the other common data modes like packet. Basics cannot be VEs, control ops for repeaters, or club trustees. Basics get most VHF/UHF and about half of HF/MF spectrum, including parts of all subbands-by-mode. Basic is meant as the entry level. Easy to get, lots of privs, yet there's still a reason to upgrade.

4) "Intermediate" license test is more complex 50-60 question exam on regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Intermediates get 300-400 watts on all bands, all modes. Intermediates can be VEs after qualification (see below), control ops for repeaters, and club trustees. Intermediates get all VHF/UHF and about three quarters (or more) of HF/MF spectrum. Intermediate requires at least one year experience as a Basic.

5) "Full" license test is quite complex 100-120 question exam on regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical, with some regs to cover expanded privs. Fulls get all privileges, modes, bands, etc. except that Fulls can be VEs only after qualification (see below). Full license requires at least one year as an Intermediate.

6) All licenses are 10 year and fully renewable/modifiable. No age requirements or limits.

7) Basics have six-character calls, Intermediates have five- or six-character calls, and Fulls have four-, five-, or six-character calls. Nobody has to give up an existing callsign.

8) Separate 30-35 question test for VE qualification, open to Intermediates and Fulls, which allows them to be VEs. Existing VEs are grandfathered.

9) Existing Novices, Techs and Tech Pluses become Basics, existing Generals and Advanceds become Intermediates, and existing Extras become Fulls. Existing hams can continue to use their current privileges as long as they retain license documents showing their old license class.

10) Experience requirement is not waived for existing hams to upgrade, but their time in existing classes counts.

End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is envisioned as a 21st century version of the Novice) and has reasonable but meaningful steps to reach full privileges. Testing matches the privs granted. Power levels are set about one S-unit apart. Nobody loses any privileges. There are only three license classes and four written tests, so FCC doesn't have more work.

Example of new privileges:

80/75 meters
3500-3575 CW only
3575-3750 CW/data
3750-4000 CW/analog phone/image

Basic: 3525-3625 and 3900-4000
Intermediate: 3525-3750 and 3850-4000
Full: entire band

73 de Jim, N2EY

3568. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 16:39:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjssr6ubv0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 76983

N2EY wrote:

> How about this:
>
> 1) Three classes of license: Basic, Intermediate, Full (change the
> names if you don't like them - Third, Second, First, Novice,
> General, Extra, whatever)
>
> 2) HF/MF bands split into subbands by mode and split again by
> license class. Some bands may be split by mode only.
> Bottom of each band is CW only, middle is CW/digital, top is
> phone/image. Percentage division about 20%/30%/50% (varies with
> band). "Digital" includes digital voice modes if bandwidth under
> 1 kHz.
>
> 3) "Basic" license test is simple 20-25 question exam on regs,
> procedures, and safety. Very little technical and RF exposure
> stuff. Main objective is to keep Basics out of trouble. Basics
> get 200-50 watts on HF/MF and 25 watts or so on VHF/UHF (power
> level is below the point where RF exposure evaluation required).
> Modes are CW, analog voice, PSK31, RTTY and many of the other
> common data modes like packet. Basics cannot be VEs, control
> ops for repeaters, or club trustees. Basics get most VHF/UHF
> and about half of HF/MF spectrum, including parts of all
> subbands-by-mode. Basic is meant as the entry level. Easy to
> get, lots of privs, yet there's still a reason to upgrade.
>
> 4) "Intermediate" license test is more complex 50-60 question exam
> on regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Intermediates
> get 300-400 watts on all bands, all modes. Intermediates can be
> VEs after qualification (see below), control ops for repeaters,
> and club trustees. Intermediates get all VHF/UHF and about
> three quarters (or more) of HF/MF spectrum. Intermediate requires
> at least one year experience as a Basic.
>
> 5) "Full" license test is quite complex 100-120 question exam on
> regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical,
> with some regs to cover expanded privs. Fulls get all
> privileges, modes, bands, etc. except that Fulls can be VEs
> only after qualification (see below). Full license requires
> at least one year as an Intermediate.
>
> 6) All licenses are 10 year and fully renewable/modifiable. No

> age requirements or limits.
>
> 7) Basics have six-character calls, Intermediates have five- or
> six-character calls, and Fulls have four-, five-, or
> six-character calls. Nobody has to give up an existing callsign.
>
> 8) Separate 30-35 question test for VE qualification, open to
> Intermediates and Fulls, which allows them to be VEs. Existing
> VEs are grandfathered.
>
> 9) Existing Novices, Techs and Tech Pluses become Basics,
> existing Generals and Advanceds become Intermediates, and
> existing Extras become Fulls. Existing hams can continue to
> use their current privileges as long as they retain license
> documents showing their old license class.
>
> 10) Experience requirement is not waived for existing hams to
> upgrade, but their time in existing classes counts.
>
> End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is
> envisioned as a 21st century version of the Novice) and has
> reasonable but meaningful steps to reach full privileges.
> Testing matches the privs granted. Power levels are set about
> one S-unit apart. Nobody loses any privileges. There are only
> three license classes and four written tests, so FCC doesn't
> have more work.
>
> Example of new privileges:
>
> 80/75 meters
> 3500-3575 CW only
> 3575-3750 CW/data
> 3750-4000 CW/analog phone/image
>
> Basic: 3525-3625 and 3900-4000
> Intermediate: 3525-3750 and 3850-4000
> Full: entire band
>

Polish it up and send it in, Jim, that one deserves its own RM #!

Dick

3569. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 16:40:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjsstkubv1@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 76984

Lloyd wrote:

>
> I liked it better when you were Psycho-Babbling about
> incentive licensing. Can you please psycho-babble some
> more about incentive licensing?

Fer sure you know about psychobabble!

3570. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 16:53:11 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <pst3mvsip3cpp2vs0sge47u2dtr66ilrau@4ax.com>
Source record: 76985

On Fri, 12 Sep 2003 10:58:46 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Jeffrey Herman wrote:
>> "Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>>
>>>I hate to break it to you fine folks....But.....there is no such
>>>thing as a 1/4 wave DIPOLE.
>>
>>
>> then
>>
>> "Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>>
>>>Searched the web for 1/4 wave dipole. Results 1 - 10 of about
>>>39,100. Search took 0.17 seconds
>>
>>
>> So Bob, go ahead and build a "1/4 wave dipole" and tell us how it
>> performs!
>>
>> "Dipole" *is* defined as half-wave, for within any half-wave segment,
>> there are two (di-) voltage/current poles. You cannot have a "1/4
>> wave dipole." When that term is used (such as in your Google search),
>> they're really refering to each of the two elements as being 1/4 wave-
>> length each, and 1/4 * 2 = 1/2.
>
> I did the same search. You don't get anywhere as many hits (104) when
>searching on 1/4 wave dipole. Interestingly enough, you get some where
>people are asking if a poster *really* meant 1/2 wave dipole. If you
>just type in 1/4 wave dipole, you'll get hits on 1/4 1/4 wave. 1/4 wave
>dipole, wave, and dipole. I don't doubt that you could get around 39,000
>hits with that broad a search.
>
> At best, it is a misnomer, at worst, a pretty poor antenna.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I provided a working link and cut/pasted the search results. Why
didn't you just click on the link? If you had, your search results
would have been exactly the same.

Try searching the web and not the ng's.

3571. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 16:54:27 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <6hu3mvgblcusug5hb1f2b1m5n4o60bn9ae@4ax.com>
Source record: 76986

On Fri, 12 Sep 2003 11:04:18 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Jeffrey Herman wrote:
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>>
>>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>>
>>
>> Geez, talk about a page from history! It was years ago that I
>> posed almost the same question to you, Carl, except I asked
>> "How many members of NCI are licensed" to which you replied,
>> "It doesn't matter..."
>
>
>
> Jeffrey, the answer is "thousands, and growing every day."
>
> It's too bad that a person that refuses to give out even the basic
>numbers of devotees decides to ask for a numerical breakdown of a rival
>groups numbers.
>
> Assuming his accounting methods are acceptable, the answer is
>thousands, and growing every day.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

The code requirement is dead, so numbers don't matter.

3572. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 17:05:51 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309120905.32490493@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76987

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0309051305.17994313@posting.google.com>...
> S. Hanrahan <aa7ya@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:<juuflvotqfg61il3lnmmfr4gv1ra1i9jlp@4ax.com>...
> > On Wed, 03 Sep 2003 11:22:58 -0700, Jack Twilley
> > <jmt+usenet@twilley.org> wrote:

> > It took me a little over 6 months to go from nothing to 20 WPM. I
> > passed the 20 WPM code before I took the General written exam.
>
> When I "did" my Extra ya had to pass both the writtens and the code
> test at the same sitting or wait a month and go back and do *all* of
> it all over again.

Heck yes. In fact it went something like this:

First, ya had to have a General or Advanced for at least two years
before they'd even let ya try the Extra.

Then ya had to pass the receive test with at least 100 correct
consecutive legible characters. No going back and fixing things after
the code stopped, either, after the last dit it was PENCILS DOWN or ya
flunked right there.

If ya passed the receive, they let ya try sending with their straight
key or *your* speed key. You sent until the examiner was satisfied.

Only then did they let you try the written. Mess up at any point -
even one character or question - and it was "go home and study some
more and don't come back for at least 30 days". No CSCE, no partial
credit, nada, do it all first try at one sitting or it doesn't count
at all.

> Dinosaur? Who ME?
>
Naw.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3573. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 17:47:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <wEn8b.1431$NM1.536@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76988

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:6hu3mvgblcusug5hb1f2b1m5n4o60bn9ae@4ax.com...
> On Fri, 12 Sep 2003 11:04:18 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
> >Jeffrey Herman wrote:
> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
> >>
> >>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
> >>
> >>
> >> Geez, talk about a page from history! It was years ago that I
> >> posed almost the same question to you, Carl, except I asked
> >> "How many members of NCI are licensed" to which you replied,
> >> "It doesn't matter..."
> >>
> >>
> >>
> > Jeffrey, the answer is "thousands, and growing every day."
> >
> > It's too bad that a person that refuses to give out even the basic
> >numbers of devotees decides to ask for a numerical breakdown of a rival
> >groups numbers.
> >
> > Assuming his accounting methods are acceptable, the answer is
> >thousands, and growing every day.
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> The code requirement is dead, so numbers don't matter.
>

How is it dead? The FCC has not changed the rules. And until they do.
Morse code is still a requirement for ARS operation on HF.

Dan/W4NTI

3574. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 17:56:14 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <2Nn8b.1514$NM1.1414@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76989

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0309120758.35bbdf8c@posting.google.com...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0309111636.5e022daa@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030911081910.12631.00001025@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > > In article <eIO7b.1587$zx2.1002@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> > > <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
> > >
> > > >But, I'll bet, if you think about it.....it made you a better
operator. It
> > > >was a SKILL you HAD TO LEARN in order to StAY ON THE AIR? Think
about it.
> > >
> > > 'zactly. No other option. The Novice was not supposed to be a
permanent
> > > license. That's why it had so few privileges and was so focused,
> > >
> > > And the old Novice had another feature - it was a one-time one year
license
> > > until 1967, when it became two years. Which meant that you either
upgraded
> > > before the license ran out or you were off the air. The Novice year/2
years was
> > > a big learning time. Lotta incentive!
> > >
> > > In fact, one of the reasons FCC gave us incentive licensing was that
they
> > > perceived a drop off in learning after the Novice year.
> > >
> > > Most sensible newbies in those times had at least a receiver and
antenna set up
> > > and working before they went for the Novice exam. They'd spent serious
time
> > > listening to hams on the air before ever taking a test. They knew
which bands
> > > were best at various times of day and year simply from observation.
They
> > > developed a lot of operating skills and knowledge of operating
practices before
> > > ever getting a transmitter.
> > >
> > > When the Novice became 5 year renewable, that incentive went away.

> > >
> > > We're not going to get the mfrs. to stop making IC-706s and start
making S-40s,
> > > so what's the solution?
> >
> > Merge the Novice and Tech Plus classes into a new class and give the
> > new class the privileges of both. Along with moving what are now the
> > HF Novice bands down to the XX.025s with a 100-200W max power out.
> > Wouldn't hurt anything and it might work.
>
> Sounds good but doesn't go far enough.
>
> How about this:
>
> 1) Three classes of license: Basic, Intermediate, Full (change the
> names if you don't like them - Third, Second, First, Novice,
> General, Extra, whatever)
>
> 2) HF/MF bands split into subbands by mode and split again by
> license class. Some bands may be split by mode only.
> Bottom of each band is CW only, middle is CW/digital, top is
> phone/image. Percentage division about 20%/30%/50% (varies with
> band). "Digital" includes digital voice modes if bandwidth under
> 1 kHz.
>
> 3) "Basic" license test is simple 20-25 question exam on regs,
> procedures, and safety. Very little technical and RF exposure
> stuff. Main objective is to keep Basics out of trouble. Basics
> get 200-50 watts on HF/MF and 25 watts or so on VHF/UHF (power
> level is below the point where RF exposure evaluation required).
> Modes are CW, analog voice, PSK31, RTTY and many of the other
> common data modes like packet. Basics cannot be VEs, control
> ops for repeaters, or club trustees. Basics get most VHF/UHF
> and about half of HF/MF spectrum, including parts of all
> subbands-by-mode. Basic is meant as the entry level. Easy to
> get, lots of privs, yet there's still a reason to upgrade.
>
> 4) "Intermediate" license test is more complex 50-60 question exam
> on regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Intermediates
> get 300-400 watts on all bands, all modes. Intermediates can be
> VEs after qualification (see below), control ops for repeaters,
> and club trustees. Intermediates get all VHF/UHF and about
> three quarters (or more) of HF/MF spectrum. Intermediate requires
> at least one year experience as a Basic.
>
> 5) "Full" license test is quite complex 100-120 question exam on
> regs, procedures, safety and technical stuff. Mostly technical,
> with some regs to cover expanded privs. Fulls get all
> privileges, modes, bands, etc. except that Fulls can be VEs
> only after qualification (see below). Full license requires

> at least one year as an Intermediate.
>
> 6) All licenses are 10 year and fully renewable/modifiable. No
> age requirements or limits.
>
> 7) Basics have six-character calls, Intermediates have five- or
> six-character calls, and Fulls have four-, five-, or
> six-character calls. Nobody has to give up an existing callsign.
>
> 8) Separate 30-35 question test for VE qualification, open to
> Intermediates and Fulls, which allows them to be VEs. Existing
> VEs are grandfathered.
>
> 9) Existing Novices, Techs and Tech Pluses become Basics,
> existing Generals and Advanceds become Intermediates, and
> existing Extras become Fulls. Existing hams can continue to
> use their current privileges as long as they retain license
> documents showing their old license class.
>
> 10) Experience requirement is not waived for existing hams to
> upgrade, but their time in existing classes counts.
>
> End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is
> envisioned as a 21st century version of the Novice) and has
> reasonable but meaningful steps to reach full privileges.
> Testing matches the privs granted. Power levels are set about
> one S-unit apart. Nobody loses any privileges. There are only
> three license classes and four written tests, so FCC doesn't
> have more work.
>
> Example of new privileges:
>
> 80/75 meters
> 3500-3575 CW only
> 3575-3750 CW/data
> 3750-4000 CW/analog phone/image
>
> Basic: 3525-3625 and 3900-4000
> Intermediate: 3525-3750 and 3850-4000
> Full: entire band
>
>

I like it Jim. I suggested to FCC years ago to go with a 3 tier license structure. My major difference was to make the diverse modes a 'add on' to the license. Instead of power restrictions.

Would be a lot easier to regulate that way. Having to test for a 'add on endorsement' would still maintain the technical aspects of the ARS. And provide a way of continued learning.

Just a thought.

Dan/W4NTI

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

3575. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 17:57:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F620901.9090701@psu.edu>
Source record: 76992

Bob Brock wrote:
> On Fri, 12 Sep 2003 10:58:46 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
>
>>Jeffrey Herman wrote:
>>
>>>"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>I hate to break it to you fine folks....But.....there is no such
>>>>thing as a 1/4 wave DIPOLE.
>>>
>>>
>>>then
>>>
>>>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>>>
>>>
>>>>Searched the web for 1/4 wave dipole. Results 1 - 10 of about
>>>>39,100. Search took 0.17 seconds
>>>
>>>
>>>So Bob, go ahead and build a "1/4 wave dipole" and tell us how it
>>>performs!
>>>
>>>"Dipole" *is* defined as half-wave, for within any half-wave segment,
>>>there are two (di-) voltage/current poles. You cannot have a "1/4
>>>wave dipole." When that term is used (such as in your Google search),
>>>they're really refering to each of the two elements as being 1/4 wave-
>>>length each, and 1/4 * 2 = 1/2.
>>
>> I did the same search. You don't get anywhere as many hits (104) when
>>searching on 1/4 wave dipole. Interestingly enough, you get some where
>>people are asking if a poster *really* meant 1/2 wave dipole. If you
>>just type in 1/4 wave dipole, you'll get hits on 1/4 1/4 wave. 1/4 wave
>>dipole, wave, and dipole. I don't doubt that you could get around 39,000
>>hits with that broad a search.
>>
>> At best, it is a misnomer, at worst, a pretty poor antenna.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> I provided a working link and cut/pasted the search results. Why

> didn't you just click on the link? If you had, your search results
> would have been exactly the same.
>
> Try searching the web and not the ng's.

Against my better judgement, I'll communicate with you.

Re-read my post.

Explain how a search engine works.

Explain how I can get 104 hits vs your 39,000.

Explain how you can get 39,000 hits. I got 24,500 hits when I did it
your way, but those numbers can change.

Think about how being specific in search params will give you more
relevent results than just typing in the words, which will give you many
many hits on sometimes only one of the words.

Oh I forgot, you don't have to explain. But that won't make you correct,
either.

- mike KB3EIA -

3576. Re: ARRL Policy Shift?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 18:01:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <iSn8b.1558$NM1.926@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76990

Yeah thats it. Make those nasty rip off ARRL guys stop going around getting BPL info, lets make them stop going to WARC meetings and fighting to KEEP AMATEUR RADIO GOING.

Yeah....lets make them all sit at Newington instead.

Yep...youse guys are the types that would bitch about anything....just to bitch.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:bjsnc5$kr3$0@208.206.142.71...
> Yep, it was reported as a part of "long range planning by the BOD" or some
> such.
>
>
>
> Clay N4AOX wrote:
>
> > Hi Gang,
> > If you go back in previous issue(s) of QST (when they were reporting
> > such things) and read excerpts from K1ZZ'ss report to the ARRL BoD on his
> > vision of the future, you will find that what Roger reports should be no
> > surprise, particularly for the CBers, FRS/ GMRSers, SWLers REACTers, etc. I
> > suppose you could frame this as enlarging the tent to get more in the tent
> > or something like that. The Newington crowd has to do this to support
> > those six figure incomes, overseas junkets, expense accounts, etc.
> >
> > 73,
> > Clay N4AOX
> >
> > "Roger" <Roger@lavenderladsfruits.net> wrote in message
> > news:bjpga3$um8$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > x-no-archive: yes
> > > Information from source inside ARRL indicates their
> > > membership numbers are falling rapidly. In an effort to
> > > bolster their failing membership numbers, ARRL will begin
> > > targeting the huge numbers of CB hobby type operators, who
> > > are generally referred to as "freebanders." ARRL will also

> > > extend a friendly hand to Unlicensed Low Power FM hobbyists.
> > > Look for future articles and adverstising aimed at these two
> > > untapped large audiences of potential ARRL members.
> > >
> > > Roger
> > >
> > >
> > >
>

3577. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 18:03:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <fUn8b.1577$NM1.623@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76991

"Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:23340ef8c0f36832979d5f2d70c241e4.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
>
> > When I was drawn to and got my ticket, you know what the greatest relief
> > was? Being able to turn a radio on and not hear all that hissing,
> > heterodyning, etc.!!! FM is great and that is what I like most about
ham
> > radio. HF sucks for all the noise.
>
>
> Well, I feel exactly the opposite. To me, FM is boring, but hidden in
> all that noise and hissing on HF are the reasons I love ham radio.
> Reasons like John, 9M2GV, an expat Brit running a rubber plantation
> overlooking the Mallacca Straits. Reasons like Sparky, W3UBM/MM making
> the Pacific runs on the rusty old SS Manderson Victory. Reasons
> like working K0IR (as VK0IR) on three modes and five bands from
> Heard Island, almost at the antipode on the low side of the
> freckles-del-Sol. In other words, picking out an almost ghostly
> signal from the molecular noise of the universe and finding a
> friend, a kindred soul playing exhuberantly in the ether. FM sucks
> for all the silence.
>
> YMMV.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> Grand Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke
>
>
>
> --
> Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

Ah the days of 'real radio'. Yes indeed Hans you have a way with words.

Too bad Kim has me blocked. I'd slap her around a bit.. hi.

Dan/W4NTI

3578. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 18:05:41 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <VVn8b.1591$NM1.1232@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 76993

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bjs1gs$i7k@library1.airnews.net...
> "Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:23340ef8c0f36832979d5f2d70c241e4.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
> >
> >
> > > When I was drawn to and got my ticket, you know what the greatest
relief
> > > was? Being able to turn a radio on and not hear all that hissing,
> > > heterodyning, etc.!!! FM is great and that is what I like most about
> ham
> > > radio. HF sucks for all the noise.
> >
> >
> > Well, I feel exactly the opposite. To me, FM is boring, but hidden in
> > all that noise and hissing on HF are the reasons I love ham radio.
> > Reasons like John, 9M2GV, an expat Brit running a rubber plantation
> > overlooking the Mallacca Straits. Reasons like Sparky, W3UBM/MM making
> > the Pacific runs on the rusty old SS Manderson Victory. Reasons
> > like working K0IR (as VK0IR) on three modes and five bands from
> > Heard Island, almost at the antipode on the low side of the
> > freckles-del-Sol. In other words, picking out an almost ghostly
> > signal from the molecular noise of the universe and finding a
> > friend, a kindred soul playing exhuberantly in the ether. FM sucks
> > for all the silence.
> >
> > YMMV.
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> > Grand Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke
> >
> >
>
> You definitely have a point with the exhilaration of a long-distance
> contact--especially if they are willing to slow down long enough to get
into
> a ragchew! But, these days--for someone like me anyway--the "contact" can
> be had over the internet. If we're talking pleasure contacts--those where
> we take some time to "get to know" someone--internet definitely takes the
> upper hand for me. If we're talking necessity radio--that part where
> communication necessity comes into play--ham radio has it hands down.
>
> Kim W5TIT

>
>

This commentary from hug and chalk Kim should prove, to those that were wavering...that she has no concept at all of what ham radio is all about.

Dan/W4NTI

3579. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 20:14:01 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309121214.7d06772d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 76994

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309061806.621b7987@posting.google.com>...

> Jim has repeatedly pointed out where the ARRL proposed fewer license
> classes and a lower code speed for full priveleges during the last
> restructuring, which he always equates with lower standards.

That's Jim;s OPINION, Brain. Other than that, you have not
satisfied the question of how the ARRL has allegedly pushed for "lower
standards".

Steve, K4YZ

3580. Re: OT: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 20:51:12 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F6231C0.5040904@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 76995

Hans Kohb wrote:

>Eight dits is the prosign for "error".
>
I understand that 7 to 10 dits also means "error". Thus
if you send one dit too many, you don't have to declare that
your error signal has an error in it.....

3581. Re: ARRL Policy Shift?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 21:00:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjtc4v$e5q$0@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 76996

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> Yeah thats it. Make those nasty rip off ARRL guys stop going around getting
> BPL info, lets make them stop going to WARC meetings and fighting to KEEP
> AMATEUR RADIO GOING.
>
> Yeah....lets make them all sit at Newington instead.
>
> Yep...youse guys are the types that would bitch about anything....just to
> bitch.
>

Lessee, now....You're happy that K1ZZ published an editorial in QST
suggesting combining CB and ham radio?

Dick

> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bjsnc5$kr3$0@208.206.142.71...
> > Yep, it was reported as a part of "long range planning by the BOD" or
> some
> > such.
> >
> >
> >
> > Clay N4AOX wrote:
> >
> > > Hi Gang,
> > > If you go back in previous issue(s) of QST (when they were
> reporting
> > > such things) and read excerpts from K1ZZ'ss report to the ARRL BoD on
> his
> > > vision of the future, you will find that what Roger reports should be no
> > > surprise, particularly for the CBers, FRS/ GMRSers, SWLers REACTers,
> etc. I
> > > suppose you could frame this as enlarging the tent to get more in the
> tent
> > > or something like that. The Newington crowd has to do this to support
> > > those six figure incomes, overseas junkets, expense accounts, etc.
> > >
> > > 73,
> > > Clay N4AOX
> > >

> > > "Roger" <Roger@lavenderladsfruits.net> wrote in message
> > > news:bjpga3$um8$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > x-no-archive: yes
> > > > Information from source inside ARRL indicates their
> > > > membership numbers are falling rapidly. In an effort to
> > > > bolster their failing membership numbers, ARRL will begin
> > > > targeting the huge numbers of CB hobby type operators, who
> > > > are generally referred to as "freebanders." ARRL will also
> > > > extend a friendly hand to Unlicensed Low Power FM hobbyists.
> > > > Look for future articles and adverstising aimed at these two
> > > > untapped large audiences of potential ARRL members.
> > > >
> > > > Roger
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > >

3582. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 21:01:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjtc86$e5q$1@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 76997

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Bob Brock wrote:
> > On Fri, 12 Sep 2003 10:58:46 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
> >
> >
> >>Jeffrey Herman wrote:
> >>
> >>>"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>I hate to break it to you fine folks....But.....there is no such
> >>>>thing as a 1/4 wave DIPOLE.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>then
> >>>
> >>>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Searched the web for 1/4 wave dipole. Results 1 - 10 of about
> >>>>39,100. Search took 0.17 seconds
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>So Bob, go ahead and build a "1/4 wave dipole" and tell us how it
> >>>performs!
> >>>
> >>>"Dipole" *is* defined as half-wave, for within any half-wave segment,
> >>>there are two (di-) voltage/current poles. You cannot have a "1/4
> >>>wave dipole." When that term is used (such as in your Google search),
> >>>they're really refering to each of the two elements as being 1/4 wave-
> >>>length each, and 1/4 * 2 = 1/2.
> >>
> >> I did the same search. You don't get anywhere as many hits (104) when
> >>searching on 1/4 wave dipole. Interestingly enough, you get some where
> >>people are asking if a poster *really* meant 1/2 wave dipole. If you
> >>just type in 1/4 wave dipole, you'll get hits on 1/4 1/4 wave. 1/4 wave
> >>dipole, wave, and dipole. I don't doubt that you could get around 39,000
> >>hits with that broad a search.
> >>
> >> At best, it is a misnomer, at worst, a pretty poor antenna.
> >>
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >

> >
> > I provided a working link and cut/pasted the search results. Why
> > didn't you just click on the link? If you had, your search results
> > would have been exactly the same.
> >
> > Try searching the web and not the ng's.
>
> Against my better judgement, I'll communicate with you.
>
> Re-read my post.
>
> Explain how a search engine works.
>
> Explain how I can get 104 hits vs your 39,000.
>
> Explain how you can get 39,000 hits. I got 24,500 hits when I did it
> your way, but those numbers can change.
>
> Think about how being specific in search params will give you more
> relevent results than just typing in the words, which will give you many
> many hits on sometimes only one of the words.
>
> Oh I forgot, you don't have to explain. But that won't make you correct,
> either.
>
>

That guy had something to do with running a nuclear power plant???

Scary.....

3583. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 21:02:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjtc9o$e5q$2@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 76998

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bjs1gs$i7k@library1.airnews.net...
> > "Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:23340ef8c0f36832979d5f2d70c241e4.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
> > >
> > >
> > > > When I was drawn to and got my ticket, you know what the greatest
> relief
> > > > was? Being able to turn a radio on and not hear all that hissing,
> > > > heterodyning, etc.!!! FM is great and that is what I like most about
> > ham
> > > > radio. HF sucks for all the noise.
> > >
> > >
> > > Well, I feel exactly the opposite. To me, FM is boring, but hidden in
> > > all that noise and hissing on HF are the reasons I love ham radio.
> > > Reasons like John, 9M2GV, an expat Brit running a rubber plantation
> > > overlooking the Mallacca Straits. Reasons like Sparky, W3UBM/MM making
> > > the Pacific runs on the rusty old SS Manderson Victory. Reasons
> > > like working K0IR (as VK0IR) on three modes and five bands from
> > > Heard Island, almost at the antipode on the low side of the
> > > freckles-del-Sol. In other words, picking out an almost ghostly
> > > signal from the molecular noise of the universe and finding a
> > > friend, a kindred soul playing exhuberantly in the ether. FM sucks
> > > for all the silence.
> > >
> > > YMMV.
> > >
> > > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> > > Grand Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke
> > >
> > >
> >
> > You definitely have a point with the exhilaration of a long-distance
> > contact--especially if they are willing to slow down long enough to get
> into
> > a ragchew! But, these days--for someone like me anyway--the "contact" can
> > be had over the internet. If we're talking pleasure contacts--those where
> > we take some time to "get to know" someone--internet definitely takes the
> > upper hand for me. If we're talking necessity radio--that part where
> > communication necessity comes into play--ham radio has it hands down.

> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> This commentary from hug and chalk Kim should prove, to those that were
> wavering...that she has no concept at all of what ham radio is all about.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Was there ever any doubt??

3584. Re: ARRL Policy Shift?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 22:23:21 UTC
From: Jack Twilley <jmt+usenet@twilley.org>
Message-ID: <86ekylmysm.fsf@duchess.twilley.org>
Source record: 76999

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

>>>>> "Dick" == Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> writes:

Dick> Lessee, now....You're happy that K1ZZ published an editorial in
Dick> QST suggesting combining CB and ham radio?

Cite, please?

Jack.
- --
Jack Twilley
jmt at twilley dot org
http colon slash slash www dot twilley dot org slash tilde jmt slash
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.2.3 (FreeBSD)

iD8DBQE/YkdfGPFSfAB/ezgRAsscAJ4s+n83LoPCge1Cdny4tyUoIshNzwCdEOtS
8pgKSHqGjKw+36mma0dv7B4=
=+CJb
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

3585. Re: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:01:47 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <vfs8b.52689$3b2.6427695@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 77000

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0309120433.48e36421@posting.google.com...
> Hi all,
>
> I'm curious. If I make a mistake during a QSO, what is the correct way
> to get back on track. Do I:
>
> 1. Send 6 or 7 dits or an extra long dah?
> -and-
> 2. Do I resume at the character or do I repeat the entire word?
>
> Also, I heard a "shave and a haircut, two bits" at the end of a QSO
> the other night. When is that appropriate?
>
> Thanks. :-)
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

Bert,
Please pose this and all related CW questions to NCI
Inc.&#65533; The National Code Institute.

Capt. Carl or one of his minions will happily answer all your Morse Code
questions.

10-73's!

3586. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:04:48 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309121504.6ce45798@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77051

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0309110823.40369a16@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309091548.744bad7a@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030909061940.12631.00000969@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > > In article <f45722ac.0309072055.4f9d0339@posting.google.com>,
> > > brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> > >
> > > >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > >news:<bjgncb$t1n$1@208.206.142.76>...
> > > >> N2EY wrote:
> > > >> >
> > > >> > It's self-evident that a radio amateur who has no Morse code skills is
> not a
> > > >> > fully qualified radio amateur, particularly for HF/MF amateur operation.
> That's
> > > >> > a plain and simple fact.
> > > >>
> > > >> What is it about plain and simple facts that so confuses NCI members?
> > > >
> > > >Duh!!!
> > >
> > > We know you are confused, Brian.
> >
> > "Duh!!!" doens't indicate a lack of confusion
>
> My point exactly.

Yet you said it did.

> We know you are confused, Brian.

We? You got a mouse in your pocket?

> > > >Why does it have to be "particularly for HF/MF operations?"
> > >
> > > Because that's where Morse operation by amateurs is most common.
> >
> > If a lack of Morse code skills renders one less than a fully qualified
> > amateur radio operator,
>
> It does. Get over it.

Can't. I've had Morse whether I liked it or not.

> So does lack of a lot of other skills.

What skills do you lack?

> > I would think "praticularly for VHF+
> > operation" would have been more appropriate for the very reason you
> > gave.
>
> That makes no sense at all.

Since everyone presently on HF had to go thru the Morse hoop, and
those on VHF+ didn't necessarily have to do it...

> We know you are confused, Brian.

Too bad things must be explained to you in the minutest of detail.

> > Duh!!! again.
>
> Exactly. You keep proving my point for me. Thanks.

So what do you lack to be a fully qualified radio amateur,
particularly for HF/MF amateur operation?

3587. Will PCTA Censure Bruce?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:09:32 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309121509.257a657a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77052

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030907205819.17885.00000795@mb-m05.aol.com>...

> >Do you posts
> >violate yous ISP's TOS?
>
> I dont know, and I dont care, do you?
>
> >Would you be the same way about operation in
> >the ham bands
>
> Of course

Bruce is their poster boy.

3588. Re: ARRL Policy Shift?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:11:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <eos8b.3808$NM1.375@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77053

Of course not. But then again I haven't seen that. Where was that written
and when?

Course since its is attributed to ZZ, it really don't surprise me.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bjtc4v$e5q$0@208.206.142.113...
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > Yeah thats it. Make those nasty rip off ARRL guys stop going around
getting
> > BPL info, lets make them stop going to WARC meetings and fighting to
KEEP
> > AMATEUR RADIO GOING.
> >
> > Yeah....lets make them all sit at Newington instead.
> >
> > Yep...youse guys are the types that would bitch about anything....just
to
> > bitch.
> >
>
> Lessee, now....You're happy that K1ZZ published an editorial in QST
> suggesting combining CB and ham radio?
>
> Dick
>
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bjsnc5$kr3$0@208.206.142.71...
> > > Yep, it was reported as a part of "long range planning by the BOD" or
> > some
> > > such.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Clay N4AOX wrote:
> > >
> > > > Hi Gang,
> > > > If you go back in previous issue(s) of QST (when they were

> > reporting
> > > > such things) and read excerpts from K1ZZ'ss report to the ARRL BoD
on
> > his
> > > > vision of the future, you will find that what Roger reports should
be no
> > > > surprise, particularly for the CBers, FRS/ GMRSers, SWLers REACTers,
> > etc. I
> > > > suppose you could frame this as enlarging the tent to get more in
the
> > tent
> > > > or something like that. The Newington crowd has to do this to
support
> > > > those six figure incomes, overseas junkets, expense accounts, etc.
> > > >
> > > > 73,
> > > > Clay N4AOX
> > > >
> > > > "Roger" <Roger@lavenderladsfruits.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:bjpga3$um8$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > > x-no-archive: yes
> > > > > Information from source inside ARRL indicates their
> > > > > membership numbers are falling rapidly. In an effort to
> > > > > bolster their failing membership numbers, ARRL will begin
> > > > > targeting the huge numbers of CB hobby type operators, who
> > > > > are generally referred to as "freebanders." ARRL will also
> > > > > extend a friendly hand to Unlicensed Low Power FM hobbyists.
> > > > > Look for future articles and adverstising aimed at these two
> > > > > untapped large audiences of potential ARRL members.
> > > > >
> > > > > Roger
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> >

3589. Re: ARRL Policy Shift?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:11:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjtjqquj0@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 77054

Jack Twilley wrote:

> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
> >>>>> "Dick" == Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> writes:
>
> Dick> Lessee, now....You're happy that K1ZZ published an editorial in
> Dick> QST suggesting combining CB and ham radio?
>
> Cite, please?
>

I no longer keep QST beyond the past year or so, therefore I no longer have the issue where he broached the subject in his monthly "It seems to us" column. But it sure was there some time back, a year and a half or two years ago, maybe a little longer. Look through your old QSTs and you'll find it.

I think he was testing the waters,and I should not be surprised if he found them uncomfortably warm!

Dick

3590. Re: OT: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:14:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjtk00uj1@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 77055

Bert Craig wrote:

> Hi all,
>
> I'm curious. If I make a mistake during a QSO, what is the correct way
> to get back on track. Do I:
>
> 1. Send 6 or 7 dits or an extra long dah?
> -and-
> 2. Do I resume at the character or do I repeat the entire word?
>
> Also, I heard a "shave and a haircut, two bits" at the end of a QSO
> the other night. When is that appropriate?

Aw, just stop, give a short pause, send "di di dum dum di di" and start
the busted word again.

Dick

3591. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:14:22 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <irs8b.3869$NM1.3416@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77056

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bjtc9o$e5q$2@208.206.142.113...
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:bjs1gs$i7k@library1.airnews.net...
> > > "Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > > news:23340ef8c0f36832979d5f2d70c241e4.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> > > > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > > When I was drawn to and got my ticket, you know what the greatest
> > relief
> > > > > was? Being able to turn a radio on and not hear all that hissing,
> > > > > heterodyning, etc.!!! FM is great and that is what I like most
about
> > > ham
> > > > > radio. HF sucks for all the noise.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Well, I feel exactly the opposite. To me, FM is boring, but hidden
in
> > > > all that noise and hissing on HF are the reasons I love ham radio.
> > > > Reasons like John, 9M2GV, an expat Brit running a rubber plantation
> > > > overlooking the Mallacca Straits. Reasons like Sparky, W3UBM/MM
making
> > > > the Pacific runs on the rusty old SS Manderson Victory. Reasons
> > > > like working K0IR (as VK0IR) on three modes and five bands from
> > > > Heard Island, almost at the antipode on the low side of the
> > > > freckles-del-Sol. In other words, picking out an almost ghostly
> > > > signal from the molecular noise of the universe and finding a
> > > > friend, a kindred soul playing exhuberantly in the ether. FM sucks
> > > > for all the silence.
> > > >
> > > > YMMV.
> > > >
> > > > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> > > > Grand Exhalted Liberator of the Electric Smoke
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > You definitely have a point with the exhilaration of a long-distance
```

> > > contact--especially if they are willing to slow down long enough to
get
> > into
> > > a ragchew! But, these days--for someone like me anyway--the "contact"
can
> > > be had over the internet. If we're talking pleasure contacts--those
where
> > > we take some time to "get to know" someone--internet definitely takes
the
> > > upper hand for me. If we're talking necessity radio--that part where
> > > communication necessity comes into play--ham radio has it hands down.
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > >
> >
> > This commentary from hug and chalk Kim should prove, to those that were
> > wavering...that she has no concept at all of what ham radio is all
about.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Was there ever any doubt??
>

Initially from me there was. But it went away quickly.

Dan/W4NTI

3592. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:15:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjtk2ruj2@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 77057

N2EY wrote:

> In article <d22b54c3.0309110224.47fc3080@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> That's the good 'ole American Spirit! Just wait until everything is
> >> dumbed-down to your level, and it's yours!
> >
> >Uh, Larry . . Alun is a Brit. Like Cornwallis was a Brit (so doan
> >expect much in the way of the American Spirit there) . .
> >
> >Like Oliver Cromwell was a Brit. Like Bertrand Russel was a Brit. Like
> >Clement Atlee was a Brit.
>
> Like William Penn was a Brit. Like Winston Churchill was a Brit. Like Margaret
> Thatcher is a Brit. Like J.K. Rowling is a Brit.
>
> Like Tony Blair is a Brit.
>
> >The ultimate "class-leveling" socialists and
> >propagators of the dumb-down syndrome . .
> >
> Funny, I've never met one of those...

Fortunately, most of the time they're the "Loyal Opposition"!

3593. Re: OT: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:16:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjtk54uj3@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 77058

Robert Casey wrote:

> Hans Kohb wrote:
>
> >Eight dits is the prosign for "error".
> >
> I understand that 7 to 10 dits also means "error". Thus
> if you send one dit too many, you don't have to declare that
> your error signal has an error in it.....

Surely not a closed loop in CW!

3594. Re: OT: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:16:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <lts8b.3888$NM1.1040@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77059

"Robert Casey" <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F6231C0.5040904@ix.netcom.com...
> Hans Kohb wrote:
>
> >Eight dits is the prosign for "error".
> >
> I understand that 7 to 10 dits also means "error". Thus
> if you send one dit too many, you don't have to declare that
> your error signal has an error in it.....
>
Both are true. Send a bunch of dits. Of course there is also another
'error sign'. Some of the higher speed guys use it.... dit dit space dit
dit.

Dan/W4NTI

3595. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:19:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309121519.4b7afbb0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77060

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0309111357.4ccc9f8d@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309110930.fc9fdf1@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Had to. You waited 6 months for your license and you couldn't operate
> > til it arrived.
>
> Six weeks.

Right. Mine only took 9 or 10 weeks in 1986. Figured it was longer
in the bad old days.

3596. Re: The Chosen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:25:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309121525.54ca30fd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77061
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<9b590f5e564adc3cc2ce5ff0ead6e71b.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> The Wise Ones live in the depths of the D, E, and F-Layers, and in the
> servers at Google.com. They are the descendants of the Gods. I
> personally subscribe to the theory they are the children of Thor
> Heyerdahl, the Viking god of Thunder and Balsawood Raft Dxpeditions. But
> that's another story.

snip

I liked the story of "Little Billy Beeper" better.

3597. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:27:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309121527.4c21f8a0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77062

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030911081911.12631.00001026@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0309101459.631262a5@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >You aked why, then you can't deal with the answer.
>
> You did not answer the questions I asked, so there's no reason for me to answer
> the questions you asked.
>
> You are full of questions and short of answers.

So there's no reason for you ask again, is there?

3598. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:33:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309121533.e8bc3b4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77063

jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) wrote in message
news:<bjrgf5mnb1@news.hawaii.edu>...
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> > To bury his Dipole. He was complaining about how noisy HF was, so I told
> > him
> > if he buried it, that it would stop the Noise. The fool believed me and
> > buried
> > it, I still cant stop laughing., I hate to tell the guy the truth,
> > because now he Brags about how quit his Receiver is.
>
> There's some truth in that. Wasn't there research done on buried
> antennas some decades ago? I believe the antennas were encased in
> insulation so that there was no direct contact with the soil.
>
> Jeff KH6O

http://www.2d10.com/archives/archive211.html

3599. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:36:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309121536.42c33eb0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77064

Radioman <radio@ptt.edu> wrote in message news:<3F5CA1C6.9E1F98C9@ptt.edu>...
> > On 07 Sep 2003 23:48:26 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:
> >
> > >>Thank God. It's had enough trying to figure it out here.
> > >
> > >Come on Jr keep up, I thought you were good at this.
> >
> > Good at what?
>
>
> The only thing WA8ULX is good at...
>
> ...is being a troll.

I think he'd be good at driving a big truck - for a week - w/o a
shower & brown racing stripe on the seat.

3600. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:37:32 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309121537.69581ae5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77065

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0309120758.35bbdf8c@posting.google.com>...
. . . .

> End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is
> envisioned as a 21st century version of the Novice) and has
> reasonable but meaningful steps to reach full privileges.
> Testing matches the privs granted. Power levels are set about
> one S-unit apart. Nobody loses any privileges. There are only
> three license classes and four written tests, so FCC doesn't
> have more work.
>
> Example of new privileges:
>
> 80/75 meters
> 3500-3575 CW only
> 3575-3750 CW/data
> 3750-4000 CW/analog phone/image
>
> Basic: 3525-3625 and 3900-4000
> Intermediate: 3525-3750 and 3850-4000
> Full: entire band

That's all well and good James and I'd support your basics but what
you're suggesting is a radical, complete top-to-bottom restructuring.
Much more so than any we've seen in the past seventy-some years.
Versus some Band-Aids on what already exists. With the FCC we have
today we'd be lucky to get even a Band-Aid or two let alone a complete
rework of HF ham radio. We're allowed to dream but then comes cold
hard reality.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3601. Re: The Chosen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:46:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjtls6$859$0@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 77066
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Brian wrote:

> "K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<9b590f5e564adc3cc2ce5ff0ead6e71b.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > The Wise Ones live in the depths of the D, E, and F-Layers, and in the
> > servers at Google.com. They are the descendants of the Gods. I
> > personally subscribe to the theory they are the children of Thor
> > Heyerdahl, the Viking god of Thunder and Balsawood Raft Dxpeditions. But
> > that's another story.
>
> snip
>
> I liked the story of "Little Billy Beeper" better.

Ah yes, you finally found a role model!

3602. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-12 23:50:56 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309121550.6b2cedf5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77067

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030912061912.22081.00000517@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0309110224.47fc3080@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> That's the good 'ole American Spirit! Just wait until everything is
> >> dumbed-down to your level, and it's yours!
> > >
> > >Uh, Larry . . Alun is a Brit. Like Cornwallis was a Brit (so doan
> > >expect much in the way of the American Spirit there) . .
> > >
> > >Like Oliver Cromwell was a Brit. Like Bertrand Russel was a Brit. Like
> > >Clement Atlee was a Brit.
> >
> > Like William Penn was a Brit. Like Winston Churchill was a Brit. Like Margaret
> > Thatcher is a Brit. Like J.K. Rowling is a Brit.
> >
> > Like Tony Blair is a Brit.
> >
> > >The ultimate "class-leveling" socialists and
> > >propagators of the dumb-down syndrome . .
> > >
> > Funny, I've never met one of those...

I sure ran into a flock of socialists when I was in the U.K. When were
you last there?

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3603. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 00:19:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030912201910.06226.00000475@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 77068

In article <e79dbd9b.0309120549.8ce0b40@posting.google.com>, k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
>> In article <23340ef8c0f36832979d5f2d70c241e4.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>,
>"Hans
>> Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>> >hidden in
>> >all that noise and hissing on HF are the reasons I love ham radio.
>> >Reasons like John, 9M2GV, an expat Brit running a rubber plantation
>> >overlooking the Mallacca Straits. Reasons like Sparky, W3UBM/MM making
>> >the Pacific runs on the rusty old SS Manderson Victory. Reasons
>> >like working K0IR (as VK0IR) on three modes and five bands from
>> >Heard Island, almost at the antipode on the low side of the
>> >freckles-del-Sol. In other words, picking out an almost ghostly
>> >signal from the molecular noise of the universe and finding a
>> >friend, a kindred soul playing exhuberantly in the ether.
>>
>> But...but Hans, we've been told repeatedly that "better modes and
>modulations"
>> have made all that "antiquated, horse and buggy" "electronic paintball war"
>> stuff "obsolete". The "professionals" don't do any of that - who are we to
>> stand against "progress"?
>
>Jim,
>
>Your point escapes me.

I'm pointing out that a lot of what you describe has been repeatedly described by the quoted terms by self-described "professionals in radio".

> (Maybe you're just trolling?)
>
Nope. Just making an observation.

>My enjoyment of amateur radio is independent of the particular mode I
>happen to be using at the time, and my quote above is equally true
>regardless whether the mode-du-jour is antique or progressive.

OK, fine.

Would you enjoy it as much if your QSOs went through a series of automated digital systems that would insure perfect copy at both ends with no operator skill required?

>And, OBTW,
>it's called Amateur Radio.
>
My point exaclty. Tell it to the professionals.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3604. Re: Will PCTA Censure Bruce?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 00:23:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030912202354.18064.00000639@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 77069

>Bruce is their poster boy.

And you are Karls poster buy

3605. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 00:26:51 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030912202651.18064.00000640@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 77070

>I think he'd be good at driving a big truck - for a week - w/o a
>shower & brown racing stripe on the seat.
>

But just think, I would have you there to lick the Brown Racing stripe clean.

3606. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 00:48:15 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <jPt8b.425516$YN5.287945@sccrnsc01>
Source record: 77071

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in
news:5c01b95b.0309121214.7d06772d@posting.google.com:

> That's Jim;s OPINION, Brain. Other than that, you have not
> satisfied the question of how the ARRL has allegedly pushed for "lower
> standards".
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

It's my opinion too, and I'm always right.

KB7ADL

3607. Re: ARRL Policy Shift?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 00:54:24 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <%Ut8b.427173$o%2.194223@sccrnsc02>
Source record: 77072

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:iSn8b.1558$NM1.926@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

> Yeah thats it. Make those nasty rip off ARRL guys stop going around
> getting BPL info, lets make them stop going to WARC meetings and
> fighting to KEEP AMATEUR RADIO GOING.
>
> Yeah....lets make them all sit at Newington instead.
>
> Yep...youse guys are the types that would bitch about anything....just
> to bitch.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

That's the modern ARRL plan Dan. Fight the threats from without, while the Service rots from within. Let the service rot if it means raking in a few more dollars. Pretty soon there won't be anything good left in the service worth protecting. That would be like spending money to preserve what the CB service is today.

KB7ADL

3608. Re: The Chosen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 01:36:09 UTC
From: unkadean <dnorris@k7no.com>
Message-ID: <53t4mvkdf539de0n411ms3th81l4chaf0h@4ax.com>
Source record: 77073
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Fri, 12 Sep 2003 11:10:31 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>

>
> I thought absinth was outlawed!... 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

I thought the 'absinth' of something was 'nothing'?

3609. Re: The Chosen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 01:43:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bjtsno$s7f$0@208.207.71.157>
Source record: 77074
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

unkadean wrote:

> On Fri, 12 Sep 2003 11:10:31 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
> >
>
> >
> > I thought absinth was outlawed!... 8^)
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> I thought the 'absinth' of something was 'nothing'?

Absinth maketh the heart grow fonder?

3610. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 02:03:41 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93F4E04F12EAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 77075

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
news:d22b54c3.0309120338.77e58fc3@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns93F3E3A7EB9E6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
>> news:d22b54c3.0309110715.543e6db6@posting.google.com:
>>
>> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> > news:<Xns93F28BBE48EBAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> >
>> >
>> >>
>> >> I was certainly taught how to use a Smith chart in engineering
>> >> school. Not only that, but how to derive the axes mathematically.
>> >> The latter I have forgotten, but I will never forget how to use
>> >> one. There again, I went to engineering school in Emgland, where
>> >> you don't have to do 'English 101' or 'Western Civilization' if you
>> >> study engineering, hence sufficient time to learn about Smith
>> >> Charts!
>> >
>> > I really hate to bust yer bubble again Alun but Smith Charts and all
>> > the rest of the artifact nomograph "solvers" were already stale
>> > about the time you popped out of school. Didja also have a course in
>> > slide rule operations too? I'll bet you did, dinya?
>> >
>> > Looks to me like you were obsolete when you graduated. Here's
>> > today's "Smith Charts" Alun.
>> >
>> > http://home.t-online.de/home/weberconnect/csmith2.htm
>> >
>> > http://rf.rfglobalnet.com/software_modeling/software/2/102.htm
>> >
>> >
>> >> 73 de N3KIP
>> >
>> > w3rv
>> >
>>
>> Smith charts still work. And no, the last time I used a slide rule was
>> in high school. So, I am perhaps 5-10 years younger than you think.
>
> The world was blessed with your codeless presence on Nov 11 1957.
> Handheld calculators rendered slide rules obsolete when you were

> 14-15. Are you still using Leydon jars for capacitors Alun?
>
> w3rv
>

That's about right on the dates, except that there were very few calculators around back then. I remember my dad paying the equivalent of about $250 for a rather large four-function calculator c1970-1971 ish. It was made by Sharp. Sinclair had a cheaper one, but you had to build it from a kit!

Also, high school (at least it's sometimes called that, amongst other things) is usually age 11-18 in the UK, so it takes in middle school/junior high (although in some areas of the UK there are middle schools, just to confuse the issue).

3611. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 02:08:30 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93F4E12021A50elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 77076

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in news:3F61E12B.1080808@psu.edu:

> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
>> The world was blessed with your codeless presence on Nov 11 1957.
>> Handheld calculators rendered slide rules obsolete when you were
>> 14-15. Are you still using Leydon jars for capacitors Alun?
>
> Come on, Brian! He's sans cw. That's the wave of the future. No
> Leyden
> for him!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

I don't work CW, but if you took the trouble to look up my date of birth, then you know I passed a code test. One thing you can't get from a database is the date I was first licenced, which is February 29th, 1980 - as a no-coder, of course!

3612. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 02:18:05 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <56v4mvc2mt8kqrs3u37a8mo8d2sjd0u3os@4ax.com>
Source record: 77077

On Fri, 12 Sep 2003 13:57:21 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Bob Brock wrote:

>> Try searching the web and not the ng's.
>
> Against my better judgement, I'll communicate with you.
>
>Re-read my post.
>
>Explain how a search engine works.
>
>Explain how I can get 104 hits vs your 39,000.
>
>Explain how you can get 39,000 hits. I got 24,500 hits when I did it
>your way, but those numbers can change.

Click on the link. I did and here is what I got...BTW, this is copy
and paste, so it's exactly what's there.

Searched the web for 1/4 wave dipole. Results 1 - 10 of about
38,900. Search took 0.20 seconds

Someone is lying and anyone who wants to click on the link can tell
who. BTW, I found five sites that list 1/4 wave dipoles and one site
that lists a 3/4 wave dipole in the first ten listed.
>
>Think about how being specific in search params will give you more
>relevent results than just typing in the words, which will give you many
>many hits on sometimes only one of the words.
>
>Oh I forgot, you don't have to explain. But that won't make you correct,
>either.
>
> - mike KB3EIA -

No, since I'm already correct and have documented it, there is no need
for me to prove anything. You know, I have better things to do right
now than to click on a link that I've already provided to show that it
says the same thing that it said when I posted it.

Plonk for now. I may take you back out when I get caught up on
things, but I really don' have time to deal with liars right now.

3613. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 02:19:07 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <3kv4mvo70gg2cnhfge828d521b6blfrvvt@4ax.com>
Source record: 77078

On Fri, 12 Sep 2003 17:47:08 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>
>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:6hu3mvgblcusug5hb1f2b1m5n4o60bn9ae@4ax.com...
>> On Fri, 12 Sep 2003 11:04:18 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>>
>> >Jeffrey Herman wrote:
>> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>> >>
>> >>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> Geez, talk about a page from history! It was years ago that I
>> >> posed almost the same question to you, Carl, except I asked
>> >> "How many members of NCI are licensed" to which you replied,
>> >> "It doesn't matter..."
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>
>> > Jeffrey, the answer is "thousands, and growing every day."
>> >
>> > It's too bad that a person that refuses to give out even the basic
>> >numbers of devotees decides to ask for a numerical breakdown of a rival
>> >groups numbers.
>> >
>> > Assuming his accounting methods are acceptable, the answer is
>> >thousands, and growing every day.
>> >
>> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>> The code requirement is dead, so numbers don't matter.
>>
>
>How is it dead? The FCC has not changed the rules. And until they do.
>Morse code is still a requirement for ARS operation on HF.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>
If you can't see the handwriting on the wall, that's your problem..not
mine.

3614. Re: The Chosen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 02:41:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F62842D.6060608@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77079
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> unkadean wrote:
>
>
>>On Fri, 12 Sep 2003 11:10:31 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>>
>>
>>> I thought absinth was outlawed!... 8^)
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>I thought the 'absinth' of something was 'nothing'?
>
>
> Absinth maketh the heart grow fonder?
>

Absinth of malith?
```

3615. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 02:47:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030912224741.11891.00000757@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 77080

In article <%R48b.877$%G3.809@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>Thats right, my incentive was in 1961 when my mother paid for my ticket to >Pittsburg PA and went along to take my General test.

Just out of curiosity, Dan - where were you living in '61 that made Pittsburgh the nearest FCC office?

>"We ain't doing this again Danny, you better pass it the first time". I >did. At age 14.

I had it easier 'cause I was just a subway ride from the Philly FCC office. Short walk at each end and a pair of PTC tokens for the trip. Parental units were *not* involved. Tech and Advanced in '68 at 14 and Extra two years later.

You'll like this bit:

The way they ran the Philly exams was that they did the code first and then the writtens. And they started with 20 wpm. Better be there on time or you missed it.

So the day I'm there for the big E, the examiner comes out right at 8 AM and asks the assembled multitude if anybody is taking 20 wpm code. Turns out I'm not only the youngest one there but I'm the only one trying for Extra.

Examiner and I go in the exam room, he sets up the code machine, phones, pad and pencil, etc. You know the drill. Says all I need is one minute solid out of five. I put on the cans and he starts the machine. I have no trouble copying, so he comes around and looks obver my shoulder while I write in block letters. I figure I've got it licked, right?

After about 90 seconds he turns off the code machine. Uh-oh, I think, something's not right, I've never heard of a test being interrupted like that.

"Pretty easy, huh, kid?"
"Uh, yeah, I guess".
"It should be - that was 13. Here's 20"

And he changed drive spindles and the real test began.

I'll never know if he just forgot to change speeds, if he wanted to make sure I could do 13 first, or if he wanted to rattle the kid's cage a bit. Didn't matter, I passed.

Then 20 per with a straight key until he said "OK, kid".

You've been there, Dan, you're just 7 years ahead of me.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3616. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 02:59:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F62885A.5060004@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77081

Bob Brock wrote:
> On Fri, 12 Sep 2003 13:57:21 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
>
>>Bob Brock wrote:
>
>
>>>Try searching the web and not the ng's.
>>
>> Against my better judgement, I'll communicate with you.
>>
>>Re-read my post.
>>
>>Explain how a search engine works.
>>
>>Explain how I can get 104 hits vs your 39,000.
>>
>>Explain how you can get 39,000 hits. I got 24,500 hits when I did it
>>your way, but those numbers can change.
>
>
> Click on the link. I did and here is what I got...BTW, this is copy
> and paste, so it's exactly what's there.
> ----------
> Searched the web for 1/4 wave dipole. Results 1 - 10 of about
> 38,900. Search took 0.20 seconds
> ----------
>
> Someone is lying and anyone who wants to click on the link can tell
> who. BTW, I found five sites that list 1/4 wave dipoles and one site
> that lists a 3/4 wave dipole in the first ten listed.
>
>>Think about how being specific in search params will give you more
>>relevent results than just typing in the words, which will give you many
>>many hits on sometimes only one of the words.
>>
>>Oh I forgot, you don't have to explain. But that won't make you correct,
>>either.
>>
>> - mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> No, since I'm already correct and have documented it, there is no need
> for me to prove anything. You know, I have better things to do right

> now than to click on a link that I've already provided to show that it
> says the same thing that it said when I posted it.
>
> Plonk for now. I may take you back out when I get caught up on
> things, but I really don' have time to deal with liars right now.

Perhaps if Mr. Brock does have me killfiled, someone could explain to him that if he wants to find relevant hits on 1/4 wave dipole, he can just put the words in quote marks on Yahoo or Google.

Then the search will return relevant hits, rather than simple occurrences of the individual words, along with the hits wanted. There is no doubt in my mind that he got those 39,500 hits. It is symptomatic of poor database searching technique.

His 39,500 hit number, for all it's sound and fury, signifies nothing.

Then please tell him I will be happy to be filtered from his mail forever if possible.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3617. Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 04:04:50 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0309121920.252a5f30@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77082

I never hear people complain about:
1. The amount of junk food other hams eat
2. Smokers at hamfests

Junk food is a staple at club meetings and Field Day. At my club's meetings, you can always find plenty of salty potato chips (not the low-salt Pringles Right Crisps), coffee cake, glazed muffins, sweet rolls, and other unhealthy food. There is always plenty of soda pop to drink. True, apple pie snacks and cookies are junk food too, but at least they taste good. Kentucky Fried Chicken and donuts are served at each of our annual Field Day weekends.

I am the only ham radio operator who complains that other hams eat too much junk food. As a Morse Code testing opponent, I hate to say this, but junk food seems to be an EVEN MORE sacred tradition than Morse Code tests. The trend has been towards reducing Morse Code testing requirements, but I see no sign that the junk food tradition is ready to head off into the sunset.

People complain about hams with body odor at hamfests, but I can't remember reading anyone complaining about smokers at hamfests. I don't notice people's body odor - I don't run around sniffing everybody. But the foul tobacco smoke spreads like wildfire. I don't think body odor can spread 10-20 feet away very easily.

Hmmm, I see a great idea for a compromise on the Morse Code testing issue. The anti-Morse-testing side complains that the Morse Code test is unnecessary. The pro-Morse-testing side complains that removing the Morse Code test will make it too easy for people to become licensed. I propose that we replace the Morse Code test with health requirements. The replacement license requirements will be:
1. Your Body Mass Index (http://nhlbisupport.com/bmi/bmicalc.htm) must be below 19. Of course, if I gain 5 pounds this fall and winter, I'll have to revise the cutoff upward to 20.
2. No smokers may earn ham radio licenses.
3. No club is allowed to serve soda pop, donuts, glazed muffins, or potato chips with more than 135mg of sodium per serving.
4. At all club Field Day events, vegetables must be served for dinner.

Hey, these requirements would make it nice and challenging for people to earn their licenses. We want our hams to be healthy. Too many are afflicted with obesity, heart disease, high cholesterol, high blood pressure, and other health problems. We won't give licenses away - hams will need to cut the fast food, junk food, and tobacco out of their lives. This will be quite a challenge given how sacred the

Kentucky Fried Chicken, soda pop, and donuts are.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
usenet@@@@jasonhsu.com

3618. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 04:33:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030913003318.12501.00002366@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 77084

In article <d22b54c3.0309110224.47fc3080@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>
>Uh, Larry . . Alun is a Brit. Like Cornwallis was a Brit (so doan
>expect much in the way of the American Spirit there) . .

Brian:

Don't look now, but my reply was to Bob.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3619. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 04:33:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030913003319.12501.00002368@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 77083

In article <bjqv3a$mddbp$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Yeah Larry, now with my back injury and the head injury I have now when I
>fell out of my chair laughing so hard reading that, and hit my head, I look
>like a war victim now!!!!!!! :)
>
>Great Googely Moogely!!!

Ryan:

My most sincere apologies!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3620. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 04:33:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030913003319.12501.00002367@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 77085

In article <bjqv39$mddbp$11@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Wow, there's at least one thing we are equal and agree upon Larry!!!!! :) :)
>
>Ryan KC8PMX
>MI-Chauffers and Emergency Vehicle Permit holder
>Confirmed Parallel Parker And Proud!

Ryan:

As one PP'er to another, it is an honor to know you! It's nice to know that
we're morally and intellectually superior to the dumbed-down, unwashed,
non-PP'ing hoardes of inferior drivers.

Michigan still has "Chauffeur's" licenses? Which class of CDL is that
equivalent to? Here in Delaware, I'm told that Emergency Vehicle
operators don't require anything more than a standard Class D Driver's
license. They do, however, have to be a card-carrying member of
the "Emergency Service" (usually a local volunteer FD) to which
the emergency vehicle is registered.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3621. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 04:50:38 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <bju7mu$5kv$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 77088

Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote:
>If you can't accept the fact that people build, sell, and buy 1/4 wave
>dipoles for use in UHF, get over it. Just don't try to make stuff up
>and post it.

Again, by definition "dipole" means two current or voltage poles; it
does not refer to the number of elements of the antenna.

You can't have two (di-) current or voltage poles in just a 1/4-wave
segment. Calling it such doesn't make it so. It takes a 1/2-wavelength
for two (di-) such poles to appear.

Jeff KH6O
--
Operations Specialist 1st, U.S. Coast Guard
Mathematics Lecturer, University of Hawaii System

3622. Re: OT: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 04:55:10 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030913005510.15462.00002925@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 77087

In article <b7d1465c.0309120433.48e36421@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net (Bert Craig) writes:

>Hi all,
>
>I'm curious. If I make a mistake during a QSO, what is the correct way
>to get back on track. Do I:
>
>1. Send 6 or 7 dits or an extra long dah?
> -and-

Bert:

The actual prosign for an error is eight dits. I've heard hams using a straight key or "bug" send a long dash, but that's normally an alternative form of "zero" and not an "error" prosign. BTW, another alternative form of "zero" is the letter "O" (three dahs).

>2. Do I resume at the character or do I repeat the entire word?

It would be better to repeat the word; the OM on the other end will most likely figure out what you're doing in any case.

>Also, I heard a "shave and a haircut, two bits" at the end of a QSO
>the other night. When is that appropriate?

At the end of the QSO. It is a traditional ending, especially if you happen to have long hair and a 3-day growth of beard.

>Thanks. :-)

Your Velcome!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3623. Re: When is the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 04:55:11 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030913005511.15462.00002926@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 77086

In article <20030912061912.22081.00000517@mb-m17.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>The ultimate "class-leveling" socialists and
>>propagators of the dumb-down syndrome . .
>>
>Funny, I've never met one of those...
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

In that case, you've never been to England. They're everywhere over there. Just walk into any Pub, and there they are. Unless you're lucky enough to stumble into a Torrie Pub.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3624. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 05:02:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <fxx8b.6244$NM1.188@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77089

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
> > Ham radio is, and will always be, just what you make
> > of it, people.
>
> Well DUHHHHH!! Dwight!

Juging from the complaints here, its clearly not that obvious, Dick.

> You forgot to mention that follows what FCC
> allows *anyone* to make of it.....

The rules haven't changed that much, Dick. It's still the same ham radio,
with many of the same people.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3625. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 05:05:51 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <bju8jf$6f3$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 77090

Brian Kelly wrote:
> The world was blessed with your codeless presence on Nov 11 1957.
> Handheld calculators rendered slide rules obsolete when you were
> 14-15. Are you still using Leydon jars for capacitors Alun?

The basic four-function handheld calculator was still about $600
when he was 17; at least that's what we were selling them for at
RS at that time.

I was still using a slide rule in my 1980 college physics class.

Jeff KH6O
--
Operations Specialist 1st, U.S. Coast Guard
Mathematics Lecturer, University of Hawaii System

3626. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 05:25:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <tTx8b.6259$NM1.1314@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77091

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> However, there was a dark side back then:

People tend to see the good things in life. I guess that is good if not taken too far. But some do take it too far. I had a neighbor obsessed with the medieval time period. She routinely went to medieval fairs. One day, after listening to her chant about how wonderful life must have been back then, I could not resist pointing out some of the finer points of that time (disease, poor body hygene, poor dental hygene, and so on). That took some of the wind out of her sails.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3627. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 05:26:01 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <bju9p9$7pp$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 77092

In article <3F62885A.5060004@adelphia.net>,
Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
>
> Perhaps if Mr. Brock does have me killfiled, someone could explain to
>him that if he wants to find relevant hits on 1/4 wave dipole, he can
>just put the words in quote marks on Yahoo or Google.
>
> Then the search will return relevant hits, rather than simple
>occurrences of the individual words, along with the hits wanted. There
>is no doubt in my mind that he got those 39,500 hits. It is symptomatic
>of poor database searching technique.
>
> His 39,500 hit number, for all it's sound and fury, signifies nothing.
>
> Then please tell him I will be happy to be filtered from his mail
>forever if possible.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

What's really scary, Mike, is that folks like Bob believe everything
they read on the web. A manufacturer might advertise a misnomer such
as "1/4-wave dipole" and someone like Bob believes such an item can
really exist, when in fact "1/4-wave" and "dipole" are contradictions.

Jeff KH6O

--
Operations Specialist 1st, U.S. Coast Guard
Mathematics Lecturer, University of Hawaii System

3628. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 05:34:37 UTC
From: jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu
Message-ID: <bjua9d$8dc$1@news.hawaii.edu>
Source record: 77093

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>Jeffrey Herman wrote:
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:

>>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?

>> Geez, talk about a page from history! It was years ago that I
>> posed almost the same question to you, Carl, except I asked
>> "How many members of NCI are licensed" to which you replied,
>> "It doesn't matter..."

>Jeffrey, the answer is "thousands, and growing every day."
>
> It's too bad that a person that refuses to give out even the basic
>numbers of devotees decides to ask for a numerical breakdown of a rival
>groups numbers.
>
> Assuming his accounting methods are acceptable, the answer is
>thousands, and growing every day.

When I posed that question to Carl some years ago, he couldn't come
up with any membership roster; there were no records of who had joined
since there was no dues, nor did any application form exist.

Jeff KH6O
--
Operations Specialist 1st, U.S. Coast Guard
Mathematics Lecturer, University of Hawaii System

3629. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 05:56:51 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <Dky8b.1971$hY2.1604@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77094

Assuming that your post is serious and not intended to be humerous, Jason, I'd say that you should be careful not to neglect your mental hygene. Eating right and staying away from tobacco is nice, but it won't ultimately do you any good if your thinking is toxic.

I don't smoke, but I would gladly take up smoking as an alternative to becoming another miserable, obnoxious member of the PC-police.

There's probably only one hope for you now, Jason, and that is to buy yourself a pack of Chesterfields or Luckies and fire one on up on your way to "Golden Corral" to take advantage of that all-you-can-eat buffet.

"Smoking section, please!"

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message news:f7d9a152.0309121920.252a5f30@posting.google.com...
> I never hear people complain about:
> 1. The amount of junk food other hams eat
> 2. Smokers at hamfests
>
> Junk food is a staple at club meetings and Field Day. At my club's
> meetings, you can always find plenty of salty potato chips (not the
> low-salt Pringles Right Crisps), coffee cake, glazed muffins, sweet
> rolls, and other unhealthy food. There is always plenty of soda pop
> to drink. True, apple pie snacks and cookies are junk food too, but
> at least they taste good. Kentucky Fried Chicken and donuts are
> served at each of our annual Field Day weekends.
>
> I am the only ham radio operator who complains that other hams eat too
> much junk food. As a Morse Code testing opponent, I hate to say this,
> but junk food seems to be an EVEN MORE sacred tradition than Morse
> Code tests. The trend has been towards reducing Morse Code testing
> requirements, but I see no sign that the junk food tradition is ready
> to head off into the sunset.
>
> People complain about hams with body odor at hamfests, but I can't
> remember reading anyone complaining about smokers at hamfests. I
> don't notice people's body odor - I don't run around sniffing
> everybody. But the foul tobacco smoke spreads like wildfire. I don't
> think body odor can spread 10-20 feet away very easily.
>
> Hmmm, I see a great idea for a compromise on the Morse Code testing
> issue. The anti-Morse-testing side complains that the Morse Code test
> is unnecessary. The pro-Morse-testing side complains that removing

> the Morse Code test will make it too easy for people to become
> licensed. I propose that we replace the Morse Code test with health
> requirements. The replacement license requirements will be:
> 1. Your Body Mass Index (http://nhlbisupport.com/bmi/bmicalc.htm)
> must be below 19. Of course, if I gain 5 pounds this fall and winter,
> I'll have to revise the cutoff upward to 20.
> 2. No smokers may earn ham radio licenses.
> 3. No club is allowed to serve soda pop, donuts, glazed muffins, or
> potato chips with more than 135mg of sodium per serving.
> 4. At all club Field Day events, vegetables must be served for
> dinner.
>
> Hey, these requirements would make it nice and challenging for people
> to earn their licenses. We want our hams to be healthy. Too many are
> afflicted with obesity, heart disease, high cholesterol, high blood
> pressure, and other health problems. We won't give licenses away -
> hams will need to cut the fast food, junk food, and tobacco out of
> their lives. This will be quite a challenge given how sacred the
> Kentucky Fried Chicken, soda pop, and donuts are.
>
> Jason Hsu, AG4DG
> usenet@@@@jasonhsu.com

3630. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 05:58:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Nly8b.6274$NM1.3607@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77095

"N2EY" wrote
>
> 3) "Basic" license test is simple 20-25 question
> exam on regs, procedures, and safety. Very little
> technical and RF exposure stuff. Main objective
> is to keep Basics out of trouble. Basics get
> 200-50 watts on HF/MF and 25 watts or so on
> VHF/UHF (power level is below the point where
> RF exposure evaluation required). Modes are
> CW, analog voice, PSK31, RTTY and many of
> the other common data modes like packet. Basics
> cannot be VEs, control ops for repeaters, or club
> trustees. Basics get most VHF/UHF and about
> half of HF/MF spectrum, including parts of all
> subbands-by-mode. Basic is meant as the entry
> level. Easy to get, lots of privs, yet there's still a
> reason to upgrade. (snip)
>
> (snip)
>
> 9) Existing Novices, Techs and Tech Pluses
> become Basics, (snip)

What is the justification for sharply cutting back on existing Tech and Tech Plus privileges? We can presently use up to 1500 watts on VHF/UHF. You suggest a 25 watt limit. We can currently be repeater control ops. You suggest we shouldn't. We currently have no limits on operating modes. You propose limits. Since there have been no serious problems reported in any of these areas, I don't see a justification for any of these changes.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3631. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 06:33:10 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <GSy8b.1720$_Z5.1658@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77096

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:xOl8b.1567$Bs4.79@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Wigged-out William H. O'Hara, III" <whoohara@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns93F46D273FCB7AX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@216.168.3.44...
> > "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in
> > news:cgX7b.1176$G_.1020@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com:
> >
> > Well, just refer them to your QRZ post.
>
>snip<
>
> William refers to an article describing how non-hams can monitor ham radio
> transmissions in order to obtain info during an emergency. His claims are
> ridiculous of course, particularly his assertion that it is illegal for
> non-hams to monitor ham radio transmissions, but if you would like to look
> at what he's ranting about and judge for yourself, go to the "Library"
page
> at USPN http://www.uspacket.net and read the article: "Emergency Digital
> Communications - Another Angle".

The post on QRZ is long gone, but was a direct copy of the article mentioned
above. I cut 'n pasted it to QRZ, several months back.

Since putting the info here about the article at USPN, not a single ham has
mentioned anything about taking a look at it. Apparently nobody here gives a
hoot about William's ranting and foaming at the mouth, having spotted him as
a troll.

Can't say I'm surprised about that... I don't give a hoot about it either.

That makes it unanimous I suppose, with William being the sole exception.

Having failed even as a Troll, I wonder what worlds William will be out to
conquer next? Whatever it is, I wish him more success than he has found
here.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

3632. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 08:23:15 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93F52C850EFEEelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 77097

jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) wrote in
news:bju8jf$6f3$1@news.hawaii.edu:

> Brian Kelly wrote:
>> The world was blessed with your codeless presence on Nov 11 1957.
>> Handheld calculators rendered slide rules obsolete when you were
>> 14-15. Are you still using Leydon jars for capacitors Alun?
>
> The basic four-function handheld calculator was still about $600
> when he was 17; at least that's what we were selling them for at
> RS at that time.
>
> I was still using a slide rule in my 1980 college physics class.
>
> Jeff KH6O

Well, that's why it's called Rip-off Shack. I had a couple of TI scientific calculators when I was in college. The first one I unfortunately lost (actually dropped from a motorcycle at 70-80 mph!), but I still have the latter, although it hasn't been possible to replace the battery pack for years, so it can't really be used.

I don't think either of these cost more than about $ 125 at most, and my father bought a four-function Sharp for about $ 250 when I was about 13, i.e. about 1970ish. In fact he replaced the Sharp with a CBM costing maybe $ 75 when I was about 15 or so. Surely these couldn't have cost more in the US, especially not the ones made by Texas Instruments?

If you sold a 4-function machine in Rip-off Shack for $ 600, surely that can't have been when I was 17, i.e. 1974/5? That can't be right. In fact that would have been when I got my first TI scientific, at 17, for a fraction of that price. By 1980 I was on my second scientific calculator.

3633. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 08:28:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030913042805.02537.00000555@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 77098

In article <d22b54c3.0309121537.69581ae5@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<c2356669.0309120758.35bbdf8c@posting.google.com>...
>. . . .
>
>> End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is
>> envisioned as a 21st century version of the Novice) and has
>> reasonable but meaningful steps to reach full privileges.
>> Testing matches the privs granted. Power levels are set about
>> one S-unit apart. Nobody loses any privileges. There are only
>> three license classes and four written tests, so FCC doesn't
>> have more work.
>>
>> Example of new privileges:
>>
>> 80/75 meters
>> 3500-3575 CW only
>> 3575-3750 CW/data
>> 3750-4000 CW/analog phone/image
>>
>> Basic: 3525-3625 and 3900-4000
>> Intermediate: 3525-3750 and 3850-4000
>> Full: entire band
>
>That's all well and good James and I'd support your basics but what
>you're suggesting is a radical, complete top-to-bottom restructuring.

Long overdue. The basic structure we have now dates to 1951.

>Much more so than any we've seen in the past seventy-some years.
>Versus some Band-Aids on what already exists. With the FCC we have
>today we'd be lucky to get even a Band-Aid or two let alone a complete
>rework of HF ham radio. We're allowed to dream but then comes cold
>hard reality.

If we don't ask we'll never get. FCC isn't going to come up with any new ideas.
What can they do - say no?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3634. Re: The Chosen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 08:28:29 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309130028.7b4daceb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77099
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3F62842D.6060608@adelphia.net>...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> >
> > unkadean wrote:
> >
> >
> >>On Fri, 12 Sep 2003 11:10:31 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>> I thought absinth was outlawed!... 8^)
> >>>
> >>> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >>I thought the 'absinth' of something was 'nothing'?
> >
> >
> > Absinth maketh the heart grow fonder?
> >
>
> Absinth of malith?

Both when Heyerdahl's goofy balsa barge sank.

3635. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 09:07:59 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <mfn5mvk0tqdpuvhfhor7qctvd40mdl9sc8@4ax.com>
Source record: 77100

On 13 Sep 2003 04:50:38 GMT, jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman)
wrote:

>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote:
>>If you can't accept the fact that people build, sell, and buy 1/4 wave
>>dipoles for use in UHF, get over it. Just don't try to make stuff up
>>and post it.
>
>Again, by definition "dipole" means two current or voltage poles; it
>does not refer to the number of elements of the antenna.
>
>You can't have two (di-) current or voltage poles in just a 1/4-wave
>segment. Calling it such doesn't make it so. It takes a 1/2-wavelength
>for two (di-) such poles to appear.
>
>Jeff KH6O

You must have replied to the wrong post. But out of curiousity, how
many current or voltage poles is a "J" as in J-pole.

3636. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 09:20:22 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <3kn5mvcur5nu0utacii8i040pi82bnu52t@4ax.com>
Source record: 77101

On 13 Sep 2003 05:26:01 GMT, jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman)
wrote:

>In article <3F62885A.5060004@adelphia.net>,
>Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
>>
>> Perhaps if Mr. Brock does have me killfiled, someone could explain to
>>him that if he wants to find relevant hits on 1/4 wave dipole, he can
>>just put the words in quote marks on Yahoo or Google.
>>
>> Then the search will return relevant hits, rather than simple
>>occurrences of the individual words, along with the hits wanted. There
>>is no doubt in my mind that he got those 39,500 hits. It is symptomatic
>>of poor database searching technique.
>>
>> His 39,500 hit number, for all it's sound and fury, signifies nothing.
>>
>> Then please tell him I will be happy to be filtered from his mail
>>forever if possible.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>What's really scary, Mike, is that folks like Bob believe everything
>they read on the web. A manufacturer might advertise a misnomer such
>as "1/4-wave dipole" and someone like Bob believes such an item can
>really exist, when in fact "1/4-wave" and "dipole" are contradictions.
>
>Jeff KH6O

When about 10-15,000 of them get together and do it, it does give it
some creedence.

What I find really ironic is that, instead of simply providing
adefinition, someone would dance all around it and tell lies. Here,
let me do your homework for you...

http://rhyme.lycos.com/r/d?u=dipole_antenna

http://dict.die.net/dipole%20antenna/

http://www.hyperdictionary.com/dictionary/dipole+antenna

There, do you feel better now??? The way the discussions go is that
if you make an assertion, it's up to you to support it. I'm getting
damn sick and tired of having to do you guys homework for you.

3637. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 12:24:05 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <F%D8b.2040$nQ.981515@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77102

```
"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns93F4E04F12EAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> news:d22b54c3.0309120338.77e58fc3@posting.google.com:
>
> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:<Xns93F3E3A7EB9E6elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in
> >> news:d22b54c3.0309110715.543e6db6@posting.google.com:
> >>
> >> > Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> >> > news:<Xns93F28BBE48EBAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >>
> >> >> I was certainly taught how to use a Smith chart in engineering
> >> >> school. Not only that, but how to derive the axes mathematically.
> >> >> The latter I have forgotten, but I will never forget how to use
> >> >> one. There again, I went to engineering school in Emgland, where
> >> >> you don't have to do 'English 101' or 'Western Civilization' if you
> >> >> study engineering, hence sufficient time to learn about Smith
> >> >> Charts!
> >> >
> >> > I really hate to bust yer bubble again Alun but Smith Charts and all
> >> > the rest of the artifact nomograph "solvers" were already stale
> >> > about the time you popped out of school. Didja also have a course in
> >> > slide rule operations too? I'll bet you did, dinya?
> >> >
> >> > Looks to me like you were obsolete when you graduated. Here's
> >> > today's "Smith Charts" Alun.
> >> >
> >> > http://home.t-online.de/home/weberconnect/csmith2.htm
> >> >
> >> > http://rf.rfglobalnet.com/software_modeling/software/2/102.htm
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >> 73 de N3KIP
> >> >
> >> > w3rv
> >> >
> >>
> >> Smith charts still work. And no, the last time I used a slide rule was
> >> in high school. So, I am perhaps 5-10 years younger than you think.
> >
```

> > The world was blessed with your codeless presence on Nov 11 1957.
> > Handheld calculators rendered slide rules obsolete when you were
> > 14-15. Are you still using Leydon jars for capacitors Alun?
> >
> > w3rv
> >
>
> That's about right on the dates, except that there were very few
> calculators around back then. I remember my dad paying the equivalent of
> about $250 for a rather large four-function calculator c1970-1971 ish. It
> was made by Sharp. Sinclair had a cheaper one, but you had to build it
> from a kit!
>
> Also, high school (at least it's sometimes called that, amongst other
> things) is usually age 11-18 in the UK, so it takes in middle
> school/junior high (although in some areas of the UK there are middle
> schools, just to confuse the issue).
>

I graduated from college in 1973. Only ONE student in the entire engineering department at the university owned a calculator at that time. Naturally many of us checked into buying one but since it cost $325 to purchase one with adequate engineering/scientific functions (a Hewitt-Packard), none of the rest of us did. That was a huge chunk of change back then. By comparison, a slide rule was approximately $30. The following year, one could by a Texas Instruments with all the functions for a "mere" $125. So I got one for work. By the way, some companies started providing calculators for employees at this time but you wouldn't believe the paperwork you had to fill out. Plus you had to have a docking station with a lock at your desk so it didn't "walk off". Prices dropped relatively quickly over the next several years. When they got close to the cost of a slide rule, calculators finally displaced slide rules.

Just to put those numbers in perspective, I'll list some other things that I remember from 1973-1974. An engineer who had just graduated with a Bachelor's degree from college was getting about $10,000 to $11,000 per year. A nice 1200 sq ft house with full basement and decent sized yard could be purchased in the suburbs around Seattle for under $30,000 and the monthly payment was under $300 per month.

So you can see that a calculator in 1973 and before was more than a week's wage for a working, professional engineer. It was out of the question for most students.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3638. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:00:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309130500.25c65720@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77103

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<c2356669.0309111255.644e65c6@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309110930.fc9fdf1@posting.google.com>...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030911081910.12631.00001025@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > > In article <eIO7b.1587$zx2.1002@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
> > > <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
> > >
> > > >But, I'll bet, if you think about it.....it made you a better operator. It
> > > >was a SKILL you HAD TO LEARN in order to StAY ON THE AIR? Think about it.
> > >
> > > 'zactly. No other option. The Novice was not supposed to be a permanent
> > > license. That's why it had so few privileges and was so focused,
> > >
> > > And the old Novice had another feature - it was a one-time one year license
> > > until 1967, when it became two years.
> >
> > Had to.
>
> Had to what?

(See above)

Had to... become two years.

> > You waited 6 months for your license and you couldn't operate
> > til it arrived.
>
> Six weeks, not six months.

Right.

> In the time between passing the test and getting the license, I built
> my first transmitter and power supply from junk parts and bought a
> crystal for it. Hooked up the TR switch and got everything ready.
> Already had the receiver and antenna. When the license arrived I was
> ready to go.

You are not unusual in being ready to go when the license finally came.

3639. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:02:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309130502.4c163767@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77104

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<UP48b.875$%G3.607@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309110930.fc9fdf1@posting.google.com...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<20030911081910.12631.00001025@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> > > In article <eIO7b.1587$zx2.1002@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Dan/W4NTI"
> > > <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
> > >
> > > >But, I'll bet, if you think about it.....it made you a better operator.
> It
> > > >was a SKILL you HAD TO LEARN in order to StAY ON THE AIR? Think
> about it.
> > >
> > > 'zactly. No other option. The Novice was not supposed to be a permanent
> > > license. That's why it had so few privileges and was so focused,
> > >
> > > And the old Novice had another feature - it was a one-time one year
> license
> > > until 1967, when it became two years.
> >
> > Had to. You waited 6 months for your license and you couldn't operate
> > til it arrived.
>
> You are so full of mis-information Brian, have you considered a lobotomy to
> remove the tumor?
>
> The wait from taking the test until it came in the mail was 6 to 8 weeks.
> That was the 'official' time the FCC gave you when that question was asked.
>
> It sometimes made it in 4. It took mine 6 1/2 weeks.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Sorry, meant weeks. Mine came in 8 or 9 (weeks). I think the VE
might have held on to it until the Novice class ended. I graduated
ahead of the class.

3640. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:04:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309130504.199430f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77105

jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) wrote in message
news:<bjua9d$8dc$1@news.hawaii.edu>...
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
> >Jeffrey Herman wrote:
> >> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
> >>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>
> >> Geez, talk about a page from history! It was years ago that I
> >> posed almost the same question to you, Carl, except I asked
> >> "How many members of NCI are licensed" to which you replied,
> >> "It doesn't matter..."
>
> >Jeffrey, the answer is "thousands, and growing every day."
> >
> > It's too bad that a person that refuses to give out even the basic
> >numbers of devotees decides to ask for a numerical breakdown of a rival
> >groups numbers.
> >
> > Assuming his accounting methods are acceptable, the answer is
> >thousands, and growing every day.
>
>
> When I posed that question to Carl some years ago, he couldn't come
> up with any membership roster; there were no records of who had joined
> since there was no dues, nor did any application form exist.
>
> Jeff KH6O

Jeff, people who get their mail in glass mailboxes shouldn't throw stones.

3641. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:08:01 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <N6idnU1Pd8NTi_6iXTWJiw@crocker.com>
Source record: 77106

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0309121920.252a5f30@posting.google.com...
> I never hear people complain about:
> 1. The amount of junk food other hams eat
> 2. Smokers at hamfests

i hate to break this to you jason, but these vices are not just limited to hams... may i suggest you join a health club, or maybe the sierra club, or some local vegan support group to find others of like feelings... if you insist on going to club meetings and hamfests with feelings like this all you will do is frustrate yourself and annoy others that you try to change.

3642. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:12:09 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309130512.279c14e2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77107

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030909001350.16504.00000674@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> From: well_look@this.now
>
> Anonymous poster. No-one accuses this person of being a coward even after
> expressing strong biased opinion.

Go right ahead, Vippy, since you think it's important.

(Rest of stupid stuff snipped...It doesn't make any sense anyway)

> > Thats it in a nutshell.
>
> From a nut.

YOU have NO BUSINESS accusing anyone else, anonymous or otherwise
of being a nut, Vippy.

Steve, K4YZ

3643. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:14:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309130514.bda863d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77108

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030909174739.12631.00000984@mb-m28.aol.com>...

> Dwight, for some, this newsgroup is their hobby... :-)

For some of us, it is "a" hobby...those of us with a valid radio
station/operator LICENSE don't have to depend on it for our sole
source of recreation...Like SOME people we know...

Steve, K4YZ

3644. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:14:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309130514.1621de5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77109

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030906091922.14837.00002769@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <9bnilv8q3omrvq3impcbgpbv65dpddjhbu@4ax.com>, Bob Brock
> <bbrock@i-america.net> writes:
>
> >I'm
> >here to see if the ham community will then move on to something really
> >important like revising the written tests and the test pools so that
> >when someone passes the test, they actually know how to use a radio,
> >set up or build an antenna, the protocols on the frequencies they are
> >authouized to use, how to minimize RF exposure and stay within safe
> >levels.
>
> The test pools are under constant revision. Anyone can submit proposed Q&A to
> the QPC for consideration.

Smith Charts, again?

> > If someone doesn't know what all those buttons do on their
> >radio, they shouldn't be licensed to use it.
>
> Then we'd need rig-specific licenses.

Bad idea.

> And what would you do about homebrew rigs like mine?

Lets not get all superior. Elecraft manuals are on-line.

> >If they don't know
> >enough not to use repeater imputs for simplex operation, they
> >shouldn't be licensed to use the frequency.
>
> Now that makes sense! But such things are already addressed in the question
> pools.
>
> The problem is that what needs to change is the test methodology. By lumping
> all of the subjects into a one-size-fits-all written test, prospective hams can
> have huge holes in their knowledge and still pass because of strenghts in other
> areas. One answer to that is subelements.
>
> The big problem is convincing FCC that testing at such a level is needed. For
> more than 25 years, FCC's view towards amateur radio testing is to reduce the
> license requirements and make the licenses easier to get, not harder. That's
> one of the reasons some folks defend the code test so diligently - they know
> that if it goes, it will not be replaced by any other test, nor will the test

> methods used for the written be improved.

But Jim, the Morse Exam was supposed to be a Morse Exam, not a "Lets
make it harder for people to get into amateur radio" Exam.

> >It's my hope that when it is all over with Morse, that the ham
> >community will address the real important issues and Morse ain't it.
>
> Morse will continue to be a major part of amateur radio with or without a test.
> The test, however, is symbolic of the changes that have been ongoing for a long
> time.

The Morse Exam is symbolic of only the Morse Code. The VECs threw
that out the window when they subbed a Farnsworth Exam at 13-15WPM for
Morse at 5WPM as specified by the FCC in PArt 97.

> >It is at best a scapegoat that hams can argue about while the more
> >important issues of licensing inept operators is ignored. IMO, the
> >ham community has some really screwed up priorities and hopefully,
> >with the endgame for code in sight, they may....just may come to grips
> >with some real issues.
> >
> >I'm hopeful, but not expectant.
> >
> I think you will find that the exact same problems will arise in connection
> with any move to increase license requirements. The "Smith chart solution" post
> in another thread is only half in jest.
>
> There are already folks like W5YI campaigning for less WRITTEN testing, saying
> the Tech test is too hard.

The Tech test And privs are insane for an entry level license.

3645. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:16:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309130516.621ad76d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77110

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:<jPt8b.425516$YN5.287945@sccrnsc01>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in
> news:5c01b95b.0309121214.7d06772d@posting.google.com:
>
> > That's Jim;s OPINION, Brain. Other than that, you have not
> > satisfied the question of how the ARRL has allegedly pushed for "lower
> > standards".
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
> >
>
> It's my opinion too, and I'm always right.

Of course, Vince. I never doubted it!

Steve, K4YZ

3646. Re: The Chosen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:21:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309130521.5255a50c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77111
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bjtls6$859$0@208.207.71.169>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<9b590f5e564adc3cc2ce5ff0ead6e71b.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > > The Wise Ones live in the depths of the D, E, and F-Layers, and in the
> > > servers at Google.com. They are the descendants of the Gods. I
> > > personally subscribe to the theory they are the children of Thor
> > > Heyerdahl, the Viking god of Thunder and Balsawood Raft Dxpeditions. But
> > > that's another story.
> >
> > snip
> >
> > I liked the story of "Little Billy Beeper" better.
>
> Ah yes, you finally found a role model!

It was kind of cute how Hans villianized the NCTA.

3647. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:25:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309130525.6f33bc26@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77112

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309121214.7d06772d@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309061806.621b7987@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Jim has repeatedly pointed out where the ARRL proposed fewer license
> > classes and a lower code speed for full priveleges during the last
> > restructuring, which he always equates with lower standards.
>
> That's Jim;s OPINION, Brain. Other than that, you have not
> satisfied the question of how the ARRL has allegedly pushed for "lower
> standards".
>
> Steve, K4YZ

I don't necessarily understand how Jim arrived at his OPINION, but
you're welcome to ask him, if you've the guts to do so.

I'm always amazed at how you PCTA give each other passes on every
damned thing.

Go ahead, ask him.

3648. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:26:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309130526.736357da@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77113

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:<jPt8b.425516$YN5.287945@sccrnsc01>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in
> news:5c01b95b.0309121214.7d06772d@posting.google.com:
>
> > That's Jim;s OPINION, Brain. Other than that, you have not
> > satisfied the question of how the ARRL has allegedly pushed for "lower
> > standards".
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
> >
>
> It's my opinion too, and I'm always right.
>
> KB7ADL

Well there you have it, Steve. You have two people to query now; Jim and Vince.

Surely you will find your answer.

3649. 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:30:52 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjv63a$t1m@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 77114

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F62885A.5060004@adelphia.net...
>
> > Bob Brock wrote:
> >
> > Someone is lying and anyone who wants to click on the link can tell
> > who. BTW, I found five sites that list 1/4 wave dipoles and one site
> > that lists a 3/4 wave dipole in the first ten listed.
> >
>
> Perhaps if Mr. Brock does have me killfiled, someone could explain to
> him that if he wants to find relevant hits on 1/4 wave dipole, he can
> just put the words in quote marks on Yahoo or Google.
>
> Then the search will return relevant hits, rather than simple
> occurrences of the individual words, along with the hits wanted. There
> is no doubt in my mind that he got those 39,500 hits. It is symptomatic
> of poor database searching technique.
>
> His 39,500 hit number, for all it's sound and fury, signifies nothing.
>
> Then please tell him I will be happy to be filtered from his mail
> forever if possible.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

OK, really. I don't know if you guys are trolling and can't even tell which one of you (not just you two, but Dick, et al). IF there is no 1/4 wave dipole, and IF they aren't effective as an antenna--if there are 1/4 wave--then, why the following:

From http://www.qsl.net/wd4bis/Newham/nhp2.html
. . ."When gain figures are listed as dBd, they are using a 1/4 wave dipole cut for the center frequency of the band of interest as the reference.". . .

From
http://www.wr6wr.com/newSite/articles/features/olderfeatures/antennaswithtwist.html
. . ."The shortest self-resonant linear length of wire is not the half-wave dipole as one might mistakenly assume, but instead, a wire one quarter of a wavelength long." and . . ."On-the-air tests on 2 Meters with KI6O indicated that the transmitted signal strengths of the short dipole were equal to or better than the full half-wave antenna. Because the "on-the-air" tests were crude at best, I don't make the claim that the short antenna had any gain, but in any case, it was no worse than the full-size antenna.". . . and "The 1/4 wavelength 40-meter dipole antenna would normally have a

radiation resistance of about 14 Ohms. The radiation resistance of the short 40-meter dipole was increased to 50 Ohms by the use of the spiral coils and resulted in a much better match to the 50-ohm transmission line.". . . (The last being proof that experimentation and innovation can overcome any impedance mismatches when dealing with the volatile 1/4 wavelength arithmetic). Uh oh...now Dick's gonna find out that....oh, never mind, it'll go right over his head.

From http://www.oakvilleamateurs.net/newsletters/hb200302.pdf
. . ."For most 40-meters, the most practical antenna is the 1/4-wave dipole (66 feet in total length) up at least 33 feet in the air. If you've never worked (or heard) Europe on 40, it's likely your dipole is too low. The challenge grows on 80 where your quarter wave dipole (133' 9") needs to be up at least 66 feet.". . . Oh, for Dick's sake, I'll let him explain why the distances from the radiation plane of the antenna to the ground level are important when working with 1/4 wavelength antenna designs. OH, dang it, now he's going to know...oh, never mind, that'll go right up over his head, too!

The above is from a search using the boolean combination of "1/4;wave;dipole and antenna" with a result of 12 hits from Altavista, my search engine of choice.

Now, this dialogue that's been occurring on this topic is misleading at best, and shameful at worst. Dick jumped on the bandwagon of someone else (like he always does because he can't think for himself) that he *thought* knew what they were talking about--when, in actuality that person was trolling for the general knowledge of all participants in the discussion. So, you've all been "snookered" and the previous thread under which this topic was flowing, "FISTS petition to the FCC" is the best damned example of a total mess as I've ever seen.

Kim W5TIT -- done with the topic, but changed to an appropriately titled topic. After all, we wouldn't want a search on "1/4 wave dipole" to miss all this pertinent, scientific discussion. *yeah, right*

3650. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:35:53 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjv6cm$g7k@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 77116

"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:mfn5mvk0tqdpuvhfhor7qctvd40mdl9sc8@4ax.com...
> On 13 Sep 2003 04:50:38 GMT, jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman)
> wrote:
>
> >Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote:
> >>If you can't accept the fact that people build, sell, and buy 1/4 wave
> >>dipoles for use in UHF, get over it. Just don't try to make stuff up
> >>and post it.
> >
> >Again, by definition "dipole" means two current or voltage poles; it
> >does not refer to the number of elements of the antenna.
> >
> >You can't have two (di-) current or voltage poles in just a 1/4-wave
> >segment. Calling it such doesn't make it so. It takes a 1/2-wavelength
> >for two (di-) such poles to appear.
> >
> >Jeff KH6O
>
> You must have replied to the wrong post. But out of curiousity, how
> many current or voltage poles is a "J" as in J-pole.
>

GASP!!!! Bob! Don't get them going with the word i-m-p-e-d-a-n-c-e!!!!
;)

Kim W5TIT

3651. Re: Will PCTA Censure Bruce?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:35:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309130535.1ed9ccc9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77115

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030912202354.18064.00000639@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Bruce is their poster boy.
>
> And you are Karls poster buy

This is the part where Rev. Jim comes in and puts in an apostrophe to
show posession, and a period to show closure.

But that might cause a rift in the PCT Agenda, so Bruce gets a pass.
Again.

3652. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:44:38 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vm67q8r5glb2de@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77118

The leftist-socialist-utopian types will soundly
support your ideas.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--
--

Former New York Mayor Ed Koch,
self proclaimed DEMOCRAT,
SHORTLY after the 9/11 attack-

"...everybody has a right to have thier own
oppinion... ...i'm even a Democrat... ...but
in this time of trouble, we need to show the
world our resolve and we're united, and we
should NOT denigrate the president."

--

Tom Daschle believes in the rich paying taxes....
...um, except for HIMSELF...

http://sibbyonline.blogspot.com/2003_08_10_sibbyonline_archive.html

--

If you sympathize with terrorists & middle eastern tyrants,
vote for liberals...

--

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0309121920.252a5f30@posting.google.com...
> I never hear people complain about:
> 1. The amount of junk food other hams eat
> 2. Smokers at hamfests
>
> Junk food is a staple at club meetings and Field Day. At my club's
> meetings, you can always find plenty of salty potato chips (not the
> low-salt Pringles Right Crisps), coffee cake, glazed muffins, sweet
> rolls, and other unhealthy food. There is always plenty of soda pop
> to drink. True, apple pie snacks and cookies are junk food too, but
> at least they taste good. Kentucky Fried Chicken and donuts are
> served at each of our annual Field Day weekends.
>
> I am the only ham radio operator who complains that other hams eat too

> much junk food. As a Morse Code testing opponent, I hate to say this,
> but junk food seems to be an EVEN MORE sacred tradition than Morse
> Code tests. The trend has been towards reducing Morse Code testing
> requirements, but I see no sign that the junk food tradition is ready
> to head off into the sunset.
>
> People complain about hams with body odor at hamfests, but I can't
> remember reading anyone complaining about smokers at hamfests. I
> don't notice people's body odor - I don't run around sniffing
> everybody. But the foul tobacco smoke spreads like wildfire. I don't
> think body odor can spread 10-20 feet away very easily.
>
> Hmmm, I see a great idea for a compromise on the Morse Code testing
> issue. The anti-Morse-testing side complains that the Morse Code test
> is unnecessary. The pro-Morse-testing side complains that removing
> the Morse Code test will make it too easy for people to become
> licensed. I propose that we replace the Morse Code test with health
> requirements. The replacement license requirements will be:
> 1. Your Body Mass Index (http://nhlbisupport.com/bmi/bmicalc.htm)
> must be below 19. Of course, if I gain 5 pounds this fall and winter,
> I'll have to revise the cutoff upward to 20.
> 2. No smokers may earn ham radio licenses.
> 3. No club is allowed to serve soda pop, donuts, glazed muffins, or
> potato chips with more than 135mg of sodium per serving.
> 4. At all club Field Day events, vegetables must be served for
> dinner.
>
> Hey, these requirements would make it nice and challenging for people
> to earn their licenses. We want our hams to be healthy. Too many are
> afflicted with obesity, heart disease, high cholesterol, high blood
> pressure, and other health problems. We won't give licenses away -
> hams will need to cut the fast food, junk food, and tobacco out of
> their lives. This will be quite a challenge given how sacred the
> Kentucky Fried Chicken, soda pop, and donuts are.
>
> Jason Hsu, AG4DG
> usenet@@@@jasonhsu.com

3653. Re: Did you hear about the No-Coder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:46:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309130546.f12515e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77119

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030911204647.14153.00000967@mb-m18.aol.com>...
> >But I did hear about the No-Code Tech that married her CBer brother.
> >How is your sister?
> >
>
> I think you were think of yourself

You think I was think of myself?

Why am I reminded of the Far Side Comic where the boy with the
misshapened head is trying to enter the "Shcool for the Gifted" by
pushing on the door that says "PULL?"

So anyway, how's you're sister/wife, good buddy?

3654. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:47:14 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vm67v564e0pj4c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77120

I heard from the latest audio news that more nations
around the world are dropping thier morse code
testing requirements.

makes you wonder if the VEC's who petitioned
to return a higher code speed test for extra class
hams are just doing so to fight the tide.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--
--

Former New York Mayor Ed Koch,
self proclaimed DEMOCRAT,
SHORTLY after the 9/11 attack-

"...everybody has a right to have thier own
oppinion... ...i'm even a Democrat... ...but
in this time of trouble, we need to show the
world our resolve and we're united, and we
should NOT denigrate the president."

--

Tom Daschle believes in the rich paying taxes....
...um, except for HIMSELF...

http://sibbyonline.blogspot.com/2003_08_10_sibbyonline_archive.html

--

If you sympathize with terrorists & middle eastern tyrants,
vote for liberals...

--

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0309121214.7d06772d@posting.google.com...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309061806.621b7987@posting.google.com>...
>
> > Jim has repeatedly pointed out where the ARRL proposed fewer license
> > classes and a lower code speed for full priveleges during the last
> > restructuring, which he always equates with lower standards.
>
> That's Jim;s OPINION, Brain. Other than that, you have not

> satisfied the question of how the ARRL has allegedly pushed for "lower
> standards".
>
> Steve, K4YZ

3655. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:48:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309130548.5ff7d25b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77121

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bj29m9$vi7$0@208.207.71.176>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj17rmran0@208.206.142.111>...

> > > bang is still as holey as a moth-eaten cotten curtain in a 1940's flophouse.
> >
> > Was that your primary residence?
>
> I saw the movie.

You starred in it.

3656. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 13:49:47 UTC
From: Emmersom Bigguns <ebigguns@boobs.com>
Message-ID: <%fF8b.55122$3b2.6958951@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 77117

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0309121920.252a5f30@posting.google.com...
> I never hear people complain about:
> 1. The amount of junk food other hams eat
> 2. Smokers at hamfests

Carl, please keep your retarded children away from your computer.
Damn, don't you have leashes at the NCI Compound?

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.516 / Virus Database: 313 - Release Date: 9/1/2003

3657. Re: Did you hear about the No-Coder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 14:01:40 UTC
From: lbudney@pobox.com
Message-ID: <n0d8948r.fsf@pobox.com>
Source record: 77122

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> Why am I reminded of the Far Side Comic where the boy with the
> misshapened head is trying to enter the "Shcool for the Gifted"...

If my parents tried to send me to a "Shcool for the Gifted", I wouldn't go.

--Len.

3658. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 14:06:57 UTC
From: Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com>
Message-ID: <5wF8b.127913$kP.77907@fed1read03>
Source record: 77123

What a nonsense generalization. As though the rest of society doesn't eat junk food or smoke or are affected by obesity, heart disease, high cholesterol, high blood pressure, and other health problems.

One study showed with a population sample of six million, one million will have high blood
pressure and not know it!

Another study shows more than 30 percent of American adults, were obese.

I went to a gathering of lawyers the other day -- and so help me they were all fat, smoked like a chimney and eat the catered junk food like it was going out of style -- therefore all lawyers are fat and smoke etc.
Give me a break oh generalized one.

--
73 From The Signal In The Noise
Caveat Generalization - Ya All

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0309121920.252a5f30@posting.google.com...
> I never hear people complain about:
> 1. The amount of junk food other hams eat
> 2. Smokers at hamfests
>
SNIP

3659. Re: slide rules (was: Could This Be The Solution?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 14:25:52 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309130625.1d3ca689@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77124

slide rules

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030912081915.12501.00002347@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0309111623.47ff3047@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>

> And besides the slide rule, there were various forms of specialized "lightning
> calculators". At one time ARRL sold a several different types for solving LC
> problems, designing coils, power/resistance, etc. I still have and use one of
> the later-model slide rule LC ones for tuned-circuit work. Gives an eagle-eye
> view of effects ("if I use a 140 pf variable instad of 100, I'll be able to
> reach 2 MHz...").

I forgot about those, they were really slick. I had an L/C version.
Went the way of the 75A4.

I have a current-tech version. I originally bought Mathcad for doing
biz-type engineeing number crunching but at this point I've written
and canned more ham related math routines than I have for biz
purposes. One of 'em is an L/C cruncher which is pretty simple. I also
wrote a coil designer which is *not* simple. Net result is that I can
bring both up in separate windows and copy-paste results between 'em
and bingo, almost instant tank circuit designs right down to the
number of turns of #X wire x Y form diameter x Z winding length. To
the fifth decimal place when I get really anal.

> >The engineering students' full dress uniform (the physics majors
> >weren't far behind) also included a pocket protector full of whatever
> >ya could jam into it, a worn-out rumpled corduroy jacket and a
> >beat-to-crap briecase . . The uniform definitely differentiated the
> >engineers from the business administration weenies.
> >
> And other wannabees. In my day it was only slightly different. Denim replaced
> corduroy and the briefcase was often a backpack. Mine was an old Bulletin
> delivery bag.

No, NO! Tell me you din use a Bulletin bag for a briefcase, say it
isn't true! Gauche! GAUCHE! You'd have been lampooned back across
Chestnut St. if you'd shown up in class on our side of the street with
one of those.

But then you people also had water buffalo on campus. <Sigh>.

> Years ago I learned to do basic math to 2 decimal places in me head. Saved a
> lot of fiddling. Refined it when I started running so I could figure out time

> splits on the fly. Still amazes the unwashed multitudes.

The unwashed multitudes can't make change for a buck in their heads.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3660. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 14:25:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030913102558.15462.00002929@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 77125

In article <Nly8b.6274$NM1.3607@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote
>>
>> 3) "Basic" license test is simple 20-25 question
>> exam on regs, procedures, and safety. Very little
>> technical and RF exposure stuff. Main objective
>> is to keep Basics out of trouble. Basics get
>> 200-50 watts on HF/MF and 25 watts or so on
>> VHF/UHF (power level is below the point where
>> RF exposure evaluation required). Modes are
>> CW, analog voice, PSK31, RTTY and many of
>> the other common data modes like packet. Basics
>> cannot be VEs, control ops for repeaters, or club
>> trustees. Basics get most VHF/UHF and about
>> half of HF/MF spectrum, including parts of all
>> subbands-by-mode. Basic is meant as the entry
>> level. Easy to get, lots of privs, yet there's still a
>> reason to upgrade. (snip)
>>
>> (snip)
>>
>> 9) Existing Novices, Techs and Tech Pluses
>> become Basics, (snip)
>
>
> What is the justification for sharply cutting back on existing Tech and
>Tech Plus privileges?

You snipped the second sentence of 9), Dwight. Here it is again:

9) Existing Novices, Techs and Tech Pluses become Basics,
existing Generals and Advanceds become Intermediates, and
existing Extras become Fulls. Existing hams can continue to
use their current privileges as long as they retain license
documents showing their old license class.

"Existing hams can continue to use their current privileges as long as they retain license documents showing their old license class."

Just like Tech Pluses who have been renewed as Techs can still use HF, and anybody with an old Novice or code-tested-Tech license document gets Element 1 credit. If FCC accepts the idea for those uses, why not for the above?

IOW, no existing ham loses any privileges.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>

We can presently use up to 1500 watts on VHF/UHF. You
>suggest a 25 watt limit. We can currently be repeater control ops. You
>suggest we shouldn't. We currently have no limits on operating modes. You
>propose limits. Since there have been no serious problems reported in any of
>these areas, I don't see a justification for any of these changes.
>

3661. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 14:25:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030913102559.15462.00002930@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 77126

In article <F%D8b.2040$nQ.981515@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Just to put those numbers in perspective, I'll list some other things that I >remember from 1973-1974. An engineer who had just graduated with a >Bachelor's degree from college was getting about $10,000 to $11,000 per >year. A nice 1200 sq ft house with full basement and decent sized yard >could be purchased in the suburbs around Seattle for under $30,000 and the >monthly payment was under $300 per month.

I graduated EE school in 1976 and those numbers are right in line with my experience (1976 numbers about 15% higher due to inflation).

Some other datapoints:

- New car prices ranged from $3000 to $5000
- Gasoline was about 60 cents a gallon
- A year's tuition at an Ivy League university was $4500
- Ham rig prices were somewhat less than today's prices Maybe 60-75%.
- Inflation was double digit and interest rates were not far behind

73 de Jim, N2EY

3662. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 14:33:41 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309130633.53b676@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77127

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030913042805.02537.00000555@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0309121537.69581ae5@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<c2356669.0309120758.35bbdf8c@posting.google.com>...
> >. . . .
> >
> >> End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is
> >> envisioned as a 21st century version of the Novice) and has
> >> reasonable but meaningful steps to reach full privileges.
> >> Testing matches the privs granted. Power levels are set about
> >> one S-unit apart. Nobody loses any privileges. There are only
> >> three license classes and four written tests, so FCC doesn't
> >> have more work.
> >>
> >> Example of new privileges:
> >>
> >> 80/75 meters
> >> 3500-3575 CW only
> >> 3575-3750 CW/data
> >> 3750-4000 CW/analog phone/image
> >>
> >> Basic: 3525-3625 and 3900-4000
> >> Intermediate: 3525-3750 and 3850-4000
> >> Full: entire band
> >
> >That's all well and good James and I'd support your basics but what
> >you're suggesting is a radical, complete top-to-bottom restructuring.
>
> Long overdue. The basic structure we have now dates to 1951.
>
> >Much more so than any we've seen in the past seventy-some years.
> >Versus some Band-Aids on what already exists. With the FCC we have
> >today we'd be lucky to get even a Band-Aid or two let alone a complete
> >rework of HF ham radio. We're allowed to dream but then comes cold
> >hard reality.
>
> If we don't ask we'll never get. FCC isn't going to come up with any new ideas.
> What can they do - say no?

Yeah, absolutely. They'll say "we've already put enough work into
diddling with this stuff in the past few years, come back in 5-10

years when we have a better picture of the effects of what we've already done become apparent". Which is typical FCC behavior when it comes to major restructurings going back decades.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3663. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 14:37:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030913103742.13421.00001181@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 77128

>You must have replied to the wrong post. But out of curiousity, how
>many current or voltage poles is a "J" as in J-pole.

You Morron a J-Pole is a half wave ant , not a quarter wave. It appears that Brock knows nothing about ants, my guess is hes nothing more then a Dumb Down CBplusser Knuckle Dragger, at Im sure a member of NCI

3664. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 14:39:11 UTC
From: Hiram Hambones <dobbs4ffe@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1063464432.130183@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 77129

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0309121920.252a5f30@posting.google.com...

> I never hear people complain about:
>
> 1. The amount of junk food other hams eat
> 2. Smokers at hamfests

It's not worth the time and effort to reform them.
I say let the ignorant goofballs smoke away with
their tobacco and eat their horrid fast food. This way they die
faster and sooner, then you can go pick up their radio estate
gear on the cheap from their XYL, who in all likelyhood
has been secretly wanting to clean out all her husband's
hated "ham radio junk" from out of the house for years.
(I've managed to get hold of 5 HF stations this way over
the past 3 Years)

Once I even scored a complete IC-706 and TS-50 station for
$275.00 "cash-and-carry". The ham's wife hated that
radio crap so much she was glad to see it go and did not
want to deal with it. (she was ready to shitcan all of her OM's
gear, I caught her in time at a yard sale before she sold the
house and moved to Fla. - woooo hoooo!)

3665. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 14:44:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030913104442.13421.00001182@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 77130

> I don't see a justification for any of these changes.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NE

Of course you dont, you want a FREE HANDOUT License.

3666. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 14:48:53 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bjvalj$90n@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 77131

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030913102559.15462.00002930@mb-m06.aol.com...
> In article <F%D8b.2040$nQ.981515@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >Just to put those numbers in perspective, I'll list some other things
that I
> >remember from 1973-1974. An engineer who had just graduated with a
> >Bachelor's degree from college was getting about $10,000 to $11,000 per
> >year. A nice 1200 sq ft house with full basement and decent sized yard
> >could be purchased in the suburbs around Seattle for under $30,000 and
the
> >monthly payment was under $300 per month.
>
> I graduated EE school in 1976 and those numbers are right in line with my
> experience (1976 numbers about 15% higher due to inflation).
>
> Some other datapoints:
>
> - New car prices ranged from $3000 to $5000
> - Gasoline was about 60 cents a gallon
> - A year's tuition at an Ivy League university was $4500
> - Ham rig prices were somewhat less than today's prices Maybe 60-75%.
> - Inflation was double digit and interest rates were not far behind
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

My first son was born in October 1974. The following year, 1975, I can't remember the exact figure but my then-husband made right at or a little under $3,000.00 and I think the only "assistance" (welfare) we were on then was for Medicaid. I don't remember ever doing food stamps, cash, or anything like that. But, I think I remember when I found out I was pregnant, we immediately went to Social Services to see what we could do about Health Insurance.

Anyway, so health issues aside (and other than pregnancy neither of us ever went to the doctor), we, uh, well, subsisted on that income. Heh heh, we sure didn't "live" on it, but we weren't in need; we had food on the table, gas for the car to go to work, and rented an actual house. Granted, we went without cooking gas all Summer (we cooked on a grill outside or ate a lot of sandwiches), so we could save up for heating oil through the Winter. The house rent, if I remember correctly, was $75.00/month. Two-story, 2-bdrm, 1 bath, kitchen, living and dining. Huge lot (I grew and froze all our veggies in a 32' x 32' garden--with NO motorized tools mind ya), we had a

deer every Winter that I'd make stretch for meats (mostly ground to make it last), and my husband ate fish (trout right out of the Battenkill River). Yuk, I didn't like fish.

Gasoline for the auto, what was it? $0.28 or something near there? Gosh, I can't remember all those prices. Baby food was, I think, $0.19 a jar and--oh, disposable diapers were just coming onto the market and I sure as all get-out didn't have money for them. LOL I went the cloth diaper route, in fact I can't think of any of my friends using the disposable, except for whatever ones they got in baby showers and, when those were gone, that was it.

Anyway, life may have seemed simpler then, and maybe it was to some degree. But, I'll take life today much quicker! I could not be shopping for a 2300 sq. ft. home back then!!

Kim W5TIT

3667. Re: Will PCTA Censure Bruce?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 14:49:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030913104954.13421.00001183@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 77132

Oh I see you still cant pass the Dumb Down EXTRA. I guess it wasnt CW after all.

3668. Re: Did you hear about the No-Coder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 14:51:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030913105126.13421.00001184@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 77133

>So anyway, how's you're sister/wife, good buddy?

I dont know, by the way hows your Mama, havent seen that OLD WINCH in a long time.

3669. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 14:54:20 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309130654.ef0ebcf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77134

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93F4E04F12EAelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> > The world was blessed with your codeless presence on Nov 11 1957.
> > Handheld calculators rendered slide rules obsolete when you were
> > 14-15. Are you still using Leydon jars for capacitors Alun?
> >
> > w3rv
> >
>
> That's about right on the dates, except that there were very few
> calculators around back then. I remember my dad paying the equivalent of
> about $250 for a rather large four-function calculator c1970-1971 ish. It
> was made by Sharp. Sinclair had a cheaper one, but you had to build it
> from a kit!

Sure they were out there in that timeframe. I forget exactly what year
it was, maybe '71, when I paid $200 for a four-function Japanese-made
Canon calculator. Beautifully finished, solid as a rock. They were
sold by Canon itinerent peddlers who went out knocking on the doors of
tech-based companies which is how I got mine. I happen to prefer HP
RPN calculators which are no longer available in stores. My 1983 HP
32S died about three years ago but HP still sells the things direct.
It's a cult calculator and HP supports the cult. Odd . . !

> Also, high school (at least it's sometimes called that, amongst other
> things) is usually age 11-18 in the UK, so it takes in middle
> school/junior high (although in some areas of the UK there are middle
> schools, just to confuse the issue).

It's all the same ball of wax. The regime I plodded thru was into
first grade at five, into junior high school for seventh grade, then
into high school for tenth thru twelfth grades, pop out at 17-18.

w3rv

3670. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 14:57:01 UTC
From: jason_hsu@my-deja.com
Message-ID: <f7d9a152.0309130657.2baaf0de@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77135

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<Dky8b.1971$hY2.1604@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>...
> Assuming that your post is serious and not intended to be humerous, Jason,
> I'd say that you should be careful not to neglect your mental hygene. Eating
> right and staying away from tobacco is nice, but it won't ultimately do you
> any good if your thinking is toxic.
>
Come on, how seriously can you take anything in
rec.radio.amateur.policy?

> I don't smoke, but I would gladly take up smoking as an alternative to
> becoming another miserable, obnoxious member of the PC-police.
>
I guess the "PC police" are more evil than Phillip Morris, whose
products kill millions around the world every year. Wouldn't you
rather rebel against Phillip Morris? They represent everything you
hate about the Establishment!

> There's probably only one hope for you now, Jason, and that is to buy
> yourself a pack of Chesterfields or Luckies and fire one on up on your way
> to "Golden Corral" to take advantage of that all-you-can-eat buffet.

Smoking is so disgusting that I wouldn't even do it if it were
healthy.

If it's any consolation to you, the Atkins diet followers think I
guzzle carbs the way a 1972 Cadillac guzzles fuel. (According to news
articles, these people now have their own grocery stores and
restaurants. Ugh.) The anti-meat anti-fat Ornish diet followers
think I guzzle fat the way a 1972 Cadillac guzzles fuel.

I guess I must be eating right if other hams think I'm on a crash diet
and the followers of the latest diet fads think I eat like a hog.

Jason Hsu, AG4DG
usenet@@@@jasonhsu.com

3671. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 16:34:21 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <hGH8b.2078$nQ.1017334@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77136

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309130514.1621de5@posting.google.com...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030906091922.14837.00002769@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> > There are already folks like W5YI campaigning for less WRITTEN testing,
saying
> > the Tech test is too hard.
>
> The Tech test And privs are insane for an entry level license.

I do hope you mean the test is insanely simple and the privileges insanely
high for the level of testing done.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3672. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 19:10:48 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <YYJ8b.1711$v51.498@newssvr32.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77137

"Jason Hsu" <jason_hsu@my-deja.com> wrote in message
news:f7d9a152.0309130657.2baaf0de@posting.google.com...
>
> > I don't smoke, but I would gladly take up smoking as an alternative to
> > becoming another miserable, obnoxious member of the PC-police.
> >
> I guess the "PC police" are more evil than Phillip Morris, whose
> products kill millions around the world every year. Wouldn't you
> rather rebel against Phillip Morris? They represent everything you
> hate about the Establishment!

Nope. The tobacco companies are great benefactors of mankind, compared to the PC police... Tobacco may poison individuals, but "PC" poisons entire cultures, causing much more damage and expense than all of the tobacco companies combined.

One quick example: Irrationally afraid of nuclear power, the "PC police" has seen to it that we stick with the burning of fossil fuels for our electricity. How clever.

The main problem with "PC" is not to be found in individual examples of PC actions though, but rather in the pervasive stupidity it imposes upon the entire culture. It is basically an instrumnent of deconstructionists who insist that there is no truth, there is no history, so its "OK" to lie as long as its allegedly for somebody else's "good".

"PC" sees it's fullest expression in California, the cereal-bowl state.

(Once you get past the fruits and nuts, the only thing left are the flakes.)

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

3673. Re: Did you hear about the No-Coder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 19:16:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309131116.7712243d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77138

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030913105126.13421.00001184@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> >So anyway, how's you're sister/wife, good buddy?
>
> I dont know, by the way hows your Mama, havent seen that OLD WINCH in a long
> time.

That would be "WENCH" you "morron."

The OLD WINCH was used to pull your diesel rig out of the ditch.

So why don't you know how your sister/wife is? I hope she didn't have
to go to the women's shelter again?

3674. Re: Did you hear about the No-Coder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 19:17:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309131117.54f80b15@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77139

lbudney@pobox.com wrote in message news:<n0d8948r.fsf@pobox.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >
> > Why am I reminded of the Far Side Comic where the boy with the
> > misshapened head is trying to enter the "Shcool for the Gifted"...
>
> If my parents tried to send me to a "Shcool for the Gifted", I wouldn't go.
>
> --Len.

Ha!!!

What a "morron" I am. I've been taking lessons brom Bruice.

3675. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 19:20:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309131120.18a687b6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77140

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309130526.736357da@posting.google.com>...
> "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:<jPt8b.425516$YN5.287945@sccrnsc01>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in
> > news:5c01b95b.0309121214.7d06772d@posting.google.com:
> >
> > > That's Jim;s OPINION, Brain. Other than that, you have not
> > > satisfied the question of how the ARRL has allegedly pushed for "lower
> > > standards".
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> > >
> >
> > It's my opinion too, and I'm always right.
> >
> > KB7ADL
>
> Well there you have it, Steve. You have two people to query now; Jim and Vince.
>
> Surely you will find your answer.

"(MY)" answer, Brain?

I'm not the one with a question. I am satisfied with the
League's performance, considering they charge the same amount for
their services for other like-organizations (ie: AOPA).

In MY opinion the League has continued to provide what I would
expect from it. The only thing it can "absolutely" promise is to do
it's best to represent it's membership...NOT an easy thing to do in an
organization with fluid demographics and preceived needs.

The perception of shortcomings was from others. Address the
"question" issue to them.

Steve, K4YZ

3676. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 19:25:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309131125.3626b8fd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77141

jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) wrote in message
news:<bju7mu$5kv$1@news.hawaii.edu>...
> Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote:
> >If you can't accept the fact that people build, sell, and buy 1/4 wave
> >dipoles for use in UHF, get over it. Just don't try to make stuff up
> >and post it.
>
> Again, by definition "dipole" means two current or voltage poles; it
> does not refer to the number of elements of the antenna.
>
> You can't have two (di-) current or voltage poles in just a 1/4-wave
> segment. Calling it such doesn't make it so. It takes a 1/2-wavelength
> for two (di-) such poles to appear.
>
> Jeff KH6O

Hmmm. Wonder why earth or radials are necessary for 1/4 wave
antennas? And if the earth is already a dipole...

3677. Re: ARRL Policy Shift?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 19:27:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309131127.1aefb6fb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77142

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:<%Ut8b.427173$o%2.194223@sccrnsc02>...

> That's the modern ARRL plan Dan. Fight the threats from without, while the
> Service rots from within. Let the service rot if it means raking in a few
> more dollars. Pretty soon there won't be anything good left in the service
> worth protecting. That would be like spending money to preserve what the
> CB service is today.

We need to get Hans' troll-o-meter on this one, Vince.

No Amateur Radio Service=No Members=No Dollars=NoARRL.

Looks like a pretty silly assertion to me.

Steve, K4YZ

3678. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 19:47:10 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309131147.2090071e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77143

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309050223.429cc87c@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309041424.284a7a9c@posting.google.com>...
>
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309031544.d516785@posting.google.com>...
>
> > > "hiram's cat" <eeefrincen4@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<1062593747.245315@newshost03.voicenet.com>...
>
> > >
> > > > All the ARRL ever was, is, and ever will be is a
> > > > publishing company with a 501(c)3 tax exemption
> > > > that wraps itself in fake ivy leaves of academia.
> > > > Another typical "non-profit" that milks donations
> > > > from suckers with trinkets and who's Corporate
> > > > Board and Executive Staff members skim 50%
> > > > right-off-the-top for "administrative expenses".
> > > > I dropped them, my SCM, and my membership way back
> > > > in 1984 and I've never regreted my decision.
> > >
> > > Yet another anonymous scumbag with libelous accusations and no
> > > proof to offer.
> > >
> > > Considering the IMPROVEMENTS that have occured in the ARRL since
> > > 1984, I'd say your departure was beneficial. Lord knows no one here
> > > has missed you.
> > >
> > > Back under your rock, worthless troll.
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> >
> > Wow, Steve.
> >
> > An anonymous poster posts something you agree with and you act like
> > best friends. Another anonymous poster posts something you don't
> > agree with and you go psycho.
>
> What's "psycho" about it, Brain, or are you simply working off of
> the same correspondence school degree that Lennie does?

One is wholesome and righteous, the other is scum that should slither
back under a rock. That's psycho.

> > Why is that?
>
> Perhaps because the other poster didn't make a lot of assinine
> assertions that are not substantiated by facts, Brain.

The ARS has improved since 1984. That's plain for everyone to see.

> You may refer to "fact" in Websters to find out what they are,
> Brain...You DO seem to have a problem with the concept.

Not at all. As Ronald Reagan said, "Facts are stupid things."

3679. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 19:55:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309131155.3d901998@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77144

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030913003319.12501.00002367@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <bjqv39$mddbp$11@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Wow, there's at least one thing we are equal and agree upon Larry!!!!! :) :)
> >
> >Ryan KC8PMX
> >MI-Chauffers and Emergency Vehicle Permit holder
> >Confirmed Parallel Parker And Proud!
>
> Ryan:
>
> As one PP'er to another, it is an honor to know you! It's nice to know that
> we're morally and intellectually superior to the dumbed-down, unwashed,
> non-PP'ing hoardes of inferior drivers.
>
> Michigan still has "Chauffeur's" licenses? Which class of CDL is that
> equivalent to?

For once in you life could you put away the measuring stick and just
accept another individual as an equal?

Here in Delaware, I'm told that Emergency Vehicle
> operators don't require anything more than a standard Class D Driver's
> license.

I.E., in Delaware they don't measure up to superior Larry.

They do, however, have to be a card-carrying member of
> the "Emergency Service" (usually a local volunteer FD) to which
> the emergency vehicle is registered.

With a shack on their hip, no doubt.

3680. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 19:58:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309131158.64ba5d64@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77145

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030912202651.18064.00000640@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >I think he'd be good at driving a big truck - for a week - w/o a
> >shower & brown racing stripe on the seat.
> >
>
> But just think, I would have you there to lick the Brown Racing stripe clean.

No you wouldn't.

3681. Re: Did you hear about the No-Coder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 19:59:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030913155944.14409.00000799@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 77147

>The OLD WINCH was used to pull your diesel rig out of the ditch.
>

Thats what I was reffering to, it takes an old winch to move her

3682. Re: Dan I told this 1 CBplusser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 19:59:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309131159.159deceb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77146

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030908112050.19971.00000916@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> >What Extra?? There is nothing extra about any ham radio exam these days.
> >He'll get it given to him, just as he's alwayt wanted.
> >
> >
>
> Well of course, thats what hes waiting for. He knows he isnt smart enough to
> pass even a Dumb Down Test.

I'm glad you two found each other. You have a lot in common.

3683. Re: Did you hear about the No-Coder

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 20:00:23 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030913160023.14409.00000800@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 77148

>Ha!!!
>
>What a "morron" I am.

We all know that

3684. Re: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 20:03:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309131203.2117101a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77149

"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
news:<vfs8b.52689$3b2.6427695@twister.neo.rr.com>...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:b7d1465c.0309120433.48e36421@posting.google.com...
> > Hi all,
> >
> > I'm curious. If I make a mistake during a QSO, what is the correct way
> > to get back on track. Do I:
> >
> > 1. Send 6 or 7 dits or an extra long dah?
> > -and-
> > 2. Do I resume at the character or do I repeat the entire word?
> >
> > Also, I heard a "shave and a haircut, two bits" at the end of a QSO
> > the other night. When is that appropriate?
> >
> > Thanks. :-)
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
>
> Bert,
> Please pose this and all related CW questions to NCI
> Inc.ï¿½ The National Code Institute.
>
> Capt. Carl or one of his minions will happily answer all your Morse Code
> questions.
>
> 10-73's!

Depends on whether he's using Morse or Farnsworth. Get back to me.

3685. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 20:10:24 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309131210.2fc6d587@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77150

W1AW also sends Morse Code practice on VHF, if you live close enough.
But I don't think 8-land is close enough.

If not, Jim can tell you how to build an Elecraft K1 out of junk box
parts, or something like that.

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bjqv35$mddbp$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> Yeah, that might be true if you have HF capability........
>
> > I've sed it before I'll say it again: The W1AW code practice sessions
> > and getting on the air ASAP are the best methods out there for
> > learning the code. The 1AW sessions are reliable, they're not
> > repetitive and you can pace yourself without breaking a sweat
> > depending on your own set of learning curve variables. Yes it's
> > Farnsworth and 1AW Farnworth has obviously worked for decades. Now go
> > copy 1AW 5wpm sessions until you "get it".
> >
> >
> > w3rv

3686. Re: BPL: 1st Experimental License Issued

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 20:12:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309131212.2b86ddf6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77151

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0309120254.22de3c66@posting.google.com>...
> wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030911183717.07383.00001051@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> > >WD2XEQ AMBIENT CORPORATION 0118-EX-PL-2003
> > >
> > >New experimental to operate in 1.7-88 MHz for testing power line carrier
> > >systems. Fixed: States of NY and MA
> >
> > Its about time.
>
> About time for WHAT?!

For the destruction of the ARS. Bruice gets, ahem, exited when he
thinks about it. Its his dream, his goal.

3687. Re: The Chosen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 20:47:51 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030913164751.17961.00001324@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 77152

Subject: Re: The Chosen

"K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<9b590f5e564adc3cc2ce5ff0ead6e71b.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> The Wise Ones live in the depths of the D, E, and F-Layers, and

The chosen have mastered a skill known as "Morse code". All others are to be
shunned.

3688. Re: hams are ruining amateur radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 20:53:32 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030913165332.17961.00001325@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 77153

>hams are ruining amateur radio

I could have told you that.

3689. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 21:06:41 UTC
From: vshah101@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030913170641.17961.00001326@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 77154

From: k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)

>> Anonymous poster. No-one accuses this person of being a coward even after
>> expressing strong biased opinion.
>
> Go right ahead, Vippy, since you think it's important.

I just a bit upset that this person claiming that the cb culture is ruining the hobby. He is creating an artificial crisis and a highly absurd cause for this "crisis". He claims this (made up) crisis is a result of lowering the code speed requirement

Even then, his only evidence (which he also made up) is hearing cb handles and 10 codes and this is proof that the hobby is going bad.

.

3690. Re: ARRL Policy Shift?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 23:42:04 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <gXN8b.237030$2x.67527@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 77155

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in
news:5c01b95b.0309131127.1aefb6fb@posting.google.com:

>
> No Amateur Radio Service=No Members=No Dollars=NoARRL.
>
> Looks like a pretty silly assertion to me.
>
> Steve, K4YZ
>

Try this one Steve:

Incapable licensees = CBer type behavior = Trashed Bands = No Enjoyment.

KB7ADL

3691. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-13 23:51:49 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <p4O8b.237095$2x.66933@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 77156

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in
news:vm67v564e0pj4c@corp.supernews.com:

> I heard from the latest audio news that more nations
> around the world are dropping thier morse code
> testing requirements.
>
> makes you wonder if the VEC's who petitioned
> to return a higher code speed test for extra class
> hams are just doing so to fight the tide.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>

The ARRL has a destructive agenda. If they cared about amateur radio as much as for the amount of money their bank account, they would have said something at the last world conference. It's all lip service and lies to try and get hams like me to hold our piece and hope we don't feel like we're being lied to again.

KB7ADL

3692. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 00:07:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk0bgq$u1b$0@208.207.71.165>
Source record: 77157

Brian wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj29m9$vi7$0@208.207.71.176>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj17rmran0@208.206.142.111>...
>
> > > > bang is still as holey as a moth-eaten cotten curtain in a 1940's flophouse.
> > >
> > > Was that your primary residence?
> >
> > I saw the movie.
>
> You starred in it.

Nope, I was 'way overqualified for the role. It was a docu-comedy of your life story.

3693. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 00:19:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030913201906.25815.00003002@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 77159

In article <bjua9d$8dc$1@news.hawaii.edu>, jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>>Jeffrey Herman wrote:
>>> "Carl R. Stevenson" wrote:
>
>>>>How many *US* licensees are members of FISTS, Dick?
>
>>> Geez, talk about a page from history! It was years ago that I
>>> posed almost the same question to you, Carl, except I asked
>>> "How many members of NCI are licensed" to which you replied,
>>> "It doesn't matter..."
>
>>Jeffrey, the answer is "thousands, and growing every day."
>>
>> It's too bad that a person that refuses to give out even the basic
>>numbers of devotees decides to ask for a numerical breakdown of a rival
>>groups numbers.
>>
>> Assuming his accounting methods are acceptable, the answer is
>>thousands, and growing every day.
>
>
>When I posed that question to Carl some years ago, he couldn't come
>up with any membership roster; there were no records of who had joined
>since there was no dues, nor did any application form exist.
>
Since then the same question has been posed many times, but there's never a straight answer. Last time it was asked, Carl claimed that he could not tell us because the membership list was confidential, and they would not give out names or calls. How that prevented giving a membership total was not explained.

One indicator of NCI membership is to look for the highest NCI member number, then subtract 1000 (because they started with #1001, not #0001. Guess why?)

The highest number I've ever seen was 47xx, so there are maybe 4000 members. Or rather there were ~4000 members in the history of the org, because numbers are not reused, there are no dues and membership never expires.

My guess is that there are maybe 3000 US hams who are active NCI members. That's less than .44%

73 de Jim, N2EY

3694. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 00:19:07 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030913201907.25815.00003003@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 77158

In article <d22b54c3.0309130633.53b676@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030913042805.02537.00000555@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0309121537.69581ae5@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>> >N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in message
>> >news:<c2356669.0309120758.35bbdf8c@posting.google.com>...
>> >. . . .
>> >
>> >> End result is a system that is easy to get into (Basic is
>> >> envisioned as a 21st century version of the Novice) and has
>> >> reasonable but meaningful steps to reach full privileges.
>> >> Testing matches the privs granted. Power levels are set about
>> >> one S-unit apart. Nobody loses any privileges. There are only
>> >> three license classes and four written tests, so FCC doesn't
>> >> have more work.
>> >>
>> >> Example of new privileges:
>> >>
>> >> 80/75 meters
>> >> 3500-3575 CW only
>> >> 3575-3750 CW/data
>> >> 3750-4000 CW/analog phone/image
>> >>
>> >> Basic: 3525-3625 and 3900-4000
>> >> Intermediate: 3525-3750 and 3850-4000
>> >> Full: entire band
>> >
>> >That's all well and good James and I'd support your basics but what
>> >you're suggesting is a radical, complete top-to-bottom restructuring.
>>
>> Long overdue. The basic structure we have now dates to 1951.
>>
>> >Much more so than any we've seen in the past seventy-some years.
>> >Versus some Band-Aids on what already exists. With the FCC we have
>> >today we'd be lucky to get even a Band-Aid or two let alone a complete
>> >rework of HF ham radio. We're allowed to dream but then comes cold
>> >hard reality.
>>
>> If we don't ask we'll never get. FCC isn't going to come up with any new

>ideas.
>> What can they do - say no?
>
>Yeah, absolutely. They'll say "we've already put enough work into
>diddling with this stuff in the past few years, come back in 5-10
>years when we have a better picture of the effects of what we've
>already done become apparent". Which is typical FCC behavior when it
>comes to major restructurings going back decades.

OK, fine.

But how can it hurt to ask?

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

3695. Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 01:28:08 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <IuP8b.57189$3b2.7364893@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 77160

If your not a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, there is a CW contest going one right now.

If you are a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, then never mind, it's a Ham Radio thing. You would not understand.

10-73's!

3696. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 01:38:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk0gqccqt0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 77161

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" wrote:

> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in
> news:vm67v564e0pj4c@corp.supernews.com:
>
> > I heard from the latest audio news that more nations
> > around the world are dropping thier morse code
> > testing requirements.
> >
> > makes you wonder if the VEC's who petitioned
> > to return a higher code speed test for extra class
> > hams are just doing so to fight the tide.
> >
> > Clint
> > KB5ZHT
> >
>
> The ARRL has a destructive agenda. If they cared about amateur radio as
> much as for the amount of money their bank account, they would have said
> something at the last world conference. It's all lip service and lies to
> try and get hams like me to hold our piece and hope we don't feel like
> we're being lied to again.

No, Vince, I believe you're way off base here. ARRL has a real problem-It wants to do what is best for ham radio, and divining what that is is not a simple chore, by any means. Then you have the other facets of the problem, which include but certainly are not limited to, the vast array of opinions among hams, members and otherwise, then there's the FCC and their own budget constraints, etc, etc etc.

But NO, you'll never get me to believe that ARRL as an organization has anything but the best interests of ham radio at heart. I do believe that at times they get a little off course, but they seem to manage to make the necessary corrections.

Dick

3697. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 01:43:39 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <fJP8b.4825$Ss1.4170@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 77162

Quite frankly, Charles, I'd love to see all of the smokers suddenly stop. Really. Then everyone would find out what this is *really* all about. It's about money. You can't cut income taxes the way the government has without reducing spending - and they found a way to grab more money from the 25% of the adult population that smokes - and make it politically 'correct' as well! Our county found a way to sell that "future" tobacco income and raise a ton of money. Guess what? They spent it. Now Monroe County is facing some nasty decisions. New York state now charges $1.50 or $1.55 per pack plus 8.25% sales tax on that tax (at least here in Monroe County). I see a sign at the local grocery store - over $50.00 per carton plus 8.25% sales tax. Was it Alabama that rejected property tax hikes to support schools? What is happening is the elimination of support for necessary items (schools do come to mind). Unemployment has new wrinkles designed to keep folks from collecting even if they were laid off for business reasons. Yes, they now will pay for college education if you can't find a job after a year; unfortunately, there has been no funding for that since 2001! If you work for a company with a company paid pension and you are eligible to collect it, they will reduce unemployment by that amount - even if you aren't collecting it! Lovely.

I was very fortunate in that I found another job within the company I work for. They have hollowed out the pension system and use the savings to hire new top managers (the new president only had to show up for work. He could quit or be fired the same day and would receive $175,000 per year for life. If he stays 9 years, he gets $1,000,000 per year for life.).

Interestingly, a new store was built about 5 blocks from me. I tried it and was amazed. The groceries are the same quality as I'm used to and are far cheaper. 3 *large* reinforced shopping bags (one of which was so heavy it was cutting into my hand) cost me $38.20. Hmmm ... I wonder how the main store (Wegman's) is going to fair when folks discover this? So, Sam's club for meat and this other store for everything else as far as I'm concerned.

Back to the smoking. I really wish everyone could stop smoking. You think Social Security is in a mess (you are aware that the feds have "borrowed" those funds?) now, just wait until 25% of the population starts living an extra 5 to 10 years! Many folks (non-smokers as well) live their final few years in a nursing home. The big difference in costs between smokers and non-smokers is the 5 or 10 years of Social Security that the non-smokers collect. Even a modest check of $1200 per month is $14,000 per year. That comes to $140,000 for an extra 10 years.

Maybe we should pay the ball players $100,000,000 per year instead of only $10,000,000. That should fix things just fine. At least their kids will get a decent education.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.516 / Virus Database: 313 - Release Date: 9/1/03

3698. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 02:18:15 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <duj7mv8mhvs4ql56f3sho5v98bu5lc8761@4ax.com>
Source record: 77163

On Sat, 13 Sep 2003 08:35:53 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>"Bob Brock" <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:mfn5mvk0tqdpuvhfhor7qctvd40mdl9sc8@4ax.com...
>> On 13 Sep 2003 04:50:38 GMT, jeffreyh@Hawaii.Edu (Jeffrey Herman)
>> wrote:
>>
>> >Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote:
>> >>If you can't accept the fact that people build, sell, and buy 1/4 wave
>> >>dipoles for use in UHF, get over it. Just don't try to make stuff up
>> >>and post it.
>> >
>> >Again, by definition "dipole" means two current or voltage poles; it
>> >does not refer to the number of elements of the antenna.
>> >
>> >You can't have two (di-) current or voltage poles in just a 1/4-wave
>> >segment. Calling it such doesn't make it so. It takes a 1/2-wavelength
>> >for two (di-) such poles to appear.
>> >
>> >Jeff KH6O
>>
>> You must have replied to the wrong post. But out of curiousity, how
>> many current or voltage poles is a "J" as in J-pole.
>>
>
>*GASP*!!!! Bob! Don't get them going with the word i-m-p-e-d-a-n-c-e!!!!
>;)
>
>Kim W5TIT

ROTFLMAO...

3699. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 02:19:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030913221914.07346.00000596@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77164

In article <f7d9a152.0309121920.252a5f30@posting.google.com>,
jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:

>I never hear people complain about:
>1. The amount of junk food other hams eat
>2. Smokers at hamfests

Jason, meet Vipul. Look up almost any post here by 'vshah101'. He's way ahead
of you on the 'fat ham' riff.
>
>Junk food is a staple at club meetings and Field Day.

Maybe where you live...

>At my club's
>meetings, you can always find plenty of salty potato chips (not the
>low-salt Pringles Right Crisps), coffee cake, glazed muffins, sweet
>rolls, and other unhealthy food. There is always plenty of soda pop
>to drink.

When's the next meeting?

>True, apple pie snacks and cookies are junk food too, but
>at least they taste good. Kentucky Fried Chicken and donuts are
>served at each of our annual Field Day weekends.

mmmmmm......donuts........
>
>I am the only ham radio operator who complains that other hams eat too
>much junk food.

No, you're not. You and Vipul should have a good time. Discuss amongst
yourselves.

>As a Morse Code testing opponent, I hate to say this,
>but junk food seems to be an EVEN MORE sacred tradition than Morse
>Code tests. The trend has been towards reducing Morse Code testing
>requirements, but I see no sign that the junk food tradition is ready
>to head off into the sunset.
>
>People complain about hams with body odor at hamfests, but I can't
>remember reading anyone complaining about smokers at hamfests. I
>don't notice people's body odor - I don't run around sniffing
>everybody. But the foul tobacco smoke spreads like wildfire. I don't
>think body odor can spread 10-20 feet away very easily.

No comment...
>
>Hmmm, I see a great idea for a compromise on the Morse Code testing
>issue. The anti-Morse-testing side complains that the Morse Code test
>is unnecessary. The pro-Morse-testing side complains that removing
>the Morse Code test will make it too easy for people to become
>licensed. I propose that we replace the Morse Code test with health
>requirements. The replacement license requirements will be:
>1. Your Body Mass Index (http://nhlbisupport.com/bmi/bmicalc.htm)
>must be below 19. Of course, if I gain 5 pounds this fall and winter,
>I'll have to revise the cutoff upward to 20.
>2. No smokers may earn ham radio licenses.
>3. No club is allowed to serve soda pop, donuts, glazed muffins, or
>potato chips with more than 135mg of sodium per serving.
>4. At all club Field Day events, vegetables must be served for
>dinner.
>
HAW!!!

Those'll go over big!

>Hey, these requirements would make it nice and challenging for people
>to earn their licenses. We want our hams to be healthy. Too many are
>afflicted with obesity, heart disease, high cholesterol, high blood
>pressure, and other health problems.

Take all that away, and what will they talk about on 75 meters? ;-)

>We won't give licenses away -
>hams will need to cut the fast food, junk food, and tobacco out of
>their lives. This will be quite a challenge given how sacred the
>Kentucky Fried Chicken, soda pop, and donuts are.

I dunno if you're serious, trolling, or satirical, but it's funny any of those ways!

Seriously, though, it's not just a ham radio problem - it's an American problem. Just look around you. Combine an aging population, cheap sugary/fatty foods, sedentary but high-stress living, and a drop in other vices like smoking, and you have a recipe (pun intended) for folks getting heavier.

I'm 6' 3" and my target weight is 180. I'll let ya know when I get there.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3700. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 02:33:19 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309131833.3afbc8a6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77165

"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<bjvalj$90n@library1.airnews.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030913102559.15462.00002930@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > In article <F%D8b.2040$nQ.981515@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint"
> > <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >
> > >Just to put those numbers in perspective, I'll list some other things
> that I
> > >remember from 1973-1974. An engineer who had just graduated with a
> > >Bachelor's degree from college was getting about $10,000 to $11,000 per
> > >year. A nice 1200 sq ft house with full basement and decent sized yard
> > >could be purchased in the suburbs around Seattle for under $30,000 and
> the
> > >monthly payment was under $300 per month.
> >
> > I graduated EE school in 1976 and those numbers are right in line with my
> > experience (1976 numbers about 15% higher due to inflation).

First job outa school paid just under $13K, I thought I'd gone to
heaven. Then I moved to New York State, where they sell beer and wine
in the supermarkets and I KNEW I'd gone to heaven...

> > Some other datapoints:
> >
> > - New car prices ranged from $3000 to $5000
> > - Gasoline was about 60 cents a gallon
> > - A year's tuition at an Ivy League university was $4500
> > - Ham rig prices were somewhat less than today's prices Maybe 60-75%.
> > - Inflation was double digit and interest rates were not far behind
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> My first son was born in October 1974.

Are you gonna be mad at me if I call ya grandma?

> The following year, 1975, I can't
> remember the exact figure but my then-husband made right at or a little
> under $3,000.00 and I think the only "assistance" (welfare) we were on then
> was for Medicaid. I don't remember ever doing food stamps, cash, or
> anything like that. But, I think I remember when I found out I was
> pregnant, we immediately went to Social Services to see what we could do
> about Health Insurance.

I don't know if folks in that situation would qualify for Medicaid
today. Probably depends on what state you live in.
>
> Anyway, so health issues aside (and other than pregnancy neither of us ever
> went to the doctor), we, uh, well, subsisted on that income. Heh heh, we
> sure didn't "live" on it, but we weren't in need; we had food on the table,
> gas for the car to go to work, and rented an actual house. Granted, we went
> without cooking gas all Summer (we cooked on a grill outside or ate a lot of
> sandwiches), so we could save up for heating oil through the Winter. The
> house rent, if I remember correctly, was $75.00/month. Two-story, 2-bdrm, 1
> bath, kitchen, living and dining. Huge lot (I grew and froze all our
> veggies in a 32' x 32' garden--with NO motorized tools mind ya), we had a
> deer every Winter that I'd make stretch for meats (mostly ground to make it
> last), and my husband ate fish (trout right out of the Battenkill River).
> Yuk, I didn't like fish.

This was New York State?

I got my first deer a little less than 2 years ago. Only problem was I
got 'er with a Honda Odyssey. Even though I asked nice, for some
reason the body shop wouldn't paint a little Bambi outline on the new
fender...
>
> Gasoline for the auto, what was it? $0.28 or something near there?

Until it doubled after the first OPEC embargo. But yeah, it was cheap,
as were used cars and parts. Plus you could work on 'em yourself.

Oddly enough, gas today is even cheaper, once you adjust for
inflation. It's one of the few necessities that has gone that way.

> Gosh, I
> can't remember all those prices. Baby food was, I think, $0.19 a jar
> and--oh, disposable diapers were just coming onto the market and I sure as
> all get-out didn't have money for them. LOL I went the cloth diaper route,
> in fact I can't think of any of my friends using the disposable, except for
> whatever ones they got in baby showers and, when those were gone, that was
> it.

Yup. A lot depended on what it cost to wash the diapers vs. buying the
disposables. If you pay all your own utilities the cloth route gets
expensive real fast. If the water and electric are somebody else's
problem it goes the other way.

Then there's baby formula vs....no, I'm NOT gonna go there!
>
> Anyway, life may have seemed simpler then, and maybe it was to some degree.
> But, I'll take life today much quicker! I could not be shopping for a 2300
> sq. ft. home back then!!
>
2300 sf would be a big house fer me, then or today. Location,
location, location....

I remember reading someplace that the biggest economic change in the past 30-40 years as it applies to average folks is this:

In the "old days", necessities were relatively inexpensive and luxuries were relatively expensive. But since then the trend has been for the necessities to get more and more expensive and the luxuries cheaper and cheaper. So now many hams can afford a $1000-2000 rig, but they can't afford a nice house on a big lot with no CC&Rs to put the rig in.

IIRC the minimum wage back in '75 was around $1.50, and there are about 2000 working hours in a straight-time year. (40 hrs/week x 50 weeks). So you folks were essentially living on one minimum-wage income. Think about what those numbers work out to today...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3701. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 02:33:31 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <%rQ8b.4827$6E1.4395@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 77166

As a member of NCI, I have used land-line Morse as well as international
Morse. You wouldn't understand. It's a ham radio thing. :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
news:IuP8b.57189$3b2.7364893@twister.neo.rr.com...
> If your not a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, there is a CW contest
> going one right now.
>
> If you are a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, then never mind, it's a
Ham
> Radio thing. You would not understand.
>
> 10-73's!
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.516 / Virus Database: 313 - Release Date: 9/1/03

3702. Re: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 02:51:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030913225155.14837.00002956@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 77167

In article <f45722ac.0309131203.2117101a@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Depends on whether he's using Morse or Farnsworth. Get back to me.

Brian:

Morse "or" Farnsworth? That's like comparing a Timex to a Casio
when discussing cheap wristwatches! It's the same thing!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3703. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 02:51:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030913225155.14837.00002955@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 77170

In article <bjsnto$m13$0@208.206.142.71>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>My mileage does not vary in the least, Hans. And this is a large part of what
>separates the.........
>
>Oh well, probably enough has already been written on the subject.

Dick:

Then allow me to say it. It separates the Real Hams from the unmotivated,
disinterested 2-meter FM jockeys who wouldn't know a challenging and
satisfactory radio operating experience if it landed on their big toe.

>---
> BTW, I think the last time I turned on my linear amp was when I worked that
>etherial signal from the other side of the planet, VK0IR, on a near-dead 20
>meter CW band. Their response to my 100 watt calls was "didi dum dum didi",
>and "QRZ?"
>
>Running 1400 watts out, the recognition was immediate.
>
>Dick

I'll bet. It would have been interesting to see if 250 watts would have
made the trip.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3704. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 02:51:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030913225156.14837.00002957@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 77169

In article <c2356669.0309120905.32490493@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>Heck yes. In fact it went something like this:
>
>First, ya had to have a General or Advanced for at least two years
>before they'd even let ya try the Extra.
>
>Then ya had to pass the receive test with at least 100 correct
>consecutive legible characters. No going back and fixing things after
>the code stopped, either, after the last dit it was PENCILS DOWN or ya
>flunked right there.
>
>If ya passed the receive, they let ya try sending with their straight
>key or *your* speed key. You sent until the examiner was satisfied.
>
>Only then did they let you try the written. Mess up at any point -
>even one character or question - and it was "go home and study some
>more and don't come back for at least 30 days". No CSCE, no partial
>credit, nada, do it all first try at one sitting or it doesn't count
>at all.
>
>> Dinosaur? Who ME?
>>
>Naw.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

Ah, yes, the good old days. Challenging licensing requirements and uncompromising testing procedures. Of course, all that is waaaaay too PoliticKally IncorrecKt today, since someone with a particular ethnic origin, skin color, religion, "gender," or a hangnail might not be able to pass the first time or two. This certainly won't do in these enlightened times. After all, it might "exclude" someone who is, in reality, a nascent technical genius who just needs the ability to talk on the HF phone bands in order to find the inspiration to create the next fabulous new invention which will revolutionize electronic communication for the rest of all time!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3705. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 02:51:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030913225157.14837.00002958@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 77168

In article <f45722ac.0309131155.3d901998@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Ryan:
>>
>> As one PP'er to another, it is an honor to know you! It's nice to know
>that
>> we're morally and intellectually superior to the dumbed-down, unwashed,
>> non-PP'ing hoardes of inferior drivers.
>>
>> Michigan still has "Chauffeur's" licenses? Which class of CDL is that
>> equivalent to?
>
>For once in you life could you put away the measuring stick and just
>accept another individual as an equal?
>
> Here in Delaware, I'm told that Emergency Vehicle
>> operators don't require anything more than a standard Class D Driver's
>> license.
>
>I.E., in Delaware they don't measure up to superior Larry.
>
> They do, however, have to be a card-carrying member of
>> the "Emergency Service" (usually a local volunteer FD) to which
>> the emergency vehicle is registered.
>
>With a shack on their hip, no doubt.

Brian:

I'm very sorry about your inferiority complex, but I was just asking for
some information from Ryan about driver's licenses. This is not about
my "superiority" or anything else that you should be whining about --
unless you are having problems of your own. Care to talk about it?

73 de Larry, K3LT

3706. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 03:01:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F63DA68.9080901@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77171

N2EY wrote:
> In article <f7d9a152.0309121920.252a5f30@posting.google.com>,
> jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:

<snippage>

>>We won't give licenses away -
>>hams will need to cut the fast food, junk food, and tobacco out of
>>their lives. This will be quite a challenge given how sacred the
>>Kentucky Fried Chicken, soda pop, and donuts are.
>
>
> I dunno if you're serious, trolling, or satirical, but it's funny any of those
> ways!

Yeah, here we go Jim:

Entry level license is the Smart!tician. Test requirements are eating
no less than 3 meals of meat per week. The successful applicant must
also demonstrate the ability to cooko pasta in at least 30 unappetizing
ways. Extra credit for recipes including Tofu.

Priveliges for the Smart!tician will be the same as the technician plus
is today.

Next up the ladder is the Generallyhealthy! class. Test requiremts are
to show the ability to fast for a minimum of 3 days, followed by a
cleansing diet of only fruit juices, in addition to the Smart!tician
tests. This is as high in the service as meat eaters can go * the lone
exception is noted below

Priveliges for the Generallyhealthy! are the same as the Smart!tician,
plus HF access in SSB only.

At the top of the sprout heap is the ExtraDelicious! license. This is
the epitome of both hamdom and the oh so healthy lifestyle. The
ExtraDelicious! *must* be a vegatarian, specificly a vegan. *The only
exception to this is that medical waivers can be granted for
lacto-ovarians, and in certain rare instances, for macrobiotics. These
must be signed by a physician.

The successful applicant for ExtraDelicious! must display the ability
to be condescending onto others, to announce their vegan status to every
person they meet within 45 seconds, and to be a general nuisance at
restaraunts, being required to ask the waitress of the possibilty of
animal products in everything in the facility, including the salt and
pepper shakers.

The ExtraDelicious! has all priveliges, as befits the obvious
superiority of this type of person.

> Seriously, though, it's not just a ham radio problem - it's an American
> problem. Just look around you. Combine an aging population, cheap sugary/fatty
> foods, sedentary but high-stress living, and a drop in other vices like
> smoking, and you have a recipe (pun intended) for folks getting heavier.
>
> I'm 6' 3" and my target weight is 180. I'll let ya know when I get there.

You have to be kidding, Jim! Unless you have an incredibly small bone
structure, that will be hard to attain. I'm not too wild about the way
"they" figure the body weight thing out either. It really has to be done
more on a fat percentage thing rather than some stupid one size fits all
approach. By the tables, I am considered grossly obese, and yet by the
fat percentage, not. Put me in the pool, and I sink like a stone. Fat
being neutral density as compared to water, allows the person to float
easily, and weigh relatively less in water than a person of high
muscle/fat ratio of equal weight.

Go figure! - Mike KB3EIA -

3707. Hey Carl-Glom this!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 03:16:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk0mihorn0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 77172

It meant something, in those... years, to be a telegraph operator. They were looked upon with wonder as possessing knowledge which separated them from the rest of the crowd.

There are some surprising parallels between the experiences of nineteenth century women telegraphers and the twentieth-century story of women in the field of computer programming. Some of these similarities are technically based; the telegrapher's work, like that of a modern computer programmer, consisted of translating English-language instructions into machine-readable codes. Morse Code is, in fact, a direct ancestor of the ASCII codes used by software programmers. The computer itself is the direct descendant of the telegraph; as Carolyn Marvin observed in "When Old Technologies Were New",

In a historical sense, the computer is no more than an instantaneous telegraph with a prodigious memory, and all the communications inventions in between have simply been elaborations on the telegraph's original work.

http://www.mindspring.com/~tjepsen/WKU.htm

3708. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 03:17:21 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bk0mgv$lsk@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 77173

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0309131833.3afbc8a6@posting.google.com...
> "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bjvalj$90n@library1.airnews.net>...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030913102559.15462.00002930@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > >
> > > - New car prices ranged from $3000 to $5000
> > > - Gasoline was about 60 cents a gallon
> > > - A year's tuition at an Ivy League university was $4500
> > > - Ham rig prices were somewhat less than today's prices Maybe 60-75%.
> > > - Inflation was double digit and interest rates were not far behind
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
> > My first son was born in October 1974.
>
> Are you gonna be mad at me if I call ya grandma?
>

Proud of it!! She's eight years old and we go shopping all the time. I've
been teaching her to shop since she was about 18 months old. Every school
year so far, we've paid a visit to Payless Shoe Source. I save all Summer,
and when we go in the store I tell her to start picking until I tell her to
stop. We have a blast!

Oh, and she is my youngest son's daughter. Oldest has never had kids yet.

> >
> > Anyway, so health issues aside (and other than pregnancy neither of us
ever
> > went to the doctor), we, uh, well, subsisted on that income. Heh heh,
we
> > sure didn't "live" on it, but we weren't in need; we had food on the
table,
> > gas for the car to go to work, and rented an actual house. Granted, we
went
> > without cooking gas all Summer (we cooked on a grill outside or ate a
lot of
> > sandwiches), so we could save up for heating oil through the Winter.
The
> > house rent, if I remember correctly, was $75.00/month. Two-story,
2-bdrm, 1
> > bath, kitchen, living and dining. Huge lot (I grew and froze all our
> > veggies in a 32' x 32' garden--with NO motorized tools mind ya), we had

a
> > deer every Winter that I'd make stretch for meats (mostly ground to make
it
> > last), and my husband ate fish (trout right out of the Battenkill
River).
> > Yuk, I didn't like fish.
>
> This was New York State?
>

Oh, definitely. I lived in NY until 1979.

>
> I got my first deer a little less than 2 years ago. Only problem was I
> got 'er with a Honda Odyssey. Even though I asked nice, for some
> reason the body shop wouldn't paint a little Bambi outline on the new
> fender...
> >

Well, yeah, deer are hard to come by if one is depending upon only "one"
man--and don't get any twisted ideas there... What I mean is, all the guys
used to start hunting on Season open. Good 'ol Rick usually got first meat
by Thanksgiving. He was single and, actually, going to college at the time
(he's the reason we were on the Plattsburgh campus to see Alice Cooper).
So, about three of us families would divvy up that one. Then, as it went,
there'd usually be one or two more and we'd divvy that one up. One could
end up with a freezer full of ground meat. My kids' Godfather tried to get
me into racoon and turtle but, dude, that weren't happenin'.

> >
> > Gasoline for the auto, what was it? $0.28 or something near there?
>
> Until it doubled after the first OPEC embargo. But yeah, it was cheap,
> as were used cars and parts. Plus you could work on 'em yourself.
>

heh heh...yeah, or use them for freezers! We used to have a Ford Galaxy
that died on us in the middle of Winter. Same week, the fridge went. Well,
money was tight. So, we'd use the car to keep the refridgerated stuff in
and, believe it or not, it was actually cold enough to even keep ice cream a
day or two!

>
> Oddly enough, gas today is even cheaper, once you adjust for
> inflation. It's one of the few necessities that has gone that way.
>

Oh no...good 'ol Rick (mentioned above) used to get into how money was going
to be cheaper in the future than it was then...in fact, he'd make long-term
credit purchases based upon that. You mathemeticians!

>
> Yup. A lot depended on what it cost to wash the diapers vs. buying the

> disposables. If you pay all your own utilities the cloth route gets
> expensive real fast. If the water and electric are somebody else's
> problem it goes the other way.
>
> Then there's baby formula vs....no, I'm NOT gonna go there!
> >

Yeah, and neither did I :o

> >
> > Anyway, life may have seemed simpler then, and maybe it was to some
degree.
> > But, I'll take life today much quicker! I could not be shopping for a
2300
> > sq. ft. home back then!!
> >
> 2300 sf would be a big house fer me, then or today. Location,
> location, location....
>

Right here where we are at. Moving it in before the end of this year. And, it is big! We've decided instead of building, to go ahead and buy a manufactured home, and have a pier and beam foundation put in, then move it onto that. We can get more house for the money, it's vinyl sided, has the OSB top, bottom, and sides (marine grade), we've upgraded the carpet, have two living areas, 3 baths (if the home we think we've settled on ends up being the one we get), and I'll gain an extra bedroom to boot! That's in case my parents or my hubby's Mom ever has to come and live with us (the two living areas will accommodate a nice gathering and be good for if the parents have to live with us, too!).

>
> In the "old days", necessities were relatively inexpensive and
> luxuries were relatively expensive. But since then the trend has been
> for the necessities to get more and more expensive and the luxuries
> cheaper and cheaper. So now many hams can afford a $1000-2000 rig, but
> they can't afford a nice house on a big lot with no CC&Rs to put the
> rig in.
>

Yeah, it seems that way. I was just telling my darlin' the other day that I still feel "priviledged" to shop for something in a store called Linens and Things (don't know if you have those up there). I remember when that store used to be for the rich folks (from my perspective).

>
> IIRC the minimum wage back in '75 was around $1.50, and there are
> about 2000 working hours in a straight-time year. (40 hrs/week x 50
> weeks). So you folks were essentially living on one minimum-wage
> income. Think about what those numbers work out to today...
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

2080 hrs. to be exact. And, that wage sounds about right. Hey, do you remember when 5-Friday months were the cat's meow? Or, did you ever budget that way? I budgeted based on a four week month. When those 5 Fridays rolled around, that was high cotton time!

Yes, I was a stay-at-home mom until my kid (one went to go live with his dad) was about 11 and then was working from home, so still was at home for him. I've only been climbing the professional ladder for about 18 years; somewhere around there anyway.

Radio. Yeah, I remember when we first became hams! I didn't know it, but Cliff had been saving from the time I'd gotten him interested in the hobby and we were going to classes and "studying." When we got our ticket--he started out with swim COW so he was a Tech+, he went out and bought a Yeas 890AT (or is that 850AT). Anyway, he got what was then a darned nice radio with all the bells and whistles. We already had a 70' tower up, with a 10M quad antenna on top. Man, that thing was nice. First bad wind that year (90 mph past the house--straight line winds) blew that quad over and broke one of the fiberglass spreaders. We could have replaced it. But, this was a 3-element quad for 10M. Imagine how darned big and cumbersome that thing was!?

Kim W5TIT

3709. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 03:37:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk0nq8qtk0@208.207.71.138>
Source record: 77174

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>
> Brian:
> Care to talk about it?
>

SHhhhhhhhhhh!!!! Say and anything but that!

3710. Re: schematics wanted - "jamming device"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 04:03:58 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vm7q5gctaihq42@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77175

you got a local CB'r or ham that you're mad at,
and want to plant a little device in his yard so
his reception is dead, huh?

I've heard people doing this before.... buying about
$5 worth of parts at radio shack, putting together a
transmitter the size of a matchbox and tossing it in
somebody's yard one night where he won't ever find
it... and until the small battery that is in it goes dead,
his ears are plugged up and he can't hear a thing.

Clint
KB5ZHT

3711. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 04:05:29 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vm7q8ccns5bp5f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77176

the rest of the world, as you described it, just crapped on us
before, during and after the recent event in iraq.

Why do you think they'd give a hoot in hell about anything
we said in this instance, either??????

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

If you sympathize with terrorists & middle eastern tyrants,
vote for liberals...

--

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:p4O8b.237095$2x.66933@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in
> news:vm67v564e0pj4c@corp.supernews.com:
>
> > I heard from the latest audio news that more nations
> > around the world are dropping thier morse code
> > testing requirements.
> >
> > makes you wonder if the VEC's who petitioned
> > to return a higher code speed test for extra class
> > hams are just doing so to fight the tide.
> >
> > Clint
> > KB5ZHT
> >
>
>
> The ARRL has a destructive agenda. If they cared about amateur radio as
> much as for the amount of money their bank account, they would have said
> something at the last world conference. It's all lip service and lies to
> try and get hams like me to hold our piece and hope we don't feel like
> we're being lied to again.
>
> KB7ADL

3712. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 08:18:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030914041854.23307.00002987@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 77178

In article <fJP8b.4825$Ss1.4170@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Back to the smoking. I really wish everyone could stop smoking. You think
>Social Security is in a mess (you are aware that the feds have "borrowed"
>those funds?) now, just wait until 25% of the population starts living an
>extra 5 to 10 years! Many folks (non-smokers as well) live their final few
>years in a nursing home. The big difference in costs between smokers and
>non-smokers is the 5 or 10 years of Social Security that the non-smokers
>collect. Even a modest check of $1200 per month is $14,000 per year. That
>comes to $140,000 for an extra 10 years.

There was a report issued in some then-socialist Eastern European country a few
years back where the advice was to avoid antismoking programs! The report
showed that if the population stopped smoking, the longer lifespan would raise
retirement pension funding demands much more than the savings in medical costs.
Raised quite a stink when it became public...

73 de Jim, N2EY

3713. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 08:18:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030914041855.23307.00002988@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 77177

In article <3F63DA68.9080901@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <f7d9a152.0309121920.252a5f30@posting.google.com>,
>> jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:
>
> <snippage>
>
>>>We won't give licenses away -
>>>hams will need to cut the fast food, junk food, and tobacco out of
>>>their lives. This will be quite a challenge given how sacred the
>>>Kentucky Fried Chicken, soda pop, and donuts are.
>>
>>
>> I dunno if you're serious, trolling, or satirical, but it's funny any of
>those
>> ways!
>
> Yeah, here we go Jim:
>
> Entry level license is the Smart!tician. Test requirements are eating
>no less than 3 meals of meat per week.

I think you mean "no more than..."

>The successful applicant must
>also demonstrate the ability to cooko pasta in at least 30 unappetizing
>ways. Extra credit for recipes including Tofu.

Toe food?
>
> Priveliges for the Smart!tician will be the same as the technician plus

>is today.
>
> Next up the ladder is the Generallyhealthy! class. Test requiremts are
>to show the ability to fast for a minimum of 3 days, followed by a
>cleansing diet of only fruit juices, in addition to the Smart!tician
>tests. This is as high in the service as meat eaters can go * the lone
>exception is noted below
>
> Priveliges for the Generallyhealthy! are the same as the Smart!tician,
>plus HF access in SSB only.
>
> At the top of the sprout heap is the ExtraDelicious! license. This is

>the epitome of both hamdom and the oh so healthy lifestyle. The
>ExtraDelicious! *must* be a vegatarian, specificly a vegan.

At the risk of invoking Godwin's Law: Hitler was a vegetarian. I am not making this up.

>*The only
>exception to this is that medical waivers can be granted for
>lacto-ovarians, and in certain rare instances, for macrobiotics. These
>must be signed by a physician.
>
> The successful applicant for ExtraDelicious! must display the ability
>to be condescending onto others, to announce their vegan status to every
>person they meet within 45 seconds, and to be a general nuisance at
>restaraunts, being required to ask the waitress of the possibilty of
>animal products in everything in the facility, including the salt and
>pepper shakers.

You ever hear of Edgar Friendly?
>
> The ExtraDelicious! has all priveliges, as befits the obvious
>superiority of this type of person.
>
>> Seriously, though, it's not just a ham radio problem - it's an American
>> problem. Just look around you. Combine an aging population, cheap
>>sugary/fatty
>> foods, sedentary but high-stress living, and a drop in other vices like
>> smoking, and you have a recipe (pun intended) for folks getting heavier.
>>
>> I'm 6' 3" and my target weight is 180. I'll let ya know when I get there.
>
> You have to be kidding, Jim!

No, I'm serious.

>Unless you have an incredibly small bone
>structure, that will be hard to attain.

Back when I was running marathons, I was 178.

>I'm not too wild about the way
>"they" figure the body weight thing out either. It really has to be done
>more on a fat percentage thing rather than some stupid one size fits all
>approach. By the tables, I am considered grossly obese, and yet by the
>fat percentage, not. Put me in the pool, and I sink like a stone. Fat
>being neutral density as compared to water, allows the person to float
>easily, and weigh relatively less in water than a person of high
>muscle/fat ratio of equal weight.
>
BMI is a better indicator, but your point is well made.

Perhaps the best indicators are things like total cholesterol, LDL, HDL, resting heart rate, blood pressure, 12 minute test (how far can you

walk/jog/run in 12 minutes?) rather than weight.

> Go figure!

73 de Jim, N2EY
>

3714. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 09:11:21 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309140111.3a1a1a72@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77179

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030913201907.25815.00003003@mb-m07.aol.com>...

> >> If we don't ask we'll never get. FCC isn't going to come up with any new
> ideas.
> >> What can they do - say no?
> >
> >Yeah, absolutely. They'll say "we've already put enough work into
> >diddling with this stuff in the past few years, come back in 5-10
> >years when we have a better picture of the effects of what we've
> >already done become apparent". Which is typical FCC behavior when it
> >comes to major restructurings going back decades.
>
> OK, fine.
>
> But how can it hurt to ask?

Can't hurt a thing and it might plant some seeds but don't expect an
R&O to directly fall out of it.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >

w3rv

3715. Re: BPL: 1st Experimental License Issued

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 09:20:14 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309140120.63b1fbd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77180

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309131212.2b86ddf6@posting.google.com>...
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0309120254.22de3c66@posting.google.com>...
> > wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030911183717.07383.00001051@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> > > >WD2XEQ AMBIENT CORPORATION 0118-EX-PL-2003
> > > > >
> > > > >New experimental to operate in 1.7-88 MHz for testing power line carrier
> > > > >systems. Fixed: States of NY and MA
> > > >
> > > > Its about time.
> > >
> > About time for WHAT?!
>
> For the destruction of the ARS. Bruice gets, ahem, exited when he
> thinks about it. Its his dream, his goal.

'Nother Putz groupie eh? How do ya spell "another fart in a hurricane?"

3716. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 10:20:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <AhX8b.6597$Aq2.2820@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77181

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> You snipped the second sentence of 9), Dwight. Here it is again:
>
> 9) Existing Novices, Techs and Tech Pluses become Basics,
> existing Generals and Advanceds become Intermediates, and
> existing Extras become Fulls. Existing hams can continue to
> use their current privileges as long as they retain license
> documents showing their old license class.
>
> "Existing hams can continue to use their current privileges as long
> as they retain license documents showing their old license class."

You're right. Sorry. In my haste to catch up with so many new messages posted while off the newsgroup for a few days, I didn't notice that part. Having said that, I still don't see the justification for a change. There are also some conflicts. For example, how would you justify to new hams, who, from the description, basically passed the same tests as existing hams, that their privileges are restricted while privileges for existing Techs and Tech Pluses are not. Why is one group able to operate safely and properly while the other isn't (enough of a difference to justify greatly restricted privileges)?

In the end, I don't see how this addresses any current issue in ham radio. There are already three license classes (Tech, General, and Extra), so all you would do is rename them (which doesn't do a whole lot). Some HF privileges could just be added to the existing Tech license, without all the effort to mess with the other license classes and license exams (much easier for the FCC). Adding HF to the Tech license would increase it's appeal, which addresses the need to attract new people. Dropping code from the other license classes (General and Extra) would increase their appeal, which would attract more to upgrade.

In other words, just about all you're trying to accomplish could be done much more easily (by minor modifications to the existing license structure). This simple fact undermines your idea.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3717. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 10:37:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <SxX8b.6606$Aq2.1445@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77182

"WA8ULX" wrote:
>
> Of course you dont, you want a FREE HANDOUT License.

Bruce, I've having a hard time even believing you have a license. Based on your poorly written messages in this newsgroup and others, I don't see how you were literate enough to even understand the license exams? Clearly, you're one of those who had to memorize the question pool instead of understanding the content. Now that you have a license, you still don't seem to understand the concepts behind ham radio - the concept of "goodwill" obviously went right over your head.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3718. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 10:55:36 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <IOX8b.6608$Aq2.1479@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77183

"charlesb" wrote:
>
> There's probably only one hope for you now, Jason, and that is to buy
> yourself a pack of Chesterfields or Luckies and fire one on up on your way
> to "Golden Corral" to take advantage of that all-you-can-eat buffet.

Hey, the "Golden Corral" has much better food than the so-called fast food joints, and it's cheaper too. Take out is especially inexpensive. Where else can you get a steak dinner for two to thee bucks?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3719. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 11:15:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <L5Y8b.6644$Aq2.164@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77184

"charlesb" wrote:
>
> One quick example: Irrationally afraid of nuclear
> power, the "PC police" has seen to it that we stick
> with the burning of fossil fuels for our electricity.
> How clever.

Irrationally afraid of nuclear power? According to the UN, there have been 386 serious nuclear power plant accidents around the world (serious defined as a significant release of nuclear material into the atmosphere). Several of those accidents have been right here in this country. In addition, there have been over 6,000 nuclear weapons tests, resulting in millions of tons of radioactive material spread across this planet. Nobody is certain how many nuclear weapons accidents there have been. And, since records are not kept, nobody is certain how many accidents there have been at nuclear research facilities. The nuclear industry, peaceful or military, has been no friend to this planet or it's people. And that's not a "PC" perspective - it's simple common sense.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3720. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 12:19:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030914081904.23307.00002990@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 77185

In article <20030913225156.14837.00002957@mb-m03.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0309120905.32490493@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>Heck yes. In fact it went something like this:
>>
>>First, ya had to have a General or Advanced for at least two years
>>before they'd even let ya try the Extra.
>>
>>Then ya had to pass the receive test with at least 100 correct
>>consecutive legible characters. No going back and fixing things after
>>the code stopped, either, after the last dit it was PENCILS DOWN or ya
>>flunked right there.
>>
>>If ya passed the receive, they let ya try sending with their straight
>>key or *your* speed key. You sent until the examiner was satisfied.
>>
>>Only then did they let you try the written. Mess up at any point -
>>even one character or question - and it was "go home and study some
>>more and don't come back for at least 30 days". No CSCE, no partial
>>credit, nada, do it all first try at one sitting or it doesn't count
>>at all.
>>
>>> Dinosaur? Who ME?
>>>
>>Naw.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>Jim:
>
>Ah, yes, the good old days.

With all due respect, Larry - were you there?

Did you have to take a sending test?

Did you have to pass all of the elements to upgrade at the same time?

Did you have to wait 2 years to even try the Extra?

>Challenging licensing requirements and
>uncompromising testing procedures.

They've been "compromising" forever. Back before WW2 the exam was all blue book essays. Before 1960 there was diagram drawing. The tests I took in 1967-70 were "dumbed down" compared to those because my tests were all multiple choice.

>Of course, all that is waaaaay too
>PoliticKally IncorrecKt today, since someone with a particular ethnic
>origin, skin color, religion, "gender," or a hangnail might not be able
>to pass the first time or two. This certainly won't do in these
>enlightened times.

None of that had anything to do with the license test changes.

Incentive Licensing came about in LBJ's time

Dick Bash did his stuff (and got away with it) when Nixon and Ford were in office

The change to the VE system happened under Reagan

We got medical waivers because a "king" wanted a favor from George Bush 1.

We also got a nocodeham license because of GB 1.

Etc.

>After all, it might "exclude" someone who is, in
>reality, a nascent technical genius who just needs the ability to talk
>on the HF phone bands in order to find the inspiration to create the
>next fabulous new invention which will revolutionize electronic
>communication for the rest of all time!
>
Or something like that.

Don't hold yer breath waiting for it, tho.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3721. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 12:24:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309140424.1c62f771@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77186

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309131120.18a687b6@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309130526.736357da@posting.google.com>...
> > "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:<jPt8b.425516$YN5.287945@sccrnsc01>...
> > > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in
> > > news:5c01b95b.0309121214.7d06772d@posting.google.com:
> > >
> > > > That's Jim;s OPINION, Brain. Other than that, you have not
> > > > satisfied the question of how the ARRL has allegedly pushed for "lower
> > > > standards".
> > > >
> > > > Steve, K4YZ
> > > >
> > >
> > > It's my opinion too, and I'm always right.
> > >
> > > KB7ADL
> >
> > Well there you have it, Steve. You have two people to query now; Jim and Vince.
> >
> > Surely you will find your answer.
>
> "(MY)" answer, Brain?
>
> I'm not the one with a question.

But you are, or else you wouldn't have asked Vince to

I'll watch while you >>TRY<< to show us where the ARRL has been
"pushing for lower standards as improvements", Vince.

Or shall I heap that expectation on the same pile of unanswered
questions along with all of Lennie's...?!?!

So in the end, you still won't question Jim what the ARRL has done to
reduce standards. Typical PCT Agenda double standard.

3722. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 12:29:12 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309140429.4d750612@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77187

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<SxX8b.6606$Aq2.1445@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "WA8ULX" wrote:
> >
> > Of course you dont, you want a FREE HANDOUT License.
>
>
> Bruce, I've having a hard time even believing you have a license. Based
> on your poorly written messages in this newsgroup and others, I don't see
> how you were literate enough to even understand the license exams? Clearly,
> you're one of those who had to memorize the question pool instead of
> understanding the content.

No, no, no. Bruce didn't memorize anything. He took the exam on a
lark, w/o studying, and scored 100%. Furthermore, he did it in under
8 minutes, and collected $250 from a couple of "CB Plussers" who bet
he couldn't do it.

But he breaks into a sweat every time he has to sign his paycheck.

Now that you have a license, you still don't seem
> to understand the concepts behind ham radio - the concept of "goodwill"
> obviously went right over your head.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3723. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 12:34:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309140434.48e3193a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77188

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030913225157.14837.00002958@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0309131155.3d901998@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> Ryan:
> >>
> >> As one PP'er to another, it is an honor to know you! It's nice to know
> that
> >> we're morally and intellectually superior to the dumbed-down, unwashed,
> >> non-PP'ing hoardes of inferior drivers.
> >>
> >> Michigan still has "Chauffeur's" licenses? Which class of CDL is that
> >> equivalent to?
> >
> >For once in you life could you put away the measuring stick and just
> >accept another individual as an equal?
> >
> > Here in Delaware, I'm told that Emergency Vehicle
> >> operators don't require anything more than a standard Class D Driver's
> >> license.
> >
> >I.E., in Delaware they don't measure up to superior Larry.
> >
> > They do, however, have to be a card-carrying member of
> >> the "Emergency Service" (usually a local volunteer FD) to which
> >> the emergency vehicle is registered.
> >
> >With a shack on their hip, no doubt.
>
> Brian:
>
> I'm very sorry about your inferiority complex, but I was just asking for
> some information from Ryan about driver's licenses. This is not about
> my "superiority" or anything else that you should be whining about --
> unless you are having problems of your own. Care to talk about it?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, you might want to check with Michigan's BMV if you're after
licensing information. No, don't.

Just relax and enjoy the knowledge that there's another PPer in your
midsts.

3724. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 12:52:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309140452.72c337bd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77189

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030913225156.14837.00002957@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0309120905.32490493@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >Heck yes. In fact it went something like this:
> >
> >First, ya had to have a General or Advanced for at least two years
> >before they'd even let ya try the Extra.
> >
> >Then ya had to pass the receive test with at least 100 correct
> >consecutive legible characters. No going back and fixing things after
> >the code stopped, either, after the last dit it was PENCILS DOWN or ya
> >flunked right there.
> >
> >If ya passed the receive, they let ya try sending with their straight
> >key or *your* speed key. You sent until the examiner was satisfied.
> >
> >Only then did they let you try the written. Mess up at any point -
> >even one character or question - and it was "go home and study some
> >more and don't come back for at least 30 days". No CSCE, no partial
> >credit, nada, do it all first try at one sitting or it doesn't count
> >at all.
> >
> >> Dinosaur? Who ME?
> >>
> >Naw.
> >
> >73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Jim:
>
> Ah, yes, the good old days. Challenging licensing requirements and
> uncompromising testing procedures. Of course, all that is waaaaay too
> PoliticKally IncorrecKt today, since someone with a particular ethnic
> origin, skin color, religion, "gender," or a hangnail might not be able
> to pass the first time or two. This certainly won't do in these
> enlightened times. After all, it might "exclude" someone who is, in
> reality, a nascent technical genius who just needs the ability to talk
> on the HF phone bands in order to find the inspiration to create the
> next fabulous new invention which will revolutionize electronic
> communication for the rest of all time!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, instead of complaining all of the time about others, why don't you relate to us how you've revolutionized radio communications?

BTW, how's your WAS coming?

Saw in QST where a ham had 48 states in 1957, then completed WAS with Hawaii and Nevada in 2003. No doubt another revolutionizing operator.

3725. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 13:05:53 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <RIZ8b.192114$Ay2.48775778@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 77190

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:%rQ8b.4827$6E1.4395@news02.roc.ny...
> As a member of NCI
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA

Say it ain't so, Jim. ;-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

3726. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 13:06:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309140506.3fb99a8d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77191

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bjsnto$m13$0@208.206.142.71>...
>
> My mileage does not vary in the least, Hans.

Of course not. Even your electric meter doesn't vary whether you're
running 100 watts or 1400 watts. Hi!

> And this is a large part of what
> separates the.........

Men from the boys?

> Oh well, probably enough has already been written on the subject.
> ----------
> BTW, I think the last time I turned on my linear amp was when I worked that
> etherial signal from the other side of the planet, VK0IR, on a near-dead 20
> meter CW band.

Riiiight! CW bands never close. That's why you can always get
through.

> Their response to my 100 watt calls was "didi dum dum didi",
> and "QRZ?"

What? You didn't get through? Or was your sending so atrocious that
they couldn't copy you? I hope you didn't hit them with your banana
boat swing.

> Running 1400 watts out, the recognition was immediate.
>
> Dick

Might makes right. What a wonderful little CW adventure.

3727. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 13:11:58 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <yOZ8b.2319$GZ7.1956@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77192

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030914041855.23307.00002988@mb-m29.aol.com...
>
> Back when I was running marathons, I was 178.

That's amazing! How old are you now?

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

3728. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 13:12:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309140512.7d45f76a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77193

"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
news:<IuP8b.57189$3b2.7364893@twister.neo.rr.com>...
> If your not a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, there is a CW contest
> going one right now.
>
> If you are a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, then never mind, it's a Ham
> Radio thing. You would not understand.
>
> 10-73's!

Rev. Jim is going to chastise you for your dirty mouth. Oh, never
mind, it's a PCTA thing.

3729. Re: test only

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 13:16:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309140516.5a613e1a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77194

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bk0bgq$u1b$0@208.207.71.165>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj29m9$vi7$0@208.207.71.176>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bj17rmran0@208.206.142.111>...
>
> > > > > bang is still as holey as a moth-eaten cotten curtain in a 1940's flophouse.
> > > > >
> > > > Was that your primary residence?
> > > >
> > > I saw the movie.
> > >
> > You starred in it.
>
> Nope, I was 'way overqualified for the role.

Only because you lived it.

> It was a docu-comedy of your life story.

Couldn't have been. I was a 50's baby.

You're dismissed.

3730. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 13:17:19 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <zTZ8b.2322$a_7.438@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77195

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:L5Y8b.6644$Aq2.164@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "charlesb" wrote:
> >
> > One quick example: Irrationally afraid of nuclear
> > power, the "PC police" has seen to it that we stick
> > with the burning of fossil fuels for our electricity.
> > How clever.
>
>
> Irrationally afraid of nuclear power? According to the UN, there have
been
> 386 serious nuclear power plant accidents around the world (serious
defined
> as a significant release of nuclear material into the atmosphere). Several
> of those accidents have been right here in this country. In addition,
there
> have been over 6,000 nuclear weapons tests, resulting in millions of tons
of
> radioactive material spread across this planet. Nobody is certain how many
> nuclear weapons accidents there have been. And, since records are not
kept,
> nobody is certain how many accidents there have been at nuclear research
> facilities. The nuclear industry, peaceful or military, has been no friend
> to this planet or it's people. And that's not a "PC" perspective - it's
> simple common sense.
>

Yes, irrationally afraid of nuclear power. Nothing you said there convinced
me otherwise.

Keep in mind the fact that fossil-fuel burning plants pollute while working
perfectly. Unlike the nuclear plants, they don't have to wait for an
accident in order to cause a problem.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

3731. Re: ARRL Policy Shift?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 13:18:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309140518.5570eda0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77196

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:<gXN8b.237030$2x.67527@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in
> news:5c01b95b.0309131127.1aefb6fb@posting.google.com:
>
> > >
> > > No Amateur Radio Service=No Members=No Dollars=NoARRL.
> > >
> > > Looks like a pretty silly assertion to me.
> > >
> > > Steve, K4YZ
> > >
>
>
> Try this one Steve:
>
> Incapable licensees = CBer type behavior = Trashed Bands = No Enjoyment.

= WA8ULX

3732. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 13:19:23 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <vVZ8b.2324$YZ7.2212@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77197

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309140434.48e3193a@posting.google.com...
>
> Just relax and enjoy the knowledge that there's another PPer in your
> midsts.

I'd appreciate it if you PP'ers would use the restroom facilities instead of doing it in our midst.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

3733. Re: ARRL Policy Shift?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 13:20:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309140520.77d196c3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77198

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bjtjqquj0@208.206.142.72>...
> Jack Twilley wrote:
>
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> > >>>>> "Dick" == Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> writes:
> >
> > Dick> Lessee, now....You're happy that K1ZZ published an editorial in
> > Dick> QST suggesting combining CB and ham radio?
> >
> > Cite, please?
> >
>
> I no longer keep QST beyond the past year or so, therefore I no longer
> have the issue where he broached the subject in his monthly "It seems to
> us" column. But it sure was there some time back, a year and a half or
> two years ago, maybe a little longer. Look through your old QSTs and
> you'll find it.
>
> I think he was testing the waters,and I should not be surprised if he
> found them uncomfortably warm!
>
> Dick

FWIW, I recall reading it also. And like Dick, I purge the house
clutter periodically. But there was a thread on the subject. Good
luck finding it.

Brian

3734. Re: The Chosen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 13:24:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309140524.24d87da4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77199

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030913164751.17961.00001324@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> Subject: Re: The Chosen
>
> "K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:<9b590f5e564adc3cc2ce5ff0ead6e71b.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > The Wise Ones live in the depths of the D, E, and F-Layers, and
>
> The chosen have mastered a skill known as "Morse code". All others are to be
> shunned.

Yep, dem dare layers doan werk wit dem other hi-falutin' modes.

3735. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 13:30:48 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <c4_8b.2861$nQ.1181502@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77200

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:L5Y8b.6644$Aq2.164@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "charlesb" wrote:
> >
> > One quick example: Irrationally afraid of nuclear
> > power, the "PC police" has seen to it that we stick
> > with the burning of fossil fuels for our electricity.
> > How clever.
>
>
> Irrationally afraid of nuclear power? According to the UN, there have
been
> 386 serious nuclear power plant accidents around the world (serious
defined
> as a significant release of nuclear material into the atmosphere). Several
> of those accidents have been right here in this country. In addition,
there
> have been over 6,000 nuclear weapons tests, resulting in millions of tons
of
> radioactive material spread across this planet. Nobody is certain how many
> nuclear weapons accidents there have been. And, since records are not
kept,
> nobody is certain how many accidents there have been at nuclear research
> facilities. The nuclear industry, peaceful or military, has been no friend
> to this planet or it's people. And that's not a "PC" perspective - it's
> simple common sense.

The following comments address power plants only. Weapons is an entirely
different issue.

Yes, irrationally afraid. The number of deaths from nuclear power plants
pales into insignificance in comparison to the number of minors who have
died to bring us coal to burn not only from accidents but black lung
disease. The damage done from nuclear power plants pales into
insignificance in comparison to the damage done from oil spills. More
people have died from dams breaking than power plant accidents.

If we applied the same logic and standards to other sources of power as we
do to nuclear, we would not have any electricity at all. We'd have to shut
down every coal, oil, and hydroelectric power plant in the world.

Nuclear power is the cleanest, safest, most efficient form of power
generation available at this time.

Wind and solar have to be excluded at this time since the technology doesn't
exist to make these forms widely available on an efficient basis. And if we

follow the logic of some people in this group on other items, wind power is too antiquated since it's been used for hundreds if not thousands of years.

And let's compare nuclear power to some non-power industries. Are you aware of how devastating accidents at chemical plants can be? Have you ever seen a grain elevator explode from sparks causing the suspended dust to explode?

I'd rather live next to a nuclear power plant than any other type of power generating facility or any of several other industrial endeavors.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3736. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 13:53:13 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bk1rs6$p83@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 77001

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:c4_8b.2861$nQ.1181502@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> Nuclear power is the cleanest, safest, most efficient form of power
> generation available at this time.
>

Absolutely correct. Hands down. Although undeniably, all the comments about deaths from other energy sources aside--an incident with nuclear power carries much further impact and potential for harm than from any other source (currently in use). While deaths and environmental impact may be higher in number than from nuclear incidents, I think it would be found that nuclear power/nuclear anything has greater risk than is immediately recognized.

Take a coal mine. At any one coal mine there are probably folks who have, and who have already died from, black lung or other health diseases; there have probably been some people maimed and killed from caves, and there have probably even been some serious environmental effects from the mining of coal. But, one (serious) incident at a nuclear power plant--take Chernobyl since that's the worst in history--and you have generations of trouble: to the environment, to disaster recovery; to ecnomical and infrastructure; and we haven't even mentioned the immediate and long-term health effects.

Kim W5TIT

3737. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 14:20:59 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vm8uae66eef9bd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77002

He's trying to blanket the topic anyway....
NCI isn't trying to stop or ban the use of morse
code on the airwaves, they simply understand that
the testing of morse code no longer falls within
the scope and original intent of ham radio.. which
is to keep the art of radio alive and expand it's use,
etc., and, well, logic there says that if morse code
is being abandoned left and right in the radio world
in favor of new means of communication, than you
you are no longer adhereing or supporting this
doctrine of ham radio.

Plus, the real reason the old buzzards want to keep
it around is simple but non well-founded.. "I did
it, so YOU should have to!"

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

If you sympathize with terrorists & middle eastern tyrants,
vote for liberals...

--

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:%rQ8b.4827$6E1.4395@news02.roc.ny...
> As a member of NCI, I have used land-line Morse as well as international
> Morse. You wouldn't understand. It's a ham radio thing. :)
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
> "shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
> news:IuP8b.57189$3b2.7364893@twister.neo.rr.com...
> > If your not a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, there is a CW contest
> > going one right now.
> >
> > If you are a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, then never mind, it's a
> Ham
> > Radio thing. You would not understand.
> >

> > 10-73's!
> >
> >
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.516 / Virus Database: 313 - Release Date: 9/1/03
>
>

3738. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 14:22:16 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vm8ucqlp6pd301@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77003

When I took my drivers test years ago to get a license
to drive an automobile, the never required me to
prove that I could hitch a horse team to a wagon.
The youngsters today, likewise, tell me that the
departments of motor vehicles around the country
do not ask them to prove they are proficient with
buggy whips.

Enough said.

Clint

--

--

If you sympathize with terrorists & middle eastern tyrants,
vote for liberals...

--

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309140512.7d45f76a@posting.google.com...
> "shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
news:<IuP8b.57189$3b2.7364893@twister.neo.rr.com>...
> > If your not a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, there is a CW contest
> > going one right now.
> >
> > If you are a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, then never mind, it's a
Ham
> > Radio thing. You would not understand.
> >
> > 10-73's!
>
> Rev. Jim is going to chastise you for your dirty mouth. Oh, never
> mind, it's a PCTA thing.

3739. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 14:23:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030914102340.07346.00000605@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77004

In article <yOZ8b.2319$GZ7.1956@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
<n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030914041855.23307.00002988@mb-m29.aol.com...
>>
>> Back when I was running marathons, I was 178.

That was 19-20 years ago. Tempus fugit. I still run, just not that far.
>
>That's amazing! How old are you now?
>
49.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3740. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 14:41:50 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <O6%8b.2868$nQ.1193559@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77005

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vm8ucqlp6pd301@corp.supernews.com...
> When I took my drivers test years ago to get a license
> to drive an automobile, the never required me to
> prove that I could hitch a horse team to a wagon.
> The youngsters today, likewise, tell me that the
> departments of motor vehicles around the country
> do not ask them to prove they are proficient with
> buggy whips.
>
> Enough said.
>
> Clint

The youngsters today still tell me that they must learn to use a pencil and learn to write script. Typing and word processing are taught AFTER they have learned to write manually. Enough said.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3741. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 14:58:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F648247.60409@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77006

charlesb wrote:
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309140434.48e3193a@posting.google.com...
>
>>Just relax and enjoy the knowledge that there's another PPer in your
>>midsts.
>
>
> I'd appreciate it if you PP'ers would use the restroom facilities instead of
> doing it in our midst.

But PP'ers are so arrogant and superior minded that they think they can
PP wherever they want!

- Mike KB3EIA -

President, No Parallel Parking Test International

taking driving into the future

3742. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 15:10:43 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Tx%8b.2873$nQ.1197531@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77007

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bk1rs6$p83@library1.airnews.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:c4_8b.2861$nQ.1181502@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > Nuclear power is the cleanest, safest, most efficient form of power
> > generation available at this time.
> >
>
> Absolutely correct. Hands down. Although undeniably, all the comments
> about deaths from other energy sources aside--an incident with nuclear
power
> carries much further impact and potential for harm than from any other
> source (currently in use). While deaths and environmental impact may be
> higher in number than from nuclear incidents, I think it would be found
that
> nuclear power/nuclear anything has greater risk than is immediately
> recognized.
>
> Take a coal mine. At any one coal mine there are probably folks who have,
> and who have already died from, black lung or other health diseases; there
> have probably been some people maimed and killed from caves, and there
have
> probably even been some serious environmental effects from the mining of
> coal. But, one (serious) incident at a nuclear power plant--take
Chernobyl
> since that's the worst in history--and you have generations of trouble: to
> the environment, to disaster recovery; to ecnomical and infrastructure;
and
> we haven't even mentioned the immediate and long-term health effects.

Again not so. Only 31 people died from Chernobyl. Even now there has been
no increased incident of deaths from diseases that may possibly be linked to
radiation. The area where the fallout could be discerned from the normal
background measurements was relatively small. In addition, that accident
was due to an unauthorized experiment being conducted at the facility. In
other words, rules and safety precautions were being deliberately ignored.
Nuclear power generation has been round for 50 years now. A total of 34
people have died. That's the 31 at Chernobyl and 3 in the 1950s at an
experimental government facility (where once again regulations were not
followed).

The collapse of hydroelectric dams have affected areas as wide or wider than
a nuclear power plant accident. And they have killed more people. I'd much
rather live next to a nuclear plant than downstream of a dam.

And speaking of long term environmental impacts, what about thousands of square miles that are supposedly affected by acid rain from burning coal?? What about the miles of coast and ocean that have been contaminated by oil spills?? The long term effects could be quite significant.

So if an honest evaluation and comparison of long term effects, deaths, environmental impacts, etc is done and the same standards applied across the board, then it would indeed be necessary to shut down all oil, coal, and hydroelectric plants. Personally I don't care to sit in the dark and shiver.

Now let's take a look at serious industrial accidents. A prime example is the chemical plant in Bhopal. 3,000 people died immediately when that happened. As many as 10,000 people have died from long term effects of exposure to the gas released since it damaged their lungs and other organs. No one is shutting down the chemical industry. Yet some chemicals are as persistent in the environment as nuclear materials.

So sorry to say, your long term environmental arguments just don't hold water. There's lots of things that can affect even wider spread areas and last just as long.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3743. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 15:39:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F648C04.3010702@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77010

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message

> Again not so. Only 31 people died from Chernobyl. Even now there has been
> no increased incident of deaths from diseases that may possibly be linked to
> radiation.

Directly attributable deaths, Dee. It's important to make a distinction

The area where the fallout could be discerned from the normal
> background measurements was relatively small. In addition, that accident
> was due to an unauthorized experiment being conducted at the facility. In
> other words, rules and safety precautions were being deliberately ignored.
> Nuclear power generation has been round for 50 years now. A total of 34
> people have died. That's the 31 at Chernobyl and 3 in the 1950s at an
> experimental government facility (where once again regulations were not
> followed).

Don't forget there were deaths earlier than the 1950's

> The collapse of hydroelectric dams have affected areas as wide or wider than
> a nuclear power plant accident. And they have killed more people. I'd much
> rather live next to a nuclear plant than downstream of a dam.

> And speaking of long term environmental impacts, what about thousands of
> square miles that are supposedly affected by acid rain from burning coal??
> What about the miles of coast and ocean that have been contaminated by oil
> spills?? The long term effects could be quite significant.
>
> So if an honest evaluation and comparison of long term effects, deaths,
> environmental impacts, etc is done and the same standards applied across the
> board, then it would indeed be necessary to shut down all oil, coal, and
> hydroelectric plants. Personally I don't care to sit in the dark and
> shiver.
>
> Now let's take a look at serious industrial accidents. A prime example is
> the chemical plant in Bhopal. 3,000 people died immediately when that
> happened. As many as 10,000 people have died from long term effects of
> exposure to the gas released since it damaged their lungs and other organs.
> No one is shutting down the chemical industry. Yet some chemicals are as
> persistent in the environment as nuclear materials.

If you want my take on the whole nuc power issue, the techies have
placed the blame on the public, while so very much lies within themselves.

You try to convince the public that the reactor is safe. What they
remember is that they were told that Chernoble was safe. The public is

left to sort out who is telling the truth, and who is not. And the superior attitude of the techies did not help. Any guess why they chose not to believe anyone?

I think that the way we were building the things was an inherently unsafe situation. The concentration of so much power in one or two relatively small places (per area served) is not an inherently safe operation. It achieves economy of scale, but in the end, probably didn't even do that.

Mistakes were made in the basic premises. And yes there is an element of irrationality with peoples reaction to the problem. Can you completely blame them? The techie person will answer yes, no doubt. But that is being as irrational as they are, because it ignores that they HAVE to be convinced.

Don't get me wrong, I a a firm proponent of nuc power. I just think it has been handled very very poorly by the Techies.

As the world is now entering it's period of geometric population growth, there I have no doubt that nuclear power will make a return; the other choice is no power at all. The population growth is poised to consume most of what is left of the fossil fuels, and will probably do so in a surprisingly short time.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3744. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 15:45:43 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <H209b.60152$3b2.7791412@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 77008

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vm8uae66eef9bd@corp.supernews.com...
> He's trying to blanket the topic anyway....
> NCI isn't trying to stop or ban the use of morse
> code on the airwaves, they simply understand that
> the testing of morse code no longer falls within
> the scope and original intent of ham radio.. which
> is to keep the art of radio alive and expand it's use,
> etc., and, well, logic there says that if morse code
> is being abandoned left and right in the radio world
> in favor of new means of communication, than you
> you are no longer adhereing or supporting this
> doctrine of ham radio.
>
> Plus, the real reason the old buzzards want to keep
> it around is simple but non well-founded.. "I did
> it, so YOU should have to!"
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
Great job Clint!
You spoke the words exactly as written by Cpt. Carl. You would make a good
Liberal, you follow orders so well. You might want to call the DNC and see
if they could use your during the next election.

Good luck!

10-73's!

3745. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 15:47:53 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <J409b.60215$3b2.7793191@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 77009

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vm8ucqlp6pd301@corp.supernews.com...
> When I took my drivers test years ago to get a license
> to drive an automobile, the never required me to
> prove that I could hitch a horse team to a wagon.
> The youngsters today, likewise, tell me that the
> departments of motor vehicles around the country
> do not ask them to prove they are proficient with
> buggy whips.
>
> Enough said.
>
> Clint
>
Clint my man, you scored again!
You must be Cpt. Carls right hand job man. You quote their Bible so well.

Don't look now, but Ted Kennedy likes the way you don't think for
yourself.....

10-73's!

3746. Re: BPL: 1st Experimental License Issued

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 15:52:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309140752.51c20c05@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77011

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0309140120.63b1fbd@posting.google.com>...

> 'Nother Putz groupie eh? How do ya spell "another fart in a hurricane?"

B-R-U-C-E

3747. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 16:07:47 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309140807.2e3fc77c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77012

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:<vm7q8ccns5bp5f@corp.supernews.com>...

> the rest of the world, as you described it, just crapped on us
> before, during and after the recent event in iraq.
>
> Why do you think they'd give a hoot in hell about anything
> we said in this instance, either??????

> "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
> news:p4O8b.237095$2x.66933@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in
> > news:vm67v564e0pj4c@corp.supernews.com:
> >
> > > I heard from the latest audio news that more nations
> > > around the world are dropping thier morse code
> > > testing requirements.
> > >
> > > makes you wonder if the VEC's who petitioned
> > > to return a higher code speed test for extra class
> > > hams are just doing so to fight the tide.

> > The ARRL has a destructive agenda. If they cared about amateur radio as
> > much as for the amount of money their bank account, they would have said
> > something at the last world conference. It's all lip service and lies to
> > try and get hams like me to hold our piece and hope we don't feel like
> > we're being lied to again.

You guys have a unique perspective on what's transpiring.

May I suggest that you write it down, mail it to Tom Clancy, and
see if he can't work the plot into one of his next books?

Steve, K4YZ

3748. Re: The Chosen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 16:13:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309140813.30d6118a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77013

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030913164751.17961.00001324@mb-m01.aol.com>...

> The chosen have mastered a skill known as "Morse code". All others are to be
> shunned.

Life must be miserable for you, Vippy.

Can't meet any "preety fems"...

Can't seem to get along with anyone in Amateur Radio...

Family "forced" you out of the "EE field"...

Sheesh....What a loser.

Steve, K4YZ

3749. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 16:18:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030914121855.02537.00000566@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 77015

In article <zTZ8b.2322$a_7.438@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
<n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:

>Keep in mind the fact that fossil-fuel burning plants pollute while working
>perfectly.

Yup. So do nuclear plants. The pollution in each case is different, of course.
Nuke plants generate various forms of radioactive waste that will remain
hazardous for far longer than anyone realistically knows how to deal with.

>Unlike the nuclear plants, they don't have to wait for an
>accident in order to cause a problem.

But when a nuke plant has a problem, it's a BIG problem!

73 de Jim, N2EY

3750. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 16:18:56 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030914121856.02537.00000567@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 77014

In article <f45722ac.0309140512.7d45f76a@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
>news:<IuP8b.57189$3b2.7364893@twister.neo.rr.com>...
>> If your not a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, there is a CW contest
>> going one right now.
>>
>> If you are a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, then never mind, it's a
>Ham
>> Radio thing. You would not understand.
>>
>> 10-73's!
>
>Rev. Jim is going to chastise you for your dirty mouth.

Who are you talking about, Brian?

>Oh, never mind, it's a PCTA thing.

You mean like the way you never censure Len or Carl (or anybody else who
happens to oppose code tests), no matter what they say or how they say it?

Oh, never mind, it's an NCTA double standards thing.

3751. Re: hams are ruining amateur radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 16:21:53 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309140821.3b8af96a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77016

vshah101@aol.com (Vshah101) wrote in message
news:<20030913165332.17961.00001325@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> >hams are ruining amateur radio
>
> I could have told you that.

No, you couldn't. Your constant barrage of anti-Amateur Radio
rhetoric is strewn with evidence of a gross misunderstanding of
Amateur Radio at SEVERAL levels, Vippy...You don't understand it's
purpose, it's "language", nor it's role in our communities.

Too bad for you. It's a lot of fun. If you'd quit trying to
mold Amateur Radio into what YOU want it to be and take what it
offers, you'd have a lot more fun...Problem is you keep thinking that
this is Burger King...You want it "your way, right away", and you get
ill when it's not delivered to you on that silver platter.

Boohoo for Vippy.

Steve, K4YZ

3752. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 16:34:36 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <wM09b.2898$nQ.1210588@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77017

```
----- Original Message -----
From: "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Sent: Sunday, September 14, 2003 11:39 AM
Subject: Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>
> > Again not so. Only 31 people died from Chernobyl. Even now there has
been
> > no increased incident of deaths from diseases that may possibly be
linked to
> > radiation.
>
> Directly attributable deaths, Dee. It's important to make a distinction

I addressed the long term effects.

>
> The area where the fallout could be discerned from the normal
> > background measurements was relatively small. In addition, that
accident
> > was due to an unauthorized experiment being conducted at the facility.
In
> > other words, rules and safety precautions were being deliberately
ignored.
> > Nuclear power generation has been round for 50 years now. A total of 34
> > people have died. That's the 31 at Chernobyl and 3 in the 1950s at an
> > experimental government facility (where once again regulations were not
> > followed).
>
> Don't forget there were deaths earlier than the 1950's

Not from Power Generation Facilities. I'm not counting bombs and bomb
testing. And keep in mind that power plants can't blow up. They can melt
down, which confines the effects to the building. They can release
contaminated steam, which is diluted very rapidly to background levels of
radiation.

>
>
> > The collapse of hydroelectric dams have affected areas as wide or wider
than
> > a nuclear power plant accident. And they have killed more people. I'd
much
```

> > rather live next to a nuclear plant than downstream of a dam.
>
> > And speaking of long term environmental impacts, what about thousands of
> > square miles that are supposedly affected by acid rain from burning
coal??
> > What about the miles of coast and ocean that have been contaminated by
oil
> > spills?? The long term effects could be quite significant.
> >
> > So if an honest evaluation and comparison of long term effects, deaths,
> > environmental impacts, etc is done and the same standards applied across
the
> > board, then it would indeed be necessary to shut down all oil, coal, and
> > hydroelectric plants. Personally I don't care to sit in the dark and
> > shiver.
> >
> > Now let's take a look at serious industrial accidents. A prime example
is
> > the chemical plant in Bhopal. 3,000 people died immediately when that
> > happened. As many as 10,000 people have died from long term effects of
> > exposure to the gas released since it damaged their lungs and other
organs.
> > No one is shutting down the chemical industry. Yet some chemicals are
as
> > persistent in the environment as nuclear materials.
>
> If you want my take on the whole nuc power issue, the techies have
> placed the blame on the public, while so very much lies within themselves.
>
> You try to convince the public that the reactor is safe. What they
> remember is that they were told that Chernoble was safe. The public is
> left to sort out who is telling the truth, and who is not. And the
> superior attitude of the techies did not help. Any guess why they chose
> not to believe anyone?
>

And bad information and false promises are the biggest problems in life as a
whole. Being born isn't safe either. Sleeping isn't safe. There is
nothing in this world that is safe. However people are foolish enough to
think so.

> I think that the way we were building the things was an inherently
> unsafe situation. The concentration of so much power in one or two
> relatively small places (per area served) is not an inherently safe
> operation. It achieves economy of scale, but in the end, probably didn't
> even do that.
>

My point was that it is no riskier than things we accept on a daily basis.
As I commented above, there is nothing that is truly safe.

> Mistakes were made in the basic premises. And yes there is an element
> of irrationality with peoples reaction to the problem. Can you
> completely blame them? The techie person will answer yes, no doubt. But
> that is being as irrational as they are, because it ignores that they
> HAVE to be convinced.
>
> Don't get me wrong, I a a firm proponent of nuc power. I just think it
> has been handled very very poorly by the Techies.
>

I agree there. Tech types have a tendency to forget that they have to address emotions. Sometimes facts will help and sometimes not. The facts must be presented not in a "I assure you that it is safe" but in "here is the data" and give people time to mull it over and come to their own conclusions. However as in any other endeavor there is no guarantee that it will work.

> As the world is now entering it's period of geometric population
> growth, there I have no doubt that nuclear power will make a return; the
> other choice is no power at all. The population growth is poised to
> consume most of what is left of the fossil fuels, and will probably do
> so in a surprisingly short time.
>

Eventually need will indeed bring us to nuclear power. We are still reacting to the shock of our parents over the devastation caused by the only two nuclear bombs ever used in war and the multitude of science fiction movies and novels about life after the bomb. Our country is still suffering from the guilt of having used these weapons. But as they say, time heals all.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3753. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 16:39:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <pR09b.2899$nQ.1211776@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77018

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030914121855.02537.00000566@mb-m23.aol.com...
> In article <zTZ8b.2322$a_7.438@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
> <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:
>
> >Keep in mind the fact that fossil-fuel burning plants pollute while
working
> >perfectly.
>
> Yup. So do nuclear plants. The pollution in each case is different, of
course.
> Nuke plants generate various forms of radioactive waste that will remain
> hazardous for far longer than anyone realistically knows how to deal with.
>

We already know how to realistically deal with them but since it requires reprocessing, the various anti-nuke groups won't let us do that either.

> >Unlike the nuclear plants, they don't have to wait for an
> >accident in order to cause a problem.
>
> But when a nuke plant has a problem, it's a BIG problem!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

No bigger a problem than a hydroelectric dam breaking. The BIG problem is the slanted and sometimes false information that is spread by the media just to have an exciting story.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3754. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 17:12:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk27i3$42t$0@208.206.142.108>
Source record: 77019

Clint wrote:

> He's trying to blanket the topic anyway....
> NCI isn't trying to stop or ban the use of morse
> code on the airwaves, they simply understand that
> the testing of morse code no longer falls within
> the scope and original intent of ham radio.. which
> is to keep the art of radio alive and expand it's use,

The operative phrase here is "expand its use", not diminish
it by refusing to learn the Most Basic Radiocommunications Mode.

>
> etc., and, well, logic there says that if morse code
> is being abandoned left and right in the radio world
> in favor of new means of communication,

When you finally get around to getting a radio that will actually
work on HF, take a listen to the lower end of any band and report
back what you find. Then you might want to 'accurize' that statemtent.

> than you
> you are no longer adhereing or supporting this
> doctrine of ham radio.

And of course YOU and NCI are, to hear your story.

WRONG story, full of total inaccuracies which you have
no interest in correcting. Who do you suppose is involved
in 'advancing late digital modes'? CLUE: It's not Carl Stevenson,
Chief Executive of NCI, you see
he's too busy ratchetjawing on SSB now that he's finally found a
license that allows it!

>
>
> Plus, the real reason the old buzzards want to keep
> it around is simple but non well-founded.. "I did
> it, so YOU should have to!"
>

There is an unintended element of truth in what you say. WE had to
learn radio's most basic mode, and there exists no good reason why
you shouldn't have to learn it also if you aspire to a full-privileges
ham raduio license.
Othewise you may very well to find yourself
on your arse groping for a useless microphone.

3755. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 17:14:18 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <KI19b.2080$PE5.956@newssvr32.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77020

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:pR09b.2899$nQ.1211776@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
>
> No bigger a problem than a hydroelectric dam breaking. The BIG problem is
> the slanted and sometimes false information that is spread by the media
just
> to have an exciting story.

- which is one facet of the PC cult.

I remember the first time I heard the term "political correctness"... I remember thinking that they must be talking about Red China and their crude brainwashing experiments, back in the 1950's. It most certainly leaves that same bad taste in the mouth, doesn't it?

Then I found out that it was the latest thing going on in U.S. politics, and I thought it was a joke. Surely after winning the cold war and conclusively proving that socialism was a miserable dead-end, we would not be stupid enough to take on the trappings of the corrupt, backward culture we had just defeated.

Imagine my surprise when it turned out that many people really ARE that stupid! Amazing, isn't it?

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

3756. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 17:15:25 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk27nd$42t$1@208.206.142.108>
Source record: 77021

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> ----- Original Message -----
> From: "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Sent: Sunday, September 14, 2003 11:39 AM
> Subject: Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?
>
> > Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > >
> > > > Again not so. Only 31 people died from Chernobyl. Even now there has
> been
> > > > no increased incident of deaths from diseases that may possibly be
> linked to
> > > > radiation.
> > >
> > > Directly attributable deaths, Dee. It's important to make a distinction
> >
> I addressed the long term effects.
>
> > >
> > > The area where the fallout could be discerned from the normal
> > > > background measurements was relatively small. In addition, that
> accident
> > > > was due to an unauthorized experiment being conducted at the facility.
> In
> > > > other words, rules and safety precautions were being deliberately
> ignored.
> > > > Nuclear power generation has been round for 50 years now. A total of 34
> > > > people have died. That's the 31 at Chernobyl and 3 in the 1950s at an
> > > > experimental government facility (where once again regulations were not
> > > > followed).
> > >
> > > Don't forget there were deaths earlier than the 1950's
> >
> Not from Power Generation Facilities. I'm not counting bombs and bomb
> testing. And keep in mind that power plants can't blow up. They can melt
> down, which confines the effects to the building. They can release
> contaminated steam, which is diluted very rapidly to background levels of
> radiation.
>
> > >
> > >

> > > The collapse of hydroelectric dams have affected areas as wide or wider
> than
> > > a nuclear power plant accident. And they have killed more people. I'd
> much
> > > rather live next to a nuclear plant than downstream of a dam.
> >
> > > And speaking of long term environmental impacts, what about thousands of
> > > square miles that are supposedly affected by acid rain from burning
> coal??
> > > What about the miles of coast and ocean that have been contaminated by
> oil
> > > spills?? The long term effects could be quite significant.
> > >
> > > So if an honest evaluation and comparison of long term effects, deaths,
> > > environmental impacts, etc is done and the same standards applied across
> the
> > > board, then it would indeed be necessary to shut down all oil, coal, and
> > > hydroelectric plants. Personally I don't care to sit in the dark and
> > > shiver.
> > >
> > > Now let's take a look at serious industrial accidents. A prime example
> is
> > > the chemical plant in Bhopal. 3,000 people died immediately when that
> > > happened. As many as 10,000 people have died from long term effects of
> > > exposure to the gas released since it damaged their lungs and other
> organs.
> > > No one is shutting down the chemical industry. Yet some chemicals are
> as
> > > persistent in the environment as nuclear materials.
> >
> > If you want my take on the whole nuc power issue, the techies have
> > placed the blame on the public, while so very much lies within themselves.
> >
> > You try to convince the public that the reactor is safe. What they
> > remember is that they were told that Chernoble was safe. The public is
> > left to sort out who is telling the truth, and who is not. And the
> > superior attitude of the techies did not help. Any guess why they chose
> > not to believe anyone?
> >
>
> And bad information and false promises are the biggest problems in life as a
> whole. Being born isn't safe either. Sleeping isn't safe. There is
> nothing in this world that is safe. However people are foolish enough to
> think so.
>
> > I think that the way we were building the things was an inherently
> > unsafe situation. The concentration of so much power in one or two
> > relatively small places (per area served) is not an inherently safe
> > operation. It achieves economy of scale, but in the end, probably didn't
> > even do that.

> >
>
> My point was that it is no riskier than things we accept on a daily basis.
> As I commented above, there is nothing that is truly safe.
>
> > Mistakes were made in the basic premises. And yes there is an element
> > of irrationality with peoples reaction to the problem. Can you
> > completely blame them? The techie person will answer yes, no doubt. But
> > that is being as irrational as they are, because it ignores that they
> > HAVE to be convinced.
> >
> > Don't get me wrong, I a a firm proponent of nuc power. I just think it
> > has been handled very very poorly by the Techies.
> >
>
> I agree there. Tech types have a tendency to forget that they have to
> address emotions. Sometimes facts will help and sometimes not. The facts
> must be presented not in a "I assure you that it is safe" but in "here is
> the data" and give people time to mull it over and come to their own
> conclusions. However as in any other endeavor there is no guarantee that it
> will work.
>
> > As the world is now entering it's period of geometric population
> > growth, there I have no doubt that nuclear power will make a return; the
> > other choice is no power at all. The population growth is poised to
> > consume most of what is left of the fossil fuels, and will probably do
> > so in a surprisingly short time.
> >
>
> Eventually need will indeed bring us to nuclear power. We are still
> reacting to the shock of our parents over the devastation caused by the only
> two nuclear bombs ever used in war and the multitude of science fiction
> movies and novels about life after the bomb. Our country is still suffering
> from the guilt of having used these weapons. But as they say, time heals
> all.

Meanwhile, yesterday the Ozone Hole was reported to be larger than ever
before....

3757. Re: slide rules (was: Could This Be The Solution?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 18:19:04 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030914141904.02537.00000569@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 77025

In article <d22b54c3.0309130625.1d3ca689@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>slide rules
>
>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030912081915.12501.00002347@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> In article <d22b54c3.0309111623.47ff3047@posting.google.com>,
>kelly@dvol.com
>> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>>
>
>> And besides the slide rule, there were various forms of specialized
>"lightning
>> calculators". At one time ARRL sold a several different types for solving
>LC
>> problems, designing coils, power/resistance, etc. I still have and use one
>of
>> the later-model slide rule LC ones for tuned-circuit work. Gives an
>eagle-eye
>> view of effects ("if I use a 140 pf variable instad of 100, I'll be able to
>> reach 2 MHz...").
>
>I forgot about those, they were really slick. I had an L/C version.
>Went the way of the 75A4.

damn.....I always trashpick the wrong neighborhoods...
>
>I have a current-tech version. I originally bought Mathcad for doing
>biz-type engineeing number crunching but at this point I've written
>and canned more ham related math routines than I have for biz
>purposes. One of 'em is an L/C cruncher which is pretty simple. I also
>wrote a coil designer which is *not* simple. Net result is that I can
>bring both up in separate windows and copy-paste results between 'em
>and bingo, almost instant tank circuit designs right down to the
>number of turns of #X wire x Y form diameter x Z winding length. To
>the fifth decimal place when I get really anal.

Nice!

What's even neater is that nowadays we have the choice.

>> >The engineering students' full dress uniform (the physics majors
>> >weren't far behind) also included a pocket protector full of whatever
>> >ya could jam into it, a worn-out rumpled corduroy jacket and a
>> >beat-to-crap briecase . . The uniform definitely differentiated the

>> >engineers from the business administration weenies.
>> >
>> And other wannabees. In my day it was only slightly different. Denim
>> replaced
>> corduroy and the briefcase was often a backpack. Mine was an old Bulletin
>> delivery bag.
>
>No, NO! Tell me you din use a Bulletin bag for a briefcase, say it
>isn't true! Gauche! GAUCHE!

Turned inside out so the lettering didn't show.

>You'd have been lampooned back across
>Chestnut St. if you'd shown up in class on our side of the street with
>one of those.
>
Not at all. It was the '70s. Compared to what was considered "fashion" in
1973-76, that bag was the most chic thing going...

>But then you people also had water buffalo on campus. <Sigh>.

That was long after my time.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3758. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 18:19:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030914141905.02537.00000570@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 77022

In article <f45722ac.0309140424.1c62f771@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>So in the end, you still won't question Jim what the ARRL has done to
>reduce standards.

Neither will you, obviously.

3759. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 18:19:06 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030914141906.02537.00000571@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 77023

In article <f7d9a152.0309130657.2baaf0de@posting.google.com>,
jason_hsu@my-deja.com (Jason Hsu) writes:

>"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
>news:<Dky8b.1971$hY2.1604@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>...
>> Assuming that your post is serious and not intended to be humerous, Jason,
>> I'd say that you should be careful not to neglect your mental hygene.
>Eating
>> right and staying away from tobacco is nice, but it won't ultimately do you
>> any good if your thinking is toxic.
>>
>Come on, how seriously can you take anything in
>rec.radio.amateur.policy?

So you were trolling. OK...
>
>> I don't smoke, but I would gladly take up smoking as an alternative to
>> becoming another miserable, obnoxious member of the PC-police.
>>
>I guess the "PC police" are more evil than Phillip Morris, whose
>products kill millions around the world every year. Wouldn't you
>rather rebel against Phillip Morris? They represent everything you
>hate about the Establishment!

Does Phillip Morris force anyone to smoke? Or is it a choice people make?
>
>> There's probably only one hope for you now, Jason, and that is to buy
>> yourself a pack of Chesterfields or Luckies and fire one on up on your way
>> to "Golden Corral" to take advantage of that all-you-can-eat buffet.
>
>Smoking is so disgusting that I wouldn't even do it if it were
>healthy.

Well, it's unhealthy, so you're off the hook.

True fact: The *original* antismoking campaigns had nothing to do with health
concerns. Their real problem with smoking was that it was perceived to be an
activity done *only* for pleasure - and therefore evil! (You have to eat and
sleep, so those activities were not targeted as much).
>
>If it's any consolation to you, the Atkins diet followers think I
>guzzle carbs the way a 1972 Cadillac guzzles fuel. (According to news
>articles, these people now have their own grocery stores and
>restaurants. Ugh.)

Why "ugh"? If that diet works for some people, that's a good thing.

Do you understand the relationship of carbs and insulin?

>The anti-meat anti-fat Ornish diet followers
>think I guzzle fat the way a 1972 Cadillac guzzles fuel.

There are all kinds of fats. Some are needed, some are almost poison.
>
>I guess I must be eating right if other hams think I'm on a crash diet
>and the followers of the latest diet fads think I eat like a hog.

No, you're eating right *for you* if your weight and other indicators are good.

George Sheehan used to say that each of us is an "experiment of one", and that a big part of living is trying out different approaches and seeing what works best for each of us at various times of our lives.

For example, I've found that eating mostly sugary and carb-y foods causes me to gain weight and be tired. Plus I'm hungry all the time that way. Eating the same number of calories in protein and healthy fats causes me to lose weight, have more energy, and be much less hungry. So instead of cereal and skim milk for breakfast I have a veggie omelet. Works for me. YMMV.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3760. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 18:19:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030914141909.02537.00000572@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 77024

In article <c4_8b.2861$nQ.1181502@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:L5Y8b.6644$Aq2.164@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>> "charlesb" wrote:
>> >
>> > One quick example: Irrationally afraid of nuclear
>> > power, the "PC police" has seen to it that we stick
>> > with the burning of fossil fuels for our electricity.
>> > How clever.

>>
>> Irrationally afraid of nuclear power? According to the UN, there have
>> been
>> 386 serious nuclear power plant accidents around the world (serious
>> defined
>> as a significant release of nuclear material into the atmosphere). Several
>> of those accidents have been right here in this country. In addition,
>> there
>> have been over 6,000 nuclear weapons tests, resulting in millions of tons
>> of
>> radioactive material spread across this planet. Nobody is certain how many
>> nuclear weapons accidents there have been. And, since records are not
>> kept,
>> nobody is certain how many accidents there have been at nuclear research
>> facilities. The nuclear industry, peaceful or military, has been no friend
>> to this planet or it's people. And that's not a "PC" perspective - it's
>> simple common sense.
>
>The following comments address power plants only. Weapons is an entirely
>different issue.
>
>Yes, irrationally afraid. The number of deaths from nuclear power plants
>pales into insignificance in comparison to the number of minors who have
>died to bring us coal to burn not only from accidents but black lung
>disease.

How do we know this is true? Are there no accidents in uranium mining?

Part of the problem is the difficulty of data gathering. If a miner works in a deep mine for 30 years and dies of black lung, it's a safe bet where he got it - and that gets recorded.

But if someone works in nuclear processing job for a few years develops cancer or leukemia 20 years later how do we establish a causal link? If a baby born in

Harrisburg in 1980 had a birth defect that becomes fatal 10 years later, does that get counted as a result of the Three Mile Island accident?

>The damage done from nuclear power plants pales into
>insignificance in comparison to the damage done from oil spills.

Specifics, please? I'm not defending oil spills, but their effects are clear and observable.

>More
>people have died from dams breaking than power plant accidents.
>
Maybe. Again, the problem is one of data collection. If Holtwood Dam (a few miles from TMI) fails and somebody drowns, that's obvious and recorded. If somebody who was downwind of TMI in 1979 gets cancer as a result of exposure, who can prove it?

>If we applied the same logic and standards to other sources of power as we
>do to nuclear, we would not have any electricity at all.

I disagree!

>We'd have to shut
>down every coal, oil, and hydroelectric power plant in the world.
>
>Nuclear power is the cleanest, safest, most efficient form of power
>generation available at this time.

Based on what statistics?

First off, to compare apples to apples you have to consider things like how many KWH are generated per fatality. Yes, it's a gruesome stat, but that's how risk assesment works.

Second, the risks take different forms. For example, a coal fired plant, even with the best pollution control, spews a measurable amount of pollution into the air.But a coal plant cannot melt down or leak massive amounts of long-lived pollution. OTOH, a nuke plant emits much less pollution per KWH generated, but it can have a meltdown or leak that contaminates a wide area for an unimaginable length of time.

Then there is the matter of nuclear waste. How is it to be dealt with? Where is it to be stored for the enormous lengths of time required for it to become reasonably safe? How are nuke plants to be decommissioned?

When the technology was new, we were assured that long before nuke waste became a problem, there would be systems in place to deal with it. We're still waiting for those systems. We were also told that nuke power would be "too cheap to meter" and other such George jetson nonsense. Still waiting...
>
>Wind and solar have to be excluded at this time since the technology doesn't
>exist to make these forms widely available on an efficient basis.

I disagree again!

Wind technology has come a long way and is becoming competitive with other forms of generation. How many trillion dollars of tax money has been poured into nuclear power research since 1945? How does that compare to wind power research?

>And if we
>follow the logic of some people in this group on other items, wind power is
>too antiquated since it's been used for hundreds if not thousands of years.

HAW! Good point!
>
>And let's compare nuclear power to some non-power industries. Are you aware
>of how devastating accidents at chemical plants can be? Have you ever seen
>a grain elevator explode from sparks causing the suspended dust to explode?

Sure. But when a grain elevator explodes, it does not leave long-lived waste all over a huge area. Nor does its operation generate things that look harmless but will be very dangerous thousands of years from now.
>
>I'd rather live next to a nuclear power plant than any other type of power
>generating facility or any of several other industrial endeavors.

OK, fine. Does that include a wind farm?

But would you rather live next to a nuclear materials processing facility? Or nukewaste storage facility?

The BIG problem with evaluating risk in a real world situation is that the math doesn't tell the whole story from a human perspective. The risk of a catastrophic nuke plant accident is very small, but the results of such an accident are very bad.

How many people has the Chernobyl accident killed - so far? How much economic damage? How much will never be properly recorded?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3761. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 18:23:25 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bk2bmq$jkj@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 77026

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030914121855.02537.00000566@mb-m23.aol.com...
> In article <zTZ8b.2322$a_7.438@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
> <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:
>
> >Keep in mind the fact that fossil-fuel burning plants pollute while
working
> >perfectly.
>
> Yup. So do nuclear plants. The pollution in each case is different, of
course.
> Nuke plants generate various forms of radioactive waste that will remain
> hazardous for far longer than anyone realistically knows how to deal with.
>
> >Unlike the nuclear plants, they don't have to wait for an
> >accident in order to cause a problem.
>
> But when a nuke plant has a problem, it's a BIG problem!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Yep, my point exactly. And, waste generation and facilitation is a part of the equation I completely forgot to even include in the debate. And, it's a very important part of the issue.

Suffice it to say that no one will ever convince me that nuclear generation is a cost/environmental/health effective way for our power needs. It will never happen to be that nuclear generation is the way to go...and the industry recognizes that as well. No new nuclear power generation is planned, 'least not that I know of...

Kim W5TIT

3762. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 18:26:26 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bk2bsf$sr8@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 77027

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:wM09b.2898$nQ.1210588@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> Eventually need will indeed bring us to nuclear power. We are still
> reacting to the shock of our parents over the devastation caused by the
only
> two nuclear bombs ever used in war and the multitude of science fiction
> movies and novels about life after the bomb. Our country is still
suffering
> from the guilt of having used these weapons. But as they say, time heals
> all.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Without elaborating--and I know that is difficult--let me assure there will be no future nuclear generation plants; that is, if we define "future" as maybe even a little longer than the next 200 years. Beyond that, maybe. There's too much new technology surfacing that will alleviate current trends in electric generation to even consider the high cost and volatility of a nuclear solution.

Kim W5TIT

3763. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 18:44:46 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <yG29b.4870$we6.4399@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 77028

Bert,

The fighting isn't worth it. If I could justify the necessity of CW, I would - but I can't. Hopefully, folks will gravitate towards groups and modes that they enjoy and everyone can have fun (not unlike some of the repeaters). Oh well ... :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:RIZ8b.192114$Ay2.48775778@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
> news:%rQ8b.4827$6E1.4395@news02.roc.ny...
> > As a member of NCI
> >
> > 73 from Rochester, NY
> > Jim AA2QA
>
> Say it ain't so, Jim. ;-)
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.516 / Virus Database: 313 - Release Date: 9/1/03

3764. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 19:49:46 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vm9hiusm03d83@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77029

Heh, KABOOM! :)

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

UNR paragraph from UNR 678

2. Authorizes Member States co-operating with the Government of Kuwait, unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements, as set forth in paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions, to use all necissary means to uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;

--
"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030914121855.02537.00000566@mb-m23.aol.com...
> In article <zTZ8b.2322$a_7.438@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
> <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:
>
> >Keep in mind the fact that fossil-fuel burning plants pollute while
working
> >perfectly.
>
> Yup. So do nuclear plants. The pollution in each case is different, of
course.
> Nuke plants generate various forms of radioactive waste that will remain
> hazardous for far longer than anyone realistically knows how to deal with.
>
> >Unlike the nuclear plants, they don't have to wait for an
> >accident in order to cause a problem.
>
> But when a nuke plant has a problem, it's a BIG problem!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

3765. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 19:52:00 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vm9hn3q1esl4fc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77030

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bk2bmq$jkj@library1.airnews.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message

No new nuclear power generation is
> planned, 'least not that I know of...
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

that's because the environmental wackos are doing thier damndest
to fight them, at every level of governement and in every manner
of social disobedience...

This is why california hasn't built any new power plants in 10 years
while experiencing a DOUBLING of population.... resulting in
the blackouts they just had.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

UNR paragraph from UNR 678

2. Authorizes Member States co-operating with the Government of Kuwait,
unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements, as set forth in
paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions, to use all necissary means to
uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant
resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;

--

3766. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 20:12:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <dZ39b.3692$nQ.1250280@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77031

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bk2bmq$jkj@library1.airnews.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030914121855.02537.00000566@mb-m23.aol.com...
> > In article <zTZ8b.2322$a_7.438@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
> > <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:
> >
> > >Keep in mind the fact that fossil-fuel burning plants pollute while
> working
> > >perfectly.
> >
> > Yup. So do nuclear plants. The pollution in each case is different, of
> course.
> > Nuke plants generate various forms of radioactive waste that will remain
> > hazardous for far longer than anyone realistically knows how to deal
with.
> >
> > >Unlike the nuclear plants, they don't have to wait for an
> > >accident in order to cause a problem.
> >
> > But when a nuke plant has a problem, it's a BIG problem!
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> Yep, my point exactly. And, waste generation and facilitation is a part
of
> the equation I completely forgot to even include in the debate. And, it's
a
> very important part of the issue.
>
> Suffice it to say that no one will ever convince me that nuclear
generation
> is a cost/environmental/health effective way for our power needs. It will
> never happen to be that nuclear generation is the way to go...and the
> industry recognizes that as well. No new nuclear power generation is
> planned, 'least not that I know of...
>

Because they are blocked on every hand by people who operate on emotions
rather data.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3767. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 20:16:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <N049b.3694$nQ.1250999@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77032

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vm9hn3q1esl4fc@corp.supernews.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bk2bmq$jkj@library1.airnews.net...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>
> No new nuclear power generation is
> > planned, 'least not that I know of...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> that's because the environmental wackos are doing thier damndest
> to fight them, at every level of governement and in every manner
> of social disobedience...
>
> This is why california hasn't built any new power plants in 10 years
> while experiencing a DOUBLING of population.... resulting in
> the blackouts they just had.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT

You might make it clear that California hasn't built any new plants of ANY KIND because the environmentalists wackos are blocking them. It's not just nuclear they are blocking. They have taken the step that any risk whatsoever is unacceptable. Actually I'm amazed that there even willing to take the risk of getting out bed. Maybe they don't even use beds since they could fall out and break their necks.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3768. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 20:25:51 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030914162551.12631.00001087@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 77034

In article <Tx%8b.2873$nQ.1197531@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Only 31 people died from Chernobyl. Even now there has been
>no increased incident of deaths from diseases that may possibly be linked to
>radiation.

Directly attributed deaths. If a pregnant woman 1000 miles away was exposed to high levels of windblown radiation, and her child developed leukemia at age 2 and died as a direct result of that exposure, how does that death ever get attributed to the Chernobyl accident?

>The area where the fallout could be discerned from the normal
>background measurements was relatively small.

How many square miles? How long will it be hot?

>In addition, that accident
>was due to an unauthorized experiment being conducted at the facility. In
>other words, rules and safety precautions were being deliberately ignored.

Yep. Absolutely true. And I've never seen any reason given.

But these were not stupid, evil or suicidal people. They just did some amazingly dumb things, which got out of their control. And perhaps that's the real lesson of Chernobyl: People will do amazingly stupid things for no explainable reason at all. Then the rest of us are left to pick up the pieces.

But when technology is small and distributed, the effects of doing amazingly stupid things for no explainable reason at all are contained to a relatively small area and numbers of people. When technology is huge and concentrated, the effects can be much worse.

And the more complex the technology, the easier it is to do something really dumb.

>Nuclear power generation has been round for 50 years now. A total of 34
>people have died. That's the 31 at Chernobyl and 3 in the 1950s at an
>experimental government facility (where once again regulations were not
>followed).

Attributable deaths.
>
>The collapse of hydroelectric dams have affected areas as wide or wider than
>a nuclear power plant accident. And they have killed more people. I'd much
>rather live next to a nuclear plant than downstream of a dam.

When is the last time a hydro dam in the USA collapsed and killed people?
>
>And speaking of long term environmental impacts, what about thousands of
>square miles that are supposedly affected by acid rain from burning coal??
>What about the miles of coast and ocean that have been contaminated by oil
>spills?? The long term effects could be quite significant.

Sure. But not as significant as the effects of radioactive materials that take millennia to break down.

Consider just one spent fuel rod from a nuke plant like TMI. How long before it is harmless?
>
>So if an honest evaluation and comparison of long term effects, deaths,
>environmental impacts, etc is done and the same standards applied across the
>board, then it would indeed be necessary to shut down all oil, coal, and
>hydroelectric plants.

I'd like to see such a comparison.

> Personally I don't care to sit in the dark and
>shiver.

It's not a binary problem.

>Now let's take a look at serious industrial accidents. A prime example is
>the chemical plant in Bhopal. 3,000 people died immediately when that
>happened. As many as 10,000 people have died from long term effects of
>exposure to the gas released since it damaged their lungs and other organs.
>No one is shutting down the chemical industry.

The chemical industry in India does not have anywhere near the safeguards of the chemical industry in the USA.

And as horrible as the Bhopal disaster was, the gas dispersed and will break down. How long will TMI be radioactive?

>Yet some chemicals are as
>persistent in the environment as nuclear materials.

Some examples, please?

A process can be developed to break down any chemical compound. PCBs, for example, were specifically designed to be inert and nonreactive, yet they can be broken down into their components quickly. But there's no way to speed up nuclear decay.
>
>So sorry to say, your long term environmental arguments just don't hold
>water. There's lots of things that can affect even wider spread areas and
>last just as long.

Perhaps we should discuss the half life of plutonium?

And if you're going to discuss dangerous industrial processes, consider this: The most dangerous common form of mechanized transportation in use today in the

USA are privately owned motor vehicles. Every year and a half, about as many Americans die on US highways as died in the entire Vietnam war. Airlines, trains, buses and ships are far safer, yet few people refuse to drive or ride in a car compared to other modes. Why?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3769. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 20:25:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030914162552.12631.00001088@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 77033

In article <bk1rs6$p83@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>news:c4_8b.2861$nQ.1181502@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>>
>> Nuclear power is the cleanest, safest, most efficient form of power
>> generation available at this time.

>Absolutely correct. Hands down.

I disagree. Terms like "clean", "safe" and "efficient" have to be defined for
the context.

And we have to include technologies like wind turbines, which require no fuel
and make pollution that is ignsignificant compared to their competition..

>Although undeniably, all the comments
>about deaths from other energy sources aside--an incident with nuclear power
>carries much further impact and potential for harm than from any other
>source (currently in use).

Bingo.

>While deaths and environmental impact may be
>higher in number than from nuclear incidents, I think it would be found that
>nuclear power/nuclear anything has greater risk than is immediately
>recognized.

And that's the problem - the risk and bad effects may not be well understood
yet.

It should be noted that levels of radiation exposure once considered "safe" are
now considered "unsafe", based on long term research. With both animals and
humans.

>Take a coal mine. At any one coal mine there are probably folks who have,
>and who have already died from, black lung or other health diseases; there
>have probably been some people maimed and killed from caves, and there have
>probably even been some serious environmental effects from the mining of
>coal.

Most power generation coal nowadays is surface mined. Powder River Basin, for
example, is in demand because it's low sulfur.

>But, one (serious) incident at a nuclear power plant--take Chernobyl
>since that's the worst in history--and you have generations of trouble: to
>the environment, to disaster recovery; to ecnomical and infrastructure; and

>we haven't even mentioned the immediate and long-term health effects.

EXACTLY! "Generations of trouble" - that's the real problem.

The Chernobyl design was not a good one for a number of reasons, yet they kept using them. The "sarcophagus" built to contain the building is failing, after less than 20 years.

But the biggest problem is that nobody really knows how to clean up the Chernobyl mess. Or the Three Mile Island mess, which is approaching its 25th anniversary.

It is my understanding that the oldest "commercial" nuke plants are approaching 50 years of age. To my knowledge, none of them have been decommissioned, in part because nobody knows how to do it safely, or what to do with the pieces. Or who is supposed to pay for it. If a nuke-owning utility doesn't have the money to take care of an old plant, who's gonna pay the bill?

And the ultimate problem may simply boil down to money. Even if everyone accepts the risks of nuke plants, the total cost per kWH over the life of a plant may not be competitive. Particularly when you consider the enormous first cost, interest charges, and the decommissioning costs. These costs occur when the plant is not making any juice, too. Ultimately the utilities look at the numbers and say "where was that information on gas turbines?"

73 de Jim, N2EY

3770. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 20:41:48 UTC
From: Steve Stone <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net>
Message-ID: <go49b.4882$Fj6.491@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 77035

I think anyone who is a train engineer should pass a test for operating a coal fired steam locomotive

3771. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 21:44:43 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <fj59b.3708$nQ.1266825@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77036

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030914162551.12631.00001087@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <Tx%8b.2873$nQ.1197531@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >Only 31 people died from Chernobyl. Even now there has been
> >no increased incident of deaths from diseases that may possibly be linked
to
> >radiation.
>
> Directly attributed deaths. If a pregnant woman 1000 miles away was
exposed to
> high levels of windblown radiation, and her child developed leukemia at
age 2
> and died as a direct result of that exposure, how does that death ever get
> attributed to the Chernobyl accident?
>
> >The area where the fallout could be discerned from the normal
> >background measurements was relatively small.
>
> How many square miles? How long will it be hot?
>

Dissipation will be by the inverse square law so at 1000 miles from the
plant it will have a concentration of only 1 millioneth of the concentration
at the release site. While specific deaths can't be attributed, the overall
numbers can be assigned by simply comparing the death rate due to leukemia
in the affected zone to the death rate outside. This can be done for each
cause of death that can be increased by radiation. If society wants the
data, it can be gathered. But people would rather hide behind the emotional
fear of possible problems than researching what problems will occur and the
magnitude of the problem and making an enlightened decision.

> >In addition, that accident
> >was due to an unauthorized experiment being conducted at the facility.
In
> >other words, rules and safety precautions were being deliberately
ignored.
>
> Yep. Absolutely true. And I've never seen any reason given.
>
> But these were not stupid, evil or suicidal people. They just did some
> amazingly dumb things, which got out of their control. And perhaps that's
the

> real lesson of Chernobyl: People will do amazingly stupid things for no
> explainable reason at all. Then the rest of us are left to pick up the
pieces.
>

Still, stupidity can't be allowed to stop us from facing the energy needs of
the future. Instead one addresses the issue and error proofs and mistake
proofs the facility.

>
> But when technology is small and distributed, the effects of doing
amazingly
> stupid things for no explainable reason at all are contained to a
relatively
> small area and numbers of people. When technology is huge and
concentrated, the
> effects can be much worse.
>
> And the more complex the technology, the easier it is to do something
really
> dumb.
>

Nuclear technology is not complex. It's relatively simple in fact.

> >Nuclear power generation has been round for 50 years now. A total of 34
> >people have died. That's the 31 at Chernobyl and 3 in the 1950s at an
> >experimental government facility (where once again regulations were not
> >followed).
>
> Attributable deaths.
> >
> >The collapse of hydroelectric dams have affected areas as wide or wider
than
> >a nuclear power plant accident. And they have killed more people. I'd
much
> >rather live next to a nuclear plant than downstream of a dam.
>
> When is the last time a hydro dam in the USA collapsed and killed people?
> >
> >And speaking of long term environmental impacts, what about thousands of
> >square miles that are supposedly affected by acid rain from burning
coal??
> >What about the miles of coast and ocean that have been contaminated by
oil
> >spills?? The long term effects could be quite significant.
>
> Sure. But not as significant as the effects of radioactive materials that
take
> millennia to break down.

Not proven. Millennia worth of acid rain could conceivably be just as harmful as the time taken to breakdown radioactive materials. Why? Because even though the acid rain dissipates, it keeps on coming down year after year.

> Consider just one spent fuel rod from a nuke plant like TMI. How long before it
> is harmless?

Let it be reprocessed and recycled and it's not a problem.

> >So if an honest evaluation and comparison of long term effects, deaths,
> >environmental impacts, etc is done and the same standards applied across the
> >board, then it would indeed be necessary to shut down all oil, coal, and
> >hydroelectric plants.
> I'd like to see such a comparison.

I would too. It is exactly the type of data that we as a society need to make informed decisions about our energy future. Right now we are stuck with people's emotional reactions. I should have said "...it would probably be necessary..." My point was that people are refusing to even consider the dangers of other means of power generation.

> > Personally I don't care to sit in the dark and
> >shiver.
> It's not a binary problem.

It's getting close to that in California although shivering will be mild (except perhaps up in the mountains) as it isn't a severe climate. California has built no new power plants of any kind in 10 years. They can't get any of them (fossil fuel, hydro, or nuclear) past the environmental requirements in the state. Population continued to grow and they had brown outs and blackouts. Their solution was to buy it from out of state. Well that hasn't worked either. The rates are simply too high and the state can't afford it. Costs are being absorbed by the state government instead of being passed to the users and it's wrecked the state budget. It looks like those contracts will be canceled and California will be right back to their brown outs and black outs.

> >Now let's take a look at serious industrial accidents. A prime example is
> >the chemical plant in Bhopal. 3,000 people died immediately when that
> >happened. As many as 10,000 people have died from long term effects of
> >exposure to the gas released since it damaged their lungs and other organs.
> >No one is shutting down the chemical industry.

>
> The chemical industry in India does not have anywhere near the safeguards
of
> the chemical industry in the USA.
>
> And as horrible as the Bhopal disaster was, the gas dispersed and will
break
> down. How long will TMI be radioactive?
>

TMI has been contained so it will not impact the surrounding residents.
Long term radiation exposure thus becomes a non-issue.

> >Yet some chemicals are as
> >persistent in the environment as nuclear materials.
>
> Some examples, please?
>
> A process can be developed to break down any chemical compound. PCBs, for
> example, were specifically designed to be inert and nonreactive, yet they
can
> be broken down into their components quickly. But there's no way to speed
up
> nuclear decay.

Yes you can speed up radioactive decay by reprocessing and reusing the spent
fuel. While PCBs can be broken down, it's not being done due to cost. Save
with PVC. Same with other chemicals.

> >
> >So sorry to say, your long term environmental arguments just don't hold
> >water. There's lots of things that can affect even wider spread areas
and
> >last just as long.
>
> Perhaps we should discuss the half life of plutonium?
>

Again preprocess and reuse.

> And if you're going to discuss dangerous industrial processes, consider
this:
> The most dangerous common form of mechanized transportation in use today
in the
> USA are privately owned motor vehicles. Every year and a half, about as
many
> Americans die on US highways as died in the entire Vietnam war. Airlines,
> trains, buses and ships are far safer, yet few people refuse to drive or
ride
> in a car compared to other modes. Why?
>

1. Convenience
2. It's what they are used to
3. Each feels they are in control so it can't happen to them.

Just because we do something doesn't mean it's rational. Mankind is a rationalizing animal. We will find justifications for our wants and desires and fears whether there is any basis in fact for them or not.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3772. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 22:11:52 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vm9ptb2m1ok1f3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77037

LOL!

A good liberal? you have NO idea..... I'm as right wing
and conservative as they come... evidently you don't read
my other posts or in other NG's either, where i'm referred
to as the "jim birch devil"

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

UNR paragraph from UNR 678

2. Authorizes Member States co-operating with the Government of Kuwait,
unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements, as set forth in
paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions, to use all necissary means to
uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant
resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;

--
"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
news:H209b.60152$3b2.7791412@twister.neo.rr.com...
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> news:vm8uae66eef9bd@corp.supernews.com...
> > He's trying to blanket the topic anyway....
> > NCI isn't trying to stop or ban the use of morse
> > code on the airwaves, they simply understand that
> > the testing of morse code no longer falls within
> > the scope and original intent of ham radio.. which
> > is to keep the art of radio alive and expand it's use,
> > etc., and, well, logic there says that if morse code
> > is being abandoned left and right in the radio world
> > in favor of new means of communication, than you
> > you are no longer adhereing or supporting this
> > doctrine of ham radio.
> >
> > Plus, the real reason the old buzzards want to keep
> > it around is simple but non well-founded.. "I did
> > it, so YOU should have to!"
> >
> > Clint
> > KB5ZHT

> >
> Great job Clint!
> You spoke the words exactly as written by Cpt. Carl. You would make a good
> Liberal, you follow orders so well. You might want to call the DNC and see
> if they could use your during the next election.
>
> Good luck!
>
> 10-73's!
>
>

3773. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 22:17:19 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vm9q7ht06o01f2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77038

--

--

UNR paragraph from UNR 678

2. Authorizes Member States co-operating with the Government of Kuwait,
unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements, as set forth in
paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions, to use all necissary means to
uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant
resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;

--
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk27i3$42t$0@208.206.142.108...

>
> The operative phrase here is "expand its use", not diminish
> it by refusing to learn the Most Basic Radiocommunications Mode.

that's expanding the use and art of morse code, not expanding the
use and art of radio in general. For that matter, there aren't
profeciency tests in other modes of operation, either, in the
form of a seperate practical test such as there is with CW.

>
>
>
> >
> > etc., and, well, logic there says that if morse code
> > is being abandoned left and right in the radio world
> > in favor of new means of communication,
>
> When you finally get around to getting a radio that will actually
> work on HF, take a listen to the lower end of any band and report
> back what you find. Then you might want to 'accurize' that statemtent.

I also read the news and listen to it as well and hear all the time
about CW being dropped in favor of digital and other forms of
communication.

>
> WRONG story, full of total inaccuracies

well, no, full of details that you find personally distasteful,
but not inaccurate.

Who do you suppose is involved
> in 'advancing late digital modes'? CLUE: It's not Carl Stevenson,
> Chief Executive of NCI,

I never implied that he was. Nor was I aware that this was
an intended purpose and goal of NCI.....

>
> There is an unintended element of truth in what you say. WE had to
> learn radio's most basic mode, and there exists no good reason why
> you shouldn't have to learn it also if you aspire to a full-privileges
> ham raduio license.

and our forefathers all had to learn how to hitch horses to a buggy,
and had to be proficient in the use of reigns and a buggy whip.
Does it make sense for the various departments of motor vehicle
saftey to require a person to learn this before letting him drive
a modern automobile?

Clint
KB5ZHT

3774. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 22:18:38 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vm9qa2h7qsddec@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77039

>
> The youngsters today still tell me that they must learn to use a pencil
and
> learn to write script. Typing and word processing are taught AFTER they
> have learned to write manually. Enough said.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

yes, if we were talking about a degree in literature from a school or
college,
which we are not.

Clint
KB5ZHT

3775. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 22:19:59 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vm9qcicbk1fre4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77040

boy, you have no idea how far off you are with that
anology... I find liberalism and the left wing as
disgraceful as anybody.

that doesn't mean, though, I that I want to live
in the past and let the world pass me up by not
wanting to progress with the times.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

UNR paragraph from UNR 678

2. Authorizes Member States co-operating with the Government of Kuwait,
unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements, as set forth in
paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions, to use all necissary means to
uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant
resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;

--
"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
news:J409b.60215$3b2.7793191@twister.neo.rr.com...
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> news:vm8ucqlp6pd301@corp.supernews.com...
> > When I took my drivers test years ago to get a license
> > to drive an automobile, the never required me to
> > prove that I could hitch a horse team to a wagon.
> > The youngsters today, likewise, tell me that the
> > departments of motor vehicles around the country
> > do not ask them to prove they are proficient with
> > buggy whips.
> >
> > Enough said.
> >
> > Clint
> >
> Clint my man, you scored again!
> You must be Cpt. Carls right hand job man. You quote their Bible so well.
>
> Don't look now, but Ted Kennedy likes the way you don't think for
> yourself.....

>
> 10-73's!
>
>

3776. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 22:21:53 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vm9qg3sb2m5v3f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77041

what about requireing anybody to pass a basic test showing
they know how to cultivate land, raise and harvest thier own
crops before they can buy groceries at the store?

"well, sunny, that's the way we had to do it when I was
a young'n on the farm.... you have it just too easy today,
being able to buy that potatoe right off the shelf. It's just
plain wrong... EEK- my chest hurts........"

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

UNR paragraph from UNR 678

2. Authorizes Member States co-operating with the Government of Kuwait,
unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements, as set forth in
paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions, to use all necissary means to
uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant
resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;

--
"Steve Stone" <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> wrote in message
news:go49b.4882$Fj6.491@news02.roc.ny...
> I think anyone who is a train engineer should pass a test for operating a
> coal fired steam locomotive
>
>

3777. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 22:33:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <g169b.11257$NM1.1421@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77042

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:p408b.237095$2x.66933@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...

> The ARRL has a destructive agenda. If they cared about amateur radio as
> much as for the amount of money their bank account, they would have said
> something at the last world conference. It's all lip service and lies to
> try and get hams like me to hold our piece and hope we don't feel like
> we're being lied to again.
>
> KB7ADL

I may be wrong here Vince. But I don't think the ARRL could actually make
comments at the conference. I was under the impression that the enities
that could were delegates from the countries there.

Dan/W4NTI

3778. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 22:35:04 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <s269b.11259$NM1.7178@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77043

Now that is a hell of a stretch. If so, then explain how we got the major improvement on 40 meters? Sorry old man, your full of crap.

Dan/W4NTI

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message news:vm7q8ccns5bp5f@corp.supernews.com...
> the rest of the world, as you described it, just crapped on us
> before, during and after the recent event in iraq.
>
> Why do you think they'd give a hoot in hell about anything
> we said in this instance, either??????
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
> --
>
> --
>
> If you sympathize with terrorists & middle eastern tyrants,
> vote for liberals...
>
> --
>
>
> "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
> news:p4O8b.237095$2x.66933@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in
> > news:vm67v564e0pj4c@corp.supernews.com:
> >
> > > I heard from the latest audio news that more nations
> > > around the world are dropping thier morse code
> > > testing requirements.
> > >
> > > makes you wonder if the VEC's who petitioned
> > > to return a higher code speed test for extra class
> > > hams are just doing so to fight the tide.
> > >
> > > Clint
> > > KB5ZHT
> > >
> >
> >
> > The ARRL has a destructive agenda. If they cared about amateur radio as

> > much as for the amount of money their bank account, they would have said
> > something at the last world conference. It's all lip service and lies
to
> > try and get hams like me to hold our piece and hope we don't feel like
> > we're being lied to again.
> >
> > KB7ADL
>
>

3779. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 22:47:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <2e69b.11264$NM1.2900@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77044

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:p4O8b.237095$2x.66933@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in
> news:vm67v564e0pj4c@corp.supernews.com:
>
> > I heard from the latest audio news that more nations
> > around the world are dropping thier morse code
> > testing requirements.
> >
> > makes you wonder if the VEC's who petitioned
> > to return a higher code speed test for extra class
> > hams are just doing so to fight the tide.
> > Clint
> > KB5ZHT
>
> The ARRL has a destructive agenda. If they cared about amateur radio as
> much as for the amount of money their bank account, they would have said
> something at the last world conference. It's all lip service and lies to
> try and get hams like me to hold our piece and hope we don't feel like
> we're being lied to again.

Lied to about what?
As to the last "world conference" (presumably meaning WRC2003),
you should know the ARRL had NO voice in the conference as
they could only be there as an observer. The conference was
a representation of individual country's regulatory
administrations.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3780. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 22:48:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <pf69b.11266$NM1.8622@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77045

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk0gqccqt0@208.206.142.70...
>
>
> "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" wrote:
>
> > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in
> > news:vm67v564e0pj4c@corp.supernews.com:
> >
> > > I heard from the latest audio news that more nations
> > > around the world are dropping thier morse code
> > > testing requirements.
> > >
> > > makes you wonder if the VEC's who petitioned
> > > to return a higher code speed test for extra class
> > > hams are just doing so to fight the tide.
> > >
> > > Clint
> > > KB5ZHT
> > >
> >
> > The ARRL has a destructive agenda. If they cared about amateur radio as
> > much as for the amount of money their bank account, they would have said
> > something at the last world conference. It's all lip service and lies
to
> > try and get hams like me to hold our piece and hope we don't feel like
> > we're being lied to again.
>
> No, Vince, I believe you're way off base here. ARRL has a real problem-It
> wants to do what is best for ham radio, and divining what that is is not a
> simple chore, by any means. Then you have the other facets of the problem,
> which include but certainly are not limited to, the vast array of opinions
> among hams, members and otherwise, then there's the FCC and their own
> budget constraints, etc, etc etc.
>
> But NO, you'll never get me to believe that ARRL as an organization has
> anything but the best interests of ham radio at heart. I do believe that
at
> times they get a little off course, but they seem to manage to make the
> necessary corrections.
>
> Dick

I'm in shock, as I fully agree with Dick on that.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3781. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 22:52:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F64F17E.6060509@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77046

Dee D. Flint wrote:

>Mike Coslo Wrote:

<some snippage>

>>You try to convince the public that the reactor is safe. What they
>>remember is that they were told that Chernoble was safe. The public is
>>left to sort out who is telling the truth, and who is not. And the
>>superior attitude of the techies did not help. Any guess why they chose
>>not to believe anyone?
>>
>
>
> And bad information and false promises are the biggest problems in life as a
> whole. Being born isn't safe either. Sleeping isn't safe. There is
> nothing in this world that is safe. However people are foolish enough to
> think so.

Good heavens, Dee. You could also point out that people are content to
hurtle themselves at each other at relative speeds of 140 miles per hour
and above in metal and glass boxes containing very dangerous flammable
fluids.

But I'd probably call that slippery sloping the issue.

>>I think that the way we were building the things was an inherently
>>unsafe situation. The concentration of so much power in one or two
>>relatively small places (per area served) is not an inherently safe
>>operation. It achieves economy of scale, but in the end, probably didn't
>>even do that.
>>
>
>
> My point was that it is no riskier than things we accept on a daily basis.
> As I commented above, there is nothing that is truly safe.

No there isn't. But fact is, the safety must be addressed. THe idea
that all is well, and mockery of safety issues is how we get places like
Love Canal and Chernoble. Would you care to go live in either of those
places? Those people were told "There's no problem." Now when people
come around and tell people "There's no problem" the reaction is quite
different

And Jim mentions the waste disposal problem. This IS a real problem, as
beyond whatever safety precautions we put on the material, it is going
to be nasty stuff for a long time. And there we are telling people

"there's no problem" in storage again.

I feel in discussing this with you that I'm being pushed into the anti nuclear power group, when I can assure you that isn't the case. What is obvious to me is that due to the history of this topic, people have a pretty good reason to be skeptical.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3782. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 22:59:29 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vm9smmokp5p06c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77047

well, I was speaking mostly about the nations that seem to
fight us tooth-and-nail on most issues we bring before them,
particularly the UN... my point was that I wouldn't expect
a sympathetic ear on thier end if they all have come to
an agreement amongst themselves and WE are the
outstanding oppinion. That is to say, if the reports i've heard
and that are echoed in here that many nations are dropping
thier code requirements, and more are planning on doing the
same, and of ALL countries to fight it the USA tries,
I wouldn't hold my breath.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

UNR paragraph from UNR 678

2. Authorizes Member States co-operating with the Government of Kuwait,
unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements, as set forth in
paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions, to use all necissary means to
uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant
resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;

--
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:s269b.11259$NM1.7178@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Now that is a hell of a stretch. If so, then explain how we got the
major
> improvement on 40 meters? Sorry old man, your full of crap.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> news:vm7q8ccns5bp5f@corp.supernews.com...
> > the rest of the world, as you described it, just crapped on us
> > before, during and after the recent event in iraq.
> >
> > Why do you think they'd give a hoot in hell about anything
> > we said in this instance, either??????
> >
> > Clint
> > KB5ZHT
> >

> > --
> >
> > --
> >
> > If you sympathize with terrorists & middle eastern tyrants,
> > vote for liberals...
> >
> > --
> >
> >
> > "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
> > news:p408b.237095$2x.66933@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> > > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in
> > > news:vm67v564e0pj4c@corp.supernews.com:
> > >
> > > > I heard from the latest audio news that more nations
> > > > around the world are dropping thier morse code
> > > > testing requirements.
> > > >
> > > > makes you wonder if the VEC's who petitioned
> > > > to return a higher code speed test for extra class
> > > > hams are just doing so to fight the tide.
> > > >
> > > > Clint
> > > > KB5ZHT
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> > > The ARRL has a destructive agenda. If they cared about amateur radio
as
> > > much as for the amount of money their bank account, they would have
said
> > > something at the last world conference. It's all lip service and lies
> to
> > > try and get hams like me to hold our piece and hope we don't feel like
> > > we're being lied to again.
> > >
> > > KB7ADL
> >
> >
>
>

3783. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 23:02:10 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vm9srknhdsb29c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77048

```
--
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:N049b.3694$nQ.1250999@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>

>
> You might make it clear that California hasn't built any new plants of ANY
> KIND because the environmentalists wackos are blocking them. It's not
just
> nuclear they are blocking.

yes, very very true....

Clint
```

3784. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 23:08:40 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Yx69b.3728$nQ.1280192@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77049

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vm9qa2h7qsddec@corp.supernews.com...
>
> >
> > The youngsters today still tell me that they must learn to use a pencil
> and
> > learn to write script. Typing and word processing are taught AFTER they
> > have learned to write manually. Enough said.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> yes, if we were talking about a degree in literature from a school or
> college,
> which we are not.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>

This is elementary school, middle school, and high school. Perhaps I should have used the word cursive instead of script as you seem to have totally misinterpreted my statement to mean something else.

Students must learn printing and writing in cursive before they are taught typing and word processing.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

3785. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 23:10:54 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <2A69b.11353$NM1.4565@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77050

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vm9ptb2m1ok1f3@corp.supernews.com...
> LOL!
>
> A good liberal? you have NO idea..... I'm as right wing
> and conservative as they come... evidently you don't read
> my other posts or in other NG's either, where i'm referred
> to as the "jim birch devil"
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT

They just don't get it (the PCTAs that is).

Ending morse testing should happen because there
is NO logical/rational reason for government to
continue mandating morse knowledge of all HF licensed
hams. Getting the government out of a "morse code affirmative
action program" by ending mandated morse is far more
a conservative concept than a liberal one.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3786. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 23:14:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <SD69b.3729$nQ.1281030@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77201

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F64F17E.6060509@adelphia.net...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> > My point was that it is no riskier than things we accept on a daily
basis.
> > As I commented above, there is nothing that is truly safe.
>
> No there isn't. But fact is, the safety must be addressed. THe idea
> that all is well, and mockery of safety issues is how we get places like
> Love Canal and Chernoble. Would you care to go live in either of those
> places? Those people were told "There's no problem." Now when people
> come around and tell people "There's no problem" the reaction is quite
> different
>
> And Jim mentions the waste disposal problem. This IS a real problem, as
> beyond whatever safety precautions we put on the material, it is going
> to be nasty stuff for a long time. And there we are telling people
> "there's no problem" in storage again.
>
> I feel in discussing this with you that I'm being pushed into the anti
> nuclear power group, when I can assure you that isn't the case. What is
> obvious to me is that due to the history of this topic, people have a
> pretty good reason to be skeptical.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

I quite agree that safety must be addressed and that people should be
skeptical. I would certainly insist on seeing the data to show safety
rather than just letting someone tell me it's safe.

The point I was trying to make is that people are allowing themselves to be
scared off of nuclear power by emotional arguments and are not exercising
the appropriate degree of skepticism on these arguments and demanding data.

The "I think, I feel, I believe" approach has no place on either side of the
argument. But when people let fear get in the way of seeking facts to
resolve the issue, then they are doing all of us a disservice.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3787. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 23:16:31 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <jF69b.3730$nQ.1281487@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77202

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vm9smmokp5p06c@corp.supernews.com...
> well, I was speaking mostly about the nations that seem to
> fight us tooth-and-nail on most issues we bring before them,
> particularly the UN... my point was that I wouldn't expect
> a sympathetic ear on thier end if they all have come to
> an agreement amongst themselves and WE are the
> outstanding oppinion. That is to say, if the reports i've heard
> and that are echoed in here that many nations are dropping
> thier code requirements, and more are planning on doing the
> same, and of ALL countries to fight it the USA tries,
> I wouldn't hold my breath.
>

Each country is free to do as their respective governing bodies wish to do.
There is no "fighting" involved.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3788. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 23:18:57 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vm9tr6qcenin03@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77203

well, so often what happens is that when a person expresses
an oppinion against testing morse code profeciency, he is
assailed with the PCTA crowd with accusations of hating
the code, wanting it taken off the bands, and even worse
things that reach the comical level.

I do not HATE CW; I actually have a key, and I actually
make code contacts from time to time. In fact, my first many
QSL cards were CW contacts on 15 meters; for a while,
until I upgraded to general, thats all I did was operate CW
on 15.

I just also realize that there is no need to continue requireing
a profeciency test in CW; the argument referring to advancing
the radio art no longer holds water as the radio art is slowly
phasing CW out in many sectors of SW use.... and the argument
that it makes a good "yahoo" filter is wrong, due to the fact
that most of the onair violations are made by very veteran hams
with advanced liscences... thus, they themselves passed a code
test. I have NEVER heard stronger advocates of the rules than
by new hams that pop on VHF repeaters, who will get
rather brutal with you if you so much as make an off-color joke.
Tune into 40 or 75 meters and you'd think you had tuned into
27.185 Mhz, good buddy.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

UNR paragraph from UNR 678

2. Authorizes Member States co-operating with the Government of Kuwait,
unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements, as set forth in
paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions, to use all necissary means to
uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant
resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;

--
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:2A69b.11353$NM1.4565@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> news:vm9ptb2m1ok1f3@corp.supernews.com...
> > LOL!

> >
> > A good liberal? you have NO idea..... I'm as right wing
> > and conservative as they come... evidently you don't read
> > my other posts or in other NG's either, where i'm referred
> > to as the "jim birch devil"
> >
> > Clint
> > KB5ZHT
>
> They just don't get it (the PCTAs that is).
>
> Ending morse testing should happen because there
> is NO logical/rational reason for government to
> continue mandating morse knowledge of all HF licensed
> hams. Getting the government out of a "morse code affirmative
> action program" by ending mandated morse is far more
> a conservative concept than a liberal one.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

3789. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 23:19:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <el69b.11408$NM1.326@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77204

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk27i3$42t$0@208.206.142.108...
>
>
> Clint wrote:
>
> > He's trying to blanket the topic anyway....
> > NCI isn't trying to stop or ban the use of morse
> > code on the airwaves, they simply understand that
> > the testing of morse code no longer falls within
> > the scope and original intent of ham radio.. which
> > is to keep the art of radio alive and expand it's use,
>
> The operative phrase here is "expand its use", not diminish
> it by refusing to learn the Most Basic Radiocommunications Mode.

It is NOT refusing to learn...it is simply allowing the
choice to be made by each individual. There is no
reason for everyone on HF to know morse as was
well shown by the lack of any credible reasons given to the
FCC in 98-143.

> > etc., and, well, logic there says that if morse code
> > is being abandoned left and right in the radio world
> > in favor of new means of communication,
>
> When you finally get around to getting a radio that will actually
> work on HF, take a listen to the lower end of any band and report
> back what you find. Then you might want to 'accurize' that statemtent.

Let's see...a mix of morse and data. Your point?
The choice then, depending on what one wants to do,
is to learn and use morse IF they want to make those contacts.
If not, who cares? So what?

> > than you
> > you are no longer adhereing or supporting this
> > doctrine of ham radio.
>
> And of course YOU and NCI are, to hear your story.

How is he or NCI not adhereing to the doctrine of ham
radio?

> WRONG story, full of total inaccuracies which you have
> no interest in correcting. Who do you suppose is involved

> in 'advancing late digital modes'? CLUE: It's not Carl Stevenson,
> Chief Executive of NCI, you see
> he's too busy ratchetjawing on SSB now that he's finally found a
> license that allows it!

Even if true, so what?

> > Plus, the real reason the old buzzards want to keep
> > it around is simple but non well-founded.. "I did
> > it, so YOU should have to!"
>
> There is an unintended element of truth in what you say.

At least you admit it. that's some progress.

> WE had to
> learn radio's most basic mode, and there exists no good reason why
> you shouldn't have to learn it also if you aspire to a full-privileges
> ham raduio license.

BZZZT - WRONG!! The burden of proof was on you and other
PCTA's to justify exactly WHY hams should learn it. You failed
to do so during the 98-143 comment phase as is well
documented in the FCC's R&O for 98-143.

Even if I take your challenge at face value, the
simple answer is that the reason every HF shouldn't have to
learn morse is because there's no justifiable reason,
rational or need for it.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3790. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 23:21:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <gK69b.11421$NM1.9850@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77205

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:O6%8b.2868$nQ.1193559@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> news:vm8ucqlp6pd301@corp.supernews.com...
> > When I took my drivers test years ago to get a license
> > to drive an automobile, the never required me to
> > prove that I could hitch a horse team to a wagon.
> > The youngsters today, likewise, tell me that the
> > departments of motor vehicles around the country
> > do not ask them to prove they are proficient with
> > buggy whips.
> >
> > Enough said.
> >
> > Clint
>
> The youngsters today still tell me that they must learn to use a pencil
and
> learn to write script. Typing and word processing are taught AFTER they
> have learned to write manually. Enough said.

Bad anology since morse isn't a foundation to any other
body of radio knowledge and/or language skills or
writing skills.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3791. Re: Hey Carl-Glom this!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 23:25:14 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <uN69b.11437$NM1.8091@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77206

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk0mihorn0@208.206.142.95...
> It meant something, in those... years, to be a telegraph operator. They
> were looked upon with wonder as possessing
> knowledge which separated them from the rest of the crowd.

So? I am equally in awe of many had/motor skills that I have
no need nor desire to master.

> There are some surprising parallels between the experiences of
> nineteenth century women telegraphers and the
> twentieth-century story of women in the field of computer programming.
> Some of these similarities are technically based; the
> telegrapher's work, like that of a modern computer programmer, consisted
> of translating English-language instructions into
> machine-readable codes. Morse Code is, in fact, a direct ancestor of the
> ASCII codes used by software programmers. The
> computer itself is the direct descendant of the telegraph; as Carolyn
> Marvin observed in "When Old Technologies Were New",
>
> In a historical sense, the computer is no more than an instantaneous
> telegraph with a prodigious memory, and all the
> communications inventions in between have simply been elaborations on
> the telegraph's original work.

Your point? Should all computer users learn
ASCII now to understand computer basics?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3792. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-14 23:36:48 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vm9usff4mpm58f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77207

that's a good point... sending and receiving CW isn't a building block
to anything else..... now, the electrical principals of what a CW
transmission is, and a knowledge test of that is a good idea, but
that's comparing apples and oranges. I think most of the PCTA
is being disingenuous when they come up with "good reasons"
to keep CW testing alive; I think the true deeper reason lies
somewhere in the "I had to do it so everybody should" relm,
as i've stated before.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

UNR paragraph from UNR 678

2. Authorizes Member States co-operating with the Government of Kuwait,
unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements, as set forth in
paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions, to use all necissary means to
uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant
resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;

--
"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:gK69b.11421$NM1.9850@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:O6%8b.2868$nQ.1193559@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> > news:vm8ucqlp6pd301@corp.supernews.com...
> > > When I took my drivers test years ago to get a license
> > > to drive an automobile, the never required me to
> > > prove that I could hitch a horse team to a wagon.
> > > The youngsters today, likewise, tell me that the
> > > departments of motor vehicles around the country
> > > do not ask them to prove they are proficient with
> > > buggy whips.
> > >
> > > Enough said.
> > >
> > > Clint
> >
> > The youngsters today still tell me that they must learn to use a pencil

> and
> > learn to write script. Typing and word processing are taught AFTER they
> > have learned to write manually. Enough said.
>
> Bad anology since morse isn't a foundation to any other
> body of radio knowledge and/or language skills or
> writing skills.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

3793. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 00:04:36 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bk2vmh$lkr@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 77208

```
"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vm9hn3q1esl4fc@corp.supernews.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bk2bmq$jkj@library1.airnews.net...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>
> No new nuclear power generation is
> > planned, 'least not that I know of...
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
>
> that's because the environmental wackos are doing thier damndest
> to fight them, at every level of governement and in every manner
> of social disobedience...
>

Has nothing to do with "wackos", Clint. Nothing at all. It has everything
to do with Board Room decisions for publicly held corporations who have
learned thier lesson losses from the construction, start-up, and generation
of power from nuclear power plants. They are not cost effective in any way.
They've become a pariah on the backs of the companies who have already built
and own them.

>
> This is why california hasn't built any new power plants in 10 years
> while experiencing a DOUBLING of population.... resulting in
> the blackouts they just had.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>

Sad to say, I think you're totally wrong. The above statement(s) are
speculative at best and sensationalistic at worst. Nuclear power is
economically unfeasible--proven by the plants already built and generating
in this country. Leave alone all the implications of environmental and
health impacts. They are just plain bad economics.

Kim W5TIT
```

3794. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 00:05:25 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bk2vo1$c5o@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 77209

```
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:dZ39b.3692$nQ.1250280@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bk2bmq$jkj@library1.airnews.net...
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030914121855.02537.00000566@mb-m23.aol.com...
> > > In article <zTZ8b.2322$a_7.438@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
> > > <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:
> > >
> > > >Keep in mind the fact that fossil-fuel burning plants pollute while
> > working
> > > >perfectly.
> > >
> > > Yup. So do nuclear plants. The pollution in each case is different, of
> > course.
> > > Nuke plants generate various forms of radioactive waste that will
remain
> > > hazardous for far longer than anyone realistically knows how to deal
> with.
> > >
> > > >Unlike the nuclear plants, they don't have to wait for an
> > > >accident in order to cause a problem.
> > >
> > > But when a nuke plant has a problem, it's a BIG problem!
> > >
> > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> >
> > Yep, my point exactly. And, waste generation and facilitation is a part
> of
> > the equation I completely forgot to even include in the debate. And,
it's
> a
> > very important part of the issue.
> >
> > Suffice it to say that no one will ever convince me that nuclear
> generation
> > is a cost/environmental/health effective way for our power needs. It
will
> > never happen to be that nuclear generation is the way to go...and the
> > industry recognizes that as well. No new nuclear power generation is
> > planned, 'least not that I know of...
> >
```

>
> Because they are blocked on every hand by people who operate on emotions
> rather data.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

See my reply to Clint, Dee. Nuclear power is bad ecnomics.

Kim W5TIT

3795. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 00:10:33 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bk301l$bt5@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 77210

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:fj59b.3708$nQ.1266825@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> Dissipation will be by the inverse square law so at 1000 miles from the
> plant it will have a concentration of only 1 millioneth of the
concentration
> at the release site.
>

It's a popular thought in the environmental impact world that the "solution to pollution is dissolution" or something like that. And, of course, that's wrong. On its 1000 mile (more actually) trip to infinitesimal measurement, how much impact did it have along the way?

>
> Nuclear technology is not complex. It's relatively simple in fact.
>

Another favorite thought. Yeah, in basis theory, the technology is not complex. Everything on paper looks great.

>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Kim W5TIT

3796. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 00:22:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk30p1$4em$0@208.206.142.106>
Source record: 77211

Steve Stone wrote:

> I think anyone who is a train engineer should pass a test for operating a
> coal fired steam locomotive

Now that's odd! Why in the world would you think such a thing?

3797. Re: Cunningham violates copyright law at new web site

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 00:29:43 UTC
From: Bakelite Man <thx3121@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1063586274.240989@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 77212
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:8701708AF.BF56756733@taranews.net...

(....much redundant "we've-heard-all-this-crap
-from-lloyd-da-toid-before-as-he-needs-to
-get-a-new-schtick" useless drivel snipped)

Go take yer kindergardenish "..I'm gonna
tell on you nyah! nyah!" crap back
to 14.313 where the weekend toilet
ticks eat it up like flies to cowpies.

3798. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 00:47:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk327e$96s$0@208.206.142.90>
Source record: 77214

Clint wrote:

> >
> > The operative phrase here is "expand its use", not diminish
> > it by refusing to learn the Most Basic Radiocommunications Mode.
>
> that's expanding the use and art of morse code, not expanding the
> use and art of radio in general.

If you don't believe that promoting and expanding the use of radiotelegraphy is doing same to "radio in general" there is news you've not yet heard.

> For that matter, there aren't
> profeciency tests in other modes of operation, either, in the
> form of a seperate practical test such as there is with CW.

Ah, but Morse is the only mode which demands selftraining! Any mope can learn any of the others by cracking a book and doing a little hookup wiring. With manual radiotelegraphy, there is really no way to do it short of selftraining. Thus the CW test.

>
>
> >
> >
> >
> > >
> > > etc., and, well, logic there says that if morse code
> > > is being abandoned left and right in the radio world
> > > in favor of new means of communication,
> >
> > When you finally get around to getting a radio that will actually
> > work on HF, take a listen to the lower end of any band and report
> > back what you find. Then you might want to 'accurize' that statemtent.
>
> I also read the news and listen to it as well and hear all the time
> about CW being dropped in favor of digital and other forms of
> communication.
>

By commercials and military, yes, for both efficiency in transferring huge amounts of data, and primarly in some services for monetary reasons. It's cheaper to use modes that non-technical personnel can handle, thus saving personnel costs. If they can add communications as a duty to personnel othewise assigned, it is cost savings, nevermind that the newly assigned person may be squeezed for time to perform all those added duties, thus causing safety and job

efficiency to suffer. Dollars are conserved, so it is done.

Ham radio has no such needs nor constraints, even for emergency comms. Maximum throughput is the *last* thing you need when the desperate need is for *any* communications. At that point what is needed is basic, reliable, ubiquitous communications modes. In ham radio, Morse is second only to the voice modes, by far. I can imagine that NCI strongly favors changing that, despite their statements to the contrary - for obvious reasons.

>
> >
> > WRONG story, full of total inaccuracies
>
> well, no, full of details that you find personally distasteful,
> but not inaccurate.

As I said, QUITE inaccurate.

>
>
> Who do you suppose is involved
> > in 'advancing late digital modes'? CLUE: It's not Carl Stevenson,
> > Chief Executive of NCI,
>
> I never implied that he was. Nor was I aware that this was
> an intended purpose and goal of NCI.....
>
> >
> > There is an unintended element of truth in what you say. WE had to
> > learn radio's most basic mode, and there exists no good reason why
> > you shouldn't have to learn it also if you aspire to a full-privileges
> > ham raduio license.
>
> and our forefathers all had to learn how to hitch horses to a buggy,
> and had to be proficient in the use of reigns and a buggy whip.
> Does it make sense for the various departments of motor vehicle
> saftey to require a person to learn this before letting him drive
> a modern automobile?

Well, you old Hoop jumper, none of that has anything whatever to do with radio communications, much less ham radio nor Morse code. It's just more NCI mumbo jumbo drivel straight from the Carl Stevenson X files.

If you refuse to learn how to handle radio's most basic mode you can never be able to regard yourself as fully qualified in ham radio communciations.

That's just the Way it Is. Live with it.

3799. Re: Cunningham violates copyright law at new web site

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 00:50:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <v189b.11356$Aq2.344@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77215
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bakelite Man" <thx3121@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:1063586274.240989@newshost03.voicenet.com...
>
> "Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
> news:8701708AF.BF56756733@taranews.net...
>
> (....much redundant "we've-heard-all-this-crap
> -from-lloyd-da-toid-before-as-he-needs-to
> -get-a-new-schtick" useless drivel snipped)
>
> Go take yer kindergardenish "..I'm gonna
> tell on you nyah! nyah!" crap back
> to 14.313 where the weekend toilet
> ticks eat it up like flies to cowpies.
>
>
>
>

He is not allowed on 14.313.

Dan/W4NTI

3800. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 00:51:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309141651.384a64a5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77216

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030914121856.02537.00000567@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0309140512.7d45f76a@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
> >news:<IuP8b.57189$3b2.7364893@twister.neo.rr.com>...
> >> If your not a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, there is a CW contest
> >> going one right now.
> >>
> >> If you are a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, then never mind, it's a
> Ham
> >> Radio thing. You would not understand.
> >>
> >> 10-73's!
> >
> >Rev. Jim is going to chastise you for your dirty mouth.
>
> Who are you talking about, Brian?

"Shephed"

> >Oh, never mind, it's a PCTA thing.
>
> You mean like the way you never censure Len or Carl (or anybody else who
> happens to oppose code tests), no matter what they say or how they say it?

Never? Rev. Jim, even little lies will get you turned away from the
gate.

> Oh, never mind, it's an NCTA double standards thing.

I guess as long as "shephed" is spouting the party line, its OK with
you that he calls people "retarded mouth-breeding NCI members."

3801. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 00:53:43 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <r489b.61835$3b2.8129302@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 77213

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vm9ptb2m1ok1f3@corp.supernews.com...
> LOL!
>
> A good liberal? you have NO idea..... I'm as right wing
> and conservative as they come... evidently you don't read
> my other posts or in other NG's either, where i'm referred
> to as the "jim birch devil"
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
You can't be a conservative, we believe in earning your way in life, not having "things" given to you because you are to lazy to EARN them. Sound familiar Liberal boy?

Conservative my ass!

10-73's!

3802. Re: slide rules (was: Could This Be The Solution?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 00:54:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309141654.35c7a393@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77217

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030914141904.02537.00000569@mb-m23.aol.com>...

> Nice!
>
> What's even neater is that nowadays we have the choice.

I never would have guessed you were pro-choice.

3803. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 00:57:28 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309141657.5e1ddb56@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77218

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030914141905.02537.00000570@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0309140424.1c62f771@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >So in the end, you still won't question Jim what the ARRL has done to
> >reduce standards.
>
> Neither will you, obviously.

It was Steve's question. He wanted to know.

3804. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 02:02:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk36jcmmq0@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 77219

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:O6%8b.2868$nQ.1193559@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> > news:vm8ucqlp6pd301@corp.supernews.com...
> > > When I took my drivers test years ago to get a license
> > > to drive an automobile, the never required me to
> > > prove that I could hitch a horse team to a wagon.
> > > The youngsters today, likewise, tell me that the
> > > departments of motor vehicles around the country
> > > do not ask them to prove they are proficient with
> > > buggy whips.
> > >
> > > Enough said.
> > >
> > > Clint
> >
> > The youngsters today still tell me that they must learn to use a pencil
> and
> > learn to write script. Typing and word processing are taught AFTER they
> > have learned to write manually. Enough said.
>
> Bad anology since morse isn't a foundation to any other
> body of radio knowledge and/or language skills or
> writing skills.

Wrong, because radiotelegraphy IS the most basic radio communications mode,
the use of which is possible only if the operator has self-trained enough to
be able to make use of it.

3805. Keep the cellphone charged

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 02:08:39 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk36v7nkl0@208.207.71.169>
Source record: 77220

The weather channel just put this out as Number 1 on the list of
things
to do in preparation for the hurricane that's projected to make landfall

on the east coast next week. :-))

3806. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 02:16:47 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ji99b.3776$nQ.1307672@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77221

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:gK69b.11421$NM1.9850@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:O6%8b.2868$nQ.1193559@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> > news:vm8ucqlp6pd301@corp.supernews.com...
> > > When I took my drivers test years ago to get a license
> > > to drive an automobile, the never required me to
> > > prove that I could hitch a horse team to a wagon.
> > > The youngsters today, likewise, tell me that the
> > > departments of motor vehicles around the country
> > > do not ask them to prove they are proficient with
> > > buggy whips.
> > >
> > > Enough said.
> > >
> > > Clint
> >
> > The youngsters today still tell me that they must learn to use a pencil
> and
> > learn to write script. Typing and word processing are taught AFTER they
> > have learned to write manually. Enough said.
>
> Bad anology since morse isn't a foundation to any other
> body of radio knowledge and/or language skills or
> writing skills.
>

Manual printing and cursive aren't a foundation for any other skills either. All notes can now be take by digital recorders or entered into a PDA. Bills can be paid on line eliminating the need to sign checks. Debit cards can be used in stores and you enter your PIN number. Credit cards could be converted to that system too. Manual printing and cursive can be totally eliminated as they are not needed as a foundation for any language skills since one can learn to read without writing. Composition doesn't need manual skills either. It can all be done on the typewriter or word processor.

Let's have a go at "No Handwriting International".

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3807. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 02:18:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <9k99b.3778$nQ.1307964@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77222

```
"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bk2vmh$lkr@library1.airnews.net...
> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> news:vm9hn3q1esl4fc@corp.supernews.com...
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:bk2bmq$jkj@library1.airnews.net...
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >
> > No new nuclear power generation is
> > > planned, 'least not that I know of...
> > >
> > > Kim W5TIT
> > >
> > >
> >
> > that's because the environmental wackos are doing thier damndest
> > to fight them, at every level of governement and in every manner
> > of social disobedience...
> >
>
> Has nothing to do with "wackos", Clint. Nothing at all. It has
everything
> to do with Board Room decisions for publicly held corporations who have
> learned thier lesson losses from the construction, start-up, and
generation
> of power from nuclear power plants. They are not cost effective in any
way.
> They've become a pariah on the backs of the companies who have already
built
> and own them.
>
> >
> > This is why california hasn't built any new power plants in 10 years
> > while experiencing a DOUBLING of population.... resulting in
> > the blackouts they just had.
> >
> > Clint
> > KB5ZHT
> >
>
> Sad to say, I think you're totally wrong. The above statement(s) are
> speculative at best and sensationalistic at worst. Nuclear power is
> economically unfeasible--proven by the plants already built and generating
> in this country. Leave alone all the implications of environmental and
```

> health impacts. They are just plain bad economics.
>
> Kim W5TIT

So why hasn't California built any oil, coal, or hydroelectric power platns in the last ten years? I'll tell you. They too are being blocked by the environmentalists. Are they also economically unfeasible? It's unlikely.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3808. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 02:20:56 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <cm99b.3779$nQ.1308144@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77223

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bk2vo1$c5o@library1.airnews.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:dZ39b.3692$nQ.1250280@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:bk2bmq$jkj@library1.airnews.net...
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20030914121855.02537.00000566@mb-m23.aol.com...
> > > > In article <zTZ8b.2322$a_7.438@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>,
"charlesb"
> > > > <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:
> > > >
> > > > >Keep in mind the fact that fossil-fuel burning plants pollute while
> > > working
> > > > >perfectly.
> > > >
> > > > Yup. So do nuclear plants. The pollution in each case is different,
of
> > > course.
> > > > Nuke plants generate various forms of radioactive waste that will
> remain
> > > > hazardous for far longer than anyone realistically knows how to deal
> > with.
> > > >
> > > > >Unlike the nuclear plants, they don't have to wait for an
> > > > >accident in order to cause a problem.
> > > >
> > > > But when a nuke plant has a problem, it's a BIG problem!
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > > >
> > >
> > > Yep, my point exactly. And, waste generation and facilitation is a
part
> > of
> > > the equation I completely forgot to even include in the debate. And,
> it's
> > a
> > > very important part of the issue.
> > >
> > > Suffice it to say that no one will ever convince me that nuclear
> > generation
> > > is a cost/environmental/health effective way for our power needs. It

> will
> > > never happen to be that nuclear generation is the way to go...and the
> > > industry recognizes that as well. No new nuclear power generation is
> > > planned, 'least not that I know of...
> > >
> >
> > Because they are blocked on every hand by people who operate on emotions
> > rather data.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> See my reply to Clint, Dee. Nuclear power is bad ecnomics.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

See my comments to your reply. Are coal, oil, and hydro also bad economics.
California won't allow any of them to be built either.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3809. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 02:30:03 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Lu99b.3783$nQ.1309318@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77224

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bk301l$bt5@library1.airnews.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:fj59b.3708$nQ.1266825@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > Dissipation will be by the inverse square law so at 1000 miles from the
> > plant it will have a concentration of only 1 millioneth of the
> concentration
> > at the release site.
> >
>
> It's a popular thought in the environmental impact world that the
"solution
> to pollution is dissolution" or something like that. And, of course,
that's
> wrong. On its 1000 mile (more actually) trip to infinitesimal
measurement,
> how much impact did it have along the way?
>
> >
> > Nuclear technology is not complex. It's relatively simple in fact.
> >
>
> Another favorite thought. Yeah, in basis theory, the technology is not
> complex. Everything on paper looks great.
>
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

The only way to eliminate all pollution is to eliminate the human race.
Since that is not a reasonable solution, it is up to people to develop
energy supplies and attach the appropriate safety requirements without the
emotional baggage caused by fear. To date, the nuclear industry has had a
much better safety record than many other industries and we have the ability
to make it even safer yet. Right now the irrational fears about nuclear
power are standing in the way of collecting the data that will prove it
either safe or dangerous and developing an appropriate energy action plan.
What data does get collected is buried on the back of the last page at the
bottom of the last column of the newspaper or doesn't even make it into the

paper unless it is something that they can sensationalize.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

3810. Re: Keep the cellphone charged

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 02:55:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F652A62.4070500@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77225

Dick Carroll wrote:
> The weather channel just put this out as Number 1 on the list of
> things
> to do in preparation for the hurricane that's projected to make landfall
>
> on the east coast next week. :-))
>

OHMYGAWD!

I suppose it will give people something to do!

"Can you hear me now?"

- Mike KB3EIA -

3811. Re: Hey Carl-Glom this!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 02:56:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F652ABD.2010908@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77226

Bill Sohl wrote:

> Your point? Should all computer users learn
> ASCII now to understand computer basics?

ASCII? for computer basics?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3812. Re: Hey Carl-Glom this!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 03:08:30 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030914230830.29815.00000615@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 77228

In article <uN69b.11437$NM1.8091@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>
>Your point? Should all computer users learn
>ASCII now to understand computer basics?
>
>Cheers,
>Bill K2UNK

111 040 124 110 111 116 113 040 124 110 101 124 054 123 040 110 040
107 117 117 104 040 111 104 105 101 054 102 111 114 114 041 015 012
012 067 063 104 105 114 101 122 122 131 054 113 063 114 124

3813. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 03:08:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030914230831.29815.00000617@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 77227

In article <f45722ac.0309140452.72c337bd@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>
>Larry, instead of complaining all of the time about others, why don't
>you relate to us how you've revolutionized radio communications?
>
>BTW, how's your WAS coming?
>
>Saw in QST where a ham had 48 states in 1957, then completed WAS with
>Hawaii and Nevada in 2003. No doubt another revolutionizing operator.

Brian:

I *have* worked all 50 states; however, I've never received a QSL card from
North Dakota. BTW, I worked all 50 mainly from the mobile HF station I
had in my '78 Plymouth Horizon while stationed at Andrews AFB, MD. And,
in case you're wondering, it was mainly CW, with some SSB contacts.
BTW2: It was done between Sept. 1981 and Feb. 1983, so it took me a
whole 18 months. Sorry to disappoint you.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3814. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 03:08:31 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030914230831.29815.00000616@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 77230

In article <20030914081904.23307.00002990@mb-m29.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>With all due respect, Larry - were you there?

Jim:

Obviously not. Point?

>Did you have to take a sending test?

No, but I could have easily passed one.

>Did you have to pass all of the elements to upgrade at the same time?

No. You got me there.

>Did you have to wait 2 years to even try the Extra?

No. Ditto.

>>Challenging licensing requirements and
>>uncompromising testing procedures.
>
>They've been "compromising" forever. Back before WW2 the exam was all blue
>book
>essays. Before 1960 there was diagram drawing. The tests I took in 1967-70
>were
>"dumbed down" compared to those because my tests were all multiple choice.

Yeah, I know, and that's my point. However, the level of "dumbing-down" that has occurred just in the last few years is way out of porportion to that which took place from the beginning of FCC testing and the time you and I became licensed.

>>Of course, all that is waaaaay too
>>PoliticKally IncorrecKt today, since someone with a particular ethnic
>>origin, skin color, religion, "gender," or a hangnail might not be able
>>to pass the first time or two. This certainly won't do in these
>>enlightened times.
>
>None of that had anything to do with the license test changes.

Oh, really? Prove it.

>Incentive Licensing came about in LBJ's time
>
>Dick Bash did his stuff (and got away with it) when Nixon and Ford were in

>office

>The change to the VE system happened under Reagan
>
>We got medical waivers because a "king" wanted a favor from George Bush 1.
>
>We also got a nocodeham license because of GB 1.
>
>Etc.

Damn those Republicans! OBTW -- who was President when the
"Restructuring" took place?

>>After all, it might "exclude" someone who is, in
>>reality, a nascent technical genius who just needs the ability to talk
>>on the HF phone bands in order to find the inspiration to create the
>>next fabulous new invention which will revolutionize electronic
>>communication for the rest of all time!
>>
>Or something like that.
>
>Don't hold yer breath waiting for it, tho.

Trust me, I'm not.

73 de Larry, K3LT

3815. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 03:08:32 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030914230832.29815.00000618@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 77229

In article <vVZ8b.2324$YZ7.2212@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:

>I'd appreciate it if you PP'ers would use the restroom facilities instead of >doing it in our midst.

Charles:

Now you've done it! This is sure to elicit yet another classic "ROTFLMAO" from Kim!

73 de Larry, K3LT

3816. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 03:16:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F652F71.9080701@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77231

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bk2bmq$jkj@library1.airnews.net...
>
>>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20030914121855.02537.00000566@mb-m23.aol.com...
>>
>>>In article <zTZ8b.2322$a_7.438@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
>>><n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Keep in mind the fact that fossil-fuel burning plants pollute while
>>>
>>working
>>
>>>>perfectly.
>>>
>>>Yup. So do nuclear plants. The pollution in each case is different, of
>>
>>course.
>>
>>>Nuke plants generate various forms of radioactive waste that will remain
>>>hazardous for far longer than anyone realistically knows how to deal
>>
> with.
>
>>>>Unlike the nuclear plants, they don't have to wait for an
>>>>accident in order to cause a problem.
>>>
>>>But when a nuke plant has a problem, it's a BIG problem!
>>>
>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>
>>
>>Yep, my point exactly. And, waste generation and facilitation is a part
>
> of
>
>>the equation I completely forgot to even include in the debate. And, it's
>
> a
>
>>very important part of the issue.
>>

>>Suffice it to say that no one will ever convince me that nuclear
>
> generation
>
>>is a cost/environmental/health effective way for our power needs. It will
>>never happen to be that nuclear generation is the way to go...and the
>>industry recognizes that as well. No new nuclear power generation is
>>planned, 'least not that I know of...
>>
>
>
> Because they are blocked on every hand by people who operate on emotions
> rather data.

Dee, I find myself in the uncomfortable position of agreeing with you, but very much disagreeing with your argument.

Uranium miners get ill with apalling regularity. This is part of the overall cost of this method of energy production, unless you are force fitting your argument to include only the power generation stage. There are piles of radioactive tailings around some towns out west. Kids often play on them.

http://www.inmotionmagazine.com/miners.html

http://www.downwinders.org/cortez.htm

These are just a couple examples.

Is that directly attributable? Gosh who knows? Cigarettes were "not proven to be deadly until not all that many yars ago, while I have read literature from the 1860's that documented all the effects that tobacco smoking causes. My guess is that if a group of people involved in an activity show statistically significant trends in illness, some activity they have in common just may be responsible.

I don't suspect you will understand this, but part of your approach is exactly why people distrust what they are told about NP.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3817. Re: Keep the cellphone charged

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 03:26:32 UTC
From: Jerry <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <sja9b.7654$4j3.1597@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 77232

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F652A62.4070500@adelphia.net...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
> > The weather channel just put this out as Number 1 on the list of
> > things
> > to do in preparation for the hurricane that's projected to make landfall
> >
> > on the east coast next week. :-))
> >
>
> OHMYGAWD!
>
> I suppose it will give people something to do!

Heehee! Now THAT'S funny. As an inland resident of
NC, I can expect to be asked to deploy for volunteer duty *somewhere*.
Having seen the effects of hurricanes
and actually being in one (Hugo), I take preparations seriously. Ham radio
and CAP communications will likely be put to the test. Even if cell towers
survive (unlikely during the brunt of a storm), the traffic load could be
awful.

Jerry
>
>
> "Can you hear me now?"
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

3818. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 03:28:28 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hl8bbg7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 77233

On Sat, 13 Sep 2003 22:17:21 -0500, Kim W5TIT wrote:

>> IIRC the minimum wage back in '75 was around $1.50, and there are
>> about 2000 working hours in a straight-time year. (40 hrs/week x 50
>> weeks). So you folks were essentially living on one minimum-wage
>> income. Think about what those numbers work out to today...

>2080 hrs. to be exact.

Somewhere in the early 80s the Feds changed to 2087 to account for
the leap year day. Even though it changed our paychecks only by the
cost of a donut or two, did we scream. To no avail, of course.

>Man, that thing was nice. First bad wind that year
>(90 mph past the house--straight line winds) blew that quad over and broke
>one of the fiberglass spreaders. We could have replaced it. But, this was
>a 3-element quad for 10M. Imagine how darned big and cumbersome that thing
>was!?

Was it a 11-meter "cubical quad" before it became a 10-meter quad ??
Hmmm.... ????

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3819. New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 03:28:56 UTC
From: Jerry <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <Hla9b.7655$4j3.5266@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 77234

* Court kicks New York ham's "police radio" case: A New York court has dismissed a misdemeanor charge against ARRL member Richard C. "Dick" Lalone, KC5GAX, for violating ¬397 of that state's Vehicle and Traffic Law. That section prohibits individuals other than law officers from equipping their vehicles with radios "capable of receiving signals on the frequencies allocated for police use" without first securing a permit. The section, which also prohibits knowingly interfering with police transmissions, contains an explicit exemption for "any person who holds a valid amateur radio operator's license . . . and who operates a duly licensed portable mobile transmitter and in connection therewith a receiver or receiving set on frequencies exclusively allocated . . . to duly licensed radio amateurs." In a nearly 1300-word decision, Judge John J. Hallet said it was clear the legislature never intended the provisions of ¬397 from applying to licensed Amateur Radio operators, and he dismissed the charge August 5. Susan Terry, KF4SUE, a former New York assistant attorney general, represented Lalone. ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, ARRL General Counsel Chris Imlay, W3KD, and ARRL Regulatory Information Specialist John Hennessee, N1KB, provided advice or assistance to Lalone.

I like THIS one. AW, poor cop, no donut. LOL!!!

Jerry

3820. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 03:33:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk3bto$5ak$0@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 77235

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bk2vmh$lkr@library1.airnews.net...
> > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> > news:vm9hn3q1esl4fc@corp.supernews.com...
> > > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > > news:bk2bmq$jkj@library1.airnews.net...
> > > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > >
> > > No new nuclear power generation is
> > > > planned, 'least not that I know of...
> > > >
> > > > Kim W5TIT
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > that's because the environmental wackos are doing thier damndest
> > > to fight them, at every level of governement and in every manner
> > > of social disobedience...
> > >
> >
> > Has nothing to do with "wackos", Clint. Nothing at all. It has
> everything
> > to do with Board Room decisions for publicly held corporations who have
> > learned thier lesson losses from the construction, start-up, and
> generation
> > of power from nuclear power plants. They are not cost effective in any
> way.
> > They've become a pariah on the backs of the companies who have already
> built
> > and own them.
> >
> > >
> > > This is why california hasn't built any new power plants in 10 years
> > > while experiencing a DOUBLING of population.... resulting in
> > > the blackouts they just had.
> > >
> > > Clint
> > > KB5ZHT
> > >
> >
> > Sad to say, I think you're totally wrong. The above statement(s) are
> > speculative at best and sensationalistic at worst. Nuclear power is

> > economically unfeasible--proven by the plants already built and generating
> > in this country. Leave alone all the implications of environmental and
> > health impacts. They are just plain bad economics.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
> So why hasn't California built any oil, coal, or hydroelectric power platns
> in the last ten years? I'll tell you. They too are being blocked by the
> environmentalists. Are they also economically unfeasible? It's unlikely.
>

She's wrong, of course, Dee. The newest nuclear power plant (AFAIK) is also the most modern and has the most output- Palo Verde, 50 miles west of Phoenix,.AZ.
It's *quite* different in construction than any other I've seen - if you didn't know it was a nuke you couldn't tell it from sight. No large cooling towers at all.
Power in that region is cheaper than it is in Missouri where we use coal fired plants with some hydroelectric, used mostly for peaking.

Interesting aside-the Thomas Hill coal fired plant in north Missouri was located where it is solely because of the large coal mine facility which is there.But-it turned out that coal was of high sulphur content.
So after the acid rain fuss got going, they had to stop burning Thomas Hill coal and import all the coal they use - low sulphur coal from Wyoming!

3821. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 03:44:57 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hl8cqn9.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 77236

On Sun, 14 Sep 2003 23:28:56 -0400, Jerry wrote:

>I like THIS one. AW, poor cop, no donut. LOL!!!

That's what happens when you put radio-based enforcement in the hands of unclued-in officers. It should have never gotten past the initial field stop.

Of course, if the amateur op doesn't have his license with him, the officer has reasonable cause to believe that the pre-emption does not cover him even though it still does, and if the rig has been modified so that it is capable of TRANSMITTING on the police frequency, the pre-emption is not valid even if the operator is a licensed amateur (per the FCC Public Notice on this matter many years ago).

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

3822. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 04:02:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F653A2F.7060501@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77237

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> So why hasn't California built any oil, coal, or hydroelectric power platns
> in the last ten years? I'll tell you. They too are being blocked by the
> environmentalists. Are they also economically unfeasible? It's unlikely.

Do you think it's that simple Dee? Another scenario is that the shakers
and movers found in more profitable to try to buy and sell existing
power from each other, until the inevitble happened. And it's not just
in CA. Its all over

3823. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 04:07:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <3Wa9b.12918$Aq2.8891@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77238

"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
news:r489b.61835$3b2.8129302@twister.neo.rr.com...
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> news:vm9ptb2m1ok1f3@corp.supernews.com...
> > LOL!
> >
> > A good liberal? you have NO idea..... I'm as right wing
> > and conservative as they come... evidently you don't read
> > my other posts or in other NG's either, where i'm referred
> > to as the "jim birch devil"
> >
> > Clint
> > KB5ZHT
> >
> You can't be a conservative, we believe in earning your way in life, not
> having "things" given to you because you are to lazy to EARN them. Sound
> familiar Liberal boy?
>
> Conservative my ass!

Earning your way is fine...as long as the requirement(s)
is relevent...that's were you lose your argument.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3824. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 04:07:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <4Wa9b.12919$Aq2.6141@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77239

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk36jc$mmq$0@208.207.71.169...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:O6%8b.2868$nQ.1193559@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> > > news:vm8ucqlp6pd301@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > When I took my drivers test years ago to get a license
> > > > to drive an automobile, the never required me to
> > > > prove that I could hitch a horse team to a wagon.
> > > > The youngsters today, likewise, tell me that the
> > > > departments of motor vehicles around the country
> > > > do not ask them to prove they are proficient with
> > > > buggy whips.
> > > >
> > > > Enough said.
> > > >
> > > > Clint
> > >
> > > The youngsters today still tell me that they must learn to use a
pencil
> > and
> > > learn to write script. Typing and word processing are taught AFTER
they
> > > have learned to write manually. Enough said.
> >
> > Bad anology since morse isn't a foundation to any other
> > body of radio knowledge and/or language skills or
> > writing skills.
>
> Wrong, because radiotelegraphy IS the most basic radio communications
mode,
> the use of which is possible only if the operator has self-trained enough
to
> be able to make use of it.

IF morse (i.e. radiotelegraphy) had any basis as a foundation
for higher learning of radio concepts, principles or theory
then it would be a requirement of engineering students...which
it has never been to my knowledge anywhere.
```

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3825. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 04:08:56 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <sXa9b.12933$Aq2.3697@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77240

```
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:ji99b.3776$nQ.1307672@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:gK69b.11421$NM1.9850@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:O6%8b.2868$nQ.1193559@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > >
> > > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> > > news:vm8ucqlp6pd301@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > When I took my drivers test years ago to get a license
> > > > to drive an automobile, the never required me to
> > > > prove that I could hitch a horse team to a wagon.
> > > > The youngsters today, likewise, tell me that the
> > > > departments of motor vehicles around the country
> > > > do not ask them to prove they are proficient with
> > > > buggy whips.
> > > >
> > > > Enough said.
> > > >
> > > > Clint
> > >
> > > The youngsters today still tell me that they must learn to use a
pencil
> > and
> > > learn to write script. Typing and word processing are taught AFTER
they
> > > have learned to write manually. Enough said.
> >
> > Bad anology since morse isn't a foundation to any other
> > body of radio knowledge and/or language skills or
> > writing skills.
> >
>
> Manual printing and cursive aren't a foundation for any other skills
either.
> All notes can now be take by digital recorders or entered into a PDA.
Bills
> can be paid on line eliminating the need to sign checks. Debit cards can
be
> used in stores and you enter your PIN number. Credit cards could be
> converted to that system too. Manual printing and cursive can be totally
> eliminated as they are not needed as a foundation for any language skills
```

> since one can learn to read without writing. Composition doesn't need
> manual skills either. It can all be done on the typewriter or word
> processor.
>
> Let's have a go at "No Handwriting International".
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Exaggeration to the ridiculous.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3826. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 04:15:30 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <C1b9b.12994$Aq2.3666@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77241

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hl8cqn9.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Sun, 14 Sep 2003 23:28:56 -0400, Jerry wrote:
>
> >I like THIS one. AW, poor cop, no donut. LOL!!!
>
> That's what happens when you put radio-based enforcement in the
> hands of unclued-in officers. It should have never gotten past the
> initial field stop.

It doesn't say much about the inteligence level of the prosecutor's
office either.

> Of course, if the amateur op doesn't have his license with him, the
> officer has reasonable cause to believe that the pre-emption does
> not cover him even though it still does,

But surly such an oversight would have been "cleared up" before
any actual trial.

> and if the rig has been
> modified so that it is capable of TRANSMITTING on the police
> frequency, the pre-emption is not valid even if the operator is a
> licensed amateur (per the FCC Public Notice on this matter many
> years ago).

I didn't see that as the case with the federal preemption as I read it.
What happens now that most radios will need to be modified to
operate on the 5MHz band?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3827. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 04:38:58 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93F767A486D4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 77242

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
news:C1b9b.12994$Aq2.3666@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
> news:xnfcneeyarg.hl8cqn9.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
>> On Sun, 14 Sep 2003 23:28:56 -0400, Jerry wrote:
>>
>> >I like THIS one. AW, poor cop, no donut. LOL!!!
>>
>> That's what happens when you put radio-based enforcement in the
>> hands of unclued-in officers. It should have never gotten past the
>> initial field stop.
>
> It doesn't say much about the inteligence level of the prosecutor's
> office either.
>
>> Of course, if the amateur op doesn't have his license with him, the
>> officer has reasonable cause to believe that the pre-emption does
>> not cover him even though it still does,
>
> But surly such an oversight would have been "cleared up" before
> any actual trial.
>
>> and if the rig has been
>> modified so that it is capable of TRANSMITTING on the police
>> frequency, the pre-emption is not valid even if the operator is a
>> licensed amateur (per the FCC Public Notice on this matter many
>> years ago).
>
> I didn't see that as the case with the federal preemption as I read it.
> What happens now that most radios will need to be modified to
> operate on the 5MHz band?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
>

Good point Bill. I use my FT-817 in my car. If I modified it to transmit
on 5 MHz it would be able to transmit on police frequencies too.

3828. Re: Cunningham violates copyright law at new web site

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 04:53:21 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F6545C0.4000606@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 77243
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Lloyd wrote:

>Jon Cunningham, K1TP, stole the picture he published at
>http://myrockport.com/cover.jpg from
>
>http://voy.voyeurweb.com/main/voe38/vs20030901-48078/index.html
>
>even though, right above the stolen photo, is the clear warning: "The
>photos below may only be downloaded for your private pleasure. You
>may not republish them at another web site or anywhere else."
>
>That makes Cunningham a thief and a copyright violator.
>
>
>
Maybe not. The photo still had the orginal attribution on it (the web
address)
and might be "fair use". You can quote or copy a small portion of a work
but be sure to mention where you got it from.

3829. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 05:25:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk3igb$it8$0@208.206.142.91>
Source record: 77244

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bk36jcmmq0@208.207.71.169...
> >
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > > news:O6%8b.2868$nQ.1193559@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > > >
> > > > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> > > > news:vm8ucqlp6pd301@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > When I took my drivers test years ago to get a license
> > > > > to drive an automobile, the never required me to
> > > > > prove that I could hitch a horse team to a wagon.
> > > > > The youngsters today, likewise, tell me that the
> > > > > departments of motor vehicles around the country
> > > > > do not ask them to prove they are proficient with
> > > > > buggy whips.
> > > > >
> > > > > Enough said.
> > > > >
> > > > > Clint
> > > > >
> > > > The youngsters today still tell me that they must learn to use a
> pencil
> > > and
> > > > learn to write script. Typing and word processing are taught AFTER
> they
> > > > have learned to write manually. Enough said.
> > >
> > > Bad anology since morse isn't a foundation to any other
> > > body of radio knowledge and/or language skills or
> > > writing skills.
> >
> > Wrong, because radiotelegraphy IS the most basic radio communications
> mode,
> > the use of which is possible only if the operator has self-trained enough
> to
> > be able to make use of it.
>
> IF morse (i.e. radiotelegraphy) had any basis as a foundation
> for higher learning of radio concepts, principles or theory

> then it would be a requirement of engineering students...which
> it has never been to my knowledge anywhere.

And that's where your argument falls flat on its face. The point is operational, on the air *communications *. It's called OPERATING. Has nada to do with anything beyond, although placing a radiotelegraph on the air on HF happens to be, as well, the most simple of stations to get up and running.

It's the BASICS, Bill. When you can't appreciate the fact that radiotelegraphy is radio at its most basic it's no wonder
you can't understand the concept.

The entire point is that radiotelegraphy using manually encoded Morse remains as one of the most, effective, and COST EFFECTIVE means of radiocommunications, even after all the years it has been in excistence. But only when operators self-train to gain the skill to use it.

The FCC has every reason and more than ample justification to require EVERY ham to be able to actually pass traffic in Morse on the air. It's easy to make a case that the ability is a valid requirement for licensing. The fact that they have not chosen to do so is far more related to the wants and desires of a vocal few, and a whole lot of PC, than the actual operational traffic-handling capacities of the ARS.

Now you'll come back with the same old saw about how it's "no longer sued" for this or that. Just as though no such need will ever again present to the ARS, ever, under any circumstances. Whatta crystal ball jock you are!

3830. Re: ARRL Policy Shift?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 05:55:04 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b75$p383g$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77410

The closest thing I saw to that was the MOU with REACT.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bjtjqquj0@208.206.142.72...
>
>
> Jack Twilley wrote:
>
> > -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> > Hash: SHA1
> >
> > >>>>> "Dick" == Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> writes:
> >
> > Dick> Lessee, now....You're happy that K1ZZ published an editorial in
> > Dick> QST suggesting combining CB and ham radio?
> >
> > Cite, please?
> >
>
> I no longer keep QST beyond the past year or so, therefore I no longer
> have the issue where he broached the subject in his monthly "It seems to
> us" column. But it sure was there some time back, a year and a half or
> two years ago, maybe a little longer. Look through your old QSTs and
> you'll find it.
>
> I think he was testing the waters,and I should not be surprised if he
> found them uncomfortably warm!
>
> Dick
>

3831. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 05:56:52 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b77$p383g$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77411

Just wanted to know why 13 was some type of magic number.

Thanks,

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> >
>
> Because, for most people, the speed of 13 WPM meant you could ACTUALLY
COPY
> Morse Code.
>
> For most folks, up to about 12 WPM you could copy it and NOT actually know
> it.
>
> Most countries in the world required 12 WPM. The US Military only wanted
10
> Groups per minute. Groups meaning 5 letter 'groups' in a 1 minute period.
>
> That help?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

3832. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 05:57:37 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b78$p383g$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77412

Yeah, understand that, but was wondering of the logic behind that "specific"
number.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030911214829.23171.00000686@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <bjqv2t$mddbp$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >I still am curious why the "middle" code test speed was set at
> >thirteen..... Why not 12 or 14????
>
> FCC decision in 1936.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

3833. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 06:10:52 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b79$p383g$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77413

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030911214828.23171.00000685@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <bjqv35$mddbp$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Yeah, that might be true if you have HF capability........
>
> All you need is a simple CW receiver and an antenna. W1AW runs the legal
limit
> into serious antennas; it should pound into MI on 80 and 40 with no
problem.

Don't even have a shortwave reciever at this point, as where I live the RFI is ridiculous as hell. My current residence also as well must have been lined with lead at some point, as nothing can be recieved by either tv or broadcast am/fm radio either......

Until I move, HF is pretty much out of the question.....

>
> >> I've sed it before I'll say it again: The W1AW code practice sessions
> >> and getting on the air ASAP are the best methods out there for
> >> learning the code. The 1AW sessions are reliable, they're not
> >> repetitive and you can pace yourself without breaking a sweat
> >> depending on your own set of learning curve variables. Yes it's
> >> Farnsworth and 1AW Farnworth has obviously worked for decades. Now go
> >> copy 1AW 5wpm sessions until you "get it".
>
> Hope you are feeling better, Ryan.
>

Thanks, definitely better, but have a bit to go yet.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

3834. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 06:12:38 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b7a$p383g$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77414

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bjso8p$m13$1@208.206.142.71...
>
>
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bjqv35$mddbp$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > > Yeah, that might be true if you have HF capability........
> >
> > Can't argue with that. But as Jim points out it doesn't take much of a
> > radio and antenna to at least listen on HF. What's the show-stopper in
> > your case?
> >
>
> Desire, obviously

Yes, as in regards to listening to HF voice..... Sounds just like listening
to CB. No, it is environmental conditions. Killer RFI that would make BPL
look like nothing.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3835. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 06:18:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030915021845.23171.00000764@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 77248

In article <f45722ac.0309141651.384a64a5@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030914121856.02537.00000567@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0309140512.7d45f76a@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
>> >news:<IuP8b.57189$3b2.7364893@twister.neo.rr.com>...
>> >> If your not a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, there is a CW contest
>> >> going one right now.
>> >>
>> >> If you are a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, then never mind, it's a
>> Ham
>> >> Radio thing. You would not understand.
>> >>
>> >> 10-73's!
>> >
>> >Rev. Jim is going to chastise you for your dirty mouth.
>>
>> Who are you talking about, Brian?
>
>"Shephed"

Then you weren't talking about me at all. OK.
>
>> >Oh, never mind, it's a PCTA thing.
>>
>> You mean like the way you never censure Len or Carl (or anybody else who
>> happens to oppose code tests), no matter what they say or how they say it?
>
>Never?

I can't recall you ever censuring Len or Carl or anybody else who is against
code tests. Can you give us an example where you took them to task for their
behavior here?

>Rev. Jim, even little lies will get you turned away from the gate.

Who are you talking to?
>
>> Oh, never mind, it's an NCTA double standards thing.
>
>I guess as long as "shephed" is spouting the party line, its OK with
>you that he calls people "retarded mouth-breeding NCI members."

No, it's not OK.

3836. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 06:18:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030915021846.23171.00000766@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 77245

In article <go49b.4882$Fj6.491@news02.roc.ny>, "Steve Stone"
<spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> writes:

>I think anyone who is a train engineer should pass a test for operating a
>coal fired steam locomotive

The term usually used is "locomotive engineer"

If the railroad they intend to work for uses coal fired steam locomotives,
learning how to run them would be a good idea.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3837. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 06:18:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030915021846.23171.00000765@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 77246

In article <vm9usff4mpm58f@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
<rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:

>sending and receiving CW isn't a building block
>to anything else.....

Yes, it is.

First, it's a building block to the use of the mode on the air. Although other services have pretty much stopped using Morse Code, hams use it extensivley, and an amateur license is permission to operate an amateur station, not a station in another service. Note that the Morse Code tests are at a very basic level. They're entry-level, nothing more.

Second, if someone wants to actually design and build radio equipment, having skill in Morse Code permits them to use almost anything from very simple to very sophisticated equipment to good advantage. Would you expect a newcomer to radio to build an SSB transceiver as a first project?

>now, the electrical principals of what a CW
>transmission is, and a knowledge test of that is a good idea, but
>that's comparing apples and oranges.

Why should there be *any* written test on theory if all a person wants to do is operate manufactured radios? If someone doesn't want to build a rig, why should they have to memorize all those symbols, diagrams and formulas?

>I think most of the PCTA
>is being disingenuous when they come up with "good reasons"
>to keep CW testing alive;

Why?

> I think the true deeper reason lies
>somewhere in the "I had to do it so everybody should" relm,
>as i've stated before.
>
You can think what you want, but you're mistaken on that account.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3838. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 06:18:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030915021847.23171.00000767@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 77247

In article <Yx69b.3728$nQ.1280192@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
>news:vm9qa2h7qsddec@corp.supernews.com...
>>
>> >
>> > The youngsters today still tell me that they must learn to use a pencil
>> and
>> > learn to write script. Typing and word processing are taught AFTER they
>> > have learned to write manually. Enough said.
>> >
>> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >
>>
>> yes, if we were talking about a degree in literature from a school or
>> college,
>> which we are not.
>>
>> Clint
>> KB5ZHT
>>
>
>This is elementary school, middle school, and high school. Perhaps I should
>have used the word cursive instead of script as you seem to have totally
>misinterpreted my statement to mean something else.
>
>Students must learn printing and writing in cursive before they are taught
>typing and word processing.
>
Yep. And they must learn to do basic arithmetic *by hand* even though calculators and computers are inexpensive and widely available.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3839. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 06:27:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <zZc9b.11931$NM1.11435@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77249

"Brian" wrote:
>
> No, no, no. Bruce didn't memorize anything. He took
> the exam on a lark, w/o studying, and scored 100%.
> Furthermore, he did it in under 8 minutes, and collected
> $250 from a couple of "CB Plussers" who bet he
> couldn't do it.

Well, if true, I'm certainly impressed. But, of course, I have serious doubts about that claim. In fact, I would consider it almost impossible (and Bruce certainly doesn't seem like the type of person who could go around doing the impossible). Heck, it would take almost eight minutes for even the fastest reader to read over the the exam questions. And, considering some of the questions in the pool (band limits, etc), I doubt one could pass without at least some study (even if the study is nothing more than experience).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3840. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 06:38:51 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b7b$p383g$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77415

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309131210.2fc6d587@posting.google.com...
> W1AW also sends Morse Code practice on VHF, if you live close enough.
> But I don't think 8-land is close enough.

Definitely, maybe the supposed field organizations can get together to
rebroadcast the transmissions?? Sounds like an actual good idea.

>
> If not, Jim can tell you how to build an Elecraft K1 out of junk box
> parts, or something like that.

Nice idea, but it will be deaf, as that is the problem until I move, which
won't be happening for another 2 years. Will have to suffer till then.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bjqv35$mddbp$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > Yeah, that might be true if you have HF capability........
> >
> > > I've sed it before I'll say it again: The W1AW code practice sessions
> > > and getting on the air ASAP are the best methods out there for
> > > learning the code. The 1AW sessions are reliable, they're not
> > > repetitive and you can pace yourself without breaking a sweat
> > > depending on your own set of learning curve variables. Yes it's
> > > Farnsworth and 1AW Farnworth has obviously worked for decades. Now go
> > > copy 1AW 5wpm sessions until you "get it".
> > >
> > >
> > > w3rv

3841. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 06:43:37 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b7d$p383g$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77416

Pure bullshit Dan, the formula changes for a quarter wave versus a half wave versus a full wave. 468/freq. in Mhz is for a half-wave dipole. The specific for a quarter-wave is half that. And so on and so forth.

If the person specified which length they were looking for I would have popped up the correct answer, as far out to the right of the decimal as you want (yes, calculated by hand, not calculator. I do it the old fashioned way), but they didn't specify which wavelength they were looking for.

> > > What is the length of a dipole for 14.240Mhz?
> > >
> >
> > Of what wavelength???? That is an important factor in the equation.
> >
> >
> >
>
> Congratulations you have just proven you have NO CONCEPT of what was asked.
>
> Does 468 divided by Frequency in Mhz mean anything to you?
>

Yep... for a half-wave dipole.

> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

3842. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 06:44:56 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ldd9b.11939$NM1.6819@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77250

"charlesb" wrote:
>
> Keep in mind the fact that fossil-fuel burning plants pollute
> while working perfectly. Unlike the nuclear plants, they
> don't have to wait for an accident in order to cause a
> problem.

Most would consider the massive amounts of nuclear waste (from spent fuel, contaminated building materials from closed plants, and so on) a "problem." People over many generations will have to deal with those waste products. And, of course, this environmental polution is far worse than anything generated by fossil-fuel burning plants. So, your claim above ("unlike the nuclear plants...") is patently false.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3843. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 06:59:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <9rd9b.11944$NM1.2479@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77401

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Because they are blocked on every hand by people
> who operate on emotions rather data.

Exactly what data is that, Dee? I've read lots of data on nuclear power plants and little of it supports your views on that industry. When all things are factored in (construction, deconstruction, waste management, and so on), nuclear power is the most expensive power generated. At the present time, most of that cost is being shouldered by the American taxpayers, not the present or past plant owners. Of course, that fact, and only that fact, makes nuclear power profitable for the owners (which is exactly why they continue to push for new plants).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3844. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 07:10:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2Cd9b.11949$NM1.9387@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77402

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Dissipation will be by the inverse square law so at 1000
> miles from the plant it will have a concentration of only
> 1 millioneth of the concentration at the release site. (snip)

Wind currents don't follow laws, Dee. There will be areas with much higher concentrations, and areas with much lower concentrations, over a given geographical area.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3845. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 07:20:45 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b7e$p383g$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77417

Yep, and I didn't see it specifying whether it was a half-wave or not. Regardless of the fact I DO know how to calculate it or any fraction of a full wavelength.

If the question was "What is the length of a quarter-wave dipole for 14.240Mhz?" or "What is the length of a half-wave dipole for 14.240Mhz?" or whatever then I would have answered right of the bat. Yeah, it is simple to do that formula, but to give the answer would be hard unless you gave ALL of the possibilities such as below:

one-sixteenth wave @ 14.240Mhz = 4.108146
one-eighth wave @ 14.240Mhz = 8.216292
three-sixteenth wave @ 14.240Mhz = 12.324438
quarter-wave @ 14.240Mhz = 16.432584
five-sixteenth wave @ 14.240Mhz = 20.54073
three-eighths wave @ 14.240Mhz = 24.648876
seven-sixteenths wave @ 14.240Mhz = 28.757022
half-wave @ 14.240Mhz = 32.8651685
nine-sixteenths wave @ 14.240Mhz = 36.973314
five-eighths wave @ 14.240Mhz = 41.08146
eleven-sixteenths wave @ 14.240Mhz = 45.189606
three-quarter wave @ 14.240Mhz = 49.297752
thirteen-sixteenths wave @ 14.240Mhz = 53.405898
seven-eigths wave @ 14.240Mhz = 57.514044
fifteen-sixteenths wave @ 14.240Mhz = 61.62219
full wave dipole @ 14.240Mhz = 65.730337

All of the above answers would be correct (barring accidental typos), but the original poster of the question in the first place DID NOT SPECIFY. See, it is important, unless you consider ALL antennas to be exactly one-half wavelength in length.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

>
> As you know from studying for your Technician license (and the material
also
> appears in the General study guide), you can calculate the length of your
> half-wave dipole directly knowing only the frequency. The equation is:
>
> Length in feet = 468 divided by the frequency in megahertz.
>

> Also from these same study guides, you can calculate the wavelength by the
> following equation.
>
> Wavelength in meters = 300 divided by the frequency in megahertz
> (of course if you wish you can then convert the answer to feet).
>
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

3846. Re: Go Numorse!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 07:26:37 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b7f$p383g$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77418

Hey Mike,

It actually is a good program. A neat function of the program is to be able to create of wave file of whatever is sent, including the text (in morse code) from a text file being sent. Then the wave files can be burned to a CD or made into a MP3.

I have solicited in the past for sample realistic QSO's from people but didn't get much, but those could be completely awesome practice CD's!!!!!! :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F60C3C6.7040801@psu.edu...
> I don't do much in the way of Morse CW on the air. Much of the reason
> for this has been due to some difficulties I have, but enough about that.
>
> As a personal challenge, I've decided to see if I can bring my Morse
> speed up quite a bit. I started with the ARRL code CD's that I bought a
> few years back when I wanted to first learn Morse CW.
>
> Would you believe that after two years I still have those CD's
> memorized? I couldn't believe it - I remembered exactly the letters and
> words they were using. So in the end, I don't know if I'd recommend the
> CD's, except to those that have a real quick pickup of Morse, and how do
> you know that until you try?
>
> So I tried NuMorse. Great program! I've been working with it for a few
> weeks now, and have gotten my speed up to around ten WPM, 13 on a good
> day. Soon I'll be ready to *really* do Morse CW. I intend to get up to
> 20 wpm before I get on the air. just because I expect to slow down under
> real over the air conditions.
>
> NuMorse sends out pseudo random groups that can't be memorized. It will
> also make up QSO's or load texfile QSO's that you can load into it.
> Anyone know of a good source for these?
>
> My only criticism of the program is that the prosigns are a little
> awkward, requiring use of the shift key which can slow you down a bit.
>
> Still I would rate the program as 9.5 out of 10.

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

3847. Re: Go Numorse!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 07:27:23 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b7g$p383g$10@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77420

Any questions about the program, just let me know.... Would be glad to help!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F6133A2.8060006@adelphia.net...
> Bert Craig wrote:
> > Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:<3F60C3C6.7040801@psu.edu>...
> >
> >>I don't do much in the way of Morse CW on the air. Much of the reason
> >>for this has been due to some difficulties I have, but enough about
that.
> >>
> >> As a personal challenge, I've decided to see if I can bring my Morse
> >>speed up quite a bit. I started with the ARRL code CD's that I bought a
> >>few years back when I wanted to first learn Morse CW.
> >>
> >> Would you believe that after two years I still have those CD's
> >>memorized? I couldn't believe it - I remembered exactly the letters and
> >>words they were using. So in the end, I don't know if I'd recommend the
> >>CD's, except to those that have a real quick pickup of Morse, and how do
> >>you know that until you try?
> >>
> >> So I tried NuMorse. Great program! I've been working with it for a few
> >>weeks now, and have gotten my speed up to around ten WPM, 13 on a good
> >>day. Soon I'll be ready to *really* do Morse CW. I intend to get up to
> >>20 wpm before I get on the air. just because I expect to slow down under
> >>real over the air conditions.
> >>
> >> NuMorse sends out pseudo random groups that can't be memorized. It will
> >>also make up QSO's or load texfile QSO's that you can load into it.
> >>Anyone know of a good source for these?
> >>
> >> My only criticism of the program is that the prosigns are a little
> >>awkward, requiring use of the shift key which can slow you down a bit.
> >>
> >> Still I would rate the program as 9.5 out of 10.
> >>
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >

> >
> > Kewl beans, Mike. I too used the ARRL CD's and while they initially
> > served their purpose, one does tend to memorize the groups. Anytime
> > you want to subject your ears to some ear-punishing <hihi> slo-code,
> > drop me an e-mail and we'll set up a sked. Jim, N2EY, and I recently
> > had a nice CW QSO on 40 and "three land" comes in pretty well here.
> > Thanks for the recommendation and take care. :-)
>
> Sure thing! I'll keep folks posted on my progress and we'll set things
> up soon.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

3848. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 07:29:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <aTd9b.11953$NM1.7411@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77403

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> True fact: The *original* antismoking campaigns had
> nothing to do with health concerns. Their real problem
> with smoking was that it was perceived to be an
> activity done *only* for pleasure - and therefore evil!
> (You have to eat and sleep, so those activities were not
> targeted as much).

Actually, I have a much more suspicious mind. The government's effort against smoking stepped up greatly in the late 50's, just in time to draw attention away from the health effects of the nuclear weapons tests of that time period. And, amazingly so, the "discovered" negative health effects commonly associated with smoking are almost identical to the negative health effects commonly associated with nuclear fallout (lung cancer, etc.). Amazing coincidence, isn't it? If true, an anti-smoking campaign would be a great "smoke" screen.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3849. Re: Going under the knife

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 07:34:24 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b7i$p383g$11@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77419

Actually this is supposed to be the "corrective" surgery, but you are
probably right anyhow HI HI.

Thank god for Vicoden and Ibuprophen.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:KF88b.1120$%G3.200@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Good luck...but, get ready for a life of pain.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:bjqv32$mddbp$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > Thanks for all of the wonderful responses and I am definitely feeling
alot
> > better. I am not back to 100% but getting there over the next couple of
> > weeks or so.
> >
> > I had corrective surgery to repair a problem in my lower back as a
result
> of
> > being in a car accident in 1997. Thank god it isn't vertebrae related.
> > According to the doc, I shouldn't have any more problems as long as this
> > heals properly.
> >
> > Thanks again,
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> > .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20030904210819.29660.00000475@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > > In article <bj3kad$f2s35$9@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan,
KC8PMX"
> > > <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
> > >
> > > >To all my friends, combatants, debaters and lurkers here in r.r.a.p,

> > > >
> > > >I will be going under the knife this Tuesday for surgery on my lower
> back
> > > >and won't be back for about a week or so. I am quiet sure that I am
> not
> > > >going to feel like being in the upright position for the next week
(or
> > doing
> > > >much of anything for that matter) , so everyone have a great week and
> > > >probably next week I will have a ton of catching up to do.
> > >
> > > Ryan:
> > >
> > > I hope that the surgery turns out satisfactorily, and wish you a very
> > > speedy recovery! We'll keep the light on in the window for you. Just
> > > take your time, don't do anything you're not supposed to, and get
> > > well soon!
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

3850. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 07:50:53 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b7j$p383g$12@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77421

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F61383C.8000906@adelphia.net...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > How many cases are there where you can parallel park anyways, except for
in
> > bigger cities??
>
> For all that matter, I can always pay someone to paralell park if I
> absolutely had to!

True.... I can pay Sprint to provide my cell service too.... Or a different angle, if you have a "monster truck" type of pickup, to hell with parallel parking, just drive over/onto etc. your parking spot! HI HI

>
> > Ryan KC8PMX
> > Confirmed Parallel Parker and Proud! I had to learn, so do you!!!!!!
>
> HAH! more of that hazing attitude! You PP'ers will be the ruination of
> driving!

Hey... I had to learn it....

Ryan

>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

3851. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 08:11:16 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b7k$p383g$13@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77422

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030913003319.12501.00002367@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <bjqv39$mddbp$11@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Wow, there's at least one thing we are equal and agree upon Larry!!!!! :)
:)
> >
> >Ryan KC8PMX
> >MI-Chauffers and Emergency Vehicle Permit holder
> >Confirmed Parallel Parker And Proud!
>
> Ryan:
>
> As one PP'er to another, it is an honor to know you! It's nice to know
that
> we're morally and intellectually superior to the dumbed-down, unwashed,
> non-PP'ing hoardes of inferior drivers.

Should we form an official club, pay some dues, wear a ton of
patches/buttons etc.?? lol

>
> Michigan still has "Chauffeur's" licenses? Which class of CDL is that
> equivalent to? Here in Delaware, I'm told that Emergency Vehicle
> operators don't require anything more than a standard Class D Driver's
> license. They do, however, have to be a card-carrying member of
> the "Emergency Service" (usually a local volunteer FD) to which
> the emergency vehicle is registered.

The MI Chauffers is one step down from the National CDL thingy as I believe
if I remember correctly it allows you to drive any vehicle 25,999Lbs and
under, as well as tow any trailer under that same weight. For passenger
vehicles, up to 15, otherwise that would require the CDL-C if memory serves
correctly. It also is the same license that covers a "driver for hire" from
anything from a pizza or other delivery person, limo driver etc. I had a
CDL a while back but have not elected to get it again.

Michigan has a specific class, which entails a 6 hour classroom
instruction, a skills driving course (1-2 hours depending on the course,
instructor etc.) and 8 hours driving with your chief to qualify for the
permit. As long as you pass the requirements for this, you can drive
emergency vehicles under emergency and non-emergency official department
business within the state of Michigan. Exception would be if you are
transporting the vehicle across state lines such as if your department were

buying a used pumper from another department in a different state, that
would require a CDL license.......

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

3852. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 08:13:09 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b7l$p383g$14@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77424

Larry,

The heck with those anti-parallel parkers!!!!! Tell him that if he isn't a
Real Driver (tm), he is inferior. HI HI

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> Brian:
>
> I'm very sorry about your inferiority complex, but I was just asking for
> some information from Ryan about driver's licenses. This is not about
> my "superiority" or anything else that you should be whining about --
> unless you are having problems of your own. Care to talk about it?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

3853. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 08:14:54 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b7m$p383g$15@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77423

I would have gotten 100% of the Michigan Secretary of States drivers info
had I been on line when posting that and any responses, but I download daily
and respond offline.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> Larry, you might want to check with Michigan's BMV if you're after
> licensing information. No, don't.
>
> Just relax and enjoy the knowledge that there's another PPer in your
> midsts.

3854. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 08:15:48 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b7n$p383g$16@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77425

Ummmm, we are still talking about parallel parking when referring to PP eh?
:)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX

>
> But PP'ers are so arrogant and superior minded that they think they can
> PP wherever they want!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> President, No Parallel Parking Test International
>
> taking driving into the future
>

3855. Re: schematics wanted - "jamming device"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 08:19:07 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b7o$p383g$17@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77426

Yes, it is vandalism, but a simple needle or pin placed directly in the coax
usually does the trick from what I hear. Or take some wire cutters, and
clip the wire, connect the shielding and center conductor of the coax
together and tape both ends back together with black electrical tape would
do the trick as well. Granted, not legal and probably not ethical either,
but the techniques would work in making it a little "quieter."

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vm7q5gctaihq42@corp.supernews.com...
> you got a local CB'r or ham that you're mad at,
> and want to plant a little device in his yard so
> his reception is dead, huh?
>
> I've heard people doing this before.... buying about
> $5 worth of parts at radio shack, putting together a
> transmitter the size of a matchbox and tossing it in
> somebody's yard one night where he won't ever find
> it... and until the small battery that is in it goes dead,
> his ears are plugged up and he can't hear a thing.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
>
>

3856. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 08:27:20 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b7p$p383g$18@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77427

Same here as well, but the basic would get full privileges except power, limited to 200 watts (who needs much more than that anyways) on only 2 bands, one HF and one VHF/UHF band. At least I remember I had some thought like that.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> >
> >
>
> I like it Jim. I suggested to FCC years ago to go with a 3 tier license
> structure. My major difference was to make the diverse modes a 'add on'
to
> the license. Instead of power restrictions.
>
> Would be a lot easier to regulate that way. Having to test for a 'add on
> endorsement' would still maintain the technical aspects of the ARS. And
> provide a way of continued learning.
>
> Just a thought.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

3857. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 08:37:29 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b7q$p383g$19@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77428

Yes and No..... Granted both failing will result in the loss of life, but
at least after the water drains off and everything dries out, you can still
live fairly well if you were one of the sucessful survivors. If a nuke
plant goes to hell, and leaks out a ton of radiation, it's many years before
you can do anything anywhere near the plant.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

>
> > But when a nuke plant has a problem, it's a BIG problem!
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> No bigger a problem than a hydroelectric dam breaking. The BIG problem is
> the slanted and sometimes false information that is spread by the media
just
> to have an exciting story.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

3858. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 08:47:08 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b7r$p383g$20@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77429

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:c4_8b.2861$nQ.1181502@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:L5Y8b.6644$Aq2.164@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "charlesb" wrote:
> > >
> > > One quick example: Irrationally afraid of nuclear
> > > power, the "PC police" has seen to it that we stick
> > > with the burning of fossil fuels for our electricity.
> > > How clever.
> > >
> > >
> > Irrationally afraid of nuclear power? According to the UN, there have
> been
> > 386 serious nuclear power plant accidents around the world (serious
> defined
> > as a significant release of nuclear material into the atmosphere).
Several
> > of those accidents have been right here in this country. In addition,
> there
> > have been over 6,000 nuclear weapons tests, resulting in millions of
tons
> of
> > radioactive material spread across this planet. Nobody is certain how
many
> > nuclear weapons accidents there have been. And, since records are not
> kept,
> > nobody is certain how many accidents there have been at nuclear research
> > facilities. The nuclear industry, peaceful or military, has been no
friend
> > to this planet or it's people. And that's not a "PC" perspective - it's
> > simple common sense.
>
> The following comments address power plants only. Weapons is an entirely
> different issue.
>
> Yes, irrationally afraid. The number of deaths from nuclear power plants
> pales into insignificance in comparison to the number of minors who have
> died to bring us coal to burn not only from accidents but black lung
> disease. The damage done from nuclear power plants pales into
> insignificance in comparison to the damage done from oil spills. More
> people have died from dams breaking than power plant accidents.
>

> If we applied the same logic and standards to other sources of power as we
> do to nuclear, we would not have any electricity at all. We'd have to
shut
> down every coal, oil, and hydroelectric power plant in the world.
>
> Nuclear power is the cleanest, safest, most efficient form of power
> generation available at this time.

Provided equipment is stable, and the "human error" doesn't factor in......

>
> Wind and solar have to be excluded at this time since the technology
doesn't
> exist to make these forms widely available on an efficient basis. And if
we
> follow the logic of some people in this group on other items, wind power
is
> too antiquated since it's been used for hundreds if not thousands of
years.

Wind is actually a good source, if there is a consistent breeze blowing enough to keep the blades of the windmill moving, and would seem to be fairly inexpensive to construct as well.

As far as solar, the cost of setting up systems are extremely expensive still as the manufacturers of such materials are willing to lower their prices any.......

>
> And let's compare nuclear power to some non-power industries. Are you
aware
> of how devastating accidents at chemical plants can be?

Yes.... Dow Chemical and Dow Corning are my neighbors.... and I am nervous on a daily basis.... From an insider that I know, at of one of those plants that shared this little tidbit of information..... there is 2 specific materials (they wouldn't state which two) were mixed or tampered with the wrong way in storage there that would level Midland County and make it into a crater, and pretty much create extensive damage to Saginaw and Genesee Counties, and part of the Northern portion of Oakland County as well. Makes the human error equation a little more relevant to me, especially if it is a terrorist related activity.

Have you ever seen
> a grain elevator explode from sparks causing the suspended dust to
explode?

Yep, the one I saw blew the top off of the silo, and burned for what like seemed forever!

>
> I'd rather live next to a nuclear power plant than any other type of power
> generating facility or any of several other industrial endeavors.

Not me as much.... would rather see more "natural" forms utilized if it were cost effective. That is the problem.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

3859. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 08:50:16 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk4b7t$p383g$21@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77430

Oh really.... Are you including "our side" or both sides in the war?

--
Ryan, KC8PMX

>
> And if you're going to discuss dangerous industrial processes, consider
this:
> The most dangerous common form of mechanized transportation in use today
in the
> USA are privately owned motor vehicles. Every year and a half, about as
many
> Americans die on US highways as died in the entire Vietnam war. Airlines,
> trains, buses and ships are far safer, yet few people refuse to drive or
ride
> in a car compared to other modes. Why?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

3860. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 09:58:01 UTC
From: "D. Stussy" <kd6lvw@bde-arc.ampr.org>
Message-ID: <Pine.LNX.4.58.0309150953490.332@kd6lvw.ampr.org>
Source record: 77404

On Mon, 15 Sep 2003, Phil Kane wrote:
> On Sun, 14 Sep 2003 23:28:56 -0400, Jerry wrote:
> >I like THIS one. AW, poor cop, no donut. LOL!!!
>
> That's what happens when you put radio-based enforcement in the
> hands of unclued-in officers. It should have never gotten past the
> initial field stop.

I wouldn't be surprised if that's not the last event in this story. I smell a 42 USC 1983 issue coming over the horizon (especially for "failure to train" - cf. Monell vs. Social Services of NYC).... He should sue.

> Of course, if the amateur op doesn't have his license with him, the
> officer has reasonable cause to believe that the pre-emption does
> not cover him even though it still does, and if the rig has been
> modified so that it is capable of TRANSMITTING on the police
> frequency, the pre-emption is not valid even if the operator is a
> licensed amateur (per the FCC Public Notice on this matter many
> years ago).

I disagree. Identity can be established with the driver's license, and a radio license lookup is no more complicated than radioing in a wants/warrant check on either a person or a registration check on a vehicle. With the data available, "knowledge is in hand."

3861. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 12:13:07 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309150413.20293998@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77405

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<9rd9b.11944$NM1.2479@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > Because they are blocked on every hand by people
> > who operate on emotions rather data.
>
>
> Exactly what data is that, Dee? I've read lots of data on nuclear power
> plants and little of it supports your views on that industry. When all
> things are factored in (construction, deconstruction, waste management, and
> so on), nuclear power is the most expensive power generated. At the present
> time, most of that cost is being shouldered by the American taxpayers, not
> the present or past plant owners. Of course, that fact, and only that fact,
> makes nuclear power profitable for the owners (which is exactly why they
> continue to push for new plants).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Chernobyl is what happens when you try to do nuclear power on the cheap.

3862. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 12:15:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309150415.5b657552@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77406

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<zZc9b.11931$NM1.11435@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" wrote:
> >
> > No, no, no. Bruce didn't memorize anything. He took
> > the exam on a lark, w/o studying, and scored 100%.
> > Furthermore, he did it in under 8 minutes, and collected
> > $250 from a couple of "CB Plussers" who bet he
> > couldn't do it.
>
>
> Well, if true, I'm certainly impressed. But, of course, I have serious
> doubts about that claim. In fact, I would consider it almost impossible (and
> Bruce certainly doesn't seem like the type of person who could go around
> doing the impossible). Heck, it would take almost eight minutes for even the
> fastest reader to read over the the exam questions. And, considering some of
> the questions in the pool (band limits, etc), I doubt one could pass without
> at least some study (even if the study is nothing more than experience).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

I don't have serious doubts about Bruce's claim. I simply don't beleive it.

3863. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 12:18:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030915081859.29660.00000652@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 77407

In article <9k99b.3778$nQ.1307964@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>So why hasn't California built any oil, coal, or hydroelectric power platns
>in the last ten years?

Some folks would say it's the "NIMBY" problem (Not In My Back Yard), but I say it's actually a "BANANA" problem (Build Absolutely Nothing Anywhere Near Anything). It's not just generating facilities - transmission facilities have the same problem.

>I'll tell you. They too are being blocked by the
>environmentalists.

Are you sure that's the only reason? Are none of the environmental considerations reasonable? Think about how often the ground shakes out there...

> Are they also economically unfeasible? It's unlikely.

No, it's very likely. Here's why:

First, for most of the past 10 years, investment capital has been drawn to the high-payoff telecom and dotcom industries. Until the bubble burst, those were a lot more promising to investors. A server farm can be put up in a fraction of the time that a generating plant requires, with the promise (back then) of a much larger ROI.

Second, the West has a long history of cheap electricity from govt. sponsored projects, most commonly hydro. What dies a typical Californian pay per kWH? Here in Philly, we pay something like 11 cents / kWH residential. NYC folks pay even more. What do they pay in SF or LA? (If the retail is cheap, wholesale must be even cheaper)

Third, the whold deregulation and Enron-type mess has caused anyone with any sense to avoid building actual facilties like the plague, because the market (which used to be one of the most stable and predictable) became completely unstable.

Fourth, the environmental/NIMBY/BANANA effects are greatest and most powerful in places like CA. They definitely play a role - but not the only role.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3864. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 12:19:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030915081900.29660.00000653@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 77408

In article <20030914230831.29815.00000616@mb-m21.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20030914081904.23307.00002990@mb-m29.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>With all due respect, Larry - were you there?
>
>Jim:
>
>Obviously not. Point?

That the same complaints you have about today's tests can be made by some of those who came before you.
>
>>Did you have to take a sending test?
>
>No, but I could have easily passed one.

"could have" and "did" are not the same thing.
>
>>Did you have to pass all of the elements to upgrade at the same time?
>
>No. You got me there.
>
>>Did you have to wait 2 years to even try the Extra?
>
>No. Ditto.
>
See?

>>>Challenging licensing requirements and
>>>uncompromising testing procedures.
>>
>>They've been "compromising" forever. Back before WW2 the exam was all >>blue book essays. Before 1960 there was diagram drawing. The tests I took in
>>1967-70 were "dumbed down" compared to those because my tests were all
>>multiple choice.
>
>Yeah, I know, and that's my point. However, the level of "dumbing-down"
>that has occurred just in the last few years is way out of porportion to that
>which took place from the beginning of FCC testing and the time you and I
>became licensed.

Those who had to do essays and draw diagrams might disagree.
>
>>>Of course, all that is waaaaay too
>>>PoliticKally IncorrecKt today, since someone with a particular ethnic
>>>origin, skin color, religion, "gender," or a hangnail might not be able
>>>to pass the first time or two. This certainly won't do in these
>>>enlightened times.
>>
>>None of that had anything to do with the license test changes.
>
>Oh, really? Prove it.

Just look at the records and the old regs. Nothing in there about ethnicity,
skin color, religion or gender. I dunno about hangnails.
>
>>Incentive Licensing came about in LBJ's time
>>
>>Dick Bash did his stuff (and got away with it) when Nixon and Ford were in
>>office
>
>>The change to the VE system happened under Reagan
>>
>>We got medical waivers because a "king" wanted a favor from George Bush 1.
>>
>>We also got a nocodeham license because of GB 1.
>>
>>Etc.
>
>Damn those Republicans! OBTW -- who was President when the
>"Restructuring" took place?

That would be Slick Willy Clinton.
>
>>>After all, it might "exclude" someone who is, in
>>>reality, a nascent technical genius who just needs the ability to talk
>>>on the HF phone bands in order to find the inspiration to create the
>>>next fabulous new invention which will revolutionize electronic
>>>communication for the rest of all time!
>>>
>>Or something like that.
>>
>>Don't hold yer breath waiting for it, tho.
>
>Trust me, I'm not.
>
Me neither.

So, have you commented on each of the 7 petitions now before FCC?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3865. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 12:24:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309150424.398ad11e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77409

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030914230831.29815.00000617@mb-m21.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0309140452.72c337bd@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >
> >Larry, instead of complaining all of the time about others, why don't
> >you relate to us how you've revolutionized radio communications?
> >
> >BTW, how's your WAS coming?
> >
> >Saw in QST where a ham had 48 states in 1957, then completed WAS with
> >Hawaii and Nevada in 2003. No doubt another revolutionizing operator.
>
> Brian:
>
> I *have* worked all 50 states; however, I've never received a QSL card from
> North Dakota. BTW, I worked all 50 mainly from the mobile HF station I
> had in my '78 Plymouth Horizon while stationed at Andrews AFB, MD. And,
> in case you're wondering, it was mainly CW, with some SSB contacts.
> BTW2: It was done between Sept. 1981 and Feb. 1983, so it took me a
> whole 18 months. Sorry to disappoint you.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry, I'm not disappointed, but you should be. Talk to Dave sometime
about ARRL award programs. Condensed version: If you don't have all
the cards, you don't have the award.

So you still need to confirm North Dakota for WAS. And the guy in
Qst, 1957-2003, has your 1981-200??? beat.

3866. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 12:31:00 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmbc83d78qkvbe@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77431

"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
news:r489b.61835$3b2.8129302@twister.neo.rr.com...
>

> >
> You can't be a conservative, we believe in earning your way in life, not
> having "things" given to you because you are to lazy to EARN them. Sound
> familiar Liberal boy?
>
> Conservative my ass!
>
> 10-73's!
>
>

well, you're analogy is wrong. Last I heard, they are STILL testing people
to get thier ham licences... you STILL have to fill out the correct forms
after
passing the test and pay your fees to get your licence. They are not
GIVING anything away.

you are mad simply because something that you had to do that was very
difficult has been removed for the most part, and may be totally
removed finally due to it's archaic irrelavence.

The process that is required is still taking place, but just not to your
likeing.
That is life, sometimes.

Clint
KB5ZHT
american-loving conservative

--

United Nations Resolution 678 quote...

2. Authorizes Member States co-operating with the Government of Kuwait,
unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements, as set forth in
paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions, to use all necissary means to
uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant
resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;

anti-americans, just disregard "to use all necissary means"

--

3867. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 12:38:11 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmbclihll73n9a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77432

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk327e$96s$0@208.206.142.90...
>
>
>
> If you don't believe that promoting and expanding the use of
radiotelegraphy is
> doing same to "radio in general" there is news you've not yet heard.

well, then where do you draw the cut off point? if just the small subset of
radio
known as radiotelegraphy is so important to the expansion of radio, then by
comparison, what would you call ALL the other communication forms that
aren't equally represented? why is this small subset of the radio world so
important when it's use is being REDUCED in the non-ham world, replaced
by new communication modes?

>
>
> > For that matter, there aren't
> > profeciency tests in other modes of operation, either, in the
> > form of a seperate practical test such as there is with CW.
>
> Ah, but Morse is the only mode which demands selftraining!

ALL modes of communication require selftraining, just not as strong
as an emphasis on listening-hand coordination to say the least. You
STILL have to train yourself on the rules, codes of conduct, procedures,
information regarding electrical principals and fundamentals (feedlines,
antenna lenght, RF fields, etc.)

once again, it's just that YOU had to do it. That's all.

>Any mope can learn
> any of the others by cracking a book and doing a little hookup wiring.
> With manual radiotelegraphy, there is really no way to do it short of
> selftraining. Thus the CW test.

well, I guess if everybody else is wrong and YOU are right, then it's
just going to such a terrible thing when the CW practical test is
finally, totally phased out.

> > >
> > > When you finally get around to getting a radio that will actually
> > > work on HF, take a listen to the lower end of any band and report
> > > back what you find. Then you might want to 'accurize' that statemtent.

I own a kenwood 850, a 10-15 meter vertical and a 40-80-160 meter
sloper. I transmit and recieve all up and down previously mentioned bands.
Therefore, your statement was unfounded.

>If you refuse to learn how to handle radio's most basic mode you can never
be
>able to regard yourself as fully qualified in ham radio communciations.
> That's just the Way it Is. Live with it.
>

I'm sorry but that is YOUR oppinion. What counts is the decision of those in
authority, namely the FCC. And YOU will have to live with the decisions THEY
make.

Clint
KB5ZHT

3868. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 12:41:15 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmbcrch8gkksf9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77433

>
> >sending and receiving CW isn't a building block
> >to anything else.....
>
> Yes, it is.

okay, time to fish or cut bait... in what way is CW
a building block to the operation of a ham radio
that you can't say about so many other more
modern, up to date and applicable modes?

I mean, ORIGINALLY, the first communication that
was EVER sent was a spark with a spark generator.
The do not require you to show profeciency in building
a spark generator and using it; if you say "well, we just
SKIP that step and go to CW", then you can say that
about EVERY step along the way of learning
ham radio.

Clint
KB5ZHT

3869. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 12:45:13 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmbd2ofeqiqk7b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77434

> > IF morse (i.e. radiotelegraphy) had any basis as a foundation
> > for higher learning of radio concepts, principles or theory
> > then it would be a requirement of engineering students...which
> > it has never been to my knowledge anywhere.
>
> And that's where your argument falls flat on its face. The point is
> operational, on the air *communications *. It's called OPERATING.

<snip>
you just employed the "diversion" tactic. he was totally correct; if the basic fundamentals of radio, which you have been totally parroting until now, required it, then it would be a necissary requirement for all basic electrical engineering, and it is not.

> It's the BASICS, Bill.

As YOU see it.
Why aren't new hams required to show they now how to forge/smelt copper wire, produce polyethelene insulation, make aluminum out of scratch for antennas, etc., if BASICS were the name of everything?

you're mad because YOU had to do it.

3870. where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 12:53:03 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmbdhfc0nr1n86@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77435

many people that are in or supports the doctrines of PCTA keeps
spouting "basics", and draws an anology to either handwriting...
and I say this; does this mean you could NEVER write cursive
if you were never taught print? could you NOT be taught
cursive directly without first being taught print? No.

However, it's simply another skill that can be taught, and they
do, and that's fine. However, they do not look at CW the
same way; it's pass/fail, not merely a percentage of test
that needs to be passed.

Do you think they would support a system where you had
to be tested on CW, if an only if you wanted to use CW
on the CW part of the bands? Heh, of COURSE not.
That is where thier anology fails. The art of CW needs
to be tested with a practical test if you are to use and
learn CW, but not necissarily ham radio. I would have
supported a system like that, where if you wanted to
operate CW on the lower half of the band you had to
be tested on if first, but of course, that was out of the
question.

They do not, however, likewise, first test people
on knowing how to build a double sideband carrier
transmission if they want to operate AM; they do
not require you to show how to get a microphone,
talk on it, and recieve the response on a speaker
if you want to use frequency modulated radiotelephone,
or single sideband carrier suppressed radiotelephone.

But they DO want to force CW on people that don't
necissarily have any interest in operating it. "basics"
arguments fail; "selftrained skill" fails because everything
is a selftrained skill, why put the emphasis on an outdated
mode instead of testing selftrained skills on new, modern
modes of communication?

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

United Nations Resolution 678 quote...

2. Authorizes Member States co-operating with the Government of Kuwait,
unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements, as set forth in
paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions, to use all necissary means to

uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant
resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;

anti-americans, just disregard "to use all necissary means"

--

3871. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 12:53:52 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmbdivie52pt9c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77436

> > Let's have a go at "No Handwriting International".
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Exaggeration to the ridiculous.
>

spurious analogies are in the PCTA handbook, bill.

Clint
KB5ZHT

3872. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 12:55:04 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmbdl829oh7ica@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77437

>
> If the railroad they intend to work for uses coal fired steam locomotives,
> learning how to run them would be a good idea.

yes, exactly.

I guess it's too bad that there aren't that many coal fired steam
locomotives
being used anymore.

Clint
KB5ZHT

3873. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 13:16:34 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309150516.741af340@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77438

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<zZc9b.11931$NM1.11435@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" wrote:
> >
> > No, no, no. Bruce didn't memorize anything. He took
> > the exam on a lark, w/o studying, and scored 100%.
> > Furthermore, he did it in under 8 minutes, and collected
> > $250 from a couple of "CB Plussers" who bet he
> > couldn't do it.
>
>
> Well, if true, I'm certainly impressed.

Dwight,

Some time back, I took a *practice* Extra test online. No preparation.
To make it more of a sporting course I did all the math in my head -
no calculator, no scratch paper. Took me about 7-1/2 minutes start to
finish, much of which was waiting for the computer to load the next
question. I think I got one or two wrong, but I could be mistaken
about that.

So it can be done, and I'm no expert or genius, either.

> But, of course, I have serious
> doubts about that claim. In fact, I would consider it almost impossible (and
> Bruce certainly doesn't seem like the type of person who could go around
> doing the impossible).

Did it ever occur to you that his persona here could be an act?

my Speling and Grammer isnt always Perfect eyther, Dwight

> Heck, it would take almost eight minutes for even the
> fastest reader to read over the the exam questions.

Try it sometime. Take an online practice exam and just pick the first
answer that seems even close to right, without much thinking.

> And, considering some of
> the questions in the pool (band limits, etc), I doubt one could pass without
> at least some study (even if the study is nothing more than experience).
>
But if a ham keeps even mildly up to date, those things become second
nature.

And you have to make allowances for Bruce, because according to qrz he's 305 years old.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3874. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 13:21:32 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <w1j9b.6874$9%4.5473@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77439

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Idd9b.11939$NM1.6819@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "charlesb" wrote:
> >
> > Keep in mind the fact that fossil-fuel burning plants pollute
> > while working perfectly. Unlike the nuclear plants, they
> > don't have to wait for an accident in order to cause a
> > problem.
>
>
> Most would consider the massive amounts of nuclear waste (from spent
fuel,
> contaminated building materials from closed plants, and so on) a
"problem."
> People over many generations will have to deal with those waste products.
> And, of course, this environmental polution is far worse than anything
> generated by fossil-fuel burning plants. So, your claim above ("unlike the
> nuclear plants...") is patently false.

Nope. The nuclear plants do not necessarily have to pollute in any
significant way, as there are effective, economical methods for containing
and reprocessing nuclear waste. Once you burn fossil-fuels though, you have
instant pollution injected directly into the atmosphere and the process
continues to generate toxins as long as the burning process goes on. They
end up everywhere.

Shut the fossil-fuel burner down, and it takes a number of years for the
pollution it has already produced to become absorbed into the general
environment. It doesn't just go away, it gets spread around, absorbed, and
dissipated. That would work just fine if there was just one or two
fossil-fuel burning power plants, but the unpleasant fact is that there are
thousands of them around the world. The third-world countries especially
like the "let's burn something" level of technology, because it is something
that they can readily understand, despite being protien-deprived as children
and not having much by way of an education.

Strictly speaking, there is no pollution-free method of obtaining
significant amounts of power. Of the available alternatives, nuclear is the
cleanest and safest by far, and its continued development will eventually
lead us to fusion power. Of course there will always be mindless
chicken-little bleating from those who obtain the latest scientific facts
from Mother Earth News, Cosmo, or the National Enquirer, but if you discount
this fruitcake element, you'll find that most people in the U.S. are
intelligent enough to understand the issues, and can make informed, rational
decisions if you give them half a chance.

Yes, there is a vocal minority who are convinced that the sky is falling. The fact that they get together and agree among themselves does not mean that their hysteria has any basis in fact. It really only means that though they may be wigged out, at least they are not lonely. Taken out of the context of their conspiracy of agreement and placed within a population of normals, they sooner or later find that they are not so sure that the sky is falling after all. - Except for the hard-core wiggees of course, whose only hope would be some form of shock therapy.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

3875. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 14:18:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <tSj9b.13163$NM1.5333@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77440

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Some time back, I took a *practice* Extra test online. No
> preparation. To make it more of a sporting course I did all
> the math in my head - no calculator, no scratch paper. Took
> me about 7-1/2 minutes start to finish, (snip)

Yep, but the online tests are easier. With most of them, all you have to do click an answer directly under the question, not shade a small block on an answer card with a pencil. All that (reading the questions, answers, and filling in the answer card) couldn't likely be done in eight minutes. Of course, anything is possible, so I won't say it isn't (which is why I said it was "almost" impossible). But I suspect you would agree such an accomplishment would certainly be very rare.

> Did it ever occur to you that his persona here could be an act?

Nope. It's too consistent across many newsgroups over a relatively long period of time. If it's an act, he should be in Hollywood.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3876. Re: Ahh, the joy of Echolink!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 14:32:06 UTC
From: "William H. O'Hara, III" <whoohara@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93F76B233924CAX2A3DA5M1512AODKAMO@216.168.3.44>
Source record: 77441

>> >or even to buy a radio upon discovering Echolink.
>> >Echolink devotees are

> Bingo! You've got it! Yes, when we post here on the
> Internet, it has no effect on our on the air activities -
> But when some moron uses the Internet as a substitute for
> radio *as a part of our on the air activities* then the
> hobby is undercut and damaged. Facing this threat, amateurs
> feel - threatened !

Something that I can agree with you for once.

Bill

3877. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 14:46:13 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Vgk9b.13440$NM1.410@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77442

"charlesb" wrote:
>
> Nope. The nuclear plants do not necessarily have
> to pollute in any significant way, as there are
> effective, economical methods for containing
> and reprocessing nuclear waste. (snip)

If that is true, why are there tons of nuclear waste stored around the country at weapons labs, weapons factories, power plants, and so on? Instead of being reprocessed, must agree the stuff will end up being stored in underground containment facilities - facilities to be maintained for many decades or even centuries (at taxpayers expense, I should add).

> Once you burn fossil-fuels though, you have instant
> pollution injected directly into the atmosphere and the
> process continues to generate toxins as long as the
> burning process goes on. They end up everywhere.

Look, I'm not defending fossil-fuel generator plants. All I'm saying is that nuclear power plants are not a good alternative to fossil-fuel plants - the problems are worse (and potentially catastrophic).

> (snip) Of the available alternatives, nuclear is the cleanest
> and safest by far, and its continued development will eventually
> lead us to fusion power. (snip)

It's only cleaner and safer if you ignore the waste and mining issues, and the potentual for personnel mistakes, design flaws, environmental risks, or parts failure. It is absurd to believe Three Mile Island will be the only serious incident, or the worse incident to ever possibly happen.

> (snip) you'll find that most people in the U.S. are
> intelligent enough to understand the issues, and can
> make informed, rational decisions if you give them
> half a chance. (snip)

Which is exactly why nuclear power continues to lose supporters and this country continues to move away from nuclear power.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3878. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 14:57:36 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Ark9b.13555$NM1.10525@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77443

"Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
>
> Wind is actually a good source, if there is a consistent
>breeze blowing enough to keep the blades of the
> windmill moving, and would seem to be fairly
> inexpensive to construct as well.

Los Angeles has several hundred wind turbines placed in the hills around the area. And, since I saw them getting ready to put some more up when I drove through there recently, it appears they are expanding the program. There are many other areas around the country where such turbines could be placed and the power then fed into the regional power grids (supplying cities many hundreds of miles away). I also saw several experimental solar power plants in Arizona, perhaps feeding power to local cities or the LA power grid. Alternative power sources are quickly reaching maturity.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3879. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 15:00:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk4k6f$fa4$0@208.207.71.145>
Source record: 77444

Clint wrote:

>
> >If you refuse to learn how to handle radio's most basic mode you can never
> be
> >able to regard yourself as fully qualified in ham radio communciations.
> > That's just the Way it Is. Live with it.
> >
>
> I'm sorry but that is YOUR oppinion. What counts is the decision of those in
> authority, namely the FCC.

Son, you might want to learn somewhere along the way that opinion is sometimes congruent with fact, sometimes not.

No matter what the FCC says or does, it can't alter facts. And nowhere have they ever said that a no-code license is a fully qualified ham. In fact, the retired Chief of the Amateur and Citizen's Division of FCC (now called something else) stated in his comments on the NCVEC pettion
(which BTW he helped write) that it was an oxymoron to expect an Extra class ham to be a expert on ham radio if he doesn't know Morse code. Thus he supports a code test for Extras.

And it should be obvious, to anyone who actually owns and uses a thought process - when Morse code is a widely-used mode within ham radio, *anyone* who can't use it simply and factually *cannot* be a fully qualified ham - No matter what license or privileges the FCC gives them.

> And YOU will have to live with the decisions THEY
> make.
>

Which can't change facts. Facts are immutable. Live with it. Any ham not able to operate CW is simply and factually not fully qualified.

3880. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 15:06:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk4kiifts0@208.206.142.94>
Source record: 77445

Clint wrote:

> >
> > >sending and receiving CW isn't a building block
> > >to anything else.....
> >
> > Yes, it is.
>
> okay, time to fish or cut bait... in what way is CW
> a building block to the operation of a ham radio
> that you can't say about so many other more
> modern, up to date and applicable modes?
>
> I mean, ORIGINALLY, the first communication that
> was EVER sent was a spark with a spark generator.
> The do not require you to show profeciency in building
> a spark generator and using it; if you say "well, we just
> SKIP that step and go to CW", then you can say that
> about EVERY step along the way of learning
> ham radio.

Aw Clint, surely you're better informed than that...arent you?

NOTHING has changed about the USE of Morse code, from spark to today's rigs-which aren't simple CW generators, BTW, since you seem to have missed that (at least in the case of most modern rigs).
It's the MODE, the requirement to selftrain to learn to use it, that remains just as valid today as ever.

Of course technical improvements in equipement have enhanced the use of Morse as they have other modes, but the simple requirement to learn to use it remains, as always. FACT!

3881. Re: Keep the cellphone charged

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 15:09:04 UTC
From: Tom <tj2317@no.spam>
Message-ID: <8087087132.1762978966@taranews.net>
Source record: 77446

I live in hurricane country (Gulf Coast), and the very first system to go out as a storm approaches is the cell system. It will typically become unusable about 24 hours before the storm is due to make landfall, simply due to overloading. I've been through many hurricane warnings since I arrived in 1986, and the cellular system has NEVER been able to stand up under the increased demand. By all means charge the phone up, but don't expect it to do you much good during the storm's approach or landfall.

The land line system almost goes out too, but if you stay on the phone long enough, you will eventually get a dial tone. Folks who are thinking about evacuating should make hotel reservations now, before all of the rooms vanish and the phone lines become clogged. Guarantee the room now, and fill your car's gas tank now, even if you may decide not to evacuate later.

Evacuate early to avoid clogged highways filled with panicky drivers. Don't be a hero.

3882. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 15:12:02 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk4ks2gci0@208.206.142.94>
Source record: 77447

Clint wrote:

> > > IF morse (i.e. radiotelegraphy) had any basis as a foundation
> > > for higher learning of radio concepts, principles or theory
> > > then it would be a requirement of engineering students...which
> > > it has never been to my knowledge anywhere.
> >
> > And that's where your argument falls flat on its face. The point is
> > operational, on the air *communications *. It's called OPERATING.
>
> <snip>
> you just employed the "diversion" tactic. he was totally correct; if
> the basic fundamentals of radio, which you have been totally parroting
> until now, required it, then it would be a necissary requirement for
> all basic electrical engineering, and it is not.
>
> > It's the BASICS, Bill.
>
> As YOU see it.
> Why aren't new hams required to show they now how to forge/smelt
> copper wire, produce polyethelene insulation, make aluminum out
> of scratch for antennas, etc., if BASICS were the name of
> everything?
>

Clint your ignorance is showing again. Ham radio isn't about engineering, its about operating ham radio. Sure, one CAN use engineering if one wishes, and someone surely had to do some engineering to produce the gear we all use. But if Bill's comment holds any water at all then the tests would have been becoming harder instead of becominig giveaways.

Ham radio isn't about metalurgy pr plastics technology, Clint, it's about OPERATING . But you amd Bill already knew that, it's jsut your NCI/CB attitudes showing through, again.

>
> you're mad because YOU had to do it.

3883. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 15:13:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk4kv5gci1@208.206.142.94>
Source record: 77448

Clint wrote:

> >
> > If the railroad they intend to work for uses coal fired steam locomotives,
> > learning how to run them would be a good idea.
>
> yes, exactly.
>
> I guess it's too bad that there aren't that many coal fired steam
> locomotives
> being used anymore.

On the othe hand, there IS very MUCH Morse code being used on ham radio!

3884. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 15:53:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk4n90kce0@208.206.142.95>
Source record: 77449

charlesb wrote:

>
> Strictly speaking, there is no pollution-free method of obtaining
> significant amounts of power.

Actually there is, it's just that they have no serious following in the circles where it might matter enough to move things along at a rate which would actually make them viable, available options. Some of them are

Wind
Tidal action
Hydrogen
Solar

What is mostly needed is the emphasis toward development of the alternates. While the isntalled base is fossil fuel, at affordable prices, and the pollution doesn't overwhelm us, not that much is lilely to change. It isn't for lack of possibilities. You could easily generate all your own power now, it's just much cheaper to buy it from a utility which probably burns coal to generate it. You can get engines which will run on used vegetable oil or almost any other type of fat. But few of us will as long as the corner gas station is handy and not outta sight pricewise.

Looks to me like development of hydrogen is the way to go. It's THE most plentiful fuel on the planet, is absolutely non-polluting since combusting it recombines it with oxygen to form water, from which some of the hydrogen can again be extracted. And most current vehicles can operate on it with little modification needed beyond storage. The issue of volatility is actually pretty much a non-issue, considering the volitility of gasoline. Again, it's the insalled base of fossil fuels that would have to be reworked. That's a lot of service stations to alter. And a lot of politics to rework. Not gonna happen anytime soon. No, I haven't forgotten the Hindenburg. Different era, different technology.

There are considerable wind generation facilities in Western areas, though, and I recall driving past a huge solar collector field out there somewhere. .I think it was in southwestern Arizona where the sun shines daily.

And there have been conceptual plans for large tidal action generators for a long time, without any hard plans to move on them AFAIK.

Dick

3885. Re: Cunningham violates copyright law at new web site

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 16:01:54 UTC
From: Ramsay MacDonald <anon@bog.lir.dk>
Message-ID: <9PZV32VU37879.5013194444@bog.lir.dk>
Source record: 77351
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <3F6545C0.4000606@ix.netcom.com>
Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
>
>
> LARDASS Lloyd wrote:
>
> >Jon Cunningham, K1TP, stole the picture he published at
> >http://myrockport.com/cover.jpg from
> >
> >http://voy.voyeurweb.com/main/voe38/vs20030901-48078/index.html
> >
> >even though, right above the stolen photo, is the clear warning: "The
> >photos below may only be downloaded for your private pleasure. You
> >may not republish them at another web site or anywhere else."
> >
> >That makes Cunningham a thief and a copyright violator.
> >
> >
> >
> Maybe not. The photo still had the orginal attribution on it (the web
> address) and might be "fair use". You can quote or copy a small portion of a work
> but be sure to mention where you got it from.

Indeed that does qualify as "fair use," LARDASS Lllllllloyd the 5'06" 250 lbs uneducated imbecile has no conception of the concept of either copyright or fair use.
Jon should post the photo of LARDASS standing by a stream, where he recreates his role in Deliverence.

3886. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 16:04:51 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <Dql9b.206384$Ay2.54322328@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 77450

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hl8bbg7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> Was it a 11-meter "cubical quad" before it became a 10-meter quad ??
> Hmmm.... ????
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

What are the implications if it was, Phil? Most antenna manufacturers market their 10/11m single band models as such. This includes Maco (ex Wilson), Mosley, Butternut, Trident (UK), Max-Gain, Delta X-Ray, and Cubex.

Quote from Cubex:

"These same construction techniques are used in our new line of rugged Quad antennas for the 11M band - The MAGNUM-CB Series!"

Is there a difference? (Other than frequency, that is.)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

3887. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 16:10:00 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <svl9b.206446$Ay2.54336700@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 77352

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:3Wa9b.12918$Aq2.8891@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
> news:r489b.61835$3b2.8129302@twister.neo.rr.com...
> >
> > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> > news:vm9ptb2m1ok1f3@corp.supernews.com...
> > > LOL!
> > >
> > > A good liberal? you have NO idea..... I'm as right wing
> > > and conservative as they come... evidently you don't read
> > > my other posts or in other NG's either, where i'm referred
> > > to as the "jim birch devil"
> > >
> > > Clint
> > > KB5ZHT
> > >
> > You can't be a conservative, we believe in earning your way in life, not
> > having "things" given to you because you are to lazy to EARN them. Sound
> > familiar Liberal boy?
> >
> > Conservative my ass!
>
> Earning your way is fine...as long as the requirement(s)
> is relevent...that's were you lose your argument.

Well Bill, I'm on the bottom of 40 right now listening to a band FULL of
irrelevance. <hihi>

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

3888. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 17:28:24 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309150928.57236c56@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77353

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<fj59b.3708$nQ.1266825@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030914162551.12631.00001087@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > In article <Tx%8b.2873$nQ.1197531@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint"
> > <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >
> > >Only 31 people died from Chernobyl. Even now there has been
> > >no increased incident of deaths from diseases that may possibly be linked
> to
> > >radiation.
> >
> > Directly attributed deaths. If a pregnant woman 1000 miles away was
> exposed to
> > high levels of windblown radiation, and her child developed leukemia at
> age 2
> > and died as a direct result of that exposure, how does that death ever get
> > attributed to the Chernobyl accident?
> >
> > >The area where the fallout could be discerned from the normal
> > >background measurements was relatively small.
> >
> > How many square miles? How long will it be hot?
> >
>
> Dissipation will be by the inverse square law so at 1000 miles from the
> plant it will have a concentration of only 1 millioneth of the concentration
> at the release site.

I think you mean "it will have a concentration of only 1 millionth of
the concentration at *1 mile from* the release site."

If you're talking about long-term exposure from a contained source, I
agree. But when Chernobyl popped, it let off a cloud of radioactive
gas, dust and smoke that spread over a wide area. How much a specific
individual was exposed to how much and what types of radiation and
radioactive material for how long is pretty much anyone's guess.

Plus it's not just direct exposure from one incident, but overall
exposure from many sources. Suppose radioactive dust falls in a water
source, and people or animals drink the water, and ingest the
radioactive material. How chemically toxic is plutonium?

> While specific deaths can't be attributed,

And that's the problem. If someone dies in a coal mine cavein or
downwind of Bhopal, it's attributed.

> the overall
> numbers can be assigned by simply comparing the death rate due to leukemia
> in the affected zone to the death rate outside.

Ah - but what constitutes the affected zone and what constitutes
outside? How do we know the control group wasn't exposed from other
sources? Heck, there's americium in smoke detectors...

> This can be done for each
> cause of death that can be increased by radiation. If society wants the
> data, it can be gathered.

It should be gathered. But the results may not be pretty.

> But people would rather hide behind the emotional
> fear of possible problems than researching what problems will occur and the
> magnitude of the problem and making an enlightened decision.

To a certain extent, I agree. But it's not all emotions - it's also a
matter of judgement, trust and education.

Look at the links Mike Coslo posted about Navajo uranium miners. Would
you work their jobs? Can you say with any degree of certainty that
none of their deaths or disease are due to exposure to uranium ore?

Most of all, will any of their deaths ever be attributed? Probably
not, because we don't know how much of that uranium went to make fuel
rods.

"Society" and "the public" were told for decades that nuclear energy
was "the future" and was safe, clean, and would be "too cheap to
meter". We were all supposed to trust the govt. and the industry, but
those folks make mistakes too. Is it any wonder people are not willing
to accept such promises at face value any more?

Perhaps the biggest problem is education. Most people have only the
vaguest ideas about how electricity works, let alone how it is
generated and transmitted. Yet they are expected to accept on faith
that nuke plants *and all the rest of the nuclear industry* are safe.
Until people are educated to how things really work, you're just not
going to get that kind of trust.

> > >In addition, that accident
> > >was due to an unauthorized experiment being conducted at the facility.
> > > In
> > >other words, rules and safety precautions were being deliberately
> > > ignored.
> >
> > Yep. Absolutely true. And I've never seen any reason given.
> >
> > But these were not stupid, evil or suicidal people. They just did some
> > amazingly dumb things, which got out of their control. And perhaps that's

> > the
> > real lesson of Chernobyl: People will do amazingly stupid things for no
> > explainable reason at all. Then the rest of us are left to pick up the
> > pieces.
>
> Still, stupidity can't be allowed to stop us from facing the energy needs of
> the future.

It should give us pause about what technologies we use to face those
needs. For example, look at Palo Verde, the newest US nuke plant,
which became operational in the mid '80s.

How much did it cost to build per kW of capacity?
How much has it cost to run per kWH since it started up?
How much will it cost per kWH to dispose of the waste, ranging from
very low level stuff to used fuel rods?
How much will it cost per kWH to decommission when its useful life is
over?

Now compare the answers to those obtained from, say, a wind turbine
plant.

> Instead one addresses the issue and error proofs and mistake
> proofs the facility.
>
Except that it is *IMPOSSIBLE* to error proof and mistake proof
anything that involves humans. The whole history of technological
goofs proves that simple fact again and again. There is *always* a way
for people to mess things up.

Remember the Titanic? "Practically unsinkable" was the description.
OOOPS...

Titanic's sinking was due to a long chain of human errors, not
technological ones. She wasn't even new technology, and her crew was
experienced. Sister ship Olympic was the first of that class, and much
of the Titanic crew (including her captain) was simply transferred
from Olympic when Titanic went into service.

Of course people didn't stop building steamships after 1912. But
neither did they call *any* ship "practically unsinkable", either.

We can make technology safer, but it can *never* be 100% safe. So we
have to understand the risks, and utlimately decide which risks are
worth taking. And when an industry asks millions of people to live
with a certain risk, it is to be expected that different people may
not accept certain risk factors. Because it's *their* lives and
property.
> >
> > But when technology is small and distributed, the effects of doing
> > amazingly
> > stupid things for no explainable reason at all are contained to a
> > relatively

> > small area and numbers of people. When technology is huge and
> > concentrated, the
> > effects can be much worse.
> >
> > And the more complex the technology, the easier it is to do something
> > really dumb.

> Nuclear technology is not complex. It's relatively simple in fact.

Old joke:

First banana: "Life is strange"
Second banana: "Oh yeah? Compared to what?"

When you say "Nuclear technology is not complex. It's relatively
simple in fact.", one has to ask "Compared to what?"

I would dare to guess that the Peach Bottom nuclear plant is far more
complex than Holtwood or Conowingo dams (all three are on the same
river, within 100 miles of here).

> > >Nuclear power generation has been round for 50 years now. A total of 34
> > >people have died. That's the 31 at Chernobyl and 3 in the 1950s at an
> > >experimental government facility (where once again regulations were not
> > >followed).
> >
> > Attributable deaths.
> > >
> > >The collapse of hydroelectric dams have affected areas as wide or wider
> > >than
> > >a nuclear power plant accident. And they have killed more people. I'd
> > >much rather live next to a nuclear plant than downstream of a dam.
> >
> > When is the last time a hydro dam in the USA collapsed and killed people?

Hmmm??

I don't know of a single case of such a disaster in the USA in my
lifetime.

> > >And speaking of long term environmental impacts, what about thousands of
> > >square miles that are supposedly affected by acid rain from burning
> > >coal??
> > >What about the miles of coast and ocean that have been contaminated by
> > >oil
> > >spills?? The long term effects could be quite significant.
> >
> > Sure. But not as significant as the effects of radioactive materials that
> > take millennia to break down.
>
> Not proven.

And that's the problem. We do not know the long term effects of the release of radioactive stuff into the environment. Particularly the effects of the release of elements like plutonium, which do not occur naturally at all.

> Millennia worth of acid rain could conceivably be just as
> harmful as the time taken to breakdown radioactive materials. Why? Because
> even though the acid rain dissipates, it keeps on coming down year after
> year.

I think you're grasping at straws, Dee. The acid from acid rain will break down far faster than many radioactive debris will decay.

> > Consider just one spent fuel rod from a nuke plant like TMI. How long
> > before it is harmless?
>
> Let it be reprocessed and recycled and it's not a problem.

You're avoiding the question. How many years?

As I understand it, (correct me if I'm mistaken on this) such a rod starts out as contains uranium, plutonium and some other fission products . Reprocessing extracts the usable uranium to make new rods - but the plutonium and other fission products are not usable in current technology power reactors. Plutonium can and is used in weapons, however, which is why the Bush administration is so interested in other countries' nuke programs. Like Iran.

IIRC, there's only one operational reprocessing plant in the world, and it's in France. And there are far more spent rods than it will ever be able to handle. On top of which, the rods which do result are more expensive than new ones.

When you add in the cost per kWH of reporcessing rods, what happens to the above cost evaluation?

> > >So if an honest evaluation and comparison of long term effects, deaths,
> > >environmental impacts, etc is done and the same standards applied across
> > > the
> > >board, then it would indeed be necessary to shut down all oil, coal, and
> > >hydroelectric plants.
> >
> > I'd like to see such a comparison.
>
> I would too. It is exactly the type of data that we as a society need to
> make informed decisions about our energy future. Right now we are stuck
> with people's emotional reactions. I should have said "...it would probably
> be necessary..."

Ah - but you made the statement up front that nuclear would win the comparison. That sort of thing makes folks distrust the industry that much more.

> My point was that people are refusing to even consider the
> dangers of other means of power generation.
>
I'm not one of them.

> > > Personally I don't care to sit in the dark and
> > >shiver.
> >
> > It's not a binary problem.

> It's getting close to that in California although shivering will be mild
> (except perhaps up in the mountains) as it isn't a severe climate.
> California has built no new power plants of any kind in 10 years. They
> can't get any of them (fossil fuel, hydro, or nuclear) past the
> environmental requirements in the state. Population continued to grow and
> they had brown outs and blackouts. Their solution was to buy it from out of
> state. Well that hasn't worked either. The rates are simply too high and
> the state can't afford it.

How much do they pay per kWH, residential?

> Costs are being absorbed by the state government
> instead of being passed to the users and it's wrecked the state budget. It
> looks like those contracts will be canceled and California will be right
> back to their brown outs and black outs.

Because they made some really dumb decisions about "deregulation".
They treated electricity as if it were the same as any other commodity
- which it isn't.

> > >Now let's take a look at serious industrial accidents. A prime example
> > > is
> > >the chemical plant in Bhopal. 3,000 people died immediately when that
> > >happened. As many as 10,000 people have died from long term effects of
> > >exposure to the gas released since it damaged their lungs and other
> > > organs.
> > >No one is shutting down the chemical industry.
> >
> > The chemical industry in India does not have anywhere near the safeguards
> > of
> > the chemical industry in the USA.
> >
> > And as horrible as the Bhopal disaster was, the gas dispersed and will
> > break
> > down. How long will TMI be radioactive?
>
> TMI has been contained so it will not impact the surrounding residents.
> Long term radiation exposure thus becomes a non-issue.

WHOA!

That's *ENTIRELY* the issue!

As long as TMI is contained, it poses no hazard. Just like there was
no need for lifeboats on the Titanic until it hit the iceberg...

How long must it be contained? Decades? Centuries? Millenia?

How long can the containment building be expected to stay tight, while
its radioactive contents decay?

Who gets to pay for that containment and monitoring?

Will there *ever* be a way to safely dismantle it?
>
> > >Yet some chemicals are as
> > >persistent in the environment as nuclear materials.
> >
> > Some examples, please?
> >
> > A process can be developed to break down any chemical compound. PCBs, for
> > example, were specifically designed to be inert and nonreactive, yet they
> > can
> > be broken down into their components quickly. But there's no way to speed
> > up
> > nuclear decay.
>
> Yes you can speed up radioactive decay by reprocessing and reusing the spent
> fuel.

But not waste products like irradiated equipment.

> While PCBs can be broken down, it's not being done due to cost. Save
> with PVC. Same with other chemicals.

Actually, some disposal of those chemicals is being done. PCB
transformer oil in particular.
>
> > >So sorry to say, your long term environmental arguments just don't hold
> > >water. There's lots of things that can affect even wider spread areas
> > >and last just as long.
> >
> > Perhaps we should discuss the half life of plutonium?

> Again preprocess and reuse.

For what - weapons? Are there any operational US power reactors that
will run on plutonium?

And again you've avoided the question - what's the half life of
plutonium?
>
> > And if you're going to discuss dangerous industrial processes, consider
> this:
> > The most dangerous common form of mechanized transportation in use today
> in the
> > USA are privately owned motor vehicles. Every year and a half, about as

> many
> > Americans die on US highways as died in the entire Vietnam war. Airlines,
> > trains, buses and ships are far safer, yet few people refuse to drive or
> ride
> > in a car compared to other modes. Why?
> >
>
> 1. Convenience
> 2. It's what they are used to
> 3. Each feels they are in control so it can't happen to them.

Sure. But they are CHOOSING what risks they take.
>
> Just because we do something doesn't mean it's rational.

True - and the opposite is true.

> Mankind is a
> rationalizing animal. We will find justifications for our wants and desires
> and fears whether there is any basis in fact for them or not.

And that goes as much for the folks who support nuclear power as those
who oppose it. You say you'd rather live next to a nuke plant than a
hydro dam, but can you point to a single case in the past 50 years
where a US hydro dam failed and killed people?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3889. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 18:03:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F65FEFA.8030107@psu.edu>
Source record: 77354

N2EY wrote:

> Only then did they let you try the written. Mess up at any point -
> even one character or question - and it was "go home and study some
> more and don't come back for at least 30 days". No CSCE, no partial
> credit, nada, do it all first try at one sitting or it doesn't count
> at all.

hold on s second Jim! You're saying one missed question meant flunking
the test?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3890. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 18:04:03 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <nan9b.7137$bF5.503@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77355

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk4n90kce0@208.206.142.95...
>
>
> charlesb wrote:
>
> >
> > Strictly speaking, there is no pollution-free method of obtaining
> > significant amounts of power.
>
> Actually there is, it's just that they have no serious following in the
circles
> where it might matter enough to move things along at a rate which would
actually
> make them viable, available options. Some of them are
>
> Wind
> Tidal action
> Hydrogen
> Solar
>

I hate to be the one to break it to you, but these matters are not really determined on the basis of a popularity contest, as you appear to believe. All of the alternatives you have listed have their drawbacks, and fall into third-weenie position on the basis of their merit (or lack therof) when compared to other systems, and not on the basis of advocacy. Office politics has very little to do with these matters. To assume that it does is unfortunate, because it prevents you from taking the facts of the matter seriously.

Of those four, only solar power has any potential for widespread use, and potential is about all it has right now. It is still 'way too expensive. People have been hearing about how solar is going to be affordable in "just a few years" for several decades now, a good indicator of the verity behind most of the solar folks' claims. Because of these bogus claims, it is getting harder and harder to find funding for development of solar. - And because of that, in turn, the day of affordable solar power has been pushed even further down the road.

So in a way, I suppose that advocacy can have an effect on the progress of research... In the case of solar, advocacy by enthusiasts has undermined the progress of the researchers and scientists through thier mindlessly inflated claims and protocol war behavior in regards to alternatives. Though the behavior seems perfectly reasonable to the advocate, it is offensive to the

people who actually do the work that brings us forward, and makes it more difficult, not easier for them to obtain funding.

It "feels good", but is counterproductive when you "do it".

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

3891. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 18:15:32 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmc0e8sncbqc4b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77356

I was on the upper end of the bands.... man, there was even
MORE activity.... boy, we need a practical test to
see if anybody can send and recieve ssb quickly for 10-10
contests or something.. DAMN! how has ham radio survived
without it???

Clint
KB5ZHT

--
--

United Nations Resolution 678 quote...

2. Authorizes Member States co-operating with the Government of Kuwait,
unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements, as set forth in
paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions,

------> TO USE ALL NECISSARY MEANS <--------

to uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant
resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;

anti-americans, just disregard "to use all necissary means"

--
"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:svl9b.206446$Ay2.54336700@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:3Wa9b.12918$Aq2.8891@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
> > news:r489b.61835$3b2.8129302@twister.neo.rr.com...
> > >
> > > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> > > news:vm9ptb2m1ok1f3@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > LOL!
> > > >
> > > > A good liberal? you have NO idea..... I'm as right wing
> > > > and conservative as they come... evidently you don't read
> > > > my other posts or in other NG's either, where i'm referred
> > > > to as the "jim birch devil"
> > > >
> > > > Clint
> > > > KB5ZHT
> > > >
> > > You can't be a conservative, we believe in earning your way in life,

not
> > > having "things" given to you because you are to lazy to EARN them.
Sound
> > > familiar Liberal boy?
> > >
> > > Conservative my ass!
> >
> > Earning your way is fine...as long as the requirement(s)
> > is relevent...that's were you lose your argument.
>
> Well Bill, I'm on the bottom of 40 right now listening to a band FULL of
> irrelevance. <hihi>
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
>

3892. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 18:24:24 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmc0ut5ssnas21@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77357

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk4k6f$fa4$0@208.207.71.145...

> Clint wrote:
> > I'm sorry but that is YOUR oppinion. What counts is the decision of
those in
> > authority, namely the FCC.
>
> Son, you might want to learn somewhere along the way that opinion is
sometimes
> congruent with fact, sometimes not.

I. you're not my father, do not call me son.
II. the second part of your remark has not the slightest shred of relavance
to anything.

>
> No matter what the FCC says or does, it can't alter facts.

You are so correct. However, what it DOES is make rules and laws. Therefore,
if they make a rule that code practical tests are no longer valid nor
necissary
to aquire a ham radio license, then the bottom line is that there will not
be
any further code tests. It is YOUR oppinion that somebody is not a fully
qualified ham without code testing. It is FACT that they are a fully
qualified
ham in the eyes of the FCC if they meet all the requirements the FCC sets
forth; now, THAT is a fact.

And nowhere have
> they ever said that a no-code license is a fully qualified ham.

excuse me? then what is the little piece of paper your issued with a
callsign
when you meet all the requirements set forth by the FCC to acquire one?

In fact, the
> retired Chief of the Amateur and Citizen's Division of FCC (now called
something
> else) stated in his comments on the NCVEC pettion
> (which BTW he helped write) that it was an oxymoron to expect an Extra
class
> ham to be a expert on ham radio if he doesn't know Morse code.

and that is the RETIRED chief's oppinion.

the oppinions of the current members of the FCC are what counts. Not his.

Thus he supports
> a code test for Extras.

and he's retired, and no longer a voting member of the FCC.

> >
>
> Which can't change facts. Facts are immutable.

yes, like it is a fact that the FCC makes the laws regarding the
use of ham radio bands and the requirements to do so. NOT
retired members.

Live with it. Any ham not able
> to operate CW is simply and factually not fully qualified.
>

that is your oppinion.

I tell you what; next time you're operating a motor vehicle, drive
as fast as you can... I mean pedal to the medal; do over 100mph
if you can. when a policeman pulls you over and hands you
a ticket, then tell him "I am driving at a perfectly safe speed for my
skills. Your oppinion and that of the judge that I am about to have
to go in front of are not relavant. It is an immutable fact that
a driver is not a good driver unless he can do 100 without wrecking,
which I did. That's a fact, and you can't do anything about it."

and just see what happens.

Clint
KB5ZHT
a code-tested ham who, regardless of the fact, does not believe
in code testing.

3893. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 18:27:12 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmc144n8pgcd2c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77358

>
> NOTHING has changed about the USE of Morse code, from spark to today's
> rigs-which aren't simple CW generators, BTW,

then why not test the use of spark generators, thier constructions, etc?
it's a "basic", right?

since you seem to have
> missed that (at least in the case of most modern rigs).
> It's the MODE, the requirement to selftrain to learn to use it, that
> remains just as valid today as ever.

just what century do you live in? haven't you heard that even in
the military they are pulling away from morse code use?

>
> Of course technical improvements in equipement have enhanced the use of
> Morse as they have other modes, but the simple requirement to learn to
> use it remains, as always. FACT!

Nope. your oppinion. MAN you need to learn the difference between
a fact of life and your oppinion on a topic. Nobody will buy your
circular thinking of "I said it, so it MUST be so!" thinking.

Clint
KB5ZHT
>

3894. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 18:28:43 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmc16vtkcae7bf@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77359

Ham radio isn't about engineering,

then why is there a knowledge test on circuits?

>
> Ham radio isn't about metalurgy pr plastics technology, Clint, it's about
> OPERATING .

and if you choose NOT to operate CW, then why test it if it's soley
about OPERATING????

you're mad because YOU had to do it, bottom line.

3895. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 18:29:28 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmc18c6qdpseff@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77360

> >
> > I guess it's too bad that there aren't that many coal fired steam
> > locomotives
> > being used anymore.
>
> On the othe hand, there IS very MUCH Morse code being used on ham radio!
>
and a LOT more FM, ssb, AM, packet, etc too.

Clint
KB5ZHT

3896. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 18:30:50 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F66055A.50505@psu.edu>
Source record: 77361

N2EY wrote:

>>>They've been "compromising" forever. Back before WW2 the exam was all >>blue
>>
> book essays. Before 1960 there was diagram drawing. The tests I took in
>
>>>1967-70 were "dumbed down" compared to those because my tests were all
>>>multiple choice.

Only a few things in life that are certain.

Death

Things are not as good as they once were, and never ever were.
The family is going to hell, and has been forever.

and,

When you see a wildebeest on TV, you know something really really bad
is going to happen.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3897. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 19:15:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F660FD2.2060408@psu.edu>
Source record: 77362

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F62885A.5060004@adelphia.net...
>
>>>Bob Brock wrote:
>>>
>>>Someone is lying and anyone who wants to click on the link can tell
>>>who. BTW, I found five sites that list 1/4 wave dipoles and one site
>>>that lists a 3/4 wave dipole in the first ten listed.
>>>
>>
>>Perhaps if Mr. Brock does have me killfiled, someone could explain to
>>him that if he wants to find relevant hits on 1/4 wave dipole, he can
>>just put the words in quote marks on Yahoo or Google.
>>
>>Then the search will return relevant hits, rather than simple
>>occurrences of the individual words, along with the hits wanted. There
>>is no doubt in my mind that he got those 39,500 hits. It is symptomatic
>>of poor database searching technique.
>>
>>His 39,500 hit number, for all it's sound and fury, signifies nothing.
>>
>>Then please tell him I will be happy to be filtered from his mail
>>forever if possible.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> OK, really. I don't know if you guys are trolling and can't even tell which
> one of you (not just you two, but Dick, et al). IF there is no 1/4 wave
> dipole, and IF they aren't effective as an antenna--if there are 1/4
> wave--then, why the following:
>
> From http://www.qsl.net/wd4bis/Newham/nhp2.html
> . . ."When gain figures are listed as dBd, they are using a 1/4 wave dipole
> cut for the center frequency of the band of interest as the reference.". . .

He is either referring to a half wave dipole or is just plain mistaken.

Here is a page that explains many different types of antennas

http://www.packetradio.com/ant.htm#hfcut

Lots of good design aids there. And the dipoles are half wave long.

> From
> http://www.wr6wr.com/newSite/articles/features/olderfeatures/antennaswithtwist.html
> . . ."The shortest self-resonant linear length of wire is not the half-wave
> dipole as one might mistakenly assume, but instead, a wire one quarter of a
> wavelength long."

First, I'm assuming he is talling about a single wire, not a dipole.
Big difference.

> and . . ."On-the-air tests on 2 Meters with KI6O
> indicated that the transmitted signal strengths of the short dipole were
> equal to or better than the full half-wave antenna. Because the "on-the-air"
> tests were crude at best, I donï¿½t make the claim that the short antenna had
> any gain, but in any case, it was no worse than the full-size antenna.". . .
> and "The 1/4 wavelength 40-meter dipole antenna would normally have a
> radiation resistance of about 14 Ohms. The radiation resistance of the short
> 40-meter dipole was increased to 50 Ohms by the use of the spiral coils and
> resulted in a much better match to the 50-ohm transmission line.

Then it isn't a so called 1/4 wave dipole any more. Sounds to me like
his "spiral coils are loading it.

> From http://www.oakvilleamateurs.net/newsletters/hb200302.pdf
> . . ."For most 40-meters, the most practical antenna is the 1/4-wave dipole
> (66 feet in total length) up at least 33 feet in the air.

He's right on the length. He's wrong on what he is calling it. he is
describing a nice half wave dipole. The diple is a 1/half wave antenna.
The confusion is probably brought about by each leg of the dipole being
1/4 wavelength long.

And yes, an antenna can be put up that looks something like a dipole
but really isn't at the wavelength a person is working at. This is
usually referred to as a general purpose dipole. This is fed with
balanced, or ladder line, and matched with an balanced tuner.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3898. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 19:18:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F661091.8060805@psu.edu>
Source record: 77364

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

> All of the above answers would be correct (barring accidental typos), but
> the original poster of the question in the first place DID NOT SPECIFY.
> See, it is important, unless you consider ALL antennas to be exactly
> one-half wavelength in length.

Oh.... for some frequency they are....

- Mike KB3EIA -

3899. It isn't the keyboard it's the operator

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 19:19:49 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F6610D5.CCF2E137@ptt.edu>
Source record: 77363

You are a troll.

Why did you remove your email address from your pirate web site?

3900. Re: Go Numorse!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 20:19:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F661EDD.6030404@psu.edu>
Source record: 77365

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> Any questions about the program, just let me know.... Would be glad to help!

I'm getting closer now. something has happened, and I can recieve at faster speeds better than I can at 5wpm. I still have a way to go, tho'

just about the only mistakes I make are when I accidentally press the wrong answer key. Darn that mistake sound is irritating! Good aversion therapy.

- Mike KB3EIA -

3901. Re: schematics wanted - "jamming device"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 20:47:47 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmc9boab7ishc3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77366

that actually happened here locally in my ham
community a few years ago.... one ham was
SO mad at another ham that he went and cut
the fellows coax with a pair of wire cutters.
things got pretty nasty for a while.

Clint
KB5ZHT

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bk4b7o$p383g$17@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Yes, it is vandalism, but a simple needle or pin placed directly in the
coax
> usually does the trick from what I hear. Or take some wire cutters, and
> clip the wire, connect the shielding and center conductor of the coax
> together and tape both ends back together with black electrical tape would
> do the trick as well. Granted, not legal and probably not ethical either,
> but the techniques would work in making it a little "quieter."
>
--
Top nations that fund UN treasury,
in descending order...

United States: 22%
Japan: 19.6%
Germany: 9.8%
France: 6.5%
UK: 5.6%
Italy 5.1%
Canada: 2.6%
Spain: 2.5%

Russia isn't even in this top 8 list.
France, Russia and Germany, COMBINED,
do not contribute as much to the UN as
does the United States......

--

3902. Re: Keep the cellphone charged

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 21:04:35 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <DPp9b.15476$NM1.74@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77367

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk36v7nkl0@208.207.71.169...
> The weather channel just put this out as Number 1 on the list of
> things
> to do in preparation for the hurricane that's projected to make landfall
>
> on the east coast next week. :-))
>

Thats a great idea. That way more people can TRY to access the system and
get a 'not in service' bleep.

Dan/W4NTI

3903. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 21:08:14 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309151308.348bcde6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77368

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<tSj9b.13163$NM1.5333@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > Some time back, I took a *practice* Extra test online. No
> > preparation. To make it more of a sporting course I did all
> > the math in my head - no calculator, no scratch paper. Took
> > me about 7-1/2 minutes start to finish, (snip)
>
> Yep, but the online tests are easier.

Same question pools, though.

> With most of them, all you have to
> do click an answer directly under the question, not shade a small block on
> an answer card with a pencil.

Same difference to me.

> All that (reading the questions, answers, and
> filling in the answer card) couldn't likely be done in eight minutes.

I could do it. And I'm no expert.

> Of
> course, anything is possible, so I won't say it isn't (which is why I said
> it was "almost" impossible).

Go down that road far enough and you will invent the Infinite
Improbability Generator.

> But I suspect you would agree such an
> accomplishment would certainly be very rare.

I dunno. I know I could do it. Maybe I wouldn't get every single
question right when going full speed like that, but I could pass.

> > Did it ever occur to you that his persona here could be an act?
>
> Nope. It's too consistent across many newsgroups over a relatively long
> period of time. If it's an act, he should be in Hollywood.

I think it's an act, invented for the purpose. But even if it's not an
act, the written tests are not spelling or grammar tests.
"Intelligence" isn't a single-dimension quality. A person can be
brilliant in one area and have serious developmental problems in
others.

In fact, if you deny that someone who writes like Bruce could ace the Extra written in eight minuites, then, by the same logic, you have to deny the claim that someone could be brilliant in electronics but have a difficult time with 5 wpm Morse Code.

but i think its all a act He puts on

73 de Jim, N2EY

3904. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 21:15:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <uZp9b.15483$NM1.5726@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77369

The question refered to a DIPOLE. A dipole is at least 1/2 wavelength
long.

See comments by Jeffery Herman for further clarification on a 'dipole'.

Dan/W4NTI

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bk4b7d$p383g$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Pure bullshit Dan, the formula changes for a quarter wave versus a half
wave
> versus a full wave. 468/freq. in Mhz is for a half-wave dipole. The
> specific for a quarter-wave is half that. And so on and so forth.
>
> If the person specified which length they were looking for I would have
> popped up the correct answer, as far out to the right of the decimal as
you
> want (yes, calculated by hand, not calculator. I do it the old fashioned
> way), but they didn't specify which wavelength they were looking for.
>
>
>
> > > > What is the length of a dipole for 14.240Mhz?
> > > >
> > >
> > > Of what wavelength???? That is an important factor in the equation.
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Congratulations you have just proven you have NO CONCEPT of what was
> asked.
> >
> > Does 468 divided by Frequency in Mhz mean anything to you?
> >
>
>
> Yep... for a half-wave dipole.
>
>
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
>

3905. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 21:18:18 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309151318.61dd8717@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77370

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:<vmbdhfc0nr1n86@corp.supernews.com>...
> many people that are in or supports the doctrines of PCTA keeps
> spouting "basics", and draws an anology to either handwriting...
> and I say this; does this mean you could NEVER write cursive
> if you were never taught print? could you NOT be taught
> cursive directly without first being taught print? No.

OK, fine.

But why should any sort of manual writing skill be mandatory in a
world full of keyboards?
>
> However, it's simply another skill that can be taught, and they
> do, and that's fine.

Why?

Why not teach keyboarding from Day One? Our children will spend far
more time at keyboards than writing.

> However, they do not look at CW the
> same way; it's pass/fail, not merely a percentage of test
> that needs to be passed.
>
If it were up to me, there would be several written tests (or the
written would be split up into separately-graded parts) as well as a
code test.

> Do you think they would support a system where you had
> to be tested on CW, if an only if you wanted to use CW
> on the CW part of the bands? Heh, of COURSE not.

There are no CW-only parts of the HF/MF bands. None at all.

> That is where thier anology fails. The art of CW needs
> to be tested with a practical test if you are to use and
> learn CW, but not necissarily ham radio. I would have
> supported a system like that, where if you wanted to
> operate CW on the lower half of the band you had to
> be tested on if first, but of course, that was out of the
> question.

Your opinion noted. Others have a different opinion.
>
> They do not, however, likewise, first test people
> on knowing how to build a double sideband carrier

> transmission if they want to operate AM; they do
> not require you to show how to get a microphone,
> talk on it, and recieve the response on a speaker
> if you want to use frequency modulated radiotelephone,
> or single sideband carrier suppressed radiotelephone.

Perhaps they should.
>
> But they DO want to force CW on people that don't
> necissarily have any interest in operating it. "basics"
> arguments fail; "selftrained skill" fails because everything
> is a selftrained skill, why put the emphasis on an outdated
> mode instead of testing selftrained skills on new, modern
> modes of communication?

Then answer this question: Why should people who are not interested in building or fixing their radios have to learn all that theory stuff for the written tests? Why are all hams tested on all sorts of stuff they are not interested in?

When I first started out in ham radio, all I wanted to do was join the folks I heard on 75 meter AM. Yet in order to get the license, I had to learn not only Morse Code, but all sorts of theory and regulatory stuff that had absolutely nothing to do with 75 meter AM.

Why was I forced to learn all that?

73 de Jim, N2EY

3906. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 21:38:12 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309151338.2a0c9f65@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77371

"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<bk0mgv$lsk@library1.airnews.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0309131833.3afbc8a6@posting.google.com...
> > "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<bjvalj$90n@library1.airnews.net>...
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20030913102559.15462.00002930@mb-m06.aol.com...
> > > >
> > > > - New car prices ranged from $3000 to $5000
> > > > - Gasoline was about 60 cents a gallon
> > > > - A year's tuition at an Ivy League university was $4500
> > > > - Ham rig prices were somewhat less than today's prices Maybe 60-75%.
> > > > - Inflation was double digit and interest rates were not far behind
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> > >
> > > My first son was born in October 1974.
> >
> > Are you gonna be mad at me if I call ya grandma?
>
> Proud of it!!

OK, Granny! ;-)

> She's eight years old and we go shopping all the time.

They're fun at that age, aren't they!?

> I've
> been teaching her to shop since she was about 18 months old. Every school
> year so far, we've paid a visit to Payless Shoe Source. I save all Summer,
> and when we go in the store I tell her to start picking until I tell her to
> stop. We have a blast!

Her nickname's gonna be Imelda....
>
> Oh, and she is my youngest son's daughter. Oldest has never had kids yet.

Fascinating. Sometimes the oldest (particularly girls in a big family)
avoid having kids. In part because they helpes raise their younger
siblings.

> > > Anyway, so health issues aside (and other than pregnancy neither of us
> > > ever
> > > went to the doctor), we, uh, well, subsisted on that income. Heh heh,
> > > we

> > > sure didn't "live" on it, but we weren't in need; we had food on the
> > > table,
> > > gas for the car to go to work, and rented an actual house. Granted, we
> > > went
> > > without cooking gas all Summer (we cooked on a grill outside or ate a
> > > lot of
> > > sandwiches), so we could save up for heating oil through the Winter.
> > > The
> > > house rent, if I remember correctly, was $75.00/month. Two-story,
> > > 2-bdrm, 1
> > > bath, kitchen, living and dining. Huge lot (I grew and froze all our
> > > veggies in a 32' x 32' garden--with NO motorized tools mind ya), we had
> > > a
> > > deer every Winter that I'd make stretch for meats (mostly ground to make
> > > it
> > > last), and my husband ate fish (trout right out of the Battenkill
> > > River).
> > > Yuk, I didn't like fish.
> >
> > This was New York State?
>
> Oh, definitely. I lived in NY until 1979.

HAW! We left in the same year!

>
> > I got my first deer a little less than 2 years ago. Only problem was I
> > got 'er with a Honda Odyssey. Even though I asked nice, for some
> > reason the body shop wouldn't paint a little Bambi outline on the new
> > fender...
>
> Well, yeah, deer are hard to come by if one is depending upon only "one"
> man--and don't get any twisted ideas there...

...naw...it's just TOO easy....

> What I mean is, all the guys
> used to start hunting on Season open.

Oh yeah, week of Thanksgiving. Here in PA the season is later.

> Good 'ol Rick usually got first meat
> by Thanksgiving. He was single and, actually, going to college at the time
> (he's the reason we were on the Plattsburgh campus to see Alice Cooper).
> So, about three of us families would divvy up that one. Then, as it went,
> there'd usually be one or two more and we'd divvy that one up. One could
> end up with a freezer full of ground meat.

Bambiburgers. Good times.

> My kids' Godfather tried to get
> me into racoon and turtle but, dude, that weren't happenin'.

Hardly worth the effort unless you're into Davy Crockett hats...
>
> > > Gasoline for the auto, what was it? $0.28 or something near there?
> >
> > Until it doubled after the first OPEC embargo. But yeah, it was cheap,
> > as were used cars and parts. Plus you could work on 'em yourself.
>
> heh heh...yeah, or use them for freezers! We used to have a Ford Galaxy
> that died on us in the middle of Winter. Same week, the fridge went. Well,
> money was tight. So, we'd use the car to keep the refridgerated stuff in
> and, believe it or not, it was actually cold enough to even keep ice cream a
> day or two!

Sure. Keep the critters away, mostly.

> > Oddly enough, gas today is even cheaper, once you adjust for
> > inflation. It's one of the few necessities that has gone that way.

> Oh no...good 'ol Rick (mentioned above) used to get into how money was going
> to be cheaper in the future than it was then...in fact, he'd make long-term
> credit purchases based upon that. You mathemeticians!

Wasn't he right, though?

Imagine if, back in those Galaxy-freezer days, someone had told you
what your annual family income would be for 2002. Would you have
believed them?

> > Yup. A lot depended on what it cost to wash the diapers vs. buying the
> > disposables. If you pay all your own utilities the cloth route gets
> > expensive real fast. If the water and electric are somebody else's
> > problem it goes the other way.
> >
> > Then there's baby formula vs....no, I'm NOT gonna go there!
>
> Yeah, and neither did I :o

It's rare to find such an excellent product that comes in such
delightful packaging...
>
> > > Anyway, life may have seemed simpler then, and maybe it was to some
> > > degree.
> > > But, I'll take life today much quicker! I could not be shopping for a
> > > 2300
> > > sq. ft. home back then!!
> > >
> > 2300 sf would be a big house fer me, then or today. Location,
> > location, location....
>
> Right here where we are at. Moving it in before the end of this year. And,
> it is big! We've decided instead of building, to go ahead and buy a
> manufactured home, and have a pier and beam foundation put in, then move it
> onto that.

That's building. Just not from sticks.

> We can get more house for the money, it's vinyl sided, has the
> OSB top, bottom, and sides (marine grade), we've upgraded the carpet, have
> two living areas, 3 baths (if the home we think we've settled on ends up
> being the one we get), and I'll gain an extra bedroom to boot! That's in
> case my parents or my hubby's Mom ever has to come and live with us (the two
> living areas will accommodate a nice gathering and be good for if the
> parents have to live with us, too!).

In-law suite. Or the younguns may decide to move back.

> > In the "old days", necessities were relatively inexpensive and
> > luxuries were relatively expensive. But since then the trend has been
> > for the necessities to get more and more expensive and the luxuries
> > cheaper and cheaper. So now many hams can afford a $1000-2000 rig, but
> > they can't afford a nice house on a big lot with no CC&Rs to put the
> > rig in.
>
> Yeah, it seems that way. I was just telling my darlin' the other day that I
> still feel "priviledged" to shop for something in a store called Linens and
> Things (don't know if you have those up there). I remember when that store
> used to be for the rich folks (from my perspective).

We have "Bed Bath and Beyond" up here. Same difference.
>
> > IIRC the minimum wage back in '75 was around $1.50, and there are
> > about 2000 working hours in a straight-time year. (40 hrs/week x 50
> > weeks). So you folks were essentially living on one minimum-wage
> > income. Think about what those numbers work out to today...

> 2080 hrs. to be exact. And, that wage sounds about right.

Phil Kane's comment about 2087 hours is new to me.

> Hey, do you
> remember when 5-Friday months were the cat's meow? Or, did you ever budget
> that way? I budgeted based on a four week month. When those 5 Fridays
> rolled around, that was high cotton time!

Where I used to work they did the 2 week paycheck game, only on
Tuesdays. All paychecks were the same, but while most months had 2
paydays, some months had 3. We called them "Magic Months", and waited
for them in a BIG way! Almost all years had 2 Magic Months, but a few
had 3.
>
> Yes, I was a stay-at-home mom until my kid (one went to go live with his
> dad) was about 11 and then was working from home, so still was at home for
> him. I've only been climbing the professional ladder for about 18 years;
> somewhere around there anyway.

At least you had the choice.
>
> Radio. Yeah, I remember when we first became hams! I didn't know it, but

> Cliff had been saving from the time I'd gotten him interested in the hobby
> and we were going to classes and "studying." When we got our ticket--he
> started out with swim COW so he was a Tech+, he went out and bought a Yeas
> 890AT (or is that 850AT).

890. The 850 is a Kenwood. Nice rigs both.

> Anyway, he got what was then a darned nice radio
> with all the bells and whistles. We already had a 70' tower up, with a 10M
> quad antenna on top. Man, that thing was nice. First bad wind that year
> (90 mph past the house--straight line winds) blew that quad over and broke
> one of the fiberglass spreaders. We could have replaced it. But, this was
> a 3-element quad for 10M. Imagine how darned big and cumbersome that thing
> was!?

With Isable on the way I'm gald I don't have big antennas.

But a 3 el 10 meter quad is hardly "big" in these parts. How about a full size 2 element quad for 80 meters? There was one only a few miles from here. I saw it with my own eyes - and the rest of the Yagi beams on that 100 foot tall tubular steel rotating tower. IIRC, there were something like 3 elements on 40, 5 elements on 20, 5 elements on 15, 5 elements on 10. All monobanders, too.

Good luck with the house.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3907. Re: Cunningham violates copyright law at new web site

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 21:44:35 UTC
From: Frank Todd <frank@nospam.franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <7pq9b.266754$2x.72161@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 77372
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Lloyd wrote:

> On Mon, 15 Sep 2003 04:53:21 GMT, Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote:
>
>>Lloyd wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Jon Cunningham, K1TP, stole the picture he published at
>>>http://myrockport.com/cover.jpg from
>>>
>>>http://voy.voyeurweb.com/main/voe38/vs20030901-48078/index.html
>>>
>>>even though, right above the stolen photo, is the clear warning: "The
>>>photos below may only be downloaded for your private pleasure. You
>>>may not republish them at another web site or anywhere else."
>>>
>>>That makes Cunningham a thief and a copyright violator.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>Maybe not. The photo still had the orginal attribution on it (the web
>>address)
>>and might be "fair use". You can quote or copy a small portion of a work
>>but be sure to mention where you got it from.
>
>
> According to Stanford Law School's web page:
>
> "Fair use is a copyright principle based on the belief that the public
> is entitled to freely use portions of copyrighted materials for
> purposes of commentary and criticism."
>
> Cunningham was not using "a portion" of a photo, nor was he engaging
> in any commentary or criticism of the photo. He was stealing it, and
> he broke the copyright laws.
>
> And by the way, there is nothing explicitly stated in the law about
> attribution at all.
>
> See
> http://fairuse.stanford.edu/Copyright_and_Fair_Use_Overview/chapter9/index.html
> if you don't believe me.

>
> As I said about Cunningham, *spit*

I admire Jon K1TP for the excellent work he has done with his website.
Keep up the good work Jon!

--
73

Frank K3EKO

Note: To reply, remove nospam from e-mail address.

3908. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 21:56:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309151356.3da96b99@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77373

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bk4b7b$p383g$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309131210.2fc6d587@posting.google.com...
> > W1AW also sends Morse Code practice on VHF, if you live close enough.
> > But I don't think 8-land is close enough.
>
> Definitely, maybe the supposed field organizations can get together to
> rebroadcast the transmissions?? Sounds like an actual good idea.
>
> >
> > If not, Jim can tell you how to build an Elecraft K1 out of junk box
> > parts, or something like that.
>
> Nice idea, but it will be deaf, as that is the problem until I move, which
> won't be happening for another 2 years. Will have to suffer till then.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...

Restricted neighborhood? Me too.

3909. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 22:02:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309151402.4c8573bb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77374

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030915021845.23171.00000764@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0309141651.384a64a5@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> >news:<20030914121856.02537.00000567@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> >> In article <f45722ac.0309140512.7d45f76a@posting.google.com>,
> >> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >>
> >> >"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:<IuP8b.57189$3b2.7364893@twister.neo.rr.com>...
> >> >> If your not a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, there is a CW contest
> >> >> going one right now.
> >> >>
> >> >> If you are a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, then never mind, it's a
> Ham
> >> >> Radio thing. You would not understand.
> >> >>
> >> >> 10-73's!
> >> >
> >> >Rev. Jim is going to chastise you for your dirty mouth.
> >>
> >> Who are you talking about, Brian?
> >
> >"Shephed"
>
> Then you weren't talking about me at all. OK.
> >
> >> >Oh, never mind, it's a PCTA thing.
> >>
> >> You mean like the way you never censure Len or Carl (or anybody else who
> >> happens to oppose code tests), no matter what they say or how they say it?
> >
> >Never?
>
> I can't recall you ever censuring Len or Carl or anybody else who is against
> code tests. Can you give us an example where you took them to task for their
> behavior here?

Now, now, Rev. Jim, I'm not going to do your google searches for you.
But there's a couple of them in there for Len, and a reversal - Carl
censured me. He asked me to go easy on one of your bunions.

> >Rev. Jim, even little lies will get you turned away from the gate.
>
> Who are you talking to?

You.

> >> Oh, never mind, it's an NCTA double standards thing.
> >
> >I guess as long as "shephed" is spouting the party line, its OK with
> >you that he calls people "retarded mouth-breeding NCI members."
>
> No, it's not OK.

I'm suprised. It's not OK, yet you didn't edit out "retarded
mouth-breeding NCI members."

3910. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 22:07:43 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmce1k453gnb61@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77375

>
> There are no CW-only parts of the HF/MF bands. None at all.
>

You'd better check your frequency priviledge/allocation charts.
The lower half of the HF bands except for 160 meters is
"cw/fsk only"....

>
> Your opinion noted. Others have a different opinion.

yes, agreed.
However, it would seem that MOST oppinions worldwide
are on the side of removing code tests.

> >
> > They do not, however, likewise, first test people
> > on knowing how to build a double sideband carrier
> > transmission if they want to operate AM; they do
> > not require you to show how to get a microphone,
> > talk on it, and recieve the response on a speaker
> > if you want to use frequency modulated radiotelephone,
> > or single sideband carrier suppressed radiotelephone.
>
> Perhaps they should.

but they don't.

>
> When I first started out in ham radio, all I wanted to do was join the
> folks I heard on 75 meter AM. Yet in order to get the license, I had
> to learn not only Morse Code, but all sorts of theory and regulatory
> stuff that had absolutely nothing to do with 75 meter AM.
>
> Why was I forced to learn all that?

I really don't know. Thank heaven they've gone a long way to fix
the problem, and may make the final move here soon to remove the
scourge of CW tests all together.

Clint
KB5ZHT

3911. Re: Keep the cellphone charged

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 22:09:35 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmce538gq3rjdc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77376

Here on the texas gulf coast we've had several
tropical storms over the last couple of years....
while the storms weren't that destructive
(thank God), in each case there was a loss of power.
My cell phone was the only thing that wound up
working (I was suprised the towers didn't lose power).

My mistake was not getting a seperate 12v power source
for my transcievers, though, but by the next hurricane
season I should have the problem rectified.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--
--
Top nations that fund UN treasury,
in descending order...

United States: 22%
Japan: 19.6%
Germany: 9.8%
France: 6.5%
UK: 5.6%
Italy 5.1%
Canada: 2.6%
Spain: 2.5%

Russia isn't even in this top 8 list.
France, Russia and Germany, COMBINED,
do not contribute as much to the UN as
does the United States......

--

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk36v7nkl0@208.207.71.169...
> The weather channel just put this out as Number 1 on the list of
> things
> to do in preparation for the hurricane that's projected to make landfall
>
> on the east coast next week. :-))
>

3912. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 22:12:34 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmceao11agbt9c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77377

That is GREAT, but if only the federal courts would
take up the fight against states passing laws against
private citizens having radar detectors, when
there aren't suppose to be any bodies of
governement on any level passing laws regarding
the airwaves except for the FCC.

They kinda left not just hams but all of the people
as a whole out hanging to dry on this one.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--
--
Top nations that fund UN treasury,
in descending order...

United States: 22%
Japan: 19.6%
Germany: 9.8%
France: 6.5%
UK: 5.6%
Italy 5.1%
Canada: 2.6%
Spain: 2.5%

Russia isn't even in this top 8 list.
France, Russia and Germany, COMBINED,
do not contribute as much to the UN as
does the United States......

--

"Jerry" <joxendi@bellsouth.net> wrote in message
news:Hla9b.7655$4j3.5266@bignews6.bellsouth.net...
> * Court kicks New York ham's "police radio" case: A New York court has
> dismissed a misdemeanor charge against ARRL member Richard C. "Dick"
> Lalone, KC5GAX, for violating §397 of that state's Vehicle and Traffic
> Law. That section prohibits individuals other than law officers from
> equipping their vehicles with radios "capable of receiving signals on the
> frequencies allocated for police use" without first securing a permit. The
> section, which also prohibits knowingly interfering with police
> transmissions, contains an explicit exemption for "any person who holds a
> valid amateur radio operator's license . . . and who operates a duly
> licensed portable mobile transmitter and in connection therewith a

> receiver or receiving set on frequencies exclusively allocated . . . to
> duly licensed radio amateurs." In a nearly 1300-word decision, Judge John
> J. Hallet said it was clear the legislature never intended the provisions
> of 397 from applying to licensed Amateur Radio operators, and he
> dismissed the charge August 5. Susan Terry, KF4SUE, a former New York
> assistant attorney general, represented Lalone. ARRL President Jim Haynie,
> W5JBP, ARRL General Counsel Chris Imlay, W3KD, and ARRL Regulatory
> Information Specialist John Hennessee, N1KB, provided advice or assistance
> to Lalone.
>
>
> I like THIS one. AW, poor cop, no donut. LOL!!!
>
>
> Jerry
>
>

3913. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 22:17:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309151417.46154602@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77378

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<tSj9b.13163$NM1.5333@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > Some time back, I took a *practice* Extra test online. No
> > preparation. To make it more of a sporting course I did all
> > the math in my head - no calculator, no scratch paper. Took
> > me about 7-1/2 minutes start to finish, (snip)

Inneresting how Rev Jim always protects Bruce's outlandish stories.

> Yep, but the online tests are easier. With most of them, all you have to
> do click an answer directly under the question, not shade a small block on
> an answer card with a pencil. All that (reading the questions, answers, and
> filling in the answer card) couldn't likely be done in eight minutes. Of
> course, anything is possible, so I won't say it isn't (which is why I said
> it was "almost" impossible). But I suspect you would agree such an
> accomplishment would certainly be very rare.
>
> > Did it ever occur to you that his persona here could be an act?
>
> Nope. It's too consistent across many newsgroups over a relatively long
> period of time. If it's an act, he should be in Hollywood.
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Wait a minute. Didn't he play a part in Dukes of Hazard?

3914. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 22:28:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309151428.c2cdf62@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77379

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bk4b7l$p383g$14@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> Larry,
>
> The heck with those anti-parallel parkers!!!!! Tell him that if he isn't a
> Real Driver (tm), he is inferior. HI HI
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> > Brian:
> >
> > I'm very sorry about your inferiority complex, but I was just asking for
> > some information from Ryan about driver's licenses. This is not about
> > my "superiority" or anything else that you should be whining about --
> > unless you are having problems of your own. Care to talk about it?
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT

To heck with me???

I'm a parallel parker from way back.

3915. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 22:32:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309151432.5b8728a4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77380

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<hGH8b.2078$nQ.1017334@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309130514.1621de5@posting.google.com...
> > n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
> news:<20030906091922.14837.00002769@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> > > There are already folks like W5YI campaigning for less WRITTEN testing,
> saying
> > > the Tech test is too hard.
> >
> > The Tech test And privs are insane for an entry level license.
>
> I do hope you mean the test is insanely simple and the privileges insanely
> high for the level of testing done.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Sorry.

The tested material is insanely technical and the privs are insanely
high for an entry level license.

Go do some historical research and see what the Novice material
consisted of, pre-Novice Enhancement.

Now that's an entry level license.

3916. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 23:29:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <qXr9b.16083$NM1.15285@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77381

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:svl9b.206446$Ay2.54336700@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:3Wa9b.12918$Aq2.8891@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
> > news:r489b.61835$3b2.8129302@twister.neo.rr.com...
> > >
> > > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> > > news:vm9ptb2m1ok1f3@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > LOL!
> > > >
> > > > A good liberal? you have NO idea..... I'm as right wing
> > > > and conservative as they come... evidently you don't read
> > > > my other posts or in other NG's either, where i'm referred
> > > > to as the "jim birch devil"
> > > >
> > > > Clint
> > > > KB5ZHT
> > > >
> > > You can't be a conservative, we believe in earning your way in life,
not
> > > having "things" given to you because you are to lazy to EARN them.
Sound
> > > familiar Liberal boy?
> > >
> > > Conservative my ass!
> >
> > Earning your way is fine...as long as the requirement(s)
> > is relevent...that's were you lose your argument.
>
> Well Bill, I'm on the bottom of 40 right now listening to a band FULL of
> irrelevance. <hihi>

Wonderfl, then you'll learn code if you want to participate there.
If not, nothing lost. More to the point, is there any minimum code
speed that should be banned from the CW/data segments at the
bottom of the bands?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3917. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 23:40:12 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <w5s9b.16170$NM1.5466@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77382

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk4k6f$fa4$0@208.207.71.145...
>
>
> Clint wrote:
>
> >
> > >If you refuse to learn how to handle radio's most basic mode you can
never
> > be
> > >able to regard yourself as fully qualified in ham radio communciations.
> > > That's just the Way it Is. Live with it.
> > >
> >
> > I'm sorry but that is YOUR oppinion. What counts is the decision of
those in
> > authority, namely the FCC.
>
> Son, you might want to learn somewhere along the way that opinion is
sometimes
> congruent with fact, sometimes not.
>
> No matter what the FCC says or does, it can't alter facts. And nowhere
have
> they ever said that a no-code license is a fully qualified ham.

So far the UK, Netherlands and several other countries have done
exactly that. Once all code testing is ended by the FCC will you
accept that action as supporting the FCC position that
morse isn't needed to be a "fully qualified ham?"
Additionally, I don't recall anywhere seeing any FCC reference
to the concept of a "fully qualified ham". Is that a new license
class?

> In fact, the
> retired Chief of the Amateur and Citizen's Division of FCC (now called
something
> else) stated in his comments on the NCVEC pettion
> (which BTW he helped write) that it was an oxymoron to expect an Extra
class
> ham to be a expert on ham radio if he doesn't know Morse code. Thus he
supports
> a code test for Extras.

Does he speak for the FCC today?

> And it should be obvious, to anyone who actually owns and uses a thought process
> - when Morse code is a widely-used mode within ham radio, *anyone* who can't use
> it simply and factually *cannot* be a fully qualified ham - No matter what
> license or privileges the FCC gives them.

What a crock. On that basis, if you can't speak Spanish, Chineese, and several
other languages commonly used by hams around the globe, then you
shouldn't be considered "qualified" either.

> > And YOU will have to live with the decisions THEY
> > make.
> >
>
> Which can't change facts. Facts are immutable. Live with it. Any ham not able
> to operate CW is simply and factually not fully qualified.

Your Opinion yes, a fact? Not at all. And that's an opinion
I'm entitled to.

Cheers as always,
Bill K2UNK

3918. Re: Keep the cellphone charged

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 23:49:00 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Mds9b.7032$aH5.1862@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 77383

Hmmm ... once the winds pick up to about 50 MPH, the cell phones will be a jingling 911 to ask "is this the hurricane?".

By the time the winds are up to 60 MPH, a lot of cell phone users won't be able to get through due to so many calls to 911 asking "is it going to get worse?"

Once the winds have reached hurricane force, some towers will be down and most calls won't get through. Many cell phone users will be trying to call friends/relatives to let them know how they're doing. This is an *excellent* time to call your girlfriend/boyfriend (for teenagers, of course) to give them a minute by minute description of the junk flying past your picture window. Don't laugh; when I was on Guam and a typhoon hit, one idiot went out with a new motion picture camera (this was before video tape) to take pictures of debris flying through the air! (yes, it's true)

Keep the batteries for the flashlights, unless, of course, you've got a couple of HTs to use 'em in :)

Let the cell phone users tell me how reliable they are *after* the big blow hits.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk36v7nkl0@208.207.71.169...
> The weather channel just put this out as Number 1 on the list of
> things
> to do in preparation for the hurricane that's projected to make landfall
>
> on the east coast next week. :-))
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.518 / Virus Database: 316 - Release Date: 9/11/03

3919. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 23:52:43 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <fhs9b.16269$NM1.7039@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77384

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030915021846.23171.00000765@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <vm9usff4mpm58f@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
> <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>
> >sending and receiving CW isn't a building block
> >to anything else.....
>
> Yes, it is.
>
> First, it's a building block to the use of the mode on the air.

Come on Jim. that's a self fullfilling argument. My point, and I know
you know this, is that morse knowledge is not needed in any manner as
a foundation, stepping stone, or whatever to any body or radio knowledge
or concepts.

> Although other
> services have pretty much stopped using Morse Code, hams use it
extensivley,
> and an amateur license is permission to operate an amateur station, not a
> station in another service. Note that the Morse Code tests are at a very
basic
> level. They're entry-level, nothing more.

Are you afraid that without a code test, people will "pollute the HF
airwaves"
with bad morse?

> Second, if someone wants to actually design and build radio equipment,
having
> skill in Morse Code permits them to use almost anything from very simple
to
> very sophisticated equipment to good advantage. Would you expect a
newcomer to
> radio to build an SSB transceiver as a first project?

They can build whatever they want. If they want to start with a simple
morse
Xmitter then they will learn at least enough morse to be able to use it.
If they don't self train themselves, the rig will be useless to them. As
another
point of reference, when I was going for my AAS in electricl technology we
built a 10 watt CW rig as part of the lab work. We tested it using a dummy
load and no one had to know even one character of morse to do the lab work.

> >now, the electrical principals of what a CW
> >transmission is, and a knowledge test of that is a good idea, but
> >that's comparing apples and oranges.
>
> Why should there be *any* written test on theory if all a person wants to
do is
> operate manufactured radios? If someone doesn't want to build a rig, why
should
> they have to memorize all those symbols, diagrams and formulas?

IF that's what you believe then go start NTI (No Theory Int'l).

> >I think most of the PCTA
> >is being disingenuous when they come up with "good reasons"
> >to keep CW testing alive;
>
> Why?

Actually, they haven't scored even a single point in the arguments
made to the FCC now or in the past.

> > I think the true deeper reason lies
> >somewhere in the "I had to do it so everybody should" relm,
> >as i've stated before.
> >
> You can think what you want, but you're mistaken on that account.

Exactly what is it that the PCTAs fear if there is NO morse test
at all?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3920. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-15 23:56:33 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309151556.3262b568@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77385

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:<bk4b7a$p383g$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bjso8p$m13$1@208.206.142.71...
> >
> >
> > Brian Kelly wrote:
> >
> > > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:<bjqv35$mddbp$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > > > Yeah, that might be true if you have HF capability........
> > >
> > > Can't argue with that. But as Jim points out it doesn't take much of a
> > > radio and antenna to at least listen on HF. What's the show-stopper in
> > > your case?
> > >
> >
> > Desire, obviously
>
> Yes, as in regards to listening to HF voice..... Sounds just like listening
> to CB. No, it is environmental conditions. Killer RFI that would make BPL
> look like nothing.

Show stopper. Got my share. Dit-dit.

w3rv

3921. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 00:05:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <sts9b.16370$NM1.2636@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77386

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk3igb$it8$0@208.206.142.91...
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bk36jc$mmq$0@208.207.71.169...
> > >
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:O6%8b.2868$nQ.1193559@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> > > > >
> > > > > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> > > > > news:vm8ucqlp6pd301@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > > When I took my drivers test years ago to get a license
> > > > > > to drive an automobile, the never required me to
> > > > > > prove that I could hitch a horse team to a wagon.
> > > > > > The youngsters today, likewise, tell me that the
> > > > > > departments of motor vehicles around the country
> > > > > > do not ask them to prove they are proficient with
> > > > > > buggy whips.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Enough said.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Clint
> > > > > >
> > > > > The youngsters today still tell me that they must learn to use a
> > > > pencil and
> > > > > learn to write script. Typing and word processing are taught
AFTER
> > > > > they have learned to write manually. Enough said.
> > > > >
> > > > Bad anology since morse isn't a foundation to any other
> > > > body of radio knowledge and/or language skills or
> > > > writing skills.
> > > >
> > > Wrong, because radiotelegraphy IS the most basic radio communications
> > mode,
> > > the use of which is possible only if the operator has self-trained
enough
> > to
> > > be able to make use of it.
> > >
```

> > IF morse (i.e. radiotelegraphy) had any basis as a foundation
> > for higher learning of radio concepts, principles or theory
> > then it would be a requirement of engineering students...which
> > it has never been to my knowledge anywhere.
>
> And that's where your argument falls flat on its face. The point is
> operational, on the air *communications *. It's called OPERATING. Has nada
to
> do with anything beyond, although placing a radiotelegraph on the air on
HF
> happens to be, as well, the most simple of stations to get up and running.

Tat is ONLY if one wants to operate telegraphy....which is NOT
an FCC requirement at all (i.e. there's no FCC requirement that
any ham be operating proficient in any mode).

> It's the BASICS, Bill. When you can't appreciate the fact that
radiotelegraphy
> is radio at its most basic it's no wonder
> you can't understand the concept.

When you can't accept the fact that there's no mandate for anyone to ever
use morse code or any other mode, then you'll never get it.

> The entire point is that radiotelegraphy using manually encoded Morse
remains
> as one of the most, effective, and COST EFFECTIVE means of
radiocommunications,
> even after all the years it has been in excistence. But only when
operators
> self-train to gain the skill to use it.

Which any ham will be free to do (i.e. self train in morse) after code
testing is ended. Those that want to use morse will learn it. Those that
don't, won't. That is the same for every mode and/or language
(both written or spoken) used by hams anywhere.

> The FCC has every reason and more than ample justification to require
EVERY
> ham to be able to actually pass traffic in Morse on the air.

Guess I must have missed the FCC report that acknowledges that.

> It's easy to make
> a case that the ability is a valid requirement for licensing.

So far your success with the FCC has been zilch in doing so.

> The fact that
> they have not chosen to do so is far more related to the wants and desires
of a
> vocal few, and a whole lot of PC, than the actual operational
traffic-handling

> capacities of the ARS.

Now who is crying in their beer?

> Now you'll come back with the same old saw about how it's "no longer
sued" for
> this or that.

It isn't a matter of use...those that want to will learn. It's
that freakin simple.

> Just as though no such need will ever again present to the ARS,
> ever, under any circumstances. Whatta crystal ball jock you are!

Yes, let's mandate morse for all just in case the Aliens invade as
in Independance day.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3922. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 00:07:41 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309151607.6a7e5a55@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77387

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030915021846.23171.00000766@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <go49b.4882$Fj6.491@news02.roc.ny>, "Steve Stone"
> <spfleck@zzcitlinkzz.net> writes:
>
> >I think anyone who is a train engineer should pass a test for operating a
> >coal fired steam locomotive
>
> The term usually used is "locomotive engineer"
>
> If the railroad they intend to work for uses coal fired steam locomotives,
> learning how to run them would be a good idea.

Ya can't operate any locomotive if yer not certified "in type" per
(+/-) the FAA regs for being licensed in type of A/C. I forget who
issues the certifications, the states or the feds. Plus the ASME also
gets into the act in the case of steamers because of requirments on
certification of boiler operators. Which is not the case with diesels
and full-scale Lionels.

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

3923. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 00:09:33 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <1xs9b.16404$NM1.13855@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77388

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk4ks2gci0@208.206.142.94...
>
>
> Clint wrote:
>
> > > > IF morse (i.e. radiotelegraphy) had any basis as a foundation
> > > > for higher learning of radio concepts, principles or theory
> > > > then it would be a requirement of engineering students...which
> > > > it has never been to my knowledge anywhere.
> > >
> > > And that's where your argument falls flat on its face. The point is
> > > operational, on the air *communications *. It's called OPERATING.
> >
> > <snip>
> > you just employed the "diversion" tactic. he was totally correct; if
> > the basic fundamentals of radio, which you have been totally parroting
> > until now, required it, then it would be a necissary requirement for
> > all basic electrical engineering, and it is not.
> >
> > > It's the BASICS, Bill.
> >
> > As YOU see it.
> > Why aren't new hams required to show they now how to forge/smelt
> > copper wire, produce polyethelene insulation, make aluminum out
> > of scratch for antennas, etc., if BASICS were the name of
> > everything?
> >
>
> Clint your ignorance is showing again. Ham radio isn't about engineering,
> its about operating ham radio. Sure, one CAN use engineering if one
> wishes, and someone surely had to do some engineering to produce the gear
> we all use. But if Bill's comment holds any water at all then the tests
> would have been becoming harder instead of becominig giveaways.
>
> Ham radio isn't about metalurgy pr plastics technology, Clint, it's about
> OPERATING . But you amd Bill already knew that, it's jsut your NCI/CB
> attitudes showing through, again.

You can always tell when Dick runs out of arguments...resort
to cheap namecalling.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3924. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 00:19:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030915201911.08626.00000603@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 77391

In article <vmbdl829oh7ica@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
<rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:

>> If the railroad they intend to work for uses coal fired steam locomotives,
>> learning how to run them would be a good idea.
>
>yes, exactly.

Then you agree that the skills tested for should be those actually used.
>
>I guess it's too bad that there aren't that many coal fired steam
>locomotives being used anymore.

They had their good and bad features.

The main reason most US railroads stopped using them in the 1950s was simple economics, nothing more. The total operating cost of diesel electric locomotives, in terms of ton-miles per locomotive operating dollar, was simply better. The diesels themselves were more expensive to buy, and so was their fuel. Parts were also more expensive. But the diesel-electrics did not require water, did not generate ashes or cinders, and could be left idling in cold weather without much attention.

US railroads then were (and most still are) private companies whose purpose is to make a profit.

Ham radio is completely different.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3925. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 00:19:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030915201911.08626.00000602@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 77392

In article <bk4n90kce0@208.206.142.95>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>> Strictly speaking, there is no pollution-free method of obtaining
>> significant amounts of power.
>
>Actually there is, it's just that they have no serious following in the
>circles
>where it might matter enough to move things along at a rate which would
>actually make them viable, available options. Some of them are
>
>Wind
>Tidal action
>Hydrogen
>Solar

Geothermal
Biomass

>What is mostly needed is the emphasis toward development of the alternates.

It would be interesting to know how many trillions of dollars have been poured
into nuclear power research since the end of WW2, and compare that to what has
been spent on renewables.

>While the isntalled base is fossil fuel, at affordable prices, and the
>pollution
>doesn't overwhelm us, not that much is lilely to change. It isn't for lack of
>possibilities. You could easily generate all your own power now, it's just
>much
>cheaper to buy it from a utility which probably burns coal to generate it.
>You
>can get engines which will run on used vegetable oil or almost any other type
>of
>fat. But few of us will as long as the corner gas station is handy and not
>outta sight pricewise.

There's also efficiency considerations. More efficient lighting methods and
insulation can make big differences. The effect of requiring an efficiency
rating of 12 on new air conditioners instead of 10 is enormous at the power
plant.
>
> Looks to me like development of hydrogen is the way to go. It's THE most
>plentiful fuel on the planet, is absolutely non-polluting since combusting it
>recombines it with oxygen to form water, from which some of the hydrogen can
>again be extracted.

But where do we get the hydrogen to begin with? It does not occur by itself naturally on earth in significant quantities.

To extract hydrogen from water requires electrolysis, which requires electricity. The energy available from the extracted hydrogen is no greater than the electrical energy required to extract it.

Extraction from methane (natural gas) leaves you with a lot of carbon to dispose of. And you might as well burn the methane.

>And most current vehicles can operate on it with little
>modification needed beyond storage. The issue of volatility is actually
>pretty
>much a non-issue, considering the volitility of gasoline.

Gasoline evaporates but hydrogen would have to be stored under significant pressure.

>Again, it's the
>insalled base of fossil fuels that would have to be reworked. That's a lot of
>service stations to alter. And a lot of politics to rework. Not gonna happen
>anytime soon. No, I haven't forgotten the Hindenburg. Different era,
>different technology.

Recent tests have shown that what caused the Hindenburg disaster was that the fabric covering was extremely flammable. Analysis of fabric scraps and the famous film has shown that the skin caught fire first, and ignited the gas inside.

Hydrogen isn't an energy source. It's really just a storage method.

> There are considerable wind generation facilities in Western areas, though,
>and
>I recall driving past a huge solar collector field out there somewhere. .I
>think
>it was in southwestern Arizona where the sun shines daily.
>
> And there have been conceptual plans for large tidal action generators for a
>long time, without any hard plans to move on them AFAIK.
>
Enormous initial cost is why.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3926. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 00:19:12 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030915201912.08626.00000604@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 77389

In article <bk4b79$p383g$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030911214828.23171.00000685@mb-m05.aol.com...
>> In article <bjqv35$mddbp$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
>> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>>
>> >Yeah, that might be true if you have HF capability........
>>
>> All you need is a simple CW receiver and an antenna. W1AW runs the legal
>limit
>> into serious antennas; it should pound into MI on 80 and 40 with no
>problem.
>
>Don't even have a shortwave reciever at this point, as where I live the
>RFI is ridiculous as hell. My current residence also as well must have been
>lined with lead at some point, as nothing can be recieved by either tv or
>broadcast am/fm radio either......
>
>Until I move, HF is pretty much out of the question.....

Sounds like you may have:

- Stucco-over-metal lath exterior walls
- Metal framing
- Metal roofing or under-roofing
- Steel or aluminum siding
- Combination of the above.

>> Hope you are feeling better, Ryan.

>Thanks, definitely better, but have a bit to go yet.

Keep us posted! And take it easy.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3927. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 00:19:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030915201914.08626.00000605@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 77390

In article <3F65FEFA.8030107@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> Only then did they let you try the written. Mess up at any point -
>> even one character or question - and it was "go home and study some
>> more and don't come back for at least 30 days". No CSCE, no partial
>> credit, nada, do it all first try at one sitting or it doesn't count
>> at all.
>
>
> hold on s second Jim! You're saying one missed question meant flunking
>the test?
>
No! Let me explain...

The old code test worked like this:

The examiner gave you a yellow lined legal pad and a #2 pencil. You put your name at the top of the copy sheet and got ready. You put on a pair of 'phones and when everyone at that test table was ready, the test was started. The test was 5 minutes of plain-language code at the required speed (13 or 20 wpm - back then only volunteer examiners gave 5 wpm tests)

Your job was to write down the code as received. When the code stopped, you had to put the pencil down IMMEDIATELY. No going back and fixing anything up, no filling in missed letters even if they were obvious, etc. The examiner pulled the pads away as soon as the code stopped, sometimes resulting in a long pencil mark down the page...

The examiner had to find at least 1 minute of solid copy for you to pass. That meant at least 65 correct legible consecutive characters for 13 wpm or 100 correct legible consecutive characters for 20 wpm. "Legible" meant HE had to be able to read them easily the first time - no "what's this?" from The Man. If the examiner could not find the required 65 or 100, you failed. 64 or 99 wasn't good enough. Go home and study for at least a month before retesting.

If you passed receiving, then you could try sending. You sent what was written on a laminated card that the examiner gave you. He was sole judge of your sending skill - he could decide you were OK in a few seconds, or keep you pounding away for a couple minutes. (It was rare for a sending test to last more than a minute). You had to send at the required speed, too - he would tell you if you were going too slow. If you failed the sending test, you had to go home and study for at least a month before retesting - both sending and receiving. I don't know anybody who failed sending, though.

You were allowed to bring a mill for receiving and speed key for sending, but you'd better be well-prepared if you showed up with same.

If you got that far, they'd give you the written test. After 1960 they were all multiple choice, but we did not know the exact Q and A, just general subject areas. The FCC published "study guides" in essay format. These were reprinted with permission in the ARRL License Manuals of the day. You were also expected to know the regulations (which were not part of the study guide questions).

You had to get a certain number of questions right (74%, as I recall) on the written to pass. Miss by even one question less than the required and you had to go home and study for at least a month before retesting - both sending and receiving code, and the written. No do-overs, no credit for tests already passed. All or nothing at all.

Usually they would not tell you how well you did other than "Pass" or "Fail". They did NOT tell you which ones you got wrong. (At least not in Philly).

When I took the tests in 1968 and 1970, there was a fee of $9, IIRC. I'm not sure - the fee was instituted in 1963 and was $4, then $9, then $4, then eliminated. The fee was the same whether you passed or failed. Only the Novice was free.

$9 doesn't sound like much but back in those days it was a lot of money for a high school kid. I think minimum wage back then was $1.20 or so, which meant the test was a days' pay BEFORE taxes for a minimum wage person. And a kid would have been glad to get minimum. I estimate that the equivalent today would be $50-60.

The 2 year experience requirement for Extra meant that most hams needed to make at least two trips to the FCC office to get the top license.

For those of us near an FCC office it was mostly a matter of getting off from school or work. The big offices held exams one or more days a week.

For those farther out it was a much bigger deal.

What all this did was to cause prospective and upgrading hams to be extremely well prepared before even attempting the trip to FCC. Today they would call it "overlearning".

Was it a better system back then? You be the judge. It's not coming back any time soon. And it wasn't hams, new or old, who changed it.

First time I tried 13 wpm, I did not pass because the examiner could not easily read my longhand. Which had been pounded into us by the penguins (oops, I mean IHM nuns).

So I went home and taught myself to block print. (Printing was not a parochial school subject - only "publics" were allowed to print. Something about being bold, brazen articles was involved). Next try, later that summer, I had no problem.

73 de Jim, N2EY

3928. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 00:20:26 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <eHs9b.16486$NM1.11330@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77393

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
news:c2356669.0309151318.61dd8717@posting.google.com...
> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:<vmbdhfc0nr1n86@corp.supernews.com>...
> > many people that are in or supports the doctrines of PCTA keeps
> > spouting "basics", and draws an anology to either handwriting...
> > and I say this; does this mean you could NEVER write cursive
> > if you were never taught print? could you NOT be taught
> > cursive directly without first being taught print? No.
>
> OK, fine.
>
> But why should any sort of manual writing skill be mandatory in a
> world full of keyboards?

It may well come to that. For now, since keyboards are not
everywhere 100% of the time, educators require some
sort of manual writing ability. For the record, I never had a
decent handwriting and I print everything on those rare
occasions when I have to manually apply pen to paper.

> > However, it's simply another skill that can be taught, and they
> > do, and that's fine.
>
> Why?
>
> Why not teach keyboarding from Day One? Our children will spend far
> more time at keyboards than writing.

But their need to write at some occasions hasn't
been ended. Maybe someday it will...but not now.

> > However, they do not look at CW the
> > same way; it's pass/fail, not merely a percentage of test
> > that needs to be passed.
> >
> If it were up to me, there would be several written tests (or the
> written would be split up into separately-graded parts) as well as a
> code test.

You know I agree in principal with that...except for needing
any code test at all.

> > Do you think they would support a system where you had
> > to be tested on CW, if an only if you wanted to use CW
> > on the CW part of the bands? Heh, of COURSE not.

>
> There are no CW-only parts of the HF/MF bands. None at all.

Perhaps he should have asked:
Do you think they would support a system where you had
to be tested on CW, if an only if you wanted to use CW
on the parts of the bands where CW can be used?

> > That is where thier anology fails. The art of CW needs
> > to be tested with a practical test if you are to use and
> > learn CW, but not necissarily ham radio. I would have
> > supported a system like that, where if you wanted to
> > operate CW on the lower half of the band you had to
> > be tested on if first, but of course, that was out of the
> > question.
>
> Your opinion noted. Others have a different opinion.
> >
> > They do not, however, likewise, first test people
> > on knowing how to build a double sideband carrier
> > transmission if they want to operate AM; they do
> > not require you to show how to get a microphone,
> > talk on it, and recieve the response on a speaker
> > if you want to use frequency modulated radiotelephone,
> > or single sideband carrier suppressed radiotelephone.
>
> Perhaps they should.
> >
> > But they DO want to force CW on people that don't
> > necissarily have any interest in operating it. "basics"
> > arguments fail; "selftrained skill" fails because everything
> > is a selftrained skill, why put the emphasis on an outdated
> > mode instead of testing selftrained skills on new, modern
> > modes of communication?
>
> Then answer this question: Why should people who are not interested in
> building or fixing their radios have to learn all that theory stuff
> for the written tests? Why are all hams tested on all sorts of stuff
> they are not interested in?

But, as pointed out before...ONLY morse has its own stand alone
test. No other body of ham knowledge on that is tested is
given that exclusivity.

> When I first started out in ham radio, all I wanted to do was join the
> folks I heard on 75 meter AM. Yet in order to get the license, I had
> to learn not only Morse Code, but all sorts of theory and regulatory
> stuff that had absolutely nothing to do with 75 meter AM.
> Why was I forced to learn all that?

Cause its the rules...if you want it changed, petition the FCC.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

3929. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 00:53:08 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmcnnod3ouuvf9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77394

>
> Wonderfl, then you'll learn code if you want to participate there.
> If not, nothing lost. More to the point, is there any minimum code
> speed that should be banned from the CW/data segments at the
> bottom of the bands?
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

Excellent point.... yet another reason why specific code speed testing
is irrelavent. AND, for that matter, it leads to the next argument...
what of those people that have true disabilities and cannot pass a
CW test, and have a physician's written excuse, when they had faster
than 5 wmp testing? they were NOT required to take a 13 or 20 wpm
test... yet, somehow, they were accepted into the world of ham radio
as legal operators. How is it POSSIBLE that they did this without
having ever passed a profeciency test @ high speed CW?

Oh, that's right. Because it's not really that necessary in the first place.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--
--
Top nations that fund UN treasury,
in descending order...

United States: 22%
Japan: 19.6%
Germany: 9.8%
France: 6.5%
UK: 5.6%
Italy 5.1%
Canada: 2.6%
Spain: 2.5%

Russia isn't even in this top 8 list.
France, Russia and Germany, COMBINED,
do not contribute as much to the UN as
does the United States......

--

3930. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 00:58:14 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmco1dngi5t53d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77395

```
>
> So far the UK, Netherlands and several other countries have done
> exactly that. Once all code testing is ended by the FCC will you
> accept that action as supporting the FCC position that
> morse isn't needed to be a "fully qualified ham?"

I hear belgium just got rid of it's last CW testing, in another
newsgroup.

> Additionally, I don't recall anywhere seeing any FCC reference
> to the concept of a "fully qualified ham". Is that a new license
> class?

Neither have I... I already posted a remark to that effect, too...
...that is, has the FCC been "lieing" when it passed out many
test certificates giving an operator his licence class and thus
frequency priviledges? have they been saying "um, you can
talk on the radio, but you're really not qualified to do it"?

>
> > In fact, the
> > retired Chief of the Amateur and Citizen's Division of FCC (now called
> something
> > else) stated in his comments on the NCVEC pettion

<snip PCTA dribble>
>
> Does he speak for the FCC today?

BINGO!

>
> > And it should be obvious, to anyone who actually owns and uses a thought
> process
> > - when Morse code is a widely-used mode within ham radio, *anyone* who
> can't use
> > it simply and factually *cannot* be a fully qualified ham - No matter
> what
> > license or privileges the FCC gives them.
>
> What a crock.

EXACTLY.... he's inserting his "oppinion" for "fact".

>
> > > And YOU will have to live with the decisions THEY
> > > make.
```

> > >
> >
> > Which can't change facts. Facts are immutable. Live with it. Any ham
not
> able
> > to operate CW is simply and factually not fully qualified.
>
> Your Opinion yes, a fact? Not at all. And that's an opinion
> I'm entitled to.
>
> Cheers as always,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>

Yet another voice of reason. And there are more of them out there
on this side of the argument than the PCTA's.

Clint
KB5ZHT

3931. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 01:03:04 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmcoachsfo5qfd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77396

>
> You can always tell when Dick runs out of arguments...resort
> to cheap namecalling.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>

I'm use to it.... it's the same thing I run into in other newsgroups during political debates. As soon as "the other side" runs out of arguments, I start getting the following remarks, and in no certain order...

s__thead
hatemonger
shut the f__k up
fascist
moron
why don't you take a _____ and shove it _____ until you _____....

...plus a few other directives instructing me to take objects and do things with them with certain parts of my body, most of which aren't physically possible but are quite colorful.

Clint
KB5ZHT

3932. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 01:10:42 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmcoomi02toh43@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77398

>
> Which any ham will be free to do (i.e. self train in morse) after code
> testing is ended. Those that want to use morse will learn it. Those that
> don't, won't. That is the same for every mode and/or language
> (both written or spoken) used by hams anywhere.

exactly. I will continue to use CW from time to time, even after all
code testing is gone. I like it. I enjoy it. However, I still see no further
logical reasoning for forcing everybody to become profecient at some
given "x" speed.

it's just more "I had to do it, so waaaa waaaa waaaa, YOU should have
to!"

>
> > The FCC has every reason and more than ample justification to require
> EVERY
> > ham to be able to actually pass traffic in Morse on the air.
>
> Guess I must have missed the FCC report that acknowledges that.'

it's because it's just his oppinion.

>

>
> It isn't a matter of use...those that want to will learn. It's
> that freakin simple.

like I said countless times before... when they are posed
with the question, "well, how about only code-testing for
people who want to go on the lower (code) end of the
bands and operate CW?" (since, in fact, you WILL have
to learn CW to operate it anyway) boy do they run, play
duck & cover, and dodge the issue. Nah, they want it
imposed on EVERYBODY.

Now's what was he saying about legislation by "a vocal
few"?

> Yes, let's mandate morse for all just in case the Aliens invade as
> in Independance day.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

how about that fabricated story a while back involving the russian submarine..... there were lots of PCTA types taking a little artistic license with the news and saying that the russian crew was tapping on the wall of the sub, and those messages were getting through. (the story of the sub sinking wasn't fabricated, only that there were supposedly CW signals comeing from it by way of tapping)

seriously. I can't remember if it was this newsgroup or another, but I remembered saying to myself, "now they've gone to a very SHAMEFUL level...."

Clint
KB5ZHT

3933. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 01:11:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309151711.6daf7827@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77397

Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
news:<9h7llvkvm4b98intn6bsnh3m70ofje9n29@4ax.com>...

> Kim, within a year the only debate in here about CW will be about the
> consequences of it no longer being required. The whining will be
> terrible for awhile, but like the no-code tech discussions, they will
> eventually disappear.

Ooooh, huge, huge miscalcualtion, Brock. You give these guys way too
much credit. These guys have memories like an elephant, and they will
carrry the debate to their graves. Which is why I say that the only
cure are the actuarial tables. They are as unyielding as the PCTA,
till the bitter end.

3934. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 01:14:15 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmcovbibib9ne0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77399

>
> > > However, it's simply another skill that can be taught, and they
> > > do, and that's fine.
> >
> > Why?
> >
> > Why not teach keyboarding from Day One? Our children will spend far
> > more time at keyboards than writing.
>
> But their need to write at some occasions hasn't
> been ended. Maybe someday it will...but not now.
>

exactly; changing to adapt with the times. It's called progress.

>
> But, as pointed out before...ONLY morse has its own stand alone
> test. No other body of ham knowledge on that is tested is
> given that exclusivity.

yep... "I had to do it, so everybody should have to! it's not fair
otherwise!" ... only, they won't actually admit that.

3935. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 01:18:18 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309151718.2a42dc3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77400

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030910201910.15462.00002889@mb-m06.aol.com>...

> Agreed! But I have also seen lots of stuff in the other direction. Check out
> the flak I'm getting from the irony-impaired over the "Smith Chart Test" post.

Where's the irony?

> The people that need convincing are the FCC, and from their actions over the
> past 25+ years it looks to me like they are not about to improve the written
> tests.

The Smith Chart could be folded into any current examination. But,
no, you want/need/can't live without a separate pass/fail exam that
will intimidate people and keep them from the ARS.

"The ARS isn't for everyone."

3936. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 01:24:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk5opb$t4m$0@208.206.142.112>
Source record: 77251

Bill Sohl wrote:

>
> > Ham radio isn't about metalurgy pr plastics technology, Clint, it's about
> > OPERATING . But you amd Bill already knew that, it's jsut your NCI/CB
> > attitudes showing through, again.
>
> You can always tell when Dick runs out of arguments...resort
> to cheap namecalling.
>

Ah, so NCI is cheap! For once we agree!

3937. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 02:07:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6670A2.7050905@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77252

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Clint wrote:

<some snippage>

>>
>>I mean, ORIGINALLY, the first communication that
>>was EVER sent was a spark with a spark generator.
>>The do not require you to show profeciency in building
>>a spark generator and using it; if you say "well, we just
>>SKIP that step and go to CW", then you can say that
>>about EVERY step along the way of learning
>>ham radio.
>
>
> Aw Clint, surely you're better informed than that...arent you?

And Clint says Dee was spurious?

- Mike KB3EIA -

3938. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 02:16:17 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F667270.5070607@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 77253

Phil Kane wrote:

>On Sun, 14 Sep 2003 23:28:56 -0400, Jerry wrote:
>
>
>
>>I like THIS one. AW, poor cop, no donut. LOL!!!
>>
>>
>
> That's what happens when you put radio-based enforcement in the
> hands of unclued-in officers. It should have never gotten past the
> initial field stop.
>
>
>
I wonder how many thousands of special exceptions to the various laws cops deal with, the cops need to know about. The more obscure stuff is not likely to get remembered by your average cop. Still a pain in the butt for that ham...

3939. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 02:18:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030915221852.11891.00000818@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 77254

In article <bk4b7t$p383g$21@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Oh really.... Are you including "our side" or both sides in the war?
>

Hmmm... I wrote:

"Every year and a half, about as many Americans die on US highways as died in
the entire Vietnam war."

While it's clear to me that Americans are meant, perhaps it would be clearer to
all if I wrote:

"Every year and a half, about as many Americans die on US highways as Americans
died in the entire Vietnam war."

How's that?

73 de Jim, N2EY

>> And if you're going to discuss dangerous industrial processes, consider
>this:
>> The most dangerous common form of mechanized transportation in use today
>in the
>> USA are privately owned motor vehicles. Every year and a half, about as
>many
>> Americans die on US highways as died in the entire Vietnam war. Airlines,
>> trains, buses and ships are far safer, yet few people refuse to drive or
>ride
>> in a car compared to other modes. Why?
>>

3940. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 02:31:08 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bk5ssj$ldj@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 77255

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030915081859.29660.00000652@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <9k99b.3778$nQ.1307964@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >So why hasn't California built any oil, coal, or hydroelectric power
platns
> >in the last ten years?
>
> Some folks would say it's the "NIMBY" problem (Not In My Back Yard), but I
say
> it's actually a "BANANA" problem (Build Absolutely Nothing Anywhere Near
> Anything). It's not just generating facilities - transmission facilities
have
> the same problem.
>
> >I'll tell you. They too are being blocked by the
> >environmentalists.
>
> Are you sure that's the only reason? Are none of the environmental
> considerations reasonable? Think about how often the ground shakes out
there...
>
> > Are they also economically unfeasible? It's unlikely.
>
> No, it's very likely. Here's why:
>
> First, for most of the past 10 years, investment capital has been drawn to
the
> high-payoff telecom and dotcom industries. Until the bubble burst, those
were a
> lot more promising to investors. A server farm can be put up in a fraction
of
> the time that a generating plant requires, with the promise (back then) of
a
> much larger ROI.
>
> Second, the West has a long history of cheap electricity from govt.
sponsored
> projects, most commonly hydro. What dies a typical Californian pay per
kWH?
> Here in Philly, we pay something like 11 cents / kWH residential. NYC
folks pay

> even more. What do they pay in SF or LA? (If the retail is cheap,
wholesale
> must be even cheaper)
>
> Third, the whold deregulation and Enron-type mess has caused anyone with
any
> sense to avoid building actual facilties like the plague, because the
market
> (which used to be one of the most stable and predictable) became
completely
> unstable.
>
> Fourth, the environmental/NIMBY/BANANA effects are greatest and most
powerful
> in places like CA. They definitely play a role - but not the only role.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

OH good, I was saving Dee's posted questions to go back and answer and this is along the lines of what I was thinking so, thanks Jim!

Kim W5TIT

3941. Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 02:46:25 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93F7E7865C43Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 77256

EI is the 7th country to abolish code testing by my reckoning

3942. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 02:53:46 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <_Wu9b.222$BS1.80870@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 77257

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:qXr9b.16083$NM1.15285@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:svl9b.206446$Ay2.54336700@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:3Wa9b.12918$Aq2.8891@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
> > > news:r489b.61835$3b2.8129302@twister.neo.rr.com...
> > > Earning your way is fine...as long as the requirement(s)
> > > is relevent...that's were you lose your argument.
> >
> > Well Bill, I'm on the bottom of 40 right now listening to a band FULL of
> > irrelevance. <hihi>
>
> Wonderfl, then you'll learn code if you want to participate there.
> If not, nothing lost.

Nice concept on paper, but in the real world... Quite frankly, what example
has NCI given to the prospective ham? It sure doesn't exemplify the values
of a "self-starter."

> More to the point, is there any minimum code
> speed that should be banned from the CW/data segments at the
> bottom of the bands?

Couldn't care how slow...as long as said CW/Data sub-bands remain intact.

> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

3943. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 02:58:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F667CAF.10400@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77258

N2EY wrote:

<some snippage>

> The old code test worked like this:
>
> The examiner gave you a yellow lined legal pad and a #2 pencil. You put your
> name at the top of the copy sheet and got ready. You put on a pair of 'phones
> and when everyone at that test table was ready, the test was started. The test
> was 5 minutes of plain-language code at the required speed (13 or 20 wpm - back
> then only volunteer examiners gave 5 wpm tests)
>
> Your job was to write down the code as received. When the code stopped, you had
> to put the pencil down IMMEDIATELY. No going back and fixing anything up, no
> filling in missed letters even if they were obvious, etc. The examiner pulled
> the pads away as soon as the code stopped, sometimes resulting in a long pencil
> mark down the page...
>
> The examiner had to find at least 1 minute of solid copy for you to pass. That
> meant at least 65 correct legible consecutive characters for 13 wpm or 100
> correct legible consecutive characters for 20 wpm. "Legible" meant HE had to be
> able to read them easily the first time - no "what's this?" from The Man. If
> the examiner could not find the required 65 or 100, you failed. 64 or 99 wasn't
> good enough. Go home and study for at least a month before retesting.

All sounds sensible, but the month before retesting thing seems a bit
obsessive. I can understand not retesting the same day, but not a month
wait.

> If you passed receiving, then you could try sending. You sent what was written
> on a laminated card that the examiner gave you. He was sole judge of your
> sending skill - he could decide you were OK in a few seconds, or keep you
> pounding away for a couple minutes. (It was rare for a sending test to last
> more than a minute). You had to send at the required speed, too - he would tell
> you if you were going too slow. If you failed the sending test, you had to go
> home and study for at least a month before retesting - both sending and
> receiving. I don't know anybody who failed sending, though.

Yeah, I send much better than receive.

> You were allowed to bring a mill for receiving and speed key for sending, but
> you'd better be well-prepared if you showed up with same.
>
> If you got that far, they'd give you the written test. After 1960 they were all
> multiple choice, but we did not know the exact Q and A, just general subject
> areas. The FCC published "study guides" in essay format. These were reprinted

> with permission in the ARRL License Manuals of the day. You were also expected
> to know the regulations (which were not part of the study guide questions).
>
> You had to get a certain number of questions right (74%, as I recall) on the
> written to pass. Miss by even one question less than the required and you had
> to go home and study for at least a month before retesting - both sending and
> receiving code, and the written. No do-overs, no credit for tests already
> passed. All or nothing at all.

Now here is something that seems has been improved upon. If there are
going to be different elements, it makes sense that if one element was
passed, that you don't have to be restested on it. I had to test for my
General twice because I flunked element 1 the first time. I passed the
writtens, I would have passed them again. Not muchpoint in wasting the
VE's time.

> Usually they would not tell you how well you did other than "Pass" or "Fail".
> They did NOT tell you which ones you got wrong. (At least not in Philly).
>
> When I took the tests in 1968 and 1970, there was a fee of $9, IIRC. I'm not
> sure - the fee was instituted in 1963 and was $4, then $9, then $4, then
> eliminated. The fee was the same whether you passed or failed. Only the Novice
> was free.
>
> $9 doesn't sound like much but back in those days it was a lot of money for a
> high school kid. I think minimum wage back then was $1.20 or so, which meant
> the test was a days' pay BEFORE taxes for a minimum wage person. And a kid
> would have been glad to get minimum. I estimate that the equivalent today would
> be $50-60.
>
> The 2 year experience requirement for Extra meant that most hams needed to make
> at least two trips to the FCC office to get the top license.
>
> For those of us near an FCC office it was mostly a matter of getting off from
> school or work. The big offices held exams one or more days a week.
>
> For those farther out it was a much bigger deal.

The VE system is a huge improvemnet over tha old system, I have to say.

> What all this did was to cause prospective and upgrading hams to be extremely
> well prepared before even attempting the trip to FCC. Today they would call it
> "overlearning".
>
> Was it a better system back then? You be the judge. It's not coming back any
> time soon. And it wasn't hams, new or old, who changed it.

Regardless of the Morse requirements or the test contents, the testing
system was not superior at all IMO.

Interestingly enough, it would appear that matching up what was
happening in the country at the time this was happening, the FCC tester

(government) was replaced by the VE's (non-profit, but certainly private sector. The changes in the tests might seem like a de-regultion type of move.

I guess I'm not going to blame the liberals for this one....

- Mike KB3EIA -

3944. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 03:01:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F667D74.30703@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77259

Bill Sohl wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030915021846.23171.00000765@mb-m05.aol.com...
>
>>In article <vm9usff4mpm58f@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
>><rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>>
>>
>>>sending and receiving CW isn't a building block
>>>to anything else.....
>>
>>Yes, it is.
>>
>>First, it's a building block to the use of the mode on the air.
>
>
> Come on Jim. that's a self fullfilling argument. My point, and I know
> you know this, is that morse knowledge is not needed in any manner as
> a foundation, stepping stone, or whatever to any body or radio knowledge
> or concepts.

Come on Bill! NO knowledge of much of anything is needed as a
foundation. Thousands of CB ops say otherwise!

- Mike KB3EIA -

3945. Re: Cobra 2000 with matching speaker and hand mic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 03:17:23 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <7hv9b.2170$xx4.452979@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 77260

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@nonexanonpost.com> wrote in message
news:bk5ook$ud7$0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> "Loup1962" <loup1962@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030915112008.21879.00001097@mb-m04.aol.com...
> > Cobra 2000 base with matching speaker and hand mic in excellent
condition
> for
> > $250 + actual UPS cost to you.
>
That is THE Ham radio for the No-Code wonders!

10-73's!

3946. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 03:20:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309151920.1a1a9ba1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77261

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:<vmc0ut5ssnas21@corp.supernews.com>...

> I tell you what; next time you're operating a motor vehicle, drive
> as fast as you can... I mean pedal to the medal; do over 100mph
> if you can. when a policeman pulls you over and hands you
> a ticket, then tell him "I am driving at a perfectly safe speed for my
> skills. Your oppinion and that of the judge that I am about to have
> to go in front of are not relavant. It is an immutable fact that
> a driver is not a good driver unless he can do 100 without wrecking,
> which I did. That's a fact, and you can't do anything about it."
>
> and just see what happens.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
> a code-tested ham who, regardless of the fact, does not believe
> in code testing.

Clint, first, DICK is in Missouri. Second, he used to drill 7/8"
holes in the rooftops of police cars. He probably can drive 100+
miles an hour, yet never even have to see a judge. That's just the
way things are in Missouri.

And don't try to tell him anything about the FCC. He used to know a
guy that used to work at the FCC, so he knows all about it. Past,
present, and future.

Not to worry. The actuarial tables will solve all. They may be
painfully slow, but huge corporations have lots of faith and money
riding on the fact that they are immutable.

3947. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 03:23:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309151923.27d8dfe5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77262

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:<vmc16vtkcae7bf@corp.supernews.com>...
> Ham radio isn't about engineering,
>
>
> then why is there a knowledge test on circuits?
>
>
> >
> > Ham radio isn't about metalurgy pr plastics technology, Clint, it's about
> > OPERATING .
>
> and if you choose NOT to operate CW, then why test it if it's soley
> about OPERATING????
>
> you're mad because YOU had to do it, bottom line.

Yep, in a nutshell. When the gubmn't said, "Jump!" DICK replied, "How High?"

Now he feels foolish.

3948. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 04:24:40 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk63a8$b5l$0@208.207.71.175>
Source record: 77263

Mike Coslo wrote:

> N2EY wrote:

> If
> > the examiner could not find the required 65 or 100, you failed. 64 or 99 wasn't
> > good enough. Go home and study for at least a month before retesting.
>
> All sounds sensible, but the month before retesting thing seems a bit
> obsessive. I can understand not retesting the same day, but not a month
> wait.

I'm pretty sure that was done to keep down any not-ready types who would have showed up ever day to test yet again, until he finally lucked into one. We used to get a bunch of that at the VE sessions. Was a pain trying to refrain from giving them the same written and code tests they had already taken and failed (against rthe rules) Made it necessary to keep a file on failures including the coding of the tests they had already failed.

And as Jim said earlier, the FCC used a more limited set of tests. They had only a few opf each class. That alone was reason to "urge" applicants to be more ready to pass. They weren't into non-serious stuff, for obvious reasons-it made more work for them.
Doesn't bother them how it goes with the VE's.

Dick

3949. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 04:34:33 UTC
From: Jerry <joxendi@bellsouth.net>
Message-ID: <iOO9b.577$m%5.42@bignews6.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 77455

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0309100332.49c90a47@posting.google.com...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3F5EA2BB.5070506@adelphia.net>...
If I had turn the clock back and "do" ham radio like we
> had in those days my ticket would have landed in the dumpster three
> decades ago.
>
> 'Twas the Medieval Age of radio, a one notch improvement beyond the
> Dark Age of radio.
>
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> w3rv

Now, now, it wasn't all THAT bad! I take advantage of
whatever ham radio offers me NOW, and remember what it was like back in
1967. Yes, we had tube trans-
mitters and a trunkload of cables, relays, dynamotors, and back breaking
sets that I couldn't even heft now, but
it was still fun. That's because we didn't KNOW any better. Had you told
me in '68 that we would have radios
the likes of the 706, I'd have chortled "no way". There were none of the
Analyzers and we used grid dip meters,
amp meters (to measure antenna current), and even florescent light bulbs for
"instruments". We still had fun!
I was a CAP member in those days, not a ham yet. Ever
since I was a kid, I listened to my Dad's 1940s Philco
shortwave set--Mom used to say it made a great babysitter because I would
sit for hours and try to tune
in those "Donald Duck" sounds, and not understanding why I could not tune it
in. I didn't know what a BFO was, but I was still fascinated with it. I
got the crap
shocked out of me with capacitors and plate current and
dynamotors (and survived), And I had fun. The license
was not quite convenient when in high school because my
family tended to live out in the boonies and Dad had no interest in taking
me to a Field Office to take the test. There were no hams around in the
middle of nowhere where we lived. Still, I learned, made mistakes, and
and had fun. Got a lot of "education" with CAP, and
eventually got my ticket in '89 after I was grown and married. I had a lot
of good elmers in later life and learned also how NOT to shock the stuffings
outta me. And I

am still having fun! The goofballs I encounter I just ignore
and don't get dragged into cuss fights and infantile behav-
ior. Because I was trained as a CAP radio operator before I got into ham
radio (I was very aware of it, BTW), I tend to operate in a more structured
manner. I can have a ball chatting with friends and experimenting with
projects. Suffering a fool with a radio that gets his
jollies kerchunking repeaters and QRMing HF QSOs is
not for me!

I just enjoy what I have now, marvel at the tech advantages that seemed
impossible in the '60s and remember fondly those old glow-in-the-dark rigs
that seemed so "right" way back when..... But it wasn't THAT bad! LOL!

73

Jerry
K4KWH

3950. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 04:35:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk63u0$dk9$0@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 77264

Brian wrote:

> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:<vmc0ut5ssnas21@corp.supernews.com>...
>
> > I tell you what; next time you're operating a motor vehicle, drive
> > as fast as you can... I mean pedal to the medal; do over 100mph
> > if you can. when a policeman pulls you over and hands you
> > a ticket, then tell him "I am driving at a perfectly safe speed for my
> > skills. Your oppinion and that of the judge that I am about to have
> > to go in front of are not relavant. It is an immutable fact that
> > a driver is not a good driver unless he can do 100 without wrecking,
> > which I did. That's a fact, and you can't do anything about it."
> >
> > and just see what happens.
> >
> > Clint
> > KB5ZHT
> > a code-tested ham who, regardless of the fact, does not believe
> > in code testing.
>
> Clint, first, DICK is in Missouri. Second, he used to drill 7/8"
> holes in the rooftops of police cars. He probably can drive 100+
> miles an hour, yet never even have to see a judge. That's just the
> way things are in Missouri.
>
> And don't try to tell him anything about the FCC. He used to know a
> guy that used to work at the FCC, so he knows all about it. Past,
> present, and future.
>
> Not to worry. The actuarial tables will solve all. They may be
> painfully slow, but huge corporations have lots of faith and money
> riding on the fact that they are immutable.

Babble, babble, babble & rave on! Brainiac, the Village Idiot at his finest!

BTW how would YOU know what size hole goes in the roof of cars?
You beern there and done that, hey??? And since you DON'T know, not a single one of our cars used
the rooftop for antennas. Beyond that, all the installations were done at a central radio shop, not
by field engineers.

You sure are a fart smeller!

Hey... you really want to watch that rush hour trafic, now. Those tables you're so sure of might
catch up with you a bit early, you know.....Happens every day. *I* made it through those days
intact......

3951. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 04:36:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk640p$dk9$1@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 77265

Brian wrote:

> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:<vmc16vtkcae7bf@corp.supernews.com>...
> > Ham radio isn't about engineering,
> >
> >
> > then why is there a knowledge test on circuits?
> >
> >
> > >
> > > Ham radio isn't about metalurgy pr plastics technology, Clint, it's about
> > > OPERATING .
> >
> > and if you choose NOT to operate CW, then why test it if it's soley
> > about OPERATING????
> >
> > you're mad because YOU had to do it, bottom line.
>
> Yep, in a nutshell. When the gubmn't said, "Jump!" DICK replied, "How High?"
>
> Now he feels foolish.

You and Clint are the pair in a nutshell with no clue as to how to get out.
You ARE foolish. Your past history proves it.

3952. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 04:41:07 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk6493$es4$0@208.207.71.177>
Source record: 77266

Well, Brainiac, here it is, straight from the horses a....er. .....mouth-

Keith sed...
On 16 Sep 2003 02:46:25 GMT,
Alun Palmer in <Xns93F7E7865C43Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4> wrote:
> EI is the 7th country to abolish code testing by my reckoning

>> Don't fret Alun, by the time the USA approves of no
>>more morse code testing the bands will be destroyed
>>by BPL. You can quote me on that.

So I guess you guys will get your code free bands just in time.
Gee, things have a way of evening out.......for decades you "wouldn't",
now you "couldn't"...Poor baby!

3953. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 04:56:11 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309152056.62bb66f2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77267

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bjv63a$t1m@library1.airnews.net>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F62885A.5060004@adelphia.net...

>
> From http://www.oakvilleamateurs.net/newsletters/hb200302.pdf
> . . ."For most 40-meters, the most practical antenna is the 1/4-wave dipole
> (66 feet in total length) up at least 33 feet in the air. If you've never
> worked (or heard) Europe on 40, it's likely your dipole is too low. The
> challenge grows on 80 where your quarter wave dipole (133' 9") needs to be . . .

Bilge. All of it. A 66 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole on
40M and a 134 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole on 80M. A 33
foot long center-fed dipole is a quarter wavelength long on 40M but it
is not resonant on 40M and ya better not get stupid and feed it with
coax then just plug it into the back of yer radio if ya wanna work
anybody with it.

Ask any Novice . . .

w3rv

3954. Re: schematics wanted - "jamming device"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:09:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916010907.05539.00000766@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77268

In article <bk4b7o$p383g$17@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Yes, it is vandalism, but a simple needle or pin placed directly in the coax
>usually does the trick from what I hear. Or take some wire cutters, and
>clip the wire, connect the shielding and center conductor of the coax
>together and tape both ends back together with black electrical tape would
>do the trick as well. Granted, not legal and probably not ethical either,
>but the techniques would work in making it a little "quieter."

No need to get fancy on that. For the PL-259 "UHF" type connector,
just do one winding of transparent tape around the male pin. Gives it a
hard-to-see insulator when mated. [old Signal School trick...:-)]

LHA

3955. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:09:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916010908.05539.00000767@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77269

In article <f45722ac.0309151417.46154602@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:<tSj9b.13163$NM1.5333@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> "N2EY" wrote:
>> >
>> > Some time back, I took a *practice* Extra test online. No
>> > preparation. To make it more of a sporting course I did all
>> > the math in my head - no calculator, no scratch paper. Took
>> > me about 7-1/2 minutes start to finish, (snip)
>
>Inneresting how Rev Jim always protects Bruce's outlandish stories.

Extras band together. They have to. Otherwise they hang separately.

>
>> Yep, but the online tests are easier. With most of them, all you have to
>> do click an answer directly under the question, not shade a small block on
>> an answer card with a pencil. All that (reading the questions, answers, and
>> filling in the answer card) couldn't likely be done in eight minutes. Of
>> course, anything is possible, so I won't say it isn't (which is why I said
>> it was "almost" impossible). But I suspect you would agree such an
>> accomplishment would certainly be very rare.
>>
>> > Did it ever occur to you that his persona here could be an act?
>>
>> Nope. It's too consistent across many newsgroups over a relatively long
>> period of time. If it's an act, he should be in Hollywood.
>>
>> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>Wait a minute. Didn't he play a part in Dukes of Hazard?

Yes...as the backwoods ROAD the General Lee skidded around on...

LHA

3956. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:09:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916010909.05539.00000768@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77271

In article <3F66055A.50505@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> When you see a wildebeest on TV, you know something really really bad
>is going to happen.

Tsk, tsk, you've been watching too many wild animal shows on Discovery
channel again! :-)

LHA

3957. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:09:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916010909.05539.00000769@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77272

In article <Ark9b.13555$NM1.10525@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

> Los Angeles has several hundred wind turbines placed in the hills around
>the area.

They do? WHICH "hills," senior? We've got a whole bunch of Big Hill things in this 60 x 120 mile area.

>And, since I saw them getting ready to put some more up when I
>drove through there recently, it appears they are expanding the program.
>There are many other areas around the country where such turbines could be
>placed and the power then fed into the regional power grids (supplying
>cities many hundreds of miles away). I also saw several experimental solar
>power plants in Arizona, perhaps feeding power to local cities or the LA
>power grid. Alternative power sources are quickly reaching maturity.

Dwight, I worked on Solar One in Barstow, CA, the first large-scale solar-furnace electric plant in the middle desert. Rocketdyne built the boilers (out of rocket engine material) and the thermal storage unit that stored heat during the night. MacDac of Huntington Beach was the system prime for a group of local utilities as a pilot project.

Solar Two replaced it, trying out more things in re solar power as heat. The two plants put about 50 to 100 MWe into the grid (as I recall). A small part of the GWe required by the region.

LHA

3958. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:09:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916010910.05539.00000770@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77283

In article <9k99b.3778$nQ.1307964@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>So why hasn't California built any oil, coal, or hydroelectric power platns
>in the last ten years? I'll tell you. They too are being blocked by the
>environmentalists. Are they also economically unfeasible? It's unlikely.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...typical non-amateur-radio diversionism going on...by an easterner trying to dump on the most populous state in the union.

According to a number of local newspapers (we refer to 1.4 million daily issues as "local"), California HAS built power plants (not "platns") in the last ten years. Fossil fuel types, too.

According to a bunch of ignorant easterners, California is supposed to have an "energy shortage." It doesn't. What it did have are some unscrupulous energy suppliers who played fast and loose with state government regulations and have been investigated extensively since all those "rolling blackouts, etc." of two-three years ago.

Here in the middle of Los Angeles, the Department of Water and Power has NEVER had to resort to any "rolling blackouts" or other nonsense. Electric power keeps flowing nicely at slightly less that a dozen cents a KWHr electric to residences.

Last time my area suffered a major power outage was during the Northridge Earthquake of 17 Jan 94...a MHV tower collapsed, causing the whole 10 to 12 million service area to trip out and go black. It was back up by noontime
with a Black Start underway that was completed by nightfall.

"The Environment" and electric power plants aren't really an amateur radio issue, are they? During the 17 Jan 94 Northridge quake the area lost ALL electric power for a while. Oddly, NO amateur radio nets were springing into action during a sudden emergency. Why was that? No ARRL reps on hand to write them up? :-)

LHA

3959. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:09:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916010911.05539.00000771@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77276

In article <bk4b77$p383g$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Just wanted to know why 13 was some type of magic number.

Ever stop to think about all the morsemen dooming themselves with
an "unlucky" number? :-)

LHA

PS: Good to hear you survived and all you need are some pain-killers.

3960. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:09:12 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916010912.05539.00000772@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77278

In article <bk4ks2gci0@208.206.142.94>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Clint wrote:
>
>> > > IF morse (i.e. radiotelegraphy) had any basis as a foundation
>> > > for higher learning of radio concepts, principles or theory
>> > > then it would be a requirement of engineering students...which
>> > > it has never been to my knowledge anywhere.
>> >
>> > And that's where your argument falls flat on its face. The point is
>> > operational, on the air *communications *. It's called OPERATING.
>>
>> <snip>
>> you just employed the "diversion" tactic. he was totally correct; if
>> the basic fundamentals of radio, which you have been totally parroting
>> until now, required it, then it would be a necissary requirement for
>> all basic electrical engineering, and it is not.
>>
>> > It's the BASICS, Bill.
>>
>> As YOU see it.
>> Why aren't new hams required to show they now how to forge/smelt
>> copper wire, produce polyethelene insulation, make aluminum out
>> of scratch for antennas, etc., if BASICS were the name of
>> everything?
>>
>
>Clint your ignorance is showing again. Ham radio isn't about engineering,
>its about operating ham radio. Sure, one CAN use engineering if one
>wishes, and someone surely had to do some engineering to produce the gear
>we all use. But if Bill's comment holds any water at all then the tests
>would have been becoming harder instead of becominig giveaways.
>
>Ham radio isn't about metalurgy pr plastics technology, Clint, it's about
>OPERATING . But you amd Bill already knew that, it's jsut your NCI/CB
>attitudes showing through, again.

CB radio is all about OPERATING, senior.

No morsemanship needed in CB radio...

>> you're mad because YOU had to do it.

Tattoo is just mad. He can't get many to pop-to and salute his mighty
macho morsemanship skills which were very useful in the 1930s.

Poor guy. :-)

LHA

3961. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:09:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916010913.05539.00000774@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77277

In article <vmbdivie52pt9c@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
<rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:

>> > Let's have a go at "No Handwriting International".
>> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>> Exaggeration to the ridiculous.
>>
>
>spurious analogies are in the PCTA handbook, bill.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT

Heh heh heh...too bad that "spark" is outlawed.

PCTA types would demand that ALL hams know "spark" theory and
operating skills if it was still legal... :-)

LHA

3962. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:09:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916010913.05539.00000773@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77280

In article <bk4k6f$fa4$0@208.207.71.145>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Clint wrote:
>
>> >If you refuse to learn how to handle radio's most basic mode you can never
be
>> >able to regard yourself as fully qualified in ham radio communciations.
>> > That's just the Way it Is. Live with it.
>>
>> I'm sorry but that is YOUR oppinion. What counts is the decision of those in
>> authority, namely the FCC.
>
>Son, you might want to learn somewhere along the way that opinion is
>sometimes congruent with fact, sometimes not.

"Congruent?" :-)

> No matter what the FCC says or does, it can't alter facts. And nowhere have
>they ever said that a no-code license is a fully qualified ham.

The FDA qualifies ham, senior.

The FCC does NOT use the term "ham" in Part 97. That's the LAW.

For NEW amateur radio licensees, the FCC "qualifies" radio amateurs in
three license classes. One of those is the "no-code-test" Technician.

>In fact, the
>retired Chief of the Amateur and Citizen's Division of FCC (now called
something
>else) stated in his comments on the NCVEC pettion
> (which BTW he helped write) that it was an oxymoron to expect an Extra class
>ham to be a expert on ham radio if he doesn't know Morse code. Thus he
supports
>a code test for Extras.

That is a RETIREE's OPINION, senior.

>And it should be obvious, to anyone who actually owns and uses a thought
process
>- when Morse code is a widely-used mode within ham radio, *anyone* who can't
>use it simply and factually *cannot* be a fully qualified ham - No matter
what
>license or privileges the FCC gives them.

The FCC does NOT agree with you, senior.

ANYONE granted a US amateur radio license, ANY CLASS, is a licensed
radio amateur.

That's just the way it is. Live with it.

>> And YOU will have to live with the decisions THEY
>> make.
>
> Which can't change facts. Facts are immutable. Live with it. Any ham not able
>to operate CW is simply and factually not fully qualified.

For the 1930s or on Fantasy Island where you seem to live... ?

LHA

3963. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:09:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916010914.05539.00000775@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77279

In article <20030915021846.23171.00000765@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <vm9usff4mpm58f@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
><rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>
>>sending and receiving CW isn't a building block
>>to anything else.....
>
>Yes, it is.
>
>First, it's a building block to the use of the mode on the air. Although other
>services have pretty much stopped using Morse Code, hams use it extensivley,
>and an amateur license is permission to operate an amateur station, not a
>station in another service.

Roger that, Reverend Jim...IN the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service...

>Note that the Morse Code tests are at a very
>basic level. They're entry-level, nothing more.

Well, "there ya go."

>Second, if someone wants to actually design and build radio equipment, having
>skill in Morse Code permits them to use almost anything from very simple to
>very sophisticated equipment to good advantage. Would you expect a newcomer
>to radio to build an SSB transceiver as a first project?

I built a simple battery powered voice transmitter back in 1948. Single
tube,
very low power, worked fine for a whole block. Was 14 then. :-)

>>now, the electrical principals of what a CW
>>transmission is, and a knowledge test of that is a good idea, but
>>that's comparing apples and oranges.

Comparing apples and oranges is fine for the produce market, Rev. Jim.

>Why should there be *any* written test on theory if all a person wants to do
is
>operate manufactured radios? If someone doesn't want to build a rig, why
should
>they have to memorize all those symbols, diagrams and formulas?

Well then, you WANT type-accepted radios in amateur radio?!?

Why would you WANT such a thing?

>>I think most of the PCTA
>>is being disingenuous when they come up with "good reasons"
>>to keep CW testing alive;
>
>Why?

You've been GIVEN all the "whys" you can possibly handle.

Maybe you are suffering from "information overload" and can't accept
all those valid reasons?

>> I think the true deeper reason lies
>>somewhere in the "I had to do it so everybody should" relm,
>>as i've stated before.
>>
>You can think what you want, but you're mistaken on that account.

Nope. NO ONE is "mistaken" on that account.

You WANT an exclusive Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service.

You ought to petition for an RM with the FCC. Start a movement to make
the ARS all-code, no voice, no data, nothing else but on-off-keying morse.

That would make you happy, right, Reverend Jim?

LHA

3964. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:09:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916010915.05539.00000776@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77270

In article <20030915021845.23171.00000764@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>>I guess as long as "shephed" is spouting the party line, its OK with
>>you that he calls people "retarded mouth-breeding NCI members."
>
>No, it's not OK.

Wow, you REALLY "censured" those name-callers! :-)

LHA

3965. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:09:16 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916010916.05539.00000777@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77281

In article <bk3igb$it8$0@208.206.142.91>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>> news:bk36jcmmq0@208.207.71.169...
>> >
>> >
>> > Bill Sohl wrote:
>> >
>> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>> > > news:O6%8b.2868$nQ.1193559@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>> > > >
>> > > > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
>> > > > news:vm8ucqlp6pd301@corp.supernews.com...

>> IF morse (i.e. radiotelegraphy) had any basis as a foundation
>> for higher learning of radio concepts, principles or theory
>> then it would be a requirement of engineering students...which
>> it has never been to my knowledge anywhere.
>
>And that's where your argument falls flat on its face. The point is
>operational, on the air *communications *. It's called OPERATING.

The SAME is true for Citizens Band Radio Service.

OPERATING.

Take a close look at ALL of Part 97, Title 47 CFR, senior. It requires
each and every licensed radio amateur to be responsible for their
radios' technical standards. It's the LAW, senior.

>Has nada to
>do with anything beyond, although placing a radiotelegraph on the air on HF
>happens to be, as well, the most simple of stations to get up and running.

Tsk, tsk, that was wayyyyy back in time when SPARK was still lawful,
senior.

> It's the BASICS, Bill. When you can't appreciate the fact that
radiotelegraphy
>is radio at its most basic it's no wonder
>you can't understand the concept.

Sorry, senior, that's YOUR Fantasy Island thing.

Radio at its most BASIC is voice transmission. Push to talk, then listen
for the voice from the other end. No specialized morsemanship needed at
either end.

> The entire point is that radiotelegraphy using manually encoded Morse remains
>as one of the most, effective, and COST EFFECTIVE means of
>radiocommunications,
>even after all the years it has been in excistence. But only when operators
>self-train to gain the skill to use it.

"Cost effective" for WHO?

All that time spent on "self-training?" All that time spent in a government
classroom drilling in code? Taking five times longer on a radio to convey
things not covered in Q codes, compared to the slowest of other modes?

> The FCC has every reason and more than ample justification to require EVERY
>ham to be able to actually pass traffic in Morse on the air.

They do?!?!?

Haven't seen that in Part 97, senior, and it certainly isn't in the Radio
Communications Act of 1934.

You must be reading things that aren't there...or are there only in your
Fantasy Island existance. The rest of us don't live on that Island.

>It's easy to make
>a case that the ability is a valid requirement for licensing. The fact that
>they have not chosen to do so is far more related to the wants and desires of
a
>vocal few, and a whole lot of PC, than the actual operational
traffic-handling
>capacities of the ARS.

Oh? The Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service is now ALL ABOUT "traffic
handling?!?!?"

A 100 WPM electromechanical teleprinter has a throughput FIVE times
greater than a 20 WPM morseman and can sustain that as long as paper
and ink last (over a half day at continuous output). Not only that, both
ends can be operated by anyone with minimal training. Bandwidth is less
than 350 Hz, too.

Who GETS all that "traffic" that is "handled," senior?

> Now you'll come back with the same old saw about how it's "no longer sued"
for
>this or that.

Phil will have to chime in on "no longer sued." A legal thing, right? :-)

>Just as though no such need will ever again present to the ARS,
>ever, under any circumstances. Whatta crystal ball jock you are!

Well, since it is illegal for you to use SPARK, old-timer, from your words
I'll bet you are still using your CRYSTAL SET receiver, right? :-)

LHA

3966. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:09:17 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916010917.05539.00000778@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77273

In article <3Wa9b.12918$Aq2.8891@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
>news:r489b.61835$3b2.8129302@twister.neo.rr.com...
>>
>> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
>> news:vm9ptb2m1ok1f3@corp.supernews.com...
>> > LOL!
>> >
>> > A good liberal? you have NO idea..... I'm as right wing
>> > and conservative as they come... evidently you don't read
>> > my other posts or in other NG's either, where i'm referred
>> > to as the "jim birch devil"
>> >
>> > Clint
>> > KB5ZHT
>> >
>> You can't be a conservative, we believe in earning your way in life, not
>> having "things" given to you because you are to lazy to EARN them. Sound
>> familiar Liberal boy?
>>
>> Conservative my ass!
>
>Earning your way is fine...as long as the requirement(s)
>is relevent...that's were you lose your argument.

"Shepherd" LOST his argument when he started tawkin tuff with a pseudonym
refusing to identify herself.

Must have "caught" something from one of the sheep... :-)

LHA

3967. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:09:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916010918.05539.00000779@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77274

In article <bk36jcmmq0@208.207.71.169>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>> news:O6%8b.2868$nQ.1193559@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>> >
>> > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
>> > news:vm8ucqlp6pd301@corp.supernews.com...
>> > > When I took my drivers test years ago to get a license
>> > > to drive an automobile, the never required me to
>> > > prove that I could hitch a horse team to a wagon.
>> > > The youngsters today, likewise, tell me that the
>> > > departments of motor vehicles around the country
>> > > do not ask them to prove they are proficient with
>> > > buggy whips.
>> > >
>> > > Enough said.
>> > >
>> > > Clint
>> >
>> > The youngsters today still tell me that they must learn to use a pencil
>> and
>> > learn to write script. Typing and word processing are taught AFTER they
>> > have learned to write manually. Enough said.
>>
>> Bad anology since morse isn't a foundation to any other
>> body of radio knowledge and/or language skills or
>> writing skills.
>
>Wrong, because radiotelegraphy IS the most basic radio communications mode,
>the use of which is possible only if the operator has self-trained enough to
>be able to make use of it.

Tsk, tsk. A push-to-talk voice transmitter and an ordinary receiver is all
the
BASICS to effect communications by radio.

No need for "self-trained" morsemen...or even those trained by the military.

Morsemen are needed at BOTH ends of the radio circuit. Very specialized
and NOT at all "basic."

Bad logic, senior.

3968. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:09:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916010919.05539.00000780@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77275

In article <f45722ac.0309141651.384a64a5@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030914121856.02537.00000567@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>> In article <f45722ac.0309140512.7d45f76a@posting.google.com>,
>> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>> >"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
>> >news:<IuP8b.57189$3b2.7364893@twister.neo.rr.com>...
>> >> If your not a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, there is a CW contest
>> >> going one right now.
>> >>
>> >> If you are a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, then never mind, it's a
>> Ham
>> >> Radio thing. You would not understand.
>> >>
>> >> 10-73's!
>> >
>> >Rev. Jim is going to chastise you for your dirty mouth.
>>
>> Who are you talking about, Brian?
>
>"Shephed"

...everyone knows what shepherds do with sheep... :-)

>> >Oh, never mind, it's a PCTA thing.
>>
>> You mean like the way you never censure Len or Carl (or anybody else who
>> happens to oppose code tests), no matter what they say or how they say it?
>
>Never? Rev. Jim, even little lies will get you turned away from the
>gate.

Reverend Jim thinks the radio world revolves around his ideas.

Too bad that all that morse addiction robbed his reasoning faculties.

:-(

>> Oh, never mind, it's an NCTA double standards thing.
>
>I guess as long as "shephed" is spouting the party line, its OK with
>you that he calls people "retarded mouth-breeding NCI members."

Poor gutless "shepherd" unable to give his name, callsign, or any other ID.

Very little courage on his part. Tsk, tsk.

Or maybe one of his sheep didn't put out? Who knows.

LHA

3969. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:09:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916010921.05539.00000781@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77282

In article <bk327e$96s$0@208.206.142.90>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Clint wrote:
>
>> > The operative phrase here is "expand its use", not diminish
>> > it by refusing to learn the Most Basic Radiocommunications Mode.
>>
>> that's expanding the use and art of morse code, not expanding the
>> use and art of radio in general.
>
> If you don't believe that promoting and expanding the use of radiotelegraphy
>is doing same to "radio in general" there is news you've not yet heard.

What's to "promote," senior? Morse code was first used commercially
in 1844. In 159 years of existance it has been "promoted" some time
ago, back before radio began.

"Expansion" is ridiculous. Back from 1896 to sometime just after WW
One, on-off keying was the only way to use radio for communications in
general...and Morse Codes were used because of their familiarity to
old telegraphers. That indicates that such code had PEAKED in the
"expansion" long, long ago.

>> For that matter, there aren't
>> profeciency tests in other modes of operation, either, in the
>> form of a seperate practical test such as there is with CW.
>
>Ah, but Morse is the only mode which demands selftraining! Any mope can learn
>any of the others by cracking a book and doing a little hookup wiring.
>With manual radiotelegraphy, there is really no way to do it short of
>selftraining. Thus the CW test.

"Thus the CW test?!?!?"

The "CW test" was required in ALL of early radio by governments simply
because it was the ONLY means to effect communications in early radio.

It had NOTHING at all to do with "training," either "self" or formal.

NONE of the U.S. radio regulatory agencies were ever chartered as
academic or "training" organizations.

>> I also read the news and listen to it as well and hear all the time
>> about CW being dropped in favor of digital and other forms of
>> communication.
>

> By commercials and military, yes, for both efficiency in transferring huge
>amounts of data, and primarly in some services for monetary reasons. It's
>cheaper to use modes that non-technical personnel can handle, thus saving
>personnel costs. If they can add communications as a duty to personnel
>othewise
>assigned, it is cost savings, nevermind that the newly assigned person may be
>squeezed for time to perform all those added duties, thus causing safety and
>job efficiency to suffer. Dollars are conserved, so it is done.

TIME is conserved more than anything, senior.

Are you saying that morse CANNOT get through as good as all other modes?

That WAS your flag-waving paeon to morsemanship before. Now you've
finally realized that on-off keying just can't hack it...marvelous!

> Ham radio has no such needs nor constraints, even for emergency comms.

For some, ham radio has become a living museum of radiotelegraphy. :-)

>Maximum
>throughput is the *last* thing you need when the desperate need is for *any*
>communications.

Of course...and the human voice "cannot" be as effective as on-off keying?

>At that point what is needed is basic, reliable, ubiquitous
>communications modes.

Like push-to-talk voice transmitters, useable by anyone, hearable by
anyone with an ordinary receiver. Basic, reliable, easy to use.
Ubiquitous certainly, far more so than needing specialized training in
morse code at both ends of a communications link.

>In ham radio, Morse is second only to the voice modes,
>by far.

SECOND, senior, a distant SECOND...and then only on HF ham
bands. Note: The vast majority of EM spectrum allocated to radio
amateurs is ABOVE HF.

>I can imagine that NCI strongly favors changing that, despite their
>statements to the contrary - for obvious reasons.

No Code International has ALWAYS been about eliminating the morse
code TEST. They have NEVER been against morse code USE.

The TEST. Only the TEST.

Anyone can USE morse code without the federal TEST...and that includes
licensed Technicians in the only two ham band sections allocated to "CW"
only.

>> > WRONG story, full of total inaccuracies
>>

>> well, no, full of details that you find personally distasteful,
>> but not inaccurate.
>
>As I said, QUITE inaccurate.

On the contrary, it was QUITE ACCURATE.

>> and our forefathers all had to learn how to hitch horses to a buggy,
>> and had to be proficient in the use of reigns and a buggy whip.
>> Does it make sense for the various departments of motor vehicle
>> saftey to require a person to learn this before letting him drive
>> a modern automobile?
>
> Well, you old Hoop jumper, none of that has anything whatever to do with
radio
>communications, much less ham radio nor Morse code. It's just more NCI mumbo
>jumbo drivel straight from the Carl Stevenson X files.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...all that name calling! :-)

Almost 50 1/2 years ago I was doing regular primary communications on HF
trans-Pacific without needing to use morse code or having to be trained in
same. That was true of all personnel in my signal battalion working at Army
station ADA.

Tested morse code skills are NOT NECESSARY in modern radio
communications, whether government, commercial OR amateur radio.

> If you refuse to learn how to handle radio's most basic mode you can never be
>able to regard yourself as fully qualified in ham radio communciations.

Yes he can...and also anyone else who isn't living in some fantasy
world stuck in the standards and practices of 1930s radio.

> That's just the Way it Is. Live with it.

That's the "way it is" in the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service, senior.

Too bad that "spark" is outlawed in radio communications. You no doubt
would have required everyone in 2003 to know basics of "spark" transmitters
to be "fully qualified as ham radio operators" today. :-)

Go back to Fantasy Island, Tattoo, de blane is landing...

LHA

3970. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:38:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916013808.22081.00000659@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 77284

In article <f45722ac.0309151718.2a42dc3@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030910201910.15462.00002889@mb-m06.aol.com>...
>
>> Agreed! But I have also seen lots of stuff in the other direction. Check
>out
>> the flak I'm getting from the irony-impaired over the "Smith Chart Test"
>post.
>
>Where's the irony?
>
>> The people that need convincing are the FCC, and from their actions over
>the
>> past 25+ years it looks to me like they are not about to improve the
>written
>> tests.
>
>The Smith Chart could be folded into any current examination. But,
>no, you want/need/can't live without a separate pass/fail exam that
>will intimidate people and keep them from the ARS.
>
>"The ARS isn't for everyone."

Brian, the "ARS" is only for radiotelegraphers. It is the Archaic
Radiotelegraphy Service.

LHA

3971. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:38:08 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916013808.22081.00000660@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 77285

In article <f45722ac.0309151711.6daf7827@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net> wrote in message
>news:<9h7llvkvm4b98intn6bsnh3m70ofje9n29@4ax.com>...
>
>> Kim, within a year the only debate in here about CW will be about the
>> consequences of it no longer being required. The whining will be
>> terrible for awhile, but like the no-code tech discussions, they will
>> eventually disappear.
>
>Ooooh, huge, huge miscalcualtion, Brock. You give these guys way too
>much credit. These guys have memories like an elephant, and they will
>carrry the debate to their graves. Which is why I say that the only
>cure are the actuarial tables. They are as unyielding as the PCTA,
>till the bitter end.

The PCTA have memories like an effluent. :-)

LHA

3972. Re: Keep the cellphone charged

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:38:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916013809.22081.00000661@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 77286

In article <Mds9b.7032$aH5.1862@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
<aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:

>Let the cell phone users tell me how reliable they are *after* the big blow
>hits.

I'll just wait to read about Ham Radio Saving The Day on the ARRL news
page. :-)

LHA

3973. Re: slide rules (was: Could This Be The Solution?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:38:09 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916013809.22081.00000662@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 77287

In article <f45722ac.0309141654.35c7a393@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
>news:<20030914141904.02537.00000569@mb-m23.aol.com>...
>
>> Nice!
>>
>> What's even neater is that nowadays we have the choice.
>
>I never would have guessed you were pro-choice.

I never thought Rev Jim was a "pro."

:-)

LHA

3974. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:38:10 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916013810.22081.00000663@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 77288

In article <bk640p$dk9$1@208.207.71.177>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>> Yep, in a nutshell. When the gubmn't said, "Jump!" DICK replied, "How
>High?"
>>
>> Now he feels foolish.
>
>You and Clint are the pair in a nutshell with no clue as to how to get out.
> You ARE foolish. Your past history proves it.

Just how high DID you jump, senior?

LHA

3975. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 05:38:11 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916013811.22081.00000664@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 77289

In article <bk63u0$dk9$0@208.207.71.177>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>
>> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
>news:<vmc0ut5ssnas21@corp.supernews.com>...
>>
>> > I tell you what; next time you're operating a motor vehicle, drive
>> > as fast as you can... I mean pedal to the medal; do over 100mph
>> > if you can. when a policeman pulls you over and hands you
>> > a ticket, then tell him "I am driving at a perfectly safe speed for my
>> > skills. Your oppinion and that of the judge that I am about to have
>> > to go in front of are not relavant. It is an immutable fact that
>> > a driver is not a good driver unless he can do 100 without wrecking,
>> > which I did. That's a fact, and you can't do anything about it."
>> >
>> > and just see what happens.
>> >
>> > Clint
>> > KB5ZHT
>> > a code-tested ham who, regardless of the fact, does not believe
>> > in code testing.
>>
>> Clint, first, DICK is in Missouri. Second, he used to drill 7/8"
>> holes in the rooftops of police cars. He probably can drive 100+
>> miles an hour, yet never even have to see a judge. That's just the
>> way things are in Missouri.
>>
>> And don't try to tell him anything about the FCC. He used to know a
>> guy that used to work at the FCC, so he knows all about it. Past,
>> present, and future.
>>
>> Not to worry. The actuarial tables will solve all. They may be
>> painfully slow, but huge corporations have lots of faith and money
>> riding on the fact that they are immutable.
>
>Babble, babble, babble & rave on! Brainiac, the Village Idiot at his finest!
>
> BTW how would YOU know what size hole goes in the roof of cars?
>You beern there and done that, hey??? And since you DON'T know, not a single
>one of our cars used
>the rooftop for antennas. Beyond that, all the installations were done at a
>central radio shop, not

>by field engineers.
>
> You sure are a fart smeller!
>
>Hey... you really want to watch that rush hour trafic, now. Those tables
>you're so sure of might
>catch up with you a bit early, you know.....Happens every day. *I* made it
>through those days
>intact......

Judging by your mental prowess in here, I don't think you "MADE IT"
unscathed. :-)

LHA

3976. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 06:12:18 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk7575$q3g09$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77293

Jeesh... Don't get Mike going with that one!! HI HI

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> Let's have a go at "No Handwriting International".
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

3977. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 06:13:42 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk7576$q3g09$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77294

And who is making those requirements is a factor as well in the argument.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

> Earning your way is fine...as long as the requirement(s)
> is relevent...that's were you lose your argument.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

3978. Re: Go Numorse!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 06:17:52 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk7578$q3g09$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77295

The only thing I don't like, is that for the prosigns, you have to make some type of chart to remember which key is responsible for each prosign, as the normal computer keyboard does not have a AR or BT (etc.) key on them last I knew. In the set-up of the program, there is other prosigns available, but probably not the ones used for an exam, but might be commonly used on the air.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F661EDD.6030404@psu.edu...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> > Any questions about the program, just let me know.... Would be glad to help!
>
> I'm getting closer now. something has happened, and I can recieve at
> faster speeds better than I can at 5wpm. I still have a way to go, tho'
>
> just about the only mistakes I make are when I accidentally press the
> wrong answer key. Darn that mistake sound is irritating! Good aversion
> therapy.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

3979. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 06:24:26 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk7579$q3g09$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77296

Yeah.... the amount of methane released as a product of water treatment facilities that take in the raw sewage as well as the methane released from animals at farms, and of course the enivitable other form of methane common to humans, FARTS!

Sorry in advance for this one.......
Ryan

> The only way to eliminate all pollution is to eliminate the human race.
> Since that is not a reasonable solution, it is up to people to develop
> energy supplies and attach the appropriate safety requirements without the
> emotional baggage caused by fear. To date, the nuclear industry has had a
> much better safety record than many other industries and we have the ability
> to make it even safer yet. Right now the irrational fears about nuclear
> power are standing in the way of collecting the data that will prove it
> either safe or dangerous and developing an appropriate energy action plan.
> What data does get collected is buried on the back of the last page at the
> bottom of the last column of the newspaper or doesn't even make it into the
> paper unless it is something that they can sensationalize.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

3980. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 06:29:37 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bk757a$q3g09$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77297

I don't know the specific figures, but it seems like there are enough opportunities to put alternative means of electrical energy creation such as windmills and so on that it would provide a decent amount of supplemental energy. There is a small (maybe about 120-150 feet wide) hydroelectric dam in Sanford, MI, which is not too far from where I live, and it does not provide energy as a primary source, but supports "the grid" on a secondary source.

I am sure, with gearing, that the windmills placed in "windier" areas could also provide secondary power as well.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Ark9b.13555$NM1.10525@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" wrote:
> >
> > Wind is actually a good source, if there is a consistent
> >breeze blowing enough to keep the blades of the
> > windmill moving, and would seem to be fairly
> > inexpensive to construct as well.
>
>
> Los Angeles has several hundred wind turbines placed in the hills around
> the area. And, since I saw them getting ready to put some more up when I
> drove through there recently, it appears they are expanding the program.
> There are many other areas around the country where such turbines could be
> placed and the power then fed into the regional power grids (supplying
> cities many hundreds of miles away). I also saw several experimental solar
> power plants in Arizona, perhaps feeding power to local cities or the LA
> power grid. Alternative power sources are quickly reaching maturity.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

3981. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 09:26:38 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916052638.12631.00001143@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 77290

In article <vmce1k453gnb61@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
<rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:

>> There are no CW-only parts of the HF/MF bands. None at all.

>You'd better check your frequency priviledge/allocation charts.
>The lower half of the HF bands except for 160 meters is
>"cw/fsk only"....

Incorrect! NONE of those segments are "CW-only". They're all shared with data modes.

Those data modes can be FSK, PSK, OOK or combination modes (PSK-31 is part PSK and part AM, for example). In fact, FCC allows an enormous variety of modes in those segments.

And it's not "the lower half" on bands like 17, 15, 12 and particularly 10 meters.
>
>> Your opinion noted. Others have a different opinion.
>
>yes, agreed.
>However, it would seem that MOST oppinions worldwide
>are on the side of removing code tests.

How do you figure that?

Most non-US administrations don't have the elaborate comment/proposal/NPRM structure that we have. They just do what they think is best, regardless of what their hams think. Look at Germany, for an example.
>
>> > They do not, however, likewise, first test people
>> > on knowing how to build a double sideband carrier
>> > transmission if they want to operate AM; they do
>> > not require you to show how to get a microphone,
>> > talk on it, and recieve the response on a speaker
>> > if you want to use frequency modulated radiotelephone,
>> > or single sideband carrier suppressed radiotelephone.
>>
>> Perhaps they should.
>
>but they don't.

So if the test is deficient in one area, you use that as justification for making it deficient in other areas too.

>> When I first started out in ham radio, all I wanted to do was join the
>> folks I heard on 75 meter AM. Yet in order to get the license, I had
>> to learn not only Morse Code, but all sorts of theory and regulatory
>> stuff that had absolutely nothing to do with 75 meter AM.
>>
>> Why was I forced to learn all that?
>
>I really don't know.

It was because the FCC thought it was a good idea.

>Thank heaven they've gone a long way to fix
>the problem, and may make the final move here soon to remove the
>scourge of CW tests all together.
>
Hard to see how a 5 wpm code test is a "scourge".

73 de Jim, N2EY

3982. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 10:19:05 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916061905.02537.00000601@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 77291

In article <f45722ac.0309151432.5b8728a4@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> I do hope you mean the test is insanely simple and the privileges insanely
>> high for the level of testing done.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>Sorry.
>
>The tested material is insanely technical and the privs are insanely
>high for an entry level license.
>
>Go do some historical research and see what the Novice material
>consisted of, pre-Novice Enhancement.

Go do some historical research and see what the Novice *privileges* consisted
of, pre-Novice Enhancement.

>Now that's an entry level license.

You said it, Brian.

3983. Re: Cobra 2000 with matching speaker and hand mic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 11:05:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309160305.41aa16bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77292

"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
news:<7hv9b.2170$xx4.452979@twister.neo.rr.com>...
> "Lloyd" <Lloyd@nonexanonpost.com> wrote in message
> news:bk5ook$ud7$0@pita.alt.net...
> > x-no-archive: yes
> > "Loup1962" <loup1962@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030915112008.21879.00001097@mb-m04.aol.com...
> > > Cobra 2000 base with matching speaker and hand mic in excellent
> condition
> for
> > > $250 + actual UPS cost to you.
> >
> That is THE Ham radio for the No-Code wonders!
>
> 10-73's!

That must be why you showed an interest in it.

3984. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 14:20:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <w_E9b.22915$NM1.14399@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77298

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> I think it's an act, invented for the purpose. But even if it's not an
> act, the written tests are not spelling or grammar tests.
> "Intelligence" isn't a single-dimension quality. A person can be
> brilliant in one area and have serious developmental problems in
> others.

Have you read his messages (not just the ones in this newsgroup)? I
haven't see any sign of brilliance in anything he's written, on any subject.
I'm not saying he's dirt dumb, just not the typical "rocket scientist" type.
Again, if is's an act, it's a darn good one (and that's the only good thing
about it).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3985. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 14:21:47 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk769r$20j$0@208.207.71.140>
Source record: 77299

N2EY wrote:

>
> >Thank heaven they've gone a long way to fix
> >the problem, and may make the final move here soon to remove the
> >scourge of CW tests all together.
> >
> Hard to see how a 5 wpm code test is a "scourge".
>

What does that say about the "scourgee"?

3986. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 14:26:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <e4F9b.22971$NM1.14133@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77300

"Brian" wrote:
>
> Wait a minute. Didn't he play a part in Dukes of Hazard?

Wait a minute. The Dukes were "good ol' boys." There is nothing "good" in Bruce's repertoire.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3987. End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 14:48:53 UTC
From: Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer <nobody@cypherpunks.to>
Message-ID: <396421f60cbcd976ed6bb1ed562f7166@cypherpunks.to>
Source record: 77301

Since 15 September 2003.

Hare Krishna ! Hare ! Hare !

3988. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 14:53:48 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309160653.615c2e9e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77302

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bk63u0$dk9$0@208.207.71.177>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:<vmc0ut5ssnas21@corp.supernews.com>...
> >
> > > I tell you what; next time you're operating a motor vehicle, drive
> > > as fast as you can... I mean pedal to the medal; do over 100mph
> > > if you can. when a policeman pulls you over and hands you
> > > a ticket, then tell him "I am driving at a perfectly safe speed for my
> > > skills. Your oppinion and that of the judge that I am about to have
> > > to go in front of are not relavant. It is an immutable fact that
> > > a driver is not a good driver unless he can do 100 without wrecking,
> > > which I did. That's a fact, and you can't do anything about it."
> > >
> > > and just see what happens.
> > >
> > > Clint
> > > KB5ZHT
> > > a code-tested ham who, regardless of the fact, does not believe
> > > in code testing.
> >
> > Clint, first, DICK is in Missouri. Second, he used to drill 7/8"
> > holes in the rooftops of police cars. He probably can drive 100+
> > miles an hour, yet never even have to see a judge. That's just the
> > way things are in Missouri.
> >
> > And don't try to tell him anything about the FCC. He used to know a
> > guy that used to work at the FCC, so he knows all about it. Past,
> > present, and future.
> >
> > Not to worry. The actuarial tables will solve all. They may be
> > painfully slow, but huge corporations have lots of faith and money
> > riding on the fact that they are immutable.
>
> Babble, babble, babble & rave on! Brainiac, the Village Idiot at his finest!
>
> BTW how would YOU know what size hole goes in the roof of cars?
> You beern there and done that, hey??? And since you DON'T know, not a single one of our
cars used
> the rooftop for antennas.

You woulda if you coulda figured out how to deal with the headliner.
You shoulda found someone with a little finesse.

> Beyond that, all the installations were done at a central radio shop, not
> by field engineers.

Probably was a pain in the buttocks and got shipped to the field.
Happens all the time.

> You sure are a fart smeller!
>
> Hey... you really want to watch that rush hour trafic, now. Those tables you're so sure
of might
> catch up with you a bit early, you know.....Happens every day. *I* made it through those
days
> intact......

DICK, don't know exactly what happened, but you are NOT intact.

3989. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 14:55:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309160655.145f85a6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77303

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030916013810.22081.00000663@mb-m17.aol.com>...
> In article <bk640p$dk9$1@208.207.71.177>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:
>
> >> Yep, in a nutshell. When the gubmn't said, "Jump!" DICK replied, "How
> High?"
> >>
> >> Now he feels foolish.
> >
> >You and Clint are the pair in a nutshell with no clue as to how to get out.
> > You ARE foolish. Your past history proves it.
>
> Just how high DID you jump, senior?
>
> LHA

So high that he's still bouncing off the walls. Good thing they're padded.

3990. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 14:59:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <nzF9b.23280$NM1.18866@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77304

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> They do? WHICH "hills," senior? We've got a whole
> bunch of Big Hill things in this 60 x 120 mile area.

Drive east on Interstate 10/20 and you'll see hundreds of them overlooking the valley just east of San Bernardino. You can't miss them - they're good sized and plainly visible from the Interstate (many are right beside the Interstate, with many more placed along the hillside in both directions for several miles). It's an impressive sight (but not very attractive).

> Dwight, I worked on Solar One in Barstow, CA, the first
> large-scale solar-furnace electric plant in the middle desert.

Do you know where the one in Arizona is? I saw it about a mile off to one side the Interstate as I was driving through. There was a sign for the road leading to it saying something about a power research facility, but I don't remember the name of it.

> Solar Two replaced it, trying out more things in re solar power
> as heat. The two plants put about 50 to 100 MWe into the grid
> (as I recall). A small part of the GWe required by the region.

Very likely. I don't think solar is going to be able to supply power on a large scale anytime soon. In the meantime, additional fossil fuel plants are the only real option. Nuclear power may one day become more viable, but people will have to be convinced of it's safety first. And steps will have to be taken to lower costs and better deal with waste products. Until then, I have serious reservations about additional nuclear power plants.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

3991. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 15:21:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916112119.29815.00000654@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 77305

In article <20030916052638.12631.00001143@mb-m28.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Hard to see how a 5 wpm code test is a "scourge".

Rev. Jim, fire up your time machine and go back to 1896 when you were an engineering advisor to Marconi. You are at home in the past. [Was that in Italy or in hoagietown?]

Keep on with antiquity in radio amateurism. Retrograde fire on...

LHA

3992. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 15:21:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916112119.29815.00000655@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 77306

In article <c2356669.0309151318.61dd8717@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>When I first started out in ham radio, all I wanted to do was join the
>folks I heard on 75 meter AM. Yet in order to get the license, I had
>to learn not only Morse Code, but all sorts of theory and regulatory
>stuff that had absolutely nothing to do with 75 meter AM.
>
>Why was I forced to learn all that?

Simple...a bunch of (then) old farts were convinced that all amateurs HAD to know morse code in order to BE an amateur.

So you have now joined their ranks and are an old fart (before your time). Aren't you proud?

Let's all hear it for ALL the old farts who DEMAND that ALL amateurs test for morse code to "prove themselves" to all the other old farts in amateurism. Keep 1896 alive and well in the hearts of all amateurs.

Meanwhile, all us long-time pros will just keep on ignoring morse codes as anything "basic" or whatever since it went obsolete in radio long ago.

US amateur radio seems to be a living museum for morse code, kept there by the fierce and unrelenting self-promotional morsemen who claim to know all about radio amateurism.

Keep up the wonderful world of antiquity.

LHA

3993. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 15:38:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916113829.15462.00002991@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 77307

In article <nzF9b.23280$NM1.18866@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> They do? WHICH "hills," senior? We've got a whole
>> bunch of Big Hill things in this 60 x 120 mile area.
>
> Drive east on Interstate 10/20 and you'll see hundreds of them overlooking
>the valley just east of San Bernardino. You can't miss them - they're good
>sized and plainly visible from the Interstate (many are right beside the
>Interstate, with many more placed along the hillside in both directions for
>several miles). It's an impressive sight (but not very attractive).

That's not strictly IN "Los Angeles," Dwight. :-)

Try Riverside County, not Los Angeles County. Big place out here.

Try Kern County to the north, on the way from the grapevine into the
southern tip of Huge San Joaquin Valley. Lots of them there if one
looks.

>> Dwight, I worked on Solar One in Barstow, CA, the first
>> large-scale solar-furnace electric plant in the middle desert.
>
> Do you know where the one in Arizona is? I saw it about a mile off to one
>side the Interstate as I was driving through. There was a sign for the road
>leading to it saying something about a power research facility, but I don't
>remember the name of it.

No. Haven't been far into Arizona since 1977.

Solar One in Barstow got decommissioned some time around 1983 and
Solar Two came up in the same place around 1985 (give or take).

>> Solar Two replaced it, trying out more things in re solar power
>> as heat. The two plants put about 50 to 100 MWe into the grid
>> (as I recall). A small part of the GWe required by the region.
>
> Very likely. I don't think solar is going to be able to supply power on a
>large scale anytime soon. In the meantime, additional fossil fuel plants are
>the only real option. Nuclear power may one day become more viable, but
>people will have to be convinced of it's safety first. And steps will have
>to be taken to lower costs and better deal with waste products. Until then,
>I have serious reservations about additional nuclear power plants.

From what I heard from electric power folks in the IEEE, neither of the BIG Solar power plant types could make electricity as cheaply as either fossil fuel or nuclear or hydroelectric plants.

Check out France. Over 80 percent of their electric power comes from nuclear generators. France is also the leading European reprocessor of "spent" nuclear material. Where do the French toss their unuseable nuclear material?

Electric power generation isn't exactly a big "amateur radio" policy issue, is it? :-)

All radios run on electricity. Except maybe the morse radios..."CW" gets through when nothing else will, so I would hazard a guess that "CW" radios don't need electricity at all. :-)

Keep that crystal set ready to go in case of power outages! :-)

LHA

3994. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 16:23:31 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309160823.7538ec41@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77308

These are the number of unexpired FCC ARS
licenses held by individuals on the dates listed:

As of May 14, 2000:

Novice - 49,329
Tech - 205,394
Tech Plus - 128,860
General - 112,677
Advanced - 99,782
Extra - 78,750
Total - 674,792

As of September 15, 2003:

Novice - 33,096 (decrease of 16,233)
Technician - 257,830 (increase of 52,069)
Technician Plus - 65,514 (decrease of 63,346)
General - 141,313 (increase of 28,636)
Advanced - 82,833 (decrease of 16,949)
Extra - 104,566 (increase of 25,816)
Total - 684,785 (increase of 9,993)

73 de Jim, N2EY

3995. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 16:26:43 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F6739D8.53583368@earthlink.net>
Source record: 77309

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> Los Angeles has several hundred wind turbines placed in the hills
> around the area.

...and if they could harness Len Anderson's output they'd have it made.

Dave K8MN

3996. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 16:36:34 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309160836.595af4a9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77310

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030916010914.05539.00000775@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <20030915021846.23171.00000765@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <vm9usff4mpm58f@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
> ><rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
> >
> >>sending and receiving CW isn't a building block
> >>to anything else.....
> >
> >Yes, it is.
> >
> >First, it's a building block to the use of the mode on the air. Although other
> >services have pretty much stopped using Morse Code, hams use it extensivley,
> >and an amateur license is permission to operate an amateur station, not a
> >station in another service.
>
> Roger that, Reverend Jim...

Who is "Reverend Jim", Len? You and Brian Burke keep using that name
to address someone.

It can't be me, because I graduated from electrical engineering
school, not divinity school. And my name isn't Ignatowski ;-)

What engineering school did you graduate from, Len?

> IN the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service...

No such thing exists.

I've been "in" the Amateur Radio Service for almost 36 years. You have
not done so for even one day.

> >Note that the Morse Code tests are at a very
> >basic level. They're entry-level, nothing more.
>
> Well, "there ya go."

Glad you agree!
>
> >Second, if someone wants to actually design and build radio equipment, having
> >skill in Morse Code permits them to use almost anything from very simple to
> >very sophisticated equipment to good advantage. Would you expect a newcomer
> >to radio to build an SSB transceiver as a first project?
>

> I built a simple battery powered voice transmitter back in 1948.

That's nice, Len. On what amateur band did you bootleg with it? Or was it a broadcast band device so you could pretend you were on "Ted Mack's Amateur Hour"? ;-)

I built a simple *AC line powered* Morse/CW transmitter back in 1967. Covered the 80 and 40 meter bands. Required a valid Amateur Radio license to operate.

>Single tube, very low power, worked fine for a whole block.

Ah - several hundred feet.

My transmitter was single tube, 10 watts, worked fine for several hundred *miles*. Despite my homemade receiver, lackluster antenna and entry-level skills. ;-) :-) ;-P

> Was 14 then. :-)
>
I was 13 then ;-) :-) ;-) --;

Perhaps that's why you want FCC to stop licensing people under the age of 14 - they might do things you did not do at that age. Oh wait, some of us have already done so.....

> >>now, the electrical principals of what a CW
> >>transmission is, and a knowledge test of that is a good idea, but
> >>that's comparing apples and oranges.
>
> Comparing apples and oranges is fine for the produce market,

Are you a fruit, Len? ;-)
>
> >Why should there be *any* written test on theory if all a person wants to do
> is
> >operate manufactured radios? If someone doesn't want to build a rig, why
> should
> >they have to memorize all those symbols, diagrams and formulas?
>
> Well then, you WANT type-accepted radios in amateur radio?!?

Not me.

Was your 1948 'transmitter' type-accepted?
>
> Why would you WANT such a thing?

I don't. Why do you think I want such a thing?

I simply asked:

"Why should there be *any* written test on theory if all a person wants to
do is operate manufactured radios? If someone doesn't want to build a

rig,
why should they have to memorize all those symbols, diagrams and
formulas?"

Nothing about "type-accepted radios" - which term isn't used any more,
anyway.

Why are you avoiding that simple question?

3997. Re: It isn't the keyboard it's the operator

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 17:23:09 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F6746FD.6BAEEA9F@ptt.edu>
Source record: 77311

> My email address appears in all my posts. What is your full name, address
> and telephone number?

Why don't you look it up?

> Are you saying that what I wrote and posted
> did not come from the web address I posted along with the article when
> you call me a troll?

Your Anderson link didn't work yesterday. Must be a gag order.

> BTW, BPL will be approved and ham radio is going the way of
> the dinosuar. That is my opinion. A troll is someone that post
> something just to disturb a news group with subjects that could contain:
> No Parking International
> All CBers are child molestors
> All (insert ethnic) are dirty and should be deported.
>
> BTW, I don't run a pirate site and by saying that makes you look totally ignorant
> fool. If you want to discuss my web site I will be glad to openly discuss it here
> otherwise crawl back into your hole and shout up.

"Shout up"? I must have struck a nerve.

3998. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 20:55:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309161255.447ddb52@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77312

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<nzF9b.23280$NM1.18866@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Len Over 21" wrote:
> >
> > They do? WHICH "hills," senior? We've got a whole
> > bunch of Big Hill things in this 60 x 120 mile area.
>
>
> Drive east on Interstate 10/20 and you'll see hundreds of them overlooking
> the valley just east of San Bernardino. You can't miss them - they're good
> sized and plainly visible from the Interstate (many are right beside the
> Interstate, with many more placed along the hillside in both directions for
> several miles). It's an impressive sight (but not very attractive).
>
>
> > Dwight, I worked on Solar One in Barstow, CA, the first
> > large-scale solar-furnace electric plant in the middle desert.
>
>
> Do you know where the one in Arizona is? I saw it about a mile off to one
> side the Interstate as I was driving through. There was a sign for the road
> leading to it saying something about a power research facility, but I don't
> remember the name of it.
>
>
> > Solar Two replaced it, trying out more things in re solar power
> > as heat. The two plants put about 50 to 100 MWe into the grid
> > (as I recall). A small part of the GWe required by the region.
>
>
> Very likely. I don't think solar is going to be able to supply power on a
> large scale anytime soon. In the meantime, additional fossil fuel plants are
> the only real option. Nuclear power may one day become more viable, but
> people will have to be convinced of it's safety first. And steps will have
> to be taken to lower costs and better deal with waste products. Until then,
> I have serious reservations about additional nuclear power plants.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dwight, we would need to change how we used energy, and in the solar
arena, conservation is key.

In the early 90's I took my older son's camping at Land Between Lakes,
KY/TN. There was an 1860's working farm as part of the scenery. The

weather was hot and sticky, we should have been out on the lake. Anyway, we were looking over the farm and I had decided when we pulled in that I wasn't going to go into the old farm house and get cooked. Anyway, as I stood on the breezeway at the back of the house, between the main house and the summer kitchen, I noticed that there wasn't heat pouring out of the house as I expected. So I went inside and things were pleasant. Upstairs and downstairs. No electricity.

My 2000 sq ft Ranch would have been sweltering under those condx.

The key was ventilation at ceiling level of the exterior walls, as if one of the logs were missing.

Go figure.

3999. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 20:55:41 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <hNK9b.2580$Dh1.2448@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77313

> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>
> > Los Angeles has several hundred wind turbines placed in the hills
> > around the area.

For some reason I envision truckloads of refried beans rolling into L.A., to assist the valiant cadres of illegal aliens in keeping a steady wind going.

How you Californians keep them all facing away from those hills at the same time, is what I wonder.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

4000. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 20:57:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309161257.678c0115@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77314

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<e4F9b.22971$NM1.14133@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" wrote:
> >
> > Wait a minute. Didn't he play a part in Dukes of Hazard?
>
>
> Wait a minute. The Dukes were "good ol' boys." There is nothing "good" in
> Bruce's repertoire.

Deliverance?

4001. Cocom03-32: Comments?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 21:01:32 UTC
From: Ralph Aichinger <ralph@dolphy.pangea.at>
Message-ID: <1063744828.370533@news.liwest.at>
Source record: 77315
Cross-posted to: uk.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.policy

This paper is discussed in de.comm.ham at the moment.:

www.tinyurl.com/nkt0 and
www.tinyurl.com/lmm3

Does the RSGB do something about it, is it discussed?
Does anybody know more about it? This does not look good.

Sorry, if this has been brought up already, a pointer
to past discussions would also be appreciated.

TIA
/ralph -- fup2 uk.radio.amateur

4002. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 21:01:39 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309161301.35d5728a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77316

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<w_E9b.22915$NM1.14399@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > I think it's an act, invented for the purpose. But even if it's not an
> > act, the written tests are not spelling or grammar tests.
> > "Intelligence" isn't a single-dimension quality. A person can be
> > brilliant in one area and have serious developmental problems in
> > others.
>
>
> Have you read his messages (not just the ones in this newsgroup)?

Yes - too many of 'em!

> I
> haven't see any sign of brilliance in anything he's written, on any subject.

Nor have I. But he's doing pretty well for 305 years old, dontcha
think? ;-)

> I'm not saying he's dirt dumb, just not the typical "rocket scientist" type.

It doesn't take a lot of brilliance to pass the Extra written. Just
enough right answers.

> Again, if is's an act, it's a darn good one (and that's the only good thing
> about it).

Of course. Bruce embarrasses the procodetest side, just like some
folks embarrass the nocodetest side.

In fact, that may be his entire game.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4003. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 21:01:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309161301.4f17eace@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77317

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030916061905.02537.00000601@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0309151432.5b8728a4@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> I do hope you mean the test is insanely simple and the privileges insanely
> >> high for the level of testing done.
> >>
> >> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> >Sorry.
> >
> >The tested material is insanely technical and the privs are insanely
> >high for an entry level license.
> >
> >Go do some historical research and see what the Novice material
> >consisted of, pre-Novice Enhancement.
>
> Go do some historical research and see what the Novice *privileges* consisted
> of, pre-Novice Enhancement.

No need to - I lived it, and I'm not so old that my memory is failing
or that I looked upon it as "The Good Old Days."

4004. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 22:28:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309161428.35efcb2d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77318

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0309140111.3a1a1a72@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030913201907.25815.00003003@mb-m07.aol.com>...
>
>
> > >> If we don't ask we'll never get. FCC isn't going to come up with any new
> ideas.
> > >> What can they do - say no?
> > >
> > >Yeah, absolutely. They'll say "we've already put enough work into
> > >diddling with this stuff in the past few years, come back in 5-10
> > >years when we have a better picture of the effects of what we've
> > >already done become apparent". Which is typical FCC behavior when it
> > >comes to major restructurings going back decades.
> >
> > OK, fine.
> >
> > But how can it hurt to ask?
>
> Can't hurt a thing and it might plant some seeds but don't expect an
> R&O to directly fall out of it.

Apparently it only hurts when NCI asks.

4005. Jim's "Bruce is a Genius" Postulate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 22:42:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309161442.7ac4a7a8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77319

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<w_E9b.22915$NM1.14399@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > I think it's an act, invented for the purpose. But even if it's not an
> > act, the written tests are not spelling or grammar tests.
> > "Intelligence" isn't a single-dimension quality. A person can be
> > brilliant in one area and have serious developmental problems in
> > others.
>
>
> Have you read his messages (not just the ones in this newsgroup)? I
> haven't see any sign of brilliance in anything he's written, on any subject.
> I'm not saying he's dirt dumb, just not the typical "rocket scientist" type.
> Again, if is's an act, it's a darn good one (and that's the only good thing
> about it).
>
>
Bruce can prove Rev. Jim's postulate by acting civilized. No more
leering at Kim, no more "CB-plusser" talk, no more "if I married my
Technician sister, would I still be a CBer?" questions, no more
calling other people "morrons."

I would go with the "serious developmental problems" postulate in
Bruce's case.

4006. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 22:52:08 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmf50tamo9c9e2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77320

--
--
Top nations that fund UN treasury,
in descending order...

United States: 22%
Japan: 19.6%
Germany: 9.8%
France: 6.5%
UK: 5.6%
Italy 5.1%
Canada: 2.6%
Spain: 2.5%

Russia isn't even in this top 8 list.
France, Russia and Germany, COMBINED,
do not contribute as much to the UN as
does the United States......

--

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message news:_Wu9b.222

> Nice concept on paper, but in the real world... Quite frankly, what
example
> has NCI given to the prospective ham? It sure doesn't exemplify the values
> of a "self-starter."

so where is it written, and what proof is there, that ONLY cw training
is exemplifies one as being "a self starter"? Would you say that means
all the other fields of studies and all the other areas of discipline are
full of "non starters" because CW isn't part of the agenda?

just the idea of getting into ham radio, studying to pass the exames
and learning to put together a station is, in and of itself, an example
of a self-starter, since on only the will and love of the hobby drove
the person to do it. They didn't HAVE to for any reason.

> Couldn't care how slow...as long as said CW/Data sub-bands remain intact.
>

hm, now how ODD... a certain OTHER PCTA type in this very thread
told me that here "is not a CW portion of any band, there never has
been"....
are you saying there are, and there HAS been? *GASP*

>

4007. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 22:54:34 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmf55gg0r0aj57@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77321

>
> And don't try to tell him anything about the FCC. He used to know a
> guy that used to work at the FCC, so he knows all about it. Past,
> present, and future.
>

LOL!

Yea, well... i'll tell you what... I know what i'm talking about, because I myself was told by this dude I use to know a while back, that did some stuff.... and afterwards, I heard it all from him... and now I know stuff.

really, I do. I know stuff.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4008. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 22:57:41 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmf5ba51cfbje1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77322

I have clipped the intermediate sections of the reply, but
kept the useful ones that Dick Carroll posted for my
following analysis....

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk63u0$dk9$0@208.207.71.177...

<snip>
> Babble, babble, babble & rave on! Brainiac, the Village Idiot at his
finest!

<snip>
> BTW how would YOU know what size hole goes in the roof of cars?
> You beern there and done that, hey???

<snip>
> You sure are a fart smeller!
>

Dick Caroll has resorted to insults and name-calling. He's obviously run
out of debate tactics and ideas, and never in the first place had any
facts to support his position. He's lost the argument.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4009. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 22:59:12 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309161459.1b2bc621@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77323

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030916010911.05539.00000771@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <bk4b77$p383g$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Just wanted to know why 13 was some type of magic number.
>
> Ever stop to think about all the morsemen dooming themselves with
> an "unlucky" number? :-)
>
> LHA

Great. As if Morse weren't religious enough, you get these guys
started on numerology.

4010. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 23:00:07 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmf5ftmum5a943@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77324

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030916010913.05539.00000773@mb-m16.aol.com...

>
> The FCC does NOT use the term "ham" in Part 97. That's the LAW.

interesting topic spin-off, but I once researched where the term "ham" came
from... the only thing I could find was that it was simply a bastardization
of
the term "amateur"

clint
kb5zht

4011. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 23:04:21 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmf5nr3siic1f3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77325

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030916010921.05539.00000781@mb-m16.aol.com...
> In article <bk327e$96s$0@208.206.142.90>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
> writes:

>
> What's to "promote," senior?

I like how you picked up on his condescending use of the age reference...

I remember on the local VHF frequencies once I got in an argument on the
air about (guess what???) cw testing... and the fellow I was arguing with
(oviously several years my elder) tried to belittle and detract from the
factual approach of my argument by referring to me as "young man"....
you know, "let me tell you what, YOUNG MAN, ... etc etc..."

so I had the PERFECT come back. I told him "okay, we'll end the
debate right here; you are judging the accuracy of the debate and,
thus, who wins, solely on who's older, not who's more correct. I'll
go find my friend [not included here for discreetness], who just
celebrated his 82'nd birthday; i'll let him talk on my behalf and just
feed him the lines to say, and since he's OLDER than YOU, that
means i'm automatically right, even if he, vicariously through me,
claims the moon is made out of green cheese, right?"

as I recall, not too much was said after that.

it's so easy.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4012. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 23:05:29 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmf5pvc91u2322@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77326

>
> And Clint says Dee was spurious?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

um, yea..... you see, the tactic I emplyed is called
reductio ad absurdum.... that is, demonstrating
absurdity by being absurd.

sorry you didn't "get it"

Clint
KB5ZHT

4013. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 23:06:57 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmf5sng11vvq5e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77327

>
> Come on Bill! NO knowledge of much of anything is needed as a
> foundation. Thousands of CB ops say otherwise!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

and on the citizen's band they'll stay; they will not be legally
able to get on the ham bands until they pass whatever test the FCC
dictates that they have to. If it just so happens that it no longer
includes CW, then they will simply be ham radio operators that
didn't have to take a cw test.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4014. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 23:08:46 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmf60456rv5na2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77328

> > you're mad because YOU had to do it, bottom line.
>
> Yep, in a nutshell. When the gubmn't said, "Jump!" DICK replied, "How High?"
>
> Now he feels foolish.

more or less a "bovine" mentality isn't it? the whole herd, mooing and everything,
was herded into the trailers to be taken to the slaughterfactory.... and to it they
went.

now that the times have changed and don't require it, they're mad because we're smart enough to realize we don't have to respond to the cattleprods and go up that ramp into the trailers... and off to the factory, just like THEY did....

Clint
KB5ZHT

4015. Re: Jim's "Bruce is a Genius" Postulate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 23:09:46 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916190946.24493.00000934@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77330

> Bruce can prove Rev. Jim's postulate by acting civilized. No more
>leering at Kim, no more "CB-plusser" talk, no more "if I married my
>Technician sister, would I still be a CBer?" questions, no more
>calling other people "morrons."

Forget it, its not going to happen. As long as Knuckle Draggin CBplussers are still here.

4016. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 23:09:49 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmf621hnp3dice@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77329

>
> You and Clint are the pair in a nutshell with no clue as to how to get
out.

non-relavent statement that pertains to nothing, means nothing, and proves
nothing. basically a blanketing statement meant to provoke and insult.
nothing more.

> You ARE foolish. Your past history proves it.

more of the same, with the self-fullfilling statement preceding it.

Clint
KB5ZHT
>

4017. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 23:12:32 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmf6752gjicd39@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77331

> >
> >spurious analogies are in the PCTA handbook, bill.
> >
> >Clint
> >KB5ZHT
>
> Heh heh heh...too bad that "spark" is outlawed.
>
> PCTA types would demand that ALL hams know "spark" theory and
> operating skills if it was still legal... :-)
>
> LHA

Oh, MAN! GOOD POINT!!!!
that's what I like about forums, enough people share ideas and group X thinks of things that group Y didn't, and vica versa... just where IS the PCTA's emphasis on "basics" and such, when the very basic beginning is not only NOT pushed upon them, but outlawed?

Oh, it's TOO sweet!!!!!!

Clint
KB5ZHT

4018. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 23:13:36 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309161513.7ea157db@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77332

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0309152056.62bb66f2@posting.google.com>...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bjv63a$t1m@library1.airnews.net>...
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F62885A.5060004@adelphia.net...
>
> >
> > From http://www.oakvilleamateurs.net/newsletters/hb200302.pdf
> > . . ."For most 40-meters, the most practical antenna is the 1/4-wave dipole
> > (66 feet in total length) up at least 33 feet in the air. If you've never
> > worked (or heard) Europe on 40, it's likely your dipole is too low. The
> > challenge grows on 80 where your quarter wave dipole (133' 9") needs to be . . .
>
> Bilge. All of it. A 66 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole on
> 40M and a 134 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole on 80M. A 33
> foot long center-fed dipole is a quarter wavelength long on 40M but it
> is not resonant on 40M and ya better not get stupid and feed it with
> coax then just plug it into the back of yer radio if ya wanna work
> anybody with it.
>
> Ask any Novice . . .
>
> w3rv

A Novice would tell the Extra that a 33 foot long center-fed dipole
would work great on 20M, but not for them. You see, Novices aren't
allowed on 20M.

4019. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 23:14:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk85gf$118$0@208.207.71.171>
Source record: 77333

Brian wrote:

> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<nzF9b.23280$NM1.18866@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Len Over 21" wrote:
> > >
> > > They do? WHICH "hills," senior? We've got a whole
> > > bunch of Big Hill things in this 60 x 120 mile area.
> >
> >
> > Drive east on Interstate 10/20 and you'll see hundreds of them overlooking
> > the valley just east of San Bernardino. You can't miss them - they're good
> > sized and plainly visible from the Interstate (many are right beside the
> > Interstate, with many more placed along the hillside in both directions for
> > several miles). It's an impressive sight (but not very attractive).
> >
> >
> > > Dwight, I worked on Solar One in Barstow, CA, the first
> > > large-scale solar-furnace electric plant in the middle desert.
> >
> >
> > Do you know where the one in Arizona is? I saw it about a mile off to one
> > side the Interstate as I was driving through. There was a sign for the road
> > leading to it saying something about a power research facility, but I don't
> > remember the name of it.
> >
> >
> > > Solar Two replaced it, trying out more things in re solar power
> > > as heat. The two plants put about 50 to 100 MWe into the grid
> > > (as I recall). A small part of the GWe required by the region.
> >
> >
> > Very likely. I don't think solar is going to be able to supply power on a
> > large scale anytime soon. In the meantime, additional fossil fuel plants are
> > the only real option. Nuclear power may one day become more viable, but
> > people will have to be convinced of it's safety first. And steps will have
> > to be taken to lower costs and better deal with waste products. Until then,
> > I have serious reservations about additional nuclear power plants.
> >
> >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> Dwight, we would need to change how we used energy, and in the solar
> arena, conservation is key.

>
> In the early 90's I took my older son's camping at Land Between Lakes,
> KY/TN. There was an 1860's working farm as part of the scenery. The
> weather was hot and sticky, we should have been out on the lake.
> Anyway, we were looking over the farm and I had decided when we pulled
> in that I wasn't going to go into the old farm house and get cooked.
> Anyway, as I stood on the breezeway at the back of the house, between
> the main house and the summer kitchen, I noticed that there wasn't
> heat pouring out of the house as I expected. So I went inside and
> things were pleasant. Upstairs and downstairs. No electricity.
>
> My 2000 sq ft Ranch would have been sweltering under those condx.
>
> The key was ventilation at ceiling level of the exterior walls, as if
> one of the logs were missing.
>
> Go figure.

So install an attic fan.

4020. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 23:15:05 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmf6bukmrui9a6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77334

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030916112119.29815.00000655@mb-m21.aol.com...

> Keep 1896 alive and well in the hearts of all amateurs.

yea, so much for "advancing the radio art" and so forth... that would
basically turn it into "freeze the radio art in time, and dam any possible
advancement or progress"

4021. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-16 23:17:04 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmf6fo259fcm02@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77335

AND ANOTHER NATION SENDS CW TESTING
DOWN IN FLAMES!!!

hip hip hoorey!
another nation advances with the times!!!

Clint
KB5ZHT

--
--
Top nations that fund UN treasury,
in descending order...

United States: 22%
Japan: 19.6%
Germany: 9.8%
France: 6.5%
UK: 5.6%
Italy 5.1%
Canada: 2.6%
Spain: 2.5%

Russia isn't even in this top 8 list.
France, Russia and Germany, COMBINED,
do not contribute as much to the UN as
does the United States......

--

"Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer" <nobody@cypherpunks.to> wrote
in message news:396421f60cbcd976ed6bb1ed562f7166@cypherpunks.to...
>
> Since 15 September 2003.
>
> Hare Krishna ! Hare ! Hare !
>
>
>
>
>
>

4022. Re: OT: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 00:03:43 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0309161603.4c174ddf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77336

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030913005510.15462.00002925@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> In article <b7d1465c.0309120433.48e36421@posting.google.com>, wa2si@arrl.net
> (Bert Craig) writes:
>
> >Hi all,
> >
> >I'm curious. If I make a mistake during a QSO, what is the correct way
> >to get back on track. Do I:
> >
> >1. Send 6 or 7 dits or an extra long dah?
> > -and-
>
> Bert:
>
> The actual prosign for an error is eight dits. I've heard hams using a
> straight key or "bug" send a long dash, but that's normally an alternative
> form of "zero" and not an "error" prosign. BTW, another alternative
> form of "zero" is the letter "O" (three dahs).
>
> >2. Do I resume at the character or do I repeat the entire word?
>
> It would be better to repeat the word; the OM on the other end will most
> likely figure out what you're doing in any case.
>
> >Also, I heard a "shave and a haircut, two bits" at the end of a QSO
> >the other night. When is that appropriate?
>
> At the end of the QSO. It is a traditional ending, especially if you happen
> to have long hair and a 3-day growth of beard.
>
> >Thanks. :-)
>
> Your Velcome!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Thanks all,

I appreciate all your advice and immediately put it to good
use...including my first "shave and a haircut" at the close of a QSO
w/a 62 yr. old OM, who promptly sent back "two bits." Thanks again and
see ya on tha bands. :-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

4023. Vanity Call Sign Lookup

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 00:04:58 UTC
From: Bob <news@elinkusa.com>
Message-ID: <KyN9b.25913$NM1.23036@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77337

I know about the various places where you can lookup current call signs, but can anyone tell me where, if there is such a place, I can lookup to see if one has not been used for 2 or more years? Thanks, Bob.

4024. Re: Vanity Call Sign Lookup

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 00:10:35 UTC
From: Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com>
Message-ID: <_DN9b.136174$kP.73939@fed1read03>
Source record: 77338

Try URL:
http://www.vanityhq.com/

--
73 From The Signal In The Noise
Caveat Lector Ya All
"Bob" <news@elinkusa.com> wrote in message
news:KyN9b.25913$NM1.23036@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> I know about the various places where you can lookup current call signs,
but
> can anyone tell me where, if there is such a place, I can lookup to see if
> one has not been used for 2 or more years? Thanks, Bob.
>
>

4025. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 00:19:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916201903.28496.00000698@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 77339

In article <nzF9b.23280$NM1.18866@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

> Drive east on Interstate 10/20 and you'll see hundreds of them overlooking
>the valley just east of San Bernardino. You can't miss them - they're good
>sized and plainly visible from the Interstate (many are right beside the
>Interstate, with many more placed along the hillside in both directions for
>several miles). It's an impressive sight (but not very attractive).
>
NOT ATTRACTIVE!?

If they're the kind that have the single tubular pylon and 3 bladed horizontal - axle turbine, they're not just attractive - they're beautiful!

73 de Jim, N2EY

4026. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 00:38:26 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmfb898bvsjia4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77341

good riddance.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4027. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 00:38:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F67AD54.7040507@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77340

N2EY wrote:
> In article <nzF9b.23280$NM1.18866@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:
>
>
>>Drive east on Interstate 10/20 and you'll see hundreds of them overlooking
>>the valley just east of San Bernardino. You can't miss them - they're good
>>sized and plainly visible from the Interstate (many are right beside the
>>Interstate, with many more placed along the hillside in both directions for
>>several miles). It's an impressive sight (but not very attractive).
>>
>
> NOT ATTRACTIVE!?
>
> If they're the kind that have the single tubular pylon and 3 bladed horizontal
> - axle turbine, they're not just attractive - they're beautiful!

Hah! you're not alone in your appreciation, Jim. Those are about as
aesthetically pleasing as power generation can be. They are techno-art.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4028. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 00:40:18 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmfbbn3qpdl2f8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77342

hmmm..
a little sour over your precious CW testing being
discontinued, world-wide?

Clint
KB5ZHT

4029. Re: End of CW in CEPT is for october 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 00:41:57 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmfbepjfkhdt46@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77343

>
> This will be news to FISTS who proposed a 12wpm CEPT compiant Extra
> amateur radio license.
>
> Poor Phists, a century behind the power curve.

oh, that is a goooood one..

Clint
KB5ZHT

4030. Re: NCI Petition available on FCC ECFS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 00:44:14 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmfbj35ej9pub9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77344

> >
> >Went to his WEB Site, Saw his picture, what a Dork looking character, no
wonder
> >he couldnt handle CW.
>
> Judging from the effectiveness of your rebuttals and the logic of your
> arguments, code is doomed if you are a poster child for the movement.
>

WELL said.
When logic fails, factual evidence is lacking, then the last refuge is
insults and demeaning insults.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4031. Re: NCI Petition available on FCC ECFS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 00:45:00 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmfbkhg2iusre0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77345

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030903225927.03231.00000297@mb-m11.aol.com...

> Went to his WEB Site, Saw his picture, what a Dork looking character, no
wonder
> he couldnt handle CW.

aaaah, yes..... a true sign of real intelligence of achievement.

the ability to call names. Yes, truly worth of a nobel prize.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4032. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 00:48:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <BbO9b.25959$NM1.21618@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77346

What are you so happy about? Do you hold a license from there and plan to return?

What they do has NOTHING AT ALL to do with the USA.

Dan/W4NTI

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message news:vmf6fo259fcm02@corp.supernews.com...
> AND ANOTHER NATION SENDS CW TESTING
> DOWN IN FLAMES!!!
>
> hip hip hoorey!
> another nation advances with the times!!!
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
> --
> --
> Top nations that fund UN treasury,
> in descending order...
>
> United States: 22%
> Japan: 19.6%
> Germany: 9.8%
> France: 6.5%
> UK: 5.6%
> Italy 5.1%
> Canada: 2.6%
> Spain: 2.5%
>
> Russia isn't even in this top 8 list.
> France, Russia and Germany, COMBINED,
> do not contribute as much to the UN as
> does the United States......
>
> --
>
>
> "Anonymous via the Cypherpunks Tonga Remailer" <nobody@cypherpunks.to> wrote
> in message news:396421f60cbcd976ed6bb1ed562f7166@cypherpunks.to...
> >
> > Since 15 September 2003.

> >
> > Hare Krishna ! Hare ! Hare !
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

4033. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 00:50:12 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmfbub9qc715cb@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77347

>
> Some of those aren't REAL Generals, or Extra's. The number of true
> Generals and Extra's is actually less than the numbers shown.
>
>

probably will be a real shock to the license owners when they find
out that the FCC was just "joking", I guess, by sending them a license.

4034. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 00:50:42 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmfbv6l4k61jdd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77349

>
> What's a real General or Extra, Vince?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

he's obviously a PCTSW (a pro-code test sniveling whiner)

Clint
KB5ZHT

4035. Re: OT: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 00:50:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <GdO9b.25964$NM1.20016@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77348

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
news:b7d1465c.0309161603.4c174ddf@posting.google.com...
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030913005510.15462.00002925@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > In article <b7d1465c.0309120433.48e36421@posting.google.com>,
wa2si@arrl.net
> > (Bert Craig) writes:
> >
> > >Hi all,
> > >
> > >I'm curious. If I make a mistake during a QSO, what is the correct way
> > >to get back on track. Do I:
> > >
> > >1. Send 6 or 7 dits or an extra long dah?
> > > -and-
> >
> > Bert:
> >
> > The actual prosign for an error is eight dits. I've heard hams using a
> > straight key or "bug" send a long dash, but that's normally an
alternative
> > form of "zero" and not an "error" prosign. BTW, another alternative
> > form of "zero" is the letter "O" (three dahs).
> >
> > >2. Do I resume at the character or do I repeat the entire word?
> >
> > It would be better to repeat the word; the OM on the other end will most
> > likely figure out what you're doing in any case.
> >
> > >Also, I heard a "shave and a haircut, two bits" at the end of a QSO
> > >the other night. When is that appropriate?
> >
> > At the end of the QSO. It is a traditional ending, especially if you
happen
> > to have long hair and a 3-day growth of beard.
> >
> > >Thanks. :-)
> >
> > Your Velcome!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Thanks all,
>

> I appreciate all your advice and immediately put it to good
> use...including my first "shave and a haircut" at the close of a QSO
> w/a 62 yr. old OM, who promptly sent back "two bits." Thanks again and
> see ya on tha bands. :-)
>
> --
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI

Whenever I hear that assine 'shave and a haircut' crap I don't respond at all. I started hearing it way back in the 60s and its still dumb.

Dan/W4NTI ..._._

4036. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 00:52:27 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmfc2himtdk82b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77350

>
> Don't forget that 300 million or so would benefit if all the
> requirements were dropped.
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

oh, are they dropping the written test to? are they just
going to give away the license to all hams that pay
the fee?

or are they, in fact, still requireing a knowledge test?
ah, yes. I'm sure they are.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4037. FISTS Postion to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 00:59:13 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916205913.12501.00002450@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 77451

In article <bk4b7e$p383g$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>All of the above answers would be correct (barring accidental typos), but
>the original poster of the question in the first place DID NOT SPECIFY.
>See, it is important, unless you consider ALL antennas to be exactly
>one-half wavelength in length.

Dan thinks "all" dipoles are half-wavelength... :-)

LHA

4038. Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 00:59:14 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916205914.12501.00002451@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 77452

In article <c2356669.0309160836.595af4a9@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030916010914.05539.00000775@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>> In article <20030915021846.23171.00000765@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >In article <vm9usff4mpm58f@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
>> ><rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>> >
>> >>sending and receiving CW isn't a building block
>> >>to anything else.....
>> >
>> >Yes, it is.
>> >
>> >First, it's a building block to the use of the mode on the air. Although
>other
>> >services have pretty much stopped using Morse Code, hams use it
>extensivley,
>> >and an amateur license is permission to operate an amateur station, not a
>> >station in another service.
>>
>> Roger that, Reverend Jim...
>
>Who is "Reverend Jim", Len? You and Brian Burke keep using that name
>to address someone.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...you've never seen "Taxi" then... :-)

>It can't be me, because I graduated from electrical engineering
>school, not divinity school. And my name isn't Ignatowski ;-)

Yes, yes, and you never inhaled, either...

>What engineering school did you graduate from, Len?

One right here in Southern California...

>> IN the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service...
>
>No such thing exists.

Yes it do, de facto, just not de jure. :-)

>I've been "in" the Amateur Radio Service for almost 36 years. You have
>not done so for even one day.

So, you've been squatting for almost 36 years.

Have you gotten your deed yet?

>That's nice, Len. On what amateur band did you bootleg with it? Or was
>it a broadcast band device so you could pretend you were on "Ted
>Mack's Amateur Hour"? ;-)

I've never bootlegged on anything after 1948.

>I built a simple *AC line powered* Morse/CW transmitter back in 1967.
>Covered the 80 and 40 meter bands. Required a valid Amateur Radio
>license to operate.

Well, give that person a Nobel Prize for accomplishment in physics!

By 1967 I'd already DESIGNED and mostly built (technician help was
not always available) several UHF to microwave RF emitters of more
that 10 Watts. All quite legal.

>My transmitter was single tube, 10 watts, worked fine for several
>hundred *miles*. Despite my homemade receiver, lackluster antenna and
>entry-level skills. ;-) :-) ;-P

Goodie, we'll pin an oak leaf cluster on your Nobel.

>Perhaps that's why you want FCC to stop licensing people under the age
>of 14 - they might do things you did not do at that age. Oh wait, some
>of us have already done so.....

You keep reaching for that "age thing," Rev. Jim.

Bad toke today or what?

>> Comparing apples and oranges is fine for the produce market,
>
>Are you a fruit, Len? ;-)

I'm an out-of-the-closet heterosexual.

What's your excuse?

>Why are you avoiding that simple question?

WHAT "question?"

LHA

4039. Re: OT: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 01:01:53 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <5oO9b.18562$BS1.4089196@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 77453

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:GdO9b.25964$NM1.20016@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:b7d1465c.0309161603.4c174ddf@posting.google.com...
> > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> news:<20030913005510.15462.00002925@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > > In article <b7d1465c.0309120433.48e36421@posting.google.com>,
> wa2si@arrl.net
> > > (Bert Craig) writes:
> > >
> > > >Hi all,
> > > >
> > > >I'm curious. If I make a mistake during a QSO, what is the correct
way
> > > >to get back on track. Do I:
> > > >
> > > >1. Send 6 or 7 dits or an extra long dah?
> > > > -and-
> > >
> > > Bert:
> > >
> > > The actual prosign for an error is eight dits. I've heard hams using
a
> > > straight key or "bug" send a long dash, but that's normally an
> alternative
> > > form of "zero" and not an "error" prosign. BTW, another alternative
> > > form of "zero" is the letter "O" (three dahs).
> > >
> > > >2. Do I resume at the character or do I repeat the entire word?
> > >
> > > It would be better to repeat the word; the OM on the other end will
most
> > > likely figure out what you're doing in any case.
> > >
> > > >Also, I heard a "shave and a haircut, two bits" at the end of a QSO
> > > >the other night. When is that appropriate?
> > >
> > > At the end of the QSO. It is a traditional ending, especially if you
> happen
> > > to have long hair and a 3-day growth of beard.
> > >
> > > >Thanks. :-)
> > >

> > > Your Velcome!
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> > Thanks all,
> >
> > I appreciate all your advice and immediately put it to good
> > use...including my first "shave and a haircut" at the close of a QSO
> > w/a 62 yr. old OM, who promptly sent back "two bits." Thanks again and
> > see ya on tha bands. :-)
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
>
> Whenever I hear that assine 'shave and a haircut' crap I don't respond at
> all. I started hearing it way back in the 60s and its still dumb.
>
> Dan/W4NTI ..._._

(a la Homer Simpson) Doh!

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

4040. Re: Cobra 2000 with matching speaker and hand mic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 01:11:24 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <0xO9b.4973$xx4.975741@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 77454

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309160305.41aa16bf@posting.google.com...
> "shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
news:<7hv9b.2170$xx4.452979@twister.neo.rr.com>...
> > "Lloyd" <Lloyd@nonexanonpost.com> wrote in message
> > news:bk5ook$ud7$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > x-no-archive: yes
> > > "Loup1962" <loup1962@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20030915112008.21879.00001097@mb-m04.aol.com...
> > > > Cobra 2000 base with matching speaker and hand mic in excellent
> > condition
> > for
> > > > $250 + actual UPS cost to you.
> > >
> > That is THE Ham radio for the No-Code wonders!
> >
> > 10-73's!
>
> That must be why you showed an interest in it.

Another NCI mouthpiece, or is that sock puppet?

10-73's!

4041. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 01:47:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916214700.22081.00000680@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 77457

In article <f45722ac.0309161459.1b2bc621@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030916010911.05539.00000771@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>> In article <bk4b77$p383g$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
>> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>>
>> >Just wanted to know why 13 was some type of magic number.
>>
>> Ever stop to think about all the morsemen dooming themselves with
>> an "unlucky" number? :-)
>>
>> LHA
>
>Great. As if Morse weren't religious enough, you get these guys
>started on numerology.

Maybe morsemen could use numerology to "prove something" new
about morse? So far, they only thing they've "proved" is that 'they did it
so everyone else has to, too.' It would be nice to see something new
about their addiction...er, affliction...no, I mean attitude of the ages.

LHA

4042. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 01:47:01 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916214701.22081.00000681@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 77456

In article <vmf6752gjicd39@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
<rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:

>> >spurious analogies are in the PCTA handbook, bill.
>> >
>> >Clint
>> >KB5ZHT
>>
>> Heh heh heh...too bad that "spark" is outlawed.
>>
>> PCTA types would demand that ALL hams know "spark" theory and
>> operating skills if it was still legal... :-)
>>
>> LHA
>
>Oh, MAN! GOOD POINT!!!!
>that's what I like about forums, enough people share ideas and group X
>thinks of things that group Y didn't, and vica versa... just where IS
>the PCTA's emphasis on "basics" and such, when the very basic
>beginning is not only NOT pushed upon them, but outlawed?
>
>Oh, it's TOO sweet!!!!!!

Well, that's how it goes. Every amateur must know morse in order to save
the next Titanic or something. Morse is used "countless times" in national
emergencies. It is the next most basic radio communications thing, etc.
["countless" is apt because the number of actual emergency comms done
by on-off-keying modes is zero, zilch, nada...unless the self-promoters
think that Health and Welfare messages are "emergencies."]

"Spark" or damped-wave RFI generators could only be used in any kind of
communications by an on-off keying mode. Wasn't possible to AM it or
FM it, or PM it or much of anything else except on-off kind of thing.

Somewhere about now, Rev. Jim is going to come up with the famous 1906
first-known AM application...and conveniently fail to note that such was
done on a rather large alternator generator (definitely not a "spark" xmtr)
and using a water-cooled microphone. Not really practical except it proved
AM was possible and receivable on a crystal receiving set or coherer.

Beep, beep

LHA.

4043. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 01:47:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030916214702.22081.00000682@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 77458

In article <vmf5ftmum5a943@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
<rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030916010913.05539.00000773@mb-m16.aol.com...
>
>> The FCC does NOT use the term "ham" in Part 97. That's the LAW.
>
>interesting topic spin-off, but I once researched where the term "ham" came
>from... the only thing I could find was that it was simply a bastardization
>of the term "amateur"

Heh heh. We will now expect that ARRL supporters to jump and reference
the "official" source of "ham." For once the ARRL is close to the truth.
:-)

Etymologically speaking, American English was already using "ham" as a
poor substitute for beef at the turn of the century before last. In show
biz
the term "ham actor" referred to a showy, not-very-good entertainer who
was more interested in presenting themselves than the stageplay.

The progression from "amateur" to "ham" was a natural for American
English speakers (a "bastardization of the word amateur" as you say).
According to the ARRL "official" source of all things amateur in the USA,
the word "ham" was used by professional radiotelegraphers as a not-nice
term for the non-professional radio amateurs way back in the beginning of
radio time.

"Real hams" do NOT like the word "amateur" at all applying to them. Some
want to be considered of "professional caliber" and constantly shoot off at
professionals in radio. They are shooting blanks of course, and their
caliber is about BB size.

So, we've got a bunch of these "professional amateurs" who want to be
"better" than real professionals because they think they are so damn
good. No doubt they are very skilled at morsemanship and have been
tossing out money for decades in building their "station," but very few are
REAL professionals in the sense that they accept money for amateur
services rendered (illegal, of course, a sort of "financial bootlegging").

ARRL is "professional amateurism" in an organized sense and with an IRS-
reported taxable income of $12 million or so a few years ago.

REAL hams are "superior" or something. They keep saying that outright if
not implying it constantly. I'm not sure what their "superiority" really is
other than marketing certain kinds of plant growth nutrient surrogates. :-)

Amateur radio remains a HOBBY, a recreational activity that requires government regulation due to the physics of radio waves. Apparently new folks aren't supposed to enjoy it or have fun in it unless they bow and scrape to their "superiors" in ham radio. Rank, title, status, privilege are
all "necessary" in the hobby of these "superiors." :-)

When questioned on their actual enjoyment of the hobby (to them it is a "service" of a higher calling), they answer that they enjoy it "more" just because they are "superior." :-)

LHA

4044. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 02:19:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F67C4FF.1040005@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77459

Clint wrote:
>>Don't forget that 300 million or so would benefit if all the
>>requirements were dropped.

>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>
> oh, are they dropping the written test to? are they just
> going to give away the license to all hams that pay
> the fee?
>
> or are they, in fact, still requireing a knowledge test?
> ah, yes. I'm sure they are.

Very observent, they *are* requireing a knowledge test.

But you know they really DON'T have to.

If you thing they have to, tell me the reasons why.

- Mike -

4045. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 02:19:48 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309161819.5ec1699c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77460

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:<vmbdhfc0nr1n86@corp.supernews.com>...

> many people that are in or supports the doctrines of PCTA keeps
> spouting "basics", and draws an anology to either handwriting...
> and I say this; does this mean you could NEVER write cursive
> if you were never taught print? could you NOT be taught
> cursive directly without first being taught print? No.

I am trying to figure out what you are trying to make a point of,
Clint, but it's a bit trying to read through.

> However, it's simply another skill that can be taught, and they
> do, and that's fine. However, they do not look at CW the
> same way; it's pass/fail, not merely a percentage of test
> that needs to be passed.

You, Like Lennie the Lame keep trying to incriminate some group
of people called the "PCTA", accusing them of forcing this "Pass/Fail"
criteria on them.

Clint, read the >>FCC'S<< rules. THEY made them, and like thier
predecessor the FRC, gave the same weight to that test for the same
reasons.

The ARRL did not make those rules...neither did the Radio Club of
America nor any other non-governmental entity.

If you can only copy 70% of the letters, that means you cannot
copy the message being sent to you.

That's only 18 out of 26 characters. Could YOU make sense out of
a message that only utilized 70% of the known alphabet? What if the 8
characters YOU chose to not learn are not the same 8 someone elso
chose to not learn...?!?!

> Do you think they would support a system where you had
> to be tested on CW, if an only if you wanted to use CW
> on the CW part of the bands?

Clint...read the rules...CW can be used on ANY part of the
allocated bands.

Have you thought this out?

>Heh, of COURSE not.

I didn't think so...

> That is where thier anology fails. The art of CW needs
> to be tested with a practical test if you are to use and
> learn CW, but not necissarily ham radio. I would have
> supported a system like that, where if you wanted to
> operate CW on the lower half of the band you had to
> be tested on if first, but of course, that was out of the
> question.

There's no analogy here to fail, Clint.

> They do not, however, likewise, first test people
> on knowing how to build a double sideband carrier
> transmission if they want to operate AM; they do
> not require you to show how to get a microphone,
> talk on it, and recieve the response on a speaker
> if you want to use frequency modulated radiotelephone,
> or single sideband carrier suppressed radiotelephone.

Once upon a time that's EXACTLY how a person became an
Amateur...It was all on paper, of course, but you either knew the
theory and circuitry or you didn't.

I would be completely in favor of a testing requirement that
mandated true knowledge of the theory required. I believe the content
of the present pool questions is entirely adequate >>IF<< the pools
were closed.

> But they DO want to force CW on people that don't
> necissarily have any interest in operating it. "basics"
> arguments fail; "selftrained skill" fails because everything
> is a selftrained skill, why put the emphasis on an outdated
> mode instead of testing selftrained skills on new, modern
> modes of communication?

Clint...Get over this attitude of "vicitmization". It's
childish.

The FCC is already at work acting on petitions to drop the code
testing requirement. In no time at all, you will be able to jump
right in there and tell all the other good buddies what your personal
is, how much swing you've got on the flat side, and which chip you
changed to get on that "channel", and you won't have to learn one
single letter of the code to do it.

> United Nations Resolution 678 quote...
>
> 2. Authorizes Member States co-operating with the Government of Kuwait,
> unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements, as set forth in
> paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions, to use all necissary means to
> uphold and implement resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant
> resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area;
>
> anti-americans, just disregard "to use all necissary means"

I am sure you had a point to make here, but I am not sure what it was.

Steve, K4YZ

4046. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 02:48:00 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bk8i0r$q18rm$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77461

"Clint" wrote ...

and a LOT more FM, ssb, AM, packet, etc too.

Not really -- Morse Code is the second most popular mode in Amateur Radio
after SSB. But, you knew that already, right? (Oh, apparently not!)

Arnie -
KT4ST

4047. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 02:51:10 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bk8i6q$qj8tg$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77462

"Bill Sohl" wrote ...

They just don't get it (the PCTAs that is). Ending morse testing should happen because there is NO logical/rational reason for government to continue mandating morse knowledge of all HF licensed hams. Getting the government out of a "morse code affirmative action program" by ending mandated morse is far more a conservative concept than a liberal one.

Isn't it about time to put some music to that song, Bill? I suppose if you repeat it enough times, maybe even *you* will actually believe it.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4048. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 02:55:39 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bka0m8$r28ao$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77675

Extremely restricted, but I CHOSE to live there, and that is a choice, in retrospect that I wish I hadn't made. In the long run it is actually a good thing, as I am saving monthly around 100-120 dollars towards the down payment on a house, as well as repaying some debts of which a hole that I am in that I still can't see any light at the top from where I am at, but I AM making progress, and that is the best way I can look at it. On a good note, I have almost $5,000 saved in about 3 years for this whole downpayment thing! :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

>
> Restricted neighborhood? Me too.

4049. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:00:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030916230013.23307.00003049@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 77463

In article <bk4b7k$p383g$13@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>> As one PP'er to another, it is an honor to know you! It's nice to know
>that
>> we're morally and intellectually superior to the dumbed-down, unwashed,
>> non-PP'ing hoardes of inferior drivers.
>
>Should we form an official club, pay some dues, wear a ton of
>patches/buttons etc.?? lol

Ryan:

All of the above! I propose that we also have Parallel Parking contests
and sponsor awards programs. A person who PP's 100 times would
get the basic Century Award; then 500 PP's would qualify you for the
Silver PP Award, then Gold, then Platinum, then Diamond, etc. etc.
Naturally, we'll have the official club with dues, a Board of Directors,
Officers, Executive Committee meetings, a web site, and an entire
range of Official PP Club Men's and Ladie's wear.

>> Michigan still has "Chauffeur's" licenses? Which class of CDL is that
>> equivalent to? Here in Delaware, I'm told that Emergency Vehicle
>> operators don't require anything more than a standard Class D Driver's
>> license. They do, however, have to be a card-carrying member of
>> the "Emergency Service" (usually a local volunteer FD) to which
>> the emergency vehicle is registered.
>
>The MI Chauffers is one step down from the National CDL thingy as I believe
>if I remember correctly it allows you to drive any vehicle 25,999Lbs and
>under, as well as tow any trailer under that same weight. For passenger
>vehicles, up to 15, otherwise that would require the CDL-C if memory serves
>correctly. It also is the same license that covers a "driver for hire" from
>anything from a pizza or other delivery person, limo driver etc. I had a
>CDL a while back but have not elected to get it again.
>
> Michigan has a specific class, which entails a 6 hour classroom
>instruction, a skills driving course (1-2 hours depending on the course,
>instructor etc.) and 8 hours driving with your chief to qualify for the
>permit. As long as you pass the requirements for this, you can drive
>emergency vehicles under emergency and non-emergency official department
>business within the state of Michigan. Exception would be if you are
>transporting the vehicle across state lines such as if your department were
>buying a used pumper from another department in a different state, that
>would require a CDL license.......

OK, that's pretty much what I expected. I was just surprised to hear the term "Chauffeur's License" used again! Thanks for the info.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4050. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:03:20 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bka0m9$r28ao$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77676

The way I was taught to think of it was that the length (overall) is the
reference to the "length" of the dipole antenna. For example, a "half-wave"
dipole antenna would be a "quarter-wave" in length on each side of the
center insulator or center point. So a full wavelength dipole antenna would
have each "side" of the dipole being one-half wavelength each.
Oh well.......

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:uZp9b.15483$NM1.5726@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> The question refered to a DIPOLE. A dipole is at least 1/2 wavelength
> long.
>
> See comments by Jeffery Herman for further clarification on a 'dipole'.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:bk4b7d$p383g$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > Pure bullshit Dan, the formula changes for a quarter wave versus a half
> wave
> > versus a full wave. 468/freq. in Mhz is for a half-wave dipole. The
> > specific for a quarter-wave is half that. And so on and so forth.
> >
> > If the person specified which length they were looking for I would have
> > popped up the correct answer, as far out to the right of the decimal as
> you
> > want (yes, calculated by hand, not calculator. I do it the old fashioned
> > way), but they didn't specify which wavelength they were looking for.
> >
> >
> >
> > > > > > What is the length of a dipole for 14.240Mhz?
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Of what wavelength???? That is an important factor in the equation.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >

> > > Congratulations you have just proven you have NO CONCEPT of what was
> > asked.
> > >
> > > Does 468 divided by Frequency in Mhz mean anything to you?
> > >
> >
> >
> > Yep... for a half-wave dipole.
> >
> >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

4051. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:07:37 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ZdQ9b.26166$NM1.16564@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77464

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:_Wu9b.222$BS1.80870@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:qXr9b.16083$NM1.15285@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:svl9b.206446$Ay2.54336700@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:3Wa9b.12918$Aq2.8891@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > "shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:r489b.61835$3b2.8129302@twister.neo.rr.com...
> > > > Earning your way is fine...as long as the requirement(s)
> > > > is relevent...that's were you lose your argument.
> > >
> > > Well Bill, I'm on the bottom of 40 right now listening to a band FULL
of
> > > irrelevance. <hihi>
> >
> > Wonderfl, then you'll learn code if you want to participate there.
> > If not, nothing lost.
>
> Nice concept on paper, but in the real world...

In the real world what?

> Quite frankly, what example
> has NCI given to the prospective ham? It sure doesn't exemplify the values
> of a "self-starter."

Actually, those of us at the core of NCI are "self-starters" as
we didn't sit around and wait for anything...we actively helped
"make it happen."

> > More to the point, is there any minimum code
> > speed that should be banned from the CW/data segments at the
> > bottom of the bands?
>
> Couldn't care how slow...as long as said CW/Data sub-bands remain intact.

Last I checked, there were no such subbands as CW was allowed
everywhere except for some portion of 220MHz

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4052. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:07:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <_dQ9b.26167$NM1.23380@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77465

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bk7576$q3g09$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> And who is making those requirements is a factor as well in the argument.
> Ryan, KC8PMX

The ONLY entity making requirements for US hams is the FCC.

> > Earning your way is fine...as long as the requirement(s)
> > is relevent...that's were you lose your argument.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK

4053. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:07:52 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bk8j63$q157d$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77466

"Clint" wrote in part ...

... and the argument that it makes a good "yahoo" filter is wrong, due to the fact that most of the on air violations are made by very veteran hams with advanced liscences... thus, they themselves passed a code test.

If CW is the mode being used, it does. How many FCC violations by those using CW, Clint? I'll answer that for you -- the *vast* majority are made by those using the various *voice* modes. So says the FCC summary of enforcement actions. Check out the ARRL web site if you doubt it. As a matter of fact, I have never heard so much as a cuss word on CW in the ten years I have been licensed. Can you say the same about FM or SSB? I just love these specious arguments the no-code crowd makes. Now, don't even get me started about how antiquated SSB, AM, and RTTY are compared to the much more modern applications. I say stop *all* testing requirements related to SSB, AM, and RTTY now. :-))

Arnie -
KT4ST

4054. Re: Keep the cellphone charged

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:08:14 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bka0mb$r28ao$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77677

Too bad that is the only place you probably will see it. Hams already know the capabilities and/or benefits of amateur radio.

Now, I see the "morning shows" are already showing coverage of the potential storm, and gee, wouldn't ya think a story or interview on one of those shows would have "some" impression." And of course if the average Joe (or Josephine) ham was to call up CBS, NBC, ABC, etc. and try to get some time, I am quite sure they wouldn't have much luck. BUT an organization supposingly representing amateur radio, with alleged clout would have a better chance of getting a story or interview in front of a much larger public, such as these morning shows.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030916013809.22081.00000661@mb-m17.aol.com...
> In article <Mds9b.7032$aH5.1862@news02.roc.ny>, "Jim Hampton"
> <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> writes:
>
> >Let the cell phone users tell me how reliable they are *after* the big
blow
> >hits.
>
> I'll just wait to read about Ham Radio Saving The Day on the ARRL news
> page. :-)
>
> LHA

4055. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:10:32 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bk8jb3$pu0uu$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77467

"Bert Craig" wrote ...

Well Bill, I'm on the bottom of 40 right now listening to a band FULL of
irrelevance. <hihi>

Here, Here. Yep, CW is just dead as a doornail, Right Bert?

Arnie -
KT4ST

4056. Re: No Parking Test International

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:11:00 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bka0md$r28ao$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77678

My apologies, I will grab a membership and initiation info from from Larry
and get ya sponsered in!

Ryan, KC8PMX
Parallel Parker and Proud

>
> To heck with me???
>
> I'm a parallel parker from way back.

4057. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:15:12 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bk8jjr$q4b8j$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77468

"Clint" wrote ...

I was on the upper end of the bands.... man, there was even MORE
activity.... boy, we need a practical test to see if anybody can send and
recieve ssb quickly for 10-10 contests or something.. DAMN! how has ham
radio survived without it???

Based on the stuff I hear regularly on SSB, I would certainly be in favor of
some "practical" testing. Of course, they would then have to start a NSSBT
crowd.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4058. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:16:00 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bka0mf$r28ao$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77679

Just wanted to make sure I was seeing the same thing eh! :) Millions died
in Vietnam, the U.S. forces, the Allied partners, and of course the
Vietnamese both North and South adds up to quite a bit. Just a technicality
in the statement.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030915221852.11891.00000818@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <bk4b7t$p383g$21@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >Oh really.... Are you including "our side" or both sides in the war?
> >
>
> Hmmm... I wrote:
>
> "Every year and a half, about as many Americans die on US highways as died
in
> the entire Vietnam war."
>
> While it's clear to me that Americans are meant, perhaps it would be
clearer to
> all if I wrote:
>
> "Every year and a half, about as many Americans die on US highways as
Americans
> died in the entire Vietnam war."
>
> How's that?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
> >> And if you're going to discuss dangerous industrial processes, consider
> >this:
> >> The most dangerous common form of mechanized transportation in use
today
> >in the
> >> USA are privately owned motor vehicles. Every year and a half, about as
> >many

> >> Americans die on US highways as died in the entire Vietnam war.
Airlines,
> >> trains, buses and ships are far safer, yet few people refuse to drive
or
> >ride
> >> in a car compared to other modes. Why?
> >>
>
>

4059. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:17:23 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <7nQ9b.26185$NM1.23116@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77469

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bk8i6q$qj8tg$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Bill Sohl" wrote ...
>
> They just don't get it (the PCTAs that is). Ending morse testing should
> happen because there is NO logical/rational reason for government to
> continue mandating morse knowledge of all HF licensed hams. Getting the
> government out of a "morse code affirmative action program" by ending
> mandated morse is far more a conservative concept than a liberal one.
> ----------
>
> Isn't it about time to put some music to that song, Bill? I suppose if
you
> repeat it enough times, maybe even *you* will actually believe it.

Too bad the only entity that makes the difference
(i.e. the FCC) believes my position.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4060. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:21:10 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bka0mh$r28ao$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77680

Hey Charles,

Give me a trip to Taco Bell, and some cheap welfare beer like Milwaukee's
Best or Busch beer and I could power those wind turbines on my own! :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:hNK9b.2580$Dh1.2448@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com...
>
> > Dwight Stewart wrote:
> >
> > > Los Angeles has several hundred wind turbines placed in the hills
> > > around the area.
>
> For some reason I envision truckloads of refried beans rolling into L.A.,
to
> assist the valiant cadres of illegal aliens in keeping a steady wind
going.
>
> How you Californians keep them all facing away from those hills at the
same
> time, is what I wonder.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>

4061. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:23:49 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <9tQ9b.26195$NM1.22855@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77470

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bk8jb3$pu0uu$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Bert Craig" wrote ...
>
> Well Bill, I'm on the bottom of 40 right now listening to a band FULL of
> irrelevance. <hihi>
> --
>
> Here, Here. Yep, CW is just dead as a doornail, Right Bert?

The fact that morse is in use o ham bands offers no reason
to have a code test in order to begin learning and using the mode.
If a new ham without code knowledge decided to get together
with another ham to mutually learn/use code at veerrrryyy slow
seed (say 1-2 wpm)...would you oppose that?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4062. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:27:13 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030916232713.23307.00003050@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 77471

In article <vmf6fo259fcm02@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
<rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:

>
>hip hip hoorey!
>another nation advances with the times!!!
>

Yup, dumbing it's ham radio operators down to the lowest common
denominator. Some "advance!"

73 de Larry, K3LT

4063. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:27:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030916232714.23307.00003051@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 77473

In article <Xns93F7E7865C43Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>
>EI is the 7th country to abolish code testing by my reckoning

Ireland: Beautiful country, lovely people, but the same dumbed-down
hams! Not to worry, I'm sure us Yanks won't be far behind!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4064. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:27:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030916232715.23307.00003052@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 77472

In article <20030915081900.29660.00000653@mb-m24.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>
>In article <20030914230831.29815.00000616@mb-m21.aol.com>,
>yodoc@aol.comnospam
>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
>>In article <20030914081904.23307.00002990@mb-m29.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>>
>>>With all due respect, Larry - were you there?
>>
>>Jim:
>>
>>Obviously not. Point?
>
>That the same complaints you have about today's tests can be made by some of
>those who came before you.

Jim:

All that proves is that everyone's complaining about something. Nothing
new here.

>>>Did you have to take a sending test?
>>
>>No, but I could have easily passed one.
>
>"could have" and "did" are not the same thing.

Except in this case, Jim, because if a sending test had been required,
I would have passed it with ease. This is a matter of absolute certainty,
no speculation, no doubt, no question about the outcome. End of story.

>>>Did you have to pass all of the elements to upgrade at the same time?
>>
>>No. You got me there.
>>
>>>Did you have to wait 2 years to even try the Extra?
>>
>>No. Ditto.
>>
>See?

All I "see" is that I readily succeeded at the requirements which were
in place at the time, and those requirements were a far sight more
comprehensive and challenging than those of today, or those proposed
for the future. If MY requirements had been the same as yours, I'd
still be here today as an Extra Class radio amateur, albeit I'd also be
a QCWA member (for whatever that's worth).

>>>>Challenging licensing requirements and
>>>>uncompromising testing procedures.
>>>
>>>They've been "compromising" forever. Back before WW2 the exam was all
>>>blue
>book essays. Before 1960 there was diagram drawing. The tests I took in
>>>1967-70 were "dumbed down" compared to those because my tests were all
>>>multiple choice.
>>
>>Yeah, I know, and that's my point. However, the level of "dumbing-down"
>>that has occurred just in the last few years is way out of porportion to
>that
>>which took place from the beginning of FCC testing and the time you and I
>>became licensed.
>
>Those who had to do essays and draw diagrams might disagree.

Well, it's not the fault of those who didn't that those requirements were
reduced. As stated previously, if those had been the requirements I faced,
I would have been up to the challenge. I readily accede to the fact that
those hams who faced more challenging requirements than I did are
better hams than I am for having had that experience. All I have is
the same license class.

>>>>Of course, all that is waaaaay too
>>>>PoliticKally IncorrecKt today, since someone with a particular ethnic
>>>>origin, skin color, religion, "gender," or a hangnail might not be able
>>>>to pass the first time or two. This certainly won't do in these
>>>>enlightened times.
>>>
>>>None of that had anything to do with the license test changes.
>>
>>Oh, really? Prove it.
>
>Just look at the records and the old regs. Nothing in there about ethnicity,
>skin color, religion or gender. I dunno about hangnails.

The bit about ethnicity, skin color, religion, and gender is just a part of
the typical whining of the NCTA. Hangnails notwithstanding.

>>>Incentive Licensing came about in LBJ's time
>>>
>>>Dick Bash did his stuff (and got away with it) when Nixon and Ford were in
>>>office
>>
>>>The change to the VE system happened under Reagan

>>>
>>>We got medical waivers because a "king" wanted a favor from George Bush 1.
>>>
>>>We also got a nocodeham license because of GB 1.
>>>
>>>Etc.
>>
>>Damn those Republicans! OBTW -- who was President when the
>>"Restructuring" took place?
>
>That would be Slick Willy Clinton.

Ah HA!!! The ultimate dumbing-down was, as usual, presided over by
a liberal, socialist Democrat!

>>>>After all, it might "exclude" someone who is, in
>>>>reality, a nascent technical genius who just needs the ability to talk
>>>>on the HF phone bands in order to find the inspiration to create the
>>>>next fabulous new invention which will revolutionize electronic
>>>>communication for the rest of all time!
>>>>
>>>Or something like that.
>>>
>>>Don't hold yer breath waiting for it, tho.
>>
>>Trust me, I'm not.
>>
>Me neither.
>
>So, have you commented on each of the 7 petitions now before FCC?

Just the BPL and NCVEC petitions so far, but I'm working on it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4065. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:28:32 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bk8lbm$1ss@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 77476

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:w_E9b.22915$NM1.14399@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "N2EY" wrote:
> >
> > I think it's an act, invented for the purpose. But even if it's not an
> > act, the written tests are not spelling or grammar tests.
> > "Intelligence" isn't a single-dimension quality. A person can be
> > brilliant in one area and have serious developmental problems in
> > others.
>
>
> Have you read his messages (not just the ones in this newsgroup)? I
> haven't see any sign of brilliance in anything he's written, on any
subject.
> I'm not saying he's dirt dumb, just not the typical "rocket scientist"
type.
> Again, if is's an act, it's a darn good one (and that's the only good
thing
> about it).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

heh heh:

Subject: Impotrnace of Porper Seplling

Aoccdrnig to rscheearch at an Elingsh uinervtisy, it deosn't mttaer
in waht oredr the ltteers in a wrod are, the olny iprmoatnt tihng is
that the frist and lsat ltteer is at the rghit pclae. The rset can be
a toatl mses and you can sitll raed it wouthit a porbelm. Tihs is
bcuseae we do not raed ervey lteter by it slef but the wrod as a
wlohe.

4066. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:33:40 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bk8lbn$1ss@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 77477

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0309152056.62bb66f2@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bjv63a$t1m@library1.airnews.net>...
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F62885A.5060004@adelphia.net...
>
> >
> > From http://www.oakvilleamateurs.net/newsletters/hb200302.pdf
> > . . ."For most 40-meters, the most practical antenna is the 1/4-wave
dipole
> > (66 feet in total length) up at least 33 feet in the air. If you've
never
> > worked (or heard) Europe on 40, it's likely your dipole is too low. The
> > challenge grows on 80 where your quarter wave dipole (133' 9") needs to
be . . .
>
> Bilge. All of it. A 66 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole on
> 40M and a 134 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole on 80M. A 33
> foot long center-fed dipole is a quarter wavelength long on 40M but it
> is not resonant on 40M and ya better not get stupid and feed it with
> coax then just plug it into the back of yer radio if ya wanna work
> anybody with it.
>
> Ask any Novice . . .
>
> w3rv

Newp, sorry. A 40M 1/4-wave dipole can be made to resonate just fine and
work wonderfully. Its position to the ground and center angle have
everything to do with how well it will radiate. And, using a balun or not
doesn't change the whole concept of using a 1/4-wave dipole at any
frequency.

Whether you want them to or not, they work.

Kim W5TIT

4067. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:43:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk8l9i$4gp$0@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 77474

N2EY wrote:

> In article <nzF9b.23280$NM1.18866@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:
>
> > Drive east on Interstate 10/20 and you'll see hundreds of them overlooking
> >the valley just east of San Bernardino. You can't miss them - they're good
> >sized and plainly visible from the Interstate (many are right beside the
> >Interstate, with many more placed along the hillside in both directions for
> >several miles). It's an impressive sight (but not very attractive).
> >
> NOT ATTRACTIVE!?
>
> If they're the kind that have the single tubular pylon and 3 bladed horizontal
> - axle turbine, they're not just attractive - they're beautiful!
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

He's referring to the large windmill field at Indio on I-10. I've driven through there several times lately, and yes I agree- Impressive, and in no way unattractive.

4068. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:45:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk8lbt$4gp$1@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 77475

Clint wrote:

> "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030916112119.29815.00000655@mb-m21.aol.com...
>
> > Keep 1896 alive and well in the hearts of all amateurs.
>
> yea, so much for "advancing the radio art" and so forth... that would
> basically turn it into "freeze the radio art in time, and dam any possible
> advancement or progress"

(YAWN!!!) You clowns are more stale than last week's coffee.

4069. Re: OT: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:50:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk8lm2$4gp$2@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 77478

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> news:b7d1465c.0309161603.4c174ddf@posting.google.com...
> > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> news:<20030913005510.15462.00002925@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > > In article <b7d1465c.0309120433.48e36421@posting.google.com>,
> wa2si@arrl.net
> > > (Bert Craig) writes:
> > >
> > > >Hi all,
> > > >
> > > >I'm curious. If I make a mistake during a QSO, what is the correct way
> > > >to get back on track. Do I:
> > > >
> > > >1. Send 6 or 7 dits or an extra long dah?
> > > > -and-
> > >
> > > Bert:
> > >
> > > The actual prosign for an error is eight dits. I've heard hams using a
> > > straight key or "bug" send a long dash, but that's normally an
> alternative
> > > form of "zero" and not an "error" prosign. BTW, another alternative
> > > form of "zero" is the letter "O" (three dahs).
> > >
> > > >2. Do I resume at the character or do I repeat the entire word?
> > >
> > > It would be better to repeat the word; the OM on the other end will most
> > > likely figure out what you're doing in any case.
> > >
> > > >Also, I heard a "shave and a haircut, two bits" at the end of a QSO
> > > >the other night. When is that appropriate?
> > >
> > > At the end of the QSO. It is a traditional ending, especially if you
> happen
> > > to have long hair and a 3-day growth of beard.
> > >
> > > >Thanks. :-)
> > >
> > > Your Velcome!
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >

> > Thanks all,
> >
> > I appreciate all your advice and immediately put it to good
> > use...including my first "shave and a haircut" at the close of a QSO
> > w/a 62 yr. old OM, who promptly sent back "two bits." Thanks again and
> > see ya on tha bands. :-)
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Bert
> > WA2SI
>
> Whenever I hear that assine 'shave and a haircut' crap I don't respond at
> all. I started hearing it way back in the 60s and its still dumb.
>
> Dan/W4NTI ..._._

Well, Dan, If you had been around in the 30's you would have heard it then. If you're around in another 30 years you'll probably be hearing ht then, Brianb Burke may even be sending it by then.

4070. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:52:20 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bk8lpf$qe332$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77479

"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...

Well, that's how it goes. Every amateur must know morse in order to save the next Titanic or something. Morse is used "countless times" in national emergencies. It is the next most basic radio communications thing, etc. ["countless" is apt because the number of actual emergency comms done by on-off-keying modes is zero, zilch, nada...unless the self-promoters think that Health and Welfare messages are "emergencies."]

My EM Agency has multiple sets of HF gear and every one of them is manned by an ARS operator that is CW capable -- and we'd be foolish not to include that capability in our EM package. Now, don't get me wrong, I just love the new technology. As a part of that, we have FM trunked radios, laptop computers, closed network capability, VTC Scotties, and SATLinks. IOW, we use *all* of the tools available to us. Why not just admit that CW does have a place in the EM package -- or are you just so dug into your position that you can't see the sky anymore? IMO, it's not necessary to throw out the older viable technology in order to embrace the future. If that were the case, none of us would ever use a hard-wired phone again.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4071. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:57:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk8m3n$4gp$3@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 77480

Arnie Macy wrote:

> "Clint" wrote ...
>
> and a LOT more FM, ssb, AM, packet, etc too.
> --
>
> Not really -- Morse Code is the second most popular mode in Amateur Radio
> after SSB. But, you knew that already, right? (Oh, apparently not!)
>

Arnie, if you read much of Clint's writings you soon see that he doesn't
know much.

4072. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 03:58:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk8m5i$4gp$4@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 77481

Arnie Macy wrote:

> "Bill Sohl" wrote ...
>
> They just don't get it (the PCTAs that is). Ending morse testing should
> happen because there is NO logical/rational reason for government to
> continue mandating morse knowledge of all HF licensed hams. Getting the
> government out of a "morse code affirmative action program" by ending
> mandated morse is far more a conservative concept than a liberal one.
> --
>
> Isn't it about time to put some music to that song, Bill? I suppose if you
> repeat it enough times, maybe even *you* will actually believe it.

Oh, he's alread there..without the music, the chant was enough to do the job.

4073. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 04:03:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk8mea$4gp$5@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 77482

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
> news:bk8i6q$qj8tg$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > "Bill Sohl" wrote ...
> >
> > They just don't get it (the PCTAs that is). Ending morse testing should
> > happen because there is NO logical/rational reason for government to
> > continue mandating morse knowledge of all HF licensed hams. Getting the
> > government out of a "morse code affirmative action program" by ending
> > mandated morse is far more a conservative concept than a liberal one.
> > ____
> >
> > Isn't it about time to put some music to that song, Bill? I suppose if
> you
> > repeat it enough times, maybe even *you* will actually believe it.
>
> Too bad the only entity that makes the difference
> (i.e. the FCC) believes my position.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Really??? That was last time. You have no idea what they 'll do this time.

4074. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 04:04:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk8mgr$4gp$6@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 77483

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
> news:bk8jb3$pu0uu$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > "Bert Craig" wrote ...
> >
> > Well Bill, I'm on the bottom of 40 right now listening to a band FULL of
> > irrelevance. <hihi>
> > ____
> >
> > Here, Here. Yep, CW is just dead as a doornail, Right Bert?
>
> The fact that morse is in use o ham bands offers no reason
> to have a code test in order to begin learning and using the mode.
> If a new ham without code knowledge decided to get together
> with another ham to mutually learn/use code at veerrrryyy slow
> seed (say 1-2 wpm)...would you oppose that?

I'd oppose it happening on the air on HF. That's incorrect and improper use of spectrum.

4075. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 04:06:00 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk8mj8$4gp$7@208.207.71.142>
Source record: 77484

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <vmf6fo259fcm02@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
> <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>
> >
> >hip hip hoorey!
> >another nation advances with the times!!!
> >
>
> Yup, dumbing it's ham radio operators down to the lowest common
> denominator. Some "advance!"

Does it come as a surprise that Clint, Brian and LHA feel right at home
in that environment?

4076. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 04:10:11 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bk8mqu$qh5ii$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77485

"Bill Sohl" wrote ...

The fact that morse is in use o ham bands offers no reason to have a code test in order to begin learning and using the mode. If a new ham without code knowledge decided to get together with another ham to mutually learn/use code at veerrrryyy slow seed (say 1-2 wpm)...would you oppose that?

As a matter of fact, I'm teaching a guy code now that runs about 4 wpm -- and he is *yet* to take test one. I don't need to tell you that this is considerably slower than I usually send/receive. But, the fact is that we *all* started at 0 wpm and worked up from there. My prediction is that my friend will be up to a reasonable speed in no time flat. It's all in the attitude of the learner and elmer, Bill. I have no doubt that CW will go on much longer than any testing requirements. That's why I continue to promote and teach it.

Arnie -

4077. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 04:37:53 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917003753.14296.00000834@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 77486

>Newp, sorry. A 40M 1/4-wave dipole can be made to resonate just fine and
>work wonderfully. Its position to the ground and center angle have
>everything to do with how well it will radiate. And, using a balun or not
>doesn't change the whole concept of using a 1/4-wave dipole at any
>frequency.
>
>Whether you want them to or not, they work.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Proof Positive the written is FAILURE.

4078. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 05:48:38 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk8sjmiiv0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 77487

Brian Kelly wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bjv63a$t1m@library1.airnews.net>...
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F62885A.5060004@adelphia.net...
>
> >
> > From http://www.oakvilleamateurs.net/newsletters/hb200302.pdf
> > . . ."For most 40-meters, the most practical antenna is the 1/4-wave dipole
> > (66 feet in total length) up at least 33 feet in the air. If you've never
> > worked (or heard) Europe on 40, it's likely your dipole is too low. The
> > challenge grows on 80 where your quarter wave dipole (133' 9") needs to be . . .
>
> Bilge. All of it. A 66 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole on
> 40M and a 134 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole on 80M. A 33
> foot long center-fed dipole is a quarter wavelength long on 40M but it
> is not resonant on 40M and ya better not get stupid and feed it with
> coax then just plug it into the back of yer radio if ya wanna work
> anybody with it.
>
> Ask any Novice . . .

Being licensed as a Novice would be a vast improvement for most of these geniuii.
Definitely
and most especially in the case of Putzie-Poo.

Ya gotta wonder how they plan to match these 1/4 wave dipoles at their highest impedance point.

"Uhhh.... say wot?"

4079. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 05:50:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk8smniiv1@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 77488

WA8ULX wrote:

> >Newp, sorry. A 40M 1/4-wave dipole can be made to resonate just fine and
> >work wonderfully. Its position to the ground and center angle have
> >everything to do with how well it will radiate. And, using a balun or not
> >doesn't change the whole concept of using a 1/4-wave dipole at any
> >frequency.
> >
> >Whether you want them to or not, they work.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Proof Positive the written is FAILURE.

I sure hope someone a the FCC is reading all this.

4080. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 06:00:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hlc5462.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 77490

On Tue, 16 Sep 2003 02:58:42 GMT, Mike Coslo wrote:

>All sounds sensible, but the month before retesting thing seems a bit
>obsessive. I can understand not retesting the same day, but not a month
>wait.

Made lots of sense. In SF we gave the tests once a week, on Friday,
and we were not equipped to handle the same folks week after week.
The five weeks between test-eligible days was adequate time to prepare
better.

>Now here is something that seems has been improved upon. If there are
>going to be different elements, it makes sense that if one element was
>passed, that you don't have to be restested on it. I had to test for my
>General twice because I flunked element 1 the first time. I passed the
>writtens, I would have passed them again. Not muchpoint in wasting the
>VE's time.

Elements 1 and 2 were simple stuff. Now if one passed the 13 WPM
code and the General written but failed the Advanced written, one
got a General license and did not have to retake the code or the
General written test to take the Advanced written test the next month.

The Extra, OTOH, was a "package". One could take the 20 WPM code,
pass it, pass the General and the Advanced writtens, and fail the
Extra written. Then, one would get an Advanced license, but would
still have to retake the 20 WPM code and the Extra written.

>> Usually they would not tell you how well you did other than "Pass"
>> or "Fail". They did NOT tell you which ones you got wrong. (At least
>> not in Philly).

In NY, if things were quiet, "Uncle Charlie" Finkelman would let you
watch while he graded the exam, but you could not review the
grading. In SF, you handed the paper in, and if things were slow
you would get the P/F results while you packed up your gear.
Otherwise, you went home and you were notified by mail of passing or
failing if you left a SAS postcard with the examiner.

>The VE system is a huge improvemnet over tha old system, I have to say.

That's your opinion. I beg to differ, but I'm biased.

>Regardless of the Morse requirements or the test contents, the testing
>system was not superior at all IMO.

That's your opinion. I beg to differ, but I'm biased.

>Interestingly enough, it would appear that matching up what was
>happening in the country at the time this was happening, the FCC tester
>(government) was replaced by the VE's (non-profit, but certainly private
>sector. The changes in the tests might seem like a de-regultion type of
>move.

That was the era of privatizing the FCC's functions. I call it
what it is - avoiding the FCC's responsibilities traceable to
the ineptitude of leadership of the agency and of the country as a
whole. "Get rid of what you don't understand" is the easy way out,
not the smart way.

The amateur testing was but the tip off the iceberg. Within ten
years (1985 - 1995), the following responsibilities were "privatized",
i.e. spun off to the private sector.

Testing of amateur license applicants.

Testing of commercial operator license applicants.

Testing and certification of broadcast operators, now made
voluntary.

Testing and certification of land mobile repair and adjustment
technicians, now made voluntary.

Frequency coordination in the microwave, broadcast and land mobile
services.

Interference resolution in the microwave, broadcast and land
mobile services.

Bi-annual inspection and certification of compliance of broadcast
stations.

Inspection and certification of marine radio installations
required for safety by statute or treaty on passenger-carrying
and ocean-going cargo vessels.

Auctions and encouraging wireline and wireless competition are
deemed to be far more important than patrolling the ether.

And the beat goes on.

>I guess I'm not going to blame the liberals for this one....

They're both guilty. Stupid is as stupid does.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4081. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 06:00:48 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hlc35o1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 77491

On 16 Sep 2003 00:19:14 GMT, N2EY wrote:

>The old code test worked like this:

A rather accurate description of how license tests should be
run.....

>You were allowed to bring a mill for receiving and speed key for sending, but
>you'd better be well-prepared if you showed up with same.

No mill was allowed for amateur tests - all copy was by hand. A
mill was allowed only for the First RadioTelegraph (Commercial) 25
WPM plain language test - not even for the 20 WPM code group test.

Speed keys or later on electronic keyers were allowed only if they
could be hooked up to the straight key terminals (with about 67 V
"B+" on them). Only once in all the years did I see anyone with a
bug who used that special "spring" for connection to the body of a
J-38 type straight key.

I sadly do not expect the FCC to get back into the exam business,
but there is nothing stopping them for requiring the VEC/VEs to run
the tests like they used to be run.

All it takes is commitment.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4082. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 06:00:49 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hlc5zm3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 77489

On Tue, 16 Sep 2003 01:03:16 GMT, Keith wrote:

>> Of course, if the amateur op doesn't have his license with him, the
>> officer has reasonable cause to believe that the pre-emption does
>> not cover him even though it still does, and if the rig has been
>> modified so that it is capable of TRANSMITTING on the police
>> frequency, the pre-emption is not valid even if the operator is a
>> licensed amateur (per the FCC Public Notice on this matter many
>> years ago).
>
> Please cite case law that supports your position that modified ham radios
>do not have the same exemption as all ham radios?

That was the deal that the League worked out with the FCC - if the
radio did not transmit "out of band" then the preemption covered.
The intent was to exclude VHF/UHF transceivers which have been
"opened up".

I'll dig out the Public Notice if I can find it. It was many years
ago.

>If I add 5 MHz capability to a radio do I now lose all protection of
>Federal laws?

Does your HF transceivertransmit on public safety VHF/UHF
frequencies? Does your VHF/UHF amateur transceiver transmit on 5
MHz ??

>What about if I build a kit or use a land mobile radio in the ham bands?

If you have the installed capability of transmitting on a non-amateur
frequency and do not have a license for such operation, it is not
covered under the preemption and it's your job to talk yourself out of
the jam. You're on your own.....

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4083. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 06:00:51 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hlc25q0.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 77492

On Mon, 15 Sep 2003 16:04:51 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:

>> Was it a 11-meter "cubical quad" before it became a 10-meter quad ??
>> Hmmm.... ????

>What are the implications if it was, Phil?

"Stand Clear of the Chain....." <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

4084. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 10:26:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309170226.1000e980@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77493

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<bk8mqu$qh5ii$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "Bill Sohl" wrote ...
>
> The fact that morse is in use o ham bands offers no reason to have a code
> test in order to begin learning and using the mode. If a new ham without
> code knowledge decided to get together with another ham to mutually
> learn/use code at veerrrryyy slow seed (say 1-2 wpm)...would you oppose
> that?
> ----------
>
> As a matter of fact, I'm teaching a guy code now that runs about 4 wpm --
> and he is *yet* to take test one. I don't need to tell you that this is
> considerably slower than I usually send/receive. But, the fact is that we
> *all* started at 0 wpm and worked up from there. My prediction is that my
> friend will be up to a reasonable speed in no time flat. It's all in the
> attitude of the learner and elmer, Bill. I have no doubt that CW will go on
> much longer than any testing requirements. That's why I continue to promote
> and teach it.
>
> Arnie -

Better put a zerk fitting on those keys for what's coming your way.

4085. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 10:39:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309170239.6c89dcec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77494

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bk8mj8$4gp$7@208.207.71.142>...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > In article <vmf6fo259fcm02@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
> > <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
> >
> > >
> > > >hip hip hoorey!
> > > >another nation advances with the times!!!
> > > >
> >
> > > Yup, dumbing it's ham radio operators down to the lowest common
> > > denominator. Some "advance!"
>
> Does it come as a surprise that Clint, Brian and LHA feel right at home
> in that environment?

Never been to Ireland, DICK.

4086. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 10:43:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309170243.57164958@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77495

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bk8lbt$4gp$1@208.207.71.142>...
> Clint wrote:
>
> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030916112119.29815.00000655@mb-m21.aol.com...
> >
> > > Keep 1896 alive and well in the hearts of all amateurs.
> >
> > yea, so much for "advancing the radio art" and so forth... that would
> > basically turn it into "freeze the radio art in time, and dam any possible
> > advancement or progress"
>
> (YAWN!!!) You clowns are more stale than last week's coffee.

in a 40's flophouse, no doubt.

4087. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 10:45:45 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309170245.28796a54@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77496

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bk85gf$118$0@208.207.71.171>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<nzF9b.23280$NM1.18866@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "Len Over 21" wrote:
> > > >
> > > > They do? WHICH "hills," senior? We've got a whole
> > > > bunch of Big Hill things in this 60 x 120 mile area.
> > >
> > >
> > > Drive east on Interstate 10/20 and you'll see hundreds of them overlooking
> > > the valley just east of San Bernardino. You can't miss them - they're good
> > > sized and plainly visible from the Interstate (many are right beside the
> > > Interstate, with many more placed along the hillside in both directions for
> > > several miles). It's an impressive sight (but not very attractive).
> > >
> > >
> > > > Dwight, I worked on Solar One in Barstow, CA, the first
> > > > large-scale solar-furnace electric plant in the middle desert.
> > >
> > >
> > > Do you know where the one in Arizona is? I saw it about a mile off to one
> > > side the Interstate as I was driving through. There was a sign for the road
> > > leading to it saying something about a power research facility, but I don't
> > > remember the name of it.
> > >
> > >
> > > > Solar Two replaced it, trying out more things in re solar power
> > > > as heat. The two plants put about 50 to 100 MWe into the grid
> > > > (as I recall). A small part of the GWe required by the region.
> > >
> > >
> > > Very likely. I don't think solar is going to be able to supply power on a
> > > large scale anytime soon. In the meantime, additional fossil fuel plants are
> > > the only real option. Nuclear power may one day become more viable, but
> > > people will have to be convinced of it's safety first. And steps will have
> > > to be taken to lower costs and better deal with waste products. Until then,
> > > I have serious reservations about additional nuclear power plants.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >
> > Dwight, we would need to change how we used energy, and in the solar

> > arena, conservation is key.
> >
> > In the early 90's I took my older son's camping at Land Between Lakes,
> > KY/TN. There was an 1860's working farm as part of the scenery. The
> > weather was hot and sticky, we should have been out on the lake.
> > Anyway, we were looking over the farm and I had decided when we pulled
> > in that I wasn't going to go into the old farm house and get cooked.
> > Anyway, as I stood on the breezeway at the back of the house, between
> > the main house and the summer kitchen, I noticed that there wasn't
> > heat pouring out of the house as I expected. So I went inside and
> > things were pleasant. Upstairs and downstairs. No electricity.
> >
> > My 2000 sq ft Ranch would have been sweltering under those condx.
> >
> > The key was ventilation at ceiling level of the exterior walls, as if
> > one of the logs were missing.
> >
> > Go figure.
>
> So install an attic fan.

Did; thermostat controlled.

4088. Re: Cobra 2000 with matching speaker and hand mic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 10:49:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309170249.252346e1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77497

```
"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
news:<0xO9b.4973$xx4.975741@twister.neo.rr.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309160305.41aa16bf@posting.google.com...
> > "shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
> news:<7hv9b.2170$xx4.452979@twister.neo.rr.com>...
> > > "Lloyd" <Lloyd@nonexanonpost.com> wrote in message
> > > news:bk5ook$ud7$0@pita.alt.net...
> > > > x-no-archive: yes
> > > > "Loup1962" <loup1962@aol.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:20030915112008.21879.00001097@mb-m04.aol.com...
> > > > > Cobra 2000 base with matching speaker and hand mic in excellent
> > > condition
> > > for
> > > > > $250 + actual UPS cost to you.
> > > >
> > > That is THE Ham radio for the No-Code wonders!
> > >
> > > 10-73's!
> >
> > That must be why you showed an interest in it.
>
> Another NCI mouthpiece, or is that sock puppet?
>
> 10-73's!

Another first cousin/brother to Bruce.
```

4089. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 10:50:49 UTC
From: Michael Reynolds <w0kie@cox.net>
Message-ID: <d0X9b.14288$3Y2.10133@news2.central.cox.net>
Source record: 77498
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Disgusted" <Noooo@eeee.maillll> wrote in message
news:vkl0nsoogac3c7@corp.supernews.com...
>
> I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the SHIT
> out of them!

According to the same 1930 ARRL Handbook, "The Wouff-Hong is amateur radio's most sacred symbol and stands for the enforcement of law and order in amateur operation." The Wouff-Hong's nearest analog is the old-fashion but still effective can opener. Now every can opener requires an initial insertion point, and (if you picture the human anatomical form) you can choose between upper and lower points. The object is to open up the miscreant and expose his evil to himself. This requires the subject to be supine and all opening to be done on the front side, where the victim can indeed see the results: the exposure of his own evil. The beauty of the wood Wouff-Hong lies in the fact that it leaves splinters in places from which they cannot be removed. Thus is the scoundrel reminded for life of his misdeeds and what lies ahead if any one of them should ever be repeated.

4090. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 11:21:17 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bk9g0j$qhi@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 77499

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk8sjmiiv0@208.206.142.70...
>
>
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bjv63a$t1m@library1.airnews.net>...
> > > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > > news:3F62885A.5060004@adelphia.net...
> >
> > >
> > > From http://www.oakvilleamateurs.net/newsletters/hb200302.pdf
> > > . . ."For most 40-meters, the most practical antenna is the 1/4-wave
dipole
> > > (66 feet in total length) up at least 33 feet in the air. If you've
never
> > > worked (or heard) Europe on 40, it's likely your dipole is too low.
The
> > > challenge grows on 80 where your quarter wave dipole (133' 9") needs
to be . . .
> >
> > Bilge. All of it. A 66 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole on
> > 40M and a 134 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole on 80M. A 33
> > foot long center-fed dipole is a quarter wavelength long on 40M but it
> > is not resonant on 40M and ya better not get stupid and feed it with
> > coax then just plug it into the back of yer radio if ya wanna work
> > anybody with it.
> >
> > Ask any Novice . . .
>
> Being licensed as a Novice would be a vast improvement for most of these
geniuii. *Definitely*
> and most especially in the case of Putzie-Poo.
>
> Ya gotta wonder how they plan to match these 1/4 wave dipoles at their
highest impedance point.
>
> "Uhhh.... say wot?"
>

Well, DICK, make that dick, matching is the name of the game with nearly any
"wire" type antenna, so you must be too dumbed down to pick up on that
concept. It doesn't matter the matching, it was said first there was no

such thing as a 1/4 wave antenna. Then, when proof positive was given, the *cough* superior hams (such as you in your mind) said "it would never work." Then, when proof positive was given, all that's being done now is sneering.

So, superior ham(s) et al, try again....

Kim W5TIT

4091. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 11:22:55 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bk9g3k$afh@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 77500

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk8smniiv1@208.206.142.70...
>
>
> WA8ULX wrote:
>
> > >Newp, sorry. A 40M 1/4-wave dipole can be made to resonate just fine
and
> > >work wonderfully. Its position to the ground and center angle have
> > >everything to do with how well it will radiate. And, using a balun or
not
> > >doesn't change the whole concept of using a 1/4-wave dipole at any
> > >frequency.
> > >
> > >Whether you want them to or not, they work.
> > >
> > >Kim W5TIT
> >
> > Proof Positive the written is FAILURE.
>
> I sure hope someone a the FCC is reading all this.
>

You mean you're *hoping* they'll understand how right they are to move the
amateur radio requirements into the 21st Century and challenge you? Well,
I'm surprised that you'd be that tuned in, dick.

Kim W5TIT

4092. No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 12:23:45 UTC
From: Franz Weigel <anon@bog.lir.dk>
Message-ID: <IDVNFYDX37881.3498263889@bog.lir.dk>
Source record: 77651

The last CW coder who died was sentenced
to Hell for eternity in order to transmit
6 Megapixels 24-bit color pictures in CW.

God bless you from CW !

4093. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 13:01:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917090110.07600.00000952@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 77652

>You mean you're *hoping* they'll understand how right they are to move the
>amateur radio requirements into the 21st Century and challenge you

Completely Dumbed Down, I guess what your trying to say is, lets show the FCC
we know nothing about CW or Theory.

4094. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 13:03:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917090324.07600.00000953@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 77653

>"For most 40-meters, the most practical antenna is the 1/4-wave dipole
>> > (66 feet in total length)

A Quarter Wave would only be 33 Feet not 66 feet

4095. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 13:05:01 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917090501.07600.00000954@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 77654

>Then, when proof positive was given, all that's being done now is sneering.
>

Doesnt even have a CLUE

4096. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 13:21:52 UTC
From: Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com>
Message-ID: <OdZ9b.139212$kP.63984@fed1read03>
Source record: 77655

Huh -- the definition of a dipole is:
Definition: 1.. [n] an aerial half a wavelength long consisting of
two rods connected to a transmission line at the center
So whats with this 1/4 stuff ???

--
73 From The Signal In The Noise
Caveat Lector Ya All

4097. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 14:04:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917100424.23585.00000732@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 77656

>Huh -- the definition of a dipole is:
> Definition: 1.. [n] an aerial half a wavelength long consisting of
>two rods connected to a transmission line at the center
> So whats with this 1/4 stuff ???
>

Dont confuse them. These are the same people who think the A-99 has 9.9 DB
Gain.

4098. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 14:20:31 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <P4_9b.23636$BS1.6747359@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 77657

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:ZdQ9b.26166$NM1.16564@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:_Wu9b.222$BS1.80870@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > Wonderfl, then you'll learn code if you want to participate there.
> > > If not, nothing lost.
> >
> > Nice concept on paper, but in the real world...
>
> In the real world what?

In the real world, many of AR's newbies won't even bother to try CW because
it takes too much effort to attain a usable level of proficiency. Studying
for and passing the 5-wpm test gives one a very basic level of knowledge
(NOT proficiency) and enables him/her to make an *educated* decision as to
whether or not s/he wants to pursue CE any further.

> > Quite frankly, what example
> > has NCI given to the prospective ham? It sure doesn't exemplify the
values
> > of a "self-starter."
>
> Actually, those of us at the core of NCI are "self-starters" as
> we didn't sit around and wait for anything...we actively helped
> "make it happen."

Ushering in underachievment is notheing to be proud of, Bill.

> > > More to the point, is there any minimum code
> > > speed that should be banned from the CW/data segments at the
> > > bottom of the bands?
> >
> > Couldn't care how slow...as long as said CW/Data sub-bands remain
intact.
>
> Last I checked, there were no such subbands as CW was allowed
> everywhere except for some portion of 220MHz
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

I did write CW/Data, right? HOWEVER, I don't expect to encounter many NCTA's
on the bottom of 40 or anyplace on 30.

Just watch the unequal ground between the two when a seasoned CW op outpaces his phone op counterpart in a sprint for certain rare DX contacts. Heck, I've read that some of them only work CW. Liken it to the race between the tortoise and the hare, but the tortoise KNOWS how to read the road signs and the hare is confused because "there's no pictures." Think it's a bad analogy, Bill? Try looking at the cash register keypad next time you go to McDonalds...the result of the very same mentality of underachievement NCI "actively made happen."

Cheers to you, Bill.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

4099. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 14:54:56 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <4B_9b.23872$BS1.6861649@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 77658

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:9tQ9b.26195$NM1.22855@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> If a new ham without code knowledge decided to get together
> with another ham to mutually learn/use code at veerrrryyy slow
> seed (say 1-2 wpm)...would you oppose that?

That's in place right now, Bill...6m, 2m, 220, 440...

> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

4100. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 14:59:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk9ssl$ff4$0@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 77659

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Tue, 16 Sep 2003 02:58:42 GMT, Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> >All sounds sensible, but the month before retesting thing seems a bit
> >obsessive. I can understand not retesting the same day, but not a month
> >wait.
>
> Made lots of sense. In SF we gave the tests once a week, on Friday,
> and we were not equipped to handle the same folks week after week.
> The five weeks between test-eligible days was adequate time to prepare
> better.
>
> >Now here is something that seems has been improved upon. If there are
> >going to be different elements, it makes sense that if one element was
> >passed, that you don't have to be restested on it. I had to test for my
> >General twice because I flunked element 1 the first time. I passed the
> >writtens, I would have passed them again. Not muchpoint in wasting the
> >VE's time.
>
> Elements 1 and 2 were simple stuff. Now if one passed the 13 WPM
> code and the General written but failed the Advanced written, one
> got a General license and did not have to retake the code or the
> General written test to take the Advanced written test the next month.
>
> The Extra, OTOH, was a "package". One could take the 20 WPM code,
> pass it, pass the General and the Advanced writtens, and fail the
> Extra written. Then, one would get an Advanced license, but would
> still have to retake the 20 WPM code and the Extra written.
>
> >> Usually they would not tell you how well you did other than "Pass"
> >> or "Fail". They did NOT tell you which ones you got wrong. (At least
> >> not in Philly).
>
> In NY, if things were quiet, "Uncle Charlie" Finkelman would let you
> watch while he graded the exam, but you could not review the
> grading. In SF, you handed the paper in, and if things were slow
> you would get the P/F results while you packed up your gear.
> Otherwise, you went home and you were notified by mail of passing or
> failing if you left a SAS postcard with the examiner.
>
> >The VE system is a huge improvemnet over tha old system, I have to say.
>
> That's your opinion. I beg to differ, but I'm biased.

>
> >Regardless of the Morse requirements or the test contents, the testing
> >system was not superior at all IMO.
>
> That's your opinion. I beg to differ, but I'm biased.
>
> >Interestingly enough, it would appear that matching up what was
> >happening in the country at the time this was happening, the FCC tester
> >(government) was replaced by the VE's (non-profit, but certainly private
> >sector. The changes in the tests might seem like a de-regultion type of
> >move.
>
> That was the era of privatizing the FCC's functions. I call it
> what it is - avoiding the FCC's responsibilities traceable to
> the ineptitude of leadership of the agency and of the country as a
> whole. "Get rid of what you don't understand" is the easy way out,
> not the smart way.
>
> The amateur testing was but the tip off the iceberg. Within ten
> years (1985 - 1995), the following responsibilities were "privatized",
> i.e. spun off to the private sector.
>
> Testing of amateur license applicants.
>
> Testing of commercial operator license applicants.
>
> Testing and certification of broadcast operators, now made
> voluntary.
>
> Testing and certification of land mobile repair and adjustment
> technicians, now made voluntary.
>
> Frequency coordination in the microwave, broadcast and land mobile
> services.
>
> Interference resolution in the microwave, broadcast and land
> mobile services.
>
> Bi-annual inspection and certification of compliance of broadcast
> stations.
>
> Inspection and certification of marine radio installations
> required for safety by statute or treaty on passenger-carrying
> and ocean-going cargo vessels.
>
> Auctions and encouraging wireline and wireless competition are
> deemed to be far more important than patrolling the ether.
>
> And the beat goes on.

Good Grief, what does FCC do nowdays except shuffle paper???

4101. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 15:06:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk9t9k$ff4$1@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 77660

WA8ULX wrote:

> >"For most 40-meters, the most practical antenna is the 1/4-wave dipole
> >> > (66 feet in total length)
>
> A Quarter Wave would only be 33 Feet not 66 feet

Hey, don't confuse that expert ham with actual data.

4102. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 15:07:23 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk9tbb$ff4$2@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 77662

WA8ULX wrote:

> >Then, when proof positive was given, all that's being done now is sneering.
> >
>
> Doesnt even have a CLUE

Ya know, to be clueless but receptive to learning is one thing. But to be clueless and determined to remain so is another matter entirely.

4103. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 15:08:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk9td1$ff4$3@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 77661

Caveat Lector wrote:

> Huh -- the definition of a dipole is:
> Definition: 1.. [n] an aerial half a wavelength long consisting of
> two rods connected to a transmission line at the center
> So whats with this 1/4 stuff ???

That, Sir, is the state of modern day ham radio.

4104. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 15:14:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk9tp3$h23$0@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 77663

Bert Craig wrote:

> Try looking at the cash register keypad next time you go to
> McDonalds...

Then compare that with Kim in the thread on "1/4 wave dipoles". Chances are you'll see some similarities.

4105. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 15:24:08 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <s0%9b.24225$BS1.6955907@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 77664
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Michael Reynolds" <w0kie@cox.net> wrote in message
news:d0X9b.14288$3Y2.10133@news2.central.cox.net...
> "Disgusted" <Noooo@eeee.maillll> wrote in message
> news:vkl0nsoogac3c7@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the
SHIT
> > out of them!
>
> According to the same 1930 ARRL Handbook, "The Wouff-Hong is amateur
radio's
> most sacred symbol and stands for the enforcement of law and order in
> amateur operation." The Wouff-Hong's nearest analog is the old-fashion but
> still effective can opener. Now every can opener requires an initial
> insertion point, and (if you picture the human anatomical form) you can
> choose between upper and lower points. The object is to open up the
> miscreant and expose his evil to himself. This requires the subject to be
> supine and all opening to be done on the front side, where the victim can
> indeed see the results: the exposure of his own evil. The beauty of the
wood
> Wouff-Hong lies in the fact that it leaves splinters in places from which
> they cannot be removed. Thus is the scoundrel reminded for life of his
> misdeeds and what lies ahead if any one of them should ever be repeated.

Every culture has it's dark spots, this is amateur radios. Some think it's
fun to joke about. It's pretty sickening, if you ask me. Anyone who has
truly studied what man is capable of doing to man during the Medieval period
or The Spanish Inquisition know this.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

4106. Re: Could This Be The Solution?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 15:25:12 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <s1%9b.24245$BS1.6957822@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 77665

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hlc25q0.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Mon, 15 Sep 2003 16:04:51 GMT, Bert Craig wrote:
>
> >> Was it a 11-meter "cubical quad" before it became a 10-meter quad ??
> >> Hmmm.... ????
>
> >What are the implications if it was, Phil?
>
> "Stand Clear of the Chain....." <ggg>
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

LOL! Good one, Phil.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

4107. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 15:28:35 UTC
From: Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com>
Message-ID: <C4%9b.139305$kP.68878@fed1read03>
Source record: 77666

9.9 dB Gain -- Relative to a rubber duck or a wet noodle -- perhaps -- hi hi

--
73 From The Signal In The Noise
Caveat Lector Ya All
"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030917100424.23585.00000732@mb-m22.aol.com...
> >Huh -- the definition of a dipole is:
> > Definition: 1.. [n] an aerial half a wavelength long consisting
of
> >two rods connected to a transmission line at the center
> > So whats with this 1/4 stuff ???
> >
>
> Dont confuse them. These are the same people who think the A-99 has 9.9 DB
> Gain.

4108. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 15:34:27 UTC
From: Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com>
Message-ID: <5a%9b.139306$kP.51833@fed1read03>
Source record: 77667

Oh like on a repeater -- "wow your radio is putting a whopping signal down
here (10 pounds) in Bum-Junk City ???
Or "I'll raise power and be louder" (already full quieting)
And "the first personal is"
Gottcha

--
73 From The Signal In The Noise
Caveat Lector Ya All
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk9td1$ff4$3@208.206.142.69...
>
>
> Caveat Lector wrote:
>
> > Huh -- the definition of a dipole is:
> > Definition: 1.. [n] an aerial half a wavelength long consisting
of
> > two rods connected to a transmission line at the center
> > So whats with this 1/4 stuff ???
>
> That, Sir, is the state of modern day ham radio.
>

4109. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 15:41:41 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917114141.17919.00001132@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 77668

>Ya know, to be clueless but receptive to learning is one thing. But to be
>clueless and determined to remain so is another matter entirely.

Whats sad is they complain about CW, and they dont have a Clue about anything
as simple as a Dipole. Welcome to CBHAM RADIO.

4110. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 15:43:22 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917114322.17919.00001133@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 77669

>9.9 dB Gain -- Relative to a rubber duck or a wet noodle -- perhaps -- hi hi
>
>--

Most of these new ones would argue with you about that. Most dont have clue
what DB is, let alone what Gain means.

4111. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 15:47:48 UTC
From: Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com>
Message-ID: <Cm%9b.139336$kP.35369@fed1read03>
Source record: 77670

Heard on a repeater
"I put 50 watts in and get 200 Watts out -- thats 6 dB gain gd buddy'

--
73 From The Signal In The Noise
Caveat Lector Ya All
"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030917114322.17919.00001133@mb-m05.aol.com...
> >9.9 dB Gain -- Relative to a rubber duck or a wet noodle -- perhaps -- hi
hi
> >
> >--
>
> Most of these new ones would argue with you about that. Most dont have
clue
> what DB is, let alone what Gain means.

4112. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 15:49:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bk9vqd$lc2$0@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 77671
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Bert Craig wrote:

> "Michael Reynolds" <w0kie@cox.net> wrote in message
> news:d0X9b.14288$3Y2.10133@news2.central.cox.net...
> > "Disgusted" <Noooo@eeee.maillll> wrote in message
> > news:vkl0nsoogac3c7@corp.supernews.com...
> > >
> > > I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the
> SHIT
> > > out of them!
> >
> > According to the same 1930 ARRL Handbook, "The Wouff-Hong is amateur
> radio's
> > most sacred symbol and stands for the enforcement of law and order in
> > amateur operation." The Wouff-Hong's nearest analog is the old-fashion but
> > still effective can opener. Now every can opener requires an initial
> > insertion point, and (if you picture the human anatomical form) you can
> > choose between upper and lower points. The object is to open up the
> > miscreant and expose his evil to himself. This requires the subject to be
> > supine and all opening to be done on the front side, where the victim can
> > indeed see the results: the exposure of his own evil. The beauty of the
> wood
> > Wouff-Hong lies in the fact that it leaves splinters in places from which
> > they cannot be removed. Thus is the scoundrel reminded for life of his
> > misdeeds and what lies ahead if any one of them should ever be repeated.
>
> Every culture has it's dark spots, this is amateur radios. Some think it's
> fun to joke about. It's pretty sickening, if you ask me. Anyone who has
> truly studied what man is capable of doing to man during the Medieval period
> or The Spanish Inquisition know this.

I think his description of the Rite of the Woulf Hong is a bit stretched, in
fact quite a bit.
My take on it was that it was a tool from which only a gentle prod in a certain
part of the anatomy was all that would be needed to correct the miscreant.
Maybe the thought of things to come if he didn't straighten up and fly right
was the main impetus.

4113. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 15:50:10 UTC
From: Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com>
Message-ID: <Qo%9b.139350$kP.65075@fed1read03>
Source record: 77672

6 dB gain antenna that is

--
73 From The Signal In The Noise
Caveat Lector Ya All
"Caveat Lector" <CL@latin.com> wrote in message
news:Cm%9b.139336$kP.35369@fed1read03...
> Heard on a repeater
> "I put 50 watts in and get 200 Watts out -- thats 6 dB gain gd buddy'
>
> --
> 73 From The Signal In The Noise
> Caveat Lector Ya All
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030917114322.17919.00001133@mb-m05.aol.com...
> > >9.9 dB Gain -- Relative to a rubber duck or a wet noodle -- perhaps --
hi
> hi
> > >
> > >--
> >
> > Most of these new ones would argue with you about that. Most dont have
> clue
> > what DB is, let alone what Gain means.
>
>

4114. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 15:52:15 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917115215.17919.00001136@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 77673

>Heard on a repeater
>"I put 50 watts in and get 200 Watts out -- thats 6 dB gain gd buddy'
>

Yea but, hes forgetting to add the Gain of his Ant and the Gain of the Repeater Antenna into his figure. And then of course you have to consider ERP so his figures are probably pretty low.

4115. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 15:55:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bka068$lc2$1@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 77674

WA8ULX wrote:

> >9.9 dB Gain -- Relative to a rubber duck or a wet noodle -- perhaps -- hi hi
> >
> >--
>
> Most of these new ones would argue with you about that. Most dont have clue
> what DB is, let alone what Gain means.

I had one ham insist that with antennas "gain is gain", when I tried to tell
him
that what you add in one direction you must take from another. He still doesn't
beleive it.

4116. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 16:10:24 UTC
From: Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com>
Message-ID: <OH%9b.139459$kP.46364@fed1read03>
Source record: 77681

In our Ham classes, we demonstrate yagis that way with a rubber ballon -- squish on it to get forward gain and gee some comes out the back too and a null at the 90 degree points -- ah the visual works where math disconmbobblates

--
73 From The Signal In The Noise
Caveat Lector Ya All
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:bka068$lc2$1@208.207.71.141...
>
>
> WA8ULX wrote:
>
> > >9.9 dB Gain -- Relative to a rubber duck or a wet noodle -- perhaps -- hi hi
> > >
> > >--
> >
> > Most of these new ones would argue with you about that. Most dont have clue
> > what DB is, let alone what Gain means.
>
> I had one ham insist that with antennas "gain is gain", when I tried to tell
> him
> that what you add in one direction you must take from another. He still doesn't
> beleive it.
>

4117. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 16:36:42 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <u40ab.27072$Aq2.19227@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77682

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hlc5462.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Tue, 16 Sep 2003 02:58:42 GMT, Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> >All sounds sensible, but the month before retesting thing seems a bit
> >obsessive. I can understand not retesting the same day, but not a month
> >wait.
>
> Made lots of sense. In SF we gave the tests once a week, on Friday,
> and we were not equipped to handle the same folks week after week.

So the reason was one of simple beaurocracy and FCC economics.

> The five weeks between test-eligible days was adequate time to prepare
> better.

True, but for some, a week would be enough.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4118. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 16:36:43 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <v40ab.27073$Aq2.22984@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77683

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk8mea$4gp$5@208.207.71.142...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
> > news:bk8i6q$qj8tg$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > > "Bill Sohl" wrote ...
> > >
> > > They just don't get it (the PCTAs that is). Ending morse testing
should
> > > happen because there is NO logical/rational reason for government to
> > > continue mandating morse knowledge of all HF licensed hams. Getting
the
> > > government out of a "morse code affirmative action program" by ending
> > > mandated morse is far more a conservative concept than a liberal one.
> > > ____
> > >
> > > Isn't it about time to put some music to that song, Bill? I suppose
if
> > you
> > > repeat it enough times, maybe even *you* will actually believe it.
> >
> > Too bad the only entity that makes the difference
> > (i.e. the FCC) believes my position.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> Really??? That was last time. You have no idea what they 'll do this time.

Do you really think the FCC has or will have a change of opinion...
especially in light of the entire international community endorsing
the end of mandatory code testing as an ITU requirement?

Has anyone come up with that WOW argument that will justify
the need for morse testing? So far, nothing new has been
offered by PCTAs at all.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4119. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 16:58:27 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <To0ab.27088$Aq2.17329@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77685

```
"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:P4_9b.23636$BS1.6747359@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:ZdQ9b.26166$NM1.16564@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:_Wu9b.222$BS1.80870@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > > Wonderfl, then you'll learn code if you want to participate there.
> > > > If not, nothing lost.
> > >
> > > Nice concept on paper, but in the real world...
> >
> > In the real world what?
>
> In the real world, many of AR's newbies won't even bother to try CW
because
> it takes too much effort to attain a usable level of proficiency.

So what? Use of CW has never been any requirement. Those that
want to will, those that don't won't. The sorry comentary of PCTAs seems
to be (INHO) that rather than becoming advocates to promote new
hams learning and using CW, they sit here and whine that their
previously mandated recruiting process (the test) won't be there
to automatically gain a percentage of new hams into the CW
users group.

> Studying
> for and passing the 5-wpm test gives one a very basic level of knowledge
> (NOT proficiency) and enables him/her to make an *educated* decision as to
> whether or not s/he wants to pursue CE any further.

So become an advocate of that to other new hams. You can
give the test yourself. The FCC (i.e. the government) has no
purpose to be an advocate for your favorite mode.

> > > Quite frankly, what example
> > > has NCI given to the prospective ham? It sure doesn't exemplify the
> values
> > > of a "self-starter."
> >
> > Actually, those of us at the core of NCI are "self-starters" as
> > we didn't sit around and wait for anything...we actively helped
> > "make it happen."
>
```

> Ushering in underachievment is notheing to be proud of, Bill.

Eliminating archaic requirements is always something that should
be done. You must have been upset too when states eliminated mandatory
testing on manual gearbox autos and allowed testing to be done
using any car.

> > > > More to the point, is there any minimum code
> > > > speed that should be banned from the CW/data segments at the
> > > > bottom of the bands?
> > >
> > > Couldn't care how slow...as long as said CW/Data sub-bands remain
> intact.
> >
> > Last I checked, there were no such subbands as CW was allowed
> > everywhere except for some portion of 220MHz
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
>
> I did write CW/Data, right? HOWEVER, I don't expect to encounter many
NCTA's
> on the bottom of 40 or anyplace on 30.

Which should please you then.

> Just watch the unequal ground between the two when a seasoned CW op
outpaces
> his phone op counterpart in a sprint for certain rare DX contacts.

A contest, the results of which I have no care whatsoever. Kinda like
golf...I understand the skilss involved but have no desire to learn nor
do I care who wins or loses.

> Heck,
> I've read that some of them only work CW. Liken it to the race between the
> tortoise and the hare, but the tortoise KNOWS how to read the road signs
and
> the hare is confused because "there's no pictures." Think it's a bad
> analogy, Bill? Try looking at the cash register keypad next time you go to
> McDonalds...the result of the very same mentality of underachievement NCI
> "actively made happen."

Would you rather have barcode reading cash registers or the old fashioned
key punch. Today when I "cash out" I get a well detailed register receipt
rather than a simple list of individual prices with a total. If in the
process the ability to "keypunch" becomes a lost art, who cares?
Where I do see a lack of skills (specifically math) at the register is
in the ability of a cashier to understand why I am giving her/him $11.18
(a ten spot, a single, a dime, a nickle and three cents)
when my bill is $5.93. I do so to get rid of some change in my pocket
and to avoid getting a greater amount of small change and bills back.

I much prefer getting $5.25 (a $5 bill and a quarter) rather than $3.07 (three
singles, a nickle and two cents) if I only give the cashier only the $10 bill.

But this lack of math skills is not a morse skill related knowledge that has such a wide application in life.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4120. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 16:58:28 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Uo0ab.27089$Aq2.18550@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77684

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk8mgr$4gp$6@208.207.71.142...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
> > news:bk8jb3$pu0uu$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > > "Bert Craig" wrote ...
> > >
> > > Well Bill, I'm on the bottom of 40 right now listening to a band FULL
of
> > > irrelevance. <hihi>
> > > ____
> > >
> > > Here, Here. Yep, CW is just dead as a doornail, Right Bert?
> >
> > The fact that morse is in use o ham bands offers no reason
> > to have a code test in order to begin learning and using the mode.
> > If a new ham without code knowledge decided to get together
> > with another ham to mutually learn/use code at veerrrryyy slow
> > seed (say 1-2 wpm)...would you oppose that?
>
> I'd oppose it happening on the air on HF. That's incorrect and improper
use of
> spectrum.

It is? Why, if there's a vacant slot of spectrum to do so? Seems like
there's plenty of spectrum in the "novice" segments now.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

>

4121. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 17:01:16 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <wr0ab.27092$Aq2.17141@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77686

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bk8mqu$qh5ii$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Bill Sohl" wrote ...
>
> The fact that morse is in use o ham bands offers no reason to have a code
> test in order to begin learning and using the mode. If a new ham without
> code knowledge decided to get together with another ham to mutually
> learn/use code at veerrrryyy slow seed (say 1-2 wpm)...would you oppose
> that?
> ----------
>
> As a matter of fact, I'm teaching a guy code now that runs about 4 wpm --
> and he is *yet* to take test one. I don't need to tell you that this is
> considerably slower than I usually send/receive. But, the fact is that we
> *all* started at 0 wpm and worked up from there. My prediction is that my
> friend will be up to a reasonable speed in no time flat. It's all in the
> attitude of the learner and elmer, Bill. I have no doubt that CW will go
on
> much longer than any testing requirements. That's why I continue to
promote
> and teach it.

I agree completely...I applaud your efforts, and would like to know....
Do you work with your friend on the air? If not, why not?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4122. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 17:01:18 UTC
From: David Lafferty <dplaff@cox-internet.com>
Message-ID: <vmh4rsp6sdnu9a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77687

Just to muddy the water, if I modify my 706 so I can use it on 5 MHz, it would transmit on public safety VHF/UHF frequencies.

73,
David K5DEL

> Does your HF transceivertransmit on public safety VHF/UHF
> frequencies? Does your VHF/UHF amateur transceiver transmit on 5
> MHz ??

4123. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 17:05:10 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <av0ab.27095$Aq2.16842@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77688

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:4B_9b.23872$BS1.6861649@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:9tQ9b.26195$NM1.22855@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > If a new ham without code knowledge decided to get together
> > with another ham to mutually learn/use code at veerrrryyy slow
> > seed (say 1-2 wpm)...would you oppose that?
>
> That's in place right now, Bill...6m, 2m, 220, 440...
> 73 de Bert WA2SI

I agree, but Dick C doesn't want veerryy slow code users on HF
according to another post of his early this morning.

Frankly, I also don't understand why ARRL CW sessions from W1AW
don't start on the slow code segment with something about 3 or
4 wpm. It might offer a better entrance process for potential
new CW users to get over the air reception.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4124. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 17:14:03 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <vD0ab.27101$Aq2.1731@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77689

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hlc5zm3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Tue, 16 Sep 2003 01:03:16 GMT, Keith wrote:
>
> >> Of course, if the amateur op doesn't have his license with him, the
> >> officer has reasonable cause to believe that the pre-emption does
> >> not cover him even though it still does, and if the rig has been
> >> modified so that it is capable of TRANSMITTING on the police
> >> frequency, the pre-emption is not valid even if the operator is a
> >> licensed amateur (per the FCC Public Notice on this matter many
> >> years ago).
> >
> > Please cite case law that supports your position that modified ham
radios
> >do not have the same exemption as all ham radios?
>
> That was the deal that the League worked out with the FCC - if the
> radio did not transmit "out of band" then the preemption covered.
> The intent was to exclude VHF/UHF transceivers which have been
> "opened up".
>
> I'll dig out the Public Notice if I can find it. It was many years
> ago.

I read that when it was initially out and have no recollection
of the "out-of-band" transmit aspect. The issue always was
focused on amteur rigs that could also recieve (i.e. listen to)
police broadcasts from an automobile.

> >If I add 5 MHz capability to a radio do I now lose all protection of
> >Federal laws?
>
> Does your HF transceivertransmit on public safety VHF/UHF
> frequencies? Does your VHF/UHF amateur transceiver transmit on 5
> MHz ??

Today there are several HF/VHF rigs that can do so. IC-706
has 6m and 2m, several other HF rigs now cover HF plus 6, 2 and 440.
In all the cases of harrased hams (harassed by police) in states with
laws forbidding listening to police transmissions, the issue was
always listening to..not transmitting on, police frequencies.
Here in NJ we finally changed the old state law around 1994.

> >What about if I build a kit or use a land mobile radio in the ham bands?
>

> If you have the installed capability of transmitting on a non-amateur
> frequency and do not have a license for such operation, it is not
> covered under the preemption and it's your job to talk yourself out of
> the jam. You're on your own.....

I truly don't recall that to be the case at all...for kits and or
commercial ham transcievers modified to allow non-ham
frequencies (e.g. MARS) or modified to do so because
there is a NEW ham set of frequencies (e.g. 5MHz)
.
Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4125. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 17:19:48 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <UI0ab.27109$Aq2.20546@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77690

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030916232714.23307.00003051@mb-m29.aol.com...
> In article <Xns93F7E7865C43Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
> >EI is the 7th country to abolish code testing by my reckoning
>
> Ireland: Beautiful country, lovely people, but the same dumbed-down
> hams! Not to worry, I'm sure us Yanks won't be far behind!
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Classic Larry comment :-) :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4126. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 17:40:46 UTC
From: et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA
Message-ID: <bka6au$9pk$1@freenet9.carleton.ca>
Source record: 77691
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dick Carroll (dixie@townsqr.com) writes:
> Bert Craig wrote:
>
>> "Michael Reynolds" <w0kie@cox.net> wrote in message
>> news:d0X9b.14288$3Y2.10133@news2.central.cox.net...
>> > "Disgusted" <Noooo@eeee.maillll> wrote in message
>> > news:vkl0nsoogac3c7@corp.supernews.com...
>> > >
>> > > I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the
>> SHIT
>> > > out of them!
>> >
>> > According to the same 1930 ARRL Handbook, "The Wouff-Hong is amateur
>> radio's
>> > most sacred symbol and stands for the enforcement of law and order in
>> > amateur operation." The Wouff-Hong's nearest analog is the old-fashion but
>> > still effective can opener. Now every can opener requires an initial
>> > insertion point, and (if you picture the human anatomical form) you can
>> > choose between upper and lower points. The object is to open up the
>> > miscreant and expose his evil to himself. This requires the subject to be
>> > supine and all opening to be done on the front side, where the victim can
>> > indeed see the results: the exposure of his own evil. The beauty of the
>> wood
>> > Wouff-Hong lies in the fact that it leaves splinters in places from which
>> > they cannot be removed. Thus is the scoundrel reminded for life of his
>> > misdeeds and what lies ahead if any one of them should ever be repeated.
>>
>> Every culture has it's dark spots, this is amateur radios. Some think it's
>> fun to joke about. It's pretty sickening, if you ask me. Anyone who has
>> truly studied what man is capable of doing to man during the Medieval period
>> or The Spanish Inquisition know this.
>
> I think his description of the Rite of the Woulf Hong is a bit stretched, in
> fact quite a bit.
> My take on it was that it was a tool from which only a gentle prod in a certain
> part of the anatomy was all that would be needed to correct the miscreant.
> Maybe the thought of things to come if he didn't straighten up and fly right
> was the main impetus.
>
This is an old thread, and I already basically said as much. It's
"too unspeakable" to mention how the Wouff Hong is used because the
threat is better than the application. There is no application, it's
just smoke and mirrors.

But that people are now describing quite graphically how they think the Wouff Hong is supposed to be used may be a reflection of how things have changed. In the twenties when it was originally cooked up, the idea was to prod hams into being more careful about how they operated. The chastisement was in The Old Man talking about the lids, not in the threat of doing damage to the lids. Suggesting, but never stating, that the Wouff Hong was used in a terrible fashion was more for the sake of fun, to not take a serious issue too seriously. The whole thing was basically Hiram Percy Maxim saying "I'm disappointed in some of the operating taking place today".

That sort of thing has less power today, sadly. I'm not sure if it's the make up of the hobby, or the make up of society.

So now the Wouff Hong is being portrayed as a weapon, by itself, rather than as some pseudo-ritual connected with trying to get hams to be better operators. The true meaning of the Wouff Hong is gone, when likely it is needed more than ever. Not because there is bad operating, but because it was part of a history and community that when lost, may lead to hams not being so concerned with good operating.

Michael VE2BVW

4127. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 18:14:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Pv1ab.27882$NM1.21291@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77692

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> Of course. Bruce embarrasses the procodetest side, just like
> some folks embarrass the nocodetest side.
>
> In fact, that may be his entire game.

I'm often suspicious of the motives of some individuals posting here. However, if one dwells on those thoughts too long, it could drive a one insane. Therefore, unless it is something obvious, I tend to simply take things as they appear, without too much worry about the true intent behind what appears. Besides, that philosophy just makes life (and this newsgroup) a lot easier.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4128. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 18:30:12 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <UK1ab.28030$NM1.9799@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77693

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> heh heh:
>
> Subject: Impotrnace of Porper Seplling
>
> Aoccdrnig to rscheearch at an Elingsh uinervtisy, it deosn't mttaer
> in waht oredr the ltteers in a wrod are, the olny iprmoatnt tihng is
> that the frist and lsat ltteer is at the rghit pclae. The rset can be
> a toatl mses and you can sitll raed it wouthit a porbelm. Tihs is
> bcuseae we do not raed ervey lteter by it slef but the wrod as a
> wlohe.

Good grief, Kim. Are you trying to make my life harder than it needs to be? I'm having a hard enough time trying to read some of the poorly written messages here without you intentionally misspelling just about an entire paragraph. The sad part is that I'm so used to reading misspelled words, the paragraph above was just not that difficult to figure out. At this rate, if I keep reading these newsgroups, I'm going to have several spellings of words filed away in my head from now on. Eventually, I'll have a hard time trying to remember the actual correct spelling. When that happens, my own writting may become as poor as some of the others I see here. I think I need to read a good book (just to reset my mind).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4129. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 18:31:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <aM1ab.28043$NM1.25560@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77694

"Brian" wrote:
>
> Deliverance?

There you go.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4130. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 18:43:08 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93F995B8DE06Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 77695

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
news:UI0ab.27109$Aq2.20546@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030916232714.23307.00003051@mb-m29.aol.com...
>> In article <Xns93F7E7865C43Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>> >EI is the 7th country to abolish code testing by my reckoning
>>
>> Ireland: Beautiful country, lovely people, but the same dumbed-down
>> hams! Not to worry, I'm sure us Yanks won't be far behind!
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Classic Larry comment :-) :-)
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>
>

Newsflash! - Singapore has abolished the code test. Now there are eight.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

4131. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 18:58:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F68AEE0.6060102@psu.edu>
Source record: 77698

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> Well, DICK, make that dick, matching is the name of the game with nearly any
> "wire" type antenna, so you must be too dumbed down to pick up on that
> concept. It doesn't matter the matching, it was said first there was no
> such thing as a 1/4 wave antenna. Then, when proof positive was given, the
> *cough* superior hams (such as you in your mind) said "it would never work."
> Then, when proof positive was given, all that's being done now is sneering.
>
> So, superior ham(s) et al, try again....

This is a strange one to argue about. And I make no claims of superiority.

That there can be a 1/n antenna that consists of 2 equal sections is not the argument, or at least it shouldn't be.

This type of antenna can be any fraction, even 25/32's (the fraction of a quart in a Fosters lager "oil can") How they will perform is another matter.

On a ARS test, the likelyhood of the question "design a 1/4 wave dipole would no more likely come up than my 25/32 wave dipole. they will want you to design an antenna that has a particular impedence at the desired frequency. What is the impedence of a 1/4 wave dipole?

My antenna is 96 feet total length, cut as a general purpose dipole. I use a tuner and ladder line to match impedence with my transmitter. But I would never name it a 1/n dipole.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4132. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 19:00:56 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Ib2ab.28306$NM1.22464@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77696

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> That's not strictly IN "Los Angeles," Dwight. :-)
>
> Try Riverside County, not Los Angeles County. Big
> place out here.

Perhaps I was a little loose with the specifics, Len. However, for all practical purposes, I consider just about the entire valley to be Los Angeles. The cities and towns spread out side by side from Los Angeles, with only a roadside sign to separate the individual cities or towns. From where I'm sitting, the whole thing looks like one giant metropolis. And the wind turbines I described probably supply supplimental power to that whole metropolis. However, you are correct. The wind turbines are in Riverside Country, probably supplying power to the area grid.

> No. Haven't been far into Arizona since 1977.

Well, it doesn't really matter. I was just wondering because it's the only solar facility I've personally seen.

> Electric power generation isn't exactly a big "amateur radio"
> policy issue, is it? :-)

You know how this newsgroup is, Len. If a topic gets introduced here, it becomes an issue here.

> Keep that crystal set ready to go in case of power outages! :-)

Looks like Hurricane Isabel is going to miss this area and hit north of us. Therefore, ham radio should be relatively calm, but it may be a busy weekend for the Coast Guard. However, things have been fairly quiet so far.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4133. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 19:03:17 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917150317.23859.00000907@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 77697

>Newsflash! - Singapore has abolished the code test. Now there are eight.
>
>73 de Alun, N3KI

Great, not much longer and Ham Radio will be CBHAM RADIO world wide

4134. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 19:17:22 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <6r2ab.28454$NM1.18291@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77699

"Brian" wrote:
>
> Dwight, we would need to change how we used
> energy, and in the solar arena, conservation is key.

It could be done. I recently visited a friend living in large (40')
double-wide camping trailer. I was amazed at how little electricity he
actually used, while still having most of the modern appliances and
technologies (TV, VCR, stereo, computer, etc.). I don't know exactly how he
did it. However, I noticed that he had purchased or converted most
everything to 12v, so perhaps that is the key. Almost everything was running
off batteries, with just a small transformer charging the batteries. Only a
few things (AC) ran off the main power feed.

Anyway, while it could be done, trying to convince people to do it is
another matter.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4135. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 19:19:36 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ct2ab.28474$NM1.9265@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77700

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> If they're the kind that have the single tubular pylon and
> 3 bladed horizontal - axle turbine, they're not just
> attractive - they're beautiful!

Not when you have dozens and dozens of them spread across a hillside.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4136. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 19:32:02 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <SE2ab.28590$NM1.8358@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77551

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bk8lbm$1ss@library2.airnews.net...
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:w_E9b.22915$NM1.14399@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "N2EY" wrote:
> > >
> > > I think it's an act, invented for the purpose. But even if it's not an
> > > act, the written tests are not spelling or grammar tests.
> > > "Intelligence" isn't a single-dimension quality. A person can be
> > > brilliant in one area and have serious developmental problems in
> > > others.
> > >
> > >
> > Have you read his messages (not just the ones in this newsgroup)? I
> > haven't see any sign of brilliance in anything he's written, on any
> subject.
> > I'm not saying he's dirt dumb, just not the typical "rocket scientist"
> type.
> > Again, if is's an act, it's a darn good one (and that's the only good
> thing
> > about it).
> > >
> > >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > >
> > >
>
> heh heh:
>
> Subject: Impotrnace of Porper Seplling
>
> Aoccdrnig to rscheearch at an Elingsh uinervtisy, it deosn't mttaer
> in waht oredr the ltteers in a wrod are, the olny iprmoatnt tihng is
> that the frist and lsat ltteer is at the rghit pclae. The rset can be
> a toatl mses and you can sitll raed it wouthit a porbelm. Tihs is
> bcuseae we do not raed ervey lteter by it slef but the wrod as a
> wlohe.
>
>

Look everybody....hug and chalk Kim forget to use her spell checker and we
got to see her real self.

Dan/W4NTI

4137. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 19:37:30 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <_J2ab.28637$NM1.10167@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77552

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030917150317.23859.00000907@mb-m22.aol.com...
> >Newsflash! - Singapore has abolished the code test. Now there are eight.
> >
> >73 de Alun, N3KI
>
> Great, not much longer and Ham Radio will be CBHAM RADIO world wide

Look at it this way Bruce. It will rid the CW segements of useless trash. They will all be on SSB. Digital will also be safe because that requires some intelligence to set up and operate a program. Thus elliminating most to all of the dumbed down hamsters.

Of course it will be a proccess of attrition in the CW field. Eventually there will be no one left.

I worry about that as much as I care about 'global warming'. I won't be here that long.

Oh BTW with the bands so sorry (SFI 97) I notice there is basically NILL action on SSB. But I hear lots of CW stuff....wonder why that is?

Dan/W4NTI

4138. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 19:44:57 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ZQ2ab.28706$NM1.26776@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77553

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F67C4FF.1040005@adelphia.net...
> Clint wrote:
> >>Don't forget that 300 million or so would benefit if all the
> >>requirements were dropped.
>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> > oh, are they dropping the written test to? are they just
> > going to give away the license to all hams that pay
> > the fee?
> >
> > or are they, in fact, still requireing a knowledge test?
> > ah, yes. I'm sure they are.
>
> Very observent, they *are* requireing a knowledge test.
>
> But you know they really DON'T have to.
>
> If you thing they have to, tell me the reasons why.
>
>
> - Mike -
>
To at least be reasonably sure that the applicant knows where he can put
what kind of a signal.

It is also handy in a enforcement situation. When some fool runs 10kw on
top of a broadcast station the FCC has grounds to nail his butt.

See how simple that is?

Dan/W4NTI

4139. Re: OT: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 19:48:19 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <7U2ab.28738$NM1.22124@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77554

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:5oO9b.18562$BS1.4089196@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:GdO9b.25964$NM1.20016@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:b7d1465c.0309161603.4c174ddf@posting.google.com...
> > > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> > news:<20030913005510.15462.00002925@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <b7d1465c.0309120433.48e36421@posting.google.com>,
> > wa2si@arrl.net
> > > > (Bert Craig) writes:
> > > >
> > > > >Hi all,
> > > > >
> > > > >I'm curious. If I make a mistake during a QSO, what is the correct
> way
> > > > >to get back on track. Do I:
> > > > >
> > > > >1. Send 6 or 7 dits or an extra long dah?
> > > > > -and-
> > > >
> > > > Bert:
> > > >
> > > > The actual prosign for an error is eight dits. I've heard hams
using
> a
> > > > straight key or "bug" send a long dash, but that's normally an
> > alternative
> > > > form of "zero" and not an "error" prosign. BTW, another alternative
> > > > form of "zero" is the letter "O" (three dahs).
> > > >
> > > > >2. Do I resume at the character or do I repeat the entire word?
> > > >
> > > > It would be better to repeat the word; the OM on the other end will
> most
> > > > likely figure out what you're doing in any case.
> > > >
> > > > >Also, I heard a "shave and a haircut, two bits" at the end of a QSO
> > > > >the other night. When is that appropriate?
> > > >
> > > > At the end of the QSO. It is a traditional ending, especially if
you
> > happen

> > > > to have long hair and a 3-day growth of beard.
> > > >
> > > > >Thanks. :-)
> > > >
> > > > Your Velcome!
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> > > Thanks all,
> > >
> > > I appreciate all your advice and immediately put it to good
> > > use...including my first "shave and a haircut" at the close of a QSO
> > > w/a 62 yr. old OM, who promptly sent back "two bits." Thanks again and
> > > see ya on tha bands. :-)
> > >
> > > --
> > > 73 de Bert
> > > WA2SI
> >
> > Whenever I hear that assine 'shave and a haircut' crap I don't respond
at
> > all. I started hearing it way back in the 60s and its still dumb.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI ..._._
>
> (a la Homer Simpson) Doh!
>
> --
> 73 de Bert

Go ahead and be a smart ass. Now here is my shot. Your comment that
eight dits is a 'prosign' is in error. A prosign is SK, K, B, N, etc.
The eight dits to indicate an error is actually a operating signal, for lack
of a better term.

Dan/W4NTI

4140. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 19:48:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <uU2ab.28742$NM1.5553@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77555

"charlesb" wrote:
>
> For some reason I envision truckloads of refried beans
> rolling into L.A., to assist the valiant cadres of illegal
> aliens in keeping a steady wind going.
>
> How you Californians keep them all facing away from
> those hills at the same time, is what I wonder.

No need to worry about it - the valley is shaped to funnel most of the wind generated in a that direction. Which, by the way, just happens to be generally towards Texas (and you thought the smell was coming from cows in El Paso). :)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4141. Re: OT: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 19:49:33 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <hV2ab.28750$NM1.27804@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77556

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk8lm2$4gp$2@208.207.71.142...
>
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > news:b7d1465c.0309161603.4c174ddf@posting.google.com...
> > > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> > news:<20030913005510.15462.00002925@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > > > In article <b7d1465c.0309120433.48e36421@posting.google.com>,
> > wa2si@arrl.net
> > > > (Bert Craig) writes:
> > > >
> > > > >Hi all,
> > > > >
> > > > >I'm curious. If I make a mistake during a QSO, what is the correct
way
> > > > >to get back on track. Do I:
> > > > >
> > > > >1. Send 6 or 7 dits or an extra long dah?
> > > > > -and-
> > > >
> > > > Bert:
> > > >
> > > > The actual prosign for an error is eight dits. I've heard hams
using a
> > > > straight key or "bug" send a long dash, but that's normally an
> > alternative
> > > > form of "zero" and not an "error" prosign. BTW, another alternative
> > > > form of "zero" is the letter "O" (three dahs).
> > > >
> > > > >2. Do I resume at the character or do I repeat the entire word?
> > > >
> > > > It would be better to repeat the word; the OM on the other end will
most
> > > > likely figure out what you're doing in any case.
> > > >
> > > > >Also, I heard a "shave and a haircut, two bits" at the end of a QSO
> > > > >the other night. When is that appropriate?
> > > >
> > > > At the end of the QSO. It is a traditional ending, especially if
you
> > happen

> > > > to have long hair and a 3-day growth of beard.
> > > >
> > > > >Thanks. :-)
> > > >
> > > > Your Velcome!
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> > > Thanks all,
> > >
> > > I appreciate all your advice and immediately put it to good
> > > use...including my first "shave and a haircut" at the close of a QSO
> > > w/a 62 yr. old OM, who promptly sent back "two bits." Thanks again and
> > > see ya on tha bands. :-)
> > >
> > > --
> > > 73 de Bert
> > > WA2SI
> >
> > Whenever I hear that assine 'shave and a haircut' crap I don't respond
at
> > all. I started hearing it way back in the 60s and its still dumb.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI ..._._
>
> Well, Dan, If you had been around in the 30's you would have heard it
then. If
> you're around in another 30 years you'll probably be hearing ht then,
Brianb
> Burke may even be sending it by then.
>

Hi Hi....and if/when I do I will ignore it then too.

Dan/W4NTI

4142. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 19:52:38 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <aY2ab.28768$NM1.21722@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77557

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030917003753.14296.00000834@mb-m18.aol.com...
> >Newp, sorry. A 40M 1/4-wave dipole can be made to resonate just fine and
> >work wonderfully. Its position to the ground and center angle have
> >everything to do with how well it will radiate. And, using a balun or
not
> >doesn't change the whole concept of using a 1/4-wave dipole at any
> >frequency.
> >
> >Whether you want them to or not, they work.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Proof Positive the written is FAILURE.

Just guessing....I make the impedeance at center of such a 'antenna' at
several thousand ohms.

Help me out here. What sort of a 'balun' or what sort of 'coax' will match
such a device to a 50 to 75 ohm unbalanced output of a usual ARS
transmitter?

Since the Texas TWIT has me blocked, I am addressing this to you Bruce.

Dan/W4NTI

4143. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 19:55:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <W_2ab.28785$NM1.9286@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77558

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bk9tbb$ff4$2@208.206.142.69...
>
>
> WA8ULX wrote:
>
> > >Then, when proof positive was given, all that's being done now is
sneering.
> > >
> >
> > Doesnt even have a CLUE
>
> Ya know, to be clueless but receptive to learning is one thing. But to be
> clueless and determined to remain so is another matter entirely.
>
>

The term 'Dumbass' comes to mind here.

Dan/W4NTI

4144. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 19:57:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <013ab.28797$NM1.24119@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77559

"Caveat Lector" <CL@latin.com> wrote in message
news:OdZ9b.139212$kP.63984@fed1read03...
> Huh -- the definition of a dipole is:
> Definition: 1.. [n] an aerial half a wavelength long consisting
of
> two rods connected to a transmission line at the center
> So whats with this 1/4 stuff ???
>
>
> --
> 73 From The Signal In The Noise
> Caveat Lector Ya All
>
>

Its the new hamspeak from the dumbed down amongst us.

Dan/W4NTI

4145. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 19:59:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <823ab.28804$NM1.23793@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77560

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030917100424.23585.00000732@mb-m22.aol.com...
> >Huh -- the definition of a dipole is:
> > Definition: 1.. [n] an aerial half a wavelength long consisting
of
> >two rods connected to a transmission line at the center
> > So whats with this 1/4 stuff ???
> >
>
> Dont confuse them. These are the same people who think the A-99 has 9.9 DB
> Gain.

Now just a minute here Bruce. I had a A-99 on ten meters. And compared to
my Heathkit Cantenna it had 9.9 db gain.

So there.

Dan/W4NTI

4146. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 20:19:41 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917161941.07673.00001486@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 77561

>Help me out here. What sort of a 'balun' or what sort of 'coax' will match
>such a device to a 50 to 75 ohm unbalanced output of a usual ARS
>transmitter?
>
>Since the Texas TWIT has me blocked, I am addressing this to you Bruce.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Well I dont know Dan, maybe we could use a Getter to feed it, it might match it.

4147. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 20:21:33 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917162133.07673.00001487@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 77563

>The term 'Dumbass' comes to mind here.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Well thats 1 term that sounds about right, but how about No-Coder, most of them dont have a CLUE either.

4148. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 20:22:31 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917162231.07673.00001488@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 77562

>Its the new hamspeak from the dumbed down amongst us.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Its what Uncle Bob at the Local truck stop told them.

4149. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 20:24:14 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917162414.07673.00001489@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 77564

>Now just a minute here Bruce. I had a A-99 on ten meters. And compared to
>my Heathkit Cantenna it had 9.9 db gain.
>
>So there.
>
>Dan/W4NTI
>

Well your right on that Dan, but it probably had 20 DB Gain referenced to a
Cantenna.

4150. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 20:41:47 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F68C709.7020902@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 77565

Kim W5TIT wrote:

>
>Kim W5TIT -- done with the topic, but changed to an appropriately titled
>topic. After all, we wouldn't want a search on "1/4 wave dipole" to miss
>all this pertinent, scientific discussion. *yeah, right*
>
>
>
>
Does a 1/4 wave ground plane antenna count? ;-)

4151. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 20:44:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F68C810.4050904@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77566

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> Newp, sorry. A 40M 1/4-wave dipole can be made to resonate just fine and
> work wonderfully. Its position to the ground and center angle have
> everything to do with how well it will radiate. And, using a balun or not
> doesn't change the whole concept of using a 1/4-wave dipole at any
> frequency.
>
> Whether you want them to or not, they work.

A couple points here Kim.

According to the ARRL handbook 2003 edition, chapte 20 page 4:

A fundamental form of antenna is a wire whose length is half the
transmitting wavelength. It is the unit from which many more complex
forms of antennas are constructed and is known as a dipole antenna.

It goes on from there if you want more.

Next I modeled two antennas in EZNEC.

One is a half wave dipole for the middle of the 40 meter band at 7.150
mHz. Each leg of the antenna is approximately 1/4 wavelength long at
65.45 feet. This antenna models out at an SWR of a little over 1.5:1 at
the center frequency, and 2:1 at 7.3 mHz and a touch over 2 mHz at 7 mHz
with the antenna at 50 feet, the take off angle is 35 degrees. All in
all, not too bad an antenna. Most modern rigs will handle the antenna
without a tuner, or simply with their internal tuner.

Next, I modeled a quarter wave dipole for the same frequency and all
other paramaters. With the legs at 32.7 feet, the antenna now displays
somewhat near infinite SWR. The take off angle has now risen to 54 degrees.

That antenna is simply not going to work well at all.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4152. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 20:52:51 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <DQ3ab.491693$uu5.83705@sccrnsc04>
Source record: 77567

"Franz Weigel" <anon@bog.lir.dk> wrote in message
news:IDVNFYDX37881.3498263889@bog.lir.dk...
>
> The last CW coder who died was sentenced
> to Hell for eternity in order to transmit
> 6 Megapixels 24-bit color pictures in CW.
>
> God bless you from CW !

Of what ....the "interesting" stuff you see on slow scan ...

Yawn ..... oh well ..... what ever floats yer boat ....

God Bless ..... 72 & 2/3 Tom KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

4153. Re: OT: CW QSO Question

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 21:06:08 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <414ab.25150$BS1.8122287@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 77568

```
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:7U2ab.28738$NM1.22124@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:5oO9b.18562$BS1.4089196@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:GdO9b.25964$NM1.20016@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.net> wrote in message
> > > news:b7d1465c.0309161603.4c174ddf@posting.google.com...
> > > > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> > > news:<20030913005510.15462.00002925@mb-m06.aol.com>...
> > > > > In article <b7d1465c.0309120433.48e36421@posting.google.com>,
> > > wa2si@arrl.net
> > > > > (Bert Craig) writes:
> > > > > >
> > > > > >Hi all,
> > > > > >
> > > > > >I'm curious. If I make a mistake during a QSO, what is the
correct
> > way
> > > > > >to get back on track. Do I:
> > > > > >
> > > > > >1. Send 6 or 7 dits or an extra long dah?
> > > > > > -and-
> > > > > >
> > > > > Bert:
> > > > > >
> > > > > The actual prosign for an error is eight dits. I've heard hams
> using
> > a
> > > > > straight key or "bug" send a long dash, but that's normally an
> > > alternative
> > > > > form of "zero" and not an "error" prosign. BTW, another
alternative
> > > > > form of "zero" is the letter "O" (three dahs).
> > > > > >
> > > > > >2. Do I resume at the character or do I repeat the entire word?
> > > > > >
> > > > > It would be better to repeat the word; the OM on the other end
will
> > most
> > > > > likely figure out what you're doing in any case.
> > > > > >
```

> > > > > >Also, I heard a "shave and a haircut, two bits" at the end of a
QSO
> > > > > >the other night. When is that appropriate?
> > > > > >
> > > > > > At the end of the QSO. It is a traditional ending, especially if
> you
> > > happen
> > > > > > to have long hair and a 3-day growth of beard.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > >Thanks. :-)
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Your Velcome!
> > > > > >
> > > > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > > > >
> > > > > Thanks all,
> > > > >
> > > > > I appreciate all your advice and immediately put it to good
> > > > > use...including my first "shave and a haircut" at the close of a QSO
> > > > > w/a 62 yr. old OM, who promptly sent back "two bits." Thanks again
and
> > > > > see ya on tha bands. :-)
> > > > >
> > > > > --
> > > > > 73 de Bert
> > > > > WA2SI
> > > >
> > > > Whenever I hear that assine 'shave and a haircut' crap I don't respond
> at
> > > > all. I started hearing it way back in the 60s and its still dumb.
> > > >
> > > > Dan/W4NTI ..._._
> > >
> > > (a la Homer Simpson) Doh!
> > >
> > > --
> > > 73 de Bert
> >
> > Go ahead and be a smart ass. Now here is my shot. Your comment that
> > eight dits is a 'prosign' is in error. A prosign is SK, K, B, N, etc.
> > The eight dits to indicate an error is actually a operating signal, for
lack
> > of a better term.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI

I wasn't trying to be a smart ass, Dan. I was just "lightening up" what I
perceived to be an overly terse response. Remember, I'm just asking about
something I heard (...and subsequently used) OTA.

As for the prosign issue, I never made that statement and thank you for showing me the difference.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

4154. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 21:14:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F68CF1E.7050805@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77569

Bill Sohl wrote:

> Do you really think the FCC has or will have a change of opinion...
> especially in light of the entire international community endorsing
> the end of mandatory code testing as an ITU requirement?

Well, I wouldn't condider it a lock. The FCC was recently spanked by both the Supremes and the Senate. They may be reluctant to send anything new along for a while.

In addition, the US has shown a reluctance to go along with what the rest of the world is thinking.

Finally, we haven't ratified all that many treaties lately have we?

So while it might happen, I'm not going to do any betting on it.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4155. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 21:30:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F68D2B1.3060700@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77570

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
> The way I was taught to think of it was that the length (overall) is the
> reference to the "length" of the dipole antenna. For example, a "half-wave"
> dipole antenna would be a "quarter-wave" in length on each side of the
> center insulator or center point. So a full wavelength dipole antenna would
> have each "side" of the dipole being one-half wavelength each.
> Oh well.......

You were taught incorrectly, Ryan.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4156. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 21:42:38 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309171342.5e5a1147@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77571

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030916113829.15462.00002991@mb-m06.aol.com>...

> Electric power generation isn't exactly a big "amateur radio" policy issue,
> is it? :-)

I find it ironic that you load heaps of criticism on anyone who
dares to discuss anything other than Amateur Radio policy when YOU
deem it OK to do so...Yet this was 4/5ths of the way through a post in
which not one word of Amateur Radio policy was discussed.

More "professional engineer" "Do As I Say, Not Do As I Do"
rhetoric.

Sheesh...No wonder so much of our technology development and
manufacturing is off shore. No doubt our next new Space Shuttle will
have a Mitsubishi logo on the side, stuffd full of Avionics from Sony
et al.

Steve, K4YZ

4157. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 21:47:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309171347.183aec38@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77572

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309131147.2090071e@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message

> > Perhaps because the other poster didn't make a lot of assinine
> > assertions that are not substantiated by facts, Brain.
>
> The ARS has improved since 1984. That's plain for everyone to see.

Then where does all this "Ham Radio Is Going To Hell" traffic
come from, Brain? Mostly from trolls, you and Lennie.

> > You may refer to "fact" in Websters to find out what they are,
> > Brain...You DO seem to have a problem with the concept.
>
> Not at all. As Ronald Reagan said, "Facts are stupid things."

I'd expect notning less from you, Brain...You're nothing if not
consistent.

Thanks.

Steve, K4YZ

4158. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 21:48:32 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkakra$rj6ld$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77573

"Bill Sohl" wrote ...

I agree completely...I applaud your efforts, and would like to know.... Do you work with your friend on the air? If not, why not?

No, he's not licensed yet and we live too far away from each other for him to just drop by and use my use my gear as a third party operator. Otherwise I would. We just spend lunchtime working on the computer with Morse Academy. But, IMHO, on the air is always the best way to learn.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4159. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 22:17:59 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F68DD97.6E3D3730@earthlink.net>
Source record: 77574

Alun Palmer wrote:
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> news:UI0ab.27109$Aq2.20546@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>
> >
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20030916232714.23307.00003051@mb-m29.aol.com...
> >> In article <Xns93F7E7865C43Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> >> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >EI is the 7th country to abolish code testing by my reckoning
> >>
> >> Ireland: Beautiful country, lovely people, but the same dumbed-down
> >> hams! Not to worry, I'm sure us Yanks won't be far behind!
> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT

> Newsflash! - Singapore has abolished the code test. Now there are eight.

Wow! That's quite a policy statement from a country with a little more
than 120 radio amateurs and it comes hot on the heels of the big move by
Ireland with its slightly more than 1,500 hams.

Dave K8MN

4160. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 22:34:56 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93F9BD0503158elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 77575

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:_J2ab.28637$NM1.10167@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030917150317.23859.00000907@mb-m22.aol.com...
>> >Newsflash! - Singapore has abolished the code test. Now there are
>> >eight.
>> >
>> >73 de Alun, N3KI
>>
>> Great, not much longer and Ham Radio will be CBHAM RADIO world wide
>
> Look at it this way Bruce. It will rid the CW segements of useless
> trash. They will all be on SSB. Digital will also be safe because that
> requires some intelligence to set up and operate a program. Thus
> elliminating most to all of the dumbed down hamsters.
>
> Of course it will be a proccess of attrition in the CW field.
> Eventually there will be no one left.
>
> I worry about that as much as I care about 'global warming'. I won't
> be here that long.
>
> Oh BTW with the bands so sorry (SFI 97) I notice there is basically
> NILL action on SSB. But I hear lots of CW stuff....wonder why that is?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
>

It's because people convince themselves the bands are dead and don't
transmit. If nobody transmits, then there's no-one to work. Granted the
bands are poor, but the WAE contest, for example, showed it up as a self-
fulfilling prophecy.

4161. Re: ARS License Numbers

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 22:36:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F68E238.7040205@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77576

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F67C4FF.1040005@adelphia.net...
>
>>Clint wrote:
>>
>>>>Don't forget that 300 million or so would benefit if all the
>>>>requirements were dropped.
>>>
>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>oh, are they dropping the written test to? are they just
>>>going to give away the license to all hams that pay
>>>the fee?
>>>
>>>or are they, in fact, still requireing a knowledge test?
>>>ah, yes. I'm sure they are.
>>
>>Very observent, they *are* requireing a knowledge test.
>>
>>But you know they really DON'T have to.
>>
>>If you thing they have to, tell me the reasons why.
>>
>>
>>- Mike -
>>
>
> To at least be reasonably sure that the applicant knows where he can put
> what kind of a signal.
>
> It is also handy in a enforcement situation. When some fool runs 10kw on
> top of a broadcast station the FCC has grounds to nail his butt.
>
> See how simple that is?

Oh, personally I agree that there should be a written test, and there
shoud be a Morse code test.

What gets me worked up is those who think that removing the Morse code
part of the testing is not a reduction in the amount of knowedge needed
for the license. Maybe its newspeak. Less is more!

All the learning is ultimately what determines the state of amateur
radio. While not an indicator of the individual ham, in the aggregate a

better educated ARS is a good thing in my book.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4162. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 22:38:24 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <An5ab.27520$Aq2.3962@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77577

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030917162133.07673.00001487@mb-m17.aol.com...
> >The term 'Dumbass' comes to mind here.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> Well thats 1 term that sounds about right, but how about No-Coder, most of
them
> dont have a CLUE either.

It is not a problem to be ignorant. Its being too stupid to learn that is
the problem.

Dan/W4NTI

4163. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 22:38:44 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F68E2C2.5060701@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77578

Dave Heil wrote:
> Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
>>news:UI0ab.27109$Aq2.20546@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>>
>>
>>>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>>>news:20030916232714.23307.00003051@mb-m29.aol.com...
>>>
>>>>In article <Xns93F7E7865C43Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
>>>><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>EI is the 7th country to abolish code testing by my reckoning
>>>>
>>>>Ireland: Beautiful country, lovely people, but the same dumbed-down
>>>>hams! Not to worry, I'm sure us Yanks won't be far behind!
>>>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>>
>
>
>>Newsflash! - Singapore has abolished the code test. Now there are eight.
>
>
> Wow! That's quite a policy statement from a country with a little more
> than 120 radio amateurs and it comes hot on the heels of the big move by
> Ireland with its slightly more than 1,500 hams.

Singapore probably canes you for rules infracttion. Or using bad grammer
oon the air.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4164. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 22:39:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917183909.15923.00000765@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 77580

In article <av0ab.27095$Aq2.16842@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Frankly, I also don't understand why ARRL CW sessions from W1AW
>don't start on the slow code segment with something about 3 or
>4 wpm.

Because there's no reason to.

>It might offer a better entrance process for potential
>new CW users to get over the air reception.

Not really.

At 5 wpm, each character gets approximately 2.4 seconds. At 4 wpm, each character gets approximately 3 seconds.

73 de Jim, N2EY

>

4165. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 22:39:10 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917183910.15923.00000766@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 77579

In article <vmfbbn3qpdl2f8@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
<rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:

>hmmm..
>a little sour over your precious CW testing being
>discontinued, world-wide?

Not "sour" at all.

But 8 countries (so far) is hardly "world wide".

--

It will be really interesting to see what happens to ham radio in countries
where code testing is totally eliminated.

Will there be big increases in growth (i.e., lots of new hams)?

Will there be lots of new technology brought to the ARS by new hams for whom
the code test was a "barrier"?

Time will tell.

4166. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 22:40:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <cp5ab.27523$Aq2.23492@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77581

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030917161941.07673.00001486@mb-m17.aol.com...
> >Help me out here. What sort of a 'balun' or what sort of 'coax' will
match
> >such a device to a 50 to 75 ohm unbalanced output of a usual ARS
> >transmitter?
> >
> >Since the Texas TWIT has me blocked, I am addressing this to you Bruce.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Well I dont know Dan, maybe we could use a Getter to feed it, it might
match
> it.

Your right...a getter would do it....but do you think we need a grid leak
pan to catch the left overs?

Dan/W4NTI

4167. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 22:40:28 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F68E32A.4010402@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77582

Alun Palmer wrote:
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in

>>Oh BTW with the bands so sorry (SFI 97) I notice there is basically
>>NILL action on SSB. But I hear lots of CW stuff....wonder why that is?
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>>
>>
>>
>
>
> It's because people convince themselves the bands are dead and don't
> transmit. If nobody transmits, then there's no-one to work.

So only the CW people know this Alun?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4168. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 22:41:52 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Qq5ab.6193$nQ.2131090@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77583

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F652F71.9080701@adelphia.net...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> Dee, I find myself in the uncomfortable position of agreeing with you,
> but very much disagreeing with your argument.
>
> Uranium miners get ill with apalling regularity. This is part of the
> overall cost of this method of energy production, unless you are force
> fitting your argument to include only the power generation stage. There
> are piles of radioactive tailings around some towns out west. Kids often
> play on them.
>
> http://www.inmotionmagazine.com/miners.html
>
> http://www.downwinders.org/cortez.htm
>
> These are just a couple examples.
>
> Is that directly attributable? Gosh who knows? Cigarettes were "not
> proven to be deadly until not all that many yars ago, while I have read
> literature from the 1860's that documented all the effects that tobacco
> smoking causes. My guess is that if a group of people involved in an
> activity show statistically significant trends in illness, some activity
> they have in common just may be responsible.
>
> I don't suspect you will understand this, but part of your approach is
> exactly why people distrust what they are told about NP.

It's exactly for these reasons that I keep saying that we have to do the research and not let our emotions and fears sway us. And we do have to make sure we don't do stupid things. Letting kids play on piles of tailings is stupid. Even on non-radioactive piles, they can get hurt as the piles are unstable and slide.

Right now, the fear and emotions are preventing us from doing the necessary data gathering and research. Whether or not a person believes in nuclear power, this data is sorely needed. If it's safe, we need to move forward. If it's too dangerous, we need to follow other routes. That judgment should be made on facts not feelings as people are doing today.

As far as cigarettes go, the term "coffin nails" goes a long way back. The fact that people chose to hide their heads in the sand and not do the research until relatively recently just goes to show the idiocy of not doing the research.

Statistical correlations though must be treated carefully. It doesn't necessarily prove a cause and effect relationship. It can be the case that two (or more) independent items stem from the same cause. Once again, adequate research is needed to determine why two items correlate. For this reason, statistical trends should be used to trigger research not to draw conclusions.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4169. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 22:50:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <dz5ab.6206$nQ.2134554@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77585

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bk4b77$p383g$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Just wanted to know why 13 was some type of magic number.
>
> Thanks,
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>

Also there is some evidence that once one has reached the 13wpm level, they will not forget it even if they don't use. They might grow rusty and become slow. But it stays in the brain, ready to be called upon. See the book "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy," which is available for free downloading from the internet. The author deliberately chose to make this available to the public for free so that there is no copyright infringement involved.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

> > >
> >
> > Because, for most people, the speed of 13 WPM meant you could ACTUALLY
> COPY
> > Morse Code.
> >
> > For most folks, up to about 12 WPM you could copy it and NOT actually
know
> > it.
> >
> > Most countries in the world required 12 WPM. The US Military only
wanted
> 10
> > Groups per minute. Groups meaning 5 letter 'groups' in a 1 minute
period.
> >
> > That help?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>

>

4170. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 22:51:26 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93F9BFD1EB5B9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 77584

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
news:3F68DD97.6E3D3730@earthlink.net:

> Alun Palmer wrote:
>>
>> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
>> news:UI0ab.27109$Aq2.20546@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>>
>> >
>> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>> > news:20030916232714.23307.00003051@mb-m29.aol.com...
>> >> In article <Xns93F7E7865C43Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
>> >> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >EI is the 7th country to abolish code testing by my reckoning
>> >>
>> >> Ireland: Beautiful country, lovely people, but the same dumbed-down
>> >> hams! Not to worry, I'm sure us Yanks won't be far behind!
>> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>> Newsflash! - Singapore has abolished the code test. Now there are
eight.
>
> Wow! That's quite a policy statement from a country with a little more
> than 120 radio amateurs and it comes hot on the heels of the big move by
> Ireland with its slightly more than 1,500 hams.
>
> Dave K8MN
>

I just did a quick recount, and 9V is the 9th country, not the 8th. They are Switzerland, the UK, Belgium, Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, Norway, Ireland and Singapore.

The funny thing is the only no-coder I have yet heard on HF was PE1RMZ. I know that this is a Dutch no-code call from the time I worked PE1DUP through a UK repeater. It takes time to get on HF I suppose. I was surprised that no-one appeared to have been ready in advance.

You can try to pretend that 9V and EI don't matter, but look at the bigger picture. You know where this will all end, and a d*mn good thing it is too. If it wasn't for the bl**dy code test I would have been licenced and on HF at 14.

4171. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 22:53:16 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93F9C0218F1F1elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 77586

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:3F68E32A.4010402@adelphia.net:

> Alun Palmer wrote:
>> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
>
>>>Oh BTW with the bands so sorry (SFI 97) I notice there is basically
>>>NILL action on SSB. But I hear lots of CW stuff....wonder why that is?
>>>
>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> It's because people convince themselves the bands are dead and don't
>> transmit. If nobody transmits, then there's no-one to work.
>
> So only the CW people know this Alun?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

If enough people say that conditions are too poor for SSB some people will
be daft enough to beleive it.

4172. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 22:54:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F68E663.7080807@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77587

Bert Craig wrote:
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:ZdQ9b.26166$NM1.16564@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>>news:_Wu9b.222$BS1.80870@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>>
>>>>Wonderfl, then you'll learn code if you want to participate there.
>>>>If not, nothing lost.
>>>
>>>Nice concept on paper, but in the real world...
>>
>>In the real world what?
>
>
> In the real world, many of AR's newbies won't even bother to try CW because
> it takes too much effort to attain a usable level of proficiency. Studying
> for and passing the 5-wpm test gives one a very basic level of knowledge
> (NOT proficiency) and enables him/her to make an *educated* decision as to
> whether or not s/he wants to pursue CE any further.
>
>
>>>Quite frankly, what example
>>>has NCI given to the prospective ham? It sure doesn't exemplify the
>>
> values
>
>>>of a "self-starter."
>>
>>Actually, those of us at the core of NCI are "self-starters" as
>>we didn't sit around and wait for anything...we actively helped
>>"make it happen."
>
>
> Ushering in underachievment is notheing to be proud of, Bill.
>
>
>>>>More to the point, is there any minimum code
>>>>speed that should be banned from the CW/data segments at the
>>>>bottom of the bands?
>>>
>>>Couldn't care how slow...as long as said CW/Data sub-bands remain
>>
> intact.

>
>>Last I checked, there were no such subbands as CW was allowed
>>everywhere except for some portion of 220MHz
>>
>>Cheers,
>>Bill K2UNK
>
>
> I did write CW/Data, right? HOWEVER, I don't expect to encounter many NCTA's
> on the bottom of 40 or anyplace on 30.
>
> Just watch the unequal ground between the two when a seasoned CW op outpaces
> his phone op counterpart in a sprint for certain rare DX contacts. Heck,
> I've read that some of them only work CW. Liken it to the race between the
> tortoise and the hare, but the tortoise KNOWS how to read the road signs and
> the hare is confused because "there's no pictures." Think it's a bad
> analogy, Bill? Try looking at the cash register keypad next time you go to
> McDonalds...the result of the very same mentality of underachievement NCI
> "actively made happen."
>
> Cheers to you, Bill.

Bill and Carl may one day be held in the same esteem as Dick Bash!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4173. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:02:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <JJ5ab.6213$nQ.2138783@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77588

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bk4b7r$p383g$20@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
> Wind is actually a good source, if there is a consistent breeze blowing
> enough to keep the blades of the windmill moving, and would seem to be
> fairly inexpensive to construct as well.
>
> As far as solar, the cost of setting up systems are extremely expensive
> still as the manufacturers of such materials are willing to lower their
> prices any.......
>

I've lived in Seattle. Too little sun and almost no wind. According to a book I was reading when I wanted to build a greenhouse, windloading is not a consideration there as it has the lowest winds in the country.

As far as prices, there's not enough demand to allow efficient manufacturing methods. Selling at a loss is too risky for a business unless they have a very strong reason to believe the demand will pick up.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4174. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:08:21 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0309171508.794eacc8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77589

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote

>
> Would you enjoy it as much if your QSOs went through a series of automated
> digital systems that would insure perfect copy at both ends with no operator
> skill required?
>

Because I'm a 'tinkerer' sort, with a strong sense of curiousity,
certainly yes, at least the first handful of times, just to see what
made it work.

Wouldn't you?

73, de Hans, K0HB

4175. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:20:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkaq7kbbc0@208.207.71.162>
Source record: 77590

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:P4_9b.23636$BS1.6747359@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:ZdQ9b.26166$NM1.16564@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > > news:_Wu9b.222$BS1.80870@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > > > Wonderfl, then you'll learn code if you want to participate there.
> > > > > If not, nothing lost.
> > > > >
> > > > Nice concept on paper, but in the real world...
> > > >
> > > In the real world what?
> > >
> > In the real world, many of AR's newbies won't even bother to try CW
> because
> > it takes too much effort to attain a usable level of proficiency.
> >
> So what? Use of CW has never been any requirement.

Ah, but it HAS. I can recall the time when you had to sign ertifying that you had'made at least 2 CW contacts within the past six months to be eligible to renew your license.

4176. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:23:57 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <h26ab.6219$nQ.2148227@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77591

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vmc18c6qdpseff@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > >
> > > I guess it's too bad that there aren't that many coal fired steam
> > > locomotives
> > > being used anymore.
> >
> > On the othe hand, there IS very MUCH Morse code being used on ham radio!
> >
> and a LOT more FM, ssb, AM, packet, etc too.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT

Packet has almost disappeared. There is far less packet than voice or
Morse.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4177. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:30:37 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <x86ab.6221$nQ.2151244@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77592

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vmce1k453gnb61@corp.supernews.com...
>
>
> >
> > There are no CW-only parts of the HF/MF bands. None at all.
> >
>
> You'd better check your frequency priviledge/allocation charts.
> The lower half of the HF bands except for 160 meters is
> "cw/fsk only"....
>
>
>

You yourself have just stated FSK thus proving that they are not CW only.
Please note that there are portions of the 6m and 2m bands that are indeed
CW only as not even FSK is allowed there. So the statement that there are
no portions of MF/HF limited to cw only is indeed a true statement.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4178. Re: FISTS petition to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:33:43 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <rb6ab.6223$nQ.2151635@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77593

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309151432.5b8728a4@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<hGH8b.2078$nQ.1017334@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > I do hope you mean the test is insanely simple and the privileges
insanely
> > high for the level of testing done.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Sorry.
>
> The tested material is insanely technical and the privs are insanely
> high for an entry level license.
>
> Go do some historical research and see what the Novice material
> consisted of, pre-Novice Enhancement.
>
> Now that's an entry level license.

I have no objection to reducing the technical level of questions if the
privileges are reduced correspondingly. But we both that's not in the
cards.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4179. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:44:46 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmhsgl781ddn6b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77594

> Has anyone come up with that WOW argument that will justify
> the need for morse testing? So far, nothing new has been
> offered by PCTAs at all.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>
>

well, no..... all the arguments being given to keep the code testing
are easily broken down into thier base, most center-core reason...

"I HAD TO DO IT, SO THEY SHOULD HAVE TO!!!!!"

And that just falls flat on its face.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4180. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:46:23 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmhsjktdhlt594@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77596

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F68CF1E.7050805@adelphia.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > Do you really think the FCC has or will have a change of opinion...
> > especially in light of the entire international community endorsing
> > the end of mandatory code testing as an ITU requirement?
>
> Well, I wouldn't condider it a lock. The FCC was recently spanked by
> both the Supremes and the Senate. They may be reluctant to send anything
> new along for a while.
>

except that I doubt the senate of the united states, nor the supreme court,
gives
a you-know-what about morse code testing in the ham community. Or, rather,
I certainly haven't heard it on any of the news shows on TV, radio or print
about it.

maybe i just missed it in between headlines of "Saddam", "iraq", and
"democrats
debate".

Clint
KB5ZHT

4181. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:46:26 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkaroiecd0@208.207.71.162>
Source record: 77595

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > Newp, sorry. A 40M 1/4-wave dipole can be made to resonate just fine and
> > work wonderfully. Its position to the ground and center angle have
> > everything to do with how well it will radiate. And, using a balun or not
> > doesn't change the whole concept of using a 1/4-wave dipole at any
> > frequency.
> >
> > Whether you want them to or not, they work.
>
> A couple points here Kim.
>
> According to the ARRL handbook 2003 edition, chapte 20 page 4:
>
> A fundamental form of antenna is a wire whose length is half the
> transmitting wavelength. It is the unit from which many more complex
> forms of antennas are constructed and is known as a dipole antenna.
>
> It goes on from there if you want more.
>
> Next I modeled two antennas in EZNEC.
>
> One is a half wave dipole for the middle of the 40 meter band at 7.150
> mHz. Each leg of the antenna is approximately 1/4 wavelength long at
> 65.45 feet. This antenna models out at an SWR of a little over 1.5:1 at
> the center frequency, and 2:1 at 7.3 mHz and a touch over 2 mHz at 7 mHz
> with the antenna at 50 feet, the take off angle is 35 degrees. All in
> all, not too bad an antenna. Most modern rigs will handle the antenna
> without a tuner, or simply with their internal tuner.
>
> Next, I modeled a quarter wave dipole for the same frequency and all
> other paramaters. With the legs at 32.7 feet, the antenna now displays
> somewhat near infinite SWR. The take off angle has now risen to 54 degrees.
>
> That antenna is simply not going to work well at all.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Well, there you have it!

4182. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:47:39 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <vo6ab.6226$nQ.2158382@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77598

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bk5ssj$ldj@library1.airnews.net...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030915081859.29660.00000652@mb-m24.aol.com...
> > In article <9k99b.3778$nQ.1307964@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> Flint"
> > <deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >
> > >So why hasn't California built any oil, coal, or hydroelectric power
> platns
> > >in the last ten years?
> >
> > Some folks would say it's the "NIMBY" problem (Not In My Back Yard), but
I
> say
> > it's actually a "BANANA" problem (Build Absolutely Nothing Anywhere Near
> > Anything). It's not just generating facilities - transmission facilities
> have
> > the same problem.
> >
> > >I'll tell you. They too are being blocked by the
> > >environmentalists.
> >
> > Are you sure that's the only reason? Are none of the environmental
> > considerations reasonable? Think about how often the ground shakes out
> there...
> >
> > > Are they also economically unfeasible? It's unlikely.
> >
> > No, it's very likely. Here's why:
> >
> > First, for most of the past 10 years, investment capital has been drawn
to
> the
> > high-payoff telecom and dotcom industries. Until the bubble burst, those
> were a
> > lot more promising to investors. A server farm can be put up in a
fraction
> of
> > the time that a generating plant requires, with the promise (back then)
of
> a
> > much larger ROI.
> >

> > Second, the West has a long history of cheap electricity from govt.
> sponsored
> > projects, most commonly hydro. What dies a typical Californian pay per
> kWH?
> > Here in Philly, we pay something like 11 cents / kWH residential. NYC
> folks pay
> > even more. What do they pay in SF or LA? (If the retail is cheap,
> wholesale
> > must be even cheaper)
> >
> > Third, the whold deregulation and Enron-type mess has caused anyone with
> any
> > sense to avoid building actual facilties like the plague, because the
> market
> > (which used to be one of the most stable and predictable) became
> completely
> > unstable.
> >
> > Fourth, the environmental/NIMBY/BANANA effects are greatest and most
> powerful
> > in places like CA. They definitely play a role - but not the only role.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> OH good, I was saving Dee's posted questions to go back and answer and
this
> is along the lines of what I was thinking so, thanks Jim!
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Sooner or later though, they pay the price. Either they need to build power generators or buy it at very high prices from outside California from companies who have made the investments.

Whether it is regulatory, environmental, or economic, California has created its own energy mess by its own actions.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4183. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:48:17 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmhsnb91drtgc8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77597

> Ah, but it HAS. I can recall the time when you had to sign ertifying that
you
> had'made at least 2 CW contacts within the past six months to be eligible
to
> renew your license.
>

and what decade was that?

Clint
KB5ZHT

4184. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:50:47 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmhsrsqbj49u04@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77600

>
> You yourself have just stated FSK thus proving that they are not CW only.
> Please note that there are portions of the 6m and 2m bands that are indeed
> CW only as not even FSK is allowed there. So the statement that there are
> no portions of MF/HF limited to cw only is indeed a true statement.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

um, yes. KEEN grasp of the obvious there!

Clint
KB5ZHT

4185. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:50:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkas0r$fr7$0@208.207.71.162>
Source record: 77599

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > > Do you really think the FCC has or will have a change of opinion...
> > > especially in light of the entire international community endorsing
> > > the end of mandatory code testing as an ITU requirement?
>
> Well, I wouldn't condider it a lock. The FCC was recently spanked by
> both the Supremes and the Senate. They may be reluctant to send anything
> new along for a while.
>
> In addition, the US has shown a reluctance to go along with what the
> rest of the world is thinking.
>
> Finally, we haven't ratified all that many treaties lately have we?
>
> So while it might happen, I'm not going to do any betting on it.

Then when the retired head of the Amateur and Citizen's Division of the FCC states in his comments to the NCVAEC petition, the writing of which he was a party, that it simply is an oxymoron that an Extra Class ham should be allowed to *not* be proficient in Morse when he is considered an expert at ham radio, you might take that as some sort of a clue to thinking in high places...

4186. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:52:05 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmhsube10vo82a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77501

> > > On the othe hand, there IS very MUCH Morse code being used on ham radio!
> > >
> > and a LOT more FM, ssb, AM, packet, etc too.
> >
> > Clint
> > KB5ZHT
>
> Packet has almost disappeared. There is far less packet than voice or
> Morse.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

... um, yea...
.... and taken in thier entirety, they're used more than CW.

diversion, anybody?

Clint
KB5ZHT

4187. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:55:12 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmht45sf006a79@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77502

> Not "sour" at all.
>
> But 8 countries (so far) is hardly "world wide".
>

hm, I see.... um, and you know the one and only
acceptable definition of "world wide" huh? I guess
i've missed where it's written that "world wide"
is composed of no less than 9 countries.

The fact is, it would only take two seperate nations
to call something "multinational" or "international".. so,
would it comfort you a little more if I were to have said
"internationally, code testing is being dropped"?

you'd also do well to make a case study of how many hams
are represented by the nations that are dropping it. Many
nations that aren't are composed of nations with fewer than
a dozen hams.... and a few that are run by dicators
(lybia) have 1 and only 1 ham operator.... guess who.....

Clint
KB5ZHT

4188. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:56:11 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmht614qmnrg94@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77503

better yet, just wait until they drop CW testing and
you won't have to mess with it.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4189. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:56:55 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmht7dd974nla8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77505

> Good Grief, what does FCC do nowdays except shuffle paper???
>

that, and make preparations to remove CW practical testing.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4190. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:57:04 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <kx6ab.25967$BS1.9003106@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 77504

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:To0ab.27088$Aq2.17329@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> You must have been upset too when states eliminated mandatory
> testing on manual gearbox autos and allowed testing to be done
> using any car.

Not me, just the folks filing their insurance claims and/or licking their wounds after someone who didn't know how to negotiate the clutch AND the brake pedal simultaneously rear-ended them at a red light.

> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

P.S. My first drivers license was "manual shift endorsed." <ggg>

4191. Re: Go Numorse!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:58:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ey6ab.6227$nQ.2162259@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77506

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bk7578$q3g09$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> The only thing I don't like, is that for the prosigns, you have to make
some
> type of chart to remember which key is responsible for each prosign, as
the
> normal computer keyboard does not have a AR or BT (etc.) key on them last
I
> knew. In the set-up of the program, there is other prosigns available,
but
> probably not the ones used for an exam, but might be commonly used on the
> air.
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)

For BT, most software is set up to use the "=" sign as the code for BT is the same as the code for "=". Context lets you determine the actual meaning. In copying morse (such as in testing), the "=" sign would be correct for representing BT.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4192. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-17 23:58:51 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmhtb03cm108dc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77507

well, not to worry anyway... once they remove CW testing
it's a moot point anyway.

Clint
KB5ZHT

> >
> >
>

4193. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 00:01:15 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmhtfj9hjg5221@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77508

the PCTA crowd just said "six mega what ???"

you screwed up and mentioned something modern
and applicable in the real world.... they're trapped
in 1952.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--
--

Facts are to socialists what crosses are to vampires

Top nations that fund UN treasury,
in descending order...

United States: 22%
Japan: 19.6%
Germany: 9.8%
France: 6.5%
UK: 5.6%
Italy 5.1%
Canada: 2.6%
Spain: 2.5%

Russia isn't even in this top 8 list.
France, Russia and Germany, COMBINED,
do not contribute as much to the UN as
does the United States......

--

"Franz Weigel" <anon@bog.lir.dk> wrote in message
news:IDVNFYDX37881.3498263889@bog.lir.dk...
>
> The last CW coder who died was sentenced
> to Hell for eternity in order to transmit
> 6 Megapixels 24-bit color pictures in CW.
>
> God bless you from CW !
>
>
>

4194. Re: Whaddya think folks?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 00:04:49 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmhtm96a99qa85@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77509

<well_look@this.now> wrote in message news:bjh1r6$g0i$0@208.206.142.66...
> >Welcome each and every new ham into the hobby with open arms --
> >after all, he's a brother (or she's a sister) who has taken the time
> >to study for and pass the written test, even if he doesn't have the
> >code.
>
>
> Ah god...been there and done that. These were guys that were 25
> year veterans of cb. They are smart asses...I tried to elmer
> hem...they wouldnt listen. They get on the area 2 meter repeaters
> and use their cb handles and 10 codes. Most of them are extra class
> to make matters worse.

WHAT???? how can this BE?????

If they're extra class, then they passed a CW test.... from what i've
read from the PCTA, it's just not possible
to be a rule-violater if you're passed a CW test. THEY tell me that
the rule violaters will only be non-code-tested hams....

geeze, now i'm so confused.

Clint
KB5ZHT

They have run all the older hams off the 2
> meter band here in wv and east ky. But yes like a fool I welcomed
> them into my home. Went to the classes and talked about ham radio
> to them. But they are still just hardcore cbers. Its not like this
> everywhere in the country but there is enough of this scattered
> through the country to give most of us a sign of things to come. No
> ham radio will not die or come to an end because of these
> types...but this is really what the code-nocode fuss is about. There's
> thousands of us that have got a taste of these fools and dont want
> any more of them. I dont want to be in the extra portion of any band
> and hear 10-4. I dont want some idiot that just came off cb tuning
> on top of me and whistling into his mic...but its happening and has
> been for the last 2 years since the code was dropped to 5wpm.
> Pretty soon the grand daddys of these idiots are going to come off
> cb and be on hf with us. Now you can scream about elmering and
> all that...but like i said i tried...and these fools are unelmerable.
> When they looked at my full wave loop they laughed and said their
> cb antennas would work better. One looked at my 2 element 5
> band quad at 65 feet and said his moonraker was a better antenna.
> Most of them think they know more about radio than a ham thats
> been on the air for 35 years. But i guess most you folks are'nt having

> to deal with these types and think the rest of us are crazy. Soon
> we'll all have to pay the price for most of you wanting to do away
> with the code.
> Thats it in a nutshell.

4195. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 00:20:15 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917202015.12501.00002474@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 77510

In article <v40ab.27073$Aq2.22984@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>Do you really think the FCC has or will have a change of opinion...

Maybe - maybe not. Right now there are several petitions under consideration, and almost certainly more on the way. Lots of comments, etc., to be considered. Everyone can have their say and then FCC will do whatever FCC wants, based on whatever FCC thinks is the best thing to do.

And no matter what FCC does, some folks will think it's the wrong thing. But at least we can have our say.

>especially in light of the entire international community endorsing
>the end of mandatory code testing as an ITU requirement?

"entire international community"? I think not! Just those few who get to decide policy.

For example, a poll of German hams found them overwhelmingly in favor of keeping code tests. Didn't matter.

73 de Jim, N2EY

73 de Jim, N2EY

4196. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 00:25:46 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <eY6ab.6236$nQ.2174557@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77511

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:P4_9b.23636$BS1.6747359@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>
> Just watch the unequal ground between the two when a seasoned CW op
outpaces
> his phone op counterpart in a sprint for certain rare DX contacts. Heck,
> I've read that some of them only work CW. Liken it to the race between the
> tortoise and the hare, but the tortoise KNOWS how to read the road signs
and
> the hare is confused because "there's no pictures." Think it's a bad
> analogy, Bill? Try looking at the cash register keypad next time you go to
> McDonalds...the result of the very same mentality of underachievement NCI
> "actively made happen."

Heck even if you are not a seasoned CW op, it's often faster to snag that CW
DX contact. I'm far from a seasoned op since I don't get on the air as
often as I'd like but I've personally found that it takes less tries on CW
than voice even if both have massive pileups.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4197. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 00:35:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917203524.14296.00000884@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 77512

>If enough people say that conditions are too poor for SSB some people will
>be daft enough to beleive it.

Whats the difference most of these New people actually believe they are Real
hams anyway

4198. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 00:41:09 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkauv5$m1n$0@208.207.71.151>
Source record: 77513

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" wrote:

> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309131147.2090071e@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>
> > > Perhaps because the other poster didn't make a lot of assinine
> > > assertions that are not substantiated by facts, Brain.
> >
> > The ARS has improved since 1984. That's plain for everyone to see.
>
> Then where does all this "Ham Radio Is Going To Hell" traffic
> come from, Brain? Mostly from trolls, you and Lennie.
>
> > > You may refer to "fact" in Websters to find out what they are,
> > > Brain...You DO seem to have a problem with the concept.
> >
> > Not at all. As Ronald Reagan said, "Facts are stupid things."
>
> I'd expect notning less from you, Brain...You're nothing if not
> consistent.
>
> Thanks.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

In fact, a lot of his "facts" are indeed of that very description!

4199. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 00:44:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkav69$m1n$1@208.207.71.151>
Source record: 77514

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dave Heil wrote:
> > Alun Palmer wrote:
> >
> >>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> >>news:UI0ab.27109$Aq2.20546@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net:
> >>
> >>
> >>>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >>>news:20030916232714.23307.00003051@mb-m29.aol.com...
> >>>
> >>>>In article <Xns93F7E7865C43Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> >>>><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>EI is the 7th country to abolish code testing by my reckoning
> >>>>
> >>>>Ireland: Beautiful country, lovely people, but the same dumbed-down
> >>>>hams! Not to worry, I'm sure us Yanks won't be far behind!
> >>>>73 de Larry, K3LT
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Newsflash! - Singapore has abolished the code test. Now there are eight.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> Wow! That's quite a policy statement from a country with a little more
> >>> than 120 radio amateurs and it comes hot on the heels of the big move by
> >>> Ireland with its slightly more than 1,500 hams.
> >
> > Singapore probably canes you for rules infracttion. Or using bad grammer
> > oon the air.
> >

And a genuine flogging for spitting your gum in the street!

4200. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 00:53:34 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkavme$n1j$0@208.207.71.151>
Source record: 77515

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Bert Craig wrote:
> > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:ZdQ9b.26166$NM1.16564@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> >>"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> >>news:_Wu9b.222$BS1.80870@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> >>
> >>>>Wonderfl, then you'll learn code if you want to participate there.
> >>>>If not, nothing lost.
> >>>
> >>>Nice concept on paper, but in the real world...
> >>
> >>In the real world what?
> >
> >
> > In the real world, many of AR's newbies won't even bother to try CW because
> > it takes too much effort to attain a usable level of proficiency. Studying
> > for and passing the 5-wpm test gives one a very basic level of knowledge
> > (NOT proficiency) and enables him/her to make an *educated* decision as to
> > whether or not s/he wants to pursue CE any further.
> >
> >
> >>>Quite frankly, what example
> >>>has NCI given to the prospective ham? It sure doesn't exemplify the
> >>
> > values
> >
> >>>of a "self-starter."
> >>
> >>Actually, those of us at the core of NCI are "self-starters" as
> >>we didn't sit around and wait for anything...we actively helped
> >>"make it happen."
> >
> >
> > Ushering in underachievment is notheing to be proud of, Bill.
> >
> >
> >>>>More to the point, is there any minimum code
> >>>>speed that should be banned from the CW/data segments at the
> >>>>bottom of the bands?
> >>>
> >>>Couldn't care how slow...as long as said CW/Data sub-bands remain

> >>
> > intact.
> >
> >>Last I checked, there were no such subbands as CW was allowed
> >>everywhere except for some portion of 220MHz
> >>
> >>Cheers,
> >>Bill K2UNK
> >
> >
> > I did write CW/Data, right? HOWEVER, I don't expect to encounter many NCTA's
> > on the bottom of 40 or anyplace on 30.
> >
> > Just watch the unequal ground between the two when a seasoned CW op outpaces
> > his phone op counterpart in a sprint for certain rare DX contacts. Heck,
> > I've read that some of them only work CW. Liken it to the race between the
> > tortoise and the hare, but the tortoise KNOWS how to read the road signs and
> > the hare is confused because "there's no pictures." Think it's a bad
> > analogy, Bill? Try looking at the cash register keypad next time you go to
> > McDonalds...the result of the very same mentality of underachievement NCI
> > "actively made happen."
> >
> > Cheers to you, Bill.
>
> Bill and Carl may one day be held in the same esteem as Dick Bash!

I'd vote for that!

Hey I'd imagine they consider themselves as soulmates to him.

4201. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 00:55:37 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmi0lh8uvggv6d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77516

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bkas0r$fr7$0@208.207.71.162...
>
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > Do you really think the FCC has or will have a change of opinion...
> > > especially in light of the entire international community endorsing
> > > the end of mandatory code testing as an ITU requirement?
> >
> > Well, I wouldn't condider it a lock. The FCC was recently
spanked by
> > both the Supremes and the Senate. They may be reluctant to send anything
> > new along for a while.
> >
> > In addition, the US has shown a reluctance to go along with what the
> > rest of the world is thinking.
> >

actually, only the executive (presidential) branch has shown real resistance
to world pressures. MANY other levels of government, including special
interest groups, work to have the country damn near lay down and let
the world use us as a doormat.... such as Earth First! pushing to have
tighter environmental restrictions placed on american industry, as per
the request of the united nations which WE fund about a FOURTH of
it's treasury.

> > Finally, we haven't ratified all that many treaties lately have we?

this wouldn't exactly be a "treaty"... all the nations that are chosing to
drop CW testing haven't done so in a huge gathering with a document
with signatures on it, all in agreement.... they are doing it individually
on a case-by-case basis.

> >
> > So while it might happen, I'm not going to do any betting on it.
>

that's what a lot of people said to the proposition that higher speed CW
testing being dropped... but it did. It's gone, and will not ever return, to
the
chagrin of many.

> Then when the retired head of the Amateur and Citizen's Division of the
FCC
> states in his comments to the NCVAEC petition, the writing of which he was
a
> party, that it simply is an oxymoron that an Extra Class ham should
> be allowed to *not* be proficient in Morse when he is considered an expert
at
> ham radio, you might take that as some sort of a clue to thinking in high
> places...
>

the definition of oxymoron is a statement or word that contridicts itself.
it is only
an OPINION but not a FACT that an extra class ham includes within itself the
requirement to be proficient in morse code.

the law is what counts, and currently the only proficiency required is 5wpm
(for any
class for that matter)... and soon, that will be dropped. Then, by law, just
not
to YOUR liking, will be that an extra class ham will not have to show
profeciency
in archaic, outdated communication modes.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4202. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 00:58:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkavv6$n1j$1@208.207.71.151>
Source record: 77517

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:

> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> news:vmc18c6qdpseff@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > > >
> > > I guess it's too bad that there aren't that many coal fired steam
> > > locomotives
> > > being used anymore.
> > >
> > On the othe hand, there IS very MUCH Morse code being used on ham radio!
> > >
> and a LOT more FM, ssb, AM, packet, etc too.
> >
> > Clint
> > KB5ZHT
>
> Packet has almost disappeared. There is far less packet than voice or
> Morse.

Packet never was very much viable on HF due to lack of noise immunity.
. The "store and forward" folks ruined it on VHF many years ago, tho when I
finally abandoned it in disgust I never did go back to check, so I don't know
what's there now.

4203. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 01:01:45 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Zt7ab.28288$Aq2.14535@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77518

"Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:Xns93F9BFD1EB5B9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
> news:3F68DD97.6E3D3730@earthlink.net:
>
> > Alun Palmer wrote:
> >>
> >> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> >> news:UI0ab.27109$Aq2.20546@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net:
> >>
> >> >
> >> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >> > news:20030916232714.23307.00003051@mb-m29.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <Xns93F7E7865C43Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> >> >> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >EI is the 7th country to abolish code testing by my reckoning
> >> >>
> >> >> Ireland: Beautiful country, lovely people, but the same dumbed-down
> >> >> hams! Not to worry, I'm sure us Yanks won't be far behind!
> >> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >> >
> >> Newsflash! - Singapore has abolished the code test. Now there are
> eight.
> >
> > Wow! That's quite a policy statement from a country with a little more
> > than 120 radio amateurs and it comes hot on the heels of the big move by
> > Ireland with its slightly more than 1,500 hams.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
> >
>
> I just did a quick recount, and 9V is the 9th country, not the 8th. They
> are Switzerland, the UK, Belgium, Germany, Austria, the Netherlands,
> Norway, Ireland and Singapore.
>
> The funny thing is the only no-coder I have yet heard on HF was PE1RMZ. I
> know that this is a Dutch no-code call from the time I worked PE1DUP
> through a UK repeater. It takes time to get on HF I suppose. I was
> surprised that no-one appeared to have been ready in advance.
>
> You can try to pretend that 9V and EI don't matter, but look at the bigger
> picture. You know where this will all end, and a d*mn good thing it is
> too. If it wasn't for the bl**dy code test I would have been licenced and

> on HF at 14.

I was licensed at 14 for HF. Why couldn't you do it? You handicaped? Or just lazy?

Yeah buddy I sure would wait around for decades, feeling sorry for myself, and joining NCI......sheesh.

4204. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 01:01:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkb05v$n1j$2@208.207.71.151>
Source record: 77519

Clint wrote:

> > Has anyone come up with that WOW argument that will justify
> > the need for morse testing? So far, nothing new has been
> > offered by PCTAs at all.
> >
> > Cheers,
> > Bill K2UNK
> >
> >
> >
>
> well, no..... all the arguments being given to keep the code testing
> are easily broken down into thier base, most center-core reason...
>
> "I HAD TO DO IT, SO THEY SHOULD HAVE TO!!!!!"
>
> And that just falls flat on its face.

Clint yoiu'e been reading way too much NCI propaganda for far too long.
So long in fact that YOU have fell flat on your face, or maybe the other
end.
I am capable of passing any sort of radio traffic by way of
radiotelgraphy, which I learned as a requirement of my licensure as a
ham radio operator. There is no reason for you to be exempted from the
same.

4205. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 01:05:37 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmi186fb2m5a66@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77520

> > You must have been upset too when states eliminated mandatory
> > testing on manual gearbox autos and allowed testing to be done
> > using any car.
>
> Not me, just the folks filing their insurance claims and/or licking their
> wounds after someone who didn't know how to negotiate the clutch AND the
> brake pedal simultaneously rear-ended them at a red light.

...and, just as in CW... if people get on a cw band without learning cw, they
will have a hard time navigating around and knowing what's going on. Those who don't want to, though, won't have any problem.... just as only those who tried to use a manual transmission but were only tested for an automatic had problems. Stick with what you learned.

There was no reason to force anybody to learn how to drive a standard if they were going to drive an automatic.

Again I repeat; i'd have no problem with requiring a cw test if you wanted to
use cw on the cw portion of the band. But, that's out of the question, isn't it?
we're going to stay in the past and not keep up with progress and force even people who will forever plan to use automatic transmissions to learn how to run a standard.

Clint
KB5ZHT, living in reality and modern times.

4206. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 01:29:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkb1qi$rj4$0@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 77521

Clint wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bkas0r$fr7$0@208.207.71.162...
> >
> >
> > Mike Coslo wrote:
> >
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > > Do you really think the FCC has or will have a change of opinion...
> > > > especially in light of the entire international community endorsing
> > > > the end of mandatory code testing as an ITU requirement?
> > >
> > > Well, I wouldn't condider it a lock. The FCC was recently
> spanked by
> > > both the Supremes and the Senate. They may be reluctant to send anything
> > > new along for a while.
> > >
> > > In addition, the US has shown a reluctance to go along with what the
> > > rest of the world is thinking.
> > >
>
> actually, only the executive (presidential) branch has shown real resistance
> to world pressures. MANY other levels of government, including special
> interest groups, work to have the country damn near lay down and let
> the world use us as a doormat.... such as Earth First! pushing to have
> tighter environmental restrictions placed on american industry, as per
> the request of the united nations which WE fund about a FOURTH of
> it's treasury.
>
> > > Finally, we haven't ratified all that many treaties lately have we?
>
> this wouldn't exactly be a "treaty"... all the nations that are chosing to
> drop CW testing haven't done so in a huge gathering with a document
> with signatures on it, all in agreement.... they are doing it individually
> on a case-by-case basis.
>
> > >
> > > So while it might happen, I'm not going to do any betting on it.
> >
>
> that's what a lot of people said to the proposition that higher speed CW
> testing being dropped... but it did. It's gone, and will not ever return, to

> the
> chagrin of many.
>
> > Then when the retired head of the Amateur and Citizen's Division of the
> FCC
> > states in his comments to the NCVAEC petition, the writing of which he was
> a
> > party, that it simply is an oxymoron that an Extra Class ham should
> > be allowed to *not* be proficient in Morse when he is considered an expert
> at
> > ham radio, you might take that as some sort of a clue to thinking in high
> > places...
> >
>
> the definition of oxymoron is a statement or word that contridicts itself.
> it is only
> an OPINION but not a FACT that an extra class ham includes within itself the
> requirement to be proficient in morse code.
>

Nope, it's a fact. Whether or not the code requirement is kept may be an
opinion. But skills and knowledge are facts, not opinions.

>
> the law is what counts, and currently the only proficiency required is 5wpm
> (for any
> class for that matter)... and soon, that will be dropped.

And may I say, *that* is YOUR opinion.

> Then, by law, just
> not
> to YOUR liking, will be that an extra class ham will not have to show
> profeciency
> in archaic, outdated communication modes.

Well you can keep a close watch on developments and keep your fingers
crossed... but whether or not the code test requirement is dropped, it's still
your opinion. Nothing more.
My "l;iking" has nothing to do with it, Clint, just as yours similarly does
not.. If a ham doesn't know Morse code, and can't operat it on the air, there's
no simply way he can be considered a fully qualified ham, and certainly not an
expert. The Extra class is named as the Expert clase of radio amateur.
So that's just how it is. Has nothing whatever to do with either your or my
opinion.

4207. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 01:44:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030917214427.15462.00003015@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 77522

In article <xnfcneeyarg.hlc35o1.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>, "Phil Kane"
<Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> writes:

>On 16 Sep 2003 00:19:14 GMT, N2EY wrote:
>
>>The old code test worked like this:
>
> A rather accurate description of how license tests should be
> run.....

Thanks!
>
>>You were allowed to bring a mill for receiving and speed key for sending,
>>but you'd better be well-prepared if you showed up with same.
>
> No mill was allowed for amateur tests - all copy was by hand.

I'll take your word for it, Phil. Were mills permitted if a person was
disabled? Perhaps that's the source of the stories I heard.

> A
> mill was allowed only for the First RadioTelegraph (Commercial) 25
> WPM plain language test - not even for the 20 WPM code group test.

Yet oddly enough, the US Navy was very big on copy by typewriter.
>
> Speed keys or later on electronic keyers were allowed only if they
> could be hooked up to the straight key terminals (with about 67 V
> "B+" on them).

And be sure the thing is battery powered or bring an extension cord.

> Only once in all the years did I see anyone with a
> bug who used that special "spring" for connection to the body of a
> J-38 type straight key.

The term is "wedge".

Most of us just used the straight key.

> I sadly do not expect the FCC to get back into the exam business,
> but there is nothing stopping them for requiring the VEC/VEs to run
> the tests like they used to be run.
>
> All it takes is commitment.
>
And some rules changes.

Didja know that the FISTS petition to the FCC calls for an end to "instant" retests? It proposes that if an element is failed, the person cannot be retested on that element until the next day.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4208. Re: The Chosen

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 01:55:16 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0309171755.2fcbadb0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77523
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309121525.54ca30fd@posting.google.com>...
> "K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<9b590f5e564adc3cc2ce5ff0ead6e71b.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>...
> > The Wise Ones live in the depths of the D, E, and F-Layers, and in the
> > servers at Google.com. They are the descendants of the Gods. I
> > personally subscribe to the theory they are the children of Thor
> > Heyerdahl, the Viking god of Thunder and Balsawood Raft Dxpeditions. But
> > that's another story.
>
> snip
>
> I liked the story of "Little Billy Beeper" better.

(Apologies to Kurt Vonnegut)

To all external appearances, Farnsworth Corners, U.S.A., is bright, cheerful, and happy. However, in dark corners of the city lurk Godless Nocoders who seek to undermine the moral fabric of our mighty Nation.

In a dirty basement apartment, an underfed, seedy-looking old man wearing small, round spectacles and threadbare clothes, types furiously at a musty desk illumined only by a single, naked bulb. As the pages fly through his typewriter, an evil plan gradually emerges: a treacherous treatise which threatens the well-being of the upright citizens of Farnsworth Corners. The work is completed, and the old man leans back thoughtfully and smiles as he rubs the three-day stubble on his chin. The time has come for the Hammer of Maia to strike!

Some weeks later, in another part of town, little Billy Beeper walks home from school. Suddenly he hears a voice right next to his ear.

"Psst! Hey, kid! Would you like to try my 2M HT? It's free!"

Billy's eyes open wide as he faces the stranger. An embroidered patch on the mans soiled jumpsuit reads "Codefree Charlie". "Gosh, no! Nancy told me never to touch a radio which didn't beep!"

"Aw, c'mon!" says the old man. "I only wanna be friends with you!"

"Well, I don't know," replies Billy. "I was told that FM was bad for you!"

"That's just what the grown-ups say to scare you!" says the drooling man.

"The truth is that they don't want you to try it 'cause it'll make you grow up faster and be able to smoke cigarettes and drink liquor just like them!"

Billy is hesitant, but suddenly a tall form looms before them and grabs the ruffian by the collar.

"Golly!" exclaims Billy. "It's Captain Code!"

Yes, Readers, it's Captain Code: faster than a Vibroplex Blue Racer, more powerful than an Alpha three-holer, able to leap tall pileups in a single bound.

"You should be ashamed of yourself, old man," says Captain Code to the hoodlum. "There are far better ways to earn money than to hoodwink innocent children into a life of codelessness. It's to the FCC for you!

"And as for you, young friend, take my advice and stay away from strangers, and believe nothing that they say. It's tragic, but until Godless Nocodism is abolished from the world, there will always be those who would like nothing better than to hurt you ."

"Gee, thanks, Captain Code!" says Billy. "I promise that I'll always listen to Mom and Dad, and I'll keep away from strangers with shacks on their belt!"

4209. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 02:22:22 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0309171822.2ea6ed3f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77524

"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote

>
> If you are a retarded mouth breeding NCI member, then never mind, it's a Ham
> Radio thing. You would not understand.
>

Hey, gutless anonymous twit, I have several "First Place ARRL CW Sweepstakes" certificates with my name on them, I don't breed with my mouth, and I'm a member of NCI.

Damn, doncha just hate it when somebody spoils your troll?

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB
--
SOC # 291
FISTS # 7419
NCI # 4304

4210. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 02:25:47 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309171825.66cd7b1f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77525

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030915201914.08626.00000605@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <3F65FEFA.8030107@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

> The examiner gave you a yellow lined legal pad and a #2 pencil. You put your
> name at the top of the copy sheet and got ready. You put on a pair of 'phones
> and when everyone at that test table was ready, the test was started. The test
> was 5 minutes of plain-language code at the required speed (13 or 20 wpm - back
> then only volunteer examiners gave 5 wpm tests)

Depends on which "back when". My 5, 13 and 20 wpm code tests were all
administered by FCC Examiners. And I took all of 'em one-on-one with
the Examiners, never as a member of a group taking the same test.

> You were allowed to bring a mill for receiving and speed key for sending, but
> you'd better be well-prepared if you showed up with same.

?? I don't recall using a typewriter being an option. Would have been
a lousy idea. I did use a bug to send 20 wpm. For maybe three seconds
before the Examiner waved it off. I shouldn't have bothered lugging
the bug to the exam.

> You had to get a certain number of questions right (74%, as I recall) on the
> written to pass. Miss by even one question less than the required and you had
> to go home and study for at least a month before retesting - both sending and
> receiving code, and the written. No do-overs, no credit for tests already
> passed. All or nothing at all.

Yup, yup . . . no slack. At all.

> $9 doesn't sound like much but back in those days it was a lot of money for a
> high school kid. I think minimum wage back then was $1.20 or so, which meant
> the test was a days' pay BEFORE taxes for a minimum wage person. And a kid
> would have been glad to get minimum. I estimate that the equivalent today would
> be $50-60.

Conversly I have yet to pay a dime for anything the FCC has ever done
WRT to any of my ham licenses. Not for any of the three tests and not
for the 1x2. "Life is all in the timing . . ".

> So I went home and taught myself to block print. (Printing was not a parochial
> school subject - only "publics" were allowed to print. Something about being
> bold, brazen articles was involved). Next try, later that summer, I had no
> problem.

Heh. Conversly again when I got yanked outta Quaker elemenatary school
and dumped into the public schools right off I landed in "remedial

penmanship" 'cause I had no idea how to write longhand, everything I wrote was in block style. The code tests were no sweat, all block caps but I flunked remedial penmanship and they finally gave up on me. I'd still flunk a course longhand writing. So would every other half-decent drawing board jockey I've known.

>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

4211. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 02:29:19 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkb59v$69b@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 77526

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F68AEE0.6060102@psu.edu...
>
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > Well, DICK, make that dick, matching is the name of the game with nearly
any
> > "wire" type antenna, so you must be too dumbed down to pick up on that
> > concept. It doesn't matter the matching, it was said first there was no
> > such thing as a 1/4 wave antenna. Then, when proof positive was given,
the
> > *cough* superior hams (such as you in your mind) said "it would never
work."
> > Then, when proof positive was given, all that's being done now is
sneering.
> >
> > So, superior ham(s) et al, try again....
>
>
> This is a strange one to argue about. And I make no claims of superiority.
>
> That there can be a 1/n antenna that consists of 2 equal sections is not
> the argument, or at least it shouldn't be.
>
> This type of antenna can be any fraction, even 25/32's (the fraction of
> a quart in a Fosters lager "oil can") How they will perform is another
> matter.
>
> On a ARS test, the likelyhood of the question "design a 1/4 wave dipole
> would no more likely come up than my 25/32 wave dipole. they will want
> you to design an antenna that has a particular impedence at the desired
> frequency. What is the impedence of a 1/4 wave dipole?
>
> My antenna is 96 feet total length, cut as a general purpose dipole. I
> use a tuner and ladder line to match impedence with my transmitter. But
> I would never name it a 1/n dipole.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

You can name it (or not) anything you like. I have an Alpha-Delta DXCC and
it can be used as a 1/4 (or "shortened as they say) wave dipole on 80M. It
works great and was the antenna I used at this time of year when MARS freqs
are beginning to get real noisy. Go to a longwire, go to the sloper, go to

the A-99 and the noise floor was just enough to make everyone noncopyable.

Go to the AD and everything cleared up. No one ever had a bad thing to say about signal, so I go by the non-reports.

The point, in this debate--once again--is that there are people saying there's no such thing, it'd never work, etc., etc. There are people here saying not only that there is such a thing but that there are websites with technical discussions on the 1/4 wave dipole (for all kinds of bands) and there are people here using them and telling the results. But, the ones who are using them and have results with them, and who have provided the websites with technical discussions are getting told--once again--that they are dumbed down.

Sayin' it don't make it so. And, since that is the mentality that often develops with any kind of attempt at anything remotely "real" ham radio, then that is why we "dumbed down" hams don't even regard this newsgroup as a place to try such conversation.

Kim W5TIT

4212. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 02:32:18 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309171832.1a2c0fad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77527

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93F9BFD1EB5B9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
> news:3F68DD97.6E3D3730@earthlink.net:
>
> > Alun Palmer wrote:
> >>
> >> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> >> news:UI0ab.27109$Aq2.20546@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net:
> >>
> >> >
> >> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >> > news:20030916232714.23307.00003051@mb-m29.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <Xns93F7E7865C43Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> >> >> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >EI is the 7th country to abolish code testing by my reckoning
> >> >>
> >> >> Ireland: Beautiful country, lovely people, but the same dumbed-down
> >> >> hams! Not to worry, I'm sure us Yanks won't be far behind!
> >> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >> Newsflash! - Singapore has abolished the code test. Now there are
> > eight.
> > >
> > > Wow! That's quite a policy statement from a country with a little more
> > > than 120 radio amateurs and it comes hot on the heels of the big move by
> > > Ireland with its slightly more than 1,500 hams.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
>
> I just did a quick recount, and 9V is the 9th country, not the 8th. They
> are Switzerland, the UK, Belgium, Germany, Austria, the Netherlands,
> Norway, Ireland and Singapore.
>
> The funny thing is the only no-coder I have yet heard on HF was PE1RMZ. I
> know that this is a Dutch no-code call from the time I worked PE1DUP
> through a UK repeater. It takes time to get on HF I suppose. I was
> surprised that no-one appeared to have been ready in advance.
>
> You can try to pretend that 9V and EI don't matter, but look at the bigger
> picture. You know where this will all end, and a d*mn good thing it is
> too. If it wasn't for the bl**dy code test I would have been licenced and

> on HF at 14.

How do you reconcile your "plight" with the fact that many youngters under 14 have passed 20 wpm code tests?

w3rv

4213. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 02:50:36 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <049ab.33241$NM1.11664@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77528

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030917183910.15923.00000766@mb-m12.aol.com...
> In article <vmfbbn3qpdl2f8@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
> <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>
> >hmmm..
> >a little sour over your precious CW testing being
> >discontinued, world-wide?
>
> Not "sour" at all.
>
> But 8 countries (so far) is hardly "world wide".

For what its worth...here's the IARU policy direction:

NEWS RELEASE
International Amateur Radio Union
P.O. Box 310905
Newington, CT 06131-0905 USA
FAX: +1 860 594 0259
E-Mail: iaru@iaru.org
12 September 2003

For immediate release

IARU Council Addresses Strategic Issues
The Administrative Council of the International Amateur Radio Union (IARU) held
its annual meeting on 6-8 September 2003 in Amsterdam. The meeting was to be held in Taipei in conjunction with the IARU Region 3 Conference but was moved to
Amsterdam when the Region 3 Conference had to be postponed to next year as a result of travel restrictions arising from concerns about SARS. The Council took
the following actions:

1. Four hours of the meeting were devoted to a strategic planning session with a
planning horizon of the year 2010. Several key issues that are likely to influence the future of the IARU were identified. A report is to be drafted and
circulated for further consideration by the Council early in 2004.

2. The results of the 2003 World Radiocommunication Conference concerning the
amateur and amateur-satellite services were reviewed in detail. The Council

congratulated and thanked all individuals and organizations who contributed to
the satisfactory outcome. IARU member-societies were urged to bring to the
attention of their administrations the desirability of adopting specific changes
in their domestic regulations for the amateur and amateur-satellite services, so
that they will be consistent with the revised Article 25 of the international
Radio Regulations.

3. The Council revised an existing Resolution concerning the Morse code in the
light of the WRC-03 decision to leave to each administration the question of
whether or not to require a demonstration of Morse skill to operate below 30
MHz. Under the revised Resolution, IARU policy is to support the removal of
Morse code testing requirements.

(SNIP)

Attending the Amsterdam meeting were IARU President Larry Price, W4RA; Vice
President David Wardlaw, VK3ADW; Secretary David Sumner, K1ZZ; regional
representatives Ole Garpestad, LA2RR, Don Beattie, G3BJ, Hans Blondeel
Timmerman, PB2T, Pedro Seidemann, YV5BPG, Rod Stafford, W6ROD, Tim Ellam,
VE6SH,
Fred Johnson, ZL2AMJ, K. C. Selvadurai, 9V1UV, and Yoshiji Sekido, JJ1OEY;
and
recording secretary Paul Rinaldo, W4RI.

4214. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 02:53:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Z69ab.33273$NM1.1752@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77529

Additionally:

IARU Says "Remove Code", Excerpted from ARRL Letter

"The focus was on the future when the International Amateur Radio Union Administrative Council met September 6-7 in Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

In the aftermath of WRC-03, the council urged IARU member-societies to call to the attention of their administrations "the desirability of adopting specific changes in their domestic regulations for the amateur and amateur-satellite services, so that they will be consistent with the revised Article 25 of the international Radio Regulations." In that vein, the IARU governing body called for the removal of Morse code as an examination requirement to operate on HF.
The council reiterated its stance first taken in 2001 that Morse code proficiency "as a qualifying criterion for an HF amateur license is no longer relevant to the healthy future of amateur Radio."

"IARU policy is to support the removal of Morse code testing as a requirement for an amateur license to operate on frequencies below 30 MHz," the IARU Administrative Council resolved. At the same time, the council's resolution recognized Morse code as "an effective and efficient mode of communication used by many thousands of radio amateurs." It also took into account ITU-Radiocommunication Sector (ITU-R) Recommendation M.1544, which sets down the minimum qualifications of radio amateurs.

4215. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 03:04:02 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Cg9ab.33344$NM1.2470@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77530

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F68CF1E.7050805@adelphia.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > Do you really think the FCC has or will have a change of opinion...
> > especially in light of the entire international community endorsing
> > the end of mandatory code testing as an ITU requirement?
>
> Well, I wouldn't condider it a lock. The FCC was recently spanked by
> both the Supremes and the Senate. They may be reluctant to send anything
> new along for a while.
> In addition, the US has shown a reluctance to go along with what the
> rest of the world is thinking.

The US already endorsed ending mandatory morse when we voted to
do so at the WRC confernece. Seems pretty self evident
to me.

> Finally, we haven't ratified all that many treaties lately have we?

We don't have to ratify the treaty at all. The OLD treaty is
dead and buried...there is, as of 7/5/03, no ITU mandated
morse requirement even if the USA never ratifies the new
treaty.

> So while it might happen, I'm not going to do any betting on it.

It will happen, the only thing at issue is the timing.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4216. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 03:04:03 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Dg9ab.33345$NM1.5820@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77531

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bkas0r$fr7$0@208.207.71.162...

> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > Do you really think the FCC has or will have a change of opinion...
> > > especially in light of the entire international community endorsing
> > > the end of mandatory code testing as an ITU requirement?
> >
> > Well, I wouldn't condider it a lock. The FCC was recently
spanked by
> > both the Supremes and the Senate. They may be reluctant to send anything
> > new along for a while.
> >
> > In addition, the US has shown a reluctance to go along with what the
> > rest of the world is thinking.
> >
> > Finally, we haven't ratified all that many treaties lately have we?
> >
> > So while it might happen, I'm not going to do any betting on it.
>
> Then when the retired head of the Amateur and Citizen's Division of the
FCC
> states in his comments to the NCVAEC petition, the writing of which he was
a
> party, that it simply is an oxymoron that an Extra Class ham should
> be allowed to *not* be proficient in Morse when he is considered an expert
at
> ham radio, you might take that as some sort of a clue to thinking in high
> places...

The guy's retired and no longer a member of any "high places".
See also the latest from IARU.

IARU Says "Remove Code", Excerpted from ARRL Letter

"The focus was on the future when the International Amateur Radio Union
Administrative Council met September 6-7 in Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

In the aftermath of WRC-03, the council urged IARU member-societies to call
to
the attention of their administrations "the desirability of adopting
specific
changes in their domestic regulations for the amateur and amateur-satellite

services, so that they will be consistent with the revised Article 25 of the international Radio Regulations." In that vein, the IARU governing body called
for the removal of Morse code as an examination requirement to operate on HF.
The council reiterated its stance first taken in 2001 that Morse code proficiency "as a qualifying criterion for an HF amateur license is no longer
relevant to the healthy future of amateur Radio."

"IARU policy is to support the removal of Morse code testing as a requirement
for an amateur license to operate on frequencies below 30 MHz," the IARU Administrative Council resolved. At the same time, the council's resolution recognized Morse code as "an effective and efficient mode of communication used
by many thousands of radio amateurs." It also took into account ITU-Radiocommunication Sector (ITU-R) Recommendation M.1544, which sets down the
minimum qualifications of radio amateurs.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4217. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 03:09:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Vl9ab.33402$NM1.7758@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77532

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bkb05v$n1j$2@208.207.71.151...
>
>
> Clint wrote:
>
> > > Has anyone come up with that WOW argument that will justify
> > > the need for morse testing? So far, nothing new has been
> > > offered by PCTAs at all.
> > > Bill K2UNK
> >
> > well, no..... all the arguments being given to keep the code testing
> > are easily broken down into thier base, most center-core reason...
> >
> > "I HAD TO DO IT, SO THEY SHOULD HAVE TO!!!!!"
> >
> > And that just falls flat on its face.
>
> Clint yoiu'e been reading way too much NCI propaganda for far too long.
> So long in fact that YOU have fell flat on your face, or maybe the other
> end.
> I am capable of passing any sort of radio traffic by way of
> radiotelgraphy, which I learned as a requirement of my licensure as a
> ham radio operator. There is no reason for you to be exempted from the
> same.

That argument/claim found no favor in the past. The reality is that
neither the FCC nor almost every emergency preparedness
organization/operation has no desire or need for morse in
their plans. Individual hams may make the claim, but they
aren't executing the claim in the vast universe of RACES, ARES
and other amateur emergency operations.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4218. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 03:12:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <Vo9ab.33438$NM1.13359@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77533

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030917202015.12501.00002474@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <v40ab.27073$Aq2.22984@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Do you really think the FCC has or will have a change of opinion...
>
> Maybe - maybe not. Right now there are several petitions under
consideration,
> and almost certainly more on the way. Lots of comments, etc., to be
considered.
> Everyone can have their say and then FCC will do whatever FCC wants, based
on
> whatever FCC thinks is the best thing to do.
>
> And no matter what FCC does, some folks will think it's the wrong thing.
But at
> least we can have our say.
>
> >especially in light of the entire international community endorsing
> >the end of mandatory code testing as an ITU requirement?
>
> "entire international community"? I think not! Just those few who get to
decide
> policy.

They are the only ones that count.

> For example, a poll of German hams found them overwhelmingly in favor of
> keeping code tests. Didn't matter.

As well it shouldn't since this isn't a matter determined by popular vote
only by already licensed hams.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4219. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 03:15:38 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ur9ab.33468$NM1.6621@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77534

```
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bkaq7k$bbc$0@208.207.71.162...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > news:P4_9b.23636$BS1.6747359@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > >
> > > "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:ZdQ9b.26166$NM1.16564@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > > >
> > > > "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> > > > news:_Wu9b.222$BS1.80870@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> > > > > > Wonderfl, then you'll learn code if you want to participate
there.
> > > > > > If not, nothing lost.
> > > > >
> > > > > Nice concept on paper, but in the real world...
> > > >
> > > > In the real world what?
> > >
> > > In the real world, many of AR's newbies won't even bother to try CW
> > because
> > > it takes too much effort to attain a usable level of proficiency.
> >
> > So what? Use of CW has never been any requirement.
>
> Ah, but it HAS. I can recall the time when you had to sign ertifying that
you
> had'made at least 2 CW contacts within the past six months to be eligible
to
> renew your license.

I only recall having to state one's continued knowledge, not
that any specific contact(s) were made using CW.

In any case, that was something like 40 years ago.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK
```

4220. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 03:19:53 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <tv9ab.33513$NM1.20950@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77535

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:kx6ab.25967$BS1.9003106@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:To0ab.27088$Aq2.17329@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > You must have been upset too when states eliminated mandatory
> > testing on manual gearbox autos and allowed testing to be done
> > using any car.
>
> Not me, just the folks filing their insurance claims and/or licking their
> wounds after someone who didn't know how to negotiate the clutch AND the
> brake pedal simultaneously rear-ended them at a red light.
> 73 de Bert
> WA2SI
>
> P.S. My first drivers license was "manual shift endorsed." <ggg>

How long ago was that. I was first licensed in NY state in 1958 and took
my test on an automatic and then taught myself in a short time
(30 minutes or so) to drive a stick.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4221. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 03:28:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkb8pg$8l8$0@208.206.142.108>
Source record: 77536

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "IARU policy is to support the removal of Morse code testing as a
> requirement
> for an amateur license to operate on frequencies below 30 MHz," the IARU
> Administrative Council resolved.

So read it Bill-- that means they support *an* amateur radio license allowing HF operation without code, NOT the removal of all code testing.

> At the same time, the council's resolution
> recognized Morse code as "an effective and efficient mode of communication
> used
> by many thousands of radio amateurs."

QED.

4222. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 03:42:14 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <qQ9ab.489916$Ho3.83693@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 77537
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote in
news:bka6au$9pk$1@freenet9.carleton.ca:

>>
> This is an old thread, and I already basically said as much. It's
> "too unspeakable" to mention how the Wouff Hong is used because the
> threat is better than the application.

It would still be an interesting sight to see. A bunch of disgruntled League members showing up at the next Board meeting with a bunch of wouff hongs in hand. Maybe they would finally understand they needed to listen to the members that elected them. To late to change things now though. Ham radio is on the down hill side and picking up speed. And that's a BIG ten-four good buddy breaker breaker. Got ur ears on?

KB7ADL on the side.

4223. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 03:43:16 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030917234316.12631.00001185@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 77539

In article <vmbdhfc0nr1n86@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
<rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:

>But they DO want to force CW on people that don't
>necissarily have any interest in operating it. "basics"
>arguments fail; "selftrained skill" fails because everything
>is a selftrained skill, why put the emphasis on an outdated
>mode instead of testing selftrained skills on new, modern
>modes of communication?

Clint:

Last time I looked, Amateur Radio was a strictly VOLUNTARY
activity. Nobody has ever been "forced" to do anything related to
the hobby/service known as Amateur Radio. If you want to have
privileges within the ARS, you meet the licensing requirements --
as a voluntary act. Only NCTA whiners who are too lazy and
indifferent to the true nature of the ARS to be bothered to learn
a useful communications skill like Morse/CW drag out the "I'm
being forced to learn Morse code" or "I'm having Morse code
shoved down my throat" arguments. This is truly pathetic.

The truth is that a lot of hams, myself included, never imagined
themselves becoming CW operators until they made the effort to
meet the licensing requirement to pass Morse code tests at
various speed levels for increased operator privileges. This is
the genius of the Morse code testing requirement -- it brings out
the best in interested, motivated, and incentive-driven people,
who, for the most part, become the best hams.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4224. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 03:43:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030917234317.12631.00001187@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 77538

In article <Xns93F9BFD1EB5B9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>You can try to pretend that 9V and EI don't matter, but look at the bigger >picture. You know where this will all end, and a d*mn good thing it is >too. If it wasn't for the bl**dy code test I would have been licenced and >on HF at 14.

Alun:

Me too. However, by the time I was 28, I realized I was just being too damn lazy, got off my duff, and learned the code! That was 22 years ago. What's your excuse?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4225. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 03:43:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030917234317.12631.00001186@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 77540

In article <vmhtfj9hjg5221@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
<rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:

>
>the PCTA crowd just said "six mega what ???"
>
>you screwed up and mentioned something modern
>and applicable in the real world.... they're trapped
>in 1952.

Clint:

In exactly what way is transmitting 6 megapixel color images using
CW "applicable in the real world?" I'm an avid CW operator, but I've
never heard of any way to do that using Morse code. However, since
you seem to think you're some sort of technical genius, I guess
you've got it figured out!

BTW -- if I'm "trapped in 1952" -- the year I was born, BTW, why isn't
a gallon of gasoline selling for 24 cents? Damn those time traps --
they're never around when you need them!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4226. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 03:51:59 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <zZ9ab.30060$Aq2.10739@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77541

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bkb8pg$8l8$0@208.206.142.108...
>
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "IARU policy is to support the removal of Morse code testing as a
> > requirement
> > for an amateur license to operate on frequencies below 30 MHz," the IARU
> > Administrative Council resolved.
>
> So read it Bill-- that means they support *an* amateur radio license
allowing HF
> operation without code, NOT the removal of all code testing.

If that's what you think it sez...dream on.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4227. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 03:54:10 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309171954.184a1dc0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77542

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3F68C810.4050904@adelphia.net>...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > Newp, sorry. A 40M 1/4-wave dipole can be made to resonate just fine and
> > work wonderfully. Its position to the ground and center angle have
> > everything to do with how well it will radiate. And, using a balun or not
> > doesn't change the whole concept of using a 1/4-wave dipole at any
> > frequency.
> >
> > Whether you want them to or not, they work.
>
> A couple points here Kim.
>
> According to the ARRL handbook 2003 edition, chapte 20 page 4:
>
> A fundamental form of antenna is a wire whose length is half the
> transmitting wavelength. It is the unit from which many more complex
> forms of antennas are constructed and is known as a dipole antenna.
>
> It goes on from there if you want more.
>
> Next I modeled two antennas in EZNEC.
>
> One is a half wave dipole for the middle of the 40 meter band at 7.150
> mHz. Each leg of the antenna is approximately 1/4 wavelength long at
> 65.45 feet. This antenna models out at an SWR of a little over 1.5:1 at
> the center frequency, and 2:1 at 7.3 mHz and a touch over 2 mHz at 7 mHz
> with the antenna at 50 feet, the take off angle is 35 degrees. All in
> all, not too bad an antenna. Most modern rigs will handle the antenna
> without a tuner, or simply with their internal tuner.
>
> Next, I modeled a quarter wave dipole for the same frequency and all
> other paramaters. With the legs at 32.7 feet, the antenna now displays
> somewhat near infinite SWR. The take off angle has now risen to 54 degrees.

Don't confuse her with Novice physics Mike, she's never had physics
and doesn't know a NEC deck from a sun deck.

> That antenna is simply not going to work well at all.

Will work like a Cantenna works.

> - Mike KB3EIA -

4228. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 04:13:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918001321.08239.00001428@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 77543

>The point, in this debate--once again--is that there are people saying
>there's no such thing, it'd never work, etc., etc. There are people here
>saying not only that there is such a thing but that there are websites with
>technical discussions on the 1/4 wave dipole (for all kinds of bands) and
>there are people here using them and telling the results. But, the ones who
>are using them and have results with them, and who have provided the
>websites with technical discussions are getting told--once again--that they
>are dumbed down.
>
>Sayin' it don't make it so. And, since that is the mentality that often
>develops with any kind of attempt at anything remotely "real" ham radio,
>then that is why we "dumbed down" hams don't even regard this newsgroup as a
>place to try such conversation.
>
>Kim W5TIT

I agree with TIT, all No-Codes should start using 1/4 Wave dipoles ASAP. I think that should put a halt to worrying about the No-Coders getting on HF. Tell you what, this one time, and one time only, I will be a nice guy to No-Coders, and provide the length of a 1/4 Wave dipole for any Freq they choose, as long as they promise to use it .

4229. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 04:14:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918001450.08239.00001429@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 77544

>Will work like a Cantenna works.
>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike stop telling them that, let them use 1/4 Wave Dipoles all the time.

4230. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 04:16:22 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkbbig$re77i$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77545

"Clint" wrote in part ...

you are mad simply because something that you had to do that was very
difficult has been removed for the most part, and may be totally removed
finally due to it's archaic irrelavence.

Very difficult? Oh please. I passed all three tests (5, 13, 20) with 10 of
10 right on the written and solid copy for each. Passed all five writtens
first time out every time. Hmmmm ... I guess it must be you. As to CW
being archaic, well let's have your expert thoughts on those outdated and
archaic modes known as Single Side Band, Amplified Modulation, and RTTY.
I've noticed that the written exams still include material on each of them.
Surely you would be in favor of eliminating that irrelevant nonsense as
well, right?

Arnie -
KT4ST

4231. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 04:26:35 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkbc5l$r1rff$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77546

"Clint" wrote in part ...

KB5ZHT, living in reality and modern times.

Now that's just too funny.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4232. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 04:31:29 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkbcf1ibd0@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 77547

Bill Sohl wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bkb8pg$8l8$0@208.206.142.108...
> >
> >
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > "IARU policy is to support the removal of Morse code testing as a
> > > requirement
> > > for an amateur license to operate on frequencies below 30 MHz," the IARU
> > > Administrative Council resolved.
> >
> > So read it Bill-- that means they support *an* amateur radio license
> allowing HF
> > operation without code, NOT the removal of all code testing.
>
> If that's what you think it sez...dream on.

It sez what it sez, Bill. And that's what it sez!

4233. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 04:35:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkbcmaibd1@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 77548

WA8ULX wrote:

> >Will work like a Cantenna works.
> >
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Mike stop telling them that, let them use 1/4 Wave Dipoles all the time.

Problem is,. they just THINK they're using 1/4 wave dipoles. Why don't some
o youse guys fix them up with what they think they've gpt?

4234. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 04:38:51 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309172038.d92c8bd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77549

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<dz5ab.6206$nQ.2134554@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> news:bk4b77$p383g$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > Just wanted to know why 13 was some type of magic number.
> >
> > Thanks,
> >
> > --
> > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> > .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> >
>
> Also there is some evidence that once one has reached the 13wpm level, they
> will not forget it even if they don't use. They might grow rusty and become
> slow. But it stays in the brain, ready to be called upon. See the book
> "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy," which is available for free
> downloading from the internet. The author deliberately chose to make this
> available to the public for free so that there is no copyright infringement
> involved.

I'm living proof of validity of the "use it or lose it" theory. I
spent a couple decades+ running CW >13 wpm then I put ham radio aside
for the following couple decades. When I decided to jump back in I was
absolutely convinced that I'd have to relearn CW, or at least I'd have
to work at regaining the speed I had when I dropped out. Was *not* the
case. I could still copy 30 wpm in my head like I'd never left the
bands. Amazed me. But I guess once the neurons are firmly welded
together they don't come apart for life. I think I lost some of my
ability to get it down solid on paper at speed and I'm working on
that.

However I do not agree with a hypothesis that simply cramming for then
passing a 13 or even a 20wpm code test assures a lifetime ability to
copy Morse at any usable speed. I've seen too many examples of "cram &
pass" types who never actually used the stuff on the air to any extent
all but completely forget how to copy Morse. Apparently there is some
combination of both a speed and a number of hours of experience at
that speed which embeds Morse for life.

> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

w3rv

4235. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 04:40:18 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkbcvikdv0@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 77550

Arnie Macy wrote:

> "Clint" wrote in part ...
>
> KB5ZHT, living in reality and modern times.
> --
>
> Now that's just too funny.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST

Naw, Arnie, reality TV is thoroughly modern!

4236. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 04:40:51 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkbd0c$rh5u5$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77601

"Bill Sohl" wrote in part ...

So far the UK, Netherlands and several other countries have done exactly that. Once all code testing is ended by the FCC will you accept that action as supporting the FCC position that morse isn't needed to be a "fully qualified ham?" Additionally, I don't recall anywhere seeing any FCC reference to the concept of a "fully qualified ham". Is that a new license class?

I believe that a person who aspires to be an Amateur Extra Class *should* be able to send/receive Morse Code at a minmum level. You and I both know that even if testing for CW goes away, the mode will remain a very popular one in the ARS for a very long time. To me, at least, it just makes sense that a person holding the highest class of license should have a working (practical) knowledge of the second most popular mode we have.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4237. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 04:46:16 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkbdai$q5n0b$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77602

"Clint" wrote in part ...

Yet another voice of reason. And there are more of them out there on this side of the argument than the PCTA's.

Unfortunately, Clint you are not one of them. I find the vast majority of your arguments to be without merit whatever.

4238. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 04:51:56 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkbdl6$rel8p$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77603

"Clint" wrote in part ...

I remember on the local VHF frequencies once I got in an argument on the air about (guess what???) cw testing... and the fellow I was arguing with (oviously several years my elder) tried to belittle and detract from the factual approach of my argument by referring to me as "young man".... you know, "let me tell you what, YOUNG MAN, ... etc etc..."

so I had the PERFECT come back. I told him "okay, we'll end the debate right here; you are judging the accuracy of the debate and, thus, who wins, solely on who's older, not who's more correct. I'll go find my friend [not included here for discreetness], who just celebrated his 82'nd birthday; i'll let him talk on my behalf and just feed him the lines to say, and since he's OLDER than YOU, that means i'm automatically right, even if he, vicariously through me, claims the moon is made out of green cheese, right?" as I recall, not too much was said after that. it's so easy.

Gee, Clint -- I'm impressed. You sure did show that "old" guy a thing or two. Without knowing him, I'll wager that he has forgotten more about Ham radio than you and I will ever learn. Good going, sport. Why don't you just alienate all the elmers out there while your at it?

Arnie -
KT4ST

4239. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 04:55:18 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918005518.22634.00001208@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 77604

>Problem is,. they just THINK they're using 1/4 wave dipoles. Why don't some
>o youse guys fix them up with what they think they've gpt?

I know they think that, they cant help they dont have a CLUE. Its called
No-Code Dumbing Down, isnt it wonderful?

4240. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 04:57:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkbdvroiq0@208.206.142.93>
Source record: 77605

Brian Kelly wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3F68C810.4050904@adelphia.net>...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > > Newp, sorry. A 40M 1/4-wave dipole can be made to resonate just fine and
> > > work wonderfully. Its position to the ground and center angle have
> > > everything to do with how well it will radiate. And, using a balun or not
> > > doesn't change the whole concept of using a 1/4-wave dipole at any
> > > frequency.
> > >
> > > Whether you want them to or not, they work.
> >
> > A couple points here Kim.
> >
> > According to the ARRL handbook 2003 edition, chapte 20 page 4:
> >
> > A fundamental form of antenna is a wire whose length is half the
> > transmitting wavelength. It is the unit from which many more complex
> > forms of antennas are constructed and is known as a dipole antenna.
> >
> > It goes on from there if you want more.
> >
> > Next I modeled two antennas in EZNEC.
> >
> > One is a half wave dipole for the middle of the 40 meter band at 7.150
> > mHz. Each leg of the antenna is approximately 1/4 wavelength long at
> > 65.45 feet. This antenna models out at an SWR of a little over 1.5:1 at
> > the center frequency, and 2:1 at 7.3 mHz and a touch over 2 mHz at 7 mHz
> > with the antenna at 50 feet, the take off angle is 35 degrees. All in
> > all, not too bad an antenna. Most modern rigs will handle the antenna
> > without a tuner, or simply with their internal tuner.
> >
> > Next, I modeled a quarter wave dipole for the same frequency and all
> > other paramaters. With the legs at 32.7 feet, the antenna now displays
> > somewhat near infinite SWR. The take off angle has now risen to 54 degrees.
>
> Don't confuse her with Novice physics Mike, she's never had physics
> and doesn't know a NEC deck from a sun deck.
>

It's even worse. She has no idea how to break a sine wave down into its components, nor anything about the 360 degrees involved. To say nothing about how voltage/current/impedance

values appear at each point on the waveform when it is expressed as a dipole antenna, and how
they interrelate. NOTHING about electrical wavelength versus linear measurement, or what that
even means..

All that is really quite simple and can be easily learned and understood with no help from NEC. It's antenna basics. But with the testing requirements now in place, it won't be.

>
> > That antenna is simply not going to work well at all.

Until she figures out how to match her 50 ohm transiciever output to several thousand ohms or
more.

But.....she isn't actually *using* a 1/4 wave dipole - she just thinks she is.
In fact she's sure of it. She said so.

4241. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 05:00:00 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkbe4a$r8nem$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77606

"Clint" wrote ...

the PCTA crowd just said "six mega what ???" you screwed up and mentioned
something modern and applicable in the real world.... they're trapped in
1952.

Gee, you got us there, Clint. All of us knuckle-dragging CW'ers are just caught in a time warp. We don't know a thing about modern communications technology. Gosh, I'll bet you can tell me all about the "new" technologies like SATLink, VTC Scottie, trunked spread spectrum FM and closed networking, right? Not that I'd ever use all that stuff at work or anything ... right?

Arnie -
KT4ST

4242. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 05:02:37 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F693C6D.1060500@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 77607

N2EY wrote:

>In article <vmfbbn3qpdl2f8@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
><rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>
>
>
>>hmmm..
>>a little sour over your precious CW testing being
>>discontinued, world-wide?
>>
>>
>
>Not "sour" at all.
>
>But 8 countries (so far) is hardly "world wide".
>
>
>
So when will Afghanistan and Iraq drop code testing? ;-)

4243. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 05:09:12 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkbelooiq1@208.206.142.93>
Source record: 77608

Arnie Macy wrote:

> "Clint" wrote in part ...
>
> I remember on the local VHF frequencies once I got in an argument on the
> air about (guess what???) cw testing... and the fellow I was arguing with
> (oviously several years my elder) tried to belittle and detract from the
> factual approach of my argument by referring to me as "young man".... you
> know, "let me tell you what, YOUNG MAN, ... etc etc..."
>
> so I had the PERFECT come back. I told him "okay, we'll end the debate right
> here; you are judging the accuracy of the debate and, thus, who wins, solely
> on who's older, not who's more correct. I'll go find my friend [not included
> here for discreetness], who just celebrated his 82'nd birthday; i'll let him
> talk on my behalf and just feed him the lines to say, and since he's OLDER
> than YOU, that means i'm automatically right, even if he, vicariously
> through me, claims the moon is made out of green cheese, right?" as I
> recall, not too much was said after that. it's so easy.
> ----------
>
> Gee, Clint -- I'm impressed. You sure did show that "old" guy a thing or
> two. Without knowing him, I'll wager that he has forgotten more about Ham
> radio than you and I will ever learn. Good going, sport. Why don't you
> just alienate all the elmers out there while your at it?
>

Elmers??? Who needs amy steenkin' Elmers???

4244. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 05:17:01 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309172117.31a02275@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77609

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:<xnfcneeyarg.hlc5zm3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>...
> On Tue, 16 Sep 2003 01:03:16 GMT, Keith wrote:
>
> >> Of course, if the amateur op doesn't have his license with him, the
> >> officer has reasonable cause to believe that the pre-emption does
> >> not cover him even though it still does, and if the rig has been
> >> modified so that it is capable of TRANSMITTING on the police
> >> frequency, the pre-emption is not valid even if the operator is a
> >> licensed amateur (per the FCC Public Notice on this matter many
> >> years ago).
> > >
> > > Please cite case law that supports your position that modified ham radios
> > >do not have the same exemption as all ham radios?
> >
> > That was the deal that the League worked out with the FCC - if the
> > radio did not transmit "out of band" then the preemption covered.
> > The intent was to exclude VHF/UHF transceivers which have been
> > "opened up".
> >
> > I'll dig out the Public Notice if I can find it. It was many years
> > ago.
> >
> > >If I add 5 MHz capability to a radio do I now lose all protection of
> > >Federal laws?
> >
> > Does your HF transceivertransmit on public safety VHF/UHF
> > frequencies? Does your VHF/UHF amateur transceiver transmit on 5
> > MHz ??

Yup, my FT-847 can recieve & transmit 160M thru 2m except 60M plus 440
all modes out of the box and it'll fit under the dash. Ditto a number
of other current-tech xcvrs like the very popular IC-706, etc. If I
mod it to operate on 60M which is clearly a legal maneuver I'll also
be able to operate all over the VHF and lower UHF spectrum which is
clearly illegal.

> > >What about if I build a kit or use a land mobile radio in the ham bands?
> >
> > If you have the installed capability of transmitting on a non-amateur
> > frequency and do not have a license for such operation, it is not
> > covered under the preemption and it's your job to talk yourself out of
> > the jam. You're on your own.....

That old Public Notice is the problem, it is not the solution.

w3rv

4245. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 05:19:32 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F69405B.F31A0F87@earthlink.net>
Source record: 77610

Alun Palmer wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
> news:3F68DD97.6E3D3730@earthlink.net:
>
> > Alun Palmer wrote:
> >>
> >> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
> >> news:UI0ab.27109$Aq2.20546@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net:
> >>
> >> >
> >> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >> > news:20030916232714.23307.00003051@mb-m29.aol.com...
> >> >> In article <Xns93F7E7865C43Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> >> >> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >EI is the 7th country to abolish code testing by my reckoning
> >> >>
> >> >> Ireland: Beautiful country, lovely people, but the same dumbed-down
> >> >> hams! Not to worry, I'm sure us Yanks won't be far behind!
> >> >> 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >> >
> >> Newsflash! - Singapore has abolished the code test. Now there are
> eight.
> >> >
> > > Wow! That's quite a policy statement from a country with a little more
> > > than 120 radio amateurs and it comes hot on the heels of the big move by
> > > Ireland with its slightly more than 1,500 hams.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> > >
>
> I just did a quick recount, and 9V is the 9th country, not the 8th. They
> are Switzerland, the UK, Belgium, Germany, Austria, the Netherlands,
> Norway, Ireland and Singapore.
>
> The funny thing is the only no-coder I have yet heard on HF was PE1RMZ. I
> know that this is a Dutch no-code call from the time I worked PE1DUP
> through a UK repeater. It takes time to get on HF I suppose. I was
> surprised that no-one appeared to have been ready in advance.
>
> You can try to pretend that 9V and EI don't matter, but look at the bigger
> picture.

I'm not trying to pretend at all. We're talking about two countries
with a little over 1,600 radio amateurs between them.

> You know where this will all end, and a d*mn good thing it is
> too. If it wasn't for the bl**dy code test I would have been licenced > and on HF at 14.

You mean if it wasn't for you, you'd have been licensed and on HF at 14.
I was licensed for HF at 14 and I passed a code test. Don't blame the
test. Blame yourself.

Dave K8MN

4246. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 05:21:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkbfctrep0@208.206.142.107>
Source record: 77611

Arnie Macy wrote:

> "Clint" wrote ...
>
> the PCTA crowd just said "six mega what ???" you screwed up and mentioned
> something modern and applicable in the real world.... they're trapped in
> 1952.
> ----------
>
> Gee, you got us there, Clint. All of us knuckle-dragging CW'ers are just
> caught in a time warp. We don't know a thing about modern communications
> technology. Gosh, I'll bet you can tell me all about the "new" technologies
> like SATLink, VTC Scottie, trunked spread spectrum FM and closed networking,
> right? Not that I'd ever use all that stuff at work or anything ... right?
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST

Maybe I should get Clint to sked with me at 14.080 on CLOVER? Naw.....
there's not a chance he would have a HAL modem. Betcha he never heard of such a
device.

Maybe get him onto some soundcard digi stuff with PSK31, HELLSCHRIEBER OR
MFSK16? Maybe even plain ol' vanilla RTTY?

You think he knows what a sound card IS??

Maybe get his sorry arse off that ancient old retro SSB and into something
that actually *IS* modern?

4247. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 06:53:23 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <DDcab.31912$Aq2.8781@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77612

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> I've lived in Seattle. Too little sun and almost no wind.
> According to a book I was reading when I wanted to
> build a greenhouse, windloading is not a consideration
> there as it has the lowest winds in the country.

Wind turbines don't have to be located in the back yard of the Safeco Field, Dee (Safeco Field replaced the King Dome). They can be placed on the other side of Puget Sound, where there is plenty of wind. Another alternative is some of the islands north of Seattle at the mouth of the Sound (also plenty of wind).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4248. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 07:58:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <BAdab.33076$Aq2.2472@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77613

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> Last time I looked, Amateur Radio was a strictly
> VOLUNTARY activity. Nobody has ever been
> "forced" to do anything related to the hobby/
> service known as Amateur Radio. If you want to
> have privileges within the ARS, you meet the
> licensing requirements -- as a voluntary act.

Compliance with all laws (or regulations) is a voluntary act. But, in this country, there is a mechanism for eliminating laws that no longer serve a purpose. That process is happening now with the regulations concerning Morse Code testing.

> Only NCTA whiners who are too lazy and indifferent
> to the true nature of the ARS to be bothered to learn
> a useful communications skill like Morse/CW drag out
> the "I'm being forced to learn Morse code" or "I'm
> having Morse code shoved down my throat" arguments.
> This is truly pathetic.

Attempts to prevent the process of ending code testing, with no reason other than your own preference for that testing, is indeed an attempt to force interested parties to comply with your wishes instead of complying with regulations which reflect the true needs of Amateur Radio. The only reason you've offered for keeping code testing is your desire to limit access to Amateur Radio (to keep out those who are not "interested, motivated, or incentive-driven" enough to meet your tastes). Of course, Amateur Radio was not created to be your own private club with rules designed to keep out those you don't like. Instead, Amateur Radio is open to all Americans with ANY interest in this activity, with rules to reasonably facilitate that safely and orderly. That interest is not limited to just Morse Code today. It also includes those who just want to hang out on the repeaters, those who just want to talk with their friends, those who just want to build their own equipment, and those with many other similar interests (and soon to include those interested in HF, but with no interest in Morse Code).

> (snip) This is the genius of the Morse code testing
> requirement -- it brings out the best in interested, motivated,
> and incentive-driven people, who, for the most part,
> become the best hams.

Your own ongoing behavior in this regard clearly shows that statement to be totally false.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4249. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 09:33:29 UTC
From: rhf-mail@pacbell.net
Message-ID: <e5e13af8.0309180133.d458bb7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77614
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

VF,

"And that's a BIG ten-four good buddy breaker breaker. Got ur ears on?"

Ha Haa Haaa Haaaa Haaaaa Haaaaaa Haaaaaaa

Thats the Best Laugh I have had All Day !

~ RHF
.
.
= = = "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
= = = wrote in message news:<qQ9ab.489916$Ho3.83693@sccrnsc03>...
> et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote in
> news:bka6au$9pk$1@freenet9.carleton.ca:
>
> >>
> > This is an old thread, and I already basically said as much. It's
> > "too unspeakable" to mention how the Wouff Hong is used because the
> > threat is better than the application.
>
>
> It would still be an interesting sight to see. A bunch of disgruntled
> League members showing up at the next Board meeting with a bunch of wouff
> hongs in hand. Maybe they would finally understand they needed to listen
> to the members that elected them. To late to change things now though.
> Ham radio is on the down hill side and picking up speed. And that's a BIG
> ten-four good buddy breaker breaker. Got ur ears on?
>
>
> KB7ADL on the side.

4250. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 10:18:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918061840.23171.00000848@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 77615

In article <d22b54c3.0309171832.1a2c0fad@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>How do you reconcile your "plight" with the fact that many youngters
>under 14 have passed 20 wpm code tests?

AND all the *written* tests.

The youngest extra I know got that license at the age of 8. That was before restructuring, when there were 5 *written* tests.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4251. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 10:18:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918061842.23171.00000849@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 77616

In article <3F69405B.F31A0F87@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>We're talking about two countries
>with a little over 1,600 radio amateurs between them.

Maybe you know the answer to this one, Dave:

How many amateurs are there in the 9 countries that have dropped code testing?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4252. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 10:18:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918061843.23171.00000850@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 77617

In article <e79dbd9b.0309171508.794eacc8@posting.google.com>, k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
>
>>
>> Would you enjoy it as much if your QSOs went through a series of automated
>> digital systems that would insure perfect copy at both ends with no
>> operator skill required?
>
>Because I'm a 'tinkerer' sort, with a strong sense of curiousity,
>certainly yes, at least the first handful of times, just to see what
>made it work.
>
>Wouldn't you?

Like you, it would be interesting *the first handful of times*.

But after that?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4253. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 10:18:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918061845.23171.00000851@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 77618

In article <vmht45sf006a79@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
<rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:

>> Not "sour" at all.
>>
>> But 8 countries (so far) is hardly "world wide".
>>
>
>hm, I see.... um, and you know the one and only
>acceptable definition of "world wide" huh?

Nope.

However, I find it hard to believe that anyone would reasonably call 9
countries (*so far*) would constitute "world wide" when there are many more
countries yet to make a change.

> I guess
>i've missed where it's written that "world wide"
>is composed of no less than 9 countries.

I guess i've missed where it's written that "world wide"
is composed of no more than 9 countries - out of how many?
>
>The fact is, it would only take two seperate nations
>to call something "multinational" or "international".. so,
>would it comfort you a little more if I were to have said
>"internationally, code testing is being dropped"?

Better yet - just say "So far, it's been removed in 9 countries".
>
>you'd also do well to make a case study of how many hams
>are represented by the nations that are dropping it. Many
>nations that aren't are composed of nations with fewer than
>a dozen hams.... and a few that are run by dicators
>(lybia) have 1 and only 1 ham operator.... guess who.....

Then tell us - how many hams are represented by the 8 nations that are removing
code testing? How many hams are there in Singapore, Switzerland, the UK,
Belgium, Germany, Austria, Netherlands, Norway, and Ireland...?

Here's the country to watch: Japan. They've had an HF license with no code test
for decades. (It's their 4th class license). And they used to have the world's
largest amateur population.

But about 1995 their numbers started dropping and they continue to fall. Why?

Some say it's the Japanese economy
Some say it's the Internet
Some say it's cheap cell phones
And some say it's the code test for the other licenses.

But Japan still has code testing. Maybe that will change.

(Note that Japan issues separate operator and station licenses. *Operator*
licenses are free and never expire, so the operator license totals never
decline. *Station* licenses have to be renewed and cost money (120 yen).
Station licenses are declining rapidly.

>

4254. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 12:07:38 UTC
From: Ralph Aichinger <ralph@dolphy.pangea.at>
Message-ID: <1063885589.713903@news.liwest.at>
Source record: 77619

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote:
> I just did a quick recount, and 9V is the 9th country, not the 8th. They
> are Switzerland, the UK, Belgium, Germany, Austria, the Netherlands,

Austria not yet.

Unfortunately there are more important issues at the moment,
see: http://tinyurl.com/lmm3 and http://tinyurl.com/nkt0
HF would be worth nothing if this is passed as an EU
directive.

/ralph

4255. Re: Farnsworth spacing (was Re: NCI Petition for Rulemaking)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 12:09:26 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309180409.61bb0487@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77620

kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) wrote in message
news:<d22b54c3.0309171825.66cd7b1f@posting.google.com>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030915201914.08626.00000605@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> > In article <3F65FEFA.8030107@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:
>
>
> > The examiner gave you a yellow lined legal pad and a #2 pencil. You put your
> > name at the top of the copy sheet and got ready. You put on a pair of 'phones
> > and when everyone at that test table was ready, the test was started. The test
> > was 5 minutes of plain-language code at the required speed (13 or 20 wpm - back
> > then only volunteer examiners gave 5 wpm tests)
>
> Depends on which "back when".

Yep.

> My 5, 13 and 20 wpm code tests were all
> administered by FCC Examiners.

For 3 years (1951 to 1954), FCC gave Novice and Technician tests at
FCC exam points, and only those far enough out in the sticks to
qualify for Conditionals could take N&T by mail. In 1954, all Novice
and Tech exams became by-mail only.

However, it *was* possible to get a Technician at an FCC exam office.
There was a time when, if a ham attempted the 13 wpm code and did not
get the required 65 correct consecutive characters, but did get 25
correct consecutive characters, the FCC examiner would allow said ham
to take the General/Tech written and get a Tech if the written were
passed. (The "25 correct" were considered proof of 5 wpm). This was
also back when you could hold both Tech and Novice at the same time.

> And I took all of 'em one-on-one with
> the Examiners, never as a member of a group taking the same test.

My 13 wpm was with a group. 20 wpm was me and the examiner.
>
> > You were allowed to bring a mill for receiving and speed key for sending, but
> > you'd better be well-prepared if you showed up with same.
>
> ?? I don't recall using a typewriter being an option. Would have been
> a lousy idea.

I defer to Phil Kane's statements on hams using mills.

> I did use a bug to send 20 wpm. For maybe three seconds
> before the Examiner waved it off. I shouldn't have bothered lugging
> the bug to the exam.
>
> > You had to get a certain number of questions right (74%, as I recall) on the
> > written to pass. Miss by even one question less than the required and you had
> > to go home and study for at least a month before retesting - both sending and
> > receiving code, and the written. No do-overs, no credit for tests already
> > passed. All or nothing at all.
>
> Yup, yup . . . no slack. At all.

There was also a policy that tests given by mail did not count for
element credit. A Tech who had gotten the license by mail had to do
both 13 wpm code and the Tech/General written in front of an FCC
examiner in order to upgrade.

In fact, way back when, there was a rule that if a Conditional moved
to within the prescribed striking distance of an FCC exam point,
he/she had to retest for General within 90 days or lose their license.
>
> > $9 doesn't sound like much but back in those days it was a lot of money for a
> > high school kid. I think minimum wage back then was $1.20 or so, which meant
> > the test was a days' pay BEFORE taxes for a minimum wage person. And a kid
> > would have been glad to get minimum. I estimate that the equivalent today would
> > be $50-60.
>
> Conversly I have yet to pay a dime for anything the FCC has ever done
> WRT to any of my ham licenses. Not for any of the three tests and not
> for the 1x2. "Life is all in the timing . . ".

Roger that! I think I hit the high point for my license tests but the
1x2 was a 1977 sequential-issue.
>
> > So I went home and taught myself to block print. (Printing was not a parochial
> > school subject - only "publics" were allowed to print. Something about being
> > bold, brazen articles was involved). Next try, later that summer, I had no
> > problem.
>
> Heh. Conversly again when I got yanked outta Quaker elemenatary school
> and dumped into the public schools right off I landed in "remedial
> penmanship" 'cause I had no idea how to write longhand, everything I
> wrote was in block style. The code tests were no sweat, all block caps
> but I flunked remedial penmanship and they finally gave up on me. I'd
> still flunk a course longhand writing. So would every other
> half-decent drawing board jockey I've known.

Well, that kinda explains me, because I found block printing much
easier than longhand.

There's a particular form of block printing shown in "Learning The
Radiotelegraph Code" that uses a minimum of pencil strokes, resulting
in maximum speed and legibility. It was developed for the Signal

Corps. For example, most people block-print an E by making a vertical stroke and three horizontal strokes. The Signal Corps method is to make a square-cornered "C" (horizontal top, vertical, horizontal bottom) and then the middle horizontal stroke. Pencil leaves the paper twice instead of four times. Works.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4256. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 12:14:39 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0309180414.40a11deb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77621
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bk9vqd$lc2$0@208.207.71.141>...
> Bert Craig wrote:
>
> > "Michael Reynolds" <w0kie@cox.net> wrote in message
> > news:d0X9b.14288$3Y2.10133@news2.central.cox.net...
> > > "Disgusted" <Noooo@eeee.maillll> wrote in message
> > > news:vkl0nsoogac3c7@corp.supernews.com...
> > > >
> > > > I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the
> SHIT
> > > > out of them!
> > >
> > > According to the same 1930 ARRL Handbook, "The Wouff-Hong is amateur
> radio's
> > > most sacred symbol and stands for the enforcement of law and order in
> > > amateur operation." The Wouff-Hong's nearest analog is the old-fashion but
> > > still effective can opener. Now every can opener requires an initial
> > > insertion point, and (if you picture the human anatomical form) you can
> > > choose between upper and lower points. The object is to open up the
> > > miscreant and expose his evil to himself. This requires the subject to be
> > > supine and all opening to be done on the front side, where the victim can
> > > indeed see the results: the exposure of his own evil. The beauty of the
> wood
> > > Wouff-Hong lies in the fact that it leaves splinters in places from which
> > > they cannot be removed. Thus is the scoundrel reminded for life of his
> > > misdeeds and what lies ahead if any one of them should ever be repeated.
> >
> > Every culture has it's dark spots, this is amateur radios. Some think it's
> > fun to joke about. It's pretty sickening, if you ask me. Anyone who has
> > truly studied what man is capable of doing to man during the Medieval period
> > or The Spanish Inquisition knows this.
>
> I think his description of the Rite of the Woulf Hong is a bit stretched, in
> fact quite a bit.
> My take on it was that it was a tool from which only a gentle prod in a certain
> part of the anatomy was all that would be needed to correct the miscreant.
> Maybe the thought of things to come if he didn't straighten up and fly right
> was the main impetus.

Your take sounds a heckuva lot better, Dick. Thanks, I was in rant
mode and the graphic description kinda struck a nerve.

--
73 de Bert

WA2SI

4257. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 12:57:48 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <gZhab.4330$BJ1.1524@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77622

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030918061843.23171.00000850@mb-m05.aol.com...
> In article <e79dbd9b.0309171508.794eacc8@posting.google.com>,
k0hb@arrl.net
> (K0HB) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
> >
> >>
> >> Would you enjoy it as much if your QSOs went through a series of
automated
> >> digital systems that would insure perfect copy at both ends with no
> >> operator skill required?
> >
> >Because I'm a 'tinkerer' sort, with a strong sense of curiousity,
> >certainly yes, at least the first handful of times, just to see what
> >made it work.
> >
> >Wouldn't you?
>
> Like you, it would be interesting *the first handful of times*.
>
> But after that?

You guys have managed to precisely describe what happened to packet radio, when packet/internet gateways were intoduced into the network, to "speed things up", and make it more "reliable".

Hams using HF to route messages over long distances would find that they could no longer send those messages because they were already there, forwarded over the Internet in order to "speed things up" and make packet more "reliable"...

As a direct result of this misuse of packet/internet gateways in order to "route around" hams using radio, an organized, global HF digital network, one of the most impressive accomplishments ever by hams around the world, was undermined and eventually destroyed. Dozens of digital HF stations around the world had to shut down, deprived of traffic while others were overloaded by tons of inappropriate overseas traffic shovelled into our VHF/UHF networks through the packet/internet gateways.

And, as you noted in your post, U.S. hams found the new non-ham network intrusion to be interesting *the first handful of times*, then they lost interest in packet altogether. It was no longer ham radio.

The packet/Internet gateways speeded things up as advertised, but in view of the fact that they undercut and eventually destroyed the network, they could hardly be said to have made the network more reliable on anything but a short-term, short-sighted basis.

In Europe, where it was illegal to impose non-ham networking into an amateur radio network, the packet network continued to advance and grow all the time that ours was dying away from lack of interest. Interest in the Internet is often put forward as a cause for the setback in the U.S. digital network, but it should be noted that European hams had Internet access during this time as well, and it did not have that affect upon them, despite the fact that they had cable access to the Internet long before it was common here in the U.S..

The difference was that the Europeans stuck with ham radio in their digital ham radio network, and we didn't. It's that simple.

The "series of automated digital systems that would insure perfect copy at both ends with no operator skill required" took the fun out of packet radio, here in the U.S., and that is why USPN considers non-ham networking to be off-topic, irrelevant to the business of rebuilding a digital amateur radio network here in the U.S., where the misuse and abuse of packet/internet gateways has already caused us so much damage, and has set us back so far.

Besides, there is the simple, no-brainer fact that you cannot provide emergency backup for a network that you are dependant upon. - Like a special number to dial when the phones go dead, systems such as EchoLink and packet/Internet gateways are inherently useless for emergency communications and do nothing to advance our understanding and use of radio, and so are ultimately irrelevant to our purpose as hams.

In the area of packet radio, we are making some great progress in eliminating this problem here in the U.S... Sad to say, the repeater folks may have to go through the same crippling slump and lack of interest before they too begin to clean up their act and get back to ham radio.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL
Director: USPN
http://www.uspacket.net

4258. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 16:27:36 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0309180827.6ea26cf4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77623

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030918061843.23171.00000850@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> In article <e79dbd9b.0309171508.794eacc8@posting.google.com>, k0hb@arrl.net
> (K0HB) writes:
>
> >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
> >
> >>
> >> Would you enjoy it as much if your QSOs went through a series of automated
> >> digital systems that would insure perfect copy at both ends with no
> >> operator skill required?
> >
> >Because I'm a 'tinkerer' sort, with a strong sense of curiousity,
> >certainly yes, at least the first handful of times, just to see what
> >made it work.
> >
> >Wouldn't you?
>
> Like you, it would be interesting *the first handful of times*.
>
> But after that?

Obviously I'd be pretty presumptuous to attempt to predict --- perhaps
yes, perhaps not.

73, Hans, K0HB

4259. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 17:34:48 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkcqbh$9pk3$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77624

"Bill Sohl" wrote ...

That argument/claim found no favor in the past. The reality is that neither the FCC nor almost every emergency preparedness organization/operation has no desire or need for morse in their plans. Individual hams may make the claim, but they aren't executing the claim in the vast universe of RACES, ARES and other amateur emergency operations.

Where did you get your information, Bill? I have found the opposite to be true. Almost every EMA that I have contact with, has Morse code capability. My own agency has four HF sets and *each* one is Morse capable. Having Morse code capability is an asset to the EM package -- just one more tool available. Why in the world would anyone be against that?

Arnie -
KT4ST

4260. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 18:31:41 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F69FA0D.7090502@psu.edu>
Source record: 77627

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> You can name it (or not) anything you like. I have an Alpha-Delta DXCC and
> it can be used as a 1/4 (or "shortened as they say) wave dipole on 80M. It
> works great and was the antenna I used at this time of year when MARS freqs
> are beginning to get real noisy. Go to a longwire, go to the sloper, go to
> the A-99 and the noise floor was just enough to make everyone noncopyable.

Kim, I went to the web pages of Alpha-delta. On 80 meters the antenna uses something they call an ISO-RES coil. This is an inductor that they use to as they put it, "approximate" a half wave dipole. While this goes up in a shorter space, it is nothing more than a dipole version of the coil at the bottom of a mobile antenna, and used for the same reason.

They write:

The DX-CC utilizes the exclusive ALPHA DELTA ISO-RES coil principle for shortening and multibanding an antenna. The ISO-RES is not a trap, due to the fact that there isnï¿½t a trap capacitor being used. Thus, the DX-CC is a much lower "Q" antenna than one that would be constructed using true traps! This allows the DX-CC to be broader in bandwidth than is possible with a trap-type antenna of equal size. The lower "Q" also allows the user to employ a moderate range antenna tuner (matchbox) for achieving resonance and min. SWR anywhere within the covered frequency bands.

But it's just a coil. The antenna should work okay. Nothing special, but you could work the world if you were patient.

> Go to the AD and everything cleared up. No one ever had a bad thing to say
> about signal, so I go by the non-reports.
>

> The point, in this debate--once again--is that there are people saying
> there's no such thing, it'd never work, etc., etc. There are people here
> saying not only that there is such a thing but that there are websites with
> technical discussions on the 1/4 wave dipole (for all kinds of bands) and
> there are people here using them and telling the results. But, the ones who
> are using them and have results with them, and who have provided the
> websites with technical discussions are getting told--once again--that they
> are dumbed down.

I read them too Kim. what they say is that they use coils to load these antennas. that they take up a quarter wave of space is irrelevant. When there is a loading coil, call it ISO-RES or a "spiral coil" it is part of the antenna, and adds it's length to the equation.

> Sayin' it don't make it so.

You're right. Saying a half wave antenna stuffed into a quarter wave space with coils does not make it a quarter wave antenna.

> And, since that is the mentality that often
> develops with any kind of attempt at anything remotely "real" ham radio,

Wrong battle, Kim! I know you don't like Dick or Dan or some of the others in this discussion. But they are *not* wrong on this one. As I pointed out in my quick antenna design I did yesterday, a dipole antenna of a quarter wavelength long would have almost infinite SWR, a high takeoff angle, and just wouldn't work very well. This is not a personality issue.

> then that is why we "dumbed down" hams don't even regard this
> newsgroup as a place to try such conversation.

And I would be willing to bet that if approached nicely, lots of these guys and gals would be happy to share their knowledge. It always worked for me.

I'm a "dumbed down" Ham. I didn't get my license until 1999, and didn't learn morse Code until after they reduced the requirement to 5 wpm. And I've managed. Oh, there have been a very few that have been less than cordial at the start. But I'm such a nice guy that they all come around after a while and just think I'm great! (HAR)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4261. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 18:32:38 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93FA93F177603elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 77625

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in
news:Zt7ab.28288$Aq2.14535@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net:

>
> "Alun Palmer" <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:Xns93F9BFD1EB5B9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4...
>> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in
>> news:3F68DD97.6E3D3730@earthlink.net:
>>
>> > Alun Palmer wrote:
>> >>
>> >> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in
>> >> news:UI0ab.27109$Aq2.20546@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net:
>> >>
>> >> >
>> >> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>> >> > news:20030916232714.23307.00003051@mb-m29.aol.com...
>> >> >> In article <Xns93F7E7865C43Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun
>> >> >> Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>> >> >>
>> >> >> >EI is the 7th country to abolish code testing by my reckoning
>> >> >>
>> >> >> Ireland: Beautiful country, lovely people, but the same
>> >> >> dumbed-down hams! Not to worry, I'm sure us Yanks won't be far
>> >> >> behind! 73 de Larry, K3LT
>> >> >
>> >> Newsflash! - Singapore has abolished the code test. Now there are
>> >> eight.
>> >>
>> > Wow! That's quite a policy statement from a country with a little
>> > more than 120 radio amateurs and it comes hot on the heels of the
>> > big move by Ireland with its slightly more than 1,500 hams.
>> >
>> > Dave K8MN
>> >
>>
>> I just did a quick recount, and 9V is the 9th country, not the 8th.
>> They are Switzerland, the UK, Belgium, Germany, Austria, the
>> Netherlands, Norway, Ireland and Singapore.
>>
>> The funny thing is the only no-coder I have yet heard on HF was
>> PE1RMZ. I know that this is a Dutch no-code call from the time I
>> worked PE1DUP through a UK repeater. It takes time to get on HF I
>> suppose. I was surprised that no-one appeared to have been ready in

>> advance.
>>
>> You can try to pretend that 9V and EI don't matter, but look at the
>> bigger picture. You know where this will all end, and a d*mn good
>> thing it is too. If it wasn't for the bl**dy code test I would have
>> been licenced and on HF at 14.
>
> I was licensed at 14 for HF. Why couldn't you do it?

Because I had trouble learning the bl**dy code

> You handicaped?

Only if you include difficulty learning CW

> Or just lazy?
>
> Yeah buddy I sure would wait around for decades, feeling sorry for
> myself, and joining NCI......sheesh.
>

I eventually passed code in 1993, but if it weren't for the *@#%^&! code
test I could have had an HF licence in 1971.

4262. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 18:34:56 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93FA945525D3Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 77626

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
news:20030918061840.23171.00000848@mb-m05.aol.com:

> In article <d22b54c3.0309171832.1a2c0fad@posting.google.com>,
> kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
>>How do you reconcile your "plight" with the fact that many youngters
>>under 14 have passed 20 wpm code tests?
>
> AND all the *written* tests.
>
> The youngest extra I know got that license at the age of 8. That was
> before restructuring, when there were 5 *written* tests.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

They were better at code than I am. It doesn't correlate with age, or
intelligence. I could have passed all the theory at 14.

4263. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 19:35:27 UTC
From: Hans K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <c777ab1364e2b7954c18183cd420d781.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 77628

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote

>
> Then answer this question: Why should people who are not interested in
> building or fixing their radios have to learn all that theory stuff
> for the written tests? Why are all hams tested on all sorts of stuff
> they are not interested in?
>

Because the terms of their license make them responsible for the quality
of their radiated signal(s).

Without demonstrating some familiarity with the basic underlying
science, it would be irresponsible of the regulators to allow an
applicant to establish a radio transmitting station on the public
airways. Familiarize yourself with the concept "tragedy of the
commons".

73, de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4264. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 19:50:22 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <bkd29u$t8t$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 77629

N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>In article <3F69405B.F31A0F87@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:
>
>>We're talking about two countries
>>with a little over 1,600 radio amateurs between them.
>
>Maybe you know the answer to this one, Dave:
>
>How many amateurs are there in the 9 countries that have dropped code testing?

176,685 in the year 2000 according to

http://www.iaru.org/statsum00.html

The UK and Germany are the bulk of that number.

Dennis Ferguson

4265. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:01:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <r2pab.40505$Aq2.7046@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77630

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0309171954.184a1dc0@posting.google.com...
> Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3F68C810.4050904@adelphia.net>...
> > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> >
> > > Newp, sorry. A 40M 1/4-wave dipole can be made to resonate just fine
and
> > > work wonderfully. Its position to the ground and center angle have
> > > everything to do with how well it will radiate. And, using a balun or
not
> > > doesn't change the whole concept of using a 1/4-wave dipole at any
> > > frequency.
> > >
> > > Whether you want them to or not, they work.
> >
> > A couple points here Kim.
> >
> > According to the ARRL handbook 2003 edition, chapte 20 page 4:
> >
> > A fundamental form of antenna is a wire whose length is half the
> > transmitting wavelength. It is the unit from which many more complex
> > forms of antennas are constructed and is known as a dipole antenna.
> >
> > It goes on from there if you want more.
> >
> > Next I modeled two antennas in EZNEC.
> >
> > One is a half wave dipole for the middle of the 40 meter band at 7.150
> > mHz. Each leg of the antenna is approximately 1/4 wavelength long at
> > 65.45 feet. This antenna models out at an SWR of a little over 1.5:1 at
> > the center frequency, and 2:1 at 7.3 mHz and a touch over 2 mHz at 7 mHz
> > with the antenna at 50 feet, the take off angle is 35 degrees. All in
> > all, not too bad an antenna. Most modern rigs will handle the antenna
> > without a tuner, or simply with their internal tuner.
> >
> > Next, I modeled a quarter wave dipole for the same frequency and all
> > other paramaters. With the legs at 32.7 feet, the antenna now displays
> > somewhat near infinite SWR. The take off angle has now risen to 54
degrees.
>
> Don't confuse her with Novice physics Mike, she's never had physics
> and doesn't know a NEC deck from a sun deck.
>

> > That antenna is simply not going to work well at all.
>
> Will work like a Cantenna works.
>
> > - Mike KB3EIA -

What amazes me is the Texas Twit has NO CONCEPT at all of what she is talking about. She is basing it ALL on the 'Alfa Delta'. Which is NOT WHAT THIS DISCUSSION IS ABOUT.

Can someone please straighten her out....???? PLEASE.

Dan/W4NTI

4266. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:01:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <03pab.40506$Aq2.572@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77631

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030918001450.08239.00001429@mb-m14.aol.com...
> >Will work like a Cantenna works.
> >
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
> Mike stop telling them that, let them use 1/4 Wave Dipoles all the time.

Good idea. Keep the QRM down that way.

Dan/W4NTI

4267. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:09:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <T9pab.40509$Aq2.18672@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77632

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F69FA0D.7090502@psu.edu...
>
> I'm a "dumbed down" Ham. I didn't get my license until 1999, and didn't
> learn morse Code until after they reduced the requirement to 5 wpm. And
> I've managed. Oh, there have been a very few that have been less than
> cordial at the start. But I'm such a nice guy that they all come around
> after a while and just think I'm great! (HAR)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
>
>

Thanks for the attempt. Probably futile. Your point on 'approach' should
be payed attention to.

Dan/W4NTI

4268. Re: CB Amplifiers For Sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:09:09 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <V9pab.2333$kt6.733@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 77633

Are most of them class C amps, or are they essentially switchmode amps? ;)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@cbfreebandnow.net> wrote in message
news:bk9s13$dv5$0@pita.alt.net...
> x-no-archive: yes
> Several good auctions going on Ebay, selling dozens of
> CB linear amplifiers. Power ranges between 250 watts,
> up to 2000 watt linears!
>
> Go to 27555 khz and ask for the location of the auctions
> being held on Ebay.
>
> Lloyd
>
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.520 / Virus Database: 318 - Release Date: 9/18/03

4269. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:11:26 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <2cpab.40513$Aq2.15020@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77634
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:qQ9ab.489916$Ho3.83693@sccrnsc03...
> et472@FreeNet.Carleton.CA (Michael Black) wrote in
> news:bka6au$9pk$1@freenet9.carleton.ca:
>
> >>
> > This is an old thread, and I already basically said as much. It's
> > "too unspeakable" to mention how the Wouff Hong is used because the
> > threat is better than the application.
>
>
> It would still be an interesting sight to see. A bunch of disgruntled
> League members showing up at the next Board meeting with a bunch of wouff
> hongs in hand. Maybe they would finally understand they needed to listen
> to the members that elected them. To late to change things now though.
> Ham radio is on the down hill side and picking up speed. And that's a BIG
> ten-four good buddy breaker breaker. Got ur ears on?
>
>
> KB7ADL on the side.
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

You do that so well. I recommend YOU for an application of the device.

Dan/W4NTI

4270. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:14:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Yepab.40517$Aq2.12707@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77635

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030917234316.12631.00001185@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <vmbdhfc0nr1n86@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
> <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>
> >But they DO want to force CW on people that don't
> >necissarily have any interest in operating it. "basics"
> >arguments fail; "selftrained skill" fails because everything
> >is a selftrained skill, why put the emphasis on an outdated
> >mode instead of testing selftrained skills on new, modern
> >modes of communication?
>
> Clint:
>
> Last time I looked, Amateur Radio was a strictly VOLUNTARY
> activity. Nobody has ever been "forced" to do anything related to
> the hobby/service known as Amateur Radio. If you want to have
> privileges within the ARS, you meet the licensing requirements --
> as a voluntary act. Only NCTA whiners who are too lazy and
> indifferent to the true nature of the ARS to be bothered to learn
> a useful communications skill like Morse/CW drag out the "I'm
> being forced to learn Morse code" or "I'm having Morse code
> shoved down my throat" arguments. This is truly pathetic.
>
> The truth is that a lot of hams, myself included, never imagined
> themselves becoming CW operators until they made the effort to
> meet the licensing requirement to pass Morse code tests at
> various speed levels for increased operator privileges. This is
> the genius of the Morse code testing requirement -- it brings out
> the best in interested, motivated, and incentive-driven people,
> who, for the most part, become the best hams.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Absolutely correct Larry. Bottom line is its too tough to actually try to
learn something for these whiners. It really is pathetic.

Dan/W4NTI

4271. Re: CB Amplifiers For Sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:33:47 UTC
From: David Robbins <k1ttt@arrl.net>
Message-ID: <luucnVatS8lgufeiU-KYhw@crocker.com>
Source record: 77636

who knows what they are... except i have heard them splattering all the way
from 27025 to up past 28500 from half way across the country!

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:V9pab.2333$kt6.733@news02.roc.ny...
> Are most of them class C amps, or are they essentially switchmode amps? ;)
>
> 73 from Rochester, NY
> Jim AA2QA
>
>
> "Lloyd" <Lloyd@cbfreebandnow.net> wrote in message
> news:bk9s13$dv5$0@pita.alt.net...
> > x-no-archive: yes
> > Several good auctions going on Ebay, selling dozens of
> > CB linear amplifiers. Power ranges between 250 watts,
> > up to 2000 watt linears!
> >
> > Go to 27555 khz and ask for the location of the auctions
> > being held on Ebay.
> >
> > Lloyd
> >
> >
> >
>
>
> ---
> Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
> Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
> Version: 6.0.520 / Virus Database: 318 - Release Date: 9/18/03
>
>

4272. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:35:04 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <cypab.37001$NM1.8248@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77637

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bkcqbh$9pk3$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Bill Sohl" wrote ...
>
> That argument/claim found no favor in the past. The reality is that
> neither the FCC nor almost every emergency preparedness
> organization/operation has no desire or need for morse in their plans.
> Individual hams may make the claim, but they aren't executing the claim in
> the vast universe of RACES, ARES and other amateur emergency operations.
> ----------
>
> Where did you get your information, Bill?

In seing the overall preparation, drills, etc of vaious ARES/RACES which
don't include morse at all.

> I have found the opposite to be
> true. Almost every EMA that I have contact with, has Morse code
capability.
> My own agency has four HF sets and *each* one is Morse capable. Having
> Morse code capability is an asset to the EM package -- just one more tool
> available.

Having almost any HF rig made would include CW capability. That does
not, however, indicate morse is being used or otherwise integrated
into the emergency planning.
Even so, ending morse testing in no way
stops you or anyone else from learning morse, using morse or making
your emergency plans that might include morse.

> Why in the world would anyone be against that?

No one, certainly not me nor
NCI is against anyone USING morse if that suits your purpose.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4273. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:35:05 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <dypab.37002$NM1.193@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77638

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bkbd0c$rh5u5$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Bill Sohl" wrote in part ...
>
> So far the UK, Netherlands and several other countries have done exactly
> that. Once all code testing is ended by the FCC will you accept that
action
> as supporting the FCC position that morse isn't needed to be a "fully
> qualified ham?" Additionally, I don't recall anywhere seeing any FCC
> reference to the concept of a "fully qualified ham". Is that a new
license
> class?
> ____
>
> I believe that a person who aspires to be an Amateur Extra Class *should*
be
> able to send/receive Morse Code at a minmum level.

You are certainly entitled to believe whatever you want.

> You and I both know that
> even if testing for CW goes away, the mode will remain a very popular one
in
> the ARS for a very long time.

Which is just another reason there is no NEED for any
morse testing at all.

> To me, at least, it just makes sense that a
> person holding the highest class of license should have a working
> (practical) knowledge of the second most popular mode we have.

How about knowing Spanish, Chineese, etc...two of the most
popular languages used on the air after English?

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4274. Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:42:16 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309181342.d6b6763@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77639

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030916205914.12501.00002451@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0309160836.595af4a9@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030916010914.05539.00000775@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> >> In article <20030915021846.23171.00000765@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY)
> >> writes:
> >>
> >> >In article <vm9usff4mpm58f@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
> >> ><rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
> >> >
> >> >>sending and receiving CW isn't a building block
> >> >>to anything else.....
> >> >
> >> >Yes, it is.
> >> >
> >> >First, it's a building block to the use of the mode on the air. Although
> other
> >> >services have pretty much stopped using Morse Code, hams use it
> extensivley,
> >> >and an amateur license is permission to operate an amateur station, not a
> >> >station in another service.
> >>
> >> Roger that, Reverend Jim...
> >
> >Who is "Reverend Jim", Len? You and Brian Burke keep using that name
> >to address someone.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...you've never seen "Taxi" then... :-)

I've seen most episodes of Taxi. My name's not Ignatowksi.
>
> >It can't be me, because I graduated from electrical engineering
> >school, not divinity school. And my name isn't Ignatowski ;-)

>
> >What engineering school did you graduate from, Len?
>
> One right here in Southern California...

One without a name...:->
>

> >> IN the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service...
> >
> >No such thing exists.
>
> Yes it do, de facto, just not de jure. :-)

DeJur made projectors. You're projecting ;-)
>
> >I've been "in" the Amateur Radio Service for almost 36 years. You have
> >not done so for even one day.
>
> >That's nice, Len. On what amateur band did you bootleg with it?

Hmm?

> >Or was
> >it a broadcast band device so you could pretend you were on "Ted
> >Mack's Amateur Hour"? ;-)
>
> I've never bootlegged on anything after 1948.

Ah - but that means you may have bootlegged in 1948 and before!

Come clean and tell the group all about it. It will be good for your
soul to admit your checkered past.
>
> >I built a simple *AC line powered* Morse/CW transmitter back in 1967.
> >Covered the 80 and 40 meter bands. Required a valid Amateur Radio
> >license to operate.
>
> Well, give that person a Nobel Prize for accomplishment in physics!

"that person"?

It's more than you had done in RADIO at that age.

And mine was legal. No bootlegging.
>
> By 1967 I'd already DESIGNED and mostly built (technician help was
> not always available) several UHF to microwave RF emitters of more
> that 10 Watts.

Well, give Len a Nobel Prize for accomplishment in physics!

In 1967 you were almost three times 14 years old.

And it was your JOB, wasn't it?

> All quite legal.

Not for you to operate unless you held the station license.

Guess what, Len? You can get an amateur license for VHF/UHF that
doesn't require a code test.
>

> >My transmitter was single tube, 10 watts, worked fine for several
> >hundred *miles*. Despite my homemade receiver, lackluster antenna and
> >entry-level skills. ;-) :-) ;-P
>
> Goodie, we'll pin an oak leaf cluster on your Nobel.

Is it your guilt over your own bootlegging that causes you to attack
those who followed the law, even as teenagers?
>
> >Perhaps that's why you want FCC to stop licensing people under the age
> >of 14 - they might do things you did not do at that age. Oh wait, some
> >of us have already done so.....
>
> You keep reaching for that "age thing," Rev. Jim.

Who is this "Rev. Jim" you keep addressing?

The age thing is yours, Len, not mine. You recommended that FCC not
license anyone under age 14.
>
> >> Comparing apples and oranges is fine for the produce market,
> >
> >Are you a fruit, Len? ;-)
>
> I'm an out-of-the-closet heterosexual.

"Thank you, masked man"
>

> >Why are you avoiding that simple question?
>
> WHAT "question?"
>
"Why should there be *any* written test on theory if all a person
wants to do is operate manufactured radios?

"If someone doesn't want to design, build or repair radios, why should
they have to memorize all those symbols, diagrams and formulas?"

4275. Re: Keep the cellphone charged

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175643.07346.00000676@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77640

In article <bka0mb$r28ao$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>Too bad that is the only place you probably will see it. Hams already know
>the capabilities and/or benefits of amateur radio.
>
>Now, I see the "morning shows" are already showing coverage of the potential
>storm, and gee, wouldn't ya think a story or interview on one of those shows
>would have "some" impression." And of course if the average Joe (or
>Josephine) ham was to call up CBS, NBC, ABC, etc. and try to get some time,
>I am quite sure they wouldn't have much luck. BUT an organization
>supposingly representing amateur radio, with alleged clout would have a
>better chance of getting a story or interview in front of a much larger
>public, such as these morning shows.

Ryan, I've been wondering the same thing for years.

All I get from the ARRL syncophants is a lot of excuses and rationalizations.

The only "news" the ARRL can spread is to other radio amateurs. It can't get some decent coverage in mainstream media unless it has a better spokesperson than Walter Cronkhite.

Last year the Los Angeles TIMES (a small local newspaper with a mere 1.4 million daily issues) covered model airplane events with more column-inches and photographs than amateur radio.

Interestingly, the membership of the Academy of Model Aeronautics ('AMA') has about as many members as the ARRL (about 170 thousand). The AMA lobbied for and got a whole new EM band for radio control years ago. The AMA doesn't purport to be any "pioneer" in aeronautics or any sort of entry level to aeronautics...they are just out to have FUN with model aircraft and like things in a hobby activity.

The best that the ARRL could do was come up with 5 channels on HF near 5 MHz. They haven't even agreed with the IARU on the code test issue, not even after WRC-03.

But, to hear the ARRL's own words (propaganda), they are at some kind of cutting-edge forefront of radio, "representing" amateur radio for "all" amateurs.
They are benevolent, noble, good and true and should never ever be faulted.
"Amateur radio would never exist without the ARRL" according to syncophants.

LHA

4276. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175644.07346.00000678@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77641

In article <d0X9b.14288$3Y2.10133@news2.central.cox.net>, "Michael Reynolds" <w0kie@cox.net> writes:

>"Disgusted" <Noooo@eeee.maillll> wrote in message
>news:vkl0nsoogac3c7@corp.supernews.com...
>>
>> I'd take it to the next ARRL Board of Directors meeting and beat the SHIT
>> out of them!
>
>According to the same 1930 ARRL Handbook, "The Wouff-Hong is amateur radio's
>most sacred symbol and stands for the enforcement of law and order in
>amateur operation." The Wouff-Hong's nearest analog is the old-fashion but
>still effective can opener. Now every can opener requires an initial
>insertion point, and (if you picture the human anatomical form) you can
>choose between upper and lower points. The object is to open up the
>miscreant and expose his evil to himself. This requires the subject to be
>supine and all opening to be done on the front side, where the victim can
>indeed see the results: the exposure of his own evil. The beauty of the wood
>Wouff-Hong lies in the fact that it leaves splinters in places from which
>they cannot be removed. Thus is the scoundrel reminded for life of his
>misdeeds and what lies ahead if any one of them should ever be repeated.

So, not only were the Founding Fathers of the ARRL anal retentive, but they exhibited some kind of perverse fascination with sodomy and inflicting suffering on those who did not think/do as they did.

Not a good thing to found a radio activity hobby on...

LHA

4277. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:44 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175644.07346.00000677@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77642

In article <bkbe4a$r8nem$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Clint" wrote ...
>
> the PCTA crowd just said "six mega what ???" you screwed up and mentioned
>something modern and applicable in the real world.... they're trapped in
>1952.
>_____
>
>Gee, you got us there, Clint. All of us knuckle-dragging CW'ers are just
>caught in a time warp.

Yes.

>We don't know a thing about modern communications technology.

Not enough to indicate you "know" them.

Memorizing the latest advertisements in QST is not enough.

>Gosh, I'll bet you can tell me all about the "new" technologies
>like SATLink, VTC Scottie, trunked spread spectrum FM and closed networking,
>right?

Indicate TRUE proof of your involvement with those.

>Not that I'd ever use all that stuff at work or anything ... right?

You aren't even in SHARES.

The only ALE you are in is at the local pub.

Here Isabel is about to make landfall and Big Arnie is making all the
boasting
in this newsgroup without being Out There helping to Save The Day Through
Ham Band CW.

LHA

4278. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:45 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175645.07346.00000679@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77645

In article <W_2ab.28785$NM1.9286@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>The term 'Dumbass' comes to mind here.

Please don't call others by your family names...

LHA

4279. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:46 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175646.07346.00000680@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77646

In article <3F68AEE0.6060102@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
>> Well, DICK, make that dick, matching is the name of the game with nearly
>any
>> "wire" type antenna, so you must be too dumbed down to pick up on that
>> concept. It doesn't matter the matching, it was said first there was no
>> such thing as a 1/4 wave antenna. Then, when proof positive was given, the
>> *cough* superior hams (such as you in your mind) said "it would never
>work."
>> Then, when proof positive was given, all that's being done now is sneering.
>>
>> So, superior ham(s) et al, try again....
>
> This is a strange one to argue about. And I make no claims of
superiority.
>
>That there can be a 1/n antenna that consists of 2 equal sections is not
>the argument, or at least it shouldn't be.
>
>This type of antenna can be any fraction, even 25/32's (the fraction of
>a quart in a Fosters lager "oil can") How they will perform is another
>matter.
>
>On a ARS test, the likelyhood of the question "design a 1/4 wave dipole
>would no more likely come up than my 25/32 wave dipole. they will want
>you to design an antenna that has a particular impedence at the desired
>frequency. What is the impedence of a 1/4 wave dipole?
>
>My antenna is 96 feet total length, cut as a general purpose dipole. I
>use a tuner and ladder line to match impedence with my transmitter. But
>I would never name it a 1/n dipole.

Mike, it seems to have started when Dan adamantly defined a "dipole"
as a "half-wave."

A "dipole" is simple two conductors in the same axial line have close to
the same length for each of the two conductors.

The "feed" can be anything that is balanced.

The impedance at the feed point will vary depending on (in order):

1. Wavelength of the RF applied.
2. Height above ground.

3. Conductivity of the ground.
4. Influence of conductors within 5 to 10 wavelength from dipole center.

The pattern of the dipole will vary according to the same factors.

There is NO absolute rule that a "75 Ohm" (closer to "72 Ohm")
impedance MUST exist. Within a zero to about 2 wavelength distance
above ground, the impedance of a dipole at exactly half wavelength
will vary from zero to slightly over 120 Ohms resistive in a graphical
appearance much like a damped transient step-impulse waveform.

Dipoles do NOT have to be symmetric in conductor lengths. A certain
combination of unequal lengths allows some "broadband" properties, that
is, a greater frequency span within a certain VSWR limit, than a symmetric
dipole.

Vertical dipoles have different characteristics of impedance and pattern
than horizontal dipoles but both exhibit general similar behavior in
characteristic changes above ground.

In here, the characteristics of the "superior" (i.e., amateur extra class,
the
alleged "experts" in ham radio) vary widely with their elevation above the
terrestrial sphere. Some are so far out of orbit that all they can spout
are
some homilies learned long ago...their last vestiges of contact with the
rest of the human race. They can, however, do "CW" and thus they can
"get through when nothing else can," supposedly without electricity, power
transfer matching, or common sense.

LHA

4280. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175647.07346.00000681@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77644

In article <bk9g0j$qhi@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Being licensed as a Novice would be a vast improvement for most of these
>geniuii. *Definitely*
>> and most especially in the case of Putzie-Poo.
>>
>> Ya gotta wonder how they plan to match these 1/4 wave dipoles at their
>highest impedance point.
>>
>> "Uhhh.... say wot?"
>>
>
>Well, DICK, make that dick, matching is the name of the game with nearly any
>"wire" type antenna, so you must be too dumbed down to pick up on that
>concept. It doesn't matter the matching, it was said first there was no
>such thing as a 1/4 wave antenna. Then, when proof positive was given, the
>*cough* superior hams (such as you in your mind) said "it would never work."
>Then, when proof positive was given, all that's being done now is sneering.
>
>So, superior ham(s) et al, try again....

Kim, he can NOT do so.

All we get out of DICK is a lot of gratuitous insults and denigrations.

I guess that's what the "superiors" in US ham radio think is the "proper
attitude" of hams?

LHA

4281. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:48 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175648.07346.00000682@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77643

In article <f45722ac.0309170243.57164958@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:<bk8lbt$4gp$1@208.207.71.142>...
>> Clint wrote:
>>
>> > "Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>> > news:20030916112119.29815.00000655@mb-m21.aol.com...
>> >
>> > > Keep 1896 alive and well in the hearts of all amateurs.
>> >
>> > yea, so much for "advancing the radio art" and so forth... that would
>> > basically turn it into "freeze the radio art in time, and dam any
>possible
>> > advancement or progress"
>>
>> (YAWN!!!) You clowns are more stale than last week's coffee.
>
>in a 40's flophouse, no doubt.

I don't think DICK could afford flophouse rates...

LHA

4282. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175649.07346.00000683@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77707

In article <vo6ab.6226$nQ.2158382@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Sooner or later though, they pay the price. Either they need to build power
>generators or buy it at very high prices from outside California from
>companies who have made the investments.
>
>Whether it is regulatory, environmental, or economic, California has created
>its own energy mess by its own actions.

Tell us some more LIES, girl.

We don't have any "energy mess" here.

California's energy gets disrupted once in a while by natural disasters.

We do NOT have they kind of debacle of power loss such as the recent northeast, many-state, greater-than-a-day outage...NOT caused by any natural disaster.

California HAS had some unscrupulous private energy company managers who tried to scam both subscribers and the state government in what amounted to a form of usury. The EASTERN press picked up on that and made hilarity of it.

The EASTERN press didn't make any hilarity about the recent many-state outages in the northeast, did it? Apparent cause was carelessness, not a natural disaster.

Of course not. The EAST can do no wrong.

LHA

4283. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:49 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175649.07346.00000684@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77709

In article <JJ5ab.6213$nQ.2138783@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
>news:bk4b7r$p383g$20@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
>>
>> Wind is actually a good source, if there is a consistent breeze blowing
>> enough to keep the blades of the windmill moving, and would seem to be
>> fairly inexpensive to construct as well.
>>
>> As far as solar, the cost of setting up systems are extremely expensive
>> still as the manufacturers of such materials are willing to lower their
>> prices any.......
>
>I've lived in Seattle. Too little sun and almost no wind. According to a
>book I was reading when I wanted to build a greenhouse, windloading is not a
>consideration there as it has the lowest winds in the country.

Oh, tell us ALL about WESTERN Washington, Dee.

The whole state is "just like Seattle," isn't it?

I doubt you've ever been beyond the Puget Sound area.

You don't know EASTERN Washington.

Did you get all your personal-experience-geography from that radiotelegraph joy book?

LHA

4284. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:50 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175650.07346.00000685@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77648

In article <ct2ab.28474$NM1.9265@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" wrote:
>>
>> If they're the kind that have the single tubular pylon and
>> 3 bladed horizontal - axle turbine, they're not just
>> attractive - they're beautiful!
>
> Not when you have dozens and dozens of them spread across a hillside.

Rev. Jim don't see no turbine wind farms in PA.

Or maybe he DOES...through his mind...?

LHA

4285. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175651.07346.00000686@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77708

In article <Ib2ab.28306$NM1.22464@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> That's not strictly IN "Los Angeles," Dwight. :-)
>>
>> Try Riverside County, not Los Angeles County. Big
>> place out here.
>
> Perhaps I was a little loose with the specifics, Len. However, for all
>practical purposes, I consider just about the entire valley to be Los
>Angeles. The cities and towns spread out side by side from Los Angeles, with
>only a roadside sign to separate the individual cities or towns. From where
>I'm sitting, the whole thing looks like one giant metropolis. And the wind
>turbines I described probably supply supplimental power to that whole
>metropolis. However, you are correct. The wind turbines are in Riverside
>Country, probably supplying power to the area grid.

Quite right, Dwight, but, to the rest of the newsgroup, the Greater Los Angeles area is a tiny, small settlement with nothing of interest to the national leaders on the east coast.

Never mind that California is the most populous state in the Union or is the real birthplace of modern semiconductor electronics or a leading supplier to the aerospace industry.

California DOES have some private power providers who tried to scam both the subscribers and the state government with alleged "shortages" and other nonsense. The Los Angeles DWP was NEVER "without power" or had any "brownouts" or "rolling blackouts" while serving more than 10 million with electric power.

>> No. Haven't been far into Arizona since 1977.
>
> Well, it doesn't really matter. I was just wondering because it's the
>only solar facility I've personally seen.

My wife and I cut across a corner of it in 2000 and 2001...just to be accurate for all the trollers in here... :-)

That is "not far into Arizona" as I said and is accurate.

>> Electric power generation isn't exactly a big "amateur radio"
>> policy issue, is it? :-)
>
> You know how this newsgroup is, Len. If a topic gets introduced here, it

>becomes an issue here.

NO! :-)

There's a bunch of ANAL RETENTIVE PCTAs in here who think that
anything against beloved morse code is "irrelevant." Some of those want
to use the newsgroup as an old-times chat room since they apparently
live all their free time in here.

>> Keep that crystal set ready to go in case of power outages! :-)
>
> Looks like Hurricane Isabel is going to miss this area and hit north of
>us. Therefore, ham radio should be relatively calm, but it may be a busy
>weekend for the Coast Guard. However, things have been fairly quiet so far.

Isabel promises death, destruction, and terror for all the USA according
to the major news sources.

Only amateur radio emergency radiomen using morse code can Save The
Day (according to ARRL propaganda).

We can all read about it a month from now on the ARRL site. Going to be
hard to find all that Hams-Save-The-Day in other major news sources.

Lose electric power?

Use CW!

"CW gets through when nothing else will!"

LHA

4286. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:52 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175652.07346.00000687@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77650

In article <bk8mj8$4gp$7@208.207.71.142>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>> In article <vmf6fo259fcm02@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
>> <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>>
>> >
>> >hip hip hoorey!
>> >another nation advances with the times!!!
>> >
>>
>> Yup, dumbing it's ham radio operators down to the lowest common
>> denominator. Some "advance!"
>
>Does it come as a surprise that Clint, Brian and LHA feel right at home
>in that environment?

I don't know about Clint or Brian "feeling at home in any environment."

A half century ago I felt right at home working primary communications
on Army radio station ADA. Not only feeling that but BEING AT HOME
at the new site of Camp Tomlinson...barracks at one corner of the huge
antenna field. ADA never used "CW" (on-off keying), trans-Pacific or
local.

DICK, you've NEVER done that in the US Army, have you?

All you can do is demand that EVERYONE HAD TO DO IT LIKE YOU
DID but you can never offer any viable proof why they should.

LHA

4287. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:53 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175653.07346.00000688@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77705

In article <bkbdl6$rel8p$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Clint" wrote in part ...
>
> I remember on the local VHF frequencies once I got in an argument on the
>air about (guess what???) cw testing... and the fellow I was arguing with
>(oviously several years my elder) tried to belittle and detract from the
>factual approach of my argument by referring to me as "young man".... you
>know, "let me tell you what, YOUNG MAN, ... etc etc..."
>
>so I had the PERFECT come back. I told him "okay, we'll end the debate right
>here; you are judging the accuracy of the debate and, thus, who wins, solely
>on who's older, not who's more correct. I'll go find my friend [not included
>here for discreetness], who just celebrated his 82'nd birthday; i'll let him
>talk on my behalf and just feed him the lines to say, and since he's OLDER
>than YOU, that means i'm automatically right, even if he, vicariously
>through me, claims the moon is made out of green cheese, right?" as I
>recall, not too much was said after that. it's so easy.
>____
>
>Gee, Clint -- I'm impressed. You sure did show that "old" guy a thing or
>two. Without knowing him, I'll wager that he has forgotten more about Ham
>radio than you and I will ever learn. Good going, sport. Why don't you
>just alienate all the elmers out there while your at it?

Are all "elmers" PCTAs? If so, WHY?

You KNOW all elmers personally, right?

Why don't YOU continue to alienate and denigrate all the others who have
been on HF much longer than you, who have worked HF comm 24/7 longer
than you've been alive?

Since you aren't out getting ready for emergency work on Isabel, why don't
you start a petition for an RM with the FCC to make the 'ARS' the Archaic
RadioTELEGRAPHY Service.

Make it official. Quit making it offal.

LHA

4288. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:54 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175654.07346.00000689@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77649

In article <bkbdai$q5n0b$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Clint" wrote in part ...
>
> Yet another voice of reason. And there are more of them out there on this
>side of the argument than the PCTA's.
>____
>
>Unfortunately, Clint you are not one of them. I find the vast majority of
>your arguments to be without merit whatever.

Macy, almost ALL your arguments are superfluous, denigratory, and
without a shred of merit in here.

All you do is promote myths of "CW" as if this was still the 1930s.

LHA

4289. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:55 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175655.07346.00000690@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77702

In article <bkbd0c$rh5u5$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Bill Sohl" wrote in part ...
>
> So far the UK, Netherlands and several other countries have done exactly
>that. Once all code testing is ended by the FCC will you accept that action
>as supporting the FCC position that morse isn't needed to be a "fully
>qualified ham?" Additionally, I don't recall anywhere seeing any FCC
>reference to the concept of a "fully qualified ham". Is that a new license
>class?
>____
>
>I believe that a person who aspires to be an Amateur Extra Class *should* be
>able to send/receive Morse Code at a minmum level.

Explain why a TEST is necessary.

>You and I both know that
>even if testing for CW goes away, the mode will remain a very popular one in
>the ARS for a very long time.

"Very long" is very subjective. It is as "long" as the extremes of the
actuarial tables.

If OOK CW is already so damn popular, why are you so insistent that a TEST
for it MUST BE KEPT?

>To me, at least, it just makes sense that a
>person holding the highest class of license should have a working
>(practical) knowledge of the second most popular mode we have.

It only "makes sense" when considering YOU are one.

If everyone else is of the same class, then you aren't either "special" or
"superior" anymore.

You seem to NEED the status, rank, title, and privileges of Amateur Extra
more than what all those privileges allow you to do. All you do is "work
CW?"

Everyone else has to do as you did...because...

LHA

4290. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175656.07346.00000691@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77701

In article <bkbbig$re77i$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Clint" wrote in part ...
>
> you are mad simply because something that you had to do that was very
>difficult has been removed for the most part, and may be totally removed
>finally due to it's archaic irrelavence.
>_____
>
>Very difficult? Oh please. I passed all three tests (5, 13, 20) with 10 of
>10 right on the written and solid copy for each. Passed all five writtens
>first time out every time. Hmmmm ... I guess it must be you.

Of course it "must be everyone else." Doesn't the Communications Act
of 1934 state that the abilities of US radio amateurs shall be founded on
the abilities of Arnold Macy?

>As to CW
>being archaic, well let's have your expert thoughts on those outdated and
>archaic modes known as Single Side Band, Amplified Modulation, and RTTY.

Morse code was first used commercially in 1844.

Absolutely NOTHING about single side band (sic), amplified modulation
(sic) and RTTY until the 1900s.

There were some attempts at TTY in landline use but those did not become
viable until around 1880.

"Radio" was first acknowledged as a communications medium in 1896 in
both Italy and Russia.

The only CW radio transmitters of 1900 were the rotary alternators that
could sustain a reasonably pure sine wave at radio frequencies with a
minimum of harmonic content.

Amateurs at the previous turn of the century (1900) could afford only the
damped-wave oscillator sources known as "spark." "Spark" is FAR from
a Continuous Wave source, being a combination AM-FM-PM of highly
variable and rather unstable RF which can ONLY be modulated by on-off
keying.

"Spark," that paragon of once-viable technology among amateurs, is no
ILLEGAL.

>I've noticed that the written exams still include material on each of them.

When did the "amateur expert" Arnie Macy last take an amateur radio test?

I can't find any VEC QPC questions on "spark" transmitters.

Are you still using a "spark" transmitter for amateur communications?

Remember that "spark" was once "viable technology."

>Surely you would be in favor of eliminating that irrelevant nonsense as >well, right?

I think you can eliminate all your irrelevant nonsense about trying to keep US amateur radio DUMBED DOWN to 1930s standards and practices.

Now, why in the hell aren't you OUT THERE as an EM person getting ready for Isabel's destructive landfall?

We can't read about Macy's marvelous savings of the day through ham band OOK CW on the ARRL news page if you don't get off the Internet and be ready for all those disasterous emergencies.

LHA

4291. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175657.07346.00000693@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77706

In article <bkb05v$n1j$2@208.207.71.151>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Clint wrote:
>
>> > Has anyone come up with that WOW argument that will justify
>> > the need for morse testing? So far, nothing new has been
>> > offered by PCTAs at all.
>> >
>> > Cheers,
>> > Bill K2UNK
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>> well, no..... all the arguments being given to keep the code testing
>> are easily broken down into thier base, most center-core reason...
>>
>> "I HAD TO DO IT, SO THEY SHOULD HAVE TO!!!!!"
>>
>> And that just falls flat on its face.
>
>Clint yoiu'e been reading way too much NCI propaganda for far too long.
>So long in fact that YOU have fell flat on your face, or maybe the other
>end.

Poor baby. Can't admit that so few like your favorite radio mode?

Seems like everyone is daft except those that believe in your fantasies.

>I am capable of passing any sort of radio traffic by way of
>radiotelgraphy, which I learned as a requirement of my licensure as a
>ham radio operator.

You are also quite capable of passing gas. We can smell it in here.

>There is no reason for you to be exempted from the same.

IF YOU HAD TO DO IT, SO DOES EVERYONE ELSE!

We all knew that, DICK.

LHA

4292. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175657.07346.00000692@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77710

In article <bkb1qi$rj4$0@208.206.142.69>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

> Well you can keep a close watch on developments and keep your fingers
>crossed... but whether or not the code test requirement is dropped, it's
>still your opinion. Nothing more.

> My "l;iking" has nothing to do with it, Clint, just as yours similarly does
>not.. If a ham doesn't know Morse code, and can't operat it on the air,
there's
>no simply way he can be considered a fully qualified ham, and certainly not an
>expert.

THE WAY YOU HAD TO DO IT IS HOW EVERYONE ELSE MUST DO!

> The Extra class is named as the Expert clase of radio amateur.
>So that's just how it is. Has nothing whatever to do with either your or my
>opinion.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...self-promoting definition time again? :-)

That "clase" is called 'Amateur Extra' in the rules, DICK.

Nothing at all about the extra being "expert."

Note that the FCC specifically identifies that "clase" as AMATEUR Extra.

That "clase" has the most privileges of any of the three license "clases,"
DICK. That's all, nothing more.

The remainder of the "expertise" is in your fantasies.

Happy dreaming.

LHA

4293. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175658.07346.00000694@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77704

In article <bkas0r$fr7$0@208.207.71.162>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Then when the retired head of the Amateur and Citizen's Division of the FCC
>states in his comments to the NCVAEC petition, the writing of which he was a
>party, that it simply is an oxymoron that an Extra Class ham should
>be allowed to *not* be proficient in Morse when he is considered an expert at
>ham radio, you might take that as some sort of a clue to thinking in high
>places...

Oh, my, an "authority" on CW!

About as much "authority" as your SINGLE example of GMDSS never, ever
going to work in maritime distress and safety!

Why don't you work with the FCC to make the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
Service an alternate reality?

LHA

4294. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:56:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175659.07346.00000695@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77647

In article <bkaq7kbbc0@208.207.71.162>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>> So what? Use of CW has never been any requirement.
>
>Ah, but it HAS. I can recall the time when you had to sign ertifying that you
>had'made at least 2 CW contacts within the past six months to be eligible to
>renew your license.

DICK, what was past is past.

WAKE UP. This is a new millennium. The only one living in your fantasy
world is you.

A half century ago I never had to be "ertified" in CW (on-off keying) to be
a
fixed station operations-maintenance supervisor at Army station ADA.

Times CHANGE.

Please try to get closer to 2003 than 70 years ago.

LHA

4295. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:57:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175700.07346.00000696@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77711

In article <P4_9b.23636$BS1.6747359@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>, "Bert Craig"
<wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> writes:

>"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
>news:ZdQ9b.26166$NM1.16564@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
>> news:_Wu9b.222$BS1.80870@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>> > > Wonderfl, then you'll learn code if you want to participate there.
>> > > If not, nothing lost.
>> >
>> > Nice concept on paper, but in the real world...
>>
>> In the real world what?
>
>In the real world, many of AR's newbies won't even bother to try CW because
>it takes too much effort to attain a usable level of proficiency. Studying
>for and passing the 5-wpm test gives one a very basic level of knowledge
>(NOT proficiency) and enables him/her to make an *educated* decision as to
>whether or not s/he wants to pursue CE any further.

In the "real world" of radio, damn few want to pursue morse code in order
to join the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service.

>> > Quite frankly, what example
>> > has NCI given to the prospective ham? It sure doesn't exemplify the
>values
>> > of a "self-starter."
>>
>> Actually, those of us at the core of NCI are "self-starters" as
>> we didn't sit around and wait for anything...we actively helped
>> "make it happen."
>
>Ushering in underachievment is notheing to be proud of, Bill.

Trying to hold amateur radio hobbyists stuck at 1930s standards and
practices is NOT something to be "proud of," Egbert.

Keeping amateur radio hobby activities stuck in the Past should require
you to petition the FCC for a separate amateur radio service...such as
the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service.

But...there is NO way you can bring back the "viable technolgy" (that once
was a mainstay of US amateur radio) called "Spark." It is outlawed.

Note: "Spark" could ONLY work with on-off keying.

>> > > More to the point, is there any minimum code
>> > > speed that should be banned from the CW/data segments at the
>> > > bottom of the bands?
>> >
>> > Couldn't care how slow...as long as said CW/Data sub-bands remain
>intact.
>>
>> Last I checked, there were no such subbands as CW was allowed
>> everywhere except for some portion of 220MHz
>>
>> Cheers,
>> Bill K2UNK
>
>I did write CW/Data, right? HOWEVER, I don't expect to encounter many NCTA's
>on the bottom of 40 or anyplace on 30.

Why don't you STAY in your "bottom ends" and play with radiotelegraphy?

Perfectly legal for you to do so.

Why bother the rest of the world with superfluous fantasies and gratuitous
denigrations of NCTAs who don't enjoy your fantasy land adventures?

>Just watch the unequal ground between the two when a seasoned CW op outpaces
>his phone op counterpart in a sprint for certain rare DX contacts.

Don't they always? To hear them tell it, of course.

Is contesting the ONLY activity of US amateur radio?

Isn't US amateur radio a SERVICE to the nation, saving the day in
emergency communications when absolutely all professional comm
facilities have been destroyed?

> Heck,
>I've read that some of them only work CW. Liken it to the race between the
>tortoise and the hare, but the tortoise KNOWS how to read the road signs and
>the hare is confused because "there's no pictures." Think it's a bad
>analogy, Bill? Try looking at the cash register keypad next time you go to
>McDonalds...the result of the very same mentality of underachievement NCI
>"actively made happen."

Egbert...a half century ago I was doing actual HF communications in the US
Army trans-Pacific as part of the primary communications link for the US
Far East Command. *NO* "CW" (on-off keying) modes were required or
used. 36, later expanded to 43 transmitters. HF. 24/7 operations.

NO "McDonalds cash register keypads" then.

The US military didn't go into "contesting." It was only interested in
national defense and preventing the Cold War from becoming Hot.

Why in the world do you keep harping on morse code as a
"requirement" for US amateur radio licensing?

Why are you trying to keep US amateur radio DUMBED DOWN to the
levels of 1930 and earlier?

LHA

4296. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 21:57:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918175702.07346.00000697@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77703

In article <bk8lpf$qe332$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...
>
> Well, that's how it goes. Every amateur must know morse in order to save
>the next Titanic or something. Morse is used "countless times" in national
>emergencies. It is the next most basic radio communications thing, etc.
>["countless" is apt because the number of actual emergency comms done by
>on-off-keying modes is zero, zilch, nada...unless the self-promoters think
>that Health and Welfare messages are "emergencies."]
>_____
>
>My EM Agency has multiple sets of HF gear and every one of them is manned by
>an ARS operator that is CW capable -- and we'd be foolish not to include
>that capability in our EM package.

Absolutely...nothing gets through like morse code.

Amateur use of morse code will always save the day.

Amateur radio will save/rescue untold numbers of hurricane victims.

>Now, don't get me wrong, I just love the new technology.

Anything invented/discovered after 1930 must be "new technology" to you.

>As a part of that, we have FM trunked radios, laptop
>computers, closed network capability, VTC Scotties, and SATLinks. IOW, we
>use *all* of the tools available to us.

But, more importantly, MORSE CODE SKILL is a NECESSITY for
emergency communications, right?

Of course it is. You MUST require all amateurs to KNOW morse code.

Morse code gets through when nothing else will.

That's why all amateurs are SUPERIOR to professsional communications
people.

"Real" amateurs KNOW morse code, therefore they are superior.

>Why not just admit that CW does
>have a place in the EM package -- or are you just so dug into your position
>that you can't see the sky anymore?

I'm not "dug in," just covered with all that bullshit shoveled by the PCTA.

> IMO, it's not necessary to throw out
>the older viable technology in order to embrace the future.

Newflash: "Spark" (damped wave oscillation) was once a "viable technology."
No longer. It is outlawed in the USA.

Don't worry...your crystal set will still receive signals. No electric
power
required.

Are you properly equipped with "viable technology" of crystal sets?

>If that were
>the case, none of us would ever use a hard-wired phone again.

According to the US Census Bureau, there are over 100 million cellular
telephone subscribers in the USA. There are over 150 million "hard-wired"
telephones in the USA.

What is the point of your little "viable technology" diatribe?

And why in the hell aren't you OUT THERE being ten kinds of EM
manager with impending doom/disaster from Isabel?

LHA

4297. Re: Low reenlistment rate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 22:05:41 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309181405.274179b6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77712

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<gZhab.4330$BJ1.1524@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030918061843.23171.00000850@mb-m05.aol.com...
> > In article <e79dbd9b.0309171508.794eacc8@posting.google.com>,
> k0hb@arrl.net
> > (K0HB) writes:
> >
> > >n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
> > >
> > >>
> > >> Would you enjoy it as much if your QSOs went through a series of
> automated
> > >> digital systems that would insure perfect copy at both ends with no
> > >> operator skill required?
> > >
> > >Because I'm a 'tinkerer' sort, with a strong sense of curiousity,
> > >certainly yes, at least the first handful of times, just to see what
> > >made it work.
> > >
> > >Wouldn't you?
> >
> > Like you, it would be interesting *the first handful of times*.
> >
> > But after that?
>
> You guys have managed to precisely describe what happened to packet radio,
> when packet/internet gateways were intoduced into the network, to "speed
> things up", and make it more "reliable".

I didn't know that!

I was thinking about the systems Carl Stevenson and Gary Coffmann had
said were possible, but did not describe in detail.
>
> Hams using HF to route messages over long distances would find that they
> could no longer send those messages because they were already there,
> forwarded over the Internet in order to "speed things up" and make packet
> more "reliable"...
>
> As a direct result of this misuse of packet/internet gateways in order to
> "route around" hams using radio, an organized, global HF digital network,
> one of the most impressive accomplishments ever by hams around the world,
> was undermined and eventually destroyed. Dozens of digital HF stations
> around the world had to shut down, deprived of traffic while others were

> overloaded by tons of inappropriate overseas traffic shovelled into our
> VHF/UHF networks through the packet/internet gateways.

Did they "have to" shut down, or did they simply get bored and walk
away because there was no point in staying on the air without traffic?
>
> And, as you noted in your post, U.S. hams found the new non-ham network
> intrusion to be interesting *the first handful of times*, then they lost
> interest in packet altogether. It was no longer ham radio.

I would phrase it differently. It was still ham radio, but it wasn't
that interesting anymore.
>
> The packet/Internet gateways speeded things up as advertised, but in view of
> the fact that they undercut and eventually destroyed the network, they could
> hardly be said to have made the network more reliable on anything but a
> short-term, short-sighted basis.

And eventually you get to the point where the "ham radio" part becomes
a bunch of "RF modems" to connect hams to the gateways, right?
>
> In Europe, where it was illegal to impose non-ham networking into an amateur
> radio network, the packet network continued to advance and grow all the time
> that ours was dying away from lack of interest. Interest in the Internet is
> often put forward as a cause for the setback in the U.S. digital network,
> but it should be noted that European hams had Internet access during this
> time as well, and it did not have that affect upon them, despite the fact
> that they had cable access to the Internet long before it was common here in
> the U.S..
>
> The difference was that the Europeans stuck with ham radio in their digital
> ham radio network, and we didn't. It's that simple.

I see it a little differently. People become hams for many different
reasons. Some of those reasons continue, while others have been taken
over by other communications methods. Not too long ago, if a "regular
person" wanted to communicate with distant friends and relatives, they
had very few options (post office, telephone, telegram) and none of
them were "free" - except amateur radio. Free email and the like has
changed that completely. In similar fashion, ~20 years ago it was
common for folks (around here, anyway) to get ham licenses for
"honeydew" comms. But with cheap cellphones, that's almost
disappeared.

The folks who stay are those who are attracted to radio as an end in
itself.
>
> The "series of automated digital systems that would insure perfect copy at
> both ends with no operator skill required" took the fun out of packet radio,
> here in the U.S., and that is why USPN considers non-ham networking to be
> off-topic, irrelevant to the business of rebuilding a digital amateur radio
> network here in the U.S., where the misuse and abuse of packet/internet

> gateways has already caused us so much damage, and has set us back so far.

IOW, it stopped being about radio for its own sake. The message became
more important than the medium. Go down that road far enough and we're
all just emailing each other.
>
> Besides, there is the simple, no-brainer fact that you cannot provide
> emergency backup for a network that you are dependant upon. - Like a special
> number to dial when the phones go dead, systems such as EchoLink and
> packet/Internet gateways are inherently useless for emergency communications
> and do nothing to advance our understanding and use of radio, and so are
> ultimately irrelevant to our purpose as hams.

WELL SAID!

A big part of the attraction of amateur radio (for me, anyway, and
maybe for you) is being *independent* of the commercial/government
communications infrastructure. If the 'phones don't work, the radio
still does. Etc.

> In the area of packet radio, we are making some great progress in
> eliminating this problem here in the U.S... Sad to say, the repeater folks
> may have to go through the same crippling slump and lack of interest before
> they too begin to clean up their act and get back to ham radio.
>
I remember years ago when the first repeaters came on the air that
some of them got around the need for a duplexer by putting the
transmitter and receiver at different sites. And they were linked by a
leased phone line. For some reason that rubbed me the wrong way - and
now I know why. It was non-independent.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4298. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 22:08:09 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309181408.1329ec52@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77713

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93FA945525D3Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
> news:20030918061840.23171.00000848@mb-m05.aol.com:
>
> > In article <d22b54c3.0309171832.1a2c0fad@posting.google.com>,
> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:
> >
> >>How do you reconcile your "plight" with the fact that many youngters
> >>under 14 have passed 20 wpm code tests?
> >
> > AND all the *written* tests.
> >
> > The youngest extra I know got that license at the age of 8. That was
> > before restructuring, when there were 5 *written* tests.
> >
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
> >
>
> They were better at code than I am.

Heck, they were better at code than *I* was at their age!

> It doesn't correlate with age, or
> intelligence.

There are many different kinds of intelligence.

>I could have passed all the theory at 14.

But could you have passed all the theory at 8? I don't think I could have.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4299. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 22:12:42 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkdai1$lpl@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 77714

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F69FA0D.7090502@psu.edu...
>
> I'm a "dumbed down" Ham. I didn't get my license until 1999, and didn't
> learn morse Code until after they reduced the requirement to 5 wpm. And
> I've managed. Oh, there have been a very few that have been less than
> cordial at the start. But I'm such a nice guy that they all come around
> after a while and just think I'm great! (HAR)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Sorry you see yourself as "dumbed down." I don't. I am no different than anyone else who's got a license--because I passed the requirements for the license I've got, and they did too.

Anyway, the web has the info; and you're right about the DXCC, I went back and read it. Guess the folks who say they are testing and using and pushing the performance of 1/4 wave dipoles should give up the concept of a fundamental of amateur radio: experiementation.

Kim W5TIT

4300. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 22:13:40 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkdajs$dok@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 77715

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:T9pab.40509$Aq2.18672@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F69FA0D.7090502@psu.edu...
> >
> > I'm a "dumbed down" Ham. I didn't get my license until 1999, and didn't
> > learn morse Code until after they reduced the requirement to 5 wpm. And
> > I've managed. Oh, there have been a very few that have been less than
> > cordial at the start. But I'm such a nice guy that they all come around
> > after a while and just think I'm great! (HAR)
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
> Thanks for the attempt. Probably futile. Your point on 'approach' should
> be payed attention to.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Hey, Dan? Approach this: _ _ | _ _

Kim W5TIT

4301. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 22:21:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Tdqab.40565$Aq2.26840@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77716

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>> (snip) Only NCTA whiners who are too lazy and
>> indifferent to the true nature of the ARS to be
>> bothered to learn a useful communications skill like
>> Morse/CW (snip)
>
> Absolutely correct Larry. Bottom line is its too tough to
> actually try to learn something for these whiners. It really
> is pathetic.

No, it's pathetic that some judge themselves, and others, based on something as outdated as Morse Code/CW. This was designed for communications in the early 1900's. By the late 1900's, it's usefullness as a communications mode had almost entirely disappeared. Today, it has no substantial use other than recreation. As such, it has no value as a license exam requirement. To claim otherwise simply because you've built a self-identity around that mode is truely pathetic.

In the end, look at yourselves before you start talking about what is pathetic. The two of you (Dan and Larry) sound like a couple of tired old CB'ers still arguing that D-104 microphones and tube-type linears were better as you sit around humming the tune to the movie "Convoy." You're too old to raise hell in real life anymore, so you instead sit around trying to raise hell in this newsgroup, patting each other on the backs for the imagined value of your skill while the rest of the world continues to pass you by.

Most Code/CW users understand the changing times and simply enjoy Code/CW for what it is - one more enjoyable operating mode in the rich diversity of Amateur Radio. Too bad you two can't come to grips with that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4302. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 22:40:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918184019.22114.00001137@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 77717

>I don't. I am no different than
>anyone else who's got a license--because I passed the requirements for the
>license I've got, and they did too.

Big difference, you know nothing about the subject matter, your Licenses is nothing more than a FREE WELFARE HANDOUT, that is given out to the MIND Challenged people.

4303. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 22:41:27 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918184127.22114.00001138@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 77718

>Hey, Dan? Approach this: _ _ | _ _
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

Whats that, a picture of you on your Back with 1 TIT sticking up.

4304. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 22:53:01 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bkdcue$87k$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 77754

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote

> A half century ago I felt right at home working primary communications
> on Army radio station ADA.

Homey is a submarine radio shack. Sit back, put your feet up, listen
to the rhythm of genuine Kleinschmidts clattering away, a nice fresh cup of
coffee at hand. Copy the sked, grab your traffic, route stamp it and have
your watchstander run it. Oh yeah...

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.518 / Virus Database: 316 - Release Date: 9/11/2003

4305. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 23:17:21 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bkdek1$8te$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 77755

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote

> I am capable of passing any sort of radio traffic by way of
> radiotelgraphy,

I'd like to see you pass a weather satellite photo fax via
radiotelegraphy....

> which I learned as a requirement of my licensure as a
> ham radio operator. There is no reason for you to be exempted from the
> same.

Well, at least you finally admit that it's "I had to do it, you
should too."

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.518 / Virus Database: 316 - Release Date: 9/11/2003

4306. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 23:22:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <37rab.40602$Aq2.40093@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77719

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030918184127.22114.00001138@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >Hey, Dan? Approach this: _ _ | _ _
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
> >
>
> Whats that, a picture of you on your Back with 1 TIT sticking up.

I have no idea what that means. But coming from her its probably vulgar.

Dan/W4NTI

4307. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 23:33:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <0hrab.40614$Aq2.16758@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77720

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:Tdqab.40565$Aq2.26840@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" wrote
> >
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >> (snip) Only NCTA whiners who are too lazy and
> >> indifferent to the true nature of the ARS to be
> >> bothered to learn a useful communications skill like
> >> Morse/CW (snip)
> >
> > Absolutely correct Larry. Bottom line is its too tough to
> > actually try to learn something for these whiners. It really
> > is pathetic.
>
>
> No, it's pathetic that some judge themselves, and others, based on
> something as outdated as Morse Code/CW. This was designed for
communications
> in the early 1900's. By the late 1900's, it's usefullness as a
> communications mode had almost entirely disappeared. Today, it has no
> substantial use other than recreation. As such, it has no value as a
license
> exam requirement. To claim otherwise simply because you've built a
> self-identity around that mode is truely pathetic.
>
> In the end, look at yourselves before you start talking about what is
> pathetic. The two of you (Dan and Larry) sound like a couple of tired old
> CB'ers still arguing that D-104 microphones and tube-type linears were
> better as you sit around humming the tune to the movie "Convoy." You're
too
> old to raise hell in real life anymore, so you instead sit around trying
to
> raise hell in this newsgroup, patting each other on the backs for the
> imagined value of your skill while the rest of the world continues to pass
> you by.
>
> Most Code/CW users understand the changing times and simply enjoy
Code/CW
> for what it is - one more enjoyable operating mode in the rich diversity
of
> Amateur Radio. Too bad you two can't come to grips with that.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

Coming from a Technician licensee, who knows NOTHING about how Morse Code is used, enjoyed, or anything. I'll just consider the source.

Tell you what Dwight....when you get some knowledge of the subject, I'll pay attention. Just quit trying to put on a spin on a subject you know NOTHING about.

Have a nice day.

Dan/W4NTI

>

4308. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 23:34:45 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkdfen$j426$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77721

"Bill Sohl" wrote in part ...

"FCC nor almost every emergency preparedness organization/operation has no desire or need for morse in their plans."

I ask because you wrote the above. Why do you think the EM planners have "no need" for Morse? Any tool available should be considered for use in the EM package. Not only is our equipment capable of Morse, but we have CW capable operators for each. We've used it in the past and I strongly suspect that will do so in the future as well.

Arnie -

4309. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 23:48:31 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkdg8h$jtbf$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77722

"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...

> Absolutely NOTHING about single side band (sic), amplified modulation
(sic) and RTTY until the >1900s.

That would make those modes about 103 years old, Len. At what point do we start to consider them outdated?

>When did the "amateur expert" Arnie Macy last take an amateur radio test?

Since I'm a VE -- I looked at the current material about a week ago.

>Now, why in the hell aren't you OUT THERE as an EM person getting ready for Isabel's destructive landfall? We can't read about Macy's marvelous savings of the day through ham band OOK CW on the ARRL news page if you don't get off the Internet and be ready for all those disasterous emergencies.

Well, I must say that I have been quite busy for the past two weeks. The initial track of the storm was not looking very good for the SE United States. Fortunately for us, we were able to miss the bullet on this one. Of course you know that we *did* use that old stand-by Morse Code when Floyd came calling in 1999. SSB (you know, that 103 year old technology) was just not cutting it, so we went to CW until the condx improved. It's kinda hard to talk with someone 250 miles away on a handi-talkie.

Arnie -

4310. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 23:51:32 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkdge7$6d4g$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77723

"Len Over 21" wrote ...

Macy, almost ALL your arguments are superfluous, denigratory, and without a shred of merit in here. All you do is promote myths of "CW" as if this was still the 1930s.

Are you Clint's Daddy? I was hoping that *he* would answer the question. I will say this, though. He sure does admire you. Are you sure y'all aren't related?

Arnie -

4311. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 23:53:40 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkdgi6$hve8$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77724

"Bill Sohl" wrote ...

How about knowing Spanish, Chinese, etc...two of the most popular languages
used on the air after English?

Wow, now that's a bit of a stretch, isn't it?

Arnie -
KT4ST

4312. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-18 23:59:58 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmkhpid2i7j4eb@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77725

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030917234317.12631.00001186@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <vmhtfj9hjg5221@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
> <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>
> >
> >the PCTA crowd just said "six mega what ???"
> >
> >you screwed up and mentioned something modern
> >and applicable in the real world.... they're trapped
> >in 1952.
>
> Clint:
>
> In exactly what way is transmitting 6 megapixel color images using
> CW "applicable in the real world?"

This shouldn't take long. I shall use short words with few syllables so
that you can understand what I had said. Obviously you flew over it
without any REAL discrimination to the actual wording.

I never claimed you COULD send that with CW.
What I was saying is that the majority of the CW-using crowd is
trapped in a time warp that keeps them set back 30 years or so
(evident by thier "hell bent for leather" desire to keep cw testing
around), and wouldn't understand the concept of anything modern
(such as updating the various requirements in ham radio).

>
> BTW -- if I'm "trapped in 1952" -- the year I was born, BTW, why isn't
> a gallon of gasoline selling for 24 cents? Damn those time traps --
> they're never around when you need them!
>

and, likewise, the cost of living along with the average wages were
considerably less.

My advice, in the future, is to think before you talk, lest your
foot winds up in your mouth and you look silly.

"better to keep your mouth shut and have people WONDER
if your stupid, than to open it and remove all doubt."

Clint
KB5ZHT

4313. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:00:29 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmkhqgb7fchf0b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77726

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bkbe4a$r8nem$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...

>
> Gee, you got us there, Clint. All of us knuckle-dragging CW'ers are just
> caught in a time warp.

Yep.
pretty much.

4314. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:01:20 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkdh0i$hs6c$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77727

"Len Over 21" wrote ...

> >I believe that a person who aspires to be an Amateur Extra Class *should*
be
> >able to send/receive Morse Code at a minmum level.
>
> Explain why a TEST is necessary.
>
To demonstrate that minimal ability

> >You and I both know that
> >even if testing for CW goes away, the mode will remain a very popular one
in
> >the ARS for a very long time.
>
> "Very long" is very subjective. It is as "long" as the extremes of the
> actuarial tables.

As long as people use, it will survive. SSB is a good example of that. 103
years old and still going strong.

>
> If OOK CW is already so damn popular, why are you so insistent that a
TEST
> for it MUST BE KEPT?
>

Not *if* CW *is* the second most popular mode in the ARS.

> >To me, at least, it just makes sense that a
> >person holding the highest class of license should have a working
> >(practical) knowledge of the second most popular mode we have.
>
> It only "makes sense" when considering YOU are one.

It's my opinion, Len. I think I made that pretty clear.
>
> If everyone else is of the same class, then you aren't either "special"
or
> "superior" anymore.

I could care less if everyone was an Extra Class. I just think if they hold
that class of license, they should also possess a minimum level of CW
proficiency.
>
> You seem to NEED the status, rank, title, and privileges of Amateur
Extra

> more than what all those privileges allow you to do. All you do is
"work
> CW?"
>
> Everyone else has to do as you did...because...

I don't need any status or rank. I worked my way up the ladder like
thousands before me. That doesn't make me any better or worse than anyone.
It just means I was motivated to succeed -- and I did.

Arnie -
KT4ST

> LHA

4315. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:04:11 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmki1gii2q2fed@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77728

>
> > So while it might happen, I'm not going to do any betting on it.
>
> It will happen, the only thing at issue is the timing.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>

I remember shortly before they dropped the cw testing over 5wpm,
I was on the radio talking about it and saying the same thing..... that
it was only a matter of time.

you should have HEARD all the dinosaurs roaring! I got everything
from "it will NEVER happen!" to "not likely" to, of course,
direct insults and personal attacks.

well, it HAPPENED.

and now you say the final rung of the ladder will eventually be removed,
and the dinosaurs haven't learned thier lesson; they are roaring again.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4316. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:06:45 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmki67crtvut89@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77729

> > I am capable of passing any sort of radio traffic by way of
> > radiotelgraphy, which I learned as a requirement of my licensure as a
> > ham radio operator.

yep. well, there is no longer a 13 or 20 wpm requirement for a license, and soon there will no longer be a 5 wpm cw testing requirement. Then, people will get ham radio licenses and be ham radio operators WITHOUT having done it.

what's your point?

There is no reason for you to be exempted from the
> > same.

in your opinion. However, the opinion that counts is that of the fcc body itself, not you... and, eventually, just like with 13 and 20 wpm testing, they'll drop the 5. THAT is what will count.

4317. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:09:11 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkdhf9$jept$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77730

"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...

You KNOW all elmers personally, right? Why don't YOU continue to alienate and denigrate all the others who have been on HF much longer than you, who have worked HF comm 24/7 longer than you've been alive? Since you aren't out getting ready for emergency work on Isabel, why don't you start a petition for an RM with the FCC to make the 'ARS' the Archaic RadioTELEGRAPHY Service.

What in the world are you talking about, Len? Have you been into the sauce again? I have nothing but respect for the Elmers in the ARS. I might not always agree with them, but I sure would never get in an argument over a repeater with one. That's just pure disrespect.

BTW, thanks for mentioning Isabel. We *have* been working very hard tracking her and making preliminary preparations for a possible evacuation. Fortunately, we didn't have to implement them this time around. But thanks for caring about my job. It's touching, really.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4318. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:09:54 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmkic5k6uucl4c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77731

>
> DICK, what was past is past.
>

My grandfather (God rest his soul, he passed away
7 years ago) lived to the ripe old age of 87. Every now
and then he'd get really drunk on vodka, and then go
into a past-recalling delirium where he'd keep talking
about the need to have a horse and buggy give you a
ride if you wanted to make it back into his neck of
the woods all the way from the main road.

The next morning he'd sober up and find himself back
in the modern day era. The horse and buggy were long
gone.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4319. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:10:45 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmkidph3r3g282@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77732

> Now that's just too funny.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
>

you find the idea of wanting to keep your conscience and
life in the modern day era? sounds like you suffer from
dementia.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4320. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:13:01 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmkii071fngv0c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77733

I have this hilarious vision of elementary school students on a field trip to the local museum in the not to distant future... and they see a strange gismo on a table on the other side of a purple-fuzzy rope thing, covered with dust and cobwebs.... the museum director has to kindly explain to them, "that's a morse code key. It was used to send morse code signals many decades ago back when it was used as a means of communication.."

and a student raises his hand and says, "morse WHAT?"

Clint
KB5ZHT

4321. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:14:16 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmkikafbpl1663@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77734

> Very difficult? Oh please. I passed all three tests (5, 13, 20) with 10
of
> 10 right on the written and solid copy for each.

AH, so it's EASY? SIMPLE? hah, proof then there's no point. Other
hams kept saying it was a discipline of selftraining, and you just said
it was as breeze. Well, if it's a natural as breathing air, then, no need
to test it.

End of discussion.

It's SO easy :)

Clint
KB5ZHT

4322. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:15:49 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmkin91ugtpfcf@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77736

Why don't you
> just alienate all the elmers out there while your at it?
>

I don't see a problem in that, if they are going to be
so condescending as to treat young people as though
it's not possible for them to know anything simply
because they haven't lived for 233 years.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4323. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:16:27 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkdhst$ep9s$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77735

"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...

< I snipped theother droll parts, but this I found interesting>

According to the US Census Bureau, there are over 100 million cellular telephone subscribers in the USA. There are over 150 million "hard-wired" telephones in the USA. What is the point of your little "viable technology" diatribe? And why in the hell aren't you OUT THERE being ten kinds of EM manager with impending doom/disaster from Isabel?

My point exactly, Len. Why waste all that money on hard-wired technology when we have nearly as many wireless phones already. Put that archaic technology to bed, right? Isn't that your mantra?

And once again, I really do appreciate your concern for my job performance. I'll make sure to tell my boss that you asked. :-)

Arnie -
KT4ST

4324. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:17:49 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmkiqvj72rbc67@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77737

>
> However, I find it hard to believe that anyone would reasonably call 9
> countries (*so far*) would constitute "world wide"

oh, okay. So I guess you'll be the standard to which "reasonable" will
be defined. Got ya.

>
> >
>
>

4325. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:19:41 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmkiug7s5mc6e9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77738

> So read it Bill-- that means they support *an* amateur radio license
allowing HF
> operation without code, NOT the removal of all code testing.
>

yea, dick, grab whatever little bit of flotsam you can to stay afloat since
the cw
titanic is sinking.... it's all you have left.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4326. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:20:31 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmkj01tjtemn29@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77739

>
> If that's what you think it sez...dream on.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>

Just like the 13 and 20wpm test... I myself said "if not this time, then next time around" but it happened that time.

sooner or later, it's gone. THEN what will the coders whine about?

Clint
KB5ZHT

4327. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:29:03 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bkdiip$a9f$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 77756

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote

[re: transmitting a 6 mega-pixel image]

> I never claimed you COULD send that with CW.

Well, actually, you _could_. I don't have all the tech stuff handy
to determine just how large a 6 mega-pixel 24-bit color image would actually
_be_, so let's just call it a 6 megabyte file, making it, what, 48 million
bits? Now, how many bits in a 'word' of Morse, average? A dozen, maybe? So,
sending at, let's say, 20 wpm gives us a hypothetical bit-rate of 240
bits/min or 4 bits/sec, so we come out with a mere 12 million seconds to
transmit the image (I _swear_ I did not intend for that answer to come out
that simple!).
It would only take 138.88 days.....

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.518 / Virus Database: 316 - Release Date: 9/11/2003

4328. Re: CB Amplifiers For Sale

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:30:06 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F6A4E0C.70807@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 77740

David Robbins wrote:

>who knows what they are... except i have heard them splattering all the way
>from 27025 to up past 28500 from half way across the country!
>
>
>
A ham friend once upgraded/repaired/modified one of these to eliminate
splatter
and harmonics for a neighbor.
Idea being that my ham friend didn't want to get blamed for the TVI
coming from
a bad CB amp....

4329. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:31:54 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bkdinr$ag7$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 77757

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vmkikafbpl1663@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > Very difficult? Oh please. I passed all three tests (5, 13, 20) with
10
> of
> > 10 right on the written and solid copy for each.
>
> AH, so it's EASY? SIMPLE? hah, proof then there's no point. Other
> hams kept saying it was a discipline of selftraining, and you just said
> it was as breeze. Well, if it's a natural as breathing air, then, no need
> to test it.
>
> End of discussion.
>
> It's SO easy :)

The scary bit is if you keep applying logic to this argument, it
just keeps getting wierder. One of 'em rebutted the "I had to do it, so
should you" argument by basically saying, uhm..."I had to do it, so should
you."

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.518 / Virus Database: 316 - Release Date: 9/11/2003

4330. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:36:05 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F6A4F74.3000004@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 77741
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Bert Craig wrote:

>Every culture has it's dark spots, this is amateur radios. Some think it's
>fun to joke about. It's pretty sickening, if you ask me. Anyone who has
>truly studied what man is capable of doing to man during the Medieval period
>or The Spanish Inquisition know this.
>
>
>
Even in modern times in places. Even if Saddam didn't have any weapons
of mass
destruction or give any help to Usama's gang, it's a good thing Saddam's
henchmen are no longer
around to use wouff hong like devices on people they dont like.

Did we have this amount of trouble occupying Germany and Japan after WW2?

4331. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:43:18 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309181643.7b2e0e28@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77742

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bkbdvroiq0@208.206.142.93>...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
>
> > Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:<3F68C810.4050904@adelphia.net>...
> > > Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > >
> > > > Newp, sorry. A 40M 1/4-wave dipole can be made to resonate just fine and
> > > > work wonderfully. Its position to the ground and center angle have
> > > > everything to do with how well it will radiate. And, using a balun or not
> > > > doesn't change the whole concept of using a 1/4-wave dipole at any
> > > > frequency.
> > > >
> > > > Whether you want them to or not, they work.
> > >
> > > A couple points here Kim.
> > >
> > > According to the ARRL handbook 2003 edition, chapte 20 page 4:
> > >
> > > A fundamental form of antenna is a wire whose length is half the
> > > transmitting wavelength. It is the unit from which many more complex
> > > forms of antennas are constructed and is known as a dipole antenna.
> > >
> > > It goes on from there if you want more.
> > >
> > > Next I modeled two antennas in EZNEC.
> > >
> > > One is a half wave dipole for the middle of the 40 meter band at 7.150
> > > mHz. Each leg of the antenna is approximately 1/4 wavelength long at
> > > 65.45 feet. This antenna models out at an SWR of a little over 1.5:1 at
> > > the center frequency, and 2:1 at 7.3 mHz and a touch over 2 mHz at 7 mHz
> > > with the antenna at 50 feet, the take off angle is 35 degrees. All in
> > > all, not too bad an antenna. Most modern rigs will handle the antenna
> > > without a tuner, or simply with their internal tuner.
> > >
> > > Next, I modeled a quarter wave dipole for the same frequency and all
> > > other paramaters. With the legs at 32.7 feet, the antenna now displays
> > > somewhat near infinite SWR. The take off angle has now risen to 54 degrees.
> >
> > Don't confuse her with Novice physics Mike, she's never had physics
> > and doesn't know a NEC deck from a sun deck.
> >
>
> It's even worse. She has no idea how to break a sine wave down into its components, nor

> anything about the 360 degrees involved.

Don't bring up degrees, it's a sore point for her.

> To say nothing about how voltage/current/impedance
> values appear at each point on the waveform when it is expressed as a dipole antenna, and how
> they interrelate. NOTHING about electrical wavelength versus linear measurement, or what that
> even means..

. . . I wonder how she'd tweak the length of her "quarter wave" dipole
if ya tossed her the free-space length equation and told her to crank
in the Vf term for a specific radiator material . .

> All that is really quite simple and can be easily learned and understood with no help from
> NEC. It's antenna basics.

Right: We were both Novices back when newbies had KNOW somthing about
antennas.

> But with the testing requirements now in place, it won't be.

OBVIOUSLY!

I dunno who it was who made the comment in this thread but he's right,
the more "quarter wave dipoles" these refugees from 27 Mhz use the
less QRM we have to deal with.

> > > That antenna is simply not going to work well at all.
>
> Until she figures out how to match her 50 ohm transiciever output to several thousand ohms or
> more.
>
> But.....she isn't actually *using* a 1/4 wave dipole - she just thinks she is.
> In fact she's sure of it. She said so.

Along these lines . . Field Day a few years back and one of the
codeless village idiots had put up some tribander or another which I
was using on 20 CW. I pointed it just south of due west from here in
Philly. To check things out I quickly worked a couple Euros, an OA, a
VK and a JA. Without touching the rotator control box.

I put the 259B to it and the SWR was flat at about 1.7:1 from 13.5 to
14.5 Mhz. I asked him what the hell kinda "beam" this crapper was.

"Well, it's not a CW antenna, it's tuned for the phone bands . . ".

I figger that pile of aluminum tubing at the high end of the coax was
acting as a top hat for the gawdawful lossy feedline which was doing
all the radiating.

Then came his buddy, another one, who stated that the reason g5rv's "work" is because they're "trap antennas". I asked him to show me the traps in the 40M g5rv we'd put up. "I don't know where they are but they have to be there somewhere."

N2EY was there too . .

And neither of us have been back to run FD with that pack of 21st Century nitwits.

w3rv

4332. Re: Keep the cellphone charged

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:45:19 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F6A519D.3070800@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 77743

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

>Now, I see the "morning shows" are already showing coverage of the potential
>storm, and gee, wouldn't ya think a story or interview on one of those shows
>would have "some" impression." And of course if the average Joe (or
>Josephine) ham was to call up CBS, NBC, ABC, etc. and try to get some time,
>I am quite sure they wouldn't have much luck. BUT an organization
>supposingly representing amateur radio, with alleged clout would have a
>better chance of getting a story or interview in front of a much larger
>public, such as these morning shows.
>
>
Some years ago, when Hawaii got hit bad by a hurricane (or the Pacific
ocean equivalent word,
is it cyclone or typhoon?) it was on one of the national news shows
(ABC, CBS or NBC)
that hams were using 2 meter HTs to supply emergency comms between some
of the islands.

Another time a hurricane hit the Virgin Islands and law and order broke
down (looting and
such). Everything was out except for a few hams on HF, who told of the
situation to the
mainland. We sent in the national guard to restore order. And this was
mentioned on
network news to the public.

We do get some mentions, but we could use more....

4333. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:51:32 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309181651.33bd90b4@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77744

Ralph Aichinger <ralph@dolphy.pangea.at> wrote in message
news:<1063885589.713903@news.liwest.at>...
> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote:
> > I just did a quick recount, and 9V is the 9th country, not the 8th. They
> > are Switzerland, the UK, Belgium, Germany, Austria, the Netherlands,
>
> Austria not yet.
>
> Unfortunately there are more important issues at the moment,
> see: http://tinyurl.com/lmm3 and http://tinyurl.com/nkt0
> HF would be worth nothing if this is passed as an EU
> directive.

Absolutely! We're fighting it to the death on our side of the pond. Go
for it and good luck.

> /ralph

w3rv

4334. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 00:58:11 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <kpadndxIQYGGyveiXTWJgA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 77745

Brian Kelly wrote in message ...
>
>Bilge. All of it. A 66 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole on
>40M and a 134 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole on 80M. A 33
>foot long center-fed dipole is a quarter wavelength long on 40M but it
>is not resonant on 40M and ya better not get stupid and feed it with
>coax then just plug it into the back of yer radio if ya wanna work
>anybody with it.
>

A search on google on quarter wave dipole will give plenty of sources.

4335. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 01:11:17 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hlfkac4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 77746

On Tue, 16 Sep 2003 01:03:16 GMT, Keith wrote:

>> Of course, if the amateur op doesn't have his license with him, the
>> officer has reasonable cause to believe that the pre-emption does
>> not cover him even though it still does, and if the rig has been
>> modified so that it is capable of TRANSMITTING on the police
>> frequency, the pre-emption is not valid even if the operator is a
>> licensed amateur (per the FCC Public Notice on this matter many
>> years ago).

> Please cite case law that supports your position that modified ham radios
> do not have the same exemption as all ham radios?

And on Tue, 16 Sep 2003 22:09:22 -0700 (PDT), Phil Kane wrote:

> That was the deal that the League worked out with the FCC - if the
> radio did not transmit "out of band" then the preemption covered.
> The intent was to exclude VHF/UHF transceivers which have been
> "opened up".
>
> I'll dig out the Public Notice if I can find it. It was many years
> ago.

FCC PR Docket No. 91-36 MO&O Released September 3, 1993.

V. CONCLUSION [Emphasis added]

13. We hold that state and local laws that preclude the
possession in vehicles or elsewhere of amateur radio service
transceivers by amateur operators merely on the basis that the
transceivers are capable of the RECEPTION of public safety,
special emergency, or other radio service frequencies, the
RECEPTION of which is not prohibited by federal law, are
inconsistent with the federal objectives of facilitating and
promoting the amateur radio service and, more fundamentally,
with the federal interest in amateur operators' being able to
transmit and receive on authorized amateur service frequencies.
We therefore hold that such state and local laws are preempted
by federal law.

Footnotes

33. The rules, however, do prohibit amateur service
transmissions outside of the allocated amateur service bands.
47 C.F.R. Sec. 97.307(b); Public Notice, Extended Coverage
Transceivers in the Amateur Radio Service, mimeo no. 4114 (July
21, 1987)(noting that "[i]t is a violation of the Commission's

regulations to . . . transmit on a frequency allocated to a licensed service without the appropriate Commission-issued station license.").

The above proceedings are very clear that it covers only "out of band" reception and does not cover equipment that has "out of band" transmit capability.

Not being a real lawyer, although you try to play one, you may not accept the fact that in FCC practice, situations which are not specifically mentioned for preemption are not preempted. Adminsitrative Practice 101.

There has not been any challenge to this ruling, therefore it stands as effective law until overturned. Administrative Practice 102.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
ARRL Volunteer Counsel

4336. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 01:15:36 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkdlbq$jmc4$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77747

"Clint" wrote ...

you find the idea of wanting to keep your conscience and life in the modern
day era? sounds like you suffer from dementia.

Now, that was even funnier. Not even a cogent sentence.

Arnie -

4337. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 01:17:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918211703.17920.00001134@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 77748

>A search on google on quarter wave dipole will give plenty of sources.
>

Good, keep using 1/4 wave Dipoles

4338. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 01:20:31 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkdll1$jt1r$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77749

"Clint" wrote ...

AH, so it's EASY? SIMPLE? hah, proof then there's no point. Other hams kept saying it was a discipline of selftraining, and you just said it was as breeze. Well, if it's a natural as breathing air, then, no need to test it. End of discussion. It's SO easy :)

No actually, I had to put in quite a few hours learning the code. But like anything else, once I had done it -- I was more than ready for the exams. As I said before, it must be you.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4339. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 01:20:54 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918212054.17920.00001135@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 77750

>you find the idea of wanting to keep your conscience and
>life in the modern day era? sounds like you suffer from
>dementia.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT

You No-Code Kooks keep throwing the words "modern day era" out. What is that supposed to me?

4340. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 01:26:34 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkdm0c$k764$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77901

"Clint" wrote ...

I don't see a problem in that, if they are going to be so condescending as to treat young people as though it's not possible for them to know anything simply because they haven't lived for 233 years.

I'm not surprised by your answer at all, Clint. Someone calls you "son" and you get all bent out of shape and have to 'show them a thing or two'. The only problem -- you will have missed out on a plethora of knowledge because of that attitude. Too bad, really.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4341. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 01:29:46 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkdm6amga0@208.207.71.178>
Source record: 77902

Clint wrote:

>
> My advice, in the future, is to think before you talk, lest your
> foot winds up in your mouth and you look silly.
>
> "better to keep your mouth shut and have people WONDER
> if your stupid, than to open it and remove all doubt."
>

That's good advice It's a shame you can't realize you need to observe it.

4342. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 01:37:50 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkdmlg$khae$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77903

"Len Over 21" wrote ...

< I snipped the rest because it is well known that my Emergency Management Agency *uses* every piece of technology I listed -- and Len knows it too >

Here Isabel is about to make landfall and Big Arnie is making all the boasting in this newsgroup without being Out There helping to Save The Day Through Ham Band CW.

Even after a year of killfile, I see that you have the same mantra, Len. Ho Hum boring -- as usual. Don't you ever get tired of being so wrong, so mad, and so bitter all the time?

Arnie -
KT4ST

4343. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 01:39:51 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <H7tab.513160$uu5.85491@sccrnsc04>
Source record: 77904

>
> This shouldn't take long. I shall use short words with few syllables so
> that you can understand what I had said. Obviously you flew over it
> without any REAL discrimination to the actual wording.
>
> I never claimed you COULD send that with CW.
> What I was saying is that the majority of the CW-using crowd is
> trapped in a time warp that keeps them set back 30 years or so
> (evident by thier "hell bent for leather" desire to keep cw testing
> around), and wouldn't understand the concept of anything modern
> (such as updating the various requirements in ham radio.
>
> My advice, in the future, is to think before you talk, lest your
> foot winds up in your mouth and you look silly.
>
> "better to keep your mouth shut and have people WONDER
> if your stupid, than to open it and remove all doubt."
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT

Clint my man .....you should have followed your own advice and not posted that glittering generality of a Mongolian Cluster ..... I really think your are able to do better than that pathetic attempt to ruffle the CWist's feathers ... The fellows who I know who operate CW do so in addition to digital modes and various ones at that. I don't operate HF fone for various reasons but I can say in all honesty that the primary reason is that I talk all day. It is a refreshing break for me to get on an avocal mode and communicate with a fellow ham ....but Clint I know you also never operate fone as you know the superiority of digital modes and the inherent moderness therein.

God Bless 72&7/8ths Tom KI3R Belle Vernon Pa.

Beeping along since '65 amongst other things .....

4344. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 01:47:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6A6089.6040004@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77905

JJ wrote:
> Brian Kelly wrote in message ...
>
>> Bilge. All of it. A 66 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole
>> on 40M and a 134 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole on
>> 80M. A 33 foot long center-fed dipole is a quarter wavelength long
>> on 40M but it is not resonant on 40M and ya better not get stupid
>> and feed it with coax then just plug it into the back of yer radio
>> if ya wanna work anybody with it.
>>
>
>
> A search on google on quarter wave dipole will give plenty of
> sources.

That's where we started on this sorry thread. Go back and read the posts, including my 1/4 vs 1/2 wave dipole design done in EZNEC, and then let us know how well a 1/4 wave dipole works.

Then why don't you build a 1/4 wave dipole for whatever band gets you into Central PA. We'll do a sked, and see how well your antenna works.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4345. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 01:49:22 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkdnb4$kdbm$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77906

"Clint" wrote ...

> > Gee, you got us there, Clint. All of us knuckle-dragging CW'ers are
just
> > caught in a time warp.

> Yep.
> pretty much.

No really, Clint. You seem to be the self-styled expert. You have strongly implied that anyone that is pro-CW is bereft of any knowledge concerning modern communications technology. So, put up or shut up. Explain to the group what a Scottie VTC looks like, how it works, and what additional hardware is needed for it to function properly. Once you've done that, tell us all about WANs, why they are superior to other types, and what additional measures are needed to make them secure. Then, since you seem to be the expert -- let me know which of the two systems you would recommend to my agency based on a long term cost analysis. And don't forget to factor in the yearly maintenance contract. I'll wait here, sport.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4346. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 02:00:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918220003.07578.00000601@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 77907

In article <bkd29u$t8t$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) writes:

>N2EY <n2ey@aol.com> wrote:
>>In article <3F69405B.F31A0F87@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>>writes:
>>
>>>We're talking about two countries
>>>with a little over 1,600 radio amateurs between them.
>>
>>Maybe you know the answer to this one, Dave:
>>
>>How many amateurs are there in the 9 countries that have dropped code
>testing?
>
>176,685 in the year 2000 according to
>
> http://www.iaru.org/statsum00.html
>
>The UK and Germany are the bulk of that number.

Thanks, Dennis!

Currently there are about 685,000 US hams.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4347. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 02:10:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6A65FE.6070201@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77908

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
>
>>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>>news:bkb8pg$8l8$0@208.206.142.108...
>>
>>>
>>>Bill Sohl wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>"IARU policy is to support the removal of Morse code testing as a
>>>>requirement
>>>>for an amateur license to operate on frequencies below 30 MHz," the IARU
>>>>Administrative Council resolved.
>>>
>>>So read it Bill-- that means they support *an* amateur radio license
>>
>>allowing HF
>>
>>>operation without code, NOT the removal of all code testing.
>>
>>If that's what you think it sez...dream on.
>
>
> It sez what it sez, Bill. And that's what it sez!

Oh yeah? Who sez it sez what it sez? 8^) - Mike KB3EIA -

4348. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 02:13:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6A669E.4070406@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77909

Arnie Macy wrote:
> "Clint" wrote ...
>
> the PCTA crowd just said "six mega what ???" you screwed up and mentioned
> something modern and applicable in the real world.... they're trapped in
> 1952.
> ----------
>
> Gee, you got us there, Clint. All of us knuckle-dragging CW'ers are just
> caught in a time warp. We don't know a thing about modern communications
> technology. Gosh, I'll bet you can tell me all about the "new" technologies
> like SATLink, VTC Scottie, trunked spread spectrum FM and closed networking,
> right? Not that I'd ever use all that stuff at work or anything ... right?

Heck, we don't even use 1/4 wave dipoles, Arnie!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4349. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 02:18:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918221840.00545.00000894@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 77911

In article <eHs9b.16486$NM1.11330@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
>news:c2356669.0309151318.61dd8717@posting.google.com...
>> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
>news:<vmbdhfc0nr1n86@corp.supernews.com>...
>> > many people that are in or supports the doctrines of PCTA keeps
>> > spouting "basics", and draws an anology to either handwriting...
>> > and I say this; does this mean you could NEVER write cursive
>> > if you were never taught print? could you NOT be taught
>> > cursive directly without first being taught print? No.
>>
>> OK, fine.
>>
>> But why should any sort of manual writing skill be mandatory in a
>> world full of keyboards?
>
>It may well come to that. For now, since keyboards are not
>everywhere 100% of the time, educators require some
>sort of manual writing ability. For the record, I never had a
>decent handwriting and I print everything on those rare
>occasions when I have to manually apply pen to paper.

The local school district requires the students to learn no less than *three* different kinds of manual writing:

Block printing
Denilian (sp?) script
Cursive (longhand)

And they do it all by 3rd grade.

Even though the kids could get along with just one, all three are taught - and required.
>
>> > However, it's simply another skill that can be taught, and they
>> > do, and that's fine.
>>
>> Why?
>>
>> Why not teach keyboarding from Day One? Our children will spend far
>> more time at keyboards than writing.
>
>But their need to write at some occasions hasn't
>been ended. Maybe someday it will...but not now.

Handwriting is how old? ;-)
>
>> > However, they do not look at CW the
>> > same way; it's pass/fail, not merely a percentage of test
>> > that needs to be passed.
>> >
>> If it were up to me, there would be several written tests (or the
>> written would be split up into separately-graded parts) as well as a
>> code test.
>
>You know I agree in principal with that...except for needing
>any code test at all.

But does the NCVEC petition, or the NCI petition address the writtens? Not at
all.
>
>> > Do you think they would support a system where you had
>> > to be tested on CW, if an only if you wanted to use CW
>> > on the CW part of the bands? Heh, of COURSE not.
>>
>> There are no CW-only parts of the HF/MF bands. None at all.
>
>Perhaps he should have asked:
>Do you think they would support a system where you had
>to be tested on CW, if an only if you wanted to use CW
>on the parts of the bands where CW can be used?

CW can be used anywhere on the HF/MF bands....
>
>> > That is where thier anology fails. The art of CW needs
>> > to be tested with a practical test if you are to use and
>> > learn CW, but not necissarily ham radio. I would have
>> > supported a system like that, where if you wanted to
>> > operate CW on the lower half of the band you had to
>> > be tested on if first, but of course, that was out of the
>> > question.
>>
>> Your opinion noted. Others have a different opinion.
>> >
>> > They do not, however, likewise, first test people
>> > on knowing how to build a double sideband carrier
>> > transmission if they want to operate AM; they do
>> > not require you to show how to get a microphone,
>> > talk on it, and recieve the response on a speaker
>> > if you want to use frequency modulated radiotelephone,
>> > or single sideband carrier suppressed radiotelephone.
>>
>> Perhaps they should.
>> >
>> > But they DO want to force CW on people that don't
>> > necissarily have any interest in operating it. "basics"
>> > arguments fail; "selftrained skill" fails because everything

>> > is a selftrained skill, why put the emphasis on an outdated
>> > mode instead of testing selftrained skills on new, modern
>> > modes of communication?
>>
>> Then answer this question: Why should people who are not interested in
>> building or fixing their radios have to learn all that theory stuff
>> for the written tests? Why are all hams tested on all sorts of stuff
>> they are not interested in?
>
>But, as pointed out before...ONLY morse has its own stand alone
>test. No other body of ham knowledge on that is tested is
>given that exclusivity.

Doesn't answer the question.
>
>> When I first started out in ham radio, all I wanted to do was join the
>> folks I heard on 75 meter AM. Yet in order to get the license, I had
>> to learn not only Morse Code, but all sorts of theory and regulatory
>> stuff that had absolutely nothing to do with 75 meter AM.
>> Why was I forced to learn all that?
>
>Cause its the rules..

Apply that logic to the code test!

>.if you want it changed, petition the FCC.

W5YI's working on it - you watch.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4350. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 02:18:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918221841.00545.00000895@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 77910

In article <IDVNFYDX37881.3498263889@bog.lir.dk>, Franz Weigel
<anon@bog.lir.dk> writes:

>The last CW coder who died was sentenced
>to Hell for eternity in order to transmit
>6 Megapixels 24-bit color pictures in CW.
>
>God bless you from CW !

Gee - who was it said they were only against the TEST?

4351. Rev.Jim the troller (was Re: Bootlegging in 1948?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 02:36:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918223634.29660.00000717@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 77913

In article <c2356669.0309181342.d6b6763@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
(N2EY) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030916205914.12501.00002451@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>> In article <c2356669.0309160836.595af4a9@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>> (N2EY) writes:
>>
>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>> >news:<20030916010914.05539.00000775@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>> >> In article <20030915021846.23171.00000765@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>> (N2EY)
>> >> writes:
>> >>
>> >> >In article <vm9usff4mpm58f@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
>> >> ><rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>> >> >
>> >> >>sending and receiving CW isn't a building block
>> >> >>to anything else.....
>> >> >
>> >> >Yes, it is.
>> >> >
>> >> >First, it's a building block to the use of the mode on the air.
>Although
>> other
>> >> >services have pretty much stopped using Morse Code, hams use it
>> extensivley,
>> >> >and an amateur license is permission to operate an amateur station, not
>a
>> >> >station in another service.
>> >>
>> >> Roger that, Reverend Jim...
>> >
>> >Who is "Reverend Jim", Len? You and Brian Burke keep using that name
>> >to address someone.
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...you've never seen "Taxi" then... :-)
>
>I've seen most episodes of Taxi. My name's not Ignatowksi.

We've all seen your prodigious output here in the Newsgroup.

Your surname is Miccolis but you are a dead-ringer for the Rev. Jim
character, totally stoked on morsemanship...spaced out as to any
other radio communications mode.

>> >It can't be me, because I graduated from electrical engineering
>> >school, not divinity school. And my name isn't Ignatowski ;-)
>
>> >What engineering school did you graduate from, Len?
>>
>> One right here in Southern California...
>
>One without a name...:->

It's easy enough for a BSEE to find out. Not that many out here.

On the other hand, it is difficult to figure out WHERE YOU WORK,
in terms of an actual company name.

You rationalize on "not revealing it" for some kind of "fear" of getting
"bad mail" from others.

I think your REAL fear is just in everyone discovering you don't do a
damn thing in radio for a living.

No problem for me. I've revealed most of my employers in here, plus a
number of personal references who are long-time licensed radio amateurs.

You won't do that.

All you seem to want is some kind of "rep" in the newsgroup for being here
almost all of your free time, writing terribly long, boring peans to
yourself
and morsemanship...when not using the newsgroup as some kind of "chat
room" in talking about absolutely non-radio-amateur subjects.

>> >> IN the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service...
>> >
>> >No such thing exists.
>>
>> Yes it do, de facto, just not de jure. :-)
>
>DeJur made projectors. You're projecting ;-)

I'm telling it like it is. "Archaic RadioTELEGRAPHY Service."

That's what you want.

That gives you some rank-status-privilege as an AMATEUR because
your aren't IN radio as a professional.

>> >I've been "in" the Amateur Radio Service for almost 36 years. You have
>> >not done so for even one day.
>>
>> >That's nice, Len. On what amateur band did you bootleg with it?
>
>Hmm?
>
>> >Or was
>> >it a broadcast band device so you could pretend you were on "Ted

>> >Mack's Amateur Hour"? ;-)
>>
>> I've never bootlegged on anything after 1948.
>
>Ah - but that means you may have bootlegged in 1948 and before!

YOU don't really KNOW if I "bootlegged" at all, do you?

All you want to do is to selectively use my messages as an ignition
point for a Flame War.

YOU didn't exist in 1948. That was 55 years ago.

You have NO KNOWLEDGE of what I did back then or even 56 years
ago, but you are trolling, trolling, looking for a Flame Fest to start.

So, great big expert radio ham, tell US your "personal experiences" with
small output personal wireless AM broadcast band links of the pre-1950
period.

>Come clean and tell the group all about it. It will be good for your
>soul to admit your checkered past.

Go stick a whouff-hong someplace, pervert.

It will satisfy your sex life.

>It's more than you had done in RADIO at that age.
>
>And mine was legal. No bootlegging.

YOU didn't exist in 1947...or 1948.

By February 1953 I was already (at 20 years of age) a soldier serving
overseas, assigned to an Army radio station with the callsign ADA.
I was with ADA for three years.

You've never served in the armed forces of the United States, much less
"assigned overseas."

You've made fun of my military service in the past. [that's in Google, by
the way, you seem to live part of your time there...]

You want to be honored a respected for being safely within in the USA
borders, never serving. You want to make fun of those veterans who
who don't love your blessed sacrament, morsemanship.

>> By 1967 I'd already DESIGNED and mostly built (technician help was
>> not always available) several UHF to microwave RF emitters of more
>> that 10 Watts.
>
>Well, give Len a Nobel Prize for accomplishment in physics!
>
>In 1967 you were almost three times 14 years old.

Wow, for an ALLEGED MSEE, you've got BAD arithmetic skills.

Three times fourteen is forty-two. 1967 - 42 = 1925.

I was born in 1932.

In early 1967 I was 34 years old, my Honorable Discharge was
7 years in the past.

>And it was your JOB, wasn't it?

You are damn right is was MY JOB.

I was good at enough to be given design responsibility.

>> All quite legal.
>
>Not for you to operate unless you held the station license.

Go Whouff-Hong yourself, sweetums. I DID have a station license
in the PLMRS (as its called now) in a partnership in a business.

Don't give us this CRAP about "holding a station license" when you've
stated in the past in here that ham radio is "all about OPERATING."

>Guess what, Len? You can get an amateur license for VHF/UHF that
>doesn't require a code test.

Guess what, Rev. Jim, you can become a REAL Preacher by going to
a theology school instead of playing the part in a newsgroup.

Then you give your sermons a real kick...the ones about the Sermon on
The Antenna Mount.

>Is it your guilt over your own bootlegging that causes you to attack
>those who followed the law, even as teenagers?

You are really REACHING for some Flame War, aren't you, Rev. Jim?

Why don't you pull out your Raddio Kop shield and come arrest me for
bootlegging?

>Who is this "Rev. Jim" you keep addressing?

Yourself, Stokey. Get off the hard stuff before it does you in...

>The age thing is yours, Len, not mine. You recommended that FCC not
>license anyone under age 14.

Let us know when you've passed the mental age of 14 and we can
discuss things rationally. So far, you aren't close to that.

>> >Why are you avoiding that simple question?
>>
>> WHAT "question?"
>>
>"Why should there be *any* written test on theory if all a person

>wants to do is operate manufactured radios?
>
>"If someone doesn't want to design, build or repair radios, why should
>they have to memorize all those symbols, diagrams and formulas?"

Those aren't "questions" except to the loaded, "do you still beat your
wife" sort of "questions."

They don't have to be "answered" because YOU don't have one single
bit of "authority" to demand answers.

Take pride in your work for a living. Reveal at least the area of
"electrical
work" you do.

I've never known anyone in electronics engineering to NOT take pride in
what they do or talk shop about it. You are the exception. You won't
say word one about what area of "electrical engineering" you are in.

Either you do NOT work in "electrical engineering" or you are terribly
ashamed of what you do that you don't dare admit it.

Either way, ALL you are is an AMATEUR who tries to pass hisself off as
a great big guru in AMATEURISM.

Show me up by giving an answer to that, Fearless Fosdick.

Bet you can't. You will weasel-word your way around it.

LHA

4352. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 02:36:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918223635.29660.00000718@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 77912

In article <Yepab.40517$Aq2.12707@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>Absolutely correct Larry. Bottom line is its too tough to actually try to
>learn something for these whiners. It really is pathetic.

Yes, it's "pathetic" that so many long-timers jumped through all the
hoops and now they demand that all others do the same as they did.

Jump, jump, Danny.

LHA

4353. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 02:36:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030918223635.29660.00000719@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 77914

In article <c777ab1364e2b7954c18183cd420d781.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>, "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
>>
>> Then answer this question: Why should people who are not interested in
>> building or fixing their radios have to learn all that theory stuff
>> for the written tests? Why are all hams tested on all sorts of stuff
>> they are not interested in?
>
>Because the terms of their license make them responsible for the quality
>of their radiated signal(s).
>
>Without demonstrating some familiarity with the basic underlying
>science, it would be irresponsible of the regulators to allow an
>applicant to establish a radio transmitting station on the public
>airways. Familiarize yourself with the concept "tragedy of the
>commons".

That's very incorrect, Hans Kohb.

Everyone knows that "CW" gets through when nothing else will, so
all that is required for amateur radio is to demonstrate on-off keying
morse code ability and that will suffice.

Right?

LHA

4354. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 02:58:02 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030918225802.11891.00000932@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 77919

In article <vmkhpid2i7j4eb@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
<rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20030917234317.12631.00001186@mb-m28.aol.com...
>> In article <vmhtfj9hjg5221@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
>> <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>>
>> >
>> >the PCTA crowd just said "six mega what ???"
>> >
>> >you screwed up and mentioned something modern
>> >and applicable in the real world.... they're trapped
>> >in 1952.
>>
>> Clint:
>>
>> In exactly what way is transmitting 6 megapixel color images using
>> CW "applicable in the real world?"
>
>This shouldn't take long. I shall use short words with few syllables so
>that you can understand what I had said.

Clint:

Ah, the old "start off with an insult to the intelligence to the poster"
opening. A classic on Usenet, particularly on rrap. Well done -- you've
already lost your argument!

>Obviously you flew over it
>without any REAL discrimination to the actual wording.

Not really, but if it gives you comfort to think so, who am I to deny
you your little pleasure?

>I never claimed you COULD send that with CW.

Ah Ha! That makes one wonder why you mentioned it, then…

>What I was saying is that the majority of the CW-using crowd is
>trapped in a time warp that keeps them set back 30 years or so
>(evident by thier "hell bent for leather" desire to keep cw testing
>around), and wouldn't understand the concept of anything modern
>(such as updating the various requirements in ham radio).

Well, we all know that this isn't true, just another specious
non-argument by a whining NCTA.

>> BTW -- if I'm "trapped in 1952" -- the year I was born, BTW, why isn't
>> a gallon of gasoline selling for 24 cents? Damn those time traps --
>> they're never around when you need them!

>and, likewise, the cost of living along with the average wages were
>considerably less.

True enough. I guess what we need is a selective "time trap" that just
"traps" prices.

>My advice, in the future, is to think before you talk, lest your
>foot winds up in your mouth and you look silly.

Yeah -- good thing I wasn't "talking."

>"better to keep your mouth shut and have people WONDER
>if your stupid, than to open it and remove all doubt."

And, you even finish with an insult to my intelligence. I'll say one
thing for you, my friend, you really have this Usenet thing dialed in!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4355. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 02:58:03 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030918225803.11891.00000933@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 77916

In article <Xns93FA93F177603elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>I eventually passed code in 1993, but if it weren't for the *@#%^&! code >test I could have had an HF licence in 1971.

Alun:

The problem wasn't the "*@#%^&! code test" at all. It was you and your negative attitude toward it. The fact that you eventually passed it means that you had that ability all along, and just couldn't actualize it due to your negative feelings toward taking the test. I know; I've been there myself. The difference between you and me is that once I learned the code and began using it, I found it's value. This has served as the most convincing proof possible that code testing is a valid licensing requirement in the Amateur Radio Service.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4356. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 02:58:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030918225804.11891.00000934@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 77917

In article <20030918175652.07346.00000687@mb-m26.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

> A half century ago I felt right at home working primary communications
> on Army radio station ADA. Not only feeling that but BEING AT HOME
> at the new site of Camp Tomlinson...barracks at one corner of the huge
> antenna field. ADA never used "CW" (on-off keying), trans-Pacific or
> local.
>
> DICK, you've NEVER done that in the US Army, have you?
>
> All you can do is demand that EVERYONE HAD TO DO IT LIKE YOU
> DID but you can never offer any viable proof why they should.
>
> LHA

Lennie:

Your half-century old experiences in military communications, where, by your own admission, you never utilized the Morse/CW mode, are irrelevant to the discussion of Morse code testing requirements within the AMATEUR Radio Service in 2003. In fact, as a person who does not use the Morse code for any reason whatsoever, you are self-disqualified from rendering any judgment on the topic whatsoever. Therefore, I suggest that you stop wasting your time, find something you know something about (which from my personal observation seems to be limited to megalomaniacal, ego-driven character assassination) and talk about that, instead. You are not influencing anyone on the topic of code testing.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4357. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 02:58:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030918225805.11891.00000935@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 77920

In article <BAdab.33076$Aq2.2472@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

> Compliance with all laws (or regulations) is a voluntary act. But, in this
>country, there is a mechanism for eliminating laws that no longer serve a
>purpose. That process is happening now with the regulations concerning Morse
>Code testing.

Dwight:

This may be so, but it is an imperfect system being directed by people with imperfect wisdom and questionable motives. I say questionable because their motives, for the most part, are entirely self-serving.

>> Only NCTA whiners who are too lazy and indifferent
>> to the true nature of the ARS to be bothered to learn
>> a useful communications skill like Morse/CW drag out
>> the "I'm being forced to learn Morse code" or "I'm
>> having Morse code shoved down my throat" arguments.
>> This is truly pathetic.

> Attempts to prevent the process of ending code testing, with no reason
>other than your own preference for that testing, is indeed an attempt to
>force interested parties to comply with your wishes instead of complying
>with regulations which reflect the true needs of Amateur Radio.

And it is my right as an American Citizen to make an attempt to preserve this requirement. I am not challenging your right to do the opposite, even though you seem interesting in squelching my own efforts. What are you afraid of?

>The only
>reason you've offered for keeping code testing is your desire to limit
>access to Amateur Radio (to keep out those who are not "interested,
>motivated, or incentive-driven" enough to meet your tastes).

That's hardly the "only" reason I've offered. I suggest a few nights spent on Google looking at my past postings.

>Of course,
>Amateur Radio was not created to be your own private club with rules
>designed to keep out those you don't like.

And, of course, that is not my intent -- only your "spin."

>Instead, Amateur Radio is open to
>all Americans with ANY interest in this activity, with rules to reasonably
>facilitate that safely and orderly. That interest is not limited to just

>Morse Code today. It also includes those who just want to hang out on the
>repeaters, those who just want to talk with their friends, those who just
>want to build their own equipment, and those with many other similar
>interests (and soon to include those interested in HF, but with no interest
>in Morse Code).

The interests of those desiring to simply "hang out on repeaters" is already
met with the No-code Technician's class license. And since the same
license also gives full access to ALL the frequencies above 50 MHz, all
of your other arguments lose their validity. HF access is different, and it
is here that the Morse/CW mode offers benefits and advantages which
can be exploited to the benefit of all radio amateurs -- but only if they
know how to do so. Therefore, the testing requirement remains current
and valid -- forever.

>> (snip) This is the genius of the Morse code testing
>> requirement -- it brings out the best in interested, motivated,
>> and incentive-driven people, who, for the most part,
>> become the best hams.

> Your own ongoing behavior in this regard clearly shows that statement to
>be totally false.

Another specious and unprovable argument, colored by your own
prejudice and self-interest.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4358. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 02:58:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030918225806.11891.00000936@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 77918

In article <Tdqab.40565$Aq2.26840@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>> Absolutely correct Larry. Bottom line is its too tough to
>> actually try to learn something for these whiners. It really
>> is pathetic.

> No, it's pathetic that some judge themselves, and others, based on
>something as outdated as Morse Code/CW. This was designed for communications
>in the early 1900's. By the late 1900's, it's usefullness as a
>communications mode had almost entirely disappeared. Today, it has no
>substantial use other than recreation. As such, it has no value as a license
>exam requirement. To claim otherwise simply because you've built a
>self-identity around that mode is truely pathetic.

Dwight:

Sorry, but that is a judgment that you are not qualified to make. I'm not even going to bother to mention how wrong this judgment is, because it comes from someone who is incapable of rendering a credible judgment of the Morse/CW mode because of his lack of experience therein.

> In the end, look at yourselves before you start talking about what is
>pathetic. The two of you (Dan and Larry) sound like a couple of tired old
>CB'ers still arguing that D-104 microphones and tube-type linears were
>better as you sit around humming the tune to the movie "Convoy." You're too
>old to raise hell in real life anymore,

Sez who, Dwight? Again, you're speaking out of turn, and making judgments you are not qualified to make.

>so you instead sit around trying to
>raise hell in this newsgroup, patting each other on the backs for the
>imagined value of your skill while the rest of the world continues to pass
>you by.

Incorrect. Dan and I are just speaking the truth based on practical experience…something you don't have when it comes to Morse/CW.

> Most Code/CW users understand the changing times and simply enjoy Code/CW
>for what it is - one more enjoyable operating mode in the rich diversity of
>Amateur Radio. Too bad you two can't come to grips with that.

Dwight, I'll match my involvement in the "rich diversity of Amateur Radio" against anyone's in this newsgroup -- or just about anywhere else in the ARS! And don't get me wrong -- I'm not claiming to be anything like Joe Super Ham -- but I'm eminently qualified to judge the value and currency

of the Morse/CW mode based on my experience. You are not. Therefore, whenever you speak on the subject, you are wasting your time.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4359. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 02:58:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030918225807.11891.00000937@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 77915

In article <0hrab.40614$Aq2.16758@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>Coming from a Technician licensee, who knows NOTHING about how Morse Code
>is used, enjoyed, or anything. I'll just consider the source.
>
>Tell you what Dwight....when you get some knowledge of the subject, I'll pay
>attention. Just quit trying to put on a spin on a subject you know NOTHING
>about.
>
>Have a nice day.

Dan:

Precisely on point. The plain truth is, those who don't know the Morse
code and have not used it to a recognizably sufficient level of proficiency
are simply unqualified to make any judgments whatsoever about the
mode or the testing requirement therefor. The NCTA has nothing going
for them other than their passionate quest to become the lowest common
denominator.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4360. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 03:01:24 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93FAEA31CEF7Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 77921

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote in
news:c2356669.0309181408.1329ec52@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns93FA945525D3Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in
>> news:20030918061840.23171.00000848@mb-m05.aol.com:
>>
>> > In article <d22b54c3.0309171832.1a2c0fad@posting.google.com>,
>> > kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:
>> >
>> >>How do you reconcile your "plight" with the fact that many youngters
>> >>under 14 have passed 20 wpm code tests?
>> >
>> > AND all the *written* tests.
>> >
>> > The youngest extra I know got that license at the age of 8. That was
>> > before restructuring, when there were 5 *written* tests.
>> >
>> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>> >
>>
>> They were better at code than I am.
>
> Heck, they were better at code than *I* was at their age!
>
>> It doesn't correlate with age, or intelligence.
>
> There are many different kinds of intelligence.
>
>>I could have passed all the theory at 14.
>
> But could you have passed all the theory at 8? I don't think I could
> have.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

It's hard to say. I didn't really develop an interest in radio until I was
13. Probably not.

4361. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 03:09:47 UTC
From: Keith <spm@less.lo>
Message-ID: <%ruab.8133$UN4.1015@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77922

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote:

>Not being a real lawyer,

I think you interpret law like a muslim fundamentalist that make women wear head to toe coverings in Afghanistan or face beatings.

Like I told you before, I can discuss the law and not be a lawyer. I think the abortion ruling is absurd ruling by the courts, but according to your Taliban lawyer theology I am not allowed to talk about the law or my views on it. I am not giving legal advice for pay or portraying myself as a member of the Oregon Bar so I can discuss the law and you can't do anything about it.

> although you try to play one, you may not
> accept the fact that in FCC practice, situations which are not
> specifically mentioned for preemption are not preempted.
> Adminsitrative Practice 101.

That isn't case law, that is a discussion by the FCC of ham radios that can receive out of band. To get my Icom 730 to operate on the WARC bands I had to modify it and it can even operate out of the box out of band.
If the FCC stated that the exemption does not cover any radio that is modified or transmits outside of allocated ham bands then you would be correct. But the fact that the FCC mentions reception in a ruling about ham radio transceivers that can receive out of band police or fire frequencies means that a ham radio operator can no longer experiment, improve or enhance his electronic equipment because Taliban Lawyer Phil says so is stupid.
Site the case law that proves that ham radio operators can no longer modify their amateur radios and therefore will be in violation of any Federal or State law.
Why don't you get your ARRL buddies to look at this issue and you can all send out a ARRL bulletin with a legal advisory? If what you say is true don't you think it is in the best interest of all league members to know this information? Especially since thousands league members have modified their ham radios to operate on 60 meters in the last few months.

4362. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 03:11:10 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <hq6dnQvg-P-h5feiU-KYjA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 77924

Mike Coslo wrote in message >
> That's where we started on this sorry thread. Go back and read the
>posts, including my 1/4 vs 1/2 wave dipole design done in EZNEC, and
>then let us know how well a 1/4 wave dipole works.
>
> Then why don't you build a 1/4 wave dipole for whatever band gets you
>into Central PA. We'll do a sked, and see how well your antenna works.

Geeesh what a knuckle headed bunch. I never claimed that a 1/4 dipole would work as well as a 1/2 wave. However hook it to some ladder line and a tuner and you might be supprised. This all started when the so called "experts" here said there is no such thing. All I am saying is go to google and do a search and it will be obvious to the most casual observer that there is. Was I too fast for you are do I need to slow down?

4363. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 03:22:52 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <bkdsqc$30em$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 77925

Dee D. Flint <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
>"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
>news:vm9hn3q1esl4fc@corp.supernews.com...
>> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> news:bk2bmq$jkj@library1.airnews.net...
>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>
>> No new nuclear power generation is
>> > planned, 'least not that I know of...
>> >
>> > Kim W5TIT
>> >
>> >
>>
>> that's because the environmental wackos are doing thier damndest
>> to fight them, at every level of governement and in every manner
>> of social disobedience...
>>
>> This is why california hasn't built any new power plants in 10 years
>> while experiencing a DOUBLING of population.... resulting in
>> the blackouts they just had.
>
>You might make it clear that California hasn't built any new plants of ANY
>KIND because the environmentalists wackos are blocking them. It's not just
>nuclear they are blocking. They have taken the step that any risk
>whatsoever is unacceptable. Actually I'm amazed that there even willing to
>take the risk of getting out bed. Maybe they don't even use beds since they
>could fall out and break their necks.

It would be good to clear up a couple of things about California electricity generation, since the above really is becoming urban legend.

The assertion that no new power generation capacity has been built in California recently just isn't true. About 4.5 GW of generating capacity was added in the 1990's, and more since then. The non-renewable plants which have been built recently have mostly been natural gas fired plants, mostly because the technology for natural gas generation has made huge efficiency gains over the past couple of decades (and small plants have become as efficient as large ones, meaning you can locate them closer to consumers and save transmission costs too), making it about the most cost effective way to generate electricity until fuel costs began to rise even more recently. In recent years new coal and oil fired plants have produced more expensive electricity than natural gas (for equal emissions out the chimney)

when the costs of the plants are included, while I think the cost of nuclear power plant construction, maintenance and subsidies makes their output more expensive than even the non-hydro renewables (including wood!).

Also note that all but, perhaps, a lunatic fringe in California, would love to build more hydro plants. The problem is that to do this you need to get sufficient output from the facility to pay for the cost of building it, and the output from a hydraulic plant is proportional to the river's flow rate times the vertical distance from the top of a dam you can afford to build to the turbines at the bottom. A river's flow rate and topography are dictated by God, not by people, and unfortunately just about all the economic hydro sites in California have already been developed (Yosemite is an exception, I guess, but I don't think it is "wacko" to oppose flooding that).

As for the blackouts of 2000-2001 being caused by the lack of adequate generating capacity, I'd just point out that the system of generators which produced rolling blackouts in the winter of 2001 at a 28 GW demand level was pretty much identically the same system that comfortably met a 53 GW peak load on a hot day in the summer of 1999, so any theory that it was the lack of new generating capacity which caused the problem would also need to explain where 25 GW of existing capacity disappeared to. The fact is that much of it was taken out of service (by its new, post-deregulation owners) for "maintenance", an action which most now view as having a lot more to do with the ability of generators to make more money by selling less power in the new, deregulated market than it did with any immediate need for 20 GW of generating capacity to receive simultaneous repairs.

To tell the truth, while there are a lot of things I could find fault with in California, electricity generation and consumption isn't one of them. California has kept its per-capita electricity consumption almost constant over the past quarter-century, compared to a >50% per-capita increase in the rest of the country, while increasing its per-capita GDP at a rate substantially higher than the rest of the country, without any other associated pain or inconvenience that I can figure out and at prices that were, until recently, lower than, say, the US northeast. About 10% of the electricity comes from non-hydro renewable sources (there are about 6,000 wind turbines in the Altamont pass about an hour from where I live; I-80 passes through there). The response to the 2001 blackouts, and subsequent rate increases (probably assisted by the economy), was that California residents and businesses lowered consumption by 15% over the next year. If you look at http://www.caiso.com you'll probably find demand peaking at about one kilowatt per person on a summer day with temperatures in the urban areas ranging from the low 80's to mid 90's. I don't think there is anywhere else in the country that can match this, yet here it is done effortlessly.

I hence don't think there are so many negatives to be learned from how the construction of electric generation, and consumption of that power, has been managed in California. If you want to learn what not to do, I think the best lesson might concern how not to deregulate an electricity market.

In any case, for non-renewable energy sources I think natural gas still has big cost advantages over coal for equal emissions out the stack, while oil which, unlike the others, needs to be imported from unstable places, should be saved for those things which can't currently be done as well any other way (e.g. transportation). Natural gas is also a good substance to derive hydrogen from should we ever have the infrastructure to use it, this eliminating its greenhouse gas emissions as well. I'm not entirely opposed to nuclear power, particularly since its fuel costs tend to be uncorrelated with fossil fuel costs, but I think if you honestly added up the full cost of providing that power, including all the hidden government subsidies, you'd find it to be more expensive than just about anything else (I'd also be more impressed by their claims of safety if they'd buy liability insurance or self-insure, like all other power producers do, instead of threatening to close up existing plants and build no more if congress doesn't continue to reauthorize the Price Anderson Act's liability cap, yet another big subsidy). These days you can get more energy out of a pound of silicon, which is mostly just sand, then you can by turning a pound of nuclear fuel into really unpleasant stuff. And it mystifies me why people so commonly complain about the environmentalist wackos who want to keep oil reserves in the Alaska Wildlife Refuge from being exploited but have no comment or care about the Alaska politicians who have insisted the development of natural gas reserves in the existing fields, useful to replace declining production in other domestic fields, be tightly wrapped in a pork barrel straight jacket.

Of course, I may have been reading too much written by Amory Lovins recently.

Dennis Ferguson

4364. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 03:29:54 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F6A7827.21D14BF4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 77923

Clint wrote:
>
> >
> > DICK, what was past is past.
> >
>
> My grandfather (God rest his soul, he passed away
> 7 years ago) lived to the ripe old age of 87. Every now
> and then he'd get really drunk on vodka, and then go
> into a past-recalling delirium where he'd keep talking
> about the need to have a horse and buggy give you a
> ride if you wanted to make it back into his neck of
> the woods all the way from the main road.
>
> The next morning he'd sober up and find himself back
> in the modern day era. The horse and buggy were long
> gone.

I always love a tale which attempts to impart a message. In this one,
we learned that your grandad was a drunk.

Dave K8MN

4365. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 03:47:51 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F6A7C5A.F72C48E4@earthlink.net>
Source record: 77926

JJ wrote:
>
> Brian Kelly wrote in message ...
> >
> >Bilge. All of it. A 66 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole on
> >40M and a 134 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole on 80M. A 33
> >foot long center-fed dipole is a quarter wavelength long on 40M but it
> >is not resonant on 40M and ya better not get stupid and feed it with
> >coax then just plug it into the back of yer radio if ya wanna work
> >anybody with it.
> >
>
> A search on google on quarter wave dipole will give plenty of sources.

It surely does but not many of them actually have anything to do with a quarter wave dipole. Many deal with comparisons between half wave dipoles and quarter wave monopoles.

While it is possible to construct a quarter wave dipole, such an antenna would be quite difficult to match and would not be very efficient. Despite this, our resident airhead, Kim, has come up with a number of urls which she is positive prove her case. She even thinks she is using a quarter wave dipole at home.

Kim is a ditz who knows nothing about morse code or antennas.

Dave K8MN

4366. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 03:54:59 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hlfpdo6.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 77928

On 17 Sep 2003 22:17:01 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>> If you have the installed capability of transmitting on a non-amateur
>> frequency and do not have a license for such operation, it is not
>> covered under the preemption and it's your job to talk yourself out of
>> the jam. You're on your own.....
>
>That old Public Notice is the problem, it is not the solution.

Perhaps someone will take it up with the Five Gnomes and see if
they can get it right this time. As if they will know what we are
talking about. <ggg>

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4367. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 03:55:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hlfqoj7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 77927

On Wed, 17 Sep 2003 17:14:03 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:

>
>I read that when it was initially out and have no recollection
>of the "out-of-band" transmit aspect. The issue always was
>focused on amteur rigs that could also recieve (i.e. listen to)
>police broadcasts from an automobile.

See my posting on that. The preemption only covered receive
capability. Gotta read the footnotes, too.

Don't get me wrong.....I, too, feel that if it is not -used- to
transmit, it's no one's business, but until and unless the situation
is clarified, it is what it is.

If you were to ask me if an automobile proceeding down Main Street
needs a rider on a horse to proceed it with a blue lantern, the
answer might be "yes" if the old ordinance has never been removed.
That doesn't mean that I agree with it, or that the ordinance is not
stupid - it means that that's what it still says.

>Today there are several HF/VHF rigs that can do so. IC-706 >has 6m and
>2m, several other HF rigs now cover HF plus 6, 2 and 440.
>In all the cases of harrased hams (harassed by police) in states with
>laws forbidding listening to police transmissions, the issue was
>always listening to..not transmitting on, police frequencies.

It's time for the Five Gnomes to revisit the situation - as if they
know what we are talking about. We all know that ham radio issues
are not high on the Totem Pole at the FCC any more.

> Here in NJ we finally changed the old state law around 1994.

My rock-bottom stance is that such statutes should clearly indicate
that what is prohibited is radio equipment used in connection with
illegal activity - nothing more. That is a legitimate law
enforcement objective, and does not involve the law enforcement
officers (who are not qualified technicians) in determining if the
equipment has been modified or whether it has the capability of
transmitting and if so on what frequencies.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4368. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:03:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919000335.01893.00000668@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 77932

In article <3F6A6089.6040004@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

> That's where we started on this sorry thread. Go back and read the
>posts, including my 1/4 vs 1/2 wave dipole design done in EZNEC, and
>then let us know how well a 1/4 wave dipole works.

Did you pay Roy for your copy of EZNEC or are you one of the software
bootleggers who steal from Roy Lewallen's work?

Do you know how to operate EZNEC properly?

> Then why don't you build a 1/4 wave dipole for whatever band gets you
>into Central PA. We'll do a sked, and see how well your antenna works.

Why don't you write a Famous Paper on "Why a 1/4-Wave Dipole Will NOT
Work" and have it published in RF Design magazine? [that's an electronics
trade publication, usually well-respected among RF industry folks]

I'd love to see the Letters to the Editor section on that one.

LHA

4369. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:03:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919000336.01893.00000670@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 77929

In article <bkdll1$jt1r$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Clint" wrote ...
>
> AH, so it's EASY? SIMPLE? hah, proof then there's no point. Other hams kept
>saying it was a discipline of selftraining, and you just said it was as
>breeze. Well, if it's a natural as breathing air, then, no need to test it.
>End of discussion. It's SO easy :)
>____
>
>No actually, I had to put in quite a few hours learning the code. But like
>anything else, once I had done it -- I was more than ready for the exams.
>As I said before, it must be you.

EVERYBODY HAS TO DO IT LIKE YOU DID IT. BECAUSE...

Whiny little retrograde, aren't you?

LHA

4370. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:03:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919000336.01893.00000669@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 77938

In article <bkdmlg$khae$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote ...
>
>< I snipped the rest because it is well known that my Emergency Management
>Agency *uses* every piece of technology I listed -- and Len knows it too >
>
>Here Isabel is about to make landfall and Big Arnie is making all the
>boasting in this newsgroup without being Out There helping to Save The Day
>Through Ham Band CW.
>____
>
>Even after a year of killfile, I see that you have the same mantra, Len.

You never had me "killfiled," hypocrite.

You were busy "working to track Isabel for a year" or something similar.

You never did check out a working US Army field communications center
or even investigate the how and why of US Army comm use when you
were supposedly working for the US Army. You had ample time to do so.

But you never did and you had far more/easier access than most.

You must have found out an awful truth...that the US military does NOT
use any morse code for communications now!

Poor baby. Still bitter about that, huh?

You are trying to turn that bitterness around by making up more BS
about the morse code.

Doesn't work, Ah-nold...you aren't the Codinator from the future.

You are only carrying on a relic of the past.

"Ahl be back."

LHA

Ho
>Hum boring -- as usual. Don't you ever get tired of being so wrong, so mad,
>and so bitter all the time?
>

4371. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:03:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919000337.01893.00000671@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 77937

In article <bkdhst$ep9s$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...
>
>< I snipped theother droll parts, but this I found interesting>
>
> According to the US Census Bureau, there are over 100 million cellular
>telephone subscribers in the USA. There are over 150 million "hard-wired"
>telephones in the USA. What is the point of your little "viable technology"
>diatribe? And why in the hell aren't you OUT THERE being ten kinds of EM
>manager with impending doom/disaster from Isabel?
>____
>
>My point exactly, Len. Why waste all that money on hard-wired technology
>when we have nearly as many wireless phones already. Put that archaic
>technology to bed, right? Isn't that your mantra?

No. I just want to toss the morse code test in the dumpster where it
rightfully belongs.

As to technology, you seem to think that anything invented/discovered
after 1933 as "high tech."

You've proved yourself woefully IGNORANT of radio technology twice today
by claiming "SSB is 103 years old."

This isn't 1912 and the year of the Titanic disaster. Radio has improved
since then. Most radio amateurs have improved since then. You don't
seem to have learned anything correctly.

>And once again, I really do appreciate your concern for my job performance.
>I'll make sure to tell my boss that you asked. :-)

I'm not "concerned" about your "job performance." If you are taking money
from the USA for your "EMA" task, then I'd say you are busy Fleecing
America. Here you are claiming all that "hard work" and you are busy
Internetting while Isabel makes landfall.

You are a half century behind on demonstrated knowledge of radio
technology and what you have learned seems to be all wrong as far as
chronology is involved.

LHA

4372. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:03:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919000338.01893.00000672@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 77935

In article <bkdhf9$jept$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...
>
>You KNOW all elmers personally, right? Why don't YOU continue to alienate
>and denigrate all the others who have been on HF much longer than you, who
>have worked HF comm 24/7 longer than you've been alive? Since you aren't
>out getting ready for emergency work on Isabel, why don't you start a
>petition for an RM with the FCC to make the 'ARS' the Archaic
>RadioTELEGRAPHY Service.
>____
>
>What in the world are you talking about, Len?

The Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service, better known as the "ARS."

You are such an important "EMA" or whatever during a major
hurricane and you are playing in the newsgroup?

>BTW, thanks for mentioning Isabel. We *have* been working very hard
>tracking her and making preliminary preparations for a possible evacuation.

You are now in NOAA?

Good grief, there's no end to the stories you make up.

>Fortunately, we didn't have to implement them this time around.

Why don't you PRACTICE?

Keep up those morse skills. Be ready to deflect the hurricanes with
rapid-fire 20 WPM code! Save lives and property by being radio
amateurs! Get mentioned in the ARRL newsletter.

And get forgotten by the major press even now IN the path of Isabel
reporting and using newfangled communications equipment called
"portable television" and "satellite communications."

>But thanks for caring about my job. It's touching, really.

I care less what you do.

You've made so much BS in here about your professional amateurism
that there's no believing what you say. I doubt you were ever an Army
civilian doing criminal investigation.

By all means, keep up with the Living Museum of Morse and Radio-
telegraphy.

It must please you greatly to keep the ARS DUMBED DOWN at the standards and practices of 70 years ago.

LHA

4373. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:03:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919000339.01893.00000673@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 77934

In article <bkdh0i$hs6c$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote ...
>
>> >I believe that a person who aspires to be an Amateur Extra Class *should*
>be
>> >able to send/receive Morse Code at a minmum level.
>>
>> Explain why a TEST is necessary.
>>
>To demonstrate that minimal ability

To WHOM?

YOU don't regulate US amateur radio. The FCC does.

>> "Very long" is very subjective. It is as "long" as the extremes of the
>> actuarial tables.
>
>As long as people use, it will survive. SSB is a good example of that. 103
>years old and still going strong.

You are still IGNORANT of technical details, senior.

Radio as a demonstrated communications medium wasn't demonstrated
until 1896. That was 107 years ago, done in both Italy and Russia that
year.

SSB on radio wasn't really proven until 1928 (75 years ago) and the
commercial communications service providers did it, not amateurs.

>> If OOK CW is already so damn popular, why are you so insistent that a
TEST
>> for it MUST BE KEPT?
>
>Not *if* CW *is* the second most popular mode in the ARS.

Invalid, Billy Beeper. The only source for that "statistic" is the ARRL
and they are notoriously pro-morse.

Newcomers don't "owe" the ARS any damn thing and aren't obliged to
be "ruled" by long-timers. Try to grasp the reality of that, morseman.

>> >To me, at least, it just makes sense that a
>> >person holding the highest class of license should have a working
>> >(practical) knowledge of the second most popular mode we have.
>>

>> It only "makes sense" when considering YOU are one.
>
>It's my opinion, Len. I think I made that pretty clear.

Okay, you use the "Carroll" definition: EVERYBODY HAS TO DO
WHAT YOU DID. BECAUSE...

>> If everyone else is of the same class, then you aren't either "special"
>or
>> "superior" anymore.
>
>I could care less if everyone was an Extra Class. I just think if they hold
>that class of license, they should also possess a minimum level of CW
>proficiency.

That's only your OPINION, sweetums.

[ever hear that before? you just used it...]

>I don't need any status or rank. I worked my way up the ladder like
>thousands before me. That doesn't make me any better or worse than anyone.
>It just means I was motivated to succeed -- and I did.

Oh, wow, another "Dr. Phil" of the ham airways! B F D

EVERYBODY HAS TO DO LIKE YOU DID. BECAUSE...

Amateur radio is a HOBBY, senior.

It isn't a job, isn't a guild, isn't a profession (just the opposite, that's
why
it is called AMATEUR radio). It isn't a branch of the US military.

Everyone has to WORK up to it? WHY?

To satisfy WHOM? YOUM?

Who died and made you chief of hobby radio judgement?

Stuff it.

Now go play in the rain with your emergency comms code key.

LHA

4374. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:03:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919000340.01893.00000674@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 77931

In article <bkdge7$6d4g$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote ...
>
> Macy, almost ALL your arguments are superfluous, denigratory, and without a
>shred of merit in here. All you do is promote myths of "CW" as if this was
>still the 1930s.
>____
>
>Are you Clint's Daddy?

No. You have a bastard offspring?

>I was hoping that *he* would answer the question.

Well "he" did.

What's the matter, sweetums, can't handle two at one time?

Too fast for your limited 20 WPM BS throughput?

>I will say this, though. He sure does admire you.

Sorry, bastard parrent, Clint and I are not related.

We happen to agree on tossing morse code testing in the dumpster where
it belongs. So do thousands of others.

>Are you sure y'all aren't related?

We are "related" as much as you and I are "related."

You never did look into a deployed brigade or regiment signal center
when you were working (as a civilian) for the US Army.

Never did have the guts to look in, did you?

You still haven't answered why you are busy Internetting when your
mighty macho morsemanship is so sorely needed in hurrican emergency
comms.

LHA

4375. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:03:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919000341.01893.00000675@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 77936

In article <bkdg8h$jtbf$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...
>
>> Absolutely NOTHING about single side band (sic), amplified modulation
>(sic) and RTTY until the >1900s.
>
>That would make those modes about 103 years old, Len. At what point do we
>start to consider them outdated?
>
>>When did the "amateur expert" Arnie Macy last take an amateur radio test?
>
>Since I'm a VE -- I looked at the current material about a week ago.

You didn't answer my question.

Not unexpected.

VEs don't take tests. They just proctor them.

>>Now, why in the hell aren't you OUT THERE as an EM person getting ready for
>Isabel's destructive landfall? We can't read about Macy's marvelous savings
>of the day through ham band OOK CW on the ARRL news page if you don't get
>off the Internet and be ready for all those disasterous emergencies.
>
>Well, I must say that I have been quite busy for the past two weeks.

Not too busy to play in the newsgroup...bragging up a storm.

>The
>initial track of the storm was not looking very good for the SE United
>States. Fortunately for us, we were able to miss the bullet on this one.

I've just seen some various network news video of reporters out IN
the Isabel landfall area using all the newfangled video and radio and
stuff that you must think "won't work" in a storm.

>Of course you know that we *did* use that old stand-by Morse Code when Floyd
>came calling in 1999.

Of course you did, saved hundreds, thousands of lives and property by
using high-speed morse to deflect Floyd.

Any more mythology you want to repeat?

>SSB (you know, that 103 year old technology) was just
>not cutting it, so we went to CW until the condx improved.

You are technically ignorant senior.

"SSB" in radio dates from about 1930 so it is merely 70 years old.

Amateurs never really used it on any large scale until after 1950, that being 50 years ago.

>It's kinda hard to talk with someone 250 miles away on a handi-talkie.

Not a problem, poor baby. You've never done any Space Station or Shuttle contacts with an HT, have you?

Couldn't connect your morse key to an HT, senior?

LHA

4376. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:03:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919000342.01893.00000676@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 77933

In article <bkdfen$j426$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Bill Sohl" wrote in part ...
>
>"FCC nor almost every emergency preparedness organization/operation has no
>desire or need for morse in their plans."
>____
>
>I ask because you wrote the above. Why do you think the EM planners have
>"no need" for Morse? Any tool available should be considered for use in the
>EM package.

How about flag semaphore? Night semaphore with lighted torches?

That worked well in the US Civil War...and the crossed flags with torch
at the center became the collar insignia of the US Army Signal Corps.

Signal Corps LONG AGO abandoned flag and torch semaphore and
doesn't use morse code for communications anymore. [are you keeping
up to date on your former employer, the US Army?]

>Not only is our equipment capable of Morse, but we have CW
>capable operators for each. We've used it in the past and I strongly
>suspect that will do so in the future as well.

Great! You helped save the Titanic and now you are ready to save the
Titanic II.

Why in the hell are you busy Internetting when Isabel has hit land?

Afraid of getting your code key wet?

LHA

4377. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:03:43 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919000343.01893.00000677@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 77930

In article <d22b54c3.0309181643.7b2e0e28@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Then came his buddy, another one, who stated that the reason g5rv's
>"work" is because they're "trap antennas". I asked him to show me the
>traps in the 40M g5rv we'd put up. "I don't know where they are but
>they have to be there somewhere."
>
>N2EY was there too . .
>
>And neither of us have been back to run FD with that pack of 21st
>Century nitwits.

Tell us all how it feels to be an 1896 Nitwit, nitwit.

Beep, beep.

LHA

4378. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:12:08 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919001208.24386.00000884@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77939

>However hook it to some ladder line and a tuner
>and you might be supprised

Good Idea, I suggest all No-Coders use this as there Antenna of choice

4379. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:14:41 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkdvrh$ef5$0@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 77940

Brian Kelly wrote:

>
> N2EY was there too . .
>
> And neither of us have been back to run FD with that pack of 21st
> Century nitwits.

Do ya suppose Clint knows any more? More than how to howl and whine about the code? Hey Clint,
how's yer 1/4 wave dipole doing for ya?

4380. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:22:44 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <owvab.103383$mp.50832@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 77941
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
news:20030919000336.01893.00000669@mb-m22.aol.com:

>
> You never had me "killfiled," hypocrite.
>
> You were busy "working to track Isabel for a year" or something
> similar.
>
> You never did check out a working US Army field communications
> center or even investigate the how and why of US Army comm use
> when you were supposedly working for the US Army. You had ample
> time to do so.
>
> But you never did and you had far more/easier access than most.
>
> You must have found out an awful truth...that the US military does
> NOT use any morse code for communications now!

****
****
ATTENTION USENET VISITORS, THIS AREA HAS BEEN DECLARED A TROLL
WILDLIFE REFUGE. TO LEARN ABOUT THE TROLL, ITS HABITAT, AND
ITS WAY OF LIFE, PLEASE READ THE SIGN-POST BELOW. IF YOU WOULD
LIKE TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE TROLL, YOU CAN PICK UP BOOKS AND
SOUVENIRS IN THE GIFT SHOP AT THE END OF THE TOUR. THANK YOU
IN ADVANCE FOR OBSERVING ALL TROLL WILDLIFE REFUGE RULES, HAVE
A NICE DAY.
****
****

| Common name: Woodland Troll |
| Scientific name: Trollus Useneticus |

##########
# #
PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS:
# #
The common woodland troll (Trollus Useneticus) is an
approximately 1.7m long nocturnal furry creature that
has been found to exist in nearly every climate and
latitude. Predominant features include: a very pale

```
# complexion, a large bony ridge above the eyes, a dense #
# cranium, dragging knuckles, and a pungent odor. #
# #
#################################################################################

#################################################################################
# #
# HABITAT: #
# #
# Most trolls spend the daylight hours under a large rock #
# sleeping. Unfortunately, the natural habitat of the #
# troll has been encroached by development (as is all too #
# common these days). The modern troll has to make due #
# with a slimy, moss covered rock. Often, trolls are #
# forced to endure poor sanitation and filthy living #
# conditions. Combined with the general lack of hygiene #
# among trolls, this results in a very unpleasant odor. #
# #
#################################################################################

#################################################################################
# #
# ACTIVITIES AND DIET: #
# #
# During their active period at night, the common troll #
# engages in numerous activities, though the most #
# important of these is foraging for food. The one #
# characteristic that ties all different troll species #
# and sub-species together is their diet. Trolls #
# invariably survive off of a combination of cheetos, #
# arguments, and annoying others. A typical troll #
# requires approximately 10 arguments and flames per day #
# just to stay alive. With the increasing use of #
# killfiles and just regular ignoring of trolls, it has #
# become more and more difficult for trolls to eke out a #
# basic sustenance. #
# #
#################################################################################

#################################################################################
# #
# KNOWN PREDATORS: #
# #
# Unfortunately, trolls have many predators. Most common #
# among them are the helpful researcher, the informative #
# poster, the cool headed responder, and the kill-filer. #
# The cool header responder is technically not a troll #
# predator however. Trolls are typically unfazed by #
# logical counter arguments and cool headed reason. #
# However, even though their posts do not deliver the #
# same level of sustenance that a "flamer" or an "annoyed #
```

```
# poster" may provide, they still provide a valuable #
# source of dietary fiber for the troll. #
# #
# The most dangerous predators for the trolls are the #
# helpful researcher, the informative poster, and the #
# kill-filer. The common troll is highly allergic to #
# fact, real data, and research. Upon skin contact with #
# actual hard evidence and real data, the troll will #
# experience intense itching and burning at the site of #
# contact, followed by lesions and blisters. Eventually, #
# this results in loss of skin near the area of contact, #
# and usually to loss of a limb (in the example of #
# contact near the arm or leg). Contact with facts and #
# data near the facial area usually results in a slow #
# painful death. Contact with extremely high doses of #
# fact and hard data can cause temporary loss of #
# consciousness and even permanent brain damage for the #
# troll. #
# #
# The kill-filer poses a much more insidious threat to #
# the troll. Not posing a direct threat to the troll per #
# se, the kill-filer simply deprives the troll of yet #
# another source of nourishment. Some trolls have #
# developed counter measures to thwart the kill-filers, #
# usually this takes the form of a type of camoflage. #
# #
# The trolls' predators have reaped a terrible slaughter #
# over the years, resulting in the death of great hordes #
# of trolls. Trolls continue to breed rapidly though and #
# their population is stable. However, it is unknown how #
# long this situation can persist. Eventually, natural #
# predators and poachers may result in lower numbers of #
# trolls. Already we are seeing lower diversity among #
# the different troll species. That is why this troll #
# habitat refuge exists, to ensure the preservation of #
# the troll for not only our future, but the future of #
# our children. #
# #
#################################################################

============================================================
/ This troll habitat refuge has been paid for in part by /
/ the anti Troll-Defamation League, the International /
/ Society for the Advancement of Trolls, and the Troll /
/ Habitat Preservation Alliance. /
============================================================
```

4381. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:25:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bke0f6fkl0@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 77942

So then it would be necessary for someone who was being checked to cause his radio to make an illigal transmission before it could be determined whether or not he was "preempted". Nonsense.

That section says nothing whatever about the capability of the gear to transmit, only receive. Since the "scanner laws" specifically cover recption of police radio signals with an intent to prevent their criminal use, they don't address transmission in any way.
Phil I almost always agree with your point of view, but I believe you're wrong on this one.

dick

Phil Kane wrote:

> On Tue, 16 Sep 2003 01:03:16 GMT, Keith wrote:
>
> >> Of course, if the amateur op doesn't have his license with him, the
> >> officer has reasonable cause to believe that the pre-emption does
> >> not cover him even though it still does, and if the rig has been
> >> modified so that it is capable of TRANSMITTING on the police
> >> frequency, the pre-emption is not valid even if the operator is a
> >> licensed amateur (per the FCC Public Notice on this matter many
> >> years ago).
> >
> > Please cite case law that supports your position that modified ham radios
> > do not have the same exemption as all ham radios?
> >
> And on Tue, 16 Sep 2003 22:09:22 -0700 (PDT), Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > That was the deal that the League worked out with the FCC - if the
> > radio did not transmit "out of band" then the preemption covered.
> > The intent was to exclude VHF/UHF transceivers which have been
> > "opened up".
> >
> > I'll dig out the Public Notice if I can find it. It was many years
> > ago.
>
> FCC PR Docket No. 91-36 MO&O Released September 3, 1993.
>
> V. CONCLUSION [Emphasis added]
>
> 13. We hold that state and local laws that preclude the
> possession in vehicles or elsewhere of amateur radio service
> transceivers by amateur operators merely on the basis that the

> transceivers are capable of the RECEPTION of public safety,
> special emergency, or other radio service frequencies, the
> RECEPTION of which is not prohibited by federal law, are
> inconsistent with the federal objectives of facilitating and
> promoting the amateur radio service and, more fundamentally,
> with the federal interest in amateur operators' being able to
> transmit and receive on authorized amateur service frequencies.
> We therefore hold that such state and local laws are preempted
> by federal law.
>
> Footnotes
>
> 33. The rules, however, do prohibit amateur service
> transmissions outside of the allocated amateur service bands.
> 47 C.F.R. Sec. 97.307(b); Public Notice, Extended Coverage
> Transceivers in the Amateur Radio Service, mimeo no. 4114 (July
> 21, 1987)(noting that "[i]t is a violation of the Commission's
> regulations to . . . transmit on a frequency allocated to a
> licensed service without the appropriate Commission-issued
> station license.").
>
> The above proceedings are very clear that it covers only "out of
> band" reception and does not cover equipment that has "out of band"
> transmit capability.
>
> Not being a real lawyer, although you try to play one, you may not
> accept the fact that in FCC practice, situations which are not
> specifically mentioned for preemption are not preempted.
> Adminsitrative Practice 101.
>
> There has not been any challenge to this ruling, therefore it stands
> as effective law until overturned. Administrative Practice 102.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> ARRL Volunteer Counsel

4382. 1/8 Wave Dipoles will work

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:25:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919002538.24386.00000885@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 77943

just as good as 1/4 Wave Dipoles, with 1 advantage, you will not need as much wire or space to install it. A tuner is probably helpfull, but many people report a good match can be obtained using RG-58. It appears the best way to get a match using coax is to, coil about 8' of Coax at the back of the rig and the same at the fed point.

4383. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:32:58 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bke0tqfkl1@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 77944

N2EY wrote:

> In article <IDVNFYDX37881.3498263889@bog.lir.dk>, Franz Weigel
> <anon@bog.lir.dk> writes:
>
> >The last CW coder who died was sentenced
> >to Hell for eternity in order to transmit
> >6 Megapixels 24-bit color pictures in CW.
> >
> >God bless you from CW !
>
> Gee - who was it said they were only against the TEST?

The truth usually manages to slip out.

4384. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:42:47 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919004247.14837.00003074@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 77946

In article <20030918225804.11891.00000934@mb-m11.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Your half-century old experiences in military communications, where, by
>your own admission, you never utilized the Morse/CW mode, are irrelevant
>to the discussion of Morse code testing requirements within the AMATEUR
>Radio Service in 2003.

No more "irrelevant" than your constant BULLSHIT about morsemanship.

EVERYONE ELSE in radio but certain amateurs, maritime radio included, have dropped morse code modes. Morse doesn't work well enough for communications...doesn't really "get through when nothing else will" and isn't a "universal language."

I've been far more INVOLVED with civilian communications than any early military radio. On the engineering level, not as an amateur hobbyist.

>In fact, as a person who does not use the Morse
>code for any reason whatsoever, you are self-disqualified from rendering
>any judgment on the topic whatsoever.

Hey, like you are "qualified to land any human resources (personnel) job because of your alleged high grades" and wind up driving a BUS?

Like you've NEVER worked any military communications in your entire TWENTY except a telephone on your desk?

Tell me all about your "qualifications" for judgement about anyone, big shot. You seem to forget all the BS you were spouting about "summa cum laude" and "landing any (important) job you wanted." You wound up DRIVING A BUS.

You NEVER HAD to do military communications 24/7 anyplace so ALL you can use as a judgement reference is as an AMATEUR, playing around in a radio hobby, bragging up a storm like you were Marconi himself.

Roll, you are RETROGRADE as an AMATEUR. All you want to do is to keep everyone else in amateurism DUMBED DOWN to 1930s standards and practices.

That's all you are "qualified" to do, Roll. Spread RETROGRADE BS to all newcomers.

>Therefore, I suggest that you
>stop wasting your time, find something you know something about (which

>from my personal observation seems to be limited to megalomaniacal,
>ego-driven character assassination) and talk about that, instead.

Ho ho ho!

Boy, you lookin in da mirro again when makin messages! :-)

Where is that big "human resources" job you said (so many times) you
could get?

You can't even get anyone to do a PSK31 contact with yet you make all
the 1930s noise about morse code!

Roll, despite your snide EGO in over-drive, I've not only done what I say
I've done, but I have the references and the proof, including being friends
with radio amateurs who can testify as to what we did.

All you have after a twenty in the USAF and that alleged degree (where you
said you could get any personnel job you wanted) is driving a BUS.

>You are not influencing anyone on the topic of code testing.

You are beyond "influence," Larry Ego.

If you had all that personal "power" and "moral resolve" you brag about
having, then you COULD have gotten a good job in personnel and worked
your way up. You didn't. You opted OUT. Took the EASY route. No
strain, no pain.

All you are is an AMATEUR at a level of the 1930s standards and
practices in amateur radio. No more. Your BS doesn't work. All YOU
are "qualified" in is hoop-jumping to old, old rules, and shoveling manure
with your degree showing.

LHA

4385. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:42:51 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919004251.14837.00003075@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 77945

In article <bkdsqc$30em$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis Ferguson) writes:

>Dee D. Flint <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
>>"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
>>news:vm9hn3q1esl4fc@corp.supernews.com...
>>> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>> news:bk2bmq$jkj@library1.airnews.net...
>>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>
>>> No new nuclear power generation is
>>> > planned, 'least not that I know of...
>>> >
>>> > Kim W5TIT
>>> >
>>> >
>>>
>>> that's because the environmental wackos are doing thier damndest
>>> to fight them, at every level of governement and in every manner
>>> of social disobedience...
>>>
>>> This is why california hasn't built any new power plants in 10 years
>>> while experiencing a DOUBLING of population.... resulting in
>>> the blackouts they just had.
>>
>>You might make it clear that California hasn't built any new plants of ANY
>>KIND because the environmentalists wackos are blocking them. It's not just
>>nuclear they are blocking. They have taken the step that any risk
>>whatsoever is unacceptable. Actually I'm amazed that there even willing to
>>take the risk of getting out bed. Maybe they don't even use beds since they
>>could fall out and break their necks.
>
>It would be good to clear up a couple of things about California
>electricity generation, since the above really is becoming urban
>legend.
>
>The assertion that no new power generation capacity has been built
>in California recently just isn't true. About 4.5 GW of generating
>capacity was added in the 1990's, and more since then. The
>non-renewable plants which have been built recently have mostly been
>natural gas fired plants, mostly because the technology for natural
>gas generation has made huge efficiency gains over the past couple
>of decades (and small plants have become as efficient as large ones,
>meaning you can locate them closer to consumers and save transmission

>costs too), making it about the most cost effective way to generate
>electricity until fuel costs began to rise even more recently. In
>recent years new coal and oil fired plants have produced more expensive
>electricity than natural gas (for equal emissions out the chimney)
>when the costs of the plants are included, while I think the cost of
>nuclear power plant construction, maintenance and subsidies makes
>their output more expensive than even the non-hydro renewables
>(including wood!).
>
>Also note that all but, perhaps, a lunatic fringe in California, would
>love to build more hydro plants. The problem is that to do this you
>need to get sufficient output from the facility to pay for the cost
>of building it, and the output from a hydraulic plant is proportional
>to the river's flow rate times the vertical distance from the top of
>a dam you can afford to build to the turbines at the bottom. A river's
>flow rate and topography are dictated by God, not by people, and
>unfortunately just about all the economic hydro sites in California
>have already been developed (Yosemite is an exception, I guess, but
>I don't think it is "wacko" to oppose flooding that).
>
>As for the blackouts of 2000-2001 being caused by the lack of adequate
>generating capacity, I'd just point out that the system of generators
>which produced rolling blackouts in the winter of 2001 at a 28 GW
>demand level was pretty much identically the same system that
>comfortably met a 53 GW peak load on a hot day in the summer of 1999,
>so any theory that it was the lack of new generating capacity which
>caused the problem would also need to explain where 25 GW of existing
>capacity disappeared to. The fact is that much of it was taken out of
>service (by its new, post-deregulation owners) for "maintenance", an
>action which most now view as having a lot more to do with the ability
>of generators to make more money by selling less power in the new,
>deregulated market than it did with any immediate need for 20 GW of
>generating capacity to receive simultaneous repairs.
>
>To tell the truth, while there are a lot of things I could find fault
>with in California, electricity generation and consumption isn't one
>of them. California has kept its per-capita electricity consumption
>almost constant over the past quarter-century, compared to a >50%
>per-capita increase in the rest of the country, while increasing its
>per-capita GDP at a rate substantially higher than the rest of the
>country, without any other associated pain or inconvenience that I
>can figure out and at prices that were, until recently, lower
>than, say, the US northeast. About 10% of the electricity comes from
>non-hydro renewable sources (there are about 6,000 wind turbines in
>the Altamont pass about an hour from where I live; I-80 passes through
>there). The response to the 2001 blackouts, and subsequent rate
>increases (probably assisted by the economy), was that California
>residents and businesses lowered consumption by 15% over the next
>year. If you look at http://www.caiso.com you'll probably find
>demand peaking at about one kilowatt per person on a summer day

>with temperatures in the urban areas ranging from the low 80's
>to mid 90's. I don't think there is anywhere else in the country
>that can match this, yet here it is done effortlessly.

Thank you for that, Dennis!

I can only add that our Southern California DWP (Department of Water and Power) *never* had any brown-outs, blackouts, or electric power shortage during the private e-power scams elsewhere. Our DWP was actually selling electric power to the rest of the Pacific Intertie while that bogus "shortage" period was supposed to have happened.

>I hence don't think there are so many negatives to be learned from how
>the construction of electric generation, and consumption of that
>power, has been managed in California. If you want to learn what not
>to do, I think the best lesson might concern how not to deregulate
>an electricity market.

Nobody seems inclined to mention anything about the infamous multi-state, multi-day power LOSS in the northeast quadrant of the USA. NYC totally blacked out, loss stretched into Canada.

No natural disaster cause. Still under investigation, but likely cause is eastern POOR PLANNING and OPERATION.

Hasn't happened that way here. Government-run electric power generation in the Pacific states had plenty of electric power all along.

LHA

4386. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 04:59:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bke2fk$j05$0@208.206.142.74>
Source record: 77947

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <20030918175652.07346.00000687@mb-m26.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >
> > A half century ago I felt right at home working primary communications
> > on Army radio station ADA. Not only feeling that but BEING AT HOME
> > at the new site of Camp Tomlinson...barracks at one corner of the huge
> > antenna field. ADA never used "CW" (on-off keying), trans-Pacific or
> > local.
> >
> > DICK, you've NEVER done that in the US Army, have you?
> >
> > All you can do is demand that EVERYONE HAD TO DO IT LIKE YOU
> > DID but you can never offer any viable proof why they should.
> >
> > LHA
>
> Lennie:
>
> Your half-century old experiences in military communications, where, by
> your own admission, you never utilized the Morse/CW mode, are irrelevant
> to the discussion of Morse code testing requirements within the AMATEUR
> Radio Service in 2003. In fact, as a person who does not use the Morse
> code for any reason whatsoever, you are self-disqualified from rendering
> any judgment on the topic whatsoever. Therefore, I suggest that you
> stop wasting your time, find something you know something about (which
> from my personal observation seems to be limited to megalomaniacal,
> ego-driven character assassination) and talk about that, instead. You
> are not influencing anyone on the topic of code testing.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Well, Well...Lennie is still touting his BC610 babysitting experience as
being (= / >) ham radio, hmm??

While he was sitting around twiddling his
thumbs and waiting for a breaker to trip so he'd have something to do, I was
busily involved in operating AND REPAIRING one of the very first video tape
systems in the country, among many other very interesting work activities at
the Signal School at Fort Monmouth.
You see, instead of sending me to an obscure, remote MINOR outpost about as far
away as it's possible to be sent, when I finished electronics training, the
Signal School kept me there as permanent party, to work as a broadcast

engineer at the educational TV station ran by the school. A most interesting and challenging assignment, indeed. I would have been completely happy to have stayed there for the remainder of my term of service, but my name came up for an overseas tour of duty rotation, so off to Europe I went after a year and a half.

I sure do feel for poor ol' Lennie, tho, he must have had a rough go of it 'way out there in the JA boondocks with nothing to do but listen to the transformers hum and wait for another overload. And I hear those BC610's didn't overload all that often, either. Tsk, tsk.

What a chutz-putz!

4387. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 05:17:42 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bke3hmkqf0@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 77948

JJ wrote:

> Mike Coslo wrote in message >
> > That's where we started on this sorry thread. Go back and read the
> >posts, including my 1/4 vs 1/2 wave dipole design done in EZNEC, and
> >then let us know how well a 1/4 wave dipole works.
> >
> > Then why don't you build a 1/4 wave dipole for whatever band gets you
> >into Central PA. We'll do a sked, and see how well your antenna works.
>
> Geeesh what a knuckle headed bunch. I never claimed that a 1/4 dipole would
> work as well as a 1/2 wave. However hook it to some ladder line and a tuner
> and you might be supprised.

Yoiu might get some really noisy arcs inside the tuner, too.

I would think you'd know that ladder line and a fixed dipole, while they will work well on a wide range of bands and frequencies, are not the cureall for all ills. Attempting to match a dipole at it's highest natural impedance point isn't even close to "good engineering practice". It isn't even good "poor engineering practice". There are antennas that just can't be adequately matched and this is one.

You can always call a dipole whatever you want it to be. A halfwave dipole at 40 meters is a quarterwave dipole at 80 meters, if you want it to be that way. But it sure isn't very smart. And don't expect it to work out.

The real point was that she had no idea what she was actually using. It sure wasn't a 1/4 wave dipole.

4388. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 05:19:45 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <7XudneWlu_dLC_eiU-KYjA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 77950

Dick Carroll wrote in message ...
>
> I would think you'd know that ladder line and a fixed dipole, while they
will
>work well on a wide range of bands and frequencies, are not the cureall for
all
>ills.

I never said they were.

>Attempting to match a dipole at it's highest natural impedance point isn't
>even close to "good engineering practice". It isn't even good "poor
engineering
>practice". There are antennas that just can't be adequately matched and
this is
>one.

I never said it was "good or bad engineering practrice".

> You can always call a dipole whatever you want it to be. A halfwave dipole
at
>40 meters is a quarterwave dipole at 80 meters, if you want it to be that
way.
>But it sure isn't very smart. And don't expect it to work out.

I never said it would. Some claimed there is no such thing as a 1/4 wave
dipole, I simply stated there is, I never made any claims it would be a good
antenna.

Gee, your reading comprehension isn't any better than some of the others.

4389. Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 05:21:59 UTC
From: En.TAKETHISOUT.ginuitastic@Gee-Enginuity.com
Message-ID: <2f986907.0309182121.7f64b0e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77949

I've been a ham for only a month now, and been using these groups for about 6 weeks.
I really can't stand some of the things that go on here.
Has anybody ever noticed that 8 out of 10 threads on this group (and many other amateur radio groups) end in a flame war?
It's really shocking how people can start an argument over nothing which can escalate to vicious strings of insults complete with profanity, sexual references and terms such as "CBplusser" and "Knuckle-Dragger". It's just unbelievable to me that while all of the books talk about how wonderful and helpful hams are, a significant number of them spend their time cutting each other down over random issues. I see "newbies" come to these boards for help, and get cut down by inconsiderate jerks who just feel like making people feel stupid. How many hams didn't start out with a lower-level license? People need to stop beating up on us poor no-coders. Don't they realize that the new people look up to the old-timers? I must say that after reading books about how hams help people all over the world and are generally just a wonderful bunch, these groups have really changed my view of the amateur radio community. I don't doubt that even this thread will end in a violent exchange of profanities and become just another flame war.

I'm afraid I just can't manage a 73 right now.
-KG6SGY

My e-mail address is real; just take out the ".TAKETHISOUT."
(obviously).

4390. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 06:06:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bke6dj$pm7$0@208.206.142.96>
Source record: 77751

Greg Courville wrote:

> I've been a ham for only a month now, and been using these groups for
> about 6 weeks.
> I really can't stand some of the things that go on here.
> Has anybody ever noticed that 8 out of 10 threads on this group (and
> many other amateur radio groups) end in a flame war?
> It's really shocking how people can start an argument over nothing
> which can escalate to vicious strings of insults complete with
> profanity, sexual references and terms such as "CBplusser" and
> "Knuckle-Dragger".

Greg if you want to see how all this began just spend some time in Google and you canget an educaion. It sure didn't start by old timers belittling newcomers. In fact it was and IS the exact reverse. Not all newcomers, by any means, just those on this board who decided to do it, and persist to this day.

> It's just unbelievable to me that while all of the
> books talk about how wonderful and helpful hams are, a significant
> number of them spend their time cutting each other down over random
> issues. I see "newbies" come to these boards for help, and get cut
> down by inconsiderate jerks who just feel like making people feel
> stupid.

You're making assumptions here that shouldn't, indeed can't, be made. The jerks who show up her complaining about the code test requrement and blaming all us who just did it, without complaining. That in so doing learned that Morse code does indeed add substantially to ham radio, to the point that we believe code testing has a permanent place in ham radio, is just so much nonsense to them. They already know all about it.

> How many hams didn't start out with a lower-level license?
> People need to stop beating up on us poor no-coders.

Come into ham radio with a proper attitude (note I didn't say THE proper attitude) and you'll be received just as well as anyone ever was.

> Don't they
> realize that the new people look up to the old-timers?

You REALLY must have not been reading here very closely at all, Greg. Were that the case *here* you wouldn't have a report to make.

> I must say that
> after reading books about how hams help people all over the world and
> are generally just a wonderful bunch, these groups have really changed

> my view of the amateur radio community.

Don't feel lonesome.
It sure changed my view of ham radio, too. I showed up here several years ago to engage in civil, sincere discourse on the merits of code testing, and was immediately set upon by the code haters for my views. It's been all downhill from there.

> I don't doubt that even this
> thread will end in a violent exchange of profanities and become just
> another flame war.
>

Once again, you will get the treatment you deserve here, at least from me.

So far you're doing OK, I don't blame you for your concern. But I suggest you might benefit from a bit more knowledge of the background of what has happened here.

4391. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 06:11:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bke6n7$q45$0@208.206.142.96>
Source record: 77752

JJ wrote:

> Some claimed there is no such thing as a 1/4 wave
> dipole, I simply stated there is, I never made any claims it would be a good
> antenna.

Ok. Since it was me who said there is no such thing as a 1/4 wave dipole, I'll modify my statement to read "There is no such thing as a 1/4 wave dipole other than at the station of a clueless ham who knows no better".

That should take care of it.

4392. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 06:39:34 UTC
From: Greg Courville <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com>
Message-ID: <vml95ia6298f13@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77753

Thank you for responding.
I know that it is unfair to draw generalizations about the amateur community from posts on a newsgroup. And I am not trying to say that it's the old-timers who are causing all the trouble. I'm sorry it came out that way (and I realize that it's mostly the immature jerks, not the old-timers, doing the name-calling). It just gets me really depressed to see that well more than half of the posts in this group have nothing to do with the hobby, and were written for the sole purpose of hurting other people.
I would like to state that, despite being a no-code tech, and despite the fact that learning morse is the only thing keeping me from a general-class license, I support the code test. I agree that ham radio has drastically "dumbed-down" over the past several years, and I agree that it's not good for the hobby. However, I hate it when I see people looked down upon simply because they're lowly technicians. I hate seeing the "code/no-code"-related flame-wars that erupt every day. If people confined their comments to civilized discussion and debate, we wouldn't have this problem. There will never be a total agreement as to whether the code requirement should be dropped, but there's no reason for people to express their opinions like raving lunatics. People who just want to exchange clever insults should find a different newsgroup.
On a side-note, I have not ever been insulted by any member of this group. I am basing my opinion solely on the threads I read every day.
I hope I have not offended anybody by what I have posted so far, and I encourage further response.

-KG6SGY

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bke6dj$pm7$0@208.206.142.96...
>
>
> Greg Courville wrote:
>
> > I've been a ham for only a month now, and been using these groups for
> > about 6 weeks.
> > I really can't stand some of the things that go on here.
> > Has anybody ever noticed that 8 out of 10 threads on this group (and
> > many other amateur radio groups) end in a flame war?
> > It's really shocking how people can start an argument over nothing
> > which can escalate to vicious strings of insults complete with
> > profanity, sexual references and terms such as "CBplusser" and
> > "Knuckle-Dragger".
>
> Greg if you want to see how all this began just spend some time in Google
> and you canget an educaion. It sure didn't start by old timers belittling

> newcomers. In fact it was and IS the exact reverse. Not all newcomers, by
> any means, just those on this board who decided to do it, and persist to
> this day.
>
>
>
> > It's just unbelievable to me that while all of the
> > books talk about how wonderful and helpful hams are, a significant
> > number of them spend their time cutting each other down over random
> > issues. I see "newbies" come to these boards for help, and get cut
> > down by inconsiderate jerks who just feel like making people feel
> > stupid.
>
> You're making assumptions here that shouldn't, indeed can't, be made.
> The jerks who show up her complaining about the code test requrement and
> blaming all us who just did it, without complaining. That in so doing
> learned that Morse code does indeed add substantially to ham radio, to the
> point that we believe code testing has a permanent place in ham radio, is
> just so much nonsense to them. They already know all about it.
>
>
>
> > How many hams didn't start out with a lower-level license?
> > People need to stop beating up on us poor no-coders.
>
> Come into ham radio with a proper attitude (note I didn't say THE proper
> attitude) and you'll be received just as well as anyone ever was.
>
>
>
> > Don't they
> > realize that the new people look up to the old-timers?
>
> You REALLY must have not been reading here very closely at all, Greg.
> Were that the case *here* you wouldn't have a report to make.
>
>
>
> > I must say that
> > after reading books about how hams help people all over the world and
> > are generally just a wonderful bunch, these groups have really changed
> > my view of the amateur radio community.
>
> Don't feel lonesome.
> It sure changed my view of ham radio, too. I showed up here several years
> ago to engage in civil, sincere discourse on the merits of code testing,
> and was immediately set upon by the code haters for my views. It's been
> all downhill from there.
>
>

>
> > I don't doubt that even this
> > thread will end in a violent exchange of profanities and become just
> > another flame war.
> >
>
> Once again, you will get the treatment you deserve here, at least from me.
>
> So far you're doing OK, I don't blame you for your concern. But I suggest
> you might benefit from a bit more knowledge of the background of what has
> happened here.
>
>

4393. Re: Rev.Jim the troller (was Re: Bootlegging in 1948?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 09:16:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309190116.120b2256@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77758

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030918223634.29660.00000717@mb-m24.aol.com>...
> In article <c2356669.0309181342.d6b6763@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> (N2EY) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030916205914.12501.00002451@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> >> In article <c2356669.0309160836.595af4a9@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
> >> (N2EY) writes:
> >>
> >> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >> >news:<20030916010914.05539.00000775@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> >> >> In article <20030915021846.23171.00000765@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> (N2EY)
> >> >> writes:
> >> >>
> >> >> >In article <vm9usff4mpm58f@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
> >> >> ><rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
> >> >> >
> >> >> >>sending and receiving CW isn't a building block
> >> >> >>to anything else.....
> >> >> >
> >> >> >Yes, it is.
> >> >> >
> >> >> >First, it's a building block to the use of the mode on the air.
> Although
> other
> >> >> >services have pretty much stopped using Morse Code, hams use it
> extensivley,
> >> >> >and an amateur license is permission to operate an amateur station, not
> a
> >> >> >station in another service.
> >> >>
> >> >> Roger that, Reverend Jim...
> >> >
> >> >Who is "Reverend Jim", Len? You and Brian Burke keep using that name
> >> >to address someone.
> >>
> >> Tsk, tsk, tsk...you've never seen "Taxi" then... :-)
> >
> >I've seen most episodes of Taxi. My name's not Ignatowksi.
>
> We've all seen your prodigious output here in the Newsgroup.
>

> Your surname is Miccolis but you are a dead-ringer for the Rev. Jim
> character, totally stoked on morsemanship...spaced out as to any
> other radio communications mode.
>
> >> >It can't be me, because I graduated from electrical engineering
> >> >school, not divinity school. And my name isn't Ignatowski ;-)
>
> >> >What engineering school did you graduate from, Len?
> >>
> >> One right here in Southern California...
> >
> >One without a name...:->
>
> It's easy enough for a BSEE to find out. Not that many out here.
>
> On the other hand, it is difficult to figure out WHERE YOU WORK,
> in terms of an actual company name.
>
> You rationalize on "not revealing it" for some kind of "fear" of getting
> "bad mail" from others.
>
> I think your REAL fear is just in everyone discovering you don't do a
> damn thing in radio for a living.
>
> No problem for me. I've revealed most of my employers in here, plus a
> number of personal references who are long-time licensed radio amateurs.
>
> You won't do that.
>
> All you seem to want is some kind of "rep" in the newsgroup for being here
> almost all of your free time, writing terribly long, boring peans to
> yourself
> and morsemanship...when not using the newsgroup as some kind of "chat
> room" in talking about absolutely non-radio-amateur subjects.
>
> >> >> IN the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service...
> >> >
> >> >No such thing exists.
> >>
> >> Yes it do, de facto, just not de jure. :-)
> >
> >DeJur made projectors. You're projecting ;-)
>
> I'm telling it like it is. "Archaic RadioTELEGRAPHY Service."
>
> That's what you want.
>
> That gives you some rank-status-privilege as an AMATEUR because
> your aren't IN radio as a professional.
>

> >> >I've been "in" the Amateur Radio Service for almost 36 years. You have
> >> >not done so for even one day.
>
> >> >That's nice, Len. On what amateur band did you bootleg with it?
> >
> >Hmm?
> >
> >> >Or was
> >> >it a broadcast band device so you could pretend you were on "Ted
> >> >Mack's Amateur Hour"? ;-)
> >>
> >> I've never bootlegged on anything after 1948.
> >
> >Ah - but that means you may have bootlegged in 1948 and before!
>
> YOU don't really KNOW if I "bootlegged" at all, do you?
>
> All you want to do is to selectively use my messages as an ignition
> point for a Flame War.
>
> YOU didn't exist in 1948. That was 55 years ago.
>
> You have NO KNOWLEDGE of what I did back then or even 56 years
> ago, but you are trolling, trolling, looking for a Flame Fest to start.
>
> So, great big expert radio ham, tell US your "personal experiences" with
> small output personal wireless AM broadcast band links of the pre-1950
> period.
>
> >Come clean and tell the group all about it. It will be good for your
> >soul to admit your checkered past.
>
> Go stick a whouff-hong someplace, pervert.
>
> It will satisfy your sex life.
>
>
> >It's more than you had done in RADIO at that age.
> >
> >And mine was legal. No bootlegging.
>
> YOU didn't exist in 1947...or 1948.
>
> By February 1953 I was already (at 20 years of age) a soldier serving
> overseas, assigned to an Army radio station with the callsign ADA.
> I was with ADA for three years.
>
> You've never served in the armed forces of the United States, much less
> "assigned overseas."
>

> You've made fun of my military service in the past. [that's in Google, by
> the way, you seem to live part of your time there...]
>
> You want to be honored a respected for being safely within in the USA
> borders, never serving. You want to make fun of those veterans who
> who don't love your blessed sacrament, morsemanship.
>
> >> By 1967 I'd already DESIGNED and mostly built (technician help was
> >> not always available) several UHF to microwave RF emitters of more
> >> that 10 Watts.
> >
> >Well, give Len a Nobel Prize for accomplishment in physics!
> >
> >In 1967 you were almost three times 14 years old.
>
> Wow, for an ALLEGED MSEE, you've got BAD arithmetic skills.
>
> Three times fourteen is forty-two. 1967 - 42 = 1925.
>
> I was born in 1932.
>
> In early 1967 I was 34 years old, my Honorable Discharge was
> 7 years in the past.
>
> >And it was your JOB, wasn't it?
>
> You are damn right is was MY JOB.
>
> I was good at enough to be given design responsibility.
>
> >> All quite legal.
> >
> >Not for you to operate unless you held the station license.
>
> Go Whouff-Hong yourself, sweetums. I DID have a station license
> in the PLMRS (as its called now) in a partnership in a business.
>
> Don't give us this CRAP about "holding a station license" when you've
> stated in the past in here that ham radio is "all about OPERATING."
>
> >Guess what, Len? You can get an amateur license for VHF/UHF that
> >doesn't require a code test.
>
> Guess what, Rev. Jim, you can become a REAL Preacher by going to
> a theology school instead of playing the part in a newsgroup.
>
> Then you give your sermons a real kick...the ones about the Sermon on
> The Antenna Mount.
>
>

> >Is it your guilt over your own bootlegging that causes you to attack
> >those who followed the law, even as teenagers?
>
> You are really REACHING for some Flame War, aren't you, Rev. Jim?
>
> Why don't you pull out your Raddio Kop shield and come arrest me for
> bootlegging?
>
>
> >Who is this "Rev. Jim" you keep addressing?
>
> Yourself, Stokey. Get off the hard stuff before it does you in...
>
> >The age thing is yours, Len, not mine. You recommended that FCC not
> >license anyone under age 14.
>
> Let us know when you've passed the mental age of 14 and we can
> discuss things rationally. So far, you aren't close to that.
>
>
>
>
>
> >> >Why are you avoiding that simple question?
> >>
> >> WHAT "question?"
> >>
> >"Why should there be *any* written test on theory if all a person
> >wants to do is operate manufactured radios?
> >
> >"If someone doesn't want to design, build or repair radios, why should
> >they have to memorize all those symbols, diagrams and formulas?"
>
> Those aren't "questions" except to the loaded, "do you still beat your
> wife" sort of "questions."
>
> They don't have to be "answered" because YOU don't have one single
> bit of "authority" to demand answers.
>
> Take pride in your work for a living. Reveal at least the area of
> "electrical
> work" you do.
>
> I've never known anyone in electronics engineering to NOT take pride in
> what they do or talk shop about it. You are the exception. You won't
> say word one about what area of "electrical engineering" you are in.
>
> Either you do NOT work in "electrical engineering" or you are terribly
> ashamed of what you do that you don't dare admit it.
>

> Either way, ALL you are is an AMATEUR who tries to pass hisself off as
> a great big guru in AMATEURISM.
>
> Show me up by giving an answer to that, Fearless Fosdick.
>
> Bet you can't. You will weasel-word your way around it.
>
> LHA

Will all those around here who give a rat's patooie about what this putz says or thinks (there's an oxymoron for ya) please raise yer hand?

Thought so.

What's the next thread about?

w3rv

4394. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 09:40:50 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <CaAab.163$Oy7.153@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77759

"Greg Courville" <En.TAKETHISOUT.ginuitastic@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in
message news:2f986907.0309182121.7f64b0e6@posting.google.com...

>
> It's really shocking how people can start an argument over nothing
> which can escalate to vicious strings of insults complete with
> profanity, sexual references and terms such as "CBplusser" and
> "Knuckle-Dragger".

Worst of all is how almost everything degenerates into a code/nocode debate,
sooner or later.

Utterly disgusting!

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

4395. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 09:55:43 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93FB3C4D5CCADelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 77760

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
news:20030918225803.11891.00000933@mb-m11.aol.com:

> In article <Xns93FA93F177603elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>I eventually passed code in 1993, but if it weren't for the *@#%^&!
>>code test I could have had an HF licence in 1971.
>
> Alun:
>
> The problem wasn't the "*@#%^&! code test" at all. It was you and your
> negative attitude toward it.

Only partly true. My negative attitude I freely admit. However, I had no aptitude for the subject, and still don't. Who knows why I should be good at science and languages, and yet lousy at woodwork and CW, and yet it's so. Each of us has innate abilities in some things, balanced by innate incompetence in others, i.e everyone is unique. I feel that this has been ignored by the pro-code side of the debate, or rather that it is known damn well, but none of you will admit it!

It is possible to learn something that one is no good at in order to pass a test, although unlikely that practical fluency in the skill would ever be acheived. It is even possible to learn something that one is both no good at and has no interest in, although much harder, and then the level of difficulty becomes crushingly hard. This is true of any skill, and interest is, if anything, maybe more important than ability, but any schoolteacher will tell you that when neither are present in even the snallest degree the chance of success is slim to none. So it was with me and Morse code. I did it eventually, with a huge amount of outside help, without which I would never have succeeded on my own. The reason I didn't succeed earlier is straightforward - I didn't get help before.

So there it is. I have a negative attitude, coupled with zero aptitude, and have never heard any convincing argument in these last 32 years as to why I should have had to have done it in the first place. Sure, I've heard lots of lame excuses as to why there should be a CW test, but nothing even approaching anything beleivable. No doubt CW is very useful, but I am no bloody good at it, and I prefer to actually _talk_ on the radio in the first place. That's all. No PSK31, no SSTV, no RTTY, etc. Boring and limited to some, but if you prefer CW or PSK, or WHY, then you're welcome to use them.

> The fact that you eventually passed it
> means that you had that ability all along, and just couldn't actualize

> it due to your negative feelings toward taking the test. I know; I've
> been there myself. The difference between you and me is that once I
> learned the code and began using it, I found it's value. This has
> served as the most convincing proof possible that code testing is a
> valid licensing requirement in the Amateur Radio Service.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

73 de Alun, N3KIP

4396. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 09:59:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309190159.1f389f5d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77761

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030918175649.07346.00000683@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> In article <vo6ab.6226$nQ.2158382@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >Sooner or later though, they pay the price. Either they need to build power
> >generators or buy it at very high prices from outside California from
> >companies who have made the investments.
> >
> >Whether it is regulatory, environmental, or economic, California has created
> >its own energy mess by its own actions.
>
> Tell us some more LIES, girl.
>
> We don't have any "energy mess" here.

Then all the stories in the LA Times, CNN, MSNBC, etc etc are
themselves "LIES", Lennie?

> California's energy gets disrupted once in a while by natural disasters.

Uh huh...And the MAN-MADE disaster of too many people in too
small an area, unless YOU are now more knowlegeble about such matters
than those quoted by the aforementioned GENERAL news media?

> We do NOT have they kind of debacle of power loss such as the recent
> northeast, many-state, greater-than-a-day outage...NOT caused by any
> natural disaster.

No...You just have some of the highest energy-per-capita rates,
brown-outs, and air pollution that kills. The "routine" stuff.

> California HAS had some unscrupulous private energy company managers
> who tried to scam both subscribers and the state government in what
> amounted to a form of usury. The EASTERN press picked up on that and
> made hilarity of it.

Why shouldn't they? It was the truth. Ooooops...I forgot, YOU
have a hard time with the truth...sorry...I forgot...

> The EASTERN press didn't make any hilarity about the recent many-state
> outages in the northeast, did it? Apparent cause was carelessness, not a
> natural disaster.

No one in ANY press market has made any "hilarity" out of any
such energy related crisis, Lennie.

If you think anyone was laughing, it was your own puny mindset paranoia bugging you again. Seems it's been doing that a lot lately, huh, Lennie...

Been keeping an eye on street traffic lately??? That FedEx or Bustr Brown been around once too often for your tastes...?!?! How about air traffic...Has that "news helicopter" been over your neighborhood a bit too low and too frequently, Lennie?

> Of course not. The EAST can do no wrong.

Yet another LennieRant implementation of geographical bigotry.

Nothing new...Same old putz.

Steve, K4YZ

4397. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 10:05:36 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309190205.2a54ca7c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77762

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030919004251.14837.00003075@mb-m03.aol.com>...

> No natural disaster cause. Still under investigation, but likely cause
> is eastern POOR PLANNING and OPERATION.

Or it could be that the power grid up there pre-dates the
electric grids anywhere else in the United States by several decades
and is in need of replacement.

It's a lot easier to build something better than the other guy
when you have his errors to learn from.

Being in second place has SOME advantages.

Steve, K4YZ

4398. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 10:10:50 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309190210.4c209224@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77763

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030919004251.14837.00003075@mb-m03.aol.com>...

> In article <bkdsqc$30em$1@heap.juniper.net>, dennis@wawa.juniper.net (Dennis
> Ferguson) writes:
>
> >Dee D. Flint <deehays@qix.net> wrote:

> >>"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message

> >>> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message

> >>> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message

All of that snipped because most intelligent people don't need to
see quotes of quotes of quotes in order to follow the topic.

> Thank you for that, Dennis!
>
> I can only add that our Southern California DWP...(SNIP)

Yet again caught violating his own dogma.

What did this have to do with "Amateur Radio POLICY", Lennie...Or
have YOU forgotten "the charter" of what the NG is supposed to be
about...

Or are we just yet-again victim of the "Do As I Say Not Do As I
Do" rhetoric of a newsgroup antagonist...?!?!

Sheesh. You make this sooooooooooo easy.

Steve, K4YZ

4399. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 10:14:00 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0309190214.1908f779@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77764

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<dypab.37002$NM1.193@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
> news:bkbd0c$rh5u5$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > To me, at least, it just makes sense that a
> > person holding the highest class of license should have a working
> > (practical) knowledge of the second most popular mode we have.
>
> How about knowing Spanish, Chineese, etc...two of the most
> popular languages used on the air after English?

Nah, how about just the *second* most popular language on the
air...prosigns and Q signals. They allow us to effectively communicate
with the third most popular language...and fourth, and fifth, and so
on...

That's right, Bill. Try getting your message across via phone to that
JA station who doesn't speak a lick of English, WITHOUT speaking
Japanese. I can...and you know why. Too bad your NCI followers don't
know why. Didn't you tell them, Bill? Oh, you left that part out. No
prob, your secret's safe with me.

> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

P.S. Here's a useful phrase for the <English only speaking> NCTA's
next SSB encounter with a JA station, "Ei-go ga dekimasu ka?" (Do you
speak English?)

4400. Re: Rev.Jim the troller (was Re: Bootlegging in 1948?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 10:36:33 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309190236.12d51c4d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77765

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030918223634.29660.00000717@mb-m24.aol.com>...

> No problem for me. I've revealed most of my employers in here, plus a
> number of personal references who are long-time licensed radio amateurs.

Your friend's license status is irrelevant. What is YOUR license
status, Sir Putzalot?

> I'm telling it like it is. "Archaic RadioTELEGRAPHY Service."

Actually, you are lying, and hoping if you repeat the lie over
and over someone will believe you.

If they are not licensed in the Amateur radio service and have no
practical experience in Amateur Radio, much the same as you, then they
might "bite" on your laughable rhetoric.

Otherwise, you're making up stuff as you go along to deceive and
antagonize.

> YOU don't really KNOW if I "bootlegged" at all, do you?

You have. Why deny it, Lennie?

> All you want to do is to selectively use my messages as an ignition
> point for a Flame War.

Oh...it's OK for >>YOU<< to do that, but anyone else doing it is
"igniting" a "flamewar"...!!!

BBBWWWHAHAHA

BTW...Did you get Mrs. Lennie to the OB/GYN to fix that fishy
smell you're always complaining of...?!?!

> >It's more than you had done in RADIO at that age.
> >
> >And mine was legal. No bootlegging.
>
> YOU didn't exist in 1947...or 1948.
>
> By February 1953 I was already (at 20 years of age) a soldier serving
> overseas, assigned to an Army radio station with the callsign ADA.
> I was with ADA for three years.

And still not germane to AMATEUR RADIO of 2003, Lennie.

> You've never served in the armed forces of the United States, much less
> "assigned overseas."

Was it required, Lennie? Can you prove that Jim ILLEGALLY dodged
military service? Do you REALLY want to go there?

> You've made fun of my military service in the past. [that's in Google, by
> the way, you seem to live part of your time there...]

Jim has never made fun of ANYONE'S "military service", Lennie.

What Jim has made light of is your frequent ramblings about how
you allegedly passed millions of messages on your own, and how you
somehow think that that military service somehow pertains to Amateur
Radio.

And >>I<< take extreme exception to your pale and threadbare
attempts to link that "service" to the combat deaths of United States
Soldiers who were KIA three years before you were even
in-theater...And even then you were hundreds of miles from the hot
zones.

> You want to be honored a respected for being safely within in the USA
> borders, never serving. You want to make fun of those veterans who
> who don't love your blessed sacrament, morsemanship.

Leonard H. Anderson is again lying.

> >And it was your JOB, wasn't it?
>
> You are damn right is was MY JOB.

And it seems your JOB is all that you have to hold up, Lennie.
Kinda lonely in that small world of yours, isn't it...???

> Go Whouff-Hong yourself, sweetums. I DID have a station license
> in the PLMRS (as its called now) in a partnership in a business.

But...but...but...LENNIE...>>>THIS<<< is a newsgroup about
AMATEUR RADIO...Not PLMRS, the Army in the 1950's, or shadetree
psychiatry from Mrs. Lennie's correspondence school study guides.

> Don't give us this CRAP about "holding a station license" when you've
> stated in the past in here that ham radio is "all about OPERATING."

You do not have a station license.

You do not have an operator's license.

Except as the invited guest of a duly licensed Amateur who DOES
hold a STATION license and an appropriate OPERATOR'S license, YOU are
just a spectator.

> Bet you can't. You will weasel-word your way around it.

Like how you weasel-word your way around "I'm getting an Extra
Lite out of the box", Lennie...???

"Restructuring" is almost 3 years old now, and you've gotten no
closer to an Amateur license than hurling unfounded accusations,
profanities and threadbare recycled rhetoric in this forum.

Seems YOU have set the bar for "weasel-wording", Lennie.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

4401. Re: FISTS Postion to the FCC

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 10:39:43 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309190239.2b7bcf38@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77766

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030916205913.12501.00002450@mb-m04.aol.com>...
> In article <bk4b7e$p383g$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >All of the above answers would be correct (barring accidental typos), but
> >the original poster of the question in the first place DID NOT SPECIFY.
> >See, it is important, unless you consider ALL antennas to be exactly
> >one-half wavelength in length.
>
> Dan thinks "all" dipoles are half-wavelength...

Lennie...WHAT did the "FISTS" organization have to do with
ANYTHING in this thread YOU started with their name...???

Steve, K4YZ

4402. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 10:53:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <jeBab.38186$NM1.5162@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77767

"WA8ULX" wrote:
>
> Big difference, you know nothing about the subject matter,
> your Licenses is nothing more than a FREE WELFARE
> HANDOUT, that is given out to the MIND Challenged
> people.

So, according to you, every single American who receives a ham license from this day forward is actually receiving a welfare handout because he or she is mind challenged? Hardly, Bruce. The only mind challenged people around here are those with views similar to yours.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4403. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 11:08:44 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <0tBab.38234$NM1.19253@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77768

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
>
> Coming from a Technician licensee, who knows
> NOTHING about how Morse Code is used,
> enjoyed, or anything. I'll just consider the source.
>
> Tell you what Dwight....when you get some
> knowledge of the subject, I'll pay attention. Just
> quit trying to put on a spin on a subject you know
> NOTHING about.

First of all, the subject was you and Larry (and your attitudes about code), which I do know something about. Second, one does not need to know code itself to see the amount of code used in this country or elsewhere. Perhaps if you looked up from you code key occasionally, and stopped looking down your nose at everyone else when you do, you would see the same decline of code use and therefore recognize how useless it is as a testing requirement. Of course, to acknowledge that reality would force you to drop your false pride and I truly wonder whether you're man enough to do that (the same with Larry).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4404. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 11:47:23 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <f1Cab.38355$NM1.3352@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77769

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> Sorry, but that is a judgment that you are not
> qualified to make. I'm not even going to bother
> to mention how wrong this judgment is, because
> it comes from someone who is incapable of
> rendering a credible judgment of the Morse/CW
> mode because of his lack of experience therein.

Of course, it is indeed a judgement I'm qualified to make. I certainly know as much about overall code USE in this country and elsewhere as you do. I also know just as much as you do about its NECESSITY to meet the goals and purpose of Amateur Radio. And those are the only things required to make a judgement on its value as a testing requirement.

> Incorrect. Dan and I are just speaking the truth
> based on practical experience.something you
> don't have when it comes to Morse/CW.

What experience is that, Larry? What experience do you have that makes you uniquely qualified to judge the value of a specific testing requirement? The answer is, of course, absolutely nothing - you're not uniquely qualified to make value judgements about testing requirements.

> (snip) but I'm eminently qualified to judge the value
> and currency of the Morse/CW mode based on my
> experience. (snip)

The issue isn't about the value of Morse Code itself, Larry. Instead, it's about the value of Morse Code as a testing requirement (read the subject line at the top of these messages). And you're no more "eminently qualified" to make judgements about that than any other ham radio operator. In fact, your inability to keep track of the overall subject from one message to the next makes me doubt you're even as qualified as other operators. Most people can keep up with the subject without constant reminders.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4405. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 12:34:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3JCab.38370$NM1.20347@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77770

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> This may be so, but it is an imperfect system being
> directed by people with imperfect wisdom and
> questionable motives. I say questionable because
> their motives, for the most part, are entirely
> self-serving.

Can you can show me one law in this country that wasn't advocated by people with self-serving motives? Laws, by their very nature, tend to serve the interests of at least someone. In reality, the only reason you're pointing to this is because people are now advocating the change of a law you happen to like (the code test requirement). And, of course, you would like everyone to believe your position in all this is not at all self-serving. Of course, anyone with common sense knows that's nonsense.

> And it is my right as an American Citizen to make an
> attempt to preserve this requirement. I am not
> challenging your right to do the opposite, even though
> you seem interesting in squelching my own efforts. What
> are you afraid of?

I'm afraid of your motives in all this, Larry. I don't like the words I hear from many advocating the continuation of the code testing requirement. Those words often reek of bigotry, elitism, and discrimination against other Americans. Are you comfortable with some of the things said by those with your position? Are you comfortable with some of the things you've said (the garbage about a dumb downed America, your superiority, and so on)?

> (snip) HF access is different, and it is here that the
> Morse/CW mode offers benefits and advantages
> which can be exploited to the benefit of all radio
> amateurs -- but only if they know how to do so.
> Therefore, the testing requirement remains current
> and valid -- forever.

Since it appears only a small minority of hams use Morse/CW on a regular or routine basis, a testing requirement obviously does not benefit "all radio amateurs." In addition, the testing requirements are not there to exclusively benefit Amateur Radio operators - they also exist to facilitate the goals and purposes of Amateur Radio. Therefore, any testing requirement must be judged within the context of each of these. The code testing requirement fails in each regard.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4406. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 12:58:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <x3Dab.38377$NM1.11375@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77771

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> Isabel promises death, destruction, and terror for
> all the USA according to the major news sources.

Well, in spite of the media hype, Isabel certainly ended up being not much of a storm. Compared to some of the previous hurricanes to hit this area, the damage was very light. Since most boaters in the area have a healthy respect for hurricanes, the Coast Guard didn't receive a single distress call. Furthermore, based on what I saw driving up the coast yesterday afternoon, it appears most boats in the area made it through the storm without any major damage (and only a few homes or commercial buildings were damaged).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4407. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 13:15:04 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919091504.29599.00000072@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 77772

> So, according to you, every single American who receives a ham license
>from this day forward is actually receiving a welfare handout because he or
>she is mind challenged?

CORRECT

4408. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 13:28:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919092821.29599.00000073@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 77773

>sexual references

You must be refering to TIT, remember it was her idea to get that Callsign

>and terms such as "CBplusser" and
>"Knuckle-Dragger".

Well I started the term CBplusser and it pretty much fits. Take the example TIT has been involved in lately. She, and others dont have any idea what a 1/4 Wave Dipole is, and trying to educate her is a waste of time. By the way she is 1 of them there CBplusser, Knuckle Draggin Generals.

> I see "newbies" come to these boards for help, and get cut
>down by inconsiderate jerks who just feel like making people feel
>stupid.

Someone true, but, you should have at least some basic understanding of the material, which the present writtens do not provide.

>Don't they
>realize that the new people look up to the old-timers?

Since when, all we here is were the ones holding them back.

4409. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 14:14:25 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0309190614.535abb15@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77774

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote

>
> Everyone knows that "CW" gets through when nothing else will, so
> all that is required for amateur radio is to demonstrate on-off keying
> morse code ability and that will suffice.
>
> Right?
>

Wrong, Your Eminent Pompousity.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

4410. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 14:39:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F6B1519.8080509@psu.edu>
Source record: 77775

JJ wrote:
> Mike Coslo wrote in message >
>
>>That's where we started on this sorry thread. Go back and read the
>>posts, including my 1/4 vs 1/2 wave dipole design done in EZNEC, and
>>then let us know how well a 1/4 wave dipole works.
>>
>>Then why don't you build a 1/4 wave dipole for whatever band gets you
>>into Central PA. We'll do a sked, and see how well your antenna works.
>
>
>
> Geeesh what a knuckle headed bunch. I never claimed that a 1/4 dipole would
> work as well as a 1/2 wave. However hook it to some ladder line and a tuner
> and you might be supprised. This all started when the so called "experts"
> here said there is no such thing. All I am saying is go to google and do a
> search and it will be obvious to the most casual observer that there is. Was
> I too fast for you are do I need to slow down?

Ahh, JJ, you don't do yourself any service by calling us knuckle heads!

Many of the references you get are simply wrong, others are picking up on just one of the words. Narrow the search params and you'll get about 100 hits. Some of them explaining that a 1/4 wave dipole is a mistaken term. Some that are calling a 1/4 wave ground plane a dipole, all kinds of stuff.

Webpage hits don't make something correct.

Or as Granpappy used to say "Just 'cause a cat has kittens in an oven, don't make 'em biscuits!"

I've never made a 1/4 wave dipole antenna and tried matching it with ladder line and a tuner. I suspect it won't work very well du to the huge impedence mismatch - even balanced tuners have their limits. But I'm not going to try it either. I don't have something to prove, and I've provided both official definitions and some examples worked out in a repected program.

Why don't you make one and try it out. Let us know how it works. Post your results and theory on r.r.a.antenna for thier review too.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4411. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 14:47:06 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F6B16EA.2080703@psu.edu>
Source record: 77776

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> JJ wrote:
>
>
>>Some claimed there is no such thing as a 1/4 wave
>>dipole, I simply stated there is, I never made any claims it would be a good
>>antenna.
>
>
> Ok. Since it was me who said there is no such thing as a 1/4 wave dipole, I'll
> modify my statement to read "There is no such thing as a 1/4 wave dipole other
> than at the station of a clueless ham who knows no better".
>
> That should take care of it.

Probably not!

I think this thread should be forwarded to the F.C.C. as an example of
why the testing requirement might be at a bit too low of a level right
now. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4412. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 14:52:50 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309190652.17c016cb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77777

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:<CaAab.163$Oy7.153@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Greg Courville" <En.TAKETHISOUT.ginuitastic@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in
> message news:2f986907.0309182121.7f64b0e6@posting.google.com...
>
> >
> > It's really shocking how people can start an argument over nothing
> > which can escalate to vicious strings of insults complete with
> > profanity, sexual references and terms such as "CBplusser" and
> > "Knuckle-Dragger".
>
> Worst of all is how almost everything degenerates into a code/nocode debate,
> sooner or later.
>
> Utterly disgusting!

'Scuse me but the this newsgroup is a direct spin-off from another
group (dot misc?) some number of years ago *specifically* as the place
to go for debating the code test issue. The idea was to lighten up the
increasing volume of traffic on the subject in that group when the
matter became a large and hot debate. The message is that this NG
remains true to it's founding principles and is still primarily the
code test battleground. If ya doan like it, fine, nobody has you
chained to RRAP, there are plenty of other ham NGs which are not
nearly as disgusting.

> Charles Brabham, N5PVL

w3rv

4413. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 14:58:32 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919105832.18064.00000925@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 77778

>I think this thread should be forwarded to the F.C.C. as an example of
>why the testing requirement might be at a bit too low of a level right
>now. 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA

Sad part is its worse than that, TIT is a Techplus, and doesnt have the
slighest idea how a simple Dipole works.

4414. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 15:12:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F6B1CE2.7020100@psu.edu>
Source record: 77779
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc

Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL wrote:

> # The kill-filer poses a much more insidious threat to #
> # the troll. Not posing a direct threat to the troll per #
> # se, the kill-filer simply deprives the troll of yet #
> # another source of nourishment. Some trolls have #
> # developed counter measures to thwart the kill-filers, #
> # usually this takes the form of a type of camoflage. #

Isn't there a category for the person who reads the troll's posts, and
then gives them the response they deserve, namely none?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4415. Re: 1/8 Wave Dipoles will work

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 15:26:39 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F6B202F.5040104@psu.edu>
Source record: 77780

WA8ULX wrote:
> just as good as 1/4 Wave Dipoles, with 1 advantage, you will not need as much
> wire or space to install it. A tuner is probably helpfull, but many people
> report a good match can be obtained using RG-58. It appears the best way to get
> a match using coax is to, coil about 8' of Coax at the back of the rig and the
> same at the fed point.

Bruce, now you let the cat out of the bag! Soon all hams will know that the whole idea of putting up these large antennas is just another ploy of PCTA's to keep those they consider inferior from getting on the air! This forces people who have enough land only to put up an antenna. More elitist snobbery!

Fact is. ANY dipole of ANY fractional length works just great!

Don't have enough space for a 1/8th wave dipole? Put up a 1/16 wave dipole. Or a 1/32 wave. In fact, dump the silly fractions, and put up a .001 wave dipole antenna.

Now for the deepest darkest little known fact of radio antennas..... They work better the SMALLER they are!!!!!

The reason for this is that by concentrating the power into a smaller space, the rf excited electrons *push* the rf out of the antenna much more energetically than in those stupid half wave antennas.

Once the rf is out of the antenna, nothing slows it dow, but in a half wave antenna, the electrons get tired pushing through all that wire.

- mike KB3EIA -

4416. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 15:49:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkf8itfis0@208.207.71.158>
Source record: 77781

Robert wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> > I am capable of passing any sort of radio traffic by way of
> > radiotelgraphy,
>
> I'd like to see you pass a weather satellite photo fax via
> radiotelegraphy....

Uh,, Bob, that isn't traffic, It's *data*. I guess if you were really
familiar with radio
you;d know that, wouldn't you?

>
>
> > which I learned as a requirement of my licensure as a
> > ham radio operator. There is no reason for you to be exempted from the
> > same.
>
> Well, at least you finally admit that it's "I had to do it, you
> should too."

The difference is, I know why. You obviously don't.

4417. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 16:22:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6B2D8E.20106@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77782

JJ wrote:
> Dick Carroll wrote in message ...
>
>> I would think you'd know that ladder line and a fixed dipole, while they
>
> will
>
>>work well on a wide range of bands and frequencies, are not the cureall for
>
> all
>
>>ills.
>
>
> I never said they were.

No, no you didn't. But you posted about all those web page hits, as if
that proves something.

>
>>Attempting to match a dipole at it's highest natural impedance point isn't
>>even close to "good engineering practice". It isn't even good "poor
>
> engineering
>
>>practice". There are antennas that just can't be adequately matched and
>
> this is
>
>>one.
>
>
> I never said it was "good or bad engineering practrice".

No, no you didn't. But you posted about all those web page hits, as if
that proves something.

>
>>You can always call a dipole whatever you want it to be. A halfwave dipole
>
> at
>
>>40 meters is a quarterwave dipole at 80 meters, if you want it to be that
>
> way.

>
>>But it sure isn't very smart. And don't expect it to work out.
>
>
> I never said it would. Some claimed there is no such thing as a 1/4 wave
> dipole, I simply stated there is, I never made any claims it would be a good
> antenna.

All dipoles are 1/4 wave at some frequency. You just wouldn't want to
use them.

> Gee, your reading comprehension isn't any better than some of the others.

Well, gee.... just what were you saying? I'm trying to figure out just
what you mean. You're saying that there are lots of hits out there on
1/4 wave antennas, but you don't mean that they work well, and those of
us that say a 1/4 wave antenna isn't practical or advisable are wrong
because as long as you aren't worried aboout the antenna working or not,
you can make a dipole of any fractional length?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4418. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 16:46:28 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <0OKdnY7bP6DrqfaiU-KYgw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 77784

Mike Coslo wrote in message <3F6B2D8E.20106@adelphia.net>...
>
> All dipoles are 1/4 wave at some frequency. You just wouldn't want to
>use them.

Thanks for proving my point, I never made ANY claims on the performance of a 1/4 wave dipole. Some said there was no such thing, I simply stated there is. So you admit the same I stated earlier in the thread, any dipole is a quarter wave at some frequency.

4419. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 16:47:25 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919124725.03483.00001100@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 77783

>Well, gee.... just what were you saying? I'm trying to figure out just
>what you mean. You're saying that there are lots of hits out there on
>1/4 wave antennas, but you don't mean that they work well, and those of
>us that say a 1/4 wave antenna isn't practical or advisable are wrong
>because as long as you aren't worried aboout the antenna working or not,
>you can make a dipole of any fractional length?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
WaIT a minute Mike, there are 1/4 Wave Ants that will work, but not 1/4 Wave
Dipoles

4420. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 16:51:15 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <P8ecnZp8FcEUqPaiXTWJig@gbronline.com>
Source record: 77785

Dwight Stewart wrote in message ...
>"WA8ULX" wrote:
>>
>> Big difference, you know nothing about the subject matter,
>> your Licenses is nothing more than a FREE WELFARE
>> HANDOUT, that is given out to the MIND Challenged
>> people.
>
>
> So, according to you, every single American who receives a ham license
>from this day forward is actually receiving a welfare handout because he or
>she is mind challenged? Hardly, Bruce. The only mind challenged people
>around here are those with views similar to yours.
>

You have to have a mind to be mind challenged, that leaves brucie out.

4421. Boise BPL testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 17:31:25 UTC
From: Paul <Paul@localhost.invalid>
Message-ID: <vmmf4qq6sqvk22@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77786

Sept 22 BPL scheduled for testing start in the Eagle Rd. @ McMillian area (or Eagle/Fairview not sure). This is not too far from my location. It would be nice to get some metrology on this before and after. What type of instrumentation is typically used? All I have is shortwave scanner which is pretty useless.

4422. Re: Boise BPL testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 18:06:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkfgj0$eu9$0@208.206.142.76>
Source record: 77787

If you're not a ham I suggest you find some local ham operators and alert them to the threat if they aren't already aware of it -and many will not be if they haven't been very active lately.
I'm sure the local ham radio community will be interested, if not other low band VHF users.

Go to this URL..... http://www.qrz.com/i/names.html

Type in boise idaho ands you'll get a list of local hams and a club. If they don't already know about BPL I'm sure they'll be interested.

Dick

Paul wrote:

> Sept 22 BPL scheduled for testing start in the Eagle Rd. @ McMillian
> area (or Eagle/Fairview not sure). This is not too far from my location.
> It would be nice to get some metrology on this before and after. What
> type of instrumentation is typically used? All I have is shortwave
> scanner which is pretty useless.

4423. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 18:11:26 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309191011.53667dcc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77788

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<bkbe4a$r8nem$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "Clint" wrote ...
>
> the PCTA crowd just said "six mega what ???" you screwed up and mentioned
> something modern and applicable in the real world.... they're trapped in
> 1952.
> ----------
>
> Gee, you got us there, Clint. All of us knuckle-dragging CW'ers are just
> caught in a time warp. We don't know a thing about modern communications
> technology. Gosh, I'll bet you can tell me all about the "new" technologies
> like SATLink, VTC Scottie, trunked spread spectrum FM and closed networking,
> right? Not that I'd ever use all that stuff at work or anything ... right?
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST

Forget about the stuff at work, how do you use it in Amateur Radio?

4424. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 18:13:09 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hlgvl08.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 77789

On Fri, 19 Sep 2003 11:43:57 -0400, Richard J Hasbro wrote:

>> Perhaps someone will take it up with the Five Gnomes and see if
>> they can get it right this time. As if they will know what we are
>> talking about. <ggg>
>>
>> --
>> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>>
>> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
>> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>>
>>
>
> Will you please check & correct your posting headers?
>You are posting to this forum using incorrect headers.

What is there in the headers that you object to?
>
>Thank you,

You're welcome.

>Rich
>Detroit, MI
>Hasbro Tronics LTD

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4425. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 18:19:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309191019.3a6d825f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77790

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bke2fk$j05$0@208.206.142.74>...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > In article <20030918175652.07346.00000687@mb-m26.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> > (Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> > >
> > > A half century ago I felt right at home working primary communications
> > > on Army radio station ADA. Not only feeling that but BEING AT HOME
> > > at the new site of Camp Tomlinson...barracks at one corner of the huge
> > > antenna field. ADA never used "CW" (on-off keying), trans-Pacific or
> > > local.
> > >
> > > DICK, you've NEVER done that in the US Army, have you?
> > >
> > > All you can do is demand that EVERYONE HAD TO DO IT LIKE YOU
> > > DID but you can never offer any viable proof why they should.
> > >
> > > LHA
> >
> > Lennie:
> >
> > Your half-century old experiences in military communications, where, by
> > your own admission, you never utilized the Morse/CW mode, are irrelevant
> > to the discussion of Morse code testing requirements within the AMATEUR
> > Radio Service in 2003. In fact, as a person who does not use the Morse
> > code for any reason whatsoever, you are self-disqualified from rendering
> > any judgment on the topic whatsoever. Therefore, I suggest that you
> > stop wasting your time, find something you know something about (which
> > from my personal observation seems to be limited to megalomaniacal,
> > ego-driven character assassination) and talk about that, instead. You
> > are not influencing anyone on the topic of code testing.
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Well, Well...Lennie is still touting his BC610 babysitting experience as
> being (= / >) ham radio, hmm??
>
> While he was sitting around twiddling his
> thumbs and waiting for a breaker to trip so he'd have something to do, I was
> busily involved in operating AND REPAIRING one of the very first video tape
> systems in the country, among many other very interesting work activities at
> the Signal School at Fort Monmouth.
> You see, instead of sending me to an obscure, remote MINOR outpost about as far

> away as it's possible to be sent,

And just the other day you were bragging about how you had a field job
with the troopers.

when I finished electronics training, the
> Signal School kept me there as permanent party, to work as a broadcast
> engineer at the educational TV station ran by the school. A most interesting
> and challenging assignment, indeed.

Indeed. Typical duty given to sycophant students.

I would have been completely happy to have
> stayed there for the remainder of my term of service, but my name came up for an
> overseas tour of duty rotation, so off to Europe I went after a year and a half.

I thought you were sending CW as the ChiComs were overrunning your
position?

> I sure do feel for poor ol' Lennie, tho, he must have had a rough go of it 'way
> out there in the JA boondocks with nothing to do but listen to the transformers
> hum and wait for another overload. And I hear those BC610's didn't overload all
> that often, either. Tsk, tsk.

Yet all that message traffic was sent w/o touching a Morse key.

4426. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 18:22:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309191022.4529760@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77791

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bkbcf1ibd0@208.206.142.69>...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bkb8pg$8l8$0@208.206.142.108...
> > >
> > >
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > > "IARU policy is to support the removal of Morse code testing as a
> > > > requirement
> > > > for an amateur license to operate on frequencies below 30 MHz," the IARU
> > > > Administrative Council resolved.
> > >
> > > So read it Bill-- that means they support *an* amateur radio license
> allowing HF
> > > operation without code, NOT the removal of all code testing.
> >
> > If that's what you think it sez...dream on.
>
> It sez what it sez, Bill. And that's what it sez!

Part 97 sez Morse Code at 5WPM, not Farnsworth Code at 13-15WPM.

So does it really matter what a regulation sez?

4427. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 18:30:13 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309191030.34c4a9ca@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77792

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309171347.183aec38@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309131147.2090071e@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
>
> > > Perhaps because the other poster didn't make a lot of assinine
> > > assertions that are not substantiated by facts, Brain.
> >
> > The ARS has improved since 1984. That's plain for everyone to see.
>
> Then where does all this "Ham Radio Is Going To Hell" traffic
> come from, Brain? Mostly from trolls, you and Lennie.
>
> > > You may refer to "fact" in Websters to find out what they are,
> > > Brain...You DO seem to have a problem with the concept.
> >
> > Not at all. As Ronald Reagan said, "Facts are stupid things."
>
> I'd expect notning less from you, Brain...You're nothing if not
> consistent.
>
> Thanks.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Steve, not my fault that Ron said it, and I liked Ron. But his quote applied in your declaration that amateur radio has not improved since 1984.

That is not fact.

4428. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 20:48:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkfq3dian0@208.206.142.86>
Source record: 77793

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bke2fk$j05$0@208.206.142.74>...
> > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> >
> > > In article <20030918175652.07346.00000687@mb-m26.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> > > (Len Over 21) writes:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > A half century ago I felt right at home working primary communications
> > > > on Army radio station ADA. Not only feeling that but BEING AT HOME
> > > > at the new site of Camp Tomlinson...barracks at one corner of the huge
> > > > antenna field. ADA never used "CW" (on-off keying), trans-Pacific or
> > > > local.
> > > >
> > > > DICK, you've NEVER done that in the US Army, have you?
> > > >
> > > > All you can do is demand that EVERYONE HAD TO DO IT LIKE YOU
> > > > DID but you can never offer any viable proof why they should.
> > > >
> > > > LHA
> > >
> > > Lennie:
> > >
> > > Your half-century old experiences in military communications, where, by
> > > your own admission, you never utilized the Morse/CW mode, are irrelevant
> > > to the discussion of Morse code testing requirements within the AMATEUR
> > > Radio Service in 2003. In fact, as a person who does not use the Morse
> > > code for any reason whatsoever, you are self-disqualified from rendering
> > > any judgment on the topic whatsoever. Therefore, I suggest that you
> > > stop wasting your time, find something you know something about (which
> > > from my personal observation seems to be limited to megalomaniacal,
> > > ego-driven character assassination) and talk about that, instead. You
> > > are not influencing anyone on the topic of code testing.
> > >
> > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> > Well, Well...Lennie is still touting his BC610 babysitting experience as
> > being (= / >) ham radio, hmm??
> >
> > While he was sitting around twiddling his
> > thumbs and waiting for a breaker to trip so he'd have something to do, I was
> > busily involved in operating AND REPAIRING one of the very first video tape
> > systems in the country, among many other very interesting work activities at

> > the Signal School at Fort Monmouth.
> > You see, instead of sending me to an obscure, remote MINOR outpost about as far
> > away as it's possible to be sent,
>
> And just the other day you were bragging about how you had a field job
> with the troopers.
>

??? I did? Sure don't recall any such remark. I think you're (STILL) confused.

>
> when I finished electronics training, the
> > Signal School kept me there as permanent party, to work as a broadcast
> > engineer at the educational TV station ran by the school. A most interesting
> > and challenging assignment, indeed.
>
> Indeed. Typical duty given to sycophant students.

Hmmm.. well I *did* graduate within a fraction of a point of the top score in the class, though that score wan't mine. It went to a fella who had already completed over half of a college EE program. Instructors do like to see their students do well. If that makes me a "synchophant", whatever you think that is, guess all I can do is agree.

>
>
> I would have been completely happy to have
> > stayed there for the remainder of my term of service, but my name came up for an
> > overseas tour of duty rotation, so off to Europe I went after a year and a half.
>
> I thought you were sending CW as the ChiComs were overrunning your
> position?
>

Brian, we already told you- think is dangerous to your mental health. Evidently it overly strains your faculties.

>
> > I sure do feel for poor ol' Lennie, tho, he must have had a rough go of it 'way
> > out there in the JA boondocks with nothing to do but listen to the transformers
> > hum and wait for another overload. And I hear those BC610's didn't overload all
> > that often, either. Tsk, tsk.
>
> Yet all that message traffic was sent w/o touching a Morse key.

But not by Lennie! The operating wasn't done at the transmitter site. He sat and watched. Just like he -and you- are doing here.

4429. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 21:07:45 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <BeKab.43400$Aq2.29924@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77794

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bkdfen$j426$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Bill Sohl" wrote in part ...
>
> "FCC nor almost every emergency preparedness organization/operation has no
> desire or need for morse in their plans."
> ----------
>
> I ask because you wrote the above. Why do you think the EM planners have
> "no need" for Morse? Any tool available should be considered for use in
the
> EM package.

Here's three specific reasons why EMs don't want code

1. It requires a specific skill set that even when code was a higher speed
requirement
didn't include ALL hams.
2. It doesn't allow for non hams to use the amateur equipment themselves
with
having the licensed ham simply in the room as control op.
3. Only the decoding ham can understand what is being sent while others
standing by
understand none of what is being heard.

> Not only is our equipment capable of Morse, but we have CW
> capable operators for each. We've used it in the past and I strongly
> suspect that will do so in the future as well.

Most emergency operations don't even need or use HF.
All of yesterday's activity for Hurricane Isabel was VHF/UHF
for local and county operations.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4430. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 21:21:24 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <orKab.43438$Aq2.26701@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77795

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030918221840.00545.00000894@mb-m02.aol.com...
> In article <eHs9b.16486$NM1.11330@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> >news:c2356669.0309151318.61dd8717@posting.google.com...
> >> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> >news:<vmbdhfc0nr1n86@corp.supernews.com>...
> >> > many people that are in or supports the doctrines of PCTA keeps
> >> > spouting "basics", and draws an anology to either handwriting...
> >> > and I say this; does this mean you could NEVER write cursive
> >> > if you were never taught print? could you NOT be taught
> >> > cursive directly without first being taught print? No.
> >>
> >> OK, fine.
> >>
> >> But why should any sort of manual writing skill be mandatory in a
> >> world full of keyboards?
> >
> >It may well come to that. For now, since keyboards are not
> >everywhere 100% of the time, educators require some
> >sort of manual writing ability. For the record, I never had a
> >decent handwriting and I print everything on those rare
> >occasions when I have to manually apply pen to paper.
>
> The local school district requires the students to learn no less than
three
> different kinds of manual writing:
>
> Block printing
> Denilian (sp?) script
> Cursive (longhand)
>
> And they do it all by 3rd grade.
>
> Even though the kids could get along with just one, all three are taught -
and
> required.

So? That probably varies all over the country.

> >> > However, it's simply another skill that can be taught, and they
> >> > do, and that's fine.
> >>

> >> Why?
> >>
> >> Why not teach keyboarding from Day One? Our children will spend far
> >> more time at keyboards than writing.
> >
> >But their need to write at some occasions hasn't
> >been ended. Maybe someday it will...but not now.
>
> Handwriting is how old? ;-)

several hundred years?

> >> > However, they do not look at CW the
> >> > same way; it's pass/fail, not merely a percentage of test
> >> > that needs to be passed.
> >> >
> >> If it were up to me, there would be several written tests (or the
> >> written would be split up into separately-graded parts) as well as a
> >> code test.
> >
> >You know I agree in principal with that...except for needing
> >any code test at all.
>
> But does the NCVEC petition, or the NCI petition address the writtens? Not
at
> all.

No, why should it? I have ALWAYS said the code was a
separate issue from writtens. I'm not opposed to revisiting
the writtens, but there's no need to wait for that before ending all
code testing.

> >> > Do you think they would support a system where you had
> >> > to be tested on CW, if an only if you wanted to use CW
> >> > on the CW part of the bands? Heh, of COURSE not.
> >>
> >> There are no CW-only parts of the HF/MF bands. None at all.
> >
> >Perhaps he should have asked:
> >Do you think they would support a system where you had
> >to be tested on CW, if an only if you wanted to use CW
> >on the parts of the bands where CW can be used?
>
> CW can be used anywhere on the HF/MF bands....

change last few words to: "where CW is traditionally used"

> >> > That is where thier anology fails. The art of CW needs
> >> > to be tested with a practical test if you are to use and
> >> > learn CW, but not necissarily ham radio. I would have
> >> > supported a system like that, where if you wanted to
> >> > operate CW on the lower half of the band you had to

> >> > be tested on if first, but of course, that was out of the
> >> > question.
> >>
> >> Your opinion noted. Others have a different opinion.
> >> >
> >> > They do not, however, likewise, first test people
> >> > on knowing how to build a double sideband carrier
> >> > transmission if they want to operate AM; they do
> >> > not require you to show how to get a microphone,
> >> > talk on it, and recieve the response on a speaker
> >> > if you want to use frequency modulated radiotelephone,
> >> > or single sideband carrier suppressed radiotelephone.
> >>
> >> Perhaps they should.
> >> >
> >> > But they DO want to force CW on people that don't
> >> > necissarily have any interest in operating it. "basics"
> >> > arguments fail; "selftrained skill" fails because everything
> >> > is a selftrained skill, why put the emphasis on an outdated
> >> > mode instead of testing selftrained skills on new, modern
> >> > modes of communication?
> >>
> >> Then answer this question: Why should people who are not interested in
> >> building or fixing their radios have to learn all that theory stuff
> >> for the written tests? Why are all hams tested on all sorts of stuff
> >> they are not interested in?
> >
> >But, as pointed out before...ONLY morse has its own stand alone
> >test. No other body of ham knowledge on that is tested is
> >given that exclusivity.
>
> Doesn't answer the question.

It addresses the fact that one can learn a subset of theory
because it isn't tested separately from rule, regs, etc.
Bottom line, if he/you want to petition to end theory
requirements then you are free to do so.

> >> When I first started out in ham radio, all I wanted to do was join the
> >> folks I heard on 75 meter AM. Yet in order to get the license, I had
> >> to learn not only Morse Code, but all sorts of theory and regulatory
> >> stuff that had absolutely nothing to do with 75 meter AM.
> >> Why was I forced to learn all that?
> >
> >Cause its the rules..
>
> Apply that logic to the code test!

Agreed...and that is why we are following the LEGAL process
to get it changed...or are you saying we shouldn't be allowed
to do that because "once a rule, always a rule?"

> >.if you want it changed, petition the FCC.
>
> W5YI's working on it - you watch.

Who knows...as of now, there's no petition from W5YI.
There's a petition from NCVEC which includes W5YI...but
not anything from W5YI separately.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4431. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 21:23:19 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <btKab.294022$2x.84057@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 77796

"Greg Courville" <En.TAKETHISOUT.ginuitastic@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message news:2f986907.0309182121.7f64b0e6@posting.google.com...
> I've been a ham for only a month now, and been using these groups for
> about 6 weeks.
> I really can't stand some of the things that go on here.
> Has anybody ever noticed that 8 out of 10 ...snip ..

Hello Greg and welcome aboard ..you have entered an endeavor which is a cross section of the population as a whole. This move will give you plenty of stories to chuckle about in the years to come, some frustration and increased knowledge not only about radio but of human nature. Do not rate amateur radio or compare in any way to what you read on this or other newsgroups. Just enjoy have fun ...and take people's remarks at face value. You will find the sprit that ham radio has rises above all of this.

God Bless 73 Tom KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

4432. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 21:26:05 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <NvKab.43454$Aq2.19896@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77797

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hlfqoj7.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Wed, 17 Sep 2003 17:14:03 GMT, Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> >
> >I read that when it was initially out and have no recollection
> >of the "out-of-band" transmit aspect. The issue always was
> >focused on amteur rigs that could also recieve (i.e. listen to)
> >police broadcasts from an automobile.
>
> See my posting on that. The preemption only covered receive
> capability. Gotta read the footnotes, too.

OK, that being the case, the few actual state laws I know about don't
question transmit, but rather only make it illegal
to be able to listen ... usually only in a vehicle...except (I think)
in either FL or KY.

> Don't get me wrong.....I, too, feel that if it is not -used- to
> transmit, it's no one's business, but until and unless the situation
> is clarified, it is what it is.
>
> If you were to ask me if an automobile proceeding down Main Street
> needs a rider on a horse to proceed it with a blue lantern, the
> answer might be "yes" if the old ordinance has never been removed.
> That doesn't mean that I agree with it, or that the ordinance is not
> stupid - it means that that's what it still says.
>
> >Today there are several HF/VHF rigs that can do so. IC-706 >has 6m and
> >2m, several other HF rigs now cover HF plus 6, 2 and 440.
> >In all the cases of harrased hams (harassed by police) in states with
> >laws forbidding listening to police transmissions, the issue was
> >always listening to..not transmitting on, police frequencies.
>
> It's time for the Five Gnomes to revisit the situation - as if they
> know what we are talking about. We all know that ham radio issues
> are not high on the Totem Pole at the FCC any more.
>
> > Here in NJ we finally changed the old state law around 1994.
>
> My rock-bottom stance is that such statutes should clearly indicate
> that what is prohibited is radio equipment used in connection with
> illegal activity - nothing more.

That is exactly how we changed the NJ law. Today, anyone can
have a scanner anywhere in NJ (home, car, etc) and unless they are
using the scanner in connection with illegal criminal activity,
there's no violation.

That is a legitimate law
> enforcement objective, and does not involve the law enforcement
> officers (who are not qualified technicians) in determining if the
> equipment has been modified or whether it has the capability of
> transmitting and if so on what frequencies.

Agreed.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4433. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 21:30:58 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <mAKab.43468$Aq2.37457@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77798

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bke0f6fkl0@208.206.142.83...
> So then it would be necessary for someone who was being checked to cause
his
> radio to make an illigal transmission before it could be determined
whether or
> not he was "preempted". Nonsense.
>
> That section says nothing whatever about the capability of the gear to
> transmit, only receive.

I agree with Dick (oh my gosh)

> Since the "scanner laws" specifically cover recption of
> police radio signals with an intent to prevent their criminal use, they
don't
> address transmission in any way.

Actually, most of those laws make no reference to "intent."
They simply prohibit any/all reception, usually from a motor vehicle.

> Phil I almost always agree with your point of view, but I believe you're
wrong
> on this one.
> dick

Me Too.
Bill K2UNK
>
>
> Phil Kane wrote:
>
> > On Tue, 16 Sep 2003 01:03:16 GMT, Keith wrote:
> >
> > >> Of course, if the amateur op doesn't have his license with him, the
> > >> officer has reasonable cause to believe that the pre-emption does
> > >> not cover him even though it still does, and if the rig has been
> > >> modified so that it is capable of TRANSMITTING on the police
> > >> frequency, the pre-emption is not valid even if the operator is a
> > >> licensed amateur (per the FCC Public Notice on this matter many
> > >> years ago).
> >
> > > Please cite case law that supports your position that modified ham
radios
> > > do not have the same exemption as all ham radios?
> >

> > And on Tue, 16 Sep 2003 22:09:22 -0700 (PDT), Phil Kane wrote:
> >
> > > That was the deal that the League worked out with the FCC - if the
> > > radio did not transmit "out of band" then the preemption covered.
> > > The intent was to exclude VHF/UHF transceivers which have been
> > > "opened up".
> > >
> > > I'll dig out the Public Notice if I can find it. It was many years
> > > ago.
> >
> > FCC PR Docket No. 91-36 MO&O Released September 3, 1993.
> >
> > V. CONCLUSION [Emphasis added]
> >
> > 13. We hold that state and local laws that preclude the
> > possession in vehicles or elsewhere of amateur radio service
> > transceivers by amateur operators merely on the basis that the
> > transceivers are capable of the RECEPTION of public safety,
> > special emergency, or other radio service frequencies, the
> > RECEPTION of which is not prohibited by federal law, are
> > inconsistent with the federal objectives of facilitating and
> > promoting the amateur radio service and, more fundamentally,
> > with the federal interest in amateur operators' being able to
> > transmit and receive on authorized amateur service frequencies.
> > We therefore hold that such state and local laws are preempted
> > by federal law.
> >
> > Footnotes
> >
> > 33. The rules, however, do prohibit amateur service
> > transmissions outside of the allocated amateur service bands.
> > 47 C.F.R. Sec. 97.307(b); Public Notice, Extended Coverage
> > Transceivers in the Amateur Radio Service, mimeo no. 4114 (July
> > 21, 1987)(noting that "[i]t is a violation of the Commission's
> > regulations to . . . transmit on a frequency allocated to a
> > licensed service without the appropriate Commission-issued
> > station license.").
> >
> > The above proceedings are very clear that it covers only "out of
> > band" reception and does not cover equipment that has "out of band"
> > transmit capability.
> >
> > Not being a real lawyer, although you try to play one, you may not
> > accept the fact that in FCC practice, situations which are not
> > specifically mentioned for preemption are not preempted.
> > Adminsitrative Practice 101.
> >
> > There has not been any challenge to this ruling, therefore it stands
> > as effective law until overturned. Administrative Practice 102.
> >

> > --
> > 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
> > ARRL Volunteer Counsel
>

4434. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 21:45:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <HNKab.39560$NM1.7405@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77799

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F6A6089.6040004@adelphia.net...
> JJ wrote:
> > Brian Kelly wrote in message ...
> >
> >> Bilge. All of it. A 66 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole
> >> on 40M and a 134 foot dipole is roughly a *half wave* dipole on
> >> 80M. A 33 foot long center-fed dipole is a quarter wavelength long
> >> on 40M but it is not resonant on 40M and ya better not get stupid
> >> and feed it with coax then just plug it into the back of yer radio
> >> if ya wanna work anybody with it.
> >>
> >
> >
> > A search on google on quarter wave dipole will give plenty of
> > sources.
>
>
> That's where we started on this sorry thread. Go back and read the
> posts, including my 1/4 vs 1/2 wave dipole design done in EZNEC, and
> then let us know how well a 1/4 wave dipole works.
>
> Then why don't you build a 1/4 wave dipole for whatever band gets you
> into Central PA. We'll do a sked, and see how well your antenna works.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

Why bother ? I just used my 20 meter dipole, coax fed with 50 ohm cable on
7.030. The SWR was off the scale.

I then hit the tune button on my FT-1000mp and that piece of junk wouldn't
tune it. So I called CQ for a couple of hours. No replies.

I then called my buddy across town to fire up and give me a listen. I was
S1 and almost in the noise.

So, for an experiment, knowing it was just a lark because the Texas Twit
said so, I hooked up my 40 meter half wave, center fed with 50 ohm coax.
My signal was now 30 db over S9.

Can you get the Texas Twit to explain this for me please.

Dan/W4NTI

4435. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 21:50:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <tSKab.39567$NM1.1238@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77800

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bke6n7$q45$0@208.206.142.96...
>
>
> JJ wrote:
>
> > Some claimed there is no such thing as a 1/4 wave
> > dipole, I simply stated there is, I never made any claims it would be a
good
> > antenna.
>
> Ok. Since it was me who said there is no such thing as a 1/4 wave dipole,
I'll
> modify my statement to read "There is no such thing as a 1/4 wave dipole
other
> than at the station of a clueless ham who knows no better".
>
> That should take care of it.
>

Did someone call the Texas Twit?

Dan/W4NTI

4436. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 21:51:43 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <PTKab.39569$NM1.30140@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77851

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030919105832.18064.00000925@mb-m05.aol.com...
> >I think this thread should be forwarded to the F.C.C. as an example of
> >why the testing requirement might be at a bit too low of a level right
> >now. 8^)
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA
>
> Sad part is its worse than that, TIT is a Techplus, and doesnt have the
> slighest idea how a simple Dipole works.

Its even worse than that Bruce. Give a listen to the 'Ektra' subbands on
75 some night. Now there is a eye opener.

Dan/W4NTI

4437. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 21:57:09 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <VYKab.804$Hd6.600926@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77852

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0309172038.d92c8bd@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<dz5ab.6206$nQ.2134554@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Ryan, KC8PMX" <kc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
> > news:bk4b77$p383g$2@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > > Just wanted to know why 13 was some type of magic number.
> > >
> > > Thanks,
> > >
> > > --
> > > Ryan, KC8PMX
> > > FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> > > --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. .
..-.
> > > .. --. .... - . .-. ...
> > >
> >
> > Also there is some evidence that once one has reached the 13wpm level,
they
> > will not forget it even if they don't use. They might grow rusty and
become
> > slow. But it stays in the brain, ready to be called upon. See the book
> > "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy," which is available for free
> > downloading from the internet. The author deliberately chose to make
this
> > available to the public for free so that there is no copyright
infringement
> > involved.
>
> I'm living proof of validity of the "use it or lose it" theory. I
> spent a couple decades+ running CW >13 wpm then I put ham radio aside
> for the following couple decades. When I decided to jump back in I was
> absolutely convinced that I'd have to relearn CW, or at least I'd have
> to work at regaining the speed I had when I dropped out. Was *not* the
> case. I could still copy 30 wpm in my head like I'd never left the
> bands. Amazed me. But I guess once the neurons are firmly welded
> together they don't come apart for life. I think I lost some of my
> ability to get it down solid on paper at speed and I'm working on
> that.
>
> However I do not agree with a hypothesis that simply cramming for then
> passing a 13 or even a 20wpm code test assures a lifetime ability to
> copy Morse at any usable speed. I've seen too many examples of "cram &

> pass" types who never actually used the stuff on the air to any extent
> all but completely forget how to copy Morse. Apparently there is some
> combination of both a speed and a number of hours of experience at
> that speed which embeds Morse for life.
>
>
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> w3rv

It appears to me that the reason 13wpm and higher works, according to the reference, is that you CAN'T successfully cram to pass the higher speeds. You've got to have those neural connections solidly in place. However for 10wpm and down you can cram and pass the tests.

Regardless, there is definitely a point at which a person won't forget even if they believe they have done so (your experience being a case in point).

To me, this is the level that Extras should reach, i.e. a level that they won't forget.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4438. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 21:59:11 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <P_Kab.806$Hd6.601977@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77853

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:DDcab.31912$Aq2.8781@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > I've lived in Seattle. Too little sun and almost no wind.
> > According to a book I was reading when I wanted to
> > build a greenhouse, windloading is not a consideration
> > there as it has the lowest winds in the country.
>
>
> Wind turbines don't have to be located in the back yard of the Safeco
> Field, Dee (Safeco Field replaced the King Dome). They can be placed on
the
> other side of Puget Sound, where there is plenty of wind. Another
> alternative is some of the islands north of Seattle at the mouth of the
> Sound (also plenty of wind).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

How much land will be used to build enough turbines to power Seattle and the
surrounding suburbs? And the other side of Puget Sound doesn't have "plenty
of wind". It's higher than Seattle but still much lower than many other
areas of the country.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4439. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 22:01:35 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309191401.545ca4e7@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77854

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bke0tqfkl1@208.206.142.83>...
> N2EY wrote:
>
> > In article <IDVNFYDX37881.3498263889@bog.lir.dk>, Franz Weigel
> > <anon@bog.lir.dk> writes:
> >
> > >The last CW coder who died was sentenced
> > >to Hell for eternity in order to transmit
> > >6 Megapixels 24-bit color pictures in CW.
> > >
> > >God bless you from CW !
> >
> > Gee - who was it said they were only against the TEST?
>
> The truth usually manages to slip out.

Tell me about it. Using CW won't get anyone sentenced to hell. Lying
about how it always gets thru will.

CW gets thru when everything else will.

4440. Re: 1/8 Wave Dipoles will work

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 22:03:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <r2Lab.39587$NM1.23557@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77855

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F6B202F.5040104@psu.edu...
> WA8ULX wrote:
> > just as good as 1/4 Wave Dipoles, with 1 advantage, you will not need as
much
> > wire or space to install it. A tuner is probably helpfull, but many
people
> > report a good match can be obtained using RG-58. It appears the best way
to get
> > a match using coax is to, coil about 8' of Coax at the back of the rig
and the
> > same at the fed point.
>
>
> Bruce, now you let the cat out of the bag! Soon all hams will know that
> the whole idea of putting up these large antennas is just another ploy
> of PCTA's to keep those they consider inferior from getting on the air!
> This forces people who have enough land only to put up an antenna. More
> elitist snobbery!
>
> Fact is. ANY dipole of ANY fractional length works just great!
>
> Don't have enough space for a 1/8th wave dipole? Put up a 1/16 wave
> dipole. Or a 1/32 wave. In fact, dump the silly fractions, and put up a
> .001 wave dipole antenna.
>
> Now for the deepest darkest little known fact of radio
> antennas..... They work better the SMALLER they are!!!!!
>
> The reason for this is that by concentrating the power into a smaller
> space, the rf excited electrons *push* the rf out of the antenna much
> more energetically than in those stupid half wave antennas.
>
> Once the rf is out of the antenna, nothing slows it dow, but in a half
> wave antenna, the electrons get tired pushing through all that wire.
>
> - mike KB3EIA -
>

New wave electronics?

Dan/W4NTI

4441. Re: Boise BPL testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 22:04:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309191404.71f6248e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77856

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bkfgj0$eu9$0@208.206.142.76>...
> If you're not a ham I suggest you find some local ham operators and alert
> them to the threat if they aren't already aware of it -and many will not be
> if they haven't been very active lately.
> I'm sure the local ham radio community will be interested, if not other low
> band VHF users.
>
> Go to this URL........ http://www.qrz.com/i/names.html
>
> Type in boise idaho ands you'll get a list of local hams and a club. If they
> don't already know about BPL I'm sure they'll be interested.
>
> Dick

Dick, that's about the 1st useful post from you in about 8 years. Bravo!

4442. Re: Boise BPL testing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 22:05:09 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <p4Lab.39592$NM1.24118@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77857

"Paul" <Paul@localhost.invalid> wrote in message
news:vmmf4qq6sqvk22@corp.supernews.com...
> Sept 22 BPL scheduled for testing start in the Eagle Rd. @ McMillian
> area (or Eagle/Fairview not sure). This is not too far from my location.
> It would be nice to get some metrology on this before and after. What
> type of instrumentation is typically used? All I have is shortwave
> scanner which is pretty useless.
>

Record before and after noise on received signals. Make a log of it.
Exact 'S-meter' readings are not necessary.

You will see a major degredation of received signals.

Dan/W4NTI

4443. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 22:06:41 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309191406.2d1fee3c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77858

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030919091504.29599.00000072@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> > So, according to you, every single American who receives a ham license
> >from this day forward is actually receiving a welfare handout because he or
> >she is mind challenged?
>
> CORRECT

Thus, Bruce is mind challenged.

He could have answered the fifth, but he doesn't know the article of
the constitution regarding self-incrimination.

4444. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 22:15:33 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkfv65$1el3c$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77859

"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...

I care less what you do. You've made so much BS in here about your professional amateurism that there's no believing what you say. I doubt you were ever an Army civilian doing criminal investigation.

Actually I think you care a great deal about what I do since you mention it in every one of your replies to me. It must really frost you that I've been successful at everything I've ever done -- including Emergency Management (apparently you've failed at many things along the way) If you doubt my credentials, feel free to read the article on my web site that was done by the local paper when I was appointed as director for EM. Then verify the sources. As for you -- since you *still* can't reply without being the insulting obnoxious petty bore you've always been, its back to the killfile. To be honest, I'd much rather exchange views with Bill Sohl -- at least he makes cogent debatable arguments from his side of the isle.

Arnie -
KT4ST

www.qsl.net/kt4st/ema.htm

4445. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 22:16:42 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <efLab.831$Hd6.607480@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77860

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vmkikafbpl1663@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > Very difficult? Oh please. I passed all three tests (5, 13, 20) with
10
> of
> > 10 right on the written and solid copy for each.
>
> AH, so it's EASY? SIMPLE? hah, proof then there's no point. Other
> hams kept saying it was a discipline of selftraining, and you just said
> it was as breeze. Well, if it's a natural as breathing air, then, no need
> to test it.
>
> End of discussion.
>
> It's SO easy :)
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
>

It's easy if one puts in the time to learn. The discipline comes in allocating the time and using it correctly. If one stops prematurely, they fail. If one uses the time ineffectively, they fail.

All one is doing in "learning code" is training a reflex. This is very easy but it just takes time.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4446. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 22:24:12 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309191424.772cb2ec@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77861

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bkf8itfis0@208.207.71.158>...
> Robert wrote:
>
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> >
> > > I am capable of passing any sort of radio traffic by way of
> > > radiotelgraphy,
> >
> > I'd like to see you pass a weather satellite photo fax via
> > radiotelegraphy....
>
> Uh,, Bob, that isn't traffic, It's *data*. I guess if you were really
> familiar with radio
> you;d know that, wouldn't you?

Uhhh, DICK, you should know that weather data can be passed via many
modes, and that satellite imagery is referred to as wefax or wxsat.

Typically, what is called "DATA" is RTTY.

But all that is old technology. Today, we get our weather via
wideband, though you're free to play with UKMO and NAM transmissions.

> > > which I learned as a requirement of my licensure as a
> > > ham radio operator. There is no reason for you to be exempted from the
> > > same.
> >
> > Well, at least you finally admit that it's "I had to do it, you
> > should too."
>
> The difference is, I know why. You obviously don't.

Couldn't be much of a difference since you obviously don't know why.
And I know why you don't. You're simply ignorant about weather comms.
Stick to things you know, such as CW and more CW. When you're done
talking about CW, you could switch to Morse so you don't sound like a
broken record.

And FWIW, radar image intensity bulletins used to be transmitted via
tty, and the receiver had to plot it on a predetermined overlay for
that particular radar station. So the concept is there for satellite
data transmission, but was never implemented. So go and create a
satellite overlay grid, then encode satellite IR temps (if you can),
and get cracking on Robert's idea.

See, you CAN use CW to send useful information rather than just ARRL numbergrams.

73, Brian

4447. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 22:26:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309191426.70a7e231@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77862

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F6A7827.21D14BF4@earthlink.net>...
> Clint wrote:
> >
> > >
> > > DICK, what was past is past.
> > >
> >
> > My grandfather (God rest his soul, he passed away
> > 7 years ago) lived to the ripe old age of 87. Every now
> > and then he'd get really drunk on vodka, and then go
> > into a past-recalling delirium where he'd keep talking
> > about the need to have a horse and buggy give you a
> > ride if you wanted to make it back into his neck of
> > the woods all the way from the main road.
> >
> > The next morning he'd sober up and find himself back
> > in the modern day era. The horse and buggy were long
> > gone.
>
> I always love a tale which attempts to impart a message. In this one,
> we learned that your grandad was a drunk.
>
> Dave K8MN

And that many a PCTA behave as if they were.

4448. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 22:37:01 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919183701.26686.00000897@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 77863

>Its even worse than that Bruce. Give a listen to the 'Ektra' subbands on
>75 some night. Now there is a eye opener.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Dan as you know Im not on HF much mainly Weak Signal on 6 Meters.

4449. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 22:40:20 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <oBLab.839$Hd6.614125@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77864

"Greg Courville" <En.TAKETHISOUT.ginuitastic@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in
message news:2f986907.0309182121.7f64b0e6@posting.google.com...
> I've been a ham for only a month now, and been using these groups for
> about 6 weeks.
> I really can't stand some of the things that go on here.
> Has anybody ever noticed that 8 out of 10 threads on this group (and
> many other amateur radio groups) end in a flame war?
> It's really shocking how people can start an argument over nothing
> which can escalate to vicious strings of insults complete with
> profanity, sexual references and terms such as "CBplusser" and
> "Knuckle-Dragger". It's just unbelievable to me that while all of the
> books talk about how wonderful and helpful hams are, a significant
> number of them spend their time cutting each other down over random
> issues. I see "newbies" come to these boards for help, and get cut
> down by inconsiderate jerks who just feel like making people feel
> stupid. How many hams didn't start out with a lower-level license?
> People need to stop beating up on us poor no-coders. Don't they
> realize that the new people look up to the old-timers? I must say that
> after reading books about how hams help people all over the world and
> are generally just a wonderful bunch, these groups have really changed
> my view of the amateur radio community. I don't doubt that even this
> thread will end in a violent exchange of profanities and become just
> another flame war.
>
> I'm afraid I just can't manage a 73 right now.
> -KG6SGY
>
> My e-mail address is real; just take out the ".TAKETHISOUT."
> (obviously).

Don't sweat it. The hams that you will meet in person in your local
community, local club, and on the air both locally and long range are a
pretty good bunch.

Somehow the internet brings out the worst of people in discussions. Perhaps
because they are insulated from direct contact with each other by the
internet. Who knows?

Anyway, welcome to ham radio. I think you will find some of the other
internet sites and news groups more helpful than this one. Any group with
"policy" in it's name is guaranteed to be an argumentative bunch.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4450. Re: Hey Dino with the tiny pino

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 22:44:41 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030919184441.211$nd@newsreader.com>
Source record: 77865
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> auctionratter@yahoo.com (Auctions croak here) wrote:
> > Dear Dino tinypino,
> >
> > First, moron...you misspelled the word. It is spelled hYpocrite.
> >
> > Second, I see your goofy keyclown ass is a little annoyed. Good.
> >
> > Third, Stop by with your camera and tape anytime.
> >
> > Linear amplifiers are going to be reported to ebay and yahoo. Period.
> > You can't do a thing about it, sonnyboy. Accept your inferiority and
> > work around it, assclown.
> >
> Hey Dino, here's pic of your latest fan, he's -n8wwm- dogie. Thought
> you might like to know what the total loser looks like. He still lives
> in his Mom's basement, with his walkie talkie. I'm starting to hear
> his call on the freeband lately, so he's obviously a closet fag, and
> a freebander. (notice all his male genitalia referecnces)
>
> http://www.geocities.com/picsrfun2003/n8.bmp

--
http://NewsReader.Com/
50 GB/month

4451. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 22:53:31 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <LNLab.842$Hd6.617948@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77866

"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
news:vml95ia6298f13@corp.supernews.com...
> Thank you for responding.
> I know that it is unfair to draw generalizations about the amateur
community
> from posts on a newsgroup. And I am not trying to say that it's the
> old-timers who are causing all the trouble. I'm sorry it came out that way
> (and I realize that it's mostly the immature jerks, not the old-timers,
> doing the name-calling). It just gets me really depressed to see that well
> more than half of the posts in this group have nothing to do with the
hobby,
> and were written for the sole purpose of hurting other people.
> I would like to state that, despite being a no-code tech, and despite the
> fact that learning morse is the only thing keeping me from a general-class
> license, I support the code test. I agree that ham radio has drastically
> "dumbed-down" over the past several years, and I agree that it's not good
> for the hobby. However, I hate it when I see people looked down upon
simply
> because they're lowly technicians. I hate seeing the
"code/no-code"-related
> flame-wars that erupt every day. If people confined their comments to
> civilized discussion and debate, we wouldn't have this problem. There will
> never be a total agreement as to whether the code requirement should be
> dropped, but there's no reason for people to express their opinions like
> raving lunatics. People who just want to exchange clever insults should
find
> a different newsgroup.
> On a side-note, I have not ever been insulted by any member of this group.
I
> am basing my opinion solely on the threads I read every day.
> I hope I have not offended anybody by what I have posted so far, and I
> encourage further response.
>
> -KG6SGY

There are many of us who do not look down on Technicians or consider them lowly. In the club to which I belong, our most expert satellite operator is a Technician. Everyone respects his knowledge in this area. Another Technician was our expert on VHF SSB including propagation, antennas, etc. Although now a General, he was well respected when he was still a Technician.

Unfortunately, there are way too many people who get their licenses and become strictly "repeater creatures". Those who combine this with being disrepectful of experienced hams tend to rub people the wrong way. As in

anything else, we tend to be unduly affected by the few bad apples and forget that there are a lot of good people working at their personal development.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4452. Re: 1/8 Wave Dipoles will work

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 23:09:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <j0Mab.1442$iT4.955112@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 77867

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F6B202F.5040104@psu.edu...
>
>>WA8ULX wrote:
>>
>>>just as good as 1/4 Wave Dipoles, with 1 advantage, you will not need as
>
> much
>
>>>wire or space to install it. A tuner is probably helpfull, but many
>
> people
>
>>>report a good match can be obtained using RG-58. It appears the best way
>
> to get
>
>>>a match using coax is to, coil about 8' of Coax at the back of the rig
>
> and the
>
>>>same at the fed point.
>>
>>
>>Bruce, now you let the cat out of the bag! Soon all hams will know that
>>the whole idea of putting up these large antennas is just another ploy
>>of PCTA's to keep those they consider inferior from getting on the air!
>>This forces people who have enough land only to put up an antenna. More
>>elitist snobbery!
>>
>>Fact is. ANY dipole of ANY fractional length works just great!
>>
>>Don't have enough space for a 1/8th wave dipole? Put up a 1/16 wave
>>dipole. Or a 1/32 wave. In fact, dump the silly fractions, and put up a
>>.001 wave dipole antenna.
>>
>>Now for the deepest darkest little known fact of radio
>>antennas..... They work better the SMALLER they are!!!!!
>>
>>The reason for this is that by concentrating the power into a smaller
>>space, the rf excited electrons *push* the rf out of the antenna much
>>more energetically than in those stupid half wave antennas.
>>

>>Once the rf is out of the antenna, nothing slows it dow, but in a half
>>wave antenna, the electrons get tired pushing through all that wire.
>>
>>- mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> New wave electronics?

Yes! It's time that all hams throw off the shackles placed on them by
Old white male Eurocentric CW loving troglodytes and the lies they
spread! Everything correct is incorrect!

..... Okay, Mike, enough of that! 8^)

4453. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 23:15:26 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <i6Mab.846$Hd6.623809@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77868

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309191022.4529760@posting.google.com...
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bkbcf1ibd0@208.206.142.69>...
> > Bill Sohl wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > news:bkb8pg$8l8$0@208.206.142.108...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > >
> > > > > "IARU policy is to support the removal of Morse code testing as a
> > > > > requirement
> > > > > for an amateur license to operate on frequencies below 30 MHz,"
the IARU
> > > > > Administrative Council resolved.
> > > >
> > > > So read it Bill-- that means they support *an* amateur radio license
> > allowing HF
> > > > operation without code, NOT the removal of all code testing.
> > >
> > > If that's what you think it sez...dream on.
> >
> > It sez what it sez, Bill. And that's what it sez!
>
> Part 97 sez Morse Code at 5WPM, not Farnsworth Code at 13-15WPM.

If you contact the VE team ahead of time, you have the right to insist that they obtain and administer the test to you with both the word speed and the letter speed set to 5wpm. Tell you what though, even counting dots and dashes, letters at that slow speed are painful to decipher. Plus there is no time between letters for your brain to process the letter. Unless a person actually counts the dots and dashes, it's much easier to fail when the Morse test is set at word and letter speed of 5wpm than when the Morse test is set with the word speed at 5wpm and the character speed at 13wpm. At a character speed of 5wpm, you can't hear the letter as a letter and you can't react to the sound on a reflex basis.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4454. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 23:21:57 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <pcMab.39727$NM1.31110@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77869

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309191401.545ca4e7@posting.google.com...
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bke0tqfkl1@208.206.142.83>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > > In article <IDVNFYDX37881.3498263889@bog.lir.dk>, Franz Weigel
> > > <anon@bog.lir.dk> writes:
> > >
> > > >The last CW coder who died was sentenced
> > > >to Hell for eternity in order to transmit
> > > >6 Megapixels 24-bit color pictures in CW.
> > > >
> > > >God bless you from CW !
> > >
> > > Gee - who was it said they were only against the TEST?
> >
> > The truth usually manages to slip out.
>
> Tell me about it. Using CW won't get anyone sentenced to hell. Lying
> about how it always gets thru will.
>
> CW gets thru when everything else will.

Keep it up Brian, your record is perfect. What record you ask? 100
percent wrong, all the time.

Dan/W4NTI

4455. Re: 1/8 Wave Dipoles will work

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 23:24:54 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <afMab.6182$Lx5.5859@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 77870

Dang,

I'm glad you guys didn't tell that 1100 foot Windom I had up in the 60s. I probably wouldn't have been able to get out of the state, much less work Washington DC from Rochester, NY at 1:00 PM (in the afternoon) on 160! Plus working some CW nets in the South with the Johnson Ranger in *standby* (not tune).
LOL

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:j0Mab.1442$iT4.955112@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> > news:3F6B202F.5040104@psu.edu...
> >
> >>WA8ULX wrote:
> >>
> >>>just as good as 1/4 Wave Dipoles, with 1 advantage, you will not need
as
> >
> > much
> >
> >>>wire or space to install it. A tuner is probably helpfull, but many
> >
> > people
> >
> >>>report a good match can be obtained using RG-58. It appears the best
way
> >
> > to get
> >
> >>>a match using coax is to, coil about 8' of Coax at the back of the rig
> >
> > and the
> >
> >>>same at the fed point.
> >>
> >>
> >>Bruce, now you let the cat out of the bag! Soon all hams will know that
> >>the whole idea of putting up these large antennas is just another ploy
> >>of PCTA's to keep those they consider inferior from getting on the air!
> >>This forces people who have enough land only to put up an antenna. More

> >>elitist snobbery!
> >>
> >>Fact is. ANY dipole of ANY fractional length works just great!
> >>
> >>Don't have enough space for a 1/8th wave dipole? Put up a 1/16 wave
> >>dipole. Or a 1/32 wave. In fact, dump the silly fractions, and put up a
> >>.001 wave dipole antenna.
> >>
> >>Now for the deepest darkest little known fact of radio
> >>antennas..... They work better the SMALLER they are!!!!!
> >>
> >>The reason for this is that by concentrating the power into a smaller
> >>space, the rf excited electrons *push* the rf out of the antenna much
> >>more energetically than in those stupid half wave antennas.
> >>
> >>Once the rf is out of the antenna, nothing slows it dow, but in a half
> >>wave antenna, the electrons get tired pushing through all that wire.
> >>
> >>- mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >
> >
> > New wave electronics?
>
> Yes! It's time that all hams throw off the shackles placed on them by
> Old white male Eurocentric CW loving troglodytes and the lies they
> spread! Everything correct is incorrect!
>
> ..... Okay, Mike, enough of that! 8^)
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.520 / Virus Database: 318 - Release Date: 9/18/03

4456. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 23:29:03 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <3jMab.848$Hd6.628109@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77871

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:orKab.43438$Aq2.26701@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030918221840.00545.00000894@mb-m02.aol.com...
> >
> > But does the NCVEC petition, or the NCI petition address the writtens?
Not
> at
> > all.
>
> No, why should it? I have ALWAYS said the code was a
> separate issue from writtens. I'm not opposed to revisiting
> the writtens, but there's no need to wait for that before ending all
> code testing.
>

Yes it should address writtens because by eliminating the code test without addressing the writtens, you are reducing the overall level of knowledge required to earn the various levels of ham licenses. Until the replacement exams are ready, the old exams, including the code should remain intact.

Personally if the code is dropped, I would like to see the exams restructured as follows:

A) Regulations element: One must pass this before being allowed to take any of the other elements.
A lengthy and separate exam covering the FCC rules and regulations in depth. Based on what I hear on the air and the statements on the internet from any hams, there's a real problem in this area. This one should require at least a score of 85% to pass.

B) Technician element:
Rewritten to move the regulations questions to A). Additional technical material and operating procedures material to keep the test pool about the same size.

C) General element:
Rewritten to move the regulations questions to A). Additional technical material, operating procedures, and basic VE requirements material to keep the test pool about the same size.

D) Extra element
Rewritten to move the regulations questions to A). Additional technical material, operating procedures, and extensive VE requirements material to keep the test pool about the same size.

I'd really like to see a rules test as a stand alone test that one must pass before even taking any of the other elements.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4457. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 23:35:54 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <upMab.39750$NM1.15557@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77872

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message news:LNLab.842
>
> Unfortunately, there are way too many people who get their licenses and
> become strictly "repeater creatures". Those who combine this with being
> disrepectful of experienced hams tend to rub people the wrong way.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Listen to her....She has got it right. BINGO !!!!

Dan/W4NTI

4458. Re: Stay tuned, keysissiez!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-19 23:49:48 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030919194948.501$zt@newsreader.com>
Source record: 77873
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

twistyisaliar@yahoo.com (George Is Innocent) wrote:
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20030919184049.995$g2@newsreader.com...
> > auctionratter@yahoo.com (Auctions croak here) wrote:
> > >> Special aside to Mopedholic...when you finish up in Oldsmar get your
> > > tuffet up to see tra1npuppet...he is cwying and needs some sisterly
> > > love.
> > >
> > I can be in Toledo in two hours.
>
> Why go to the trouble? After you find there are no gay men there
> willing to have sex with you'll just have to turn around and drive 2
> hrs back home again.
>
I'm only looking for one particular fag, he answers to N8WWM. Thanks
for your concern.

--
http://NewsReader.Com/
50 GB/month

4459. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 00:26:08 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmn7l1gvm3gd1d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77874

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:bkdiip$a9f$1@nd.eastky.net...
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote
>
> [re: transmitting a 6 mega-pixel image]
>
> > I never claimed you COULD send that with CW.
>

well, I was just responding to his words he tried to
shove in my mouth.

> It would only take 138.88 days.....

hey, we're rock'n!

Clint
KB5ZHT

4460. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 00:27:42 UTC
From: Howard <misterrnNOSPAM@mercednet.com>
Message-ID: <il7nmvg11k0ohpkh4k8ko8uc65e9btjkoa@4ax.com>
Source record: 77875

On 18 Sep 2003 22:21:59 -0700,
En.TAKETHISOUT.ginuitastic@Gee-Enginuity.com (Greg Courville) wrote:

>I've been a ham for only a month now, and been using these groups for
>about 6 weeks.
>I really can't stand some of the things that go on here.
>Has anybody ever noticed that 8 out of 10 threads on this group (and
>many other amateur radio groups) end in a flame war?
>It's really shocking how people can start an argument over nothing
>which can escalate to vicious strings of insults complete with
>profanity, sexual references and terms such as "CBplusser" and
>"Knuckle-Dragger". It's just unbelievable to me that while all of the
>books talk about how wonderful and helpful hams are, a significant
>number of them spend their time cutting each other down over random
>issues. I see "newbies" come to these boards for help, and get cut
>down by inconsiderate jerks who just feel like making people feel
>stupid. How many hams didn't start out with a lower-level license?
>People need to stop beating up on us poor no-coders. Don't they
>realize that the new people look up to the old-timers? I must say that
>after reading books about how hams help people all over the world and
>are generally just a wonderful bunch, these groups have really changed
>my view of the amateur radio community. I don't doubt that even this
>thread will end in a violent exchange of profanities and become just
>another flame war.
>
>I'm afraid I just can't manage a 73 right now.
>-KG6SGY

One other thing Greg. Get a News Reader with a kill file. Place the
foul-mouth jerks in it and this place improves drastically. :)

Howard
N3TNQ
>My e-mail address is real; just take out the ".TAKETHISOUT."
>(obviously).

4461. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 00:30:30 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmn7t7e7qq8p41@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77876

>
> Great! You helped save the Titanic and now you are ready to save the
> Titanic II.
>

I still get tickled to death over a Simpson's cartoon episode where homer
and a friend are stuck in a cabin that's bound in by snow.... they find an
old morse code key and start tapping away "S-O-S, send help..".. and
the camera follows the telegraph wire all the way in town, to a local
museum, to a samuel morse exhibit where the line ends and that's
where you hear the code being tapped out.

nobody is standing nearby to even see it.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4462. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 00:32:22 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmn80odmb00cc1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77877

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:bkdek1$8te$1@nd.eastky.net...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>
> > which I learned as a requirement of my licensure as a
> > ham radio operator. There is no reason for you to be exempted from the
> > same.
>
> Well, at least you finally admit that it's "I had to do it, you
> should too."
>

well i'll beeee..... , you're RIGHT!

Didn't figure he had the guts.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

Facts are to socialists what crosses are to vampires

--

4463. N8WWM is a loser

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 00:34:44 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030919203444.643$TB_-_@newsreader.com>
Source record: 77878
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.cb

```
Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
> > auctionratter@yahoo.com (Auctions croak here) wrote:
> > > Dear Dino tinypino,
> > >
> > > First, moron...you misspelled the word. It is spelled hYpocrite.
> > >
> > > Second, I see your goofy keyclown ass is a little annoyed. Good.
> > >
> > > Third, Stop by with your camera and tape anytime.
> > >
> > > Linear amplifiers are going to be reported to ebay and yahoo. Period.
> > > You can't do a thing about it, sonnyboy. Accept your inferiority and
> > > work around it, assclown.
> > >
> > Hey Dino, here's pic of your latest fan, he's -n8wwm- dogie. Thought
> > you might like to know what the total loser looks like. He still lives
> > in his Mom's basement, with his walkie talkie. I'm starting to hear
> > his call on the freeband lately, so he's obviously a closet fag, and
> > a freebander. (notice all his male genitalia referecnces)
> >
> > http://www.geocities.com/picsrfun2003/n8.bmp
>
That is one ugly walkie talkie operator!

--
http://NewsReader.Com/
50 GB/month
```

4464. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 00:35:12 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmn86278ffb6b6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77879

--

Facts are to socialists what crosses are to vampires

--
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bkf8itfis0@208.207.71.158...
>
> Uh,, Bob, that isn't traffic, It's *data*. I guess if you were really
> familiar with radio
> you;d know that, wouldn't you?
>
>

funny, I missed the part of his post where he CLAIMED that.

I believe his point was that a weather fax is a very modern
use of the radio spectrum, and goes a long way to advancing
the art of radio as WELL as it's usefullness.

CW isn't the former, and only the old "I had to do it" die hards
find the latter to be true.

> > Well, at least you finally admit that it's "I had to do it, you
> > should too."
>
> The difference is, I know why. You obviously don't.
>
>

and that's a valid argument point to keep the CW testing, WHY????

Clint
KB5ZHT

4465. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 00:40:38 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmn8g8n1kn4a7c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77880

>
> The scary bit is if you keep applying logic to this argument, it
> just keeps getting wierder.

no, you just keep getting angrier because the modern-world hams
in here and elsewhere refute your (non)logic and continue to work
toward eliminating CW testing when there are other radio related
fields and issues better suited to being tested due to thier modern
day applications.

One of 'em rebutted the "I had to do it, so
> should you" argument by basically saying, uhm..."I had to do it, so should
> you."
>

and it was a failed rebuttle, due to the fact that it was illogical. Think
of it
philosphically.... what if EVERY field of endeavor that required testing
for profeciency failed to modernize, and simply keep the oldest, first
testing method on record? there would be modern day problems
and enigmas that the person may not be prepared for, though the
testing requirements showed him to be ready.....

i'm also an aviation student, learning to fly to get my pilot's license.
Now, imagine if only the first, oldest known information and testing
was used, back right after the wright brothers flew for the first time,
and I then climbed into a twin-engine jet and said, "okay, ready
to go to 20,000 feet!"

it is just too easy to beat you guys.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4466. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 00:41:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309191641.6de6c194@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77881

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030919000342.01893.00000676@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <bkdfen$j426$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
> <kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:
>
> >"Bill Sohl" wrote in part ...
> >
> >"FCC nor almost every emergency preparedness organization/operation has no
> >desire or need for morse in their plans."
> >_____
> >
> >I ask because you wrote the above. Why do you think the EM planners have
> >"no need" for Morse? Any tool available should be considered for use in the
> >EM package.
>
> How about flag semaphore? Night semaphore with lighted torches?
>
> That worked well in the US Civil War...and the crossed flags with torch
> at the center became the collar insignia of the US Army Signal Corps.
>
> Signal Corps LONG AGO abandoned flag and torch semaphore and
> doesn't use morse code for communications anymore. [are you keeping
> up to date on your former employer, the US Army?]

I once saw lighted torch semaphore demonstrated by a Chinese Acrobatic Circus.

I think they were sending "Yankee Go Home."

Or were they just juggling?

> >Not only is our equipment capable of Morse, but we have CW
> >capable operators for each. We've used it in the past and I strongly
> >suspect that will do so in the future as well.
>
> Great! You helped save the Titanic and now you are ready to save the
> Titanic II.
>
> Why in the hell are you busy Internetting when Isabel has hit land?
>
> Afraid of getting your code key wet?
>
> LHA

Now Len, you know they aren't actually using Morse Code for storm comms.

4467. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 00:42:14 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmn8j86dqrq6f6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77882

> It's easy if one puts in the time to learn. The discipline comes in
> allocating the time and using it correctly. If one stops prematurely,
they
> fail. If one uses the time ineffectively, they fail.

great! then those who want to use CW should allocate the time and use
it correctly to learn the discipline of CW.

Those who have no use for it and don't plan in it, shouldn't have it shoved
down thier throats.

NEXT?!?!?!?!

Clint
KB5ZHT

4468. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 00:43:31 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmn8llbq5get89@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77883

AH!

we've finally gotten to the personal character attacks.

You must have already conceded defeat. That's the only
thing one can conclude when the ideas and facts stop
flowing and the insults start flying.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

Facts are to socialists what crosses are to vampires

--

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bkdge7$6d4g$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Len Over 21" wrote ...
>
> Macy, almost ALL your arguments are superfluous, denigratory, and without
a
> shred of merit in here. All you do is promote myths of "CW" as if this
was
> still the 1930s.
> --
>
> Are you Clint's Daddy? I was hoping that *he* would answer the question.
I
> will say this, though. He sure does admire you. Are you sure y'all
aren't
> related?
>
> Arnie -
>
>

4469. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 00:48:26 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmn8us4ls3q565@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77884

>
> And that many a PCTA behave as if they were.

BINGO!
along with people who live in the past.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4470. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 01:04:59 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bkg92r$bn6$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 77828

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vmn8g8n1kn4a7c@corp.supernews.com...
>
> >
> > The scary bit is if you keep applying logic to this argument, it
> > just keeps getting wierder.
>
> no, you just keep getting angrier because the modern-world hams
> in here and elsewhere refute your (non)logic and continue to work
> toward eliminating CW testing

Uhm, we're on the same side on that matter. I was pointing out how
the PCTA argument devolves.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.518 / Virus Database: 316 - Release Date: 9/11/2003

4471. Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 01:13:41 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <e57nmvs00r5nl9jjdgcdmdq42s8f28i0nf@4ax.com>
Source record: 77885

In response to the WRC 03 decision on Morse Code, Industry Canada asked the Radio Amateurs of Canada (RAC, our ARRL equivalent) to advise as to what Canadian amateurs want to do with respect to the Morse testing requirement.

RAC set up an online survey on their website for the month of August, and invited all Canadian amateurs (both members of RAC and non-members alike) to voice their opinions. The results have been tabulated and published, and has been presented to the RAC Board of Directors for discussion with IC in the near future. The following web site has the details:

http://www.rac.ca/news/mresults.htm

Basically, the majority (overall 66%, or two out of three respondents) is in favour of dropping the Morse requirement for access to the HF bands. Similarly, 69% are in favour of modifying the Basic exam, presumably to increase its relevance to operating on HF. For those of you south of the border, the numbers are quite interesting, and may give you some insight into the statistics you might find within the US Amateur community. I was surprised, for example, at the percentage of Advanced with Morse (our 'Extra') licence holders who are in favour of dropping it - 52% - and we're the guys who 'paid the dues' and made it to the top rung of both theoretical and Morse capability!

The same process was used to review reducing the Morse requirement from 13 WPM to 5 WPM a couple of years ago - Industry Canada went along with the recommendation the Amateur community (via RAC) - it is anticipated that they will in all likelyhood do so again, as this is obviously the will of the majority. Not all of us, not by a long shot - but clearly, the majority!

In short, it certainly looks like it is only a matter of time before Canada drops the Morse requirement for HF. But we may have an opportunity to raise the skill level of those who enter Amateur Radio through more relevant (and maybe more rigorous) testing.

To close with a quote from a famous Canadian, Marshall McLuhan (the media visionary and professor who conceptualized the "Global Village" and the impact of high-speed communications way back in the '60s):

"The past went that-a-way. When faced with a totally new situation, we tend always to attach ourselves to the objects, to the flavor of the most recent past. We look at the present through a rear view mirror. We march backwards into the future."

We sure do.

73, Leo

4472. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 01:15:52 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmnaife87u3a24@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77886

just don't EVER speak your mind when it comes to
morse code testing, unless it's to the effect that you
LOVE it and couldn't live without it.

You have to put on the jackboots of the CW police
and march in goosestep with the CW nazis, or
you'll get bashed a good one with a morse code
key.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4473. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 01:16:57 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmnakb54rcls82@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77887

It sure didn't start by old timers belittling
> newcomers. In fact it was and IS the exact reverse.

...yea, but what if he says he doesn't like CW testing....
then, in what method will you choose- burning him
in oil or decapitation?

Clint
KB5ZHT

4474. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 01:23:37 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <t_Nab.1495$iT4.982366@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 77888

Clint wrote:
> just don't EVER speak your mind when it comes to
> morse code testing, unless it's to the effect that you
> LOVE it and couldn't live without it.
>
> You have to put on the jackboots of the CW police
> and march in goosestep with the CW nazis, or
> you'll get bashed a good one with a morse code
> key.

And your posts are different because?

Maybe you should get together with Carl and Bill. I hear they are looking for people like you.

BTW, Godwin gotcha.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4475. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 01:26:33 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <d1Oab.4224$g63.4033@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77889

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vmnakb54rcls82@corp.supernews.com...
> It sure didn't start by old timers belittling
> > newcomers. In fact it was and IS the exact reverse.
>
> ...yea, but what if he says he doesn't like CW testing....
> then, in what method will you choose- burning him
> in oil or decapitation?

I think we sould try decrapitation first.... But should we use it on the new guy or on ourselves?

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

4476. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 01:32:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <e7Oab.1499$iT4.984015@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 77890

Leo wrote:

> In response to the WRC 03 decision on Morse Code, Industry Canada
> asked the Radio Amateurs of Canada (RAC, our ARRL equivalent) to
> advise as to what Canadian amateurs want to do with respect to the
> Morse testing requirement.
>
> RAC set up an online survey on their website for the month of August,
> and invited all Canadian amateurs (both members of RAC and non-members
> alike) to voice their opinions. The results have been tabulated and
> published, and has been presented to the RAC Board of Directors for
> discussion with IC in the near future. The following web site has the
> details:
>
> http://www.rac.ca/news/mresults.htm
>
> Basically, the majority (overall 66%, or two out of three respondents)
> is in favour of dropping the Morse requirement for access to the HF
> bands. Similarly, 69% are in favour of modifying the Basic exam,
> presumably to increase its relevance to operating on HF. For those of
> you south of the border, the numbers are quite interesting, and may
> give you some insight into the statistics you might find within the US
> Amateur community. I was surprised, for example, at the percentage of
> Advanced with Morse (our 'Extra') licence holders who are in favour of
> dropping it - 52% - and we're the guys who 'paid the dues' and made it
> to the top rung of both theoretical and Morse capability!
>
> The same process was used to review reducing the Morse requirement
> from 13 WPM to 5 WPM a couple of years ago - Industry Canada went
> along with the recommendation the Amateur community (via RAC) - it is
> anticipated that they will in all likelyhood do so again, as this is
> obviously the will of the majority. Not all of us, not by a long
> shot - but clearly, the majority!
>
> In short, it certainly looks like it is only a matter of time before
> Canada drops the Morse requirement for HF. But we may have an
> opportunity to raise the skill level of those who enter Amateur Radio
> through more relevant (and maybe more rigorous) testing.

Well if you raise the skill level, it will just keep people out of Ham radio. That has been one of the reasons cited for getting rid of the code test. It won't do just to increase the entrance requirements, which will partially defeat the purpose.

> To close with a quote from a famous Canadian, Marshall McLuhan (the
> media visionary and professor who conceptualized the "Global Village"
> and the impact of high-speed communications way back in the '60s):
>
> "The past went that-a-way. When faced with a totally new situation, we
> tend always to attach ourselves to the objects, to the flavor of the
> most recent past. We look at the present through a rear view mirror.
> We march backwards into the future."

Perhaps being knowledgeable about RF matters is also in the past, Leo. A person can pick up a rig, a linear and an antenna without knowing anything about RF electronics. He/she can pay someone to put it up, and can be talking in no time. Given this, why should there be any requirements at all?

(suggested antenna is a 1/4 wave dipole) 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4477. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 01:34:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309191734.5a36f9bc@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77891

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<x3Dab.38377$NM1.11375@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Len Over 21" wrote:
> >
> > Isabel promises death, destruction, and terror for
> > all the USA according to the major news sources.
>
>
> Well, in spite of the media hype, Isabel certainly ended up being not much
> of a storm. Compared to some of the previous hurricanes to hit this area,
> the damage was very light. Since most boaters in the area have a healthy
> respect for hurricanes, the Coast Guard didn't receive a single distress
> call. Furthermore, based on what I saw driving up the coast yesterday
> afternoon, it appears most boats in the area made it through the storm
> without any major damage (and only a few homes or commercial buildings were
> damaged).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Dwight, your assessment won't stop FEMA from delivering millions of
dollars in emergency aid so that people can get their carpets
shampooed and a new set of trash cans.

4478. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 01:51:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309191751.1ed18426@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77892

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F68DD97.6E3D3730@earthlink.net>...
>
> Wow! That's quite a policy statement from a country with a little more
> than 120 radio amateurs and it comes hot on the heels of the big move by
> Ireland with its slightly more than 1,500 hams.
>
> Dave K8MN

Wow! You've stated that you've operated from countries where you were
the only active amateur.

Somehow that was significant then, but 120 or 1,500 native amateurs
aren't?

There's that famous Heil smugness again.

4479. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 02:07:07 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <2icnmvo0latgvfph96fv37p47lqsa7fcs2@4ax.com>
Source record: 77893

Good points, Mike - my comments are below:

> Well if you raise the skill level, it will just keep people out of Ham
>radio. That has been one of the reasons cited for getting rid of the
>code test. It won't do just to increase the entrance requirements, which
>will partially defeat the purpose.

There are advantages to having more people in Amateur Radio - not the least of which are more voices to oppose things like BPL. And, less unused bandwidth, which could be taken away and reassigned to commercial iterests if we don't utilize it.

On the other hand, bringing in large numbers of less-skilled operators defeats the purpose of Amateur Radio, which I recall was to develop a pool of skilled radio operators.

The concept of modifying the test is a middle ground - by adding questions on actual practical HF operation, for example, we would ensure that new amateurs could go and set up and operate their station without undue interference to others. A good thing, I believe, and one that would raise the level of 'professionalism' amongst the novice Amateur operators.

>Perhaps being knowledgeable about RF matters is also in the past, Leo. A
>person can pick up a rig, a linear and an antenna without knowing
>anything about RF electronics. He/she can pay someone to put it up, and
>can be talking in no time. Given this, why should there be any
>requirements at all?

There are legions of operators out there today who operate 'point and shoot' equipment - the level of technical knowledge and ability has most certainly deteriorated as a result. Not many construct their own equipment any more, not even antennas. But, the price of admission to the Amateur ranks is testing of theoretical knowledge - this keeps those who are unwilling of making the commitment from oprating (legally) on our frequencies. As it always has been, and should be. Without this, we would become a variant of CB.

>(suggested antenna is a 1/4 wave dipole) 8^)

...for some of the incognoscenti on the air, I'd recommend a 1/4 wave stub :)

> - Mike KB3EIA -

73, Leo

4480. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 02:11:07 UTC
From: Gorilla Bananna <shamdeede@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1064024458.300920@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 77894
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Greg Courville" <En.TAKETHISOUT.ginuitastic@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in
message news:2f986907.0309182121.7f64b0e6@posting.google.com...
> I've been a ham for only a month now, and been using these groups for
> about 6 weeks.
> I really can't stand some of the things that go on here.

You should have been around 10 Years or so
ago when the 14.313 / 3894.5 wars were in full swing !!

> Has anybody ever noticed that 8 out of 10 threads on this group (and
> many other amateur radio groups) end in a flame war?
> It's really shocking how people can start an argument over nothing
> which can escalate to vicious strings of insults complete with
> profanity, sexual references and terms such as "CBplusser" and
> "Knuckle-Dragger". It's just unbelievable to me that while all of the
> books talk about how wonderful and helpful hams are, a significant
> number of them spend their time cutting each other down over random
> issues.

You can thank R. Hollingsworth for all of the above goings on.

Ham radio used to have 3 or 4 frequencies where all the
kooks would migrate to, day and night. It used to be that
14.313 or 14.300 were the "daytime kook channels" and
3894.5 or 3.901 were the "nightime kook channels".
Everywhere else was clean and clear.

Look at this this way: Every part of town
needs it's 'low rent district'. A place where
the lower strata of society can live, reproduce
kill off and amuse itself, apart from, and more importantly
out of sight/mind from the rest of polite society.

This is EXACTLY what PURPOSE the above frequencies
served, and it did it's function quite well. When R.H. started
to apply the "heat", all the crazies migrated away from ham
radio to Internet Newsgroups....and now we are where we
are as a result of the same.

>I see "newbies" come to these boards for help, and get cut
> down by inconsiderate jerks who just feel like making people feel
> stupid. How many hams didn't start out with a lower-level license?
> People need to stop beating up on us poor no-coders. Don't they
> realize that the new people look up to the old-timers? I must say that
> after reading books about how hams help people all over the world and

> are generally just a wonderful bunch, these groups have really changed
> my view of the amateur radio community. I don't doubt that even this
> thread will end in a violent exchange of profanities and become just
> another flame war.

This is the unfortunate result of the foregoing circumstances
when all the kooks migrated from 75 and 20 Meters.
Best to just ignore them, what few of them are left that is.
(many of the "all time great goofballs" of the 14.313/14.300
Maritime Net wars are now SK, or off of ham radio completely
and all your left with is the latecommerswho don't have a clue
as to the history if the same which goes back to 1978 and
peaked around 1989 -92)

>
> I'm afraid I just can't manage a 73 right now.
> -KG6SGY

4481. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 02:32:07 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <H_Oab.295774$2x.85373@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 77895

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in news:vmnaife87u3a24
@corp.supernews.com:

> just don't EVER speak your mind when it comes to
> morse code testing, unless it's to the effect that you
> LOVE it and couldn't live without it.
>
> You have to put on the jackboots of the CW police
> and march in goosestep with the CW nazis, or
> you'll get bashed a good one with a morse code
> key.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT

Hey! Stand up and salute when you say that...

Then shine my boots!

KB7ADL

4482. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 03:08:40 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <YwPab.6215$z47.4073@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 77896

Leo,

For more gain than that 1/4 wave stub, consider a 1 foot dish for 160 meters. With a 1/1000 wavelength dipole at the focal point, you should be able to get some interesting results.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

> ...for some of the incognoscenti on the air, I'd recommend a 1/4 wave
> stub :)
>
> 73, Leo
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.520 / Virus Database: 318 - Release Date: 9/18/03

4483. Re: If I had a Wouff Hong.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 03:18:15 UTC
From: Dave Bushong <dbushong@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <XFPab.1521$iT4.1009328@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 77897
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Robert Casey wrote:

> [...] Did we have this amount of trouble occupying Germany and Japan after WW2?
>

Yeah. After six months, everything was peachy in Germany and in Japan.
That is why there were so many tourists going there.

Oh wait -- that's bullshit.

And when you say "we", as in "did we have this amount of trouble", do
you really mean "we", or are you referring to the generation who gave
you everything that you now disparage?

More people die every week in car crashes in the US, than the entire US
death toll in Iraq since the war started.

How come no one is bitching about car crashes? 100 US citizens per day
die in automobile accidents. But the news says "another US soldier was
killed in Iraq..."

Both of those stories are horrible, awful, but put it into perspective.
On average, one child per day dies from choking on crayons according
to the CDC.

http://search.cdc.gov/search97cgi/s97is.dll?collection=cdcall1&Action=filterSearch&ResultTemplate=advresult.hts&queryText=children+die+crayon&querytext2=&opt1=and1&opt3=htmlpdf&CaseSensitive=false&SortField=Score&filter=advsearch.hts

4484. Re: 1/8 Wave Dipoles will work

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 03:36:56 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309191936.38dd24fa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77898

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<r2Lab.39587$NM1.23557@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
> news:3F6B202F.5040104@psu.edu...
> > WA8ULX wrote:
> > > just as good as 1/4 Wave Dipoles, with 1 advantage, you will not need as
> much
> > > wire or space to install it. A tuner is probably helpfull, but many
> people
> > > report a good match can be obtained using RG-58. It appears the best way
> to get
> > > a match using coax is to, coil about 8' of Coax at the back of the rig
> and the
> > > same at the fed point.
> >
> >
> > Bruce, now you let the cat out of the bag! Soon all hams will know that
> > the whole idea of putting up these large antennas is just another ploy
> > of PCTA's to keep those they consider inferior from getting on the air!
> > This forces people who have enough land only to put up an antenna. More
> > elitist snobbery!
> >
> > Fact is. ANY dipole of ANY fractional length works just great!
> >
> > Don't have enough space for a 1/8th wave dipole? Put up a 1/16 wave
> > dipole. Or a 1/32 wave. In fact, dump the silly fractions, and put up a
> > .001 wave dipole antenna.
> >
> > Now for the deepest darkest little known fact of radio
> > antennas..... They work better the SMALLER they are!!!!!
> >
> > The reason for this is that by concentrating the power into a smaller
> > space, the rf excited electrons *push* the rf out of the antenna much
> > more energetically than in those stupid half wave antennas.
> >
> > Once the rf is out of the antenna, nothing slows it dow, but in a half
> > wave antenna, the electrons get tired pushing through all that wire.
> >
> > - mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
> New wave electronics?

Nah, 'snot about wave mechanics, has to do with thermodynamics. My take is that the FCC figgers that if they license enough of these 21st century quarter-wave dipole adherents one of 'em just might finally stumble onto the way of *decreasing* Entropy. Something about not needing to drill for more oyl in Alaska and getting Dubya's energy bill thru the house . . .

> Dan/W4NTI

w3rv

4485. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 03:39:46 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F6BCC03.4B5F07CB@earthlink.net>
Source record: 77899

Bill Sohl wrote:

> Most emergency operations don't even need or use HF.
> All of yesterday's activity for Hurricane Isabel was VHF/UHF
> for local and county operations.

Think beyond local and county operations, Bill. Here in West Virginia
there were HF operations on both 40 and 75m.

Dave K8MN

4486. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 03:44:00 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F6BCD01.E4F4B3CC@earthlink.net>
Source record: 77900

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F6A7827.21D14BF4@earthlink.net>...
> > Clint wrote:
> > >
> > > >
> > > > DICK, what was past is past.
> > > >
> > >
> > > My grandfather (God rest his soul, he passed away
> > > 7 years ago) lived to the ripe old age of 87. Every now
> > > and then he'd get really drunk on vodka, and then go
> > > into a past-recalling delirium where he'd keep talking
> > > about the need to have a horse and buggy give you a
> > > ride if you wanted to make it back into his neck of
> > > the woods all the way from the main road.
> > >
> > > The next morning he'd sober up and find himself back
> > > in the modern day era. The horse and buggy were long
> > > gone.
> >
> > I always love a tale which attempts to impart a message. In this one,
> > we learned that your grandad was a drunk.

>
> And that many a PCTA behave as if they were.

Not so, Farnsworth. There is nothing about a PCTA in the tale anywhere.
You continue to do your reading between the lines.

Dave K8MN

4487. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 03:47:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hlhlbq9.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 77801

On Fri, 19 Sep 2003 15:52:35 -0400, Richard J Hasbro wrote:

>Your postings are reading out garbled
>and/or incomplete on some news readers, due to incorrect
>headers. Excuse me for bothering you...sheeeesh!

What in the header is incorrect? My outgoing character set is ISO
8859-1 (Latin 1).

If it is something that can be "fixed" at this end, I'll look ito
it.

If it's something that my ISP is adding, well, that's beyond my
control.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4488. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 03:47:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hlhlqqa.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 77802

On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 01:28:33 GMT, Keith wrote:

>Several years ago a cop issued a three year old child a
>ticket for trespassing. Of course, rational minds stopped that insanity.

Send said cop back to training.......

>If
>you had been the DA I think you would have attempted to get the three year
>old charged as a adult and probably thrown in a stalking charge to seal his
>fate.

You thunk wrong. I would have attempted to get said cop examined by
a shrink.

Stop playing the fool about what I would think or not think,
especially about the law and how I would apply it. By your own
declaration you have no qualifications as an attorney and are
therefore unqualified to debate with me as an equal or better in
that regard.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4489. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 03:52:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919235200.15462.00003112@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 77803

In article <bkdcue$87k$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote
>
>> A half century ago I felt right at home working primary communications
>> on Army radio station ADA.
>
> Homey is a submarine radio shack. Sit back, put your feet up, listen
>to the rhythm of genuine Kleinschmidts clattering away, a nice fresh cup of
>coffee at hand. Copy the sked, grab your traffic, route stamp it and have
>your watchstander run it. Oh yeah...

Well, you certainly had a nice "ground connection" with all that water
ABOVE you. :-)

At RCA EASD in Van Nuys, CA, I shared an office cubicle with John
Kaiser. John served 4 years in the Pacific during WW2. One lunch time
I asked him about submarine life, being very unfamiliar with the Navy or
that particular part of the USN. Since we were both in electronics
engineering, I asked him if the lights really went out during depth bomb
attacks, as I'd seen it in the movies.

John considered this question for at least a whole minute. He answered
(approximately) "I really don't know...when GQ was sounded I went to my
station (the radio cubicle), shut my eyes, grabbed the receiver handles,
and prayed a lot...never did notice if the lights dimmed or anything..."

LHA

4490. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 03:52:03 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030919235203.15462.00003113@mb-m06.aol.com>
Source record: 77804

In article <bke2fk$j05$0@208.206.142.74>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>> In article <20030918175652.07346.00000687@mb-m26.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>> (Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>> > A half century ago I felt right at home working primary communications
>> > on Army radio station ADA. Not only feeling that but BEING AT HOME
>> > at the new site of Camp Tomlinson...barracks at one corner of the huge
>> > antenna field. ADA never used "CW" (on-off keying), trans-Pacific or
>> > local.
>> >
>> > DICK, you've NEVER done that in the US Army, have you?
>> >
>> > All you can do is demand that EVERYONE HAD TO DO IT LIKE YOU
>> > DID but you can never offer any viable proof why they should.
>> >
>> > LHA
>>
>> Lennie:
>>
>> Your half-century old experiences in military communications, where, by
>> your own admission, you never utilized the Morse/CW mode, are irrelevant
>> to the discussion of Morse code testing requirements within the AMATEUR
>> Radio Service in 2003. In fact, as a person who does not use the Morse
>> code for any reason whatsoever, you are self-disqualified from rendering
>> any judgment on the topic whatsoever. Therefore, I suggest that you
>> stop wasting your time, find something you know something about (which
>> from my personal observation seems to be limited to megalomaniacal,
>> ego-driven character assassination) and talk about that, instead. You
>> are not influencing anyone on the topic of code testing.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
> Well, Well...Lennie is still touting his BC610 babysitting experience as
>being (= / >) ham radio, hmm??
>
> While he was sitting around twiddling his
>thumbs and waiting for a breaker to trip so he'd have something to do, I was
>busily involved in operating AND REPAIRING one of the very first video tape
>systems in the country, among many other very interesting work activities at

>the Signal School at Fort Monmouth.

Ooooo! Spent your whole tour of Army duty at Monmouth, did you?

You had fun splicing mag tape? :-)

That's STUDIO BROADCASTING duties, NOT communications.

>You see, instead of sending me to an obscure, remote MINOR outpost about as
far
>away as it's possible to be sent, when I finished electronics training, the
>Signal School kept me there as permanent party, to work as a broadcast
>engineer at the educational TV station ran by the school.

My Signal School training was 7 months total at Fort Monmouth in 1952 for
microwave radio relay MOS. We didn't DICK around with AFRS things,
but spent all the Monmouth time in learning to operate and maintain radio
relay equipment for communications.

The primary communications facility for an Area Command is hardly "minor,"
numbbrain. Took half a battalion to handle the quarter-million messages
per month relayed through ADA in the mid-1950s.

ADA was the callsign of the Far East Command Headquarters in Tokyo.

ADA is still the callsign and now belongs to USARPAC, the United States
Army Pacific, based at Fort Shafter, Hawaii.

>A most interesting
>and challenging assignment, indeed. I would have been completely happy to have
>stayed there for the remainder of my term of service, but my name came up for
an
>overseas tour of duty rotation, so off to Europe I went after a year and a
half.

And what did you do in Yurp, old-timer? Fix more mag tape units for
AFRS Special Services' broadcasting?

> I sure do feel for poor ol' Lennie, tho, he must have had a rough go of it
'way
>out there in the JA boondocks with nothing to do but listen to the
transformers
>hum and wait for another overload. And I hear those BC610's didn't overload
all
>that often, either. Tsk, tsk.

ADA didn't have "BC-610s," ignorant one. BC-339 1 KW oldies, BC-340 10 KW
oldies, Press Wireless PW-15s, Western Electric LD-T2 4 KW PEP SSBs,
AN/FRC-22 40 KW (Linear mode) used as amplifiers for the LD-T2, a Collins
Autotune 1 KW model, a Wilcox Electric 1 KW AM transmitter. Frequency
synthesizers had yet to develop so all FSK transmitters used O-5 exciters
requiring direct crystal control. ADA had about 3 dozen O-5s on racks
behind the central control console and QSYs required changing quartz
crystals kept in a heated cabinet. Each shift in a 24 hour period averaged

about 11 QSYs each. Every QSY had frequency checked prior to resumption of traffic by a General Radio Frequency Meter at the receiver site at Camp Owada (roughly 30 miles away), reporting Mark and Space frequencies to the order-wire TTY loop linking transmitters, control at Chuo Kogyo, and receiver frequency standards. The average QSY was 2 minutes from QSY order issued by control until frequency standards reported (on TTY) that frequencies were within limits. SSB transmitters were servo-tuned to 10 preset frequencies and a QSY on those took 30 seconds; frequency standards would double-check the pilot carrier frequency but those never varied. All of the O-5s required separate manual setting of Mark and Space; a Fox Test mechanical TTY player was used for Mark/Space setting (control had 3 at their disposal for that).

BC-610s were in the AN/GRC-26 vans, self-contained stations fitted with TTYs and exciters for FSK RTTY. My battalion was a caretaker for a half-dozen of those to be used for emergency communications netting. For emergency linking on landline cable going out, ADA transmitters had 7 AN/TRC-8 and 6 AN/TRC-1 UHF-VHF radio relay terminals at the old site on Tsukishima. At the new transmitter site ADA had four 24-voice-channel GE microwave radio relay terminals (two running, two as hot spares) at 1.8 GHz band center, full duplex, 10 foot diameter Andrew parabolic reflector antennas on a 200 foot tower, pressurized 1 5/8" solid coaxial feed.

The billet for C Company (transmitters), 8235th Army Unit, Army Central Command Japan, was at Hardy Barracks in Tokyo's Roppongi district. Tokyo, a major metropolitan area, is hardly in the "backwoods" of anyplace. Hardy Barracks still exists as a US facility today despite almost total pull-out of US installations since the 1950s...a two-page article on Hardy Barracks of the 1950s was done in the Pacific Stars & Stripes last year in November, staffer Rick Chernitzer interviewing me for the entire article (photos used were mine also). Hardy Barracks is less than a mile from the Diet (Japanese Congress).

In 1955 ADA handled about 220 thousand TTY messages a month to/from Army units, plus additional circuits for USAF and USN. Two Facsimile terminals were at the control center. Control's TTY "room" was the entire second story of a converted warehouse holding over 200 various TTY terminals, most being rack-sized units having both transmitting distributor and receiving punch (all tapes were punched chadless to allow over-printing to read the address preambles). Control at Chuo Kogyo (the name of the former Tokyo civilian company) originated very few messages, serving to relay all traffic by the "torn tape" method with operators reading
the address preambles and hand-carrying tapes to the proper destination.

Radio circuits were to Saigon (then in "French Indochina"), Manila, Okinawa, Pusan (Korea), Seoul (Korea), Anchorage, Seattle, Hawaii, San Francisco on a 24/7 basis with other radio circuits as needed such as the Far East Commander's aircraft. Okinawa, Seattle, Hawaii, and San Francisco had SSB in addition to FSK RTTY. Each SSB circuit had two voice channels plus about 8 TTY channels with duplicated Mark

Space tones to avoid selective fading effects.

The receiver site at Camp Owada was truly "out in the boondocks" and shared between Army and USAF. It was a radio-quiet environment and the antenna field was considered the largest in the world in the mid-1950s. "Receivers" had antenna multicouplers to allow space-diversity auto-switching between a pair of widely-separated rhombics. With tone pairing on SSB to overcome selective fading effects, the combined space and frequency diversity allowed an excellent low error rate at receivers.

USAF was given responsibility for operating the Army HF primary communications in 1962 and they continued until the Central Honshu HF comm facility was disbanded in 1978. That included the 9 microwave terminals I was responsible for at Chuo Kogyo control as supervisor.

HF communications capability still exists in Japan at Camp Zama (near Yokohama), maintained as a secondary comm means by the 78th Signal Battalion under the command of the 516th Signal Brigade at Fort Shafter. US military primary communications is now handled by the DSN (Digital Switched Network) using fiber-optic cable and satellite relay. The DSN offers both telephony and Internet-like computer-modem communications with the added capability of being encrypted.

>What a chutz-putz!

Too bad you didn't get into the Big Leagues of REAL communications, old-timer. You wouldn't have to snarl and hurl epithets as an amateur after fussing around with AFRS toys.

Leonard H. Anderson
ex-RA16408336, US Army Signal Corps

4491. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 03:53:19 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F6BCF2E.57F37149@earthlink.net>
Source record: 77805

Brian wrote:
>
> Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F68DD97.6E3D3730@earthlink.net>...
> >
> > Wow! That's quite a policy statement from a country with a little more
> > than 120 radio amateurs and it comes hot on the heels of the big move by
> > Ireland with its slightly more than 1,500 hams.
> >
> > Dave K8MN
>
> Wow! You've stated that you've operated from countries where you were
> the only active amateur.

I don't recall making a statement about attempting to influence a
foreign country's policy on amateur radio.

> Somehow that was significant then, but 120 or 1,500 native amateurs
> aren't?

Yes, it is significant that a country has only one radio amateur.
No, I made no comparison to my being in a unique situation and a country
having a small population of radio amateurs deciding to abolish morse
testing.

> There's that famous Heil smugness again.

Not really, my little electrolyte. It is simply you attempting once
again to tie two unrelated events together.

Dave K8MN

4492. Re: ARRL you can Kiss my $39.00 a Year Good Bye

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 03:59:41 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309191959.1b77eb3c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77806

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<VYKab.804$Hd6.600926@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0309172038.d92c8bd@posting.google.com...

> >
> > . . . I think I lost some of my ability to get it down solid on paper at
> > speed and I'm working on that.
> >
> > However I do not agree with a hypothesis that simply cramming for then
> > passing a 13 or even a 20wpm code test assures a lifetime ability to
> > copy Morse at any usable speed. I've seen too many examples of "cram &
> > pass" types who never actually used the stuff on the air to any extent
> > all but completely forget how to copy Morse. Apparently there is some
> > combination of both a speed and a number of hours of experience at
> > that speed which embeds Morse for life.
> >
> >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
> > w3rv
>
> It appears to me that the reason 13wpm and higher works, according to the
> reference, is that you CAN'T successfully cram to pass the higher speeds.
> You've got to have those neural connections solidly in place. However for
> 10wpm and down you can cram and pass the tests.

I'm not particularly convinced that's the case but there isn't even
any soft evidence which indicates that is or is not the case.

> Regardless, there is definitely a point at which a person won't forget even
> if they believe they have done so (your experience being a case in point).

Agreed. In spades.

> To me, this is the level that Extras should reach, i.e. a level that they
> won't forget.

We agree 200% on THAT point!

> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

w3rv

4493. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 04:13:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F6BD3CF.456BD5E3@earthlink.net>
Source record: 77807

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <20030918225804.11891.00000934@mb-m11.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >Your half-century old experiences in military communications, where, by
> >your own admission, you never utilized the Morse/CW mode, are irrelevant
> >to the discussion of Morse code testing requirements within the AMATEUR
> >Radio Service in 2003.
>
> No more "irrelevant" than your constant BULLSHIT about morsemanship.
>
> EVERYONE ELSE in radio but certain amateurs, maritime radio
> included, have dropped morse code modes.

Why would you have a problem because radio amateurs use morse. You
aren't involved.

> Morse doesn't work
> well enough for communications...

Works fine, Len. I can see where you'd have a problem if you aren't
able to read the stuff though.

> doesn't really "get through when
> nothing else will"

I've attmpting copying a weak 6m SSB station during an auroral event
with little success. That same station was pretty easily copied when he
switched to morse. It has also been my experience that weak Europeans
using CW can be copied on 160m when their SSB signals can't be read.
How does that compare with your experience?

and isn't a "universal language."

How would you know?

> I've been far more INVOLVED with civilian communications than any
> early military radio. On the engineering level, not as an amateur
> hobbyist.

Did you have a point? Were you aware that the portion beginning "On
the..." isn't a sentence?

> Tell me all about your "qualifications" for judgement about anyone, big
> shot. You seem to forget all the BS you were spouting about "summa
> cum laude" and "landing any (important) job you wanted." You wound

> up DRIVING A BUS.

This'd be a perfect place for the N2EY profile of your actions, Len old boy.

> You NEVER HAD to do military communications 24/7 anyplace...

Neither did you.

> ... so ALL
> you can use as a judgement reference is as an AMATEUR, playing
> around in a radio hobby, bragging up a storm like you were Marconi
> himself.

...and you're kind of the reverse, Len. You're a guy with no experience as a radio amateur and you haunt an amateur radio newsgroup, making frequent mention of your professional qualifications and your military experience of fifty years ago.

> Roll, despite your snide EGO in over-drive, I've not only done what I say
> I've done, but I have the references and the proof, including being friends
> with radio amateurs who can testify as to what we did.

But, Len, you don't always do what you say you'll do. I seem to remember some comment you made several years back about getting an "Extra right out of the box"?

> If you had all that personal "power" and "moral resolve" you brag about
> having, then you COULD have gotten a good job in personnel and worked
> your way up. You didn't. You opted OUT. Took the EASY route. No
> strain, no pain.

Ahem. You haven't taken the easy route to an amateur radio ticket, Len. You haven't made any attempt to obtain a license of any class. Your inertia certainly tops any of the things of which you accuse Larry.

> All you are is an AMATEUR at a level of the 1930s standards and
> practices in amateur radio. No more. Your BS doesn't work. All YOU
> are "qualified" in is hoop-jumping to old, old rules, and shoveling manure
> with your degree showing.

But Leonard, old chap, you aren't an AMATEUR radio op at all under the standards of any year. You aren't even qualified in "hoop jumping" as you call it. The fact is, if you are ever to grace us with your presence on the ham bands, you'll jump through whatever "hoops" the government has in place or you won't be licensed.

Dave K8MN

4494. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 04:14:29 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F6BD425.EC5A58E6@earthlink.net>
Source record: 77808

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <d22b54c3.0309181643.7b2e0e28@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >Then came his buddy, another one, who stated that the reason g5rv's
> >"work" is because they're "trap antennas". I asked him to show me the
> >traps in the 40M g5rv we'd put up. "I don't know where they are but
> >they have to be there somewhere."
> >
> >N2EY was there too . .
> >
> >And neither of us have been back to run FD with that pack of 21st
> >Century nitwits.
>
> Tell us all how it feels to be an 1896 Nitwit, nitwit.
>
> Beep, beep.

Why not regale us with some tales of your years as an uninvolved nitwit,
Netwit?

Dave K8MN

4495. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 04:19:05 UTC
From: Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F6BD539.30A1D79B@earthlink.net>
Source record: 77809

Len Over 21 wrote:
>
> In article <Yepab.40517$Aq2.12707@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Absolutely correct Larry. Bottom line is its too tough to actually try to
> >learn something for these whiners. It really is pathetic.
>
> Yes, it's "pathetic" that so many long-timers jumped through all the
> hoops and now they demand that all others do the same as they did.

Nobody can now meet the requirements most of us met, Leonardo as current requirements are not as stringent.

> Jump, jump, Danny.

...and you, of course, don't seem to be able to meet even the current requirements. Don't bother jumping, Len. Just stand there on the sidelines and watch the game.

Dave K8MN

4496. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 04:48:55 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030920004855.21457.00000698@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 77814

In article <20030919004247.14837.00003074@mb-m03.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>
>In article <20030918225804.11891.00000934@mb-m11.aol.com>,
>yodoc@aol.comnospam
>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
>>Your half-century old experiences in military communications, where, by
>>your own admission, you never utilized the Morse/CW mode, are irrelevant
>>to the discussion of Morse code testing requirements within the AMATEUR
>>Radio Service in 2003.
>
> No more "irrelevant" than your constant BULLSHIT about morsemanship.

It's not bullshit, Lennie. I can do it, and I can prove it!

> EVERYONE ELSE in radio but certain amateurs, maritime radio
> included, have dropped morse code modes. Morse doesn't work
> well enough for communications...doesn't really "get through when
> nothing else will" and isn't a "universal language."

And the above is meaningless, since you're not a qualified judge of the Morse/CW mode. End of story.

> I've been far more INVOLVED with civilian communications than any
> early military radio. On the engineering level, not as an amateur
> hobbyist.

Still meaningless, since amateur radio operators ARE hobbyists. Your experience may be relevant to commercial or military communications environments, but not to the AMATEUR radio service. I really don't know why you waste your time here.

>>In fact, as a person who does not use the Morse
>>code for any reason whatsoever, you are self-disqualified from rendering
>>any judgment on the topic whatsoever.
>
> Hey, like you are "qualified to land any human resources (personnel)
> job because of your alleged high grades" and wind up driving a BUS?

You've still never provided that exact quote, Lennie, but the fact is, bus driving pays better in these parts.

> Like you've NEVER worked any military communications in your entire
> TWENTY except a telephone on your desk?

I've used lotsa LMR radios, but I was in transportation, not Comm. As I already said thousands of times, I'm strictly an AMATEUR radio operator.

> Tell me all about your "qualifications" for judgement about anyone, big
> shot. You seem to forget all the BS you were spouting about "summa
> cum laude" and "landing any (important) job you wanted." You wound
> up DRIVING A BUS.

C'mon, Lennie. Show us the quote!

> You NEVER HAD to do military communications 24/7 anyplace so ALL
> you can use as a judgement reference is as an AMATEUR, playing
> around in a radio hobby, bragging up a storm like you were Marconi
> himself.

Yawn! And just when did I make THAT claim?

> Roll, you are RETROGRADE as an AMATEUR. All you want to do is to
> keep everyone else in amateurism DUMBED DOWN to 1930s standards
> and practices.

Which, of course, is why I've been using PSK-31 since the moment it became available to radio amateurs! However, I guess there must have been a lot of PSK-31 being used in the '30's, if you are to be believed.

> Where is that big "human resources" job you said (so many times) you
> could get?
>
> You can't even get anyone to do a PSK31 contact with yet you make all
> the 1930s noise about morse code!

I make lotsa PSK-31 contacts, Lennie -- just not with anyone on this newsgroup…well, not with any NCTA's, at least!

> Roll, despite your snide EGO in over-drive, I've not only done what I say
> I've done, but I have the references and the proof, including being
>friends with radio amateurs who can testify as to what we did.

Fine, good. I've never questioned that. However, you seem to think it is necessary to keep driving that point home over and over. Kinda makes one wonder who you're trying to convince?

> All you have after a twenty in the USAF and that alleged degree (where you
> said you could get any personnel job you wanted) is driving a BUS.

What I have, Lennie, is a job that I like, that I enjoy doing, that gives me a lot of satisfaction working with people who really need my services, and has pay and benefits way above what I could get in any entry-level HR job. Moreover, my fellow bus drivers come from all walks of life and many professional occupations, and many are fellow college graduates. So what is YOUR problem with MY job? Yes, I may have one time indulged in idle speculation that I could get a good HR job, but then, I was unfamiliar with the realities of life regarding that field -- mainly that it is dominated by women and minorities, and doesn't pay well except at

the highest levels of experience and responsibility. I chose that field to get a Bachelor's degree mainly because I wanted a degree in ANY field at all which was generally business-related, and I got a lot of transfer credit from previous college experience. Whether or not I ever work a single day in HR is now irrelevant to me -- but getting my degree exposed me to much more than the personnel management curriculum. It exposed me to arts, science, mathematics, humanities, literature, and the rest of the general college curriculum. It made me a better person, and that helps me in a job where I have to deal with physically and mentally "challenged" people on a daily basis. So go ahead, keep ridiculing me for making the effort to better myself. It only serves to prove to everyone what they already know about you.

>>You are not influencing anyone on the topic of code testing.
>
> You are beyond "influence," Larry Ego.

Pot -- Kettle -- Black. Your specialty.

> If you had all that personal "power" and "moral resolve" you brag about
> having, then you COULD have gotten a good job in personnel and worked
> your way up. You didn't. You opted OUT. Took the EASY route. No
> strain, no pain.

I addressed my personal need for a job with good pay and benefits, and adapted to reality, Lennie. I probably could have got a low-level HR job if I were willing to make an expensive relocation to a much higher cost of living area at my own expense. I chose not to. You do understand basic economics, don't you, Lennie?

> All you are is an AMATEUR at a level of the 1930s standards and
> practices in amateur radio. No more. Your BS doesn't work. All YOU
> are "qualified" in is hoop-jumping to old, old rules, and shoveling manure
> with your degree showing.

And all you're good for is making loud sucking sounds, Lennie.

Putz! (Apologies to Steve)

73 de Larry, K3LT

4497. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 04:48:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030920004857.21457.00000699@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 77813

In article <Xns93FB3C4D5CCADelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>>>I eventually passed code in 1993, but if it weren't for the *@#%^&!
>>>code test I could have had an HF licence in 1971.
>>
>> Alun:
>>
>> The problem wasn't the "*@#%^&! code test" at all. It was you and your
>> negative attitude toward it.
>
>Only partly true. My negative attitude I freely admit.

Alun:

Stop right there. Your negative attitude was the whole problem.

>However, I had no
>aptitude for the subject, and still don't.

Incorrect. By your own admission, you eventually did pass the code
test, which shows that you could, indeed, demonstrate some aptitude.
However, it was your negative attitude toward it which truly got in
your way.

>Who knows why I should be good
>at science and languages, and yet lousy at woodwork and CW, and yet it's
>so.

It's still all about attitude. I'll bet that if, given the time and proximity
which
would allow some personal mentoring, I could totally change your attitude,
and therefore your aptitude, toward both CW and woodworking. Whether
you realize it or not, you have that potential within you. You just don't want
to tap into it -- and that's attitude.

>Each of us has innate abilities in some things, balanced by innate
>incompetence in others, i.e everyone is unique. I feel that this has been
>ignored by the pro-code side of the debate, or rather that it is known
>damn well, but none of you will admit it!

I, for one, must disagree because I have lived on both sides of this
particular fence. From the time I originally became aware of Amateur
Radio, at age 14, until I finally became licensed at age 28, I had a very
negative attitude toward learning the Morse code, and therefore, I failed
at every attempt to do so. It wasn't until I, through more mature
judgment and some soul-searching, became aware of my negative

attitude toward the code and it's effect on my so-called "aptitude" for it, that I was able to make the change. I believe this was the value of the code testing requirement for me, since my desire to be a licensed radio amateur was stronger than my objection to learning the code. At the end of the day, I made a turnabout in my attitude toward the code, and from then on, it came quite easily for me. My experience led me to become convinced that the code testing requirement is of great value in getting prospective radio amateurs involved in this mode.

>It is possible to learn something that one is no good at in order to pass
>a test, although unlikely that practical fluency in the skill would ever
>be acheived.

Yet another example of a negative attitude. I overcame this by making a personal shift in my attitude, and deciding that I would, indeed, become a proficient CW operator. Once that change was made, CW came quite easily for me, and even became fun -- to the point where it is now one of my preferred modes to use OTA.

>It is even possible to learn something that one is both no
>good at and has no interest in, although much harder, and then the level
>of difficulty becomes crushingly hard. This is true of any skill, and
>interest is, if anything, maybe more important than ability, but any
>schoolteacher will tell you that when neither are present in even the
>snallest degree the chance of success is slim to none. So it was with me
>and Morse code. I did it eventually, with a huge amount of outside help,
>without which I would never have succeeded on my own. The reason I didn't
>succeed earlier is straightforward - I didn't get help before.

All of the above makes my point about attutude.

>So there it is. I have a negative attitude, coupled with zero aptitude,
>and have never heard any convincing argument in these last 32 years as to
>why I should have had to have done it in the first place. Sure, I've heard
>lots of lame excuses as to why there should be a CW test, but nothing even
>approaching anything beleivable.

Obviously, your negative attitude toward the code is deeply ingrained, but it can still be overcome. However, in the absence of any requirement for you to overcome it, you will not likely change.

>No doubt CW is very useful, but I am no
>bloody good at it, and I prefer to actually _talk_ on the radio in the
>first place. That's all. No PSK31, no SSTV, no RTTY, etc. Boring and
>limited to some, but if you prefer CW or PSK, or WHY, then you're welcome
>to use them.

I, for one, found just "talking" on the radio to be quite unfulfilling. Each QSO became just more of the same old tedious re-hashing of the same old boring topics -- mainly the weather, the relative health of the operator on the other end, station equipment, etc. I always tried to make it more interesting by raising questions about unrealted topics, but it always went the same way. This, followed by the tendency of phone operators to

make lengthy monologues which made it almost impossible to even remember what they were talking about, came to convince me that phone is generally a waste of time. I now use it only in contests and local VHF/FM contacts, mainly from my car.

I'd say that your experience is pretty typical of most NCTA's. Your main problem is that nothing happened to change your attitude. Now, in the future, with the lack of a code testing requirement, there will no longer be anything there to create the kind of epiphany which I experienced in learning the code. This will truly be a great loss to the amateur radio community.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4498. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 04:48:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030920004858.21457.00000700@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 77810

In article <0tBab.38234$NM1.19253@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>> Tell you what Dwight....when you get some
>> knowledge of the subject, I'll pay attention. Just
>> quit trying to put on a spin on a subject you know
>> NOTHING about.
>
>
> First of all, the subject was you and Larry (and your attitudes about
>code), which I do know something about. Second, one does not need to know
>code itself to see the amount of code used in this country or elsewhere.
>Perhaps if you looked up from you code key occasionally, and stopped looking
>down your nose at everyone else when you do, you would see the same decline
>of code use and therefore recognize how useless it is as a testing
>requirement. Of course, to acknowledge that reality would force you to drop
>your false pride and I truly wonder whether you're man enough to do that
>(the same with Larry).

Dwight:

You just locked, loaded, took careful aim, and shot yourself in the foot!
If you had ANY experience with Morse/CW at all, you'd realize that the
mode which is in "decline" lately on HF is SSB -- due to poor operating
conditions. The CW segments continue to jump with activity. You
are hopelessly out of the loop due to your own operational inexperience.

I'm gonna give you some free advice here, Dwight. You're getting almost
Kim-like in your shrill but specious arguments. You are truly not
equipped for this debate whatsoever, and are making a bigger fool of
yourself with each and every posting. You're out of your depth when
discussing code testing, so I would suggest, for the sake of your own
credibility, that you chose a topic you know something about.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4499. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 04:48:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030920004859.21457.00000701@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 77811

In article <f1Cab.38355$NM1.3352@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> Sorry, but that is a judgment that you are not
>> qualified to make. I'm not even going to bother
>> to mention how wrong this judgment is, because
>> it comes from someone who is incapable of
>> rendering a credible judgment of the Morse/CW
>> mode because of his lack of experience therein.
>
>
> Of course, it is indeed a judgement I'm qualified to make. I certainly
>know as much about overall code USE in this country and elsewhere as you do.

Dwight:

How many CW contacts have you made in your ham "career?" I'm into the multiple thousands. If you have less than 500, then you're not even close to being qualified to render a judgment against code testing.

>I also know just as much as you do about its NECESSITY to meet the goals and
>purpose of Amateur Radio.

Except, of course, when it comes to the issue of retaining a testing requirement for a valuable basic communications skill. However, this type of selectivity is certainly nothing new in the human condition.

>And those are the only things required to make a
>judgement on its value as a testing requirement.

Incorrect, but the above is probably the main reason why we're losing our culture here in the United States.

>> Incorrect. Dan and I are just speaking the truth
>> based on practical experience.something you
>> don't have when it comes to Morse/CW.

> What experience is that, Larry? What experience do you have that makes you
>uniquely qualified to judge the value of a specific testing requirement?

Twenty-two plus years of OTA HF experience as a radio amateur, which has been about 80 percent CW, 19 percent RTTY and other digital modes, and 1 percent phone. What's your breakdown?

>The
>answer is, of course, absolutely nothing - you're not uniquely qualified to

>make value judgements about testing requirements.

I can see why you'd think that way, Dwight, especially when my own objective evaluation of those requirements does not advance your own agenda to gain full HF privileges without any necessity to make the effort to learn the valuable communications skill of Morse code.

>> (snip) but I'm eminently qualified to judge the value
>> and currency of the Morse/CW mode based on my
>> experience. (snip)

> The issue isn't about the value of Morse Code itself, Larry. Instead, it's
>about the value of Morse Code as a testing requirement (read the subject
>line at the top of these messages).

I have consistently directed my comments toward the testing requirement as opposed to the mode itself. The confusion there is primarily an NCTA problem.

>And you're no more "eminently qualified"
>to make judgements about that than any other ham radio operator.

Unless, of course, that "other" ham radio operator has OTA HF/CW experience at least equal to my own. And, unfortunately for the NCTA, most hams who do have CW experience similar to mine are usually PCTA's.

>In fact,
>your inability to keep track of the overall subject from one message to the
>next makes me doubt you're even as qualified as other operators. Most people
>can keep up with the subject without constant reminders.

Now you're grasping at straws, Dwight. Trying to find some way to discredit me any way you can. This is always the indication that you've run out of logical, reasonable arguments. I'll give you partial credit for not having resorted to name calling -- yet.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4500. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 04:49:00 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030920004900.21457.00000702@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 77812

In article <3JCab.38370$NM1.20347@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> This may be so, but it is an imperfect system being
>> directed by people with imperfect wisdom and
>> questionable motives. I say questionable because
>> their motives, for the most part, are entirely
>> self-serving.
>
>
> Can you can show me one law in this country that wasn't advocated by
>people with self-serving motives? Laws, by their very nature, tend to serve
>the interests of at least someone. In reality, the only reason you're
>pointing to this is because people are now advocating the change of a law
>you happen to like (the code test requirement). And, of course, you would
>like everyone to believe your position in all this is not at all
>self-serving.

Dwight:

Which it isn't. The only outcome I desire is to preserve Morse code testing in order to preserve the continued growth in the numbers of new hams who have been exposed to training in this mode, in the interest of getting some percentage of them to get to the point where they can effectively use it OTA.

>> And it is my right as an American Citizen to make an
>> attempt to preserve this requirement. I am not
>> challenging your right to do the opposite, even though
>> you seem interesting in squelching my own efforts. What
>> are you afraid of?
>
>
> I'm afraid of your motives in all this, Larry. I don't like the words I
>hear from many advocating the continuation of the code testing requirement.
>Those words often reek of bigotry, elitism, and discrimination against other
>Americans.

One of the classic NCTA whines. Us horrible old PCTA's want to keep Morse code going so that we can continue to demonstrate the dominance of the white, middle-class, American male, who represents 5% of the world's population yet consumes 25% of the planet's resources, and is responsible for racism, bigotry, famine, disease, poverty, ethnic cleansing, global warming, destruction of the environment, homophobia, halitosis,

and every other bad thing you can think of. Yawn! However, I guess that
works for you NCTA's, in the absence of any truly valid reason for the
further dumbing-down of licensing requirements in the ARS.

>Are you comfortable with some of the things said by those with
>your position? Are you comfortable with some of the things you've said (the
>garbage about a dumb downed America, your superiority, and so on)?

Don't look now, Dwight, but America *is* dumbed-down. It has been made
that way by a liberal, socialist media that continuously mocks traditional
values of morality, integrity, ingenuity and hard work, and makes it a virtue
to be dependent on government for cradle-to-grave life support. It is truly
an international conspiracy to deprive America of it's greatness.

>> (snip) HF access is different, and it is here that the
>> Morse/CW mode offers benefits and advantages
>> which can be exploited to the benefit of all radio
>> amateurs -- but only if they know how to do so.
>> Therefore, the testing requirement remains current
>> and valid -- forever.

> Since it appears only a small minority of hams use Morse/CW on a regular
>or routine basis,

And it is my desire that the ARS continues to have at least that "small number"
of CW-using hams among it's ranks. I don't think that's too much to ask.

>a testing requirement obviously does not benefit "all
>radio amateurs."

Well, it certainly doesn't benefit those hams who can't be bothered to
learn a useful communications skill. However, considering the nature of
the ARS in today's electronic communications reality, where the typical
teenager with a computer and a cell phone has truly global communications
capability in his pocket, ham radio still serves as the ultimate backup
system which can effectively employ numerous modes of communication,
including the most basic form -- Morse/CW. I don't want to see that
valuable capability become obsolete merely because of the indifference
of those who don't wish to make the effort to learn the Morse code.

>In addition, the testing requirements are not there to
>exclusively benefit Amateur Radio operators - they also exist to facilitate
>the goals and purposes of Amateur Radio.

And it is my belief that unless we preserve code testing, those goals cannot
be fully achieved.

>Therefore, any testing requirement
>must be judged within the context of each of these. The code testing
>requirement fails in each regard.

Just the opposite is true. However, as previously stated, you are not
qualified to make any judgment against the code testing requirement,
since you have not gained practical operational experience in this mode.

You have not had that mode's unique benefits and advantages proved to you over and over again through years of daily OTA use. I have. And I didn't go into ham radio as a CW "lover" by any means -- in fact, I was a dedicated NCTA at the time. I came across to the other side due to my own experience with Morse/CW, and thus became a True Believer. Moreover, while I now consider myself to be primarily a digital mode operator in my OTA experience, I still continue to be convinced of the value of CW when I use that mode after using PSK-31, RTTY, or any other digital mode. It's all good, and I believe that we hams need all of these resources at our fingertips. However, the only way we'll "have" CW is to know the code, and that's the rub for you NCTA's.

I'm reasonably sure you'll ultimately get your way, since that's the direction this country is going in general -- down the tubes.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4501. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 04:51:05 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920005105.15923.00000794@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 77815

In article <f45722ac.0309191641.6de6c194@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030919000342.01893.00000676@mb-m22.aol.com>...
>> In article <bkdfen$j426$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
>> <kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:
>>
>> >"Bill Sohl" wrote in part ...
>> >
>> >"FCC nor almost every emergency preparedness organization/operation has no
>> >desire or need for morse in their plans."
>> >____
>> >
>> >I ask because you wrote the above. Why do you think the EM planners have
>> >"no need" for Morse? Any tool available should be considered for use in
>the
>> >EM package.
>>
>> How about flag semaphore? Night semaphore with lighted torches?
>>
>> That worked well in the US Civil War...and the crossed flags with torch
>> at the center became the collar insignia of the US Army Signal Corps.
>>
>> Signal Corps LONG AGO abandoned flag and torch semaphore and
>> doesn't use morse code for communications anymore. [are you keeping
>> up to date on your former employer, the US Army?]
>
>I once saw lighted torch semaphore demonstrated by a Chinese Acrobatic
>Circus.
>
>I think they were sending "Yankee Go Home."
>
>Or were they just juggling?

Don't know. I don't speak Mandarin Morse.

>> >Not only is our equipment capable of Morse, but we have CW
>> >capable operators for each. We've used it in the past and I strongly
>> >suspect that will do so in the future as well.
>>
>> Great! You helped save the Titanic and now you are ready to save the
>> Titanic II.
>>
>> Why in the hell are you busy Internetting when Isabel has hit land?

>>
>> Afraid of getting your code key wet?
>>
>> LHA
>
>Now Len, you know they aren't actually using Morse Code for storm comms.

No! No? You mean the ARRL news page has led everyone astray all
these years?!? Say it isn't so!

LHA

:-)

4502. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 04:51:06 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920005106.15923.00000795@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 77817

In article <bkfv65$1el3c$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...
>
> I care less what you do. You've made so much BS in here about your
>professional amateurism that there's no believing what you say. I doubt you
>were ever an Army civilian doing criminal investigation.
>_____
>
>Actually I think you care a great deal about what I do since you mention it
>in every one of your replies to me.

I just think you are one of the usual morseman BS artists in here.

>It must really frost you that I've been
>successful at everything I've ever done -- including Emergency Management
>(apparently you've failed at many things along the way)

You've been "successful at everything you've done?"

What have you "done" other than acquiring titles?

What have I "failed at many times along the way?"

I started out working as an industrial illustrator, then switched to
electronics engineering in 1958. Did engineering full time until
retirement. I have a nice income, a wonderful wife (who was my steady
girl friend in high school), a fully-paid-for house in Southern California
and another, also fully-paid-for house in Washington state (that one on
5 acres).

I've never tried to "get" any amateur radio license. Had a commercial
radio license since 1956. Having done 3 years of Big Time long-distance
24/7 HF communications in the military, I have no interest in "working DX
from my home station."

>If you doubt my
>credentials, feel free to read the article on my web site that was done by
>the local paper when I was appointed as director for EM.

I'm sure you can get all sorts of "credentials." :-)

But, what have you DONE besides acquire credentials?

>Then verify the
>sources. As for you -- since you *still* can't reply without being the
>insulting obnoxious petty bore you've always been, its back to the killfile.

So, you think it is "okay" to be the insulting obnoxious petty bore
who has an amateur license but you object to all of us who don't
have an amateur license?

Sure looks that way to me and many others, Ah-nold.

>To be honest, I'd much rather exchange views with Bill Sohl -- at least he
>makes cogent debatable arguments from his side of the isle.

When I see "cogent debate" from yourself, sans the snarly sarcasm of
the codified royal classes attitude from yourself, I'll be more than happy
to do REAL debate with you, Ah-nold.

You can't do it. Have never done it.

Surprise us with a first for yourself and lay off the "morsemen are
superior beings" bullshit and you can get some "cogent debate."

Happy credentialism.

LHA

4503. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 04:51:07 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920005107.15923.00000796@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 77816

In article <bkfq3dian0@208.206.142.86>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>> when I finished electronics training, the
>> > Signal School kept me there as permanent party, to work as a broadcast
>> > engineer at the educational TV station ran by the school. A most
>interesting
>> > and challenging assignment, indeed.
>>
>> Indeed. Typical duty given to sycophant students.
>
>Hmmm.. well I *did* graduate within a fraction of a point of the top score in
>the class,
>though that score wan't mine. It went to a fella who had already completed
>over half of a
>college EE program. Instructors do like to see their students do well. If
>that makes me a
>"synchophant", whatever you think that is, guess all I can do is agree.

Must have been a new policy at Fort Monmouth to rate "students" by
"points."

Those of us in Basic Radar and Microwave Radio Relay MOS classes
got a very binary "score:" Pass or Fail. [Fail score was off to the
infantry or other wonderful cannon fodder duties]

That was in 1952 when the Korean War was still on.

Must have gotten very quiet after 1953 and the Truce started.

>> I would have been completely happy to have
>> > stayed there for the remainder of my term of service, but my name came up
>for an
>> > overseas tour of duty rotation, so off to Europe I went after a year and
>a half.
>>
>> I thought you were sending CW as the ChiComs were overrunning your
>> position?
>
> Brian, we already told you- think is dangerous to your mental health.
>Evidently it overly strains your faculties.

DICK, you seem to be shaking your "we-we" again.

Tsk, tsk.

>> > I sure do feel for poor ol' Lennie, tho, he must have had a rough go of
>it 'way
>> > out there in the JA boondocks with nothing to do but listen to the
>transformers
>> > hum and wait for another overload. And I hear those BC610's didn't
>overload all
>> > that often, either. Tsk, tsk.
>>
>> Yet all that message traffic was sent w/o touching a Morse key.
>
> But not by Lennie! The operating wasn't done at the transmitter site. He
>sat and watched. Just like he -and you- are doing here.

DICK, I've already TOLD you what station ADA did. Try to remember it.

In 1953 through 1956, ADA *never* used any on-off keying codings.

ADA never had or used any "BC-610s" either...too low a power output
for reliable 24/7 trans-Pacific use.

ADA relayed 220 thousand TTY messages a month in 1955.

TTY, not morse. A half century ago.

Try not to equate the military or the rest of the world with the technical
competence of the Misery state police.

LHA

4504. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 04:55:27 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkgmjv$9nm$0@208.207.71.166>
Source record: 77818

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bke0tqfkl1@208.206.142.83>...
> > N2EY wrote:
> >
> > > In article <IDVNFYDX37881.3498263889@bog.lir.dk>, Franz Weigel
> > > <anon@bog.lir.dk> writes:
> > >
> > > >The last CW coder who died was sentenced
> > > >to Hell for eternity in order to transmit
> > > >6 Megapixels 24-bit color pictures in CW.
> > > >
> > > >God bless you from CW !
> > >
> > > Gee - who was it said they were only against the TEST?
> >
> > The truth usually manages to slip out.
>
> Tell me about it. Using CW won't get anyone sentenced to hell. Lying
> about how it always gets thru will.

Then you'd be wise to stop saying it, woiuldn't you?

>
>
> CW gets thru when everything else will.

As well as when most other modes used by hams won't.

Believe it, even though unlike me you'll never experience it.

4505. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 05:02:18 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <ubRab.40319$NM1.36431@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77819

"Dave Heil" <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:3F6BCC03.4B5F07CB@earthlink.net...
> Bill Sohl wrote:
>
> > Most emergency operations don't even need or use HF.
> > All of yesterday's activity for Hurricane Isabel was VHF/UHF
> > for local and county operations.
>
> Think beyond local and county operations, Bill. Here in West Virginia
> there were HF operations on both 40 and 75m.

So be it then. This issue is about
a CW test requirement anyway...not whether you want to use
CW in your local area for emergency comms.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4506. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 05:09:24 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <8iRab.40342$NM1.8253@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77820

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:3jMab.848$Hd6.628109@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:orKab.43438$Aq2.26701@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030918221840.00545.00000894@mb-m02.aol.com...
> > >
> > > But does the NCVEC petition, or the NCI petition address the writtens?
> Not
> > at
> > > all.
> >
> > No, why should it? I have ALWAYS said the code was a
> > separate issue from writtens. I'm not opposed to revisiting
> > the writtens, but there's no need to wait for that before ending all
> > code testing.
> >
>
> Yes it should address writtens because by eliminating the code test
without
> addressing the writtens, you are reducing the overall level of knowledge
> required to earn the various levels of ham licenses. Until the
replacement
> exams are ready, the old exams, including the code should remain intact.

Gee, when the states stopped requiring manual transmission knowledge
and/or use of hand signals while driving, what'd they replace
those elements with to keep the driving test at the same level of knowledge?

The point is that licensing should be about rational requirement
consistent with license privileges. It has NOTHING to do with maintaining
any set level of difficulty...as if that can even be measured in some
way.

> Personally if the code is dropped, I would like to see the exams
> restructured as follows:
>
> A) Regulations element: One must pass this before being allowed to take
any
> of the other elements.
> A lengthy and separate exam covering the FCC rules and regulations in
depth.
> Based on what I hear on the air and the statements on the internet from

any
> hams, there's a real problem in this area. This one should require at
least
> a score of 85% to pass.
>
> B) Technician element:
> Rewritten to move the regulations questions to A). Additional technical
> material and operating procedures material to keep the test pool about the
> same size.
>
> C) General element:
> Rewritten to move the regulations questions to A). Additional technical
> material, operating procedures, and basic VE requirements material to keep
> the test pool about the same size.
>
> D) Extra element
> Rewritten to move the regulations questions to A). Additional technical
> material, operating procedures, and extensive VE requirements material to
> keep the test pool about the same size.
>
> I'd really like to see a rules test as a stand alone test that one must
pass
> before even taking any of the other elements.

Not a bad approach... but not sure 85% should be expected passing
rate for A. In any case, such a change in approach would involve
considerable comment and discussion which should NOT stop
the immediate removal of Element 1 (code).

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4507. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 05:11:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkgnir$n1c$0@208.206.142.97>
Source record: 77821

Brian wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bkf8itfis0@208.207.71.158>...
> > Robert wrote:
> >
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> > >
> > > > I am capable of passing any sort of radio traffic by way of
> > > > radiotelgraphy,
> > >
> > > I'd like to see you pass a weather satellite photo fax via
> > > radiotelegraphy....
> >
> > Uh,, Bob, that isn't traffic, It's *data*. I guess if you were really
> > familiar with radio
> > you;d know that, wouldn't you?
>
> Uhhh, DICK, you should know that weather data can be passed via many
> modes, and that satellite imagery is referred to as wefax or wxsat.
>
> Typically, what is called "DATA" is RTTY.
>

No, Brian, digital information that is not analog voice is generally known as data tansmission.

>
> But all that is old technology. Today, we get our weather via
> wideband, though you're free to play with UKMO and NAM transmissions.

I guess you missed the entire point that WEFAX isn't in any circumstance handled by Morse code. That is reserved for text communications or coded letter groups.

>
> > > > which I learned as a requirement of my licensure as a
> > > > ham radio operator. There is no reason for you to be exempted from the
> > > > same.
> > >
> > > Well, at least you finally admit that it's "I had to do it, you
> > > should too."
> >
> > The difference is, I know why. You obviously don't.
>
> Couldn't be much of a difference since you obviously don't know why.
> And I know why you don't. You're simply ignorant about weather comms.
> Stick to things you know, such as CW and more CW. When you're done

> talking about CW, you could switch to Morse so you don't sound like a
> broken record.
>

More gibberish and attempted bafflegab. That's all you know so you stick to it.

>
> And FWIW, radar image intensity bulletins used to be transmitted via
> tty, and the receiver had to plot it on a predetermined overlay for
> that particular radar station. So the concept is there for satellite
> data transmission, but was never implemented. So go and create a
> satellite overlay grid, then encode satellite IR temps (if you can),
> and get cracking on Robert's idea.
>
> See, you CAN use CW to send useful information rather than just ARRL
> numbergrams.
>
> 73, Brian

Piffle. THAT is an obsolete use of Morse code.

Using it to pass message traffic when radio conditons are such that it works well but other available modes won't is another matter, as you know.

4508. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 05:20:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030920012037.21457.00000704@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 77823

In article <vmnaife87u3a24@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
<rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:

>
>just don't EVER speak your mind when it comes to
>morse code testing, unless it's to the effect that you
>LOVE it and couldn't live without it.
>
>You have to put on the jackboots of the CW police
>and march in goosestep with the CW nazis, or
>you'll get bashed a good one with a morse code
>key.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT

OK, Clint. That'll be 20 lashes with a J-38 with a 30" connecting cable.
Take your shirt off and start hugging that pole over there...but put on this
foam-padded jacket first -- I don't wanna hurt my key!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4509. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 05:20:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030920012037.21457.00000703@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 77824

In article <vmnakb54rcls82@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
<rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:

>
> It sure didn't start by old timers belittling
>> newcomers. In fact it was and IS the exact reverse.
>
>...yea, but what if he says he doesn't like CW testing....
>then, in what method will you choose- burning him
>in oil or decapitation?
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT

Clint:

I've got something worse in mind for the NCTA's -- a date with Kim!
And for Kim, it would be a date with you!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4510. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 05:20:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030920012038.21457.00000705@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 77822

In article <CaAab.163$Oy7.153@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
<n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:

>> It's really shocking how people can start an argument over nothing
>> which can escalate to vicious strings of insults complete with
>> profanity, sexual references and terms such as "CBplusser" and
>> "Knuckle-Dragger".
>
>Worst of all is how almost everything degenerates into a code/nocode debate,
>sooner or later.
>
>Utterly disgusting!
>
>Charles Brabham, N5PVL

Charles:

I'm sure you've been told this before, but here goes...

This newsgroup exists specifically for the code/no-code debate, and
other amateur radio policy issues. It's purpose is to isolate this
particularly contentious debate and permit other newsgroups to be
able to address more specific technical and operational issues.
Your whining about the nature of this newsgroup is, in fact, quite
off-topic, and a violation of Usenet policy. If you cannot grasp the
nature of this newsgroup and abide with Usenet policy by accepting
rrap for what it was specifically intended to be, then I suggest your
time would be better spent elsewhere.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4511. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 05:23:49 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <FvRab.40378$NM1.8438@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77825

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bkgnir$n1c$0@208.206.142.97...
>
>
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bkf8itfis0@208.207.71.158>...
> > > Robert wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> > > >
> > > > > I am capable of passing any sort of radio traffic by way of
> > > > > radiotelgraphy,
> > > >
> > > > I'd like to see you pass a weather satellite photo fax via
> > > > radiotelegraphy....
> > >
> > > Uh,, Bob, that isn't traffic, It's *data*. I guess if you were really
> > > familiar with radio
> > > you;d know that, wouldn't you?
> >
> > Uhhh, DICK, you should know that weather data can be passed via many
> > modes, and that satellite imagery is referred to as wefax or wxsat.
> >
> > Typically, what is called "DATA" is RTTY.
>
> No, Brian, digital information that is not analog voice is generally known
as data
> tansmission.

Not true. There is an incredible amount of digital "traffic" that is
actually
voice. Voice over IP, Voice over ATM, traditional PCM encoded voice, etc.
Once digitized, voice traffic isn't any different than any other digital
information (i.e. data).

Additionally, the term "traffic" is generic as to type/content and
does include any/all types of information transfer...voice, text, video,
image, etc.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4512. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 05:25:49 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkgoct$tf3$0@208.206.142.97>
Source record: 77826

Leo wrote:

> In response to the WRC 03 decision on Morse Code, Industry Canada
> asked the Radio Amateurs of Canada (RAC, our ARRL equivalent) to
> advise as to what Canadian amateurs want to do with respect to the
> Morse testing requirement.
>
> RAC set up an online survey on their website for the month of August,
> and invited all Canadian amateurs (both members of RAC and non-members
> alike) to voice their opinions. The results have been tabulated and
> published, and has been presented to the RAC Board of Directors for
> discussion with IC in the near future. The following web site has the
> details:
>
> http://www.rac.ca/news/mresults.htm
>
> Basically, the majority (overall 66%, or two out of three respondents)
> is in favour of dropping the Morse requirement for access to the HF
> bands. Similarly, 69% are in favour of modifying the Basic exam,
> presumably to increase its relevance to operating on HF. For those of
> you south of the border, the numbers are quite interesting, and may
> give you some insight into the statistics you might find within the US
> Amateur community. I was surprised, for example, at the percentage of
> Advanced with Morse (our 'Extra') licence holders who are in favour of
> dropping it - 52% - and we're the guys who 'paid the dues' and made it
> to the top rung of both theoretical and Morse capability!
>
> The same process was used to review reducing the Morse requirement
> from 13 WPM to 5 WPM a couple of years ago - Industry Canada went
> along with the recommendation the Amateur community (via RAC) - it is
> anticipated that they will in all likelyhood do so again, as this is
> obviously the will of the majority. Not all of us, not by a long
> shot - but clearly, the majority!
>
> In short, it certainly looks like it is only a matter of time before
> Canada drops the Morse requirement for HF. But we may have an
> opportunity to raise the skill level of those who enter Amateur Radio
> through more relevant (and maybe more rigorous) testing.
>
> To close with a quote from a famous Canadian, Marshall McLuhan (the
> media visionary and professor who conceptualized the "Global Village"
> and the impact of high-speed communications way back in the '60s):
>
> "The past went that-a-way. When faced with a totally new situation, we

> tend always to attach ourselves to the objects, to the flavor of the
> most recent past. We look at the present through a rear view mirror.
> We march backwards into the future."
>
> We sure do.
>
> 73, Leo

Yes, Leo, you'r also the country which allows all comers to enter as immigrants, with no ID or any proof of who they are or what they plan to do. All in the name of "inclusivity" or some such nonsense. Come one, come all.

Terrorist? Who cares?

You'r marching backward into the future, all right.

Good luck.

4513. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 05:35:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkgovf$tf3$1@208.206.142.97>
Source record: 77827

Dave Heil wrote:

> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F6A7827.21D14BF4@earthlink.net>...
> > > Clint wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > DICK, what was past is past.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > My grandfather (God rest his soul, he passed away
> > > > 7 years ago) lived to the ripe old age of 87. Every now
> > > > and then he'd get really drunk on vodka, and then go
> > > > into a past-recalling delirium where he'd keep talking
> > > > about the need to have a horse and buggy give you a
> > > > ride if you wanted to make it back into his neck of
> > > > the woods all the way from the main road.
> > > >
> > > > The next morning he'd sober up and find himself back
> > > > in the modern day era. The horse and buggy were long
> > > > gone.
> > >
> > > I always love a tale which attempts to impart a message. In this one,
> > > we learned that your grandad was a drunk.
>
> >
> > And that many a PCTA behave as if they were.
>
> Not so, Farnsworth. There is nothing about a PCTA in the tale anywhere.
> You continue to do your reading between the lines.
>
> Dave K8MN

Dave, he's way past that. Now he's writing between the lines.

4514. NCNCI - Was Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 08:54:54 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <yBUab.22$uh1.0@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77829

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030920012038.21457.00000705@mb-m10.aol.com...
> In article <CaAab.163$Oy7.153@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
> <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:
>
> >> It's really shocking how people can start an argument over nothing
> >> which can escalate to vicious strings of insults complete with
> >> profanity, sexual references and terms such as "CBplusser" and
> >> "Knuckle-Dragger".
> > >
> > >Worst of all is how almost everything degenerates into a code/nocode
debate,
> > >sooner or later.
> > >
> > >Utterly disgusting!
> > >
> > >Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> >
> > Charles:
> >
> > I'm sure you've been told this before, but here goes...
> >
> > This newsgroup exists specifically for the code/no-code debate, and
> > other amateur radio policy issues. It's purpose is to isolate this
> > particularly contentious debate and permit other newsgroups to be
> > able to address more specific technical and operational issues.

Yes, we all know how this discussion was "run off" from another place, where
the hams found it to be pointless, ignorant and disgusting... Just like it
is here.

I like hearing the story about the code/no-code discussion was chased off to
a lesser venue, and believe it is 'way past time for this to happen again.

> Your whining about the nature of this newsgroup is, in fact, quite
> off-topic, and a violation of Usenet policy.

Gee, that's tough....

>If you cannot grasp the
> nature of this newsgroup and abide with Usenet policy by accepting
> rrap for what it was specifically intended to be, then I suggest your
> time would be better spent elsewhere.

I'm sure it would, but since I don't have anything better to do, I'll point
out how silly and counterproductive the behavior on this newsgroup is, from

time to time.

Everybody already knows how ignorant the code/no-code debate is, but I'll go ahead and point that out every now and then, as well.

Anybody else want to join NCNCI ? (No Code/No-Code International, of course!)

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

4515. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 11:02:04 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkhc3b$1pg57$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77830

"Clint" wrote ...

AH! we've finally gotten to the personal character attacks. You must have already conceded defeat. That's the only thing one can conclude when the ideas and facts stop flowing and the insults start flying.

Don't flatter yourself, Clint. The comment was directed to Len. You, OTOH, haven't responded to the comment except for making some superfluous remark about defeat where there is none. In doing so, you make my point for me.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4516. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 11:09:59 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkhci7$1qkvb$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77831

"Clint" wrote ...

um, yea..... you see, the tactic I emplyed is called reductio ad absurdum.... that is, demonstrating absurdity by being absurd. sorry you didn't "get it"

No, we get it alright. Your arguments are absurd. Thanks for the self-verification.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4517. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 11:11:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309200311.7d6599c8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77832

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:<vmn8us4ls3q565@corp.supernews.com>...
> >
> > And that many a PCTA behave as if they were.
>
> BINGO!
> along with people who live in the past.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT

They just don't get it. They don't get much at all.

4518. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 11:21:46 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309200321.3d1bbd20@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77833

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bk6493$es4$0@208.207.71.177>...
> Well, Brainiac, here it is, straight from the horses a....er. .....mouth-
>
> Keith sed...
> On 16 Sep 2003 02:46:25 GMT,
> Alun Palmer in <Xns93F7E7865C43Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4> wrote:
> > EI is the 7th country to abolish code testing by my reckoning
>
> >> Don't fret Alun, by the time the USA approves of no
> >>more morse code testing the bands will be destroyed
> >>by BPL. You can quote me on that.
>
>
> So I guess you guys will get your code free bands just in time.
> Gee, things have a way of evening out.......for decades you "wouldn't",
> now you "couldn't"...Poor baby!

DICK, I've always been a coded ham. You're statements do noting but
reveal your dementia.

4519. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 11:37:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309200337.360b9a3b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77834

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bke6dj$pm7$0@208.206.142.96>...
> Greg Courville wrote:
>
> > I've been a ham for only a month now, and been using these groups for
> > about 6 weeks.
> > I really can't stand some of the things that go on here.
> > Has anybody ever noticed that 8 out of 10 threads on this group (and
> > many other amateur radio groups) end in a flame war?
> > It's really shocking how people can start an argument over nothing
> > which can escalate to vicious strings of insults complete with
> > profanity, sexual references and terms such as "CBplusser" and
> > "Knuckle-Dragger".
>
> Greg if you want to see how all this began just spend some time in Google
> and you canget an educaion. It sure didn't start by old timers belittling
> newcomers. In fact it was and IS the exact reverse. Not all newcomers, by
> any means, just those on this board who decided to do it, and persist to
> this day.
>
DICK would like to present himself as a "reasonable" ham. DICK is
primary in this newgroup for inciting namecalling, preferring to call
names rather than have a legitimate discussion. See -every- post he's
made in the last week.

Don't believe DICK.
>
> > It's just unbelievable to me that while all of the
> > books talk about how wonderful and helpful hams are, a significant
> > number of them spend their time cutting each other down over random
> > issues. I see "newbies" come to these boards for help, and get cut
> > down by inconsiderate jerks who just feel like making people feel
> > stupid.
>
> You're making assumptions here that shouldn't, indeed can't, be made.

Assumptions can always be made. That's what makes them assumptions.

> The jerks who show up her complaining about the code test requrement and
> blaming all us who just did it, without complaining.

And? Finish the thought.

That in so doing
> learned that Morse code does indeed add substantially to ham radio, to the
> point that we believe code testing has a permanent place in ham radio, is
> just so much nonsense to them. They already know all about it.

>
Yet there are those of us who don't believe as you do. We are
constantly attacked.
>
> > How many hams didn't start out with a lower-level license?
> > People need to stop beating up on us poor no-coders.
>
> Come into ham radio with a proper attitude (note I didn't say THE proper
> attitude) and you'll be received just as well as anyone ever was.
>
THE proper attitude is what he meant, though. Otherwise enter at your
own risk.
>
> > Don't they
> > realize that the new people look up to the old-timers?
>
> You REALLY must have not been reading here very closely at all, Greg.
> Were that the case *here* you wouldn't have a report to make.
>
His words are valid. Initially, newcomers do look up to the
old-timers. Till the moment the old-timers start pushing "No CW=No
Ham" ideology.
>
> > I must say that
> > after reading books about how hams help people all over the world and
> > are generally just a wonderful bunch, these groups have really changed
> > my view of the amateur radio community.
>
> Don't feel lonesome.
> It sure changed my view of ham radio, too. I showed up here several years
> ago to engage in civil, sincere discourse on the merits of code testing,
> and was immediately set upon by the code haters for my views. It's been
> all downhill from there.
>
DICK was instrumental in the downhill part. And he's been here more
than just "several years." He's working on his 1st decade of bile.
>
> > I don't doubt that even this
> > thread will end in a violent exchange of profanities and become just
> > another flame war.
> >
>
> Once again, you will get the treatment you deserve here, at least from me.
>
> So far you're doing OK, I don't blame you for your concern. But I suggest
> you might benefit from a bit more knowledge of the background of what has
> happened here.

Absolutely.

Brian

4520. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 11:40:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309200340.4cea8bf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77835

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030920012037.21457.00000703@mb-m10.aol.com>...
> In article <vmnakb54rcls82@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
> <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>
> >
> > It sure didn't start by old timers belittling
> >> newcomers. In fact it was and IS the exact reverse.
> >
> >...yea, but what if he says he doesn't like CW testing....
> >then, in what method will you choose- burning him
> >in oil or decapitation?
> >
> >Clint
> >KB5ZHT
>
> Clint:
>
> I've got something worse in mind for the NCTA's -- a date with Kim!
> And for Kim, it would be a date with you!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Forever thinking of Kim, aren't you?

4521. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 11:46:51 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309200346.3984ccb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77836

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<pcMab.39727$NM1.31110@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309191401.545ca4e7@posting.google.com...
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:<bke0tqfkl1@208.206.142.83>...
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > > In article <IDVNFYDX37881.3498263889@bog.lir.dk>, Franz Weigel
> > > > <anon@bog.lir.dk> writes:
> > > >
> > > > >The last CW coder who died was sentenced
> > > > >to Hell for eternity in order to transmit
> > > > >6 Megapixels 24-bit color pictures in CW.
> > > > >
> > > > >God bless you from CW !
> > > >
> > > > Gee - who was it said they were only against the TEST?
> > >
> > > The truth usually manages to slip out.
> >
> > Tell me about it. Using CW won't get anyone sentenced to hell. Lying
> > about how it always gets thru will.
> >
> > CW gets thru when everything else will.
>
> Keep it up Brian, your record is perfect. What record you ask? 100
> percent wrong, all the time.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

So, using CW WILL get someone sentenced to hell?

And, CW DOESN'T get thru when everything else will?

100% wrong, huh? All the time, huh?

You're starting to sound like your gud buddy Bruice.

73, Brian

4522. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 11:50:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309200350.7033203b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77837

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bkgmjv$9nm$0@208.207.71.166>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bke0tqfkl1@208.206.142.83>...
> > > N2EY wrote:
> > >
> > > > In article <IDVNFYDX37881.3498263889@bog.lir.dk>, Franz Weigel
> > > > <anon@bog.lir.dk> writes:
> > > >
> > > > >The last CW coder who died was sentenced
> > > > >to Hell for eternity in order to transmit
> > > > >6 Megapixels 24-bit color pictures in CW.
> > > > >
> > > > >God bless you from CW !
> > > >
> > > > Gee - who was it said they were only against the TEST?
> > >
> > > The truth usually manages to slip out.
> >
> > Tell me about it. Using CW won't get anyone sentenced to hell. Lying
> > about how it always gets thru will.
>
> Then you'd be wise to stop saying it, woiuldn't you?

I think some of you need a reminder.

4523. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 12:00:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309200400.1c165115@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77838

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bkfq3dian0@208.206.142.86>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bke2fk$j05$0@208.206.142.74>...
> > > Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
> > >
> > > > In article <20030918175652.07346.00000687@mb-m26.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> > > > (Len Over 21) writes:
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > A half century ago I felt right at home working primary communications
> > > > > on Army radio station ADA. Not only feeling that but BEING AT HOME
> > > > > at the new site of Camp Tomlinson...barracks at one corner of the huge
> > > > > antenna field. ADA never used "CW" (on-off keying), trans-Pacific or
> > > > > local.
> > > > >
> > > > > DICK, you've NEVER done that in the US Army, have you?
> > > > >
> > > > > All you can do is demand that EVERYONE HAD TO DO IT LIKE YOU
> > > > > DID but you can never offer any viable proof why they should.
> > > > >
> > > > > LHA
> > > >
> > > > Lennie:
> > > >
> > > > Your half-century old experiences in military communications, where, by
> > > > your own admission, you never utilized the Morse/CW mode, are irrelevant
> > > > to the discussion of Morse code testing requirements within the AMATEUR
> > > > Radio Service in 2003. In fact, as a person who does not use the Morse
> > > > code for any reason whatsoever, you are self-disqualified from rendering
> > > > any judgment on the topic whatsoever. Therefore, I suggest that you
> > > > stop wasting your time, find something you know something about (which
> > > > from my personal observation seems to be limited to megalomaniacal,
> > > > ego-driven character assassination) and talk about that, instead. You
> > > > are not influencing anyone on the topic of code testing.
> > > >
> > > > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >
> > > Well, Well...Lennie is still touting his BC610 babysitting experience as
> > > being (= / >) ham radio, hmm??
> > >
> > > While he was sitting around twiddling his
> > > thumbs and waiting for a breaker to trip so he'd have something to do, I was

> > > busily involved in operating AND REPAIRING one of the very first video tape
> > > systems in the country, among many other very interesting work activities at
> > > the Signal School at Fort Monmouth.
> > > You see, instead of sending me to an obscure, remote MINOR outpost about as far
> > > away as it's possible to be sent,
> >
> > And just the other day you were bragging about how you had a field job
> > with the troopers.
> >
>
> ??? I did? Sure don't recall any such remark. I think you're (STILL) confused.

No, not at all. But if you want to disavow your work in Missouri,
then so be it.

> > when I finished electronics training, the
> > > Signal School kept me there as permanent party, to work as a broadcast
> > > engineer at the educational TV station ran by the school. A most interesting
> > > and challenging assignment, indeed.
> >
> > Indeed. Typical duty given to sycophant students.
>
> Hmmm.. well I *did* graduate within a fraction of a point of the top score in the class,
> though that score wan't mine. It went to a fella who had already completed over half of a
> college EE program. Instructors do like to see their students do well. If that makes me a
> "synchophant", whatever you think that is, guess all I can do is agree.

I agree as well.

> > I would have been completely happy to have
> > > stayed there for the remainder of my term of service, but my name came up for an
> > > overseas tour of duty rotation, so off to Europe I went after a year and a half.
> >
> > I thought you were sending CW as the ChiComs were overrunning your
> > position?
> >
>
> Brian, we already told you- think is dangerous to your mental health. Evidently it overly
> strains your faculties.

So you served in no combat role?

> >
> > > I sure do feel for poor ol' Lennie, tho, he must have had a rough go of it 'way
> > > out there in the JA boondocks with nothing to do but listen to the transformers
> > > hum and wait for another overload. And I hear those BC610's didn't overload all
> > > that often, either. Tsk, tsk.
> >
> > Yet all that message traffic was sent w/o touching a Morse key.
>
> But not by Lennie! The operating wasn't done at the transmitter site. He sat and watched.
> Just like he -and you- are doing here.

Again you show your ignorance of at least weather comms. I formatted and originated all of my own message traffic. Cut the tapes, and sent it down the line. Letters, figures, ding, ding.

Beats drilling 7/8" holes in the rooftops of police cruisers.

4524. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 12:05:54 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309200405.2fefccb8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77839

Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:<3F6BCF2E.57F37149@earthlink.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> >
> > Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<3F68DD97.6E3D3730@earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > > Wow! That's quite a policy statement from a country with a little more
> > > than 120 radio amateurs and it comes hot on the heels of the big move by
> > > Ireland with its slightly more than 1,500 hams.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN
> >
> > Wow! You've stated that you've operated from countries where you were
> > the only active amateur.
>
> I don't recall making a statement about attempting to influence a
> foreign country's policy on amateur radio.

I don't recall saying that.

> > Somehow that was significant then, but 120 or 1,500 native amateurs
> > aren't?
>
> Yes, it is significant that a country has only one radio amateur.

In what way?

> No, I made no comparison to my being in a unique situation and a country
> having a small population of radio amateurs deciding to abolish morse
> testing.

But these countries which have a native population of amateurs should
be allowed self-rule? Why are 120 or 1,500 native amateurs not
significant?

> > There's that famous Heil smugness again.
>
> Not really, my little electrolyte. It is simply you attempting once
> again to tie two unrelated events together.

And you attempting to discount countries with low native amateur
populations.

4525. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 12:08:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <KqXab.1057$Hd6.823267@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77840

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vmn8j86dqrq6f6@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > It's easy if one puts in the time to learn. The discipline comes in
> > allocating the time and using it correctly. If one stops prematurely,
> they
> > fail. If one uses the time ineffectively, they fail.
>
> great! then those who want to use CW should allocate the time and use
> it correctly to learn the discipline of CW.
>
> Those who have no use for it and don't plan in it, shouldn't have it
shoved
> down thier throats.
>
> NEXT?!?!?!?!
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT

Please note that my reply, in this case, was not an argument either for or against keeping the CW testing. It was simply a comment on learning. Therefore your response is irrelevant to this particular comment. If you wish to debate effectively, responses need to be related to the statement.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4526. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 12:29:59 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkhi8j$nna@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 77841

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bke6n7$q45$0@208.206.142.96...
>
>
> JJ wrote:
>
> > Some claimed there is no such thing as a 1/4 wave
> > dipole, I simply stated there is, I never made any claims it would be a
good
> > antenna.
>
> Ok. Since it was me who said there is no such thing as a 1/4 wave dipole,
I'll
> modify my statement to read "There is no such thing as a 1/4 wave dipole
other
> than at the station of a clueless ham who knows no better".
>
> That should take care of it.
>

JJ:

I just read the posts in this thread. It's pretty comical. These folks are
just plain desperate...not even worth the strokes of your fingers...

Kim W5TIT

4527. Mopedophile yammering some more

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 12:51:51 UTC
From: auctionratter@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <b19589b2.0309200451.1cfc4005@posting.google.com>
Source record: 77842
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

We know why you are looking for N8, too...don't we stevieclown? You
can't fool us, sissielipz.

I think you ought to go there. When your slilly ass gets shown up for
the gutless punk it is, AGAIN, we can all laugh at you some more.

Now get yourself to the new Oldsmar truckstop and perform your primary
function, you ingester of gonadotrophic hormones,you. Your Masters,
the AKC, command you.

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote in message
news:<20030919194948.501$zt@newsreader.com>...
> twistyisaliar@yahoo.com (George Is Innocent) wrote:
> > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > news:20030919184049.995$g2@newsreader.com...
> > > auctionratter@yahoo.com (Auctions croak here) wrote:
> > > >> Special aside to Mopedholic...when you finish up in Oldsmar get your
> > > > tuffet up to see tra1npuppet...he is cwying and needs some sisterly
> > > > love.
> > > >
> > > I can be in Toledo in two hours.
> >
> > Why go to the trouble? After you find there are no gay men there
> > willing to have sex with you'll just have to turn around and drive 2
> > hrs back home again.
> >
> I'm only looking for one particular fag, he answers to N8WWM. Thanks
> for your concern.

4528. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 12:52:17 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkhif5$2l0@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 77843

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:0OKdnY7bP6DrqfaiU-KYgw@gbronline.com...
>
> Mike Coslo wrote in message <3F6B2D8E.20106@adelphia.net>...
> >
> > All dipoles are 1/4 wave at some frequency. You just wouldn't want to
> >use them.
>
> Thanks for proving my point, I never made ANY claims on the performance of
a
> 1/4 wave dipole. Some said there was no such thing, I simply stated there
> is. So you admit the same I stated earlier in the thread, any dipole is a
> quarter wave at some frequency.
>
>

Ummmmmm, I think they are pretty confused about the issue, JJ. Let 'em be.
;)

Kim W5TIT

4529. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 12:53:46 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkhihu$n44@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 77844

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:P8ecnZp8FcEUqPaiXTWJig@gbronline.com...
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote in message ...
> >"WA8ULX" wrote:
> >>
> >> Big difference, you know nothing about the subject matter,
> >> your Licenses is nothing more than a FREE WELFARE
> >> HANDOUT, that is given out to the MIND Challenged
> >> people.
> > >
> > >
> > > So, according to you, every single American who receives a ham license
> > >from this day forward is actually receiving a welfare handout because he
or
> > >she is mind challenged? Hardly, Bruce. The only mind challenged people
> > >around here are those with views similar to yours.
> > >
> >
> > You have to have a mind to be mind challenged, that leaves brucie out.
> >
> >

ROFLMAO!!!!!!!!!!!!!! These guys would actually try to answer the
question: So, what is the best antenna?

Kim W5TIT

4530. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 13:02:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6C5031.2060201@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77845

Robert wrote:
> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> news:vmn8g8n1kn4a7c@corp.supernews.com...
>
>>> The scary bit is if you keep applying logic to this argument, it
>>>just keeps getting wierder.
>>
>>no, you just keep getting angrier because the modern-world hams
>>in here and elsewhere refute your (non)logic and continue to work
>>toward eliminating CW testing
>
>
> Uhm, we're on the same side on that matter. I was pointing out how
> the PCTA argument devolves.

I thought NCTA's were the nice guys in this discussion.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4531. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 13:05:04 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6C50D0.4000203@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77846

Arnie Macy wrote:
> "Clint" wrote ...
>
> AH! we've finally gotten to the personal character attacks. You must have
> already conceded defeat. That's the only thing one can conclude when the
> ideas and facts stop flowing and the insults start flying.
> ----------
>
> Don't flatter yourself, Clint. The comment was directed to Len. You, OTOH,
> haven't responded to the comment except for making some superfluous remark
> about defeat where there is none. In doing so, you make my point for me.

Hey, Arnie! If "personal character attacks are an admission of defeat,
why don't you ask Clint about calling us N***'s? He must really be
admitting defeat if he both calls us that *and* invokes Godwin's law.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4532. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 13:07:30 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkhjbm$78u@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 77847

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309200321.3d1bbd20@posting.google.com...
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bk6493$es4$0@208.207.71.177>...
> > Well, Brainiac, here it is, straight from the horses a....er.
.....mouth-
> >
> > Keith sed...
> > On 16 Sep 2003 02:46:25 GMT,
> > Alun Palmer in <Xns93F7E7865C43Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4> wrote:
> > > EI is the 7th country to abolish code testing by my reckoning
> >
> > >> Don't fret Alun, by the time the USA approves of no
> > >>more morse code testing the bands will be destroyed
> > >>by BPL. You can quote me on that.
> >
> >
> > So I guess you guys will get your code free bands just in time.
> > Gee, things have a way of evening out.......for decades you "wouldn't",
> > now you "couldn't"...Poor baby!
>
> DICK, I've always been a coded ham. You're statements do noting but
> reveal your dementia.

Someone sent me an email and said the Waddles, while spouting off something
about dumbness, in the same sentence said that I was one of those
dumbed-down GENERALS!!!!

Dementia, hell, these guys need their medication!

Kim W5TIT

4533. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 13:13:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6C52B8.4010105@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77848

Brian wrote:
> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bke6dj$pm7$0@208.206.142.96>...
>
>>Greg Courville wrote:
>>
>>
>>>I've been a ham for only a month now, and been using these groups for
>>>about 6 weeks.
>>>I really can't stand some of the things that go on here.
>>>Has anybody ever noticed that 8 out of 10 threads on this group (and
>>>many other amateur radio groups) end in a flame war?
>>>It's really shocking how people can start an argument over nothing
>>>which can escalate to vicious strings of insults complete with
>>>profanity, sexual references and terms such as "CBplusser" and
>>>"Knuckle-Dragger".
>>
>>Greg if you want to see how all this began just spend some time in Google
>>and you canget an educaion. It sure didn't start by old timers belittling
>>newcomers. In fact it was and IS the exact reverse. Not all newcomers, by
>>any means, just those on this board who decided to do it, and persist to
>>this day.
>>
>
> DICK would like to present himself as a "reasonable" ham. DICK is
> primary in this newgroup for inciting namecalling, preferring to call
> names rather than have a legitimate discussion. See -every- post he's
> made in the last week.

Strange, Brian. I am a nickle extra, and am not very good at CW, and I
get along just fine with Dick.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4534. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 13:25:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <BzYab.42466$NM1.36106@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77849

"WA8ULX" wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> So, according to you, every single American who
>> receives a ham license from this day forward is
>> actually receiving a welfare handout because he or
> > she is mind challenged?
>
> CORRECT

You still need to work on reading comprehension, Bruce. By that response, you either never intend to receive a ham license again or are admitting to being mind challenged. Read it again and think about it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4535. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 13:30:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6C56A9.4060406@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77850

Leo wrote:
> Good points, Mike - my comments are below:
>
>
>> Well if you raise the skill level, it will just keep people out of Ham
>>radio. That has been one of the reasons cited for getting rid of the
>>code test. It won't do just to increase the entrance requirements, which
>>will partially defeat the purpose.
>
>
> There are advantages to having more people in Amateur Radio - not the
> least of which are more voices to oppose things like BPL. And, less
> unused bandwidth, which could be taken away and reassigned to
> commercial iterests if we don't utilize it.
>
> On the other hand, bringing in large numbers of less-skilled operators
> defeats the purpose of Amateur Radio, which I recall was to develop a
> pool of skilled radio operators.

Yup. Keep in mind I'm playing devil's advocate a bit here Leo - but with a bite. The arguments that can be used against testing are good ones.

I'm a firm believer in a well educated ARS. I think we have to work on and decide just how much rf savvy the average ham has. I like to be surrounded by people who are both knowledgeable and those who are eager to learn. Just like on my hockey team, where I recruit both decent athletes and those who are working hard at becoming good hockey players.

I like being around savvy and hard working people. I think it improves the situation.

> The concept of modifying the test is a middle ground - by adding
> questions on actual practical HF operation, for example, we would
> ensure that new amateurs could go and set up and operate their station
> without undue interference to others. A good thing, I believe, and
> one that would raise the level of 'professionalism' amongst the novice
> Amateur operators.

Yes indeed. I really hope that the new people coming into the ARS are accepting of the occasional reminder of being out-of-band, or splatter or all the other things that are often deficient in newcomers. I thank goodness that there were people to correct me when I needed it.

>>Perhaps being knowledgeable about RF matters is also in the past, Leo. A
>>person can pick up a rig, a linear and an antenna without knowing
>>anything about RF electronics. He/she can pay someone to put it up, and

>>can be talking in no time. Given this, why should there be any
>>requirements at all?
>
>
> There are legions of operators out there today who operate 'point and
> shoot' equipment - the level of technical knowledge and ability has
> most certainly deteriorated as a result. Not many construct their own
> equipment any more, not even antennas. But, the price of admission to
> the Amateur ranks is testing of theoretical knowledge - this keeps
> those who are unwilling of making the commitment from oprating
> (legally) on our frequencies. As it always has been, and should be.
> Without this, we would become a variant of CB.

Yup, and that is my major point, even if I'm arguing it as devils advocate. We are at a crossroads now. The removal of Morse Code if it happens (and no doubt in my mind it will) is one of the major changes in amateur radio to come along in a while. I want a savvy ARS, but if we don't watch it, we can end up with relative anarchy.

Good posting Leo.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4536. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 13:34:30 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <GHYab.42488$NM1.15906@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77951

"Brian" wrote:
> wa8ulx@aol.com wrote:
>>> So, according to you, every single American who
>>> receives a ham license from this day forward is
>>> actually receiving a welfare handout because he or
>>> she is mind challenged?
>>
>> CORRECT
>
> Thus, Bruce is mind challenged.
>
> He could have answered the fifth, but he doesn't know
> the article of the constitution regarding self-incrimination.

LOL. I wonder what he will say about this when he has to get a new license
after the current one expires.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4537. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 13:43:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <VPYab.42508$NM1.24804@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77952

"Brian Kelly" wrote:
>
> 'Scuse me but the this newsgroup is a direct spin-off
> from another group (dot misc?) some number of years
> ago *specifically* as the place to go for debating the
> code test issue. (snip)

Where did you find that information? I've seen no mention of it anywhere
else.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4538. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 13:57:24 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmon6cq7qbmoda@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77953

>
> So be it then. This issue is about
> a CW test requirement anyway...not whether you want to use
> CW in your local area for emergency comms.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK
>
>

EXATCLY. The problem is that the PCTA crowd refuses to
split the two issues; they are attempting to force it to a "ALL
CW OR NOTHING" debate, and it's not so.

I use cw; my first several QSL cards were from CW contacts.
I enjoy it from time to time. I never said it should never be
used or done away with.

I have only said that testing one's skill at it no longer necessary.

Clint
KB5ZHT
>

4539. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 13:59:35 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmonaflq4rh635@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77954

actually, it was my tale and he correctly read
between the lines; he knew EXACTLY what
I was meaning to say.

Clint
KB5ZHT

>
> Not so, Farnsworth. There is nothing about a PCTA in the tale anywhere.
> You continue to do your reading between the lines.
>
> Dave K8MN

4540. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:00:32 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmonc8lddr8856@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77955

nope, he didn't.
that was what I was drawing an analogy to... that, and PCTA'ers
living in the past.

Clint
KB5ZHT.

>
> Dave, he's way past that. Now he's writing between the lines.
>

4541. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:01:19 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmondnh31cd778@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77956

>
> I thought NCTA's were the nice guys in this discussion.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

you better take that back!
just kidding...

Clint
KB5ZHT

4542. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:03:00 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmongs27ok1ic2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77957

OH, I doubt that very seriously.
You made that comment free of slant in either direction? in a
discussion of pro/con referring to CW testing, and you're placing
a post saying "oh, it's so easy, just take the time and do it",
and it's suppose to be "free of spin"?

please sell me some ocean front property in kansas while
you're at it.

Clint
KB5ZHT

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:KqXab.1057$Hd6.823267@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...

>
> Please note that my reply, in this case, was not an argument either for or
> against keeping the CW testing. It was simply a comment on learning.
> Therefore your response is irrelevant to this particular comment. If you
> wish to debate effectively, responses need to be related to the statement.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

4543. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:04:26 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmonjhrt1s1q06@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77958

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bkhc3b$1pg57$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Clint" wrote ...
>
> AH! we've finally gotten to the personal character attacks. You must
have
> already conceded defeat. That's the only thing one can conclude when the
> ideas and facts stop flowing and the insults start flying.
> ----------
>
> Don't flatter yourself, Clint. The comment was directed to Len. You,
OTOH,
> haven't responded to the comment except for making some superfluous remark
> about defeat where there is none. In doing so, you make my point for me.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
>

don't flatter YOURSELF, arnie... I made that comment without personal
reference
to myself.. it was merely the fact that you have switched to a personal
attack that
I was drawing attention to. Heh, nice try though.

And, that is where you scored NO points.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

Facts are to socialists what crosses are to vampires

--

4544. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:05:35 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmonlnjh2a3340@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77959

> Hey, Arnie! If "personal character attacks are an admission of defeat,
> why don't you ask Clint about calling us N***'s? He must really be
> admitting defeat if he both calls us that *and* invokes Godwin's law.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

and just fill in the blanks as to what a N*** is, and we'll see if
I was guilty of calling you an inflammatory and insulting name.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4545. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:06:44 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmonnsl0t2574@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77960

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bkhci7$1qkvb$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...

>
> No, we get it alright.

well, obviously you did not.

Your arguments are absurd.

that IS what "reductio ad absurdum" is.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4546. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:06:52 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <0aZab.42555$NM1.33021@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77961

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> You just locked, loaded, took careful aim, and shot
> yourself in the foot! If you had ANY experience with
> Morse/CW at all, you'd realize that the mode which
> is in "decline" lately on HF is SSB -- due to poor
> operating conditions. The CW segments continue to
> jump with activity. (snip)

So you're saying code use "in this country" is jumping with activity? If so, where? I've looked in the commercial bands, shortwave broadcast bands, military bands, and so on, and found very little code use (certainly far less than just a few decades ago, just as I said).

> I'm gonna give you some free advice here, Dwight.
> (snip) You're out of your depth when discussing code
> testing, so I would suggest, for the sake of your own
> credibility, that you chose a topic you know something
> about.

Now, let me give you some advice, Larry. You're too narrow-minded to even understand the concepts behind code testing. Code testing is not, and has never been, solely to benefit Amateur Radio. Therefore, you can't focus solely on Amateur Radio when discussing the code testing issue. So, for the sake of your own credibility on this subject, look outside your own narrowly defined little world at the much larger picture elsewhere (the view from the FCC's perspective). Only then will you be aware enough to seriously discuss this issue.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4547. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:09:47 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmontimic1tk01@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77962

>
> I've got something worse in mind for the NCTA's -- a date with Kim!
> And for Kim, it would be a date with you!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

why, i've never even met Kim....

Clint
KB5ZHT

4548. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:10:07 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmonu6sp8srd12@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77963

>
> Forever thinking of Kim, aren't you?

does he have tit on the brain?

Clint
KB5ZHT

4549. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:14:27 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmoo6aocnj11df@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77964

> And your posts are different because?
>

because i'm not trying to force something on people
who don't want it forced on them- the very definition
of an oppressive doctrine or ruling body.

I am advocating a more free, open end to the hobby
leaving more self-choice to couple with the self
training and self improvement.

"Doo az vee zay, or yu vill proov dat yu are
inverior!"

Clint
KB5ZHT

4550. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:15:06 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmoo7i26j2tife@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77965

Does this mean the PCTA are more like Colonel Clink, or
Sargeant Schultz?

Clint

--

--

A quote from Paul Cook, a typical "understanding
and tolerant" liberal...

">People like you really have no place in a civilized society although that
>same society does try to accommodate you. You're basically an idiot who
>takes advantage of what a society has to offer each and every single day
yet
>you refuse to acknowledge its cost or its benefits to you. "

Facts are to socialists what crosses are to vampires

--
"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:H_Oab.295774$2x.85373@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in news:vmnaife87u3a24
> @corp.supernews.com:
>
> > just don't EVER speak your mind when it comes to
> > morse code testing, unless it's to the effect that you
> > LOVE it and couldn't live without it.
> >
> > You have to put on the jackboots of the CW police
> > and march in goosestep with the CW nazis, or
> > you'll get bashed a good one with a morse code
> > key.
> >
> > Clint
> > KB5ZHT
>
>
> Hey! Stand up and salute when you say that...
>
> Then shine my boots!
>
>
> KB7ADL
>

>

4551. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:18:18 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmoodi9qnalo8d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77966
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
> > Has anybody ever noticed that 8 out of 10 threads on this group (and
> > many other amateur radio groups) end in a flame war?

such is true with many newsgroups.. there are many more people lurking
and reading than posting, but when a post is made that incites the passion
in somebody to say something, they are quick to do it....

It's just unbelievable to me that while all of the
> > books talk about how wonderful and helpful hams are,

and they ARE for the most part... but what you're dealing with here
is a small portion, a minority of them that isn't really representative
of the whole. NG's are famous for having people with a chip on
thier shoulders to use as a pulpit for thier beliefs, since most other
forms of doing so have limits to what you can do or say.

>
> You can thank R. Hollingsworth for all of the above goings on.
>

no, you can thank a free an open society for still allowing debate.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4552. Re: NCNCI - Was Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:20:56 UTC
From: Clint <rattlehead@computronDOTnet>
Message-ID: <vmooigs9sqa7f9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77967

> I like hearing the story about the code/no-code discussion was chased off
to
> a lesser venue, and believe it is 'way past time for this to happen again.
>

going to be hard to chase it off, better yet, if it annoys you that bad,
just
start kilfilling anything have "CW", "NCI", "PCTA", "NCTA", etc in
the subject lines.

Clint
KB5ZHT

> > Your whining about the nature of this newsgroup is, in fact, quite
> > off-topic, and a violation of Usenet policy.

it's a ham radio newsgroup, so I don't think CW is off topic.... and debate
isn't a violation of usenet policy (that's HALF of what it's for), what's a
violation
I believe is inflammatory, abusive behavior.

And there's little chance that will ever stop on ANY ng.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4553. Re: Mopedophile yammering some more (on the Lib Net?)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:36:11 UTC
From: maxipads vendingmachine <wwwwwwww@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1064069108.151525@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 77968
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Or we can just listen to him check into the
Liberty Net tonight from "near --------
Ohio and bellyache along with the rest of
the Saturday nite malcontents and misfits. :)

And now for a prediction:

I predict that W9FAM will eventually replace
W1WCR as the LN NCS. He has an excellent
ability to pontificate about his past broadcast
days and all the world leaders he's alleged to
have met. Hogs the microphone and yammers on and
on, which is good, as since he's an ex-mainstream
broadcaster which no doubt drives the Liberty
Net regulars nuts. (it's always good to have an
embedded ringer eh?) His effect on the net regulars
is almost as good as a skunk in a circus tent.
Seems most of the regulars only check in long after
FAM's gone to another freq. or shut down for
the night. You can almost *feel* the frustration
from the usual bunch of paranoid fools reaching
the boiling point....even better than when the
nutcase from Sarasota would check in and
blabber and play tapes for a 1/2 hour stretch!
We just f-n love it - teee hee hee hee hee heee!!

---------------x----v---i---i---x------------

Deep-13 & Electro Slack Treatment
by Lamprey Systems (Music that rocks!)

"Auctions croak here" <auctionratter@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:b19589b2.0309200451.1cfc4005@posting.google.com...
> We know why you are looking for N8, too...don't we stevieclown? You
> can't fool us, sissielipz.
>
> I think you ought to go there. When your slilly ass gets shown up for
> the gutless punk it is, AGAIN, we can all laugh at you some more.
>
> Now get yourself to the new Oldsmar truckstop and perform your primary
> function, you ingester of gonadotrophic hormones,you. Your Masters,
> the AKC, command you.
>
>
>

> Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote in message
news:<20030919194948.501$zt@newsreader.com>...
> > twistyisaliar@yahoo.com (George Is Innocent) wrote:
> > > <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > > news:20030919184049.995$g2@newsreader.com...
> > > > auctionratter@yahoo.com (Auctions croak here) wrote:
> > > > >> Special aside to Mopedholic...when you finish up in Oldsmar get
your
> > > > > tuffet up to see tra1npuppet...he is cwying and needs some
sisterly
> > > > > love.
> > > > >
> > > > I can be in Toledo in two hours.
> > >
> > > Why go to the trouble? After you find there are no gay men there
> > > willing to have sex with you'll just have to turn around and drive 2
> > > hrs back home again.
> > >
> > I'm only looking for one particular fag, he answers to N8WWM. Thanks
> > for your concern.

4554. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:39:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920103944.28589.00001927@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 77969

> LOL. I wonder what he will say about this when he has to get a new license
>after the current one expires.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Well thats easy, I will just be renewing an existing License, BIG difference
from the New Welfare Licenses.

4555. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:48:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <6NZab.42630$NM1.17664@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77970

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> How many CW contacts have you made in your
> ham "career?" I'm into the multiple thousands. If
> you have less than 500, then you're not even close
> to being qualified to render a judgment against
> code testing.

And exactly how does the number of CW contacts made qualify one to make a judgement about the value of code testing as a license requirement? Again, code testing is not, and never has been, solely for the benefit of Amateur Radio (or solely to benefit CW operations on those bands). Code use is declining here and around the world. Looking solely at Amateur Radio, even the majority of those operators don't use code/cw on any routine or regular basis. Because of these facts, the need for a code testing requirement has vanished.

> Twenty-two plus years of OTA HF experience as a
> radio amateur, which has been about 80 percent CW,
> 19 percent RTTY and other digital modes, and 1
> percent phone. What's your breakdown?

I believe the question was what experience you have that makes you UNIQUELY qualified to judge the value of a specific TESTING REQUIREMENT. I don't see anything above that would make you uniquely qualified in this subject. Again, code testing is not, and never has been, solely for the benefit of Amateur Radio (or operations in those bands). Therefore, the FCC is not going to judge the value of code testing based solely on Amateur Radio. You have to look at the larger picture, Larry. At this point, you're still too narrowly focused.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4556. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:54:46 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <WSZab.1119$Hd6.877681@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77971

Yes a post stating what it takes to learn CW and stating causes of failure
is indeed free of spin. If I had wanted to discuss the pro/cons of CW, as I
have in other posts, I would have done so.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vmongs27ok1ic2@corp.supernews.com...
> OH, I doubt that very seriously.
> You made that comment free of slant in either direction? in a
> discussion of pro/con referring to CW testing, and you're placing
> a post saying "oh, it's so easy, just take the time and do it",
> and it's suppose to be "free of spin"?
>
> please sell me some ocean front property in kansas while
> you're at it.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:KqXab.1057$Hd6.823267@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> > >
> > > Please note that my reply, in this case, was not an argument either for
or
> > against keeping the CW testing. It was simply a comment on learning.
> > Therefore your response is irrelevant to this particular comment. If
you
> > wish to debate effectively, responses need to be related to the
statement.
> > >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
> >
> >

4557. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 14:57:51 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <PVZab.1121$Hd6.878876@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77972

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030920004857.21457.00000699@mb-m10.aol.com...
>
> All of the above makes my point about attutude.
>

Attitude is the key in almost every endeavor. I've succeeded in a number of things for which I had no talent but had sufficient reason to pursue. These include Morse code, music, and karate. I had no talent for any of them but did quite well simply because I wanted to.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4558. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 15:12:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <J7_ab.42680$NM1.38979@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77973

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> (snip) However, as previously stated, you are not qualified
> to make any judgment against the code testing requirement,
> since you have not gained practical operational experience
> in this mode. (snip)

Larry, one does not need to survive a house fire to make judgements about fire safety. Or be attacked by a foreign government to make a judgement about certain defense planning. Or live under a dictator to make judgements about laws affecting our freedoms. Or experience a business failure to make wise business judgements. Or experience anything else firsthand to make value judgements about it.

> (snip) You have not had that mode's unique benefits
> and advantages proved to you over and over again through
> years of daily OTA use. I have. (snip)

Again, this is not about Morse Code/CW use - it's about the code test requirement. I can have that operational experience without a test requirement and you can continue to enjoy the "mode's unique benefits and advantages" long after the testing requirement is gone.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4559. Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1362– September 19 2003

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 15:13:46 UTC
From: radionews@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920111346.07421.00001063@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 77974

Amateur Radio Newsline™ Report 1362– September 19 2003

A NOTE TO THOSE WHO ONLY “READ” AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE

As you are aware, Amateur Radio Newsline is, primarily, an audio news service and this weeks newscast is very audio intensive. While reading gives the basic facts, we advise you to download the audio file at http://www.arnewsline.org/quincy to get the most out of the newscast in relation to our coverage of Hurricane Isabel and the role Amateur Radio played and continues to play in storm communications efforts. This is a story told in “sound” from the scene that really cannot be reported in any other way.

**

Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1362 with a release date of Friday, September 19th 2003 to follow in 5-4-3-2-1.

The following is a Q-S-T. Ham radio is there as a hurricane pounds the U-S east coast, the ARRL holds tight on Morse and more petitions are on their way to the FCC. Find out the details on Amateur Radio Newsline report number 1362 coming your way right now.

(Billboard Cart Here)

**

RESCUE RADIO: HAM ADIO AND HURRICANE ISABEL

Her name is Isabel. She is a hurricane that slammed into the United States East coast with gale force winds. Emergency services including ham radio were ready and waiting as we hear in this report:

--

Roaring ashore with winds of more than 100 miles an hour, Isabel made landfall along North Carolina's Ocracoke Island, crossing the Outer Banks around midday September 18th. On the west end of Ocracoke Island, sustained winds were measured at 80 miles an hour. Storm surge of 12 feet was reported I

Bernard Nobles, WA4MOK, is a Section Emergency Coordinator in North Carolina. He says hams mobilized over a large part of the state:

4:07 IN In emergency operations centers
OUT in the eastern part of the state

The action wasn't just in North Carolina. Hams throughout the eastern seaboard were in position, ready to provide backup communications. Only a few hours after the storm had moved ashore, more than 800-thousand customers were without power in North Carolina and Virginia. Bill Moraine, N2COP, is a Public

Information Officer in southeastern North Carolina. He says hams were providing a variety of communications services:

--

IN they really run the range of
OUT in northeastern North Carolina.

--

Morrain says High Frequency conditions were often deplorable with extensive interference. He says the Hurricane Watch Net was being relayed locally through both EchoLink and IRLP, the Internet Repeater Linking Project, to help overcome H-F problem. All along the storms projected path ham radio operators trained in emergency communications were in service or on stand-by alert. The Hurricane Watch Net was busy on 14-point-325 MHz. At the National Hurricane Center in Florida, amateur station WX4NHC helped with relaying storm reports. With hams throughout the mid-Atlantic region helping in the communications effort, Morraine said putting a number on those assisting would be tough:

--

IN We don't have a handle
OUT in this particular disaster One bit of good news.

--

Morraine says Isabel is no Hugo, referring to the devastating hurricane that slammed into North Carolina in 1989:

--

IN Thanksfully, Isabel
OUT about 105.

--

Hams were scheduled to staff the North Carolina Emergency Management Eastern Branch headquarters in Kinston. The amateur station at the state emergency operations center in Raleigh was also activating, with an umbrella of liaison stations being organized to monitor the 146.88 MHz repeater and the Tarheel Net.

The National Weather Service had hurricane warnings posted for parts of North Carolina and Virginia. Forecasters warned hurricane force winds were possible 150 miles inland, along with tornadoes.

As Isabel began moving north after landfall, flooding became a serious threat. At least one hotel in Kill Devil Hills collapsed into the ocean. Evacuations were being ordered along Chesapeake Bay.

In the hurricane's first day ashore, nearly 900 flights had to be cancelled, with some airports closing or limiting service. Up to a foot of rain was possible in West Virginia's hilly Eastern Panhandle, with between 6 and 9 inches of rain expected over parts of Pennsylvania. Amateur radio operators say

they will stay on the air helping--as long as needed.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm David Black, KB4KCH, in Birmingham Alabama.

+++

As David said, it was North Carolina that was the first to feel Isabel’s fury. Gay Pearce, KN4AQ, is in Raleigh with that part of the story.

+++

Amateur Radio was in full swing in eastern North Carolina as Hurricane Isabel made landfall on Thursday. For hams and everyone else, the term "made landfall" was a confusing one. High winds, rain and power failures reached the Raleigh-Durham area, 150 miles inland, well before the hurricane eye crossed the coastline.

--

IN: WAKE EOC POWER FAIL AUDIO]

--

The Tarheel Emergency Net, North Carolina's ARES net, was in operation, splitting duty between 3923 and 7232 kHz, depending on propagation

--

IN: HF COUNTY CHECK-IN AUDIO],

--

The North Carolina ARES group has not yet begun to use 60 meters.

Most traffic between the coast and the states Eastern Branch headquarters in Kinston was being handled on linked repeater systems.

Several hams have remained on Hatteras Island on the Outer Banks, and for a time, hams across the world could listen to them via Echolink and IRLP connections. That ended as power and phone service failed near the coast.

The National Hurricane Center in Miami continued to use the Internet links to take reports from areas where connections remained in place.

--

[K4JVP AUDIO]

--

There was some confusion early as too many sources of input were mixed together on one combined Echoink/IRLP conference. The National Hurricane Center's liaison station commented:

--

[HNC CONFUSION AUDIO]

--

Control operators were able to clear up that confusion, but locally, repeater operators are finding that they can't mix local emergency and logistics traffic with a full-time Internet connection that's carrying similar traffic on other repeaters. That's a lesson for the next emergency.

Repeaters were used inland as well. The wide coverage 146.88 repeater in Raleigh linked the State EOC with surrounding counties and the Eastern Branch headquarters.

--

[VHF COUNTY CHECK-IN AUDIO]

--

Shelters began filling up as the storm moved inland, but with most shelters located in counties that would receive at least Tropical Storm force winds and a possible loss of power and telephone service, Amateurs were dispatched to provide communications.

--

[SHELTER VOLUNTEER AUDIO]

--

Reporting for Newsline from the fringe of Hurricane Isabel, this is Gary Pearce KN4AQ in Raleigh, North Carolina.

--

More on Hurricane Isabel and the role of ham radio in future Amateur Radio Newsline reports. (Numerous sources)

**

Break 1

From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline, heard on bulletin stations around the world including the WR4AMS repeater serving Eastern Kentucky.

(5 sec pause here)

**

RESTRUCTURING: THE ARRL POSITION - WAIT TO HEAR FROM OUR MEMBERS

Why hasn't the ARRL joined those who have already filed petitions to the FCC on the topics of Morse Code testing and changes to license priveleges? In a note to his constituancy the League’s Southwestern Division Director Art Goddard, W6XD, explains it this way:

“After determining that the FCC will be handling these matters in due course, your ARRL has set a timetable that includes ample opportunity to

collect member input before determining its direction at the January 2004 Board meeting.”

Goddard says to say tuned for further developments. He also tells ARRL members to contact their own ARRL Director and make known their views on these vital issues.

Goddard also suppled a brief overview of a meeting in St. Louis this past weekend, where ARRL Directors and Officers took what he calls the next step to define the ARRL's future role in Advancing and Advocating Amateur Radio. Although the details of ARRL's Long Range Plan aren't yet complete, W6XD says that hams can expect to see bold new actions in several key areas. These include advocacy in key regulatory and legislative issues, lifetime learning, certification and personal achievement and public recognition of Amateur Radio as a valuable service. Goddard adds that there will also be financial stability to implement all of these strategies. (ARRL SW Div. Report)

**

RESTRUCTURING: MORE CODE PETITIONS COMING

The ARRL may be taking the correct road on this one. This is because the latest ham radio restructuring show appears to be only in its opening act. In fact, it looks as if the six petitions favoring abolishing Morse testing and the one from FISTS favoring its retention may be only the beginning of a deluge of requests from both sides in the issue. We have heard that there are a number of other petitions already at the FCC or on their way but know little about them. Our Bruce Tennant, K6PZW has more:

As we go to air we believe there are as many as another half dozen petitions being filed on both sides of this contriversial restructuring issue. Amateur Radio Newsline will keep following this story and will have more fore you in upcoming reports. (Various sources)

**

RESTRUCTURING: FILE ON EACH PETITION

Still with this latest round of restructuring. If you are among those planning to file comments on one or more of the Morse petitions already before the FCC then listen up. If you want to make known your feelings on all of them, then you will have to file separate comments on each one.

As of this moment, a comment filed on any one particular petition will be considered for that specific rule making request alone and not on all. And having read the petitions, we can understand why. Each one asks for a specific approach in handling the Morse question and it would be impossible to provide a one comment that would fit all.

By the way, as we go to air the FISTS pro-code request has still not been assigned a rule making designation by the FCC. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

RADIO LAW: CONGRESS MAY INCREASE FCC AUTHORITY TO ISSUE FINES

The Federal Communications Commission would be given the authority to levy significantly higher fines. This, if a bill being considered by the Commerce Committee of the U.S. Senate becomes law. Amateur Radio Newsline's Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, has the details:

--

The Wall Street Journal reports that fines for violating FCC rules could jump tenfold, and activities of lobbyists would be further restricted under a bill introduced in mid-June by Senator John McCain who chairs the Committee that authorizes the agency's funding. In addition to the increase in the Commission's authority to levy fines, the proposed legislation would also extend the statute of limitations on violations of the agency's rules from one year to two.

Other provisions include restrictions that would prevent top staffers from lobbying the agency for one year after leaving their positions, and a ban on the payment of travel expenses of FCC officials by companies and private interest groups. In other words, if the FCC were to send out a representative to any gathering the cost must be borne by the agency and not the events sponsor. Its far to early to know if such a prohibition would impact on the FCC ability to attend hamfests, conventions and other hobby radio gatherings.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I'm Mark Abramowicz, NT3V, in Philadelphia.

--

McCain's bill reportedly has the support of Senator Ernest Hollings increasing its chances of gaining broader support. Even so, it is still expected to face tough opposition as it makes its way through the regulatory aproval process. (Published news reports)

**

REMEMBERING : THE 2ND ANNUAL N2LEN 9/11 NET

The second annual N2LEN nine eleven net took place on Thursday, September 11tth. The gathering used voice over I P technology to link repeaters world wide over the Internet. This allowed radio amateurs and non-ham listeners to reflect on the terrorist attacks of two years ago and the role that radio amateurs played in the aftermath.

ARRL President Jim Haynie, W5JBP, was this years keynote speaker. He addressed the role of Amateur Radio in homeland security and urged each amateur to develop his or her emergency communication skills.

As with the 2002 net, this year's cyberspace and radio meting relied on EchoLink and eQSO Internet software connections as well as repeaters and simplex links around the world. (N2LEN Net News Release)

**

AMATEUR RADIO SURVIVAL: UCF CLUB EVICTED FROM ITS HOME

The University of Central Florida Amateur Radio Club station K4UCF has been evicted. This, from the campus location that it had occupied for 30 years. Mert Garlick, N6AWE, reports:

--

According to a qrz.com website posting from Matt Collins, KG4JYD, the eviction took place last June but seems only now to have been made public. It reportedly resulted from faculty complaints about the radio club who concluded that damage to computer equipment was from a lightning strike that entered the building through the club's antenna system. University's plant personnel also complained that club members worked on the roof of the building without authorization.

But Matt Kassawara KG4FEQ , has a differing view. Kassawar who is with the club says that the ham station is the closest equipment to the antenna system. He says that neither that equipment nor the club repeaters were damaged by a lightning strike, indicating that the clubs antenna could not have been the source of the damage.

The club requested that University of Central Florida provide comparable space from which to operate. So far UCF administrators have refused.

For the Amateur Radio Newsline, I’m Mert Garlick, N6AWE.

--

More information is on the web at qrz.com and http://pegasus.cc.ucf.edu/~wb4tcw/evictimeline.html (qrz.com)

**

ENFORCEMENT: NY COURT DISMISSES HAM SCANNER CASE

Some good news for a New York State ham as a court dismisses a misdemeanor charge against Richard C. Lalone, KC5GAX. This for allegedly for violating an anti-scanner provision that state's Vehicle and Traffic Law.

According to the ARRL Letter, in a 1300-word decision, Judge John J. Hallet said it was clear the legislature never intended the provisions of traffic law 397 from applying to licensed Amateur Radio operators. He then dismissed the charge against Lalone August 5th.

The law in question prohibits individuals in New York state -- other than law officers -- from equipping their vehicles with radios capable of receiving signals on the frequencies allocated for police use without first securing a permit. The section also contains an explicit exemption for any person who holds a valid amateur radio operator's license. (ARRL)

**

ENFORCEMENT: FCC ASKS POWER COMPANY TO TRY HARDER TO RESOLVE NOISE COMPLAINTS

The FCC has asked American Electric Power Company of Columbus, Ohio to take a closer look at several power line noise complaints and try harder to resolve them. This in relation to complaints filed by four Amateur Radio operators in

Ohio, Indiana and Oklahoma.

According to the ARRL Letter AEP responded February 10th to the FCC's initial correspondence regarding the four cases. But the agencys' Special Counsel Riley Hollingsworth says that follow-up reports from the complainants suggest discrepancies exist between what AEP told the FCC and what the complainants report.

Hollingsworth said evidence to date indicates that none of the cases has been satisfactorily resolved. In one case, AEP erroneously identified the amateur's own antenna as the source of the noise.

Now, Hollingsworth has asked AEP to revisit each of these issues and to update the FCC within 45 days of any progress in each case. He also referred the power company to ARRL RFI Specialist Mike Gruber, W1MG, for technical assistance. (ARRL, FCC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: PAGING FINE

The FCC has affirmed a $9,000 fine against Air Paging, Inc.. This for failure to operate its Wireless Radio Station in accordance with its station authorization, continuous radiation of an unmodulated carrier, and failure to provide station identification by the assigned call sign.

Air Paging did not file a response to the initial Notice of Liability, so the $9,000 figure was affirmed. In addition, the Commission does not know if Air Paging has corrected the various violations, so Air Paging has been given 30 days to outline what measures it has taken or will take to correct the violations and ensure that they do not recur. The entire mater is in cyberspace at
http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DA-03-2741A1.doc (CGC)

**

ENFORCEMENT: TWO MORE TOWER FINES ISSUED

The FCC has issued two more broadcasters hefty fines because of tower related violations. A monetary forfeiture in the amount of $10,000 was issued to Pinnacle Towers, Inc., owner of a tower in Des Moines, Iowa, for failing to clean and repaint its antenna structure to maintain good visibility. Dinged with a $3000 fine is Best Country Broadcasting, LLC, owner of the antenna structure located in Bogalusa, Louisiana. No reason for this fine was mentioned in the FCC digest for the Best Country fine. (CGC)

**

BREAK 2

This is ham radio news for today's radio amateur. From the United States of America, We are the Amateur Radio Newsline with links to the world from our only official website at www.arnewsline.org and being relayed by the volunteer services of the following radio amateur:

(5 sec pause here)

**

INTERNATIONAL - AUSTRALIA: BPL COMING TO VK-LAND

The problem of Broadband over Powerlines or BPL is about to hit dwn-under. This as Australia makes ready to give it a go. Q-News Graham Kemp, VK4BB, has the latest:

--

PLT, PLC, BPL. What ever way you say it it means noise. Now, the Wireless Institute of Australia - Victoria says there is now clear evidence of a PLT-C/PBL push in Australia. That no-one can continue to be in denial mode.

From the Q-NEWS perspective Barry VK2AAB will no longer be a "voice in the wilderness." Many of us will soon be asking "why didn't we act sooner".

You'll recall months ago we mentioned the little units being sold by DSE. Well these are small fry compared to the same basics being applied to our 240 volt mains supply, or worse, the High voltage distribution system.

--

It appears as id BPL is quickly becoming a world-wide problem for Amateur Radio. (Q-News)

**

RADIO LAW FOLLOW-UP: NEVADA TOLD TO SCRAP NEW RADIO SYSTEM

Here’s a follow up on a story we brought to you several months ago regarding a new state wide radio system in Nevada and an oversight by the regulators planning it. As previousy reported, the Nevada Highway Patrol had spent $14 million on a contract with Motorola to build a computerized radio system. It was activated back in 2000 but nobody from the state ever applied to the FCC for licenses for the frequencies. As a result, the FCC had told the Nevada Highway Patrol and other state agencies to stop using the 140 frequencies by last June.

To comply with the federal order, Nevada has had to scrap a costly radio system that's less than two yeas old. So on Tuesday, September 9th the Nevada state Board of Examiners voted to spend $16.1 million on new radio gear for the Nevada Highway Patrol. (Published news reports)

**

NAMES IN THE NEWS: W4FAL AND K2AD ELECTED NEW NFCC DIRECTORS

Some names in the news. They are Frank Lynch, W4FAL and Doug Sharp, K2AD who have been elected as Directors of the National Frequency Coordinators Council.

The NFCC made known the results on September 6th. This, after twenty-eigh of its member councils took part in the vote.

The National Frequency Coordinators Council is an umbrella group of recognized repeater coordinators. It was formed as the result of a meeting held in St. Charls Missouri in the late 1990's. (ARNewsline(tm))

**

HAMFESTS AND CONVENTIONS: QUEENSLAND AUSTRALIA ON SEPTEMBER 19-21

On the hamfest scene, the 30th annual North Queensland Amateur Radio Convention takes place September 19th to the 21st. The venue is down-under at James Cook University in the state of Queensland Australia. For details please e-mail vk4zz@wia.org.au (Q-News)

**

HAMFESTS AND CONVENTIONS: THE DX BASH IN TEXAS IN OCTOBER

Back on this side of the Pacific, the 13th Annual DX BASH will be held on Oct 10th to the 11 at Lake Buchanan near Austin, Texas. Icom has provided a IC-746 Pro and IC-756 Pro II that will be in use at the W5KFT contest station for attendees to try out in actual "on the air" conditions. Also planned are programs on operating, contesting, towers and antennas. More nformation is on-line at www.dxbash.com (W5KFT)

**

SWL-FESTS: SCADS IN HUNTINGTON BEACH IN SEPTEMBER

And short-wave hobbyists, this one is for you. Word that the Annual Southern California Area D-X'ers Picnic will be held on September 20th from 8am to 4pm. This, at the Huntington Beach Central Park in Huntington Beach California.

Huntington Beach is a suburb of Los Angeles. Further information available from Stewart MacKenzie, WDX6AA, at 714-846-1685 from about 9 a.m. to 8 p.m. - Pacific coast time. (SCADS)

**

DX

In D-X, if you are waiting for a Q-S-L card for last June's WB8XX operation on Antigua, you will have to be patient a bit longer. According to Kevin, cards ordered 2 months ago from PY2TNT never did show up and now it appears that the company maybe out of business. Kevin says that the website is suspended and E-mails bounce. WB8XX adds that he will be ordering more cards from a stateside supplier, and will have all of the cards out as soon as the 2nd order arrives. (VHF Reflector)

**

THAT FINAL ITEM: TEACHING HAM RADIO IN ALBANIA

And finaly this week, how would one of you like to teach ham radio in Albania? Yes, we said Albania. Well you can if you know the British Radio Amateur Examination course and like to travel. Here R-S-G-B Newsreader Jeramy Boot,

G4NJH, with the rest of the story:

--

A radio amateur lecturer is required to help give a radio amateur course in the Technical University of Tirana, Albania, this coming November. The course will integrate amateur radio communications theory and practice into the University's normal study programme.

The course is organised in coordination with the Ministry of Telecommunications in Albania, in conjunction with the IARU, and using RSGB documentation. Several agencies and companies are providing financial support. The applicant should have experience of
teaching electronics and telecommunications at the amateur radio level in a UK setting. The course material is based on the UK RAE at the Full licence level and will lead to a CEPT-recognised qualification for the successful students. The successful amateur will help to coordinate the other visiting lecturers, and the assignment will take three weeks out of a six-week program.

This is a unique opportunity to join a multi-national amateur radio team helping to create a new group of telecommunication engineers to benefit the Albanian economy. It will provide a rich experience, not to mention the opportunity to operate ZA1A from the hotel in any spare moments.

--

For more details, please contact Roger, G3LQP, by e-mail to g3lqp@aol.com (GB2RS)

**

NEWSCAST CLOSE

With thanks to Alan Labs, AMSAT, the ARRL, the CGC Communicator, CQ Magazine, the FCC, the Ohio Penn DX Bulletin, Radio Netherlands, Rain, the RSGB and Australia's Q-News, that's all from the Amateur Radio Newsline(tm). Our e-mail address is newsline @arnewsline.org. More information is available at Amateur Radio Newsline's(tm) only official website located at www.arnewsline.org. You can also write to us or support us at Amateur Radio Newsline(tm), P.O. Box 660937, Arcadia, California 91066.

For now, with Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF, at the editors desk, I’m Don Wilbanks, AE5DW, saying 73 and we thank you for listening." Amateur Radio Newsline(tm) is Copyright 2003. All rights reserved.

4560. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 15:24:33 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkhrfh$1vrlr$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77975

"Clint" wrote ...

and just fill in the blanks as to what a N*** is, and we'll see if I was guilty of calling you an inflammatory and insulting name.

My Polish ancestors know very well what the word "Nazi" means. Many of them met the real ones sixty years ago and didn't survive. You seem to use the word with abandon, without having a single clue as to what it *really* means, and to whom it refers.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4561. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 15:27:10 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkhrkd$1v0vf$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77976

"Mike Coslo" wrote ...

Hey, Arnie! If "personal character attacks are an admission of defeat, why don't you ask Clint about calling us N***'s? He must really be admitting defeat if he both calls us that *and* invokes Godwin's law.

Many of my ancestors met the "real" Nazis and never survived. I think too many people (including Clint) use the term without really knowing what implication it truly has. As to me admitting defeat, he is just exercising wishful thinking.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4562. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 15:29:28 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkhrls$ji7@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 77978

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F6C52B8.4010105@adelphia.net...
> Brian wrote:
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bke6dj$pm7$0@208.206.142.96>...
> >
> >>Greg Courville wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>I've been a ham for only a month now, and been using these groups for
> >>>about 6 weeks.
> >>>I really can't stand some of the things that go on here.
> >>>Has anybody ever noticed that 8 out of 10 threads on this group (and
> >>>many other amateur radio groups) end in a flame war?
> >>>It's really shocking how people can start an argument over nothing
> >>>which can escalate to vicious strings of insults complete with
> >>>profanity, sexual references and terms such as "CBplusser" and
> >>>"Knuckle-Dragger".
> >>
> >>Greg if you want to see how all this began just spend some time in
Google
> >>and you canget an educaion. It sure didn't start by old timers
belittling
> >>newcomers. In fact it was and IS the exact reverse. Not all newcomers,
by
> >>any means, just those on this board who decided to do it, and persist to
> >>this day.
> >>
> >
> > DICK would like to present himself as a "reasonable" ham. DICK is
> > primary in this newgroup for inciting namecalling, preferring to call
> > names rather than have a legitimate discussion. See -every- post he's
> > made in the last week.
>
> Strange, Brian. I am a nickle extra, and am not very good at CW, and I
> get along just fine with Dick.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Which just goes to show: it's not lack of license class, it's lack of class
in all.

Kim W5TIT

4563. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 15:30:27 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkhrqj$1qp6a$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 77977

"Clint" wrote ...

well, obviously you did not. Your arguments are absurd. that IS what
"reductio ad absurdum" is.

Wow, I never knew that. Thanks for the lesson. </sarcasm>

Arnie -
KT4ST

4564. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 15:31:36 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <sp_ab.1205$Hd6.891178@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77979

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:J7_ab.42680$NM1.38979@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) However, as previously stated, you are not qualified
> > to make any judgment against the code testing requirement,
> > since you have not gained practical operational experience
> > in this mode. (snip)
>
>
> Larry, one does not need to survive a house fire to make judgements
about
> fire safety. Or be attacked by a foreign government to make a judgement
> about certain defense planning. Or live under a dictator to make
judgements
> about laws affecting our freedoms. Or experience a business failure to
make
> wise business judgements. Or experience anything else firsthand to make
> value judgements about it.
>

One does have to eat a pizza to evaluate its taste and whether they will like it or not. I love pizza but hate tomatoes, cheese, and garlic. Yet combine them into a pizza and the result is entirely different. No one can tell how a cake will taste simply from reading the ingredients on a box. You can evaluate its nutritional content but not its taste. So while there are some things that do not need to be experienced to evaluate them, there are other things that do.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4565. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 15:34:18 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkhrut$1ov@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 77980

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vmontimic1tk01@corp.supernews.com...
>
> >
> > I've got something worse in mind for the NCTA's -- a date with Kim!
> > And for Kim, it would be a date with you!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
> why, i've never even met Kim....
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
>

ahem Larry thinks that just because he could not handle an intelligent, good-looking, self-starting, independent woman such as myself, that all men are as weak and obsessed with material things as he is...

Pay no mind... his kind is in the minority.

Kim W5TIT

4566. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 15:36:02 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkhs27$79d@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 77982

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:6NZab.42630$NM1.17664@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > How many CW contacts have you made in your
> > ham "career?" I'm into the multiple thousands. If
> > you have less than 500, then you're not even close
> > to being qualified to render a judgment against
> > code testing.
>
>
> And exactly how does the number of CW contacts made qualify one to make
a
> judgement about the value of code testing as a license requirement?
>

Well, more importantly, when was the last time Larry wore a bra?
(Wooshhhhhh--he will never get that one).

Kim W5TIT

4567. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 15:36:23 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6C7446.7010507@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77981

Arnie Macy wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" wrote ...
>
> Hey, Arnie! If "personal character attacks are an admission of defeat, why
> don't you ask Clint about calling us N***'s? He must really be admitting
> defeat if he both calls us that *and* invokes Godwin's law.
> ----------
>
> Many of my ancestors met the "real" Nazis and never survived. I think too
> many people (including Clint) use the term without really knowing what
> implication it truly has. As to me admitting defeat, he is just exercising
> wishful thinking.

Yup, no one who had any real dealing with them personally, or through
family would ever spout that off. That's why Godwin's law is what it is.

We can have plenty of fun in here arguing with each other without
resorting to that.

Think about it Clint.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4568. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 15:37:21 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkhs4l$k5d@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 77984

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:PVZab.1121$Hd6.878876@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030920004857.21457.00000699@mb-m10.aol.com...
> >
> > All of the above makes my point about attutude.
> >
>
> Attitude is the key in almost every endeavor. I've succeeded in a number
of
> things for which I had no talent but had sufficient reason to pursue.
These
> include Morse code, music, and karate. I had no talent for any of them
but
> did quite well simply because I wanted to.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

But, Dee, does that mean that everyone must? I'm not saying you've ever
said that, because I don't know. I just wonder what posture you're taking,
above.

Kim W5TIT

4569. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 15:38:39 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkhs73$u4d@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 77983

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:J7_ab.42680$NM1.38979@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) However, as previously stated, you are not qualified
> > to make any judgment against the code testing requirement,
> > since you have not gained practical operational experience
> > in this mode. (snip)
>
>
> Larry, one does not need to survive a house fire to make judgements
about
> fire safety. Or be attacked by a foreign government to make a judgement
> about certain defense planning. Or live under a dictator to make
judgements
> about laws affecting our freedoms. Or experience a business failure to
make
> wise business judgements. Or experience anything else firsthand to make
> value judgements about it.
>

But, but, but!!!! Larry's obviously got or had large boobs, and has
obviously worn a bra. Right?! He *has* hasn't he? Surely, for if not he
would not be making value judgements on my callsign.

Kim W5TIT

4570. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 15:49:30 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <eG_ab.42759$NM1.20116@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77985

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> How much land will be used to build enough turbines
> to power Seattle and the surrounding suburbs? (snip)

With present day wind turbine technology, quite a bit. However, I was mainly speaking of suplimental power at this point.

> And the other side of Puget Sound doesn't have "plenty
> of wind". It's higher than Seattle but still much lower than
> many other areas of the country.

Are you kidding me? I lived on the other side of Puget Sound, on a cliff overlooking the Sound (just on the outskirts of Bremerton). Wind was routine and more than plentiful. My antennas were knocked down several times and I often had to wait several days for the wind to die down long enough to put them back up again. I never had a completely windless day to put up an antenna.

The wind even knocked down a twenty-five foot antenna structure with six metal guy wires holding it up (something I thought was impossible, especially since I put that structure up to survive strong winds - my emergency antenna system). On another occasion, the wind pulled a nine foot guy stake (one and a half inch thick metal rebar) right out of the ground on my main antenna structure.

Believe me, the Olympic Peninsula gets more than enough wind to drive wind turbines. In fact, the whole area around Puget Sound gets plenty of wind (wind dropped the Tacoma Narrows bridge years ago). The other side of the Peninsula, facing the ocean, gets even more wind. Even Seattle was rarely windless, especially in the winter months.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4571. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 15:53:12 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <IJ_ab.1213$Hd6.897492@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77986

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bkhs4l$k5d@library2.airnews.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:PVZab.1121$Hd6.878876@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> > news:20030920004857.21457.00000699@mb-m10.aol.com...
> > >
> > > All of the above makes my point about attutude.
> > >
> >
> > Attitude is the key in almost every endeavor. I've succeeded in a
number
> of
> > things for which I had no talent but had sufficient reason to pursue.
> These
> > include Morse code, music, and karate. I had no talent for any of them
> but
> > did quite well simply because I wanted to.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> But, Dee, does that mean that everyone must? I'm not saying you've ever
> said that, because I don't know. I just wonder what posture you're
taking,
> above.
>
> Kim W5TIT

I'm simply saying that lack of talent is not a sufficient justification for refusing to learn something. I'm saying that motivation is many times more important than talent. If a person doesn't want to learn something, say so. Don't try to justify it with the lack of talent argument. I've seen enough untalented people achieve their goals to have little patience with such rationalizations.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4572. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 15:56:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6C7908.5030603@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77987

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:J7_ab.42680$NM1.38979@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>>>(snip) However, as previously stated, you are not qualified
>>>to make any judgment against the code testing requirement,
>>>since you have not gained practical operational experience
>>>in this mode. (snip)
>>
>>
>> Larry, one does not need to survive a house fire to make judgements
>
> about
>
>>fire safety. Or be attacked by a foreign government to make a judgement
>>about certain defense planning. Or live under a dictator to make
>
> judgements
>
>>about laws affecting our freedoms. Or experience a business failure to
>
> make
>
>>wise business judgements. Or experience anything else firsthand to make
>>value judgements about it.
>>
>
>
> One does have to eat a pizza to evaluate its taste and whether they will
> like it or not. I love pizza but hate tomatoes, cheese, and garlic. Yet
> combine them into a pizza and the result is entirely different. No one can
> tell how a cake will taste simply from reading the ingredients on a box.
> You can evaluate its nutritional content but not its taste. So while there
> are some things that do not need to be experienced to evaluate them, there
> are other things that do.

HEHE, Good timing on that Dee. I think its Pizza for lunch!
8^) - Mike KB3EIA -

4573. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 15:58:25 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6C7970.2060102@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77988

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:6NZab.42630$NM1.17664@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>>>How many CW contacts have you made in your
>>>ham "career?" I'm into the multiple thousands. If
>>>you have less than 500, then you're not even close
>>>to being qualified to render a judgment against
>>>code testing.
>>
>>
>> And exactly how does the number of CW contacts made qualify one to make
>
> a
>
>>judgement about the value of code testing as a license requirement?
>>
>
>
> Well, more importantly, when was the last time Larry wore a bra?
> (Wooshhhhhh--he will never get that one).

Now THAT doesn't bring up good mental images, Kim! I may be damaged
now! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4574. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 16:10:56 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <k__ab.42806$NM1.32466@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77989

"Brian" wrote:
>
> Dwight, your assessment won't stop FEMA from
> delivering millions of dollars in emergency aid so
> that people can get their carpets shampooed and
> a new set of trash cans.

Especially after the news reporters spiced up the stories for the cameras. Did you pay attention to some of the broadcasts? Some of those reporters were acting like the world was coming to an end.

The one that had me laughing the most was the woman holding onto the huge cement flower pot as she talked about being blown away if she didn't hold on. While all this was going on, her thin nylon windbreaker was hardly moving. I saw the same reporter later hanging onto a light pole, again with her clothing hardly moving in the wind.

Another funny moment happened towards the beginning of the storm. The reporter was talking about how the area looks "like a ghost town," just as a bunch of teenagers passed behind him playing catch with a football.

And, now, the same reporters are out searching for that one damaged building, that one fallen tree, that one flooded street, in a mostly undamaged area, to put on the evening news like that is the typical situation throughout the path of the storm. It would all be hilarious if it wasn't for the bad impression it creates elsewhere (and the mostly unnecessary disaster aid it garnishes).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4575. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 16:13:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <H0%ab.1216$Hd6.904539@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 77990

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:eG_ab.42759$NM1.20116@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > How much land will be used to build enough turbines
> > to power Seattle and the surrounding suburbs? (snip)
>
>
> With present day wind turbine technology, quite a bit. However, I was
> mainly speaking of suplimental power at this point.
>
>
> > And the other side of Puget Sound doesn't have "plenty
> > of wind". It's higher than Seattle but still much lower than
> > many other areas of the country.
>
>
> Are you kidding me? I lived on the other side of Puget Sound, on a cliff
> overlooking the Sound (just on the outskirts of Bremerton). Wind was
routine
> and more than plentiful. My antennas were knocked down several times and I
> often had to wait several days for the wind to die down long enough to put
> them back up again. I never had a completely windless day to put up an
> antenna.
>
> The wind even knocked down a twenty-five foot antenna structure with six
> metal guy wires holding it up (something I thought was impossible,
> especially since I put that structure up to survive strong winds - my
> emergency antenna system). On another occasion, the wind pulled a nine
foot
> guy stake (one and a half inch thick metal rebar) right out of the ground
on
> my main antenna structure.
>
> Believe me, the Olympic Peninsula gets more than enough wind to drive
wind
> turbines. In fact, the whole area around Puget Sound gets plenty of wind
> (wind dropped the Tacoma Narrows bridge years ago). The other side of the
> Peninsula, facing the ocean, gets even more wind. Even Seattle was rarely
> windless, especially in the winter months.
>

Must have lived in a different Seattle than I did. There was seldom any
significant wind of any kind. The Tacoma Narrows was an unusual situation.

The local geography in that area created a "wind tunnel" effect specific to that location. When it hit the resonant frequency of the bridge, the oscillations exceeded the strength of the bridge. That resonant frequency could only be triggered by a specific wind speed. If the wind had been either weaker or stronger, it would not have happened that particular day. It would have happened sooner or later however.

Your location could easily have had a similar problem.

I spent several years living in Seattle and was out and about almost every weekend, including the Olympic peninsula and up into the mountains. Winds were minimal.

However, the fact that most of the time, winds were minimal does not mean that high winds cannot occur occasionally.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4576. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 16:58:42 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <4h0pmvsk9bl1ja0dgd0nd6dp47se1c65tr@4ax.com>
Source record: 77991

Very well said, Dee - anything is possible if you want to do it badly enough.. I am certainly no prodigy at morse, electronics, martial arts, cooking, business management or anything else - but I have always been able to accomplish the things that I was motivated to do. Mind you, it took me until I was 45 to become motivated enough to learn morse code - but I wanted to get on HF, focused on the goal, bought some training software online and passed the 5 wpm test four weeks later. Conversely, I have wanted to learn to play the guitar since I was a teenager - not sufficiently enough, though, as I never did do it. Which, in retrospect, is probably a good thing....

Talent has very little to do with accomplishment (it does relate to the level of excellence that one can attain, but to become reasonably proficient in anything talent is not a factor), especially in ventures based primarily on rote repetition like morse, Karate, or learning a language. Aptitude and motivation, yes, but not talent. Otherwise, I'd have accomplished nothing so far :)

Blaming a lack of talent for failure to accomplish something reflects on a persons' own inability to accept responsibility for their own actions - successful people, quite simply, go out and get what they want. Or, in the words of Albert Gray:

"Successful people are successful because they form the habits of doing those things that failures don't like to do"

73, Leo

On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 15:53:12 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:

>
>"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>news:bkhs4l$k5d@library2.airnews.net...
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>> news:PVZab.1121$Hd6.878876@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>> >
>> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>> > news:20030920004857.21457.00000699@mb-m10.aol.com...
>> > >
>> > > All of the above makes my point about attutude.
>> > >
>> >
>> > Attitude is the key in almost every endeavor. I've succeeded in a
>number
>> of

>> > things for which I had no talent but had sufficient reason to pursue.
>> These
>> > include Morse code, music, and karate. I had no talent for any of them
>> but
>> > did quite well simply because I wanted to.
>> >
>> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >
>>
>> But, Dee, does that mean that everyone must? I'm not saying you've ever
>> said that, because I don't know. I just wonder what posture you're
>taking,
>> above.
>>
>> Kim W5TIT
>
>I'm simply saying that lack of talent is not a sufficient justification for
>refusing to learn something. I'm saying that motivation is many times more
>important than talent. If a person doesn't want to learn something, say so.
>Don't try to justify it with the lack of talent argument. I've seen enough
>untalented people achieve their goals to have little patience with such
>rationalizations.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4577. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 17:46:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <sn0bb.46215$Aq2.29557@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77992

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vmn7l1gvm3gd1d@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
> news:bkdiip$a9f$1@nd.eastky.net...
> >
> > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote
> >
> > [re: transmitting a 6 mega-pixel image]
> >
> > > I never claimed you COULD send that with CW.
> >
>
> well, I was just responding to his words he tried to
> shove in my mouth.
>
>
> > It would only take 138.88 days.....
>
> hey, we're rock'n!
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
>

It continues to amaze me how these no knowledge, no experience, code haters
think they know so much about the mode.

Dan/W4NTI

4578. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 17:51:41 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Ns0bb.46237$Aq2.19627@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77993

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vmnaife87u3a24@corp.supernews.com...
> just don't EVER speak your mind when it comes to
> morse code testing, unless it's to the effect that you
> LOVE it and couldn't live without it.
>
> You have to put on the jackboots of the CW police
> and march in goosestep with the CW nazis, or
> you'll get bashed a good one with a morse code
> key.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
>
>
Perhaps if you know nothings, with zero experience in Morse Code had a
clue, it would help.

Dan/W4NTI

4579. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 17:53:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <hu0bb.46244$Aq2.39259@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77994

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vmoo6aocnj11df@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > And your posts are different because?
> >
>
>
> because i'm not trying to force something on people
> who don't want it forced on them- the very definition
> of an oppressive doctrine or ruling body.
>
> I am advocating a more free, open end to the hobby
> leaving more self-choice to couple with the self
> training and self improvement.
>
> "Doo az vee zay, or yu vill proov dat yu are
> inverior!"
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
>

Oh bull....you are so advocating something. And if your to dumb to know what it is......your advocating the ellimination of Morse Code from the Amateur Service. Care to try that again?

Dan/W4NTI

4580. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 17:58:28 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmp5afappccuf9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77996

I don't know hardly any code haters myself. I myself aren't one, I enjoy using it. Most the hams I know either love it or are indifferent towards it, that is, they have no opinion on the use of CW one way or the other.

It's the testing of a skill that you may or may not elect to use that I think meets rejection.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4581. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 17:58:38 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6C959C.9090809@adelphia.net>
Source record: 77995

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
> news:vmoo6aocnj11df@corp.supernews.com...
>
>>>And your posts are different because?
>>>
>>
>>
>>because i'm not trying to force something on people
>>who don't want it forced on them- the very definition
>>of an oppressive doctrine or ruling body.
>>
>>I am advocating a more free, open end to the hobby
>>leaving more self-choice to couple with the self
>>training and self improvement.
>>
>>"Doo az vee zay, or yu vill proov dat yu are
>>inverior!"
>>
>>Clint
>>KB5ZHT
>>
>>
>
>
> Oh bull....you are so advocating something. And if your to dumb to know
> what it is......your advocating the ellimination of Morse Code from the
> Amateur Service. Care to try that again?

He comes in calls us the most repulsive people on the face of the
earth, remember the N***S? and then says this?

I still want to ask if this is the brave new ham type that we have to
look forward to after Morse is gone.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4582. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 17:59:46 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmp5cqt51alk36@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77997

If I had wanted to discuss the pro/cons of CW, as I
> have in other posts, I would have done so.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

actually, you did.
I think what you meant to say was the pros and cons
of CW testing.

JFTR....

Clint
KB5ZHT

4583. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 18:04:52 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmp5mcqudnlh86@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 77998

>
> My Polish ancestors know very well what the word "Nazi" means. Many of
them
> met the real ones sixty years ago and didn't survive. You seem to use the
> word with abandon, without having a single clue as to what it *really*
> means, and to whom it refers.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST

AH, that was what you were referring to... well, youre definition of
"abandon"
seems to differ from mine, as I used it once and only once and that was
referring to the really extreme, hardline CW pro-testing crowd.

Um, you said your polish ANCESTORS knew the national socialists in wwII
germany... as in, not *you*... so, therefore, I will assume you don't know
what it *really* means, nor do you have a clue or to whom it refers;
by the very same definition; therefore, YOU are disqualified as the
judge of same.

If you have been hiding in a cave for the last many years and didn't bring
yourself out into the sunlight and fresh oxegen long enough to know
what the reference means, then i'll educate you. It was a symbolic
reference to any group, such as the brown shirts of the aforementioned
group, and ultimately the national socialist party itself that ascended to
power, of ramming thier radical ideas down people throats without
regard to anything but it's own desire and wishes, no matter how
useful, unuseful or down right malevolent.

</education>

Clint
KB5ZHT

4584. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 18:11:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <5L0bb.46318$Aq2.29144@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 77999

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:e7Oab.1499$iT4.984015@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Leo wrote:
>
> > In response to the WRC 03 decision on Morse Code, Industry Canada
> > asked the Radio Amateurs of Canada (RAC, our ARRL equivalent) to
> > advise as to what Canadian amateurs want to do with respect to the
> > Morse testing requirement.
> >
> > RAC set up an online survey on their website for the month of August,
> > and invited all Canadian amateurs (both members of RAC and non-members
> > alike) to voice their opinions. The results have been tabulated and
> > published, and has been presented to the RAC Board of Directors for
> > discussion with IC in the near future. The following web site has the
> > details:
> >
> > http://www.rac.ca/news/mresults.htm
> >
> > Basically, the majority (overall 66%, or two out of three respondents)
> > is in favour of dropping the Morse requirement for access to the HF
> > bands. Similarly, 69% are in favour of modifying the Basic exam,
> > presumably to increase its relevance to operating on HF. For those of
> > you south of the border, the numbers are quite interesting, and may
> > give you some insight into the statistics you might find within the US
> > Amateur community. I was surprised, for example, at the percentage of
> > Advanced with Morse (our 'Extra') licence holders who are in favour of
> > dropping it - 52% - and we're the guys who 'paid the dues' and made it
> > to the top rung of both theoretical and Morse capability!
> >
> > The same process was used to review reducing the Morse requirement
> > from 13 WPM to 5 WPM a couple of years ago - Industry Canada went
> > along with the recommendation the Amateur community (via RAC) - it is
> > anticipated that they will in all likelyhood do so again, as this is
> > obviously the will of the majority. Not all of us, not by a long
> > shot - but clearly, the majority!
> >
> > In short, it certainly looks like it is only a matter of time before
> > Canada drops the Morse requirement for HF. But we may have an
> > opportunity to raise the skill level of those who enter Amateur Radio
> > through more relevant (and maybe more rigorous) testing.
>
> Well if you raise the skill level, it will just keep people out of Ham
> radio. That has been one of the reasons cited for getting rid of the
> code test. It won't do just to increase the entrance requirements, which

> will partially defeat the purpose.
>
> > To close with a quote from a famous Canadian, Marshall McLuhan (the
> > media visionary and professor who conceptualized the "Global Village"
> > and the impact of high-speed communications way back in the '60s):
> >
> > "The past went that-a-way. When faced with a totally new situation, we
> > tend always to attach ourselves to the objects, to the flavor of the
> > most recent past. We look at the present through a rear view mirror.
> > We march backwards into the future."
>
> Perhaps being knowledgeable about RF matters is also in the past, Leo. A
> person can pick up a rig, a linear and an antenna without knowing
> anything about RF electronics. He/she can pay someone to put it up, and
> can be talking in no time. Given this, why should there be any
> requirements at all?
>
> (suggested antenna is a 1/4 wave dipole) 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Lets make it even easier. After this station is payed for, and installed by
a professional.....a 'check out' is then initiated by hooking the end of
the coax that comes from the transmitter to the left ear......and tune for
maximum smoke?

Dan/W4NTI

4585. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 18:12:00 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmp63q9p513kec@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78000

> Many of my ancestors met the "real" Nazis and never survived. I think too
> many people (including Clint) use the term without really knowing what
> implication it truly has. As to me admitting defeat, he is just
exercising
> wishful thinking.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>

well, this argument, like all of the PCTA arguments, is easy to knock over the fence and make a home run out of... right out of the ballpark, so here goes...

if you want to claim knowledge and right of discussion on a matter due to your lineage OR your association proximity to somebody that actually MET a person/group/<insert noun of choice>, then allow me to inform you that I had an uncle that actually served in the european theater as well as one that served in the south pacific against the japanese. A little closer to me in age than a grandfather, greatgrandfather, or third cousin twice removed on your mother's side sevearl generations back by marriage to the local meat butcher or whatever. Until the passing of my uncle who served in europe (and god bless, didn't get killed), I was able to speak directly to him on the matter and got first hand knowledge.

And know for one more bit of educational matter, if your cranium has the capacity to absorb data at this rate..... if the learning process of the human race were limited to contemporary times, and there were no history books (as socialists would love dream of), and there were no processes by which a person could be educated to more than his 5 senses could teach him, than civilization could not exist; we would never advance to one digree, to the nth degree, to NO point whatsoever if the learning process weren't available to us to discover that which we haven't found to be true with our own experience. You would not be aware that this is but one planet in a 9-planet solar system; that one hundred million plus one hundred million equals TWO hundred million... or any other fact or detail that could not be learned in a single solatary person's lifetime on thier own.

So don't try to claim that a person can't know anything unless he or she saw it for themselves, and couldn't learn it through thier elders. It quickly makes you appear as though you don't understand the process of education and, therefore, must

have NONE yourself.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4586. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 18:14:08 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmp67p8mbckk9e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78001

> We can have plenty of fun in here arguing with each other without
> resorting to that.
>
> Think about it Clint.
>

I have and reject the premis of your argument.
It sounds as though the PCTA crowd is really sour that they have
been correctly labeled for what they are, and are so mad about it
that they're resorting to some sort of bleeding heart tactic to side
step the argument. You must be liberals.

If you do not like what I say, then you have two options; do not
read my posts, or, crawl under the covers and hide from the
coldness of reality and the true sensations of the world...
...and put me on your "block senders" list.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4587. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 18:14:35 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmp68k8k5vejc6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78002

> Wow, I never knew that. Thanks for the lesson. </sarcasm>
>

your welcome.

</sarcasm>

4588. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 18:15:44 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmp6aremho400b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78003

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:J7_ab.42680$NM1.38979@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > (snip) However, as previously stated, you are not qualified
> > to make any judgment against the code testing requirement,
> > since you have not gained practical operational experience
> > in this mode. (snip)
>
>
> Larry, one does not need to survive a house fire to make judgements
about
> fire safety. Or be attacked by a foreign government to make a judgement
> about certain defense planning. Or live under a dictator to make
judgements
> about laws affecting our freedoms. Or experience a business failure to
make
> wise business judgements. Or experience anything else firsthand to make
> value judgements about it.
>

HEY! a roundabout way of what I said earlier in the thread when
told "you weren't there, so you couldn't KNOW!"

Clint
KB5ZHT

4589. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 18:16:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <eQ0bb.46339$Aq2.37759@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78004

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bkhif5$2l0@library2.airnews.net...
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:0OKdnY7bP6DrqfaiU-KYgw@gbronline.com...
> >
> > Mike Coslo wrote in message <3F6B2D8E.20106@adelphia.net>...
> > >
> > > All dipoles are 1/4 wave at some frequency. You just wouldn't want to
> > >use them.
> >
> > Thanks for proving my point, I never made ANY claims on the performance
of
> a
> > 1/4 wave dipole. Some said there was no such thing, I simply stated
there
> > is. So you admit the same I stated earlier in the thread, any dipole is
a
> > quarter wave at some frequency.
> >
> >
>
> Ummmmmm, I think they are pretty confused about the issue, JJ. Let 'em
be.
> ;)
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Another ignorant and irrelevant comment from the Texas Twit.

Dan/W4NTI

4590. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 18:16:45 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmp6cne32q9e42@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78005

>
> One does have to eat a pizza to evaluate its taste and whether they will
> like it or not.

<snip erroneous diatribe>

incorrect anology... the correct one would be to say "you don't have to eat
a pizza to know WHAT it is, and WHAT it's made of".

it's so easy.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4591. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 18:21:13 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmp6l3mtqbj739@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78006

>
> *ahem* Larry thinks that just because he could not handle an intelligent,
> good-looking, self-starting, independent woman such as myself, that all
men
> are as weak and obsessed with material things as he is...
>
> Pay no mind... his kind is in the minority.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

I was about to SAAAAY.....

And, what's MORE, it sounds as though he's passing a terrible judgement on
you,
by wishing to use the idea of a date with you "a punishment". I have no idea
what you're personality is like or how attractive you are, but I was
certainly going
to give you the benifit of the doubt in the intelligence area because you're
a ham
radio operator....

Clint
KB5ZHT

4592. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 18:21:38 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmp6lsp4nc6153@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78007

> Which just goes to show: it's not lack of license class, it's lack of
class
> in all.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

OOOUUUUCH!!!!!
that HAD to hurt!

Clint
KB5ZHT

4593. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 18:29:54 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmp75ap22ck87b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78008

OH, you're logic (or lack thereof) is SO easy to beat!
But i'll do it anyway, even though there isn't a challenge in
it.... i'll do it by anology.

> Oh bull....you are so advocating something.

yes, i'm advocating changes to the LAW, not directly
to people... a change that is more of a freeing up,
a liberation if you will, than an imposing of ideas
or an order onto people.

I'm advocating the "stopping" of something,
not the "imposing" of an idea onto people.

If you had a law passed that said "everybody must
wear a blue shirt in order to get a job", then, that
is IMPOSING something on somebody, perhaps
against thier will. If you successfully do it, than
you HAVE imposed something upon PEOPLE.

if I, then, advocate removing that law, saying "I
think that a person shouldn't HAVE to wear a
blue shirt, as it's not necissary to do a job.. you
can wear any color shirt you like", how is
that IMPOSING anything on a person?

OH, I get it.. you say that by advocating freedom
of choice, i'm burdening people!

"we shouldn't make people put up with all these
freedoms of decision! we should MAKE them
do what WE think they should do!"

just what does that, or WHO does that, sound
like?

And if your to dumb to know
> what it is......your advocating the ellimination of Morse Code from the
> Amateur Service. Care to try that again?
>

and ONCE again, you have revealed the SPIN that the PCTA is
trying to put on people such as myself. People like myself simply
advocate the removal of TESTING. Why do you fellows REFUSE
to ackowledge that? you don't like the idea that we are advocating
freeing up unnecessary legislation and regulation, so you try
to SPIN it into us saying "we want morse code OFF the ham bands!"

and it's not true.

I think you want to frighten people into believing that, because the truth finds a much better flavor with most people..... but, you won't succeed, because each and every time you try to spin the issue you will be countered by others such as I.

REPEAT: I, and most other NCTA's out there, advocate ONLY the removal of morse code TESTING; not it's ELIMINATION from the ham band.

See? you're argument fails because you're trying to argue the wrong point.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4594. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 18:31:48 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmp78s79dmfee0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78009

> >
> >
> Perhaps if you know nothings, with zero experience in Morse Code had a
> clue, it would help.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

you really have some thick reality filters there, don't you? or, really,
it's not
even reality FILTERS, you have reality MODIFIERS.

I have posted several times in here that I've passed morse code testing,
and my first QSL cards were using the CW mode on 15 meters... and
I still ocassionally use CW.

I just don't believe people should be FORCED to learn it if they don't
want to.

Just who is being more imposing here, somebody who says "you shouldn't
have to do what you don't want to", or "you should do what you are
told and SHUT UP" ??????

I'm matching wits here with an unarmed man.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4595. oxendine trouble with a capitol t

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 18:35:19 UTC
From: bestinterests@heart.yours
Message-ID: <bki6l7pll1@news.netmar.com>
Source record: 78011
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>oxendine posting as twistyisaliar@yahoo to rec.radio.cb

From joxendi@bellsouth.net Mon, 08 Jan 2001 13:06:00 -0500 Date: Mon, 08 Jan 2001 13:06:00 -0500
From: Jerry Oxendine joxendi@bellsouth.net
Subject: Talk Equipment for Sale
I have the following items for sale:
1. 60 self-supporting tower, excellent condition, $200
2. HF Radio, Kenwood TS50, all mode, all HF bands, CAP HF frequencies already programmed. This radio is in excellent condition, has power cord mike, instruction manual AND has the SO-2 option installed to bring it into NTIA compliance. It also has the mobile mounting bracket. You may listen to this radio on the NC Wing HF net on Tuesday/Thursday night net at 2030 local--Callsign CAP Kitty Hawk 426. I can be reached via email or at 704-861-9340. Thanks, Jerry

>keep him out of misc.transportation.trucking

----- Posted via NewsOne.Net: Free (anonymous) Usenet News via the Web -----
http://newsone.net/ -- Free reading and anonymous posting to 60,000+ groups
NewsOne.Net prohibits users from posting spam. If this or other posts
made through NewsOne.Net violate posting guidelines, email abuse@newsone.net

4596. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 18:38:11 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bki6qi$2467c$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78010

"Clint" wrote in part ...

If you have been hiding in a cave for the last many years and didn't bring yourself out into the sunlight and fresh oxegen long enough to know what the reference means, then i'll educate you. It was a symbolic reference to any group, such as the brown shirts of the aforementioned group, and ultimately the national socialist party itself that ascended to power, of ramming thier radical ideas down people throats without regard to anything but it's own desire and wishes, no matter how useful, unuseful or down right malevolent.

What a complete and total jerk you are. If you had even one shred of decency, or you had family members that had died at the hands of the Nazis (as I have) -- you would *never* use the term in the above context.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4597. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 19:04:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <hx1bb.1240$Hd6.954714@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78013

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vmp6cne32q9e42@corp.supernews.com...
>
> >
> > One does have to eat a pizza to evaluate its taste and whether they will
> > like it or not.
>
> <snip erroneous diatribe>
>
> incorrect anology... the correct one would be to say "you don't have to
eat
> a pizza to know WHAT it is, and WHAT it's made of".
>
> it's so easy.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT

No my analogy is quite correct. To determine the worth of pizza, you must eat to see if it is a food worth your bother. Knowing the ingredients will not tell you that. Watching other people eat one will not tell you that. Same with Morse code. Reading about past and present usage, looking at the table of dots and dashes, and watching other people operate, etc will not tell you whether you like it. It will only tell you what it is and what it is made of. Until you experience using the code for yourself (i.e. eating the pizza for yourself), it is impossible to tell whether you will like it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4598. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 19:05:39 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bki8e2$247pm$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78012

"Clint" wrote ...

well, this argument, like all of the PCTA arguments, is easy to knock over the fence and make a home run out of... right out of the ballpark, so here goes...

if you want to claim knowledge and right of discussion on a matter due to your lineage OR your association proximity to somebody that actually MET a person/group/<insert noun of choice>, then allow me to inform you that I had an uncle that actually served in the european theater as well as one that served in the south pacific against the japanese. A little closer to me in age than a grandfather, greatgrandfather, or third cousin twice removed on your mother's side sevearl generations back by marriage to the local meat butcher or whatever. Until the passing of my uncle who served in europe (and god bless, didn't get killed), I was able to speak directly to him on the matter and got first hand knowledge.

And know for one more bit of educational matter, if your cranium has the capacity to absorb data at this rate..... if the learning process of the human race were limited to contemporary times, and there were no history books (as socialists would love dream of), and there were no processes by which a person could be educated to more than his 5 senses could teach him, than civilization could not exist; we would never advance to one digree, to the nth degree, to NO point whatsoever if the learning process weren't available to us to discover that which we haven't found to be true with our own experience. You would not be aware that this is but one planet in a 9-planet solar system; that one hundred million plus one hundred million equals TWO hundred million... or any other fact or detail that could not be learned in a single solatary person's lifetime on thier own.

So don't try to claim that a person can't know anything unless he or she saw it for themselves, and couldn't learn it through thier elders. It quickly makes you appear as though you don't understand the process of education and, therefore, must have NONE yourself.

Clint,

This is not a game where you hit home runs. This is a serious subject. I'm a few years older than you, so it stands to reason that I've had the opportunity to speak directly with many of the members of my family who survived the Nazis' attempt to exterminate them in Poland. I listened to them many times over as a young man and understand fully the meaning of the word. I don't subscribe to your loose definition, and neither do the many people who lived under that tyranny. When you use it to describe those that are in favor of code testing in the ARS, you cheapen the meaning, and

therefore the memories of all those people who did not survive. Please, think about this before you use the word again. That's all that I ask.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4599. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 19:11:52 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bki8pn$23md0$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78014

"Kim W5TIT" wrote ...

But, but, but!!!! Larry's obviously got or had large boobs, and has obviously worn a bra. Right?! He *has* hasn't he? Surely, for if not he would not be making value judgements on my callsign.

It took a while, but I have grown accustomed to your callsign, Kim. And it wasn't necessary for me to wear a bra to do it. ;-)

Arnie -
KT4ST

4600. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 19:44:31 UTC
From: garigue <garigue@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <z62bb.527908$YN5.351877@sccrnsc01>
Source record: 78015

>
> Why bother ? I just used my 20 meter dipole, coax fed with 50 ohm cable
on
> 7.030. The SWR was off the scale.
>
> I then hit the tune button on my FT-1000mp and that piece of junk wouldn't
> tune it. So I called CQ for a couple of hours. No replies.
>
> I then called my buddy across town to fire up and give me a listen. I was
> S1 and almost in the noise.
>
> So, for an experiment, knowing it was just a lark because the Texas Twit
> said so, I hooked up my 40 meter half wave, center fed with 50 ohm coax.
> My signal was now 30 db over S9.
>
> Can you get the Texas Twit to explain this for me please.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

No problem there Dan ....your were an obvious victim of an instantaneous wind shift ...nothing less and nothing more. That is why I ALWAYS had a square of red flannel tied to the driven element of my TH-6. I used to have it at 40 feet but the accuracy just wasn't there. This method has saved me countless of hours listening to those confusing K numbers and that drone on 10 mcs.

72&9/16 ....Tom KI3R Belle Vernon Pa

4601. Re: EchoLink and Hurricane Isabel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 19:49:33 UTC
From: Lloyd <Lloyd@no.spammmmm>
Message-ID: <0872989.9697634@taranews.net>
Source record: 78016
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 09:57:30 -0700, Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com> wrote:
> Interesting clip from the "Amateur Radio Newsline"
> Posted here
>
> "Morrain says High Frequency conditions were often deplorable with
> extensive interference. He says the Hurricane Watch Net was being
> relayed locally through both EchoLink and IRLP, the Internet Repeater
> Linking Project, to help overcome H-F problem. All along the storms
> projected path ham radio operators trained in emergency communications
> were in service or on stand-by alert."

Better be careful that you don't drive too many Echolink critics
crazy. Remember: They claim that it isn't "real ham radio."

How can they explain the fact that it was heavily relied upon in
an emergency situation which the "real" service couldn't handle?

4602. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 20:17:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309201217.e2311fa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78017

Clint, not only can Dave be the smuggest of PCTAs on r.r.a.p., but he
has a certain penchant for obtuseness. He is a master of not
understanding whatever it is that isn't going his way.

Brian

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:<vmonaflq4rh635@corp.supernews.com>...
> actually, it was my tale and he correctly read
> between the lines; he knew EXACTLY what
> I was meaning to say.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
> >
> > Not so, Farnsworth. There is nothing about a PCTA in the tale anywhere.
> > You continue to do your reading between the lines.
> >
> > Dave K8MN

4603. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 20:44:48 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309201244.3c45c707@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78018

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bkgnir$n1c$0@208.206.142.97>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bkf8itfis0@208.207.71.158>...
> > > Robert wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
> > > >
> > > > > I am capable of passing any sort of radio traffic by way of
> > > > > radiotelgraphy,
> > > >
> > > > I'd like to see you pass a weather satellite photo fax via
> > > > radiotelegraphy....
> > >
> > > Uh,, Bob, that isn't traffic, It's *data*. I guess if you were really
> > > familiar with radio
> > > you;d know that, wouldn't you?
> >
> > Uhhh, DICK, you should know that weather data can be passed via many
> > modes, and that satellite imagery is referred to as wefax or wxsat.
> >
> > Typically, what is called "DATA" is RTTY.
> >
>
> No, Brian, digital information that is not analog voice is generally known as data
> tansmission.

Sorry, senior.

> > But all that is old technology. Today, we get our weather via
> > wideband, though you're free to play with UKMO and NAM transmissions.
>
> I guess you missed the entire point that WEFAX isn't in any circumstance handled by Morse
> code. That is reserved for text communications or coded letter groups.

Poor DICK. I guess you missed the entire point that useful satellite
information could be sent via Morse/CW, if you were willing to develop
the protocol and the overlay grids, similar to the old gridded radar
bulletins.

For what its worth (FWIW), real satellite data isn't pictures, isn't
FAX. It is rows and columns of pixels, each with a value ranging from
zero to 255, seven layers deep. They are formatted into data groups,
and 'puter programs display and/or animate the data with various

enhancement curves (algorithms) which make the DATA more useful.

> > > > > which I learned as a requirement of my licensure as a
> > > > > ham radio operator. There is no reason for you to be exempted from the
> > > > > same.
> > > > >
> > > > > Well, at least you finally admit that it's "I had to do it, you
> > > > > should too."
> > > >
> > > > The difference is, I know why. You obviously don't.
> > >
> > Couldn't be much of a difference since you obviously don't know why.
> > And I know why you don't. You're simply ignorant about weather comms.
> > Stick to things you know, such as CW and more CW. When you're done
> > talking about CW, you could switch to Morse so you don't sound like a
> > broken record.
>
> More gibberish and attempted bafflegab. That's all you know so you stick to it.

Gibberish and what? I know meteorology and weather comms. I'll stick
to that and you can deliver the "bafflegab."

> > And FWIW, radar image intensity bulletins used to be transmitted via
> > tty, and the receiver had to plot it on a predetermined overlay for
> > that particular radar station. So the concept is there for satellite
> > data transmission, but was never implemented. So go and create a
> > satellite overlay grid, then encode satellite IR temps (if you can),
> > and get cracking on Robert's idea.
> >
> > See, you CAN use CW to send useful information rather than just ARRL
> > numbergrams.
> >
> > 73, Brian
>
> Piffle. THAT is an obsolete use of Morse code.
>
> Using it to pass message traffic when radio conditons are such that it works well but
> other available modes won't is another matter, as you know.

I'll take wideband any day. You take "bafflegab."

4604. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 20:57:50 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309201257.1f047259@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78019

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<bkhjbm$78u@library2.airnews.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309200321.3d1bbd20@posting.google.com...
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:<bk6493$es4$0@208.207.71.177>...
> > > Well, Brainiac, here it is, straight from the horses a....er.
> .....mouth-
> > >
> > > Keith sed...
> > > On 16 Sep 2003 02:46:25 GMT,
> > > Alun Palmer in <Xns93F7E7865C43Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4> wrote:
> > > > EI is the 7th country to abolish code testing by my reckoning
> >
> > > > >> Don't fret Alun, by the time the USA approves of no
> > > > >>more morse code testing the bands will be destroyed
> > > > >>by BPL. You can quote me on that.
> > >
> > >
> > > So I guess you guys will get your code free bands just in time.
> > > Gee, things have a way of evening out.......for decades you "wouldn't",
> > > now you "couldn't"...Poor baby!
> >
> > DICK, I've always been a coded ham. You're statements do noting but
> > reveal your dementia.
>
> Someone sent me an email and said the Waddles, while spouting off something
> about dumbness, in the same sentence said that I was one of those
> dumbed-down GENERALS!!!!
>
> Dementia, hell, these guys need their medication!
>
> Kim W5TIT

DICK is small taters. All his dementia and meds rolled up and smoked
wouldn't get a flea high.

How you doing, Kim?

Did you see where Larry was trying to raffle off a date with you?

That boy is FIXATED on you.

4605. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 21:06:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309201306.7b442c30@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78020

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<GHYab.42488$NM1.15906@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" wrote:
> > wa8ulx@aol.com wrote:
> >>> So, according to you, every single American who
> >>> receives a ham license from this day forward is
> >>> actually receiving a welfare handout because he or
> >>> she is mind challenged?
> >>
> >> CORRECT
> >
> > Thus, Bruce is mind challenged.
> >
> > He could have answered the fifth, but he doesn't know
> > the article of the constitution regarding self-incrimination.
>
>
> LOL. I wonder what he will say about this when he has to get a new license
> after the current one expires.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Bruice is a new Extra; after vowing that he would never upgrade and
surrender his REAL Advanced ticket showing 13wpm Morse Code prowess
(+/- code waiver).

Bruice is the welfare idiot of which he speaks.

4606. Re: EchoLink and Hurricane Isabel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 21:10:49 UTC
From: Who Me? <Whome@whoareyou.net>
Message-ID: <vmpgiop3vgpm24@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78022
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:0872989.9697634@taranews.net...
> On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 09:57:30 -0700, Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com> wrote:
> > Interesting clip from the "Amateur Radio Newsline"
> > Posted here
> >
> > "Morrain says High Frequency conditions were often deplorable with
> > extensive interference. He says the Hurricane Watch Net was being
> > relayed locally through both EchoLink and IRLP, the Internet Repeater
> > Linking Project, to help overcome H-F problem. All along the storms
> > projected path ham radio operators trained in emergency communications
> > were in service or on stand-by alert."
>
> Better be careful that you don't drive too many Echolink critics
> crazy. Remember: They claim that it isn't "real ham radio."
>
> How can they explain the fact that it was heavily relied upon in
> an emergency situation which the "real" service couldn't handle?

There was some confusion early as too many sources of input were mixed
together on one combined Echoink/IRLP conference. The National
Hurricane Center's liaison station commented:

4607. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 21:11:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309201311.5a08601c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78021

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:<vmonu6sp8srd12@corp.supernews.com>...
> >
> > Forever thinking of Kim, aren't you?
>
> does he have tit on the brain?
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT

Certainly his brain is soft and warm.

4608. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 21:13:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309201313.42798b68@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78023

Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bkgoct$tf3$0@208.206.142.97>...

> Yes, Leo, you'r also the country which allows all comers to enter as
> immigrants, with no ID or any proof of who they are or what they plan to
> do. All in the name of "inclusivity" or some such nonsense. Come one, come
> all.
>
> Terrorist? Who cares?

Then they cross our border.

4609. Re: EchoLink and Hurricane Isabel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 21:14:06 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <yq3bb.5731$436.3091@newssvr32.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78024
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:0872989.9697634@taranews.net...
> On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 09:57:30 -0700, Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com> wrote:
> > Interesting clip from the "Amateur Radio Newsline"
> > Posted here
> >
> > "Morrain says High Frequency conditions were often deplorable with
> > extensive interference. He says the Hurricane Watch Net was being
> > relayed locally through both EchoLink and IRLP, the Internet Repeater
> > Linking Project, to help overcome H-F problem. All along the storms
> > projected path ham radio operators trained in emergency communications
> > were in service or on stand-by alert."
>
> Better be careful that you don't drive too many Echolink critics
> crazy. Remember: They claim that it isn't "real ham radio."
>
> How can they explain the fact that it was heavily relied upon in
> an emergency situation which the "real" service couldn't handle?

I guess you kinda forgot about the part where the EchoLink stuff shut down the instant the power went down, making it utterly useless for any kind of communication, especially emergency communication. Forgot to quote that part, huh?

An honest oversight, I am sure.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

4610. Re: EchoLink and Hurricane Isabel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 21:15:47 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <7s3bb.5732$B26.4572@newssvr32.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78025
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:0872989.9697634@taranews.net...
> On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 09:57:30 -0700, Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com> wrote:

Re: EchoLink

I was disgusted to hear about the ARRL president getting on that hokey setup and pretending to be operating as a ham. - Honoring the 9-11 victims *as a ham* by getting on a non-ham setup that would be guaranteed to go dead during any emergency precisely because it is based on non-ham stuff. Why couldn't the guy get on W1AW and actually use radio? Is utilizing a non-ham setup that is no good for emergency communications really an appropriate way to honor the memory of those people *as a ham*? I don't think so. Instead, I wonder what kind of message he was sending when he turned to the non-ham stuff to communicate with other hams *as a ham*. I think the man should be ashamed of himself.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

4611. Re: New York Court Kicks Out charges against ham!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 21:19:00 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hliytvb.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 78026

On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 00:32:50 -0400, Troll Patrol wrote:

>> Stop playing the fool about what I would think or not think,
>> especially about the law and how I would apply it. By your own
>> declaration you have no qualifications as an attorney and are
>> therefore unqualified to debate with me as an equal or better in
>> that regard.
>>
> Kane hits another perfect "Ten" on the
> troll-o-meter
>
> TROLL-O-METER
>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
> /
> /
> /
> /
> /
> /
> /
> Troll-O-Meter Reading
>
>
>Troll Patrol HQ

Mission Accomplished. Over and Out.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

4612. Re: EchoLink and Hurricane Isabel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 21:26:57 UTC
From: KC0??? <Whome@whoareyou.net>
Message-ID: <vmphh2262m1i45@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78027
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

No he didn't forget! He let it out on PURPOSE! Echolink is a joke.......

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:yq3bb.5731$436.3091@newssvr32.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
> news:0872989.9697634@taranews.net...
> > On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 09:57:30 -0700, Caveat Lector <CL@latin.com> wrote:
> > > Interesting clip from the "Amateur Radio Newsline"
> > > Posted here
> > >
> > > "Morrain says High Frequency conditions were often deplorable with
> > > extensive interference. He says the Hurricane Watch Net was being
> > > relayed locally through both EchoLink and IRLP, the Internet Repeater
> > > Linking Project, to help overcome H-F problem. All along the storms
> > > projected path ham radio operators trained in emergency communications
> > > were in service or on stand-by alert."
> >
> > Better be careful that you don't drive too many Echolink critics
> > crazy. Remember: They claim that it isn't "real ham radio."
> >
> > How can they explain the fact that it was heavily relied upon in
> > an emergency situation which the "real" service couldn't handle?
>
> I guess you kinda forgot about the part where the EchoLink stuff shut down
> the instant the power went down, making it utterly useless for any kind of
> communication, especially emergency communication. Forgot to quote that
> part, huh?
>
> An honest oversight, I am sure.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>

4613. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 21:45:47 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <fU3bb.46623$Aq2.27362@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78028

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vmp75ap22ck87b@corp.supernews.com...
> OH, you're logic (or lack thereof) is SO easy to beat!
> But i'll do it anyway, even though there isn't a challenge in
> it.... i'll do it by anology.
>
>
>
> > Oh bull....you are so advocating something.
>
> yes, i'm advocating changes to the LAW, not directly
> to people... a change that is more of a freeing up,
> a liberation if you will, than an imposing of ideas
> or an order onto people.
>
> I'm advocating the "stopping" of something,
> not the "imposing" of an idea onto people.
>
> If you had a law passed that said "everybody must
> wear a blue shirt in order to get a job", then, that
> is IMPOSING something on somebody, perhaps
> against thier will. If you successfully do it, than
> you HAVE imposed something upon PEOPLE.
>
> if I, then, advocate removing that law, saying "I
> think that a person shouldn't HAVE to wear a
> blue shirt, as it's not necissary to do a job.. you
> can wear any color shirt you like", how is
> that IMPOSING anything on a person?
>
> OH, I get it.. you say that by advocating freedom
> of choice, i'm burdening people!

When a standard must maintained, whether it be a ham license, or a pilots license, then a test is required. Otherwise the quality goes down.

CW is a tradition in the ARS. It is a valuble mode of communications. However, it requires a certain amount of dedication and desire to maintain your ability to work the mode.

In otherwords advocating freedom of choice has nothing to do with getting a ham license. People SHOULD NOT be able to force a change on the licensing authorities, based mainly on being too lazy to try to meet the standard.

Why should those of us that have the dedication have to be forced to have
our privlidges reduced by those among us that are too lazy to bother to meet
the standards we did? Should be rejoice at this? I don't think so.

>
> "we shouldn't make people put up with all these
> freedoms of decision! we should MAKE them
> do what WE think they should do!"
>
> just what does that, or WHO does that, sound
> like?
>
> And if your to dumb to know
> > what it is......your advocating the ellimination of Morse Code from the
> > Amateur Service. Care to try that again?
> >
>
> and ONCE again, you have revealed the SPIN that the PCTA is
> trying to put on people such as myself. People like myself simply
> advocate the removal of TESTING. Why do you fellows REFUSE
> to ackowledge that? you don't like the idea that we are advocating
> freeing up unnecessary legislation and regulation, so you try
> to SPIN it into us saying "we want morse code OFF the ham bands!"
> and it's not true.
>

We know that is what you SAY. The reality of the situation is based on the
simple knowledge that human beings will take the easy way. Once CW testing
is elliminated, CW use will eventually dissapear. Folks simply will not
bother to learn it.

I honestly don't think that 5 words per minute is asking too much to gain
access to a large part of the spectrum. I can see your bitch about 20 and
maybe even 13. But for GAWDS sake....5wpm....ANYONE can do that.
Especially with the multiple guess test. Give it a rest. Pay your dues.
Even if it is only half price...or less.

> I think you want to frighten people into believing that, because the truth
> finds a much better flavor with most people..... but, you won't succeed,
> because each and every time you try to spin the issue you will be
countered
> by others such as I.

Im not spinning a thing. Im telling the truth and you cain't stand it.

>
> REPEAT: I, and most other NCTA's out there, advocate ONLY the
> removal of morse code TESTING; not it's ELIMINATION from the
> ham band.

See my comments above...think about it.

Dan/W4NTI

>
> See? you're argument fails because you're trying to argue the wrong point.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
>

4614. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 21:49:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <7Y3bb.46625$Aq2.568@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78029

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vmp78s79dmfee0@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > >
> > >
> > Perhaps if you know nothings, with zero experience in Morse Code had a
> > clue, it would help.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> you really have some thick reality filters there, don't you? or, really,
> it's not
> even reality FILTERS, you have reality MODIFIERS.
>
> I have posted several times in here that I've passed morse code testing,
> and my first QSL cards were using the CW mode on 15 meters... and
> I still ocassionally use CW.
>
> I just don't believe people should be FORCED to learn it if they don't
> want to.
>
> Just who is being more imposing here, somebody who says "you shouldn't
> have to do what you don't want to", or "you should do what you are
> told and SHUT UP" ??????
>
> I'm matching wits here with an unarmed man.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
>

Attempt you insults all you want to Clint. I still say you know nothing and
have no experience in the mode.

If you don't run over 18wpm consistantly, and are able to sit down and copy
in your head. And have done so for years. Then may statement is true.
You have no concept.

And with you smart assed attitude you never will.

Dan/W4NTI

4615. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 21:56:53 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <F24bb.46631$Aq2.19769@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78030

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bki8e2$247pm$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Clint" wrote ...
>
> well, this argument, like all of the PCTA arguments, is easy to knock
over
> the fence and make a home run out of... right out of the ballpark, so
here
> goes...
>
> if you want to claim knowledge and right of discussion on a matter due to
> your lineage OR your association proximity to somebody that actually MET a
> person/group/<insert noun of choice>, then allow me to inform you that I
had
> an uncle that actually served in the european theater as well as one that
> served in the south pacific against the japanese. A little closer to me
in
> age than a grandfather, greatgrandfather, or third cousin twice removed on
> your mother's side sevearl generations back by marriage to the local meat
> butcher or whatever. Until the passing of my uncle who served in europe
(and
> god bless, didn't get killed), I was able to speak directly to him on the
> matter and got first hand knowledge.
>
> And know for one more bit of educational matter, if your cranium has the
> capacity to absorb data at this rate..... if the learning process of the
> human race were limited to contemporary times, and there were no history
> books (as socialists would love dream of), and there were no processes by
> which a person could be educated to more than his 5 senses could teach
him,
> than civilization could not exist; we would never advance to one digree,
to
> the nth degree, to NO point whatsoever if the learning process weren't
> available to us to discover that which we haven't found to be true with
our
> own experience. You would not be aware that this is but one planet in a
> 9-planet solar system; that one hundred million plus one hundred million
> equals TWO hundred million... or any other fact or detail that could not
be
> learned in a single solatary person's lifetime on thier own.
>
> So don't try to claim that a person can't know anything unless he or she
saw
> it for themselves, and couldn't learn it through thier elders. It quickly

> makes you appear as though you don't understand the process of education
> and, therefore, must have NONE yourself.
> ----------
>
> Clint,
>
> This is not a game where you hit home runs. This is a serious subject.
I'm
> a few years older than you, so it stands to reason that I've had the
> opportunity to speak directly with many of the members of my family who
> survived the Nazis' attempt to exterminate them in Poland. I listened to
> them many times over as a young man and understand fully the meaning of
the
> word. I don't subscribe to your loose definition, and neither do the many
> people who lived under that tyranny. When you use it to describe those
that
> are in favor of code testing in the ARS, you cheapen the meaning, and
> therefore the memories of all those people who did not survive. Please,
> think about this before you use the word again. That's all that I ask.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
>
>
>

Arnie,

This Clint character uses this sort of 'arguement' on everything he does. Yet he claims 'knowledge' of the subject after saying basically that unless you were there, you know nothing about it.

He shoots himself in the foot here as he does with the pro code testing commentary. In fact his arguement proves he is just being a world class smart ass.

In otherwords let it go Arnie. May I express my sincere regrets that you have such a knowledge of those NAZI bastards.

Dan/W4NTI

4616. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:03:18 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309201403.5f3df220@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78031

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:<VPYab.42508$NM1.24804@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" wrote:
> >
> > 'Scuse me but the this newsgroup is a direct spin-off
> > from another group (dot misc?) some number of years
> > ago *specifically* as the place to go for debating the
> > code test issue. (snip)
>
>
> Where did you find that information? I've seen no mention of it anywhere
> else.

The spin-off happened in the mid-90's give or take, long before I got
into this funny farm and it's come up several times since but I can't
cite any specific posts. Larry is probably one of the "originals", you
might ask him.

>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

w3rv

4617. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:18:36 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6CD28A.9000002@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78032

Clint wrote:
>>We can have plenty of fun in here arguing with each other without
>>resorting to that.
>>
>>Think about it Clint.
>>

> I have and reject the premis of your argument.
> It sounds as though the PCTA crowd is really sour that they have
> been correctly labeled for what they are, and are so mad about it
> that they're resorting to some sort of bleeding heart tactic to side
> step the argument. You must be liberals.

And I think YOU are FRENCH!!! Are you French, Clint?

It is fascinating to read your repulsive posts about equating Pro-coder with Nazi's. Just fascinating. However, you have convinced me of one thing.I think you are perhaps the epitome of the No-coder, the brave new ham that takes the ARS into the 21st century.

> If you do not like what I say, then you have two options; do not
> read my posts, or, crawl under the covers and hide from the
> coldness of reality and the true sensations of the world...
> ...and put me on your "block senders" list.

Nahh, I will read your posts, and in the off chance there is something of intelligence in them, perhaps I will reply. I read everyone's posts. No need to crawl under the covers.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4618. Re: EchoLink and Hurricane Isabel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:19:06 UTC
From: KC0??? <Whome@whoareyou.net>
Message-ID: <vmpkip60hbdc13@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78033
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You just don't get it do ya, DUMBASS. Were you there? I was. It did go
down. It did not work. It failed, and so do you pudding cup. Bite my ass.

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:0872989.96976354@taranews.net...
> On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 17:26:57 -0400, KC0??? <Whome@whoareyou.net> wrote:
> > No he didn't forget! He let it out on PURPOSE! Echolink is a joke.......
>
> Because it didn't go down. You see, oh net-clueless one, Echolink has
> multiple servers all across the country, and it's not possible to kill
> all of those servers with a power outage.
>
> Anybody using a battery-powered laptop with a phoneline or satellite
> link would have stayed in business just fine. It's no different than
> using an emergency-powered ham station, except that it's a lot more
> reliable.
>
> Echolink is the wave of the future AND YOU JUST CAN'T STAND IT!!!!

4619. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:20:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6CD2F0.2090604@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78034

Clint wrote:
>>We can have plenty of fun in here arguing with each other without
>>resorting to that.
>>
>>Think about it Clint.
>>
>
>
>
> I have and reject the premis of your argument.

SO what you are saying is that you HAVE to call us Nazi's, Clint?

You have my pity, Clint, you really do.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4620. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:21:17 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6CD32B.6030402@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78035

Clint wrote:
>>One does have to eat a pizza to evaluate its taste and whether they will
>>like it or not.
>
>
> <snip erroneous diatribe>
>
> incorrect anology... the correct one would be to say "you don't have to eat
> a pizza to know WHAT it is, and WHAT it's made of".
>
> it's so easy.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
>

4621. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:24:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6CD402.4040108@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78036

Arnie Macy wrote:
> "Clint" wrote in part ...
>
> If you have been hiding in a cave for the last many years and didn't bring
> yourself out into the sunlight and fresh oxegen long enough to know what the
> reference means, then i'll educate you. It was a symbolic reference to any
> group, such as the brown shirts of the aforementioned group, and ultimately
> the national socialist party itself that ascended to power, of ramming thier
> radical ideas down people throats without regard to anything but it's own
> desire and wishes, no matter how useful, unuseful or down right malevolent.
> ----------
>
> What a complete and total jerk you are. If you had even one shred of
> decency, or you had family members that had died at the hands of the Nazis
> (as I have) -- you would *never* use the term in the above context.

I dunno, Arnie. From what I've seen in his posts, Clint knows
absolutely everything. After all just read the lecture he gave you about
that group. I pity him though.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4622. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:29:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920182946.21642.00001014@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78037

In article <Xns93FB3C4D5CCADelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
>news:20030918225803.11891.00000933@mb-m11.aol.com:
>
>> In article <Xns93FA93F177603elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
>> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>>>I eventually passed code in 1993, but if it weren't for the *@#%^&!
>>>code test I could have had an HF licence in 1971.
>>
>> Alun:
>>
>> The problem wasn't the "*@#%^&! code test" at all. It was you and your
>> negative attitude toward it.
>
>Only partly true. My negative attitude I freely admit.

OK, fine.

>However, I had no
>aptitude for the subject, and still don't.

That cannot be true, or you would never have been able to pass the test at all.

>Who knows why I should be good
>at science and languages, and yet lousy at woodwork and CW, and yet it's
>so.

Could part of the answer be...attitude?

>Each of us has innate abilities in some things, balanced by innate
>incompetence in others, i.e everyone is unique.

Where I work, we have the saying:

"Everyone is good at something"

>I feel that this has been
>ignored by the pro-code side of the debate, or rather that it is known
>damn well, but none of you will admit it!

Not at all! People have varying levels of innate ability.

Passing the tests, however, do not require anything like an expert level of
skill, nor much innate ability.
>

>It is possible to learn something that one is no good at in order to pass
>a test, although unlikely that practical fluency in the skill would ever
>be acheived.

Maybe not. But practical fluency is not required.

>It is even possible to learn something that one is both no
>good at and has no interest in, although much harder, and then the level
>of difficulty becomes crushingly hard.

There ya go - addy-tood.

>This is true of any skill, and
>interest is, if anything, maybe more important than ability, but any
>schoolteacher will tell you that when neither are present in even the
>snallest degree the chance of success is slim to none. So it was with me
>and Morse code. I did it eventually, with a huge amount of outside help,
>without which I would never have succeeded on my own. The reason I didn't
>succeed earlier is straightforward - I didn't get help before.

If you believe you cannot - you cannot.

Had someone told me when I was growing up that someday I'd complete marathons,
I'd have said they were nuts. Never saw myself as "athletic". Never involved in
sports at school in any way. Did not start road running until 1981. Yet by age
30 I was a marathoner.
>
>So there it is. I have a negative attitude, coupled with zero aptitude,
>and have never heard any convincing argument in these last 32 years as to
>why I should have had to have done it in the first place. Sure, I've heard
>lots of lame excuses as to why there should be a CW test, but nothing even
>approaching anything beleivable. No doubt CW is very useful, but I am no
>bloody good at it, and I prefer to actually _talk_ on the radio in the
>first place. That's all. No PSK31, no SSTV, no RTTY, etc. Boring and
>limited to some, but if you prefer CW or PSK, or WHY, then you're welcome
>to use them.

OK, fine.

Now take that attitude and argument and apply it to the theory part of the
written test. Keep in mind how many hams today use manufactured equipment, and
how few would actually attempt to repair their gear.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4623. Re: Bootlegging in 1948?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:29:49 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920182949.21642.00001015@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78038

```
In article <20030918223634.29660.00000717@mb-m24.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0309181342.d6b6763@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20030916205914.12501.00002451@mb-m04.aol.com>...
>>> In article <c2356669.0309160836.595af4a9@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>>> (N2EY) writes:
>>>
>>> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>> >news:<20030916010914.05539.00000775@mb-m16.aol.com>...
>>> >> In article <20030915021846.23171.00000765@mb-m05.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>> (N2EY)
>>> >> writes:
>>> >>
>>> >> >In article <vm9usff4mpm58f@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
>>> >> ><rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>>> >> >
>>> >> >>sending and receiving CW isn't a building block
>>> >> >>to anything else.....
>>> >> >
>>> >> >Yes, it is.
>>> >> >
>>> >> >First, it's a building block to the use of the mode on the air.
>>Although
>>> other
>>> >> >services have pretty much stopped using Morse Code, hams use it
>>> extensivley,
>>> >> >and an amateur license is permission to operate an amateur station,
>not
>>a
>>> >> >station in another service.
>>> >>
>>> >> Roger that, Reverend Jim...
>>> >
>>> >Who is "Reverend Jim", Len? You and Brian Burke keep using that name
>>> >to address someone.
>>>
>>> Tsk, tsk, tsk...you've never seen "Taxi" then... :-)
>>
>>I've seen most episodes of Taxi. My name's not Ignatowksi.
>
```

> We've all seen your prodigious output here in the Newsgroup.

And we've all seen your even-more-prodigious output here in this newsgroup, Len. Under a wide variety of AOL screen names - nocwtest, lenof21, averyfine, averyfineman, lenover21, and probably more.

Perhaps you aspire to emulate Louie DePalma...;-)
>
> Your surname is Miccolis but you are a dead-ringer for the Rev. Jim
> character, totally stoked on morsemanship...spaced out as to any
> other radio communications mode.

Not me. I use a variety of communications modes.

>>> >It can't be me, because I graduated from electrical engineering
>>> >school, not divinity school. And my name isn't Ignatowski ;-)
>>
>>> >What engineering school did you graduate from, Len?
>>>
>>> One right here in Southern California...
>>
>>One without a name...:->
>
> It's easy enough for a BSEE to find out. Not that many out here.

But you won't tell us the name.
>
> On the other hand, it is difficult to figure out WHERE YOU WORK,
> in terms of an actual company name.

That's right. Because it's not relevant to an amateur radio policy discussion.
>
> You rationalize on "not revealing it" for some kind of "fear" of getting
> "bad mail" from others.
>
Nope. It's not relevant.

And, it's just common sense that no matter what job I hold/held, and no matter who my employer(s) are/were, they would not make any difference in your behavior towards me.

> I think your REAL fear is just in everyone discovering you don't do a
> damn thing in radio for a living.

Nope.

The only REAL fear is yours, because you desperately want to know, but I won't tell you.
>
> No problem for me. I've revealed most of my employers in here, plus a
> number of personal references who are long-time licensed radio amateurs.

None of the employers had anything to do with amateur radio. They're irrelevant to the discussion.

You want to knwo them for reasons that have nothing to do with amateur radio.
>
> You won't do that.
>
I've given a number of personal references who are long-time licensed radio amateurs, too, Len.

But what's really relevant is what a person has done in amateur radio. I've been an active, licensed radio amateur for almost 36 years - operating, building stations, writing articles, elmering, etc. You wrote a few basic articles for a now-defunct amateur radio periodical and have never held any class of amateur radio license.

> All you seem to want is some kind of "rep" in the newsgroup for being here
> almost all of your free time, writing terribly long, boring peans to
> yourself
> and morsemanship...when not using the newsgroup as some kind of "chat
> room" in talking about absolutely non-radio-amateur subjects.

That's not me, Len. It's you - except the ""peans to morsemanship" are "diatribes against Morse code" in your case.
>
>>> >> IN the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service...
>>> >
>>> >No such thing exists.
>>>
>>> Yes it do, de facto, just not de jure. :-)
>>
>>DeJur made projectors. You're projecting ;-)
>
> I'm telling it like it is.

HAW! That's almost funny.

You're projecting your own reactions and motivations onto others. Classical transference behavior, really.
>
>>> >I've been "in" the Amateur Radio Service for almost 36 years. You have
>>> >not done so for even one day.
>>>
>>> >That's nice, Len. On what amateur band did you bootleg with it?
>>
>>Hmm?
>>
>>> >Or was
>>> >it a broadcast band device so you could pretend you were on "Ted
>>> >Mack's Amateur Hour"? ;-)
>>>
>>> I've never bootlegged on anything after 1948.
>>
>>Ah - but that means you may have bootlegged in 1948 and before!
>
> YOU don't really KNOW if I "bootlegged" at all, do you?

Nope. But you raised the subject, not me.

I wrote (emphasis added):

"you *MAY* have bootlegged in 1948 and before!"

Maybe you did - and maybe you didn't.

I will say categorically that I have *never* bootlegged - that is, operated
illegally.

Can you say the same thing, Len?
>
> All you want to do is to selectively use my messages as an ignition
> point for a Flame War.

Nope.

Either you bootlegged before 1949 or you didn't.

Which is it?
>
> YOU didn't exist in 1948. That was 55 years ago.

Irrelevant.

Either you bootlegged before 1949 or you didn't.

Which is it?
>
> You have NO KNOWLEDGE of what I did back then or even 56 years
> ago, but you are trolling, trolling, looking for a Flame Fest to start.

Nope.

Either you bootlegged before 1949 or you didn't.

Which is it?
>
> So, great big expert radio ham, tell US your "personal experiences" with
> small output personal wireless AM broadcast band links of the pre-1950
> period.

Irrelevant.

Either you bootlegged before 1949 or you didn't.

Which is it?
>
>>Come clean and tell the group all about it. It will be good for your
>>soul to admit your checkered past.
>
> Go stick a whouff-hong someplace, pervert.
>
> It will satisfy your sex life.

Sounds like you're getting angry, Len. If you don't have a checkered past,
there's nothing to admit. Your anger *may* indicate a guilty conscience....;-)
;-)

Either you bootlegged before 1949 or you didn't.

Which is it?
>
>>It's more than you had done in RADIO at that age.
>>
>>And mine was legal. No bootlegging.
>
> YOU didn't exist in 1947...or 1948.

Doesn't matter.

What I did at 13 is much more than you had done at age 14.
>
> By February 1953 I was already (at 20 years of age) a soldier serving
> overseas, assigned to an Army radio station with the callsign ADA.
> I was with ADA for three years.

Fascinating - you were 14 in 1948 but 20 in early 1953.

> You've never served in the armed forces of the United States, much less
> "assigned overseas."

I never claimed to be. How is that relevant to amateur radio or bootlegging by
14 year olds?
>
> You've made fun of my military service in the past. [that's in Google, by
> the way, you seem to live part of your time there...]

Where? Produce the post.

I dare ya! ;-)

Shall we google up your frequent insults and denigrations of others' military
and government service?

For example - how about the way you made fun of Jeffrey Herman's Coast Gurad
shore station radio operating?
>

> You want to be honored a respected for being safely within in the USA
> borders, never serving. You want to make fun of those veterans who
> who don't love your blessed sacrament, morsemanship.

Not me. But you sure do demonstrate the principle of "can dish it out but can't
take it".
>
>>> By 1967 I'd already DESIGNED and mostly built (technician help was
>>> not always available) several UHF to microwave RF emitters of more
>>> that 10 Watts.
>>

>>Well, give Len a Nobel Prize for accomplishment in physics!
>>
>>In 1967 you were almost three times 14 years old.
>
> Wow, for an ALLEGED MSEE, you've got BAD arithmetic skills.

Nope.
>
> Three times fourteen is forty-two.

The answer to Life, the Universe, and Everything.

1967 - 42 = 1925.

And I wrote "almost three times 14". *almost*

> I was born in 1932.

And you were 14 in 1948, huh? Talk about bad math skills!

> In early 1967 I was 34 years old, my Honorable Discharge was
> 7 years in the past.
>
>>And it was your JOB, wasn't it?
>
> You are damn right is was MY JOB.

So it is irrelevant to what *amateurs* do.

That was the essence of your diatribe against Jeffrey Herman's job.

> I was good at enough to be given design responsibility.

Me, too...
>
>>> All quite legal.
>>
>>Not for you to operate unless you held the station license.
>
> Go Whouff-Hong yourself, sweetums.

And you call *me* a "pervert"...

> I DID have a station license
> in the PLMRS (as its called now) in a partnership in a business.

Angrier and angrier you get. Strong is the dark side with you. Consume you it
does....
>
> Don't give us this CRAP about "holding a station license" when you've
> stated in the past in here that ham radio is "all about OPERATING."

Where did I say that, Len? Produce the post.

I double dare ya! ;-) ;-)

>>Is it your guilt over your own bootlegging that causes you to attack
>>those who followed the law, even as teenagers?
>
> You are really REACHING for some Flame War, aren't you, Rev. Jim?

Not me.
Either you bootlegged before 1949 or you didn't.

Which is it?

>>Who is this "Rev. Jim" you keep addressing?
>
> Yourself, Stokey. Get off the hard stuff before it does you in...

What ARE you talking about, Len? "Stokey"?
>
>>The age thing is yours, Len, not mine. You recommended that FCC not
>>license anyone under age 14.
>
> Let us know when you've passed the mental age of 14 and we can
> discuss things rationally. So far, you aren't close to that.

ah, the old ad hominem by Len when all else fails. So predictable.

>>> >Why are you avoiding that simple question?
>>>
>>> WHAT "question?"

>>"Why should there be *any* written test on theory if all a person
>>wants to do is operate manufactured radios?
>>
>>"If someone doesn't want to design, build or repair radios, why should
>>they have to memorize all those symbols, diagrams and formulas?"
>
> Those aren't "questions" except to the loaded, "do you still beat your
> wife" sort of "questions."

Not at all. The "do you still beat your wife" question is only "loaded" if the
answers are confined to "yes" and "no".

There's no such restriction on those questions.
>
> They don't have to be "answered" because YOU don't have one single
> bit of "authority" to demand answers.

Not demanding. Asking.

You don't like those questions because they demonstrate a *MAJOR* flaw in your
jeremiads against Morse code testing.
>
> Take pride in your work for a living. Reveal at least the area of
>"electrical work" you do.

I already have. Electrical engineering. Design work, to be precise. That's all
you need to know. ;-) ;-) ;-) ;-)

If that makes you angry, it's your problem, not mine.

Even that is irrelevant to an amateur radio policy discussion.
>
> Either way, ALL you are is an AMATEUR who tries to pass hisself off as
> a great big guru in AMATEURISM.

Is being an amateur somehow bad? Amateurs do things for the love of the thing alone.

You are not a radio amateur. Nor have you ever been. And that's a fact.

As for "guru", that's all in your imagination. I don't claim to be an "expert" or "guru" in anything. Not even Morse Code.

4624. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:36:01 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6CD69F.8020501@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78039

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
> news:bki8e2$247pm$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
>>"Clint" wrote ...
>>
>> well, this argument, like all of the PCTA arguments, is easy to knock
>
> over
>
>>the fence and make a home run out of... right out of the ballpark, so
>
> here
>
>>goes...
>>
>>if you want to claim knowledge and right of discussion on a matter due to
>>your lineage OR your association proximity to somebody that actually MET a
>>person/group/<insert noun of choice>, then allow me to inform you that I
>
> had
>
>>an uncle that actually served in the european theater as well as one that
>>served in the south pacific against the japanese. A little closer to me
>
> in
>
>>age than a grandfather, greatgrandfather, or third cousin twice removed on
>>your mother's side sevearl generations back by marriage to the local meat
>>butcher or whatever. Until the passing of my uncle who served in europe
>
> (and
>
>>god bless, didn't get killed), I was able to speak directly to him on the
>>matter and got first hand knowledge.
>>
>>And know for one more bit of educational matter, if your cranium has the
>>capacity to absorb data at this rate..... if the learning process of the
>>human race were limited to contemporary times, and there were no history
>>books (as socialists would love dream of), and there were no processes by
>>which a person could be educated to more than his 5 senses could teach
>
> him,
>

>>than civilization could not exist; we would never advance to one digree,
>
> to
>
>>the nth degree, to NO point whatsoever if the learning process weren't
>>available to us to discover that which we haven't found to be true with
>
> our
>
>>own experience. You would not be aware that this is but one planet in a
>>9-planet solar system; that one hundred million plus one hundred million
>>equals TWO hundred million... or any other fact or detail that could not
>
> be
>
>>learned in a single solatary person's lifetime on thier own.
>>
>>So don't try to claim that a person can't know anything unless he or she
>
> saw
>
>>it for themselves, and couldn't learn it through thier elders. It quickly
>>makes you appear as though you don't understand the process of education
>>and, therefore, must have NONE yourself.
>>_____
>>
>>Clint,
>>
>>This is not a game where you hit home runs. This is a serious subject.
>
> I'm
>
>>a few years older than you, so it stands to reason that I've had the
>>opportunity to speak directly with many of the members of my family who
>>survived the Nazis' attempt to exterminate them in Poland. I listened to
>>them many times over as a young man and understand fully the meaning of
>
> the
>
>>word. I don't subscribe to your loose definition, and neither do the many
>>people who lived under that tyranny. When you use it to describe those
>
> that
>
>>are in favor of code testing in the ARS, you cheapen the meaning, and
>>therefore the memories of all those people who did not survive. Please,
>>think about this before you use the word again. That's all that I ask.
>>
>>Arnie -
>>KT4ST

>
> Arnie,
>
> This Clint character uses this sort of 'arguement' on everything he does.
> Yet he claims 'knowledge' of the subject after saying basically that unless
> you were there, you know nothing about it.
>
> He shoots himself in the foot here as he does with the pro code testing
> commentary. In fact his arguement proves he is just being a world class
> smart ass.
>
> In otherwords let it go Arnie. May I express my sincere regrets that you
> have such a knowledge of those NAZI bastards.

As well it's unfortunate we know people that think that it is a fine
argument technique to invoke them as a pejorative description. That is
sad, sad sad.

It is also indicative of a person that doesn't play well with others

As I noted in an earlier post:

> We can have plenty of fun in here arguing with each other without
>> resorting to that.
>>
>> Think about it Clint.
>>

and he replied:

>
> I have and reject the premis of your argument.

Sad to think that a person believes that it is important to call people
that whether right or wrong, believe that the extra knowledge of a Morse
code test are equal to the worst scourge ever unleashed on the face of
the earth.

Coupled with lectures to Dee on what her taste bud do or don't do.

Its clear...

Clint doesn't play well with the other boys and girls.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4625. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:44:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920184424.14837.00003100@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 78047

In article <eG_ab.42759$NM1.20116@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>>
>> How much land will be used to build enough turbines
>> to power Seattle and the surrounding suburbs? (snip)
>
> With present day wind turbine technology, quite a bit. However, I was
>mainly speaking of suplimental power at this point.
>
>> And the other side of Puget Sound doesn't have "plenty
>> of wind". It's higher than Seattle but still much lower than
>> many other areas of the country.
>
> Are you kidding me? I lived on the other side of Puget Sound, on a cliff
>overlooking the Sound (just on the outskirts of Bremerton). Wind was routine
>and more than plentiful. My antennas were knocked down several times and I
>often had to wait several days for the wind to die down long enough to put
>them back up again. I never had a completely windless day to put up an
>antenna.
>
> The wind even knocked down a twenty-five foot antenna structure with six
>metal guy wires holding it up (something I thought was impossible,
>especially since I put that structure up to survive strong winds - my
>emergency antenna system). On another occasion, the wind pulled a nine foot
>guy stake (one and a half inch thick metal rebar) right out of the ground on
>my main antenna structure.
>
> Believe me, the Olympic Peninsula gets more than enough wind to drive wind
>turbines. In fact, the whole area around Puget Sound gets plenty of wind
>(wind dropped the Tacoma Narrows bridge years ago). The other side of the
>Peninsula, facing the ocean, gets even more wind. Even Seattle was rarely
>windless, especially in the winter months.

The FIRST Tacoma Narrows bridge was designed WITHOUT sufficient thought about sparse, elegant-looking minimal structures acting as airfoils during high winds. At the time of construction, the first Tacoma Narrows bridge was the third-longest single span in the world. It was open for nearly a year and developed such severe oscillation (as a result of the airfoil effects) that it was dubbed "Galloping Gertie." :-)

The high winds in the Narrows region proved too much for it in the 1940s just before WW2 and it went into catastrophic structural oscillation. It was rebuilt a decade later and has remained standing for half a century.

Tacoma Narrows bridge is a major passageway for vehicular traffic from the Kitsap County to the Tacoma city region but, at two lanes each way, has become too crowded for modern traffic. A third Narrows bridge, adjacent to the second, is planned to begin construction in the near future. The second Tacoma Narrows bridge still retains a little windsock at each end and warning signs about High Winds affecting both bicyclists and pedestrians. Every once in a while a high-box trailer will begin fish-tailing while crossing and may temporarily disrupt traffic, all due to high winds.

Eastern Washington still exhibits more severe winds than Western Washington, just not as often.

LHA

4626. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:44:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920184425.14837.00003101@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 78044

In article <3F6C52B8.4010105@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:<bke6dj$pm7$0@208.206.142.96>...
>>
>>>Greg Courville wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>I've been a ham for only a month now, and been using these groups for
>>>>about 6 weeks.
>>>>I really can't stand some of the things that go on here.
>>>>Has anybody ever noticed that 8 out of 10 threads on this group (and
>>>>many other amateur radio groups) end in a flame war?
>>>>It's really shocking how people can start an argument over nothing
>>>>which can escalate to vicious strings of insults complete with
>>>>profanity, sexual references and terms such as "CBplusser" and
>>>>"Knuckle-Dragger".
>>>
>>>Greg if you want to see how all this began just spend some time in Google
>>>and you canget an educaion. It sure didn't start by old timers belittling
>>>newcomers. In fact it was and IS the exact reverse. Not all newcomers, by
>>>any means, just those on this board who decided to do it, and persist to
>>>this day.
>>>
>>
>> DICK would like to present himself as a "reasonable" ham. DICK is
>> primary in this newgroup for inciting namecalling, preferring to call
>> names rather than have a legitimate discussion. See -every- post he's
>> made in the last week.
>
> Strange, Brian. I am a nickle extra, and am not very good at CW, and I
>get along just fine with Dick.
>

You like Dick? !!?!!

LHA

4627. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:44:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920184425.14837.00003102@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 78050

In article <f45722ac.0309200340.4cea8bf@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>news:<20030920012037.21457.00000703@mb-m10.aol.com>...
>> In article <vmnakb54rcls82@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
>> <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>>
>> >
>> > It sure didn't start by old timers belittling
>> >> newcomers. In fact it was and IS the exact reverse.
>> >
>> >...yea, but what if he says he doesn't like CW testing....
>> >then, in what method will you choose- burning him
>> >in oil or decapitation?
>> >
>> >Clint
>> >KB5ZHT
>>
>> Clint:
>>
>> I've got something worse in mind for the NCTA's -- a date with Kim!
>> And for Kim, it would be a date with you!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Forever thinking of Kim, aren't you?

He is FASCINATED by her, almost to an obsession.

That could derive from his imagination and not being able to get a real
date himself (imaginary foreign "girlfriends" aren't real).

One more plus for monotonic on-off tone patterns listened to for too long.
No way to deduce clues as to the other morseperson's gender, age, or
much of anything else except to produce on-off monotonic tone
patterns called (colloquially) "CW."

Of course, Larrah could be out this Saturday getting fitted for a bra...

LHA

4628. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:44:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920184426.14837.00003103@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 78042

In article <3F6C7446.7010507@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Arnie Macy wrote:
>> "Mike Coslo" wrote ...
>>
>> Hey, Arnie! If "personal character attacks are an admission of defeat, why
>> don't you ask Clint about calling us N***'s? He must really be admitting
>> defeat if he both calls us that *and* invokes Godwin's law.
>> --
>>
>> Many of my ancestors met the "real" Nazis and never survived. I think too
>> many people (including Clint) use the term without really knowing what
>> implication it truly has. As to me admitting defeat, he is just exercising
>> wishful thinking.
>
> Yup, no one who had any real dealing with them personally, or through
>family would ever spout that off. That's why Godwin's law is what it is.

Does "Godwin's Law" demand strict adherence to morseodism?

> We can have plenty of fun in here arguing with each other without
>resorting to that.

We can't if Ah-nold the Codinator has a hissy-fit every time someone
refuses to admire his code key.

> Think about it Clint.

Think about penalty box time for sticking...or trying to stick it to
someone,
Michael.

LHA

4629. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:44:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920184427.14837.00003104@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 78151

In article <bkhrfh$1vrlr$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Clint" wrote ...
>
> and just fill in the blanks as to what a N*** is, and we'll see if I was
>guilty of calling you an inflammatory and insulting name.
>_____
>
>My Polish ancestors know very well what the word "Nazi" means. Many of them
>met the real ones sixty years ago and didn't survive.

Yet you had enough "Polish ancestors" that survived so that you were
created...

Are ANCESTORS now to be a "credential" for qualified commentary on
amateur radio?!?!?

Radio as a communications medium was first demonstrated in 1896 in
Italy and in 1896 in Russia. Electronic history doesn't have much to say
about Polish radio.

The acronym "NAZI" is formed from German words meaning (literal
translation) 'National Socialist Party.' [National Socialistiche Partei]
In the pronunciation of the German word for 'National' it sounds to have
a Z in it, therefore the acronym has a Z in it.

>You seem to use the
>word with abandon, without having a single clue as to what it *really*
>means, and to whom it refers.

In colloquial American English, the word 'nazi' (all lower-case) has come
to mean nearly any in-your-face extremist group wanting Their Way (or
else!). Hence "smoking nazis" and feminist "nazis" sometimes referred to
as "feminazis" as two examples.

Do you need any more help on etymology?

LHA

4630. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:44:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920184428.14837.00003105@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 78048

In article <bkgnir$n1c$0@208.206.142.97>, Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>
>> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:<bkf8itfis0@208.207.71.158>...
>> > Robert wrote:
>> >
>> > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote
>> > >
>> > > > I am capable of passing any sort of radio traffic by way of
>> > > > radiotelgraphy,
>> > >
>> > > I'd like to see you pass a weather satellite photo fax via
>> > > radiotelegraphy....
>> >
>> > Uh,, Bob, that isn't traffic, It's *data*. I guess if you were really
>> > familiar with radio
>> > you;d know that, wouldn't you?
>>
>> Uhhh, DICK, you should know that weather data can be passed via many
>> modes, and that satellite imagery is referred to as wefax or wxsat.
>>
>> Typically, what is called "DATA" is RTTY.
>
>No, Brian, digital information that is not analog voice is generally known as
>data tansmission.

Only in "Tansania." :-)

At home, my wife and I enjoy watching and listening to cable service that
is ALL DIGITAL carrying many more TV channels than the old analog
cable service PLUS carrying over three dozen binaural, Dolby enhanced
specialty music channels carrying both voice and music.

US military field radio routinely uses DIGITAL modes in sending all kinds
of communications material...facsimile, scanned images, voice, text,
almost anything. In the field or at permanent bases. No problem.

Why DO you have such a problem with newer technology?

>> But all that is old technology. Today, we get our weather via
>> wideband, though you're free to play with UKMO and NAM transmissions.
>
> I guess you missed the entire point that WEFAX isn't in any circumstance

>handled by Morse code. That is reserved for text communications or coded letter
>groups.

"Coded letter groups?!?!?"

Old-timer, you are still STUCK in technology of a half-century ago.

Even then, "coded letter groups" were fast disappearing in encrypted communications. [those are alive only in fictional novels and in the minds of old-timers]

>> Couldn't be much of a difference since you obviously don't know why.
>> And I know why you don't. You're simply ignorant about weather comms.
>> Stick to things you know, such as CW and more CW. When you're done
>> talking about CW, you could switch to Morse so you don't sound like a
>> broken record.
>
> More gibberish and attempted bafflegab. That's all you know so you stick to it.

Brian has good advice for you. Try heeding it.

If you don't, you will remain an ignorant old-timer unable to comprehend a modern world.

LHA

4631. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:44:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920184429.14837.00003106@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 78046

In article <J7_ab.42680$NM1.38979@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) However, as previously stated, you are not qualified
>> to make any judgment against the code testing requirement,
>> since you have not gained practical operational experience
>> in this mode. (snip)
>
> Larry, one does not need to survive a house fire to make judgements about
>fire safety. Or be attacked by a foreign government to make a judgement
>about certain defense planning. Or live under a dictator to make judgements
>about laws affecting our freedoms. Or experience a business failure to make
>wise business judgements. Or experience anything else firsthand to make
>value judgements about it.

Dwight, if Larrah had to do it, EVERYBODY has to do it.

>> (snip) You have not had that mode's unique benefits
>> and advantages proved to you over and over again through
>> years of daily OTA use. I have. (snip)
>
> Again, this is not about Morse Code/CW use - it's about the code test
>requirement. I can have that operational experience without a test
>requirement and you can continue to enjoy the "mode's unique benefits and
>advantages" long after the testing requirement is gone.

Larrah can't grasp the theological import of that clear and concise idea.
He is a self-professed "true believer" and cannot see ANY other religious
idea but his old cult status.

LHA

4632. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:44:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920184432.14837.00003107@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 78045

In article <20030920004900.21457.00000702@mb-m10.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <3JCab.38370$NM1.20347@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight >Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:
>
>>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>>
>>> This may be so, but it is an imperfect system being
>>> directed by people with imperfect wisdom and
>>> questionable motives. I say questionable because
>>> their motives, for the most part, are entirely
>>> self-serving.
>>
>>
>> Can you can show me one law in this country that wasn't advocated by
>>people with self-serving motives? Laws, by their very nature, tend to serve
>>the interests of at least someone. In reality, the only reason you're
>>pointing to this is because people are now advocating the change of a law
>>you happen to like (the code test requirement). And, of course, you would
>>like everyone to believe your position in all this is not at all
>>self-serving.
>
>Dwight:
>
>Which it isn't. The only outcome I desire is to preserve Morse code testing
>in order to preserve the continued growth in the numbers of new hams who
>have been exposed to training in this mode, in the interest of getting some
>percentage of them to get to the point where they can effectively use it
>OTA.

Riiiiiiiigt... :-)

Outside of sounding like low-grade bullshit, that "reason" could be taken as wanting a government WELFARE program to preserve morse code.

If morsemanship is so damn much fun, easy to learn, etc., then it can be done WITHOUT needing the subsistence of any federal testing.

>>> And it is my right as an American Citizen to make an
>>> attempt to preserve this requirement. I am not
>>> challenging your right to do the opposite, even though
>>> you seem interesting in squelching my own efforts. What
>>> are you afraid of?
>>
>> I'm afraid of your motives in all this, Larry. I don't like the words I

>>hear from many advocating the continuation of the code testing requirement.
>>Those words often reek of bigotry, elitism, and discrimination against other
>>Americans.
>
>One of the classic NCTA whines. Us horrible old PCTA's want to keep
>Morse code going so that we can continue to demonstrate the dominance
>of the white, middle-class, American male, who represents 5% of the
>world's population yet consumes 25% of the planet's resources, and is
>responsible for racism, bigotry, famine, disease, poverty, ethnic cleansing,
>global warming, destruction of the environment, homophobia, halitosis,
>and every other bad thing you can think of.

All Dwight said was that "your words reek of bigotry, elitism, and
discrimination against other Americans."

If you want to sound immature, do continue in your demonstrated mode
instead of trying to present cogent counter-arguments. [that would be a
refreshing change...]

>Yawn! However, I guess that
>works for you NCTA's, in the absence of any truly valid reason for the
>further dumbing-down of licensing requirements in the ARS.

"Dumbing down" would be accurate for the Archaic Radiotelegraphy
Society (ARS).

However, in the United States, the Amateur Radio Service is NOT all
about morsemanship. Therefore, trying to KEEP the US ARS at 1930s
standards and practices is definitely a DUMBING DOWN...and you ARE
guilty of that.

>>Are you comfortable with some of the things said by those with
>>your position? Are you comfortable with some of the things you've said (the
>>garbage about a dumb downed America, your superiority, and so on)?
>
>Don't look now, Dwight, but America *is* dumbed-down.

Roll, you've lost what little senses you have, even after that BA in "Human
Resources." :-(

>It has been made
>that way by a liberal, socialist media that continuously mocks traditional
>values of morality, integrity, ingenuity and hard work, and makes it a virtue
>to be dependent on government for cradle-to-grave life support.

...all because YOU didn't get a high-level position in Human Resources
(that you naturally deserve) on graduating college? Tsk, tsk, tsk.

>> Since it appears only a small minority of hams use Morse/CW on a regular
>>or routine basis,
>
>And it is my desire that the ARS continues to have at least that "small
number"

>of CW-using hams among it's ranks. I don't think that's too much to ask.

That can still be done...WITHOUT testing.

If YOU want to TRULY support personal initiative without "government
support" (and all its 'evil' socialist-like things) then you should be able
to eliminate the federal code test!

Except you do NOT. You keep demanding that the government continue
the federal code test in order to keep a few code users around...

H Y P O C R I S Y

>And it is my belief that unless we preserve code testing, those goals cannot
>be fully achieved.

You seem very confused. First you damn all that federal government
welfare...then you demand that the government keep on testing code.

>>Therefore, any testing requirement
>>must be judged within the context of each of these. The code testing
>>requirement fails in each regard.
>
>Just the opposite is true. However, as previously stated, you are not
>qualified to make any judgment against the code testing requirement,
>since you have not gained practical operational experience in this mode.

Reducto ad absurdum judgement.

The FCC regulates and licenses ALL civil radio in the USA...yet none of
the staff nor commission of the FCC is required to pass any morse code
test in order to regulate US amateur radio.

You seem dumb and dumberer to the fact that every other radio service
(except a small part of maritime radio) in the USA has either DROPPED
morse code skill or never considered it as worthwhile when that service
started. Morse code is "alive" only in AMATEUR radio...and then only as
just another recreation.

>You have not had that mode's unique benefits and advantages proved
>to you over and over again through years of daily OTA use.

Every other radio service that ever used morse code, not only "daily"
but in 24/7 use, has DROPPED it. There were NO "benefits" or
"advantages" there that they found. Had there been any, they would
have kept it.

> I have.

You are NOT any sort of "authority." You pretend to be one, but your
pretense is transparent.

>And I didn't go into ham radio as a CW "lover" by any means -- in fact,
>I was a dedicated NCTA at the time. I came across to the other side
>due to my own experience with Morse/CW, and thus became a True

>Believer.

Nonsense. You were able to achieve tested proficiency in code by passing a 20 WPM federal test...that enabled you to get an Amateur Extra class license so that you could now have SOME kind of "high" award for your life experience. That rank-status-privilege artificiality allowed you to be "better" than "lower" classes.

>I'm reasonably sure you'll ultimately get your way, since that's the
>direction this country is going in general -- down the tubes.

Not really. YOUR life may be going down the tubes but the rest of us are rather firmly involved with optimism and are forging a brighter future even for those who, like yourself, remain rooted in old ways, old values, old standards, old practices, with a strict moral-superiority code stuck in your own ego.

Get some mental therapy, Roll. It will help you in the long run.

LHA

4633. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:44:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920184433.14837.00003108@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 78041

In article <3F6BD425.EC5A58E6@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>Why not regale us with some tales of your years as an uninvolved nitwit,
>Netwit?

Sounds like you're wanting a little tale, herr robust...

LHA

4634. Re: EchoLink and Hurricane Isabel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:44:37 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <pL4bb.4419$Mh5.2630@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78040
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:0872989.96976354@taranews.net...
> On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 17:26:57 -0400, KC0??? <Whome@whoareyou.net> wrote:
> > No he didn't forget! He let it out on PURPOSE! Echolink is a joke.....
>
> Because it didn't go down. You see, oh net-clueless one, Echolink has
> multiple servers all across the country, and it's not possible to kill
> all of those servers with a power outage.

Lloyd is right, you know.... The only part of EchoLink that shut down was the part that was in the area affected by the emergency, when the power went off.

In places unaffected by the emergency, it worked just fine! In this respect, EchoLink is every bit as valid and effective as a phone number you can dial to report a problem when the phone lines go dead. As long as there is no emergency the system works just fine!

Once the power shut down in the affected area and EchoLink went belly-up, the real Hams were still able to communicate with Ham Radio by use of battery power, as in their vehicles, or with power from a generator... Only the non-Ham stuff like EchoLink was dead, and in many parts of the northeast, EchoLink is still dead as this is being written, a few days after the storm hit.

No power, no phones - No EchoLink... That's one difference between EchoLink and Ham Radio.

Amateur Radio is independent of non-ham communications carriers; EchoLink of course is not. Not independent, and not Ham Radio.

> Anybody using a battery-powered laptop with a phoneline or satellite
> link would have stayed in business just fine.

Grasping at straws already, huh? Didn't take long, did it?

In packet radio, we call the "amateur telephone" devotees who cannot differentiate between Ham Radio and the non-Ham stuff "LandLine Lids". I suppose you must be another type of LandLine Lid.

You know.... The kind of guy whose idea of responding to an emergency *as a ham* is to demonstrate their ability to use the telephone. Since he's a Ham, his phone conversation is of course "ham radio"... Riiiiiight!
;-)

>It's no different than
> using an emergency-powered ham station, except that it's a lot more
> reliable.

I'd ask the hams in the areas with no power before I put forward any radical statements about how "reliable" EchoLink is with no Internet connection. You don't want to end up looking stupid and dishonest by making unsupported and unsupportable statements, do you?

>
> Echolink is the wave of the future AND YOU JUST CAN'T STAND IT!!!!

EchoLink is an Internet chat, nothing more and nothing less. As far as that goes, it is no better or worse than any other Internet chat. The only unfortunate part about it is that some people are easily confused by EchoLink, thinking that it is Ham Radio. It distracts them from the real thing, leaving them totally helpless and unprepared in the case of an emergency.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

4635. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:44:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920184439.14837.00003109@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 78049

In article <20030920004855.21457.00000698@mb-m10.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20030919004247.14837.00003074@mb-m03.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>
>>In article <20030918225804.11891.00000934@mb-m11.aol.com>,
>>yodoc@aol.comnospam
>>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>>
>>>Your half-century old experiences in military communications, where, by
>>>your own admission, you never utilized the Morse/CW mode, are irrelevant
>>>to the discussion of Morse code testing requirements within the AMATEUR
>>>Radio Service in 2003.
>>
>> No more "irrelevant" than your constant BULLSHIT about morsemanship.
>
>It's not bullshit, Lennie. I can do it, and I can prove it!

Irrelevant to any necessity of morse code testing.

The ORIGINAL need for morse code tests of radio operators (back in 1912 or so for the USA) was that the government needed some way of communications with ALL radio users in order to mitigate interference.

Way back then the primitive technology of early radio permitted ONLY on-off keying. There was NO voice, "data" (teleprinter), television, facsimile, or anything...just on-off keying.

"Morse code" was already established in wireline communications, having begun in 1844. Since the Morse-Vail telegraph involved ONLY on-off keying, the mode was readily adapted to primitive radio.

Radio as a demonstrated communications medium is only 107 years old and the first USA radio regulations came about 91 years ago. Electronics technology has progressed rapidly since then. Except for some sporadic developments by amateurs, the technology of amateur radio has been advanced almost entirely by commercial designers-manufacturers of amateur radio equipment.

As of today, "morse code" is ONLY required for amateur radio licensing and one small area of US maritime radio. EVERY OTHER radio service has either dropped morse code modes or never adopted it in the first place. There is NO NEED for "all" radio users to know morse code in order to mitigate interference...modern communications methods used by

the governments are faster, clearer, and more direct than morse code mode communications.

The FCC is NOT chartered to maintain some kind of Living Museum of The Airways to keep any level of proficiency of morse code alive. The FCC is the ONLY authority for regulating US civil radio. Larrah Roll is not an authority, the ARRL is not an authority on amateur radio regulation.

The FCC does NOT require any staffer or commissioner to pass any sort of amateur radio test in order to regulate all US civil radio. That's the LAW.

>> EVERYONE ELSE in radio but certain amateurs, maritime radio
>> included, have dropped morse code modes. Morse doesn't work
>> well enough for communications...doesn't really "get through when
>> nothing else will" and isn't a "universal language."
>
>And the above is meaningless, since you're not a qualified judge of
>the Morse/CW mode. End of story.

Reducto ad absurdum rationalization of self-defining ego.

Larrah, you are so FAR from a competent "judge" that your comments are a travesty of debate-discussion.

The JUDGEMENT of EVERY OTHER RADIO SERVICE IN THE USA should be sufficient for anyone with common sense. Morse code had its day long ago with primitive early radio. That has past. "Spark," once the only viable radio transmitter technology for amateurs, is outlawed. Morse code is NOT a necessity for anything except: "All hams should do like the long-time hams had to do it...pass a code test."

US amateur radio is NOT any Living Museum of Radiotelegraphy Arts, by either law or common sense. There is NO law on any books saying that morse code skills must be preserved via testing forever and ever.

>> I've been far more INVOLVED with civilian communications than any
>> early military radio. On the engineering level, not as an amateur
>> hobbyist.
>
>Still meaningless, since amateur radio operators ARE hobbyists.

That must be incorrect since a few hams insist that amateur radio is a SERVICE. Some are artifacts on display at the imaginary Living Museum of Radiotelegraphy.

>Your
>experience may be relevant to commercial or military communications
>environments, but not to the AMATEUR radio service.

My experience as a radio-electronics HOBBYIST began in 1947 and continues to this day.

Electronics encompasses a very large field of endeavors and activities
which is NOT limited to a little niche called "ham radio."

To repeat, the FCC does NOT require any staffer or commissioner to
pass any amateur radio tests in order to be the SOLE JUDGE and
REGULATOR of US amateur radio.

>I really don't know why you waste your time here.

I am doing two things. Firstly, I am campaigning to END all morse code
testing for any sort of USA radio license.

Secondly, I enjoy great amusement in puncturing the ego balloons of the
over-inflated credentialists who are so very ignorant of electronics
technology in general but insist that they are some kind of "experts" in
radio for having passed a few federal tests long ago.

YOUR only "interest" in being in this newsgroup seems to be as a sort
of public-relations venue to promote Larry Roll as an "expert" in AMATEUR
radio. YOU are not an expert in anything but a lot of bullshit shoveling
about your alleged accomplishments and "skills."

>> Hey, like you are "qualified to land any human resources (personnel)
>> job because of your alleged high grades" and wind up driving a BUS?
>
>You've still never provided that exact quote, Lennie, but the fact is, bus
>driving pays better in these parts.

Poor baby. Still trying to divert everyone to living in Google archives
so that they don't have to confront the real subjects here?

If you are so set on driving a bus, why did you waste all your time in
college classes on NON-transportation subjects?

>> Like you've NEVER worked any military communications in your entire
>> TWENTY except a telephone on your desk?
>
>I've used lotsa LMR radios, but I was in transportation, not Comm. As I
>already said thousands of times, I'm strictly an AMATEUR radio
>operator.

Yes, and that is all you will ever be. A hobbyist in one small field of
electronics called "ham radio." You seem to be ignorant of basic
electronics, field and wave propagation knowledge unless it is spoon-
fed you through ARRL publications. Supposedly the vast majority of
amateur radio communications modes you say you use is telegraphy
(voice is only "1%"). All you seem to have done is to promote your-
self (or at least your ego) in here and been a dilettante in ham radio
using already-built equipment (that you may not understand in theory).

You are an AMATEUR in radio is all senses of that word.

>> Tell me all about your "qualifications" for judgement about anyone, big
>> shot. You seem to forget all the BS you were spouting about "summa
>> cum laude" and "landing any (important) job you wanted." You wound

>> up DRIVING A BUS.
>
>C'mon, Lennie. Show us the quote!

No need. You said it in here. You now drive a bus. You are a bus
driver with (supposedly) a Human Resources (personnel) degree and
a "twenty" from the USAF.

>Which, of course, is why I've been using PSK-31 since the moment it
>became available to radio amateurs!

Provide SOME proof of that ridiculous claim, Roll.

PSK31 is a method of on-air data communications using a very small
bandwidth, developed-innovated by Peter Martinez, G3PLX, in the UK.
PSK31 was in-use nearly two years in the UK and parts of Europe
before the first articles on it appeared in USA amateur radio publications.

You are, as usual, doing considerable bullshitting again.

I'm familiar with Peter Martinez' various innovations since 1973 and his
experiments with polyphase filter SSB generation-demodulation as
published in Radio Communications magazine of that year.

>However, I guess there must have
>been a lot of PSK-31 being used in the '30's, if you are to be believed.

Sorry, but you are telling LIES again, Roll. I've never ever claimed
that "PSK31 was in use in the 1930s."

TELEPRINTERS were in wide use in commercial/government radio in
the 1930s. So much so that the first SSB circuits on HF radio of that
period carried six to eight TTY channels each (in addition to two voice
bandwidth channels).

TELEPRINTERS were already taking over telegraphy service providers
in 1900 and continued to grow in use until the 1960s when faster, quieter,
more reliable "data" modes supplanted them. Manual telegraphers were
"downsized" and sought a venue for their no-longer-needed skills in such
places as amateur radio.

>I make lotsa PSK-31 contacts, Lennie -- just not with anyone on this
>newsgroup…well, not with any NCTA's, at least!

Again, just a braggart's claim. Provide SOME form of proof of that.

>Fine, good. I've never questioned that. However, you seem to think it is
>necessary to keep driving that point home over and over. Kinda makes one
>wonder who you're trying to convince?

I'm not trying to "convince" you, Roll. Your ego is such that you will not
accept any debate or challenge of proof on your claims.

Your comments in this newsgroup wind up as being springboards for
exposing the attitudes of certain vocal long-timers who wish to continue

DUMBING DOWN US amateur radio by keeping them held to the
standards and practices of 70 years ago.

>What I have, Lennie, is a job that I like, that I enjoy doing, that gives me
>a lot of satisfaction working with people who really need my services, and
>has pay and benefits way above what I could get in any entry-level HR
>job.

Okay, you "enjoy your job." Sure. But...that job has NOTHING TO DO
WITH RADIO. :-)

>Moreover, my fellow bus drivers come from all walks of life and
>many professional occupations, and many are fellow college graduates.

That's nice. Supervisors need a Masters Degree, do they? Transport
Supervisors need PhDs? :-)

>So what is YOUR problem with MY job?

I have no real dispute with YOUR job...except when you try to pull the usual
bullshit of yours on everyone else...such as "a professional (in radio) does
not have any experience in ham radio." :-)

Sooner or later you will HAVE to come to grips with the reality of radio
physics that human legislation does NOT change said physics. The
technology of radio, electronics, fields and waves remains the SAME
regardless of human laws separating radio services.

>Yes, I may have one time
>indulged in idle speculation that I could get a good HR job, but then, I was
>unfamiliar with the realities of life regarding that field -- mainly that it
is
>dominated by women and minorities, and doesn't pay well except at
>the highest levels of experience and responsibility.

So, misogyny aside, you could not bear to enter into any field in an
ENTRY level position?

Sounds that way to me.

Yet you DEMAND that all ham radio newcomers go into the same sort
of ENTRY LEVEL, starting at the bottom and working their way up...in a
HOBBY ACTIVITY. Makes no sense logically...makes sense only when
coupled to your well-displayed ego.

Ah, but YOU could NOT accept any ENTRY LEVEL position in a JOB
even though you had a military service pension benefit or could have
parlayed that military experience in a government job. YOU have to
"start at the top?"

>Pot -- Kettle -- Black. Your specialty.

I was never into cooking utensil design or manufacture. :-)

What I've shown in here so far is a lot of hypocrisy and mythology
demonstrated by long-time ham radio operators about their hobby.
If pointing out that such hypocrisy and mythology creates soot, smutz,
and dirt by the hypocrites and legend-spewers, then that's just too bad.
Soot, smutz, dirt is still soot, smutz, and dirt.

>I addressed my personal need for a job with good pay and benefits, and
>adapted to reality, Lennie. I probably could have got a low-level HR
>job if I were willing to make an expensive relocation to a much higher
>cost of living area at my own expense. I chose not to. You do understand
>basic economics, don't you, Lennie?

I'm very much aware of "economics" at many levels, basic to advanced.

I'm also very much aware of bullshit artists trying to sell themselves even
though their "product" is just vapor.

>And all you're good for is making loud sucking sounds, Lennie.
>
>Putz! (Apologies to Steve)

Now everyone can realize that, despite a BA in "Human Resources,"
you do NOT have a second career in that...

LHA

4636. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:44:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920184440.14837.00003110@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 78043

In article <3F6BD3CF.456BD5E3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
writes:

>But Leonard, old chap, you aren't an AMATEUR radio op at all under the
>standards of any year. You aren't even qualified in "hoop jumping" as
>you call it. The fact is, if you are ever to grace us with your
>presence on the ham bands, you'll jump through whatever "hoops" the
>government has in place or you won't be licensed.

Herr Robust...go back to your day job of translating "Main Kampf"
into Morse...

LHA

4637. Re: EchoLink and Hurricane Isabel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 22:54:52 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F6CDABA.8060604@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 78152
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

>
>
>
>Anybody using a battery-powered laptop with a phoneline or satellite
>link would have stayed in business just fine.
>
As long as that phone line doesn't go down. Satellite link would be
better if the
signal doesn't mind going thru rain saturated skies.

>It's no different than
>using an emergency-powered ham station, except that it's a lot more
>reliable.
>
If Echolink works, then other internet comms would also work as well.
It's an extra tool, nice to have, but it doesn't replace radio.

>
>Echolink is the wave of the future AND YOU JUST CAN'T STAND IT!!!!
>
>

4638. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 23:12:08 UTC
From: Harry Quiff <quiff@merkin.net>
Message-ID: <bkims8qhf1@216.221.129.15>
Source record: 78153
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 18:30:35 -0400, BIG AL wrote:

> ALL OF YOU PEOPLE NEED TO STAY OFF OF MY FREQUENCY. 3.894.5 IS BIG AL'S
> FREQUENCY. UNLESS YOU ARE INVITED DO NOT COME TO MY FREQUENCY. ESPECIALLY
> W8RBK ELVIE WITH HIS GIRLY VOICE. HO HO

Why don't you go fuck yourself?

No one cares about the assclowns on night time HF. Every one is a loser.

I hope Riley eventually finds and ass fucks every one of you.

4639. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-20 23:17:41 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920191741.22784.00001011@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 78154

>Bruice is a new Extra; after vowing that he would never upgrade and
>surrender his REAL Advanced ticket showing 13wpm Morse Code prowess

You know why I upgraded and it still BUGS you that you cant do the same thing.
Heres what Bothers Brian.

Took the Test on a Bet by 2 No-Coders, did no studying, score 100%, collected
$250.00 from the No-Coders, and to top it off, I got to see the No-Coders fail
there Tech plus.

>(+/- code waiver).

No Code waiver on my part

>Bruice is the welfare idiot of which he speaks.

Well if thats so Brian, just what does that make you, since you are unable to
even consider passing the EXTRA.

4640. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:13:19 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmpr9aamjrlrdd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78155

LOL!

"you're code is SO sensual.. I just love the way your dits
are well rounded.... makes them such a pleasure to listen
to between the dahs.... "

anymore and it'd be to spicey for me to say :)))

Clint
KB5ZHT

4641. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:28:05 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmps51af7m1mcc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78156

>
> When a standard must maintained, whether it be a ham license, or a pilots
> license, then a test is required. Otherwise the quality goes down.

only if the maintained standard is directly relavent to the operation of
what is
being spoken of.

Adherence to the rules, paying attention to "gentleman's agreements", and
following all the rules and regulations are not mutually inclusive with that
of morse code skill.

If THAT was the fact, the overwhelming number of violaters on the 40 and
75m bands (who were legally licensed, with 13 and 20 wmp code testing)
would NOT have done what they did; it sounded like channel 19
cb for many years before hollingsworth helped to clean it up (more proof
that code testing is NOT a "yahoo filter")

>
> CW is a tradition in the ARS.

as is FM, ssb, AM, etc.....

It is a valuble mode of communications.]

as is FM, ssb, AM, etc...

> However, it requires a certain amount of dedication and desire to maintain
> your ability to work the mode.

as is FM, ssb, AM, etc...

>
> In otherwords advocating freedom of choice has nothing to do with getting
a
> ham license.

I was saying that in response to the accusation that I was forceing an idea
on
somebody; I was doing just the opposite... advocating a greater range
of freedom of choice.

>People SHOULD NOT be able to force a change on the licensing
> authorities, based mainly on being too lazy to try to meet the standard.

it's a representative republic; the very cornerstone of democracy is that
the people are able to effect change when they feel it necessary for
whatever reason THEY feel. The idea that it's because they're "too lazy

to try to meet the standard" is simply your spin & rhetoric.

>
> Why should those of us that have the dedication have to be forced to have
> our privlidges reduced by those among us that are too lazy to bother to
meet
> the standards we did?

I wasn't aware that the NCTA crowd was advocating reducing your frequency
priviledges. Or, is that more spin? As far as I know, you and other
licensees
were going to retain all the priviledges they had before the testing reform.

By the way, thak you for including the latter part of the comment, PROVING
I was right... that it all boils down to nothing MORE than "I did it, so
waaaaa
waaaa waaaaa, everybody should have to be forced to do it!!!!!"

>Should be rejoice at this? I don't think so.

if it were true, no. But it's not. Your priviledges will not change; you
will be able
to transmit on all the frequencies that you could before the reform.

>
> We know that is what you SAY. The reality of the situation is based on
the
> simple knowledge that human beings will take the easy way. Once CW
testing
> is elliminated, CW use will eventually dissapear. Folks simply will not
> bother to learn it.

OH! so you admit the OTHER half of the AWEFUL truth! it comes down to
you want to FORCE people to do something they don't want to do necessarily
of thier own free will! well, the thing that made america so powerful, such
that
in 200 years +, we have surpassed nations in economic power that have been
on the planet for THOUSANDS of years, was that the free market forces were
allowed to decide what course the market would take... and low and behold,
the united states economic output is one third that of the total of the
ENTIRE
world..... that is, a nation with only 4.5% of the population has an
economic
value of 33% (about 11 trillion out of 34 trillion dollars) that of ALL
nations
combined....

...if people worked morse code ONLY because they were forced to, then
I doubt they would use it at all... that is to say, these same people would
only pass the code test and then not use CW if they really didn't have thier
hearts into it. If that was the ONLY thing keeping CW alive, it would
have died a long time ago. But the bands are full of CW operators that
are using it of thier own free will.

If the free market determines that it no longer wants it, than keeping it around is tantamount to nothing more than subsidizing a mode of communications. You will certainly NOT make any more fans or lovers of the code by MAKING them do it.

>
> I honestly don't think that 5 words per minute is asking too much to gain
> access to a large part of the spectrum. I can see your bitch about 20 and
> maybe even 13. But for GAWDS sake....5wpm....ANYONE can do that.
> Especially with the multiple guess test. Give it a rest. Pay your dues.
> Even if it is only half price...or less.

nah, better to work toward removing it, which is inevitable eventually.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4642. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:30:06 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkiree$295e7$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78157

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote ...

This Clint character uses this sort of 'arguement' on everything he does. Yet he claims 'knowledge' of the subject after saying basically that unless you were there, you know nothing about it. He shoots himself in the foot here as he does with the pro code testing commentary. In fact his arguement proves he is just being a world class smart ass. In otherwords let it go Arnie. May I express my sincere regrets that you have such a knowledge of those NAZI bastards.

You are right, Dan -- and I will let it go. I just wanted to get my thoughts on record.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4643. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:30:07 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmps8rblr3jr69@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78158

> Attempt you insults all you want to Clint. I still say you know nothing
and
> have no experience in the mode.

i'm glad your ESP classes and crystal ball are working for you. I had no
idea you KNEW so much about me without ever having met me or talked
to me on the air.

>
> If you don't run over 18wpm consistantly, and are able to sit down and
copy
> in your head. And have done so for years. Then may statement is true.
> You have no concept.
>
> And with you smart assed attitude you never will.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

well, perhaps it's my choice as a ham radio operator and a citizen of this
democratic society NOT to do be proficient at a code speed over 13,
or 18, or 40, or whatever.

Clint
KB5ZHT

>

4644. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:31:29 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkirh0$2bgpl$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78159

"Mike Coslo" wrote ...

Sad to think that a person believes that it is important to call people
that whether right or wrong, believe that the extra knowledge of a Morse
code test are equal to the worst scourge ever unleashed on the face of the
earth. Coupled with lectures to Dee on what her taste bud do or don't do.
Its clear... Clint doesn't play well with the other boys and girls.

Yep, he also runs with scissors I'll bet.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4645. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:32:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920203256.21642.00001016@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78160

In article <3F6CD69F.8020501@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>> Arnie,
>>
>> This Clint character uses this sort of 'arguement' on everything he does.
>> Yet he claims 'knowledge' of the subject after saying basically that unless
>> you were there, you know nothing about it.
>>
>> He shoots himself in the foot here as he does with the pro code testing
>> commentary. In fact his arguement proves he is just being a world class
>> smart ass.
>>
>> In otherwords let it go Arnie. May I express my sincere regrets that you
>> have such a knowledge of those NAZI bastards.
>
> As well it's unfortunate we know people that think that it is a fine
>argument technique to invoke them as a pejorative description. That is
>sad, sad sad.

I think you've been hit with too many hockeypucks without wearing
a helmet.

NOWHERE can any rational mind connect WANTING TO ELIMINATE
AN AMATEUR RADIO CODE TEST with the HOLOCAUST of WW2!

If you have a need for that, then you also have a need for mental therapy.

> It is also indicative of a person that doesn't play well with others

Yes, on Macy's side.

He can't stomach any opposition to some of his hobby preferences so
he pulls off this "ancestral insult" bullshit.

Poor baby. Has to rule the playground or he has a hissy fit.

> Clint doesn't play well with the other boys and girls.

Well, Mikey, YOU go and play with other boys and girls.

Meanwhile, us ADULTS will continue to bring up the SUBJECT of MORSE
CODE TESTING...not "outrage about ancestral insults."

Cheap, Mikey, you really cheap...

LHA

4646. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:32:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920203257.21642.00001018@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78163

In article <bki6qi$2467c$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Clint" wrote in part ...
>
> If you have been hiding in a cave for the last many years and didn't bring
>yourself out into the sunlight and fresh oxegen long enough to know what the
>reference means, then i'll educate you. It was a symbolic reference to any
>group, such as the brown shirts of the aforementioned group, and ultimately
>the national socialist party itself that ascended to power, of ramming thier
>radical ideas down people throats without regard to anything but it's own
>desire and wishes, no matter how useful, unuseful or down right malevolent.
>____
>
>What a complete and total jerk you are. If you had even one shred of
>decency, or you had family members that had died at the hands of the Nazis
>(as I have) -- you would *never* use the term in the above context.

What IS it with this RIGHTEOUS WRATH stuff, Ah-nold?

Are you so lacking in counter-arguments, have such thin skin that you
can't handle strong opposition that you bring out this ARTIFICIALITY
of "insults to ancestors?"

Rhetorically asking on my part. Of course you are deficient on both
counts. We all knew that. You don't have a good reason for keeping the
code test. You supposedly have me in some "kill file" so you can't be
disturbed by harsh words against your opinions. Tsk, tsk. No guts.

Drop all the "insult to ancestors" crap and GET REAL.

LHA

4647. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:32:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920203257.21642.00001017@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78166

In article <bki8e2$247pm$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>
>Clint,
>
>This is not a game where you hit home runs.

This is a newsgroup. It would seem that ANY trick is okay to win
message points.

>This is a serious subject.

Yes. Ah-nold the Codinator got his sword knotted.

>I'm
>a few years older than you, so it stands to reason that I've had the
>opportunity to speak directly with many of the members of my family who
>survived the Nazis' attempt to exterminate them in Poland.

Kiddo, I'm a few years older than YOU, but don't have any "ancestors"
who were in concentration camps. Instead, I've talked DIRECTLY to
those who were there, even a couple of ex-soldiers who helped
liberate one camp. Lots of those centers for Holocaust remembrance
here in Los Angeles.

Cut out this totally artificial-to-the-subject "ancestral insult" crap.

The word "nazi" (all lower case) has come to mean what Clint said
in the American language of TODAY.

>I listened to
>them many times over as a young man and understand fully the meaning of the
>word. I don't subscribe to your loose definition, and neither do the many
>people who lived under that tyranny. When you use it to describe those that
>are in favor of code testing in the ARS, you cheapen the meaning, and
>therefore the memories of all those people who did not survive.

You ought to run right down to your nearest Simon Weisenthal Center
and TELL THEM ABOUT YOUR OUTRAGE!!!!

>Please,
>think about this before you use the word again. That's all that I ask.

If the "ancestral outrage/insult" ploy is the best thing you can come up
with in a newsgroup concerning the MORSE CODE TEST FOR
AMATEUR RADIO LICENSING, you might as well quit trying to post
anything. Your artificiality has lost it for you. Negative message points.

LHA

4648. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:32:58 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920203258.21642.00001019@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78161

In article <7Y3bb.46625$Aq2.568@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dan/W4NTI"
<w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>Attempt you insults all you want to Clint. I still say you know nothing and
>have no experience in the mode.

Okay, so it's all right if YOU do the insulting, but "not all right" if
someone
else doesn't agree with you. :-)

>If you don't run over 18wpm consistantly, and are able to sit down and copy
>in your head. And have done so for years. Then may statement is true.
>You have no concept.

I can visually copy 1200 Baud text as it comes in and comprehend
everything. 300 Baud text is a piece of cake. :-)

>And with you smart assed attitude you never will.

Ah, well, with a smart-assed dumb and dumberer attitude like yours
about morse code, there isn't much hope for advancement in US ham
radio. It's all about the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service.

LHA

4649. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:32:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920203259.21642.00001020@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78164

In article <3F6C959C.9090809@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

> He comes in calls us the most repulsive people on the face of the
>earth, remember the N***S? and then says this?
>
> I still want to ask if this is the brave new ham type that we have to
>look forward to after Morse is gone.

Mike, I don't think you are the "most repulsive people on the face of the
earth." Ignorant of the wider world of radio communications, yes.
Unable to learn much of that wider radio world, yes. Rigid, strict
moralists in what is supposed to be an avocation, a recreation, yes.

Sort of like a hockeypuck in a way. Dense, solid, overly heavy for its
size, with no redeeming esthetics to it. :-)

LHA

4650. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:32:59 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920203259.21642.00001021@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78165

In article <Ns0bb.46237$Aq2.19627@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>Perhaps if you know nothings, with zero experience in Morse Code had a
>clue, it would help.

Isn't it amazing that the REST OF THE RADIO WORLD doesn't give
a damn about using morse code! Only in HAM radio.

Too bad the rest of the radio world can't see the TRUE LIGHT like you
do, huh, Dan?

LHA

4651. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:33:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920203300.21642.00001022@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78162

In article <sn0bb.46215$Aq2.29557@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>It continues to amaze me how these no knowledge, no experience, code haters
>think they know so much about the mode.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

It continues to amaze me how those no-knowledge, no-experience, code
lovers of amateur radio cannot get on the ball and overcome their
ignorance of all the other modes of communictions!

LHA

4652. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:33:02 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920203302.21642.00001023@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78167

In article <4h0pmvsk9bl1ja0dgd0nd6dp47se1c65tr@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>Very well said, Dee - anything is possible if you want to do it badly
>enough..

Yeah, riiiiiight, "Leo." :-)

Want to be a world-reknowned theoretical astrophysicist? No problem,
just contract some bad neural disease, go to an ivy-covered UK college
and write a few books. All you have to do is WILL yourself...for about
3 millenia. By that time, astrophysics will have become "easy" for you.

Want to be a famous artist and be featured in national magazines even
though you don't have have any art talent at all? No problem. WILL
yourself to draw/paint, spend hours at it...but hire a very good publicist
so you can become a "Grandpa Moses." [we've already had a Grandma]

>I am certainly no prodigy at morse, electronics, martial
>arts, cooking, business management or anything else - but I have
>always been able to accomplish the things that I was motivated to do.

...or conveniently FORGET those things you were not able to do...

>Mind you, it took me until I was 45 to become motivated enough to
>learn morse code - but I wanted to get on HF, focused on the goal,
>bought some training software online and passed the 5 wpm test four
>weeks later.

Oh, my. At age 20 I was ALREADY ON HF...and on VHF, on UHF,
on microwaves in Big Time communications before reaching 24...all
without any sort of morsemanship.

At age 26 I thought it might be a fun thing to learn morse code and
get a ham license to augment my First Phone license passed in '56.
Wasn't WORTH it to listen to all that beeping. I'd already done three
years of communications in the US Army, all of it trans-Pacific, all
without using or having to know morse code.

Doesn't make sense to me that, in this new millennium, AMATEURS
still DEMAND that everyone know morse in order to get a HAM license.

>Conversely, I have wanted to learn to play the guitar
>since I was a teenager - not sufficiently enough, though, as I never
>did do it. Which, in retrospect, is probably a good thing....

What?!? NO MOTIVATION!?! Terrible!

Can't you even do simple chords on a git-box?

I never had that problem. Next door neighbor was a part-time guitarist. Designed and built a portable amplifier to fit inside his guitar. Not a big boom-box with 5 KW of acoustic power...was way back in '63 when guitars were first getting popular. Design from scratch was no problem for me, nor the hardware. I liked drums better.

>Talent has very little to do with accomplishment (it does relate to
>the level of excellence that one can attain, but to become reasonably
>proficient in anything talent is not a factor), especially in ventures
>based primarily on rote repetition like morse, Karate, or learning a
>language.

HAH!!!!

I happen to have a talent for languages and have the physical equipment to speak with very little "English" dialect. I know others MORE literate (through formal schooling) in the same language as I know but have atrocious accents and can't always form written sentences in that language. They can spend decades of such study and will never get it down properly. Not a problem for me.

I just don't see any sense in maintaining a federal morse code test in this day and age for a HOBBY activity. I've been doing REAL HF comm long before nearly all of these old-timer morsemen without needing any HOBBY code test.

>Blaming a lack of talent for failure to accomplish something reflects
>on a persons' own inability to accept responsibility for their own
>actions - successful people, quite simply, go out and get what they
>want. Or, in the words of Albert Gray:

Yes, WANT violin playing ability on par with Itzak Perlman badly enough and it can be done?

WANT to be a baseball great like the Mariner's John Olerud and it can be done just by determination and practice?

"Will and idea" (and determination) is all that is necessary?

I don't think so.

The existance of the morse code test for an AMATEUR radio license is NOT some moral bullshit thing of "will and determination." There's NO divine idea that the morse code test must always be. AMATEUR radio is a hobby, not a Premium Life Accomplishment.

I think some of you have wigged-out too far and need investigation for Illegal substance abuse...

LHA

4653. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:36:29 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmpskoorigikbd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78168

I think that may be a prevailing sentiment and character
trait of that crowd, actually.

After talking to them enough, you FINALLY get out
of them, as I have, the truth (but I suspected it all along).

It's is tantamount to an authoritarian's way of running
a government. Free market forces aren't to dictate
policy or courses of action, but the pointing of fingers
and swinging of riding crops IS. If you read the
various responses that a few of the PCTA types have
made to all of our comments, it all boils down to the following
doctrine...

(1) I had to do it, so should YOU.
(2) It shouldn't be up to a free citizen to operate as he sees
fit; he should do what he's told, for the better good of
the existence of the archaic mode in question (CW)
(3) Shut up, your opinion in the operation of the government
(read: FCC) doesn't matter, and you should not have the
the right to have any influence on how it governs you;
you're the subject of the empire.
(4) The public at large (ham radio operators) should NOT
be BURDENED with having to make choices; they
should not have the freedom to choose how to use
thier skills to the ends that they see fit; such is an
IMPOSITION upon them.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

A quote from Paul Cook, a typical "understanding
and tolerant" liberal...

">People like you really have no place in a civilized society although that
>same society does try to accommodate you. You're basically an idiot who
>takes advantage of what a society has to offer each and every single day
yet
>you refuse to acknowledge its cost or its benefits to you. "

Facts are to socialists what crosses are to vampires

--
"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309201217.e2311fa@posting.google.com...
> Clint, not only can Dave be the smuggest of PCTAs on r.r.a.p., but he
> has a certain penchant for obtuseness. He is a master of not
> understanding whatever it is that isn't going his way.
>
> Brian
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:<vmonaflq4rh635@corp.supernews.com>...
> > actually, it was my tale and he correctly read
> > between the lines; he knew EXACTLY what
> > I was meaning to say.
> >
> > Clint
> > KB5ZHT
> >
> > >
> > > Not so, Farnsworth. There is nothing about a PCTA in the tale
anywhere.
> > > You continue to do your reading between the lines.
> > >
> > > Dave K8MN

4654. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:38:00 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmpsnjrqojo010@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78169

> What a complete and total jerk you are. If you had even one shred of
> decency, or you had family members that had died at the hands of the Nazis
> (as I have) -- you would *never* use the term in the above context.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
>

I had two uncles fight in that war, for one thing, and for another, I did
not know you had a monopoly on morality. Forgot you were coronated
to that position, I guess.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4655. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:39:02 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmpspih97rne46@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78170

I pity him though.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Hm, nice condescending attitude.

4656. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:40:07 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmpsrifqb4dl7a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78171

>
> Do you need any more help on etymology?
>
> LHA
>
>

I think that person, in an attempt to try to take the moral
high ground, appointed himself the monopoly on
morality and sympathy.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4657. Play the Art Bell Drinking Game tonight !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:41:43 UTC
From: Beloved Leader #4 <profishwrapper@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1064105442.55001@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 78172
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

As you probably know by now, tonight Art Bell returns
to host Coast to Coast AM. In honor of this (his latest
return from retirement...again) we present:

******* The Art Bell Drinking Game ********

taken from http://www.skepticult.org/artpar/Drunk.htm

Supplies needed for play

*One bottle of Wild Turkey Bourbon per player

*One six-pack of beer per player preferably
generic or Rolling Rock to keep with the Art
Bell theme

*One shot glass per player

*One 16 oz beer mug per player

*One AM radio or Internet RealAudio set to to www.coasttocoastam.com

How to play :

Tune your radio to Art Bell Coast to Coast or Dreamland

When Art uses the words "anomaly" or "paradigm" incorrectly, everyone
drinks a shot of wild turkey.

When Art uses the words "anomaly" or "paradigm" correctly, everyone guzzles
a boilermaker.

When Art uses the phrase "It's all starting to come together" everyone must
remove an article of clothing and yells: "Beam me up Scotty!
(this part has no effect on the outcome of the game, but it's a hell of a
lot of fun).

Winning the game :

The last person to remain conscious wins the game. Under normal conditions,
a winner is determined in the first 45 minutes of Art's show.

4658. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:42:20 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmpsvnsh66lufc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78173

> And I think YOU are FRENCH!!! Are you French, Clint?

LOL! that's a good one.

>
> It is fascinating to read your repulsive posts about equating Pro-coder
> with Nazi's. Just fascinating. However, you have convinced me of one
> thing.I think you are perhaps the epitome of the No-coder, the brave new
> ham that takes the ARS into the 21st century.
>

well, i'll play your little game.
Are you saying that, if that IS so, than they don't meet YOUR qualifications
even if they DO meet the FCC's qualifications, and therefore are invalid?
I guess it's going to be a shock for the millions of hams worldwide to find
out that the Final and Last Word falls to Mike, KB3EIA.

And you insinuate that I am judgemental.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4659. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:43:01 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmpt10ja2rvk22@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78174

> You have my pity, Clint, you really do.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

LOL, I guess you STILL think that concocting a remark
like that somehow gains your superiority and relavence.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4660. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:46:56 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmpt8efngup3e3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78175

Hey, look your family members certainly have my
sympathy for what happened, but do not try to use
that moral high ground to change and divert the course
HERE.

I guess freedom of speech, if and only if it doesn't
offend? If you really got that offended by what I said,
and this is the last time I will speak to you on this matter
(period), then block my messages from being downloaded
on your computer, or do not read them; however, you
should not try to censor anybody.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4661. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:50:01 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmpte4g6t6mp7f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78176

> Arnie,
>
> This Clint character uses this sort of 'arguement' on everything he does.
> Yet he claims 'knowledge' of the subject after saying basically that
unless
> you were there, you know nothing about it.

BZZZZZZZT!

Should we give mike a point for trying a "turn around" tactic?

It was I who was told by one of you toleratant and understanding types
that it was I who couldn't know anything unless I was there.

>
> He shoots himself in the foot here as he does with the pro code testing
> commentary.

heh, okay... sit back and see the events that unfold in the ham radio
community regarding testing over the next few years and see what happens.

>In fact his arguement proves he is just being a world class
> smart ass.

Is that better or worse than being a self-crowned, self-proclaimed
"arbitrator of all that is right and just on ham license testing" ????

You think you've won the race until you find out that you showed
up to the WRONG race track.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4662. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:53:30 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmptkm6quagt26@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78177

> No my analogy is quite correct. To determine the worth of pizza, you must
> eat to see if it is a food worth your bother. Knowing the ingredients will
> not tell you that.

here's a more accurate anology....

"You can't possibly know anything about pizza, and i'm telling you that it's an important staple to you diet. Your opinion means nothing; I am now pointing the gun of licenseing system at your head and ORDERING you to take a bite of the pizza, I am not worried one bit about what the facts are or what the market wants... I am going to see to it that everybody is force fed pizza whether they like it or not."

Clint
KB5ZHT

4663. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 00:58:06 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmptt9rrsje11c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78178

> Outside of sounding like low-grade bullshit, that "reason" could be
taken
> as wanting a government WELFARE program to preserve morse code.
>
> If morsemanship is so damn much fun, easy to learn, etc., then it can
> be done WITHOUT needing the subsistence of any federal testing.

That was my EXACT point in an earlier post.... I was told by a certain
PCTA type that "it won't exist anymore unless we force it on everybody"...
well, heh, according to darwin and also the free market, the most fit
survive and the free market, left to run the course as it will in and of
its own needs will result in the best suited result.

If you have to MAKE it happen, then it isn't making it on it's own
merit.

> >>
> >> I'm afraid of your motives in all this, Larry. I don't like the words
I
> >>hear from many advocating the continuation of the code testing
requirement.
> >>Those words often reek of bigotry, elitism, and discrimination against
other
> >>Americans.

social engineering.
it's affirmative action for CW; it's as you said, a welfare program for
it....

> >
> >One of the classic NCTA whines. Us horrible old PCTA's want to keep
> >Morse code going so that we can continue to demonstrate the dominance
> >of the white, middle-class, American male, who represents 5% of the
> >world's population yet consumes 25% of the planet's resources,

and ALSO produces 33% of the worlds economic output, to the tune
of 11 TRILLION dollars out of the 33 trillion sum total of all nations.

Just to keep the record straight.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4664. Re: EchoLink and Hurricane Isabel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 01:16:26 UTC
From: Beloved Leader #4 <profishwrapper@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1064107522.341249@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 78179
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:0872989.96976354@taranews.net...
> On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 17:26:57 -0400, KC0??? <Whome@whoareyou.net> wrote:
> > No he didn't forget! He let it out on PURPOSE! Echolink is a
joke.......
>
> Because it didn't go down. You see, oh net-clueless one, Echolink has
> multiple servers all across the country, and it's not possible to kill
> all of those servers with a power outage.
>
> Anybody using a battery-powered laptop with a phoneline or satellite
> link would have stayed in business just fine. It's no different than
> using an emergency-powered ham station, except that it's a lot more
> reliable.
>
> Echolink is the wave of the future AND YOU JUST CAN'T STAND IT!!!!

Well said !!

Echolink's performance during the Hurricane
Emergency exposed the TECHNOLOGICAL
OBSOLENCE of traditional SSB Amateur Radio.

And there's N O B O D Y who can dispute that
from a rational technological perspective.

4665. Re: EchoLink and Hurricane Isabel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 01:32:19 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <Dc7bb.4527$HB5.2425@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78180
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Another no-callsign Troll, running down amateur radio on a ham radio
newsgroup.

(yawn)

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

"Beloved Leader #4" <profishwrapper@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:1064107522.341249@newshost03.voicenet.com...
>
> "Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
> news:0872989.96976354@taranews.net...
> > On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 17:26:57 -0400, KC0??? <Whome@whoareyou.net> wrote:
> > > No he didn't forget! He let it out on PURPOSE! Echolink is a
> joke.......
> >
> > Because it didn't go down. You see, oh net-clueless one, Echolink has
> > multiple servers all across the country, and it's not possible to kill
> > all of those servers with a power outage.
> >
> > Anybody using a battery-powered laptop with a phoneline or satellite
> > link would have stayed in business just fine. It's no different than
> > using an emergency-powered ham station, except that it's a lot more
> > reliable.
> >
> > Echolink is the wave of the future AND YOU JUST CAN'T STAND IT!!!!
>
> Well said !!
>
> Echolink's performance during the Hurricane
> Emergency exposed the TECHNOLOGICAL
> OBSOLENCE of traditional SSB Amateur Radio.
>
> And there's N O B O D Y who can dispute that
> from a rational technological perspective.
>

4666. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 01:34:28 UTC
From: "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net>
Message-ID: <Ee7bb.394723$Oz4.182456@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 78181

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in
news:bkhrut$1ov@library2.airnews.net:
>
> *ahem* Larry thinks that just because he could not handle an
> intelligent, good-looking, self-starting, independent woman such as
> myself, that all men are as weak and obsessed with material things as
> he is...
>
> Pay no mind... his kind is in the minority.
>
> Kim W5TIT

Larry, I saw a photo of TIT once on QRZ and let me tell you, she's not as
dumb as she looks.

KB7ADL

4667. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 01:43:37 UTC
From: Ed Price <edprice@cox.net>
Message-ID: <1n7bb.332$La.205@fed1read02>
Source record: 78182
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Harry Quiff" <quiff@merkin.net> wrote in message
news:bkims8qhf1@216.221.129.15...
> On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 18:30:35 -0400, BIG AL wrote:
>
> > ALL OF YOU PEOPLE NEED TO STAY OFF OF MY FREQUENCY. 3.894.5 IS BIG AL'S
> > FREQUENCY. UNLESS YOU ARE INVITED DO NOT COME TO MY FREQUENCY.
ESPECIALLY
> > W8RBK ELVIE WITH HIS GIRLY VOICE. HO HO
>
>
> Why don't you go fuck yourself?
>
> No one cares about the assclowns on night time HF. Every one is a loser.
>
> I hope Riley eventually finds and ass fucks every one of you.

Hmmm, 3.894.5 is a rather unique way to express it. Accuracy always commands
respect.

Ed
WB6WSN

4668. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 01:52:15 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkj08fjks0@208.206.142.69>
Source record: 78183

Arnie Macy wrote:

>"Clint" wrote in part ...
>
> If you have been hiding in a cave for the last many years and didn't bring
>yourself out into the sunlight and fresh oxegen long enough to know what the
>reference means, then i'll educate you. It was a symbolic reference to any
>group, such as the brown shirts of the aforementioned group, and ultimately
>the national socialist party itself that ascended to power, of ramming thier
>radical ideas down people throats without regard to anything but it's own
>desire and wishes, no matter how useful, unuseful or down right malevolent.
>_____
>
>What a complete and total jerk you are. If you had even one shred of
>decency, or you had family members that had died at the hands of the Nazis
>(as I have) -- you would *never* use the term in the above context.
>
>
>

Arnie, that's the mindset of the codefree New Agers. They can't make
in the environment that we made it within, so the proper thing for them
to do is demonize that environment so that none of them should have to
do so. In so doing they also demonize everyone who finds nothing
threatening nor untoward about that environment.
It's a classic case of destroy that which you can't attain. If you
can't make it to the top, work the top down to something you can get to.
What a shame.

4669. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:13:25 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkj1g4$2aflr$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78184

"Clint" wrote ...

Hey, look your family members certainly have my sympathy for what happened,
but do not try to use that moral high ground to change and divert the course
HERE.

I guess freedom of speech, if and only if it doesn't offend? If you really
got that offended by what I said, and this is the last time I will speak to
you on this matter (period), then block my messages from being downloaded on
your computer, or do not read them; however, you should not try to censor
anybody.

I am not trying to censor you, Clint. I am just highly offended by the use
of the word out of context. It is not a matter of freedom of speech, it is
a matter of decency. You could have easily chosen to use another word to
characterize the pro-code side of this debate and still made your point.
That's all I'm saying.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4670. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:14:27 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <h22qmvccsjlivdm2td12rb19c71r9lq6nm@4ax.com>
Source record: 78185

Friendly fellow - the technical abilities of Farnsworth, and the
gentle persuasive manner of Mike Tyson.

But, as Nick Pope once said:

"Minds are like parachutes; they work best when they are open".

Be well,

73, Leo

On 21 Sep 2003 00:33:02 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <4h0pmvsk9bl1ja0dgd0nd6dp47se1c65tr@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
>writes:
>
>>Very well said, Dee - anything is possible if you want to do it badly
>>enough..
>
> Yeah, riiiiiight, "Leo." :-)
>
>snip

4671. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:19:49 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309201819.14c8ac94@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78186

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030920005105.15923.00000794@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0309191641.6de6c194@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
> >news:<20030919000342.01893.00000676@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> >> In article <bkdfen$j426$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
> >> <kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >"Bill Sohl" wrote in part ...
> >> >
> >> >"FCC nor almost every emergency preparedness organization/operation has no
> >> >desire or need for morse in their plans."
> >> >____
> >> >
> >> >I ask because you wrote the above. Why do you think the EM planners have
> >> >"no need" for Morse? Any tool available should be considered for use in
> the
> >> >EM package.
> >>
> >> How about flag semaphore? Night semaphore with lighted torches?
> >>
> >> That worked well in the US Civil War...and the crossed flags with torch
> >> at the center became the collar insignia of the US Army Signal Corps.
> >>
> >> Signal Corps LONG AGO abandoned flag and torch semaphore and
> >> doesn't use morse code for communications anymore. [are you keeping
> >> up to date on your former employer, the US Army?]
> >
> >I once saw lighted torch semaphore demonstrated by a Chinese Acrobatic
> >Circus.
> >
> >I think they were sending "Yankee Go Home."
> >
> >Or were they just juggling?
>
> Don't know. I don't speak Mandarin Morse.

Well, why not? Maybe you need a test?

> >> >Not only is our equipment capable of Morse, but we have CW
> >> >capable operators for each. We've used it in the past and I strongly
> >> >suspect that will do so in the future as well.
> >>

> >> Great! You helped save the Titanic and now you are ready to save the
> >> Titanic II.
> >>
> >> Why in the hell are you busy Internetting when Isabel has hit land?
> >>
> >> Afraid of getting your code key wet?
> >>
> >> LHA
> >
> >Now Len, you know they aren't actually using Morse Code for storm comms.
>
> No! No? You mean the ARRL news page has led everyone astray all
> these years?!? Say it isn't so!
>
> LHA
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> :-)

Ah, yes. It is so!

The October QST shows the DMSP night-time visual image of North
America, during the big black out. Very worthwhile to take a look at.
And not a single pixel of it was sent using Morse Code.

;^) Brian

4672. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:21:49 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkj1vs$2bflg$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78187

"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...

Kiddo, I'm a few years older than YOU, but don't have any "ancestors" who were in concentration camps. Instead, I've talked DIRECTLY to those who were there, even a couple of ex-soldiers who helped liberate one camp. Lots of those centers for Holocaust remembrance here in Los Angeles. Cut out this totally artificial-to-the-subject "ancestral insult" crap. The word "nazi" (all lower case) has come to mean what Clint said in the American language of TODAY.

I've also talked to them *directly*, Len. And to a person, they do not accept the "modern" definition of the word -- and why should they? If you had relatives that lived through it (and some that didn't) I strongly suspect that you would feel differently.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4673. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:22:12 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmq2r1aekde48a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78188

> Okay, so it's all right if YOU do the insulting, but "not all right" if
> someone
> else doesn't agree with you. :-)
>

does it suprise you that the PCTA crowd also adds hypocrisy to it's list
of character flaws?

Clint
KB5ZHT

4674. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:22:31 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkj217$m99$0@208.206.142.113>
Source record: 78189

Mike Coslo wrote:

>
>
> Clint wrote:
>
>>> We can have plenty of fun in here arguing with each other without
>>> resorting to that.
>>>
>>> Think about it Clint.
>>>
>>
>>
>>
>> I have and reject the premis of your argument.
>
>
> SO what you are saying is that you HAVE to call us Nazi's, Clint?
>
> You have my pity, Clint, you really do.

That's about the extent of the mental capacity of the no-coder, Mike.
They have too little vision to
be able to see value in radiotelegraphy, so all they can see is that
anyone who has that capacity must be on the far opposite end of the scale.

One must ponder their IQ. For the most part it's down with the whale
offal.

4675. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:25:00 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmq30am583bk07@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78190

>
> I am not trying to censor you, Clint. I am just highly offended by the
use
> of the word out of context.

but always remember, that is *your* opinion.
I happen to think the analogy is quite accurate.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4676. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:27:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309201827.6415a41d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78191

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030920184425.14837.00003101@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <3F6C52B8.4010105@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >> Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:<bke6dj$pm7$0@208.206.142.96>...
> >>
> >>>Greg Courville wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>I've been a ham for only a month now, and been using these groups for
> >>>>about 6 weeks.
> >>>>I really can't stand some of the things that go on here.
> >>>>Has anybody ever noticed that 8 out of 10 threads on this group (and
> >>>>many other amateur radio groups) end in a flame war?
> >>>>It's really shocking how people can start an argument over nothing
> >>>>which can escalate to vicious strings of insults complete with
> >>>>profanity, sexual references and terms such as "CBplusser" and
> >>>>"Knuckle-Dragger".
> >>>
> >>>Greg if you want to see how all this began just spend some time in Google
> >>>and you canget an educaion. It sure didn't start by old timers belittling
> >>>newcomers. In fact it was and IS the exact reverse. Not all newcomers, by
> >>>any means, just those on this board who decided to do it, and persist to
> >>>this day.
> >>>
> >>
> >> DICK would like to present himself as a "reasonable" ham. DICK is
> >> primary in this newgroup for inciting namecalling, preferring to call
> >> names rather than have a legitimate discussion. See -every- post he's
> >> made in the last week.
> >>
> > Strange, Brian. I am a nickle extra, and am not very good at CW, and I
> >get along just fine with Dick.
> >
>
> You like Dick? !!?!!
>
> LHA

Oh, geez!

I think I'll go sign up for the date with Kim just to set the record straight.

;^)

4677. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:29:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920222955.21457.00000746@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 78192

In article <vmnaife87u3a24@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
<rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:

>You have to put on the jackboots of the CW police
>and march in goosestep with the CW nazis, or
>you'll get bashed a good one with a morse code
>key.

BZZZZZZT.....Godwin's Law invoked.

GAME OVER

You just lost, Clint.

All your base are belong to us.

4678. Re: End of CW in Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:29:55 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920222955.21457.00000747@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 78193

In article <20030920184440.14837.00003110@mb-m03.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <3F6BD3CF.456BD5E3@earthlink.net>, Dave Heil <k8mn@earthlink.net>
>writes:
>
>>But Leonard, old chap, you aren't an AMATEUR radio op at all under the
>>standards of any year. You aren't even qualified in "hoop jumping" as
>>you call it. The fact is, if you are ever to grace us with your
>>presence on the ham bands, you'll jump through whatever "hoops" the
>>government has in place or you won't be licensed.
>
> Herr Robust...go back to your day job of translating "Main Kampf"
> into Morse...
>
BZZZZZZT.....Godwin's Law invoked.

GAME OVER

You just lost, Len.

All your base are belong to us.

4679. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:32:55 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <e13qmvcond9cbb09dqvuo0s42q364mvoq8@4ax.com>
Source record: 78194

Dick / Brian,

Not sure what relationship this has to either Amateur Radio or the
news that I posted....I must have accidentally cross-posted to
alt.jingoism and alt.fearmongering again!

Sorry 'boot that, eh?

73, Leo

On 20 Sep 2003 14:13:17 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:

>Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bkgoct$tf3$0@208.206.142.97>...
>
>> Yes, Leo, you'r also the country which allows all comers to enter as
>> immigrants, with no ID or any proof of who they are or what they plan to
>> do. All in the name of "inclusivity" or some such nonsense. Come one, come
>> all.
>>
>> Terrorist? Who cares?
>
>Then they cross our border.

4680. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:37:30 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkj2t9$29rs8$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78195

"Clint" wrote ...

"You can't possibly know anything about pizza, and i'm telling you that it's an important staple to you diet. Your opinion means nothing; I am now pointing the gun of licenseing system at your head and ORDERING you to take a bite of the pizza, I am not worried one bit about what the facts are or what the market wants... I am going to see to it that everybody is force fed pizza whether they like it or not."

Well in the case of Amateur Radio, *we* are the market. A recent (June 5, 2003) survey done in the Dakota Division is quite enlightening. Here are some of the results that are specifically related to Morse Code:

"Division members are divided on the Entry level license with slightly more of those replying saying that Morse Code should not be required for access to HF. That changes as as we move to General and Extra. Nearly 70% say there should be a Morse requirement for Extra Class licensees.

Two areas are particularly interesting. Nearly 94% said we should continue to keep a CW and data band segement even if the Morse Code Requirement was eliminated. More than 83% said the Entry level license should have some HF privileges."

This survey indicates that there is not the groundswell of support for the complete removal of CW testing that is claimed by the NCTA side of this debate.

Arnie -
KT4ST

4681. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:41:00 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309201841.51137659@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78196

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<i6Mab.846$Hd6.623809@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309191022.4529760@posting.google.com...
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:<bkbcf1ibd0@208.206.142.69>...
> > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > >
> > > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:bkb8pg$8l8$0@208.206.142.108...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Bill Sohl wrote:
> > > > >
> > > > > > "IARU policy is to support the removal of Morse code testing as a
> > > > > > requirement
> > > > > > for an amateur license to operate on frequencies below 30 MHz,"
> the IARU
> > > > > > Administrative Council resolved.
> > > > >
> > > > > So read it Bill-- that means they support *an* amateur radio license
> allowing HF
> > > > > operation without code, NOT the removal of all code testing.
> > > >
> > > > If that's what you think it sez...dream on.
> > >
> > > It sez what it sez, Bill. And that's what it sez!
> >
> > Part 97 sez Morse Code at 5WPM, not Farnsworth Code at 13-15WPM.
>
> If you contact the VE team ahead of time, you have the right to insist that
> they obtain and administer the test to you with both the word speed and the
> letter speed set to 5wpm.

Wow, you mean if I prearrange it, the VEC will actually comply with Part 97?

Tell you what though, even counting dots and
> dashes, letters at that slow speed are painful to decipher. Plus there is
> no time between letters for your brain to process the letter. Unless a
> person actually counts the dots and dashes, it's much easier to fail when
> the Morse test is set at word and letter speed of 5wpm than when the Morse
> test is set with the word speed at 5wpm and the character speed at 13wpm.

If I knew Morse Code at 13-15 wpm, that is.

> At a character speed of 5wpm, you can't hear the letter as a letter and you
> can't react to the sound on a reflex basis.

But, Dee, I passed the Novice test with 100% copy.

4682. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:52:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Xn8bb.47515$Aq2.25949@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78197

"WA8ULX" wrote:
>
> Well thats easy, I will just be renewing an existing License,
> BIG difference from the New Welfare Licenses.

Do you get a new license in the mail like most others do?

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4683. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:55:50 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Wq8bb.47546$Aq2.19250@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78198

"WA8ULX" wrote:
>
> Took the Test on a Bet by 2 No-Coders, did no studying,
> score 100%, collected $250.00 from the No-Coders, and
> to top it off, I got to see the No-Coders fail there Tech plus.

The last time you told this story, I thought it was two CB'ers you supposedly collected the bet from.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4684. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:56:13 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkj4q2$8ed@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 78106

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:sp_ab.1205$Hd6.891178@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:J7_ab.42680$NM1.38979@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> > >
> > > (snip) However, as previously stated, you are not qualified
> > > to make any judgment against the code testing requirement,
> > > since you have not gained practical operational experience
> > > in this mode. (snip)
> > >
> > >
> > Larry, one does not need to survive a house fire to make judgements
> about
> > fire safety. Or be attacked by a foreign government to make a judgement
> > about certain defense planning. Or live under a dictator to make
> judgements
> > about laws affecting our freedoms. Or experience a business failure to
> make
> > wise business judgements. Or experience anything else firsthand to make
> > value judgements about it.
> >
>
> One does have to eat a pizza to evaluate its taste and whether they will
> like it or not.
>

Not necessarilly. If one knows the ingredients of pizza, they do not have
to eat it to know whether they would like it or not.

>
> I love pizza but hate tomatoes, cheese, and garlic. Yet
> combine them into a pizza and the result is entirely different. No one
can
> tell how a cake will taste simply from reading the ingredients on a box.
>

Depends. If it's a chocolate cake and we know that we can't *really* taste
the eggs (I can't stand eggs), then I'm pretty sure I'd like a chocolate
cake.

>
> You can evaluate its nutritional content but not its taste. So while
there

> are some things that do not need to be experienced to evaluate them, there
> are other things that do.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

I think you're grabbing at straws, Dee.

Kim W5TIT

4685. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:57:12 UTC
From: Lou <Spamfree@Spamfree.com>
Message-ID: <ms8bb.12$LJ5.2141@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 78200
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ed Price" <edprice@cox.net> wrote in message
news:1n7bb.332$La.205@fed1read02...
>
> "Harry Quiff" <quiff@merkin.net> wrote in message
> news:bkims8qhf1@216.221.129.15...
> > On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 18:30:35 -0400, BIG AL wrote:
> >
> > > ALL OF YOU PEOPLE NEED TO STAY OFF OF MY FREQUENCY. 3.894.5 IS BIG
AL'S
> > > FREQUENCY. UNLESS YOU ARE INVITED DO NOT COME TO MY FREQUENCY.
> ESPECIALLY
> > > W8RBK ELVIE WITH HIS GIRLY VOICE. HO HO
> >
> >
> > Why don't you go fuck yourself?
> >
> > No one cares about the assclowns on night time HF. Every one is a loser.
> >
> > I hope Riley eventually finds and ass fucks every one of you.
>
>
>
> Hmmm, 3.894.5 is a rather unique way to express it. Accuracy always
commands
> respect.
>
> Ed
> WB6WSN
>

Since when did it become a "private" frequency? The H.F. Frequencies used for Ham operation are open to any one with the proper class of license to use them. Of course common courtesy does count when the frequency may already be in use. No wonder people are turning away from Ham. It is getting horrible. Used to be, I boasted it to anyone interested. Now, I tell them not to waste their time. It is getting to be High Power CB. As for the FCC, they have lost the battle so far as I'm concerned. The horses are out of the barn. TOO LATE! I'm about ready to sell all my ham gear.. Get my cash out of it while there is still some value left to it. I would NEVER buy a new rig again, that is for sure. I'll buy "used" if I decide to stay in it. It just isn't worth the huge cash lay out.

Lou

4686. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 02:57:32 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ws8bb.47563$Aq2.6518@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78199

"Brian" wrote:
>
> Bruice is the welfare idiot of which he speaks.

You won't get any argument about that from me.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4687. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 03:03:00 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkj4q3$8ed@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 78105

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bki8pn$23md0$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote ...
>
> But, but, but!!!! Larry's obviously got or had large boobs, and has
> obviously worn a bra. Right?! He *has* hasn't he? Surely, for if not he
> would not be making value judgements on my callsign.
> ----------
>
> It took a while, but I have grown accustomed to your callsign, Kim. And
it
> wasn't necessary for me to wear a bra to do it. ;-)
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
>

Uh, Arnie? If you wore a bra, the only thing you'd get from me would be,
"What ya packin' there, big fella?" ;)

Kim W5TIT

4688. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 03:04:41 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <dz8bb.47627$Aq2.26004@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78101

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> One does have to eat a pizza to evaluate its taste
> and whether they will like it or not. (snip) So while
> there are some things that do not need to be
> experienced to evaluate them, there are other things
> that do.

Well, unless one can eat a license requirement, I think my analogies were
a little more relavent.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4689. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 03:04:49 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920230449.16504.00001327@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 78103

>The last time you told this story, I thought it was two CB'ers you
>supposedly collected the bet from.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET

Theres no difference

4690. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 03:05:01 UTC
From: BIG AL <imafuckingwindbag@bigalk4oka.net>
Message-ID: <vmq5ars9c9i455@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78102
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

HO HO. SELL YOUR GEAR I DONT CARE. JUST STAY OFF OF 3.894.5. THATS BIG ALS FREQUENCY. HO HO. I'LL BE TAKING OVER 3.898 NEXT. HO HO

AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. HO HO

"Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
news:ms8bb.12$LJ5.2141@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> "Ed Price" <edprice@cox.net> wrote in message
> news:1n7bb.332$La.205@fed1read02...
> >
> > "Harry Quiff" <quiff@merkin.net> wrote in message
> > news:bkims8qhf1@216.221.129.15...
> > > On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 18:30:35 -0400, BIG AL wrote:
> > >
> > > > ALL OF YOU PEOPLE NEED TO STAY OFF OF MY FREQUENCY. 3.894.5 IS BIG
> AL'S
> > > > FREQUENCY. UNLESS YOU ARE INVITED DO NOT COME TO MY FREQUENCY.
> > ESPECIALLY
> > > > W8RBK ELVIE WITH HIS GIRLY VOICE. HO HO
> > >
> > >
> > > Why don't you go fuck yourself?
> > >
> > > No one cares about the assclowns on night time HF. Every one is a
loser.
> > >
> > > I hope Riley eventually finds and ass fucks every one of you.
> >
> >
> >
> > Hmmm, 3.894.5 is a rather unique way to express it. Accuracy always
> commands
> > respect.
> >
> > Ed
> > WB6WSN
> >
>
> Since when did it become a "private" frequency? The H.F. Frequencies used
> for Ham operation are open to any one with the proper class of license to
> use them. Of course common courtesy does count when the frequency may
> already be in use. No wonder people are turning away from Ham. It is
getting

> horrible. Used to be, I boasted it to anyone interested. Now, I tell them
> not to waste their time. It is getting to be High Power CB. As for the
FCC,
> they have lost the battle so far as I'm concerned. The horses are out of
the
> barn. TOO LATE! I'm about ready to sell all my ham gear.. Get my cash out
of
> it while there is still some value left to it. I would NEVER buy a new rig
> again, that is for sure. I'll buy "used" if I decide to stay in it. It
just
> isn't worth the huge cash lay out.
>
> Lou
>
>

4691. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 03:06:09 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030920230609.16504.00001328@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 78104

> You won't get any argument about that from me.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

And you will never be able to get a Real ham License, just 1 of them there
CBplusser Licenses

4692. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 03:11:34 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkj4ss$g6u@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 78107

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:Ee7bb.394723$Oz4.182456@rwcrnsc54...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in
> news:bkhrut$1ov@library2.airnews.net:
> >
> > *ahem* Larry thinks that just because he could not handle an
> > intelligent, good-looking, self-starting, independent woman such as
> > myself, that all men are as weak and obsessed with material things as
> > he is...
> >
> > Pay no mind... his kind is in the minority.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
>
> Larry, I saw a photo of TIT once on QRZ and let me tell you, she's not as
> dumb as she looks.
>
>
> KB7ADL
>

Yep. And I'm not as dumb as you act, either.

Kim W5TIT

4693. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 03:17:02 UTC
From: "David G. Nagel" <nagel@core.com>
Message-ID: <vmq625lg4b4kf2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78108
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In a word he "GOTYA".

Harry Quiff wrote:
> On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 18:30:35 -0400, BIG AL wrote:
>
>
>>ALL OF YOU PEOPLE NEED TO STAY OFF OF MY FREQUENCY. 3.894.5 IS BIG AL'S
>>FREQUENCY. UNLESS YOU ARE INVITED DO NOT COME TO MY FREQUENCY. ESPECIALLY
>>W8RBK ELVIE WITH HIS GIRLY VOICE. HO HO
>
>
>
> Why don't you go fuck yourself?
>
> No one cares about the assclowns on night time HF. Every one is a loser.
>
> I hope Riley eventually finds and ass fucks every one of you.

4694. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 03:20:35 UTC
From: Lou <Spamfree@Spamfree.com>
Message-ID: <iO8bb.13$LJ5.2273@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 78109
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@bigalk4oka.net> wrote in message
news:vmq5ars9c9i455@corp.supernews.com...
> HO HO. SELL YOUR GEAR I DONT CARE. JUST STAY OFF OF 3.894.5. THATS BIG ALS
> FREQUENCY. HO HO. I'LL BE TAKING OVER 3.898 NEXT. HO HO
>
> AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. HO HO
>
>

If I choose to talk on that frequency, I will, so long as I'm abiding by the rules and regulations as they are spelled out. YOU or no one else, can tell me to stay off. ASS WIPE.

BIG AL.. the only thing big about you, is your mouth....

Lou

4695. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 03:22:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2Q8bb.47792$Aq2.28893@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78110

"Arnie Macy" wrote:
>
> Well in the case of Amateur Radio, *we* are the market. (snip)

Actually, since the FCC works for all Americans, the American people are the market. Current operators represent less than one half of one percent of that market and we are not growing fast enough to even keep up with the normal population growth. To many, those facts strongly suggest a need for some serious changes.

> A recent (June 5, 2003) survey done in the Dakota Division is
> quite enlightening. Here are some of the results (snip)

What was the breakdown by license class of those surveyed and what efforts were made to insure the results were representative?

> This survey indicates that there is not the groundswell of support
> for the complete removal of CW testing that is claimed by the
> NCTA side of this debate.

I don't remember anyone saying there was groundswell support. Instead, most have argued about the current need for a license requirement.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4696. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 03:37:56 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <o29bb.47926$Aq2.31047@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78111

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> Well, more importantly, when was the last time Larry
> wore a bra? (Wooshhhhhh--he will never get that one).

Obviously, Larry feels he doesn't have to have experience to make judgements - about you, your callsign, or anything else, Kim. Clearly, he only expects that from everyone else.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4697. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 03:37:59 UTC
From: Eddie <Ed@wontgetthroo.org>
Message-ID: <oi5qmvk64iks5193rl9gfbt2846skhehac@4ax.com>
Source record: 78112

Hmmmm -

It's amazing, but I keep hearing these 'sour grapes' attitudes from the old timers, both on the radio and in the newsgroups.

Fact is, if the Big Government changes the rules, and as a result somebody gets a licence just like yours without having to jump through all of the hoops that you did years ago, they still have a licence that allows them to do the same thing that yours does.

In other words, it's equal. Maybe not in terms of effort, but in all other respects and for all intents and purposes, equal.

That's a hard pill to swallow, especially if you pride yourself on passing a 20 WPM code test to get your Extra, and it only takes 5 WPM now. But, da rules is da rules, and someone who gets their Extra tomorrow morning with 5 WPM can do exactly what you can do on the air today. Same privileges, same modes, sames frequencies. Same licence! And soon, when code is retired, it will be 0 WPM to get in and play.

Fact is, the FCC makes the rules, and you and I follow 'em. Simple as that. Like it or not, you don't control the process. You live with it, like everybody else. Time was, an Extra was WAY up there in the amateur ranks (20 WPM is bloody hard!!) - today, it's simply a ticket to use a small additional frequency allocation. Nothing more - no big status thing to lord over everybody else! Still a lot of theory in the test, but it can be done by memorizing the question bank answers - I proved that a week ago Friday.

That's just the way it is, Friend - deal with it, or be bitter and upset - it's your choice! Either way, as long as you're endlessly debating the issue over here on Usenet, you're off the air - and we're having a blast QSOing in your absence!

CB Plus - maybe, same as yours, after devaluation!

88's
Eddie - Extra Class Amateur Licence

...5 WPM Extra as of Sept. 12th, 2003 (gotta LOVE that big nickel!)...

On 21 Sep 2003 03:06:09 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>> You won't get any argument about that from me.
>>
>>
>>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

>And you will never be able to get a Real ham License, just 1 of them there
>CBplusser Licenses

4698. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 03:42:41 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkj6nh$n5$0@208.206.142.73>
Source record: 78113

Well Leo, you wre right on the last part.....

Leo wrote:

>Friendly fellow - the technical abilities of Farnsworth, and the
>gentle persuasive manner of Mike Tyson.
>
>But, as Nick Pope once said:
>
>"Minds are like parachutes; they work best when they are open".
>
>Be well,
>
>73, Leo
>
>On 21 Sep 2003 00:33:02 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>
>
>>In article <4h0pmvsk9bl1ja0dgd0nd6dp47se1c65tr@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
>>writes:
>>
>>
>>
>>>Very well said, Dee - anything is possible if you want to do it badly
>>>enough..
>>>
>>>
>> Yeah, riiiiiight, "Leo." :-)
>>
>>snip
>>
>>

4699. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 03:54:29 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <PMacnezI--AWufCiU-KYjQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 78114

Dwight Stewart wrote in message ...
>
>"WA8ULX" wrote:
>>
>> Took the Test on a Bet by 2 No-Coders, did no studying,
>> score 100%, collected $250.00 from the No-Coders, and
>> to top it off, I got to see the No-Coders fail there Tech plus.
>
>
> The last time you told this story, I thought it was two CB'ers you
>supposedly collected the bet from.

Yea, here are his words,
From: WA8ULX (wa8ulx@aol.com)
Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
View: Complete Thread (242 articles)
Original Format
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-04-14 13:48:14 PST
"Your just Mad because you dont even have a License. I think your upset that
I
made $250. off of Clowns like you who wont even take the test."

"don't have a license", "clowns like you who wont even take the test"
dosen't sound like Tech plus license holders dose it? Proof that brucies'
story is just that, a story.

4700. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 04:36:40 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93FD633E205Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 78115

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in
news:20030920004857.21457.00000699@mb-m10.aol.com:

> In article <Xns93FB3C4D5CCADelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> <elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>>>I eventually passed code in 1993, but if it weren't for the *@#%^&!
>>>>code test I could have had an HF licence in 1971.
>>>
>>> Alun:
>>>
>>> The problem wasn't the "*@#%^&! code test" at all. It was you and
>>> your negative attitude toward it.
>>
>>Only partly true. My negative attitude I freely admit.
>
> Alun:
>
> Stop right there. Your negative attitude was the whole problem.

If there had been no code test, then there would have been no problem,
period. Ergo, you are incorrect.

>
>>However, I had no
>>aptitude for the subject, and still don't.
>
> Incorrect. By your own admission, you eventually did pass the code
> test, which shows that you could, indeed, demonstrate some aptitude.

I'm sure I have some small residual glimmer of aptitude for all manner of
things that I am no bloody good at. For example, I can swim, albeit just
barely, but I am obviously a poor candidate for an olympic swimming team
position! In the same way, having been able to tell the difference between
'name is Frank' and 'name is Hank' at 13 and 20 wpm, after 23 years (up to
that point) of attempting to learn the Morse code, doesn't mean that I
would be a good choice to man a CW station in a contest.

> However, it was your negative attitude toward it which truly got in
> your way.
>

Where there is no interest, progress is usually poor. Ask any teacher.

>>Who knows why I should be good
>>at science and languages, and yet lousy at woodwork and CW, and yet

>>it's so.
>
> It's still all about attitude. I'll bet that if, given the time and
> proximity which
> would allow some personal mentoring, I could totally change your
> attitude, and therefore your aptitude, toward both CW and woodworking.

And no doubt macrame and ornithology as well, but what would be the point?

> Whether you realize it or not, you have that potential within you. You
> just don't want to tap into it -- and that's attitude.
>

No, and yes, respectively.

>>Each of us has innate abilities in some things, balanced by innate
>>incompetence in others, i.e everyone is unique. I feel that this has
>>been ignored by the pro-code side of the debate, or rather that it is
>>known damn well, but none of you will admit it!
>
> I, for one, must disagree because I have lived on both sides of this
> particular fence. From the time I originally became aware of Amateur
> Radio, at age 14, until I finally became licensed at age 28, I had a
> very negative attitude toward learning the Morse code, and therefore, I
> failed at every attempt to do so. It wasn't until I, through more
> mature judgment and some soul-searching, became aware of my negative
> attitude toward the code and it's effect on my so-called "aptitude" for
> it, that I was able to make the change. I believe this was the value
> of the code testing requirement for me, since my desire to be a
> licensed radio amateur was stronger than my objection to learning the
> code. At the end of the day, I made a turnabout in my attitude toward
> the code, and from then on, it came quite easily for me. My experience
> led me to become convinced that the code testing requirement is of
> great value in getting prospective radio amateurs involved in this
> mode.
>
>>It is possible to learn something that one is no good at in order to
>>pass a test, although unlikely that practical fluency in the skill
>>would ever be acheived.
>
> Yet another example of a negative attitude. I overcame this by making
> a personal shift in my attitude, and deciding that I would, indeed,
> become a proficient CW operator. Once that change was made, CW came
> quite easily for me, and even became fun -- to the point where it is
> now one of my preferred modes to use OTA.
>
>>It is even possible to learn something that one is both no
>>good at and has no interest in, although much harder, and then the
>>level of difficulty becomes crushingly hard. This is true of any skill,
>>and interest is, if anything, maybe more important than ability, but
>>any schoolteacher will tell you that when neither are present in even

>>the snallest degree the chance of success is slim to none. So it was
>>with me and Morse code. I did it eventually, with a huge amount of
>>outside help, without which I would never have succeeded on my own. The
>>reason I didn't
>> succeed earlier is straightforward - I didn't get help before.
>
> All of the above makes my point about attutude.

No, the point is that I was so bad that I needed help. You insist on missing that point as it doesn't agree with your views.

This comes down to a much more fundamental debate that takes the discussion away from Morse Code. Namely, the old one about 'nature v. nurture'. I lean heavily towards the nature end of the scale. That is I beleive that 9/10ths of our abilities are innate. It is posssible for innate talents to fail to be developed. It is also possible for people to overcome their lack of talent in many areas, often only with a great deal of effort.

>
>>So there it is. I have a negative attitude, coupled with zero aptitude,
>>and have never heard any convincing argument in these last 32 years as
>>to why I should have had to have done it in the first place. Sure, I've
>>heard lots of lame excuses as to why there should be a CW test, but
>>nothing even approaching anything beleivable.
>
> Obviously, your negative attitude toward the code is deeply ingrained,
> but it can still be overcome. However, in the absence of any
> requirement for you to overcome it, you will not likely change.
>

Luckily, there is no requirement for pro-code brainwashing to hold an amateur radio licence! (although some expend all possible efforts to do so).

>>No doubt CW is very useful, but I am no
>>bloody good at it, and I prefer to actually _talk_ on the radio in the
>>first place. That's all. No PSK31, no SSTV, no RTTY, etc. Boring and
>>limited to some, but if you prefer CW or PSK, or WHY, then you're
>>welcome to use them.
>
> I, for one, found just "talking" on the radio to be quite unfulfilling.

Whereas I have never found that to be a problem.

> Each QSO became just more of the same old tedious re-hashing of the
> same old boring topics -- mainly the weather, the relative health of
> the operator on the other end, station equipment, etc. I always tried
> to make it more interesting by raising questions about unrealted
> topics, but it always went the same way. This, followed by the
> tendency of phone operators to make lengthy monologues which made it
> almost impossible to even remember what they were talking about, came

> to convince me that phone is generally a waste of time.

Amateur radio is not a productive use of my time. That is one of it's best qualities.

> I now use it
> only in contests and local VHF/FM contacts, mainly from my car.
>
> I'd say that your experience is pretty typical of most NCTA's. Your
> main problem is that nothing happened to change your attitude.

The only problem from my point of view was passing code, and that I have overcome. I no longer have a problem, except from your point of view.

> Now,
> in the future, with the lack of a code testing requirement, there will
> no longer be anything there to create the kind of epiphany which
> I experienced in learning the code. This will truly be a great loss to
> the amateur radio community.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
>

St Paul experienced an epiphany on the road to Damascus, so we are told. However, although we are both in the Amateur Radio Service, of the two of us only you are in the Morse Code Religion. My 'problem', which is no problem for me, is only that I have not seen the light.

73 de Alun, N3KIP

4701. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 04:38:44 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93FD68E860C2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 78116

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in
news:IJ_ab.1213$Hd6.897492@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com:

>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bkhs4l$k5d@library2.airnews.net...
>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>> news:PVZab.1121$Hd6.878876@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>> >
>> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>> > news:20030920004857.21457.00000699@mb-m10.aol.com...
>> > >
>> > > All of the above makes my point about attutude.
>> > >
>> >
>> > Attitude is the key in almost every endeavor. I've succeeded in a
>> > number of things for which I had no talent but had sufficient reason
>> > to pursue. These include Morse code, music, and karate. I had no
>> > talent for any of them but did quite well simply because I wanted
>> > to.
>> >
>> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >
>>
>> But, Dee, does that mean that everyone must? I'm not saying you've
>> ever said that, because I don't know. I just wonder what posture
>> you're taking, above.
>>
>> Kim W5TIT
>
> I'm simply saying that lack of talent is not a sufficient justification
> for refusing to learn something. I'm saying that motivation is many
> times more important than talent. If a person doesn't want to learn
> something, say so. Don't try to justify it with the lack of talent
> argument. I've seen enough untalented people achieve their goals to
> have little patience with such rationalizations.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

You mean like becoming president despite a lack of talent, for example?

4702. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 04:51:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <%6abb.47997$Aq2.45630@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78117

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> Outside of sounding like low-grade bullshit, (snip)

I might have thought that when I first read his response, but decided to be a little more controlled in my written response (knowing full well that others would come to that conclusion on their own).

> All Dwight said was that "your words reek of bigotry, elitism, and
> discrimination against other Americans."

Now, I didn't specifically say Larry's words reeked of anything. What I said is the words I hear from many advocating the continuation of the code testing requirement often reek of bigotry, elitism, and discrimination against other Americans. Of course, some of Larry's past comments certainly might fit into that category, but he has since somewhat toned down his rhetoric.

> If YOU want to TRULY support personal initiative without
> "government support" (and all its 'evil' socialist-like things) then
> you should be able to eliminate the federal code test!
>
> Except you do NOT. You keep demanding that the government
> continue the federal code test in order to keep a few code users
> around...

I've discussed that contradiction with Larry before. He does seem to exclude code testing from his conservative views opposing excessive government regulation. If Morse Code has real value, it should be able to survive in as close to a free market environment as possible. I think it has that value and can survive just fine without a regulation mandating testing.

> The FCC regulates and licenses ALL civil radio in the USA...
> yet none of the staff nor commission of the FCC are required to
> pass any morse code test in order to regulate US amateur radio.

Of course, that should be obvious. But Larry's position benefits him more - if accepted, it would undermine all those with different views on this subject. Clearly, only those with views similar to his would accept such a premise.

> You seem dumb and dumberer to the fact that every other radio
> service (except a small part of maritime radio) in the USA has either
> DROPPED morse code (snip)

Actually, as you may know, even the International Maritime Organization (IMO) voted in 1998 to eliminate Morse Code. The Coast Guard itself dropped

code in 1995. As a result of these two events, the Coast Guard now urges commercial vessels not to use code since CG personnel, and an increasing number of radio operators in the maritime service, may no longer have the skills necessary to communicate using that system. The UN-chartered IMO is responsible for defining and regulating international maritime telecommunications. It's positions are adopted by the ITU.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4703. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 04:51:33 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93FD8BA34331elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 78118

Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in
news:4h0pmvsk9bl1ja0dgd0nd6dp47se1c65tr@4ax.com:

> Very well said, Dee - anything is possible if you want to do it badly
> enough..

And if you want to do it badly enough you may end up doing it so badly
that it would have been better if you had not tried!

> I am certainly no prodigy at morse, electronics, martial
> arts, cooking, business management or anything else - but I have
> always been able to accomplish the things that I was motivated to do.
> Mind you, it took me until I was 45 to become motivated enough to
> learn morse code - but I wanted to get on HF, focused on the goal,
> bought some training software online and passed the 5 wpm test four
> weeks later. Conversely, I have wanted to learn to play the guitar
> since I was a teenager - not sufficiently enough, though, as I never
> did do it. Which, in retrospect, is probably a good thing....
>
> Talent has very little to do with accomplishment (it does relate to
> the level of excellence that one can attain

Indeed it does. There are some things that I will never be excellent at,
and Morse code is one of them.

> , but to become reasonably
> proficient in anything talent is not a factor), especially in ventures
> based primarily on rote repetition like morse, Karate, or learning a
> language. Aptitude and motivation, yes, but not talent. Otherwise,
> I'd have accomplished nothing so far :)
>
> Blaming a lack of talent for failure to accomplish something reflects
> on a persons' own inability to accept responsibility for their own
> actions

So you can do anything can you? Do you beat up on yourself whenever you
fail at something? That doesn't sound very healthy to me.

> - successful people, quite simply, go out and get what they
> want. Or, in the words of Albert Gray:
>
> "Successful people are successful because they form the habits of
> doing those things that failures don't like to do"
>
> 73, Leo
>

Fine qualities for a chairman of a Fortune 500 company maybe, but as a
condition for admission into a hobby???

>
> On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 15:53:12 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> wrote:
>
>>
>>"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>news:bkhs4l$k5d@library2.airnews.net...
>>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>>> news:PVZab.1121$Hd6.878876@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>>> >
>>> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>>> > news:20030920004857.21457.00000699@mb-m10.aol.com...
>>> > >
>>> > > All of the above makes my point about attutude.
>>> > >
>>> >
>>> > Attitude is the key in almost every endeavor. I've succeeded in a
>>> > number of things for which I had no talent but had sufficient
>>> > reason to pursue. These include Morse code, music, and karate. I
>>> > had no talent for any of them but did quite well simply because I
>>> > wanted to.
>>> >
>>> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>> >
>>>
>>> But, Dee, does that mean that everyone must? I'm not saying you've
>>> ever said that, because I don't know. I just wonder what posture
>>> you're taking, above.
>>>
>>> Kim W5TIT
>>
>>I'm simply saying that lack of talent is not a sufficient justification
>>for refusing to learn something. I'm saying that motivation is many
>>times more important than talent. If a person doesn't want to learn
>>something, say so. Don't try to justify it with the lack of talent
>>argument. I've seen enough untalented people achieve their goals to
>>have little patience with such rationalizations.
>>
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

4704. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 04:54:16 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93FD9304915elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 78119

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
news:20030920203302.21642.00001023@mb-m01.aol.com:

> In article <4h0pmvsk9bl1ja0dgd0nd6dp47se1c65tr@4ax.com>, Leo
> <nomail@nope.org> writes:
>
>>Very well said, Dee - anything is possible if you want to do it badly
>>enough..
>
> Yeah, riiiiiight, "Leo." :-)
>
> Want to be a world-reknowned theoretical astrophysicist? No
> problem, just contract some bad neural disease, go to an ivy-covered
> UK college and write a few books. All you have to do is WILL
> yourself...for about 3 millenia. By that time, astrophysics will
> have become "easy" for you.
>
> Want to be a famous artist and be featured in national magazines
> even though you don't have have any art talent at all? No problem.
> WILL yourself to draw/paint, spend hours at it...but hire a very
> good publicist so you can become a "Grandpa Moses." [we've already
> had a Grandma]
>
>>I am certainly no prodigy at morse, electronics, martial
>>arts, cooking, business management or anything else - but I have always
>>been able to accomplish the things that I was motivated to do.
>
> ...or conveniently FORGET those things you were not able to do...
>
>>Mind you, it took me until I was 45 to become motivated enough to
>>learn morse code - but I wanted to get on HF, focused on the goal,
>>bought some training software online and passed the 5 wpm test four
>>weeks later.
>
> Oh, my. At age 20 I was ALREADY ON HF...and on VHF, on UHF,
> on microwaves in Big Time communications before reaching 24...all
> without any sort of morsemanship.
>
> At age 26 I thought it might be a fun thing to learn morse code and
> get a ham license to augment my First Phone license passed in '56.
> Wasn't WORTH it to listen to all that beeping. I'd already done
> three years of communications in the US Army, all of it
> trans-Pacific, all without using or having to know morse code.
>

> Doesn't make sense to me that, in this new millennium, AMATEURS
> still DEMAND that everyone know morse in order to get a HAM license.
>
>>Conversely, I have wanted to learn to play the guitar
>>since I was a teenager - not sufficiently enough, though, as I never
>>did do it. Which, in retrospect, is probably a good thing....
>
> What?!? NO MOTIVATION!?! Terrible!
>
> Can't you even do simple chords on a git-box?
>
> I never had that problem. Next door neighbor was a part-time
> guitarist. Designed and built a portable amplifier to fit inside his
> guitar. Not a big boom-box with 5 KW of acoustic power...was way
> back in '63 when guitars were first getting popular. Design from
> scratch was no problem for me, nor the hardware. I liked drums
> better.
>
>>Talent has very little to do with accomplishment (it does relate to
>>the level of excellence that one can attain, but to become reasonably
>>proficient in anything talent is not a factor), especially in ventures
>>based primarily on rote repetition like morse, Karate, or learning a
>>language.
>
> HAH!!!!
>
> I happen to have a talent for languages and have the physical
> equipment to speak with very little "English" dialect. I know
> others MORE literate (through formal schooling) in the same language
> as I know but have atrocious accents and can't always form written
> sentences in that language. They can spend decades of such study
> and will never get it down properly. Not a problem for me.
>
> I just don't see any sense in maintaining a federal morse code test
> in this day and age for a HOBBY activity. I've been doing REAL HF
> comm long before nearly all of these old-timer morsemen without
> needing any HOBBY code test.
>
>
>>Blaming a lack of talent for failure to accomplish something reflects
>>on a persons' own inability to accept responsibility for their own
>>actions - successful people, quite simply, go out and get what they
>>want. Or, in the words of Albert Gray:
>
> Yes, WANT violin playing ability on par with Itzak Perlman badly
> enough and it can be done?
>
> WANT to be a baseball great like the Mariner's John Olerud and it
> can be done just by determination and practice?
>

> "Will and idea" (and determination) is all that is necessary?
>
> I don't think so.
>
> The existance of the morse code test for an AMATEUR radio license
> is NOT some moral bullshit thing of "will and determination."
> There's NO divine idea that the morse code test must always be.
> AMATEUR radio is a hobby, not a Premium Life Accomplishment.
>
> I think some of you have wigged-out too far and need investigation
> for Illegal substance abuse...
>
> LHA
>
>
>

Exactly my point, although more eloquently stated

4705. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 05:11:27 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <gkcqmvcbc8h5n0rkj1isqqjhldelkruuh7@4ax.com>
Source record: 78120

Alun,

It would be a challenge indeed to be less eloquent than the poster
that you refer to below - I'd certainly be interested in knowing how
one would go about achieving that!

Be Well,

73, Leo

On 21 Sep 2003 04:54:16 GMT, Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
>news:20030920203302.21642.00001023@mb-m01.aol.com:

>snip

>> I think some of you have wigged-out too far and need investigation
>> for Illegal substance abuse...
>>
>> LHA
>
>Exactly my point, although more eloquently stated

4706. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 05:32:52 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <8Kabb.48013$Aq2.40223@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78121

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> The FIRST Tacoma Narrows bridge was designed
> WITHOUT sufficient thought about sparse, elegant-
> looking minimal structures acting as airfoils during high
> winds. At the time of construction, the first Tacoma
> Narrows bridge was the third-longest single span in the
> world. It was open for nearly a year and developed
> such severe oscillation (as a result of the airfoil effects)
> that it was dubbed "Galloping Gertie." :-)
>
> The high winds in the Narrows region proved too
> much for it in the 1940s just before WW2 and it went
> into catastrophic structural oscillation. It was rebuilt a
> decade later and has remained standing for half a
> century. Tacoma Narrows bridge is a major passageway
> for vehicular traffic from the Kitsap County to the
> Tacoma city region but, at two lanes each way, has
> become too crowded for modern traffic. A third Narrows
> bridge, adjacent to the second, is planned to begin
> construction in the near future. The second Tacoma
> Narrows bridge still retains a little windsock at each end
> and warning signs about High Winds affecting both
> bicyclists and pedestrians. Every once in a while a high-
> box trailer will begin fish-tailing while crossing and may
> temporarily disrupt traffic, all due to high winds.

Good grief, Len. You sound like a tour guide. Actually, we lived in Tacoma for about four years (mid-70's) before heading overseas to Germany and lived in Bremerton for about a year and a half just a few years ago. I've drove across that bridge many, many, times. When we lived in Tacoma, we used to walk our dog on the beach under the bridge occasionally (on the side opposite Tacoma - a fairly popular spot for nude and topless sunbathers at that time). We used to park at the observation point on that side of the bridge (there was a plaque there with much of the information you gave above).

The bridge was much more interesting in the mid-70's. At that time, the side walls were cross-crossed metal strips allowing for a fairly unobstructed view of the surrounding area and water below. In addition, the roadway surface was open grating, allowing one to look straight down to the water directly below the bridge. Today, the side walls are solid steel plates and the roadway grating has been replaced with asphalt.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4707. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 05:33:44 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <0tcqmvcia8lv1qqji4pnsklp5sasfug91g@4ax.com>
Source record: 78122

Alun,

Interesting points - my responses are below:

On 21 Sep 2003 04:51:33 GMT, Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote:

>Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in
>news:4h0pmvsk9bl1ja0dgd0nd6dp47se1c65tr@4ax.com:
>
>> Very well said, Dee - anything is possible if you want to do it badly
>> enough..
>
>And if you want to do it badly enough you may end up doing it so badly
>that it would have been better if you had not tried!

Alun, a defeatist attitude only condemns one to failure. Have
confidence in yourself - look at the things that you have done in your
life - if you had not tried, where would you be now? Maybe you will
try and fail - but to never try is to fail anyway....

No one says that you have to be an expert at everything - competent is
good enough!
>
>> I am certainly no prodigy at morse, electronics, martial
>> arts, cooking, business management or anything else - but I have
>> always been able to accomplish the things that I was motivated to do.
>> Mind you, it took me until I was 45 to become motivated enough to
>> learn morse code - but I wanted to get on HF, focused on the goal,
>> bought some training software online and passed the 5 wpm test four
>> weeks later. Conversely, I have wanted to learn to play the guitar
>> since I was a teenager - not sufficiently enough, though, as I never
>> did do it. Which, in retrospect, is probably a good thing....
>>
>> Talent has very little to do with accomplishment (it does relate to
>> the level of excellence that one can attain
>
>Indeed it does. There are some things that I will never be excellent at,
>and Morse code is one of them.

Me too - good enough to pass the required exam, but that's about it!
But, passing the exam was the goal (as required by law - the "price of
admission" to HF) - and I achieved that 100 percent! (with my 10
percent morse skills, which may never be used again - they served
their purpose! God rest my morse skills.)
>
>> , but to become reasonably

>> proficient in anything talent is not a factor), especially in ventures
>> based primarily on rote repetition like morse, Karate, or learning a
>> language. Aptitude and motivation, yes, but not talent. Otherwise,
>> I'd have accomplished nothing so far :)
>>
>> Blaming a lack of talent for failure to accomplish something reflects
>> on a persons' own inability to accept responsibility for their own
>> actions
>
>So you can do anything can you? Do you beat up on yourself whenever you
>fail at something? That doesn't sound very healthy to me.

No, but I do strive to achieve those goals that I set for myself. If I fail, then fine, if I know that I put in the best effort that I could, I'll accept it - but that doesn't happen often. I suspect that, if you do a quick review of your past goals and achievements, you'll come up with a similar success rate.....

>
>> - successful people, quite simply, go out and get what they
>> want. Or, in the words of Albert Gray:
>>
>> "Successful people are successful because they form the habits of
>> doing those things that failures don't like to do"
>>
>> 73, Leo
>>
>
>Fine qualities for a chairman of a Fortune 500 company maybe, but as a
>condition for admission into a hobby???

Fine qualities for anyone, actually (my posting had nothing at all to do with the admission requirements into this or any other hobby, simply the innate ability of people to accomplish whatever they set their minds to. (Based on their abilities, of course - reality check time). For example, I'm sure that you have developed the self discipline to do what needs to be done in your life, even if occasionally difficult or distasteful, haven't you? Therein lies the meaning of the quote. Failures always have an excuse why they couldn't get things completed.

A failure usually engineers their own fate. In my career as a manager, I have never considered anyone who gave something their best shot to have failed! The mark of a true loser is someone who gives up before he tries.....and has a dozen reasons why it wouldn't have been possible anyway......

Be Well,

73, Leo

>
>>

>> On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 15:53:12 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>>>
>>>"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>>>news:bkhs4l$k5d@library2.airnews.net...
>>>> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>>>> news:PVZab.1121$Hd6.878876@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>>>> >
>>>> > "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>>>> > news:20030920004857.21457.00000699@mb-m10.aol.com...
>>>> > >
>>>> > > All of the above makes my point about attutude.
>>>> > >
>>>> >
>>>> > Attitude is the key in almost every endeavor. I've succeeded in a
>>>> > number of things for which I had no talent but had sufficient
>>>> > reason to pursue. These include Morse code, music, and karate. I
>>>> > had no talent for any of them but did quite well simply because I
>>>> > wanted to.
>>>> >
>>>> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>> >
>>>>
>>>> But, Dee, does that mean that everyone must? I'm not saying you've
>>>> ever said that, because I don't know. I just wonder what posture
>>>> you're taking, above.
>>>>
>>>> Kim W5TIT
>>>
>>>I'm simply saying that lack of talent is not a sufficient justification
>>>for refusing to learn something. I'm saying that motivation is many
>>>times more important than talent. If a person doesn't want to learn
>>>something, say so. Don't try to justify it with the lack of talent
>>>argument. I've seen enough untalented people achieve their goals to
>>>have little patience with such rationalizations.
>>>
>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>>

4708. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 05:40:06 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkjdjmgtp0@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 78123

JJ wrote:

>Dwight Stewart wrote in message ...
>
>
>>"WA8ULX" wrote:
>>
>>
>>> Took the Test on a Bet by 2 No-Coders, did no studying,
>>>score 100%, collected $250.00 from the No-Coders, and
>>>to top it off, I got to see the No-Coders fail there Tech plus.
>>>
>>>
>> The last time you told this story, I thought it was two CB'ers you
>>supposedly collected the bet from.
>>
>>
>
>Yea, here are his words,
>From: WA8ULX (wa8ulx@aol.com)
>Subject: Re: Article in World Radio
>View: Complete Thread (242 articles)
>Original Format
>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy
>Date: 2003-04-14 13:48:14 PST
>"Your just Mad because you dont even have a License. I think your upset that
>I
>made $250. off of Clowns like you who wont even take the test."
>
>"don't have a license", "clowns like you who wont even take the test"
>dosen't sound like Tech plus license holders dose it? Proof that brucies'
>story is just that, a story.
>
>
>

There are eight million stories in the Naked City......

4709. Re: EchoLink and Hurricane Isabel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 05:42:03 UTC
From: Dean <mo@no.com>
Message-ID: <ubeqmvc6m2tke2f1impc0ig9aj57essbhn@4ax.com>
Source record: 78124
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 20 Sep 2003 23:04:25 GMT, Lloyd <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote:

>On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 18:19:06 -0400, KC0??? <Whome@whoareyou.net> wrote:
>> You just don't get it do ya, DUMBASS. Were you there? I was. It did go
>> down. It did not work. It failed, and so do you pudding cup. Bite my ass.
>
>It didn't go down. I was on the hurricane net via nasouth at the time
>and listened to multiple stations from the affected area check in
>throughout all of Thursday afternoon. The exercise will be written up
>in both QST and CQ in a couple of months, from what I understand.
>
>Just because YOUR connection went down, Chicken Little, doesn't mean
>that the whole world's went down. It just means that you don't have
>the technical smarts to deal with new technologies like Echolink and
>IRLP (which is connected to Echolink, BTW).
>
>So bite MY ass, Goldilocks, and go back to your appliance operations.
>You clearly shouldn't be hanging out with the big boys of ham radio.

Get your General lardass or shut the hell up. You'll wait until the
code is done away with then get your HF privileges. Too bad you can't
sting up a dipole in your 1 bedroom apartment, lardass.

4710. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 05:43:14 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkjdpigtp1@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 78125

Ah, that nocode eloquence!

Leo wrote:

>Alun,
>
>It would be a challenge indeed to be less eloquent than the poster
>that you refer to below - I'd certainly be interested in knowing how
>one would go about achieving that!
>
>Be Well,
>
>73, Leo
>
>On 21 Sep 2003 04:54:16 GMT, Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
>>news:20030920203302.21642.00001023@mb-m01.aol.com:
>>
>>
>
>
>
>>snip
>>
>>
>
>
>
>>> I think some of you have wigged-out too far and need investigation
>>> for Illegal substance abuse...
>>>
>>> LHA
>>>
>>>
>>Exactly my point, although more eloquently stated
>>
>>
>
>
>

4711. TWISTED ACCUSES JERRY O. OF TAKING PART IN VAST CONSPIRACY AGAINST HIM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 05:58:02 UTC
From: twistyisaliar@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <932afc6.0309202158.6c06e168@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78126
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Twistedhed posting as bestinterests@heart.yours wrote in message
news:<bki6l7pll1@news.netmar.com>...
> >oxendine posting as twistyisaliar@yahoo to rec.radio.cb
>
>
>
> From joxendi@bellsouth.net Mon, 08 Jan 2001 13:06:00 -0500 Date: Mon, 08 Jan
> 2001 13:06:00 -0500
> From: Jerry Oxendine joxendi@bellsouth.net
> Subject: Talk Equipment for Sale
> I have the following items for sale:
> 1. 60 self-supporting tower, excellent condition, $200
> 2. HF Radio, Kenwood TS50, all mode, all HF bands, CAP HF frequencies already
> programmed. This radio is in excellent condition, has power cord mike,
> instruction manual AND has the SO-2 option installed to bring it into NTIA
> compliance. It also has the mobile mounting bracket. You may listen to this
> radio on the NC Wing HF net on Tuesday/Thursday night net at 2030
> local--Callsign CAP Kitty Hawk 426. I can be reached via email or at
(phone number deleted)
>
>
> >keep him out of misc.transportation.trucking

Jerry is innocent, you have no idea who is doing what, dickweed

4712. Re: NCNCI - Was Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:37 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022837.11891.00000975@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78133

In article <vmooigs9sqa7f9@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
<rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:

>
>> I like hearing the story about the code/no-code discussion was chased off
>to
>> a lesser venue, and believe it is 'way past time for this to happen again.
>>
>
>going to be hard to chase it off, better yet, if it annoys you that bad,
>just
>start kilfilling anything have "CW", "NCI", "PCTA", "NCTA", etc in
>the subject lines.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT

Clint:

That would still let way too much QRM get through your newsgroup
filter. I suggest that you simply QSY to a quieter, less challenging
frequency.

>> > Your whining about the nature of this newsgroup is, in fact, quite
>> > off-topic, and a violation of Usenet policy.
>
>it's a ham radio newsgroup, so I don't think CW is off topic.... and debate
>isn't a violation of usenet policy (that's HALF of what it's for), what's a
>violation
>I believe is inflammatory, abusive behavior.
>
>And there's little chance that will ever stop on ANY ng.

Yup, you seem to have got that right. So why are you whining about
what's going on here?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4713. Re: NCNCI - Was Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:38 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022838.11891.00000976@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78145

In article <yBUab.22$uh1.0@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
<n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:

>> Charles:
>>
>> I'm sure you've been told this before, but here goes...
>>
>> This newsgroup exists specifically for the code/no-code debate, and
>> other amateur radio policy issues. It's purpose is to isolate this
>> particularly contentious debate and permit other newsgroups to be
>> able to address more specific technical and operational issues.
>
>Yes, we all know how this discussion was "run off" from another place, where
>the hams found it to be pointless, ignorant and disgusting... Just like it
>is here.

Charles:

No matter which spin you place on it, this newsgroup exists for a specific
purpose -- to be a venue for the hotly contentious code/no-code (test)
debate. Whether we were "run off" of rec.radio.amateur and rec.radio.
amateur.misc is irrelevant…we're here now, and we're here to stay!

>I like hearing the story about the code/no-code discussion was chased off to
>a lesser venue, and believe it is 'way past time for this to happen again.

Sorry about your luck, Charlie, but that's not gonna happen.

>> Your whining about the nature of this newsgroup is, in fact, quite
>> off-topic, and a violation of Usenet policy.
>
>Gee, that's tough....

For you!

>>If you cannot grasp the
>> nature of this newsgroup and abide with Usenet policy by accepting
>> rrap for what it was specifically intended to be, then I suggest your
>> time would be better spent elsewhere.
>
>I'm sure it would, but since I don't have anything better to do, I'll point
>out how silly and counterproductive the behavior on this newsgroup is, from
>time to time.

Go ahead, be my guest. It's been done before, and it'll be done again, but
it will always have the same effect: None. We'll still be here.

>Everybody already knows how ignorant the code/no-code debate is, but I'll go
>ahead and point that out every now and then, as well.

You know, Charlie, I'm not even going to disagree with that. I was sucked into this debate merely because I saw NCTA's making flagrantly irrational and illogical accusations against those of us who simply saw a reasonable licensing requirement and made the effort to meet it and succeed in doing so. So, yes, this debate is ignorant. But only because it was started through the ignorance of the NCTA.

>Anybody else want to join NCNCI ? (No Code/No-Code International, of
>course!)

Not me.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4714. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:41 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022841.11891.00000977@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78142

In article <f45722ac.0309200337.360b9a3b@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:<bke6dj$pm7$0@208.206.142.96>...
>> Greg Courville wrote:
>>
>> > I've been a ham for only a month now, and been using these groups for
>> > about 6 weeks.
>> > I really can't stand some of the things that go on here.
>> > Has anybody ever noticed that 8 out of 10 threads on this group (and
>> > many other amateur radio groups) end in a flame war?
>> > It's really shocking how people can start an argument over nothing
>> > which can escalate to vicious strings of insults complete with
>> > profanity, sexual references and terms such as "CBplusser" and
>> > "Knuckle-Dragger".

Then Dick Carroll wrote:

>> Greg if you want to see how all this began just spend some time in Google
>> and you canget an educaion. It sure didn't start by old timers belittling
>> newcomers. In fact it was and IS the exact reverse. Not all newcomers, by
>> any means, just those on this board who decided to do it, and persist to
>> this day.

Greg again:

>> > It's just unbelievable to me that while all of the
>> > books talk about how wonderful and helpful hams are, a significant
>> > number of them spend their time cutting each other down over random
>> > issues. I see "newbies" come to these boards for help, and get cut
>> > down by inconsiderate jerks who just feel like making people feel
>> > stupid.

>> You're making assumptions here that shouldn't, indeed can't, be made.

Now comes Brian:

>Assumptions can always be made. That's what makes them assumptions.

Brian:

Just because assumptions can always be made, doesn't mean that
we aren't making the correct ones.

>> The jerks who show up her complaining about the code test requrement and
>> blaming all us who just did it, without complaining.

>And? Finish the thought.

That thought is complete. It was the NCTA that started this debate, and
turned it into the slugfest it became when they blamed just about everything
bad in this world on those of us hams who were able to learn the Morse
code and pass tests at strictly amateur-level speeds. The code testing
requirements had always been reasonable and were proven to be
achievable by people from all walks of life, even those with severe
communicative disabilities. However, the NCTA, in their need to make
the attempt to prove the code tests to be unreasonable and somehow
irrelevant, were the FIRST ones to resort to the empty rhetoric, negativity,
and name-calling with which we have all had to contend.

>> That in so doing
>> learned that Morse code does indeed add substantially to ham radio, to the
>> point that we believe code testing has a permanent place in ham radio, is
>> just so much nonsense to them. They already know all about it.
>>
>Yet there are those of us who don't believe as you do. We are
>constantly attacked.

Incorrect. It is the NCTA's to began the "attacks." In one of my earliest
postings on Fidonet over a decade ago, one of the NCTA replies accused
me of "ethnic cleansing" because I dared to agree with the present code
testing requirements. I surely didn't start out with the notion of making
such rash statements, but I certainly wasn't going to let them go
unanswered, either.

>> > How many hams didn't start out with a lower-level license?
>> > People need to stop beating up on us poor no-coders.

Don't look now, but nobody's beating up on the "poor no-coders" unless
and until those same "poor no-coders" start beating up on us innocent
PCTA's who are merely stating their opinions with passion and
conviction.

>> Come into ham radio with a proper attitude (note I didn't say THE proper
>> attitude) and you'll be received just as well as anyone ever was.

Dick is absolutely right. My own radio club is full of No-code Techs, but
because of the fact that, for the most part, they haven't bothered to
place their codeless status under scrutiny by making accusations against
those of us who believe in and support code testing, we all get along
very well, indeed. When dealing with fellow hams in person, I have
never once asked for their license class. However, because my own
is self-evident by the configuration of my call sign, I have many times
been subjected to inquiries regarding my personal stance on code
testing, and then been treated accordingly. And while these are just
a few out of the dozens of hams I have dealt with in the past ten
years, these NCTA's have all followed the same pattern -- they stir
up controversy, focus that controversy on me and other PCTA's,
then drop out of sight the second they realize they're losing the
battle. The sad thing is, if they had only left it out entirely, nobody

would have had to bother with the issue in the first place!

>THE proper attitude is what he meant, though. Otherwise enter at your
>own risk.

No, Dick said what he meant, and he meant what he said. The NCTA
"attitude," which basically boils down to "I think we need to get rid of
code testing, and if you dare to disagree with me, I'm going to smear
you all over the floor" is the attitude to which he refers.

>> > Don't they
>> > realize that the new people look up to the old-timers?
>>
>> You REALLY must have not been reading here very closely at all, Greg.
>> Were that the case *here* you wouldn't have a report to make.
>>
>His words are valid. Initially, newcomers do look up to the
>old-timers. Till the moment the old-timers start pushing "No CW=No
>Ham" ideology.

I don't recall ever "pushing" that ideology until some NCTA pushed the
CW = obsolete, politically incorrect, non-inclusive, racist, bigoted,
homophobic, environmentally damaging, etc. etc. ideologies first.

>> > I must say that
>> > after reading books about how hams help people all over the world and
>> > are generally just a wonderful bunch, these groups have really changed
>> > my view of the amateur radio community.
>>
>> Don't feel lonesome.
>> It sure changed my view of ham radio, too. I showed up here several years
>> ago to engage in civil, sincere discourse on the merits of code testing,
>> and was immediately set upon by the code haters for my views. It's been
>> all downhill from there.
>>
>DICK was instrumental in the downhill part. And he's been here more
>than just "several years." He's working on his 1st decade of bile.

Yup, but Brian has over a decade of NCTA bile under HIS belt!

>> > I don't doubt that even this
>> > thread will end in a violent exchange of profanities and become just
>> > another flame war.

>> Once again, you will get the treatment you deserve here, at least from me.
>>
>> So far you're doing OK, I don't blame you for your concern. But I suggest
>> you might benefit from a bit more knowledge of the background of what has
>> happened here.
>
>Absolutely.

>Brian

I suggest you take your own advice, Brian, and find out just exactly WHO started the code/no-code debate and why.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4715. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022842.11891.00000979@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78129

In article <vmontimic1tk01@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
<rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:

>> I've got something worse in mind for the NCTA's -- a date with Kim!
>> And for Kim, it would be a date with you!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>why, i've never even met Kim....

Clint:

Well, I'm sure that in some ways that have nothing to do with amateur radio, Kim is a very nice person. So, if you ever do meet her, try to keep that in mind, and not the fact that Riley Hollingsworth once said that her choice of a call sign had the potential to take the ARS "...one step closer to extinction."

73 de Larry, K3LT

4716. Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:42 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022842.11891.00000978@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78139

In article <f45722ac.0309200340.4cea8bf@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Forever thinking of Kim, aren't you?

Brian:

I think about everyone in this newsgroup, particularly the "regulars" who have been here for a number of years. The truth is, in spite of our numerous and passionate disagreements, I don't think there's anyone here that I wouldn't like to know in person -- including Kim, and you! I think of time spent here as time spent with friends, and I can't help but to wonder if everyone else sees it the same way. Tonight, as in many nights in the past, I found myself composing, then quickly deleting, several posts aimed at certain people which contained my usually acerbic tone. In other words, I'm starting to wonder just exactly what I, and we, are all doing here, and what it all means. I can't honestly say that I'm ever going to change my mind about anything here, but I also have come to realize that in all likelihood, nobody else will, either. However, the way in which we disagree is something upon which we all should reflect, and I don't exclude myself from that.

Things are happening in my life that are causing me to consider the more eternal ramifications of everything I do. I know that I am not perfect, and that I, like most other people, am able to fall into the pattern of allowing my lesser nature to come to the surface. And while I cannot make a credible promise to not allow that to happen anymore, I can at least occasionally take the time to stop and reflect upon it, and take stock of my own behaviour.

I would like to think that if it were ever possible for all of us to meet in person, that that meeting would be both pleasant and enjoyable. And, as we continue to batter each other's opinions, I think it is necessary to realize that we are not necessarily battering each other personally. Whether or not the nature of Usenet tends to make our reactions to each other impersonal by nature, it does bear keeping in mind that there is another human being at the other end of our rhetoric. I know that I want to be treated as such, and I will try to keep that in mind when reacting to the rest of you.

Just some food for thought…any and all comments welcome.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4717. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022843.11891.00000980@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78130

In article <bkhrut$1ov@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>*ahem* Larry thinks that just because he could not handle an intelligent,
>good-looking, self-starting, independent woman such as myself, that all men
>are as weak and obsessed with material things as he is...
>
>Pay no mind... his kind is in the minority.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

ROTFLMAO!!! Darn, now you got me doing it! Anyway, I'm glad that
you have such a positive image of yourself. After all, *somebody* has
to have a positive image of you! Now, if only you could convince
Riley!

BTW -- that's still MISTER Hollingsworth to you!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4718. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:43 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022843.11891.00000981@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78140

In article <vmp6l3mtqbj739@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>> *ahem* Larry thinks that just because he could not handle an intelligent,
>> good-looking, self-starting, independent woman such as myself, that all
>men
>> are as weak and obsessed with material things as he is...
>>
>> Pay no mind... his kind is in the minority.
>>
>> Kim W5TIT

>I was about to SAAAAY.....
>
>And, what's MORE, it sounds as though he's passing a terrible judgement on
>you,
>by wishing to use the idea of a date with you "a punishment".

Clint:

Actually, I thought it was quite hilarious!

>I have no idea
>what you're personality is like or how attractive you are, but I was
>certainly going
>to give you the benifit of the doubt in the intelligence area because you're
>a ham
>radio operator....

That's very kind of you, Clint. Very kind, indeed!!!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4719. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:44 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022844.11891.00000982@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78132

In article <d22b54c3.0309201403.5f3df220@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> "Brian Kelly" wrote:
>> >
>> > 'Scuse me but the this newsgroup is a direct spin-off
>> > from another group (dot misc?) some number of years
>> > ago *specifically* as the place to go for debating the
>> > code test issue. (snip)
>>
>>
>> Where did you find that information? I've seen no mention of it anywhere
>> else.
>
>The spin-off happened in the mid-90's give or take, long before I got
>into this funny farm and it's come up several times since but I can't
>cite any specific posts. Larry is probably one of the "originals", you
>might ask him.

Brian/Dwight:

This newsgroup got it's start in the early '90's when the code/no-code debate became an off-topic annoyance in the rec.radio.amateur and rec.radio.amateur.misc newsgroups. It was therefore decided to make this newsgroup the repository for the code/no-code debate, as well as any other inherently contentious amateur radio "policy" issues. In short, a place for those who will never agree to freely disagree, without the inconvenience of being bothered by the objections of those who couldn't care less.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4720. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022845.11891.00000983@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78127

In article <Ee7bb.394723$Oz4.182456@rwcrnsc54>, "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL"
<vlfiscus@mcn.net> writes:

>Larry, I saw a photo of TIT once on QRZ and let me tell you, she's not as
>dumb as she looks.
>
>
>KB7ADL

Vince:

Let's hope so. I've never thought Kim's problem was a lack of
intelligence -- just a lack of good judgment.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4721. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:45 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022845.11891.00000984@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78135

In article <PVZab.1121$Hd6.878876@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20030920004857.21457.00000699@mb-m10.aol.com...
>>
>> All of the above makes my point about attutude.
>>
>
>Attitude is the key in almost every endeavor. I've succeeded in a number of
>things for which I had no talent but had sufficient reason to pursue. These
>include Morse code, music, and karate. I had no talent for any of them but
>did quite well simply because I wanted to.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dee:

Well said. I can say the same with regard to Morse code, music, cooking, photography, shooting, and any of my other interests. My "talent" seemed to increase in direct proportion to the amount of effort I was willing to apply to learning and mastering techniques used by these activities. A lot of people think that "talent" makes it easy for people to make certain achievements in their life, whereas, what they are really seeing is the simple result of strong desire to achieve. In fact, a lot of people with true, pure "talent" tend to become bored, jaded, and detached from whatever it is for which they have this talent. It was that way for me with music. I started on the clarinet, but quickly learned how to play over 20 different instruments. Therefore, I must have had some kind of "talent," but the fact that it was easy for me didn't mean I had any particularly overwhelming desire to become a performance-grade artist in any of the instruments I could play. Therefore, I didn't. Had I picked one, stuck with it, and became it's true master, perhaps I'd be sitting in a symphony orchestra instead of driving a bus. But sitting in my high school and college bands and orchestras didn't inspire me to do that for a living. Go figure.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4722. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:47 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022847.11891.00000985@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78144

In article <0aZab.42555$NM1.33021@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> You just locked, loaded, took careful aim, and shot
>> yourself in the foot! If you had ANY experience with
>> Morse/CW at all, you'd realize that the mode which
>> is in "decline" lately on HF is SSB -- due to poor
>> operating conditions. The CW segments continue to
>> jump with activity. (snip)

> So you're saying code use "in this country" is jumping with activity? If
>so, where? I've looked in the commercial bands, shortwave broadcast bands,
>military bands, and so on, and found very little code use (certainly far
>less than just a few decades ago, just as I said).

Dwight:

Uh huh. Right. I totally agree. And if I were discussing commercial or military communications, that may be a relevant point. However, since we're discussing Amateur Radio, you're just spinning your wheels with the NCTA's most famously irrelevant and unresponsive argument.

>> I'm gonna give you some free advice here, Dwight.
>> (snip) You're out of your depth when discussing code
>> testing, so I would suggest, for the sake of your own
>> credibility, that you chose a topic you know something
>> about.

> Now, let me give you some advice, Larry. You're too narrow-minded to even
>understand the concepts behind code testing. Code testing is not, and has
>never been, solely to benefit Amateur Radio.

OK, Dwight -- then, for the umpteenth time, please inform us what it IS relevant to OTHER than the ARS? By your own admission, no other communications service is using Morse/CW to any noticeable extent. So, WHICH ONE IS???

>Therefore, you can't focus
>solely on Amateur Radio when discussing the code testing issue.

The heck I can't, Dwight!

>So, for the
>sake of your own credibility on this subject, look outside your own narrowly

>defined little world at the much larger picture elsewhere (the view from the
>FCC's perspective). Only then will you be aware enough to seriously discuss
>this issue.

Dwight, unless and until you can show us just exactly WHERE the
ARS's code testing requirement ***IS*** relevant OUTSIDE of the ARS,
all you're doing is blowing smoke. And not very dense smoke at that.

The subject of this thread is "where PCTA's fail in logic." So far, it has
only served to prove that the NCTA's have no concept of logic at all,
and are therefore unqualified to discuss it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4723. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:48 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022848.11891.00000986@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78143

In article <6NZab.42630$NM1.17664@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> How many CW contacts have you made in your
>> ham "career?" I'm into the multiple thousands. If
>> you have less than 500, then you're not even close
>> to being qualified to render a judgment against
>> code testing.

> And exactly how does the number of CW contacts made qualify one to make a
>judgement about the value of code testing as a license requirement?

Dwight:

Simply by serving as an indication of your level of experience in that particular mode.

>Again,
>code testing is not, and never has been, solely for the benefit of Amateur
>Radio (or solely to benefit CW operations on those bands).

I see. Then perhaps you can tell us how it "benefits" photography, cooking, stamp collecting, or any other activity which isn't Amateur Radio?

>Code use is declining here and around the world.

Not really. In fact, the only place where it has "declined" is within the military
and commercial communications arenas, where there were relatively few Morse/CW operators compared to the Amateur Radio Service. And, since everything I'm discussing here is related ONLY to the Amateur Radio Service, that's the only group of Morse/CW users who are being considered by me in any of my postings.

>Looking solely at Amateur Radio, even
>the majority of those operators don't use code/cw on any routine or regular
>basis. Because of these facts, the need for a code testing requirement has
>vanished.

The total number of hams who don't use Morse code is relatively high, but only due to the fact that there are many other modes for radio amateurs to employ. I've never demonstrated any confusion on that point, therefore, you are raising an irrelevant and invalid argument here.

>> Twenty-two plus years of OTA HF experience as a
>> radio amateur, which has been about 80 percent CW,

>> 19 percent RTTY and other digital modes, and 1
>> percent phone. What's your breakdown?

> I believe the question was what experience you have that makes you
>UNIQUELY qualified to judge the value of a specific TESTING REQUIREMENT. I
>don't see anything above that would make you uniquely qualified in this
>subject.

Obviously, since you are in disagreement. That doesn't make you right when you say I'm not a qualified judge of the code testing requirement -- it just means
you have an axe to grind which makes it necessary for you to attempt to discredit me.

>Again, code testing is not, and never has been, solely for the
>benefit of Amateur Radio (or operations in those bands).

And, once again, you fail to mention who or what is benefited by it, if not the ARS. Please provide an answer, or quite wasting our time with this illogical statement.

>Therefore, the FCC
>is not going to judge the value of code testing based solely on Amateur
>Radio.

Then WHAT besides the ARS are they going to judge it by? The ARS is the only communications service currently using the Morse/CW mode to any extent which would require the regulatory attention of the FCC. Therefore, the Coast Guard, MARS, the Maritime service, etc. etc. are all entirely irrelevant and unresponsive to this issue.

>You have to look at the larger picture, Larry. At this point, you're
>still too narrowly focused.

I am focused on the Amateur Radio Service, Dwight. I realize you're thinking about all the other radio services which, for purely economic reasons, have dropped the use of Morse/CW and therefore the necessity to undergo the expensive process of recruiting, training, and providing pay and benefits to Morse/CW operators. This has no impact in the ARS -- but you, in true NCTA fashion, fail to grasp this very simple concept. The plain fact is that the ARS has no personnel-based "cost" at all. Therefore, your argument is irrelevant and unresponsive.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4724. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022849.11891.00000988@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78138

In article <sp_ab.1205$Hd6.891178@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>One does have to eat a pizza to evaluate its taste and whether they will
>like it or not. I love pizza but hate tomatoes, cheese, and garlic. Yet
>combine them into a pizza and the result is entirely different. No one can
>tell how a cake will taste simply from reading the ingredients on a box.
>You can evaluate its nutritional content but not its taste. So while there
>are some things that do not need to be experienced to evaluate them, there
>are other things that do.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dee:

Correct. And the Morse/CW mode is definitely one of those things that one must "experience" before they become qualified to make any sort of judgment about code testing.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4725. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022849.11891.00000987@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78141

In article <J7_ab.42680$NM1.38979@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) However, as previously stated, you are not qualified
>> to make any judgment against the code testing requirement,
>> since you have not gained practical operational experience
>> in this mode. (snip)

> Larry, one does not need to survive a house fire to make judgements about
>fire safety. Or be attacked by a foreign government to make a judgement
>about certain defense planning. Or live under a dictator to make judgements
>about laws affecting our freedoms. Or experience a business failure to make
>wise business judgements. Or experience anything else firsthand to make
>value judgements about it.

Dwight:

Perhaps, but the accuracy of those judgments are definitely affected by having had those experiences, or not. Someone who has never experienced a house fire, a terrorist attack, life under a tyrannical dictator, or a business failure is certainly capable of making the entirely incorrect judgment about any of the above. Therefore, I will give you this one, with the stipulation that people who haven't used the Morse code can also make a judgment that code testing is current and essential as a licensing requirement in the ARS -- but I'm sure you would disagree.

>> (snip) You have not had that mode's unique benefits
>> and advantages proved to you over and over again through
>> years of daily OTA use. I have. (snip)

> Again, this is not about Morse Code/CW use - it's about the code test
>requirement.

Unresponsive. 100 percent of my comments are directed precisely at the code testing requirement -- very scrupulously so. There is no confusion on this issue, therefore your constantly bringing this up only serves to demonstrate your own lack of reading comprehension.

>I can have that operational experience without a test
>requirement and you can continue to enjoy the "mode's unique benefits and
>advantages" long after the testing requirement is gone.

I do not disagree. However, experience has shown that people who aren't required to be code tested usually don't bother to learn and use the Morse

code, so the issue does relate to code use, only to the extent that the lack of a requirement would tend to cause a decline in the use of the Morse/CW mode in the fullness of time.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4726. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022850.11891.00000989@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78131

In article <bkhs27$79d@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Well, more importantly, when was the last time Larry wore a bra?
>(Wooshhhhhh--he will never get that one).
>
>Kim W5TIT

Obviously not, since I'm not in the habit of wearing ladie's underwear!
So, for once you're right, Kim -- that one hit my skull and slid right off!
However, my "issue" with you has nothing to do with your bra or what's
in it -- it's about your call sign. But I don't expect you to "get" that,
either.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4727. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022850.11891.00000990@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78137

In article <bkhs73$u4d@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>But, but, but!!!! Larry's obviously got or had large boobs, and has
>obviously worn a bra. Right?! He *has* hasn't he? Surely, for if not he
>would not be making value judgements on my callsign.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

One doesn't need to be endowed with large breasts or wear the
requisite bra in order to be aware of what constitutes mature,
intelligent, and dignified behaviour. That is, of course, unless you
believe that Riley Hollingsworth is a cross-dresser! After all, you
cannot disparage my opinion of your call sign without showing
him the exact same level of disrespect.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4728. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022851.11891.00000991@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78128

In article <bki8pn$23md0$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>
>It took a while, but I have grown accustomed to your callsign, Kim. And it
>wasn't necessary for me to wear a bra to do it. ;-)
>
>Arnie -
>KT4ST

Arnie:

I'm fully accustomed to Kim's call sign as well. It's well suited to her
childish, self-centered, attention-grabbing personality. Moreover, I've
come so accustomed to it that I've given up on the notion that she'll
ever show some growth and maturity and change it for something
more appropriate, dignified, and respectful of her fellow YL's.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4729. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:51 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022851.11891.00000992@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78136

In article <20030920184429.14837.00003106@mb-m03.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>
> Dwight, if Larrah had to do it, EVERYBODY has to do it.

Except YOU, Lennie. YOU never do anything but whine!

>>> (snip) You have not had that mode's unique benefits
>>> and advantages proved to you over and over again through
>>> years of daily OTA use. I have. (snip)
>>
>> Again, this is not about Morse Code/CW use - it's about the code test
>>requirement. I can have that operational experience without a test
>>requirement and you can continue to enjoy the "mode's unique benefits and
>>advantages" long after the testing requirement is gone.
>
> Larrah can't grasp the theological import of that clear and concise idea.
> He is a self-professed "true believer" and cannot see ANY other religious
> idea but his old cult status.

Well, at least I'm a True Believer in something useful, unlike Lennie,
who only "believes" in sitting on the sidelines, throwing rotten apples
at those who are acquiring and utilizing useful communications skills.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4730. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:28:53 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921022853.11891.00000993@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78134

In article <vmptt9rrsje11c@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>> Outside of sounding like low-grade bullshit, that "reason" could be
>taken
>> as wanting a government WELFARE program to preserve morse code.
>>
>> If morsemanship is so damn much fun, easy to learn, etc., then it can
>> be done WITHOUT needing the subsistence of any federal testing.
>
>That was my EXACT point in an earlier post.... I was told by a certain
>PCTA type that "it won't exist anymore unless we force it on everybody"...
>well, heh, according to darwin and also the free market, the most fit
>survive and the free market, left to run the course as it will in and of
>its own needs will result in the best suited result.

Clint:

The so-called "free market" is VERY highly regulated all over the globe. About the only thing most business entrepreneurs are "free" to do these days is to strictly comply with regulations telling them what they can sell, how they can sell it, and whom they can sell it to. Code testing doesn't even come close to being the same thing, particularly since the Technician's license gives a ham 97% of all available amateur radio operating privileges without a hint of a code test.

>If you have to MAKE it happen, then it isn't making it on it's own
>merit.

Fine. Then let's get rid of any and all testing in schools at every educational level. After all, all those tests only "force" students to demonstrate academic achievement, don't they? That's "making" an education happen, so we can't have that, can we?

>social engineering.
>it's affirmative action for CW; it's as you said, a welfare program for
>it....

Don't look now, Clint, but welfare programs are "handouts" that give away valuable assets as if the recipient were entitled to them simply by virtue of being there with his/her hand out. It is the NCTA that wants a welfare program, not the PCTA.

>> >One of the classic NCTA whines. Us horrible old PCTA's want to keep
>> >Morse code going so that we can continue to demonstrate the dominance
>> >of the white, middle-class, American male, who represents 5% of the
>> >world's population yet consumes 25% of the planet's resources,

>
>and ALSO produces 33% of the worlds economic output, to the tune
>of 11 TRILLION dollars out of the 33 trillion sum total of all nations.
>
>Just to keep the record straight.

So what's your problem, then?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4731. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 06:41:41 UTC
From: Roger Wiseman <Dumbass@NoSlpam.comz>
Message-ID: <bkjh77$n6n$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 78146
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
news:iO8bb.13$LJ5.2273@iad-read.news.verio.net...

"BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@bigalk4oka.net> wrote in message
news:vmq5ars9c9i455@corp.supernews.com...
> HO HO. SELL YOUR GEAR I DONT CARE. JUST STAY OFF OF 3.894.5. THATS BIG ALS
> FREQUENCY. HO HO. I'LL BE TAKING OVER 3.898 NEXT. HO HO
>
> AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. HO HO
>
>

If I choose to talk on that frequency, I will, so long as I'm abiding by the
rules and regulations as they are spelled out. YOU or no one else, can tell
me to stay off. ASS WIPE.
.....
Good thing old Rich Whiten is gone...THAT was a radio Hog times two....
The old YI YI song reminds me of Rich's selfish stupidity as he keyed over
all but a few of his chosen "butt buddies".
Rich would, in his arrogance, ignore all Hams who weren' t running
megawatts....of course old Rich got caught running over the legal
limit...among other things.
Story is that Rich got pissed and sent his resignation of his license to
Riley Hollingsworth. Riley accepted the resignation and rescinded Rich's
license.
Enter another story...Rich is now claiming that his letter of resignation
was sent "by mistake" to Hollingsworth and Whiten wants his license back.
Sorry, Rich. Your weak story ain't holding water up this way.
Gosh...how does one send email "by mistake"?
Rich is full of it...he screwed up out of anger and now he wants to take it
all back. It doesn't work that way.
Porkbutt Song.....YI, YI, YI.....

4732. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 08:25:49 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921042549.11891.00000994@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78147

In article <Xns93FD68E860C2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>
>You mean like becoming president despite a lack of talent, for example?
>
>

Let's leave Jimmy Carter out of this.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4733. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 08:25:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921042550.11891.00000995@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78148

In article <bkj4q2$8ed@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Not necessarilly. If one knows the ingredients of pizza, they do not have
>to eat it to know whether they would like it or not.

Kim:

Just out of curiosity, what ARE the ingredients of a pizza?

>> I love pizza but hate tomatoes, cheese, and garlic. Yet
>> combine them into a pizza and the result is entirely different. No one
>can
>> tell how a cake will taste simply from reading the ingredients on a box.

Unless, of course, that particular cake is made with tomatoes, cheese,
and garlic -- then you, by your own admission, would have a prejudiced
notion of it's taste. And, if the cake was made from scratch, one may
not have a box from which to read the list of ingredients. Then, the
only way to judge the cake's taste would be through direct, personal
experience. I'm sure more cakes are judged in this manner than by
any analysis of the ingredient list.

>Depends.

Eouuuuuu!!! I wouldn't want to make a cake or a pizza out of them!

>If it's a chocolate cake and we know that we can't *really* taste
>the eggs (I can't stand eggs), then I'm pretty sure I'd like a chocolate
>cake.

Have you ever tasted a cake (of any flavour) made *without* eggs?
I'm pretty sure you could tell the difference.

>> You can evaluate its nutritional content but not its taste. So while
>there
>> are some things that do not need to be experienced to evaluate them, there
>> are other things that do.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>
>I think you're grabbing at straws, Dee.

No, Kim, actually she is quite correct. Personal experience *does* give
us a better ability to evaluate things and formulate judgments for or
against them. While non-participatory analysis of the parts of the whole
may lead us to draw some certain conclusions, those conclusions would

tend to then be colored by our prejudices for or against any one component, such as eggs, cheese, or tomatoes. Only when the whole concept is brought together into the sum of it's parts, and experienced by a truly qualified and objective person who doesn't have an agenda to either be for or against the result, can a fair and credible judgement be made. This applies equally to cake, pizza, and Morse code testing within the ARS. It is not "grasping at straws."

73 de Larry, K3LT

4734. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 08:25:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921042552.11891.00000996@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 78149

In article <%6abb.47997$Aq2.45630@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>
>> All Dwight said was that "your words reek of bigotry, elitism, and
>> discrimination against other Americans."
>
>
> Now, I didn't specifically say Larry's words reeked of anything. What I
>said is the words I hear from many advocating the continuation of the code
>testing requirement often reek of bigotry, elitism, and discrimination
>against other Americans. Of course, some of Larry's past comments certainly
>might fit into that category, but he has since somewhat toned down his
>rhetoric.

Dwight:

Thank you for noticing -- I've been making an effort to conduct myself at a level more in keeping with that of a reasonable, intelligent person. I may slip from time to time, and I just noticed upon review of postings made earlier that I had, indeed, again transgressed against Kim. This just serves to remind me of my need to maintain my watchfulness over my own behaviour.

Now, then, how does the advocation of code testing in any way correlate to bigotry, elitism, and/or discrimination against other Americans? The code tests, both past and present, have proved to be achievable by people from all walks of life, including those with communicative disabilities up to and including total deafness. Try as I may, I can't find anything patently "discriminatory" there. So, take a shot of setting me straight -- how is code testing "discrimination?"

>> If YOU want to TRULY support personal initiative without
>> "government support" (and all its 'evil' socialist-like things) then
>> you should be able to eliminate the federal code test!
>>
>> Except you do NOT. You keep demanding that the government
>> continue the federal code test in order to keep a few code users
>> around...

> I've discussed that contradiction with Larry before. He does seem to
>exclude code testing from his conservative views opposing excessive
>government regulation.

Correct, because I don't consider it to be "excessive" government regulation. I believe the government has a valid need to regulate certain

things, especially valuable and finite resources such as the RF spectrum. Therefore, I believe that when license is to be given for the PRIVILEGE of free use of RF spectrum, which is worth potentially billions of dollars should it be converted to commerce in the commercial utility communications and broadcasting industries, certain government regulation makes good sense.

>If Morse Code has real value, it should be able to
>survive in as close to a free market environment as possible.

Well, that's a wonderful concept, Dwight, but history has shown that it doesn't work when put to the actual test. The No-code Technician experiment only served to bring us a couple hundred grand of new hams who self-limited their amateur radio experience to the 2-meter repeaters. Naturally, they all want the freedom to use HF phone, but that still (for now) requires that they learn the Morse code and pass a test, albeit at a mere 5 WPM. The fact that they are not doing so in any great numbers indicates that the Morse code does not have any particular drawing power based on it's own "merits," as the NCTA would infer. And now that there is a very bold dotted line drawn around even this meager requirement, the incentive has all but fully evaporated.

>I think it has
>that value and can survive just fine without a regulation mandating testing.

And I don't -- and have seen conclusive proof that it won't.

>> The FCC regulates and licenses ALL civil radio in the USA...
>> yet none of the staff nor commission of the FCC are required to
>> pass any morse code test in order to regulate US amateur radio.

> Of course, that should be obvious. But Larry's position benefits him
>more - if accepted, it would undermine all those with different views on
>this subject. Clearly, only those with views similar to his would accept
>such a premise.

First of all, FCC Commissioners are political appointees, not necessarily technical experts. They can, and do, depend on the advice of professional technical experts, who actually formulate and subsequently make recommendations on regulatory matters. The Commissioners mainly ensure that these regulations meet the needs of their respective political constituencies, often with numerous conflicting interests battering them from every angle.

Second, it is not my desire to "undermine" anyone. I don't view the Morse code testing requirements, past or present, to be in any way unachievable or otherwise discriminatory. In fact, I view them as being directly in support of the concept of learning and maintaining the use of a highly useful communications skill, therefore, the requirement has, IMHO, intrinsic merit. This does not "benefit me more" than anyone else in the ARS. Moreover, I am definitely not squelching anyone with different views. This newsgroup is adequate evidence of that.

>> You seem dumb and dumberer to the fact that every other radio
>> service (except a small part of maritime radio) in the USA has either
>> DROPPED morse code (snip)

> Actually, as you may know, even the International Maritime Organization
>(IMO) voted in 1998 to eliminate Morse Code. The Coast Guard itself dropped
>code in 1995. As a result of these two events, the Coast Guard now urges
>commercial vessels not to use code since CG personnel, and an increasing
>number of radio operators in the maritime service, may no longer have the
>skills necessary to communicate using that system. The UN-chartered IMO is
>responsible for defining and regulating international maritime
>telecommunications. It's positions are adopted by the ITU.

All of this is really swell, Dwight, and trust me, if my dinghy were to spring a leak in the middle of a busy shipping lane, the last thing I would do is break out my J-38 and ask the next passing Liberian tanker to swing by my position and fish me out of the drink. However, I would have my marine HF and VHF radios powered up, and I'd have the mic in hand, screaming like bloody havoc! However, this discussion is about the AMATEUR Radio Service. Can you PUHLEEEZE, just for once, get that concept thru your Kevlar skull? Your lack of situational awareness, while accusing me of the same, is getting to be quite frustrating.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4735. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 09:38:50 UTC
From: BIG AL <imafuckingwindbag@porkbutt.net>
Message-ID: <vmqsd54hmlp907@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78150
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

BIG AL IS TELLING YOU TO STAY OFF OF 3.894.5 AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE
PROKBUTT SONG A YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG. HO HO BIG AL OWNS
3.894.5 AND SOON 3.898 HO HO STOP SCREAMING ELVIE. HO HO

"Roger Wiseman" <Dumbass@NoSlpam.comz> wrote in message
news:bkjh77$n6n$0@pita.alt.net...
>
> "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> news:iO8bb.13$LJ5.2273@iad-read.news.verio.net...
>
>
> "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@bigalk4oka.net> wrote in message
> news:vmq5ars9c9i455@corp.supernews.com...
> > HO HO. SELL YOUR GEAR I DONT CARE. JUST STAY OFF OF 3.894.5. THATS BIG
ALS
> > FREQUENCY. HO HO. I'LL BE TAKING OVER 3.898 NEXT. HO HO
> >
> > AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. HO HO
> >
> >
>
> If I choose to talk on that frequency, I will, so long as I'm abiding by
the
> rules and regulations as they are spelled out. YOU or no one else, can
tell
> me to stay off. ASS WIPE.
> .....
> Good thing old Rich Whiten is gone...THAT was a radio Hog times two....
> The old YI YI song reminds me of Rich's selfish stupidity as he keyed over
> all but a few of his chosen "butt buddies".
> Rich would, in his arrogance, ignore all Hams who weren' t running
> megawatts....of course old Rich got caught running over the legal
> limit...among other things.
> Story is that Rich got pissed and sent his resignation of his license to
> Riley Hollingsworth. Riley accepted the resignation and rescinded Rich's
> license.
> Enter another story...Rich is now claiming that his letter of resignation
> was sent "by mistake" to Hollingsworth and Whiten wants his license back.
> Sorry, Rich. Your weak story ain't holding water up this way.
> Gosh...how does one send email "by mistake"?
> Rich is full of it...he screwed up out of anger and now he wants to take
it
> all back. It doesn't work that way.

> Porkbutt Song.....YI, YI, YI.....
>
>

4736. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 09:41:05 UTC
From: BIG AL <imafuckingwindbag@porkbutt.net>
Message-ID: <vmqshdfh78hr4b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78051
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

SHOW UP ON MY FREQUENCY AND I WILL RUN YOU OFF. HO HO

"Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
news:iO8bb.13$LJ5.2273@iad-read.news.verio.net...
>
>
> "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@bigalk4oka.net> wrote in message
> news:vmq5ars9c9i455@corp.supernews.com...
> > HO HO. SELL YOUR GEAR I DONT CARE. JUST STAY OFF OF 3.894.5. THATS BIG
ALS
> > FREQUENCY. HO HO. I'LL BE TAKING OVER 3.898 NEXT. HO HO
> >
> > AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. HO HO
> >
> >
>
> If I choose to talk on that frequency, I will, so long as I'm abiding by
the
> rules and regulations as they are spelled out. YOU or no one else, can
tell
> me to stay off. ASS WIPE.
>
> BIG AL.. the only thing big about you, is your mouth....
>
> Lou
>
>

4737. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 09:42:10 UTC
From: BIG AL <imafuckingwindbag@porkbutt.net>
Message-ID: <vmqsjcp4qn3968@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78052
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

IT BECAME MY PRIVATE FREQUENCY YEARS AGO. HO HO . STAY AWAY UNLESS INVITED
PORKBUTT.

"Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
news:ms8bb.12$LJ5.2141@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> "Ed Price" <edprice@cox.net> wrote in message
> news:1n7bb.332$La.205@fed1read02...
> >
> > "Harry Quiff" <quiff@merkin.net> wrote in message
> > news:bkims8qhf1@216.221.129.15...
> > > On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 18:30:35 -0400, BIG AL wrote:
> > >
> > > > ALL OF YOU PEOPLE NEED TO STAY OFF OF MY FREQUENCY. 3.894.5 IS BIG
> AL'S
> > > > FREQUENCY. UNLESS YOU ARE INVITED DO NOT COME TO MY FREQUENCY.
> > ESPECIALLY
> > > > W8RBK ELVIE WITH HIS GIRLY VOICE. HO HO
> > >
> > >
> > > Why don't you go fuck yourself?
> > >
> > > No one cares about the assclowns on night time HF. Every one is a
loser.
> > >
> > > I hope Riley eventually finds and ass fucks every one of you.
> >
> >
> >
> > Hmmm, 3.894.5 is a rather unique way to express it. Accuracy always
> commands
> > respect.
> >
> > Ed
> > WB6WSN
> >
>
> Since when did it become a "private" frequency? The H.F. Frequencies used
> for Ham operation are open to any one with the proper class of license to
> use them. Of course common courtesy does count when the frequency may
> already be in use. No wonder people are turning away from Ham. It is
getting
> horrible. Used to be, I boasted it to anyone interested. Now, I tell them
> not to waste their time. It is getting to be High Power CB. As for the

FCC,
> they have lost the battle so far as I'm concerned. The horses are out of
the
> barn. TOO LATE! I'm about ready to sell all my ham gear.. Get my cash out
of
> it while there is still some value left to it. I would NEVER buy a new rig
> again, that is for sure. I'll buy "used" if I decide to stay in it. It
just
> isn't worth the huge cash lay out.
>
> Lou
>
>

4738. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 10:23:48 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6D7C83.4060506@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78053

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
>
> Mike Coslo wrote:
>
>>
>>
>> Clint wrote:
>>
>>>> We can have plenty of fun in here arguing with each other without
>>>> resorting to that.
>>>>
>>>> Think about it Clint.
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> I have and reject the premis of your argument.
>>
>>
>>
>> SO what you are saying is that you HAVE to call us Nazi's, Clint?
>>
>> You have my pity, Clint, you really do.
>
>
>
> That's about the extent of the mental capacity of the no-coder, Mike.
> They have too little vision to
> be able to see value in radiotelegraphy, so all they can see is that
> anyone who has that capacity must be on the far opposite end of the scale.
>
> One must ponder their IQ. For the most part it's down with the whale
> offal.

I liken it to people who watch the televised arguments on Fox news and
others. A half hour of angry people yelling at each other. Eventually
some people think this is the way to conduct all discourse.

When in fact it is just exhhibiting dhildish, boorish, behavior that
just proves that something went amiss when they were being brought up.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4739. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 12:19:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6D9794.3050002@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78054

Alun Palmer wrote:

> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in

>> I think some of you have wigged-out too far and need investigation
>> for Illegal substance abuse...
>>
>> LHA

>
> Exactly my point, although more eloquently stated

Care to put your accusations in writing and signed, guys?

Pretty pleeze?

You align yourself with a fine group Alun. We who like the idea of a Morse test are accused of being jacbooted thugs N****S, and now illegal drug abusers.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4740. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 12:22:35 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6D985B.5070501@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78055

Leo wrote:
> Alun,
>
> It would be a challenge indeed to be less eloquent than the poster
> that you refer to below - I'd certainly be interested in knowing how
> one would go about achieving that!
>
> Be Well,
>
> 73, Leo

Baseless and terrible accusations are what pass for eloquence in some circles Leo. Its the future of Ham radio.

> On 21 Sep 2003 04:54:16 GMT, Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
>>news:20030920203302.21642.00001023@mb-m01.aol.com:
>
>
>>snip
>
>
>>> I think some of you have wigged-out too far and need investigation
>>> for Illegal substance abuse...
>>>
>>> LHA
>>
>>Exactly my point, although more eloquently stated
>
>

4741. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 12:28:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6D99C8.6050302@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78056

Alun Palmer wrote:
> Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in
> news:4h0pmvsk9bl1ja0dgd0nd6dp47se1c65tr@4ax.com:
>
>
>>Very well said, Dee - anything is possible if you want to do it badly
>>enough..
>
>
> And if you want to do it badly enough you may end up doing it so badly
> that it would have been better if you had not tried!
>
>
>>I am certainly no prodigy at morse, electronics, martial
>>arts, cooking, business management or anything else - but I have
>>always been able to accomplish the things that I was motivated to do.
>>Mind you, it took me until I was 45 to become motivated enough to
>>learn morse code - but I wanted to get on HF, focused on the goal,
>>bought some training software online and passed the 5 wpm test four
>>weeks later. Conversely, I have wanted to learn to play the guitar
>>since I was a teenager - not sufficiently enough, though, as I never
>>did do it. Which, in retrospect, is probably a good thing....
>>
>>Talent has very little to do with accomplishment (it does relate to
>>the level of excellence that one can attain
>
>
> Indeed it does. There are some things that I will never be excellent at,
> and Morse code is one of them.
>
>
>>, but to become reasonably
>>proficient in anything talent is not a factor), especially in ventures
>>based primarily on rote repetition like morse, Karate, or learning a
>>language. Aptitude and motivation, yes, but not talent. Otherwise,
>>I'd have accomplished nothing so far :)
>>
>>Blaming a lack of talent for failure to accomplish something reflects
>>on a persons' own inability to accept responsibility for their own
>>actions
>
>
> So you can do anything can you? Do you beat up on yourself whenever you
> fail at something? That doesn't sound very healthy to me.

You mean you don't? You have some diminished expectations, Alun. I want to do well at anything I do.

>>"Successful people are successful because they form the habits of
>>doing those things that failures don't like to do"
>>
>>73, Leo
>>
>
>
> Fine qualities for a chairman of a Fortune 500 company maybe, but as a
> condition for admission into a hobby???

They are fine qualities for anyone! No one has to be achairman of a corporation. But if we all tried to do our best at whatever we do, the world would be a better place.

The only disadvantage of my outlook vs yours is that I don't have an excuse for failure before I even start.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4742. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 12:31:22 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309210431.172e0f7d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78057

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030921022841.11891.00000977@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0309200337.360b9a3b@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Dick Carroll <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >news:<bke6dj$pm7$0@208.206.142.96>...
> >> Greg Courville wrote:
> >>
> >> > I've been a ham for only a month now, and been using these groups for
> >> > about 6 weeks.
> >> > I really can't stand some of the things that go on here.
> >> > Has anybody ever noticed that 8 out of 10 threads on this group (and
> >> > many other amateur radio groups) end in a flame war?
> >> > It's really shocking how people can start an argument over nothing
> >> > which can escalate to vicious strings of insults complete with
> >> > profanity, sexual references and terms such as "CBplusser" and
> >> > "Knuckle-Dragger".
>
> Then Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> >> Greg if you want to see how all this began just spend some time in Google
> >> and you canget an educaion. It sure didn't start by old timers belittling
> >> newcomers. In fact it was and IS the exact reverse. Not all newcomers, by
> >> any means, just those on this board who decided to do it, and persist to
> >> this day.
>
> Greg again:
>
> >> > It's just unbelievable to me that while all of the
> >> > books talk about how wonderful and helpful hams are, a significant
> >> > number of them spend their time cutting each other down over random
> >> > issues. I see "newbies" come to these boards for help, and get cut
> >> > down by inconsiderate jerks who just feel like making people feel
> >> > stupid.
>
> >> You're making assumptions here that shouldn't, indeed can't, be made.
>
> Now comes Brian:
>
> >Assumptions can always be made. That's what makes them assumptions.
>
> Brian:
>

> Just because assumptions can always be made, doesn't mean that
> we aren't making the correct ones.

Thats the beauty of assumptions. If they were always correct, they
would be called something else.

> >> The jerks who show up her complaining about the code test requrement and
> >> blaming all us who just did it, without complaining.
>
> >And? Finish the thought.
>
> That thought is complete.

No it isn't. What about "the jerks who show up here...?"

It was the NCTA that started this debate, and
> turned it into the slugfest it became when they blamed just about everything
> bad in this world on those of us hams who were able to learn the Morse
> code and pass tests at strictly amateur-level speeds.

And I heard about all the ills that will befall the ARS if the FILTER
is done away with, if people don't show enough EFFORT. Then there's
the other Morse Myths that were being put to bed, such as, if there's
an emergency CW ALWAYS gets thru, you can cobble together a CW
transmitter out of ANYTHING in an emergency, only CW will work in an
emergency. The answer that I liked best was "I'm going to make you
learn Morse Code because I had to."

That was brilliant.

The code testing
> requirements had always been reasonable and were proven to be
> achievable by people from all walks of life, even those with severe
> communicative disabilities.

I disagree that it is reasonable. First, there is no other pass/fail
mode test. If there were, then your assertion that it was reasonable
would not fail so badly.

However, the NCTA, in their need to make
> the attempt to prove the code tests to be unreasonable and somehow
> irrelevant, were the FIRST ones to resort to the empty rhetoric, negativity,
> and name-calling with which we have all had to contend.

Larry, I don't claim to have been the first one here; I arrived about
1995. But don't you think a DECADE is long enough to get past who
said what first?

Whah, whah, whah.

> >> That in so doing
> >> learned that Morse code does indeed add substantially to ham radio, to the
> >> point that we believe code testing has a permanent place in ham radio, is
> >> just so much nonsense to them. They already know all about it.

> >>
> >Yet there are those of us who don't believe as you do. We are
> >constantly attacked.
>
> Incorrect.

Correct.

> It is the NCTA's to began the "attacks."

What? In 1992?

In one of my earliest
> postings on Fidonet over a decade ago, one of the NCTA replies accused
> me of "ethnic cleansing" because I dared to agree with the present code
> testing requirements.

He accused you of ethnic cleansing over 5WPM Extra? I can't even
imagine it.

I surely didn't start out with the notion of making
> such rash statements, but I certainly wasn't going to let them go
> unanswered, either.

And so we get from you, "welfare mothers of color with their hands
out...," "my favorite black on the bus...," "don't let the door hit
you on the ass on your way out of the ARS...," "knuckle dragging
trailer trash with southern accents...,"

You sure made the PCTA proud! Stand a little taller, Larry.

> >> > How many hams didn't start out with a lower-level license?
> >> > People need to stop beating up on us poor no-coders.
>
> Don't look now, but nobody's beating up on the "poor no-coders" unless
> and until those same "poor no-coders" start beating up on us innocent
> PCTA's who are merely stating their opinions with passion and
> conviction.

Uh, Larry, many of the NCI/NCTA are "coders." And by what passion do
you refer?

No CW = No Ham Radio

> >> Come into ham radio with a proper attitude (note I didn't say THE proper
> >> attitude) and you'll be received just as well as anyone ever was.
>
> Dick is absolutely right.

I noted that DICK didn't say "THE proper attitude," but thats
certainly what he meant.

My own radio club is full of No-code Techs, but
> because of the fact that, for the most part, they haven't bothered to
> place their codeless status under scrutiny by making accusations against

> those of us who believe in and support code testing, we all get along
> very well, indeed.

Why would their codeless status be scrutinized?

Why would an opinon that code testing should come to an end be
expected to be kept silent?

Certainly you don't keep your opinions to yourself. Sounds like you
are running a concentration camp and not a radio club where each
member is valued.

"You No-Coders sit over there and shut-up, or we'll compare you to
welfare mothers with their hands out. You know, the ARS isn't for
everyone, so don't let the door hit you on the ass on your way out."

When dealing with fellow hams in person, I have
> never once asked for their license class. However, because my own
> is self-evident by the configuration of my call sign, I have many times
> been subjected to inquiries regarding my personal stance on code
> testing, and then been treated accordingly.

I'm sure your replies were less than charming. Your subsequent
treatment was probably deserved.

And while these are just
> a few out of the dozens of hams I have dealt with in the past ten
> years, these NCTA's have all followed the same pattern -- they stir
> up controversy,

Larry, it has been a hot topic within the ARS since Novice
Enhancement. Why wouldn't it e brought up, unless we're in a
concentration camp.

> focus that controversy on me and other PCTA's,

Uh, Larry, you act as a lightning rod because of your people skills.
Is it any wonder your career in Human Resources didn't fly?

> then drop out of sight the second they realize they're losing the
> battle.

Uh, Larry, you call 5WPM "losing the battle?"

The sad thing is, if they had only left it out entirely, nobody
> would have had to bother with the issue in the first place!

It is an issue who'se time has come, and now, is almost past.

> >THE proper attitude is what he meant, though. Otherwise enter at your
> >own risk.
>
> No, Dick said what he meant, and he meant what he said.

You may think that. I don't.

The NCTA
> "attitude," which basically boils down to "I think we need to get rid of
> code testing, and if you dare to disagree with me, I'm going to smear
> you all over the floor" is the attitude to which he refers.

Putting to bed your thirty or so Morse Myths is not smearing you all
over the floor.

> >> > Don't they
> >> > realize that the new people look up to the old-timers?
> >>
> >> You REALLY must have not been reading here very closely at all, Greg.
> >> Were that the case *here* you wouldn't have a report to make.
> >>
> >His words are valid. Initially, newcomers do look up to the
> >old-timers. Till the moment the old-timers start pushing "No CW=No
> >Ham" ideology.
>
> I don't recall ever "pushing" that ideology until some NCTA pushed the
> CW = obsolete, politically incorrect, non-inclusive, racist, bigoted,
> homophobic, environmentally damaging, etc. etc. ideologies first.

And there it is.

> >> > I must say that
> >> > after reading books about how hams help people all over the world and
> >> > are generally just a wonderful bunch, these groups have really changed
> >> > my view of the amateur radio community.
> >>
> >> Don't feel lonesome.
> >> It sure changed my view of ham radio, too. I showed up here several years
> >> ago to engage in civil, sincere discourse on the merits of code testing,
> >> and was immediately set upon by the code haters for my views. It's been
> >> all downhill from there.
> >>
> >DICK was instrumental in the downhill part. And he's been here more
> >than just "several years." He's working on his 1st decade of bile.
>
> Yup, but Brian has over a decade of NCTA bile under HIS belt!

You mean DICK? What would he be doing with NCTA bile? Didn't have
enough of his own?

> >> > I don't doubt that even this
> >> > thread will end in a violent exchange of profanities and become just
> >> > another flame war.
>
> >> Once again, you will get the treatment you deserve here, at least from me.
> >>
> >> So far you're doing OK, I don't blame you for your concern. But I suggest
> >> you might benefit from a bit more knowledge of the background of what has
> >> happened here.
> >

> >Absolutely.
>
> >Brian
>
> I suggest you take your own advice, Brian, and find out just exactly WHO
> started the code/no-code debate and why.

Larry, I know that your reasons to retain the code exams are
irrational. Who called who a "his favorite black on the bus" really
doesn't matter at this point. Your retention arguments just don't
hold up. Sorry.

Now instead of trying to take your ball and going home, why don't you
try to play nice? Lose the stupid "I am a superior ham" nonsense and
go work on your WAS.

Brian

4743. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 12:32:50 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921083250.08239.00001601@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 78060

>"Your just Mad because you dont even have a License. I think your upset that
>I
>made $250. off of Clowns like you who wont even take the test."
>
>"don't have a license", "clowns like you who wont even take the test"
>dosen't sound like Tech plus license holders dose it? Proof that brucies'
>story is just that, a story.

You guys are just upset that you not even smart enough to pass the Extra , let
alone make $250.00.

4744. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 12:32:56 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkk5pe$g54@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 78058

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:o29bb.47926$Aq2.31047@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > Well, more importantly, when was the last time Larry
> > wore a bra? (Wooshhhhhh--he will never get that one).
>
>
> Obviously, Larry feels he doesn't have to have experience to make
> judgements - about you, your callsign, or anything else, Kim. Clearly, he
> only expects that from everyone else.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

That's because Larry's "superiority" can only be had by him on an even
playing field. With him and him standing there and no one else.

Kim W5TIT

4745. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 12:33:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6D9AD5.2070707@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78059

Leo wrote:
> Alun,
>
> It would be a challenge indeed to be less eloquent than the poster
> that you refer to below - I'd certainly be interested in knowing how
> one would go about achieving that!

SPANK! I knew there was something about you that I liked, Leo! Well stated. Squelch of the week!

>
> On 21 Sep 2003 04:54:16 GMT, Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
>>news:20030920203302.21642.00001023@mb-m01.aol.com:
>
>
>>snip
>
>
>>> I think some of you have wigged-out too far and need investigation
>>> for Illegal substance abuse...
>>>
>>> LHA
>>
>>Exactly my point, although more eloquently stated

It's probably a good idea to keep this in the realm of fun argument guys. This crosses the line. If you think that accusing CW affecionado's of drug abuse is amusing, I might beg to differ.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4746. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 12:34:39 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921083439.08239.00001602@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 78061

> There are eight million stories in the Naked City......
>

But mine is a TRUE STORY, and I have the License and the $250.00 to prove it.

4747. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 12:37:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6D9BC4.6030805@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78062

Dick Carroll; wrote:
> Ah, that nocode eloquence!

Dick, We're N***'s, Jackbooted thugs, liberals (apologies to the liberals out there) and now drug abusers. There's only one accusation left. That one will probably come soon.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4748. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 12:47:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921084703.23307.00003143@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 78063

In article <d22b54c3.0309181643.7b2e0e28@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>Field Day a few years back and one of the
>codeless village idiots had put up some tribander or another which I
>was using on 20 CW. I pointed it just south of due west from here in
>Philly. To check things out I quickly worked a couple Euros, an OA, a
>VK and a JA. Without touching the rotator control box.
>
>I put the 259B to it and the SWR was flat at about 1.7:1 from 13.5 to
>14.5 Mhz. I asked him what the hell kinda "beam" this crapper was.
>
>"Well, it's not a CW antenna, it's tuned for the phone bands . . ".
>
>I figger that pile of aluminum tubing at the high end of the coax was
>acting as a top hat for the gawdawful lossy feedline which was doing
>all the radiating.

I remember that. The 'phone folks had even poorer results with it. Thing was fed with nice new RG-213 and was 70something feet up in the air. Shoulda been a killer but my homebrew trap dipole at 50' was doing at least as well.
>
>Then came his buddy, another one, who stated that the reason g5rv's
>"work" is because they're "trap antennas". I asked him to show me the
>traps in the 40M g5rv we'd put up. "I don't know where they are but
>they have to be there somewhere."

Good thing Mr. Varney wasn't there.
>
>N2EY was there too . .

Oyez, comedy of errors. Good time was had by all.
>
>And neither of us have been back to run FD with that pack of 21st
>Century nitwits.

Well, I wouldn't call 'em that!

Just folks with relatively little experience, that's all. FD is supposed to be a learning experience, and I sure learned a few things ;-)

One of the big differences between ham radio today and the way it was years ago is the way hams get started. There are exceptions, of course, but the following is generally true:

Once upon a time, most new hams started out on HF, and so learned early on about things like basic antennas, zero beating, tuning up rigs and antennas,

characteristics of different bands and modes, how to deal with QRM and QRN, etc. Lots of homebrewingAnd they also got a front row seat on how much CW is used in the ARS, and how useful it is to hams.

What you got in that system was an "HF-centric" view.

Nowadays the entry point is usually VHF/UHF with manufactured equipment. Different experience calling for different knowledge and skills. And the result is often a "VHF-centric" view.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4749. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 12:53:12 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309210453.58a4d3e6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78064

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030921022842.11891.00000978@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0309200340.4cea8bf@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Forever thinking of Kim, aren't you?
>
> Brian:
>
> I think about everyone in this newsgroup, particularly the "regulars" who
> have been here for a number of years. The truth is, in spite of our
> numerous and passionate disagreements, I don't think there's anyone
> here that I wouldn't like to know in person -- including Kim, and you!
> I think of time spent here as time spent with friends, and I can't help
> but to wonder if everyone else sees it the same way. Tonight, as in
> many nights in the past, I found myself composing, then quickly
> deleting, several posts aimed at certain people which contained my
> usually acerbic tone. In other words, I'm starting to wonder just
> exactly what I, and we, are all doing here, and what it all means. I
> can't honestly say that I'm ever going to change my mind about
> anything here, but I also have come to realize that in all likelihood,
> nobody else will, either. However, the way in which we disagree is
> something upon which we all should reflect, and I don't exclude myself
> from that.
>
> Things are happening in my life that are causing me to consider the
> more eternal ramifications of everything I do. I know that I am not
> perfect, and that I, like most other people, am able to fall into the
> pattern of allowing my lesser nature to come to the surface. And
> while I cannot make a credible promise to not allow that to happen
> anymore, I can at least occasionally take the time to stop and
> reflect upon it, and take stock of my own behaviour.
>
> I would like to think that if it were ever possible for all of us to meet
> in person, that that meeting would be both pleasant and enjoyable.
> And, as we continue to batter each other's opinions, I think it is
> necessary to realize that we are not necessarily battering each
> other personally. Whether or not the nature of Usenet tends to
> make our reactions to each other impersonal by nature, it does
> bear keeping in mind that there is another human being at the
> other end of our rhetoric. I know that I want to be treated as such,
> and I will try to keep that in mind when reacting to the rest of you.
>
> Just some food for thought…any and all comments welcome.

>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Dammit, Larry, now you've done it!

First, I have always wanted to meet Dick Carroll, just to see if his head was misshapened or if he suffered from Napoleans affliction, if he has that MO twang, or if he like guns as much as I do so we could quit sparring over the code.

I'd like to mess around in Dave Heil's shack an see what he's done with those low band loops, or if he prominently displays my KH2 QSL card on his wall, next to Martii's. I imagine my thought of him being smug would disappear - it may be an artifact of me reading his posts on the web.

Len, well, what can I say. He's been my mentor for years. Never afraid to jump in with both feet, but more caustic than Drano. Few have dared to go there - but you're one of them.

Kim, beer and BBQ?

There are many more, but I'll stop now.

Maybe we need to gather at Dayton 2005.

Brian

4750. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 13:03:24 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <wkhbb.1423$Hd6.1113222@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78065

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vmpskoorigikbd@corp.supernews.com...
> (4) The public at large (ham radio operators) should NOT
> be BURDENED with having to make choices; they
> should not have the freedom to choose how to use
> thier skills to the ends that they see fit; such is an
> IMPOSITION upon them.
>

By eliminating the testing requirement for Morse code, we are seriously undermining people's freedom of choice. Choices need to be based on sufficient knowledge of the subject. Morse code is one of those areas where a person needs to learn the basics and experience it before they have sufficient knowledge. Keeping the test means that individuals will have a better knowledge base upon which to choose whether or not to pursue Morse code to proficient level. No one is required to use Morse code after learning it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4751. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 13:10:58 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Crhbb.1424$Hd6.1114311@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78066

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vmptkm6quagt26@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > No my analogy is quite correct. To determine the worth of pizza, you
> must
> > eat to see if it is a food worth your bother. Knowing the ingredients
> will
> > not tell you that.
>
> here's a more accurate anology....
>
> "You can't possibly know anything about pizza, and i'm telling you that
> it's an important staple to you diet. Your opinion means nothing; I
> am now pointing the gun of licenseing system at your head and
> ORDERING you to take a bite of the pizza, I am not worried
> one bit about what the facts are or what the market wants... I am
> going to see to it that everybody is force fed pizza whether they
> like it or not."
>

I and other parents that I know have always required our children to eat foods that are good for them whether they liked them or not. My children have always been required to eat what was served whether they liked it or not. Children were not allowed to dictate the menu.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4752. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 13:14:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <suhbb.1425$Hd6.1114760@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78067

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bkj1g4$2aflr$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Clint" wrote ...
>
> Hey, look your family members certainly have my sympathy for what
happened,
> but do not try to use that moral high ground to change and divert the
course
> HERE.
>
> I guess freedom of speech, if and only if it doesn't offend? If you really
> got that offended by what I said, and this is the last time I will speak
to
> you on this matter (period), then block my messages from being downloaded
on
> your computer, or do not read them; however, you should not try to censor
> anybody.
> --
>
> I am not trying to censor you, Clint. I am just highly offended by the
use
> of the word out of context. It is not a matter of freedom of speech, it
is
> a matter of decency. You could have easily chosen to use another word to
> characterize the pro-code side of this debate and still made your point.
> That's all I'm saying.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST

Arnie,

Unfortunately we have too many people in this country who think freedom of speech takes precedence over common decency. They don't realize or don't care that by being inconsiderate in their choice of words or analogies that people will discount what they say. It is more important to them to do it their way rather than in a way that will get the audience on their side.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4753. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 13:17:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Dxhbb.1426$Hd6.1115213@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78068

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vmq30am583bk07@corp.supernews.com...
>
> >
> > I am not trying to censor you, Clint. I am just highly offended by the
> use
> > of the word out of context.
>
> but always remember, that is *your* opinion.
> I happen to think the analogy is quite accurate.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT

Visit a Holocaust museum and watch the documentaries on the History channel
for a while and read the transcripts of the Nuremberg trials. See if you
think the analogy is accurate then.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4754. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 13:26:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <KFhbb.1428$Hd6.1116681@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78069

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309201841.51137659@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<i6Mab.846$Hd6.623809@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > At a character speed of 5wpm, you can't hear the letter as a letter and
you
> > can't react to the sound on a reflex basis.
>
> But, Dee, I passed the Novice test with 100% copy.

Passing with 100% copy when the character speed is 5wpm can be done by counting dots and dashes and checking the lookup table in your head rather than responding on a reflex basis. There is no contradiction as you seem to imply. At characters speeds of 13wpm, one can avoid the trap of counting and lookup and learn to respond reflexively ultimately leading to mastering higher speeds.

Using a method that encourages people to count the dots and dashes erects a barrier to going on to higher speeds. Why use a method that creates hardships that will cause a person to have to start over with a new learning process if they should want to use it? The teaching and learning of any subject should be approached from the point of view that the person may someday want to use the material taught not from the viewpoint of passing a test on it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4755. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 13:27:02 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bkk8u1$su6$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 78622

Man, this keeps getting better and better....

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote

> I and other parents that I know have always required our children to eat
> foods that are good for them whether they liked them or not. My children
> have always been required to eat what was served whether they liked it or
> not. Children were not allowed to dictate the menu.

This, on top of Roll's admissions, couldn't make the PCTA's position
and attitude any plainer, to even a casual observer.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.520 / Virus Database: 318 - Release Date: 9/19/2003

4756. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 13:41:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <WThbb.1429$Hd6.1118758@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78070

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030921022845.11891.00000984@mb-m11.aol.com...
> In article <PVZab.1121$Hd6.878876@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >news:20030920004857.21457.00000699@mb-m10.aol.com...
> >>
> >> All of the above makes my point about attutude.
> >>
> >
> >Attitude is the key in almost every endeavor. I've succeeded in a number
of
> >things for which I had no talent but had sufficient reason to pursue.
These
> >include Morse code, music, and karate. I had no talent for any of them
but
> >did quite well simply because I wanted to.
> >
> >Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Dee:
>
> Well said. I can say the same with regard to Morse code, music,
> cooking, photography, shooting, and any of my other interests. My
> "talent" seemed to increase in direct proportion to the amount of
> effort I was willing to apply to learning and mastering techniques used
> by these activities. A lot of people think that "talent" makes it easy
> for people to make certain achievements in their life, whereas, what
> they are really seeing is the simple result of strong desire to achieve.
> In fact, a lot of people with true, pure "talent" tend to become bored,
> jaded, and detached from whatever it is for which they have this talent.
> It was that way for me with music. I started on the clarinet, but
> quickly learned how to play over 20 different instruments. Therefore,
> I must have had some kind of "talent," but the fact that it was easy
> for me didn't mean I had any particularly overwhelming desire to become
> a performance-grade artist in any of the instruments I could play.
> Therefore, I didn't. Had I picked one, stuck with it, and became it's
> true master, perhaps I'd be sitting in a symphony orchestra instead
> of driving a bus. But sitting in my high school and college bands and
> orchestras didn't inspire me to do that for a living. Go figure.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

>

I have seen much the same thing. The talented find it too easy and drop by the wayside. I particularly saw this in the martial arts. I saw several students, including some of my own, who could have, if they continue, dramatically overshadowed me and the other instructors. Yet after a few months, they dropped out. It was us untalented but hardworking people who went on to the national tournaments and brought home the medals.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4757. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 13:46:38 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <elarmvopts69k15bdjth3i15tu0nni9old@4ax.com>
Source record: 78071

Dee,

There are a few excellent articles which support your theory of code learning at:

http://www.cq2k.com/articles.htm

73, Leo

On Sun, 21 Sep 2003 13:26:02 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:

>snip

>Using a method that encourages people to count the dots and dashes erects a
>barrier to going on to higher speeds. Why use a method that creates
>hardships that will cause a person to have to start over with a new learning
>process if they should want to use it? The teaching and learning of any
>subject should be approached from the point of view that the person may
>someday want to use the material taught not from the viewpoint of passing a
>test on it.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4758. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 13:54:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <J4ibb.1430$Hd6.1121315@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78072

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309210431.172e0f7d@posting.google.com...
> I disagree that it is reasonable. First, there is no other pass/fail
> mode test. If there were, then your assertion that it was reasonable
> would not fail so badly.
>

If it were practical to set up and administer pass/fail tests on other modes, I would certainly support doing so. It is unfortunate that it is only practical to administer code testing and written testing.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4759. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 14:01:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6DAF9B.7010801@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78073

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030921022845.11891.00000984@mb-m11.aol.com...
>
>>In article <PVZab.1121$Hd6.878876@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>
> Flint"
>
>><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>>>news:20030920004857.21457.00000699@mb-m10.aol.com...
>>>
>>>>All of the above makes my point about attutude.
>>>>
>>>
>>>Attitude is the key in almost every endeavor. I've succeeded in a number
>>
> of
>
>>>things for which I had no talent but had sufficient reason to pursue.
>>
> These
>
>>>include Morse code, music, and karate. I had no talent for any of them
>>
> but
>
>>>did quite well simply because I wanted to.
>>>
>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>>Dee:
>>
>>Well said. I can say the same with regard to Morse code, music,
>>cooking, photography, shooting, and any of my other interests. My
>>"talent" seemed to increase in direct proportion to the amount of
>>effort I was willing to apply to learning and mastering techniques used
>>by these activities. A lot of people think that "talent" makes it easy
>>for people to make certain achievements in their life, whereas, what
>>they are really seeing is the simple result of strong desire to achieve.
>>In fact, a lot of people with true, pure "talent" tend to become bored,
>>jaded, and detached from whatever it is for which they have this talent.

>>It was that way for me with music. I started on the clarinet, but
>>quickly learned how to play over 20 different instruments. Therefore,
>>I must have had some kind of "talent," but the fact that it was easy
>>for me didn't mean I had any particularly overwhelming desire to become
>>a performance-grade artist in any of the instruments I could play.
>>Therefore, I didn't. Had I picked one, stuck with it, and became it's
>>true master, perhaps I'd be sitting in a symphony orchestra instead
>>of driving a bus. But sitting in my high school and college bands and
>>orchestras didn't inspire me to do that for a living. Go figure.
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>
> I have seen much the same thing. The talented find it too easy and drop by
> the wayside. I particularly saw this in the martial arts. I saw several
> students, including some of my own, who could have, if they continue,
> dramatically overshadowed me and the other instructors. Yet after a few
> months, they dropped out. It was us untalented but hardworking people who
> went on to the national tournaments and brought home the medals.

It's called DRIVE, Dee, and without it, all the talent in the world
means nothing. I'd hire a driven person before a talented person any day.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4760. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 14:06:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6DB09D.70308@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78074

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> news:vmptkm6quagt26@corp.supernews.com...
>
>>>No my analogy is quite correct. To determine the worth of pizza, you
>>
>>must
>>
>>>eat to see if it is a food worth your bother. Knowing the ingredients
>>
>>will
>>
>>>not tell you that.
>>
>>here's a more accurate anology....
>>
>>"You can't possibly know anything about pizza, and i'm telling you that
>>it's an important staple to you diet. Your opinion means nothing; I
>>am now pointing the gun of licenseing system at your head and
>>ORDERING you to take a bite of the pizza, I am not worried
>>one bit about what the facts are or what the market wants... I am
>>going to see to it that everybody is force fed pizza whether they
>>like it or not."
>>
>
>
> I and other parents that I know have always required our children to eat
> foods that are good for them whether they liked them or not. My children
> have always been required to eat what was served whether they liked it or
> not. Children were not allowed to dictate the menu.

Oh how cruel! Dee, you are a meanie. You are stunting your kids
emotional growth and forcing them to do something they don't want to. NO
one should be forced to do something they don't want to be it Morse Code
or eating foods that are good for them. - end of being facetious.

How about NBI - NO Broccoli International?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4761. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 14:10:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6DB1C2.50807@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78075

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
> news:bkj1g4$2aflr$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
>>"Clint" wrote ...
>>
>> Hey, look your family members certainly have my sympathy for what
>
> happened,
>
>>but do not try to use that moral high ground to change and divert the
>
> course
>
>>HERE.
>>
>>I guess freedom of speech, if and only if it doesn't offend? If you really
>>got that offended by what I said, and this is the last time I will speak
>
> to
>
>>you on this matter (period), then block my messages from being downloaded
>
> on
>
>>your computer, or do not read them; however, you should not try to censor
>>anybody.
>>____
>>
>>I am not trying to censor you, Clint. I am just highly offended by the
>
> use
>
>>of the word out of context. It is not a matter of freedom of speech, it
>
> is
>
>>a matter of decency. You could have easily chosen to use another word to
>>characterize the pro-code side of this debate and still made your point.
>>That's all I'm saying.
>>
>>Arnie -
>>KT4ST
>

>
> Arnie,
>
> Unfortunately we have too many people in this country who think freedom of
> speech takes precedence over common decency. They don't realize or don't
> care that by being inconsiderate in their choice of words or analogies that
> people will discount what they say. It is more important to them to do it
> their way rather than in a way that will get the audience on their side.

What these free speech hypocrites don't seem to get, is that it works both ways. While they insist on calling us Nazi's, they consider our objections and replies to their repulsive comments to be denying them their free speech. It is not. That is an example of free speech in action. Everyone has their say. Just as they can call us Nazi's, we can object.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4762. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 14:12:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6DB205.7030907@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78076

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> news:vmq30am583bk07@corp.supernews.com...
>
>>>I am not trying to censor you, Clint. I am just highly offended by the
>>
>>use
>>
>>>of the word out of context.
>>
>>but always remember, that is *your* opinion.
>>I happen to think the analogy is quite accurate.
>>
>>Clint
>>KB5ZHT
>
>
> Visit a Holocaust museum and watch the documentaries on the History channel
> for a while and read the transcripts of the Nuremberg trials. See if you
> think the analogy is accurate then.

Have you thought for a minute, Dee, that he STILL might?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4763. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 14:15:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6DB2DF.6040104@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78077

Brian wrote:
> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030921022842.11891.00000978@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>
>>In article <f45722ac.0309200340.4cea8bf@posting.google.com>,
>>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>
>>
>>>Forever thinking of Kim, aren't you?
>>
>>Brian:
>>
>>I think about everyone in this newsgroup, particularly the "regulars" who
>>have been here for a number of years. The truth is, in spite of our
>>numerous and passionate disagreements, I don't think there's anyone
>>here that I wouldn't like to know in person -- including Kim, and you!
>>I think of time spent here as time spent with friends, and I can't help
>>but to wonder if everyone else sees it the same way. Tonight, as in
>>many nights in the past, I found myself composing, then quickly
>>deleting, several posts aimed at certain people which contained my
>>usually acerbic tone. In other words, I'm starting to wonder just
>>exactly what I, and we, are all doing here, and what it all means. I
>>can't honestly say that I'm ever going to change my mind about
>>anything here, but I also have come to realize that in all likelihood,
>>nobody else will, either. However, the way in which we disagree is
>>something upon which we all should reflect, and I don't exclude myself
>>from that.
>>
>>Things are happening in my life that are causing me to consider the
>>more eternal ramifications of everything I do. I know that I am not
>>perfect, and that I, like most other people, am able to fall into the
>>pattern of allowing my lesser nature to come to the surface. And
>>while I cannot make a credible promise to not allow that to happen
>>anymore, I can at least occasionally take the time to stop and
>>reflect upon it, and take stock of my own behaviour.
>>
>>I would like to think that if it were ever possible for all of us to meet
>>in person, that that meeting would be both pleasant and enjoyable.
>>And, as we continue to batter each other's opinions, I think it is
>>necessary to realize that we are not necessarily battering each
>>other personally. Whether or not the nature of Usenet tends to
>>make our reactions to each other impersonal by nature, it does
>>bear keeping in mind that there is another human being at the
>>other end of our rhetoric. I know that I want to be treated as such,

>>and I will try to keep that in mind when reacting to the rest of you.
>>
>>Just some food for thought…any and all comments welcome.
>>
>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>
> Dammit, Larry, now you've done it!
>
> First, I have always wanted to meet Dick Carroll, just to see if his
> head was misshapened or if he suffered from Napoleans affliction, if
> he has that MO twang, or if he like guns as much as I do so we could
> quit sparring over the code.
>
> I'd like to mess around in Dave Heil's shack an see what he's done
> with those low band loops, or if he prominently displays my KH2 QSL
> card on his wall, next to Martii's. I imagine my thought of him being
> smug would disappear - it may be an artifact of me reading his posts
> on the web.
>
> Len, well, what can I say. He's been my mentor for years. Never
> afraid to jump in with both feet, but more caustic than Drano. Few
> have dared to go there - but you're one of them.
>
> Kim, beer and BBQ?
>
> There are many more, but I'll stop now.
>
> Maybe we need to gather at Dayton 2005.

Yaknow, people can be pro-code and no-code and have spirited arguments without accusing each other against crimes against humanity! Or illegal drug abuse.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4764. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 14:16:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6DB32A.5070300@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78078

Brian wrote:
> Dammit, Larry, now you've done it!
>
> First, I have always wanted to meet Dick Carroll, just to see if his
> head was misshapened or if he suffered from Napoleans affliction, if
> he has that MO twang, or if he like guns as much as I do so we could
> quit sparring over the code.
>
> I'd like to mess around in Dave Heil's shack an see what he's done
> with those low band loops, or if he prominently displays my KH2 QSL
> card on his wall, next to Martii's. I imagine my thought of him being
> smug would disappear - it may be an artifact of me reading his posts
> on the web.
>
> Len, well, what can I say. He's been my mentor for years. Never
> afraid to jump in with both feet, but more caustic than Drano. Few
> have dared to go there - but you're one of them.
>
> Kim, beer and BBQ?
>
> There are many more, but I'll stop now.
>
> Maybe we need to gather at Dayton 2005.

Just no group hug! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4765. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 14:48:49 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <lTibb.1434$Hd6.1129524@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78079

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:elarmvopts69k15bdjth3i15tu0nni9old@4ax.com...
> Dee,
>
> There are a few excellent articles which support your theory of code
> learning at:
>
> http://www.cq2k.com/articles.htm
>
> 73, Leo
>
> On Sun, 21 Sep 2003 13:26:02 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> wrote:
>
> >snip
>
> >Using a method that encourages people to count the dots and dashes erects
a
> >barrier to going on to higher speeds. Why use a method that creates
> >hardships that will cause a person to have to start over with a new
learning
> >process if they should want to use it? The teaching and learning of any
> >subject should be approached from the point of view that the person may
> >someday want to use the material taught not from the viewpoint of passing
a
> >test on it.
> >
> >Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

No that page does not really support me. It advocates the "sounds-like" method which is also poor and creates another barrier. The "sounds-like" approach will get you past the 5wpm easily but then blocks you at about 15wpm more or less. As discussed in "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy," I advocate learning by direct association of the letter to the sound to build a reflex. Any method that requires additional associations, will create a plateau at some point. To get past that point, you've got to ditch the association.

Also the page says nothing about how often and how long to practice. I note that they talk about taking a year to get to 5wpm. That's way too long and will discourage people. With proper methods and the proper frequency of practice, it should only take about 30 hours to get to 5wpm (see "Morse Code, The Essential Language").

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4766. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 14:50:32 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <YUibb.1437$Hd6.1129265@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78080

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F6DB09D.70308@adelphia.net...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> > news:vmptkm6quagt26@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > >>>No my analogy is quite correct. To determine the worth of pizza, you
> > >>
> > >>must
> > >>
> > >>>eat to see if it is a food worth your bother. Knowing the ingredients
> > >>
> > >>will
> > >>
> > >>>not tell you that.
> > >>
> > >>here's a more accurate anology....
> > >>
> > >>"You can't possibly know anything about pizza, and i'm telling you that
> > >>it's an important staple to you diet. Your opinion means nothing; I
> > >>am now pointing the gun of licenseing system at your head and
> > >>ORDERING you to take a bite of the pizza, I am not worried
> > >>one bit about what the facts are or what the market wants... I am
> > >>going to see to it that everybody is force fed pizza whether they
> > >>like it or not."
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> > > I and other parents that I know have always required our children to eat
> > > foods that are good for them whether they liked them or not. My
children
> > > have always been required to eat what was served whether they liked it
or
> > > not. Children were not allowed to dictate the menu.
> >
> > Oh how cruel! Dee, you are a meanie. You are stunting your kids
> > emotional growth and forcing them to do something they don't want to. NO
> > one should be forced to do something they don't want to be it Morse Code
> > or eating foods that are good for them. - end of being facetious.
> >
> > How about NBI - NO Broccoli International?
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >

I LIKE broccoli. Let's make it NO Peas International.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4767. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 14:51:44 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <4Wibb.1439$Hd6.1129943@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78081

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F6DB205.7030907@adelphia.net...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> > news:vmq30am583bk07@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > >>>I am not trying to censor you, Clint. I am just highly offended by the
> > >>
> > >>use
> > >>
> > >>>of the word out of context.
> > >>
> > >>but always remember, that is *your* opinion.
> > >>I happen to think the analogy is quite accurate.
> > >>
> > >>Clint
> > >>KB5ZHT
> > >
> > >
> > > Visit a Holocaust museum and watch the documentaries on the History
channel
> > > for a while and read the transcripts of the Nuremberg trials. See if
you
> > > think the analogy is accurate then.
> >
> > Have you thought for a minute, Dee, that he STILL might?
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >

Yes I have and I shudder at the thought.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4768. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 14:56:14 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <i_ibb.45996$NM1.13175@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78082

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030920203258.21642.00001019@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <7Y3bb.46625$Aq2.568@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI"
> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Attempt you insults all you want to Clint. I still say you know nothing
and
> >have no experience in the mode.
>
> Okay, so it's all right if YOU do the insulting, but "not all right" if
> someone
> else doesn't agree with you. :-)
>
> >If you don't run over 18wpm consistantly, and are able to sit down and
copy
> >in your head. And have done so for years. Then may statement is true.
> >You have no concept.
>
> I can visually copy 1200 Baud text as it comes in and comprehend
> everything. 300 Baud text is a piece of cake. :-)
>
> >And with you smart assed attitude you never will.
>
> Ah, well, with a smart-assed dumb and dumberer attitude like yours
> about morse code, there isn't much hope for advancement in US ham
> radio. It's all about the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service.
>
> LHA

Why do you care? All you do is bad mouth ham radio and those that are
members of the club.

Dan/W4NTI

4769. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 14:56:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6DBC7D.8030803@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78083

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F6DB09D.70308@adelphia.net...
>
>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>
>>>"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
>>>news:vmptkm6quagt26@corp.supernews.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>>No my analogy is quite correct. To determine the worth of pizza, you
>>>>
>>>>must
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>eat to see if it is a food worth your bother. Knowing the ingredients
>>>>
>>>>will
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>>not tell you that.
>>>>
>>>>here's a more accurate anology....
>>>>
>>>>"You can't possibly know anything about pizza, and i'm telling you that
>>>>it's an important staple to you diet. Your opinion means nothing; I
>>>>am now pointing the gun of licenseing system at your head and
>>>>ORDERING you to take a bite of the pizza, I am not worried
>>>>one bit about what the facts are or what the market wants... I am
>>>>going to see to it that everybody is force fed pizza whether they
>>>>like it or not."
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>I and other parents that I know have always required our children to eat
>>>foods that are good for them whether they liked them or not. My
>>
> children
>
>>>have always been required to eat what was served whether they liked it
>>
> or
>
>>>not. Children were not allowed to dictate the menu.

>>
>>Oh how cruel! Dee, you are a meanie. You are stunting your kids
>>emotional growth and forcing them to do something they don't want to. NO
>>one should be forced to do something they don't want to be it Morse Code
>>or eating foods that are good for them. - end of being facetious.
>>
>>How about NBI - NO Broccoli International?
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> I LIKE broccoli.

Me too actually.

Let's make it NO Peas International.

Pretty Peas?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4770. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 15:13:48 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Mejbb.46178$NM1.1629@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78084

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vmps51af7m1mcc@corp.supernews.com...
>
> >
> > When a standard must maintained, whether it be a ham license, or a
pilots
> > license, then a test is required. Otherwise the quality goes down.
>
>
> only if the maintained standard is directly relavent to the operation of
> what is
> being spoken of.
>
> Adherence to the rules, paying attention to "gentleman's agreements", and
> following all the rules and regulations are not mutually inclusive with
that
> of morse code skill.
>
> If THAT was the fact, the overwhelming number of violaters on the 40 and
> 75m bands (who were legally licensed, with 13 and 20 wmp code testing)
> would NOT have done what they did; it sounded like channel 19
> cb for many years before hollingsworth helped to clean it up (more proof
> that code testing is NOT a "yahoo filter")
>
> >
> > CW is a tradition in the ARS.
>
> as is FM, ssb, AM, etc.....
>
> It is a valuble mode of communications.]
>
> as is FM, ssb, AM, etc...
>
> > However, it requires a certain amount of dedication and desire to
maintain
> > your ability to work the mode.
>
> as is FM, ssb, AM, etc...
>
> >
> > In otherwords advocating freedom of choice has nothing to do with
getting
> a
> > ham license.

>
> I was saying that in response to the accusation that I was forceing an
idea
> on
> somebody; I was doing just the opposite... advocating a greater range
> of freedom of choice.
>
> >People SHOULD NOT be able to force a change on the licensing
> > authorities, based mainly on being too lazy to try to meet the
standard.
>
> it's a representative republic; the very cornerstone of democracy is that
> the people are able to effect change when they feel it necessary for
> whatever reason THEY feel. The idea that it's because they're "too lazy
> to try to meet the standard" is simply your spin & rhetoric.
>
> >
> > Why should those of us that have the dedication have to be forced to
have
> > our privlidges reduced by those among us that are too lazy to bother to
> meet
> > the standards we did?
>
> I wasn't aware that the NCTA crowd was advocating reducing your frequency
> priviledges. Or, is that more spin? As far as I know, you and other
> licensees
> were going to retain all the priviledges they had before the testing
reform.
>
> By the way, thak you for including the latter part of the comment, PROVING
> I was right... that it all boils down to nothing MORE than "I did it, so
> waaaaa
> waaaa waaaaa, everybody should have to be forced to do it!!!!!"
>
>
> >Should be rejoice at this? I don't think so.
>
> if it were true, no. But it's not. Your priviledges will not change; you
> will be able
> to transmit on all the frequencies that you could before the reform.
>
>
> >
> > We know that is what you SAY. The reality of the situation is based on
> the
> > simple knowledge that human beings will take the easy way. Once CW
> testing
> > is elliminated, CW use will eventually dissapear. Folks simply will
not
> > bother to learn it.

>
> OH! so you admit the OTHER half of the AWEFUL truth! it comes down to
> you want to FORCE people to do something they don't want to do necessarily
> of thier own free will! well, the thing that made america so powerful,
such
> that
> in 200 years +, we have surpassed nations in economic power that have been
> on the planet for THOUSANDS of years, was that the free market forces were
> allowed to decide what course the market would take... and low and behold,
> the united states economic output is one third that of the total of the
> ENTIRE
> world..... that is, a nation with only 4.5% of the population has an
> economic
> value of 33% (about 11 trillion out of 34 trillion dollars) that of ALL
> nations
> combined....
>
> ...if people worked morse code ONLY because they were forced to, then
> I doubt they would use it at all... that is to say, these same people
would
> only pass the code test and then not use CW if they really didn't have
thier
> hearts into it. If that was the ONLY thing keeping CW alive, it would
> have died a long time ago. But the bands are full of CW operators that
> are using it of thier own free will.
>
> If the free market determines that it no longer wants it, than keeping it
> around is tantamount to nothing more than subsidizing a mode of
> communications. You will certainly NOT make any more fans or
> lovers of the code by MAKING them do it.
>
> >
> > I honestly don't think that 5 words per minute is asking too much to
gain
> > access to a large part of the spectrum. I can see your bitch about 20
and
> > maybe even 13. But for GAWDS sake....5wpm....ANYONE can do that.
> > Especially with the multiple guess test. Give it a rest. Pay your
dues.
> > Even if it is only half price...or less.
>
> nah, better to work toward removing it, which is inevitable eventually.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
>

Good points Clint. But your last sentence shoots it all to hotel.
Basically you just admitted your too lazy to meet the standards. Whatever.

This arguement has and probably will, go on and on and on.

And there is a movement to remove the CW segements from the HF allocations. There has been a discussion right here and I believe one or was it two ??, comments I read to the FCC.

So there is a group out there that is really starting to piss the real hams off. Bet that ticked you off, didn't it ?

Have a nice day.

Dan/W4NTI

4771. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 15:15:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <dgjbb.49218$Aq2.18992@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78085

"Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
news:Ee7bb.394723$Oz4.182456@rwcrnsc54...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in
> news:bkhrut$1ov@library2.airnews.net:
> >
> > *ahem* Larry thinks that just because he could not handle an
> > intelligent, good-looking, self-starting, independent woman such as
> > myself, that all men are as weak and obsessed with material things as
> > he is...
> >
> > Pay no mind... his kind is in the minority.
> >
> > Kim W5TIT
>
>
> Larry, I saw a photo of TIT once on QRZ and let me tell you, she's not as
> dumb as she looks.
>
>
> KB7ADL
>

That was here 'skinny chicken' picture. She won't put up her real photo.
Ever hear of hug and chalk?

Dan/W4NTI

4772. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 15:25:24 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <sagrmvonuf6knjv7k1s2u6gb6enk4b6651@4ax.com>
Source record: 78086

Good point, Mike. The concept of free speech is a basic tenet in any democratic society - one needs only to look as far as the former Iraq, where open disagreement with a government policy could buy you a quick ticket to the next world, or at the very least a personalized basic electricity course.

But free speech does not mean that any simian with a functional larnyx is permitted to publicly say anything that he or she wishes - for example, the holocaust deniers and the KKK have proved that point quite well in recent history. Slander and libel laws are another example of limits on 'free speech', intended to mitigate and assign accountability for the damage that it can cause if out of control.

Those who lean most heavily on the free speech arguement are those who are unable to formulate lucid and cogent rebuttals. Which takes more mental effort, delivering a strong targeted counterpoint or calling your opponent a Nazi? This is especially difficult to do well in a real-time heated arguement with someone, requiring both a quick mind and self control - but given the time delay provided by Internet newsgroup communications, one wonders at the intellectual capabilities of the individual who after a few hours of deep mental calisthenics cannot do better than grade-school name calling as a response.

I'll bet that Charles Darwin would have loved Amateur Radio.....

73, Leo

On Sun, 21 Sep 2003 14:10:58 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:

>snip

> What these free speech hypocrites don't seem to get, is that it works
>both ways. While they insist on calling us Nazi's, they consider our
>objections and replies to their repulsive comments to be denying them
>their free speech. It is not. That is an example of free speech in
>action. Everyone has their say. Just as they can call us Nazi's, we can
>object.
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

4773. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 15:25:26 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Gpjbb.49257$Aq2.14311@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78087

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:J4ibb.1430$Hd6.1121315@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309210431.172e0f7d@posting.google.com...
> > I disagree that it is reasonable. First, there is no other pass/fail
> > mode test. If there were, then your assertion that it was reasonable
> > would not fail so badly.
> >
>
> If it were practical to set up and administer pass/fail tests on other
> modes, I would certainly support doing so. It is unfortunate that it is
> only practical to administer code testing and written testing.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

It actually could be done. Example; Pass a basic written test for say the General class.

This would give you basic privlidges of say SSB, FM, at 200 watts on HF. Possible retaining the sub bands also.

Then have a ENDORSEMENT to be added for additional modes, i.e. SSTV, Digital, even CW, etc.

This could be the pass or fail part of things. Given at a local ham club, by those that already have the endorsement or are grandfathered into it by past experience.

Just a thought.

Dan/W4NTI

>

4774. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 15:42:06 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <p4hrmv47ino5gitj94uq8srg8i352450pb@4ax.com>
Source record: 78088

Dee,

Well, it does support your point on not trying to learn the code a a series of dots and dashes - but agreed, it may not be as good as method as straight letter association for high speed operation.

Guess it depends on the end goal - if you intend to go above 15 WPM, then this may not be the best method. If you want to pass a 5 WPM test and get on the air, it can be done using this method in well under 30 hours. (that's how I did it - 1/2 hour a day for three weeks).

With practice, I no longer find myself using the word associations as much as I did initially - I'm just writing down the letter received, and hearing words like "the" as words, not letters. So, is there really a disadvantage to learning by this method? Perceived, perhaps, but I haven't hit a wall yet. Passed the test, though - that was the goal! :)

73, Leo

On Sun, 21 Sep 2003 14:48:49 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:

>
>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>news:elarmvopts69k15bdjth3i15tu0nni9old@4ax.com...
>> Dee,
>>
>> There are a few excellent articles which support your theory of code
>> learning at:
>>
>> http://www.cq2k.com/articles.htm
>>
>> 73, Leo
>>
>> On Sun, 21 Sep 2003 13:26:02 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >snip
>>
>> >Using a method that encourages people to count the dots and dashes erects
>a
>> >barrier to going on to higher speeds. Why use a method that creates
>> >hardships that will cause a person to have to start over with a new
>learning

>> >process if they should want to use it? The teaching and learning of any
>> >subject should be approached from the point of view that the person may
>> >someday want to use the material taught not from the viewpoint of passing
>a
>> >test on it.
>> >
>> >Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>
>No that page does not really support me. It advocates the "sounds-like"
>method which is also poor and creates another barrier. The "sounds-like"
>approach will get you past the 5wpm easily but then blocks you at about
>15wpm more or less. As discussed in "The Art and Skill of Radiotelegraphy,"
>I advocate learning by direct association of the letter to the sound to
>build a reflex. Any method that requires additional associations, will
>create a plateau at some point. To get past that point, you've got to ditch
>the association.
>
>Also the page says nothing about how often and how long to practice. I note
>that they talk about taking a year to get to 5wpm. That's way too long and
>will discourage people. With proper methods and the proper frequency of
>practice, it should only take about 30 hours to get to 5wpm (see "Morse
>Code, The Essential Language").
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4775. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 16:06:16 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkki9o$bs8$0@208.207.71.148>
Source record: 78089

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>In article <Ee7bb.394723$Oz4.182456@rwcrnsc54>, "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL"
><vlfiscus@mcn.net> writes:
>
>
>
>>Larry, I saw a photo of TIT once on QRZ and let me tell you, she's not as
>>dumb as she looks.
>>
>>
>>KB7ADL
>>
>>
>
>Vince:
>
>Let's hope so. I've never thought Kim's problem was a lack of
>intelligence -- just a lack of good judgment.
>
>73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>

Uhhh.....you can get any sort of accurate read on someone's ingelligence
by looking at a posted photo on the net? You coulda fooled the dickens
outta me, especially in her case.

4776. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 16:12:01 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <l5kbb.1455$Hd6.1143771@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78090

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:Gpjbb.49257$Aq2.14311@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:J4ibb.1430$Hd6.1121315@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0309210431.172e0f7d@posting.google.com...
> > > I disagree that it is reasonable. First, there is no other pass/fail
> > > mode test. If there were, then your assertion that it was reasonable
> > > would not fail so badly.
> > >
> >
> > If it were practical to set up and administer pass/fail tests on other
> > modes, I would certainly support doing so. It is unfortunate that it is
> > only practical to administer code testing and written testing.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> It actually could be done. Example; Pass a basic written test for say
the
> General class.
>
> This would give you basic privlidges of say SSB, FM, at 200 watts on HF.
> Possible retaining the sub bands also.
>
> Then have a ENDORSEMENT to be added for additional modes, i.e. SSTV,
> Digital, even CW, etc.
>
> This could be the pass or fail part of things. Given at a local ham club,
> by those that already have the endorsement or are grandfathered into it by
> past experience.
>
> Just a thought.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

I would insist on an operational test for SSB and FM too besides the
written. And I would insist that the operationals be conducted by a VE team
to an established standard not just a "well he is doing OK" sort of thing.

I don't really believe in the concepts of endorsements for various modes.
The candidate should be required to learn the basics in each of the modes
before getting a license. Or make SSB and FM contingent on passing the

other modes first. They should be the last privileges to be earned rather than the first. Otherwise we will end up with way too many of the HF equivalent of "repeater creatures."

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4777. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 16:20:10 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <_ckbb.1456$Hd6.1145040@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78091

Leo,

It looks like you are one of the lucky ones who shake the word associations easily and move on. Other people do hit a barrier as they find it hard to get rid of the word associations. So in my opinion (and I freely admit it is an opinion) that it is better not to risk the word association approach even though it may take a little longer that way.

By the way the 30 hours is an average so that is what I quote to people so they don't get prematurely discouraged. Some will take less (like you) and some will take longer (like me). The good thing is that once a person gets to 30 hours they can see visible progress even if they are one of the people who needs a little more time. So once they are at a point they see progress, they are willing to take the time to finish as they know they can do it.

And I like to teaching things from the point of view that the real goal is to provide the basis for future advancement and use rather than setting the goal as passing a test. Tests are merely a tool to check the effectiveness of the teaching and to check the effectiveness of the learning. Although there are other ways to do this checking, tests are the most efficient.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:p4hrmv47ino5gitj94uq8srg8i352450pb@4ax.com...
> Dee,
>
> Well, it does support your point on not trying to learn the code a a
> series of dots and dashes - but agreed, it may not be as good as
> method as straight letter association for high speed operation.
>
> Guess it depends on the end goal - if you intend to go above 15 WPM,
> then this may not be the best method. If you want to pass a 5 WPM
> test and get on the air, it can be done using this method in well
> under 30 hours. (that's how I did it - 1/2 hour a day for three
> weeks).
>
> With practice, I no longer find myself using the word associations as
> much as I did initially - I'm just writing down the letter received,
> and hearing words like "the" as words, not letters. So, is there
> really a disadvantage to learning by this method? Perceived, perhaps,
> but I haven't hit a wall yet. Passed the test, though - that was the
> goal! :)
>
> 73, Leo

>
>
> On Sun, 21 Sep 2003 14:48:49 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
> >news:elarmvopts69k15bdjth3i15tu0nni9old@4ax.com...
> >> Dee,
> >>
> >> There are a few excellent articles which support your theory of code
> >> learning at:
> >>
> >> http://www.cq2k.com/articles.htm
> >>
> >> 73, Leo
> >>
> >> On Sun, 21 Sep 2003 13:26:02 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
> >> wrote:
> >>
> >> >snip
> >>
> >> >Using a method that encourages people to count the dots and dashes
erects
> >a
> >> >barrier to going on to higher speeds. Why use a method that creates
> >> >hardships that will cause a person to have to start over with a new
> >learning
> >> >process if they should want to use it? The teaching and learning of
any
> >> >subject should be approached from the point of view that the person
may
> >> >someday want to use the material taught not from the viewpoint of
passing
> >a
> >> >test on it.
> >> >
> >> >Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >>
> >
> >No that page does not really support me. It advocates the "sounds-like"
> >method which is also poor and creates another barrier. The "sounds-like"
> >approach will get you past the 5wpm easily but then blocks you at about
> >15wpm more or less. As discussed in "The Art and Skill of
Radiotelegraphy,"
> >I advocate learning by direct association of the letter to the sound to
> >build a reflex. Any method that requires additional associations, will
> >create a plateau at some point. To get past that point, you've got to
ditch
> >the association.

> >
> >Also the page says nothing about how often and how long to practice. I
note
> >that they talk about taking a year to get to 5wpm. That's way too long
and
> >will discourage people. With proper methods and the proper frequency of
> >practice, it should only take about 30 hours to get to 5wpm (see "Morse
> >Code, The Essential Language").
> >
> >Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

4778. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 16:33:36 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkkjt0fdh0@208.207.71.148>
Source record: 78092

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>In article <Xns93FD68E860C2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>
>
>>You mean like becoming president despite a lack of talent, for example?
>>
>>
>>
>>
>
>Let's leave Jimmy Carter out of this.
>
>
>

To say nothing of Slick.

4779. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 16:33:52 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309210833.366d3377@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78093

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3F6D7C83.4060506@adelphia.net>...
>
> I liken it to people who watch the televised arguments on Fox news and
> others. A half hour of angry people yelling at each other. Eventually
> some people think this is the way to conduct all discourse.
>
> When in fact it is just exhhibiting dhildish, boorish, behavior that
> just proves that something went amiss when they were being brought up.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike, you should have this "discourse" with DICK, Larry, Steve, Bruce,
Kelly, and Dan.

We'll understand and acknowledge that learning has taken place when we
see a change in their behavior.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Brian

4780. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 16:39:03 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkkk77$g6s$0@208.207.71.148>
Source record: 78094

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

>how does the advocation of code testing in any way correlate
>to bigotry, elitism, and/or discrimination against other Americans? The
>code tests, both past and present, have proved to be achievable by people
>from all walks of life, including those with communicative disabilities up to
>and including total deafness. Try as I may, I can't find anything patently
>"discriminatory" there. So, take a shot of setting me straight -- how is
>code testing "discrimion?
>

Well Lar, it is beyond evident they have gone about changing Webster's
definition of the word to mean "anything I decide is descrimination".
Of course that just follows along with the PC drift in sociaty where
such "I don't want to"
movements tend to ride the coattails of real discrimination.

4781. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 16:46:07 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkkkkfgug0@208.207.71.148>
Source record: 78095

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
>
>
>>> I think some of you have wigged-out too far and need investigation
>>> for Illegal substance abuse...
>>>
>>> LHA
>>
>
>>
>> Exactly my point, although more eloquently stated
>
>
> Care to put your accusations in writing and signed, guys?
>
> Pretty pleeze?
>
> You align yourself with a fine group Alun. We who like the idea of a
> Morse test are accused of being jacbooted thugs N****S, and now
> illegal drug abusers.

You know the drill, Mike. To divert suspicion from oneself, accuse
the opposition of exactly what one does himself.
You do have to wonder at times. Radically violent thought process and
illicit substances sure would go far to deter one from the
selfdiscipline of learning something like Morse code.

4782. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 16:53:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309210853.7543f64a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78096

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bkj217$m99$0@208.206.142.113>...
>
> That's about the extent of the mental capacity of the no-coder, Mike.
> They have too little vision to
> be able to see value in radiotelegraphy, so all they can see is that
> anyone who has that capacity must be on the far opposite end of the scale.
>
> One must ponder their IQ. For the most part it's down with the whale
> offal.

Dick, have you not heard one word we've said to you over the past
decade?

If you want to use code, FINE!

If you want to build code into your personal Emergency Operations
Plan, FINE!

If you want to create an organization, call it FISTS, and dedicate it
to the use of Morse Code, FINE!

If you want to participate (or not) in CW Contests, FINE!

If you want to risk your life trying to cobble together a CW
transmitter during an emergency, FINE!

But the days of requiring otherwise qualified people to have to learn
your favorite mode just to participate in HF are over. Get used to
it. Adjust. Adapt. Overcome.

Your approach to getting other people to learn your favorite mode has
to change, because you can't say, "Just learn it because I had to."

That just doesn't wash anymore. People don't accept "Just because,"
anymore.

You've got work to do, and it isn't getting done by being crappy to
people who don't share your views. You think vinegar is going to
attract new Morse enthusiasts? It isn't. You think wasting your time
arguing with people like me is going to convert us? It isn't. I
think code is just one of many modes authorized by the FCC. I haven't
used SSTV, so why aren't you complaining about that?

Get on with it, and quit complaining to me about it.

73, Brian

4783. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 16:55:06 UTC
From: Lou <Spamfree@Spamfree.com>
Message-ID: <VJkbb.17$LJ5.2836@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 78097
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"W7TI" <noway@nohow.com> wrote in message
news:j6ermvgs0q3mt67h82b4f4c0ia8httd2ef@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 22:57:12 -0400, "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote:
>
> >Since when did it become a "private" frequency? The H.F. Frequencies used
> >for Ham operation are open to any one with the proper class of license to
> >use them. O
>
> ____
>
> Does the word "troll" have any meaning to you?
>
> He trolled, you bit, he's happy.
>
> --
> Bill, W7TI
>

Well, yes, I did reply.. among others.. Troll? Ass Hole is a better term.
And back to his comment, he will not run me off, if I so desire to chat on
that frequency. Not a chance.... Lou

4784. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 16:57:44 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93FD83DA54D0Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 78098

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:3F6D9794.3050002@adelphia.net:

> Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
>
>>> I think some of you have wigged-out too far and need investigation
>>> for Illegal substance abuse...
>>>
>>> LHA
>
>>
>> Exactly my point, although more eloquently stated
>
> Care to put your accusations in writing and signed, guys?
>
> Pretty pleeze?
>
> You align yourself with a fine group Alun. We who like the idea of a
> Morse test are accused of being jacbooted thugs N****S, and now illegal
> drug abusers.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

You are now quoting me out of context, snipping everything I agreed with,
leaving in the inane joke at the end, and leaving in my apparently
agreeing only to that.

4785. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 17:12:51 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkkm6j$l9o$0@208.207.71.148>
Source record: 78099

Dee D. Flint wrote:

>"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
>news:vmq30am583bk07@corp.supernews.com...
>
>
>>>I am not trying to censor you, Clint. I am just highly offended by the
>>>
>>>
>>use
>>
>>
>>>of the word out of context.
>>>
>>>
>>but always remember, that is *your* opinion.
>>I happen to think the analogy is quite accurate.
>>
>>Clint
>>KB5ZHT
>>
>>
>
>Visit a Holocaust museum and watch the documentaries on the History channel
>for a while and read the transcripts of the Nuremberg trials. See if you
>think the analogy is accurate then.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Those folk can't be bothered to learn facts Dee, their minds are cast
in stone. No amount of
rational persuasion is competent to educate or enlighten them.
Meanwhile they rant about the
backward state of code supporters, of whom far more are involved and
knowledgable on late digital modes than any serious number of them!

Such ignorance would be amazing, even laughable, if it didn't portend
the future.

>
>
>

4786. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 17:27:33 UTC
From: BIG AL <imafuckingwindbag@porkbutt.net>
Message-ID: <vmro0vgbgi3kab@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78201
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

YOU WILL NOT TALK ON MY FREQUENCY. DO NOT EVEN GET NEAR 3.894.5. STAY ON 2 METERS WHERE YOU BELONG.

I HEAR ALL.

aY yi YI yi

HO HO

"Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message news:VJkbb.17$LJ5.2836@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> Well, yes, I did reply.. among others.. Troll? Ass Hole is a better term.
> And back to his comment, he will not run me off, if I so desire to chat on
> that frequency. Not a chance.... Lou
>
>

4787. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 17:29:26 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkkn5m$l9o$1@208.207.71.148>
Source record: 78100

Dee D. Flint wrote:

>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>news:3F6DB09D.70308@adelphia.net...
>
>
>>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
>>>news:vmptkm6quagt26@corp.supernews.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>No my analogy is quite correct. To determine the worth of pizza, you
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>must
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>eat to see if it is a food worth your bother. Knowing the ingredients
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>will
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>not tell you that.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>here's a more accurate anology....
>>>>
>>>>"You can't possibly know anything about pizza, and i'm telling you that
>>>>it's an important staple to you diet. Your opinion means nothing; I
>>>>am now pointing the gun of licenseing system at your head and
>>>>ORDERING you to take a bite of the pizza, I am not worried
>>>>one bit about what the facts are or what the market wants... I am
>>>>going to see to it that everybody is force fed pizza whether they
>>>>like it or not."
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>I and other parents that I know have always required our children to eat

>>>foods that are good for them whether they liked them or not. My
>>>
>>>
>children
>
>
>>>have always been required to eat what was served whether they liked it
>>>
>>>
>or
>
>
>>>not. Children were not allowed to dictate the menu.
>>>
>>>
>>Oh how cruel! Dee, you are a meanie. You are stunting your kids
>>emotional growth and forcing them to do something they don't want to. NO
>>one should be forced to do something they don't want to be it Morse Code
>>or eating foods that are good for them. - end of being facetious.
>>
>>How about NBI - NO Broccoli International?
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>>
>
>I LIKE broccoli. Let's make it NO Peas International.
>
>
>

No, let's go with Brussels Sprouts. No-BS-I??? Yeah, that's it!!

4788. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 17:41:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921134129.12631.00001265@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78204

In article <vmps51af7m1mcc@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>> When a standard must maintained, whether it be a ham license, or a pilots
>> license, then a test is required. Otherwise the quality goes down.
>
>only if the maintained standard is directly relavent to the operation of
>what is being spoken of.
>
>Adherence to the rules, paying attention to "gentleman's agreements", and
>following all the rules and regulations are not mutually inclusive with that
>of morse code skill.

See below.
>
>If THAT was the fact, the overwhelming number of violaters on the 40 and
>75m bands (who were legally licensed, with 13 and 20 wmp code testing)
>would NOT have done what they did; it sounded like channel 19
>cb for many years before hollingsworth helped to clean it up (more proof
>that code testing is NOT a "yahoo filter")

How many violators are you talking about, versus how many licensed hams? Maybe 30 violators out of 300,000? That's 1 in 10,000 - .01%

Note also that ALL hams have taken written tests on the regulations and operating practices, yet there are still violators.

No "filter" is perfect.

Note this plain, simple fact:

The vast majority of hams cited by FCC for operating violations are/were using voice modes. Enforcement actions against hams using CW/Morse are almost nonexistent. The ratio is far beyond what the relative popularity of the modes would predict.

So maybe it's not the TEST but the USE of the mode that is the key. (bad pun intended).

>> CW is a tradition in the ARS.
>
>as is FM, ssb, AM, etc.....
>
> It is a valuble mode of communications.]
>
>as is FM, ssb, AM, etc...
>

>> However, it requires a certain amount of dedication and desire to maintain
>> your ability to work the mode.
>
>as is FM, ssb, AM, etc...
>
>>
>> In otherwords advocating freedom of choice has nothing to do with getting
>a
>> ham license.
>
>I was saying that in response to the accusation that I was forceing an idea
>on
>somebody; I was doing just the opposite... advocating a greater range
>of freedom of choice.

You're forcing the idea that the standards for a license must be changed.
>
>>People SHOULD NOT be able to force a change on the licensing
>> authorities, based mainly on being too lazy to try to meet the standard.
>
>it's a representative republic; the very cornerstone of democracy is that
>the people are able to effect change when they feel it necessary for
>whatever reason THEY feel.

Up to a point, that's true. However, the idea that "the people" can force
whatever they want is limited. For example, even if a majority of people think
that OJ was guilty, it is not within the government's power to imprison or
excecute him based solely on what "the people" think. Nor should it be.

> The idea that it's because they're "too lazy
>to try to meet the standard" is simply your spin & rhetoric.

The same can be said for someone who says the only reason anyone is procodetest
is because they think "I did it, so everybody should have to be forced to do
it!!!!!"
>
>> Why should those of us that have the dedication have to be forced to have
>> our privlidges reduced by those among us that are too lazy to bother to
>meet
>> the standards we did?
>
>I wasn't aware that the NCTA crowd was advocating reducing your frequency
>priviledges. Or, is that more spin? As far as I know, you and other
>licensees
>were going to retain all the priviledges they had before the testing reform.

Look again. There are those who not only advocate code test elimination, but
also the reduction or elimination of the CW/data subbands.

>> We know that is what you SAY. The reality of the situation is based on
>> the simple knowledge that human beings will take the easy way. Once CW
>> testing

>> is elliminated, CW use will eventually dissapear. Folks simply will not
>> bother to learn it.

I don't believe that.
>
>OH! so you admit the OTHER half of the AWEFUL truth! it comes down to
>you want to FORCE people to do something they don't want to do necessarily
>of thier own free will!

Not really. Nobody is required to get a ham license. It's all voluntary.

Why do the schools bother to teach basic arithmetic and math to children these days? Calculators are everywhere. Why not let the kids decide what they want to learn instead of FORCING old-fashioned manual arithmetic on them?

>well, the thing that made america so powerful, such
>that
>in 200 years +, we have surpassed nations in economic power that have been
>on the planet for THOUSANDS of years, was that the free market forces were
>allowed to decide what course the market would take... and low and behold,
>the united states economic output is one third that of the total of the
>ENTIRE
>world..... that is, a nation with only 4.5% of the population has an
>economic
>value of 33% (about 11 trillion out of 34 trillion dollars) that of ALL
>nations
>combined....

Things also cost a lot more here, too.
>
>...if people worked morse code ONLY because they were forced to, then
>I doubt they would use it at all... that is to say, these same people would
>only pass the code test and then not use CW if they really didn't have thier
>hearts into it. If that was the ONLY thing keeping CW alive, it would
>have died a long time ago. But the bands are full of CW operators that
>are using it of thier own free will.

Absolute fact.
>
>If the free market determines that it no longer wants it, than keeping it
>around is tantamount to nothing more than subsidizing a mode of
>communications. You will certainly NOT make any more fans or
>lovers of the code by MAKING them do it.

Actually, all the test does is require entry-level skills.

>> I honestly don't think that 5 words per minute is asking too much to gain
>> access to a large part of the spectrum. I can see your bitch about 20 and
>> maybe even 13. But for GAWDS sake....5wpm....ANYONE can do that.
>> Especially with the multiple guess test. Give it a rest. Pay your dues.
>> Even if it is only half price...or less.
>
>nah, better to work toward removing it, which is inevitable eventually.

>
Then what will you say to those who would use the same argument against the General and Extra written tests? After all, FCC thinks a single 35 question multiple choice test is good enough to allow Techs to use any authorized mode, frequency or power above 30 MHz. Is operating a transmitter on 14 MHz that different from operating one on 144 MHz that another couple of tests are required? Or is it just a "hoop jump" to FORCE theory on hams, amny of whom don't want it?

4789. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 17:41:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921134130.12631.00001267@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78202

In article <3F6DBC7D.8030803@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>> I LIKE broccoli.
>
>Me too actually.

Make that three.
>
>Let's make it NO Peas International.
>
>Pretty Peas?
>
Peas are great!

Green beans, on the other hand.....

--

And if ya really want to get people fired up:

Calves' liver, anyone?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4790. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 17:41:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921134130.12631.00001266@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78203

In article <P_Kab.806$Hd6.601977@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>How much land will be used to build enough turbines to power Seattle and the >surrounding suburbs?

Good question! Depends on the number of turbines needed.

However, note that the land used for wind turbines of the pylon-tower type is also available for other uses, such as farming.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4791. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 18:13:17 UTC
From: Greg Courville <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com>
Message-ID: <vmrqi4c5i2beed@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78205

>Yaknow, people can be pro-code and no-code and have spirited arguments
>without accusing each other against crimes against humanity!

Exactly!
I'm perfectly fine with people debating the code/no-code issue, and this is exactly the right newsgroup to do it on, but what bothers me is when a post on .equipment about what rig to get turns into an argument, then into a discussion of how stupid other people are, then into a code/nocode flame war. Even this thread is rapidly spiraling towards flame-war state (see last sentence of initial post). It's fine to debate, and even argue, about the CW issue; it's fine to let people know your point of view. But when it turns into a flame war, all that does is create hard feelings and fill the news servers with absolute garbage.

-Greg KG6SGY

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F6DB2DF.6040104@adelphia.net...
> Brian wrote:
> > yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030921022842.11891.00000978@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >
> >>In article <f45722ac.0309200340.4cea8bf@posting.google.com>,
> >>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Forever thinking of Kim, aren't you?
> >>
> >>Brian:
> >>
> >>I think about everyone in this newsgroup, particularly the "regulars"
who
> >>have been here for a number of years. The truth is, in spite of our
> >>numerous and passionate disagreements, I don't think there's anyone
> >>here that I wouldn't like to know in person -- including Kim, and you!
> >>I think of time spent here as time spent with friends, and I can't help
> >>but to wonder if everyone else sees it the same way. Tonight, as in
> >>many nights in the past, I found myself composing, then quickly
> >>deleting, several posts aimed at certain people which contained my
> >>usually acerbic tone. In other words, I'm starting to wonder just
> >>exactly what I, and we, are all doing here, and what it all means. I
> >>can't honestly say that I'm ever going to change my mind about
> >>anything here, but I also have come to realize that in all likelihood,
> >>nobody else will, either. However, the way in which we disagree is
> >>something upon which we all should reflect, and I don't exclude myself

> >>from that.
> >>
> >>Things are happening in my life that are causing me to consider the
> >>more eternal ramifications of everything I do. I know that I am not
> >>perfect, and that I, like most other people, am able to fall into the
> >>pattern of allowing my lesser nature to come to the surface. And
> >>while I cannot make a credible promise to not allow that to happen
> >>anymore, I can at least occasionally take the time to stop and
> >>reflect upon it, and take stock of my own behaviour.
> >>
> >>I would like to think that if it were ever possible for all of us to
meet
> >>in person, that that meeting would be both pleasant and enjoyable.
> >>And, as we continue to batter each other's opinions, I think it is
> >>necessary to realize that we are not necessarily battering each
> >>other personally. Whether or not the nature of Usenet tends to
> >>make our reactions to each other impersonal by nature, it does
> >>bear keeping in mind that there is another human being at the
> >>other end of our rhetoric. I know that I want to be treated as such,
> >>and I will try to keep that in mind when reacting to the rest of you.
> >>
> >>Just some food for thought.any and all comments welcome.
> >>
> >>73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
> >
> > Dammit, Larry, now you've done it!
> >
> > First, I have always wanted to meet Dick Carroll, just to see if his
> > head was misshapened or if he suffered from Napoleans affliction, if
> > he has that MO twang, or if he like guns as much as I do so we could
> > quit sparring over the code.
> >
> > I'd like to mess around in Dave Heil's shack an see what he's done
> > with those low band loops, or if he prominently displays my KH2 QSL
> > card on his wall, next to Martii's. I imagine my thought of him being
> > smug would disappear - it may be an artifact of me reading his posts
> > on the web.
> >
> > Len, well, what can I say. He's been my mentor for years. Never
> > afraid to jump in with both feet, but more caustic than Drano. Few
> > have dared to go there - but you're one of them.
> >
> > Kim, beer and BBQ?
> >
> > There are many more, but I'll stop now.
> >
> > Maybe we need to gather at Dayton 2005.
>
> Yaknow, people can be pro-code and no-code and have spirited arguments

> without accusing each other against crimes against humanity! Or illegal
> drug abuse.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

4792. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 18:29:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921142942.12501.00002585@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 78206

In article <c777ab1364e2b7954c18183cd420d781.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>, "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>
>>
>> Then answer this question: Why should people who are not interested in
>> building or fixing their radios have to learn all that theory stuff
>> for the written tests? Why are all hams tested on all sorts of stuff
>> they are not interested in?
>
>Because the terms of their license make them responsible for the quality
>of their radiated signal(s).

Maybe. But a ham is not required to actually know how his/her equipment works, nor to be able to work on it. Just for the result.

I'm not required to know how my cars work, just how to use them safely. I am "responsible", however, to see that they meet all applicable DMV requirements, including pollution and safety equipment. I can do the work myself or have it done by others. The same is true for ham equipment.

The FCC thinks that Technicians are adequately tested on that, for all authorized modes and technologies. There are no modes or technologies authorized for amateur HF/MF that are not also authorized for amateur VHF/UHF. So there is no absolute need for any of the General or Extra written tests *except* perhaps a few regulatory and propagation questions.
>
>Without demonstrating some familiarity with the basic underlying
>science, it would be irresponsible of the regulators to allow an
>applicant to establish a radio transmitting station on the public
>airways.

See above about Technicians.

And here's another point: There's almost nothing in the tests about some technologies that hams are allowed to use. For example, vacuum tubes - not very much in the tests about them! Yet FCC *trusts* hams who want to use vacuum tube technology to learn what they need to know about it and operate their equipment responsibly. So why all the tests?

>Familiarize yourself with the concept "tragedy of the
>commons".

You got a handy reference?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4793. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 18:47:53 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bkkrmf$3vg$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 78620

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

> Look again. There are those who not only advocate code test elimination,
but
> also the reduction or elimination of the CW/data subbands.

I've only seen that from a very few blindingly obvious trolls and a
known brain-damaged pair who's personal flame-fest has been infesting
r.r.*** for _years_.

I'd be interested in some quotes on this.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.520 / Virus Database: 318 - Release Date: 9/18/2003

4794. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 18:55:08 UTC
From: Roger Wussman <BastardSon@NoSlpam.comp>
Message-ID: <bkks6f$7ok$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 78207
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
news:VJkbb.17$LJ5.2836@iad-read.news.verio.net...
"W7TI" <noway@nohow.com> wrote in message
news:j6ermvgs0q3mt67h82b4f4c0ia8httd2ef@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 22:57:12 -0400, "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote:
>
> >Since when did it become a "private" frequency? The H.F. Frequencies used
> >for Ham operation are open to any one with the proper class of license to
> >use them. O
>
> ____
>
> Does the word "troll" have any meaning to you?
>
> He trolled, you bit, he's happy.
>
> --
> Bill, W7TI
>

Well, yes, I did reply.. among others.. Troll? Ass Hole is a better term.
And back to his comment, he will not run me off, if I so desire to chat on
that frequency. Not a chance.... Lou
.....

Oh, DUH!! You still don't get it, do you?
Sure your name isn't Barney? As in Fife?

4795. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 19:19:06 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <9mtrmv0v7fg1dfq98ehit55jmi0g7rh535@4ax.com>
Source record: 78208

Dee,

That makes perfect sense - I wasn't aware that word associations could cause a problem later on.

I guess that we belong to different schools of thought regarding the CW testing for HF band access - you see the goal as continual development of CW skills, with the test being a measurement of progress towards that goal. I viewed it more as a hurdle to be overcome so that I could gain full access to HF - and do not plan on becoming proficient in CW past that goal (may change, however - I'm getting rather fond of CW, especially when working DX in marginal band conditions....).

I think that your approach is actually the right way to go - in retrospect, it would have been better for me to 'aim high and miss, than aim low and make it", if I do decide to go on and build speed.

Enjoyed the dialogue on this - thanks, Dee!

73, Leo

On Sun, 21 Sep 2003 16:20:10 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:

>Leo,
>
>It looks like you are one of the lucky ones who shake the word associations
>easily and move on. Other people do hit a barrier as they find it hard to
>get rid of the word associations. So in my opinion (and I freely admit it
>is an opinion) that it is better not to risk the word association approach
>even though it may take a little longer that way.
>
>By the way the 30 hours is an average so that is what I quote to people so
>they don't get prematurely discouraged. Some will take less (like you) and
>some will take longer (like me). The good thing is that once a person gets
>to 30 hours they can see visible progress even if they are one of the people
>who needs a little more time. So once they are at a point they see
>progress, they are willing to take the time to finish as they know they can
>do it.
>
>And I like to teaching things from the point of view that the real goal is
>to provide the basis for future advancement and use rather than setting the
>goal as passing a test. Tests are merely a tool to check the effectiveness
>of the teaching and to check the effectiveness of the learning. Although
>there are other ways to do this checking, tests are the most efficient.

>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>news:p4hrmv47ino5gitj94uq8srg8i352450pb@4ax.com...
>> Dee,
>>
>> Well, it does support your point on not trying to learn the code a a
>> series of dots and dashes - but agreed, it may not be as good as
>> method as straight letter association for high speed operation.
>>
>> Guess it depends on the end goal - if you intend to go above 15 WPM,
>> then this may not be the best method. If you want to pass a 5 WPM
>> test and get on the air, it can be done using this method in well
>> under 30 hours. (that's how I did it - 1/2 hour a day for three
>> weeks).
>>
>> With practice, I no longer find myself using the word associations as
>> much as I did initially - I'm just writing down the letter received,
>> and hearing words like "the" as words, not letters. So, is there
>> really a disadvantage to learning by this method? Perceived, perhaps,
>> but I haven't hit a wall yet. Passed the test, though - that was the
>> goal! :)
>>
>> 73, Leo
>>
>>
>> On Sun, 21 Sep 2003 14:48:49 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
>> wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>> >news:elarmvopts69k15bdjth3i15tu0nni9old@4ax.com...
>> >> Dee,
>> >>
>> >> There are a few excellent articles which support your theory of code
>> >> learning at:
>> >>
>> >> http://www.cq2k.com/articles.htm
>> >>
>> >> 73, Leo
>> >>
>> >> On Sun, 21 Sep 2003 13:26:02 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
>> >> wrote:
>> >>
>> >> >snip
>> >>
>> >> >Using a method that encourages people to count the dots and dashes
>erects
>> >>a

>> >> >barrier to going on to higher speeds. Why use a method that creates
>> >> >hardships that will cause a person to have to start over with a new
>> >learning
>> >> >process if they should want to use it? The teaching and learning of
>any
>> >> >subject should be approached from the point of view that the person
>may
>> >> >someday want to use the material taught not from the viewpoint of
>passing
>> >a
>> >> >test on it.
>> >> >
>> >> >Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> >>
>> >
>> >No that page does not really support me. It advocates the "sounds-like"
>> >method which is also poor and creates another barrier. The "sounds-like"
>> >approach will get you past the 5wpm easily but then blocks you at about
>> >15wpm more or less. As discussed in "The Art and Skill of
>Radiotelegraphy,"
>> >I advocate learning by direct association of the letter to the sound to
>> >build a reflex. Any method that requires additional associations, will
>> >create a plateau at some point. To get past that point, you've got to
>ditch
>> >the association.
>> >
>> >Also the page says nothing about how often and how long to practice. I
>note
>> >that they talk about taking a year to get to 5wpm. That's way too long
>and
>> >will discourage people. With proper methods and the proper frequency of
>> >practice, it should only take about 30 hours to get to 5wpm (see "Morse
>> >Code, The Essential Language").
>> >
>> >Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>

4796. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 19:24:19 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <DVmbb.1517$Hd6.1178703@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78209

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:9mtrmv0v7fg1dfq98ehit55jmi0g7rh535@4ax.com...
>
>
> Dee,
>
> That makes perfect sense - I wasn't aware that word associations could
> cause a problem later on.
>
> I guess that we belong to different schools of thought regarding the
> CW testing for HF band access - you see the goal as continual
> development of CW skills, with the test being a measurement of
> progress towards that goal. I viewed it more as a hurdle to be
> overcome so that I could gain full access to HF - and do not plan on
> becoming proficient in CW past that goal (may change, however - I'm
> getting rather fond of CW, especially when working DX in marginal band
> conditions....).
>

This is not an unusual phenomena by the way. People who thought they would never use it end up falling in love with it. The next five years or so are going to have those marginal band conditions on a regular basis. Plus if the QRP (very low power) bug bites you, code goes hand in hand with it. Low band work (80 and 160 meters) can also draw a person into code for similar reasons.

> I think that your approach is actually the right way to go - in
> retrospect, it would have been better for me to 'aim high and miss,
> than aim low and make it", if I do decide to go on and build speed.
>
> Enjoyed the dialogue on this - thanks, Dee!
>
> 73, Leo
>

Me too. I wish more dialogues could be like this. Look forward to hearing you on HF.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4797. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 19:59:49 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vms0q2cib8m678@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78210

LOL!

Didn't you know that gorgeous women are smart
and praiseworthy, and aesthetically-challenged
(using a PC term there) women are needing help
and deserving pity?

Okay, i'm going to run like hell after saying that one.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4798. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 20:04:36 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vms12vc6pv1ocb@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78211

> Clint:
>
> Well, I'm sure that in some ways that have nothing to do with amateur
> radio, Kim is a very nice person. So, if you ever do meet her, try to
keep
> that in mind, and not the fact that Riley Hollingsworth once said that her
> choice of a call sign had the potential to take the ARS "...one step
> closer to extinction."
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

is that a true story? or did he say callsigns LIKE hers (without nameing
hers specifically) were potentially harmful? Just curious... talk about
being (in)famous.

When I first saw the callsign, I must admit I thought nothing about it
until I found out that the person who owened it was a woman. Seriously;
call it male chauvanism, or bias, whatever, but I literally only say
"kilo 5 tango india tango" when I saw it... but when I learned of the
gender of the owner, something clicked in me mentally and caused
me to re-assess the callsign.

The only thing that it DOES bring to mind, now, is the constant question
of whether or not she chose it because she's female and nothing more,
OR, if it is because she is female "and THEN some", if you get my drift.
I have never had the nerve to ask her a beavis and butthead question,
no matter how much it has in fact been going through my very
barbaric, primitive, neanderthal mind.

Where's my club?

Clint
KB5ZHT

4799. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 20:15:07 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vms1mo6l7tn4c0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78212

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:wkhbb.1423$Hd6.1113222@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> news:vmpskoorigikbd@corp.supernews.com...
> > (4) The public at large (ham radio operators) should NOT
> > be BURDENED with having to make choices; they
> > should not have the freedom to choose how to use
> > thier skills to the ends that they see fit; such is an
> > IMPOSITION upon them.
> >
>
> By eliminating the testing requirement for Morse code, we are seriously
> undermining people's freedom of choice.

Oh, that is such dreadful stretch it literally IS laughable. Be reducing or
eliminating a requirement we are LIMITING freedom? just what
backwards, reverse logic came up with THAT?

or, if this is it....

Keeping the test means that individuals will have a
> better knowledge base upon which to choose whether or not to pursue Morse
> code to proficient level.

THAT is where the very basic logic that the PCTA crowd has is incorrect!
You are refusing to diffuse the two subjects of "testing" and "use on the
bands".
Morse code, as well as ssb, fm, fax, and every other mode of operation
exists totaly independant of testing for it... for the very simple reason
that the
testing process is NOT the one and only available means for learning about
it.
Reference books, history, word of mouth, the internet, and every other
method
available for exchanging ideas in society will continuously make it and
every
other legal form of communication readily available to anybody who has,
AND THIS IS THE IMPORTANT PART, an basic natural desire to do so.
If this desire doesn't exist, over a thousand years of human history tells
us
that FORCEING people to do something they do not want to do naturally
compels them to resist it. I honestly believe this is one of the basic
reasons
you DO see such a resentment for the code today.

Free of exterior pressures, allowing a free society to evolve naturally and pursue it's natural course, just like in economics and politics, is the best policy you can use.

Let me give you another example; 8-track tapes. They were available before cassettes and compact disks were. It is illogical to make a law REQUIREING people to learn about 8-track tapes, "just so they can have the knowledge base necissary to make an informed decision". This comes naturally; 8-track tapes need not and SHOULD not have been subsidized by the federal government in any way. The free market chose what they did for such a multitude of reasons, each on of which are necessary to enumerate here but the ultimate reason is the same. Seriously; what logic would there be if you went to hastings, or discount music, walmart, or whatever retailer you can name and wanted to buy a compact disk, and the salesman there said "i'm sorry sir, first you are going to have to present your license proving that you have been schooled in the history and use of 8-track tapes."

Clint
KB5ZHT

4800. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 20:17:57 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vms1s0nhti9j91@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78213

Talking heads... I think CNN first made this popular.
It was the darndest thing I ever saw; well-groomed
adults sitting there in each of thier little windows, and
once the "ringmaster" fielded the question, all
nuiances of a mature environment went right out the
window and the high-dollar, well paid, pampered
"experts" just started screaming at each other.

You were lucky to understand any real comments,
whether or not you agreed with what was being
said sometimes couldn't even come up to your
attention. It would end with the "ringmaster"
saying "well, I thank you all for joining us,
always a pleasure to have you."

and I thought to myself, "boy, THIS will never
catch on. THAT was insanity!"

oh, but just look at what has happened.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4801. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 20:28:32 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <QRnbb.8568$xl1.1406@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 78214

Hello, gang.

I just read through the tread and would offer this - I had learned dots and dashes back in 1962. I passed my novice, but couldn't pass 13. In 1964, due to a long time friend of mine, I purchased a code record, got to 18 words per minute, and obtained my general. Then I discovered I enjoyed code. I passed the extra in 1966 along with my commercial radiotelegraph and 1st radiotelephone license and in 1967 handed in a perfect copy on a typewriter at 40 words per minute in the Navy. There is a problem with the dot/dash/mental table which will really hurt when one tries to get past 10 words per minute. Been there, done that LOL

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.520 / Virus Database: 318 - Release Date: 9/18/03

4802. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 20:29:58 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vms2iiossmp1a8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78215

"if you want......
"if you want....
"if you want....

....then all that is FINE, but..."

isn't even getting through to those people. They're not hearing it.
read back a few threads and you'll see one of them actually
tell me that "removing the testing requirement limits people's
choices". I'll just let that one sink in with you and please accept
my remark as being accurate, you can go back and read it.

They will not seperate the two issues of "testing" and "use".
It's "you WILL learn it!" (followed by the unspoken but
agreed upon reasoning, "because I had to").

I think the basic problem is that they have a few preconceived
notions that are wrong. They seem to feel that people will
enjoy doing something if forced to do it, if they otherwise wouldn't,
which human psychology doesn't support this at ALL, nor does
the history of economics. They feel that somehow, if not required
to be tested on it, people will forget about it and not want to
do it.

I never took a profeciency test for ssb, fm or AM and I enjoy using
those modes, managed to look up reference material on them and
learn about them without having to have a test to make me do so,
and furthermore, what I did have to know was covered on a
knowledge test. Hey, there's an idea. How about just incorporating
CW into the knowledge test as part of the database? asking
what random characters are? what the definition of the farnsworth
rate is, and how a code key works? What does "full break in"
ability mean on linear amplifiers?

Oh, no, this will never do. even though the reasons given were that
a person needs to learn about it in order to make informed decisions,
and this would have him learn about it, it comes back down to
the old tried and true SPEED OF RECEPTION test;

I had to do it. Read: We were once subjects of the british
king
So should you. Read: YOU, therefore, are a subject of the king.

Shut up and do it. Read: Shut up with your ideas of revolution.
Do what the redcoats TELL you to do.

Oops, i'm sorry, now did I offend somebody to referring to the redcoats, the way I did previously with the brownshirts? Lord knows in today's society we need to avoid everything that offends anybody.

but I digress.

Clint

4803. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 20:31:13 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921163113.12300.00000696@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 78217

In article <20030921042549.11891.00000994@mb-m11.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <Xns93FD68E860C2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer ><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>
>>
>>You mean like becoming president despite a lack of talent, for example?
>>
>>
>
>Let's leave Jimmy Carter out of this.
>

You mean the only president to forge a sucessful, lasting Middle East peace agreement?

73 de Jim, N2EY

4804. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 20:31:14 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921163114.12300.00000697@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 78216

In article <vmp75ap22ck87b@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>I, and most other NCTA's out there, advocate ONLY the
>removal of morse code TESTING; not it's ELIMINATION from the
>ham band.
>
"Most other NCTAs" - but not all other NCTAs.

That's the point.

4805. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 20:33:44 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vms2pk7vj65r92@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78218

>
> Arnie,
>
> Unfortunately we have too many people in this country who think freedom of
> speech takes precedence over common decency. They don't realize or don't
> care that by being inconsiderate in their choice of words or analogies
that
> people will discount what they say. It is more important to them to do it
> their way rather than in a way that will get the audience on their side.
>

I happen to also know what a society would devolve down to if you
omitted EVERYTHING and ANYTHING that offended some person,
somewhere. If you first cleansed all your speech, writings, thoughts,
and every other form of expressing yourself simply because one person
somewhere would get mad about it, what do you have left?

Oh, that's right. A socialist utopia.
That's not "my" america.

"just shut up and buy 8-track tapes when the redcoats
point thier muskets at you and TELL you to."

Clint
KB5ZHT

4806. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 20:34:17 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <dXnbb.1534$Hd6.1190040@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78219

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030921163113.12300.00000696@mb-m20.aol.com...
> In article <20030921042549.11891.00000994@mb-m11.aol.com>,
yodoc@aol.comnospam
> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
> >In article <Xns93FD68E860C2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
> ><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
> >
> >>
> >>You mean like becoming president despite a lack of talent, for example?
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Let's leave Jimmy Carter out of this.
> >
>
> You mean the only president to forge a sucessful, lasting Middle East
peace
> agreement?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

You're kidding I hope. The Middle East hasn't been at peace before, during,
or since.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4807. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 20:36:43 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vms2v6siojt551@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78220

> What these free speech hypocrites don't seem to get, is that it works
> both ways. While they insist on calling us Nazi's, they consider our
> objections and replies to their repulsive comments to be denying them
> their free speech.

gotcha on that one.
I never told any of you PCTA to quit stating your opinions, the way you guys have, many times in this thread alone, said "quit whining about it and do it" (which means shut up).

We are saying that it is our strong opinion that, in the democratic process that this country uses and has been strengthened by, the next step in the strengthening part of the process (as far as the role of the FCC in amatuer radio plays), is to eliminate morse code testing.

NOT use (we're not telling you to SHUT UP with using morse code and quit transmitting), we're saying quit FORCING it on people.
we're advocating the EXPANSION of freedom, not the restriction of freedom via regulation.

"just shut up and buy 8-track tapes when the redcoats point thier bayonets at you and TELL you to."

Clint
KB5ZHT

4808. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 20:38:25 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <5%nbb.1535$Hd6.1190756@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78221

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vms2pk7vj65r92@corp.supernews.com...
>
> >
> > Arnie,
> >
> > Unfortunately we have too many people in this country who think freedom
of
> > speech takes precedence over common decency. They don't realize or don't
> > care that by being inconsiderate in their choice of words or analogies
> that
> > people will discount what they say. It is more important to them to do
it
> > their way rather than in a way that will get the audience on their side.
> >
>
> I happen to also know what a society would devolve down to if you
> omitted EVERYTHING and ANYTHING that offended some person,
> somewhere. If you first cleansed all your speech, writings, thoughts,
> and every other form of expressing yourself simply because one person
> somewhere would get mad about it, what do you have left?
>
> Oh, that's right. A socialist utopia.
> That's not "my" america.
>
> "just shut up and buy 8-track tapes when the redcoats
> point thier muskets at you and TELL you to."
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT

As you obviously don't know, the message gets through a lot better when you speak in terms appropriate to the audience. Any public speaker knows this or if he doesn't, he learns it quite quickly. If you don't present your ideas using terms that the audience understands and likes, they will tune you out. Your message is wasted. and so is your time if you've just got to "let it all hang out."

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4809. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 20:40:21 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vms3658pkbuu3f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78222

> Good point, Mike. The concept of free speech is a basic tenet in any
> democratic society - one needs only to look as far as the former Iraq,
> where open disagreement with a government policy could buy you a quick
> ticket to the next world, or at the very least a personalized basic
> electricity course.
>
> But free speech does not mean that any simian with a functional larnyx
> is permitted to publicly say anything that he or she wishes - for
> example, the holocaust deniers and the KKK have proved that point
> quite well in recent history. Slander and libel laws are another
> example of limits on 'free speech', intended to mitigate and assign
> accountability for the damage that it can cause if out of control.
>

and you are correct.
PROVE where I either slandered an innocent person, or screamed
"FIRE!" in a crowded theater.

Oh, and also consider the fact that they are allowing people to burn
the american flag and immersing a cross of jesus in a jar of urine (talk
about OFFEND millions of people without a care to it!).....

..and I would then, say to you sir, that I did nothing illegal in my
reference. I would ALSO say that, if in using a national socialist
reference I was doing something illegal, 90% of the news media
and talk show hosts would be dragged off in handcuffs retroactive
to YEARS ago.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4810. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 20:41:11 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vms37mh4ggqe73@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78223

>
> Visit a Holocaust museum and watch the documentaries on the History
channel
> for a while and read the transcripts of the Nuremberg trials. See if you
> think the analogy is accurate then.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

I have, I have, and I have.
And I still do.

Nice try.

"Shut up and buy 8-track tapes when the redcoats point bayonets at
you and TELL you to."

Clint
KB5ZHT

4811. wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 20:42:50 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vms3aoclp8q3e2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78224

Hey, wanna talk SHUDDER?

this is what makes ME shudder... the thought that you are invoking
the priviledges of free speech and rights of society just like I am,
but also advocating that an idea, concept or practice be forced
upon a person against thier will.

And you're doing that with a straight face.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4812. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 20:44:56 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vms3em9lu81s65@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78225

>
>
> Those folk can't be bothered to learn facts Dee, their minds are cast
> in stone. No amount of
> rational persuasion is competent to educate or enlighten them.
> Meanwhile they rant about the
> backward state of code supporters, of whom far more are involved and
> knowledgable on late digital modes than any serious number of them!
>
> Such ignorance would be amazing, even laughable, if it didn't portend
> the future.
>

Name the first fact that I am refusing to learn.

I am more than willing to learn about the history of morse code, and it's
use, and it's applications (no matter how dwindling and disappearing today);
I have no problem with other people doing the same, if they SO CHOOSE.

I have a problem with people like yourself claiming how nice freedom is
and then saying "but you should learn THIS regardless of whether or
not you want to!"

"shut up and buy the 8-track tapes when the redcoats TELL you to.
we don't care if you listen to it later or not, but you WILL do what
you're told and buy it."

Clint
KB5ZHT

4813. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 20:45:47 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vms3g7rbtqhu96@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78226

>
> I and other parents that I know have always required our children to eat
> foods that are good for them whether they liked them or not.

and that's fine for children.

Funny, I thought we were talking about ADULT hams.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4814. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 21:19:01 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <9u3smv05e6bbbjq231jjke67pta6ap29qh@4ax.com>
Source record: 78227

Clint,

My dissertation was directed entirely at the point that Mike had raised regarding calling other folks "Nazis" because they would not agree with their point of view. But, to answer your question: did you do something illegal? Of course not. Insensitive, foolish and intellectually bankrupt, perhaps - none of which are punishable offences.

The use of Ad Hominem (attacking the person rather than the points raised by the person) in arguements dates back to Roman times, and has long been the province of those not literate enough to defend their position in a lucid and cogent manner. I suspect that the Nazi (not the euphemistic full 'National Socialist' name that you now use in this post) reference was used because it was the only card left to play in an otherwise empty hand. Due to the atrocities committed during WW II, the word "Nazi" has severely negative connotations for a large percentage of the world's population, reaching beyond the Hogan's Heroes-esque usage that you recognize and reminding them of the horrors of that regime, for many in a very personal way.

But, an educated man like yourself would know that, now, wouldn't he?
:)

Leo

On Sun, 21 Sep 2003 15:40:21 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:

>
>> Good point, Mike. The concept of free speech is a basic tenet in any
>> democratic society - one needs only to look as far as the former Iraq,
>> where open disagreement with a government policy could buy you a quick
>> ticket to the next world, or at the very least a personalized basic
>> electricity course.
>>
>> But free speech does not mean that any simian with a functional larnyx
>> is permitted to publicly say anything that he or she wishes - for
>> example, the holocaust deniers and the KKK have proved that point
>> quite well in recent history. Slander and libel laws are another
>> example of limits on 'free speech', intended to mitigate and assign
>> accountability for the damage that it can cause if out of control.
>>
>
>
>and you are correct.

>PROVE where I either slandered an innocent person, or screamed
>"FIRE!" in a crowded theater.
>
>Oh, and also consider the fact that they are allowing people to burn
>the american flag and immersing a cross of jesus in a jar of urine (talk
>about OFFEND millions of people without a care to it!).....
>
>..and I would then, say to you sir, that I did nothing illegal in my
>reference. I would ALSO say that, if in using a national socialist
>reference I was doing something illegal, 90% of the news media
>and talk show hosts would be dragged off in handcuffs retroactive
>to YEARS ago.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>

4815. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 21:24:50 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vms5pecaljht6d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78228

>
> As you obviously don't know, the message gets through a lot better when
you
> speak in terms appropriate to the audience. Any public speaker knows this
> or if he doesn't, he learns it quite quickly. If you don't present your
> ideas using terms that the audience understands and likes, they will tune
> you out. Your message is wasted. and so is your time if you've just got
to
> "let it all hang out."
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
>

all true, accepted as submitted.
However, if the premise of your argument is that my approach offended
everybody
so it reached no one, you are incorrect. In fact, i'll hazard a guess that
it offended
1, mabye 2 people; the remainder that have jumped onto the bandwagon with
this
person were disingenuously doing so, only doing so since it helped thier
private
little war and pet cause...

I will also hazard the guess, and free of much apprehension in doing so,
that the
vast majority of people that read it (who I WAS likewise posting to, for
reading)
didn't drop to the ground in gut-wrenching revulsion to the point that the
point
was lost. I don't think it was lost on anywhere NEAR the people you would
have me believe. On the contrary, what I DID in fact do was help to remove
some of the window dressing of your (read: PCTA crowd) arguments, strip
away the pretty, "happy fuzzy bunny" covers that are often used to hide
the REAL core of the argument.

And, as you've read in this thread as well as newsgroups, others have
recieved
it wide and clear- albeit, to YOUR chagrin, but so be it, such is the way of
socratic dialogue... and that is this-

"I had to do it, so should you."

Furthermore, there is the DISTINCT possiblity that the following is true,
but

i'm not pushing this point as it is moot and would achieve nothing- the unspoken
total truth may lie somewhere in,

"I had to do it, those of my peerage and common interests likewise didn't have
enough spine and nerve to speak our minds on the issue, so we feel that by
doing so yourselves you are QUITE insensitive to the interest of protecting
our feelings and reputations, so we kindly request you to lay down the banners
of your cause, surrender, and just do what you are told as well. We don't want
anybody offended."

Quite a thing to be proud of, indeed.

Just let us who are willing to carry the banner and lead the charge do so; just
sit back and relax; the willing and able bodied among us will take care of
everything.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4816. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 21:29:48 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <gLobb.1541$Hd6.1198511@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78229

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vms3g7rbtqhu96@corp.supernews.com...
>
> >
> > I and other parents that I know have always required our children to eat
> > foods that are good for them whether they liked them or not.
>
> and that's fine for children.
>
> Funny, I thought we were talking about ADULT hams.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>

The same applies to students of all ages. When an adult goes to college, they can select which area that they are going to get a degree in. Once they make the selection, they have no choice in the basic classes only in the electives that follow the basic classes. For example, all the engineering curricula at the university I attended required all engineering students to take a basic electrical engineering class. If I had not taken it, I would have been denied my degree. Well in my engineering career, I have yet to use that material since I am not an electrical engineer.

So a person can choose to be a ham (i.e. choose to be a mechanical engineer). They cannot choose which material is required to be a ham (or mechanical engineer). The curriculum has to be set by an experienced person.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4817. There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 21:54:07 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921175407.05888.00001994@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 78230

the Code cant be learned. All the rest are excuses.

1. Mentally challenged
2. To Lazy

No other real reason exist, so which one do you CBplussers claim?

4818. All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:02:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921180224.05888.00001996@mb-m07.aol.com>
Source record: 78231

No-Code Licenses should come a designator following there Callsign, that lets people know there status.
Such as W5TIT-1, or W5TIT-2, that way we will know if they are Mentally Challenged Operator, or a Lazy Operator, 1 being Mental, 2 being Lazy, that way we would know which ones not to talk to.

4819. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:08:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921180825.21642.00001040@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78232

In article <3F6DB2DF.6040104@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Brian wrote:
>> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>news:<20030921022842.11891.00000978@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>>
>>>In article <f45722ac.0309200340.4cea8bf@posting.google.com>,
>>>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>Forever thinking of Kim, aren't you?
>>>
>>>Brian:
>>>
>>>I think about everyone in this newsgroup, particularly the "regulars" who
>>>have been here for a number of years. The truth is, in spite of our
>>>numerous and passionate disagreements, I don't think there's anyone
>>>here that I wouldn't like to know in person -- including Kim, and you!
>>>I think of time spent here as time spent with friends, and I can't help
>>>but to wonder if everyone else sees it the same way. Tonight, as in
>>>many nights in the past, I found myself composing, then quickly
>>>deleting, several posts aimed at certain people which contained my
>>>usually acerbic tone. In other words, I'm starting to wonder just
>>>exactly what I, and we, are all doing here, and what it all means. I
>>>can't honestly say that I'm ever going to change my mind about
>>>anything here, but I also have come to realize that in all likelihood,
>>>nobody else will, either. However, the way in which we disagree is
>>>something upon which we all should reflect, and I don't exclude myself
>>>from that.
>>>
>>>Things are happening in my life that are causing me to consider the
>>>more eternal ramifications of everything I do. I know that I am not
>>>perfect, and that I, like most other people, am able to fall into the
>>>pattern of allowing my lesser nature to come to the surface. And
>>>while I cannot make a credible promise to not allow that to happen
>>>anymore, I can at least occasionally take the time to stop and
>>>reflect upon it, and take stock of my own behaviour.
>>>
>>>I would like to think that if it were ever possible for all of us to meet
>>>in person, that that meeting would be both pleasant and enjoyable.
>>>And, as we continue to batter each other's opinions, I think it is
>>>necessary to realize that we are not necessarily battering each
>>>other personally. Whether or not the nature of Usenet tends to

>>>make our reactions to each other impersonal by nature, it does
>>>bear keeping in mind that there is another human being at the
>>>other end of our rhetoric. I know that I want to be treated as such,
>>>and I will try to keep that in mind when reacting to the rest of you.
>>>
>>>Just some food for thought…any and all comments welcome.
>>>
>>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>>
>> Dammit, Larry, now you've done it!
>>
>> First, I have always wanted to meet Dick Carroll, just to see if his
>> head was misshapened or if he suffered from Napoleans affliction, if
>> he has that MO twang, or if he like guns as much as I do so we could
>> quit sparring over the code.
>>
>> I'd like to mess around in Dave Heil's shack an see what he's done
>> with those low band loops, or if he prominently displays my KH2 QSL
>> card on his wall, next to Martii's. I imagine my thought of him being
>> smug would disappear - it may be an artifact of me reading his posts
>> on the web.
>>
>> Len, well, what can I say. He's been my mentor for years. Never
>> afraid to jump in with both feet, but more caustic than Drano. Few
>> have dared to go there - but you're one of them.
>>
>> Kim, beer and BBQ?
>>
>> There are many more, but I'll stop now.
>>
>> Maybe we need to gather at Dayton 2005.
>
> Yaknow, people can be pro-code and no-code and have spirited arguments
>without accusing each other against crimes against humanity! Or illegal
>drug abuse.

A definite pro-coder tried to connect the Holocaust of WW2 to morse
code testing...with himself as the "outraged victim of oppression."

Did I say he was suspect of illegal drug abuse? I take that back.

I say he now exhibits symptoms of severe mental imbalance.

LHA

4820. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:08:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921180827.21642.00001041@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78233

In article <8Kabb.48013$Aq2.40223@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> The FIRST Tacoma Narrows bridge was designed
>> WITHOUT sufficient thought about sparse, elegant-
>> looking minimal structures acting as airfoils during high
>> winds. At the time of construction, the first Tacoma
>> Narrows bridge was the third-longest single span in the
>> world. It was open for nearly a year and developed
>> such severe oscillation (as a result of the airfoil effects)
>> that it was dubbed "Galloping Gertie." :-)
>>
>> The high winds in the Narrows region proved too
>> much for it in the 1940s just before WW2 and it went
>> into catastrophic structural oscillation. It was rebuilt a
>> decade later and has remained standing for half a
>> century. Tacoma Narrows bridge is a major passageway
>> for vehicular traffic from the Kitsap County to the
>> Tacoma city region but, at two lanes each way, has
>> become too crowded for modern traffic. A third Narrows
>> bridge, adjacent to the second, is planned to begin
>> construction in the near future. The second Tacoma
>> Narrows bridge still retains a little windsock at each end
>> and warning signs about High Winds affecting both
>> bicyclists and pedestrians. Every once in a while a high-
>> box trailer will begin fish-tailing while crossing and may
>> temporarily disrupt traffic, all due to high winds.
>
> Good grief, Len. You sound like a tour guide.

Blame Gig Harbor then. :-) They have a tiny micro-museum there, only three rooms, one of which featuring the Narrows bridges. Free entrance.

>Actually, we lived in Tacoma
>for about four years (mid-70's) before heading overseas to Germany and lived
>in Bremerton for about a year and a half just a few years ago. I've drove
>across that bridge many, many, times. When we lived in Tacoma, we used to
>walk our dog on the beach under the bridge occasionally (on the side
>opposite Tacoma - a fairly popular spot for nude and topless sunbathers at
>that time). We used to park at the observation point on that side of the
>bridge (there was a plaque there with much of the information you gave
>above).

Never inspected the plaque (my dentist scraped it off...). Things have changed more since construction on the highways leading up to the Tacoma side has been completed.

> The bridge was much more interesting in the mid-70's. At that time, the
>side walls were cross-crossed metal strips allowing for a fairly
>unobstructed view of the surrounding area and water below. In addition, the
>roadway surface was open grating, allowing one to look straight down to the
>water directly below the bridge. Today, the side walls are solid steel
>plates and the roadway grating has been replaced with asphalt.

Really? Then its been remodeled since the 70s. Wife and I have driven over it many a time also, but we can see the Narrows on both sides from a compact wagon. Bridge roadway is both grating and concrete now with what appears as non-slip asphalt surfacing?

What I think more interesting is the western side of the Narrows bridge with three HV lines spanning the Narrows in a single run, each about a mile in length. No catenaries, just the lines. They've been there for years surviving many a windstorm. Easy to see them from the bridge.

We'll have to cease talking territorially here, Dwight. This newsgroup is only for railroading, gunnery, east-coasties-pumping-their-hoagietowns, and general demeaning denigrations of no-coders by mighty macho morsemen pounding their, er, keys. :-)

LHA

4821. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:08:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921180828.21642.00001042@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78235

In article <Crhbb.1424$Hd6.1114311@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>I and other parents that I know have always required our children to eat
>foods that are good for them whether they liked them or not. My children
>have always been required to eat what was served whether they liked it or
>not. Children were not allowed to dictate the menu.

...and so you act like you are the "parent" in here telling us what we are supposed to like?

LHA

4822. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:08:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921180829.21642.00001043@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78237

In article <bkk5pe$g54@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:o29bb.47926$Aq2.31047@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>> >
>> > Well, more importantly, when was the last time Larry
>> > wore a bra? (Wooshhhhhh--he will never get that one).
>>
>> Obviously, Larry feels he doesn't have to have experience to make
>> judgements - about you, your callsign, or anything else, Kim. Clearly, he
>> only expects that from everyone else.
>>
>>
>> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>That's because Larry's "superiority" can only be had by him on an even
>playing field. With him and him standing there and no one else.

Him and Ah-nold the Governator-wannabe. :-)

The difference is that Ah-nold made money and a nice wife and kids.

Larrah's a Morseman......

LHA

4823. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:08:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921180830.21642.00001044@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78236

In article <20030921022851.11891.00000992@mb-m11.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20030920184429.14837.00003106@mb-m03.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> Dwight, if Larrah had to do it, EVERYBODY has to do it.
>
>Except YOU, Lennie. YOU never do anything but whine!

I prefer a rose' with elaborate dinners, not the common table grappa in
a peasant cottage.

Sonny, I've probably done MORE in radio already than you've done in
your entire "career" as a hambone...er Ham.

You have PLAYED for years at ham radio, using ready-made
equipment, not really understanding what goes on behind your
ready-made front panels. Where are YOUR accomplishments in
amateur radio, your name posted as anywhere involving advancing
anything of the amateur state of the art? On FIDONET? Words,
self-glorifying yourself. On this newsgroup? More words, more
self-glorifying of yourself...plus an extreme amount of patronizing
"I am your moral superior" preacher without a church.

Yes, without a church. Up in Newington you couldn't be "honored"
when you showed up at their door so you upbraided ARRL for not
treating you as royalty. The Church of St. Hiram rejected you!

>>>> (snip) You have not had that mode's unique benefits
>>>> and advantages proved to you over and over again through
>>>> years of daily OTA use. I have. (snip)
>>>
>>> Again, this is not about Morse Code/CW use - it's about the code test
>>>requirement. I can have that operational experience without a test
>>>requirement and you can continue to enjoy the "mode's unique benefits and
>>>advantages" long after the testing requirement is gone.
>>
>> Larrah can't grasp the theological import of that clear and concise idea.
>> He is a self-professed "true believer" and cannot see ANY other religious
>> idea but his old cult status.
>
>Well, at least I'm a True Believer in something useful, unlike Lennie,
>who only "believes" in sitting on the sidelines, throwing rotten apples
>at those who are acquiring and utilizing useful communications skills.

Poor baby...someone threw a rotten apple at you and its worm also turned on you?

Sonny, you've had your morse blinders on so long you can't understand what others are saying, have said, and explained to you in detail.

Manual radiotelegraphy is NOT a "useful communications skill" anymore unless you are a cult morseodist. Morse code is in its 159th year as a slow, often error-prone technically simplistic communications tool. Only a minority of amateurs use it. Morsemen are required at each radio circuit end to make it effective at all.

I learned several kinds of RTTY and TTY over a half century ago and USED them...including one that had 4 TTY circuits on the same FSK transmitter. You think Martinez' PSK31 is "new and revolutionary?" Fine. Enjoy it, but it is an innovation intended for real-time AMATEUR teletypewriting, not as a state-of-the-art telecommunications method. I've set up and done 9600 Baud over a high HF circuit that all the nearby amateurs scoffed and refused to believe when it worked successfully.

I've done far more modes/types of radio circuit modulation than is allocated to amateurs and am engaged in some DTV test work at the moment. No DTV is yet allocated to amateur bands. You've not done "matched filter" multichannel since that isn't allowed in ham bands either...takes too long to explain it to you so I won't bother...you've not shown you can handle Ohm's Law successfully, let alone understand a cosine-squared pulse shape.

Sonny, I've done radio communications from land in many places, from the air while in a cockpit as well as cabin, on HF from the cabin of a moored sailboat...the latter just a few months ago. NDAs forbid my mentioning more, but you wouldn't understand the principles anyway. All kinds of neat, new things, including not mentionable due to Title 18 USC.

At NO time was there ever any need to use morse code or demonstrate morsemanship to successfully communicate. Not in a half century of work that began with 24/7 primary communications service over HF trans-Pacific. Never. Nada. Nyet. Nicht. No morsemanship needed at any time.

Any you've done what? Playing with your radios, doing your beeping thing the same as what was done by amateurs a half century ago or a full century ago? What kind of "new technology" is on-off keying code use? Who are you trying to fool other than children, fool?

LHA

4824. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:08:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921180833.21642.00001045@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78238

In article <%6abb.47997$Aq2.45630@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote:
>>
>> Outside of sounding like low-grade bullshit, (snip)
>
> I might have thought that when I first read his response, but decided to
>be a little more controlled in my written response (knowing full well that
>others would come to that conclusion on their own).

Well, Dwight, having had a "baptism of fire" to this newsgroup under barrages from Jim Kehler, KH2D, I've decided to use the same sort of thing now. Kehler is probably still ailing and lives on the mainland now, hasn't been a regular in this newsgroup for years.

I'm still puzzled by the pseudo-Victorianism of so many younger Americans who have to be so prissy and correct in written language. I was puzzled a half century ago and still find it odd.

We "can't" use the word shit but have to spell it "sh*t" as if the little asterisk "cleans it up." :-)

>> All Dwight said was that "your words reek of bigotry, elitism, and
>> discrimination against other Americans."
>
> Now, I didn't specifically say Larry's words reeked of anything.

That's true. His don't smell bad at all. To him. :-)

>What I
>said is the words I hear from many advocating the continuation of the code
>testing requirement often reek of bigotry, elitism, and discrimination
>against other Americans. Of course, some of Larry's past comments certainly
>might fit into that category, but he has since somewhat toned down his
>rhetoric.

I disagree on that "toning down." :-)

> I've discussed that contradiction with Larry before. He does seem to
>exclude code testing from his conservative views opposing excessive
>government regulation. If Morse Code has real value, it should be able to
>survive in as close to a free market environment as possible. I think it has
>that value and can survive just fine without a regulation mandating testing.

SELECTIVE use is quite true.

In Roll's case, the amateur radio license class probably has very real
meaning to his life's worth. It is an Accomplishment of high personal
value and an excellent reference point from which to sound the superior
moral-ethical sermons to enoble himself.

>> The FCC regulates and licenses ALL civil radio in the USA...
>> yet none of the staff nor commission of the FCC are required to
>> pass any morse code test in order to regulate US amateur radio.
>
> Of course, that should be obvious. But Larry's position benefits him
>more - if accepted, it would undermine all those with different views on
>this subject. Clearly, only those with views similar to his would accept
>such a premise.

The Fraternal Order and/or Religious Cult feelings about amateur radio
seem to override logical or common-sense thinking about licensing.

The BELIEVERS almost always cite their own accomplishments as the
role model for all to follow. They are the self-imposed moral standard
bearers and expect all others to follow...or the others will be damned.
Almost a religious zeal.

What is so curious is that the most zealous of code demanders have
absolutely NOTHING to lose in their license privileges. Except an
enormous self-pride by diminished status and rank. The overly pridefull
are immediately seen as hypocrites if they rationalize their view as
being "the proper one for amateur radio."

>> You seem dumb and dumberer to the fact that every other radio
>> service (except a small part of maritime radio) in the USA has either
>> DROPPED morse code (snip)
>
> Actually, as you may know, even the International Maritime Organization
>(IMO) voted in 1998 to eliminate Morse Code. The Coast Guard itself dropped
>code in 1995. As a result of these two events, the Coast Guard now urges
>commercial vessels not to use code since CG personnel, and an increasing
>number of radio operators in the maritime service, may no longer have the
>skills necessary to communicate using that system. The UN-chartered IMO is
>responsible for defining and regulating international maritime
>telecommunications. It's positions are adopted by the ITU.

Some morsemen in here have angrily admonished me for not mentioning
Great Lakes shipping as requiring commercial radiotelegraphy licenses!
;-) Gosh, all sorts of facts and figures on that! Of "vital importance?"
I don't think so. Rail transport is the big thing in shipping in the middle
of
the country, followed closely by trucking. Neither transport ever used much
morse code. :-)

I find it curious that so many amateurs in here haven't bothered to educate
themselves on the vast "other" world of radio. The Internet is a marvelous
tool for that. The IMO is there, SOLAS is explained on the Net, anyone
can get part way into the ITU (many documents are available only to

members), all the government agencies are on the Internet now. There are "tons" of information sources there, most manufacturers of electronics offering vast "extension courses" through Application Notes and things. Most radio amateurs seem content with going to a single source for information: the ARRL website. It is known, it is familiar, but the ARRL does considerable selectivity in what it presents there. No one can expect them to say much about that vast other world of radio...so those who only frequent the ARRL will remain ignorant.

The only thing that is left for the PCTAs is to rationalize "I had to do it so you have to also! Because..." :-)

LHA

4825. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:08:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921180834.21642.00001046@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78234

In article <3F6D9794.3050002@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Alun Palmer wrote:
>
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in
>
>>> I think some of you have wigged-out too far and need investigation
>>> for Illegal substance abuse...
>>>
>>> LHA
>
>>
>> Exactly my point, although more eloquently stated
>
>Care to put your accusations in writing and signed, guys?
>
>Pretty pleeze?

ANY time you PCTA get off your respective high horses, acting like
god-given superiors in radio just because you took a morse test and
passed.

Amateur radio is a HOBBY, Mike. It isn't professional radio nor
military radio, is NOT a "service to the nation" like the military or
government or charity organizations.

You don't get special dispensation for acting boorish and arrogant and
judgemental about others that disagree with your opinions.

All your callsign enables you to do is to transmit RF energy on certain
allocated frequencies using a limited number of allocated modes of
communication. It does not give you godhood or royal title or any
measure of intelligence. Some of you think you are entitled to act like
assholes...then get very put off when others object.

Use some tissue and wipe yourself off...

LHA

4826. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:08:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921180836.21642.00001047@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78239

In article <0tcqmvcia8lv1qqji4pnsklp5sasfug91g@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>Alun,
>
>Interesting points - my responses are below:
>
>On 21 Sep 2003 04:51:33 GMT, Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
>>Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in
>>news:4h0pmvsk9bl1ja0dgd0nd6dp47se1c65tr@4ax.com:
>>
>>> Very well said, Dee - anything is possible if you want to do it badly
>>> enough..
>>
>>And if you want to do it badly enough you may end up doing it so badly
>>that it would have been better if you had not tried!
>
>Alun, a defeatist attitude only condemns one to failure. Have
>confidence in yourself - look at the things that you have done in your
>life - if you had not tried, where would you be now? Maybe you will
>try and fail - but to never try is to fail anyway....
>
>No one says that you have to be an expert at everything - competent is
>good enough!
>>
>>> I am certainly no prodigy at morse, electronics, martial
>>> arts, cooking, business management or anything else - but I have
>>> always been able to accomplish the things that I was motivated to do.
>>> Mind you, it took me until I was 45 to become motivated enough to
>>> learn morse code - but I wanted to get on HF, focused on the goal,
>>> bought some training software online and passed the 5 wpm test four
>>> weeks later. Conversely, I have wanted to learn to play the guitar
>>> since I was a teenager - not sufficiently enough, though, as I never
>>> did do it. Which, in retrospect, is probably a good thing....
>>>
>>> Talent has very little to do with accomplishment (it does relate to
>>> the level of excellence that one can attain
>>
>>Indeed it does. There are some things that I will never be excellent at,
>>and Morse code is one of them.
>
>Me too - good enough to pass the required exam, but that's about it!
>But, passing the exam was the goal (as required by law - the "price of

>admission" to HF) - and I achieved that 100 percent! (with my 10
>percent morse skills, which may never be used again - they served
>their purpose! God rest my morse skills.)
>>
>>> , but to become reasonably
>>> proficient in anything talent is not a factor), especially in ventures
>>> based primarily on rote repetition like morse, Karate, or learning a
>>> language. Aptitude and motivation, yes, but not talent. Otherwise,
>>> I'd have accomplished nothing so far :)
>>>
>>> Blaming a lack of talent for failure to accomplish something reflects
>>> on a persons' own inability to accept responsibility for their own
>>> actions
>>
>>So you can do anything can you? Do you beat up on yourself whenever you
>>fail at something? That doesn't sound very healthy to me.
>
>No, but I do strive to achieve those goals that I set for myself. If
>I fail, then fine, if I know that I put in the best effort that I
>could, I'll accept it - but that doesn't happen often. I suspect
>that, if you do a quick review of your past goals and achievements,
>you'll come up with a similar success rate.....
>>
>>> - successful people, quite simply, go out and get what they
>>> want. Or, in the words of Albert Gray:
>>>
>>> "Successful people are successful because they form the habits of
>>> doing those things that failures don't like to do"
>>>
>>> 73, Leo
>>>
>>
>>Fine qualities for a chairman of a Fortune 500 company maybe, but as a
>>condition for admission into a hobby???
>
>Fine qualities for anyone, actually (my posting had nothing at all to
>do with the admission requirements into this or any other hobby,
>simply the innate ability of people to accomplish whatever they set
>their minds to. (Based on their abilities, of course - reality check
>time). For example, I'm sure that you have developed the self
>discipline to do what needs to be done in your life, even if
>occasionally difficult or distasteful, haven't you? Therein lies the
>meaning of the quote. Failures always have an excuse why they
>couldn't get things completed.
>
>A failure usually engineers their own fate. In my career as a
>manager, I have never considered anyone who gave something their best
>shot to have failed! The mark of a true loser is someone who gives up
>before he tries.....and has a dozen reasons why it wouldn't have been
>possible anyway......

A "manager?!?"

At Anonymous Electronics, Inc., no doubt.

As a career electronics design engineer I never had a Real manager
who wanted to hold on to the past for dear life...or make either work
or life experience some kind of "test" for "moral qualities." Do the
assigned work successfully and one gets paid...a test every week.
I passed all of those. Took some doing but it was done.

At NO company was there a willingness to hold on to the PAST in
methods, standards, or behavior. If there was a BETTER way to do
something, we tried to do it. That took much more work, but was very
satisfying when we did it.

Amateur radio is NOT professional radio, true, but I fail to see all the
moral indignation over those not caring to learn morse code for a ham
license. Sorry "Leo" but a half century ago I did 3 years of military
radio communications on HF, trans-Pacific, without ever having to use
morse code or be required to know it. It wasn't needed then, it isn't
needed now to communicate on HF radio.

WRC-03 removed the old S25.5 requirement...at the urging of the IARU
and several countries. ARRL still refuses to take a stand on the code
test. Seven or eight nations of the world have dropped code testing for
ham licenses. More will follow as COMMON SENSE dawns on ham
radio regulation.

If you start cackling about "traditional values" and other homilies about
code testing "always a part of amateur radio," then YOU lost it, not the
NCTAs. You cannot be some kind of moral superior for demanding that
"everyone else has to do it like you did."

Leonard H. Anderson
not anonymous, mailing address the same as in HR magazine bylines

4827. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:08:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921180836.21642.00001048@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78245

In article <Xns93FD633E205Eelektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
<elektros@yahoo.com> writes:

>St Paul experienced an epiphany on the road to Damascus, so we are told.
>However, although we are both in the Amateur Radio Service, of the two of
>us only you are in the Morse Code Religion. My 'problem', which is no
>problem for me, is only that I have not seen the light.

Alun, I saw the light.

Many years ago.

A small light, flickering in the growing wind of many other faster, better,
easier-to-use modes.

It went out.

LHA

4828. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:08:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921180837.21642.00001049@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78241

In article <h22qmvccsjlivdm2td12rb19c71r9lq6nm@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>Friendly fellow - the technical abilities of Farnsworth, and the
>gentle persuasive manner of Mike Tyson.

I was a "victim" of the KH2D newsgroup behavior many years ago in here.
I learned to survive.

KH2D is ailing and moved off of Guam. I'm still here.

If you want "civilized debate" and "gentle behavior," join an arts and
crafts class at a senior center, "Leo."

>But, as Nick Pope once said:
>
>"Minds are like parachutes; they work best when they are open".

Someone else said: "Open minds often let all the common sense roll
out."

If I wanted Maxims, I would have gone to the ARRL website.

>Be well,

Get help.

LHA

4829. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:08:37 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921180837.21642.00001050@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78242

In article <suhbb.1425$Hd6.1114760@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Arnie,
>
>Unfortunately we have too many people in this country who think freedom of
>speech takes precedence over common decency. They don't realize or don't
>care that by being inconsiderate in their choice of words or analogies that
>people will discount what they say. It is more important to them to do it
>their way rather than in a way that will get the audience on their side.

That sounds like the PCTA stance on retention of the code test.

EVERYONE HAS TO DO IT LIKE THEY DID IT. Because...

LHA

4830. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:08:38 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921180838.21642.00001051@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78240

In article <wkhbb.1423$Hd6.1113222@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
>news:vmpskoorigikbd@corp.supernews.com...
>> (4) The public at large (ham radio operators) should NOT
>> be BURDENED with having to make choices; they
>> should not have the freedom to choose how to use
>> thier skills to the ends that they see fit; such is an
>> IMPOSITION upon them.
>
>By eliminating the testing requirement for Morse code, we are seriously
>undermining people's freedom of choice.

Incredible illogic!!!

>Choices need to be based on sufficient knowledge of the subject.

The FCC determines what is necessary to pass THEIR requirements
for an amateur radio operator license.

>Morse code is one of those areas where
>a person needs to learn the basics and experience it before they have
>sufficient knowledge.

Tested morse code proficiency was required by the GOVERNMENT
in the early days of radio for the first US radio regulatory agency.
Back then, on-off keying codes were the ONLY way to communicate
using early primitive radio. The GOVERNMENT's main reason for the
code test was so that all radio operators in all radio services could be
contacted in order to mitigate radio interference.

This is the year 2003, not 1912, not 1896, and not 1844 (the first year
of commercial code use on the Morse-Vail telegraph system). The
FCC stated publicly 13 years ago that the morse code test was NOT
a real requirement to determine if an amateur should be licensed. The
FCC stated that the only reason for retaining the code test in 1990 was
due to ITU-R S25.5.

Most of ITU-R S25 has been rewritten at WRC-03 and there is NO
international requirement for all administrations to administer any code
test. The new wording of S25.5 allows each administration to evaluate
the code test retention within that nation.

>Keeping the test means that individuals will have a
>better knowledge base upon which to choose whether or not to pursue Morse
>code to proficient level.

Illogical reasoning. Licensing of radio amateurs in the USA is regulated by the FCC. It is not regulated by any "ARS community." It is not regulated by any amateur radio membership organization.

There is absolutely NO radio theory imparted by skill at morse code and it does not serve any purpose in the FCC's determination of whether or not an amateur radio license applicant should be granted a license.

>No one is required to use Morse code after learning it.

Then there is NO reason to subject all amateur radio license applicants to any morse code test, is there?

LHA

4831. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:08:39 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921180839.21642.00001052@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78247

In article <bkj1vs$2bflg$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...
>
>Kiddo, I'm a few years older than YOU, but don't have any "ancestors" who
>were in concentration camps. Instead, I've talked DIRECTLY to those who
>were there, even a couple of ex-soldiers who helped liberate one camp. Lots
>of those centers for Holocaust remembrance here in Los Angeles. Cut out
>this totally artificial-to-the-subject "ancestral insult" crap. The word
>"nazi" (all lower case) has come to mean what Clint said in the American
>language of TODAY.
>____
>
>I've also talked to them *directly*, Len. And to a person, they do not
>accept the "modern" definition of the word -- and why should they? If you
>had relatives that lived through it (and some that didn't) I strongly
>suspect that you would feel differently.

My first wife was Reform Jew. All her older relatives made it out of
Germany via Denmark. I've talked with them at length at the time
and also with many others in the same situation. In the Fairfax area
of western Los Angeles. She died in late 1964, a cancer victim.

Are you now going to "lecture" me on the Holocaust of WW2? Are
you now going to assume some kind of superior moral attitude about
"ancestry" because you have such weak arguments on the retention
of morse code testing in an avocational hobby activity involving radio?

May your conscience be forever burdened by the souls of seven million
who died when you profess some kind of outrage in an argument over
code testing. That is a pathetically weak, petty connection you make.

There are several Centers for the Holocaust around the USA. I would
suggest you visit one and spend some time there and reflect on the
reality of that dreadful, terrible happening over half a century ago.

Yarmulke is optional during a visit. Carrying a code key during such a
visit isn't required.

P U T Z !

LHA

4832. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:08:40 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921180840.21642.00001053@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78243

In article <f45722ac.0309201819.14c8ac94@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> :-)
>
>Ah, yes. It is so!
>
>The October QST shows the DMSP night-time visual image of North
>America, during the big black out. Very worthwhile to take a look at.
> And not a single pixel of it was sent using Morse Code.

It wasn't?!?!?

Ohmygosh, and it is published by the ARRL !!!

Maybe "CW" doesn't get through as good as all the PCTA say it do!

:-)

4833. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:08:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921180841.21642.00001054@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78244

In article <bkj1g4$2aflr$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>I am not trying to censor you, Clint. I am just highly offended by the use
>of the word out of context. It is not a matter of freedom of speech, it is
>a matter of decency. You could have easily chosen to use another word to
>characterize the pro-code side of this debate and still made your point.
>That's all I'm saying.

I am highly offended that you are so damn weak in your arguments for
morse code testing that you invoke some artificial outrage and
equate the code test arguments to the WW2 HOLOCAUST.

May the millions of souls who perished in all those camps weigh
heavily on your conscience for trying to USE that terrible happening
for your own petty little arguments over morse code testing.

LHA

4834. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:08:42 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921180842.21642.00001055@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78246

In article <i_ibb.45996$NM1.13175@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030920203258.21642.00001019@mb-m01.aol.com...
>> In article <7Y3bb.46625$Aq2.568@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>"Dan/W4NTI"
>> <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>>
>> >Attempt you insults all you want to Clint. I still say you know nothing
>and
>> >have no experience in the mode.
>>
>> Okay, so it's all right if YOU do the insulting, but "not all right" if
>> someone
>> else doesn't agree with you. :-)
>>
>> >If you don't run over 18wpm consistantly, and are able to sit down and
>copy
>> >in your head. And have done so for years. Then may statement is true.
>> >You have no concept.
>>
>> I can visually copy 1200 Baud text as it comes in and comprehend
>> everything. 300 Baud text is a piece of cake. :-)
>>
>> >And with you smart assed attitude you never will.
>>
>> Ah, well, with a smart-assed dumb and dumberer attitude like yours
>> about morse code, there isn't much hope for advancement in US ham
>> radio. It's all about the Archaic Radiotelegraphy Service.
>>
>> LHA
>
>Why do you care? All you do is bad mouth ham radio and those that are
>members of the club.

Poor baby. All upset are you? Did your ANCESTORS complain?

I bad-mouth the code lovers for demanding a government welfare
system to keep their rank-status-privilege surrogates for food stamps
in place.

I bad-mouth the code lovers for trying to keep a supposedly recreational
activity in radio DUMBED DOWN to the standards and practices of the
1930s.

I bad-mouth the code lovers who think that morsemanship is some kind of "necessity" in radio communications of 2003.

I bad-mouth the code lovers who demand that all newcomers have to work and struggle like they did long ago so that the code lovers can have their elitist playground and act superior to others.

You don't like that? I'm sure you don't. Too bad.

You keep trying to toss all that smelly stuff of yours on us and you will continue to get it right back at you.

LHA

4835. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:13:34 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.net>
Message-ID: <458smv44c3qk8e10hvdheon0nrlnftsp21@4ax.com>
Source record: 78248

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On 21 Sep 2003 06:28:42 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <f45722ac.0309200340.4cea8bf@posting.google.com>,
>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>>Forever thinking of Kim, aren't you?
>
>Brian:
>
>I think about everyone in this newsgroup, particularly the "regulars" who
>have been here for a number of years.

Nice to know somebody's been thinking about me while I've been looking
for a new Usenet feed.

>The truth is, in spite of our
>numerous and passionate disagreements, I don't think there's anyone
>here that I wouldn't like to know in person -- including Kim,

read: especially Kim, pant, pant... :-)

Just kidding...

>and you!

>I think of time spent here as time spent with friends, and I can't help
>but to wonder if everyone else sees it the same way. Tonight, as in
>many nights in the past, I found myself composing, then quickly
>deleting, several posts aimed at certain people which contained my
>usually acerbic tone. In other words, I'm starting to wonder just
>exactly what I, and we, are all doing here, and what it all means. I
>can't honestly say that I'm ever going to change my mind about
>anything here, but I also have come to realize that in all likelihood,
>nobody else will, either. However, the way in which we disagree is
>something upon which we all should reflect, and I don't exclude myself
>from that.

To quote the title of a book you probably don't like very much, Larry,
"Now You're Talking!"

I was guilty of as much of that as you or anyone else in here,
especially back in the 1990s when I first discovered Usenet. I'm sure
some people here have looked up the current call, noticed the
"formerly" call, and made the connection. I'm sure they've also

noticed that I've managed to keep my propensity for ripping people new excretory orifices in check - except when certain ham-wannabe outlaws from CB and the Freeband frequencies come crawling in here on their hands and knees and beg for it, in which case I'm more than happy to oblige, and still plenty capable, too.

>Things are happening in my life that are causing me to consider the
>more eternal ramifications of everything I do. I know that I am not
>perfect, and that I, like most other people, am able to fall into the
>pattern of allowing my lesser nature to come to the surface. And
>while I cannot make a credible promise to not allow that to happen
>anymore, I can at least occasionally take the time to stop and
>reflect upon it, and take stock of my own behaviour.

Likewise, OM.

Glad to hear it, too. You have a good head on your shoulders. It'll be interesting to see what happens when you put it to better use. Like maybe, how we're gonna get everybody on the same page to come up with some sort of test of practical knowledge if FCC dumps Element 1.

>I would like to think that if it were ever possible for all of us to meet
>in person, that that meeting would be both pleasant and enjoyable.

If it was just the hams who are regulars, yeah, no doubt. If all the trolls showed up too? You gotta be kidding me. We'd need the National Guard there to prevent a riot.

>And, as we continue to batter each other's opinions, I think it is
>necessary to realize that we are not necessarily battering each
>other personally. Whether or not the nature of Usenet tends to
>make our reactions to each other impersonal by nature, it does
>bear keeping in mind that there is another human being at the
>other end of our rhetoric. I know that I want to be treated as such,
>and I will try to keep that in mind when reacting to the rest of you.
>
>Just some food for thoughtï¿½any and all comments welcome.

Speaking of food, don't forget to look me up when you get back up here to WNY. I'm on and off of Usenet because I access it through public servers, but even if I disappear from here I still want to get together with you and Pete for some chow and chatter.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ

-=-=-=

4836. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:33:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6E278B.1030707@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78249

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
>
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
>> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>> news:3F6DB09D.70308@adelphia.net...

<snippage>

>>> Oh how cruel! Dee, you are a meanie. You are stunting your kids
>>> emotional growth and forcing them to do something they don't want to. NO
>>> one should be forced to do something they don't want to be it Morse Code
>>> or eating foods that are good for them. - end of being facetious.
>>>
>>> How about NBI - NO Broccoli International?
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>
>>
>>
>> I LIKE broccoli. Let's make it NO Peas International.
>>
>>
>>
>
> No, let's go with Brussels Sprouts. No-BS-I??? Yeah, that's it!!
>
Hehe, Good one, Dick!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4837. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:34:43 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vms9sgq6nhs899@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78250

> It wasn't?!?!?
>
> Ohmygosh, and it is published by the ARRL !!!
>
> Maybe "CW" doesn't get through as good as all the PCTA say it do!
>
> :-)
>

I, too, am likewise shocked.

From what i've learned, when all of society collapses, we retreat back into clans and
have to forage for food and struggle for basic survival, it will be the great morse code gods that will light the torch and the way back to civilization.

What I don't understand is how civilization has managed to stay together through
the tribulation without widespread knowledge and use of morse code, made possible only of course by morse code training.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4838. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:35:57 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6E281D.80302@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78251

N2EY wrote:
> In article <3F6DBC7D.8030803@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
>
>>>I LIKE broccoli.
>>
>>Me too actually.
>
>
> Make that three.
>
>>Let's make it NO Peas International.
>>
>>Pretty Peas?
>>
>
> Peas are great!
>
> Green beans, on the other hand.....
>
> --
>
> And if ya really want to get people fired up:
>
> Calves' liver, anyone?

Like 'em all so far.

Okra maybe? Snot wrapped inside a vegatable, that one.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4839. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:39:30 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmsa5di2283ef1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78252

> Tested morse code proficiency was required by the GOVERNMENT
> in the early days of radio for the first US radio regulatory agency.
> Back then, on-off keying codes were the ONLY way to communicate
> using early primitive radio. The GOVERNMENT's main reason for the
> code test was so that all radio operators in all radio services could
be
> contacted in order to mitigate radio interference.
>
> This is the year 2003, not 1912, not 1896, and not 1844 (the first year
> of commercial code use on the Morse-Vail telegraph system). The
> FCC stated publicly 13 years ago that the morse code test was NOT
> a real requirement to determine if an amateur should be licensed. The
> FCC stated that the only reason for retaining the code test in 1990 was
> due to ITU-R S25.5.

Len, how DARE you point out the fact that times change and that the needs
of a public utility and hobby are to change to meet those needs. I think it
lacks understanding and sensitivity to the feelings of the PCTA gestapo
on your part to prove that with the passing of years, requirements
to meed modern demands likewise change.

I am flabbergasted; i'm taken aback. I just am overcome with such
frustration that I do not know what to say.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4840. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:46:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6E2A97.7050403@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78253

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:Gpjbb.49257$Aq2.14311@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>>news:J4ibb.1430$Hd6.1121315@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>>
>>>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
>>>news:f45722ac.0309210431.172e0f7d@posting.google.com...
>>>
>>>>I disagree that it is reasonable. First, there is no other pass/fail
>>>>mode test. If there were, then your assertion that it was reasonable
>>>>would not fail so badly.
>>>>
>>>
>>>If it were practical to set up and administer pass/fail tests on other
>>>modes, I would certainly support doing so. It is unfortunate that it is
>>>only practical to administer code testing and written testing.
>>>
>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>>It actually could be done. Example; Pass a basic written test for say
>
> the
>
>>General class.
>>
>>This would give you basic privlidges of say SSB, FM, at 200 watts on HF.
>>Possible retaining the sub bands also.
>>
>>Then have a ENDORSEMENT to be added for additional modes, i.e. SSTV,
>>Digital, even CW, etc.
>>
>>This could be the pass or fail part of things. Given at a local ham club,
>>by those that already have the endorsement or are grandfathered into it by
>>past experience.
>>
>>Just a thought.
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>>
>
>
> I would insist on an operational test for SSB and FM too besides the

> written. And I would insist that the operationals be conducted by a VE team
> to an established standard not just a "well he is doing OK" sort of thing.

You know Dee, there is some real wisdom in that. I think many people would be served well by having an HF contact - possibly their first - at the time of testing. It would get that first contact out of the way, it would possibly calm the person down and be a little bit of fun, and would really keep people thinking about good on the air procedures and manners.

It would also be enjoyable to be on the other side of that QSO. I would suspect that an Op that was a volunteer "first contact" would be a part of the VE team.

What a nice/good idea!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4841. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:48:26 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmsam583neeu80@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78254

But, to answer your question: did you
> do something illegal? Of course not. Insensitive, foolish and
> intellectually bankrupt, perhaps - none of which are punishable
> offences.

AH... nice dodge.... as you see, the very point of bringing up
the fact that "freedom of speech is frequently curtailed today,
such as the following examples..." would ONLY be brought
up to imply that what I did was NOT protected by the concept
of freedom of speech.

I put it to you; if this is NOT the case, if there is NO insinuation
of same, then WHY bring up the fact that there are certain
extreme cases where free speech is limited or halted, when I claim
the right to do so? Just for the purpose of conversation? I think
such a claim is paper thin and WEAK at best.

I suspect that the Nazi
> (not the euphemistic full 'National Socialist' name that you now use
> in this post) reference

the two are the same; but I digress, I am not sure what point you
are making by trying to distinguish the two

was used because it was the only card left to
> play in an otherwise empty hand.

and at THAT point you are no longer discussing fact and are in
fact using opinion. The truth of the matter is that the PCTA crowd
is long out of factual support and credible reasoning to keep
the morse code testing; they abandon any further hopes now
with all sorts of dodging tactics- and if, by the way, you find
resentment to the use of nazi, I likewise, would find resentment
with the discriptions "too lazy", "dumb", "stupid", and "moron".
HOWEVER, instead of dropping to the ground and kicking
my feet and clenching my fist and screaming as a child does
when it's bottle is taken away, I am continueing the debate.

Due to the atrocities committed
> during WW II, the word "Nazi" has severely negative connotations for a
> large percentage of the world's population,

okay, you get the "DUH" award of the day for that one. KEEN grasp
of the obvious.

reaching beyond the
> Hogan's Heroes-esque usage that you recognize and reminding them of

> the horrors of that regime, for many in a very personal way.

believe me, I was not reaching for a humorous or laughable reference.
My use of a "will not accept change" analogy was intended at the latter
reality of the regime, not the former comedy that you referred to.

however, it was your right to enter the conversation, even if you
had nothing new factual to add, and you may continue doing so.

Care to point out the color of the grass and the sky now?
</reductio ad absurdum>

Clint
KB5ZHT

4842. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:54:00 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmsb0m8qmdae1b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78255

>
> I am highly offended that you are so damn weak in your arguments for
> morse code testing that you invoke some artificial outrage and
> equate the code test arguments to the WW2 HOLOCAUST.
>
> May the millions of souls who perished in all those camps weigh
> heavily on your conscience for trying to USE that terrible happening
> for your own petty little arguments over morse code testing.
>
> LHA
>

I share the outrage. I'm am seething with contempt. Um, what total
"jerks" they are. How insensitive.

Oh, by the way, i'm going to hypocritically overlook the fact that I
called THEM jerks, but when they use a referencing adjective
on me, i'm going to claim they have an empty hand on thier side
of the argument so that's the last card THEY have to play. But it's
okay for ME to do it.

And since I had to do it, so should YOU! Oh, wait, that's conflicting
with my previous remark.. oh, i'm so confused..... I want to
say one thing when it supports my argument on the one hand, but
I want to ignore and refute it when it doesn't on the next.....
Perhaps I need to go get a dictionary and look up this "logic" thing
and learn about it.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4843. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:55:38 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmsb3m8mon6u82@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78256

> The same applies to students of all ages. When an adult goes to college,

and wasn't it pointed out in an earlier post in this, or another, thread
that
electrical engineering students aren't required to learn morse code?

hmmmmmm.....

Clint
KB5ZHT

4844. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:56:44 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmsb5q3n2srhb9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78257

>
> ...and so you act like you are the "parent" in here telling us what we
> are supposed to like?
>
> LHA

And you'll do what you're told, to. You're just SO wrong for wanting
to have a say in your governmental entity known as the FCC.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4845. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 22:58:15 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmsb8ifukg83ff@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78258

>
> Sonny, I've probably done MORE in radio already than you've done in
> your entire "career" as a hambone...er Ham.
>

oh, i'm just DIEING to see if he dares say something like "you can't know
everything I know and how far i've come and where i've been"... oh,
that's going to be just TOO juicy... bet he does though!

Clint
KB5ZHT

4846. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 23:02:04 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmsbfn4ng4o3bf@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78259

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030921180224.05888.00001996@mb-m07.aol.com...
> No-Code Licenses should come a designator following there Callsign, that
lets
> people know there status.
> Such as W5TIT-1, or W5TIT-2, that way we will know if they are Mentally
> Challenged Operator, or a Lazy Operator, 1 being Mental, 2 being Lazy,
that way
> we would know which ones not to talk to.

Not up to date on your history, are you?
most PCTA types LIVE in the past, how odd.

They USE to have no code license designations, starting with "N".
Oops, that was a *fact*.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4847. It starts with the basics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 23:11:22 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmsc1d1ec9r858@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78260

It all starts with the basics.

Before there were DVD's and compact disks, there
were casettes. Before there were casettes, there were
8-track tapes. It had to start somewhere; the way in
which analog music is written upon 8-tracks is
a fundametal aspect of music/sound reproduction.

Therefore, a person can't possibly know what he likes
in terms of products and how to spend his leisure time
unless he starts at the beginning and learns. He can't
possibly do this on his own; libraries, the internet,
dictionaries, encyclopedias, documentaries and the like
are not accessible by him. He must have instruction
FORCED upon him.

To facilitate this, we need to petition the governement
to start requireing classes in the skilled use of 8-track
tapes before he can go anywhere and purchase a
casette, CD, DVD or any other device that has
written/recorded music upon it. He can't possible, of
his own powers and via his own free will, make
decisions for himself regarding modern media and
musical reproduction systems. The Pro 8-track
tape crowd, or PETC, must stand it's ground and tell
them that that's how WE had to do it in the 70's,
so, therefore, that's who THEY should do it. All
retailers will be required to ask for documentation
proving you've passed an 8-track tape tutorial
before selling patrons the products of thier choice.

We're fair, though; we will not force them to USE
8-track tapes, or even purchase an 8-track tape
player. They can use them if they like or if they
dislike. It is the stated purpose of the PETC simply
to require them to undergo training and pass a
profeciency skill test in the use of an 8-track tape,
since this is a basic in listening to music, and everything
in the last 30+ years has stemmed from that.

If a consumer whines and complains that he should
be allowed to purchase whatever media type that he
feels is to his likeing, for whatever reason he states,
he will of course be labeled as lazy, stupid, dumb,
and wanting to just have things given to him for free.

After all, it all starts with basics.

</reductio ad absurdum>

Clint
KB5ZHT

4848. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 23:35:44 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <kBqbb.50259$Aq2.16068@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78261

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F6E2A97.7050403@adelphia.net...
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:Gpjbb.49257$Aq2.14311@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> >>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> >>news:J4ibb.1430$Hd6.1121315@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >>
> >>>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> >>>news:f45722ac.0309210431.172e0f7d@posting.google.com...
> >>>
> >>>>I disagree that it is reasonable. First, there is no other pass/fail
> >>>>mode test. If there were, then your assertion that it was reasonable
> >>>>would not fail so badly.
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>If it were practical to set up and administer pass/fail tests on other
> >>>modes, I would certainly support doing so. It is unfortunate that it
is
> >>>only practical to administer code testing and written testing.
> >>>
> >>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >>
> >>It actually could be done. Example; Pass a basic written test for say
> >
> > the
> >
> >>General class.
> >>
> >>This would give you basic privlidges of say SSB, FM, at 200 watts on HF.
> >>Possible retaining the sub bands also.
> >>
> >>Then have a ENDORSEMENT to be added for additional modes, i.e. SSTV,
> >>Digital, even CW, etc.
> >>
> >>This could be the pass or fail part of things. Given at a local ham
club,
> >>by those that already have the endorsement or are grandfathered into it
by
> >>past experience.
> >>
> >>Just a thought.
> >>

> >>Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >
> >
> > I would insist on an operational test for SSB and FM too besides the
> > written. And I would insist that the operationals be conducted by a VE
team
> > to an established standard not just a "well he is doing OK" sort of
thing.
>
> You know Dee, there is some real wisdom in that. I think many people
> would be served well by having an HF contact - possibly their first -
> at the time of testing. It would get that first contact out of the way,
> it would possibly calm the person down and be a little bit of fun, and
> would really keep people thinking about good on the air procedures and
> manners.
>
> It would also be enjoyable to be on the other side of that QSO. I would
> suspect that an Op that was a volunteer "first contact" would be a part
> of the VE team.
>
> What a nice/good idea!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

In Europe, mostly the old Iron Curtain ones, required a certain amount of
SWL time. Documented etc.

Dee do indeed have some good ideas.

Dan/W4NTI

4849. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 23:39:23 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <LEqbb.1563$Hd6.1219722@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78262

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vmsb3m8mon6u82@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > The same applies to students of all ages. When an adult goes to
college,
>
> and wasn't it pointed out in an earlier post in this, or another, thread
> that
> electrical engineering students aren't required to learn morse code?
>
> hmmmmmm.....
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT

Your incorrect usage of snippage really hurts your comments. My point was to show that adults are often required to meet standards set by people who are experienced in their field of choice. This means taking courses in college for example, that the student may never use. This is similar to requiring hams to take and pass code tests.

Electrical engineering is not ham radio. Although they don't study code, all of them have to take subjects in which they have no interest and will never use otherwise they don't get the degree.

Adults are required to do things they don't want to on a regular basis.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4850. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 23:41:11 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <rGqbb.1564$Hd6.1219769@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78263

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vmsbfn4ng4o3bf@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030921180224.05888.00001996@mb-m07.aol.com...
> > No-Code Licenses should come a designator following there Callsign, that
> lets
> > people know there status.
> > Such as W5TIT-1, or W5TIT-2, that way we will know if they are Mentally
> > Challenged Operator, or a Lazy Operator, 1 being Mental, 2 being Lazy,
> that way
> > we would know which ones not to talk to.
>
> Not up to date on your history, are you?
> most PCTA types LIVE in the past, how odd.
>
> They USE to have no code license designations, starting with "N".
> Oops, that was a *fact*.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT

Wrong again. There never was a designator specifically for no code
licensees in this country. It is and always has been impossible to tell
from the call sign alone whether a person has passed the code.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4851. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 23:55:37 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921195537.26244.00000211@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 78265

>Not up to date on your history, are you?
>most PCTA types LIVE in the past, how odd.
>
>They USE to have no code license designations, starting with "N".
>Oops, that was a *fact*.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT

Dee he wouldnt know, he doesnt have a clue.

4852. IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-21 23:56:01 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <IUqbb.6747$yp6.101434@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 78264

IARU Says "Remove Code", (Excerpted from the ARRL Letter)

"The focus was on the future when the International Amateur Radio
Union Administrative Council met September 6-7 in Amsterdam,
the Netherlands. In the aftermath of WRC-03, the council urged
IARU member-societies to call to the attention of their administrations
"the desirability of adopting specific changes in their domestic
regulations for the amateur and amateur-satellite services, so that
they will be consistent with the revised Article 25 of the international
Radio Regulations."

In that vein, the IARU governing body called for the removal of Morse
code as an examination requirement to operate on HF.

The council reiterated its stance first taken in 2001 that Morse code
proficiency "as a qualifying criterion for an HF amateur license is no
longer relevant to the healthy future of amateur Radio."

"IARU policy is to support the removal of Morse code testing as a
requirement for an amateur license to operate on frequencies below
30 MHz," the IARU Administrative Council resolved.

*****
I particularly love that last paragraph .. they're finally moving from
the past into, at least, the present.

Carl - wk3c

4853. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 00:01:49 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <NZqbb.8595$Ss3.4536@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 78266

What? The last call I had before I got out of amateur radio was N2JH. That was *not* a no-code ticket! My licenses were WN2CJV, WB2OSP, WA3RJX, N2JH, and now AA2QA (after deciding to get back into amateur radio and simply testing out in one session - with no code copied between 1969 and 1993 except for the fact that I couldn't help but copy the Morse sent in the movie 'Fantastic Voyage'). Starting with WB2OSP, all were extra class tickets at 20 words per minute.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vmsbfn4ng4o3bf@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030921180224.05888.00001996@mb-m07.aol.com...
> > No-Code Licenses should come a designator following there Callsign, that
> lets
> > people know there status.
> > Such as W5TIT-1, or W5TIT-2, that way we will know if they are Mentally
> > Challenged Operator, or a Lazy Operator, 1 being Mental, 2 being Lazy,
> that way
> > we would know which ones not to talk to.
>
> Not up to date on your history, are you?
> most PCTA types LIVE in the past, how odd.
>
> They USE to have no code license designations, starting with "N".
> Oops, that was a *fact*.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.520 / Virus Database: 318 - Release Date: 9/18/03

4854. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 00:09:34 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <eeesmvs38hn16mv6c0qsg33hvfhfe1hmkt@4ax.com>
Source record: 78267

Clint, that's an interesting collection of thoughts that you have
there -

On Sun, 21 Sep 2003 17:48:26 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>
> But, to answer your question: did you
>> do something illegal? Of course not. Insensitive, foolish and
>> intellectually bankrupt, perhaps - none of which are punishable
>> offences.
>
>AH... nice dodge.... as you see, the very point of bringing up
>the fact that "freedom of speech is frequently curtailed today,
>such as the following examples..." would ONLY be brought
>up to imply that what I did was NOT protected by the concept
>of freedom of speech.

Not a dodge at all - you don't need freedom of speech to protect your
right to rant in public. I guess reading comprehension was dropped
from the curriculum in your P.S. district early on.....along with
Civics.
>
>I put it to you; if this is NOT the case, if there is NO insinuation
>of same, then WHY bring up the fact that there are certain
>extreme cases where free speech is limited or halted, when I claim
>the right to do so? Just for the purpose of conversation? I think
>such a claim is paper thin and WEAK at best.

Huh? Can you gve an example of when your free speech was curtailed?
And by whom? Do you hear voices? Did they do it?
>
> I suspect that the Nazi
>> (not the euphemistic full 'National Socialist' name that you now use
>> in this post) reference
>
>the two are the same; but I digress, I am not sure what point you
>are making by trying to distinguish the two

Not really - one carries more negative feeelings than the other. As
you know.
>
>was used because it was the only card left to
>> play in an otherwise empty hand.
>
>and at THAT point you are no longer discussing fact and are in

>fact using opinion. The truth of the matter is that the PCTA crowd
>is long out of factual support and credible reasoning to keep
>the morse code testing; they abandon any further hopes now
>with all sorts of dodging tactics- and if, by the way, you find
>resentment to the use of nazi, I likewise, would find resentment
>with the discriptions "too lazy", "dumb", "stupid", and "moron".
>HOWEVER, instead of dropping to the ground and kicking
>my feet and clenching my fist and screaming as a child does
>when it's bottle is taken away, I am continueing the debate.

... did you read this before you hit "send" - pretty funny!

ROTFLMAO!
>
>Due to the atrocities committed
>> during WW II, the word "Nazi" has severely negative connotations for a
>> large percentage of the world's population,
>
>okay, you get the "DUH" award of the day for that one. KEEN grasp
>of the obvious.

And, therefore, you KNEW what effect this would have on people, yet
you used it anyway? Oh please....
>
>reaching beyond the
>> Hogan's Heroes-esque usage that you recognize and reminding them of
>> the horrors of that regime, for many in a very personal way.
>
>believe me, I was not reaching for a humorous or laughable reference.
>My use of a "will not accept change" analogy was intended at the latter
>reality of the regime, not the former comedy that you referred to.

I see....what reality was that, specifically?
>
>however, it was your right to enter the conversation, even if you
>had nothing new factual to add, and you may continue doing so.

Thanks! BTW, conversations are carried out in person, discussions
occur on newsgroups. This was the latter.
>
>Care to point out the color of the grass and the sky now?
></reductio ad absurdum>

If you mean your point, you have done a better job of reducing it to
the absurd in this reply that anyone else ever could. Thank you!
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>
Leo

4855. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 00:12:07 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921201207.14331.00002014@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 78268

>What? The last call I had before I got out of amateur radio was N2JH. That
>was *not* a no-code ticket! My licenses were WN2CJV, WB2OSP, WA3RJX, N2JH,
>and now AA2QA (after deciding to get back into amateur radio and simply

Dont worry about, clint is just another CBplusser Knuckle Dragger, who thinks
he knows something about Ham Radio.
Just think a few months back Clint couldnt even spell Ham Radio now he can say
he is one.

4856. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 00:16:31 UTC
From: Robert N Meyer <NOSPAM@MeyerPlanet.net>
Message-ID: <vmsfqtsrup3df@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78269

WA8ULX wrote:
> No-Code Licenses should come a designator following there Callsign, that lets
> people know there status.
> Such as W5TIT-1, or W5TIT-2, that way we will know if they are Mentally
> Challenged Operator, or a Lazy Operator, 1 being Mental, 2 being Lazy, that way
> we would know which ones not to talk to.

Hmmm ... I've been proudly no-code since upgrading to Technician, then General, then Advanced back in the 70's. ... after a grand total of *1* CW contact as a Novice and none since. Yeah, I studied for and passed the FCC-administered 13wpm code test back then. But, I consider it a silly little requirement for joining our exclusive little club.

So, I guess that means that I should add a "-2" after my call when I ID, huh? I'm pretty sure that I'm not "Mental" (though the fact that I'm actually responding to this post is strong evidence to the contrary) since I graduated from college with a 4.0 GPA with a major in Computer Science and a minor in Electronics Engineering Technology.

Don't get me wrong, I highly respect the people who use CW, and I think it's use should be encouraged. Considering its value, you can hardly do otherwise. And, yes, I believe that the CW-only portions of the bands must be preserved.

But, to require it for licensing makes about sense as forcing every driver's test to be passed in a car with a manual transmission. What's the point on testing someone on something they may never use again. If, some day, they see value in it, let them go learn it.

By the way, a few weeks back, I decided that I'm going to hit the books again and go for Extra before the end of the year. Yeah, it's a silly pride thing since I'll likely never actually use the little band slivers that I don't already have with Advanced. Besides, then I'll be able to step forward publicly with my feelings that Advanced and Extra should go away ... that an entry level class (Novice?) with low power privileges in all bands and a higher (General?) license that gives you everything are all the classes we need. Anything higher, like my Advanced and the Extra I'll have soon is just vanity. Let the ARRL create awards for folks who pass tests demonstrating a higher level of technical skill.

-- Bob, KB0GT

4857. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 00:31:37 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921203137.28445.00000157@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 78270

>What's
>the point on testing someone on something they may never use again.

Just like the present written its foolish to take the written test when no knowlege is required.

>By the way, a few weeks back, I decided that I'm going to hit the books
>again and go for Extra before the end of the year.

No need to study, go take it now, Im sure you will Ace it, it really is a JOKE.

>Besides, then I'll be able to
>step forward publicly with my feelings that Advanced and Extra should go
>away ... that an entry level class (Novice?) with low power privileges
>in all bands and a higher (General?) license that gives you everything
>are all the classes we need.

Oh im sure its coming, I look for just 1 License.

4858. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 00:32:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309211632.2d9e1085@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78271

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message news:<3F6DB32A.5070300@adelphia.net>...
> Brian wrote:
> > Dammit, Larry, now you've done it!
> >
> > First, I have always wanted to meet Dick Carroll, just to see if his
> > head was misshapened or if he suffered from Napoleans affliction, if
> > he has that MO twang, or if he like guns as much as I do so we could
> > quit sparring over the code.
> >
> > I'd like to mess around in Dave Heil's shack an see what he's done
> > with those low band loops, or if he prominently displays my KH2 QSL
> > card on his wall, next to Martii's. I imagine my thought of him being
> > smug would disappear - it may be an artifact of me reading his posts
> > on the web.
> >
> > Len, well, what can I say. He's been my mentor for years. Never
> > afraid to jump in with both feet, but more caustic than Drano. Few
> > have dared to go there - but you're one of them.
> >
> > Kim, beer and BBQ?
> >
> > There are many more, but I'll stop now.
> >
> > Maybe we need to gather at Dayton 2005.
>
> Just no group hug! 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

No guarantees!

4859. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 00:36:41 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <a6gsmvg3dfflokhiaidqc0prtk510b9bba@4ax.com>
Source record: 78272

Bob,

This is the model that Canada moved to in the 1990s, and morrors the CEPT structure to a great degree. We have two categories - Basic and Advanced. Morse can be added on to either. Basic gets you full privileges above 30 MHz, with power restrictions (560W PEP on SSB - not much of a restriction!). Morse adds on full access to all of the HF bands. Advanced adds on full legal power capability (2,250W PEP), the ability to build or your own transmitting equipment and operate a club repeater, be a VE, and a few other goodies. Only one call sign is issued (exception below...) - it is assigned upon receiving the Basic licence, and is good for life. No renewals or fees are charged. When you upgrade to Advanced, or add on Morse, a new certificate is issued, but the call remains the same. The only time the call sign must change is if you move to another area in Canada (i.e. VE2 moves to VE6, you must apply for a new VE6 call sign).

Those who held one of the older qualifications are automatically transfered in the licence database to the appropriate new licence category..

A lot cleaner and cheaper!

73, Leo

Besides, then I'll be able to
>step forward publicly with my feelings that Advanced and Extra should go
>away ... that an entry level class (Novice?) with low power privileges
>in all bands and a higher (General?) license that gives you everything
>are all the classes we need. Anything higher, like my Advanced and the
>Extra I'll have soon is just vanity. Let the ARRL create awards for
>folks who pass tests demonstrating a higher level of technical skill.
>
>-- Bob, KB0GT

4860. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 00:41:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921204134.12300.00000698@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 78273

In article <dXnbb.1534$Hd6.1190040@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
<deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030921163113.12300.00000696@mb-m20.aol.com...
>> In article <20030921042549.11891.00000994@mb-m11.aol.com>,
>yodoc@aol.comnospam
>> (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>>
>> >In article <Xns93FD68E860C2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
>> ><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>> >
>> >>
>> >>You mean like becoming president despite a lack of talent, for example?
>> >>
>> >>
>> >
>> >Let's leave Jimmy Carter out of this.
>> >
>>
>> You mean the only president to forge a sucessful, lasting Middle East
>peace
>> agreement?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>You're kidding I hope.

Not at all.

Have you forgotten the Camp David accords? They cost Anwar Sadat his life.

>The Middle East hasn't been at peace before, during,
>or since.

Not the whole region. But Israel and Egypt, former enemies and combatants, have
not fought each other at *any* time I know of since those accords were signed.
Almost 25 years now, I think. And he did it without using American military
forces.

What other president can you say any of that about?

Jimmy Carter may not have been the greatest president this country ever had but
he did do some good things.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4861. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 00:47:01 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309211647.526ab743@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78274

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:<vmpskoorigikbd@corp.supernews.com>...
> I think that may be a prevailing sentiment and character
> trait of that crowd, actually.
>
> After talking to them enough, you FINALLY get out
> of them, as I have, the truth (but I suspected it all along).
>
> It's is tantamount to an authoritarian's way of running
> a government. Free market forces aren't to dictate
> policy or courses of action, but the pointing of fingers
> and swinging of riding crops IS. If you read the
> various responses that a few of the PCTA types have
> made to all of our comments, it all boils down to the following
> doctrine...
>
> (1) I had to do it, so should YOU.

Prevasive.

> (2) It shouldn't be up to a free citizen to operate as he sees
> fit; he should do what he's told, for the better good of
> the existence of the archaic mode in question (CW)

How high?

> (3) Shut up, your opinion in the operation of the government
> (read: FCC) doesn't matter, and you should not have the
> the right to have any influence on how it governs you;
> you're the subject of the empire.

Daily.

> (4) The public at large (ham radio operators) should NOT
> be BURDENED with having to make choices; they
> should not have the freedom to choose how to use
> thier skills to the ends that they see fit; such is an
> IMPOSITION upon them.

Belief in mandatory code use.

4862. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 00:47:07 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmshkml253u8c2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78275

> I particularly love that last paragraph .. they're finally moving from
> the past into, at least, the present.
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

hmmm, yes, but the PCTA's won't see it as being noteworthy or
deserving of consideration. They'll dismiss it, say THAT body of
people is ignorant and just doesn't know what's right....

"You fools! Don't you know that by living in the past we are best
prepared to meet the challenges and demands of the future?!?!?!?!"

Clint
KB5ZHT

4863. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 00:50:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309211650.25abaa3f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78276

Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93FD83DA54D0Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...

> You are now quoting me out of context, snipping everything I agreed with,
> leaving in the inane joke at the end, and leaving in my apparently
> agreeing only to that.

I wonder if that's what jack-booted thugs do, if there were such a thing?

;^)

4864. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 00:50:22 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmshqqrl5l9e03@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78277

>
> Wrong again.

BZZZZZT, wrong on your part.

There was a whole slew of N-class licenses, I knew several of them...
N5VSQ, N5XDT, etc.

Clint
KB5ZHT
>

4865. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 00:53:13 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmsi069koi7l44@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78278

hmm, guess all the n-class operators that were
no code technicians many years ago just
"didn't exist"...

they quit confining them to just n-calls years
ago, though. Figured somebody living
totally in the past with a blind eye to the future
wouldn't know that, though.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4866. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 00:55:06 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmsi3l38eker6f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78279

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030921175407.05888.00001994@mb-m07.aol.com...
> the Code cant be learned. All the rest are excuses.
>
> 1. Mentally challenged
> 2. To Lazy
>
> No other real reason exist, so which one do you CBplussers claim?

the code can be learned. It's not hard at all.

It's just not necessary to FORCE people to learn it against thier
will; it's not at all necessary to modern day use of ham radio.

That's all.

"Just shut up and march your way up into that cattlecar!"

Clint
KB5ZHT

4867. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 00:57:24 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <UNrbb.70429$BS1.30491934@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 78280

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030921204134.12300.00000698@mb-m20.aol.com...
> Jimmy Carter may not have been the greatest president this country ever
had but
> he did do some good things.

...and he's continued to do good things as an ex-president.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

4868. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:00:37 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <VQrbb.1572$Hd6.1233469@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78282

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vmshqqrl5l9e03@corp.supernews.com...
>
> >
> > Wrong again.
>
> BZZZZZT, wrong on your part.
>
> There was a whole slew of N-class licenses, I knew several of them...
> N5VSQ, N5XDT, etc.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
> >

Those calls were not issued on the basis of whether they had or had not passed a code test. Those call signs were issued to people who had passed General and Technician with code as well as no-code Techs. There is NO way to tell from a call sign whether they passed code as the call signs were issued on the basis of license class only.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
(an original N call issued when I passed my Tech with code in 1992. I have never held a codeless license).

4869. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:00:42 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <_Qrbb.50408$Aq2.4823@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78281

"JJ" wrote:
>
> Yea, here are his words,

Nope, that's not the same message. There is a reply to one of my messages where I'm almost certain he specifically said two CB'ers. I remember it because I doubted at the time two CB'ers would care enough to bet money on someone passing a ham license test. Of course, I come from the old school where if something doesn't make sense, it's probably not true.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4870. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:02:34 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <JSrbb.1573$Hd6.1233961@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78284

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vmsi069koi7l44@corp.supernews.com...
> hmm, guess all the n-class operators that were
> no code technicians many years ago just
> "didn't exist"...
>
> they quit confining them to just n-calls years
> ago, though. Figured somebody living
> totally in the past with a blind eye to the future
> wouldn't know that, though.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT

N calls were issued to Generals, Techs with code (Tech +), and codeless Techs. It did not indicate whether the person passed a code test or not.

When I took my original license testing, I passed the Novice written, Tech written, and code. I was issued an N call (which I still hold today). I never held a codeless license.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4871. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:03:42 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309211703.6f53741d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78283

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<KFhbb.1428$Hd6.1116681@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309201841.51137659@posting.google.com...
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:<i6Mab.846$Hd6.623809@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > At a character speed of 5wpm, you can't hear the letter as a letter and
> you
> > > can't react to the sound on a reflex basis.
> >
> > But, Dee, I passed the Novice test with 100% copy.
>
> Passing with 100% copy when the character speed is 5wpm can be done by
> counting dots and dashes and checking the lookup table in your head rather
> than responding on a reflex basis.

But my reflexes are rather slow. How else would you have me do it?

There is no contradiction as you seem to
> imply.

I respectfully disagree.

At characters speeds of 13wpm, one can avoid the trap of counting
> and lookup and learn to respond reflexively ultimately leading to mastering
> higher speeds.

I don't want to avoid the "trap." I couldn't get to 13wpm, that's how
I became a Technician - the consolation prize for almost General.

> Using a method that encourages people to count the dots and dashes erects a
> barrier to going on to higher speeds.

Perhaps, but there are generations of hams who did it that way. How
can that be explained if what you say is the only way?

Why use a method that creates
> hardships that will cause a person to have to start over with a new learning
> process if they should want to use it?

Because that is the method that was presented to me to learn code
with. I bought the ARRL "Now You're Talking" Novice course with 5wpm
code tape. Then I bought the ARRL 5wpm tape kit and the ARRL 13wpm
tape kit. I even got on the 40M Novice subband, but there wasn't much
to hear.

The teaching and learning of any
> subject should be approached from the point of view that the person may
> someday want to use the material taught not from the viewpoint of passing a
> test on it.

I don't see you rallying for closed question pools.

> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Dee, then there remains a disconnect between what Part 97 says and
what the VECs do.

4872. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:06:39 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bklhuv$q8q$0@208.207.71.133>
Source record: 78285

N2EY wrote:

>In article <20030921042549.11891.00000994@mb-m11.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam
>(Larry Roll K3LT) writes:
>
>
>
>>In article <Xns93FD68E860C2elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>, Alun Palmer
>><elektros@yahoo.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>
>>>You mean like becoming president despite a lack of talent, for example?
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>Let's leave Jimmy Carter out of this.
>>
>>
>>
>
>You mean the only president to forge a sucessful, lasting Middle East peace
>agreement?
>
>

He must have forged it from glass, then stumbled...

4873. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:08:37 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmsit2bbi8urc1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78286

>
> Huh? Can you gve an example of when your free speech was curtailed?
> And by whom? Do you hear voices? Did they do it?

and I QUOTE...

from leo, on sunday september 21, 2003 @ 10:25am,

<cut and paste>

Good point, Mike. The concept of free speech is a basic tenet in any
democratic society - one needs only to look as far as the former Iraq,
where open disagreement with a government policy could buy you a quick
ticket to the next world, or at the very least a personalized basic
electricity course.

But free speech does not mean that any simian with a functional larnyx
is permitted to publicly say anything that he or she wishes - for
example, the holocaust deniers and the KKK have proved that point
quite well in recent history. Slander and libel laws are another
example of limits on 'free speech', intended to mitigate and assign
accountability for the damage that it can cause if out of control

<end paste>

okay, now, read carefully and LEARN...

My response previously was that I didn't say or do ANYTHING
that falls within the realm of being controlled by the government.
I didn't say anything slanderous or that could be called libel.

SO why bring up all that diatribe, especially the second paragraph?
HM? is there any point to that, other than to insinuate that just
maybe I don't have the free speech protection to speak my mind?
or why ELSE bring it up?

You can't dodge your way out of it. It's obvious. You're just
upset that you were exposed.

> >
> > I suspect that the Nazi
> >> (not the euphemistic full 'National Socialist' name that you now use
> >> in this post) reference
> >
> >the two are the same; but I digress, I am not sure what point you
> >are making by trying to distinguish the two
>
> Not really - one carries more negative feeelings than the other. As

> you know.

that is YOUR assessment and YOUR opinion, but the facts are,
and you cannot deny it, that nazi is a slang abbreviation for
national socialist. I won't argue that point with you anymore;
if you even speak of "negative connotations", well, connotations
are by DEFINTION subjective and therefore not anything that
can be cast in stone as a fact of civil law or physics.

Now, continue pointing out the colors of grass and sky, and
feel proud that you have done so.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4874. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:14:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <Q1sbb.50430$Aq2.32185@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78287

"Eddie" wrote:
>
> It's amazing, but I keep hearing these 'sour grapes'
> attitudes from the old timers, both on the radio and
> in the newsgroups.

Sadly, Bruce (WA8ULX) isn't an old timer - his license is so new the ink isn't even dry yet. He only tries to act like an old timer (or, at least, the way he thinks they act). However, most real old timers are a lot more civilized (the type of people you would be proud to have as a friend or associate).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4875. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:15:03 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309211715.2a6811ed@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78288

Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<e13qmvcond9cbb09dqvuo0s42q364mvoq8@4ax.com>...
> Dick / Brian,
>
> Not sure what relationship this has to either Amateur Radio or the
> news that I posted....I must have accidentally cross-posted to
> alt.jingoism and alt.fearmongering again!
>
> Sorry 'boot that, eh?
>
> 73, Leo

Leo, no-sweatty dah (Korean for no-sweat). I'll have to give a visit
to alt.jingoism and fearmongering. Wonder what they said about the
9/11 anniversary?

4876. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:17:58 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bklik6rir0@208.207.71.133>
Source record: 78289

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
>>
>>
>> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>>
>>> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>> news:3F6DB09D.70308@adelphia.net...
>>
>
> <snippage>
>
>
>>>> Oh how cruel! Dee, you are a meanie. You are stunting your kids
>>>> emotional growth and forcing them to do something they don't want
>>>> to. NO
>>>> one should be forced to do something they don't want to be it Morse
>>>> Code
>>>> or eating foods that are good for them. - end of being facetious.
>>>>
>>>> How about NBI - NO Broccoli International?
>>>>
>>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> I LIKE broccoli. Let's make it NO Peas International.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>> No, let's go with Brussels Sprouts. No-BS-I??? Yeah, that's it!!
>>
> Hehe, Good one, Dick!

Well, I really *don't* like Brussels sprouts!

4877. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:25:12 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bklj1ortg0@208.207.71.133>
Source record: 78290

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>IARU Says "Remove Code", (Excerpted from the ARRL Letter)
>
>"The focus was on the future when the International Amateur Radio
>Union Administrative Council met September 6-7 in Amsterdam,
>the Netherlands. In the aftermath of WRC-03, the council urged
>IARU member-societies to call to the attention of their administrations
>"the desirability of adopting specific changes in their domestic
>regulations for the amateur and amateur-satellite services, so that
>they will be consistent with the revised Article 25 of the international
>Radio Regulations."
>
>In that vein, the IARU governing body called for the removal of Morse
>code as an examination requirement to operate on HF.
>
>The council reiterated its stance first taken in 2001 that Morse code
>proficiency "as a qualifying criterion for an HF amateur license is no
>longer relevant to the healthy future of amateur Radio."
>
>"IARU policy is to support the removal of Morse code testing as a
>requirement for an amateur license to operate on frequencies below
>30 MHz," the IARU Administrative Council resolved.
>
>*****
>I particularly love that last paragraph .. they're finally moving from
>the past into, at least, the present.
>
>

You made the same error of interpretation that your buddy Bill Sohl
did. Nowhere within that
document does it say they want to remove all code testing. If FCC should
allow a single category of
HF license to be issued and retain code testing for all others, that
would satisfy that blurb.

Sorry, that's the way it is.

4878. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:28:35 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bklj83rtg1@208.207.71.133>
Source record: 78291

Jim Hampton wrote:

>What? The last call I had before I got out of amateur radio was N2JH. That
>was *not* a no-code ticket! My licenses were WN2CJV, WB2OSP, WA3RJX, N2JH,
>and now AA2QA (after deciding to get back into amateur radio and simply
>testing out in one session - with no code copied between 1969 and 1993
>except for the fact that I couldn't help but copy the Morse sent in the
>movie 'Fantastic Voyage'). Starting with WB2OSP, all were extra class
>tickets at 20 words per minute.
>
>73 from Rochester, NY
>Jim AA2QA
>
>
>"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
>news:vmsbfn4ng4o3bf@corp.supernews.com...
>
>
>>"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
>>news:20030921180224.05888.00001996@mb-m07.aol.com...
>>
>>
>>>No-Code Licenses should come a designator following there Callsign, that
>>>
>>>
>>lets
>>
>>
>>>people know there status.
>>> Such as W5TIT-1, or W5TIT-2, that way we will know if they are Mentally
>>>Challenged Operator, or a Lazy Operator, 1 being Mental, 2 being Lazy,
>>>
>>>
>>that way
>>
>>
>>>we would know which ones not to talk to.
>>>
>>>
>>Not up to date on your history, are you?
>>most PCTA types LIVE in the past, how odd.
>>
>>They USE to have no code license designations, starting with "N".
>>Oops, that was a *fact*.

>>
>>Clint
>>KB5ZHT
>>
>>
>>
>>

So much for the accuracy of Clint's "facts".

4879. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:37:59 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bkljn9cph1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 78621

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bklj1ortg0@208.207.71.133...
>
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >IARU Says "Remove Code", (Excerpted from the ARRL Letter)
> >
> >"The focus was on the future when the International Amateur Radio
> >Union Administrative Council met September 6-7 in Amsterdam,
> >the Netherlands. In the aftermath of WRC-03, the council urged
> >IARU member-societies to call to the attention of their administrations
> >"the desirability of adopting specific changes in their domestic
> >regulations for the amateur and amateur-satellite services, so that
> >they will be consistent with the revised Article 25 of the international
> >Radio Regulations."
> >
> >In that vein, the IARU governing body called for the removal of Morse
> >code as an examination requirement to operate on HF.
> >
> >The council reiterated its stance first taken in 2001 that Morse code
> >proficiency "as a qualifying criterion for an HF amateur license is no
> >longer relevant to the healthy future of amateur Radio."
> >
> >"IARU policy is to support the removal of Morse code testing as a
> >requirement for an amateur license to operate on frequencies below
> >30 MHz," the IARU Administrative Council resolved.
> >
> >*****
> >I particularly love that last paragraph .. they're finally moving from
> >the past into, at least, the present.
> >
> >
>
> You made the same error of interpretation that your buddy Bill Sohl
> did. Nowhere within that
> document does it say they want to remove all code testing.

Your persistence is either spinning this or mis-interpreting it
yourself is mind-boggling. To begin with, it's not even the IARU talking,
it's the ARRL; "(Excerpted from the ARRL Letter)"

Here's what IARU says _themselves_:

http://www.iaru.org/rel030912.html

"3. The Council revised an existing Resolution concerning the Morse code in the light of the WRC-03 decision to leave to each administration the question of whether or not to require a demonstration of Morse skill to operate below 30 MHz. Under the revised Resolution, IARU policy is to support the removal of Morse code testing requirements."

No weasel words there.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.520 / Virus Database: 318 - Release Date: 9/18/2003

4880. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:38:24 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bklkfs$6ut@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 78294

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309210453.58a4d3e6@posting.google.com...
>
> Kim, beer and BBQ?
>

Oh good heavens, no! Pasta, or steak, and a glass of fine wine or a frozen margarita. Beer and BBQ is a Texan thing and, while I'll drink an ICE COLD beer on a hot day outside--you won't find me outside much in the Summertime around here. BBQ? It's OK. But I prefer no flavorings on my meat.

Kim W5TIT

4881. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:39:56 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bklkft$6ut@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 78295

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F6DB2DF.6040104@adelphia.net...
>
> Yaknow, people can be pro-code and no-code and have spirited arguments
> without accusing each other against crimes against humanity! Or illegal
> drug abuse.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

You're far more optimistic than I.

Kim W5TIT

4882. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:48:54 UTC
From: k0hb@arrl.net
Message-ID: <e79dbd9b.0309211748.6d559a29@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78292

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote

>
> The FCC thinks that Technicians are adequately tested on that, for all
> authorized modes and technologies. There are no modes or technologies
> authorized for amateur HF/MF that are not also authorized for amateur VHF/UHF.
> So there is no absolute need for any of the General or Extra written tests
> *except* perhaps a few regulatory and propagation questions.

Jim, your strawman is aflame, because I just pissed flaming napalm on it. Grow up.

Hans

4883. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:49:19 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <zysbb.50569$Aq2.44808@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78293

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> Perhaps, but the accuracy of those judgments are
> definitely affected by having had those experiences,
> or not. Someone who has never experienced a
> house fire, a terrorist attack, life under a tyrannical
> dictator, or a business failure is certainly capable
> of making the entirely incorrect judgment about any
> of the above. (snip)

Gladly, we don't live in a trial and error world today. I would hope the bridge designer would have enough knowledge to build a safe bridge without having to watch one (perhaps this one) fall down first. People can learn about the specifics of a subject without personally experiencing every aspect of it. We generally trust that system for a great many things in this world today (for example, the bridges we routinely drive over).

> I do not disagree. However, experience has shown
> that people who aren't required to be code tested
> usually don't bother to learn and use the Morse
> code, so the issue does relate to code use, only to
> the extent that the lack of a requirement would tend
> to cause a decline in the use of the Morse/CW mode
> in the fullness of time.

If that were true, I think a test requirement is the worst way to accomplish what you're seeking. Instead, a better solution is to find ways to attract new people to that aspect of ham radio. You're obviously not going to have much success with that effort today because "no coders" have made their choice about code while focusing solely on the license requirement (the license requirement dominates the issue in their minds). Later, when that license requirement is gone, the mode itself becomes the focus. At that point, I think many more will be interested in taking a second look at code. Obviously, there is no way for me to prove that now, but I just have a feeling about this (perhaps the same way you have a feeling about the above).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4884. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:56:44 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <wFsbb.52192$NM1.11709@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78296

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030921142942.12501.00002585@mb-m04.aol.com...
> In article <c777ab1364e2b7954c18183cd420d781.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>,
"Hans
> K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> >> Then answer this question: Why should people who are not interested in
> >> building or fixing their radios have to learn all that theory stuff
> >> for the written tests? Why are all hams tested on all sorts of stuff
> >> they are not interested in?
> >
> >Because the terms of their license make them responsible for the quality
> >of their radiated signal(s).
>
> Maybe. But a ham is not required to actually know how his/her equipment
works,
> nor to be able to work on it. Just for the result.

If you firmly believe hams don't need to know theory, then
petition the FCC to end theory knowledge as a test requirement.
If you don't then your argument is just a means to divert
the issue to arguing a different subject.

> I'm not required to know how my cars work, just how to use them safely. I
am
> "responsible", however, to see that they meet all applicable DMV
requirements,
> including pollution and safety equipment. I can do the work myself or have
it
> done by others. The same is true for ham equipment.

I repeat my comment from above.

> The FCC thinks that Technicians are adequately tested on that, for all
> authorized modes and technologies. There are no modes or technologies
> authorized for amateur HF/MF that are not also authorized for amateur
VHF/UHF.
> So there is no absolute need for any of the General or Extra written tests
> *except* perhaps a few regulatory and propagation questions.

I repeat again.

> >Without demonstrating some familiarity with the basic underlying
> >science, it would be irresponsible of the regulators to allow an
> >applicant to establish a radio transmitting station on the public

> >airways.
>
> See above about Technicians.
>
> And here's another point: There's almost nothing in the tests about some
> technologies that hams are allowed to use. For example, vacuum tubes - not
very
> much in the tests about them! Yet FCC *trusts* hams who want to use vacuum
tube
> technology to learn what they need to know about it and operate their
equipment
> responsibly. So why all the tests?

Ditto my last :-) :-)

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

4885. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 01:57:16 UTC
From: Hans Kohb <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <d637413962fc29c05122efcd088c4126.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 78297

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote

> *****
> I particularly love that last paragraph .. they're finally moving from
> the past into, at least, the present.
>
> Carl - wk3c

Carl,

As you know, I do not support continuing the Morse exam. Other well meaning people disagree with me and I respect their disagreement.

It is a puzzle to me why you continue to make a point of "rubbing peoples nose in it". Perhaps "well meaning" doesn't apply in your case.

Hans

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

4886. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 02:01:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <jKsbb.50589$Aq2.40244@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78298

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> Dwight, unless and until you can show us just exactly
> WHERE the ARS's code testing requirement ***IS***
> relevant OUTSIDE of the ARS, all you're doing is
> blowing smoke. And not very dense smoke at that.

It isn't relevant to anything outside the Amateur Radio today, Larry.
That's exactly why there are efforts being made to eliminate the Morse Code
test requirement. Those efforts extend throughout the world, including the
recent ITU vote to allow more flexibility on this issue.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4887. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 02:01:58 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <r6lsmvgp8s3g6bhv0g72ltkj3q5hrc9isg@4ax.com>
Source record: 78299

Clint, my friend, you are indeed your own worst enemy - your interpretation of clear and concise English is amusing indeed. especially the "if you can't get 'em to understand your point, repeat it over and over until they do" strategy - that's certainly a winner!

But, in closing, I'm reminded of another quote by an anonymous author - sage advice, though, in dealing with you on this issue any further, and I shall follow it now:

"Never argue with an idiot. They drag you down to their level, and beat you with experience."

QRT, my friend - our 'conversation' (sic) is now concluded.

Game. point and match.

Be Well,

Leo

On Sun, 21 Sep 2003 20:08:37 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:

>
> >
>> Huh? Can you gve an example of when your free speech was curtailed?
>> And by whom? Do you hear voices? Did they do it?
>
>and I QUOTE...
>
>from leo, on sunday september 21, 2003 @ 10:25am,
>
><cut and paste>
>
>Good point, Mike. The concept of free speech is a basic tenet in any
>democratic society - one needs only to look as far as the former Iraq,
>where open disagreement with a government policy could buy you a quick
>ticket to the next world, or at the very least a personalized basic
>electricity course.
>
>But free speech does not mean that any simian with a functional larnyx
>is permitted to publicly say anything that he or she wishes - for
>example, the holocaust deniers and the KKK have proved that point
>quite well in recent history. Slander and libel laws are another
>example of limits on 'free speech', intended to mitigate and assign
>accountability for the damage that it can cause if out of control
>

><end paste>
>
>okay, now, read carefully and LEARN...
>
>My response previously was that I didn't say or do ANYTHING
>that falls within the realm of being controlled by the government.
>I didn't say anything slanderous or that could be called libel.
>
>SO why bring up all that diatribe, especially the second paragraph?
>HM? is there any point to that, other than to insinuate that just
>maybe I don't have the free speech protection to speak my mind?
>or why ELSE bring it up?
>
>You can't dodge your way out of it. It's obvious. You're just
>upset that you were exposed.
>
>> >
>> > I suspect that the Nazi
>> >> (not the euphemistic full 'National Socialist' name that you now use
>> >> in this post) reference
>> >
>> >the two are the same; but I digress, I am not sure what point you
>> >are making by trying to distinguish the two
>>
>> Not really - one carries more negative feeelings than the other. As
>> you know.
>
>that is YOUR assessment and YOUR opinion, but the facts are,
>and you cannot deny it, that nazi is a slang abbreviation for
>national socialist. I won't argue that point with you anymore;
>if you even speak of "negative connotations", well, connotations
>are by DEFINTION subjective and therefore not anything that
>can be cast in stone as a fact of civil law or physics.
>
>Now, continue pointing out the colors of grass and sky, and
>feel proud that you have done so.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>

4888. Re: Has NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 02:05:27 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <HNsbb.1595$Hd6.1246979@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78300

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309211703.6f53741d@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<KFhbb.1428$Hd6.1116681@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0309201841.51137659@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> > news:<i6Mab.846$Hd6.623809@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > > > At a character speed of 5wpm, you can't hear the letter as a letter
and
> > you
> > > > can't react to the sound on a reflex basis.
> > >
> > > But, Dee, I passed the Novice test with 100% copy.
> >
> > Passing with 100% copy when the character speed is 5wpm can be done by
> > counting dots and dashes and checking the lookup table in your head
rather
> > than responding on a reflex basis.
>
> But my reflexes are rather slow. How else would you have me do it?
>

Slow reflexes are no problem. With the higher letter speed, there is more
time to respond to the character so is is actually an advantage to someone
with slow reflexes to use a higher character speed.

> There is no contradiction as you seem to
> > imply.
>
> I respectfully disagree.
>
> At characters speeds of 13wpm, one can avoid the trap of counting
> > and lookup and learn to respond reflexively ultimately leading to
mastering
> > higher speeds.
>
> I don't want to avoid the "trap." I couldn't get to 13wpm, that's how
> I became a Technician - the consolation prize for almost General.
>

Because you used a poor training method that forced you into the trap.

> > Using a method that encourages people to count the dots and dashes
erects a

> > barrier to going on to higher speeds.
>
> Perhaps, but there are generations of hams who did it that way. How
> can that be explained if what you say is the only way?
>

Because one way or the other, they stopped counting dots and dashes and then finally proceeded to the higher speeds.

> Why use a method that creates
> > hardships that will cause a person to have to start over with a new learning
> > process if they should want to use it?
>
> Because that is the method that was presented to me to learn code
> with. I bought the ARRL "Now You're Talking" Novice course with 5wpm
> code tape. Then I bought the ARRL 5wpm tape kit and the ARRL 13wpm
> tape kit. I even got on the 40M Novice subband, but there wasn't much
> to hear.
>
> The teaching and learning of any
> > subject should be approached from the point of view that the person may
> > someday want to use the material taught not from the viewpoint of passing a
> > test on it.
>
> I don't see you rallying for closed question pools.
>

Actually I think the closed questions pools would be good but I am putting my efforts into helping people learn code the proper way so it can be used.

> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Dee, then there remains a disconnect between what Part 97 says and
> what the VECs do.

Part 97 does not define the characteristics of 5wpm code. So there is no disconnect.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4889. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 02:13:30 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkllsa$155$0@208.207.71.133>
Source record: 78401

Hans Kohb wrote:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
>
>
>>*****
>>I particularly love that last paragraph .. they're finally moving from
>>the past into, at least, the present.
>>
>>Carl - wk3c
>>
>>
>
>
>Carl,
>
>As you know, I do not support continuing the Morse exam. Other well
>meaning people disagree with me and I respect their disagreement.
>
>It is a puzzle to me why you continue to make a point of "rubbing
>peoples nose in it". Perhaps "well meaning" doesn't apply in your case.
>
>Hans
>
>
>

"Perhaps"???

>
>
>
>

4890. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 02:18:50 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <a2msmvs2rofvb7ks1pj59h22dd5h87hc95@4ax.com>
Source record: 78402

Here in Canada stand firm with you on that one - that was by far the greatest tragedy to befall the US (and North America) in the history of the world, and certainly cannot be condoned. You will find a contingent of Canadian soldiers in Afghanistan with your troops right now, as they have been for almost two years, working with you to hunt down and destroy Al-Qaida. There is no safe haven here - this country has no tolerance for terrorists. Neverless, people do get in who should not get in (in the US as well as here) - you can't stop them all.

However, this was am Amateur Radio thread, and your comment was off topic. And, as a Canadian, I do take exception to the oversimplification that the terrorists all come through here due to our incredibly lax immigration policies - if that were true, the Canada - US border would be (and should be) sealed and guarded to end that from happening. I live a mere 45 miles from the border, and it is as open as it ever was (although more vigilant in checking IDs in the computer systems, in both directions, into Canada as well as the US), so I assume that the threat cannot be that great. It has never been conclusively proven that Canada is an entry point for the terrorists (it was suggested just after 9/11, but disproven later). And, even if they do enter the US at the Canadian border, do your Customs guys just rubber stamp their visas and welcome them in? I don't think so...

Let's stay on topic, and remember that we are both neighbours and brothers in this issue!

73, Leo

On 21 Sep 2003 18:15:03 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:

>Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<e13qmvcond9cbb09dqvuo0s42q364mvoq8@4ax.com>...
>> Dick / Brian,
>>
>> Not sure what relationship this has to either Amateur Radio or the
>> news that I posted....I must have accidentally cross-posted to
>> alt.jingoism and alt.fearmongering again!
>>
>> Sorry 'boot that, eh?
>>
>> 73, Leo
>
>
>Leo, no-sweatty dah (Korean for no-sweat). I'll have to give a visit

>to alt.jingoism and fearmongering. Wonder what they said about the
>9/11 anniversary?

4891. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 02:20:47 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <30tbb.1601$Hd6.1250293@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78403

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:JSrbb.1573$Hd6.1233961@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> news:vmsi069koi7l44@corp.supernews.com...
> > hmm, guess all the n-class operators that were
> > no code technicians many years ago just
> > "didn't exist"...
> >
> > they quit confining them to just n-calls years
> > ago, though. Figured somebody living
> > totally in the past with a blind eye to the future
> > wouldn't know that, though.
> >
> > Clint
> > KB5ZHT
>
> N calls were issued to Generals, Techs with code (Tech +), and codeless
> Techs. It did not indicate whether the person passed a code test or not.
>
> When I took my original license testing, I passed the Novice written, Tech
> written, and code. I was issued an N call (which I still hold today). I
> never held a codeless license.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

To further expand (and you should know this from having studied for the
exam):

2x3 calls beginning with W, K and N are assigned to Novice class licensees
and higher. All the Ws available in the sequential assignment are used up.
However some vacant calls are available via the vanity program. We are
currently in the Ks. It will be some time before these are used up. When
they are, calls will be assigned from the N block.

1x3 calls beginning with W, K, and N are assigned to Technician (both with
and without code) class and General class and higher. All the sequentially
assigned calls have been used up. Some vacant calls are available via the
vanity program. No distinction in the call sign is based on whether or not
the Technician has passed the code. So today, new licensees with or without
code will receive a 2x3 call beginning with K.

2x2 calls beginning with W, K, and N are assigned to Advanced class and
higher. Again all the sequential ones are gone and only some vacant calls

are available via the vanity program.

1x2 and 2x1 calls beginning with W, K, and N are assigned to Extra class only. All the sequential calls are gone but there may be some vacant calls available via the vanity program.

2x1 calls beginning with AA through AL are assigned to Extra class only. Again all the sequential calls are gone with perhaps some vacant calls being available via the vanity program.

2x2 calls beginning with AA through AL are assigned to Extra class only. These are still available in the sequential assignment and available calls may also be requested via the vanity program.

The no-code techs that you know with N calls simply received their calls when the N block of 1x3 calls was being used for the Technician (coded and no-code) and General class licensees.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

4892. Re: Play the Art Bell Drinking Game tonight !!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 02:28:57 UTC
From: Kim_Jong_Il@volcanomail.com
Message-ID: <26a0f230.0309211828.33755b83@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78404
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Beloved Leader #4" <profishwrapper@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<1064105442.55001@newshost03.voicenet.com>...

> As you probably know by now,...

[snip]

Wha?????

Accept no substitutes. But it is funny.

The one and only Beloved Leader.

4893. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 02:29:52 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921222952.07578.00000722@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78408

In article <kBqbb.50259$Aq2.16068@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>> > I would insist on an operational test for SSB and FM too besides the
>> > written. And I would insist that the operationals be conducted by a VE
>team
>> > to an established standard not just a "well he is doing OK" sort of
>thing.
>>
>> You know Dee, there is some real wisdom in that. I think many people
>> would be served well by having an HF contact - possibly their first -
>> at the time of testing. It would get that first contact out of the way,
>> it would possibly calm the person down and be a little bit of fun, and
>> would really keep people thinking about good on the air procedures and
>> manners.
>>
>> It would also be enjoyable to be on the other side of that QSO. I would
>> suspect that an Op that was a volunteer "first contact" would be a part
>> of the VE team.
>>
>> What a nice/good idea!

I did a writeup on how that sort of test could be done. All it would take is a couple of QRP rigs and some dummy loads (wouldn't actually have to be on the air).

But NCVEC would have a cow. Too much of a "burden".

>In Europe, mostly the old Iron Curtain ones, required a certain amount of
>SWL time. Documented etc.

Even more than that. They required that a prospective ham actually BUILD a receiver of a certain complexity from scratch, then use it to receive and log a certain number of stations and countries using both 'phone and CW. They'd have to explain the receiver's design, construction and operation, too.

Once all that was done, they'd get a beginner's license and authority to build a transmitter of a certain complexity and power. Which would then be used to make verified contacts in order to earn an upgraded license.

There were also written and code tests, of course. But those tests alone would not earn a license - those hams had to build their rigs, then demonstrate understanding of their theory and operation as well as actually use the dern things.

What a concept.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4894. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 02:29:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921222953.07578.00000724@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78405

In article <20030921180828.21642.00001042@mb-m01.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <Crhbb.1424$Hd6.1114311@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>Flint"
><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
>>I and other parents that I know have always required our children to eat
>>foods that are good for them whether they liked them or not. My children
>>have always been required to eat what was served whether they liked it or
>>not. Children were not allowed to dictate the menu.
>
> ...and so you act like you are the "parent" in here telling us what we
> are supposed to like?

Well, considering how often you act like a small child in here, Leonard, you're
certainly not qualified for that role.

4895. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 02:29:53 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921222953.07578.00000723@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78407

In article <vms3aoclp8q3e2@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>Hey, wanna talk SHUDDER?
>
>this is what makes ME shudder... the thought that you are invoking
>the priviledges of free speech and rights of society just like I am,
>but also advocating that an idea, concept or practice be forced
>upon a person against thier will.
>
>And you're doing that with a straight face.
>
By that logic, anyone who proposes any sort of legal requirement that is "against a person's will" makes you shudder.

For example, speed limits on highways. Or requiring children to go to school.

How about band edges? Power limitations on transmitters? Mode restrictions like no 20 kHz wide FM voice on 20 meters?

Here's a thought for ya, Clint:

Suppose NCVEC and NCI have their way and Element 1 is just dropped. Poof, no more code test. There's a good chance that will happen, too. Some would even say it's a slam dunk.

Then suppose a group wants to do away with the Amateur Extra and General licenses and their written tests. Suppose this group says the idea of requiring more written testing against their will simply makes them shudder. Forcing all that theory stuff on them....terrible, just terrible.

Will that make you shudder?

4896. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 02:29:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921222954.07578.00000725@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78406

In article <vmsb8ifukg83ff@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>> Sonny, I've probably done MORE in radio already than you've done in
>> your entire "career" as a hambone...er Ham.
>>
>
>oh, i'm just DIEING to see if he dares say something like "you can't know
>everything I know and how far i've come and where i've been"... oh,
>that's going to be just TOO juicy... bet he does though!
>
Why should he? The person who wrote:

"Sonny, I've probably done MORE in radio already than you've done in
your entire "career" as a hambone...er Ham."

already has.

4897. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 02:52:53 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <8vnsmvk876lqrq2b4amld08qivjfjaspf4@4ax.com>
Source record: 78409

So sad.

To rephrase - the technical abilities of Farnsworth, the gentle persuasive manner of Mike Tyson, and...well, just old. Old and tired - highly trained on a generation of once high-tech equipment that long ago was sold off as surplus. And to have endured the indignity of becoming 'surplus' as well. But here, in this forum, a giant - full of wisdom, and lord over all. Important, once again - and with (probably for the first time in years) - an audience. Folks to disagree with. Folks to control. Folks willing to ask for his advice. Folks willing to submit to his wrath. Power. Vitality. Youth. Importance. Just like long ago. Just the same!

Sad, old man - it's merely a figment of your own creation, not reality, not tangible, and can never bring back the past glory of your career. Or days gone by. But, in here, in the security of this Usenet group, it feels so real....and so much better than the reality of advancing age, and the lifestyle changes that they will ultimately bring.....

Be well, OM

Be well.

Leo

On 21 Sep 2003 22:08:37 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <h22qmvccsjlivdm2td12rb19c71r9lq6nm@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
>writes:
>
>>Friendly fellow - the technical abilities of Farnsworth, and the
>>gentle persuasive manner of Mike Tyson.
>
> I was a "victim" of the KH2D newsgroup behavior many years ago in here.
> I learned to survive.
>
> KH2D is ailing and moved off of Guam. I'm still here.
>
> If you want "civilized debate" and "gentle behavior," join an arts and
> crafts class at a senior center, "Leo."
>
>
>>But, as Nick Pope once said:
>>
>>"Minds are like parachutes; they work best when they are open".

>
> Someone else said: "Open minds often let all the common sense roll
> out."
>
> If I wanted Maxims, I would have gone to the ARRL website.
>
>>Be well,
>
> Get help.
>
> LHA
>

4898. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 02:53:12 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921225312.25905.00000182@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 78410

>It's just not necessary to FORCE people to learn it against thier
>will; it's not at all necessary to modern day use of ham radio.
>

Well then lets just do away with the written. Why should we force someone to
Memorize some Q&As that have no meaning.

4899. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 02:55:34 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921225534.25905.00000184@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 78411

>Nope, that's not the same message. There is a reply to one of my messages
>where I'm almost certain he specifically said two CB'ers. I remember it
>because I doubted at the time two CB'ers would care enough to bet money on
>someone passing a ham license test. Of course, I come from the old school
>where if something doesn't make sense, it's probably not true.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

It doesnt matter. I dont consider a No-Code any better than a CBer, so whats
the difference. Besides, I have the money and the License to prove it.

4900. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 02:58:25 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921225825.25905.00000185@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 78412

>Sadly, Bruce (WA8ULX) isn't an old timer - his license is so new the ink
>isn't even dry yet. He only tries to act like an old timer (or, at least,
>the way he thinks they act). However, most real old timers are a lot more
>civilized (the type of people you would be proud to have as a friend or
>associate).
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Oh is that right, I dont know what you consider and Old Timer, but my first license goes back to 1966. Which by the way is the same Call I have now. I think you must be as Dumb as Clint.

4901. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:03:20 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <YDtbb.50785$Aq2.26951@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78413

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> "Dwight writes:
>> Again, code testing is not, and never has been, solely for
>> the benefit of Amateur Radio (or solely to benefit CW
>> operations on those bands). (snip)
>
> I see. Then perhaps you can tell us how it "benefits"
> photography, cooking, stamp collecting, or any other
> activity which isn't Amateur Radio?
>
> (snip)
>
> And, once again, you fail to mention who or what is
> benefited by it, if not the ARS. Please provide an answer,
> or quite wasting our time with this illogical statement.

Larry, I know you are not so dumb as to not know how Morse Code/CW has fit into the history of Amateur Radio and how Amateur Radio has fit into the other radio services throughout that history. Knowing that, your request above could only be considered factitious. Therefore, I will treat it as such.

> (snip) And, since everything I'm discussing here is related
> ONLY to the Amateur Radio Service, that's the only group
> of Morse/CW users who are being considered by me in any
> of my postings. (snip)

Well, that may be what you're discussing, but I'm discussing Morse Code testing - a discussion which, by it's very nature, cannot be limited to just Amateur Radio. However, if the discussion were limited to just Amateur Radio, your arguments would have no more weight since most ham operators today don't use code/cw on any routine or regular basis. There is little reason to maintain testing for a mode that is seldom used by more than a relatively small minority.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4902. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:03:28 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <642dnT0oT9GL7fOiU-KYuA@gbronline.com>
Source record: 78430

Dick Carroll; wrote in message ...
>
>You made the same error of interpretation that your buddy Bill Sohl
>did. Nowhere within that
>document does it say they want to remove all code testing. If FCC should
>allow a single category of
>HF license to be issued and retain code testing for all others, that
>would satisfy that blurb.
>
>Sorry, that's the way it is.

Some also seem to miss the fact that nowhere does it say that the FCC *must*
eleminate code testing for any class of license. It is only that the IARU
"supports the removal of Morse code testing", it does not state it must be
removed.

4903. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:03:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921230356.28496.00000783@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 78415

In article <vmshkml253u8c2@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>
>"You fools! Don't you know that by living in the past we are best
>prepared to meet the challenges and demands of the future?!?!?!?!"
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT

Well, Clint, you said it, not me! I'm glad you're starting to see the light!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4904. Re: It starts with the basics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:03:56 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921230356.28496.00000782@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 78416

In article <vmsc1d1ec9r858@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>
>If a consumer whines and complains that he should
>be allowed to purchase whatever media type that he
>feels is to his likeing, for whatever reason he states,
>he will of course be labeled as lazy, stupid, dumb,
>and wanting to just have things given to him for free.
>
>After all, it all starts with basics.
>
></reductio ad absurdum>

Clint:

Yup, you've reduced your argument to the level of the absurd, all right! Unfortunately, it didn't prove or disprove anything with regard to code testing requirements in the ARS.

Amateur radio operators have always dealt with the level of technology available at their own particular slice in time. However, the one constant has been the Morse/CW mode, which continues to be a practical, effective, efficient, and universal mode of electronic communication in spite of any and all other modes which have been invented in it's wake. And, as always, radio amateurs are not able to exploit the many benefits and advantages of the Morse/CW mode unless they learn the Morse code. Code testing requirements have always been the means of providing the incentive to do so; in their absence, we will see a decline in the use of this mode in the fullness of time. This is just plain 'ole reality. No tricks of logic will change it, either.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4905. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:03:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921230357.28496.00000785@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 78414

In article <bkkjt0fdh0@208.207.71.148>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>>Let's leave Jimmy Carter out of this.
>>
>>
>>
>
>To say nothing of Slick.

He is self-explanatory.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4906. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:03:57 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921230357.28496.00000784@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 78420

In article <lUqbb.6747$yp6.101434@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>*****
>I particularly love that last paragraph .. they're finally moving from
>the past into, at least, the present.
>
>Carl - wk3c

Carl:

Exactly. In the past, we had challenging and comprehensive licensing
requirements in the ARS, which rewarded the attainment of technical
knowledge and useful operating skill with progressively increasing
operating privileges. In the present, and the future, we will have
thoroughly dumbed-down licensing requirements which give away the
whole enchilada with little or no learning or growth required. So, you're
right -- the IARU has managed to bring the ARS out of our past -- and
there's the pity!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4907. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:03:58 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921230358.28496.00000786@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 78419

In article <20030921163113.12300.00000696@mb-m20.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>>>You mean like becoming president despite a lack of talent, for example?
>>>
>>>
>>
>>Let's leave Jimmy Carter out of this.
>>
>
>You mean the only president to forge a sucessful, lasting Middle East peace
>agreement?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

Peace agreements such as the Camp David accords are not the product of any one man's wisdom or talent. They are carefully constructed documents requiring the work of a large staff of researchers, historians, diplomats, and other government officials. The President just sits there and signs them using a stack of pens while the cameras click away. The fact that there has been nothing but trouble in the Middle East before and since Camp David doesn't speak very highly for that agreement, either. Did it do some good? Sure. But at the end of the day, it didn't even come close to getting the job done. The Palistinians still want to wipe Israel off the map, and the Israelis will stop at nothing to prevent that from happening. This struggle has gone on for centuries, and will last until the end of time. The only thing that could possibly end it would be the total defeat of the whole of the Palistinian people, which, of course, won't happen either. What do YOU suggest?

73 de Larry, K3LT

4908. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:03:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921230359.28496.00000788@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 78417

In article <jKsbb.50589$Aq2.40244@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> Dwight, unless and until you can show us just exactly
>> WHERE the ARS's code testing requirement ***IS***
>> relevant OUTSIDE of the ARS, all you're doing is
>> blowing smoke. And not very dense smoke at that.
>
>
> It isn't relevant to anything outside the Amateur Radio today, Larry.
>That's exactly why there are efforts being made to eliminate the Morse Code
>test requirement. Those efforts extend throughout the world, including the
>recent ITU vote to allow more flexibility on this issue.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dwight:

Well, I'm glad I finally got your attention directed toward reality. If the Morse code isn't relevant to any communications service outside the ARS, then the fact that the commercial and military services have stopped using it isn't relevant or responsive to the issue of code testing withing the ARS. Therefore, by your own admission, the NCTA's prime argument is just so much worthless rhetoric.

The Morse/CW mode remains as a valuable, basic communications tool within the ARS, and the code testing requirement is current and essential to the continued use of this mode. End of story.

73 de Larry, K3LT

4909. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:03:59 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030921230359.28496.00000787@mb-m18.aol.com>
Source record: 78418

In article <zysbb.50569$Aq2.44808@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>Later, when that license requirement is gone, the mode itself becomes the
>focus. At that point, I think many more will be interested in taking a
>second look at code. Obviously, there is no way for me to prove that now,
>but I just have a feeling about this (perhaps the same way you have a
>feeling about the above).

Dwight:

Unfortunately, there is more evidence to support my "feeling" than there is to support yours. With the exception of hams who were trained in Morse code by the military or maritime/commercial radio services, I have yet to meet an avid and active CW user who got that way except through the code testing requirement. And, for what should have been 14 of the best years of my ham radio career, I was one of the "objectors." So, as you say, we can't prove anything now, but I'm not willing to bet that there will be some sort of "epiphany" among former no-coders to go ahead and learn the code and become CW operators when the testing requirement is gone. It just ain't gonna happen!

73 de Larry, K3LT

4910. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:06:31 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bklovn$76m$0@208.207.71.133>
Source record: 78421

N2EY wrote:

>In article <kBqbb.50259$Aq2.16068@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
>
>
>>>>I would insist on an operational test for SSB and FM too besides the
>>>>written. And I would insist that the operationals be conducted by a VE
>>>>
>>>>
>>team
>>
>>
>>>>to an established standard not just a "well he is doing OK" sort of
>>>>
>>>>
>>thing.
>>
>>
>>>You know Dee, there is some real wisdom in that. I think many people
>>>would be served well by having an HF contact - possibly their first -
>>>at the time of testing. It would get that first contact out of the way,
>>>it would possibly calm the person down and be a little bit of fun, and
>>>would really keep people thinking about good on the air procedures and
>>>manners.
>>>
>>>It would also be enjoyable to be on the other side of that QSO. I would
>>>suspect that an Op that was a volunteer "first contact" would be a part
>>>of the VE team.
>>>
>>>What a nice/good idea!
>>>
>>>
>
>I did a writeup on how that sort of test could be done. All it would take is a
>couple of QRP rigs and some dummy loads (wouldn't actually have to be on the
>air).
>
>But NCVEC would have a cow. Too much of a "burden".
>
>
>
>>In Europe, mostly the old Iron Curtain ones, required a certain amount of

>>SWL time. Documented etc.
>>
>>
>
>Even more than that. They required that a prospective ham actually BUILD a
>receiver of a certain complexity from scratch, then use it to receive and log a
>certain number of stations and countries using both 'phone and CW. They'd have
>to explain the receiver's design, construction and operation, too.
>
>Once all that was done, they'd get a beginner's license and authority to build
>a transmitter of a certain complexity and power. Which would then be used to
>make verified contacts in order to earn an upgraded license.
>
>There were also written and code tests, of course. But those tests alone would
>not earn a license - those hams had to build their rigs, then demonstrate
>understanding of their theory and operation as well as actually use the dern
>things.
>
>What a concept.
>
>

What all this shows is the percieved value of ham radio to the
governments involved.
Sure looks like ours is going the other way, fast!

4911. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:07:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921230727.05539.00000929@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 78424

In article <bklj1ortg0@208.207.71.133>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
>>IARU Says "Remove Code", (Excerpted from the ARRL Letter)
>>
>>"The focus was on the future when the International Amateur Radio
>>Union Administrative Council met September 6-7 in Amsterdam,
>>the Netherlands. In the aftermath of WRC-03, the council urged
>>IARU member-societies to call to the attention of their administrations
>>"the desirability of adopting specific changes in their domestic
>>regulations for the amateur and amateur-satellite services, so that
>>they will be consistent with the revised Article 25 of the international
>>Radio Regulations."
>>
>>In that vein, the IARU governing body called for the removal of Morse
>>code as an examination requirement to operate on HF.
>>
>>The council reiterated its stance first taken in 2001 that Morse code
>>proficiency "as a qualifying criterion for an HF amateur license is no
>>longer relevant to the healthy future of amateur Radio."
>>
>>"IARU policy is to support the removal of Morse code testing as a
>>requirement for an amateur license to operate on frequencies below
>>30 MHz," the IARU Administrative Council resolved.
>>
>>*****
>>I particularly love that last paragraph .. they're finally moving from
>>the past into, at least, the present.

>
>You made the same error of interpretation that your buddy Bill Sohl
>did. Nowhere within that
>document does it say they want to remove all code testing. If FCC should
>allow a single category of
>HF license to be issued and retain code testing for all others, that
>would satisfy that blurb.
>
>Sorry, that's the way it is.

BWAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

LHA

4912. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:07:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921230728.05539.00000930@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 78422

In article <vmsa5di2283ef1@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>> Tested morse code proficiency was required by the GOVERNMENT
>> in the early days of radio for the first US radio regulatory agency.
>> Back then, on-off keying codes were the ONLY way to communicate
>> using early primitive radio. The GOVERNMENT's main reason for the
>> code test was so that all radio operators in all radio services could
>be
>> contacted in order to mitigate radio interference.
>>
>> This is the year 2003, not 1912, not 1896, and not 1844 (the first year
>> of commercial code use on the Morse-Vail telegraph system). The
>> FCC stated publicly 13 years ago that the morse code test was NOT
>> a real requirement to determine if an amateur should be licensed. The
>> FCC stated that the only reason for retaining the code test in 1990 was
>> due to ITU-R S25.5.
>
>Len, how DARE you point out the fact that times change and that the needs
>of a public utility and hobby are to change to meet those needs. I think it
>lacks understanding and sensitivity to the feelings of the PCTA gestapo
>on your part to prove that with the passing of years, requirements
>to meed modern demands likewise change.

Careful Clint, lest someone's ANCESTORS rise out of the ground and
smite you down for using the "G-word." :-)
>
>I am flabbergasted; i'm taken aback. I just am overcome with such
>frustration that I do not know what to say.

As the old saying goes, "Schange happens..."

LHA

4913. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:07:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921230729.05539.00000931@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 78423

In article <LEqbb.1563$Hd6.1219722@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
>news:vmsb3m8mon6u82@corp.supernews.com...
>>
>> > The same applies to students of all ages. When an adult goes to
>college,
>>
>> and wasn't it pointed out in an earlier post in this, or another, thread
>> that
>> electrical engineering students aren't required to learn morse code?
>>
>> hmmmmmm.....
>>
>> Clint
>> KB5ZHT
>
>Your incorrect usage of snippage really hurts your comments. My point was
>to show that adults are often required to meet standards set by people who
>are experienced in their field of choice. This means taking courses in
>college for example, that the student may never use. This is similar to
>requiring hams to take and pass code tests.

Newsflash: The FCC was NEVER chartered as an educational organization and the US amateur radio test is NOT an academic achievement.

>Electrical engineering is not ham radio.

Not quite the right wording. Make it: Ham radio is NOT anywhere close to electrical engineering.

>Although they don't study code,
>all of them have to take subjects in which they have no interest and will
>never use otherwise they don't get the degree.

Mommy DEErest, I was USING engineering knowledge at work well before I got my electronic engineering degree. It made classes (most at night) much easier.

I did run into one instructor of the "Prussian General Officer" type who adamantly insisted, in a class on digital logic, that "there is NO such thing as an Exclusive-Or gate." I brought in a quad Ex-Or made by Texas Instruments and showed him. "We will NOT have that in MY class!" he ordered.

This instructor of Asian ancestry was young and had NOT worked in the electronics industry on any digital logic design. Yet, we in the class were not able to use a simple low-level logic device that had been made for over 15 years at that time. I have other examples from my personal experience and that of others in just about every discipline in undergraduate school which do not show a full awareness of academia to that of industry.

Perhaps one out of two electronic engineering instructors at the college/university level MIGHT have worked in the electronics industry at one time. I wouldn't bank on that. One of the excellent ones, whom I've never met, is Dan McCracken, past president of the ACM (I was a member courtesy of IEEE membership).

I digress since: 1. You refuse to acknowledge my postings because I have strong opposite views to yours; 2. You like to play some kind of Mommie DEErest and think that all newcomers to amateur radio are at the level of children.

>Adults are required to do things they don't want to on a regular basis.

Yes, Mommie, but put aside the Mommie suit and THINK in reality. Laws and regulations are NOT required to remain long after their usefulness. That YOU personally like certain regulations is NO imperative that they should be kept, certainly not to any government agency making and enforcing those laws.

Try to remember that US amateur radio is NOT an academic exercise nor is the FCC a college or university administering final exams.

Class dismissed.

LHA

4914. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:07:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030921230748.25905.00000187@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 78425

>It is a puzzle to me why you continue to make a point of "rubbing
>peoples nose in it". Perhaps "well meaning" doesn't apply in your case.
>
>Hans
>

Carl hates CW so much, because he figures his CW, not lack of motavation over the years, had kept him out of HF.

4915. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:29:40 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93FDEEFE3C7B9elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 78426

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in
news:f45722ac.0309211650.25abaa3f@posting.google.com:

> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:<Xns93FD83DA54D0Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>
>> You are now quoting me out of context, snipping everything I agreed
>> with, leaving in the inane joke at the end, and leaving in my
>> apparently agreeing only to that.
>
> I wonder if that's what jack-booted thugs do, if there were such a
> thing?
>
> ;^)
>

I expect so, and there were

4916. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:31:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <g2ubb.50866$Aq2.35980@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78427

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> (snip) Now, then, how does the advocation of code
> testing in any way correlate to bigotry, elitism, and/or
> discrimination against other Americans? (snip)

I'm not going to waste time talking in circles with you, Larry. We just discussed this less than a month ago, so there is little reason to repeat it again.

> Correct, because I don't consider it to be "excessive"
> government regulation. I believe the government has
> a valid need to regulate certain things, especially
> valuable and finite resources such as the RF spectrum.
> Therefore, I believe that when license is to be given for
> the PRIVILEGE of free use of RF spectrum, which is
> worth potentially billions of dollars should it be converted
> to commerce in the commercial utility communications
> and broadcasting industries, certain government
> regulation makes good sense. (snip)

The only thing you didn't explain with that is a government regulation requiring code testing to gain that privilege. In other words, what does code testing have to do with anything you said?

> (snip) First of all, FCC Commissioners are political
> appointees, not necessarily technical experts. They can,
> and do, depend on the advice of professional technical
> experts, who actually formulate and subsequently make
> recommendations on regulatory matters. (snip)

The original premise still stands - there is no code testing requirement at the FCC, either for the commissioners who regulate Amateur Radio or the technical experts they rely on.

> (snip) However, this discussion is about the AMATEUR
> Radio Service. (snip)

No, this discussion is about the code test requirement. How that applies to Amateur Radio is only one part of that discussion.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4917. Re: Why don't I ever hear these complaints about other hams?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:35:34 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <a6ubb.50880$Aq2.14689@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78428

"Len Over 21" wrote:
>
> (snip) We'll have to cease talking territorially here, Dwight. (snip)

Agreed. This newsgroup eats up too much of my time even without the side discussions.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4918. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:42:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6E6FD9.3010304@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78429

Hans Kohb wrote:
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
>
>>*****
>>I particularly love that last paragraph .. they're finally moving from
>>the past into, at least, the present.
>>
>>Carl - wk3c
>
>
>
> Carl,
>
> As you know, I do not support continuing the Morse exam. Other well
> meaning people disagree with me and I respect their disagreement.
>
> It is a puzzle to me why you continue to make a point of "rubbing
> peoples nose in it". Perhaps "well meaning" doesn't apply in your case.

At least I'm not the only person who thinks tthat he is doing that.
Carl apparently LIKES to rub our noses in it. Carl is perhaps the
poorest "winner" I've ever seen.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4919. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:48:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6E7154.50801@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78431

Clint wrote:
>>Wrong again.
>
>
> BZZZZZT, wrong on your part.
>
> There was a whole slew of N-class licenses, I knew several of them...
> N5VSQ, N5XDT, etc.

Your buzzer must be stuck.

You're making an assertion. Can you prove it?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4920. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:51:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6E720E.4000705@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78432

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> news:vmshqqrl5l9e03@corp.supernews.com...
>
>>>Wrong again.
>>
>>BZZZZZT, wrong on your part.
>>
>>There was a whole slew of N-class licenses, I knew several of them...
>>N5VSQ, N5XDT, etc.
>>
>>Clint
>>KB5ZHT
>>
>
> Those calls were not issued on the basis of whether they had or had not
> passed a code test. Those call signs were issued to people who had passed
> General and Technician with code as well as no-code Techs. There is NO way
> to tell from a call sign whether they passed code as the call signs were
> issued on the basis of license class only.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> (an original N call issued when I passed my Tech with code in 1992. I have
> never held a codeless license).

How d'ya think he's going to "BZZZZTT" out of this one Dee? This thread
may be better than the 1/4 wave antenna thread. Maybe time for N2EY to
weigh in one this one.............oh.........wait a second........
Jim must be a no-coder with that call sign. Jim, has Clint outed you? 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

4921. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:53:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6E726B.7070101@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78433

Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
>
> Jim Hampton wrote:
>
>> What? The last call I had before I got out of amateur radio was
>> N2JH. That
>> was *not* a no-code ticket! My licenses were WN2CJV, WB2OSP, WA3RJX,
>> N2JH,
>> and now AA2QA (after deciding to get back into amateur radio and simply
>> testing out in one session - with no code copied between 1969 and 1993
>> except for the fact that I couldn't help but copy the Morse sent in the
>> movie 'Fantastic Voyage'). Starting with WB2OSP, all were extra class
>> tickets at 20 words per minute.
>>
>> 73 from Rochester, NY
>> Jim AA2QA
>>
>>
>> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
>> news:vmsbfn4ng4o3bf@corp.supernews.com...
>>
>>
>>> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
>>> news:20030921180224.05888.00001996@mb-m07.aol.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>> No-Code Licenses should come a designator following there Callsign,
>>>> that
>>>>
>>>
>>> lets
>>>
>>>
>>>> people know there status.
>>>> Such as W5TIT-1, or W5TIT-2, that way we will know if they are Mentally
>>>> Challenged Operator, or a Lazy Operator, 1 being Mental, 2 being Lazy,
>>>>
>>>
>>> that way
>>>
>>>
>>>> we would know which ones not to talk to.
>>>>

>>>
>>> Not up to date on your history, are you?
>>> most PCTA types LIVE in the past, how odd.
>>>
>>> They USE to have no code license designations, starting with "N".
>>> Oops, that was a *fact*.
>>>
>>> Clint
>>> KB5ZHT

> So much for the accuracy of Clint's "facts".

Was there any doubt?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4922. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:55:02 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6E72E5.5080204@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78434

Dee D. Flint wrote:
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:JSrbb.1573$Hd6.1233961@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
>>"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
>>news:vmsi069koi7l44@corp.supernews.com...
>>
>>>hmm, guess all the n-class operators that were
>>>no code technicians many years ago just
>>>"didn't exist"...
>>>
>>>they quit confining them to just n-calls years
>>>ago, though. Figured somebody living
>>>totally in the past with a blind eye to the future
>>>wouldn't know that, though.
>>>
>>>Clint
>>>KB5ZHT
>>
>>N calls were issued to Generals, Techs with code (Tech +), and codeless
>>Techs. It did not indicate whether the person passed a code test or not.
>>
>>When I took my original license testing, I passed the Novice written, Tech
>>written, and code. I was issued an N call (which I still hold today). I
>>never held a codeless license.
>>
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>
>
> To further expand (and you should know this from having studied for the
> exam):
>
> 2x3 calls beginning with W, K and N are assigned to Novice class licensees
> and higher. All the Ws available in the sequential assignment are used up.
> However some vacant calls are available via the vanity program. We are
> currently in the Ks. It will be some time before these are used up. When
> they are, calls will be assigned from the N block.
>
> 1x3 calls beginning with W, K, and N are assigned to Technician (both with
> and without code) class and General class and higher. All the sequentially
> assigned calls have been used up. Some vacant calls are available via the
> vanity program. No distinction in the call sign is based on whether or not
> the Technician has passed the code. So today, new licensees with or without

> code will receive a 2x3 call beginning with K.
>
> 2x2 calls beginning with W, K, and N are assigned to Advanced class and
> higher. Again all the sequential ones are gone and only some vacant calls
> are available via the vanity program.
>
> 1x2 and 2x1 calls beginning with W, K, and N are assigned to Extra class
> only. All the sequential calls are gone but there may be some vacant calls
> available via the vanity program.
>
> 2x1 calls beginning with AA through AL are assigned to Extra class only.
> Again all the sequential calls are gone with perhaps some vacant calls being
> available via the vanity program.
>
> 2x2 calls beginning with AA through AL are assigned to Extra class only.
> These are still available in the sequential assignment and available calls
> may also be requested via the vanity program.
>
> The no-code techs that you know with N calls simply received their calls
> when the N block of 1x3 calls was being used for the Technician (coded and
> no-code) and General class licensees.

Game, set, and Match! Ohh, this will be good to watch the wordsmmithing.
I'll bet it starts with "I never said......

- Mike KB3EIA -

4923. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 03:56:19 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6E7332.1010004@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78435

Clint wrote:

> "Just shut up and march your way up into that cattlecar!"

pathetic, just pathetic

4924. Re: It starts with the basics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 04:00:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922000029.05539.00000933@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 78438

In article <20030921230356.28496.00000782@mb-m18.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>Clint:
>
>Yup, you've reduced your argument to the level of the absurd, all
>right! Unfortunately, it didn't prove or disprove anything with regard
>to code testing requirements in the ARS.
>
>Amateur radio operators have always dealt with the level of technology
>available at their own particular slice in time.

"Spark" is outlawed, Larrah.

>However, the one constant
>has been the Morse/CW mode, which continues to be a practical,
>effective, efficient, and universal mode of electronic communication
>in spite of any and all other modes which have been invented in it's
>wake.

Yes. Takes little brains to learn morse, just a LOT of practice...to find that the rest of the radio world does NOT use it anymore.

Your beloved on-off keying coding is no damn good if you can't get your transmitter to work...and then you have to have another morseman at the other end to understand your monotonic beeping.

The only radio people you can communicate with are other morsemen.

>And, as always, radio amateurs are not able to exploit the
>many benefits and advantages of the Morse/CW mode unless they
>learn the Morse code.

Your "benefits" are imaginary. Your "advantages" are imaginary.

You are trying to sell a product that isn't being bought.

You would do better selling snake oil or used cars.

Come to think of it, you probably ARE...

>Code testing requirements have always been
>the means of providing the incentive to do so; in their absence, we will
>see a decline in the use of this mode in the fullness of time.

Oh, is this an ENVIRONMENTAL or "greenie" issue to you?

If the nasty old government doesn't keep up the code test you won't have anyone to play with on the radio?

>This is just plain 'ole reality.

Yes, Larrah, you show a glimmer of understanding...but cannot understand that you are an endangered species which has NO appreciable impact on the radio ecology.

>No tricks of logic will change it, either.

So, bottom line...YOU want a WELFARE handout by keeping the code test so you can parade around like an amateur pooh-bah.

You're weird, Larrah.

Too much monoxide inhalation on that bus of yours.

LHA

4925. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 04:00:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922000030.05539.00000934@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 78437

In article <8vnsmvk876lqrq2b4amld08qivjfjaspf4@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>So sad.
>
>To rephrase - the technical abilities of Farnsworth, the gentle
>persuasive manner of Mike Tyson, and...well, just old. Old and tired
>-highly trained on a generation of once high-tech equipment that long
>ago was sold off as surplus. And to have endured the indignity of
>becoming 'surplus' as well. But here, in this forum, a giant - full of
>wisdom, and lord over all. Important, once again - and with (probably
>for the first time in years) - an audience.

Tsk, tsk, tsk, you are REALLY a thin-skinned northerner, ey?

And you say you are a "manager" for a living? What of?

I don't think you are one of those, "Leo."

YOU are OLD before your time and were so last week as well.

>Folks to disagree with.
>Folks to control. Folks willing to ask for his advice. Folks willing
>to submit to his wrath. Power. Vitality. Youth. Importance. Just like
>long ago. Just the same!

Tsk, tsk, tsk...Steamy Robeson in drag! :-)

>Sad, old man - it's merely a figment of your own creation, not
>reality, not tangible, and can never bring back the past glory of your
>career. Or days gone by.

Yup another USMC retread who CANNOT TAKE opposite opinion!

What "past days," dumbass anonlymous one?

I'm still in the electronics industry. I just don't have to get up and go
to work every day by the clock and endure a bunch of idiot relatives
of the CEO who bear the title of "manager." :-)

>But, in here, in the security of this Usenet
>group, it feels so real....and so much better than the reality of
>advancing age, and the lifestyle changes that they will ultimately
>bring.....

Hey, "security man," I'm not anonymous, hiding behind a nonsense
web address. YOU ARE.

You can reach me at my mailing address given in HR bylines. Still the same one...and also the same at the FCC ECFS on the RMs petitioning the FCC to drop the code test in the USA.

In the meantime, you blather along like some sad old-timer who wants amateur radio to remain as it was in days long gone by...why?

You must be looking in a mirror when writing all that "sad old man" stuff.

>Be well, OM
>
>Be well.

I am, thank you. YOU should be so lucky.

PUTZ.

Leonard H. Anderson

4926. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 04:00:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922000031.05539.00000935@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 78436

In article <20030921222953.07578.00000724@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030921180828.21642.00001042@mb-m01.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <Crhbb.1424$Hd6.1114311@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
>>Flint"
>><deehays@qix.net> writes:
>>
>>>I and other parents that I know have always required our children to eat
>>>foods that are good for them whether they liked them or not. My children
>>>have always been required to eat what was served whether they liked it or
>>>not. Children were not allowed to dictate the menu.
>>
>> ...and so you act like you are the "parent" in here telling us what we
>> are supposed to like?
>
>Well, considering how often you act like a small child in here, Leonard,
>you're certainly not qualified for that role.

Go to bed, little one...it's past your bedtime.

LHA

4927. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 04:01:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6E744B.7020704@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78439

Brian wrote:
> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:<Xns93FD83DA54D0Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>
>
>>You are now quoting me out of context, snipping everything I agreed with,
>>leaving in the inane joke at the end, and leaving in my apparently
>>agreeing only to that.
>
>
> I wonder if that's what jack-booted thugs do, if there were such a thing?

Missed your other post Alun.

So I'll comment here.

You should have snipped that out, man. It was immediately above your
comment. It wasn't an inane joke. It was over the line, and you repeated it.

Maybe you *don't think PCTA's abuse drugs. Then you should say it.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4928. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 04:05:09 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6E7544.6090102@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78440

Bert Craig wrote:
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030921204134.12300.00000698@mb-m20.aol.com...
>
>>Jimmy Carter may not have been the greatest president this country ever
>
> had but
>
>>he did do some good things.
>
>
> ...and he's continued to do good things as an ex-president.

But that doesn't fit with the way we are "supposed" to think, Bert! ;^)
PC swings both ways.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4929. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 04:08:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922000828.22081.00000785@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 78441

In article <3F6E6FD9.3010304@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Hans Kohb wrote:
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>>
>>
>>>>>>>
>>>I particularly love that last paragraph .. they're finally moving from
>>>the past into, at least, the present.
>>>
>>>Carl - wk3c
>>
>>
>>
>> Carl,
>>
>> As you know, I do not support continuing the Morse exam. Other well
>> meaning people disagree with me and I respect their disagreement.
>>
>> It is a puzzle to me why you continue to make a point of "rubbing
>> peoples nose in it". Perhaps "well meaning" doesn't apply in your case.
>
> At least I'm not the only person who thinks tthat he is doing that.
>Carl apparently LIKES to rub our noses in it. Carl is perhaps the
>poorest "winner" I've ever seen.

Well then, I'll just put YOU down as one of the sorriest LOSERS in
the code test issue!

Your ancestors wouldn't like to see you that way, would they?

LHA

4930. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 04:08:43 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6E761A.3010704@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78442

Leo wrote:
> So sad.
>
> To rephrase - the technical abilities of Farnsworth, the gentle
> persuasive manner of Mike Tyson, and...well, just old. Old and tired
> - highly trained on a generation of once high-tech equipment that long
> ago was sold off as surplus. And to have endured the indignity of
> becoming 'surplus' as well. But here, in this forum, a giant - full of
> wisdom, and lord over all. Important, once again - and with (probably
> for the first time in years) - an audience. Folks to disagree with.
> Folks to control. Folks willing to ask for his advice. Folks willing
> to submit to his wrath. Power. Vitality. Youth. Importance. Just like
> long ago. Just the same!
>
> Sad, old man - it's merely a figment of your own creation, not
> reality, not tangible, and can never bring back the past glory of your
> career. Or days gone by. But, in here, in the security of this Usenet
> group, it feels so real....and so much better than the reality of
> advancing age, and the lifestyle changes that they will ultimately
> bring.....
>
> Be well, OM
>
> Be well.
>
> Leo

Bravo, Bravo! Wonderful post, Leo! This is sheer poetry

- Mike KB3EIA -

4931. FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 04:28:07 UTC
From: robkemp90210@hotmail.com
Message-ID: <6114e4af.0309212028.45f4e122@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78443

http://drudgereport.com/flash3.htm?powell

FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW: 'I HAVE A TIRED FAMILY, TIRED CHILDREN AND A TIRED SPOUSE'
Sun Sep 21 2003 17:25:30 ET

Exclusive Sneak Preview

Michael K. Powell, the embattled chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, appears to be setting the stage for an exit with a candid interview pipelined for Monday runs of the NEW YORK TIMES.

Newsroom sources tell DRUDGE that Powell has gone on-the-record with NYT's Steve Labaton for a wide-ranging explanation of current affairs.

"I have a tired family, tired children and a tired spouse. Candidly, I once said I would be in this job for three years and then leave," Powell explains. "That was three years ago."

"I've been called every name in the book by every opponent in the book," he adds. "That's classic Washington. If you can't get past jingoism, you attack the person. I wish the press would focus on more than who's rebuked and who's rebuking and look at what the best alternatives are for the public in terms of policy."

Labaton was said to be finalizing the text Sunday evening, for a Business section lead, sources tell DRUDGE.

Developing...

4932. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 04:29:59 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6E7B16.2060602@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78444

Leo wrote:
> Clint, that's an interesting collection of thoughts that you have
> there -
>
> On Sun, 21 Sep 2003 17:48:26 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
> dot net> wrote:
>
>
>>But, to answer your question: did you
>>
>>>do something illegal? Of course not. Insensitive, foolish and
>>>intellectually bankrupt, perhaps - none of which are punishable
>>>offences.
>>
>>AH... nice dodge.... as you see, the very point of bringing up
>>the fact that "freedom of speech is frequently curtailed today,
>>such as the following examples..." would ONLY be brought
>>up to imply that what I did was NOT protected by the concept
>>of freedom of speech.
>
>
> Not a dodge at all - you don't need freedom of speech to protect your
> right to rant in public. I guess reading comprehension was dropped
> from the curriculum in your P.S. district early on.....along with
> Civics.

Did you mean civility?

>>I put it to you; if this is NOT the case, if there is NO insinuation
>>of same, then WHY bring up the fact that there are certain
>>extreme cases where free speech is limited or halted, when I claim
>>the right to do so? Just for the purpose of conversation? I think
>>such a claim is paper thin and WEAK at best.
>
>
> Huh? Can you gve an example of when your free speech was curtailed?
> And by whom? Do you hear voices? Did they do it?

As you posted earlier Leo, the claim of suppression of free speech is
alway pulled out whenever the argument is about to be lost - by some.

>>I suspect that the Nazi
>>
>>>(not the euphemistic full 'National Socialist' name that you now use
>>>in this post) reference

>>
>>the two are the same; but I digress, I am not sure what point you
>>are making by trying to distinguish the two
>
>
> Not really - one carries more negative feeelings than the other. As
> you know.
>
>>was used because it was the only card left to
>>
>>>play in an otherwise empty hand.
>>
>>and at THAT point you are no longer discussing fact and are in
>>fact using opinion. The truth of the matter is that the PCTA crowd
>>is long out of factual support and credible reasoning to keep
>>the morse code testing; they abandon any further hopes now
>>with all sorts of dodging tactics- and if, by the way, you find
>>resentment to the use of nazi, I likewise, would find resentment
>>with the discriptions "too lazy", "dumb", "stupid", and "moron".
>>HOWEVER, instead of dropping to the ground and kicking
>>my feet and clenching my fist and screaming as a child does
>>when it's bottle is taken away, I am continueing the debate.
>
>
> ... did you read this before you hit "send" - pretty funny!
>
> ROTFLMAO!

He probably thinks it is correct too, Leo Almmost everyone I know finds "too lazy, Dumb, Stupid, and Moron" to be the moral equivalent of N**I!

>>Due to the atrocities committed
>>
>>>during WW II, the word "Nazi" has severely negative connotations for a
>>>large percentage of the world's population,
>>
>>okay, you get the "DUH" award of the day for that one. KEEN grasp
>>of the obvious.
>
>
> And, therefore, you KNEW what effect this would have on people, yet
> you used it anyway? Oh please....

Of course Clint knows the effects. I see the classic newsgroup "I Wanna Fight" personality here. Come in, pick a side, then try to rip the other side a new backside, so to speak. Dehumanize them a little, call them names, especially the N**I name. Then wait for the outrage and complain that they are trampling on your free speech. Then try to justify your calling them N***S by making comparisons like "This guy called someone stupid, so I can call him a N***, after all, it is the equivalent".

Clint doesn't play well with others, and that is just how he likes it.

>>reaching beyond the
>>
>>>Hogan's Heroes-esque usage that you recognize and reminding them of
>>>the horrors of that regime, for many in a very personal way.
>>
>>believe me, I was not reaching for a humorous or laughable reference.
>>My use of a "will not accept change" analogy was intended at the latter
>>reality of the regime, not the former comedy that you referred to.
>
>
> I see....what reality was that, specifically?
>
>>however, it was your right to enter the conversation, even if you
>>had nothing new factual to add, and you may continue doing so.
>
>
> Thanks! BTW, conversations are carried out in person, discussions
> occur on newsgroups. This was the latter.
>
>>Care to point out the color of the grass and the sky now?
>></reductio ad absurdum>
>
>
> If you mean your point, you have done a better job of reducing it to
> the absurd in this reply that anyone else ever could. Thank you!

Is there a point?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4933. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 04:38:03 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6E7CFA.509@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78445

Clint wrote:
> >
>
>>Huh? Can you gve an example of when your free speech was curtailed?
>>And by whom? Do you hear voices? Did they do it?
>
>
> and I QUOTE...
>
> from leo, on sunday september 21, 2003 @ 10:25am,
>
> <cut and paste>
>
> Good point, Mike. The concept of free speech is a basic tenet in any
> democratic society - one needs only to look as far as the former Iraq,
> where open disagreement with a government policy could buy you a quick
> ticket to the next world, or at the very least a personalized basic
> electricity course.
>
> But free speech does not mean that any simian with a functional larnyx
> is permitted to publicly say anything that he or she wishes - for
> example, the holocaust deniers and the KKK have proved that point
> quite well in recent history. Slander and libel laws are another
> example of limits on 'free speech', intended to mitigate and assign
> accountability for the damage that it can cause if out of control
>
> <end paste>
>
> okay, now, read carefully and LEARN...
>
> My response previously was that I didn't say or do ANYTHING
> that falls within the realm of being controlled by the government.
> I didn't say anything slanderous or that could be called libel.
>
> SO why bring up all that diatribe, especially the second paragraph?
> HM? is there any point to that, other than to insinuate that just
> maybe I don't have the free speech protection to speak my mind?
> or why ELSE bring it up?
>
> You can't dodge your way out of it. It's obvious. You're just
> upset that you were exposed.

Let me get this straight. You are trying to say that the above statement
by Cliff was curtailing your free speech?

So what you are saying is that by Cliff exercising *his* free speech, you are having *your* free speech curtailed? This means that you MUST have the right to say what you want, but those with an opposing view CANNOT speak their mind.

Sorry friend, you are incorrect in your idea of what free speech is, and you do not have the right to curtails another's opinion in response to your opinion.

Curtailment of other's civil rights is not one of your civil rights.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4934. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 04:41:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6E7DB5.8090402@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78446

Dick Carroll; wrote:

> Well, I really *don't* like Brussels sprouts!

I remember when I was a kid, the Brussels sprouts were one of the last things to go in the local gardens in the fall, so us kids would pluck them and use them for throwing at squirrels, the local girls, and other places. In that conext, they wer okay.

And of course, every sprout chucked at a squirrel or a girl was one less we had to eat!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4935. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 04:42:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6E7E01.4040206@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78447

K0HB wrote:
> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
>
>
>>The FCC thinks that Technicians are adequately tested on that, for all
>>authorized modes and technologies. There are no modes or technologies
>>authorized for amateur HF/MF that are not also authorized for amateur VHF/UHF.
>>So there is no absolute need for any of the General or Extra written tests
>>*except* perhaps a few regulatory and propagation questions.
>
>
> Jim, your strawman is aflame, because I just pissed flaming napalm on it. Grow up.

Doggone it Hans! you just made me spit soda out my nose! HOWL!

- Mike KB3EIA -

4936. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 04:49:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6E7F9D.8070805@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78448

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F6DB2DF.6040104@adelphia.net...
>
>>Yaknow, people can be pro-code and no-code and have spirited arguments
>>without accusing each other against crimes against humanity! Or illegal
>>drug abuse.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> You're far more optimistic than I.

I'd wager that if you put all us in a room, we'd get along just fine.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4937. Anyone help. Power supply question.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 04:53:10 UTC
From: dont.sp@m.me
Message-ID: <JohnJamesnew@arrl.org>
Source record: 78449
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I'm setting up my ham station. I just passed my general and I would to be able to operate when I find out what my call is. Do I hook up the red wire from my rig to the plus terminal on the power supply?

My friend, who is a new Extra, says the red wire goes to the minus terminal, but that can't be right because it's opposite of how I hooked my CB. What wire goes where? Thanks

John

4938. Re: Anyone help. Power supply question.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 05:04:53 UTC
From: DAG <nospam@nospam.net>
Message-ID: <Vpvbb.116402$bo1.114956@news-server.bigpond.net.au>
Source record: 78450
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Troll Troll Troll.
Any ham knows that the red and black wires are the antenna. The power goes
in on the big round PAL25 connector.
Jeezz

>

"John James" <dont.sp@m.me> wrote in message news:JohnJamesnew@arrl.org...
>
>
> I'm setting up my ham station. I just passed my general and I would to be
> able to operate when I find out what my call is. Do I hook up the red
wire
> from my rig to the plus terminal on the power supply?
>
> My friend, who is a new Extra, says the red wire goes to the minus
terminal,
> but that can't be right because it's opposite of how I hooked my CB. What
> wire goes where? Thanks
>
>
> John
>

4939. Re: L U S E R !!Re: Use that corrective pack from Microsoft Corp.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 05:06:01 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bko63d$3sae4$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78459
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.space

Only 80 per day??? Shoot, I am getting over 80 per hour in one
account!!!!!!!!!!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Chuck Harris" <cfharris@erols.com> wrote in message
news:bkhjcj$as8$1@bob.news.rcn.net...
> I use linux too, but I still get my ISP's mailbox stuffed
> with the results of this trojan horse. About 80 a day.
>
> -Chuck, WA3UQV
>
> Fred Garvin wrote:
> > On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 04:48:59 -0400, Scott Schrader wrote:
> >
> >
> > >>fool copied the Swen virus into these groups. I pity the fool.......
> >
> >
> >
> > > Fuck 'em, I use Linux.
> >
> >
> > > Windows sucks donkey balls.
>

4940. Re: Anyone help. Power supply question.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 05:31:24 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F6E8929.3000801@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 78301
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

John James wrote:

>I'm setting up my ham station. I just passed my general and I would to be
>able to operate when I find out what my call is. Do I hook up the red wire
>from my rig to the plus terminal on the power supply?
>
>My friend, who is a new Extra, says the red wire goes to the minus terminal,
>but that can't be right because it's opposite of how I hooked my CB. What
>wire goes where? Thanks
>
>
I'm an extra "lite" :-) and the red wire is usually the positive, and
black the negative return.
But I wouldn't depend on anything posted in the r.r.a.p. group, so
either RTFM (if
you have it), or ask over in r.r.a.equipment

assuming that this isn't a troll. But most trolls usually go for "know
code = no ham" or such....

4941. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 06:05:54 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkm3g2$p5m$0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 78302

Mike Coslo wrote:

> K0HB wrote:
>
>> n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
>>
>>> The FCC thinks that Technicians are adequately tested on that, for all
>>> authorized modes and technologies. There are no modes or technologies
>>> authorized for amateur HF/MF that are not also authorized for
>>> amateur VHF/UHF.
>>> So there is no absolute need for any of the General or Extra written
>>> tests
>>> *except* perhaps a few regulatory and propagation questions.
>>
>>
>>
>> Jim, your strawman is aflame, because I just pissed flaming napalm on
>> it. Grow up.
>
>
> Doggone it Hans! you just made me spit soda out my nose! HOWL!

Gotta wonder what Hans has been drinking.....

4942. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 06:07:55 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bko63e$3sae4$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78460

I think that these licenses we have should be retested every so often, such as every ten years! All applicable elements for the respective licenses including the morse code test. Most every other license out there issued requires some form of retesting. At least this way we will find out if anyone has learned anything along the way or not... And it could be that if you were, for example a 20wpm Extra, you would have to pass all the elements required for that back then, or the license class you would have/get would be whatever elements a person DID pass on the retest. Definitely would show if anyone bothered to "grow" in the ten year period.

Ryan, KC8PMX

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:J4ibb.1430$Hd6.1121315@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309210431.172e0f7d@posting.google.com...
> > I disagree that it is reasonable. First, there is no other pass/fail
> > mode test. If there were, then your assertion that it was reasonable
> > would not fail so badly.
> >
>
> If it were practical to set up and administer pass/fail tests on other
> modes, I would certainly support doing so. It is unfortunate that it is
> only practical to administer code testing and written testing.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

4943. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 06:11:28 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bko63g$3sae4$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78461

No.... more like the Frank Burns character from the tv show M*A*S*H! :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX

"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in message
news:vmoo7i26j2tife@corp.supernews.com...
> Does this mean the PCTA are more like Colonel Clink, or
> Sargeant Schultz?
>
> Clint
>
> --
>
> --
>
> A quote from Paul Cook, a typical "understanding
> and tolerant" liberal...
>
> ">People like you really have no place in a civilized society although
that
> >same society does try to accommodate you. You're basically an idiot who
> >takes advantage of what a society has to offer each and every single day
> yet
> >you refuse to acknowledge its cost or its benefits to you. "
>
>
> Facts are to socialists what crosses are to vampires
>
> --
> "Vince Fiscus, KB7ADL" <vlfiscus@mcn.net> wrote in message
> news:H_Oab.295774$2x.85373@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> > "Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote in news:vmnaife87u3a24
> > @corp.supernews.com:
> >
> > > just don't EVER speak your mind when it comes to
> > > morse code testing, unless it's to the effect that you
> > > LOVE it and couldn't live without it.
> > >
> > > You have to put on the jackboots of the CW police
> > > and march in goosestep with the CW nazis, or
> > > you'll get bashed a good one with a morse code
> > > key.
> > >
> > > Clint

> > > KB5ZHT
> >
> >
> > Hey! Stand up and salute when you say that...
> >
> > Then shine my boots!
> >
> >
> > KB7ADL
> >
> >
>
>

4944. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 06:30:58 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkm4v2$s1t$0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 78303

Len Over 21 wrote:

>In article <3F6E6FD9.3010304@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>writes:
>
>
>
>>Hans Kohb wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>>>>*****
>>>>I particularly love that last paragraph .. they're finally moving from
>>>>the past into, at least, the present.
>>>>
>>>>Carl - wk3c
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>>Carl,
>>>
>>>As you know, I do not support continuing the Morse exam. Other well
>>>meaning people disagree with me and I respect their disagreement.
>>>
>>>It is a puzzle to me why you continue to make a point of "rubbing
>>>peoples nose in it". Perhaps "well meaning" doesn't apply in your case.
>>>
>>>
>> At least I'm not the only person who thinks tthat he is doing that.
>>Carl apparently LIKES to rub our noses in it. Carl is perhaps the
>>poorest "winner" I've ever seen.
>>
>>
>
> Well then, I'll just put YOU down as one of the sorriest LOSERS in
> the code test issue!
>
> Your ancestors wouldn't like to see you that way, would they?
>
> LHA

>

In the history of r.r.a.p there has NEVER bee n a sorrier loser than
Leonard H. Anderson.
Don't take my word for it, just Google him and see for yourself.

4945. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 06:33:30 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkm53q$s1t$1@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 78304

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Bert Craig wrote:
>
>> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>> news:20030921204134.12300.00000698@mb-m20.aol.com...
>>
>>> Jimmy Carter may not have been the greatest president this country ever
>>
>>
>> had but
>>
>>> he did do some good things.
>>
>>
>>
>> ...and he's continued to do good things as an ex-president.
>
>
> But that doesn't fit with the way we are "supposed" to think,
> Bert! ;^) PC swings both ways.

Jimmie Carter had, and still has, good intentions. But you know what's
paved with good intentions.
It's a shame, but they just won't hold off the evil that's always there.
For that it take teeth and the will to use them.

4946. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 06:36:11 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkm58r$s1t$2@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 78305

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
>>
>>
>> Jim Hampton wrote:
>>
>>> What? The last call I had before I got out of amateur radio was
>>> N2JH. That
>>> was *not* a no-code ticket! My licenses were WN2CJV, WB2OSP,
>>> WA3RJX, N2JH,
>>> and now AA2QA (after deciding to get back into amateur radio and simply
>>> testing out in one session - with no code copied between 1969 and 1993
>>> except for the fact that I couldn't help but copy the Morse sent in the
>>> movie 'Fantastic Voyage'). Starting with WB2OSP, all were extra class
>>> tickets at 20 words per minute.
>>>
>>> 73 from Rochester, NY
>>> Jim AA2QA
>>>
>>>
>>> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
>>> news:vmsbfn4ng4o3bf@corp.supernews.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
>>>> news:20030921180224.05888.00001996@mb-m07.aol.com...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> No-Code Licenses should come a designator following there
>>>>> Callsign, that
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>> lets
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> people know there status.
>>>>> Such as W5TIT-1, or W5TIT-2, that way we will know if they are
>>>>> Mentally
>>>>> Challenged Operator, or a Lazy Operator, 1 being Mental, 2 being
>>>>> Lazy,
>>>>>

>>>>
>>>>
>>>> that way
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> we would know which ones not to talk to.
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> Not up to date on your history, are you?
>>>> most PCTA types LIVE in the past, how odd.
>>>>
>>>> They USE to have no code license designations, starting with "N".
>>>> Oops, that was a *fact*.
>>>>
>>>> Clint
>>>> KB5ZHT
>>>
>
>> So much for the accuracy of Clint's "facts".
>
>
> Was there any doubt?

N ot as far as I was concerned. BrianB seemed to think so. But that's
Brian. You know how he is.

4947. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 06:41:01 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkm5ht$tc2$0@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 78306

JJ wrote:

>Dick Carroll; wrote in message ...
>
>
>>You made the same error of interpretation that your buddy Bill Sohl
>>did. Nowhere within that
>>document does it say they want to remove all code testing. If FCC should
>>allow a single category of
>>HF license to be issued and retain code testing for all others, that
>>would satisfy that blurb.
>>
>>Sorry, that's the way it is.
>>
>>
>
>Some also seem to miss the fact that nowhere does it say that the FCC *must*
>eleminate code testing for any class of license. It is only that the IARU
>"supports the removal of Morse code testing", it does not state it must be
>removed.
>
>
>

I notice a *lot* of spin from the ham radio press in the direction of
removing code testing that isn't supported in the documentation of WRC
and others.

Wonder what their agenda might be? (heh)

4948. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 06:42:44 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkm5l4$tc2$1@208.206.142.70>
Source record: 78307

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Hans Kohb wrote:
>
>> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>>
>>> *****
>>> I particularly love that last paragraph .. they're finally moving from
>>> the past into, at least, the present.
>>>
>>> Carl - wk3c
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> Carl,
>>
>> As you know, I do not support continuing the Morse exam. Other well
>> meaning people disagree with me and I respect their disagreement.
>>
>> It is a puzzle to me why you continue to make a point of "rubbing
>> peoples nose in it". Perhaps "well meaning" doesn't apply in your case.
>
>
> At least I'm not the only person who thinks tthat he is doing
> that. Carl apparently LIKES to rub our noses in it. Carl is perhaps
> the poorest "winner" I've ever seen.
>
>

I think you've misread Carl. He's the poorest loser I've ever seen.

4949. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 07:16:32 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bko63h$3sae4$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78462

I'm all for NSI (No Squash International) or NBSI (No Brussel Sprouts International)

Ryan KC8PMX

> > How about NBI - NO Broccoli International?
> >
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
> >
>
> I LIKE broccoli. Let's make it NO Peas International.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

4950. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 07:29:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <2xxbb.55604$NM1.15231@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78308

"WA8ULX" wrote:
>
> Oh is that right, I dont know what you consider and
> Old Timer, but my first license goes back to 1966.
> Which by the way is the same Call I have now. I
> think you must be as Dumb as Clint.

Oh, my mistake. So you are one of those old timers Eddie was talking about. It was an honest mistake - your behavior is more like an ill-mannered teenager than an adult, so I just assumed you were acting your age. Instead, you're old man acting your mental age.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4951. Re: Anyone help. Power supply question.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 07:44:21 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <pLxbb.55746$NM1.17363@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78309
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"John James" wrote:
>
> I'm setting up my ham station. I just passed my general
> and I would to be able to operate when I find out what
> my call is. Do I hook up the red wire from my rig to
> the plus terminal on the power supply?
>
> My friend, who is a new Extra, says the red wire goes
> to the minus terminal, but that can't be right because it's
> opposite of how I hooked my CB. What wire goes
> where? Thanks

Cross posted to multiple newsgroups, a dumb question, and a mention of CB in the same message. This has got to be a troll. But, in case it isn't, unless someone has messed with the wiring, the red wire almost always goes to the positive (+).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4952. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 08:00:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <L_xbb.55767$NM1.29008@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78310

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> Unfortunately, there is more evidence to support
> my "feeling" than there is to support yours. With
> the exception of hams who were trained in Morse
> code by the military or maritime/commercial radio
> services, I have yet to meet an avid and active
> CW user who got that way except through the
> code testing requirement. (snip)

Of course, that's mainly because the code testing requirement has been there longer than most of us have been alive. With that in mind, obviously most today would be CW users as a the result of code testing.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4953. Re: Anyone help. Power supply question.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 08:24:27 UTC
From: Ron Hardin <rhhardin@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <3F6EB1BD.3923@mindspring.com>
Source record: 78311
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

They're colored so you put the right wire on the voltmeter on them.
Just match the color.
--
Ron Hardin
rhhardin@mindspring.com

On the internet, nobody knows you're a jerk.

4954. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 08:59:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net>
Message-ID: <ERybb.56243$NM1.55651@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78312

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> Well, I'm glad I finally got your attention directed
> toward reality. If the Morse code isn't relevant to
> any communications service outside the ARS, then
> the fact that the commercial and military services
> have stopped using it isn't relevant or responsive
> to the issue of code testing withing the ARS.
> Therefore, by your own admission, the NCTA's
> prime argument is just so much worthless rhetoric.

But, as you well know, the code testing requirement was originally established exactly because code was once relevant to the military, government, and commercial services outside Amateur Radio. Since that has now changed, it is clearly time to question the need for a unique testing requirement for this one operating mode. Since most ham operators today don't use code on a regular basis, there is also little need within Amateur Radio to maintain a testing requirement for this one operating mode. All that has led to the efforts now being made to eliminate the Morse Code test requirement.

> The Morse/CW mode remains as a valuable, basic
> communications tool within the ARS, and the code
> testing requirement is current and essential to the
> continued use of this mode. End of story. (snip)

But, as much as you'd like it to be, that is not the end of the story, Larry. Because so few use it, the mode now plays only a relatively minor role within the Amateur Radio Service. Therefore, code testing is not essential to the Amateur Radio Service. Further, without outside factors (the needs of the other services) to consider, the FCC itself has no significant interest today in maintaining the "continued use of this mode" within the Amateur Radio Service. As far as the FCC is concerned, it is now just one more operating mode among the many used within the Amateur Radio Service. There is no sufficient argument to support the continued existence of a code testing requirement. As such, the code testing requirement should be eliminated.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

4955. Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 09:52:32 UTC
From: 20 WPM <20wpm@arrl.com>
Message-ID: <vmthirclu0qc6d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78313
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

1. Have yet to learn the code.
2. NCI Members.
3. Lack technical skills to setup a station.
4. Bootlegging CB'ers.

As long as Echolink keeps the above mentioned off of the HF Bands, I'm all for Echolink.

4956. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 10:29:46 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922062946.21642.00001060@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78314

In article <wFsbb.52192$NM1.11709@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030921142942.12501.00002585@mb-m04.aol.com...
>> In article <c777ab1364e2b7954c18183cd420d781.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>,
>"Hans
>> K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
>>
>> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
>> >> Then answer this question: Why should people who are not interested in
>> >> building or fixing their radios have to learn all that theory stuff
>> >> for the written tests? Why are all hams tested on all sorts of stuff
>> >> they are not interested in?
>> >
>> >Because the terms of their license make them responsible for the quality
>> >of their radiated signal(s).
>>
>> Maybe. But a ham is not required to actually know how his/her equipment
>works,
>> nor to be able to work on it. Just for the result.
>
>If you firmly believe hams don't need to know theory, then
>petition the FCC to end theory knowledge as a test requirement.

There's a difference between "need to know" and "should know".

>If you don't then your argument is just a means to divert
>the issue to arguing a different subject.

No, Bill, it's not a diversion. It's making a point.

Hams today don't *need* to know much theory in order to operate modern manufactured equipment. That's a plain, simple fact.

And most of what theory they do *need* to know is tested by the 35 question Tech test. FCC thinks that's adequate - in fact, back in 2000, FCC reduced the test requirements for Tech from 2 tests/65 questions.

I think hams *should* know more theory than just the bare minimum required to pass the Tech test, though. But that's just me.

I also think that hams *should* know Morse code - at least at a basic level. But that's just me.

The idea that hams should be tested on Morse code at even a basic level has been called "welfare for a mode", "forcing it down people's throats", various

nazi imagery, etc. So that must logically apply to requiring hams to test for more theory than they *need* to know.
>
>> I'm not required to know how my cars work, just how to use them safely. I >am
>> "responsible", however, to see that they meet all applicable DMV >requirements,
>> including pollution and safety equipment. I can do the work myself or have >it
>> done by others. The same is true for ham equipment.
>
>I repeat my comment from above.

Me, too.
>
>> The FCC thinks that Technicians are adequately tested on that, for all
>> authorized modes and technologies. There are no modes or technologies
>> authorized for amateur HF/MF that are not also authorized for amateur >VHF/UHF.
>> So there is no absolute need for any of the General or Extra written tests
>> *except* perhaps a few regulatory and propagation questions.
>
>I repeat again.

ditto
>
>> >Without demonstrating some familiarity with the basic underlying
>> >science, it would be irresponsible of the regulators to allow an
>> >applicant to establish a radio transmitting station on the public
>> >airways.
>>
>> See above about Technicians.
>>
>> And here's another point: There's almost nothing in the tests about some
>> technologies that hams are allowed to use. For example, vacuum tubes - not >very
>> much in the tests about them! Yet FCC *trusts* hams who want to use vacuum >tube
>> technology to learn what they need to know about it and operate their >equipment
>> responsibly. So why all the tests?
>
>Ditto my last :-) :-)
>
Exactly.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4957. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 10:41:57 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309220241.32057797@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78315

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030921225312.25905.00000182@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >It's just not necessary to FORCE people to learn it against thier
> >will; it's not at all necessary to modern day use of ham radio.
> >
>
> Well then lets just do away with the written. Why should we force someone to
> Memorize some Q&As that have no meaning.

Which is exactly how you did it.

4958. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 11:14:21 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkmli0$lg2@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 78316

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:zysbb.50569$Aq2.44808@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > Perhaps, but the accuracy of those judgments are
> > definitely affected by having had those experiences,
> > or not. Someone who has never experienced a
> > house fire, a terrorist attack, life under a tyrannical
> > dictator, or a business failure is certainly capable
> > of making the entirely incorrect judgment about any
> > of the above. (snip)
>
>
> Gladly, we don't live in a trial and error world today. I would hope the
> bridge designer would have enough knowledge to build a safe bridge without
> having to watch one (perhaps this one) fall down first. People can learn
> about the specifics of a subject without personally experiencing every
> aspect of it. We generally trust that system for a great many things in
this
> world today (for example, the bridges we routinely drive over).
>
>
> > I do not disagree. However, experience has shown
> > that people who aren't required to be code tested
> > usually don't bother to learn and use the Morse
> > code, so the issue does relate to code use, only to
> > the extent that the lack of a requirement would tend
> > to cause a decline in the use of the Morse/CW mode
> > in the fullness of time.
>
>
> If that were true, I think a test requirement is the worst way to
> accomplish what you're seeking. Instead, a better solution is to find ways
> to attract new people to that aspect of ham radio. You're obviously not
> going to have much success with that effort today because "no coders" have
> made their choice about code while focusing solely on the license
> requirement (the license requirement dominates the issue in their minds).
> Later, when that license requirement is gone, the mode itself becomes the
> focus. At that point, I think many more will be interested in taking a
> second look at code. Obviously, there is no way for me to prove that now,
> but I just have a feeling about this (perhaps the same way you have a
> feeling about the above).
>
>

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Besides which, there is no requirement "that people who aren't required to be code tested usually don't bother to learn and use the Morse code." So, it is a non-issue when discussing the topic.

Kim W5TIT

4959. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 11:21:51 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkmm02$2th@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 78317

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F6E7F9D.8070805@adelphia.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F6DB2DF.6040104@adelphia.net...
> >
> >>Yaknow, people can be pro-code and no-code and have spirited arguments
> >>without accusing each other against crimes against humanity! Or illegal
> >>drug abuse.
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >
> >
> > You're far more optimistic than I.
>
>
> I'd wager that if you put all us in a room, we'd get along just fine.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

You and me? Sure. Jim/N2EY and I? Sure. Brian and I? Sure. Here's who I wouldn't even consider being in the same room with: Larry Roll, Dick Carroll, Dan/W4whatever, Dave Heil, Waddles (Waddles is non-existent in my book), and that's just a few. I have no desire to "get along" with people like that.

Kim W5TIT

4960. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 12:29:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922082910.25905.00000201@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 78318

>Which is exactly how you did it.

Wrong, I knew the info, which really bugs you. Its a shame you cant memorize enough correct answers to pass the EXTRA.

4961. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 12:29:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922082954.23171.00000931@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 78320

In article <3F6E720E.4000705@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>Dee D. Flint wrote:
>> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
>> news:vmshqqrl5l9e03@corp.supernews.com...
>>
>>>>Wrong again.
>>>
>>>BZZZZZT, wrong on your part.
>>>
>>>There was a whole slew of N-class licenses, I knew several of them...
>>>N5VSQ, N5XDT, etc.
>>>
>>>Clint
>>>KB5ZHT
>>>
>>
>> Those calls were not issued on the basis of whether they had or had not
>> passed a code test. Those call signs were issued to people who had passed
>> General and Technician with code as well as no-code Techs. There is NO way
>> to tell from a call sign whether they passed code as the call signs were
>> issued on the basis of license class only.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>> (an original N call issued when I passed my Tech with code in 1992. I have
>> never held a codeless license).
>
> How d'ya think he's going to "BZZZZTT" out of this one Dee?

Clint is simply mistaken.

>Maybe time for N2EY to
>weigh in one this one

See above. Dee's information is correct.

FCC has *never* differentiated between code-tested and non-code-tested
Technician callsigns.

Also, with one exception, there has never been any requirement for a ham to
change callsigns when upgrading license class. That one exception, now long
gone, was the requirement to give up the Novice "N" or "V".

>..............oh..........wait a second........
>Jim must be a no-coder with that call sign. Jim, has Clint outed you? 8^)

Nothing to be "outed" from!

I have held this callsign since 1977, when it was sequentially issued. Before that I held WA3IYC, and before that, WN3IYC.

--

And while we're on the subject of callsigns...

I recall reading here recently that someone with a 2x3 WA8 call claimed to have held that same call since 1956. That's not correct, because FCC did not issue WA8 prefix calls that far back.

Perhaps I read that post wrong.

73 de Jim, N2EY

4962. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 12:30:35 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922083035.25905.00000202@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 78319

> So you are one of those old timers Eddie was talking
>about.

Eddie doesnt have a Clue, so it doesnt matter what he thinks.

4963. Re: Anyone help. Power supply question.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 12:33:34 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922083334.25905.00000203@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 78321
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

>My friend, who is a new Extra, says the red wire goes to the minus terminal,

Hes right do it that way

4964. Re: Anyone help. Power supply question.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 12:35:53 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922083553.25905.00000204@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 78322

> But, in case it isn't,
>unless someone has messed with the wiring, the red wire almost always goes
>to the positive (+).
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>

Dwight doesnt have a CLue, dont listen to him, hes only trying to confuse you, remember hes only a Tech.

4965. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 12:39:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922083958.25905.00000208@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 78323

>I recall reading here recently that someone with a 2x3 WA8 call claimed to
>have
>held that same call since 1956. That's not correct, because FCC did not issue
>WA8 prefix calls that far back.
>
>Perhaps I read that post wrong.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
Jim you either mis-read, or it was a typo, what ever it was, it should have
said 1966.

4966. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 13:34:17 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <ddntmvk84l4ej4k7dfnfb961s630lrobgi@4ax.com>
Source record: 78324

Thanks, Mike.

It is indeed unfortunate that this gentleman is in a situation where he needs to behave like this. However, he is a product of our great society - we place a very high value on education, training, and youth, and retire folks out of the mainstream when they get old. Men work hard all of their lives to become experts in their field, then retirement hits and - well, nothing. No job, no responsibility, and for many, no sense of value. Especially in the technical fields, where equipment and software becomes obsolete in under a year - it doesn't take long before one's knowledge is outdated, today. Browse through Fair Radio's catalog, and you will see a vast array of equipment that was once state-of-the-art. Years ago, thousands of men trained for countlesss thousands of hours on the maintenance and installation of this gear. Now, it's suitable only for anateurs, collectors, experimenters or parts. And, the men who maintained it are no longer required either - in effect, they have become surplus too.

On Retirement Day, and for the rest of our lives past that point, our realm of control is very small. Society has surplussed us, too - and we sit idle. With the knowledge that it will never be as it was again. And the future? Just the end of life's road, looming in the distance, ever closer. A lifetime of knowledge and abilities begins to decay with lack of use, as does mental capacity, reading comprehension, eyesight and even the ability to get up and move around freely. Frustration and despair begin to set in - after all, it's not going to get any better....there is no Fountain of Youth to wash away the years.

So, what is the man to do? Visit with relatives, hang out at the Legion, or the Y, or find a Senior's group, and wait - for the end. A lot of folks quietly do just that, and accept the reality of the autumn years. Some, like our friend, become bitter and annoyed, and believe that, since they have 'paid their dues' (military service, career, taxpayer, etc.), that the world 'owes' them something. You see this type of senior citizen at your local grocery store - impatient, butting in line, handling the vegetables then putting them back - you know. This sort of behaviour only alienates them further (would you want him over for dinner on Thanksgiving? - that would be fun! "Hey, @#$%^%+&, pass the #$%^^%$ potatoes, you #$%^&*$), and thereby decreases the number of friends in an already diminished pool. Death and illness take care of other old friends - and new ones sure aren't easy to make when you're bitter and angry.

Enter Walter Mitty - remember that story, about an average guy who found release in his daydreams of being a hero? Our friend has found that, through the medium of Usenet, he can become anything he wants - if he says he is, then he is. De facto. Here, he can regale us with tales of working on vast classified electronic communications networks, spaceflight systems, or anything else that he chooses - and who can dispute it? Maybe he did. Maybe he sat in the back of a Jeep operating a GRC-14 for four years at Pendleton, or sorted boots - here, in the wonderful world of Usenet, he could be the guy who showed John Glenn how to realign the radios on Friendship 7 with an old toothbrush and some tinfoil. Who can disagree? Who is this guy? Who knows?

Next, comes aggression. A big personality needs aggression - Natures' own defense against those who challenge authority, and risk exposure of the real person within - like the Wizard, in the Wizard of Oz (big aggression, great curtain - little guy!). In the military, boot camp DI's use this technique to the exclusion of all others, controlling by intimidation alone. It works - one can deal with logic and reason, but raw power and agression create fear - which cannot be dealt with using intelligence alone. This technique serves well here too, as an insulator against those who would probe and question. Here, the best defense is a good offense - vigourously and frequently applied.

There are two ways to argue a point - argue the subject, or attack the person that you are argiung with (the latter is called "ad hominem" - as old as time itself. Often used during political campaigns :)). Arguing the subject is easily done when sufficient knowledge is available to make points and counterpoints. It is best done calmly, civilly and in the true interest of learning the other guy's point (and maybe adopting it, or modifying your own stance a bit - after all, rarely is anyone 100% correct!). When you are being overwhelmed, however, and your self esteem is being threatened by a strong opponent with a solid arguement, you have three choices: agree, agree to disagree, or fight. Rational, educated people usually choose from the first two options. Fight is the mechanism that you see here - attack everything that you can about the person themselves, in the hope that they will back down and stop arguing altogether. Victory by acclamation - no more arguer, no more arguement. This takes a strong man to go in person, and one need only visit the local bar late on a Friday night to see it in action.

On Usenet, though, a small, old man can become larger than life by just pushing the keys on his keyboard, and letting his imagination go wild. Instant hero. Or expert. Or genius and inventor. One need only visit this newsgroup, as I did, to observe this phenomenon! And, if you check the group, you will see in his reply to my posting below that he is lashing out at what he thinks that he knows about me - 'manager', Northerner, youth ("old before my time") - like a punch-drunk boxer, swinging wildly at anything. "Raging Bull" - type stuff. But, he knows absolutely nothing about me, so all he can do is bellow and rage. Very frustrating, I'm sure....swinging wildly at

shadows....

So, what's the Defense? None required. Why argue with the guy?
Sure, he needs the confrontation to feed his ego, but that's not going
to happen at my expense. He can say anything he wants, but he cannot
get to me unless I let him. In this way, I remain in control.
Intelllect always triumphs over agression when physical violence is
removed from the equation. For example - a 130-pound Lieutenant
controlling a platoon of armed grunts - if they could attack him
physically whenever they diagreed with him, his authority over them
would be negated. But, that's not an option, (or a good one, anyway -
some heavy penalties to think about there....) so they do what they're
told, without question.

Feel sorry for our friend instead - but for the grace of God, that
could be you, or me, or someone we care about someday in the future!

73, Leo

On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 04:08:43 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>> So sad.
>>
>> To rephrase - the technical abilities of Farnsworth, the gentle
>> persuasive manner of Mike Tyson, and...well, just old. Old and tired
>> - highly trained on a generation of once high-tech equipment that long
>> ago was sold off as surplus. And to have endured the indignity of
>> becoming 'surplus' as well. But here, in this forum, a giant - full of
>> wisdom, and lord over all. Important, once again - and with (probably
>> for the first time in years) - an audience. Folks to disagree with.
>> Folks to control. Folks willing to ask for his advice. Folks willing
>> to submit to his wrath. Power. Vitality. Youth. Importance. Just like
>> long ago. Just the same!
>>
>> Sad, old man - it's merely a figment of your own creation, not
>> reality, not tangible, and can never bring back the past glory of your
>> career. Or days gone by. But, in here, in the security of this Usenet
>> group, it feels so real....and so much better than the reality of
>> advancing age, and the lifestyle changes that they will ultimately
>> bring.....
>>
>> Be well, OM
>>
>> Be well.
>>
>> Leo
>
>
> Bravo, Bravo! Wonderful post, Leo! This is sheer poetry
>

> - Mike KB3EIA -

4967. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 14:09:06 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns93FE6741EF2F4elektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 78325

Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in
news:3F6E744B.7020704@adelphia.net:

> Brian wrote:
>> Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com> wrote in message
>> news:<Xns93FD83DA54D0Celektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>...
>>
>>
>>>You are now quoting me out of context, snipping everything I agreed
>>>with, leaving in the inane joke at the end, and leaving in my
>>>apparently agreeing only to that.
>>
>>
>> I wonder if that's what jack-booted thugs do, if there were such a
>> thing?
>
>
> Missed your other post Alun.
>
> So I'll comment here.
>
> You should have snipped that out, man. It was immediately above your
> comment. It wasn't an inane joke. It was over the line, and you
> repeated it.
>
> Maybe you *don't think PCTA's abuse drugs. Then you should say it.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

Maybe I should have snipped it out. I didn't take it seriously.

4968. Re: It starts with the basics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 14:23:35 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmu1fi857m223@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78326

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030921230356.28496.00000782@mb-m18.aol.com...
> In article <vmsc1d1ec9r858@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> computron dot net> writes:
>
> >
> >If a consumer whines and complains that he should
> >be allowed to purchase whatever media type that he
> >feels is to his likeing, for whatever reason he states,
> >he will of course be labeled as lazy, stupid, dumb,
> >and wanting to just have things given to him for free.
> >
> >After all, it all starts with basics.
> >
> ></reductio ad absurdum>
>
> Clint:
>
> Yup, you've reduced your argument to the level of the absurd, all
> right! Unfortunately, it didn't prove or disprove anything with regard
> to code testing requirements in the ARS.

HEY! I what made you think I was referring to code testing??? HMM?
not ONE word referring to morse code in there was included. Just
what in there made you think that I was talking about profeciency
testing of morse code? I could have SWORD I was referring to
the use of 8-track tapes.

Maybe because your mind saw the accurate analogy; the human brain
is well suited for just such a task, and you just ADMITTED a simularity
by merely bringing it up yourself.

By the way, all I did was substitute "8-track tape" for CW, basically..
so, explain to me, just HOW is it not an accurate analogy for
morse code testing?

Simply because you DON'T want it to be. That's all.

YOU had to buy, use and listen to 8-track tapes; therefore,
you think EVERYBODY should have to be trained in the use of
them and show profeciency and a working knowledge of 8-track
tapes.

The analogy was simply, easy, clear, precise... and the way in which
you QUICKLY picked up on what I was doing, obviously
successful.

>
> Amateur radio operators have always dealt with the level of technology
> available at their own particular slice in time.

until now... when a portion of them are bound and determined to freeze
it to 1952, or 1912, or whenever.

However, the one constant
> has been the Morse/CW mode,

(1) it's not a constant; the definition of a constant is something that
never changes with time. CW use has been declining, therefore,
it's not a constant. The velocity of the speed of light through a
vacuum is a constant. It is always a definable, tangable,
measurable value. The proliferation of morse code use is NOT.

(2) the only reason that morse code TESTING has lasted as long
as it has is due to it's forced impostion by dictation of the government
entity that oversees communication within the boundries of the
united states, supported by a shrinking portion of the ham radio
population that endeavors to perpetuate the testing of same.

which continues to be a practical,

so is shoeing a horse. Is the testing of one's skill at shoeing a horse
necessary to ride one, much less drive a car?

> effective, efficient, and universal mode of electronic communication
> in spite of any and all other modes which have been invented in it's
> wake.

and this is supportive evidence that code testing should be perpetuated...
WHY?

And, as always, radio amateurs are not able to exploit the
> many benefits and advantages of the Morse/CW mode unless they
> learn the Morse code.

I will not deny that... nor can anybody on this planet learn the benifits
and advantages of the use 8-track tapes unless they learn about it.
Now, why should there be a government mandate forcing a person
to learn how to use it? I'm sure there are some producers of
8-track tapes that, many years ago, would have LOVED to have
this happen. Hmm..... wonder what that sounds like........

Code testing requirements have always been
> the means of providing the incentive to do so;

self-fulfilling argument

in their absence, we will
> see a decline in the use of this mode in the fullness of time.

and if this is so, what business is it of yours, or ANYBODY's,
to DICTATE what people should and shouldn't do? If I play
the devil's advocate and agree with you, then just what

rationalization is there to "8-track tapes will disappear if we
do not force people to first undergo testing to USE them
before they are allowed to listen to prerecorded music!"?

This is
> just plain 'ole reality. No tricks of logic will change it, either.

Ah, you think logic is a trick. Well, therein lies your problem,
and I believe you share that with the rest of the PCTA
world.

EXPOSED!

Clint
KB5ZHT

4969. Re: It starts with the basics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 14:30:43 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmu1stcjq0qd35@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78327

>
> "Spark" is outlawed, Larrah.

Hey, that's just a trick of logic!
how DARE you bring up a fact!

> Yes. Takes little brains to learn morse, just a LOT of practice...to
> find that the rest of the radio world does NOT use it anymore.

yea, and he tried to claim morse code was a "constant". Heh.....

> You are trying to sell a product that isn't being bought.

That is the real core of the problem, RIGHT THERE..

"if morse code testing is not continued, it's use will
decline and eventually disappear"... WELL, then, it sounds
as they they are ADMITTING that they are trying to
force people to use something they may not otherwise
do.

They also come into conflict with the other half of the
morse code-o-philes that say "you don't HAVE to use it,
once you pass the test, that's up to you."

well, how do those two arguments logically coexist? they
can't....

(1) If we don't make test for it, then you won't learn
about it, then you won't ever use CW on the air.

and THEN....

(2) you don't have to use it on the air if you don't want
to. You just need to pass a test showing you can.

>
> You would do better selling snake oil or used cars.
>
> Come to think of it, you probably ARE...

that's exactly what they're doing. EXACTLY... except
one step worse; they are saying that if the government
doesn't force you to try snake oil, whether or not you
don't want to, then you won't ever learn about it and
thus snake oil use will disappear.

well, snake oil use HAS... and WHY? enough said.

The more the pro-coders argue, the more thier (non)logic
is exposed, the more then the amatuer society sees the
real truth and agenda behind it, and the more that will
steadily migrate to the modern era... they already are,
but the process will just be quickened. That's why I defy
any statement that accuses me of "not wanting the pro-coders
to speak thier mind".. on the CONTRARY, I want them
to talk and talk and talk and talk... I want them to keep
trying to reason why a person must be forced to consume
a non-competitive product.

It actually makes our job easier.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4970. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 14:37:29 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmu29jkq905u3f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78328

>
> Well then lets just do away with the written. Why should we force someone
to
> Memorize some Q&As that have no meaning.

Oh, it's TOO easy, but i'm going to do it anyway.

The written IS necessary so that people learn what IS necessary for
ham radio, particularly the rules. Streamline the written? yes... in fact,
there
really doesn't need to be anymore to testing knowledge than saftey and
regulations.... after that point, you're doing nothing than spinning off
into
some certain angle of specialization. The world of information is basically
without limits, therefore, it's not anymore logical to test for the
profeciency
of morse code than it is to test whether you know the exact lenght of what
a dipole is; the slippery slope then takes you to the unlimited number of
antennas that are possible in every possible exceptional situation where
changes would have to be made from operating that antenna from the norm...
and, to say the least, the test book would be 3 inches thick. THEN you
on elsewhere.

However, the written test as it is is VERY applicable to MODERN day
radio needs; the testing of a mode of communication that has been found,
in a free and open market that is influenced only by market forces, to be
getting phased out on nearly all levels of operation and possibilities of
application.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4971. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 14:38:51 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmu2c4t5gv3j75@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78329

>
> Which is exactly how you did it.

I don't understand the reference, I do not know that
fellow well enough... did he get an auto-upgrade do
to testing changes or something?

Clint
KB5ZHT

4972. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 14:39:47 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmu2dtff7cr09d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78330

>
> pathetic, just pathetic
>

yes. Any bovine mentality applied to ham radio regulations,
or any other, for that matter, IS just pathetic.

but you guys just jab away with your cattleprods anyway,
don't you.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4973. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 14:41:42 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkn1n6$hk7$0@208.207.71.149>
Source record: 78331

Leo wrote:

>Thanks, Mike.
>
>It is indeed unfortunate that this gentleman is in a situation where
>he needs to behave like this. However, he is a product of our great
>society - we place a very high value on education, training, and
>youth, and retire folks out of the mainstream when they get old. Men
>work hard all of their lives to become experts in their field, then
>retirement hits and - well, nothing. No job, no responsibility, and
>for many, no sense of value. Especially in the technical fields,
>where equipment and software becomes obsolete in under a year - it
>doesn't take long before one's knowledge is outdated, today. Browse
>through Fair Radio's catalog, and you will see a vast array of
>equipment that was once state-of-the-art. Years ago, thousands of men
>trained for countlesss thousands of hours on the maintenance and
>installation of this gear. Now, it's suitable only for anateurs,
>collectors, experimenters or parts. And, the men who maintained it
>are no longer required either - in effect, they have become surplus
>too.
>
>

Gotta luv it!!! Loose :Lemon Lennie, surplussed out in 1953! HAW HAW HAW!!!!

4974. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 14:44:35 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmu2mv5iglpr7b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78332

>
> You made the same error of interpretation that your buddy Bill Sohl
> did. Nowhere within that
> document does it say they want to remove all code testing.

Well, if he did in fact cut and paste, or quote verbatim, then the following
statement ....

"as a qualifying criterion for an HF amateur license is no
>longer relevant to the healthy future of amateur Radio."

is, actually, JUST that.

I often wonder about the people that read documentation and
somehow use a twist of either comprehension or logic to overlook
what is being read.... just like the same people that read
UN resolution 678 and UN resolution 1441 and somehow
overlook that the united nations both KNEW saddam hussein
had WMD's in 1991 as well as 2001, and overlook that they
said any UN member nation may use "Any necessary means"
to enforce the two resolutions should saddam not comply with
them..... they actually read those documents and say "it
does not say that!"

but, the resolutions "did".
WORDS MEAN THINGS

Clint
KB5ZHT

4975. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 14:46:32 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmu2qievaus2e1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78334

>
> Some also seem to miss the fact that nowhere does it say that the FCC
must
> eleminate code testing for any class of license. It is only that the IARU
> "supports the removal of Morse code testing", it does not state it must be
> removed.
>
>

correct. But it does at least show proof of another organization that no
longer
unilaterally and unquestioningly supports it's continued testing, and also
takes
away from the argument that the 5wmp test needs to be perpetuated to meet
internationaly law.

Oh, and at least YOU acknowledge that they said "supports the removal"...
your fellow PCTA type Dick Carroll somehow just can't read that.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4976. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 14:47:48 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmu2sukvj5ne1b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78335

>
> I notice a *lot* of spin from the ham radio press in the direction of
> removing code testing that isn't supported in the documentation of WRC
> and others.
>
> Wonder what their agenda might be? (heh)
>

quoting documentation and official paperwork/letters is fact, not spin.

what SPIN includes is reading that documentation that was quoted and saying
that the international organization does NOT support it's removal, when, um,
it *does*.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4977. Re: EchoLink and Hurricane Isabel

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 14:48:55 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F6F0BD7.9FA133B4@ptt.edu>
Source record: 78336
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> the technical smarts to deal with new technologies like Echolink and
> IRLP (which is connected to Echolink, BTW).

It way have been connected during the emergency, but there are some basic differences between the two. IRLP is REPEATER LINKING. This does not mean using your PC as a radio like Echolink. You are not allowed to connect to IRLP with a computer, you must use a radio.

I don't use echolink because I cannot be guaranteed a radio on the other end. I haven't used IRLP much because it's fake skip. I can talk real skip on my old 11 meter radio. It's not legal, but you can't stop mother nature.

P.S. I use all radios, Ham, MURS, FRS, CB, scanners, SWL, cellphone, etc. TV sucks. I don't watch it.

4978. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 14:49:56 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmu30vdtv647d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78337

>
> It is a puzzle to me why you continue to make a point of "rubbing
> peoples nose in it". Perhaps "well meaning" doesn't apply in your case.
>
> Hans

perhaps you are confusing "rubbing peoples nose in it" with "haveing a
strong desire not to allow an inaccurate spin be placed upon the topic",
as well as "not wanting a misrepresentation of the facts to go without
a balancing, differing opinion".

Clint
KB5ZHT

4979. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 14:52:35 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <T0Ebb.6810$yp6.111741@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 78333

"Hans Kohb" <k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:d637413962fc29c05122efcd088c4126.128005@mygate.mailgate.org...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
> > *****
> > I particularly love that last paragraph .. they're finally moving from
> > the past into, at least, the present.
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
>
>
> Carl,
>
> As you know, I do not support continuing the Morse exam. Other well
> meaning people disagree with me and I respect their disagreement.
>
> It is a puzzle to me why you continue to make a point of "rubbing
> peoples nose in it". Perhaps "well meaning" doesn't apply in your case.
>
> Hans

Hans,

I simply stated that I "love that paragraph ... etc." ... indicating
that I'm pleased with the IARU Administrative Council's
policy decision.

That is simply a fact (the expression that I'm glad the IARU is
becoming more progressive).

If you *choose* to interpret that as "rubbing peoples' noses in
it" I can't help that.

Carl - wk3c

4980. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 14:54:30 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmu39glkjgjk50@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78338

> Carl hates CW so much, because he figures his CW, not lack of motavation over
> the years, had kept him out of HF.

It's sad if he literally hates it. It's fun; it's interesting. I enjoy it. My many first QSL
cards were recieved from a CW contact.

However, I , with a capital I, like it, as in MYSELF... I chose to do it. I enjoy
it and excersize my right to do so. I do not see a well-founded need to FORCE people to learn it.

Perhaps, if carl really DOES hate it as you claim, he does so because of the multitudes of people forceing him to drink the coolaid that he does not want to.
The ONLY people that will really enjoy morsecode after having been MADE to learn it are the people that would have enjoyed it in the first place. I find
it very difficult to believe, and human psychology does not support such a claim,
that by MAKING somebody do something that they do not want to is
a very powerful motivator. I'm not quite sure you had a cheering, happy, jubilant, joyous and celebratory crowd of people dragging blocks of concrete around for hundreds of years to produce the pyramids; rather, i'm sure one million lashes of one million whips probably got it done.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4981. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 14:56:33 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmu3dc5uoiohad@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78339

> Well, Clint, you said it, not me! I'm glad you're starting to see the
light!
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I, I see your point.
I will be the absolute BEST driver of a modern internal combustion engine-
driven automobile if I first take a blacksmith's apprenticeship and learn
to shoe a horse.

Yes. Quite logical.

Clint
KB5ZHT

4982. Re: 3894500 Hz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 15:01:15 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F6F0EBB.7ABBE182@ptt.edu>
Source record: 78340
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

BIG AL whined:
>
> IT BECAME MY PRIVATE FREQUENCY YEARS AGO. HO HO . STAY AWAY UNLESS INVITED
> PORKBUTT.

Explicitly stated in Part 95 & Part 97:

"No frequency shall be reserved for the exclusive use of any station."

Reread your rule book.

4983. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 15:05:11 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkn337$ml3$0@208.207.71.149>
Source record: 78341

Dwight Stewart wrote:

>
>
>>The Morse/CW mode remains as a valuable, basic
>>communications tool within the ARS, and the code
>>testing requirement is current and essential to the
>>continued use of this mode. End of story. (snip)
>>
>>
>
>
> But, as much as you'd like it to be, that is not the end of the story,
>Larry. Because so few use it, the mode now plays only a relatively minor
>role within the Amateur Radio Service.
>

Well, Dwight, you just showed the exctent of your knoweldge of the
subject. NONE!
Obviously you have no HF receiving capability and likely just as much
interest,
and just choose to adopt the standard NCI mantra. An even cursury tuning
across
the lower end of any low HF band any evening will show to be 180
degrees out
of phase with reality.

You do know about phase relationships don't you?

DON'T YOU??

> Therefore, code testing is not
>essential to the Amateur Radio Service. Further, without outside factors
>(the needs of the other services) to consider, the FCC itself has no
>significant interest today in maintaining the "continued use of this mode"
>within the Amateur Radio Service. As far as the FCC is concerned, it is now
>just one more operating mode among the many used within the Amateur Radio
>Service. There is no sufficient argument to support the continued existence
>of a code testing requirement. As such, the code testing requirement should
>be eliminated.
>
>
>

Quite an opinion you have there, Dwight. Too bad it's not accurate nor
anywhere near universally shared among other hams, particularly among

hams who actually know something about Cw, and even it.

4984. Re: Anyone help. Power supply question.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 15:12:08 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F6F1148.8F3E7006@ptt.edu>
Source record: 78342
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >My friend, who is a new Extra, says the red wire goes to the minus terminal,
>
> Hes right do it that way

Thanks for proving you're a trolling alpha-hotel.

4985. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 15:42:10 UTC
From: K3UD <K3UD@charter.net>
Message-ID: <220920031042106978%K3UD@charter.net>
Source record: 78343

In article <20030921022842.11891.00000978@mb-m11.aol.com>, Larry Roll K3LT <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:

> In article <f45722ac.0309200340.4cea8bf@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Forever thinking of Kim, aren't you?
>
> Brian:
>
> I think about everyone in this newsgroup, particularly the "regulars" who
> have been here for a number of years. The truth is, in spite of our
> numerous and passionate disagreements, I don't think there's anyone
> here that I wouldn't like to know in person -- including Kim, and you!
> I think of time spent here as time spent with friends, and I can't help
> but to wonder if everyone else sees it the same way. Tonight, as in
> many nights in the past, I found myself composing, then quickly
> deleting, several posts aimed at certain people which contained my
> usually acerbic tone. In other words, I'm starting to wonder just
> exactly what I, and we, are all doing here, and what it all means. I
> can't honestly say that I'm ever going to change my mind about
> anything here, but I also have come to realize that in all likelihood,
> nobody else will, either. However, the way in which we disagree is
> something upon which we all should reflect, and I don't exclude myself
> from that.
>
> Things are happening in my life that are causing me to consider the
> more eternal ramifications of everything I do. I know that I am not
> perfect, and that I, like most other people, am able to fall into the
> pattern of allowing my lesser nature to come to the surface. And
> while I cannot make a credible promise to not allow that to happen
> anymore, I can at least occasionally take the time to stop and
> reflect upon it, and take stock of my own behaviour.
>
> I would like to think that if it were ever possible for all of us to meet
> in person, that that meeting would be both pleasant and enjoyable.
> And, as we continue to batter each other's opinions, I think it is
> necessary to realize that we are not necessarily battering each
> other personally. Whether or not the nature of Usenet tends to
> make our reactions to each other impersonal by nature, it does
> bear keeping in mind that there is another human being at the
> other end of our rhetoric. I know that I want to be treated as such,
> and I will try to keep that in mind when reacting to the rest of you.

>
> Just some food for thoughtâ□¦any and all comments welcome.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry,

Although not very active here anymore, I did drive through Dover this summer and gave you a call on all the repeaters I could get into. I think it would be fun and interesting to meet you and the others in person.

73
George
K3UD
(ex W3GEO - WA3DNC)

--

4986. Re: 3894500 Hz

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 15:51:35 UTC
From: Lou <Spamfree@Spamfree.com>
Message-ID: <r_Ebb.28$LJ5.3733@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 78344
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Radioman" <radio@ptt.edu> wrote in message
news:3F6F0EBB.7ABBE182@ptt.edu...
>
>
> BIG AL whined:
> >
> > IT BECAME MY PRIVATE FREQUENCY YEARS AGO. HO HO . STAY AWAY UNLESS
INVITED
> > PORKBUTT.
>
>
> Explicitly stated in Part 95 & Part 97:
>
> "No frequency shall be reserved for the exclusive use of any station."
>
> Reread your rule book.

He would, but ass holes can't read! So, it won't happen! As I said, the only thing big on him is his mouth.. well maybe his ass too! The question begs again to be asked... a troll??? Nah... ASS HOLE.

4987. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 16:22:11 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309220822.197f434@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78345

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030921230729.05539.00000931@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <LEqbb.1563$Hd6.1219722@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> >news:vmsb3m8mon6u82@corp.supernews.com...
> >>> >Your incorrect usage of snippage really hurts your comments. My point was
> >to show that adults are often required to meet standards set by people who
> >are experienced in their field of choice. This means taking courses in
> >college for example, that the student may never use. This is similar to
> >requiring hams to take and pass code tests.
>
> Newsflash: The FCC was NEVER chartered as an educational
> organization and the US amateur radio test is NOT an academic
> achievement.

Even Bigger Newsflash: The FCC EXPECTS a certain degree of "self
training" from the Amateur Service, and hence it's requirement of
Amateur licenses which demonstrate increased knowledge with each
class.

It's right there in Part 97...read it for yourself, Mr.
Anderscum.

> >Electrical engineering is not ham radio.
>
> Not quite the right wording. Make it: Ham radio is NOT anywhere close
> to electrical engineering.

Even "more right" wording, Lennie: Make it: CERTAIN "electrical
engineers" are not able/capable/willing to pass even the most basic of
Amateur licenses despite the fact that even the most basic license
grants access to over 97% of all Amateur allocations.

> >Although they don't study code,
> >all of them have to take subjects in which they have no interest and will
> >never use otherwise they don't get the degree.
>
> Mommy DEErest, I was USING engineering knowledge at work well
> before I got my electronic engineering degree. It made classes (most
> at night) much easier.

An item that I am sure applies to Amateur Radio POLICY in SOME
regard...Lord knows that LENNIE would never violate his own newsgroup
rules-of-engagement.

> I did run into one instructor of the "Prussian General Officer" type
> who adamantly insisted, in a class on digital logic, that "there is NO
> such thing as an Exclusive-Or gate." I brought in a quad Ex-Or made
> by Texas Instruments and showed him. "We will NOT have that in
> MY class!" he ordered.

QUICK! A Medal of Night School Honor for Lennie!

> This instructor of Asian ancestry...(SNIP)

Of course his "ancestry" was pertinent...To a bigot, that is...

> (UNSNIP)...was young and had NOT worked in
> the electronics industry on any digital logic design. Yet, we in the
> class were not able to use a simple low-level logic device that had
> been made for over 15 years at that time. I have other examples
> from my personal experience and that of others in just about every
> discipline in undergraduate school which do not show a full
> awareness of academia to that of industry.

Still waiting for the fade-in to how this is pertinent to Amateur
Radio POLICY.

> Perhaps one out of two electronic engineering instructors at the
> college/university level MIGHT have worked in the electronics industry
> at one time. I wouldn't bank on that. One of the excellent ones, whom
> I've never met, is Dan McCracken, past president of the ACM (I was a
> member courtesy of IEEE membership).

Nope...Not here either...

> I digress...(SNIP)

Of course you do. You have NOTHING of any PERTINENT value of
construct to offer, so we are treated to yet another LenniRiffic
dissertation on how LENNIE saved the radio world through superior
firepower...

>...(UNSNIP)since: 1. You refuse to acknowledge my postings because
> I have strong opposite views to yours; 2. You like to play some kind
> of Mommie DEErest and think that all newcomers to amateur radio are
> at the level of children.

Ummmmm...THAT would be YOU, Lennie...Of course you extend that
exact same kind of "treatment" to Amateurs who are not only tenured in
the Amateur Service, but who also share like skills, knowledge or
experiences as you...

But in your LenniRiffic mind, NO ONE can be even remotely as good
as you...It's unthinkable...(thankfully ONLY by you)

> >Adults are required to do things they don't want to on a regular basis.
>
> Yes, Mommie, but put aside the Mommie suit and THINK in reality.
> Laws and regulations are NOT required to remain long after their

> usefulness. That YOU personally like certain regulations is NO
> imperative that they should be kept, certainly not to any government
> agency making and enforcing those laws.

But YOU seem to think certain rules and regulations DON'T apply
to you, Lennie...why is that? Were you granted some sort of
dispensation by the Vatican to ignore them?

> Try to remember that US amateur radio is NOT an academic exercise
> nor is the FCC a college or university administering final exams.

You are the only one making even a suggestion that it is,
Lennie...

Why is it YOU make the assertion then spend days arguing about
it?

Mrs Lennie still not got that problem fixed? Can't stand to go
upstairs?

> Class dismissed.

Not by you, it isn't.

Steve, K4YZ

4988. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 16:25:58 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309220825.3f85aab9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78346

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030921180828.21642.00001042@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> In article <Crhbb.1424$Hd6.1114311@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint"
> <deehays@qix.net> writes:
>
> >I and other parents that I know have always required our children to eat
> >foods that are good for them whether they liked them or not. My children
> >have always been required to eat what was served whether they liked it or
> >not. Children were not allowed to dictate the menu.
>
> ...and so you act like you are the "parent" in here telling us what we
> are supposed to like?

Ahhhhhhhhh yes...Here's Lennie trying to dictate to yet another
subset of Americans on a subject which he has very strong opinions yet
of which he has no practical experience...

You've been asked before, Lee-o-nard...Now here it is again...What
is YOUR experience in childrearing?

Steve, K4YZ

4989. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 16:40:00 UTC
From: Bob Brock <bbrock@i-america.net>
Message-ID: <7d9umvsc6ffk657ft959u0utbf3obfevtm@4ax.com>
Source record: 78347

On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 01:57:16 +0000 (UTC), "Hans Kohb"
<k0hb@earthlink.net> wrote:

>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote
>
>> *****
>> I particularly love that last paragraph .. they're finally moving from
>> the past into, at least, the present.
>>
>> Carl - wk3c
>
>
>Carl,
>
>As you know, I do not support continuing the Morse exam. Other well
>meaning people disagree with me and I respect their disagreement.
>
>It is a puzzle to me why you continue to make a point of "rubbing
>peoples nose in it". Perhaps "well meaning" doesn't apply in your case.
>
>Hans

No...something along these lines would be "rubbing peoples nose in
it."

BWAHHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA

4990. Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 16:44:08 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309220844.31291566@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78348

>>In article <20030920184429.14837.00003106@mb-m03.aol.com>,
lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:

> Sonny, I've probably done MORE in radio already than you've done in
> your entire "career" as a hambone...er Ham.

WHOA, PUTZBREATH!

Where are YOUR accomplishments in AMATEUR RADIO...?!?!

> You have PLAYED for years at ham radio, using ready-made
> equipment, not really understanding what goes on behind your
> ready-made front panels. Where are YOUR accomplishments in
> amateur radio, your name posted as anywhere involving advancing
> anything of the amateur state of the art? On FIDONET? Words,
> self-glorifying yourself. On this newsgroup? More words, more
> self-glorifying of yourself...plus an extreme amount of patronizing
> "I am your moral superior" preacher without a church.

GEEEEEEEZUS, Lennie!

Pretty deep in the POT/KETTLE/BLACK mode today, aren't ya?

I've done some searches on "Leonard Anderson" and "Amateur Radio"
and with the exception of YOUR self-glorifying, self gratifying
pronouncements of moral superiority of all OF Amateur Radio, the
search comes up a BIG FAT ZERO.

Yes...we all know about the few articles you wrote in "Ham
Radio"...It still amounts to only a fraction of zero.

(BTW...Several of us were gathered at the "CQ" magazine booth at
the Huntsville, AL Hamfest last month, and your name was the subject
of great laughter and joking...So there lies YOUR contribution to
Amateur radio!)

> Any you've done what? Playing with your radios, doing your beeping thing
> the same as what was done by amateurs a half century ago or a full
> century ago? What kind of "new technology" is on-off keying code use?
> Who are you trying to fool other than children, fool?

This forum is about AMATEUR RADIO.

It is NOT about Army relay stations in the 1950's, PLMRS, the
IEEE or your SWLing of the aeronautical bands and an expired
student-pilot permit over four decades old...

Morse Code communications is a part of Amateur Radio. That is a fact.

And despite the amount of effort you put in to trying to make Larry look like that's ALL he does, you fail miserably.

YOU are STILL a liar.

YOU are STILL unlicensed.

YOU are STILL an outsider looking in. Please wipe the drool off of the window when you're done. It's embarrassing.

And..oh yeah...You're STILL a PUTZ.

Have a Nice Day.

Steve, K4YZ

4991. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 17:43:15 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6F3504.8080803@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78349

Clint wrote:
>>pathetic, just pathetic
>>
>
>
> yes. Any bovine mentality applied to ham radio regulations,
> or any other, for that matter, IS just pathetic.
>
> but you guys just jab away with your cattleprods anyway,
> don't you.

You posted "Just shut up and march your way up into that cattlecar!"

Could be I was wrong. Perhaps after your references to a particular group of people who used to get rid of undesirables by marching them into cattle cars and then getting rid of them, you might understand why I thought you were making a continuing reference.

After all, people can make mistakes, Clint. Just like your "codeless callsigns, eh?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4992. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 17:47:40 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <r1bumvssnqb92cf76si49g4m68gc8pjv2a@4ax.com>
Source record: 78350

Steve,

I'm afraid that you may be treating our friend Len rather harshly. After all, he is both a septagenarian and an ex-military man, who served his country with great pride and dignity in the post-WW II era.

But now, he is getting on in years - and may be suffering from dementia, or Tourette's syndrome (the obscene outbursts are a definite indicator that this may be at play), or a whole host of other maladies which affect the aged, and may negatively impact his ability to relate to society. But, we do owe him a debt of gratitude for his service to his country, defending North America from the Communist menace back in the 1950's. He is probably quite frustrated that, although once a respected member of society, he has been cast aside like the comms equipment he once lovingly cared for. Surplus. Forgotten. Unwanted. $199.98 plus freight from Ohio. (as is - Used / Tested is extra).

We need to remember that Len may be someone's grandfather, or brother, or husband, or ice cream delivery man, and that although he is very much Semper Fi, life unfortunately is not. Perhaps that is why he lashes out. Tries so hard to associate with those he wishes he was - hams, electronics technicians - like that doofy kid from Peoria you knew back in grade school, who wanted so badly to play football with the kids in his new school, but was treated like an outcast by the kids, because he wasn't from your town. Perhaps he just wants to be a part of life again. Life is infinitely more complex than it was in Len's day - imagine trying to program a Samsung VCR with only R-808 third-tier maintenance training to fall back upon - My God. And yet, in some ways things have become simpler than could ever be imagined - who would have believed that a group of 1950's soldiers trained to operate a complex 1 KW microwave transmitter could be replaced with a single button marked "COOK"? That is disconcerting, I'm sure.

Ah...to be useful again. To be renewed! To escape from the "Island Of Lost Toys".

But he doesn't know how - the journey is arduous and difficult, and it has been so long...so very long...and lonely...

We should help him find his way! Extend the hand of friendship to our lost brother. Buy him a MFJ Morse Code Oscillator With Key for Christmas. Or something..... :)

73, Leo

On 22 Sep 2003 09:44:08 -0700, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote:

>>>In article <20030920184429.14837.00003106@mb-m03.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>> Sonny, I've probably done MORE in radio already than you've done in
>> your entire "career" as a hambone...er Ham.
>
> WHOA, PUTZBREATH!
>
> Where are YOUR accomplishments in AMATEUR RADIO...?!?!
>
>> You have PLAYED for years at ham radio, using ready-made
>> equipment, not really understanding what goes on behind your
>> ready-made front panels. Where are YOUR accomplishments in
>> amateur radio, your name posted as anywhere involving advancing
>> anything of the amateur state of the art? On FIDONET? Words,
>> self-glorifying yourself. On this newsgroup? More words, more
>> self-glorifying of yourself...plus an extreme amount of patronizing
>> "I am your moral superior" preacher without a church.
>
> GEEEEEEEZUS, Lennie!
>
> Pretty deep in the POT/KETTLE/BLACK mode today, aren't ya?
>
> I've done some searches on "Leonard Anderson" and "Amateur Radio"
>and with the exception of YOUR self-glorifying, self gratifying
>pronouncements of moral superiority of all OF Amateur Radio, the
>search comes up a BIG FAT ZERO.
>
> Yes...we all know about the few articles you wrote in "Ham
>Radio"...It still amounts to only a fraction of zero.
>
> (BTW...Several of us were gathered at the "CQ" magazine booth at
>the Huntsville, AL Hamfest last month, and your name was the subject
>of great laughter and joking...So there lies YOUR contribution to
>Amateur radio!)
>
>> Any you've done what? Playing with your radios, doing your beeping thing
>> the same as what was done by amateurs a half century ago or a full
>> century ago? What kind of "new technology" is on-off keying code use?
>> Who are you trying to fool other than children, fool?
>
> This forum is about AMATEUR RADIO.
>
> It is NOT about Army relay stations in the 1950's, PLMRS, the
>IEEE or your SWLing of the aeronautical bands and an expired
>student-pilot permit over four decades old...
>
> Morse Code communications is a part of Amateur Radio. That is a
>fact.
>

> And despite the amount of effort you put in to trying to make
>Larry look like that's ALL he does, you fail miserably.
>
> YOU are STILL a liar.
>
> YOU are STILL unlicensed.
>
> YOU are STILL an outsider looking in. Please wipe the drool off
>of the window when you're done. It's embarrassing.
>
> And..oh yeah...You're STILL a PUTZ.
>
> Have a Nice Day.
>
>Steve, K4YZ

4993. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 18:01:57 UTC
From: MD <ve3tmt@yahoo.ca>
Message-ID: <sOGbb.2342$qu4.204411@news20.bellglobal.com>
Source record: 78352
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"W7TI" <noway@nohow.com> wrote in message
news:j6ermvgs0q3mt67h82b4f4c0ia8httd2ef@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 22:57:12 -0400, "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote:
>
> >Since when did it become a "private" frequency? The H.F. Frequencies used
> >for Ham operation are open to any one with the proper class of license to
> >use them. O
>
> ____
>
> Does the word "troll" have any meaning to you?
>
> He trolled, you bit, he's happy.
>
> --
> Bill, W7TI
>

Yup, It's so much easier to add him to the kill file.

4994. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 18:04:04 UTC
From: MD <ve3tmt@yahoo.ca>
Message-ID: <rQGbb.2343$qu4.204942@news20.bellglobal.com>
Source record: 78354
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"W7TI" <noway@nohow.com> wrote in message
news:j6ermvgs0q3mt67h82b4f4c0ia8httd2ef@4ax.com...
> On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 22:57:12 -0400, "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote:
>
> >Since when did it become a "private" frequency? The H.F. Frequencies used
> >for Ham operation are open to any one with the proper class of license to
> >use them. O
>
> ____
>
> Does the word "troll" have any meaning to you?
>
> He trolled, you bit, he's happy.
>
> --
> Bill, W7TI
>
Got to admit though Bill, it would be fun to back over him in a humvee!

4995. Re: Ireland

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 18:04:10 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6F39EB.70300@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78351

Leo wrote:
> Thanks, Mike.

> There are two ways to argue a point - argue the subject, or attack the
> person that you are argiung with (the latter is called "ad hominem" -
> as old as time itself.

Ahh, such as when I'm called Hockey Puck, Drug abusing, Mentally
(deranged I believe) and the other insults I've long ago forgotten?

> So, what's the Defense? None required. Why argue with the guy?

I do not. As my first attempt dissolved into his claims that I was
trying to squelch his free speech (ahhh, sounds a little like another
chap here we've been chatting with lately) So he can spout his vitriol
without my input or response.

> Sure, he needs the confrontation to feed his ego, but that's not going
> to happen at my expense. He can say anything he wants, but he cannot
> get to me unless I let him. In this way, I remain in control.

Yup

> Feel sorry for our friend instead - but for the grace of God, that
> could be you, or me, or someone we care about someday in the future!

I do, I do.

- Mike KB3EIA -

4996. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 18:11:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <3F6F3BA0.5080309@adelphia.net>
Source record: 78353

Dick Carroll; wrote:

> You do know about phase relationships don't you?

Isn't that like when there's like this girl an this like guy, and the guy goes like "whoeeee!" and the girl goes like "what?" and the guy says like "you know, it's like this phase thing", and the girl goes like "whoeeee - I'm like into my relationship here!"

- Mike KB3EIA -

can you tell I have a bad cold?

- Mike KB3EIA -

4997. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 19:55:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922155530.10196.00000004@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 78355

>The written IS necessary so that people learn what IS necessary for
>ham radio, particularly the rules.

That might be true if the present written did that, but it doesnt

4998. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 20:04:18 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <6BIbb.63583$NM1.20271@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78356

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030921222952.07578.00000722@mb-m25.aol.com...
> In article <kBqbb.50259$Aq2.16068@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >> > I would insist on an operational test for SSB and FM too besides the
> >> > written. And I would insist that the operationals be conducted by a
VE
> >team
> >> > to an established standard not just a "well he is doing OK" sort of
> >thing.
> >>
> >> You know Dee, there is some real wisdom in that. I think many people
> >> would be served well by having an HF contact - possibly their first -
> >> at the time of testing. It would get that first contact out of the way,
> >> it would possibly calm the person down and be a little bit of fun, and
> >> would really keep people thinking about good on the air procedures and
> >> manners.
> >>
> >> It would also be enjoyable to be on the other side of that QSO. I would
> >> suspect that an Op that was a volunteer "first contact" would be a part
> >> of the VE team.
> >>
> >> What a nice/good idea!
>
> I did a writeup on how that sort of test could be done. All it would take
is a
> couple of QRP rigs and some dummy loads (wouldn't actually have to be on
the
> air).
>
> But NCVEC would have a cow. Too much of a "burden".
>
> >In Europe, mostly the old Iron Curtain ones, required a certain amount of
> >SWL time. Documented etc.
>
> Even more than that. They required that a prospective ham actually BUILD a
> receiver of a certain complexity from scratch, then use it to receive and
log a
> certain number of stations and countries using both 'phone and CW. They'd
have
> to explain the receiver's design, construction and operation, too.
>
> Once all that was done, they'd get a beginner's license and authority to

build
> a transmitter of a certain complexity and power. Which would then be used
to
> make verified contacts in order to earn an upgraded license.
>
> There were also written and code tests, of course. But those tests alone
would
> not earn a license - those hams had to build their rigs, then demonstrate
> understanding of their theory and operation as well as actually use the
dern
> things.
>
> What a concept.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

I'll tell you this Jim...the Ruskies had and probably still do have the best CW operators in the world.

I used to have to listen to them a lot in a job I had. Amazing how so many of them sounded like the hams on 20meters...hi.

Dan/W4NTI

4999. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 20:10:03 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <vGIbb.63650$NM1.40118@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78357

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vmu3dc5uoiohad@corp.supernews.com...
>
> > Well, Clint, you said it, not me! I'm glad you're starting to see the
> light!
> >
> > 73 de Larry, K3LT
> >
>
> I, I see your point.
> I will be the absolute BEST driver of a modern internal combustion engine-
> driven automobile if I first take a blacksmith's apprenticeship and learn
> to shoe a horse.
>
> Yes. Quite logical.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
>

Correct again Clint. The better you are at that will make you much better
at changing a tire.

Congratulations, your finally coming around.

Dan/W4NTI

5000. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 20:15:45 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <RLIbb.63713$NM1.42393@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78358

"Rob Kemp" <robkemp90210@hotmail.com> wrote in message
news:6114e4af.0309212028.45f4e122@posting.google.com...
> http://drudgereport.com/flash3.htm?powell
>
> FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW: 'I HAVE A TIRED FAMILY,
> TIRED CHILDREN AND A TIRED SPOUSE'
> Sun Sep 21 2003 17:25:30 ET
>
> **Exclusive Sneak Preview**
>
> Michael K. Powell, the embattled chairman of the Federal
> Communications Commission, appears to be setting the stage for an exit
> with a candid interview pipelined for Monday runs of the NEW YORK
> TIMES.
>
> Newsroom sources tell DRUDGE that Powell has gone on-the-record with
> NYT's Steve Labaton for a wide-ranging explanation of current affairs.
>
> "I have a tired family, tired children and a tired spouse. Candidly, I
> once said I would be in this job for three years and then leave,"
> Powell explains. "That was three years ago."
>
> "I've been called every name in the book by every opponent in the
> book," he adds. "That's classic Washington. If you can't get past
> jingoism, you attack the person. I wish the press would focus on more
> than who's rebuked and who's rebuking and look at what the best
> alternatives are for the public in terms of policy."
>
> Labaton was said to be finalizing the text Sunday evening, for a
> Business section lead, sources tell DRUDGE.
>
> Developing...

Wouldn't it be great if the next political appointee actually had some idea
of RF communications technology ?

Dan/W4NTI

5001. Re: Anyone help. Power supply question.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 20:18:26 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <mOIbb.63749$NM1.47944@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78359
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"John James" <dont.sp@m.me> wrote in message news:JohnJamesnew@arrl.org...
>
>
> I'm setting up my ham station. I just passed my general and I would to be
> able to operate when I find out what my call is. Do I hook up the red
wire
> from my rig to the plus terminal on the power supply?
>
> My friend, who is a new Extra, says the red wire goes to the minus
terminal,
> but that can't be right because it's opposite of how I hooked my CB. What
> wire goes where? Thanks
>
>
> John
>

Ah....job security for the electronic techs out there.

Dan/W4NTI

5002. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 20:22:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <TRIbb.63802$NM1.40770@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78360

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:9FHbb.2804$vS.1215@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> I had the pleasure of watching the documentary by Michael
> Moore called, "Bowling for Columbine". In the opening segment
> Michael goes into a Michigan Bank and gets a free shotgun
> for opening a CD account. In the documentary he discusses
> the fact that the tenage mass killers bought their ammo at Kmart
> and obtained guns at gun shows.
> The thought occurred to me, Why in the hell can a teenager in America buy
a
> weapon of mass destruction with no test or license, but to pick up a
> microphone to talk he needs to obtain a license from the federal
government? I
> can understand for a vehicle, but isn't it time to do away with Ham Radio
> licensing in a nation in which 12,000 people are murdered by untested and
> unlicensed gun owners? Just a thought.
>
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith AOL IM:kilowattradio
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> _Give SCO $699 for using Linux or the Penguin gets it._
> Torvalds: _They are smoking crack._

Hey Keith...here is a box of oranges, and over there is a box of apples.
See my point?

Dan/W4NTI

5003. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 20:32:17 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <I%Ibb.5417$7W4.2094@nwrdny03.gnilink.net>
Source record: 78362

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote in message
news:ERybb.56243$NM1.55651@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Because so few use it, the mode now plays only a relatively minor
> role within the Amateur Radio Service.

Huh???!!!

> Therefore, code testing is not
> essential to the Amateur Radio Service.

I disagree...because the aforementioned supporting statement is entirely
incorrect.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

5004. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 20:41:01 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <x7Jbb.44479$xx4.5529965@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 78361

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:9FHbb.2804$vS.1215@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> I had the pleasure of watching the documentary by Michael
> Moore called, "Bowling for Columbine". In the opening segment
> Michael goes into a Michigan Bank and gets a free shotgun
> for opening a CD account. In the documentary he discusses
> the fact that the tenage mass killers bought their ammo at Kmart
> and obtained guns at gun shows.
> The thought occurred to me, Why in the hell can a teenager in America buy
a
> weapon of mass destruction with no test or license, but to pick up a
> microphone to talk he needs to obtain a license from the federal
government? I
> can understand for a vehicle, but isn't it time to do away with Ham Radio
> licensing in a nation in which 12,000 people are murdered by untested and
> unlicensed gun owners? Just a thought.
>
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith AOL IM:kilowattradio
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> _Give SCO $699 for using Linux or the Penguin gets it._
> Torvalds: _They are smoking crack._

Another liberal mouthpiece opens his mouth and shit pours out. You and
Michael Moore are both idiots.

But anyone who visits your CB web page can see that. You are just another
wanna-be Ham Radio operator.

10-73's!

5005. Re: Anyone help. Power supply question.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 20:46:45 UTC
From: Spurious Noise <HDA@zilch.com>
Message-ID: <VcJbb.5750$Ms2.4960@fed1read03>
Source record: 78363
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

IF IN DOUBT READ THE MANUAL

--
73
> "John James" <dont.sp@m.me> wrote in message news:JohnJamesnew@arrl.org...
> >
> >
> > I'm setting up my ham station. I just passed my general and I would to
be
> > able to operate when I find out what my call is. Do I hook up the red
> wire
> > from my rig to the plus terminal on the power supply?
> >
> > My friend, who is a new Extra, says the red wire goes to the minus
> terminal,
> > but that can't be right because it's opposite of how I hooked my CB.
What
> > wire goes where? Thanks
> >
> >
> > John
> >

5006. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 20:55:21 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <ZkJbb.7038$yp6.116603@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 78364

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:9FHbb.2804$vS.1215@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
[snip]
> ... isn't it time to do away with Ham Radio licensing in a nation
> in which 12,000 people are murdered by untested and
> unlicensed gun owners? Just a thought.

To answer your question with a single word "No."

Licensing is required by international agreements and federal
law (and for good reason).

However, the requirements for licensure should be reasonable
and rational, and while the written tests meet that criteria, the
requirement for Morse proficiency no longer does.

Carl - wk3c

5007. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 21:07:06 UTC
From: Lou <Spamfree@Spamfree.com>
Message-ID: <cwJbb.39$LJ5.4087@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 78365
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"MD" <ve3tmt@yahoo.ca> wrote in message
news:sOGbb.2342$qu4.204411@news20.bellglobal.com...
>
> "W7TI" <noway@nohow.com> wrote in message
> news:j6ermvgs0q3mt67h82b4f4c0ia8httd2ef@4ax.com...
> > On Sat, 20 Sep 2003 22:57:12 -0400, "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote:
> >
> > >Since when did it become a "private" frequency? The H.F. Frequencies
used
> > >for Ham operation are open to any one with the proper class of license
to
> > >use them. O
> >
> > ____
> >
> > Does the word "troll" have any meaning to you?
> >
> > He trolled, you bit, he's happy.
> >
> > --
> > Bill, W7TI
> >
>
> Yup, It's so much easier to add him to the kill file.
>

Yeah, I've got to also consider placing this joker in the kill file.
Certainly not worth the blood pressure rise.

5008. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 21:48:45 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <n4rumvgm5tmkqatniu175h41b6k3eommrn@4ax.com>
Source record: 78366

Hmmm - looking back over his comments in the thread, I'm not sure!

But we did find out why he uses 'rattlehead' as his email address - I
believe that it actually does :)

73, Leo

On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 04:29:59 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
wrote:

>>></reductio ad absurdum>
>>
>>
>> If you mean your point, you have done a better job of reducing it to
>> the absurd in this reply that anyone else ever could. Thank you!
>
> Is there a point?
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

5009. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 22:01:54 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309221401.56afd27a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78367

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030918175644.07346.00000677@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> In article <bkbe4a$r8nem$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
> <kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

> >Not that I'd ever use all that stuff at work or anything ... right?
>
> You aren't even in SHARES.

Hey Lennie....remind us again of how many ACTIVE communications
programs (your AOL software doesn't count" YOU are PRESENTLY active
in, or even ELIGIBLE for...?!?!

SHARES?...MARS?...ARES?...SATERN?...RACES?...

OH! WAIT...REACT! I forgot eleven meters! One for Lennie!

Jump right in on Channel 9 and start broadcasting your
availability, Lennie! Of course you're gonna have to part with the
$75 if you want to be a TRUE "React'er" and have dual-band capability
by adding GMRS to your "station"...

Yes, Lennie...Go ahead and tell us about ALL the different
programs YOU are eligible for, Your Licenselessness.

Ya PUTZ!

Steve, K4YZ

5010. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 22:07:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309221407.2163041@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78368

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309220844.31291566@posting.google.com>...
> >>In article <20030920184429.14837.00003106@mb-m03.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com
> >>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
> > Sonny, I've probably done MORE in radio already than you've done in
> > your entire "career" as a hambone...er Ham.
>
> WHOA, PUTZBREATH!

That from a guy who wears a white dress and a carries a rectal
thermometer.

> Where are YOUR accomplishments in AMATEUR RADIO...?!?!

How many articles did you have published in HAM RADIO magazine?

> > You have PLAYED for years at ham radio, using ready-made
> > equipment, not really understanding what goes on behind your
> > ready-made front panels. Where are YOUR accomplishments in
> > amateur radio, your name posted as anywhere involving advancing
> > anything of the amateur state of the art? On FIDONET? Words,
> > self-glorifying yourself. On this newsgroup? More words, more
> > self-glorifying of yourself...plus an extreme amount of patronizing
> > "I am your moral superior" preacher without a church.
>
> GEEEEEEEZUS, Lennie!
>
> Pretty deep in the POT/KETTLE/BLACK mode today, aren't ya?
>
> I've done some searches on "Leonard Anderson" and "Amateur Radio"
> and with the exception of YOUR self-glorifying, self gratifying
> pronouncements of moral superiority of all OF Amateur Radio, the
> search comes up a BIG FAT ZERO.

Do the same search on "Steve Robeson" and "Amateur Radio" and you'll
see the same thing.

> Yes...we all know about the few articles you wrote in "Ham
> Radio"...It still amounts to only a fraction of zero.

In your case we cannot divide by zero.

> (BTW...Several of us were gathered at the "CQ" magazine booth at
> the Huntsville, AL Hamfest last month, and your name was the subject
> of great laughter and joking...So there lies YOUR contribution to

> Amateur radio!)

That's pathetic. I hope John Dorr wasn't part of the gaggle. Wonder
who they laugh at when you're not around?

> > Any you've done what? Playing with your radios, doing your beeping thing
> > the same as what was done by amateurs a half century ago or a full
> > century ago? What kind of "new technology" is on-off keying code use?
> > Who are you trying to fool other than children, fool?
>
> This forum is about AMATEUR RADIO.

The physics of radio communication were not changed by the
Communications Act of 1934.

> It is NOT about Army relay stations in the 1950's, PLMRS, the
> IEEE or your SWLing of the aeronautical bands and an expired
> student-pilot permit over four decades old...
>
> Morse Code communications is a part of Amateur Radio. That is a
> fact.

Is it a part of any other communications? 500KHz?

> And despite the amount of effort you put in to trying to make
> Larry look like that's ALL he does, you fail miserably.

He's still working on WAS/CW.

> YOU are STILL a liar.

No. He probably has done more in radio communications than you've
done in your entire ham career, and you probably have always used
store bought equipment.

> YOU are STILL unlicensed.

So far I don't think he's lied about that one either.

> YOU are STILL an outsider looking in. Please wipe the drool off
> of the window when you're done. It's embarrassing.

Quit showing your ass. It's embarassing.

> And..oh yeah...You're STILL a PUTZ.

And you're still a guy in a dress who can't handle his own emotions.

> Have a Nice Day.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

Yeh, you too.

5011. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 22:12:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309221412.8f4713@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78369

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030922082910.25905.00000201@mb-m05.aol.com>...
> >Which is exactly how you did it.
>
> Wrong, I knew the info, which really bugs you. Its a shame you cant memorize
> enough correct answers to pass the EXTRA.

No you didn't.

5012. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 22:15:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309221415.48673022@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78370

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:<vmu2c4t5gv3j75@corp.supernews.com>...
> >
> > Which is exactly how you did it.
>
> I don't understand the reference, I do not know that
> fellow well enough... did he get an auto-upgrade do
> to testing changes or something?
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT

Clint, Bruce said: "Well then lets just do away with the written. Why should we force someone to Memorize some Q&As that have no meaning."

Yet he claims that he was able to take the Extra exam on a lark, w/o ever studying for it, scoring 100%, in under 8 minutes.

But everyone else is forced to memorize the Q/A.

5013. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 22:30:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922183002.29815.00000759@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 78371

In article <vmsb3m8mon6u82@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>> The same applies to students of all ages. When an adult goes to college,
>
>and wasn't it pointed out in an earlier post in this, or another, thread
>that
>electrical engineering students aren't required to learn morse code?

I knew it already when I got to EE school. In fact I had the Extra 2 years prior to entering EE school.

5014. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 22:30:02 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922183002.29815.00000760@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 78373

In article <e79dbd9b.0309211748.6d559a29@posting.google.com>, k0hb@arrl.net (K0HB) writes:

>n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote
>
>>
>> The FCC thinks that Technicians are adequately tested on that, for all
>> authorized modes and technologies. There are no modes or technologies
>> authorized for amateur HF/MF that are not also authorized for amateur
>> VHF/UHF.
>> So there is no absolute need for any of the General or Extra written tests
>> *except* perhaps a few regulatory and propagation questions.
>
>Jim, your strawman is aflame, because I just pissed flaming napalm on it.

Hans,

It's not a strawman at all. It's a logical conclusion.

Can you show where my argument is logically invalid?

If someone really wanted to gut the written tests of most theory using arguments similar to those used against the code test, how would you defend the written tests?

W5YI and others have said that the entry-level *written* tests are too hard. So it's not something nobody but me is looking at.

You might want to take a look at what has happened to the number of new Technician licenses issued since the new Tech Q&A pool was put in place a while ago.

>Grow up.

Hans, I am saddened that you revert to personal attack and talking down to someone who presents an argument you dislike. At least you didn't send me to an Amish rake fight.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5015. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 22:30:03 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922183003.29815.00000761@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 78372

In article <ERybb.56243$NM1.55651@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> Well, I'm glad I finally got your attention directed
>> toward reality. If the Morse code isn't relevant to
>> any communications service outside the ARS, then
>> the fact that the commercial and military services
>> have stopped using it isn't relevant or responsive
>> to the issue of code testing withing the ARS.
>> Therefore, by your own admission, the NCTA's
>> prime argument is just so much worthless rhetoric.
>
>
> But, as you well know, the code testing requirement was originally
>established exactly because code was once relevant to the military,
>government, and commercial services outside Amateur Radio.

That was one reason, 90+ years ago.

Since then, other reasons have evolved.

>Since that has
>now changed, it is clearly time to question the need for a unique testing
>requirement for this one operating mode.

It's always appropriate to question *any* license test requirement.

>Since most ham operators today
>don't use code on a regular basis, there is also little need within Amateur
>Radio to maintain a testing requirement for this one operating mode.

First off, since Morse code tests are only required for HF/MF licenses, perhaps you might want to look at what ham operators do on HF/MF, not overall.

Also, consider how many of today's hams *regularly* build, repair or maintain their own equipment. Applying the argument you are using against the code test will gut most of the theory out of the written test, too.

> All
>that has led to the efforts now being made to eliminate the Morse Code test
>requirement.

Or maybe some people just don't like to take tests!
>
>> The Morse/CW mode remains as a valuable, basic

>> communications tool within the ARS, and the code
>> testing requirement is current and essential to the
>> continued use of this mode. End of story. (snip)
>
> But, as much as you'd like it to be, that is not the end of the story,
>Larry. Because so few use it, the mode now plays only a relatively minor
>role within the Amateur Radio Service.

"so few"? I think you underestimate the situation, Dwight.

>Therefore, code testing is not
>essential to the Amateur Radio Service.

That's a matter of opinion.

>Further, without outside factors
>(the needs of the other services) to consider, the FCC itself has no
>significant interest today in maintaining the "continued use of this mode"
>within the Amateur Radio Service. As far as the FCC is concerned, it is now
>just one more operating mode among the many used within the Amateur Radio
>Service.

Maybe - but again, that's your interpretation of what FCC thinks. And what FCC thinks and does isn't necessarily what's in the best interest of the ARS.

>There is no sufficient argument to support the continued existence
>of a code testing requirement. As such, the code testing requirement should
>be eliminated.
>
Well, I disagree on that, Dwight.

But ultimately it comes down to whose opinion carries the day with FCC.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5016. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 22:31:46 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <mLKbb.2444$Hd6.1450395@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78374

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F6E7DB5.8090402@adelphia.net...
> Dick Carroll; wrote:
>
> > Well, I really *don't* like Brussels sprouts!
>
>
> I remember when I was a kid, the Brussels sprouts were one of the last
> things to go in the local gardens in the fall, so us kids would pluck
> them and use them for throwing at squirrels, the local girls, and other
> places. In that conext, they wer okay.
>
> And of course, every sprout chucked at a squirrel or a girl was one less
> we had to eat!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Actually I like Brussel Sprouts.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5017. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 22:41:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <vUKbb.2597$iT4.1874082@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 78375

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:3F6E7DB5.8090402@adelphia.net...
>
>>Dick Carroll; wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Well, I really *don't* like Brussels sprouts!
>>
>>
>>I remember when I was a kid, the Brussels sprouts were one of the last
>>things to go in the local gardens in the fall, so us kids would pluck
>>them and use them for throwing at squirrels, the local girls, and other
>>places. In that conext, they wer okay.
>>
>>And of course, every sprout chucked at a squirrel or a girl was one less
>>we had to eat!
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Actually I like Brussel Sprouts.

I can eat one, then suddenly theyget incredibly strong tasting to me.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5018. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 22:50:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922185042.08626.00000799@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 78376

In article <bkj4q3$8ed@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
>news:bki8pn$23md0$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
>> "Kim W5TIT" wrote ...
>>
>> But, but, but!!!! Larry's obviously got or had large boobs, and has
>> obviously worn a bra. Right?! He *has* hasn't he? Surely, for if not he
>> would not be making value judgements on my callsign.
>> ____
>>
>> It took a while, but I have grown accustomed to your callsign, Kim. And
>it
>> wasn't necessary for me to wear a bra to do it. ;-)
>>
>> Arnie -
>> KT4ST
>>
>>
>
>Uh, Arnie? If you wore a bra, the only thing you'd get from me would be,
>"What ya packin' there, big fella?" ;)
>
Am I the only one reminded of the Seinfeld episode where Kramer and George's
father join forces to create a brassier for men? Kramer wanted to call it the
"bro" and Mr. Costanza wanted to call it the "man-sierre". Or vice versa.

Classic show. Good times.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5019. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 22:50:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922185043.08626.00000801@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 78377

In article <bkhihu$n44@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>ROFLMAO!!!!!!!!!!!!!! These guys would actually try to answer the
>question: So, what is the best antenna?
>
That's easy, Kim.

There is no single "best" antenna. It all depends on the application and the
available resources.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5020. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 22:50:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922185043.08626.00000800@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 78379

In article <3F6E281D.80302@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <3F6DBC7D.8030803@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
><mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>> writes:
>>
>>
>>>>I LIKE broccoli.
>>>
>>>Me too actually.
>>
>>
>> Make that three.
>>
>>>Let's make it NO Peas International.
>>>
>>>Pretty Peas?
>>>
>>
>> Peas are great!
>>
>> Green beans, on the other hand.....
>>
>> --
>>
>> And if ya really want to get people fired up:
>>
>> Calves' liver, anyone?
>
>Like 'em all so far.
>
>Okra maybe?

Reminds me of a line in a Chris Smither song:

"I got okra, enough to choke ya"

Anybody else know what a "merliton" is?

73 de Jim, N2EY.
>

5021. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 22:50:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922185044.08626.00000802@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 78378

In article <Q1sbb.50430$Aq2.32185@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>Sadly, Bruce (WA8ULX) isn't an old timer - his license is so new the ink
>isn't even dry yet.

You're mistaken, Dwight.

According to qrz.com, he's 305 years old.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5022. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 22:57:09 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bknuo1$3uqo1$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78380

"Dee D. Flint" wrote ...

Clint wrote ...

but always remember, that is *your* opinion. I happen to think the analogy
is quite accurate.

Visit a Holocaust museum and watch the documentaries on the History channel
for a while and read the transcripts of the Nuremberg trials. See if you
think the analogy is accurate then.

I don't believe that it would do any good in Clint's case, Dee. He
obviously doesn't find anything wrong with using the word as part of his
no-code test argument.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5023. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 22:58:53 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <N8Lbb.2454$Hd6.1456754@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78381

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bknuo1$3uqo1$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote ...
>
> Clint wrote ...
>
> but always remember, that is *your* opinion. I happen to think the
analogy
> is quite accurate.
>
> Visit a Holocaust museum and watch the documentaries on the History
channel
> for a while and read the transcripts of the Nuremberg trials. See if you
> think the analogy is accurate then.
> --
>
> I don't believe that it would do any good in Clint's case, Dee. He
> obviously doesn't find anything wrong with using the word as part of his
> no-code test argument.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
>

Well he says that he has visited and studied this and it doesn't change his point of view. So now that I've completed the discussion on the call signs, I'm going to put him in my killfile along with Len 0ver 21.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5024. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 23:01:24 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bknv00$3u214$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78382

"Clint" wrote ...

Hey, wanna talk SHUDDER?

this is what makes ME shudder... the thought that you are invoking the priviledges of free speech and rights of society just like I am, but also advocating that an idea, concept or practice be forced upon a person against thier will. And you're doing that with a straight face.

No, we are trying to get you to understand that there are much better ways to express your argument than by invoking an analogy that offends a large group of people. It should be obvious by now, that this is what you have done. What part of that is eluding you?

Arnie -
KT4ST

5025. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 23:10:01 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bknvg5$3vppv$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78383

"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...

Mommy DEErest, I was USING engineering knowledge at work well before I got my electronic engineering degree. It made classes (most at night) much easier.

You like to play some kind of Mommie DEErest and think that all newcomers to amateur radio are at the level of children.

Yes, Mommie, but put aside the Mommie suit and THINK in reality. Laws and regulations are NOT required to remain long after their usefulness.

Dee,

I know I'm pointing out the obvious here, but why do you think it's necessary for Len to *always* pepper his replies with personal insults. A character flaw of some kind, maybe?

Arnie -
KT4ST

5026. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 23:15:25 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <hoLbb.10$QT7.0@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 78384
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

1) Echo Link is fun and serves a purpose; it isn't the do-all and-all for amateur radio.

2) I am an NCI member

3) 20 WPM CW is a bit slow, especially for a rag-chew.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"20 WPM" <20wpm@arrl.com> wrote in message
news:vmthirclu0qc6d@corp.supernews.com...
>
> 1. Have yet to learn the code.
> 2. NCI Members.
> 3. Lack technical skills to setup a station.
> 4. Bootlegging CB'ers.
>
>
> As long as Echolink keeps the above mentioned off of the HF Bands, I'm all
> for Echolink.
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.520 / Virus Database: 318 - Release Date: 9/18/03

5027. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 23:18:11 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <ouvumv84i3n1kslioa543gjov01jiga476@4ax.com>
Source record: 78385

Arnie,

If you review this individual's posts on this subject over the last
few days, a trend becomes obvious - his intent IS to upset and annoy.
He thrives on confrontation, and really gets going when he hits a
nerve with one of his readers. Not intellectual enough to make his
point by rational arguement, he resorts to name calling and other
juvenile tactics to 'get his way'. And he knows that the "nazi" thing
works - so he keeps on with it - it's his gig.

Convincing people like this to change is analogous to trying to teach
a pig to sing - no matter how hard you try, it ain't gonna happen -
you'll only annoy the pig....

Best tactic for handling this guy - Dee has it absolutely right, use
the killfile. If there's no audience, there'll be no idiot!

Plonk 'im.

73, Leo

On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 19:01:24 -0400, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote:

>"Clint" wrote ...
>
> Hey, wanna talk SHUDDER?
>
>this is what makes ME shudder... the thought that you are invoking the
>priviledges of free speech and rights of society just like I am, but also
>advocating that an idea, concept or practice be forced upon a person against
>thier will. And you're doing that with a straight face.
>____
>
>No, we are trying to get you to understand that there are much better ways
>to express your argument than by invoking an analogy that offends a large
>group of people. It should be obvious by now, that this is what you have
>done. What part of that is eluding you?
>
>Arnie -
>KT4ST
>

5028. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 23:20:21 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <dr0vmv4rr9cs7upkr306lp3nhd06c29944@4ax.com>
Source record: 78386

An absence of character, I'd suggest.

73, Leo

On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 19:10:01 -0400, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote:

>Dee,
>
>I know I'm pointing out the obvious here, but why do you think it's
>necessary for Len to *always* pepper his replies with personal insults. A
>character flaw of some kind, maybe?
>
>Arnie -
>KT4ST
>

5029. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 23:20:27 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <%sLbb.11$SU7.1@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 78387

Keith,

You do seem to have a point.
Ever considered buying a hat and covering it?

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:9FHbb.2804$vS.1215@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> I had the pleasure of watching the documentary by Michael
> Moore called, "Bowling for Columbine". In the opening segment
> Michael goes into a Michigan Bank and gets a free shotgun
> for opening a CD account. In the documentary he discusses
> the fact that the tenage mass killers bought their ammo at Kmart
> and obtained guns at gun shows.
> The thought occurred to me, Why in the hell can a teenager in America buy
a
> weapon of mass destruction with no test or license, but to pick up a
> microphone to talk he needs to obtain a license from the federal
government? I
> can understand for a vehicle, but isn't it time to do away with Ham Radio
> licensing in a nation in which 12,000 people are murdered by untested and
> unlicensed gun owners? Just a thought.
>
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith AOL IM:kilowattradio
> NW Oregon Radio http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> _Give SCO $699 for using Linux or the Penguin gets it._
> Torvalds: _They are smoking crack._

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.520 / Virus Database: 318 - Release Date: 9/18/03

5030. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 23:23:54 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bko0a6$3vmhp$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78388

"Dwight Stewart" wrote ...

Well, that may be what you're discussing, but I'm discussing Morse Code testing - a discussion which, by it's very nature, cannot be limited to just Amateur Radio. However, if the discussion were limited to just Amateur Radio, your arguments would have no more weight since most ham operators today don't use code/cw on any routine or regular basis. There is little reason to maintain testing for a mode that is seldom used by more than a relatively small minority.

Where did you get your information, Dwight? According to the ARRL (the primary ARS organization in the US) -- CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS -- Just behind SSB. That on its face would mean that there are still a whole bunch of folks out there still using it.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5031. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 23:27:11 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <jzLbb.2618$iT4.1884041@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 78389

Arnie Macy wrote:
> "Clint" wrote ...
>
> Hey, wanna talk SHUDDER?
>
> this is what makes ME shudder... the thought that you are invoking the
> priviledges of free speech and rights of society just like I am, but also
> advocating that an idea, concept or practice be forced upon a person against
> thier will. And you're doing that with a straight face.
> ----------
>
> No, we are trying to get you to understand that there are much better ways
> to express your argument than by invoking an analogy that offends a large
> group of people. It should be obvious by now, that this is what you have
> done. What part of that is eluding you?

Arnie, I believe he is expressing himself exactly as he wants to.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5032. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 23:30:32 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bko0ml$3ss66$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78390

"Len Over 21" wrote ...

My first wife was Reform Jew. All her older relatives made it out of Germany via Denmark. I've talked with them at length at the time and also with many others in the same situation. In the Fairfax area of western Los Angeles. She died in late 1964, a cancer victim. Are you now going to "lecture" me on the Holocaust of WW2? Are you now going to assume some kind of superior moral attitude about "ancestry" because you have such weak arguments on the retention of morse code testing in an avocational hobby activity involving radio? May your conscience be forever burdened by the souls of seven million who died when you profess some kind of outrage in an argument over code testing. That is a pathetically weak, petty connection you make. There are several Centers for the Holocaust around the USA. I would suggest you visit one and spend some time there and reflect on the reality of that dreadful, terrible happening over half a century ago. Yarmulke is optional during a visit. Carrying a code key during such a visit isn't required.

P U T Z !

Based on the above, I would think that you would also be sensitive to the use of the word. Clint could have easily made his argument without invoking it. As to outrage, mine is real, my relatives who suffered and died were real, and I *do* take real offense to the use of the word in such a petty and out of context manner. You should too.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5033. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-22 23:35:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <LGLbb.2621$iT4.1886808@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 78391

Arnie Macy wrote:

> "Len Over 21" wrote in part ...
>
> Mommy DEErest, I was USING engineering knowledge at work well before I got
> my electronic engineering degree. It made classes (most at night) much
> easier.
>
> You like to play some kind of Mommie DEErest and think that all newcomers to
> amateur radio are at the level of children.
>
> Yes, Mommie, but put aside the Mommie suit and THINK in reality. Laws and
> regulations are NOT required to remain long after their usefulness.
> --
>
> Dee,
>
> I know I'm pointing out the obvious here, but why do you think it's
> necessary for Len to *always* pepper his replies with personal insults. A
> character flaw of some kind, maybe?

Some people can't do any better than that. Nothing like strong words
for weak arguments.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5034. Legal to Hack EchoLink ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 00:02:07 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <34Mbb.7394$jO7.7140@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78392

Let's see... If I were to set up a bogus hotmail or AOL account, pick out a callsign from the callbook and then set up to access EchoLink on my computer and skip around the different systems, playing "Gangsta Rap" and golden XXX-rated oldies by the "Fugs", and FBI recordings of rabbits being slaughtered over distant EchoLink repeaters - just for fun - would I be breaking any laws?

Remember that I would be accessing over the Internet, using a call I picked from a list, maybe even an inactive one. No radio involved, at least none of mine.

Who would be responsible for the transmissions on those distant repeaters?

Just what law or regulation would make it illegal to access EchoLink with a bogus callsign? I don't think there is one.

Should I cross-post this question to the newsgroups frequented by CB'ers, Freebanders, FRS folk, etc? If not - Why not?

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

5035. Re: Anyone help. Power supply question.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 00:21:36 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bko3mg$qt0$0@208.206.142.87>
Source record: 78393
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Spurious Noise wrote:

>IF IN DOUBT READ THE MANUAL
>

Uh...Manual?? What manual? Read?? You surely have him confused with
someone who can.

>
>--
>73
>
>
>>"John James" <dont.sp@m.me> wrote in message news:JohnJamesnew@arrl.org...
>>
>>
>>>I'm setting up my ham station. I just passed my general and I would to
>>>
>>>
>be
>
>
>>>able to operate when I find out what my call is. Do I hook up the red
>>>
>>>
>>wire
>>
>>
>>>from my rig to the plus terminal on the power supply?
>>>
>>>My friend, who is a new Extra, says the red wire goes to the minus
>>>
>>>
>>terminal,
>>
>>
>>>but that can't be right because it's opposite of how I hooked my CB.
>>>
>>>
>What
>
>
>>>wire goes where? Thanks
>>>

>>>
>>>John
>>>
>>>
>>>
>
>
>
>

5036. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 00:23:33 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bko3q5$qt0$1@208.206.142.87>
Source record: 78394

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:9FHbb.2804$vS.1215@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>
>[snip]
>
>
>>... isn't it time to do away with Ham Radio licensing in a nation
>>in which 12,000 people are murdered by untested and
>>unlicensed gun owners? Just a thought.
>>
>>
>
>To answer your question with a single word "No."
>
>Licensing is required by international agreements and federal
>law (and for good reason).
>
>However, the requirements for licensure should be reasonable
>and rational, and while the written tests meet that criteria, the
>requirement for Morse proficiency no longer does.
>
>Carl - wk3c
>
>
>

*O-P-I-N-I-O-N * and a poorly rationalized one at that. See N2EY's many
posts on the same subject.

5037. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 00:30:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922203001.07346.00000756@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 78395

In article <4Wa9b.12919$Aq2.6141@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>IF morse (i.e. radiotelegraphy) had any basis as a foundation
>for higher learning of radio concepts, principles or theory
>then it would be a requirement of engineering students...which
>it has never been to my knowledge anywhere.

Faulty logic, Bill.

"Radio" is but a small, specialized part of electrical engineering. That's one reason Morse isn't and wasn't part of the curriculum. Heck, soldering is a much bigger part of electrical engineering than radio, and soldering is not taught in EE school either.

But if someone wants to learn radio on their own, and wants to learn-by-doing, amateur radio can be a really fun way to learn. Skill in Morse code is an excellent tool in that learning process.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5038. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 00:40:54 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bko4qm$v81$0@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 78396

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

>"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:9FHbb.2804$vS.1215@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>
>[snip]
>
>
>>... isn't it time to do away with Ham Radio licensing in a nation
>>in which 12,000 people are murdered by untested and
>>unlicensed gun owners? Just a thought.
>>
>>
>
>To answer your question with a single word "No."
>
>Licensing is required by international agreements and federal
>law (and for good reason).
>
>However, the requirements for licensure should be reasonable
>and rational, and while the written tests meet that criteria, the
>requirement for Morse proficiency no longer does.
>
>

Further-- The evidence is clear. Today's tests concentrate on
OPERATING and not on technical issues. SO--

In a ham radio where most all hams just plunk the plastic and buy a
factory-made radio to use, where no amount of written testing can
begin to "teach" them to adequately diagnose technical problems with
that gear, gear which is very reliable and essentially troublefree,
there is no rational need to insist they learn technical subjects.

When was the last time anyone was cited by FCC for unknown technical
problems with a modern rig? It just doesn't happen today despite a
plethora of newcomers who
can't identify nor explain the difference between a 1/4 wave dipole and
a 1/2 wave.

Far better to concentrate testing on operating - to include as many
modes as feasable. INCLUDING radiotelegraphy, **the second most used
mode in ham radio**.

But you already know all this. After all, your're a techie. You know what folly it is to expect newcomers to learn enough to understand a modern systhesized transciever, from a zero base of technical knowledge. For you to insist otherwise is shameful! You woiuld advocate "filtering" non-engineers from ham radio??

I know all that frosts your backside, but hey, that's what makes the world go round.

5039. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 00:43:05 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bko4up$v81$1@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 78397

Leo wrote:

>Hmmm - looking back over his comments in the thread, I'm not sure!
>
>But we did find out why he uses 'rattlehead' as his email address - I
>believe that it actually does :)
>
>

That's the most unsurprising news yet!

5040. BIG AL AND FRANKY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 00:43:27 UTC
From: BIG AL <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
Message-ID: <vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78398
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

WE KEPT THE QRMERS OFF 3.894.5 AGAIN TONITE WITH OUR BIG ONES. WE REIGN AS KINGS OF 75. HO HO

5041. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 00:48:07 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <bLMbb.65250$NM1.51590@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78399

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030922203001.07346.00000756@mb-m26.aol.com...
> In article <4Wa9b.12919$Aq2.6141@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
Sohl"
> <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >IF morse (i.e. radiotelegraphy) had any basis as a foundation
> >for higher learning of radio concepts, principles or theory
> >then it would be a requirement of engineering students...which
> >it has never been to my knowledge anywhere.
>
> Faulty logic, Bill.
>
> "Radio" is but a small, specialized part of electrical engineering. That's
one
> reason Morse isn't and wasn't part of the curriculum. Heck, soldering is a
much
> bigger part of electrical engineering than radio, and soldering is not
taught
> in EE school either.
>
> But if someone wants to learn radio on their own, and wants to
learn-by-doing,
> amateur radio can be a really fun way to learn. Skill in Morse code is an
> excellent tool in that learning process.
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Then yoiu should have no problem gaining morse users from those that
want to learn by doing after the code test is gone.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

5042. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 00:51:21 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bko5e5$41n8h$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78400

"Leo" wrote ...

If you review this individual's posts on this subject over the last few days, a trend becomes obvious - his intent IS to upset and annoy. He thrives on confrontation, and really gets going when he hits a nerve with one of his readers. Not intellectual enough to make his point by rational arguement, he resorts to name calling and other juvenile tactics to 'get his way'. And he knows that the "nazi" thing works - so he keeps on with it - it's his gig.

Convincing people like this to change is analogous to trying to teach a pig to sing - no matter how hard you try, it ain't gonna happen - you'll only annoy the pig....

Best tactic for handling this guy - Dee has it absolutely right, use the killfile. If there's no audience, there'll be no idiot! Plonk 'im.

Leo,

I completely agree with your points. I just hate to "plonk" him. I did that to Len for about a year and missed many laughs. But, at the end of the day, it might have to be done.

73,

Arnie -
KT4ST

5043. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 00:52:33 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bko5ge$41e9f$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78451

"Mike Coslo" wrote ...

Arnie, I believe he is expressing himself exactly as he wants to.

Mike,

I believe you are right. You can lead a horse to water ...

73,

Arnie -
KT4ST

5044. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 00:53:41 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <pQMbb.65275$NM1.39430@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78452

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030922062946.21642.00001060@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <wFsbb.52192$NM1.11709@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> >news:20030921142942.12501.00002585@mb-m04.aol.com...
> >> In article
<c777ab1364e2b7954c18183cd420d781.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>,
> >"Hans
> >> K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> writes:
> >>
> >> >"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote
> >> >> Then answer this question: Why should people who are not interested
in
> >> >> building or fixing their radios have to learn all that theory stuff
> >> >> for the written tests? Why are all hams tested on all sorts of stuff
> >> >> they are not interested in?
> >> >
> >> >Because the terms of their license make them responsible for the
quality
> >> >of their radiated signal(s).
> >>
> >> Maybe. But a ham is not required to actually know how his/her equipment
> >works,
> >> nor to be able to work on it. Just for the result.
> >
> >If you firmly believe hams don't need to know theory, then
> >petition the FCC to end theory knowledge as a test requirement.
>
> There's a difference between "need to know" and "should know".
>
> >If you don't then your argument is just a means to divert
> >the issue to arguing a different subject.
>
> No, Bill, it's not a diversion. It's making a point.

Didn't sell with the FCC before, won't this time either.

> Hams today don't *need* to know much theory in order to operate modern
> manufactured equipment. That's a plain, simple fact.
>
> And most of what theory they do *need* to know is tested by the 35
question
> Tech test. FCC thinks that's adequate - in fact, back in 2000, FCC reduced

the
> test requirements for Tech from 2 tests/65 questions.
>
> I think hams *should* know more theory than just the bare minimum required
to
> pass the Tech test, though. But that's just me.
>
> I also think that hams *should* know Morse code - at least at a basic
level.
> But that's just me.

Yes, your opinion.

> The idea that hams should be tested on Morse code at even a basic level
has
> been called "welfare for a mode", "forcing it down people's throats",
various
> nazi imagery, etc. So that must logically apply to requiring hams to test
for
> more theory than they *need* to know.

As before, if that's your belief, sell it to the FCC.

> >> I'm not required to know how my cars work, just how to use them safely.
I
> >am
> >> "responsible", however, to see that they meet all applicable DMV
> >requirements,
> >> including pollution and safety equipment. I can do the work myself or
have
> >it
> >> done by others. The same is true for ham equipment.
> >
> >I repeat my comment from above.
>
> Me, too.
> >
> >> The FCC thinks that Technicians are adequately tested on that, for all
> >> authorized modes and technologies. There are no modes or technologies
> >> authorized for amateur HF/MF that are not also authorized for amateur
> >VHF/UHF.
> >> So there is no absolute need for any of the General or Extra written
tests
> >> *except* perhaps a few regulatory and propagation questions.
> >
> >I repeat again.
>
> ditto
> >
> >> >Without demonstrating some familiarity with the basic underlying
> >> >science, it would be irresponsible of the regulators to allow an

> >> >applicant to establish a radio transmitting station on the public
> >> >airways.
> >>
> >> See above about Technicians.
> >>
> >> And here's another point: There's almost nothing in the tests about
some
> >> technologies that hams are allowed to use. For example, vacuum tubes -
not
> >very
> >> much in the tests about them! Yet FCC *trusts* hams who want to use
vacuum
> >tube
> >> technology to learn what they need to know about it and operate their
> >equipment
> >> responsibly. So why all the tests?
> >
> >Ditto my last :-) :-)
> >
> Exactly.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>

5045. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 00:55:47 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bko5mj$14j$0@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 78453

Arnie Macy wrote:

>"Clint" wrote ...
>
> Hey, wanna talk SHUDDER?
>
>this is what makes ME shudder... the thought that you are invoking the
>priviledges of free speech and rights of society just like I am, but also
>advocating that an idea, concept or practice be forced upon a person against
>thier will. And you're doing that with a straight face.
>____
>
>No, we are trying to get you to understand that there are much better ways
>to express your argument than by invoking an analogy that offends a large
>group of people. It should be obvious by now, that this is what you have
>done. What part of that is eluding you?
>
>
>

ALL of it, obviously.

5046. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 00:57:08 UTC
From: Greg Courville <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com>
Message-ID: <vmv6j3kfrkpv64@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78455
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A. Abernethy, K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation below 30 MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the action, Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC letter included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16. Hollingsworth's letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference on 3.965 MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted that Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time his station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to protest the sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21 and 22 in the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints from other amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the FCC had received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity, deliberate interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints to the FCC alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt Song," the letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate interference." Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to K4OKA. The FCC letter also said the Commission had received complaints that Abernethy had used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference" on or near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about over-power operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start revocation proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of continued violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter. (For additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for Six Months" elsewhere on the AWE news page.)

"BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@porkbutt.net> wrote in message
news:vmqshdfh78hr4b@corp.supernews.com...
> SHOW UP ON MY FREQUENCY AND I WILL RUN YOU OFF. HO HO
>
>
> "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> news:iO8bb.13$LJ5.2273@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> >
> >
> > "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@bigalk4oka.net> wrote in message
> > news:vmq5ars9c9i455@corp.supernews.com...
> > > HO HO. SELL YOUR GEAR I DONT CARE. JUST STAY OFF OF 3.894.5. THATS BIG
> ALS
> > > FREQUENCY. HO HO. I'LL BE TAKING OVER 3.898 NEXT. HO HO
> > >

> > > AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. HO
HO
> > >
> > >
> >
> > If I choose to talk on that frequency, I will, so long as I'm abiding by
> the
> > rules and regulations as they are spelled out. YOU or no one else, can
> tell
> > me to stay off. ASS WIPE.
> >
> > BIG AL.. the only thing big about you, is your mouth....
> >
> > Lou
> >
> >
>
>

5047. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 00:57:16 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bko5pc$14j$1@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 78454

Arnie Macy wrote:

>"Len Over 21" wrote in part ...
>
> Mommy DEErest, I was USING engineering knowledge at work well before I got
>my electronic engineering degree. It made classes (most at night) much
>easier.
>
>You like to play some kind of Mommie DEErest and think that all newcomers to
>amateur radio are at the level of children.
>
>Yes, Mommie, but put aside the Mommie suit and THINK in reality. Laws and
>regulations are NOT required to remain long after their usefulness.
>____
>
>Dee,
>
>I know I'm pointing out the obvious here, but why do you think it's
>necessary for Len to *always* pepper his replies with personal insults. A
>character flaw of some kind, maybe?
>
>
>

It's beyond obvious by now that his character is ALL flaw.

5048. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:00:52 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bko604$14j$2@208.206.142.72>
Source record: 78458

Leo wrote:

>Arnie,
>
>If you review this individual's posts on this subject over the last
>few days, a trend becomes obvious - his intent IS to upset and annoy.
>He thrives on confrontation, and really gets going when he hits a
>nerve with one of his readers. Not intellectual enough to make his
>point by rational arguement, he resorts to name calling and other
>juvenile tactics to 'get his way'. And he knows that the "nazi" thing
>works - so he keeps on with it - it's his gig.
>
>Convincing people like this to change is analogous to trying to teach
>a pig to sing - no matter how hard you try, it ain't gonna happen -
>you'll only annoy the pig....
>
>Best tactic for handling this guy - Dee has it absolutely right, use
>the killfile. If there's no audience, there'll be no idiot!
>
>

Oh, there'll still be an idiot, just one with no audience!

>Plonk 'im.
>
>

Did it the second day he was on here.

5049. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:01:00 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bko608$41i4i$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78456

"Dee D. Flint" wrote ...

Well he says that he has visited and studied this and it doesn't change his point of view. So now that I've completed the discussion on the call signs, I'm going to put him in my killfile along with Len 0ver 21.

I really hate to see you do that. I killfiled Len for about a year, and in the process, missed many a good laughs. But, as I said in another reply -- just might have to be done.

73,

Arnie -
KT4ST

5050. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:01:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922210120.02978.00000016@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 78457

>No you didn't.

Prove it, you know you cant and that just bugs you.....

5051. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:02:59 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmv6ufd302i0a4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78463

> > I will be the absolute BEST driver of a modern internal combustion
engine-
> > driven automobile if I first take a blacksmith's apprenticeship and
learn
> > to shoe a horse.
>

> Correct again Clint. The better you are at that will make you much better
> at changing a tire.
>

LOL
now THERE'S a stretch.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5052. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:03:51 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922210351.02978.00000017@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 78464

>Yet he claims that he was able to take the Extra exam on a lark, w/o
>ever studying for it, scoring 100%, in under 8 minutes.
>
>But everyone else is forced to memorize the Q/A.

Of course they are, they dont know the material. And you, not only do you not know the material, you cant even Memorize enough answers to pass it.

5053. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:05:16 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030922210516.02978.00000018@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 78465

>You're mistaken, Dwight.
>
>According to qrz.com, he's 305 years old.
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

And dont ever forget it. Im the one who taught Marconi. Last person I have ever Elmered.

5054. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:13:38 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <fs6vmvgkvvm2e7r3tn8nsq13bfa2s2208d@4ax.com>
Source record: 78466

On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 20:51:21 -0400, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote:

Of course, that's OK too - if you are not offended by the boorish
behaviour, and are able to see these people for what they are, you can
have a lot of fun watching them.

Kind of like the zoo, only more interactive.

But, a word of advice - if you are sensitive about an issue (as many
people are to the Holocaust, for example), never let then know -
they'll just use it against you later, usualling when they feel
threatened by you. That is a pretty scummy technique - but it's the
only real weapon in a cretin's arsenal. In other words, don't give
'em any ammunition....

73, Leo

>
>I completely agree with your points. I just hate to "plonk" him. I did
>that to Len for about a year and missed many laughs. But, at the end of the
>day, it might have to be done.
>
>73,
>
>Arnie -
>KT4ST
>

5055. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:14:09 UTC
From: Lou <Spamfree@Spamfree.com>
Message-ID: <Q7Nbb.51$LJ5.4366@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 78467
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
news:vmv6j3kfrkpv64@corp.supernews.com...
> HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A. Abernethy,
> K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation below 30
> MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the action,
> Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC letter
> included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of
> transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16.
Hollingsworth's
> letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference on
3.965
> MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted that
> Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time his
> station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to protest the
> sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21 and 22 in
> the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints from other
> amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the FCC had
> received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity, deliberate
> interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints to the
FCC
> alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt Song," the
> letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate interference."
> Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in
> Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to K4OKA. The
FCC
> letter also said the Commission had received complaints that Abernethy had
> used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference" on or
> near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about over-power
> operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start
revocation
> proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of continued
> violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter. (For
> additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for Six
Months"
> elsewhere on the AWE news page.)
>
>
> "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@porkbutt.net> wrote in message
> news:vmqshdfh78hr4b@corp.supernews.com...
> > SHOW UP ON MY FREQUENCY AND I WILL RUN YOU OFF. HO HO
> >
> >

> > "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> > news:iO8bb.13$LJ5.2273@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> > >
> > >
> > > "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@bigalk4oka.net> wrote in message
> > > news:vmq5ars9c9i455@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > HO HO. SELL YOUR GEAR I DONT CARE. JUST STAY OFF OF 3.894.5. THATS
BIG
> > ALS
> > > > FREQUENCY. HO HO. I'LL BE TAKING OVER 3.898 NEXT. HO HO
> > > >
> > > > AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. HO
> HO
> > > >
> > > >
> > > If I choose to talk on that frequency, I will, so long as I'm abiding
by
> > the
> > > > rules and regulations as they are spelled out. YOU or no one else, can
> > tell
> > > > me to stay off. ASS WIPE.
> > > >
> > > > BIG AL.. the only thing big about you, is your mouth....
> > > >
> > > > Lou
> > > >

Well Ass hole AL, looks like you've had your ass reamed out once, trying for
seconds???? Something tells me, you're due for it.
Lou

5056. Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:17:36 UTC
From: Greg Courville <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com>
Message-ID: <vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78468
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

This is a little out of date, but should give a little background info for those who are unfamiliar with "BIG AL"...

HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A. Abernethy, K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation below 30 MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the action, Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC letter included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16. Hollingsworth's letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference on 3.965 MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted that Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time his station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to protest the sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21 and 22 in the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints from other amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the FCC had received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity, deliberate interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints to the FCC alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt Song," the letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate interference." Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to K4OKA. The FCC letter also said the Commission had received complaints that Abernethy had used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference" on or near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about over-power operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start revocation proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of continued violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter. (For additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for Six Months" elsewhere on the AWE news page.)

73 de KG6SGY

"BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message news:vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com...
> WE KEPT THE QRMERS OFF 3.894.5 AGAIN TONITE WITH OUR BIG ONES. WE REIGN AS
> KINGS OF 75. HO HO
>
>
>
>

5057. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:19:51 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <6o7vmvsjtgqr4ledkt87efhl03bkdmg410@4ax.com>
Source record: 78469

Oops - missed that one! I was playing on the old "if a tree falls in
the woods, and no one hears, does it make a sound?" riddle.

You are absolutely correct - there is no sound, but the tree is still
there all right :)

Good one - thanks, Dick!

73, Leo

On 23 Sep 2003 01:00:52 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
wrote:

>
>
>Leo wrote:
>
>>Arnie,
>>
>>If you review this individual's posts on this subject over the last
>>few days, a trend becomes obvious - his intent IS to upset and annoy.
>>He thrives on confrontation, and really gets going when he hits a
>>nerve with one of his readers. Not intellectual enough to make his
>>point by rational arguement, he resorts to name calling and other
>>juvenile tactics to 'get his way'. And he knows that the "nazi" thing
>>works - so he keeps on with it - it's his gig.
>>
>>Convincing people like this to change is analogous to trying to teach
>>a pig to sing - no matter how hard you try, it ain't gonna happen -
>>you'll only annoy the pig....
>>
>>Best tactic for handling this guy - Dee has it absolutely right, use
>>the killfile. If there's no audience, there'll be no idiot!
>>
>>
>
>Oh, there'll still be an idiot, just one with no audience!
>
>
>>Plonk 'im.
>>
>>
>
>
>Did it the second day he was on here.

5058. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:22:31 UTC
From: Greg Courville <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com>
Message-ID: <vmv82dpbs0s270@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78470
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I wonder if FCC knows he's up to it again?
Maybe we should refer them to this NG...
I don't know if it's such a smart idea for him to brag about his illegal activities on a public newsgroup which is archived by servers everywhere for permanent storage. Especially when everybody knows exactly who he is.

73 de KG6SGY

"Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
news:Q7Nbb.51$LJ5.4366@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> "Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
> news:vmv6j3kfrkpv64@corp.supernews.com...
> > HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A. Abernethy,
> > K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation below
30
> > MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the action,
> > Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC letter
> > included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of
> > transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16.
> Hollingsworth's
> > letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference on
> 3.965
> > MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted that
> > Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time his
> > station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to protest the
> > sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21 and 22
in
> > the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints from
other
> > amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the FCC
had
> > received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity, deliberate
> > interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints to the
> FCC
> > alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt Song,"
the
> > letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate interference."
> > Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in
> > Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to K4OKA. The
> FCC
> > letter also said the Commission had received complaints that Abernethy
had
> > used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference" on or

> > near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about
over-power
> > operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start
> revocation
> > proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of continued
> > violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter. (For
> > additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for Six
> Months"
> > elsewhere on the AWE news page.)
> >
> >
> > "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@porkbutt.net> wrote in message
> > news:vmqshdfh78hr4b@corp.supernews.com...
> > > SHOW UP ON MY FREQUENCY AND I WILL RUN YOU OFF. HO HO
> > >
> > >
> > > "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> > > news:iO8bb.13$LJ5.2273@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@bigalk4oka.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:vmq5ars9c9i455@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > HO HO. SELL YOUR GEAR I DONT CARE. JUST STAY OFF OF 3.894.5. THATS
> BIG
> > > ALS
> > > > > FREQUENCY. HO HO. I'LL BE TAKING OVER 3.898 NEXT. HO HO
> > > > >
> > > > > AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG.
HO
> > HO
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > If I choose to talk on that frequency, I will, so long as I'm
abiding
> by
> > > the
> > > > > rules and regulations as they are spelled out. YOU or no one else,
can
> > > tell
> > > > > me to stay off. ASS WIPE.
> > > > >
> > > > > BIG AL.. the only thing big about you, is your mouth....
> > > > >
> > > > > Lou
> > > > >
>
> Well Ass hole AL, looks like you've had your ass reamed out once, trying
for
> seconds???? Something tells me, you're due for it.

> Lou
>
>

5059. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:28:04 UTC
From: Lou <Spamfree@Spamfree.com>
Message-ID: <UkNbb.52$LJ5.4418@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 78471
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
news:vmv82dpbs0s270@corp.supernews.com...
> I wonder if FCC knows he's up to it again?
> Maybe we should refer them to this NG...
> I don't know if it's such a smart idea for him to brag about his illegal
> activities on a public newsgroup which is archived by servers everywhere
for
> permanent storage. Especially when everybody knows exactly who he is.
>
> 73 de KG6SGY
>

Well, he didn't claim to be "smart". So, I'm sure, in due time he'll be busted again. Those who brag usually are begging to be caught or need severe help! Matter of psychology.

Lou

5060. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:45:48 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmv9em6ecc09ab@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78472

Unfortunately for you I guess that idea would never come to light...
the actual tide of events is against you on that one; testing
requirements are being reduced at a slow pace and not increased.
I'm afraid you'd be spitting in the wind if you petitioned the FCC
and said "I would like to add to your administrative worries and
an already stretched budgetary problem."

Clint
KB5ZHT

5061. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:46:43 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bko8lv$41s81$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78473

"Leo" wrote ...

But, a word of advice - if you are sensitive about an issue (as many people are to the Holocaust, for example), never let then know - they'll just use it against you later, usualling when they feel threatened by you. That is a pretty scummy technique - but it's the only real weapon in a cretin's arsenal. In other words, don't give 'em any ammunition....

Yep, good advice. Thanks.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5062. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:48:34 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bko8pe$3v97v$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78474

"Dick Carroll;" wrote ...

Oh, there'll still be an idiot, just one with no audience!

(Plonk 'im)

Did it the second day he was on here.

Yep, Dick. It's starting to look like that's what I'll have to do.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5063. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:50:18 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmv9n6bqu9kic4@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78475

your request
> above could only be considered factitious. Therefore, I will treat it as
> such.

Ah. Denial.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5064. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:55:35 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmva14jevi5ae3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78476

> Obviously you have no HF receiving capability and likely just as much
> interest,
> and just choose to adopt the standard NCI mantra. An even cursury tuning
> across
> the lower end of any low HF band any evening will show to be 180
> degrees out
> of phase with reality.

well, I have an HF rig, many of my local ham friends have them. We do in fact hear CW signals on the lower parts of the HF bands; I sometimes participate and make contacts, recieving and transmitting CW.

It's a relative comparison here that matters; and it is as follows. A growing
percentage of the HF spectrum is being used by VOICED contacts,
and a shrinking percentage is being used for CW. That is one of the primary reasons that the band allocations were changed recently and some of the lower CW/data subbands were shrunk and the balance given to the upper portions being used by voice contacts.

>
> You do know about phase relationships don't you?
>
> DON'T YOU??

well, he's demonstrated it. You haven't.
Or, at least not an unbiased one anyway.

>
> > Therefore, code testing is not
> >essential to the Amateur Radio Service.

Exactly.

> Quite an opinion you have there, Dwight. Too bad it's not accurate nor
> anywhere near universally shared among other hams,

Yes. I'm afraid it is.
That's why there is a growing voice and ever strengthening push, year after year, to eliminate the CW testing requirement.

You do listen to the knews, DON'T YOU?

Clint
KB5ZHT

5065. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:57:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309221757.d59bcf8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78477

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<RLIbb.63713$NM1.42393@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Rob Kemp" <robkemp90210@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:6114e4af.0309212028.45f4e122@posting.google.com...
> > http://drudgereport.com/flash3.htm?powell
> >
> > FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW: 'I HAVE A TIRED FAMILY,
> > TIRED CHILDREN AND A TIRED SPOUSE'
> > Sun Sep 21 2003 17:25:30 ET
> >
> > **Exclusive Sneak Preview**
> >
> > Michael K. Powell, the embattled chairman of the Federal
> > Communications Commission, appears to be setting the stage for an exit
> > with a candid interview pipelined for Monday runs of the NEW YORK
> > TIMES.
> >
> > Newsroom sources tell DRUDGE that Powell has gone on-the-record with
> > NYT's Steve Labaton for a wide-ranging explanation of current affairs.
> >
> > "I have a tired family, tired children and a tired spouse. Candidly, I
> > once said I would be in this job for three years and then leave,"
> > Powell explains. "That was three years ago."
> >
> > "I've been called every name in the book by every opponent in the
> > book," he adds. "That's classic Washington. If you can't get past
> > jingoism, you attack the person. I wish the press would focus on more
> > than who's rebuked and who's rebuking and look at what the best
> > alternatives are for the public in terms of policy."
> >
> > Labaton was said to be finalizing the text Sunday evening, for a
> > Business section lead, sources tell DRUDGE.
> >
> > Developing...
>
> Wouldn't it be great if the next political appointee actually had some idea
> of RF communications technology ?
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Spark?

5066. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 01:57:42 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmva512t211m52@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78478

>
> It's beyond obvious by now that his character is ALL flaw.
>

kinda like PCTA's reasoning for keeping CW testing requirements.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5067. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 02:00:16 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmva9qptrifqe5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78480

> Where did you get your information, Dwight? According to the ARRL (the
> primary ARS organization in the US) -- CW is the second most popular mode
in
> the ARS -- Just behind SSB.

And that's only *half* the truth. The *REST* of the story is that this is
not
a static relationship; the use of SSB is growing while that of CW is
declining,
as each year the number of prominently morse code users either change
over, quit operating ham radio or go silent key.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5068. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 02:01:04 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309221801.1206a431@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78479

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<6BIbb.63583$NM1.20271@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...

> I'll tell you this Jim...the Ruskies had and probably still do have the best
> CW operators in the world.
>
> I used to have to listen to them a lot in a job I had. Amazing how so many
> of them sounded like the hams on 20meters...hi.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

And the ones that washed out of CW school? The Gulag?

5069. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 02:06:48 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmvam37p0qqu59@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78481

> No, we are trying to get you to understand that there are much better ways
> to express your argument than by invoking an analogy that offends a large
> group of people.

Here's the scenario, should you decide to halt all communication that offends
some people.

The whole world goes silent from lack of all human communication. WHY?

All advertisements must be taken out of public view, as smoking cigarettes angers the anti-smoking crowd, meat products anger p.e.t.a.-types, wood products anger earth first! types, etc;

All books must be taken off the shelves, even the oldest literature offends some moralists... religious books offend athiests and pagans. Secular books offend christians, etc.

All music must be taken off the airwaves and recorded music products must be taken off the shelf... as rap offends those who've been victimized by violent crime, religious music offends seculars, pagans and athiests, etc.

Alcohol must be taken off the market to avoid offended MADD.

I could continue this ad nauseum but I think the point is pretty clear. If YOU want to live in that world, go right ahead and censure everything you say and carefully make sure you are not going to first offend everybody. The utopian socialists will LOVE you for it. I, however, will not. Ever. Are we clear?

Clint
KB5ZHT

5070. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 02:15:02 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmvb5irc8om806@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78482

> If you review this individual's posts on this subject over the last
> few days, a trend becomes obvious - his intent IS to upset and annoy.

Nope.

My intent is to offer a balancing opinion (I am intitled to that..???)
My intent is to offer a bit of modern thinking to oppose the
old gaurd "will not change to the end" crowd. My intent is to
offer proof and evidence to counter emotional bleeding
heart tactics.

If you are upset and annoyed, instead of genuinely inspired to think
further about the issue, then perhaps you should take a good long
look under your bed and make sure that you are operating from
anything less than true, honest feelings and ideas, and not
"I HAD TO DO IT, AND SO SHOULD YOU!!!!" mentality.

> He thrives on confrontation,

no, I will just not back down when ganged up on by "you do
as your told and quit questioning your betters & elders!" tactics.

Not intellectual enough to make his
> point by rational arguement,

i've done so and supported proof, and got EMOTION and
"feeling" in return instead of logical arguments. The few times
a PCTA type attempted to use a counter argument, it was so
weak and thin I blew holes in it quickly. Of course, soon
the real direct personal character attacks came.... "lazy",
"stupid", "moronic", etc...

now, WHO has the lack of intellect to make a point with a
rational argument?

>he resorts to name calling

if THAT isn't the pot calling the kettle black!

And he knows that the "nazi" thing
> works - so he keeps on with it - it's his gig.

you are correct. It made an excellent analogy that
struck home and made a concept clear. It's called
using examples to support an idea.

try it instead of just dodging the issue or telling
NCTA people to "shut up and do what you're told,

you're lazy, just do it, it's simple, do what we tell
you because only WE know what's best for you!"

You're turn-around tactic won't work on the
rational among us. The ONLY people it will
strike home with and find comfort with is the
small portion of the ham society that makes up
the PCTA crowd, and those people i'm not really
interested in reaching because they are so die-hard
CW testing lovers that they are not reachable.
The ones I am reaching are the other undecideds
out there and the ones that know they do not
have enough information to make thier own
decision and thus look further.

And you guys have done a really good job
of showing that the ONLY one common
basis for keeping the CW test alive is
that YOU had to do it, and it's just plain
not fair if future generations do not have to.

I don't think you won them over, but keep talking;
you're helping MY cause.

thanks!

Clint
KB5ZHT

5071. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 02:17:07 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmvb9ghdrbb556@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78483

> Best tactic for handling this guy - Dee has it absolutely right, use the
> killfile. If there's no audience, there'll be no idiot! Plonk 'im.

Heh, you think you've won the race the fact of the matter is you went
to the WRONG race track.

I'm not really looking to you guys as an audience; I am, in fact,
speaking to those out there reading and not posting. Of which there
are more than you can possibly imagine; there are certainly more of
them than the PCTA crowd.

THEY will read my posts. And THEY just saw that YOU cannot
handle debate, you run and hide.

yep, you just hurt your cause a little more.

"we can't discuss the topic with this fellow, so let's just hide from
him!"

Clint
KB5ZHT

5072. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 02:19:12 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmvbdap35c5s9f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78484

>
> Ya PUTZ!
>

I like the part in the previous thread where the PCTA's accuse
the NCTA's of name calling.

OOPS, you're the one that just did that. My bad.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5073. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 02:21:09 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vmvbh37m8aooe9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78485

>
> WHOA, PUTZBREATH!

Leo, an obvious PCTA, said this in a previous thread.. and I quote..

"Not intellectual enough to make his
point by rational arguement, he resorts to name calling and other
juvenile tactics to 'get his way'. "

oops.

A PCTA just did that, not a NCTA type.

Add "hypocrisy" to the list of the PCTA flaws in tactics and
debate skills.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5074. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 02:35:42 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <fbbvmvcurgfci05on7iduerg0vvle4ktfk@4ax.com>
Source record: 78486

Oh, please.... An excellent analogy? No one could possibly believe
that. Not even someone at your level of social comprehension.

You're making this stuff up, right? Pots and kettles? You 'blew holes'
in someone's arguement? It's OK to intentionally use a hateful
'analogy' to prove a point, then are surprised that you got emotion in
return? (well, Duh!)

There's a career waiting for you at the local Comedy Store, my friend!
Jeez....

...ROTFL again!

Leo

PS - I'm helping your cause? I thought that your cause was the
elimination of Morse testing. If you review all of my comments so
far, you'll find that I have never once mentioned Morse testing, pro
or con. You have no idea what my position is on that subject - nice
reading comprehension, my friend.

Unless your cause is to get up on the soapbox and make a fool of
yourself - if that's it, just let me know if you need any more help!

On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 21:15:02 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>
>> If you review this individual's posts on this subject over the last
>> few days, a trend becomes obvious - his intent IS to upset and annoy.
>
>Nope.
>
>My intent is to offer a balancing opinion (I am intitled to that..???)
>My intent is to offer a bit of modern thinking to oppose the
>old gaurd "will not change to the end" crowd. My intent is to
>offer proof and evidence to counter emotional bleeding
>heart tactics.
>
>If you are upset and annoyed, instead of genuinely inspired to think
>further about the issue, then perhaps you should take a good long
>look under your bed and make sure that you are operating from
>anything less than true, honest feelings and ideas, and not
>"I HAD TO DO IT, AND SO SHOULD YOU!!!!" mentality.
>
>
>> He thrives on confrontation,

>
>no, I will just not back down when ganged up on by "you do
>as your told and quit questioning your betters & elders!" tactics.
>
> Not intellectual enough to make his
>> point by rational arguement,
>
>i've done so and supported proof, and got EMOTION and
>"feeling" in return instead of logical arguments. The few times
>a PCTA type attempted to use a counter argument, it was so
>weak and thin I blew holes in it quickly. Of course, soon
>the real direct personal character attacks came.... "lazy",
>"stupid", "moronic", etc...
>
>now, WHO has the lack of intellect to make a point with a
>rational argument?
>
>>he resorts to name calling
>
>if THAT isn't the pot calling the kettle black!
>
>And he knows that the "nazi" thing
>> works - so he keeps on with it - it's his gig.
>
>you are correct. It made an excellent analogy that
>struck home and made a concept clear. It's called
>using examples to support an idea.
>
>try it instead of just dodging the issue or telling
>NCTA people to "shut up and do what you're told,
>you're lazy, just do it, it's simple, do what we tell
>you because only WE know what's best for you!"
>
>You're turn-around tactic won't work on the
>rational among us. The ONLY people it will
>strike home with and find comfort with is the
>small portion of the ham society that makes up
>the PCTA crowd, and those people i'm not really
>interested in reaching because they are so die-hard
>CW testing lovers that they are not reachable.
>The ones I am reaching are the other undecideds
>out there and the ones that know they do not
>have enough information to make thier own
>decision and thus look further.
>
>And you guys have done a really good job
>of showing that the ONLY one common
>basis for keeping the CW test alive is
>that YOU had to do it, and it's just plain
>not fair if future generations do not have to.

>
>I don't think you won them over, but keep talking;
>you're helping MY cause.
>
>thanks!
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>

5075. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 02:42:54 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkp9p0$jh8@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 78644

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030922185042.08626.00000799@mb-m27.aol.com...
> In article <bkj4q3$8ed@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
> >news:bki8pn$23md0$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> >> "Kim W5TIT" wrote ...
> >>
> >> But, but, but!!!! Larry's obviously got or had large boobs, and has
> >> obviously worn a bra. Right?! He *has* hasn't he? Surely, for if not
he
> >> would not be making value judgements on my callsign.
> >> ____
> >>
> >> It took a while, but I have grown accustomed to your callsign, Kim.
And
> >it
> >> wasn't necessary for me to wear a bra to do it. ;-)
> >>
> >> Arnie -
> >> KT4ST
> >>
> >>
> >
> >Uh, Arnie? If you wore a bra, the only thing you'd get from me would be,
> >"What ya packin' there, big fella?" ;)
> >
> Am I the only one reminded of the Seinfeld episode where Kramer and
George's
> father join forces to create a brassier for men? Kramer wanted to call it
the
> "bro" and Mr. Costanza wanted to call it the "man-sierre". Or vice versa.
>
> Classic show. Good times.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

ROFLMAO!!!!!

Kim W5TIT

5076. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 02:43:28 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkp9p1$jh8@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 78645

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030922185043.08626.00000801@mb-m27.aol.com...
> In article <bkhihu$n44@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >ROFLMAO!!!!!!!!!!!!!! These guys would actually try to answer the
> >question: So, what is the best antenna?
> >
> That's easy, Kim.
>
> There is no single "best" antenna. It all depends on the application and
the
> available resources.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Shhhhhhhhhh....

Kim W5TIT

5077. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 02:50:44 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <2ecvmv4rt6ito9ddqrh24ka0t1c4k2oium@4ax.com>
Source record: 78487

How so? I have never stated my position one way or the other with respect to mandatory Morse testing. I have stated that I did get my 5 WPM to get on to HF because I had to by law, and that using it for QSOs is beginning to grow on me. That doesn't mean that I think everyone should have to do it!

So, does that make me pro or con, for mandatory testing? Where's the obvious? Hmmm - there's that old reading comprehension problem again....

I think that you just like to stir things up, Sir - your diatribes appear to serve no other useful purpose. Of course you are aware that the future of Morse testing will be decided at the government level, by committees of civilized people - and not within this group. As such, your energies and passionate rants are for nought, as they will not sway the decision makers one bit. Like complaining with the guys on the loading dock about the boss - won't change anything, but I bet that would make someone one feel more important and in control, huh? (know the feeling?)

Leo

On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 21:21:09 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:

>
>>
>> WHOA, PUTZBREATH!
>
>
>Leo, an obvious PCTA, said this in a previous thread.. and I quote..
>
>"Not intellectual enough to make his
>point by rational arguement, he resorts to name calling and other
>juvenile tactics to 'get his way'. "
>
>oops.
>
>A PCTA just did that, not a NCTA type.
>
>Add "hypocrisy" to the list of the PCTA flaws in tactics and
>debate skills.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>

5078. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 02:53:30 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkocja$g21$0@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 78488

Brian wrote:

>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<6BIbb.63583$NM1.20271@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
>
>
>>I'll tell you this Jim...the Ruskies had and probably still do have the best
>>CW operators in the world.
>>
>>I used to have to listen to them a lot in a job I had. Amazing how so many
>>of them sounded like the hams on 20meters...hi.
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>>
>>
>
>And the ones that washed out of CW school? The Gulag?
>

Only you and a few like you washed out. Russian military, as our own,
don't.
When one is sitting trying to learn code, realizing that if you "just
can't" then
it.s off to the infantry, the failure rate is unsurprisingly low to
nonexistant.

5079. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 02:56:33 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <49dvmv8s9vgf0uu7jkpafpmnig3ojfjot4@4ax.com>
Source record: 78489

Don't worry, they're reading your posts all right.

It's entertaining. Just like the Jerry Springer show.

Leo

PS - what cause do I have, exactly? Do you know? PCTA? NCTA? PETA?
NAACP? MADD?

Don't think I ever mentioned that....!

On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 21:17:07 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>
>
>> Best tactic for handling this guy - Dee has it absolutely right, use the
>> killfile. If there's no audience, there'll be no idiot! Plonk 'im.
>
>Heh, you think you've won the race the fact of the matter is you went
>to the WRONG race track.
>
>I'm not really looking to you guys as an audience; I am, in fact,
>speaking to those out there reading and not posting. Of which there
>are more than you can possibly imagine; there are certainly more of
>them than the PCTA crowd.
>
>THEY will read my posts. And THEY just saw that YOU cannot
>handle debate, you run and hide.
>
>yep, you just hurt your cause a little more.
>
>"we can't discuss the topic with this fellow, so let's just hide from
>him!"
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>

5080. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 02:59:24 UTC
From: Greg Courville <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com>
Message-ID: <vmvdo3d6joi04b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78490

Hmm... I wonder how I could work that concept into my study strategy...

73 de KG6SGY

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bkocja$g21$0@208.206.142.110...
>
>
> Brian wrote:
>
> >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<6BIbb.63583$NM1.20271@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >
> >
> >
> >>I'll tell you this Jim...the Ruskies had and probably still do have the
best
> >>CW operators in the world.
> >>
> >>I used to have to listen to them a lot in a job I had. Amazing how so
many
> >>of them sounded like the hams on 20meters...hi.
> >>
> >>Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >>
> >
> >And the ones that washed out of CW school? The Gulag?
> >
>
>
>
> Only you and a few like you washed out. Russian military, as our own,
> don't.
> When one is sitting trying to learn code, realizing that if you "just
> can't" then
> it.s off to the infantry, the failure rate is unsurprisingly low to
> nonexistant.
>
>

5081. N8WWM begs for attention

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 03:02:55 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030922230255.772$eO@newsreader.com>
Source record: 78491
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

He is -one- ugly fickstick.

http://www.geocities.com/picsrfun2003/n8.bmp

--
http://NewsReader.Com/
50 GB/Month

5082. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 03:09:56 UTC
From: "\"\\frank\\\"" <"\"\\frank\\\""@nospam.franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <8QObb.410527$cF.127653@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 78492

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Rob Kemp" <robkemp90210@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> news:6114e4af.0309212028.45f4e122@posting.google.com...
>
>>http://drudgereport.com/flash3.htm?powell
>>
>>FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW: 'I HAVE A TIRED FAMILY,
>>TIRED CHILDREN AND A TIRED SPOUSE'
>>Sun Sep 21 2003 17:25:30 ET
>>
>>**Exclusive Sneak Preview**
>>
>>Michael K. Powell, the embattled chairman of the Federal
>>Communications Commission, appears to be setting the stage for an exit
>>with a candid interview pipelined for Monday runs of the NEW YORK
>>TIMES.
>>
>>Newsroom sources tell DRUDGE that Powell has gone on-the-record with
>>NYT's Steve Labaton for a wide-ranging explanation of current affairs.
>>
>>"I have a tired family, tired children and a tired spouse. Candidly, I
>>once said I would be in this job for three years and then leave,"
>>Powell explains. "That was three years ago."
>>
>>"I've been called every name in the book by every opponent in the
>>book," he adds. "That's classic Washington. If you can't get past
>>jingoism, you attack the person. I wish the press would focus on more
>>than who's rebuked and who's rebuking and look at what the best
>>alternatives are for the public in terms of policy."
>>
>>Labaton was said to be finalizing the text Sunday evening, for a
>>Business section lead, sources tell DRUDGE.
>>
>>Developing...
>
>
> Wouldn't it be great if the next political appointee actually had some idea
> of RF communications technology ?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
He doesn't need to...That is why he has a STAFF!!!

--
73

Frank K3EKO

5083. Re: Correct Brainlessbluster Your a winner

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 03:21:02 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030922232102.534$R4@newsreader.com>
Source record: 78493
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking,alt.radio.pirate

"Landshark" <S3Buell@SBCGlobal.Net.> wrote:
> "LMAO In Allentown" <iam_notgeorge@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:d646379b.0309221449.23063882@posting.google.com...
> > "Brainbuster" <brainbuster@spamtrap.lineone.net> wrote in message
> news:<bkm4iu$t6m$12@newsg2.svr.pol.co.uk>...
> > > Curious Dan wrote in message ...
> > > >
> > > ><Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> > > >news:20030919204720.547$wW@newsreader.com...
> > > >> auctionratter@yahoo.com (Auctions croak here) wrote:
> > > >> > I will send mopedholic to provide sisterly comfort to you as
> > > >> > soon as he gets done in Oldsmar.
> > > >> >
> > > >> You couldn't find your ass with both hands, n8wwm.
> > > >>
> > > >> Remember -dogie-, I'm gonna make you call yourself that.
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >Thats not dougie, landfag and nobrainsbuster said it was george
> > >
> > >
> > > I never said that he was George... but he said he was you
> >
> > I am not george, ass juice. read it again I am not george. no where
> > have you read anyone say he was george that is your imagination.
> > George has done nothing he seldom posts but you sit there and jump at
> > anything that sounds like him.
>
> Of course this is George using his AOL
> proxy account, the other at UUNet is Doug.
>
> Landshark
>
I have these boiler plated for n8wwm's abuse.

help4u@wcom.com

abuse-mail@mci.com

--
http://NewsReader.Com/
50 GB/Month

5084. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 03:37:35 UTC
From: Howard <misterrnNOSPAM@mercednet.com>
Message-ID: <rufvmv0ip6easg16rmlll5jc3pe4kepnhp@4ax.com>
Source record: 78494

On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 19:00:21 GMT, Keith
<kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote:

> I had the pleasure of watching the documentary by Michael
>Moore called, "Bowling for Columbine". In the opening segment
>Michael goes into a Michigan Bank and gets a free shotgun
>for opening a CD account. In the documentary he discusses
>the fact that the tenage mass killers bought their ammo at Kmart
>and obtained guns at gun shows.
> The thought occurred to me, Why in the hell can a teenager in America buy a
>weapon of mass destruction with no test or license, but to pick up a
>microphone to talk he needs to obtain a license from the federal government? I
>can understand for a vehicle, but isn't it time to do away with Ham Radio
>licensing in a nation in which 12,000 people are murdered by untested and
>unlicensed gun owners? Just a thought.

Hmmm. That one didn't even budge the troll-ometer. You need to do
better than that.

Howard
N3TNQ

5085. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 04:25:07 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkohv3qvo1@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 78495

Leo wrote:

>Don't worry, they're reading your posts all right.
>
>It's entertaining. Just like the Jerry Springer show.
>
>Leo
>
>PS - what cause do I have, exactly? Do you know? PCTA? NCTA? PETA?
>NAACP? MADD?
>
>Don't think I ever mentioned that....!
>
>On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 21:17:07 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
>dot net> wrote:
>
>
>
>>
>>
>>>Best tactic for handling this guy - Dee has it absolutely right, use the
>>>killfile. If there's no audience, there'll be no idiot! Plonk 'im.
>>>
>>>
>>Heh, you think you've won the race the fact of the matter is you went
>>to the WRONG race track.
>>
>>I'm not really looking to you guys as an audience; I am, in fact,
>>speaking to those out there reading and not posting. Of which there
>>are more than you can possibly imagine; there are certainly more of
>>them than the PCTA crowd.
>>
>>THEY will read my posts. And THEY just saw that YOU cannot
>>handle debate, you run and hide.
>>
>>yep, you just hurt your cause a little more.
>>
>>"we can't discuss the topic with this fellow, so let's just hide from
>>him!"
>>
>>Clint
>>KB5ZHT
>>
>>

>>

I guess Clint also doesn't understand the admonition to "Never argue
with an idiot".
Or Iit isn't nice to engage in a battle of wits with unarmed persons".

5086. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 04:28:15 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkoi4vqvo2@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 78496

Howard wrote:

>On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 19:00:21 GMT, Keith
><kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>
>
>>I had the pleasure of watching the documentary by Michael
>>Moore called, "Bowling for Columbine". In the opening segment
>>Michael goes into a Michigan Bank and gets a free shotgun
>>for opening a CD account. In the documentary he discusses
>>the fact that the tenage mass killers bought their ammo at Kmart
>>and obtained guns at gun shows.
>>The thought occurred to me, Why in the hell can a teenager in America buy a
>>weapon of mass destruction with no test or license, but to pick up a
>>microphone to talk he needs to obtain a license from the federal government? I
>>can understand for a vehicle, but isn't it time to do away with Ham Radio
>>licensing in a nation in which 12,000 people are murdered by untested and
>>unlicensed gun owners? Just a thought.
>>
>>
>
>
>Hmmm. That one didn't even budge the troll-ometer. You need to do
>better than that.
>
>

Yep. "twas all noise and no signal.

5087. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 04:40:47 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <j9Qbb.31$pB6.30@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78497

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> Well, Dwight, you just showed the exctent of your
> knoweldge of the subject. NONE! Obviously you
> have no HF receiving capability and likely just as
> much interest, and just choose to adopt the standard
> NCI mantra. An even cursury tuning across the lower
> end of any low HF band any evening will show to be
> 180 degrees out of phase with reality.

To clarify, the dispute is about how much of a role code/CW plays within the Amateur Radio Service today and whether the FCC has an incentive to maintain testing for this mode. To decide that, we first have to look at the number of people using code and what it is used for. As for the numbers, even excluding the "no-code" Techs, I think most would agree that the majority mainly use the voice modes and only rarely use code. Add in the "no-code" Techs and it is fairly clear that most Ham operators don't use code.

The next question is what code is used for. Clearly, code only plays a very small role in emergency communications today (a key component of Amateur Radio). Likewise, code is seldom used by the agencies we serve (Red Cross, Civil Service, and so on). In each of these (agencies served and emergency communications), voice is the dominate mode. That leaves only recreation as the primary use of CW/code.

With these facts, we can now go back to my primary point - does the FCC have any incentive to maintain testing for a mode that is mainly used for recreation and not used by the majority of todays' ham operators? I think the answer to that is fairly obvious.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5088. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 05:03:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <xuQbb.86$pB6.75@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78498

"Bert Craig" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
>> Because so few use it, the mode now plays only a
>> relatively minor role within the Amateur Radio Service.
>
> Huh???!!!
>
> > Therefore, code testing is not essential to the
> > Amateur Radio Service.
>
> I disagree...because the aforementioned supporting
> statement is entirely incorrect.

For clarification, read my response to Dick.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5089. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 05:06:32 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F6FD4D8.80003@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 78499

>
>
>
>They USE to have no code license designations, starting with "N".
>Oops, that was a *fact*.
>
>
>
The "all code" license designations had an "N" for the second character
in the callsign.
Changed to "A" or "B" upon upgrade.

5090. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 05:07:23 UTC
From: Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F6FD50C.2080806@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 78500

WA8ULX wrote:

> No-Code Licenses should come a designator following there Callsign, that lets
>people know there status.
> Such as W5TIT-1, or W5TIT-2, that way we will know if they are Mentally
>Challenged Operator, or a Lazy Operator, 1 being Mental, 2 being Lazy, that way
>we would know which ones not to talk to.
>
>
You mean like WA8ULX-1 ?

;-)

5091. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 05:30:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <tTQbb.165$pB6.154@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78601

"N2EY" wrote:
>
> First off, since Morse code tests are only required for
> HF/MF licenses, perhaps you might want to look at
> what ham operators do on HF/MF, not overall.

Already did that in my response to Dick.

> Also, consider how many of today's hams *regularly*
> build, repair or maintain their own equipment. Applying
> the argument you are using against the code test will
> gut most of the theory out of the written test, too.

Obviously, the FCC does not require demonstrated ability to build or repair equipment. Instead, they test basic theory in the written exams, just as they test basic code/CW theory in those same written exams. However, there is a difference between testing basic theory and testing actual skill. Since code will continue to be an available mode, there is justification to maintain testing for basic theory just like the other modes. But I find no sufficient justification today for the continued skill testing of this one mode.

> Maybe - but again, that's your interpretation of what FCC
> thinks. And what FCC thinks and does isn't necessarily
> what's in the best interest of the ARS.

Actually, for the reasons already stated, I think they are concerned with what is in the best interest of the ARS. The Amateur Radio Service is not (or should not be) defined solely by CW/code, so that one mode does not solely define what is in the best interest of the ARS. However, as it is, testing of that one mode does continue to define the ARS. I personally think it is time for that to change.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5092. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 05:34:14 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923013414.12631.00001336@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78604

In article <ZkJbb.7038$yp6.116603@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>However, the requirements for licensure should be reasonable
>and rational, and while the written tests meet that criteria, the
>requirement for Morse proficiency no longer does.
>
>Carl - wk3c

Carl:

Jim, N2EY, just said, in so many words, that since today's amateur
radio equipment can no longer be designed, built, or serviced by
any but the tiny handful of hams who possess professional-grade
technical knowledge, skill, and facilities, that most of the technical
knowledge in the present written tests can also be eliminated as
a licensing requirement. I totally agree. In what way is it
"reasonable and rational" for someone to know Ohm's Law or
even the most basic digital theory, if they'll never have to use it
in their actual practice as a radio amateur? I say it isn't, and
nothing could prove this better than eliminating the code testing
requirements for the same reason. After all, code testing has
the effect of exposing prospective radio amateurs to what is
always going to be a practical and useful communications tool
which allows radio amateurs to practice basic radio
communication with only entry-level skill and technology.

If we eliminate the code testing requirement, we therefore
demonstrate that basic communications skills are no longer
necessary to be a licensed amateur radio operator. I, for one,
would like to think that the present syllabus of the written tests
still represents "basic communications skills." So, which will
it be? Code testing, written testing, both, or neither?

73 de Larry, K3LT

5093. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 05:34:15 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923013415.12631.00001337@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78611

In article <9FHbb.2804$vS.1215@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>, Keith
<kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> writes:

> I had the pleasure of watching the documentary by Michael
>Moore called, "Bowling for Columbine". In the opening segment
>Michael goes into a Michigan Bank and gets a free shotgun
>for opening a CD account.

Keith:

I bought the DVD. Actually, it was a Winchester .270 cal. bolt-action
rifle.

>In the documentary he discusses
>the fact that the tenage mass killers bought their ammo at Kmart
>and obtained guns at gun shows.

Both perfectly legal activities, assuming they were old enough to
legally do so, but I think Harris and Klebold had assistance from an
older woman. What was illegal and immoral, however, is the manner
in which that ammunition was used. How is K-Mart at fault for the
misuse of a perfectly legal product which is otherwise safe (except to
violent criminals) when utilized in it's intended manner, using the
well-known safety practices associated with it's proper use? The
fact that K-Mart was willing to acquiesce to the extortionist pressure
placed upon them by Mr. Moore only serves to make one understand
why their organization is going down the tubes. They were engaged
in perfectly moral and legitimate commerce in the sale of firearms and
ammunition, but chose instead, to allow themselves to be used as
a scapegoat for the villainous actions of those who misused these
products. I have personally purchased firearms and ammunition
from K-Mart, and it has never occurred to me to shoot up a high
school with them. Is K-Mart just lucky that I'm not a violent criminal,
or was there something different about the Marlin Model 60 and
336 rifles and the .22 LR, .30-30 Winchester, and other ammo I
bought from them that caused it not to be used to kill innocent
people?

> The thought occurred to me, Why in the hell can a teenager in America buy a
>weapon of mass destruction with no test or license, but to pick up a
>microphone to talk he needs to obtain a license from the federal government?

The truth is, he doesn't. Bootlegging is a big problem in radio. However,
like criminals who commit violent crimes with sporting firearms, it is not
the inanimate objects (firearms or radios) at fault - but the responsible
human agent who utilizes them in an improper manner. No amount of

licensing can prevent the misuse of guns, cars, radios, aircraft, or any other potentially destructive item -- and the world is full of them. It is up to us intelligent human beings to use these things in a proper, moral manner. We can either decide to accept this challenge and take the responsibility for our actions, or simply sanitize our lives of anything that could possibly hurt us. The choice is ours. If you choose the latter, you can start by throwing away every bar of soap in your house. After all, if misused, a bar of Kirk's Coco Hardwater Castile can be just as dangerous as a .22 cal. rifle.

>I
>can understand for a vehicle, but isn't it time to do away with Ham Radio
>licensing in a nation in which 12,000 people are murdered by untested and
>unlicensed gun owners? Just a thought.

What of the over 2 million people who are saved from violence each year by the legitimate use of firearms? Or the untold thousands who benefit from the emergency communications services provided by legal, licensed radio amateurs? In the case of guns, the liberal media, which has an agenda to remove the personal power given to the people to defend themselves from violence, never allows the truth to see the light of day. However, the benefits of amateur radio are well-known and occasionally given publicity which does it some good. The problem of the over 12,000 victims of violent gun crime can be readily addressed by simply enforcing existing laws, and treating criminals AS criminals and not using the inanimate object (the gun) as the scapegoat for human behaviour. In the true manner of a person with a liberal, socialist, freedom-hating agenda, Mr. Moore carefully left that truth out of his documentary. It is up to us to be intelligent enough to see through his lies of omission, and learn the truth. The same applies to code testing, or any other licensing requirements in the ARS.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5094. Re: It starts with the basics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 05:34:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923013418.12631.00001338@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78612

In article <20030922000029.05539.00000933@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>>Amateur radio operators have always dealt with the level of technology
>>available at their own particular slice in time.
>
> "Spark" is outlawed, Larrah.

Which is just but one of the numerous reasons why I don't use it, Lennie!

>>However, the one constant
>>has been the Morse/CW mode, which continues to be a practical,
>>effective, efficient, and universal mode of electronic communication
>>in spite of any and all other modes which have been invented in it's
>>wake.
>
> Yes. Takes little brains to learn morse, just a LOT of practice...to
> find that the rest of the radio world does NOT use it anymore.

Except for licensed radio amateurs, but I guess it would take one to know one, wouldn't it, Lennie?

> Your beloved on-off keying coding is no damn good if you can't get
> your transmitter to work...and then you have to have another
> morseman at the other end to understand your monotonic beeping.

Fortunately, my transmitter(s) work just fine, thanks!

> The only radio people you can communicate with are other morsemen.

And other SSBmen, other PSK-31men, other FMmen, other AMmen, other RTTYmen, other Packetmen, other Hellschreibermen, and, of course, the SSB-, PSK-31-, FM-, AM-, RTTY-, Hellschreiber, etc.-YL's using those modes. You should try it sometime!

>>And, as always, radio amateurs are not able to exploit the
>>many benefits and advantages of the Morse/CW mode unless they
>>learn the Morse code.
>
> Your "benefits" are imaginary. Your "advantages" are imaginary.

And your concept of what I find "imaginary" is imaginary.

> You are trying to sell a product that isn't being bought.

Except by tens of thousands of Morse/CW users!

> You would do better selling snake oil or used cars.

> Come to think of it, you probably ARE...

Well, I've already tried my hand at selling used cars, and showed some definite ability in that particular endeavour. However, I've never been able to detect a very high demand for snake oil -- in fact, if my memory serves me correctly, you're the only one I've seen mention it lately.

>>Code testing requirements have always been
>>the means of providing the incentive to do so; in their absence, we will
>>see a decline in the use of this mode in the fullness of time.
>
> Oh, is this an ENVIRONMENTAL or "greenie" issue to you?
>
> If the nasty old government doesn't keep up the code test you won't
> have anyone to play with on the radio?

That's not very likely in my own case, but for future radio amateurs, it would be matter of increasing concern.

>>This is just plain 'ole reality.
>
> Yes, Larrah, you show a glimmer of understanding...but cannot
> understand that you are an endangered species which has NO
> appreciable impact on the radio ecology.

With things going the way they are, Lennie, ALL radio amateurs now have a dotted line forming around them. And, regardless of the way the conventional wisdom is going, reduced licensing standards isn't doing anything to alter that reality.

>>No tricks of logic will change it, either.
>
> So, bottom line...YOU want a WELFARE handout by keeping the
> code test so you can parade around like an amateur pooh-bah.

If that's what you think, then show me, using direct quotations, where I have said that, and I'll admit to it. Otherwise, you're just blowing your uusally foul-smelling smoke. Talk about "environmental" hazards...

> You're weird, Larrah.

I'm an Amateur Radio Operator. A certain amount of "weirdness" comes with that territory, but how do you explain YOUR weirdness, Lennie?

> Too much monoxide inhalation on that bus of yours.

Maybe, but ever since they gave me my new bus last year, that problem has been drastically reduced, and I'm showing definite signs of recovery.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5095. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 05:34:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923013419.12631.00001339@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78602

In article <3F6E7F9D.8070805@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
writes:

>
>I'd wager that if you put all us in a room, we'd get along just fine.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike:

Not only that, but it might take us quite a while to even get around to
a discussion of code testing, if we ever did!

Anyone interested in an rrap get-together during Dayton '04? I don't get
to bid on my vacation time until the end of the year, but it could very
well be "doable" for me, since starting next week, I'll finally have the
weekends off on a permanent basis.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5096. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 05:34:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923013420.12631.00001340@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78605

In article <bkmm02$2th@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> writes:

>> I'd wager that if you put all us in a room, we'd get along just fine.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>>
>
>You and me? Sure. Jim/N2EY and I? Sure. Brian and I? Sure. Here's who
>I wouldn't even consider being in the same room with: Larry Roll, Dick
>Carroll, Dan/W4whatever, Dave Heil, Waddles (Waddles is non-existent in my
>book), and that's just a few. I have no desire to "get along" with people
>like that.
>
>Kim W5TIT

Kim:

Well, that's pretty sad. I guess you're overlooking the fact that a person's online "personality" can be quite different than what one would experience in person, since the written word, particularly in a virtually immediate forum such as Usenet, is, indeed, quite impersonal by nature. Moreover, your expression of a lack of desire to meet with certain members of this forum could cause all the rest, even those not included on your list, to not wish to meet with you.

I would jump at any chance to meet any and all of the regulars in this newsgroup, for no better reason than to see what they are really like in person. I think that even Len Anderson could prove to be a quite affable chap, given a chance to get to know him better. I may be wrong, but at least I'm willing to take that chance. I would like to think that given the opportunity, your curiosity would ultimately get the upper hand over your stated objections. If not, one could quite legitimately call your character into question, at a level far deeper than anything ever said in this forum.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5097. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 05:34:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923013421.12631.00001342@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78606

In article <vmu3dc5uoiohad@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>> Well, Clint, you said it, not me! I'm glad you're starting to see the
>light!
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>
>
>I, I see your point.
>I will be the absolute BEST driver of a modern internal combustion engine-
>driven automobile if I first take a blacksmith's apprenticeship and learn
>to shoe a horse.
>
>Yes. Quite logical.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT

Well, Clint, that kind of cynicism may seem to be amusing to some, but just goes to demonstrate a lack of any truly logical argument which supports your position. Therefore, it, and you, are easily dismissed.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5098. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 05:34:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923013421.12631.00001341@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78607

In article <220920031042106978%K3UD@charter.net>, K3UD <K3UD@charter.net>
writes:

>> Just some food for thoughtâ€¦any and all comments welcome.
>>
>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
>Larry,
>
>Although not very active here anymore, I did drive through Dover this
>summer and gave you a call on all the repeaters I could get into. I
>think it would be fun and interesting to meet you and the others in
>person.
>
>73
>George
>K3UD
>(ex W3GEO - WA3DNC)

George:

Sorry I missed you. I sent you my telephone number in a private
E-mail, if you're interested. Hope to hear from you!

73 de Larry, K3LT

5099. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 05:34:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923013422.12631.00001343@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78608

In article <YDtbb.50785$Aq2.26951@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>> And, once again, you fail to mention who or what is
>> benefited by it, if not the ARS. Please provide an answer,
>> or quite wasting our time with this illogical statement.
>
>
> Larry, I know you are not so dumb as to not know how Morse Code/CW has fit
>into the history of Amateur Radio and how Amateur Radio has fit into the
>other radio services throughout that history. Knowing that, your request
>above could only be considered factitious. Therefore, I will treat it as
>such.

Dwight:

I wasn't being facetious, I was asking a question based on a logical premise which you yourself raised. So, you either answer it, or your original premise is insupportable. Which is it?

>> (snip) And, since everything I'm discussing here is related
>> ONLY to the Amateur Radio Service, that's the only group
>> of Morse/CW users who are being considered by me in any
>> of my postings. (snip)

> Well, that may be what you're discussing, but I'm discussing Morse Code
>testing - a discussion which, by it's very nature, cannot be limited to just
>Amateur Radio.

OK, fine. Now, then, precisely which OTHER radio services currently require Morse code testing???

>However, if the discussion were limited to just Amateur
>Radio, your arguments would have no more weight since most ham operators
>today don't use code/cw on any routine or regular basis. There is little
>reason to maintain testing for a mode that is seldom used by more than a
>relatively small minority.

Hmmm. Funny how that "small minority" seems to come out of the woodwork in vast quantities during CW contests, Field Day, or whenever some rare DX pops up on the air!

73 de Larry, K3LT

5100. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 05:34:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923013423.12631.00001344@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78609

In article <g2ubb.50866$Aq2.35980@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> (snip) Now, then, how does the advocation of code
>> testing in any way correlate to bigotry, elitism, and/or
>> discrimination against other Americans? (snip)
>
>
> I'm not going to waste time talking in circles with you, Larry. We just
>discussed this less than a month ago, so there is little reason to repeat it
>again.

Dwight:

OIC. So, you can't answer the question, then.

>> Correct, because I don't consider it to be "excessive"
>> government regulation. I believe the government has
>> a valid need to regulate certain things, especially
>> valuable and finite resources such as the RF spectrum.
>> Therefore, I believe that when license is to be given for
>> the PRIVILEGE of free use of RF spectrum, which is
>> worth potentially billions of dollars should it be converted
>> to commerce in the commercial utility communications
>> and broadcasting industries, certain government
>> regulation makes good sense. (snip)

> The only thing you didn't explain with that is a government regulation
>requiring code testing to gain that privilege. In other words, what does
>code testing have to do with anything you said?

Everything, but you have to be able to see beyond your own
agenda in order to know that.

>> (snip) First of all, FCC Commissioners are political
>> appointees, not necessarily technical experts. They can,
>> and do, depend on the advice of professional technical
>> experts, who actually formulate and subsequently make
>> recommendations on regulatory matters. (snip)

> The original premise still stands - there is no code testing requirement
>at the FCC, either for the commissioners who regulate Amateur Radio or the
>technical experts they rely on.

Oh? So Element 1(a) has been eliminated?

>> (snip) However, this discussion is about the AMATEUR
>> Radio Service. (snip)

> No, this discussion is about the code test requirement. How that applies
>to Amateur Radio is only one part of that discussion.

No, it is the whole discussion, since there are no code testing requirements
anywhere else. You are now becoming dangerously Kim-like, Dwight.
You really should watch out for that.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5101. Where Kim fails in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 05:34:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923013427.12631.00001346@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78603

In article <bkmli0$lg2@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>Besides which, there is no requirement "that people who aren't required to
>be code tested usually don't bother to learn and use the Morse code." So,
>it is a non-issue when discussing the topic.
>
>Kim W5TIT

All:

Will someone, anyone, PUHLEESE explain the "logic" of the statement
Kim just made above? As Kim herself would say, it flew right past my
head! Also, it would probably be helpful if that explanation came from
someone other than Kim.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5102. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 05:34:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923013427.12631.00001345@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78610

In article <ERybb.56243$NM1.55651@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> Well, I'm glad I finally got your attention directed
>> toward reality. If the Morse code isn't relevant to
>> any communications service outside the ARS, then
>> the fact that the commercial and military services
>> have stopped using it isn't relevant or responsive
>> to the issue of code testing withing the ARS.
>> Therefore, by your own admission, the NCTA's
>> prime argument is just so much worthless rhetoric.
>
>
> But, as you well know, the code testing requirement was originally
>established exactly because code was once relevant to the military,
>government, and commercial services outside Amateur Radio. Since that has
>now changed, it is clearly time to question the need for a unique testing
>requirement for this one operating mode.

Dwight:

I hate to sound like a scratched CD, but that reply is unresponsive. If the above were true, then the very second radio amateurs started using modes other than CW, the code testing requirement should have been dropped, for all the same reasons given by the NCTA today. However, it wasn't. In fact, in the late '60's, over a half-century after the need for military and commercial stations to be able to shoo-off "those damn hams" from their frequencies, the Morse code testing requirement was increased as part of the now lamented "Incentive Licensing" scheme. Incentive Licensing was an ARRL initiative, and it was done to ensure that the Morse/CW mode would continue to be used in spite of the increasing popularity of SSB and digital modes. It was actually a very brilliant plan, but was spoiled by the resentment caused by the lack of full "grandfathering" of the existing Generals to the new Amateur Extra class. If only that had been done, we may not be having this debate today.

>Since most ham operators today
>don't use code on a regular basis, there is also little need within Amateur
>Radio to maintain a testing requirement for this one operating mode.

During the last ARRL 10-Meter Contest, I worked over 160 QSO's on 10-meters, using only CW. This is on 10-meters, a band famous as a

repository for the 5 WPM Novice/Techs exercising the whole of their HF phone privileges! During contests covering all HF bands, such as the November Sweepstakes (CW), it is not possible to work all of the CW stations participating. Well, at least not for me, with my minimal station in a highly antenna-compromised apartment QTH. However, in spite of my operating challenges, the CW mode provides endless potential to make points. During the November SS (Phone) last year, my club station (W3DOV) was also operating under "marginal" conditions at the QTH of Mark, KE3UY. Using literally the same power and antennas as I would at my home QTH, we worked a lot fewer stations than we could have on CW. It's as simple as that. And, excluding contests, the CW segments are very alive and full of stations all the time, largely thanks to FISTS and the old CW-geezers chasing all that paper.

>All
>that has led to the efforts now being made to eliminate the Morse Code test
>requirement.

The efforts being made to eliminate the Morse code test requirement are motivated by one thing and one thing only: laziness. The laziness born of a lack of desire to learn and gain reasonable proficiency in a proven, useful communications skill. And, considering the nature of the ARS, indulging that laziness would be an abomination.

>> The Morse/CW mode remains as a valuable, basic
>> communications tool within the ARS, and the code
>> testing requirement is current and essential to the
>> continued use of this mode. End of story. (snip)

> But, as much as you'd like it to be, that is not the end of the story,
>Larry. Because so few use it, the mode now plays only a relatively minor
>role within the Amateur Radio Service.

That has been disproved over and over again…most recently, in my last paragraph, above.

>Therefore, code testing is not
>essential to the Amateur Radio Service.

It most certainly is, if the ARS wishes to continue to develop radio operators capable of exploiting the many benefits and advantages of the Morse/CW mode.

>Further, without outside factors
>(the needs of the other services) to consider, the FCC itself has no
>significant interest today in maintaining the "continued use of this mode"
>within the Amateur Radio Service.

The FCC has stated repeatedly that whether or not it will have an interesting in the "continued use of this mode" depends upon a consensus of the amateur radio community itself. Therefore, unfortunately, we will be at the mercy of the majority. Us PCTA's

may not like the outcome, but that is the risk one takes when living
in a democracy.

>As far as the FCC is concerned, it is now
>just one more operating mode among the many used within the Amateur Radio
>Service. There is no sufficient argument to support the continued existence
>of a code testing requirement. As such, the code testing requirement should
>be eliminated.

As already stated by N2EY, this particular logic could then be applied to
testing for knowledge of any of the requirements for technical knowledge,
since radio amateurs no longer have the ability to design, build, and repair
state-of-the art communications gear unless they possess professional-
grade technical knowledge, skills, and facilities. And, since this is the
AMATEUR Radio Service, that is an unreasonable expectation. Therefore,
if code testing *is* eliminated, then we may as well also go to a simple
license application process, with, at most, an open-book test on rules and
regulations. That would then serve the needs of the dumbed-down
licensing process you would seem to prefer.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5103. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 05:56:04 UTC
From: "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkon9k$74i$0@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 78613

Dwight Stewart wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
>
>> Well, Dwight, you just showed the excitant of your
>>knowledge of the subject. NONE! Obviously you
>>have no HF receiving capability and likely just as
>>much interest, and just choose to adopt the standard
>>NCI mantra. An even cursory tuning across the lower
>>end of any low HF band any evening will show to be
>>180 degrees out of phase with reality.
>>
>>
>
>
> To clarify, the dispute is about how much of a role code/CW plays within
>the Amateur Radio Service today and whether the FCC has an incentive to
>maintain testing for this mode. To decide that, we first have to look at the
>number of people using code and what it is used for. As for the numbers,
>even excluding the "no-code" Techs, I think most would agree that the
>majority mainly use the voice modes and only rarely use code. Add in the
>"no-code" Techs and it is fairly clear that most Ham operators don't use
>code.
>
> The next question is what code is used for. Clearly, code only plays a
>very small role in emergency communications today (a key component of
>Amateur Radio). Likewise, code is seldom used by the agencies we serve (Red
>Cross, Civil Service, and so on). In each of these (agencies served and
>emergency communications), voice is the dominate mode. That leaves only
>recreation as the primary use of CW/code.
>
> With these facts, we can now go back to my primary point - does the FCC
>have any incentive to maintain testing for a mode that is mainly used for
>recreation and not used by the majority of todays' ham operators? I think
>the answer to that is fairly obvious.
>
>
>

Gotta hand it to you, Dwight. Not everyone can take few wild
statements, mold them into assumptions, then in the same paragraph,
change it all into "facts". But you manage that with the ease of someone
who writes bafflegab for the Guv'mint.

>
>
>

5104. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 06:25:27 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <rHRbb.328$pB6.62@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78614

"Arnie Macy" wrote:
>
> Where did you get your information, Dwight? According
> to the ARRL (theprimary ARS organization in the US) --
> CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS -- Just
> behind SSB. That on its face would mean that there are
> still a whole bunch of folks out there still using it.

I don't doubt CW is popular, Arnie. It's all relative. The question is whether it is popular enough to justify a unique testing requirement for this one mode. By the way, I think you meant to say just behind voice above (AM, FM, and SSB).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5105. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 07:02:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <4eSbb.442$pB6.328@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78615

"N2EY" wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
>
>> Sadly, Bruce (WA8ULX) isn't an old timer - his license is so
>> new the ink isn't even dry yet.
>
> You're mistaken, Dwight.
>
> According to qrz.com, he's 305 years old.

Good grief. Obviously he can't fill in a qrz.com form any better than he can write in this newsgroup. Either that or he has no idea when he was actually born. I can see the story now....

[local news] Police officers found a young lad, covered
in mud, wandering in the swamps of LA yesterday and
took him to an area hospital where doctors said the child
was in reasonably good condition. Police have not been
able to discover the child's itentity... (snip)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5106. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 07:05:02 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bkpe26$4conv$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78651

Especially if there is that beer and barbaque involved as well! :)

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:3F6E7F9D.8070805@adelphia.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:3F6DB2DF.6040104@adelphia.net...
> >
> >>Yaknow, people can be pro-code and no-code and have spirited arguments
> >>without accusing each other against crimes against humanity! Or illegal
> >>drug abuse.
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >
> >
> > You're far more optimistic than I.
>
>
> I'd wager that if you put all us in a room, we'd get along just fine.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>

5107. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 07:46:30 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <amnvmv0bfvn0p44ssdqi8ogkqplv67e5l4@4ax.com>
Source record: 78616

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 01:49:19 GMT, "Dwight Stewart"
<stewartx@NOSPAMearthlink.net> wrote:

> Gladly, we don't live in a trial and error world today. I would hope the
>bridge designer would have enough knowledge to build a safe bridge without
>having to watch one (perhaps this one) fall down first. People can learn
>about the specifics of a subject without personally experiencing every
>aspect of it. We generally trust that system for a great many things in this
>world today (for example, the bridges we routinely drive over).

Yet bridges - old and new - do, on occasion, fall down.

> If that were true, I think a test requirement is the worst way to
>accomplish what you're seeking. Instead, a better solution is to find ways
>to attract new people to that aspect of ham radio. You're obviously not
>going to have much success with that effort today because "no coders" have
>made their choice about code while focusing solely on the license
>requirement (the license requirement dominates the issue in their minds).
>Later, when that license requirement is gone, the mode itself becomes the
>focus. At that point, I think many more will be interested in taking a
>second look at code. Obviously, there is no way for me to prove that now,
>but I just have a feeling about this (perhaps the same way you have a
>feeling about the above).

If someone has their mind made up that they do not like something,
shoving it down their throat with a licensing requirement isn't going
to change their mind. All it's going to do is create resentment. I'm
inclined to think that many, perhaps even most, of the people who had
to learn Morse simply to upgrade so that they could get the privileges
on HF to do what they were really interested in, are so glad it's over
with Morse now that they've passed the test and never have to do it
again, the chances of them going back to it later are slim.

I could draw numerous analogies, but the fact remains that, absent a
license requirement WRT the code, once an individual has obtained gthe
license without having been forced to learn code, the code can then be
viewed as another mode for possible exploration later, rather than as
the barrier to obtaining the license that, once surmounted, is often
considered best forgotten about.

With many PCTAs none of this matters, for their aim is to force people
to jump through hoops, rather than to encourage any interest in the
hobby or the mode. All our bands can get reallocated because of lack
of use, like happened to part of 220 years ago, and they don't care,

as long as the fifteen people who will be left on the measly 2khz the ARS will have left afterward all passed a code test. There are even people who maintain that the best way to get young people interested in ham radio is to show them hams operating in CW. "Look at a bunch of kids at a ham demo and see what they gravitate to," they'll say. "See the looks on their faces."

I have. I've also seen the same looks on their faces when they see the clown at a circus, or the geek at a carnival sideshow. Kids will hang around for awhile, laughing inwardly at the old geezers acting like it's still 1902, then they're outta there, c-ya, wouldn't wanna b-ya. They're not standing there thinking this is cool, they're standing there wondering what's wrong with us messing around doing things the way they were done 100 years ago when there are twenty easier ways to do the same thing today. Anachronisms may arouse curiosity. Curiosity does not necessarily equate to a genuine interest. I might be curious about skydiving - that doesn't mean I want to risk the 5000-foot fall plus the splat just because I see other people jumping out of a perfectly good airplane...especially when I know that it's easier and safer to wait until it lands and then walk down the stairs.

So, I agree with you that we may well be better off, from the standpoint of preserving the use of the mode within the hobby, to remove the testing requirement and allow the mode to stand on its own merits. If someone asks, "Why should I learn Morse code?" the answer right now is basically, "You have to in order to get the license." And the reaction is basically, "Screw that, I'll just find another hobby."

Lose that, and we have "Because sometimes a CW signal will get through when a voice signal won't, and because Morse contacts in a contest are worth more points, and because some operators enjoy it so much that they use it exclusively and so if you want to work those guys you have to learn the code in order to 'talk to' them." And maybe, just maybe, the reaction just might be more favorable to the future of the ARS.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=-=-=

5108. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 07:46:35 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <r9pvmv0827itq9d4u74dfmvnp3grvbvobi@4ax.com>
Source record: 78617

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On 22 Sep 2003 03:03:59 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Unfortunately, there is more evidence to support my "feeling" than there
>is to support yours. With the exception of hams who were trained in
>Morse code by the military or maritime/commercial radio services, I have
>yet to meet an avid and active CW user who got that way except through
>the code testing requirement. And, for what should have been 14 of the
>best years of my ham radio career, I was one of the "objectors."

In my opinion, Larry, you aren't accounting for the fact that the
personality traits of various people differ widely. You yourself chose
to dump your objections. I chose to find another hobby instead, and so
for almost 30 years remained a radio hobbyist active in other
interests but was not part of amateur radio - I thoroughly enjoyed
SWL'ing, scanning, AM broadcast DX'ing, and didn't feel as if I was
missing out on anything by not having a ham ticket.

I also immersed myself in computers as a hobby. That led me eventually
to the Internet which, strangely enough, is what led me back to ham
radio. Vicious circle, that...but fodder for a discussion on an
entirely different topic.

What I'm trying to say here is, for every person who, like you,
decided to compromise your objections, there are who knows how many
others who felt that as a matter of principle they were not about to
waste their precious time learning what they felt was an anachronism,
and moved on to something else instead...a process which continues
today. Each such person represents a potential ham chased away from
the hobby by a wholly unnecessary licensing requirement. This is why
many view it as a hazing ritual. How many licensed drivers would be on
the road today if you had to buy a horse, learn to ride it, and be
tested on your equestrian skills in order to get behind the wheel of
the family bus? Probably very few, and in many cases the reasoning is
probably the same in both cases - i.e., they don't want to deal with a
lot of horseshit.

>So, as
>you say, we can't prove anything now, but I'm not willing to bet that there
>will be some sort of "epiphany" among former no-coders to go ahead
>and learn the code and become CW operators when the testing
>requirement is gone. It just ain't gonna happen!

Probably not, because they already have had the experience of having been forced to learn the code in order to pass the test, and having done so, are glad it's over with and don't care if they ever use it again. They've passed the only code test they'll ever have to take as long as they keep their licenses current, and are glad to have the whole ordeal over with, permanently.

Again, no way to prove anything now one way or the other...but we'll find out if and when the code test vanishes, and we see how many people licensed without a code test learn the code voluntarily on account of its merits as an operating mode, absent any lingering resentment over the licensing requirement or the prospect of prolonged beatings with the Wouff Hong hanging over their heads like the Sword Of Damocles when they begin their participation in the hobby.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=-=-=

5109. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 07:46:45 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <5dqvmv0n4a305dpv6ous80n2262cs1nmdg@4ax.com>
Source record: 78618

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On 22 Sep 2003 03:03:59 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Dwight:
>
>Well, I'm glad I finally got your attention directed toward reality. If the
>Morse code isn't relevant to any communications service outside the
>ARS, then the fact that the commercial and military services have
>stopped using it isn't relevant or responsive to the issue of code testing
>withing the ARS.

Sure it is. Part of the basis and purpose of the ARS as specified in
Part 97 is to develop a pool of trained radio operators. Since nobody
else uses CW anymore, it is no longer necessary to develop pools of
Morse-trained radio operators.

>The Morse/CW mode remains as a valuable, basic communications
>tool within the ARS, and the code testing requirement is current and
>essential to the continued use of this mode. End of story.

Hmmm...

Valuable? In some respects, perhaps. It does have its advantages,
although it also has its disadvantages.

Basic? I'm not too sure of that. It was once upon a time. I'm inclined
to think that time is either passed, or very close to it. I don't know
what percentage of hams is sufficiently skilled with the mode to
actually use it for on-air contacts, but surely the percentage must be
shrinking daily.

As for the code testing requirement being essential to the continued
use of the mode - if that's the case, then the patient is already
brain dead and being kept alive through purely artificial means, and
will expire anyway as soon as somebody pulls the plug, either
accidentally or deliberately. The question then becomes, for how long
do we prolong the inevitable, and for what purpose?

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=-=-=

-=-=-=

5110. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 07:49:08 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <UVSbb.7496$JM.6466874@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 78619

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:xuQbb.86$pB6.75@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Bert Craig" wrote:
> > "Dwight Stewart" wrote:
> >> Because so few use it, the mode now plays only a
> >> relatively minor role within the Amateur Radio Service.
> >
> > Huh???!!!
> >
> > > Therefore, code testing is not essential to the
> > > Amateur Radio Service.
> >
> > I disagree...because the aforementioned supporting
> > statement is entirely incorrect.
>
> For clarification, read my response to Dick.

I went back and read it, Dwight. As I've said before, please don't include me in that ficticious demographic. I'm a newbie, I'm relatively young, and I con't agree that "agree that the majority mainly use the voice modes and only rarely use code." How do I know, Dwight? QSL cards from CW QSO's...with newer callsigns. I think you've just proved Larry's point re. actual experience, Dwight. Try listening in the 40m Novice/Tech"+" sub-bands. Although, with the code requirement at only 5-wpm for General and Extra, you're just as likely to hear those newer calls on the bottom of the bands as well. Haven't run into a grouchy/grumpy fist yet.

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

5111. CQ 75 CQ 75 CQ 75

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 09:09:03 UTC
From: BIG AL <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
Message-ID: <vn03ehmtqcuc76@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78623
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

THIS IS K4OKA THE CARING STATION. HO HO

STOP PLAYING WITH YOURSELF BOY.

SHOW ME YOUR LITTLE ONE AND I'LL SHOW YOU MY BIG ONE. HO HO

5112. Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 09:22:57 UTC
From: BIG AL <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
Message-ID: <vn047eanujppea@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78624
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

OLD NEWS BOY.

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

WHATS A MATTER THERE BOY SCARED THAT MINE IS BIGGER THAN YOURS. HO HO

FRANK SEE YOU TONITE AT 7 ON 39845. BE THERE HO HO

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

BYE

"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
news:vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com...
> This is a little out of date, but should give a little background info for
> those who are unfamiliar with "BIG AL"...
>
> HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A. Abernethy,
> K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation below 30
> MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the action,
> Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC letter
> included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of
> transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16.
Hollingsworth's
> letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference on
3.965
> MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted that
> Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time his
> station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to protest the
> sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21 and 22 in
> the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints from other
> amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the FCC had
> received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity, deliberate
> interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints to the
FCC
> alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt Song," the
> letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate interference."
> Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in
> Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to K4OKA. The
FCC
> letter also said the Commission had received complaints that Abernethy had

> used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference" on or
> near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about over-power
> operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start
revocation
> proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of continued
> violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter. (For
> additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for Six
Months"
> elsewhere on the AWE news page.)
>
> 73 de KG6SGY
>
> "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
> news:vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com...
> > WE KEPT THE QRMERS OFF 3.894.5 AGAIN TONITE WITH OUR BIG ONES. WE REIGN
AS
> > KINGS OF 75. HO HO
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
>

5113. K4VVV K4VVV K4VVV

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 09:23:50 UTC
From: BIG AL <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
Message-ID: <vn0493nuqai916@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78625
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

THIS IS K4OKA THE CARING STATION.

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

5114. K3EKO K3EKO K3EKO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 09:24:44 UTC
From: BIG AL <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
Message-ID: <vn04aq643abp3c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78626
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

THIS IS K4OKA THE CARING STATION.

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

HO HO

5115. W8RBK

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 09:27:57 UTC
From: BIG AL <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
Message-ID: <vn04gqi0s08dbf@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78627
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

STOP SCREAMING ELVIE STOP SCREAMING

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

HO HO

5116. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 10:06:42 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309230206.484d60d8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78628

"\"\\frank\\\"" <"\"\\frank\\\""@nospam.franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
news:<8QObb.410527$cF.127653@rwcrnsc53>...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > "Rob Kemp" <robkemp90210@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:6114e4af.0309212028.45f4e122@posting.google.com...
> >
> >>http://drudgereport.com/flash3.htm?powell
> >>
> >>FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW: 'I HAVE A TIRED FAMILY,
> >>TIRED CHILDREN AND A TIRED SPOUSE'
> >>Sun Sep 21 2003 17:25:30 ET
> >>
> >>**Exclusive Sneak Preview**
> >>
> >>Michael K. Powell, the embattled chairman of the Federal
> >>Communications Commission, appears to be setting the stage for an exit
> >>with a candid interview pipelined for Monday runs of the NEW YORK
> >>TIMES.
> >>
> >>Newsroom sources tell DRUDGE that Powell has gone on-the-record with
> >>NYT's Steve Labaton for a wide-ranging explanation of current affairs.
> >>
> >>"I have a tired family, tired children and a tired spouse. Candidly, I
> >>once said I would be in this job for three years and then leave,"
> >>Powell explains. "That was three years ago."
> >>
> >>"I've been called every name in the book by every opponent in the
> >>book," he adds. "That's classic Washington. If you can't get past
> >>jingoism, you attack the person. I wish the press would focus on more
> >>than who's rebuked and who's rebuking and look at what the best
> >>alternatives are for the public in terms of policy."
> >>
> >>Labaton was said to be finalizing the text Sunday evening, for a
> >>Business section lead, sources tell DRUDGE.
> >>
> >>Developing...
> >
> >
> > Wouldn't it be great if the next political appointee actually had some idea
> > of RF communications technology ?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >

> >
> He doesn't need to...That is why he has a STAFF!!!

Yeah he has "staff" but they're as clueless as he is. His staffer
D'Wanna or whatever her name is, the political tootsie who runs the
FCC outfit which sits on ham radio got up at a seminar and expressed
amazement at how people on the ground can talk to people in airplanes
in the sky with radios.

w3rv

5117. 3894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 10:17:23 UTC
From: BIG AL <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
Message-ID: <vn07dg6h8lftdc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78629
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

YOUVE GOT TO HAVE ONE AS BIG AS MINE TO BE ON MY FREQUENCY.

HO HO

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG

5118. JIMO K4VVV

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 10:19:59 UTC
From: BIG AL <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
Message-ID: <vn07id2cakqm4e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78630
Cross-posted to:
alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

BE ON 3894.5 TONITE. THE ARKANSAS BOYS NEED TO BE SHOWN THE DOOR. HO HO

THE REST OF YOU LIMPS ONE NEED TO STAY AWAY. HO HO

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG

5119. Re: 3894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 10:23:23 UTC
From: Lou <Spamfree@Spamfree.com>
Message-ID: <MaVbb.57$LJ5.4631@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 78632
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
" BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
news:vn07dg6h8lftdc@corp.supernews.com...
> YOUVE GOT TO HAVE ONE AS BIG AS MINE TO BE ON MY FREQUENCY.
>
> HO HO
>
> AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
SONG
>
> AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
SONG
>
>

Suck MY BIG ONE... ASS HOLE! To the kill file with your dickhead crap!
```

5120. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 10:30:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030923063009.21642.00001128@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78635

In article <20030923013414.12631.00001336@mb-m28.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <ZkJbb.7038$yp6.116603@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson" ><wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>>However, the requirements for licensure should be reasonable
>>and rational, and while the written tests meet that criteria, the
>>requirement for Morse proficiency no longer does.
>>
>>Carl - wk3c
>
>Carl:
>
>Jim, N2EY, just said, in so many words, that since today's amateur
>radio equipment can no longer be designed, built, or serviced by
>any but the tiny handful of hams who possess professional-grade
>technical knowledge, skill, and facilities, that most of the technical
>knowledge in the present written tests can also be eliminated as
>a licensing requirement.

Well, not exactly.

What I was trying to say was that, given the characteristics of modern ham equipment and its popularity with hams, that there was not the same *need* for hams to be as knowledgeable in radio *theory* as there was years ago.

I think hams *should* be knowledgeable in theory today - just as I think they *should* strive for operating skills. Including Morse code skills.

But there's a big difference betwen *should know* and *need to know*.

>I totally agree. In what way is it
>"reasonable and rational" for someone to know Ohm's Law or
>even the most basic digital theory, if they'll never have to use it
>in their actual practice as a radio amateur?

Particularly when it is "shoved down their throats"?

>I say it isn't, and
>nothing could prove this better than eliminating the code testing
>requirements for the same reason. After all, code testing has
>the effect of exposing prospective radio amateurs to what is
>always going to be a practical and useful communications tool
>which allows radio amateurs to practice basic radio
>communication with only entry-level skill and technology.

Perhaps it could be said that "Those who want to learn theory will learn
theory, just as those who want to learn code will learn code".
>
>If we eliminate the code testing requirement, we therefore
>demonstrate that basic communications skills are no longer
>necessary to be a licensed amateur radio operator. I, for one,
>would like to think that the present syllabus of the written tests
>still represents "basic communications skills." So, which will
>it be? Code testing, written testing, both, or neither?
>
I think Clint has already said he only sees a need for regs and safety testing.

There's "the future".

73 de Jim, N2EY

5121. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 10:30:11 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030923063011.21642.00001129@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78636

In article <bkdiip$a9f$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:

>"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote
>
>[re: transmitting a 6 mega-pixel image]
>
>> I never claimed you COULD send that with CW.
>
> Well, actually, you _could_. I don't have all the tech stuff handy
>to determine just how large a 6 mega-pixel 24-bit color image would actually
>_be_, so let's just call it a 6 megabyte file, making it, what, 48 million
>bits? Now, how many bits in a 'word' of Morse, average? A dozen, maybe? So,
>sending at, let's say, 20 wpm gives us a hypothetical bit-rate of 240
>bits/min or 4 bits/sec, so we come out with a mere 12 million seconds to
>transmit the image (I _swear_ I did not intend for that answer to come out
>that simple!).
> It would only take 138.88 days.....
>

Ah, but you forget an important step in the analysis!

One picture is worth a thousand words. Therefore, the time required to send a "Morse picture" at 20 wpm is equal to 1,000/20 = 50 minutes with no compression.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5122. Re: 3894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 10:32:54 UTC
From: BIG AL <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
Message-ID: <vn08alph93k18d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78637
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

PULL IT OUT. LETS SEE IT. HO HO

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

"Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
news:MaVbb.57$LJ5.4631@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> " BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
> news:vn07dg6h8lftdc@corp.supernews.com...
> > YOUVE GOT TO HAVE ONE AS BIG AS MINE TO BE ON MY FREQUENCY.
> >

> Suck MY BIG ONE... ASS HOLE! To the kill file with your dickhead crap!
>
>

5123. Re: All New as well as existing

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 10:54:20 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309230254.15e0cecd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78638

Robert Casey <wa2ise@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:<3F6FD50C.2080806@ix.netcom.com>...
> WA8ULX wrote:
>
> > No-Code Licenses should come a designator following there Callsign, that lets
> >people know there status.
> > Such as W5TIT-1, or W5TIT-2, that way we will know if they are Mentally
> >Challenged Operator, or a Lazy Operator, 1 being Mental, 2 being Lazy, that way
> >we would know which ones not to talk to.
> >
> >
> You mean like WA8ULX-1 ?
>
> ;-)

Almost. The way I read it is "WA8ULX-1-2"

Does that make more sense?

;^))

5124. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 11:00:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309230300.30cdb38c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78640

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bkocja$g21$0@208.206.142.110>...
> Brian wrote:
>
> >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<6BIbb.63583$NM1.20271@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >
> >
> >
> >>I'll tell you this Jim...the Ruskies had and probably still do have the best
> >>CW operators in the world.
> >>
> >>I used to have to listen to them a lot in a job I had. Amazing how so many
> >>of them sounded like the hams on 20meters...hi.
> >>
> >>Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >>
> >
> >And the ones that washed out of CW school? The Gulag?
> >
>
>
>
> Only you and a few like you washed out.

Poor DICK. I was never in a Russian dittybopper school.

> Russian military, as our own,
> don't.

Poor DICK. I was never in a US dittybopper school.

> When one is sitting trying to learn code, realizing that if you "just
> can't" then
> it.s off to the infantry, the failure rate is unsurprisingly low to
> nonexistant.

Poor DICK. I'm sure the failure rate was quite high. Why the big
rush to RTTY and other modes which don't require the operator to be a
human modem?

Perhaps Len could shed some light on this.

5125. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 11:02:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309230302.35739724@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78641

"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
news:<vmvdo3d6joi04b@corp.supernews.com>...
> Hmm... I wonder how I could work that concept into my study strategy...
>
> 73 de KG6SGY

Raise your right hand and take an oath. Be sure to get a guaranteed
Morse Code MOS, though, or you might find yourself peeling taters in
an Infantry Division in Korea.

5126. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 11:05:55 UTC
From: Emmersom Bigguns <ebigguns@boobs.com>
Message-ID: <nOVbb.55234$xx4.5987005@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 78639

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030923013414.12631.00001336@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <ZkJbb.7038$yp6.116603@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >However, the requirements for licensure should be reasonable
> >and rational, and while the written tests meet that criteria, the
> >requirement for Morse proficiency no longer does.
> >
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> Carl:
>
> Jim, N2EY, just said, in so many words, that since today's amateur
> radio equipment can no longer be designed, built, or serviced by
> any but the tiny handful of hams who possess professional-grade
> technical knowledge, skill, and facilities, that most of the technical
> knowledge in the present written tests can also be eliminated as
> a licensing requirement. I totally agree. In what way is it
> "reasonable and rational" for someone to know Ohm's Law or
> even the most basic digital theory, if they'll never have to use it
> in their actual practice as a radio amateur? I say it isn't, and
> nothing could prove this better than eliminating the code testing
> requirements for the same reason. After all, code testing has
> the effect of exposing prospective radio amateurs to what is
> always going to be a practical and useful communications tool
> which allows radio amateurs to practice basic radio
> communication with only entry-level skill and technology.
>
> If we eliminate the code testing requirement, we therefore
> demonstrate that basic communications skills are no longer
> necessary to be a licensed amateur radio operator. I, for one,
> would like to think that the present syllabus of the written tests
> still represents "basic communications skills." So, which will
> it be? Code testing, written testing, both, or neither?
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>
I agree,
How about it Carl, let's do away with the outdated theory crap that's
keeping a lot of engineers and kids out of out hobby. Why I know a Doctor
who would love to be a Ham, but because of the stupid, outdated theory he
can not get his license.
Who would you rather have as a Ham, a Doctor who might save your life, or

another know-it-all who knows out dated electronics theory.

Will you lead Ham Radio out of the darkness and into the light Captain Carl? Break these shackles that bind us to the old ways! FREE RADIO FOR THE MASSES!

10-73's!

(Of course I'm kidding, but this will be coming real soon AND YOU KNOW THIS!)

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.516 / Virus Database: 313 - Release Date: 9/1/2003

5127. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 11:07:08 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309230307.116a3606@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78642

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030922210351.02978.00000017@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> >Yet he claims that he was able to take the Extra exam on a lark, w/o
> >ever studying for it, scoring 100%, in under 8 minutes.
> >
> >But everyone else is forced to memorize the Q/A.
>
> Of course they are, they dont know the material.

You are sooo spetchal. Your spetchalty is telling whoppers.

5128. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 11:08:39 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309230308.38b3bba5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78643

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030922210120.02978.00000016@mb-m26.aol.com>...
> >No you didn't.
>
> Prove it, you know you cant and that just bugs you.............

Clean up your act and I might start believing you.

5129. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 11:16:10 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkpa1a$g7h@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 78646

"Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
news:bkk8u1$su6$1@nd.eastky.net...
>
> Man, this keeps getting better and better....
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
>
> > I and other parents that I know have always required our children to eat
> > foods that are good for them whether they liked them or not. My
children
> > have always been required to eat what was served whether they liked it
or
> > not. Children were not allowed to dictate the menu.
>
> This, on top of Roll's admissions, couldn't make the PCTA's
position
> and attitude any plainer, to even a casual observer.
>
>

That has nothing to do with amateur radio or a person's position thereof. I
did exactly the same thing wth my kids.

Kim W5TIT

5130. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 11:21:43 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkpabu$tvu@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 78647

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030923013420.12631.00001340@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <bkmm02$2th@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT"
<kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
> >> I'd wager that if you put all us in a room, we'd get along just fine.
> >>
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >>
> > >You and me? Sure. Jim/N2EY and I? Sure. Brian and I? Sure. Here's
who
> >I wouldn't even consider being in the same room with: Larry Roll, Dick
> >Carroll, Dan/W4whatever, Dave Heil, Waddles (Waddles is non-existent in
my
> >book), and that's just a few. I have no desire to "get along" with
people
> >like that.
> >
> >Kim W5TIT
>
> Kim:
>
> Well, that's pretty sad. I guess you're overlooking the fact that a
person's
> online "personality" can be quite different than what one would experience
> in person, since the written word, particularly in a virtually immediate
forum
> such as Usenet, is, indeed, quite impersonal by nature. Moreover, your
> expression of a lack of desire to meet with certain members of this forum
> could cause all the rest, even those not included on your list, to not
wish
> to meet with you.
>

And, I would be upset....because? I don't get on a forum in a newsgroup
with the intention of meeting and greeting. Your excuses for your behavior
that this is "just a newsgroup" are weak and shrill at best. I think those
of us who probably would meet in real life are those who have been frank and
honest about who we are, up front and without using the guise of a newsgroup
to act in a manner inconsistent with who we are as people. THOSE are the
people who would end up meeting and not having to waste time muddling

through who we are and who we ain't, Larry.

> I would jump at any chance to meet any and all of the regulars in this
> newsgroup, for no better reason than to see what they are really like in
> person. I think that even Len Anderson could prove to be a quite affable
> chap, given a chance to get to know him better. I may be wrong, but
> at least I'm willing to take that chance. I would like to think that
given
> the opportunity, your curiosity would ultimately get the upper hand over
> your stated objections. If not, one could quite legitimately call your
> character into question, at a level far deeper than anything ever said
> in this forum.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

I am not in least bit curious about the majority of people in this
newsgroup. Most of all, those mentioned above.

Kim W5TIT

5131. BIG AL (ASS)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 11:32:10 UTC
From: 10-4 Good Buddy <10-4good-buddy@cbradio.org>
Message-ID: <vn0btfgltoca3b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78648
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Who is this Big Al? Retard? Mental Midget?

10-4!

5132. Re: BIG AL (ASS)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 11:55:03 UTC
From: Greg Courville <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com>
Message-ID: <vn0d4imjn12vda@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78649
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Big Al" is actually K40KA. Read the article I posted to "BIG AL AND FRANKY"
and that should pretty much sum it up.

73 de KG6SGY

"10-4 Good Buddy" <10-4good-buddy@cbradio.org> wrote in message
news:vn0btfgltoca3b@corp.supernews.com...
> Who is this Big Al? Retard? Mental Midget?
>
> 10-4!
>
>

5133. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 12:04:49 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <BFWbb.7106$yp6.126912@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 78650

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030923013414.12631.00001336@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <ZkJbb.7038$yp6.116603@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >However, the requirements for licensure should be reasonable
> >and rational, and while the written tests meet that criteria, the
> >requirement for Morse proficiency no longer does.
> >
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> Carl:
>
> Jim, N2EY, just said, in so many words,

With all due respect to Jim, just because he said it doesn't make
it true. (no matter how many words he used :-)

> that since today's amateur
> radio equipment can no longer be designed, built, or serviced by
> any but the tiny handful of hams who possess professional-grade
> technical knowledge, skill, and facilities,

That's absurd ... just as those who want to (and don't have a
legitimate physical limitation that prevents it) *could* learn
Morse at some arbitrary speed, anyone who wants to (except,
someone who's truly mentally deficient) can learn the skills
necessary to design, build, and service equipment comparable
in performance to (or better than) off the shelf commercial equipment.

Even "custom ASICs" can be affordably created in the ham's
home workshop with free or inexpensive software tools that
run on any reasonable PC, using FPGAs and other programable
logic devices ... and they can do significant signal processing at
rates higher than can be done in software on a PC (though using
the PC to do some signal processing is useful and practical in
some applications).

Some of the fancy LCD displays require special manufacturing
techniques and equipment and would be prohibitively expensive for
"one off" and small quantities, but they can be replaced by a "soft"
display on a computer screen if those sorts of bells and whistles
are desired ... check out "Ham Radio Deluxe" ... one hell of a
slick control program, that's free by the way, from Simon Brown,
HB9DRV, and Peter Halpin, PE1MHO, (NCI Director Emeritus,
holder of the 1st 6m QRP (<=5W) DXCC, and other awards and

omgosh ... a no-coder)
at: http://www.kns.ch/sysgem/hb9drv/HamRadioDeluxe.htm

Building and servicing are simply a matter of technique. SMT
parts can be soldered by hand with a small, low wattage iron
(even 200 pin QFPs ... I've done it many times) or with a simple
hot air reflow soldering system (you can buy one, or could build
one ... I've reflowed modest sized PCBs with a heat gun and
some care.

The techniques are different than the old "thru-hole" methods,
but they are really no more difficult and are certainly within
reach of anyone who cares to learn.

(and, amateur radio is *supposed* to encourage the learning
of useful technical skills, advancing the art, etc.)

> that most of the technical
> knowledge in the present written tests can also be eliminated as
> a licensing requirement. I totally agree.

So, you would prefer that the amateur ranks be centered on
appliance operators (as long as they can beep fast)??? That's
the death warrant for amateur radio if it ever becomes totally
that way.

Reducing the technical skill of amateurs to your level and
keeping "Morse as king" may make you FEEL superior,
Larry, but it's really the TRUE "dumbing down" of the
amateur radio service ...

Other than as a recreational activity in the ARS (which is fine),
the world has passed Morse by.

What's needed in the "pool of trained operators" is no longer
a cadre of Morseists, but folks who have the technical
knowledge and skill to build, field, and maintain systems that
can meet the communications needs of EMS agencies ... and
that's at a level of technology far beyond OOK Morse.

> In what way is it
> "reasonable and rational" for someone to know Ohm's Law or
> even the most basic digital theory, if they'll never have to use it
> in their actual practice as a radio amateur?

Ohm's Law is a tool that can be used for many things ... biasing
circuits, figuring out what size wire gauge is necessary to carry
a given current with what voltage drop, and on and on ... and it's
a simple equation, whose permutations can be learned in about
10 minutes ... equally useful are the formulae for inductive and
capacitive reactance, resonance, etc., etc.

These are all basic things that every amateur should know and
understand. (Do they all? No. Should they? Yes!!!)

> I say it isn't, and
> nothing could prove this better than eliminating the code testing
> requirements for the same reason.

That's absurd ...

> After all, code testing has
> the effect of exposing prospective radio amateurs to what is
> always going to be a practical and useful communications tool
> which allows radio amateurs to practice basic radio
> communication with only entry-level skill and technology.

Certain chemicals are "useful" in agriculture ... should everyone
who wants to eat a salad be required to be sprayed with them
("exposed to them") against his/her will before being allowed to
do so? (Yes, it's an extreme and contrived example, but the
principle is EXACTLY the same.)

> If we eliminate the code testing requirement, we therefore
> demonstrate that basic communications skills are no longer
> necessary to be a licensed amateur radio operator.

Larry ... most folks don't WANT to communicate via Morse.
Nothing prevents you from doing so, but to assert that everyone
must prove they can before they can do anything on HF is
pointless and counter to the interests of the future of ham radio.
(The governments of the world and even the IARU have come
to realize this ... that YOU "don't get it" is irrelevant.)

> I, for one,
> would like to think that the present syllabus of the written tests
> still represents "basic communications skills." So, which will
> it be? Code testing, written testing, both, or neither?

The sensible option ... no code testing. Adequate written testing.
That answer is obvious.

Carl - wk3c

5134. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 12:58:58 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030923085858.13774.00000036@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 78652

>Good grief. Obviously he can't fill in a qrz.com form

CBplusser, you dont fill it in QRZ fills it in.

5135. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 13:01:04 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030923090104.13774.00000037@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 78654

>You are sooo spetchal. Your spetchalty is telling whoppers.
>

And you still cant memorize enough answers to pass the EXTRA

5136. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 13:01:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030923090144.13774.00000038@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 78653

>Clean up your act and I might start believing you.
>
>
>

I dont care what you believe

5137. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 13:11:40 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <38h0nvg48d6jtmhfqn09t06uoh10p2u2kp@4ax.com>
Source record: 78655

You can fix this yourself by logging in to QRZ.com and updating your listing. Your Birthday is one of the parameters that you can are allowed to change online.

Instructions from the QRZ website:

Information that you may update with QRZ:

USA Hams may edit and/or delete: the previous callsign, grid square, county, lat/lon coordinates, birthday, QSL manager, email address and home page. All that is required is that you go to our online update page and provide us with your callsign and a real email address to which an update key may be sent. This key is yours to keep and can then be used as often as desired to update your callsign listing. The email address that you give to receive the key can be different than the one shown with your callsign (if any).

It;s easy - just a couple of keystrokes, and you'll be about 250 years younger!

73, Leo

>>Good grief. Obviously he can't fill in a qrz.com form
>
>CBplusser, you dont fill it in QRZ fills it in.

5138. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 14:34:15 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030923103415.01989.00000053@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 78656

>You can fix this yourself by logging in to QRZ.com and updating your
>listing.

No I think all leave it that way, I think its rather funny.

5139. Re: 3894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 14:48:31 UTC
From: Concerned of the Usenet <deletethisbit.itsreallyhere@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3F705D5E.2EA7@yahoo.com>
Source record: 78657
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

BIG AL wrote:
>
> YOUVE GOT TO HAVE ONE AS BIG AS MINE TO BE ON MY FREQUENCY.
>
> HO HO
>
> AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG
>
> AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG

--
"Free flow of information has a price and responsible Internauts"
The Internet under Surveillance a report by Vinton Cerf

5140. Re: 3894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 15:19:44 UTC
From: Bruce Lane <SpammersAreVermin@dev.null>
Message-ID: <MPG.19da046ab64a1ebf989a14@192.168.42.131>
Source record: 78658
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <MaVbb.57$LJ5.4631@iad-read.news.verio.net>,
Spamfree@Spamfree.com says...

> " BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
> news:vn07dg6h8lftdc@corp.supernews.com...

<drivelectomy>

Gang, it's just a troll, fercryinoutloud! They've been around
since the early days of Usenet, and their entire existence seems to be
centered around making outrageous posts just to see what kind of replies
they get.

Just killfile him and be at peace. Don't even waste your energy on
a reply.

73 de KC7GR

--
Dr. Anton Squeegee, Director, Dutch Surrealist Plumbing Institute
(Known to some as Bruce Lane, KC7GR)
kyrrin a/t bluefeathertech d-o=t c&o&m
"Quando Omni Flunkus Moritati" (Red Green)

5141. Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 15:31:50 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <jso0nv48g2r6daedgpidc966uab2a3h2jv@4ax.com>
Source record: 78660
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Well, it's pretty unlikely that the guy who got busted for this back
in 1999 is doing this, unless he's incredibly stupid. The headers on
his newsgroup postings point right back to his pesonal account on
Supernews, and the FCC could subpoena his user info and usenet usage
logs from Supernews in a flash if illegal activity is involved.

More likely, it's some troll who heard about the "Porkbutt" story, and
is having some fun stirring the pot a bit. If he really is creating
interference on 3894.5 and bragging about it here, however, he could
get a guest shot on "America's Dumbest Criminals" for this one -
should the FCC get a copy of this somehow.... :)

73, Leo

PS - For your review, the message headers are posted below:

From: "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
Newsgroups:
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.ama
teur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Subject: Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY
Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:22:57 -0400
Organization: Posted via Supernews, http://www.supernews.com
Message-ID: <vn047eanujppea@corp.supernews.com>
Reply-To: "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
References: <vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com>
<vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com>
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
X-Complaints-To: abuse@supernews.com
Lines: 74
Xref: cyclone01.bloor.is.net.cable.rogers.com alt.ham-radio.ssb:394
alt.radio.amateur:1584 rec.radio.amateur.dx:6821
rec.radio.amateur.misc:23591 rec.radio.amateur.policy:54076
X-Received-Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:37:11 EDT

On Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:22:57 -0400, "BIG AL"
<bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote:

>OLD NEWS BOY.
>
>AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

>
>WHATS A MATTER THERE BOY SCARED THAT MINE IS BIGGER THAN YOURS. HO HO
>
>FRANK SEE YOU TONITE AT 7 ON 39845. BE THERE HO HO
>
>AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.
>
>
>AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.
>
>
>AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.
>
>
>BYE
>
>
>"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
>news:vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com...
>> This is a little out of date, but should give a little background info for
>> those who are unfamiliar with "BIG AL"...
>>
>> HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A. Abernethy,
>> K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation below 30
>> MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the action,
>> Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC letter
>> included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of
>> transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16.
>Hollingsworth's
>> letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference on
>3.965
>> MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted that
>> Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time his
>> station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to protest the
>> sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21 and 22 in
>> the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints from other
>> amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the FCC had
>> received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity, deliberate
>> interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints to the
>FCC
>> alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt Song," the
>> letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate interference."
>> Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in
>> Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to K4OKA. The
>FCC
>> letter also said the Commission had received complaints that Abernethy had
>> used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference" on or
>> near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about over-power
>> operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start
>revocation

>> proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of continued
>> violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter. (For
>> additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for Six
>Months"
>> elsewhere on the AWE news page.)
>>
>> 73 de KG6SGY
>>
>> "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
>> news:vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com...
>> > WE KEPT THE QRMERS OFF 3.894.5 AGAIN TONITE WITH OUR BIG ONES. WE REIGN
>AS
>> > KINGS OF 75. HO HO
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>>
>>
>

5142. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 15:38:38 UTC
From: "\"frank\\\"" <"\"frank\\\""@nospam.franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <2OZbb.417030$cF.128230@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 78661

Brian Kelly wrote:
> "\"\\frank\\\"" <"\"\\frank\\\""@nospam.franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
news:<8QObb.410527$cF.127653@rwcrnsc53>...
>
>>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Rob Kemp" <robkemp90210@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>>news:6114e4af.0309212028.45f4e122@posting.google.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>http://drudgereport.com/flash3.htm?powell
>>>>
>>>>FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW: 'I HAVE A TIRED FAMILY,
>>>>TIRED CHILDREN AND A TIRED SPOUSE'
>>>>Sun Sep 21 2003 17:25:30 ET
>>>>
>>>>**Exclusive Sneak Preview**
>>>>
>>>>Michael K. Powell, the embattled chairman of the Federal
>>>>Communications Commission, appears to be setting the stage for an exit
>>>>with a candid interview pipelined for Monday runs of the NEW YORK
>>>>TIMES.
>>>>
>>>>Newsroom sources tell DRUDGE that Powell has gone on-the-record with
>>>>NYT's Steve Labaton for a wide-ranging explanation of current affairs.
>>>>
>>>>"I have a tired family, tired children and a tired spouse. Candidly, I
>>>>once said I would be in this job for three years and then leave,"
>>>>Powell explains. "That was three years ago."
>>>>
>>>>"I've been called every name in the book by every opponent in the
>>>>book," he adds. "That's classic Washington. If you can't get past
>>>>jingoism, you attack the person. I wish the press would focus on more
>>>>than who's rebuked and who's rebuking and look at what the best
>>>>alternatives are for the public in terms of policy."
>>>>
>>>>Labaton was said to be finalizing the text Sunday evening, for a
>>>>Business section lead, sources tell DRUDGE.
>>>>
>>>>Developing...
>>>
>>>
>>>Wouldn't it be great if the next political appointee actually had some idea

>>>of RF communications technology ?
>>>
>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>
>>>
>>
>>He doesn't need to...That is why he has a STAFF!!!
>
>
> Yeah he has "staff" but they're as clueless as he is. His staffer
> D'Wanna or whatever her name is, the political tootsie who runs the
> FCC outfit which sits on ham radio got up at a seminar and expressed
> amazement at how people on the ground can talk to people in airplanes
> in the sky with radios.
>
> w3rv
Let me put it to you this way, the FCC could careless about amateur
radio....They aren't going to care about something they can't make any
money for the US Treasury...Wake up!

--
73

Frank K3EKO

5143. Re: 3894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 15:48:43 UTC
From: Ken Bessler <kg0wx@IHATESPAMyahoo.com>
Message-ID: <pdCdnXYC3uH99u2iXTWJkg@comcast.com>
Source record: 78662
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bruce Lane" <SpammersAreVermin@dev.null> wrote in message
news:MPG.19da046ab64a1ebf989a14@192.168.42.131...
> In article <MaVbb.57$LJ5.4631@iad-read.news.verio.net>,
> Spamfree@Spamfree.com says...
>
> > " BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
> > news:vn07dg6h8lftdc@corp.supernews.com...
>
> <drivelectomy>
>
> Gang, it's just a troll, fercryinoutloud! They've been around
> since the early days of Usenet, and their entire existence seems to be
> centered around making outrageous posts just to see what kind of replies
> they get.
>
> Just killfile him and be at peace. Don't even waste your energy on
> a reply.
>
> 73 de KC7GR
>

Better yet, killfile him and create a message rule like this:

Apply this rule after the message arrives
Where the Subject line contains '3.894' or '3894' or 'bigal'
Delete it

That way you not only kill the messanger but all the
inane followups to the thread - end of problem.

Ken

5144. Re: 3894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 16:00:12 UTC
From: Lou <Spamfree@Spamfree.com>
Message-ID: <z6_bb.62$LJ5.6012@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 78663
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Bruce Lane" <SpammersAreVermin@dev.null> wrote in message
news:MPG.19da046ab64a1ebf989a14@192.168.42.131...
> In article <MaVbb.57$LJ5.4631@iad-read.news.verio.net>,
> Spamfree@Spamfree.com says...
>
> > " BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
> > news:vn07dg6h8lftdc@corp.supernews.com...
>
> <drivelectomy>
>
> Gang, it's just a troll, fercryinoutloud! They've been around
> since the early days of Usenet, and their entire existence seems to be
> centered around making outrageous posts just to see what kind of replies
> they get.
>
> Just killfile him and be at peace. Don't even waste your energy on
> a reply.
>
> 73 de KC7GR

Already kill filed him. He got enough of my time. Lou

5145. Re: 3894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 16:02:11 UTC
From: Lou <Spamfree@Spamfree.com>
Message-ID: <p8_bb.63$LJ5.6096@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 78664
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ken Bessler" <kg0wx@IHATESPAMyahoo.com> wrote in message
news:pdCdnXYC3uH99u2iXTWJkg@comcast.com...
>
> "Bruce Lane" <SpammersAreVermin@dev.null> wrote in message
> news:MPG.19da046ab64a1ebf989a14@192.168.42.131...
> > In article <MaVbb.57$LJ5.4631@iad-read.news.verio.net>,
> > Spamfree@Spamfree.com says...
> >
> > > " BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
> > > news:vn07dg6h8lftdc@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > <drivelectomy>
> >
> > Gang, it's just a troll, fercryinoutloud! They've been around
> > since the early days of Usenet, and their entire existence seems to be
> > centered around making outrageous posts just to see what kind of replies
> > they get.
> >
> > Just killfile him and be at peace. Don't even waste your energy on
> > a reply.
> >
> > 73 de KC7GR
> >
>
> Better yet, killfile him and create a message rule like this:
>
> Apply this rule after the message arrives
> Where the Subject line contains '3.894' or '3894' or 'bigal'
> Delete it
>
>
> That way you not only kill the messanger but all the
> inane followups to the thread - end of problem.
>
> Ken
>
Not a bad idea.. I hate blocking innocent replies out, but you're right, it
should stop it. Lou

5146. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 16:26:33 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <lvr0nv4gktflgbohkkjq6a60n005u4sulu@4ax.com>
Source record: 78668

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 19:00:21 GMT, Keith
<kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote:

> I had the pleasure of watching the documentary by Michael
>Moore called, "Bowling for Columbine". In the opening segment
>Michael goes into a Michigan Bank and gets a free shotgun
>for opening a CD account.

And if the same shotgun is later used to rob that bank, who's fault
would you say that is?

> In the documentary he discusses
>the fact that the tenage mass killers bought their ammo at Kmart
>and obtained guns at gun shows.

Thousands of hunters, law enforcement officers, and other legitimate,
law-abiding gun owners also buy guns at gun shows and ammo at K-Mart.

> The thought occurred to me, Why in the hell can a teenager in America buy a
>weapon of mass destruction with no test or license, but to pick up a
>microphone to talk he needs to obtain a license from the federal government?

No he doesn't. There are several radio services in which no licenses
are required, or which are licensed by rule. Examples include CB, FRS,
Marine VHF, parts of the 49 mhz band where operation of 2-way radio
devices is covered under Part 15, and the experimenter's band down
below the AM broadcast band.

> I
>can understand for a vehicle, but isn't it time to do away with Ham Radio
>licensing in a nation in which 12,000 people are murdered by untested and
>unlicensed gun owners? Just a thought.

Your question provides its own answer since, unlike the 12,000
murderers, ham radio operators are not untested and not unlicensed.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=-=-=

5147. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 16:26:35 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <vds0nv84a0kgfokc40mb750q104smjtakk@4ax.com>
Source record: 78667

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On 23 Sep 2003 00:40:54 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
wrote:

> Far better to concentrate testing on operating - to include as many
>modes as feasable. INCLUDING radiotelegraphy, **the second most used
>mode in ham radio**.

It occurs to me that, after "making a legitimate withdrawal" as number one, the second most used method of obtaining money from the bank happens to be a felony.

It also occurs to me that in sports, they refer to the player(s) who finish anywhere below #1 as the LOSERS.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=-=-=

5148. Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 16:59:26 UTC
From: Leo <leo@nunya.com>
Message-ID: <vn0v3ln66d9d34@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78669
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

AY YI YI AY YI YI CALL RILEY AT THE FCC AY YI YI AY YI YI CALL RILEY AT
THE FCC

1-800-PORKBUTT

"BIGAL" <BIGAL@75meters.net> wrote in message
news:vn0se9eu9t81fc@corp.supernews.com...
> AY YI YI AY YI YI CALL THE FCC. AY YI YI AY YI YI CALL THE FCC.
>
> YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG......
>
> MINE IS BIGGER BOY.
>
> HO HO
>
>
>
> "Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
> news:jso0nv48g2r6daedgpidc966uab2a3h2jv@4ax.com...
> > Well, it's pretty unlikely that the guy who got busted for this back
> > in 1999 is doing this, unless he's incredibly stupid. The headers on
> > his newsgroup postings point right back to his pesonal account on
> > Supernews, and the FCC could subpoena his user info and usenet usage
> > logs from Supernews in a flash if illegal activity is involved.
> >
> > More likely, it's some troll who heard about the "Porkbutt" story, and
> > is having some fun stirring the pot a bit. If he really is creating
> > interference on 3894.5 and bragging about it here, however, he could
> > get a guest shot on "America's Dumbest Criminals" for this one -
> > should the FCC get a copy of this somehow.... :)
> >
> > 73, Leo
> >
> > PS - For your review, the message headers are posted below:
> >
> > From: "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
> > Newsgroups:
> >
>
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx
> ,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
> > Subject: Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY
> > Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:22:57 -0400

> > Organization: Posted via Supernews, http://www.supernews.com
> > Message-ID: <vn047eanujppea@corp.supernews.com>
> > Reply-To: "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
> > References: <vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com>
> > <vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com>
> > X-Priority: 3
> > X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> > X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
> > X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
> > X-Complaints-To: abuse@supernews.com
> > Lines: 74
> > Xref: cyclone01.bloor.is.net.cable.rogers.com alt.ham-radio.ssb:394
> > alt.radio.amateur:1584 rec.radio.amateur.dx:6821
> > rec.radio.amateur.misc:23591 rec.radio.amateur.policy:54076
> > X-Received-Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:37:11 EDT
> >
> >
> >
> > On Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:22:57 -0400, "BIG AL"
> > <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote:
> >
> > >OLD NEWS BOY.
> > >
> > >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
> SONG.
> > >
> > >WHATS A MATTER THERE BOY SCARED THAT MINE IS BIGGER THAN YOURS. HO HO
> > >
> > >FRANK SEE YOU TONITE AT 7 ON 39845. BE THERE HO HO
> > >
> > >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
> SONG.
> > >
> > >
> > >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
> SONG.
> > >
> > >
> > >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
> SONG.
> > >
> > >
> > >BYE
> > >
> > >
> > >"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
> > >news:vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com...
> > >> This is a little out of date, but should give a little background
info
> for

> > >> those who are unfamiliar with "BIG AL"...
> > >>
> > >> HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A.
Abernethy,
> > >> K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation
below
> 30
> > >> MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the
action,
> > >> Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC
letter
> > >> included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of
> > >> transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16.
> > >Hollingsworth's
> > >> letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference
on
> > >3.965
> > >> MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted
> that
> > >> Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time
his
> > >> station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to protest
> the
> > >> sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21 and
22
> in
> > >> the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints from
> other
> > >> amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the FCC
> had
> > >> received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity, deliberate
> > >> interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints to
the
> > >FCC
> > >> alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt
Song,"
> the
> > >> letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate
> interference."
> > >> Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center
in
> > >> Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to K4OKA.
The
> > >FCC
> > >> letter also said the Commission had received complaints that
Abernethy
> had
> > >> used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference" on
> or
> > >> near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about

> over-power
> > >> operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start
> > >revocation
> > >> proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of continued
> > >> violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter. (For
> > >> additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for Six
> > >Months"
> > >> elsewhere on the AWE news page.)
> > >>
> > >> 73 de KG6SGY
> > >>
> > >> "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
> > >> news:vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com...
> > >> > WE KEPT THE QRMERS OFF 3.894.5 AGAIN TONITE WITH OUR BIG ONES. WE
> REIGN
> > >AS
> > >> > KINGS OF 75. HO HO
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> >
>
>

5149. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 17:35:30 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <vs01nv88r6ibrce7qd49uq1ind5245qju1@4ax.com>
Source record: 78670

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

>On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 19:00:21 GMT, Keith
><kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>> I had the pleasure of watching the documentary by Michael
>>Moore called, "Bowling for Columbine". In the opening segment
>>Michael goes into a Michigan Bank and gets a free shotgun
>>for opening a CD account. In the documentary he discusses
>>the fact that the tenage mass killers bought their ammo at Kmart
>>and obtained guns at gun shows.
>> The thought occurred to me, Why in the hell can a teenager in America buy a
>>weapon of mass destruction with no test or license,

A shotgun is not a weapon of mass destruction.

Chemical, nuclear, and biological weapons are weapons of mass
destruction.

A shotgun is classified as "small arms" - even fully automatic small
arms are not weapons of mass destruction.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=-=-=

5150. AY YI YI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 17:41:29 UTC
From: Leo <leo@nunya.com>
Message-ID: <vn11ighr8oak26@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78671
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

AY YI YI AY YI YI CALL 1-888-225-5322 (1-888-CALL FCC) Voice: toll-free CALL THE FCC ON ME

AY YI YI AY YI YI CALL 1-888-225-5322 (1-888-CALL FCC) Voice: toll-free CALL THE FCC ON ME

AY YI YI AY YI YI CALL 1-888-225-5322 (1-888-CALL FCC) Voice: toll-free CALL THE FCC ON ME

BIG AL WITH THE BIG ONE

HO HO

5151. Re: AY YI YI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 17:46:37 UTC
From: Frank Todd <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <1G%bb.136782$mp.67287@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 78672
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Leo wrote:
> AY YI YI AY YI YI CALL 1-888-225-5322 (1-888-CALL FCC) Voice: toll-free CALL
> THE FCC ON ME
>
> AY YI YI AY YI YI CALL 1-888-225-5322 (1-888-CALL FCC) Voice: toll-free CALL
> THE FCC ON ME
>
> AY YI YI AY YI YI CALL 1-888-225-5322 (1-888-CALL FCC) Voice: toll-free CALL
> THE FCC ON ME
>
> BIG AL WITH THE BIG ONE
>
> HO HO
>
>
>
THey'll probably hang up on you...HO HO

--
73

Frank K3EKO

5152. Re: AY YI YI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 17:55:32 UTC
From: Leo <leo@nunya.com>
Message-ID: <vn12csn4ffbp7f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78673
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Frank Todd" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
news:1G%bb.136782$mp.67287@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
> Leo wrote:
> > AY YI YI AY YI YI CALL 1-888-225-5322 (1-888-CALL FCC) Voice: toll-free
CALL
> > THE FCC ON ME

HO HO

AY YI YI YI IM BIG AL WITH THE BIG ONE

> THEy'll probably hang up on you...HO HO
>
> --
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>

5153. Re: AY YI YI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 18:00:55 UTC
From: ABERNETHY <ABERNETHY@BIGAL75METERS.COM>
Message-ID: <vn12mul2f9op23@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78674
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

GOOD TALKING TO YOU LAST NITE FRANK. BE ON TONITE HO HO

BIGAL THE CARING STATION HO HO

I WILL KEEP THE QRMERS OFF OF OUR PRIVATE FREQUENCY. 3894.5 BIG ALS
FREQUENCY. HO HO

AY YI YI YI ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG HO HO

K4OKA THE CARING STATION HO HO

BYE HO HO

"Leo" <leo@nunya.com> wrote in message
news:vn12csn4ffbp7f@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "Frank Todd" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
> news:1G%bb.136782$mp.67287@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
> > Leo wrote:
> > > AY YI YI AY YI YI CALL 1-888-225-5322 (1-888-CALL FCC) Voice:
toll-free
> CALL
> > > THE FCC ON ME
>
> HO HO
>
> AY YI YI YI IM BIG AL WITH THE BIG ONE
>
> > THEy'll probably hang up on you...HO HO
> >
> > --
> > 73
> >
> > Frank K3EKO
> >
>
>

5154. *Urgent* APRS and the Garmin Rino / PLC BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 18:21:50 UTC
From: Ralph Aichinger <ralph@dolphy.pangea.at>
Message-ID: <1064340027.256432@news.liwest.at>
Source record: 78675
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

First I want to explain why this is urgent:

I want to file a comment on PLC/BPL to the EU Commission
(see http://tinyurl.com/lmm3 and http://tinyurl/nkt0 , if
you live in the EU, you should file one too) and the deadline
is on 1st of October. So I really would like to have this
information as quick as possible!

What I am wondering is if the Garmin Rino

http://www.garmin.com/products/rino/

has directly or indirectly been influenced by APRS, or
if otherwise it could be said, that amateur radio has
led to or enabled the creation of this product.

Background: I want to argue that amateur radio not only
carries out purely technical experimentation, but also
experimentation into usage models and patterns, which can
lead to commercial products and business models. IMHO
this is a good argument for ham radio, especially in
europe, where wireless companies are hurting from dot.com-
style bidding-sprees for 3G frequencies/licenses, and no business
models or uses for these services are to be seen.

If you've got similar examples in recent times, I would
be interested in these too.

Thanks in advance! I will post a pointer to my text after filing.

/ralph oe5arp -- Followups directed to rrap

5155. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 18:28:45 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F7090DD.60501@psu.edu>
Source record: 78676

Leo wrote:
> How so? I have never stated my position one way or the other with
> respect to mandatory Morse testing. I have stated that I did get my 5
> WPM to get on to HF because I had to by law, and that using it for
> QSOs is beginning to grow on me. That doesn't mean that I think
> everyone should have to do it!
>
> So, does that make me pro or con, for mandatory testing? Where's the
> obvious? Hmmm - there's that old reading comprehension problem
> again....
>
> I think that you just like to stir things up, Sir - your diatribes
> appear to serve no other useful purpose. Of course you are aware that
> the future of Morse testing will be decided at the government level,
> by committees of civilized people - and not within this group. As
> such, your energies and passionate rants are for nought, as they will
> not sway the decision makers one bit. Like complaining with the guys
> on the loading dock about the boss - won't change anything, but I bet
> that would make someone one feel more important and in control, huh?
> (know the feeling?)

Leo, you are being much too hard on the lad. For the price of irritating some of us, he has given us an education about things that the most cerebral of us didn't know... Like the special calls that were assigned to the hams that didn't take any Morse CW test. Perhaps they were forced to use those 1/4 wave Dipoles. Maybe that's why we didn't know about them? 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

5156. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 19:31:54 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <ef71nvslrofio3afdtlfsd82kdi7vladhb@4ax.com>
Source record: 78677

Perhaps you're right, Mike - the Morse-based callsign thing was
certainly a little-known fact. There must have been budget cuts at
the FCC, though, and the project was cancelled the project there were
no funds to buy the magic decoder rings that were required :)

I expect that he'll be back here later to add his .02 again - you
gotta admit, this guy is a master debater!

73, Leo

On Tue, 23 Sep 2003 14:28:45 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>> How so? I have never stated my position one way or the other with
>> respect to mandatory Morse testing. I have stated that I did get my 5
>> WPM to get on to HF because I had to by law, and that using it for
>> QSOs is beginning to grow on me. That doesn't mean that I think
>> everyone should have to do it!
>>
>> So, does that make me pro or con, for mandatory testing? Where's the
>> obvious? Hmmm - there's that old reading comprehension problem
>> again....
>>
>> I think that you just like to stir things up, Sir - your diatribes
>> appear to serve no other useful purpose. Of course you are aware that
>> the future of Morse testing will be decided at the government level,
>> by committees of civilized people - and not within this group. As
>> such, your energies and passionate rants are for nought, as they will
>> not sway the decision makers one bit. Like complaining with the guys
>> on the loading dock about the boss - won't change anything, but I bet
>> that would make someone one feel more important and in control, huh?
>> (know the feeling?)
>
>
>Leo, you are being much too hard on the lad. For the price of irritating
>some of us, he has given us an education about things that the most
>cerebral of us didn't know... Like the special calls that were assigned
>to the hams that didn't take any Morse CW test. Perhaps they were forced
>to use those 1/4 wave Dipoles. Maybe that's why we didn't know about
>them? 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

5157. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 20:26:41 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <502cb.2332$ai7.1086@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78678

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309230300.30cdb38c@posting.google.com...
> "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bkocja$g21$0@208.206.142.110>...
> > Brian wrote:
> >
> > >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<6BIbb.63583$NM1.20271@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >>I'll tell you this Jim...the Ruskies had and probably still do have
the best
> > >>CW operators in the world.
> > >>
> > >>I used to have to listen to them a lot in a job I had. Amazing how
so many
> > >>of them sounded like the hams on 20meters...hi.
> > >>
> > >>Dan/W4NTI
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > >And the ones that washed out of CW school? The Gulag?
> > >
> >
> >
> >
> > Only you and a few like you washed out.
>
> Poor DICK. I was never in a Russian dittybopper school.
>
> > Russian military, as our own,
> > don't.
>
> Poor DICK. I was never in a US dittybopper school.
>
> > When one is sitting trying to learn code, realizing that if you "just
> > can't" then
> > it.s off to the infantry, the failure rate is unsurprisingly low to
> > nonexistant.
>
> Poor DICK. I'm sure the failure rate was quite high. Why the big
> rush to RTTY and other modes which don't require the operator to be a

> human modem?

Because RTTY could be run in the 'secure', or 'green' mode. And RATT was more capable of sending LARGE volumes of messages. Due mainly to the untrained CW operators in the US Military at the time you are referencing.

Ten groups a minute is all that was required of a O5C MOS back then.

Dan/W4NTI

>
> Perhaps Len could shed some light on this.

5158. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 20:31:00 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <842cb.2349$ai7.1102@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78679
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
news:Q7Nbb.51$LJ5.4366@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> "Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
> news:vmv6j3kfrkpv64@corp.supernews.com...
> > HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A. Abernethy,
> > K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation below
30
> > MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the action,
> > Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC letter
> > included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of
> > transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16.
> Hollingsworth's
> > letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference on
> 3.965
> > MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted that
> > Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time his
> > station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to protest the
> > sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21 and 22
in
> > the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints from
other
> > amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the FCC
had
> > received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity, deliberate
> > interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints to the
> FCC
> > alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt Song,"
the
> > letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate interference."
> > Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in
> > Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to K4OKA. The
> FCC
> > letter also said the Commission had received complaints that Abernethy
had
> > used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference" on or
> > near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about
over-power
> > operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start
> revocation
> > proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of continued
> > violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter. (For
> > additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for Six

> Months"
> > elsewhere on the AWE news page.)
> >
> >
> > "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@porkbutt.net> wrote in message
> > news:vmqshdfh78hr4b@corp.supernews.com...
> > > SHOW UP ON MY FREQUENCY AND I WILL RUN YOU OFF. HO HO
> > >
> > >
> > > "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> > > news:iO8bb.13$LJ5.2273@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@bigalk4oka.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:vmq5ars9c9i455@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > HO HO. SELL YOUR GEAR I DONT CARE. JUST STAY OFF OF 3.894.5. THATS
> BIG
> > > ALS
> > > > > FREQUENCY. HO HO. I'LL BE TAKING OVER 3.898 NEXT. HO HO
> > > > >
> > > > > AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG.
HO
> > HO
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > If I choose to talk on that frequency, I will, so long as I'm
abiding
> by
> > > the
> > > > rules and regulations as they are spelled out. YOU or no one else,
can
> > > tell
> > > > me to stay off. ASS WIPE.
> > > >
> > > > BIG AL.. the only thing big about you, is your mouth....
> > > >
> > > > Lou
> > > >
>
> Well Ass hole AL, looks like you've had your ass reamed out once, trying
for
> seconds???? Something tells me, you're due for it.
> Lou
>
>

Once? Boy are you out of touch.

Dan/W4NTI

5159. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 20:36:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <192cb.2367$ai7.1709@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78680

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309221757.d59bcf8@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<RLIbb.63713$NM1.42393@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Rob Kemp" <robkemp90210@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:6114e4af.0309212028.45f4e122@posting.google.com...
> > > http://drudgereport.com/flash3.htm?powell
> > >
> > > FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW: 'I HAVE A TIRED FAMILY,
> > > TIRED CHILDREN AND A TIRED SPOUSE'
> > > Sun Sep 21 2003 17:25:30 ET
> > >
> > > **Exclusive Sneak Preview**
> > >
> > > Michael K. Powell, the embattled chairman of the Federal
> > > Communications Commission, appears to be setting the stage for an exit
> > > with a candid interview pipelined for Monday runs of the NEW YORK
> > > TIMES.
> > >
> > > Newsroom sources tell DRUDGE that Powell has gone on-the-record with
> > > NYT's Steve Labaton for a wide-ranging explanation of current affairs.
> > >
> > > "I have a tired family, tired children and a tired spouse. Candidly, I
> > > once said I would be in this job for three years and then leave,"
> > > Powell explains. "That was three years ago."
> > >
> > > "I've been called every name in the book by every opponent in the
> > > book," he adds. "That's classic Washington. If you can't get past
> > > jingoism, you attack the person. I wish the press would focus on more
> > > than who's rebuked and who's rebuking and look at what the best
> > > alternatives are for the public in terms of policy."
> > >
> > > Labaton was said to be finalizing the text Sunday evening, for a
> > > Business section lead, sources tell DRUDGE.
> > >
> > > Developing...
> >
> > Wouldn't it be great if the next political appointee actually had some
idea
> > of RF communications technology ?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Spark?

No Brian, anything at all. He obviously knows nothing about the subject. Proof you ask? Him jumping up and down in support of BPL. Any idiot knows it will trash HF.

Dan/W4NTI

5160. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 20:37:34 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <ia2cb.2372$ai7.776@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78681

""\frank\"" <"\"\\frank\\\""@nospam.franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
news:8QObb.410527$cF.127653@rwcrnsc53...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > "Rob Kemp" <robkemp90210@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> > news:6114e4af.0309212028.45f4e122@posting.google.com...
> >
> >>http://drudgereport.com/flash3.htm?powell
> >>
> >>FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW: 'I HAVE A TIRED FAMILY,
> >>TIRED CHILDREN AND A TIRED SPOUSE'
> >>Sun Sep 21 2003 17:25:30 ET
> >>
> >>**Exclusive Sneak Preview**
> >>
> >>Michael K. Powell, the embattled chairman of the Federal
> >>Communications Commission, appears to be setting the stage for an exit
> >>with a candid interview pipelined for Monday runs of the NEW YORK
> >>TIMES.
> >>
> >>Newsroom sources tell DRUDGE that Powell has gone on-the-record with
> >>NYT's Steve Labaton for a wide-ranging explanation of current affairs.
> >>
> >>"I have a tired family, tired children and a tired spouse. Candidly, I
> >>once said I would be in this job for three years and then leave,"
> >>Powell explains. "That was three years ago."
> >>
> >>"I've been called every name in the book by every opponent in the
> >>book," he adds. "That's classic Washington. If you can't get past
> >>jingoism, you attack the person. I wish the press would focus on more
> >>than who's rebuked and who's rebuking and look at what the best
> >>alternatives are for the public in terms of policy."
> >>
> >>Labaton was said to be finalizing the text Sunday evening, for a
> >>Business section lead, sources tell DRUDGE.
> >>
> >>Developing...
> >
> >
> > Wouldn't it be great if the next political appointee actually had some
idea
> > of RF communications technology ?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI

> >
> >
> He doesn't need to...That is why he has a STAFF!!!
>
>
>
> --
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>

Well then the staff needs to know something about RF also.

What do you expect tho? When the only tech types are at whats left of the monitoring stations. Everyone else seems to be lawyers.

Dan/W4NTI

5161. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 20:40:02 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Cc2cb.2378$ai7.1022@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78682

""frank\"" <"\"frank\\\""@nospam.franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
news:2OZbb.417030$cF.128230@rwcrnsc53...
> Brian Kelly wrote:
> > "\"\\frank\\\"" <"\"\\frank\\\""@nospam.franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in
message news:<8QObb.410527$cF.127653@rwcrnsc53>...
> >
> >>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>"Rob Kemp" <robkemp90210@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >>>news:6114e4af.0309212028.45f4e122@posting.google.com...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>http://drudgereport.com/flash3.htm?powell
> >>>>
> >>>>FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW: 'I HAVE A TIRED FAMILY,
> >>>>TIRED CHILDREN AND A TIRED SPOUSE'
> >>>>Sun Sep 21 2003 17:25:30 ET
> >>>>
> >>>>**Exclusive Sneak Preview**
> >>>>
> >>>>Michael K. Powell, the embattled chairman of the Federal
> >>>>Communications Commission, appears to be setting the stage for an exit
> >>>>with a candid interview pipelined for Monday runs of the NEW YORK
> >>>>TIMES.
> >>>>
> >>>>Newsroom sources tell DRUDGE that Powell has gone on-the-record with
> >>>>NYT's Steve Labaton for a wide-ranging explanation of current affairs.
> >>>>
> >>>>"I have a tired family, tired children and a tired spouse. Candidly, I
> >>>>once said I would be in this job for three years and then leave,"
> >>>>Powell explains. "That was three years ago."
> >>>>
> >>>>"I've been called every name in the book by every opponent in the
> >>>>book," he adds. "That's classic Washington. If you can't get past
> >>>>jingoism, you attack the person. I wish the press would focus on more
> >>>>than who's rebuked and who's rebuking and look at what the best
> >>>>alternatives are for the public in terms of policy."
> >>>>
> >>>>Labaton was said to be finalizing the text Sunday evening, for a
> >>>>Business section lead, sources tell DRUDGE.
> >>>>
> >>>>Developing...
> >>>

> >>>
> >>>Wouldn't it be great if the next political appointee actually had some
idea
> >>>of RF communications technology ?
> >>>
> >>>Dan/W4NTI
> >>>
> >>>
> >>
> >>He doesn't need to...That is why he has a STAFF!!!
> >
> >
> > Yeah he has "staff" but they're as clueless as he is. His staffer
> > D'Wanna or whatever her name is, the political tootsie who runs the
> > FCC outfit which sits on ham radio got up at a seminar and expressed
> > amazement at how people on the ground can talk to people in airplanes
> > in the sky with radios.
> >
> > w3rv
> Let me put it to you this way, the FCC could careless about amateur
> radio....They aren't going to care about something they can't make any
> money for the US Treasury...Wake up!
>
>
>
> --
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>

You ought to know Franky. You got away with jamming without a callsign for
years. And didn't get caught.

The Stumpjumpers brought you up right. Now continue to spout the SJ code.

Dan/W4NTI

5162. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 21:02:35 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <vcb1nv87pdj0ppfnjj1sndo6duksnvuho0@4ax.com>
Source record: 78684

Oops, my bad, cut and paste error - that should have read:

...and the project was cancelled because there were no funds to buy
the magic decoder rings that were required :)

And I almost forgot, we learned that, on the Gulf Coast of Texas,
there are redcoats forcibly marketing 8-track tapes. Apparently, you
do not need to listen to them (the tapes, not the redcoats), but you
do have to purchase them - because they tell you to! Bummer - that
must play hell with local tourism!

So much for vacationing in Galveston next summer - looks like we're
going back to Orlando again instead. I hate 8-tracks - they always
used to stick and wow in the winter. Then again, I haven't seen
redcoats since we went to Fort Henry in Kingston, ON a couple of years
ago, and I'm pretty sure that they were actors. A real live redcoat
would be cool! Hmmm - if the 8-track is cheap, I guess we could just
throw it away after we get a picture with the redcoat. We'll see.

Reference:

http://groups.google.com/groups?q=redcoats+8-track&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&oe=UTF-8&safe=off&se
lm=vms3em9lu81s65%40corp.supernews.com&rnum=1

(I wonder if some of these folks realize that 'Google Groups' archives
all newsgroup posts indefinitely - do a quick search on Google Groups
for KB5ZHT, and have a look a few through the 293 hits it finds. (Not
exactly what you would want someone to find if he strayed of QRZ and
looked you up one day!)

This has been going on for a while, huh?

73, Leo

5163. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 21:02:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkqcdd$n0e$0@208.206.142.83>
Source record: 78683

On 23 Sep 2003 04:00:56 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bkocja$g21$0@208.206.142.110>...
>> Brian wrote:
>>
>> >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<6BIbb.63583$NM1.20271@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >>I'll tell you this Jim...the Ruskies had and probably still do have the best
>> >>CW operators in the world.
>> >>
>> >>I used to have to listen to them a lot in a job I had. Amazing how so many
>> >>of them sounded like the hams on 20meters...hi.
>> >>
>> >>Dan/W4NTI
>> >>
>> >>
>> >
>> >And the ones that washed out of CW school? The Gulag?
>> >
>>
>>
>>
>> Only you and a few like you washed out.
>
>Poor DICK. I was never in a Russian dittybopper school.
>
>> Russian military, as our own,
>> don't.
>
>Poor DICK. I was never in a US dittybopper school.
>
>> When one is sitting trying to learn code, realizing that if you "just
>> can't" then
>> it.s off to the infantry, the failure rate is unsurprisingly low to
>> nonexistant.
>
>Poor DICK. I'm sure the failure rate was quite high. Why the big
>rush to RTTY and other modes which don't require the operator to be a
>human modem?
>

Poor BRICKBrain...you're sure of quite a number of incorrect "facts".

>Perhaps Len could shed some light on this.

Ah, you look to you your clueless mentor for support yet once more.
Just as though he actually knew anything about the subject.

Two peas in a plod. Yes, a plod.

5164. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 21:15:22 UTC
From: Frank Todd <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <KJ2cb.560098$o%2.245295@sccrnsc02>
Source record: 78685

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> ""frank\"" <"\"frank\\\""@nospam.franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
> news:2OZbb.417030$cF.128230@rwcrnsc53...
>
>>Brian Kelly wrote:
>>
>>>"\"\\frank\\\"" <"\"\\frank\\\""@nospam.franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in
>
> message news:<8QObb.410527$cF.127653@rwcrnsc53>...
>
>>>>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>"Rob Kemp" <robkemp90210@hotmail.com> wrote in message
>>>>>news:6114e4af.0309212028.45f4e122@posting.google.com...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>http://drudgereport.com/flash3.htm?powell
>>>>>>
>>>>>>FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW: 'I HAVE A TIRED FAMILY,
>>>>>>TIRED CHILDREN AND A TIRED SPOUSE'
>>>>>>Sun Sep 21 2003 17:25:30 ET
>>>>>>
>>>>>>**Exclusive Sneak Preview**
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Michael K. Powell, the embattled chairman of the Federal
>>>>>>Communications Commission, appears to be setting the stage for an exit
>>>>>>with a candid interview pipelined for Monday runs of the NEW YORK
>>>>>>TIMES.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Newsroom sources tell DRUDGE that Powell has gone on-the-record with
>>>>>>NYT's Steve Labaton for a wide-ranging explanation of current affairs.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>"I have a tired family, tired children and a tired spouse. Candidly, I
>>>>>>once said I would be in this job for three years and then leave,"
>>>>>>Powell explains. "That was three years ago."
>>>>>>
>>>>>>"I've been called every name in the book by every opponent in the
>>>>>>book," he adds. "That's classic Washington. If you can't get past
>>>>>>jingoism, you attack the person. I wish the press would focus on more
>>>>>>than who's rebuked and who's rebuking and look at what the best

>>>>>>alternatives are for the public in terms of policy."
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Labaton was said to be finalizing the text Sunday evening, for a
>>>>>>Business section lead, sources tell DRUDGE.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Developing...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Wouldn't it be great if the next political appointee actually had some
>
> idea
>
>>>>>of RF communications technology ?
>>>>>
>>>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>He doesn't need to...That is why he has a STAFF!!!
>>>
>>>
>>>Yeah he has "staff" but they're as clueless as he is. His staffer
>>>D'Wanna or whatever her name is, the political tootsie who runs the
>>>FCC outfit which sits on ham radio got up at a seminar and expressed
>>>amazement at how people on the ground can talk to people in airplanes
>>>in the sky with radios.
>>>
>>>w3rv
>>
>>Let me put it to you this way, the FCC could careless about amateur
>>radio....They aren't going to care about something they can't make any
>>money for the US Treasury...Wake up!
>>
>>
>>
>>--
>>73
>>
>>Frank K3EKO
>>
>
>
> You ought to know Franky. You got away with jamming without a callsign for
> years. And didn't get caught.
>
> The Stumpjumpers brought you up right. Now continue to spout the SJ code.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Dan,

You must be smoking that wacky weed you got from Donnie...See what it
does to your brain?!?!?

--
73

Frank K3EKO

5165. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 21:25:40 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <0g21nvogafrl9boqvp91s6vhfkcsvd7h1s@4ax.com>
Source record: 78686

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On 21 Sep 2003 06:28:53 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <vmptt9rrsje11c@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
>computron dot net> writes:
>
>>If you have to MAKE it happen, then it isn't making it on it's own
>>merit.
>
>Fine. Then let's get rid of any and all testing in schools at every
>educational level. After all, all those tests only "force" students to
>demonstrate academic achievement, don't they? That's "making"
>an education happen, so we can't have that, can we?

We can, and we do, primarily because one is doomed to fail in life
without an education. You'll also note that one does not have to study
medicine and get an M.D. in order to graduate with a degree in, say,
business administration - primarily because a guy with an MBA isn't
expected to perform brain surgery. With respect to Amateur Radio,
nobody is forced to operate in CW once they're licensed, and one can
succeed in the ARS by using any one of a few dozen other modes we're
allowed to use, so forcing them to take a code test makes no sense.

>Don't look now, Clint, but welfare programs are "handouts" that give
>away valuable assets as if the recipient were entitled to them simply
>by virtue of being there with his/her hand out.

Correct. Therefore, code testing isn't a welfare program, it's a
government-subsidized life-support system for an anachronism.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=-=-=

5166. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 21:25:41 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <f431nv410at3docad9d3qivoe7ng3k8fhk@4ax.com>
Source record: 78687

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On 21 Sep 2003 08:25:52 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Now, then, how does the advocation of code testing in any way correlate
>to bigotry, elitism, and/or discrimination against other Americans?

By steadfastly refusing to admit that code testing is a
government-subsidized life support system for an anachronism, and
insisting that code testing be retained, PCTAs are supporting
artificial barriers to entry into the hobby. I suspect that for many
PCTAs, and maybe even for most PCTAs, the motive for this lies not in
promoting the use of the mode, but in retaining a piece of the RF
spectrum for their own use at the exclusion of others who their no
longer exists a practical reason for keeping them out on the basis of
code proficiency.

Whether you or any of the other PCTAs care to realize it or not,
Larry, this attitude is THE reason why so many people in other facets
of hobby radio, while respecting the abilities of hams with respect to
our knowledge about radio, tend to consider us a bunch of stuffed
shirts personally. Outside the ARS, the code test is perceived (quite
correctly) as archaic and pointless except as a hazing ritual that
exists solely as a means of keeping others from joining our exclusive
little club - which is elitism by definition - and then when you get
people like WA8ULX using derogatory terms like "CBplussers" to
describe fellow hams who don't share the same interests in radio as he
does, that, Larry, is bigotry...and ULX is far from being the only ham
in here who is guilty of it.

>The
>code tests, both past and present, have proved to be achievable by people
>from all walks of life, including those with communicative disabilities up to
>and including total deafness. Try as I may, I can't find anything patently
>"discriminatory" there. So, take a shot of setting me straight -- how is
>code testing "discrimination?"

I've already shown bigotry and elitism. I'm not going to bother
getting into discriminatory - two out of three is bad enough. I'll
give you a hint, though...a Technician who passes the written test is
not qualified to operate on HF phone, but a Tech who passes a code
test *is* qualified to operate on HF phone? That makes about as much
sense as some of the junk coming into this NG from the crossposters
over in the rec.radio.cb newsgroup. Whether or not the Tech is
qualified to operate on HF phone - or PSK31 or SSTV or any other mode

besides CW - has nothing to do with whether he or she can copy Morse. You really mean to tell me that you guys who bill yourselves as superior to most other hams don't understand how stupid that looks to those outside your steadily shrinking clique of PCTAs? And you can't see the harm it does to the image of amateur radio? C'mon, guys, get your heads out of the sand, will ya? It's 2003, not 1936.

>> I've discussed that contradiction with Larry before. He does seem to
>>exclude code testing from his conservative views opposing excessive
>>government regulation.
>
>Correct, because I don't consider it to be "excessive" government
>regulation.

If it is unnecessary, it is excessive.

> I believe the government has a valid need to regulate certain
>things, especially valuable and finite resources such as the RF
>spectrum.

Last time I checked, FCC still does regulate the RF spectrum.

>Therefore, I believe that when license is to be given for the
>PRIVILEGE of free use of RF spectrum, which is worth potentially
>billions of dollars should it be converted to commerce in the commercial
>utility communications and broadcasting industries, certain government
>regulation makes good sense.

Which we have - in the case of the ARS, it's in Part 97. Other radio services are regulated by other parts of FCC regulations. Dropping code testing will not render the ARS unregulated - it will merely remove an archaic regulation that not only no longer serves any purpose vital to the well-being of the ARS, but actually is no longer in keeping with the basis and purpose of the ARS - a fact which FCC conceded in its R&O on the last round of restructuring. One would think that if an agency of the federal beaurocracy can be made to aquiesce to this fact, a few thousand regular citizens ought to be able to understand it to, yet the PCTAs continue to cling to an obvious (to everyone else) anachronism as if it were the only worthwhile pursuit in all of amateur radio. That puts PCTAs in a distinct minority, because the rest of the world understands that it is anything but a worthwhile pursuit as far as it relates to the state of communications technology in the 22nd century world.

>>If Morse Code has real value, it should be able to
>>survive in as close to a free market environment as possible.
>
>Well, that's a wonderful concept, Dwight, but history has shown that
>it doesn't work when put to the actual test.

That alone should tell you something...like maybe that the rest of the world isn't operating under the same illusions as most PCTAs seem to be suffering from.

> The No-code Technician
>experiment only served to bring us a couple hundred grand of new
>hams who self-limited their amateur radio experience to the 2-meter
>repeaters.

I disagree - the 2-meter band is merely the most popular among those bands on which their licenses grant them operating privileges. That, along with the widespread availability of equipment for operating there, makes it a matter of course that most of them are going to show up there first.

>Naturally, they all want the freedom to use HF phone, but
>that still (for now) requires that they learn the Morse code and pass
>a test, albeit at a mere 5 WPM. The fact that they are not doing so in
>any great numbers indicates that the Morse code does not have any
>particular drawing power based on it's own "merits," as the NCTA
>would infer.

Again, that ought to tell you something. It does tell me something. It tells me that either radio hobbyists in general are smarter than PCTAs seem to think they are, or that perhaps the PCTAs aren't as smart as they think they are.

To put it another way, just because a minority of hams who happen to be PCTAs have deluded themselves into thinking that an archaic testing requirement of an anachronistic operating mode is of continued benefit to the ARS or to the science of radio, does not necessarily mean that the rest of us are going to fall victim to the same fallacy. The fact that so many people aren't buying into this supposition indicates to me that perhaps NCTAs - and hams who are interested in ham radio but not in CW operation - aren't dumbing down the hobby, as the PVTAs would infer. Perhaps the dumbing down is coming from the other side of the CW fence.

>And now that there is a very bold dotted line drawn
>around even this meager requirement, the incentive has all but
>fully evaporated.

That incentive evaporated sometime around 1970. That's when the state of communications technology truly made CW obsolete for most purposes. It remains a viable communications mode, but it is far from being the most efficient, it is far from being the easiest to learn and use, and it is long past time to do away with the code testing requirement. It's doing nothing but keeping people out of the ARS for no good reason other than that the PCTAs get to hold onto their "turf" on the bands for a little while longer. Anyone who thinks differently, mention the refarming of the Novice bands to any PCTA. Then get ready to start peeling PCTAs off the ceiling.

>>I think it has
>>that value and can survive just fine without a regulation mandating testing.
>
>And I don't -- and have seen conclusive proof that it won't.

Which leaves two reasons for continuing to have a code test, and both
of them are rooted in elitism and bigotry.

Funny...part of the Basis & Purpose mentions fostering international
goodwill - yet we have so many people in the ARS who can't even be
bothered to foster goodwill on our side of the ponds. They'd prefer to
cling like koala bears to their own little slices of the RF spectrum
and the rest of us be damned. Sickening.

>First of all, FCC Commissioners are political appointees, not necessarily
>technical experts. They can, and do, depend on the advice of professional
>technical experts, who actually formulate and subsequently make
>recommendations on regulatory matters. The Commissioners mainly
>ensure that these regulations meet the needs of their respective
>political constituencies, often with numerous conflicting interests battering
>them from every angle.

None of which has anything to do with the usefulness of code testing,
so (as they say down at the barber shop), "Next!"

>Second, it is not my desire to "undermine" anyone. I don't view the
>Morse code testing requirements, past or present, to be in any way
>unachievable or otherwise discriminatory.

Ostrich...head...sand.

> In fact, I view them as being
>directly in support of the concept of learning and maintaining the use of
>a highly useful communications skill, therefore, the requirement has,
>IMHO, intrinsic merit.

"Highly" useful? At this stage of the game, probably half the licensed
hams in the world have no interest in using CW to communicate and
wouldn't know how to if they did.

>This does not "benefit me more" than anyone
>else in the ARS.

Sure it does. You've got yours, so nuts to everybody else. You'll
fight to retain that archaic, anachronistic testing requirement even
if it means there will eventually be thirty licensed hams left in the
country, all crowded onto a 2 kilohertz slice of spectrum somewhere
down around 150 kc and the only mode permitted is CW.

>Moreover, I am definitely not squelching anyone with
>different views. This newsgroup is adequate evidence of that.

I think it's more like, this NG is evidence of the fact that you
can't squelch anyone with a differing viewpoint, even if you wish
you could. You can't do it here, and you can't do it during FCC
comment periods. That's the only reason we aren't still wasting
people's time with 13wpm and 20wpm code tests. Eventually, the 5wpm
test willhead down the same road. It will be interesting to see how
many PCTAs will stick around ande continue to be VEs and elmers and
active hams and work for the good of the ARS, and how many will take

their ball and go home.

>>> You seem dumb and dumberer to the fact that every other radio
>>> service (except a small part of maritime radio) in the USA has either
>>> DROPPED morse code (snip)
>
>> Actually, as you may know, even the International Maritime Organization
>>(IMO) voted in 1998 to eliminate Morse Code. The Coast Guard itself dropped
>>code in 1995. As a result of these two events, the Coast Guard now urges
>>commercial vessels not to use code since CG personnel, and an increasing
>>number of radio operators in the maritime service, may no longer have the
>>skills necessary to communicate using that system. The UN-chartered IMO is
>>responsible for defining and regulating international maritime
>>telecommunications. It's positions are adopted by the ITU.
>
>All of this is really swell, Dwight, and trust me, if my dinghy were to spring
>a leak in the middle of a busy shipping lane, the last thing I would do is
>break out my J-38 and ask the next passing Liberian tanker to swing by
>my position and fish me out of the drink. However, I would have my
>marine HF and VHF radios powered up, and I'd have the mic in hand,
>screaming like bloody havoc! However, this discussion is about the
>AMATEUR Radio Service. Can you PUHLEEEZE, just for once, get that
>concept thru your Kevlar skull? Your lack of situational awareness, while
>accusing me of the same, is getting to be quite frustrating.

Larry, he *was* discussing the ARS. He pointed out - quite correctly I might add - that the ARS is the only place in the RF spectrum where an archaic operating mode is widely believed by a significant number of the operators therein to reign supreme despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary. Ham radio organizations widely lament the lack of growth in the hobby, ham radio clubs have a fraction of their former membership counts, ham radio magazines print articles and reader letters lamenting the lack of activity even on the 2m repeaters, and yet we have people who continue to support a testing requirement that is probably more responsible for that than any other single factor.

The rest of the world is in the 22nd century. The ARS is still mired in the 19th century. You once asked something to the effect of, where are all the hams who were going to give us high-speed data networks over radio once the no-code licenses came out?

The answer is, we didn't get the no-code licenses unti it was 15 years too late, by which time those potential hams were already working for companies like Microsoft and couldn't have cared less any more about ham radio. That's the way it is - and if the PCTAs have their way, that's the way it'll stay. Unfortunately, something tells me that's just fine with the PCTAs, who all too often seem to me as if they have their own selfish interests in mind rather than the best interests of the ARS.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=-=-=

5167. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 21:25:48 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <5581nvknc9cbm100rb5hh6ndtk7g59dce7@4ax.com>
Source record: 78688

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:30:01 GMT, "Dwight Stewart"
<stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote:

>The Amateur Radio Service is not
>(or should not be) defined solely by CW/code, so that one mode does not
>solely define what is in the best interest of the ARS. However, as it is,
>testing of that one mode does continue to define the ARS. I personally think
>it is time for that to change.

It's been time for that to change for the last 30 years.

Better late than never, I guess. <sigh>

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=-=-=

5168. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 21:25:58 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <r781nv09pljqcho0nuuplpnkvtjlkgi416@4ax.com>
Source record: 78689

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On 23 Sep 2003 05:34:27 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Dwight:
>
>I hate to sound like a scratched CD, but that reply is unresponsive. If the
>above were true, then the very second radio amateurs started using modes
>other than CW, the code testing requirement should have been dropped,
>for all the same reasons given by the NCTA today. However, it wasn't.
>In fact, in the late '60's, over a half-century after the need for military and
>commercial stations to be able to shoo-off "those damn hams" from
>their frequencies, the Morse code testing requirement was increased
>as part of the now lamented "Incentive Licensing" scheme.

Obviously a mistake, then...so what is your rationale for compounding
that mistake by continuing to perpetuate it any longer?

>Incentive
>Licensing was an ARRL initiative, and it was done to ensure that the
>Morse/CW mode would continue to be used in spite of the increasing
>popularity of SSB and digital modes.

Another obvious mistake...let's deliberately restrict progress in the
ARS by clinging to archaic technology like koala bears. Real astute
leadership from the League there...NOT!

>It was actually a very brilliant plan,

Actually it was a very stupid plan, as shown by the test of time.

> but was spoiled by the resentment caused by the lack of full
>"grandfathering" of the existing Generals to the new Amateur Extra
>class. If only that had been done, we may not be having this debate
>today.

To say nothing of the resentment caused by deciding in the face of
rapidly advancing communications technology to remain rooted in an
anachronism left over from before the dawn of the 20th century. If
only that had not been done, the brightest young technological minds
of two full generations might have been drawn to amateur radio instead
of computers and the landline BBSes and finally the Internet, and
there would be no need for this silly debate because the ARS would
have stayed on the cutting ege of communications technology instead of
having made the decision to allow itself to be left in the dust.

>During the last ARRL 10-Meter Contest, I worked over 160 QSO's on
>10-meters, using only CW. This is on 10-meters, a band famous as a
>repository for the 5 WPM Novice/Techs exercising the whole of their HF
>phone privileges! During contests covering all HF bands, such as the
>November Sweepstakes (CW), it is not possible to work all of the CW
>stations participating.

It is not possible to work all of the phone stations participating in
the phone portion of Sweepstakes, either. The question is, did you
work a Clean Sweep?

>Well, at least not for me, with my minimal station
>in a highly antenna-compromised apartment QTH. However, in spite
>of my operating challenges, the CW mode provides endless potential
>to make points. During the November SS (Phone) last year, my
>club station (W3DOV) was also operating under "marginal" conditions
>at the QTH of Mark, KE3UY. Using literally the same power and
>antennas as I would at my home QTH, we worked a lot fewer stations
>than we could have on CW.

That's what you get for wasting all that time pounding brass instead
of learning some phone operating skills. :-)

>It's as simple as that. And, excluding
>contests, the CW segments are very alive and full of stations all the
>time, largely thanks to FISTS and the old CW-geezers chasing all
>that paper.

Excluding contests, the phone segments are also very alive and full of
stations - no thanks to FISTS or to the old CW-geezers chasing all
that paper....and no thanks to the code test, for that matter.

>The efforts being made to eliminate the Morse code test requirement
>are motivated by one thing and one thing only:

Common sense.

> laziness.

Unfortunately, common sense is not necessarily very common.

>The laziness
>born of a lack of desire to learn and gain reasonable proficiency in a
>proven, useful communications skill.

Being a good phone contest operator requires developing some skills
too, Larry. You guys might have done better in Sweepstakes Phone if
you hadn't been to lazy to gain reasonable proficiency in this proven,
useful communications skill - which is even more widely used than CW,
and therefore makes even more sense to take the time to learn.

But, like I said, common sense is... <sigh>

> And, considering the nature of
>the ARS, indulging that laziness would be an abomination.

The dicstionary on the shelf here doesn't list "abomination" but it
does define "abominable" as follows:

1. hateful; disgusting: Leprosy is an abominable disease.
2. very unpleasant: abominable manners.

Pretty much sounds like the way that many of us feel about code
testing, and it's probably how some people feel about the code itself,
but the fact remains that this pointless adherence to an anachronism
is an aberration that exists only in the ARS, and nowhere else. Small
wonder that we're the subject of ridicule elsewhere in the radio hobby
community because of it.

>>Therefore, code testing is not
>>essential to the Amateur Radio Service.
>
>It most certainly is, if the ARS wishes to continue to develop radio
>operators capable of exploiting the many benefits and advantages
>of the Morse/CW mode.

And while we're developing radio operators who have proficiency with
an operating mode that nobody but hams uses, we're failing to devlop
operators proficient in the skills that might actually be useful out
there in the real world. Yet, old-timers lament the fact that these
days, having a ham license won't get you a job bagging groceries, let
alone any meaningful work in a communications-related field. Small
wonder, when the ARS itself decided to stay rooted in 19th century
technology, eh?

>The FCC has stated repeatedly that whether or not it will have an
>interesting in the "continued use of this mode" depends upon a
>consensus of the amateur radio community itself.

Half of which, as no-code Techs, has already voted, by deciding not to
join the PCTAs in deluding themselves about the usefulness of an
anachronistic, 19th-century operating mode.

>Therefore,
>unfortunately, we will be at the mercy of the majority. Us PCTA's
>may not like the outcome, but that is the risk one takes when living
>in a democracy.

Given time, the results may prove better in the long run for the ARS.
Will you still think it unfortunate if this happens?

>>As far as the FCC is concerned, it is now
>>just one more operating mode among the many used within the Amateur Radio
>>Service. There is no sufficient argument to support the continued existence
>>of a code testing requirement. As such, the code testing requirement should
>>be eliminated.
>
>As already stated by N2EY, this particular logic could then be applied to
>testing for knowledge of any of the requirements for technical knowledge,
>since radio amateurs no longer have the ability to design, build, and repair

>state-of-the art communications gear unless they possess professional-
>grade technical knowledge, skills, and facilities.

Interesting, isn't it, to note that this separation between professional-grade technical knowledge and that available in the ARS started shortly after the ARS decided to remain in the Dark Ages while the rest of the world took off on the Technology Boom. We stayed in the Morse age while the rest of the world entered the Information Age. Yeah, incentive licensing was a great idea. Personally, I'd rank it right up there with sending troops to Vietnam.

> And, since this is the
>AMATEUR Radio Service, that is an unreasonable expectation.

Of course it is! Now, an example of a *reasonable* expectation would be to expect proficiency in a method of communications that is about 150 years old and that nobody else uses anymore. That *really* encourages people to become part of the ARS and be a part of the supposed advancement of the radio art that the Basis & Purpose portion of Part 97 says we're supposed to be all about, doesn't it?

>Therefore,
>if code testing *is* eliminated, then we may as well also go to a simple
>license application process, with, at most, an open-book test on rules and
>regulations. That would then serve the needs of the dumbed-down
>licensing process you would seem to prefer.

Come on, Larry. There are guys who can do 30, 40, or 50 wpm that can't even *program* a modern transciever, let alone fix the damned thing when one of the surface-mount components fails that is too small for many of us to even *see* let alone solder one onto a PC board. These rigs have been designed so the owners *can't* fix them, so that they have to be dragged back to the dealer or shipped to the factory for service, with appropriate outlay of cash since naturally the component isn't going to fail until, oh, I dunno, about 6.2 seconds after the warranty expires. Chances are that the "factory service" involves removing the board the failed component is on and replacing it with a brand new one because it isn't cost--effective to do component-level repairs on mass-produced PC boards.

Following this, the rig gets packed up and shipped back to its owner, who opens the package, curses a blue streak when he sees the bottom line on the invoice, makes a New Years' Resolution to become a boat anchor fanatic, then unpacks the rig and puts it back on the desk in his shack. It really doesn't matter if the guy doing the unpacking can copy at 50 wpm or doesn't know a dit from a dah, the result is going to be the same because that's how the manufacturer designed it. If you must blame somebody for that, Larry, then I respectfully suggest that you place the blame not on the NCTAs, but on the design engineers at YaeComWood, where it rightfully belongs - and remember that some of them are hams, who apparently have professional-grade technical knowledge, skills, and facilities, whether they ever passed a code

test or not.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=-=-=

5169. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 21:38:29 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309231338.5892732b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78690

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bko3q5$qt0$1@208.206.142.87>...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> >"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:9FHbb.2804$vS.1215@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> >
> >[snip]
> >
> >
> >>... isn't it time to do away with Ham Radio licensing in a nation
> >>in which 12,000 people are murdered by untested and
> >>unlicensed gun owners? Just a thought.
> >>
> >>
> >
> >To answer your question with a single word "No."
> >
> >Licensing is required by international agreements and federal
> >law (and for good reason).
> >
> >However, the requirements for licensure should be reasonable
> >and rational, and while the written tests meet that criteria, the
> >requirement for Morse proficiency no longer does.
> >
> >Carl - wk3c
> >
> >
> >
>
> *O-P-I-N-I-O-N * and a poorly rationalized one at that. See N2EY's many
> posts on the same subject.

N2EY's post must have made a great impression if you can't remember
his "poorly rationalized" argument.

5170. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 21:44:25 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309231344.1554b479@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78691

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in message news:<vds0nv84a0kgfokc40mb750q104smjtakk@4ax.com>...
> **** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****
>
> On 23 Sep 2003 00:40:54 GMT, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
> wrote:
>
>
> > Far better to concentrate testing on operating - to include as many
> >modes as feasable. INCLUDING radiotelegraphy, **the second most used
> >mode in ham radio**.
>
> It occurs to me that, after "making a legitimate withdrawal" as number
> one, the second most used method of obtaining money from the bank
> happens to be a felony.
>
> It also occurs to me that in sports, they refer to the player(s) who
> finish anywhere below #1 as the LOSERS.
>
> 73 DE John, KC2HMZ
> Tonawanda, New York

John, I like the way you think.

5171. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 21:46:49 UTC
From: Lou <Spamfree@Spamfree.com>
Message-ID: <xb3cb.87$LJ5.6464@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 78692
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:842cb.2349$ai7.1102@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> news:Q7Nbb.51$LJ5.4366@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> > "Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
> > news:vmv6j3kfrkpv64@corp.supernews.com...
> > > HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A.
Abernethy,
> > > K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation
below
> 30
> > > MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the action,
> > > Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC
letter
> > > included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of
> > > transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16.
> > Hollingsworth's
> > > letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference on
> > 3.965
> > > MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted
that
> > > Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time
his
> > > station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to protest
the
> > > sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21 and
22
> in
> > > the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints from
> other
> > > amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the FCC
> had
> > > received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity, deliberate
> > > interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints to
the
> > FCC
> > > alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt Song,"
> the
> > > letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate
interference."
> > > Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center

in
> > > Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to K4OKA.
The
> > FCC
> > > letter also said the Commission had received complaints that Abernethy
> had
> > > used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference" on
or
> > > near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about
> over-power
> > > operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start
> > revocation
> > > proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of continued
> > > violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter. (For
> > > additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for Six
> > Months"
> > > elsewhere on the AWE news page.)
> > >
> > >
> > > "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@porkbutt.net> wrote in message
> > > news:vmqshdfh78hr4b@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > SHOW UP ON MY FREQUENCY AND I WILL RUN YOU OFF. HO HO
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:iO8bb.13$LJ5.2273@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@bigalk4oka.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:vmq5ars9c9i455@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > > HO HO. SELL YOUR GEAR I DONT CARE. JUST STAY OFF OF 3.894.5.
THATS
> > BIG
> > > > ALS
> > > > > > FREQUENCY. HO HO. I'LL BE TAKING OVER 3.898 NEXT. HO HO
> > > > > >
> > > > > > AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT
SONG.
> HO
> > > HO
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > If I choose to talk on that frequency, I will, so long as I'm
> abiding
> > by
> > > > the
> > > > > rules and regulations as they are spelled out. YOU or no one else,
> can
> > > > tell

> > > > > me to stay off. ASS WIPE.
> > > > >
> > > > > BIG AL.. the only thing big about you, is your mouth....
> > > > >
> > > > > Lou
> > > > >
> >
> > Well Ass hole AL, looks like you've had your ass reamed out once, trying
> for
> > seconds???? Something tells me, you're due for it.
> > Lou
> >
> >
>
> Once? Boy are you out of touch.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
Not sure how the thread made it past my kill file, but to respond to your comment, I only went with what I was told and seen for myself as witnessed above.. IF there was more than one incident mentioned, then I didn't notice in my speed read of the article.
But, if it's been more than once, then maybe it's time they show him they're done playing games.
Lou

5172. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 21:54:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309231354.3e314559@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78693

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030923013415.12631.00001337@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <9FHbb.2804$vS.1215@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>, Keith
> <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> writes:
>
> > I had the pleasure of watching the documentary by Michael
> >Moore called, "Bowling for Columbine". In the opening segment
> >Michael goes into a Michigan Bank and gets a free shotgun
> >for opening a CD account.
>
> Keith:
>
> I bought the DVD. Actually, it was a Winchester .270 cal. bolt-action
> rifle.

My father has a .270 Win and it's a nice rifle. Wish I got one for
opening a bank account. Wished I lived in Colorado, too.

5173. LOU

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 21:55:06 UTC
From: Thirty-eight ninety-four point five <"Thirty-eight ninety-four point five"@Thirty-eight>
Message-ID: <vn1g9pltrcjba2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78694
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

LOU YOU WILL NOT OPERATE ON THIRTY-EIGHT NINETY-FOUR POINT FIVE EVER BOY

I OWN THAT ONE CAUSE I HAVE A BIG ONE OH OH

"Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
news:xb3cb.87$LJ5.6464@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:842cb.2349$ai7.1102@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> > news:Q7Nbb.51$LJ5.4366@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> > > "Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
> > > news:vmv6j3kfrkpv64@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A.
> Abernethy,
> > > > K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation
> below
> > 30
> > > > MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the
action,
> > > > Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC
> letter
> > > > included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of
> > > > transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16.
> > > Hollingsworth's
> > > > letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference
on
> > > 3.965
> > > > MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted
> that
> > > > Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time
> his
> > > > station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to protest
> the
> > > > sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21 and
> 22
> > in
> > > > the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints from
> > other
> > > > amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the
FCC
> > had
> > > > received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity,

deliberate
> > > > interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints to
> the
> > > FCC
> > > > alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt
Song,"
> > the
> > > > letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate
> interference."
> > > > Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center
> in
> > > > Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to K4OKA.
> The
> > > FCC
> > > > letter also said the Commission had received complaints that
Abernethy
> > had
> > > > used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference"
on
> or
> > > > near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about
> > over-power
> > > > operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start
> > > revocation
> > > > proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of continued
> > > > violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter.
(For
> > > > additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for Six
> > > Months"
> > > > elsewhere on the AWE news page.)
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@porkbutt.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:vmqshdfh78hr4b@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > SHOW UP ON MY FREQUENCY AND I WILL RUN YOU OFF. HO HO
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:iO8bb.13$LJ5.2273@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@bigalk4oka.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:vmq5ars9c9i455@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > > > HO HO. SELL YOUR GEAR I DONT CARE. JUST STAY OFF OF 3.894.5.
> THATS
> > > BIG
> > > > > ALS
> > > > > > > FREQUENCY. HO HO. I'LL BE TAKING OVER 3.898 NEXT. HO HO
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT

> SONG.
> > HO
> > > > HO
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > If I choose to talk on that frequency, I will, so long as I'm
> > abiding
> > > by
> > > > > the
> > > > > > rules and regulations as they are spelled out. YOU or no one
else,
> > can
> > > > > > tell
> > > > > > me to stay off. ASS WIPE.
> > > > > >
> > > > > > BIG AL.. the only thing big about you, is your mouth....
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Lou
> > > > > >
> > >
> > > Well Ass hole AL, looks like you've had your ass reamed out once,
trying
> > for
> > > seconds???? Something tells me, you're due for it.
> > > Lou
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Once? Boy are you out of touch.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> Not sure how the thread made it past my kill file, but to respond to your
> comment, I only went with what I was told and seen for myself as witnessed
> above.. IF there was more than one incident mentioned, then I didn't
notice
> in my speed read of the article.
> But, if it's been more than once, then maybe it's time they show him
they're
> done playing games.
> Lou
>
>

5174. 3 8 9 4 . 5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 21:58:28 UTC
From: Thirty-eight ninety-four point five <"Thirty-eight ninety-four point five"@Thirty-eight>
Message-ID: <vn1gg3ktpgdg9b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78695
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.flame,alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

MINE MINE MINE
3 8 9 4 . 5

THE CARING STATION

THE SODOMIZER

CAPTAIN TRUTH

5175. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 21:58:30 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309231358.62af9fad@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78696

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030923090104.13774.00000037@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> >You are sooo spetchal. Your spetchalty is telling whoppers.
> >
>
> And you still cant memorize enough answers to pass the EXTRA

You would think that.

5176. Re: LOU

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 22:02:53 UTC
From: Lou <Spamfree@Spamfree.com>
Message-ID: <Aq3cb.88$LJ5.6549@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 78697
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Thirty-eight ninety-four point five" <Thirty-eight ninety-four point five@Thirty-eight ninety-four point five> wrote in message news:vn1g9pltrcjba2@corp.supernews.com...
> LOU YOU WILL NOT OPERATE ON THIRTY-EIGHT NINETY-FOUR POINT FIVE EVER BOY
>
> I OWN THAT ONE CAUSE I HAVE A BIG ONE OH OH
>

KISS MY ASS!

I will do as I please so long as I'm within the law... YOU have not got enough ASS OR BALLS to stop me, because I WILL see to it, that you are tracked and prosecuted AGAIN - DICK HEAD. END OF DISCUSSION.

Lou

5177. Re: LOU

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 22:04:51 UTC
From: Thirty-eight ninety-four point five <"Thirty-eight ninety-four point five"@Thirty-eight>
Message-ID: <vn1gs2p0fbj27d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78698
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

hO Ho

"Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
news:Aq3cb.88$LJ5.6549@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> "Thirty-eight ninety-four point five" <Thirty-eight ninety-four point
> five@Thirty-eight ninety-four point five> wrote in message
> news:vn1g9pltrcjba2@corp.supernews.com...
> > LOU YOU WILL NOT OPERATE ON THIRTY-EIGHT NINETY-FOUR POINT FIVE EVER BOY
> >
> > I OWN THAT ONE CAUSE I HAVE A BIG ONE OH OH
> >
>
> KISS MY ASS!
>
> I will do as I please so long as I'm within the law... YOU have not got
> enough ASS OR BALLS to stop me, because I WILL see to it, that you are
> tracked and prosecuted AGAIN - DICK HEAD. END OF DISCUSSION.
>
> Lou
>
>
>

5178. Re: LOU

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 22:08:50 UTC
From: Thirty-eight ninety-four point five <"Thirty-eight ninety-four point five"@Thirty-eight>
Message-ID: <vn1h3hqp1sqjbc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78699
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

SEVEN TONITE. I'LL RUN YOU OFF BOY.

"Thirty-eight ninety-four point five" <Thirty-eight ninety-four point
five@Thirty-eight ninety-four point five> wrote in message
news:vn1gs2p0fbj27d@corp.supernews.com...
> hO Ho
>
>
> "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> news:Aq3cb.88$LJ5.6549@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> > "Thirty-eight ninety-four point five" <Thirty-eight ninety-four point
> > five@Thirty-eight ninety-four point five> wrote in message
> > news:vn1g9pltrcjba2@corp.supernews.com...
> > > LOU YOU WILL NOT OPERATE ON THIRTY-EIGHT NINETY-FOUR POINT FIVE EVER
BOY
> > >
> > > I OWN THAT ONE CAUSE I HAVE A BIG ONE OH OH
> > >
> >
> > KISS MY ASS!
> >
> > I will do as I please so long as I'm within the law... YOU have not got
> > enough ASS OR BALLS to stop me, because I WILL see to it, that you are
> > tracked and prosecuted AGAIN - DICK HEAD. END OF DISCUSSION.
> >
> > Lou
> >
> >
> >
>
>

5179. TUNE IT UP LOU LETS GO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 22:20:34 UTC
From: Thirty-eight ninety-four point five <"Thirty-eight ninety-four point five"@Thirty-eight>
Message-ID: <vn1hpiruu9604@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78700
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

3 8 9 4 . 5

B I G A L W A I T I N G F O R Y O U W I T H A B I G O N E

5180. AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 22:22:42 UTC
From: BIG AL <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
Message-ID: <vn07nhkt1kngc6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78631
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

BE ON 3894.5 TONITE. THE ARKANSAS BOYS NEED TO BE SHOWN THE DOOR. HO HO

THE REST OF YOU LIMPS ONE NEED TO STAY AWAY. HO HO

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG

5181. DOES LOU EVEN HAVE A LICENSE????

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 22:38:53 UTC
From: Thirty-eight ninety-four point five <"Thirty-eight ninety-four point five"@Thirty-eight>
Message-ID: <vn1irt7jrkb036@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78501
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

b i g a l w o u l d l i k e k n o w
w h o h e r u n s o f f o f
3 8 9 4 . 5 b i g b o y

5182. L O U H A T E S B I G A L

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 22:44:21 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn1j64erfeufe0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78502
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

MY HEART IS BROKEN BIG BOY

5183. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 22:50:02 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn1jh3gojfff6a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78503

you
> gotta admit, this guy is a master debater!
>

a masterbater?

:)

Clint
KB5ZHT

5184. Re: It starts with the basics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 22:55:48 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn1jrts6nb94df@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78504

> > "Spark" is outlawed, Larrah.
>
> Which is just but one of the numerous reasons why I don't use it,
> Lennie!
>

His point in making that statement was that the whole argument of
"all that is basic MUST be continued and included and not omitted
or deleted" is defeated in one swift stroke by bringing up the fact
that the very FIRST radio wavelength energy signal sent was via
a spark... so, by definition, spark is as "basic" as you can get,
and it's actually outlawed.

The conclusion, and the ONLY conclusion, that can be draw from
this is that the conept of something being "basic" doesn't necessarily
mean that it deserves retaining and preservation.

>
> > You are trying to sell a product that isn't being bought.
>
> Except by tens of thousands of Morse/CW users!

that are doing it by CHOICE.... there are people still buying
horses and buggies, ableit a very small percentage when
compared to the number that buy automobiles.

You don't have to reach a value of zero in order to
be insignificant.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5185. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 22:55:59 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <3c4cb.3763$Hd6.1686991@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78505

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bknvg5$3vppv$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
> Dee,
>
> I know I'm pointing out the obvious here, but why do you think it's
> necessary for Len to *always* pepper his replies with personal insults. A
> character flaw of some kind, maybe?
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>

He does that to distract from the fact that he has no valid arguments and is incapable of debating in any logical fashion. He is known to go onto long tangents leading to incredible non-sequiters. Most of us have long ago killfiled him because of it though there are a couple of people who continue to wrangle with him.

I never see his posts anymore.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5186. Re: Legal to Hack EchoLink ?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 22:59:12 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <4f4cb.3764$Hd6.1687425@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78506

"charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> wrote in message
news:34Mbb.7394$jO7.7140@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com...
>
> Let's see... If I were to set up a bogus hotmail or AOL account, pick out
a
> callsign from the callbook and then set up to access EchoLink on my
computer
> and skip around the different systems, playing "Gangsta Rap" and golden
> XXX-rated oldies by the "Fugs", and FBI recordings of rabbits being
> slaughtered over distant EchoLink repeaters - just for fun - would I be
> breaking any laws?
>
> Remember that I would be accessing over the Internet, using a call I
picked
> from a list, maybe even an inactive one. No radio involved, at least none
of
> mine.
>
> Who would be responsible for the transmissions on those distant repeaters?
>
> Just what law or regulation would make it illegal to access EchoLink with
a
> bogus callsign? I don't think there is one.
>
> Should I cross-post this question to the newsgroups frequented by CB'ers,
> Freebanders, FRS folk, etc? If not - Why not?
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>

Most likely the control op of the repeater would be held accountable. Let's
not get them in trouble or force them to close down their repeaters.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5187. FRANKY K3EKO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:02:15 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn1k7mlebshj7d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78507
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

IM GOING TO BE A LITTLE LATE ON 75 TONITE. I'VE HAD AN ACCIDENT IN MY PANTS
AND NEED TO GET CLEANED UP A BIT

5188. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:03:06 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Ki4cb.3765$Hd6.1688015@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78508

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bko608$41i4i$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote ...
>
> Well he says that he has visited and studied this and it doesn't change
his
> point of view. So now that I've completed the discussion on the call
signs,
> I'm going to put him in my killfile along with Len 0ver 21.
> --
>
> I really hate to see you do that. I killfiled Len for about a year, and
in
> the process, missed many a good laughs. But, as I said in another
reply --
> just might have to be done.
>
> 73,
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST

I do it in self preservation. It can be hard to resist responding to either one of them when they make such idiotic statements. I'd rather use my time in talking to more rational people.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5189. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:06:30 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Wl4cb.3767$Hd6.1688432@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78509

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:6o7vmvsjtgqr4ledkt87efhl03bkdmg410@4ax.com...
> Oops - missed that one! I was playing on the old "if a tree falls in
> the woods, and no one hears, does it make a sound?" riddle.
>
> You are absolutely correct - there is no sound, but the tree is still
> there all right :)
>
> Good one - thanks, Dick!
>
> 73, Leo
>

You've got to define sound first. For example if you simply define it as waveforms in the air, then yes it does make a sound. However if you define it as the result when waveforms in the air are converted to a form that can be interpreted by the brain, then it doesn't make a sound.

Either way though you are right that the tree is still there.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5190. Re: FRANKY K3EKO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:08:52 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn1kk3bmdvsn2b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78510
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

"B I G A L" wrote in message
news:vn1k7mlebshj7d@corp.supernews.com...
> IM GOING TO BE A LITTLE LATE ON 75 TONITE. I'VE HAD AN ACCIDENT IN MY
PANTS
> AND NEED TO GET CLEANED UP A BIT
>
>
>

ITS TAKING LONGER TO CLEAN MYSELF THAN I HAD PLANNED FOR. I'LL BE ON SOON.

5191. Re: FRANKY K3EKO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:11:47 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn1kpjfkc3p5ec@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78511
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

"B I G A L" wrote in message
news:vn1kk3bmdvsn2b@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "B I G A L" wrote in message
> news:vn1k7mlebshj7d@corp.supernews.com...
> > IM GOING TO BE A LITTLE LATE ON 75 TONITE. I'VE HAD AN ACCIDENT IN MY
> PANTS
> > AND NEED TO GET CLEANED UP A BIT
> >
> >
> >
>
> ITS TAKING LONGER TO CLEAN MYSELF THAN I HAD PLANNED FOR. I'LL BE ON SOON.
>
>

WHERE IS PORKBUTT WHEN YOU NEED HIM MOST

5192. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:12:32 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Ar4cb.3769$Hd6.1689555@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78512

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:tTQbb.165$pB6.154@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> Actually, for the reasons already stated, I think they are concerned with
> what is in the best interest of the ARS. The Amateur Radio Service is not
> (or should not be) defined solely by CW/code, so that one mode does not
> solely define what is in the best interest of the ARS. However, as it is,
> testing of that one mode does continue to define the ARS. I personally
think
> it is time for that to change.
>

Regardless of one's stance on the code, reviewing the history of the FCC
shows that they are NOT necessarily concerned with what's best for the ARS.
If they were, BPL would never have gotten as far as it has.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5193. Re: FRANKY K3EKO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:15:43 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn1l0uta75l0fe@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78513
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

"B I G A L" wrote in message
news:vn1kpjfkc3p5ec@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "B I G A L" wrote in message
> news:vn1kk3bmdvsn2b@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > "B I G A L" wrote in message
> > news:vn1k7mlebshj7d@corp.supernews.com...
> > > IM GOING TO BE A LITTLE LATE ON 75 TONITE. I'VE HAD AN ACCIDENT IN MY
> > PANTS
> > > AND NEED TO GET CLEANED UP A BIT
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > ITS TAKING LONGER TO CLEAN MYSELF THAN I HAD PLANNED FOR. I'LL BE ON
SOON.
> >
> >
>
> WHERE IS PORKBUTT WHEN YOU NEED HIM MOST
>
>

I'VE CALLED IN SOME HELP. THIS IS A BIG MESS. AND ITS IN MY PANTS.

5194. Re: SHOW ME YOUR LITTLE ONE AND I'LL SHOW YOU MY BIG ONE BOY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:16:28 UTC
From: Johnsie <truth2u@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1064359601.869287@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 78514
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

" BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
news:vn07rpnvkjh12c@corp.supernews.com...
> THIS IS K4OKA THE CARING STATION. HO HO
>
> STOP PLAYING WITH YOURSELF BOY.
>
> HO HO

I hear that Captain Truth was invited up to give the Guest Sermon
at one of those "snake-handling" churches up in the mountains of
Western NC recently. (That's right, C.T. was permitted to learn on the
lectern and speak to the congregation) What power! They were
all rapt with attention as he eventually launched into his homily:
"Why Does God Give Us Gastro-enteritis ?" Then, proclaiming
with the power of Daniel Webster, he thundered: "So we can FART
like THIS glub dammit!!" Then, grasping the lectern's side white knuckled
and with a look of sheer insane delight in his bloodshot eyes, he promptly
raised his right leg to a 45ï¿½ angle and let fly with a pants-splitting
anyl depth charge of hitherto unheard of duration, bass and volume.

His lovely portly wife, Betty Dee Badabumski, who wonders every day
how she landed him for a hubby, asked several people "who that man up
there was?" before the sheer stench and rising barometric pressure
sent everyone running for the fresh NC mountain air via the doors
and 2 out windows. (the snakes in the cage were also gone, having
bent the wire cages and slithered out the back door) C.T. was asked
not to return by spontaneous vote, wherupon he hopped into his
1977 Caddy with Betty Dee and was last seen heading back in the
direction of Hickory...

(word has it that he's been invited to call next week
at the 1st AME Church of The Apostolic Friday
night Bingo game. Let's hope they don't let him
near the buckets of fried chicken and Pepsi while
he's pullin numbered ping-pong bingo balls...)

5195. Re: FRANKY K3EKO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:19:17 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn1l7kha7llvde@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78515
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

"B I G A L" wrote in message
news:vn1l0uta75l0fe@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "B I G A L" wrote in message
> news:vn1kpjfkc3p5ec@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > "B I G A L" wrote in message
> > news:vn1kk3bmdvsn2b@corp.supernews.com...
> > >
> > > "B I G A L" wrote in message
> > > news:vn1k7mlebshj7d@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > IM GOING TO BE A LITTLE LATE ON 75 TONITE. I'VE HAD AN ACCIDENT IN
MY
> > > PANTS
> > > > AND NEED TO GET CLEANED UP A BIT
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > ITS TAKING LONGER TO CLEAN MYSELF THAN I HAD PLANNED FOR. I'LL BE ON
> SOON.
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > WHERE IS PORKBUTT WHEN YOU NEED HIM MOST
> >
> >
>
> I'VE CALLED IN SOME HELP. THIS IS A BIG MESS. AND ITS IN MY PANTS.
>
>
>
>

WE FOUND SOME ON THE FLOOR. HANG ON A MINUTE.

5196. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:24:06 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <pC4cb.3772$Hd6.1691693@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78516

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030923063009.21642.00001128@mb-m01.aol.com...
> I think Clint has already said he only sees a need for regs and safety
testing.
>
>
> There's "the future".
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

Given the detail and extent of the rules, we could right a killer test on rules and regs. Then require people to take and pass that before taking any of the elements for specific licenses. i.e. They have to know the rules in detail before being tested on the theory, technical knowledge, and operating practices for the licenses classes.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5197. Re: FRANKY K3EKO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:25:43 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn1ljm9oaveq2c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78517
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

```
"B I G A L" wrote in message
news:vn1l7kha7llvde@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "B I G A L" wrote in message
> news:vn1l0uta75l0fe@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > "B I G A L" wrote in message
> > news:vn1kpjfkc3p5ec@corp.supernews.com...
> > >
> > > "B I G A L" wrote in message
> > > news:vn1kk3bmdvsn2b@corp.supernews.com...
> > > >
> > > > "B I G A L" wrote in message
> > > > news:vn1k7mlebshj7d@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > IM GOING TO BE A LITTLE LATE ON 75 TONITE. I'VE HAD AN ACCIDENT IN
> MY
> > > > PANTS
> > > > > AND NEED TO GET CLEANED UP A BIT
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > ITS TAKING LONGER TO CLEAN MYSELF THAN I HAD PLANNED FOR. I'LL BE ON
> > SOON.
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > WHERE IS PORKBUTT WHEN YOU NEED HIM MOST
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > I'VE CALLED IN SOME HELP. THIS IS A BIG MESS. AND ITS IN MY PANTS.
> >
> >
> >
> >
>
> WE FOUND SOME ON THE FLOOR. HANG ON A MINUTE.
>
>

NOW I'VE GOT IT ON THE MICROPHONE. ITS STOPPED UP.
```

5198. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:28:43 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <LG4cb.3774$Hd6.1692394@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78519

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bkpa1a$g7h@library1.airnews.net...
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message
> news:bkk8u1$su6$1@nd.eastky.net...
> >
> > Man, this keeps getting better and better....
> >
> > "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote
> >
> > > I and other parents that I know have always required our children to
eat
> > > foods that are good for them whether they liked them or not. My
> children
> > > have always been required to eat what was served whether they liked it
> or
> > > not. Children were not allowed to dictate the menu.
> >
> > This, on top of Roll's admissions, couldn't make the PCTA's
> position
> > and attitude any plainer, to even a casual observer.
> >
> >
>
> That has nothing to do with amateur radio or a person's position thereof.
I
> did exactly the same thing wth my kids.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

My point was that in all activities, the already experienced people set the
standards. Students and beginners, whether adults or children, simply don't
have the qualifications to do so. So far polls of hams who have passed
code, i.e. the experienced, have a majority favoring it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5199. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:29:27 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn1lr3ocagdke2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78518

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:49dvmv8s9vgf0uu7jkpafpmnig3ojfjot4@4ax.com...

>
> PS - what cause do I have, exactly? Do you know? PCTA? NCTA? PETA?
> NAACP? MADD?
>

Heh, I hate to burst your bubble but you're not *that* evasive or
genuine.... it's quite obvious which side of the fence you stand on
due to the one-sided nature of your attacks. You have claimed
that I have used name-calling and other descriptions of
personal attack tactics, when in fact you have done this as I
have previously quoted... and have, FURTHERMORE,
not chastized the PCTA crowd (if, in fact, you're NOT one of
thier apologists if not member) when they have used
descriptions such as "moron", "dumb fuck", etc. Not a peep.

Therefore, as I said, if you are a not a member you are
certainly a sympathizer or an apologist for them, which
as far as I am care puts you in thier camp all the same.

Clint
KB5ZHT
--
PRAY FOR THE SOULS OF THE FRENCH

"say it isn't so!" ..... The french proposal going
to the United Nations pertaining to the iraqi
situation is to ask for a RETURN of
the baathist part. OH yes, you read that right...
The party responsible for gassing tens of
thousands of it's own people, defying
international laws, pileing bodies in mass
graves as an aftermath of it's bloody internal
policies and many other crimes against
humanity, is going to have a cheerleader
from the country who benifited from it's oil
contracts WITH the baathist party (go
figure!)...And, finally, the french want ALL
mention of liberation taken out of ALL
paperwork and replaced with the word
"occupation", due to the fact that they do
not like its positive connotation. This from
a country that occupied Algeria for 132 years.

- -

5200. Re: LOU

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:31:51 UTC
From: Greg Courville <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com>
Message-ID: <vn1lv8ail1dl4c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78520
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You know, it IS possible that this is a different person just trying to
cause trouble.
I'm gonna traceroute his IP and see whereabouts he is...

-KG6SGY

"Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
news:Aq3cb.88$LJ5.6549@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> "Thirty-eight ninety-four point five" <Thirty-eight ninety-four point
> five@Thirty-eight ninety-four point five> wrote in message
> news:vn1g9pltrcjba2@corp.supernews.com...
> > LOU YOU WILL NOT OPERATE ON THIRTY-EIGHT NINETY-FOUR POINT FIVE EVER BOY
> >
> > I OWN THAT ONE CAUSE I HAVE A BIG ONE OH OH
> >
>
> KISS MY ASS!
>
> I will do as I please so long as I'm within the law... YOU have not got
> enough ASS OR BALLS to stop me, because I WILL see to it, that you are
> tracked and prosecuted AGAIN - DICK HEAD. END OF DISCUSSION.
>
> Lou
>
>
>

5201. Re: FRANKY K3EKO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:31:57 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn1lvc17upqj51@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78521
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

"B I G A L" wrote in message
news:vn1ljm9oaveq2c@corp.supernews.com...
>
> "B I G A L" wrote in message
> news:vn1l7kha7llvde@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > "B I G A L" wrote in message
> > news:vn1l0uta75l0fe@corp.supernews.com...
> > >
> > > "B I G A L" wrote in message
> > > news:vn1kpjfkc3p5ec@corp.supernews.com...
> > > >
> > > > "B I G A L" wrote in message
> > > > news:vn1kk3bmdvsn2b@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > >
> > > > > "B I G A L" wrote in message
> > > > > news:vn1k7mlebshj7d@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > > IM GOING TO BE A LITTLE LATE ON 75 TONITE. I'VE HAD AN ACCIDENT
IN
> > MY
> > > > > > PANTS
> > > > > > AND NEED TO GET CLEANED UP A BIT
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > ITS TAKING LONGER TO CLEAN MYSELF THAN I HAD PLANNED FOR. I'LL BE
ON
> > > SOON.
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > WHERE IS PORKBUTT WHEN YOU NEED HIM MOST
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > I'VE CALLED IN SOME HELP. THIS IS A BIG MESS. AND ITS IN MY PANTS.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > >

> > WE FOUND SOME ON THE FLOOR. HANG ON A MINUTE.
> >
> >
>
> NOW I'VE GOT IT ON THE MICROPHONE. ITS STOPPED UP.
>
>

I CANT GET THE MICROPHONE TO WORK NOW. ITS JUMMED UP WITH MESS.

5202. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:32:27 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <fK4cb.2948$ai7.230@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78522

"Frank Todd" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
news:KJ2cb.560098$o%2.245295@sccrnsc02...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > ""frank\"" <"\"frank\\\""@nospam.franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
> > news:2OZbb.417030$cF.128230@rwcrnsc53...
> >
> >>Brian Kelly wrote:
> >>
> >>>"\"\\frank\\\"" <"\"\\frank\\\""@nospam.franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in
> >
> > message news:<8QObb.410527$cF.127653@rwcrnsc53>...
> >
> >>>>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>"Rob Kemp" <robkemp90210@hotmail.com> wrote in message
> >>>>news:6114e4af.0309212028.45f4e122@posting.google.com...
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>http://drudgereport.com/flash3.htm?powell
> >>>>>
> >>>>>FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW: 'I HAVE A TIRED FAMILY,
> >>>>>TIRED CHILDREN AND A TIRED SPOUSE'
> >>>>>Sun Sep 21 2003 17:25:30 ET
> >>>>>
> >>>>>**Exclusive Sneak Preview**
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Michael K. Powell, the embattled chairman of the Federal
> >>>>>Communications Commission, appears to be setting the stage for an
exit
> >>>>>with a candid interview pipelined for Monday runs of the NEW YORK
> >>>>>TIMES.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Newsroom sources tell DRUDGE that Powell has gone on-the-record with
> >>>>>NYT's Steve Labaton for a wide-ranging explanation of current
affairs.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>"I have a tired family, tired children and a tired spouse. Candidly,
I
> >>>>>once said I would be in this job for three years and then leave,"
> >>>>>Powell explains. "That was three years ago."

> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>"I've been called every name in the book by every opponent in the
> >>>>>>book," he adds. "That's classic Washington. If you can't get past
> >>>>>>jingoism, you attack the person. I wish the press would focus on
more
> >>>>>>than who's rebuked and who's rebuking and look at what the best
> >>>>>>alternatives are for the public in terms of policy."
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>Labaton was said to be finalizing the text Sunday evening, for a
> >>>>>>Business section lead, sources tell DRUDGE.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>Developing...
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Wouldn't it be great if the next political appointee actually had
some
> >
> > idea
> >
> >>>>>of RF communications technology ?
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Dan/W4NTI
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>He doesn't need to...That is why he has a STAFF!!!
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Yeah he has "staff" but they're as clueless as he is. His staffer
> >>>D'Wanna or whatever her name is, the political tootsie who runs the
> >>>FCC outfit which sits on ham radio got up at a seminar and expressed
> >>>amazement at how people on the ground can talk to people in airplanes
> >>>in the sky with radios.
> >>>
> >>>w3rv
> >>
> >>Let me put it to you this way, the FCC could careless about amateur
> >>radio....They aren't going to care about something they can't make any
> >>money for the US Treasury...Wake up!
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>--
> >>73
> >>
> >>Frank K3EKO
> >>
> >>
> >
> > You ought to know Franky. You got away with jamming without a callsign

for
> > years. And didn't get caught.
> >
> > The Stumpjumpers brought you up right. Now continue to spout the SJ
code.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> Dan,
>
> You must be smoking that wacky weed you got from Donnie...See what it
> does to your brain?!?!?
>
>
>
> --
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>

Just tellin the truth and you cain't stand it.

Dan/W4NTI

5203. Re: BIG AL (ASS)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:33:37 UTC
From: Greg Courville <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com>
Message-ID: <vn1m2p749ftib3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78523
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Actually, it looks like "BIG AL" might be a fan of K40KA who's trying to stir things up. He's been using a few key details from the article in his posts. For example, he never mentioned the callsign K40KA until shortly after I posted that news article.

I'm going to traceroute his IP and see at least what part of the country he's in.
Results later.

-KG6SGY

"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message news:vn0d4imjn12vda@corp.supernews.com...
> "Big Al" is actually K40KA. Read the article I posted to "BIG AL AND FRANKY"
> and that should pretty much sum it up.
>
> 73 de KG6SGY
>
>
> "10-4 Good Buddy" <10-4good-buddy@cbradio.org> wrote in message
> news:vn0btfgltoca3b@corp.supernews.com...
> > Who is this Big Al? Retard? Mental Midget?
> >
> > 10-4!
> >
> >
>
>

5204. Re: LOU

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:33:50 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn1m2uofkmf2b8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78524
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

CALL THE FCC CALL THE FCC

"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
news:vn1lv8ail1dl4c@corp.supernews.com...
> You know, it IS possible that this is a different person just trying to
> cause trouble.
> I'm gonna traceroute his IP and see whereabouts he is...
>
> -KG6SGY
>
>
> "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> news:Aq3cb.88$LJ5.6549@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> > "Thirty-eight ninety-four point five" <Thirty-eight ninety-four point
> > five@Thirty-eight ninety-four point five> wrote in message
> > news:vn1g9pltrcjba2@corp.supernews.com...
> > > LOU YOU WILL NOT OPERATE ON THIRTY-EIGHT NINETY-FOUR POINT FIVE EVER
BOY
> > >
> > > I OWN THAT ONE CAUSE I HAVE A BIG ONE OH OH
> > >
> >
> > KISS MY ASS!
> >
> > I will do as I please so long as I'm within the law... YOU have not got
> > enough ASS OR BALLS to stop me, because I WILL see to it, that you are
> > tracked and prosecuted AGAIN - DICK HEAD. END OF DISCUSSION.
> >
> > Lou
> >
> >
> >
>
>

5205. Re: BIG AL (ASS)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:35:25 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn1m5ugb5bpk1c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78525
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

HEY DICK TRACEY

IM IN NORTH CAROLINA YOU FOOL

"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
news:vn1m2p749ftib3@corp.supernews.com...
> Actually, it looks like "BIG AL" might be a fan of K40KA who's trying to
> stir things up. He's been using a few key details from the article in his
> posts. For example, he never mentioned the callsign K40KA until shortly
> after I posted that news article.
>
> I'm going to traceroute his IP and see at least what part of the country
> he's in.
> Results later.
>
> -KG6SGY
>
>
>
> "Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
> news:vn0d4imjn12vda@corp.supernews.com...
> > "Big Al" is actually K40KA. Read the article I posted to "BIG AL AND
> FRANKY"
> > and that should pretty much sum it up.
> >
> > 73 de KG6SGY
> >
> >
> > "10-4 Good Buddy" <10-4good-buddy@cbradio.org> wrote in message
> > news:vn0btfgltoca3b@corp.supernews.com...
> > > Who is this Big Al? Retard? Mental Midget?
> > >
> > > 10-4!
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

5206. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:37:02 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn1m98qbv8uu8c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78526

--
"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bko608$41i4i$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...

> I'm going to put him in my killfile along with Len 0ver 21.

EXCELLENT way to attract people to your cause...
for those of you undecideds on the topic reading, here is yet
ANOTHER soul that dearly loves the continued use
of morse code testing requirements for obtaining a license,
but cannot debate the matter openly and instead chooses
to outright IGNORE people who want to present an
opposing view. Like about 4 or 5 others in here that
are of his ilk, he proverbially pulls the covers over his
head when controversy is presented to him, when
debate is offered on a topic.

Take it to heart and understand with full confidence
that this represents the great majority of the
PCTA crowd (pro-code test agenda) crowd. They
REFUSE to hear any differing opinions; they get
childish when they run out of ideas and information
to back up thier position and start name calling all
along the insult spectrum from the mild "LAZY!"
to the vulgar expressions of "DUMB F__K!".

So when you decide to start making up your own minds
on the issue, understand that while those of us who
seek to question what is easly proven as misplaced
values and inappropriate use of FCC resources as
well as VE testers, not to mention a complete waste of
time when considering the "non ham radio world", and
offer debate and choose to talk about it, those
who staunchly defend it (the old gaurd as it were)
go ballistic and totally reactionary on the matter.

FYI.... just to let you know the character of the people
on either side of the debate.

I am not a member of NCI but I do support most of
thier agenda, but I could not and have not found a
better advocate for them than simply listening to
the PCTA crowd, or at least as it is represented
in here.

Now let's move forward with the ham radio world
and continue it's modernization.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--
PRAY FOR THE SOULS OF THE FRENCH

"say it isn't so!" ..... The french proposal going
to the United Nations pertaining to the iraqi
situation is to ask for a RETURN of
the baathist part. OH yes, you read that right...
The party responsible for gassing tens of
thousands of it's own people, defying
international laws, pileing bodies in mass
graves as an aftermath of it's bloody internal
policies and many other crimes against
humanity, is going to have a cheerleader
from the country who benifited from it's oil
contracts WITH the baathist party (go
figure!)...And, finally, the french want ALL
mention of liberation taken out of ALL
paperwork and replaced with the word
"occupation", due to the fact that they do
not like its positive connotation. This from
a country that occupied Algeria for 132 years.

5207. Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:37:07 UTC
From: Greg Courville <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com>
Message-ID: <vn1m94ge9oog85@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78527
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Actually, you're probably right. You know, he didn't even start using that
callsign until after the article I posted. I'm going to traceroute his IP so
we know his general location and the name of his ISP. If anyone had actually
heard him on the air we could go straight to the FCC.
Are there any confirmed reports of this guy actually transmitting?

-KG6SGY

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:jso0nv48g2r6daedgpidc966uab2a3h2jv@4ax.com...
> Well, it's pretty unlikely that the guy who got busted for this back
> in 1999 is doing this, unless he's incredibly stupid. The headers on
> his newsgroup postings point right back to his pesonal account on
> Supernews, and the FCC could subpoena his user info and usenet usage
> logs from Supernews in a flash if illegal activity is involved.
>
> More likely, it's some troll who heard about the "Porkbutt" story, and
> is having some fun stirring the pot a bit. If he really is creating
> interference on 3894.5 and bragging about it here, however, he could
> get a guest shot on "America's Dumbest Criminals" for this one -
> should the FCC get a copy of this somehow.... :)
>
> 73, Leo
>
> PS - For your review, the message headers are posted below:
>
> From: "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
> Newsgroups:
>
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx
,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY
> Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:22:57 -0400
> Organization: Posted via Supernews, http://www.supernews.com
> Message-ID: <vn047eanujppea@corp.supernews.com>
> Reply-To: "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
> References: <vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com>
> <vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com>
> X-Priority: 3
> X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
> X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
> X-Complaints-To: abuse@supernews.com

> Lines: 74
> Xref: cyclone01.bloor.is.net.cable.rogers.com alt.ham-radio.ssb:394
> alt.radio.amateur:1584 rec.radio.amateur.dx:6821
> rec.radio.amateur.misc:23591 rec.radio.amateur.policy:54076
> X-Received-Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:37:11 EDT
>
>
>
> On Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:22:57 -0400, "BIG AL"
> <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote:
>
> >OLD NEWS BOY.
> >
> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
SONG.
> >
> >WHATS A MATTER THERE BOY SCARED THAT MINE IS BIGGER THAN YOURS. HO HO
> >
> >FRANK SEE YOU TONITE AT 7 ON 39845. BE THERE HO HO
> >
> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
SONG.
> >
> >
> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
SONG.
> >
> >
> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
SONG.
> >
> >
> >BYE
> >
> >
> >"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
> >news:vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com...
> >> This is a little out of date, but should give a little background info
for
> >> those who are unfamiliar with "BIG AL"...
> >>
> >> HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A. Abernethy,
> >> K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation below
30
> >> MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the action,
> >> Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC letter
> >> included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of
> >> transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16.
> >Hollingsworth's
> >> letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference on

> >3.965
> >> MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted
that
> >> Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time his
> >> station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to protest
the
> >> sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21 and 22
in
> >> the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints from
other
> >> amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the FCC
had
> >> received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity, deliberate
> >> interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints to the
> >FCC
> >> alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt Song,"
the
> >> letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate
interference."
> >> Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in
> >> Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to K4OKA. The
> >FCC
> >> letter also said the Commission had received complaints that Abernethy
had
> >> used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference" on
or
> >> near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about
over-power
> >> operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start
> >revocation
> >> proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of continued
> >> violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter. (For
> >> additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for Six
> >Months"
> >> elsewhere on the AWE news page.)
> >>
> >> 73 de KG6SGY
> >>
> >> "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
> >> news:vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com...
> >> > WE KEPT THE QRMERS OFF 3.894.5 AGAIN TONITE WITH OUR BIG ONES. WE
REIGN
> >AS
> >> > KINGS OF 75. HO HO
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >>

> >
>

5208. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:38:11 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn1mbcat8283d5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78528

> > the process, missed many a good laughs. But, as I said in another
> reply --
> > just might have to be done.
> >

Yet another old guard staunch reactionary that just CANNOT
debate an idea and gets mad and runs and hides as a ostrich does
it's head in the sand when a differing opinion is given.

It's a good thing you guys aren't actual elected representatives
who make law.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5209. Anybody actually heard "BIG AL" on the air?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:41:28 UTC
From: Greg Courville <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com>
Message-ID: <vn1mh7gl0j7b9d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78529
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

As most of you know, there is a troll on these boards claiming to be K40KA. I'm still trying to figure out whether this guy is just trying to be annoying. If he is actually doing what he said he is, we can go to the FCC, so I'd like to find out if he's actually on the air. Not owning any HF equipment, I can't do much my self. If somebody could listen in when he says he'll be transmitting...

73 de KG6SGY

5210. Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:42:10 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn1mihlmncqqc7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78530
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

WHERE DID YOU PARK YOUR SQUAD CAR BARNEY PHIFE.

IM IN HICKORY, NORTH CAROLINA ALL YOU NEED TO DO IS ASK

"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
news:vn1m94ge9oog85@corp.supernews.com...
> Actually, you're probably right. You know, he didn't even start using that
> callsign until after the article I posted. I'm going to traceroute his IP
so
> we know his general location and the name of his ISP. If anyone had
actually
> heard him on the air we could go straight to the FCC.
> Are there any confirmed reports of this guy actually transmitting?
>
>
> -KG6SGY
>
>
>
> "Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
> news:jso0nv48g2r6daedgpidc966uab2a3h2jv@4ax.com...
> > Well, it's pretty unlikely that the guy who got busted for this back
> > in 1999 is doing this, unless he's incredibly stupid. The headers on
> > his newsgroup postings point right back to his pesonal account on
> > Supernews, and the FCC could subpoena his user info and usenet usage
> > logs from Supernews in a flash if illegal activity is involved.
> >
> > More likely, it's some troll who heard about the "Porkbutt" story, and
> > is having some fun stirring the pot a bit. If he really is creating
> > interference on 3894.5 and bragging about it here, however, he could
> > get a guest shot on "America's Dumbest Criminals" for this one -
> > should the FCC get a copy of this somehow.... :)
> >
> > 73, Leo
> >
> > PS - For your review, the message headers are posted below:
> >
> > From: "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
> > Newsgroups:
> >
>
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx
> ,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> > Subject: Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY
> > Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:22:57 -0400
> > Organization: Posted via Supernews, http://www.supernews.com
> > Message-ID: <vn047eanujppea@corp.supernews.com>
> > Reply-To: "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
> > References: <vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com>
> > <vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com>
> > X-Priority: 3
> > X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> > X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
> > X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
> > X-Complaints-To: abuse@supernews.com
> > Lines: 74
> > Xref: cyclone01.bloor.is.net.cable.rogers.com alt.ham-radio.ssb:394
> > alt.radio.amateur:1584 rec.radio.amateur.dx:6821
> > rec.radio.amateur.misc:23591 rec.radio.amateur.policy:54076
> > X-Received-Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:37:11 EDT
> >
> >
> >
> > On Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:22:57 -0400, "BIG AL"
> > <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote:
> >
> > >OLD NEWS BOY.
> > >
> > >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
> SONG.
> > >
> > >WHATS A MATTER THERE BOY SCARED THAT MINE IS BIGGER THAN YOURS. HO HO
> > >
> > >FRANK SEE YOU TONITE AT 7 ON 39845. BE THERE HO HO
> > >
> > >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
> SONG.
> > >
> > >
> > >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
> SONG.
> > >
> > >
> > >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
> SONG.
> > >
> > >
> > >BYE
> > >
> > >
> > >"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
> > >news:vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com...
> > >> This is a little out of date, but should give a little background

info
> for
> > >> those who are unfamiliar with "BIG AL"...
> > >>
> > >> HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A.
Abernethy,
> > >> K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation
below
> 30
> > >> MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the
action,
> > >> Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC
letter
> > >> included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of
> > >> transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16.
> > >Hollingsworth's
> > >> letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference
on
> > >3.965
> > >> MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted
> that
> > >> Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time
his
> > >> station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to protest
> the
> > >> sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21 and
22
> in
> > >> the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints from
> other
> > >> amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the FCC
> had
> > >> received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity, deliberate
> > >> interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints to
the
> > >FCC
> > >> alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt
Song,"
> the
> > >> letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate
> interference."
> > >> Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center
in
> > >> Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to K4OKA.
The
> > >FCC
> > >> letter also said the Commission had received complaints that
Abernethy
> had
> > >> used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference" on

> or
> > >> near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about
> over-power
> > >> operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start
> > >revocation
> > >> proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of continued
> > >> violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter. (For
> > >> additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for Six
> > >Months"
> > >> elsewhere on the AWE news page.)
> > >>
> > >> 73 de KG6SGY
> > >>
> > >> "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
> > >> news:vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com...
> > >> > WE KEPT THE QRMERS OFF 3.894.5 AGAIN TONITE WITH OUR BIG ONES. WE
> REIGN
> > >AS
> > >> > KINGS OF 75. HO HO
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >> >
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> >
>
>

5211. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:43:13 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <IU4cb.2991$ai7.362@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78531
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
news:xb3cb.87$LJ5.6464@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:842cb.2349$ai7.1102@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> > news:Q7Nbb.51$LJ5.4366@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> > > "Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
> > > news:vmv6j3kfrkpv64@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A.
> Abernethy,
> > > > K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation
> below
> > 30
> > > > MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the
action,
> > > > Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC
> letter
> > > > included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of
> > > > transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16.
> > > Hollingsworth's
> > > > letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference
on
> > > 3.965
> > > > MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted
> that
> > > > Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time
> his
> > > > station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to protest
> the
> > > > sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21 and
> 22
> > in
> > > > the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints from
> > other
> > > > amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the
FCC
> > had
> > > > received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity,
deliberate
> > > > interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints to
> the

> > > FCC
> > > > alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt
Song,"
> > the
> > > > letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate
> interference."
> > > > Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center
> in
> > > > Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to K4OKA.
> The
> > > FCC
> > > > letter also said the Commission had received complaints that
Abernethy
> > had
> > > > used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference"
on
> or
> > > > near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about
> > over-power
> > > > operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start
> > > revocation
> > > > proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of continued
> > > > violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter.
(For
> > > > additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for Six
> > > Months"
> > > > elsewhere on the AWE news page.)
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@porkbutt.net> wrote in message
> > > > news:vmqshdfh78hr4b@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > SHOW UP ON MY FREQUENCY AND I WILL RUN YOU OFF. HO HO
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> > > > > news:iO8bb.13$LJ5.2273@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@bigalk4oka.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:vmq5ars9c9i455@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > > > HO HO. SELL YOUR GEAR I DONT CARE. JUST STAY OFF OF 3.894.5.
> THATS
> > > BIG
> > > > > ALS
> > > > > > > FREQUENCY. HO HO. I'LL BE TAKING OVER 3.898 NEXT. HO HO
> > > > > >
> > > > > > AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT
> SONG.
> > HO
> > > > > HO

> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > If I choose to talk on that frequency, I will, so long as I'm
> > abiding
> > > by
> > > > > the
> > > > > > > rules and regulations as they are spelled out. YOU or no one
else,
> > can
> > > > > > tell
> > > > > > > me to stay off. ASS WIPE.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > BIG AL.. the only thing big about you, is your mouth....
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Lou
> > > > > > >
> > >
> > > Well Ass hole AL, looks like you've had your ass reamed out once,
trying
> > for
> > > seconds???? Something tells me, you're due for it.
> > > Lou
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Once? Boy are you out of touch.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> Not sure how the thread made it past my kill file, but to respond to your
> comment, I only went with what I was told and seen for myself as witnessed
> above.. IF there was more than one incident mentioned, then I didn't
notice
> in my speed read of the article.
> But, if it's been more than once, then maybe it's time they show him
they're
> done playing games.
> Lou
>
>

Well first off, the reference violation above is long done with. He spent his time in radio prison and returned to the HF bands. He has basically learned his lesson, this time. And has been a decent operator for several years now.

What I was refering to was he was removed from the radio voluntarily in lieu of being fined a big chunk of bux back in the 70s. He stayed off the air for years. Returned as KJ4JX and began his crap again. He later got his original call back under the vanity system.

He has been a QRMer for many years. BUT as stated above has finally seen the light.

This crap you see here from "BIG AL" is BS.. And same for the "3894.5" crap. Its just a troll.

But I wanted to set the record straight.

Dan/W4NTI

5212. Re: Anybody actually heard "BIG AL" on the air?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:46:44 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <EX4cb.3005$ai7.2406@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78533
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
news:vn1mh7gl0j7b9d@corp.supernews.com...
> As most of you know, there is a troll on these boards claiming to be
K40KA.
> I'm still trying to figure out whether this guy is just trying to be
> annoying. If he is actually doing what he said he is, we can go to the
FCC,
> so I'd like to find out if he's actually on the air. Not owning any HF
> equipment, I can't do much my self. If somebody could listen in when he
says
> he'll be transmitting...
>
>
> 73 de KG6SGY
>
>

It'd s troll. Big AL gets on occasionaly on 3894.5 and talks with whats left of his "Abernathy Radio Group". Without his Henry 8K of course.

So don't worry about it.

Dan/W4NTI

5213. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:50:48 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <fnm1nvon50tnjjufoqs7vi66lelsvdfp3u@4ax.com>
Source record: 78534

Dee,

Excellent point. I was going for the latter - sound is best defined
as vibrations detected by the ear. Vibrations are of course created
by the trww falling, but remain only vibrations until the ear receives
them. As I understand it, anyway.

And the tree, both the one that made the sound and the metaphoric
'tree' referred to in the posting is very much still there!

73, Leo

On Tue, 23 Sep 2003 23:06:30 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
wrote:

>
>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>news:6o7vmvsjtgqr4ledkt87efhl03bkdmg410@4ax.com...
>> Oops - missed that one! I was playing on the old "if a tree falls in
>> the woods, and no one hears, does it make a sound?" riddle.
>>
>> You are absolutely correct - there is no sound, but the tree is still
>> there all right :)
>>
>> Good one - thanks, Dick!
>>
>> 73, Leo
>>
>
>You've got to define sound first. For example if you simply define it as
>waveforms in the air, then yes it does make a sound. However if you define
>it as the result when waveforms in the air are converted to a form that can
>be interpreted by the brain, then it doesn't make a sound.
>
>Either way though you are right that the tree is still there.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5214. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:51:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <v05cb.3007$iT4.2206622@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 78535

Leo wrote:

> This has been going on for a while, huh?

Uh-huh!

- Mike KB3EIA -

5215. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:53:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <E15cb.3008$iT4.2206878@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 78536

WA8ULX wrote:

>>You're mistaken, Dwight.
>>
>>According to qrz.com, he's 305 years old.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>
> And dont ever forget it. Im the one who taught Marconi. Last person I have ever
> Elmered.

I like Marconi and Cheese!

- Mike KB3EIA -

5216. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:54:43 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <735cb.58467$xx4.6352103@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 78532

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:BFWbb.7106$yp6.126912@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> news:20030923013414.12631.00001336@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > In article <ZkJbb.7038$yp6.116603@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> > <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >
> > >However, the requirements for licensure should be reasonable
> > >and rational, and while the written tests meet that criteria, the
> > >requirement for Morse proficiency no longer does.
> > >
> > >Carl - wk3c
> >
> > Carl:
> >
> > Jim, N2EY, just said, in so many words,
>
> With all due respect to Jim, just because he said it doesn't make
> it true. (no matter how many words he used :-)
>
And the same is often said about you Captain Carl.

10-73's!

5217. Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-23 23:58:45 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <n3n1nvoo8f4afr7rbufsktuljgkafghgbl@4ax.com>
Source record: 78537
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

No transmissions that I could hear tonight, leading me to belive that
he is bogus. His ISP, however, cannot be seen, as he is posting
through a third-party newsgroup service, Supernews. We can only trace
him back that far - by the message headers.

Supernews, however, has a very strict Terms Of Service" (TOS)
agreement with its subscribers, which prohibit multiple postings of
this type of nuisance message and nym shifting (at least three
different ones so far, including stealing mine for a while :)).

A few complaints to abuse@supernews.com from the folks in these
newsgroups, with a copy of some of these messages **including
headers** , and he will be 'off the air' here quicker faster than he
can spell FCC! If he can, that is...

73, Leo

On Tue, 23 Sep 2003 16:37:07 -0700, "Greg Courville"
<EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote:

>Actually, you're probably right. You know, he didn't even start using that
>callsign until after the article I posted. I'm going to traceroute his IP so
>we know his general location and the name of his ISP. If anyone had actually
>heard him on the air we could go straight to the FCC.
>Are there any confirmed reports of this guy actually transmitting?
>
>
>-KG6SGY
>
>
>
>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>news:jso0nv48g2r6daedgpidc966uab2a3h2jv@4ax.com...
>> Well, it's pretty unlikely that the guy who got busted for this back
>> in 1999 is doing this, unless he's incredibly stupid. The headers on
>> his newsgroup postings point right back to his pesonal account on
>> Supernews, and the FCC could subpoena his user info and usenet usage
>> logs from Supernews in a flash if illegal activity is involved.
>>
>> More likely, it's some troll who heard about the "Porkbutt" story, and
>> is having some fun stirring the pot a bit. If he really is creating
>> interference on 3894.5 and bragging about it here, however, he could
>> get a guest shot on "America's Dumbest Criminals" for this one -
>> should the FCC get a copy of this somehow.... :)

>>
>> 73, Leo
>>
>> PS - For your review, the message headers are posted below:
>>
>> From: "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
>> Newsgroups:
>>
>alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx
>,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
>> Subject: Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY
>> Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:22:57 -0400
>> Organization: Posted via Supernews, http://www.supernews.com
>> Message-ID: <vn047eanujppea@corp.supernews.com>
>> Reply-To: "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
>> References: <vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com>
>> <vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com>
>> X-Priority: 3
>> X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
>> X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
>> X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
>> X-Complaints-To: abuse@supernews.com
>> Lines: 74
>> Xref: cyclone01.bloor.is.net.cable.rogers.com alt.ham-radio.ssb:394
>> alt.radio.amateur:1584 rec.radio.amateur.dx:6821
>> rec.radio.amateur.misc:23591 rec.radio.amateur.policy:54076
>> X-Received-Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:37:11 EDT
>>
>>
>>
>> On Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:22:57 -0400, "BIG AL"
>> <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote:
>>
>> >OLD NEWS BOY.
>> >
>> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
>SONG.
>> >
>> >WHATS A MATTER THERE BOY SCARED THAT MINE IS BIGGER THAN YOURS. HO HO
>> >
>> >FRANK SEE YOU TONITE AT 7 ON 39845. BE THERE HO HO
>> >
>> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
>SONG.
>> >
>> >
>> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
>SONG.
>> >
>> >

>> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
>SONG.
>> >
>> >
>> >BYE
>> >
>> >
>> >"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
>> >news:vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com...
>> >> This is a little out of date, but should give a little background info
>for
>> >> those who are unfamiliar with "BIG AL"...
>> >>
>> >> HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A. Abernethy,
>> >> K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation below
>30
>> >> MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the action,
>> >> Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC letter
>> >> included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of
>> >> transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16.
>> >Hollingsworth's
>> >> letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference on
>> >3.965
>> >> MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted
>that
>> >> Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time his
>> >> station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to protest
>the
>> >> sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21 and 22
>in
>> >> the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints from
>other
>> >> amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the FCC
>had
>> >> received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity, deliberate
>> >> interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints to the
>> >FCC
>> >> alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt Song,"
>the
>> >> letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate
>interference."
>> >> Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in
>> >> Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to K4OKA. The
>> >FCC
>> >> letter also said the Commission had received complaints that Abernethy
>had
>> >> used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference" on
>or
>> >> near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about
>over-power

>> >> operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start
>> >revocation
>> >> proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of continued
>> >> violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter. (For
>> >> additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for Six
>> >Months"
>> >> elsewhere on the AWE news page.)
>> >>
>> >> 73 de KG6SGY
>> >>
>> >> "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
>> >> news:vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com...
>> >> > WE KEPT THE QRMERS OFF 3.894.5 AGAIN TONITE WITH OUR BIG ONES. WE
>REIGN
>> >AS
>> >> > KINGS OF 75. HO HO
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >>
>> >>
>> >
>>
>

5218. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 00:02:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Ca5cb.3016$iT4.2209705@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 78538

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <vmu3dc5uoiohad@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> computron dot net> writes:
>
>
>>>Well, Clint, you said it, not me! I'm glad you're starting to see the
>>
>>light!
>>
>>>73 de Larry, K3LT
>>>
>>
>>I, I see your point.
>>I will be the absolute BEST driver of a modern internal combustion engine-
>>driven automobile if I first take a blacksmith's apprenticeship and learn
>>to shoe a horse.
>>
>>Yes. Quite logical.
>>
>>Clint
>>KB5ZHT
>
>
> Well, Clint, that kind of cynicism may seem to be amusing to some, but
> just goes to demonstrate a lack of any truly logical argument which
> supports your position. Therefore, it, and you, are easily dismissed.

I don't know about you, Larry, but I like to know a lot about
everything I do. That goes for cars, amateur radio, computers,
housework, history, or whatever. I suspect you feel at least somewhat
this way too. Strange that there is a whole culture built up that
celebrates ignorance.

That's why if my car breaks down on the road, I stand a good chance of
getting it running again, why I know it isn't likely the F.C.C. won't
test me on the design of a 1/4 wave dipole, and why I knew that there
wasn't any special callsigns for non-coded amateurs.

Not that I don't make mistakes, but I don't come into newsgroups acting
as if I know everything either! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

5219. Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 00:02:57 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn1npfogas533c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78539
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

WELL IF YOU DIDNT HEAR ME AND FRANK YOU NEED A NEW RECEIVER.

CALL THE FCC, CALL THE ARMY, CALL THE NAVY, CALL THEM ALL.

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:n3n1nvoo8f4afr7rbufsktuljgkafghgbl@4ax.com...
> No transmissions that I could hear tonight, leading me to belive that
> he is bogus. His ISP, however, cannot be seen, as he is posting
> through a third-party newsgroup service, Supernews. We can only trace
> him back that far - by the message headers.
>
> Supernews, however, has a very strict Terms Of Service" (TOS)
> agreement with its subscribers, which prohibit multiple postings of
> this type of nuisance message and nym shifting (at least three
> different ones so far, including stealing mine for a while :)).
>
> A few complaints to abuse@supernews.com from the folks in these
> newsgroups, with a copy of some of these messages **including
> headers** , and he will be 'off the air' here quicker faster than he
> can spell FCC! If he can, that is...
>
> 73, Leo
>
> On Tue, 23 Sep 2003 16:37:07 -0700, "Greg Courville"
> <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote:
>
> >Actually, you're probably right. You know, he didn't even start using
that
> >callsign until after the article I posted. I'm going to traceroute his IP
so
> >we know his general location and the name of his ISP. If anyone had
actually
> >heard him on the air we could go straight to the FCC.
> >Are there any confirmed reports of this guy actually transmitting?
> > >
> > >
> > >-KG6SGY
> > >
> > >
> > >
> >"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
> >news:jso0nv48g2r6daedgpidc966uab2a3h2jv@4ax.com...
> >> Well, it's pretty unlikely that the guy who got busted for this back

> >> in 1999 is doing this, unless he's incredibly stupid. The headers on
> >> his newsgroup postings point right back to his pesonal account on
> >> Supernews, and the FCC could subpoena his user info and usenet usage
> >> logs from Supernews in a flash if illegal activity is involved.
> >>
> >> More likely, it's some troll who heard about the "Porkbutt" story, and
> >> is having some fun stirring the pot a bit. If he really is creating
> >> interference on 3894.5 and bragging about it here, however, he could
> >> get a guest shot on "America's Dumbest Criminals" for this one -
> >> should the FCC get a copy of this somehow.... :)
> >>
> >> 73, Leo
> >>
> >> PS - For your review, the message headers are posted below:
> >>
> >> From: "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
> >> Newsgroups:
> >>
>
>alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.d
x
> >,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
> >> Subject: Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY
> >> Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:22:57 -0400
> >> Organization: Posted via Supernews, http://www.supernews.com
> >> Message-ID: <vn047eanujppea@corp.supernews.com>
> >> Reply-To: "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
> >> References: <vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com>
> >> <vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com>
> >> X-Priority: 3
> >> X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> >> X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
> >> X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
> >> X-Complaints-To: abuse@supernews.com
> >> Lines: 74
> >> Xref: cyclone01.bloor.is.net.cable.rogers.com alt.ham-radio.ssb:394
> >> alt.radio.amateur:1584 rec.radio.amateur.dx:6821
> >> rec.radio.amateur.misc:23591 rec.radio.amateur.policy:54076
> >> X-Received-Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:37:11 EDT
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> On Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:22:57 -0400, "BIG AL"
> >> <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> >OLD NEWS BOY.
> >> >
> >> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
> >SONG.
> >> >

> >> >WHATS A MATTER THERE BOY SCARED THAT MINE IS BIGGER THAN YOURS. HO HO
> >> >
> >> >FRANK SEE YOU TONITE AT 7 ON 39845. BE THERE HO HO
> >> >
> >> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
> >SONG.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
> >SONG.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
> >SONG.
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >BYE
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
> >> >news:vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com...
> >> >> This is a little out of date, but should give a little background
info
> >for
> >> >> those who are unfamiliar with "BIG AL"...
> >> >>
> >> >> HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A.
Abernethy,
> >> >> K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation
below
> >30
> >> >> MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the
action,
> >> >> Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC
letter
> >> >> included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of
> >> >> transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16.
> >> >Hollingsworth's
> >> >> letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference
on
> >> >3.965
> >> >> MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted
> >that
> >> >> Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time
his
> >> >> station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to protest
> >the
> >> >> sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21 and
22
> >in

> >> >> the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints from
> >other
> >> >> amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the
FCC
> >had
> >> >> received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity,
deliberate
> >> >> interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints to
the
> >> >FCC
> >> >> alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt
Song,"
> >the
> >> >> letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate
> >interference."
> >> >> Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center
in
> >> >> Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to K4OKA.
The
> >> >FCC
> >> >> letter also said the Commission had received complaints that
Abernethy
> >had
> >> >> used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference"
on
> >or
> >> >> near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about
> >over-power
> >> >> operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start
> >> >revocation
> >> >> proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of continued
> >> >> violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter.
(For
> >> >> additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for Six
> >> >Months"
> >> >> elsewhere on the AWE news page.)
> >> >>
> >> >> 73 de KG6SGY
> >> >>
> >> >> "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
> >> >> news:vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com...
> >> >> > WE KEPT THE QRMERS OFF 3.894.5 AGAIN TONITE WITH OUR BIG ONES. WE
> >REIGN
> >> >AS
> >> >> > KINGS OF 75. HO HO
> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >> >
> >> >>

> >> >>
> >> >
> >>
> >
>

5220. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 00:04:26 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <ec5cb.3020$iT4.2210228@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 78540

Brian wrote:

> And the ones that washed out of CW school? The Gulag?

I like Hungarian Gulag!

- Mike KB3EIA -

5221. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 00:05:52 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Ad5cb.3021$iT4.2210376@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 78541

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <3F6E7F9D.8070805@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
>
>>I'd wager that if you put all us in a room, we'd get along just fine.
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> Mike:
>
> Not only that, but it might take us quite a while to even get around to
> a discussion of code testing, if we ever did!
>
> Anyone interested in an rrap get-together during Dayton '04? I don't get
> to bid on my vacation time until the end of the year, but it could very
> well be "doable" for me, since starting next week, I'll finally have the
> weekends off on a permanent basis.

I'll be there, so count me in!

- Mike KB3EIA -

5222. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 00:09:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Ug5cb.3023$iT4.2211348@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 78542

Brian wrote:

> Raise your right hand and take an oath. Be sure to get a guaranteed
> Morse Code MOS, though, or you might find yourself peeling taters in
> an Infantry Division in Korea.

I like taters too, Brian!

Really, I'll quit being so goofy when this cold wears off. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

5223. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 00:14:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <sl5cb.3031$iT4.2212731@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 78543

Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:

> Especially if there is that beer and barbaque involved as well! :)

I am liking the idea of a rrap meet at Dayton. If it isn't as muddy as this past year, we could tailgate!

I bid for Yuengling Lager, Genny Red, or if we can get a designated driver, Unibroue Maudite! And Ribs and Chicken, or cow on the cob.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5224. Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 00:17:28 UTC
From: BIGAL <BIGAL@75meters.net>
Message-ID: <vn0skqjeg2k209@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78666
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

AY YI YI AY YI YI CALL THE FCC. AY YI YI AY YI YI CALL THE FCC.

YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG......

MINE IS BIGGER BOY.

HO HO

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:jso0nv48g2r6daedgpidc966uab2a3h2jv@4ax.com...
> Well, it's pretty unlikely that the guy who got busted for this back
> in 1999 is doing this, unless he's incredibly stupid. The headers on
> his newsgroup postings point right back to his pesonal account on
> Supernews, and the FCC could subpoena his user info and usenet usage
> logs from Supernews in a flash if illegal activity is involved.
>
> More likely, it's some troll who heard about the "Porkbutt" story, and
> is having some fun stirring the pot a bit. If he really is creating
> interference on 3894.5 and bragging about it here, however, he could
> get a guest shot on "America's Dumbest Criminals" for this one -
> should the FCC get a copy of this somehow.... :)
>
> 73, Leo
>
> PS - For your review, the message headers are posted below:
>
> From: "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
> Newsgroups:
>
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx
,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY
> Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:22:57 -0400
> Organization: Posted via Supernews, http://www.supernews.com
> Message-ID: <vn047eanujppea@corp.supernews.com>
> Reply-To: "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
> References: <vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com>
> <vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com>
> X-Priority: 3
> X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
> X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
> X-Complaints-To: abuse@supernews.com
> Lines: 74

> Xref: cyclone01.bloor.is.net.cable.rogers.com alt.ham-radio.ssb:394
> alt.radio.amateur:1584 rec.radio.amateur.dx:6821
> rec.radio.amateur.misc:23591 rec.radio.amateur.policy:54076
> X-Received-Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:37:11 EDT
>
>
>
> On Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:22:57 -0400, "BIG AL"
> <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote:
>
> >OLD NEWS BOY.
> >
> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
SONG.
> >
> >WHATS A MATTER THERE BOY SCARED THAT MINE IS BIGGER THAN YOURS. HO HO
> >
> >FRANK SEE YOU TONITE AT 7 ON 39845. BE THERE HO HO
> >
> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
SONG.
> >
> >
> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
SONG.
> >
> >
> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
SONG.
> >
> >
> >BYE
> >
> >
> >"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
> >news:vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com...
> >> This is a little out of date, but should give a little background info
for
> >> those who are unfamiliar with "BIG AL"...
> >>
> >> HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A. Abernethy,
> >> K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation below
30
> >> MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the action,
> >> Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC letter
> >> included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of
> >> transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16.
> >Hollingsworth's
> >> letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference on
> >3.965

> >> MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted
that
> >> Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time his
> >> station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to protest
the
> >> sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21 and 22
in
> >> the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints from
other
> >> amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the FCC
had
> >> received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity, deliberate
> >> interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints to the
> >FCC
> >> alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt Song,"
the
> >> letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate
interference."
> >> Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in
> >> Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to K4OKA. The
> >FCC
> >> letter also said the Commission had received complaints that Abernethy
had
> >> used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference" on
or
> >> near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about
over-power
> >> operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start
> >revocation
> >> proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of continued
> >> violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter. (For
> >> additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for Six
> >Months"
> >> elsewhere on the AWE news page.)
> >>
> >> 73 de KG6SGY
> >>
> >> "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
> >> news:vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com...
> >> > WE KEPT THE QRMERS OFF 3.894.5 AGAIN TONITE WITH OUR BIG ONES. WE
REIGN
> >AS
> >> > KINGS OF 75. HO HO
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >>
> >

>

5225. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 00:21:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <Mr5cb.3037$iT4.2214570@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 78545

Arnie Macy wrote:

> "Leo" wrote ...
>
> If you review this individual's posts on this subject over the last few
> days, a trend becomes obvious - his intent IS to upset and annoy. He
> thrives on confrontation, and really gets going when he hits a nerve with
> one of his readers. Not intellectual enough to make his point by rational
> arguement, he resorts to name calling and other juvenile tactics to 'get his
> way'. And he knows that the "nazi" thing works - so he keeps on with it -
> it's his gig.
>
> Convincing people like this to change is analogous to trying to teach a pig
> to sing - no matter how hard you try, it ain't gonna happen - you'll only
> annoy the pig....
>
> Best tactic for handling this guy - Dee has it absolutely right, use the
> killfile. If there's no audience, there'll be no idiot! Plonk 'im.
> ----------
>
> Leo,
>
> I completely agree with your points. I just hate to "plonk" him. I did
> that to Len for about a year and missed many laughs. But, at the end of the
> day, it might have to be done.

Or you could try an excercise in "skin toughening", Arnie (don't take
it as an insult, I've done the same thing) It is an amazingly empowering
thing when you can read some of the merde posted by someone that thrives
on confrontation and provocation, knowing that they are failing to
achieve their goal with you. After the first few ignored posts, it's fun.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5226. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 00:27:08 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <fqn1nvoo2jmf405f1g5toss5qi8jfdtg6d@4ax.com>
Source record: 78546

Good idea. When I passed the Basic test (Canadian licence, same type of questions and format as the entry-level US one - Technician, I think...?), I walked out of the room with two things: A licence. And no real practical idea on how to operate a radio station. I had the theory, and legally what not to do, but how to set up a station and initiate a QSO? On-air procedures and etiquette? Missing details galore....

I bought a used 2M HT and the RAC Operating Guide, downloaded a repeater list, listened on-air for a while, and figured out how to get through the first few QSOs. From there, the kind folks on the air guided me through the process, overlooking my frequent errors. Trial by fire. No I=E/R stuff to help me through here!

Going on HF was worse - passed the morse test, then...learning curve again (and still - 6 months later) - some of the VHF knowledge worked, but new skills were required. And the equipment is more complex to set up and use than my HT....had to build an antenna (a Big Antenna !), and go from there. And a dummy load. And an SWR meter. Etcetera. Still learning, but the folks on 40M have been great, and got me up to speed pretty quickly.

Personally, I'd like to see practical operating knowledge become part of the licence procedure. Not for the sake of testing , or making the licence harder to get, or screening out the incompetent and unmotivated - but to ensure that when you do get the licence, you have an excellent idea what is required to actually use it. Like driving a car, for example - if folks got their licence based entirely on the written test, we might not all be reading this post right now.....:).

And the best possible resource for creating a syllabus like that - the experienced amateur user community. (not me - I'm still learning! Maybe later....)

Just my .02....

73, Leo

On Tue, 23 Sep 2003 23:24:06 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:

>
>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030923063009.21642.00001128@mb-m01.aol.com...
>> I think Clint has already said he only sees a need for regs and safety
>testing.

>>
>>
>> There's "the future".
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>Given the detail and extent of the rules, we could right a killer test on
>rules and regs. Then require people to take and pass that before taking any
>of the elements for specific licenses. i.e. They have to know the rules in
>detail before being tested on the theory, technical knowledge, and operating
>practices for the licenses classes.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5227. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 00:27:44 UTC
From: Lou <Spamfree@Spamfree.com>
Message-ID: <oy5cb.91$LJ5.6549@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 78547
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:lU4cb.2991$ai7.362@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...

<A whole bunch of stuff snipped>

>
>
> Well first off, the reference violation above is long done with. He
spent
> his time in radio prison and returned to the HF bands. He has basically
> learned his lesson, this time. And has been a decent operator for
several
> years now.
>
> What I was refering to was he was removed from the radio voluntarily in
lieu
> of being fined a big chunk of bux back in the 70s. He stayed off the air
> for years. Returned as KJ4JX and began his crap again. He later got his
> original call back under the vanity system.
>
> He has been a QRMer for many years. BUT as stated above has finally seen
> the light.
>
> This crap you see here from "BIG AL" is BS.. And same for the "3894.5"
crap.
> Its just a troll.
>
> But I wanted to set the record straight.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

Well, whatever.. I'm kill filing everything and anything that comes across
about this after this response. If need be, remove the news group as well. I
won't miss it for a while. But I'm not going to get caught up in this
childish bull shit any more than I've already been suckered into doing..
Yeah, I DO fail once in a while! Lou

5228. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 00:29:15 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkqogm$47j40$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78548

"Mike Coslo" wrote ...

Or you could try an excercise in "skin toughening", Arnie (don't take it as an insult, I've done the same thing) It is an amazingly empowering thing when you can read some of the merde posted by someone that thrives on confrontation and provocation, knowing that they are failing to achieve their goal with you. After the first few ignored posts, it's fun.

Actually, I don't worry about the personal insults at all. I find most of them laughable. But, I guess each of us has that *one* thing that bugs them. Given my family history, for me *that's* it. But you are right, ignoring them will tend to make them go away and deprive them of the satisfaction. Thanks for the advice. It is well received.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5229. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 00:32:56 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkqonj$4r894$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78549

"Clint" wrote ...

EXCELLENT way to attract people to your cause... for those of you undecideds on the topic reading, here is yet ANOTHER soul that dearly loves the continued use of morse code testing requirements for obtaining a license, but cannot debate the matter openly and instead chooses to outright IGNORE people who want to present an opposing view. Like about 4 or 5 others in here that are of his ilk, he proverbially pulls the covers over his head when controversy is presented to him, when debate is offered on a topic.

Clint,

You *do* know the difference between a male and a female, right? Just checking.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5230. LOU DONT GO. ITS FUN SLAPPING YOU AROUND

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 00:35:01 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn1plom0ib5h02@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78550
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

BYE BYE BOY. SEE YOU LATER BOY. COME TO MY FREQ AND I'LL RUN YOU OFF THERE
TO.

B I G A L

"Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
news:oy5cb.91$LJ5.6549@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:lU4cb.2991$ai7.362@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> <A whole bunch of stuff snipped>
>
> >
> >
> > Well first off, the reference violation above is long done with. He
> spent
> > his time in radio prison and returned to the HF bands. He has basically
> > learned his lesson, this time. And has been a decent operator for
> several
> > years now.
> >
> > What I was refering to was he was removed from the radio voluntarily in
> lieu
> > of being fined a big chunk of bux back in the 70s. He stayed off the
air
> > for years. Returned as KJ4JX and began his crap again. He later got
his
> > original call back under the vanity system.
> >
> > He has been a QRMer for many years. BUT as stated above has finally
seen
> > the light.
> >
> > This crap you see here from "BIG AL" is BS.. And same for the "3894.5"
> crap.
> > Its just a troll.
> >
> > But I wanted to set the record straight.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
>
> Well, whatever.. I'm kill filing everything and anything that comes across

> about this after this response. If need be, remove the news group as well.
I
> won't miss it for a while. But I'm not going to get caught up in this
> childish bull shit any more than I've already been suckered into doing..
> Yeah, I DO fail once in a while! Lou
>
>
>

5231. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 00:35:48 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkqosv$4qpul$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78551

"Dee D. Flint" wrote ...

He does that to distract from the fact that he has no valid arguments and is incapable of debating in any logical fashion. He is known to go onto long tangents leading to incredible non-sequiters. Most of us have long ago killfiled him because of it though there are a couple of people who continue to wrangle with him. I never see his posts anymore.

And as of today, it's back to the KF with him. Maybe this time for two years :-))

Arnie -
KT4ST

5232. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 00:39:13 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030923203913.28225.00000106@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 78553

>I like Marconi and Cheese!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Im the one who invented it.

5233. TO THE BUNCH ON 3893

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 00:39:33 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn1pu8hul8bkf2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78552
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

YOU NEED A BIGGER SIGNAL TO SHUT ME AND FRANKY DOWN.

5234. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 01:01:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923210119.07578.00000755@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78554

In article <RLIbb.63713$NM1.42393@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>Wouldn't it be great if the next political appointee actually had some idea
>of RF communications technology ?
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Dan:

Forgive my cynicism, but since when has practical knowledge and
experience in a particular field of endeavor ever been a requirement
to become a political appointee? Mr. Powell became FCC Chairman
because he's a rare commodity in Washington politics: a black
Republican. And, I guess, being Colin Powell's son didn't hurt much,
either. Michael gave President Bush another way to pay off Secretary
of State Powell for not running against him in the Presidential race,
and add some "diversity" to his administration. A double-whammy.
I just wonder what kind of new nightmare we'll get in Michael's place?

Of course, in fairness to Chairman Powell, he does have a point about
the political back stabbing. However, I guess that's what we get when
we allow our government to be run mainly by career politicians who are
all beholden to special interests. I believe that the only way to correct
this situation is to never vote for an incumbent seeking his third or
subsequent term in a non-term limited office.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5235. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 01:09:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030923210922.23307.00003205@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 78555

In article <pC4cb.3772$Hd6.1691693@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030923063009.21642.00001128@mb-m01.aol.com...
>> I think Clint has already said he only sees a need for regs and safety
>testing.
>>
>>
>> There's "the future".
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>>
>
>Given the detail and extent of the rules, we could right a killer test on
>rules and regs.

Not really. All questions and answers are filtered through the QPC and again through the FCC. "Killer" Q&A can be rejected.

>Then require people to take and pass that before taking any
>of the elements for specific licenses. i.e. They have to know the rules in
>detail before being tested on the theory, technical knowledge, and operating
>practices for the licenses classes.

Better yet - split the test into different subelements and require a passing grade in each. No getting all the regs questions wrong and all the theory questions right (or vice versa) and still passing.

I suggested that in my comments to 98-143. FCC went the other way. Tells ya somethin'.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5236. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 01:09:22 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030923210922.23307.00003204@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 78556

In article <BFWbb.7106$yp6.126912@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20030923013414.12631.00001336@mb-m28.aol.com...
>> In article <ZkJbb.7038$yp6.116603@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >However, the requirements for licensure should be reasonable
>> >and rational, and while the written tests meet that criteria, the
>> >requirement for Morse proficiency no longer does.
>> >
>> >Carl - wk3c
>>
>> Carl:
>>
>> Jim, N2EY, just said, in so many words,
>
>With all due respect to Jim, just because he said it doesn't make
>it true. (no matter how many words he used :-)

It would be even better if my actual words were repeated...
>
>> that since today's amateur
>> radio equipment can no longer be designed, built, or serviced by
>> any but the tiny handful of hams who possess professional-grade
>> technical knowledge, skill, and facilities,
>
>That's absurd ...

It's also *not* what I wrote.

What I was trying to say was that, given the characteristics of modern ham
equipment and its popularity with hams, that there was not the same *need* for
hams to be as knowledgeable in radio *theory* as there was years ago.

I think hams *should* be knowledgeable in theory today - just as I think they
should strive for operating skills. Including Morse code skills.

But there's a big difference betwen *should know* and *need to know*.

>just as those who want to (and don't have a
>legitimate physical limitation that prevents it) *could* learn
>Morse at some arbitrary speed, anyone who wants to (except,
>someone who's truly mentally deficient) can learn the skills
>necessary to design, build, and service equipment comparable

>in performance to (or better than) off the shelf commercial equipment.

Maybe, Carl - but we'll probably never know because most hams simply won't do that, for a variety of reasons.
>
>Even "custom ASICs" can be affordably created in the ham's
>home workshop with free or inexpensive software tools that
>run on any reasonable PC, using FPGAs and other programable
>logic devices ... and they can do significant signal processing at
>rates higher than can be done in software on a PC (though using
>the PC to do some signal processing is useful and practical in
>some applications).

Agreed! And if someone has the interest, the time and the resources, they can do that sort of thing.

But most simply won't, because they can buy something ready built for less time, money and aggravation. And their store-bought set will have some resale value.
>
>Some of the fancy LCD displays require special manufacturing
>techniques and equipment and would be prohibitively expensive for
>"one off" and small quantities, but they can be replaced by a "soft"
>display on a computer screen if those sorts of bells and whistles
>are desired ... check out "Ham Radio Deluxe" ... one hell of a
>slick control program, that's free by the way, from Simon Brown,
>HB9DRV, and Peter Halpin, PE1MHO, (NCI Director Emeritus,
>holder of the 1st 6m QRP (<=5W) DXCC, and other awards and
>omgosh ... a no-coder)
>at: http://www.kns.ch/sysgem/hb9drv/HamRadioDeluxe.htm

Exactly. But how many hams are actually doing all that?
>
>Building and servicing are simply a matter of technique. SMT
>parts can be soldered by hand with a small, low wattage iron
>(even 200 pin QFPs ... I've done it many times) or with a simple
>hot air reflow soldering system (you can buy one, or could build
>one ... I've reflowed modest sized PCBs with a heat gun and
>some care.

May your eyes always be sharp enough, and your hands steady enough, to do the things you like best.
>
>The techniques are different than the old "thru-hole" methods,
>but they are really no more difficult and are certainly within
>reach of anyone who cares to learn.

I disagree. Not everyone's eyesight and manual dexterity are up to the task.
>
>(and, amateur radio is *supposed* to encourage the learning
>of useful technical skills, advancing the art, etc.)

Of course! - but the word is *encourage* - not "force down their throats".
>
>> that most of the technical
>> knowledge in the present written tests can also be eliminated as
>> a licensing requirement. I totally agree.
>
>So, you would prefer that the amateur ranks be centered on
>appliance operators (as long as they can beep fast)???

"beep fast"??? 20 wpm is not fast. 5 wpm is certainly not fast.

>That's
>the death warrant for amateur radio if it ever becomes totally
>that way.

Look around you, Carl. What percentage of hams are homebrewing their stations,
or a significant part thereof? Particularly HF and VHF-low UHF stations?

>Reducing the technical skill of amateurs to your level and
>keeping "Morse as king" may make you FEEL superior,
>Larry, but it's really the TRUE "dumbing down" of the
>amateur radio service ...

You're missing the point.

The question is not whether hams *should* be technically knowledgeable, but
whether such knowledge *must be* tested.
>
>Other than as a recreational activity in the ARS (which is fine),
>the world has passed Morse by.

Other than as a recreational activity, the world has also passed homebrewing
most electronic equipment by. Wasn't SMT developed to improve *automated*
electronic manufacturing?

>What's needed in the "pool of trained operators" is no longer
>a cadre of Morseists, but folks who have the technical
>knowledge and skill to build, field, and maintain systems that
>can meet the communications needs of EMS agencies ... and
>that's at a level of technology far beyond OOK Morse.

The current writtens don't test tehory knoweldge at anything like that level.
>
>> In what way is it
>> "reasonable and rational" for someone to know Ohm's Law or
>> even the most basic digital theory, if they'll never have to use it
>> in their actual practice as a radio amateur?
>
>Ohm's Law is a tool that can be used for many things ... biasing
>circuits, figuring out what size wire gauge is necessary to carry
>a given current with what voltage drop, and on and on ... and it's
>a simple equation, whose permutations can be learned in about
>10 minutes ... equally useful are the formulae for inductive and
>capacitive reactance, resonance, etc., etc.

Sure - if a person takes the time and trouble to learn the concepts and how to use them.

But should such learning be voluntary or should it be *forced* on everyone as a condition of being licensed? Particularly those who have no interest in it?

>These are all basic things that every amateur should know and
>understand. (Do they all? No. Should they? Yes!!!)

Agreed - but how is that evr going to happen?

>> I say it isn't, and
>> nothing could prove this better than eliminating the code testing
>> requirements for the same reason.
>
>That's absurd ...
>
>> After all, code testing has
>> the effect of exposing prospective radio amateurs to what is
>> always going to be a practical and useful communications tool
>> which allows radio amateurs to practice basic radio
>> communication with only entry-level skill and technology.
>
>Certain chemicals are "useful" in agriculture ... should everyone
>who wants to eat a salad be required to be sprayed with them
>("exposed to them") against his/her will before being allowed to
>do so? (Yes, it's an extreme and contrived example, but the
>principle is EXACTLY the same.)

No, it has nothing to do with the subject.

>> If we eliminate the code testing requirement, we therefore
>> demonstrate that basic communications skills are no longer
>> necessary to be a licensed amateur radio operator.
>
>Larry ... most folks don't WANT to communicate via Morse.

Maybe. With you as the salesman and judge of what people want, I wouldn't be surprised.....

Carl - most folks don't WANT to build their own radios, either.

>Nothing prevents you from doing so, but to assert that everyone
>must prove they can before they can do anything on HF is
>pointless and counter to the interests of the future of ham radio.
>(The governments of the world and even the IARU have come
>to realize this ... that YOU "don't get it" is irrelevant.)

They also don;t demand that hams imitate automated soldering machines...

>> I, for one,
>> would like to think that the present syllabus of the written tests
>> still represents "basic communications skills." So, which will

>> it be? Code testing, written testing, both, or neither?
>
>The sensible option ... no code testing. Adequate written testing.
>That answer is obvious.
>
What constitutes "adequate"? How are you going to defend the written tests if someone disagrees with your interpretation of "adequate"?

This isn't a straw argument - it's the next bend in the road. There's a lot of hams out there who think "incentive licensing" was a mistake. Heck, there was a proposal by QCWA some time back to give Extra privs to all pre-Nov.22 1968 Generals and Advanceds.

Consider this, Carl: The radio operating privileges of a General and an Extra are equivalent in every way except for a few subbands of four HF bands. Tell us why someone *needs* to know the stuff in the Extra syllabus in order to operate on those subbands.

How many countries have only one class of amateur license? How many have two (limited and full privileges)?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5237. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 01:27:41 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <bgp1nv87725pavclr3ck5gah78g26ovij8@4ax.com>
Source record: 78557

Well, things aren't always quite that black-and-white, Clint. I am certainly not a sympathizer nor apologist for either side of the arguement. Not beacuse I am firmly in one camp or the other - it's much simpler than that. And frankly, from what I've seen, some of the folks here need more than an apologist to get 'em through the day...

So, here it is - my position: I don't really care that much one way or the other. But hear me out. If code testing stays, then that's cool - status quo - where we are today. I learned it, I'm in, no sweat. If code goes - well, it's been a requirement for a long, long time, but perhaps its time to move on, much like the shipping industry did back in '99, and European amateurs are doing right now. (after all, we'd look pretty ridiculous if, say, the CEPT Level 2 operators in Sixpackistan could talk to us, but our guys at the equivalent level of licence were stuck above 30 MHz.) Either way, I learned it (5 WPM, certainly not a speed demon here...) because it was the current "price of admission" to HF. If I had to learn to bowl to get on 40M, I would have bought the shoes and gone to the alley - I had wanted to go on HF since I was a kid doing SWL stuff. So I did!

But, I really don't want to get too passionate about an operating mode - sure, I like it (and I'm finding it to be actually very useful under some conditions, and my speed is actually coming up - maybe 6 WPM now :)), but I am objective enough to see that it is not really required to operate a station. I can use SSB, and a staggering array of digital modes, and communicate all over the globe. (except with the porkbutt idiot - he wasn't there : ( ). But, because I like something, do I believe that you must too? No. Do I believe that you should be forced to learn it to get in to this part of the hobby? No, as long as it is not a legal requirement to do so. Do I believe that learning Morse makes a better amateur - well, I might have before I met some of the folks here... - seriously, I haven't seen any hard evidence to support that theory. Do I believe that because the hobby has always had a code requirement, that it should continue forever? Certainly not - although there is a lot to be said for tradition - if the majority want to keep it, I can live with that. If its time has ended, however, I am free to continue to use it, develop my skills and communicate with those who share my interest to my heart's delight. No loss there either.

In short, Clint, I'm not sure if you will understand where I'm coming from on this issue - people tend to treat it like a contest, where one side has to win, the Cowboys vs. the 49ers, my team is better, blah blah - the reality is, the world is changing, countries all over the world are dropping the requirement fairly quickly - and we really

don't have a hell of a lot of control over it. In the results of the Canadian survey that I posted to the group, for example, over two thirds of those who voted chose to let morse code drop from the requirements. And, over two thirds want to amend the testing to replace it with something else. Better practical assessment of candidates and more operating knowledge was one suggestion. I posted that survey because our two countries are quite close, and tend to think much more alike than, say, the US and Europe. It may well foreshadow a similar poll down there. Believe me, it's as passionate an arguement up here between Amateurs as it is in the States.

In short, to restate, I don't care too much one way or the other. perhaps because I didn't go through the rigourous testing that the Extras did years ago. I didn't have to draw schematics on my test, or answer essay-type questions, and pass 20 WPM Morse - many of these fellows did, though, and it must burn them up to see us get in there today with multiple choice answers and 5 WPM code. For them, no code is the final insult....("bad enough we got "Nickel Extras now....grumble grumble...CBPlussers coming soon.....grumble)

But, being objective here, it's probably a given - we all went to 5 WPM code, a while back and many said that would never happen. And if the rest of the world goes no code, then historically we will go along. Eventually. Always have. Its a community!

Now stop debating, Clint - for God's sake, you'll go blind :)

73, Leo

BTW, what's with the French stuff you posted - je suis anglais, mon petit chou....

On Tue, 23 Sep 2003 18:29:27 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:

>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>news:49dvmv8s9vgf0uu7jkpafpmnig3ojfjot4@4ax.com...
>
>>
>> PS - what cause do I have, exactly? Do you know? PCTA? NCTA? PETA?
>> NAACP? MADD?
>>
>
>Heh, I hate to burst your bubble but you're not *that* evasive or
>genuine.... it's quite obvious which side of the fence you stand on
>due to the one-sided nature of your attacks. You have claimed
>that I have used name-calling and other descriptions of
>personal attack tactics, when in fact you have done this as I
>have previously quoted... and have, FURTHERMORE,
>not chastized the PCTA crowd (if, in fact, you're NOT one of
>thier apologists if not member) when they have used
>descriptions such as "moron", "dumb fuck", etc. Not a peep.

>
>Therefore, as I said, if you are a not a member you are
>certainly a sympathizer or an apologist for them, which
>as far as I am care puts you in thier camp all the same.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>--
>PRAY FOR THE SOULS OF THE FRENCH
>
>"say it isn't so!" ..... The french proposal going
>to the United Nations pertaining to the iraqi
>situation is to ask for a RETURN of
>the baathist part. OH yes, you read that right...
>The party responsible for gassing tens of
>thousands of it's own people, defying
>international laws, pileing bodies in mass
>graves as an aftermath of it's bloody internal
>policies and many other crimes against
>humanity, is going to have a cheerleader
>from the country who benifited from it's oil
>contracts WITH the baathist party (go
>figure!)...And, finally, the french want ALL
>mention of liberation taken out of ALL
>paperwork and replaced with the word
>"occupation", due to the fact that they do
>not like its positive connotation. This from
>a country that occupied Algeria for 132 years.

5238. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 01:29:21 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn1srson976ebd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78558

>
> You *do* know the difference between a male and a female, right? Just
> checking.
>

Oh yes.... definitely.
I do wonder, however, how one is suppose to immediately
ascertain the difference when one is only reading a mere NG post.

--
PRAY FOR THE SOULS OF THE FRENCH

"say it isn't so!" ..... The french proposal going
to the United Nations pertaining to the iraqi
situation is to ask for a RETURN of
the baathist part. OH yes, you read that right...
The party responsible for gassing tens of
thousands of it's own people, defying
international laws, pileing bodies in mass
graves as an aftermath of it's bloody internal
policies and many other crimes against
humanity, is going to have a cheerleader
from the country who benifited from it's oil
contracts WITH the baathist party (go
figure!)...And, finally, the french want ALL
mention of liberation taken out of ALL
paperwork and replaced with the word
"occupation", due to the fact that they do
not like its positive connotation. This from
a country that occupied Algeria for 132 years.

--

5239. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 01:31:59 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn1t0r1kuvq6b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78559

> He does that to distract from the fact that he has no valid arguments

no, arguments that you cannot counter logically, leading to just the
same old bleeding heart crying tactics.

and is
> incapable of debating in any logical fashion.

better check the man in the mirror.

He is known to go onto long
> tangents leading to incredible non-sequiters.

if that's how you care to characterize logical debate;
you know, presenting an idea and then following
up with factual evidence to support it.

Most of us have long ago
> killfiled him because .....

..... because you can't handle anybody posing
a differing opinion to the sacred, holy doctrine
you refuse to let go of regarding morse code testing.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5240. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 01:34:33 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn1t5jrcl7q50e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78560

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bkpa1a$g7h@library1.airnews.net...
> "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> wrote in message

>
> That has nothing to do with amateur radio or a person's position thereof.
I
> did exactly the same thing wth my kids.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

Kim, the PCTA crowd has proven itself, above and beyond all
other descriptions, nothing short of totally hypocritical.

When I present evidence and facts to support the NCTA crowd's
ideas, they claim that they are all spurious and non-applicable
conclusions.

Then, in the same breath, they attempt to use such a condescending
line of thought... just like Len pointed out, they just showed that
they think of those who do not care to have morse code training
crammed down thier throats as "children".

Clint
KB5ZHT

5241. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 01:40:54 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn1thmnl46racd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78561

>
> My point was that in all activities, the already experienced people set
the
> standards.

No WONDER you are so frustrated. Do you REALLY believe that,
in society today, that those who are the most veteran with the most
experience in a field REALLY set the standards? Colleges and
instutitions of higher learning are filled to the BRIN with
tenured professors that have little or no experience in the world outside
of the campus they teach on; politicians often hold thier offices for
decades without ever having had a real job (bill clinton).

It's a good concept in utopia, but in the real world, such is rarely
ever the case. Especially in a democracy where people are
elected into office (representatives) or appointed to offices
by those elected (supreme court justices).

I doubt very seriously anybody outside of the half-dozen
PCTA's that are herding together with you in this debate
see this line of thinking as anything more than condescending
and in fact makes you appear quite elitist. A word to the wise;
elitists are very rarely ever given the respect that they feel
they deserve- on the contrary, they usually tend to start
to arouse great levels of contempt and resentment with the
very people they feel they are trying to "help", for a lack
of a better word.

This is why the NCTA underlieing beliefs are catching on
so quickly and gaining steam.

> So far polls of hams who have passed
> code, i.e. the experienced, have a majority favoring it.
>

(1) Um, "duh"? I had to do it so everybody should! ? !
(2) I passed a code test and I do NOT favor continueing
code testing.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5242. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 01:49:09 UTC
From: Frank Todd <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <oK6cb.559233$Ho3.98151@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 78562

Mike Coslo wrote:
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
>> In article <vmu3dc5uoiohad@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
>> computron dot net> writes:
>>
>>
>>>>> Well, Clint, you said it, not me! I'm glad you're starting to see the
>>>
>>>
>>> light!
>>>
>>>>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>>>
>>>
>>> I, I see your point.
>>> I will be the absolute BEST driver of a modern internal combustion
>>> engine-
>>> driven automobile if I first take a blacksmith's apprenticeship and
>>> learn
>>> to shoe a horse.
>>>
>>> Yes. Quite logical.
>>>
>>> Clint
>>> KB5ZHT
>>
>>
>>
>> Well, Clint, that kind of cynicism may seem to be amusing to some, but
>> just goes to demonstrate a lack of any truly logical argument which
>> supports your position. Therefore, it, and you, are easily dismissed.
>
>
> I don't know about you, Larry, but I like to know a lot about
> everything I do. That goes for cars, amateur radio, computers,
> housework, history, or whatever. I suspect you feel at least somewhat
> this way too. Strange that there is a whole culture built up that
> celebrates ignorance.
>
> That's why if my car breaks down on the road, I stand a good chance
> of getting it running again, why I know it isn't likely the F.C.C. won't
> test me on the design of a 1/4 wave dipole, and why I knew that there
> wasn't any special callsigns for non-coded amateurs.

>
> Not that I don't make mistakes, but I don't come into newsgroups
> acting as if I know everything either! 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
Just thought I'd add my two cents worth to the subject....It's about
time the FCC eradicated this ancient mode of communicaton. The FEDS
even stopped using it...Time for Amateur Radio to do the same!

--
73

Frank K3EKO

5243. Re: It starts with the basics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 01:58:59 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309231758.7cbb7730@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78563

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030923013418.12631.00001338@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <20030922000029.05539.00000933@mb-m16.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >>Amateur radio operators have always dealt with the level of technology
> >>available at their own particular slice in time.
> >
> > "Spark" is outlawed, Larrah.
>
> Which is just but one of the numerous reasons why I don't use it,
> Lennie!

Larrah, forget about the law. Get yourself some junk steel and an arc
welder. With your superior skill, you'll be heard for blocks.

5244. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 02:02:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309231802.3d89a6c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78564

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030923090144.13774.00000038@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> >Clean up your act and I might start believing you.
> >
> >
> >
>
> I dont care what you believe

Does that mean you'll quit trying to convince me that you're not a liar?

5245. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 02:08:59 UTC
From: Greg Courville <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com>
Message-ID: <vn1v5ud4v57a02@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78566
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Yeah, if you look at some of the other Big-Al threads you'll see that we've decided he's not for real.
Now we're trying to get him for violations of Supernews's policy. Write to abuse@supernews.com and attach segments of his posts. Maybe then he'll have to post directly...

-KG6SGY

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:lU4cb.2991$ai7.362@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> news:xb3cb.87$LJ5.6464@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:842cb.2349$ai7.1102@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > > "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> > > news:Q7Nbb.51$LJ5.4366@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > "Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:vmv6j3kfrkpv64@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A.
> > Abernethy,
> > > > > K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation
> > below
> > > > 30
> > > > > MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the
> action,
> > > > > Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC
> > letter
> > > > > included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of
> > > > > transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16.
> > > > Hollingsworth's
> > > > > letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference
> on
> > > > 3.965
> > > > > MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted
> > that
> > > > > Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time
> > his

> > > > > station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to
protest
> > the
> > > > > sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21
and
> > 22
> > > in
> > > > > the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints
from
> > > other
> > > > > amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the
> FCC
> > > had
> > > > > received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity,
> deliberate
> > > > > interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints
to
> > the
> > > > FCC
> > > > > alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt
> Song,"
> > > the
> > > > > letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate
> > interference."
> > > > > Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding
Center
> > in
> > > > > Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to
K4OKA.
> > The
> > > > FCC
> > > > > letter also said the Commission had received complaints that
> Abernethy
> > > had
> > > > > used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference"
> on
> > or
> > > > > near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about
> > > over-power
> > > > > operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start
> > > > revocation
> > > > > proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of
continued
> > > > > violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter.
> (For
> > > > > additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for
Six
> > > > Months"
> > > > > elsewhere on the AWE news page.)
> > > > >

> > > > >
> > > > > "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@porkbutt.net> wrote in message
> > > > > news:vmqshdfh78hr4b@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > > SHOW UP ON MY FREQUENCY AND I WILL RUN YOU OFF. HO HO
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:iO8bb.13$LJ5.2273@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@bigalk4oka.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > news:vmq5ars9c9i455@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > > > > > HO HO. SELL YOUR GEAR I DONT CARE. JUST STAY OFF OF 3.894.5.
> > THATS
> > > > > BIG
> > > > > > ALS
> > > > > > > FREQUENCY. HO HO. I'LL BE TAKING OVER 3.898 NEXT. HO HO
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT
> > SONG.
> > > > HO
> > > > > HO
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > If I choose to talk on that frequency, I will, so long as I'm
> > > abiding
> > > > > by
> > > > > > the
> > > > > > > rules and regulations as they are spelled out. YOU or no one
> else,
> > > can
> > > > > > tell
> > > > > > > me to stay off. ASS WIPE.
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > BIG AL.. the only thing big about you, is your mouth....
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > Lou
> > > > > > >
> > > >
> > > > Well Ass hole AL, looks like you've had your ass reamed out once,
> trying
> > > for
> > > > > seconds???? Something tells me, you're due for it.
> > > > > Lou
> > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > > Once? Boy are you out of touch.
> > >

> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > Not sure how the thread made it past my kill file, but to respond to
your
> > comment, I only went with what I was told and seen for myself as
witnessed
> > above.. IF there was more than one incident mentioned, then I didn't
> notice
> > in my speed read of the article.
> > But, if it's been more than once, then maybe it's time they show him
> they're
> > done playing games.
> > Lou
> >
> >
>
> Well first off, the reference violation above is long done with. He
spent
> his time in radio prison and returned to the HF bands. He has basically
> learned his lesson, this time. And has been a decent operator for
several
> years now.
>
> What I was refering to was he was removed from the radio voluntarily in
lieu
> of being fined a big chunk of bux back in the 70s. He stayed off the air
> for years. Returned as KJ4JX and began his crap again. He later got his
> original call back under the vanity system.
>
> He has been a QRMer for many years. BUT as stated above has finally seen
> the light.
>
> This crap you see here from "BIG AL" is BS.. And same for the "3894.5"
crap.
> Its just a troll.
>
> But I wanted to set the record straight.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

5246. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 02:09:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309231809.6d6186ab@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78565

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bkqcdd$n0e$0@208.206.142.83>...
> On 23 Sep 2003 04:00:56 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
> >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:<bkocja$g21$0@208.206.142.110>...
> >> Brian wrote:
> >>
> >> >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<6BIbb.63583$NM1.20271@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >>I'll tell you this Jim...the Ruskies had and probably still do have the best
> >> >>CW operators in the world.
> >> >>
> >> >>I used to have to listen to them a lot in a job I had. Amazing how so many
> >> >>of them sounded like the hams on 20meters...hi.
> >> >>
> >> >>Dan/W4NTI
> >> >>
> >> >>
> >> >
> >> >And the ones that washed out of CW school? The Gulag?
> >> >
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> Only you and a few like you washed out.
> >
> >Poor DICK. I was never in a Russian dittybopper school.
> >
> >> Russian military, as our own,
> >> don't.
> >
> >Poor DICK. I was never in a US dittybopper school.
> >
> >> When one is sitting trying to learn code, realizing that if you "just
> >> can't" then
> >> it.s off to the infantry, the failure rate is unsurprisingly low to
> >> nonexistant.
> >
> >Poor DICK. I'm sure the failure rate was quite high. Why the big
> >rush to RTTY and other modes which don't require the operator to be a

> >human modem?
>
> Poor BRICKBrain...you're sure of quite a number of incorrect "facts".

Dispute them, if you can.

> >Perhaps Len could shed some light on this.
>
> Ah, you look to you your clueless mentor for support yet once more.
> Just as though he actually knew anything about the subject.

Len attended and graduated from a military communications school. Why
would he not be familiar with the washout rate for dittybopper school?

> Two peas in a plod. Yes, a plod.

Poor DICK, doesn't know his vegetables either.

5247. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 02:13:19 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <357cb.3805$Hd6.1719288@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78568

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:E15cb.3008$iT4.2206878@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> WA8ULX wrote:
>
> >>You're mistaken, Dwight.
> >>
> >>According to qrz.com, he's 305 years old.
> >>
> >>73 de Jim, N2EY
> >>
> >
> >
> > And dont ever forget it. Im the one who taught Marconi. Last person I
have ever
> > Elmered.
>
> I like Marconi and Cheese!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

GROAN! Fifty lashes with a wet noodle for that one.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5248. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 02:14:06 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309231814.f8fbe4e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78567

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<502cb.2332$ai7.1086@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309230300.30cdb38c@posting.google.com...
> > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:<bkocja$g21$0@208.206.142.110>...
> > > Brian wrote:
> > >
> > > >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<6BIbb.63583$NM1.20271@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >>I'll tell you this Jim...the Ruskies had and probably still do have
> the best
> > > >>CW operators in the world.
> > > >>
> > > >>I used to have to listen to them a lot in a job I had. Amazing how
> so many
> > > >>of them sounded like the hams on 20meters...hi.
> > > >>
> > > >>Dan/W4NTI
> > > >>
> > > >>
> > > >
> > > >And the ones that washed out of CW school? The Gulag?
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > Only you and a few like you washed out.
> >
> > Poor DICK. I was never in a Russian dittybopper school.
> >
> > > Russian military, as our own,
> > > don't.
> >
> > Poor DICK. I was never in a US dittybopper school.
> >
> > > When one is sitting trying to learn code, realizing that if you "just
> > > can't" then
> > > it.s off to the infantry, the failure rate is unsurprisingly low to
> > > nonexistant.
> >

> > Poor DICK. I'm sure the failure rate was quite high. Why the big
> > rush to RTTY and other modes which don't require the operator to be a
> > human modem?
>
> Because RTTY could be run in the 'secure', or 'green' mode.

CW can be coded as well. As long as everyone's o the same "page"
should work OK. Authenticate.

And RATT was
> more capable of sending LARGE volumes of messages.

Tell me about the error rate, too.

Due mainly to the
> untrained CW operators in the US Military at the time you are referencing.

So the Amateur Radio Service didn't act as a pool of trained operators
for the military?

> Ten groups a minute is all that was required of a O5C MOS back then.
>
> Dan/W4NTI

Kind of negates many of the arguments for forcing people to test for
code, doesn't it?

5249. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 02:14:38 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <i67cb.3806$Hd6.1719781@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78569

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:ec5cb.3020$iT4.2210228@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Brian wrote:
>
>
> > And the ones that washed out of CW school? The Gulag?
>
> I like Hungarian Gulag!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Looks like adult beverages on the menu tonite. LOL but still a groaner.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5250. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 02:21:47 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309231821.2b4365aa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78570

"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message news:<bkohv3qvo1@208.206.142.83>...

> I guess Clint also doesn't understand the admonition to "Never argue
> with an idiot".
> Or Iit isn't nice to engage in a battle of wits with unarmed persons".

So Leo doesn't have any arms?

I'm waiting for Dann Finn to come on here and chew you out for making
fun of the disabled.

5251. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoless

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 02:26:27 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <nh7cb.3094$iT4.2248371@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 78571

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:E15cb.3008$iT4.2206878@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>WA8ULX wrote:
>>
>>
>>>>You're mistaken, Dwight.
>>>>
>>>>According to qrz.com, he's 305 years old.
>>>>
>>>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>And dont ever forget it. Im the one who taught Marconi. Last person I
>
> have ever
>
>>>Elmered.
>>
>>I like Marconi and Cheese!
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> GROAN! Fifty lashes with a wet noodle for that one.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Sorry Dee, it's this darn cold and the sudafed!

- Mike KB3EIA -

5252. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 02:27:01 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030923222701.17694.00000075@mb-m02.aol.com>
Source record: 78572

>Does that mean you'll quit trying to convince me that you're not a liar?
>

On this subject Im not a Liar, why does it bug you so much that I could do what I did. Is because you cant Memorize a few simple answers. Or would you prefer to wait for the Next handout, so you can pretend to be a real Ham?

5253. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 02:32:14 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkqvn9$511fl$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78573

"Clint" wrote ...

Oh yes.... definitely. I do wonder, however, how one is suppose to immediately ascertain the difference when one is only reading a mere NG post.

Whenever there is doubt, it would seem logical to do a small search prior to writing a reply. A very quick search on Google and you would know that Dee talks about her husband from time to time. Problem solved.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5254. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 02:50:12 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ED7cb.3822$Hd6.1727104@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78574

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bkqvn9$511fl$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Clint" wrote ...
>
> Oh yes.... definitely. I do wonder, however, how one is suppose to
> immediately ascertain the difference when one is only reading a mere NG
> post.
> ----------
>
> Whenever there is doubt, it would seem logical to do a small search prior
to
> writing a reply. A very quick search on Google and you would know that
Dee
> talks about her husband from time to time. Problem solved.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
>

Plus one should never assume especially when the poster has a non-gender
specific name such as mine.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5255. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 03:18:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923231817.07578.00000756@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78575

In article <Ca5cb.3016$iT4.2209705@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>
> Not that I don't make mistakes, but I don't come into newsgroups acting

>as if I know everything either! 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike:

Me neither. That's something I usually leave to the NCTA's.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5256. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 03:18:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923231817.07578.00000757@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78582

In article <sl5cb.3031$iT4.2212731@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> Especially if there is that beer and barbaque involved as well! :)
>
>I am liking the idea of a rrap meet at Dayton. If it isn't as muddy as
>this past year, we could tailgate!
>
>I bid for Yuengling Lager, Genny Red, or if we can get a designated
>driver, Unibroue Maudite! And Ribs and Chicken, or cow on the cob.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike:

Considering the infamous vagaries in the WX at Dayton that time of
year, I think an indoor venue would be best. A restaurant with a good-
sized banquet room would probably be best, since then everyone
could eat and drink whatever they wanted. Is anyone familiar enough
with the facilities available in the Dayton area to make any suggestions?

73 de Larry, K3LT

5257. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 03:18:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923231818.07578.00000759@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78576

In article <bkpabu$tvu@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> writes:

>I am not in least bit curious about the majority of people in this
>newsgroup. Most of all, those mentioned above.
>
>Kim W5TIT

OK, Kim, have it your way. However, if rrap does manage to get together at Dayton '04, you will definitely be missed. If you change your mind, you will be welcome to join us!

73 de Larry, K3LT

5258. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 03:18:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923231818.07578.00000758@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78580

In article <bkpe26$4conv$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>
>Especially if there is that beer and barbaque involved as well! :)

Ryan:

We'll see how many people we can get to commit to being there. As I
already said, I won't know until the vacation bids are done at the end
of the year. However, considering that Dayton usually falls during a
time of the year that is relatively free of other holidays, it should be
quite doable for me. I'm going to start looking in to a hotel reservation
in a place with a party/conference room big enough to hold us, unless
someone else already has done so and can arrange for the venue.
Let's keep this on the back burner, but with the heat turned up a bit.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5259. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 03:18:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923231819.07578.00000761@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78578

In article <f45722ac.0309231354.3e314559@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Keith:
>>
>> I bought the DVD. Actually, it was a Winchester .270 cal. bolt-action
>> rifle.
>
>My father has a .270 Win and it's a nice rifle. Wish I got one for
>opening a bank account. Wished I lived in Colorado, too.

Brian:

Ah, yes, Colorado. Beautiful country. However, with urban sprawl
happening everywhere in the state, and California-style liberal politics
gaining a foothold, with the high taxes that go with it, it's not exactly
a place I'd like to live anymore. It may be OK for now, but it is
going downhill faster than a bobsled.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5260. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 03:18:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923231819.07578.00000760@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78579

In article <20030923063009.21642.00001128@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>>If we eliminate the code testing requirement, we therefore
>>demonstrate that basic communications skills are no longer
>>necessary to be a licensed amateur radio operator. I, for one,
>>would like to think that the present syllabus of the written tests
>>still represents "basic communications skills." So, which will
>>it be? Code testing, written testing, both, or neither?
>>
>I think Clint has already said he only sees a need for regs and safety
>testing.
>
>
>There's "the future".

Jim:

Like it or not, we're definitely heading in that direction. I'd like to think
it's possible to hold the line somewhere, but in light of the fact that
abolition of the code testing requirement is almost a sure thing, the
rest of the dominoes will surely fall shortly thereafter. Once they do,
we'll most likely experience a major loss of spectrum allocations in
the ARS. Ironically, that will surely happen in the regions above
500 MHz, where there hasn't been any code testing at all for over
a decade.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5261. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 03:18:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923231820.07578.00000762@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78581

In article <5dqvmv0n4a305dpv6ous80n2262cs1nmdg@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
<kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> writes:

>>Dwight:
>>
>>Well, I'm glad I finally got your attention directed toward reality. If the
>>Morse code isn't relevant to any communications service outside the
>>ARS, then the fact that the commercial and military services have
>>stopped using it isn't relevant or responsive to the issue of code testing
>>withing the ARS.
>
>Sure it is. Part of the basis and purpose of the ARS as specified in
>Part 97 is to develop a pool of trained radio operators. Since nobody
>else uses CW anymore, it is no longer necessary to develop pools of
>Morse-trained radio operators.

Did you see that everybody? "...nobody uses CW anymore." Yup,
he REALLY said that!

Do me a favor, John, and tell that to K2RSK next time you see him!

>>The Morse/CW mode remains as a valuable, basic communications
>>tool within the ARS, and the code testing requirement is current and
>>essential to the continued use of this mode. End of story.
>
>Hmmm...
>
>Valuable? In some respects, perhaps. It does have its advantages,
>although it also has its disadvantages.

Whaaaaat? I thought you just said "...nobody uses CW anymore."
Well, anyway, please enumerate all the "disadvantages" of the
Morse/CW mode.

>Basic? I'm not too sure of that. It was once upon a time. I'm inclined
>to think that time is either passed, or very close to it. I don't know
>what percentage of hams is sufficiently skilled with the mode to
>actually use it for on-air contacts, but surely the percentage must be
>shrinking daily.

And just exactly what do you think is causing that, John?

>As for the code testing requirement being essential to the continued
>use of the mode - if that's the case, then the patient is already
>brain dead and being kept alive through purely artificial means, and
>will expire anyway as soon as somebody pulls the plug, either
>accidentally or deliberately. The question then becomes, for how long

>do we prolong the inevitable, and for what purpose?

I'm not suggesting that we pull the plug. I'm suggesting that we use a well-known cure and allow the patient to recover.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5262. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 03:18:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030923231821.07578.00000763@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78577

In article <0g21nvogafrl9boqvp91s6vhfkcsvd7h1s@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
<kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> writes:

>>Don't look now, Clint, but welfare programs are "handouts" that give
>>away valuable assets as if the recipient were entitled to them simply
>>by virtue of being there with his/her hand out.
>
>Correct. Therefore, code testing isn't a welfare program, it's a
>government-subsidized life-support system for an anachronism.
>
>73 DE John, KC2HMZ
>Tonawanda, New York

Well, that's YOUR opinion, John. Thanks for sharing it with us.
You have a right to be wrong.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5263. AY YI YI YI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 03:19:18 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn1oo7r7milo86@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78544
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

CALL THE FCC ON ME

AY YI YI YI CALL THE FCC ON ME

YOU BUNCH OF LIMP ONES

5264. FRANKY kE3KO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 03:19:36 UTC
From: "BIG.AL" <BIG.AL@3894.NET>
Message-ID: <vn0p8h8ddnbob8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78659
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

TELL THEM ARKANSAS BOYS THAT MINE IS BIGGER! Ho hO

TALK TO YOU AND JIMO TONITE.

5265. SHOW ME YOUR LITTLE ONE AND I'LL SHOW YOU MY BIG ONE BOY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 03:24:55 UTC
From: BIG AL <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
Message-ID: <vn07rpnvkjh12c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78633
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew, rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

THIS IS K4OKA THE CARING STATION. HO HO

STOP PLAYING WITH YOURSELF BOY.

HO HO

5266. PORKBUTT PORKBUTT PORKBUTT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 03:27:31 UTC
From: BIG AL <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
Message-ID: <vn080m13ld4oa1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78634
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.

3894.5 IS MINE. STAY AWAY.

5267. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 04:06:39 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <jL8cb.4273$ai7.3468@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78583

"Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
> Gotta hand it to you, Dwight. Not everyone
> can take few wild statements, mold them into
> assumptions, then in the same paragraph,
> change it all into "facts". But you manage that
> with the ease of someone who writes bafflegab
> for the Guv'mint.

What do you expect, Dick? After all, I worked for the government for several decades. :)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5268. Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 04:14:06 UTC
From: BIGAL <BIGAL@75meters.net>
Message-ID: <vn0se9eu9t81fc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78665
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

AY YI YI AY YI YI CALL THE FCC. AY YI YI AY YI YI CALL THE FCC.

YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG......

MINE IS BIGGER BOY.

HO HO

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:jso0nv48g2r6daedgpidc966uab2a3h2jv@4ax.com...
> Well, it's pretty unlikely that the guy who got busted for this back
> in 1999 is doing this, unless he's incredibly stupid. The headers on
> his newsgroup postings point right back to his pesonal account on
> Supernews, and the FCC could subpoena his user info and usenet usage
> logs from Supernews in a flash if illegal activity is involved.
>
> More likely, it's some troll who heard about the "Porkbutt" story, and
> is having some fun stirring the pot a bit. If he really is creating
> interference on 3894.5 and bragging about it here, however, he could
> get a guest shot on "America's Dumbest Criminals" for this one -
> should the FCC get a copy of this somehow.... :)
>
> 73, Leo
>
> PS - For your review, the message headers are posted below:
>
> From: "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
> Newsgroups:
>
alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx
,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: Re: BIG AL AND FRANKY
> Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:22:57 -0400
> Organization: Posted via Supernews, http://www.supernews.com
> Message-ID: <vn047eanujppea@corp.supernews.com>
> Reply-To: "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com>
> References: <vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com>
> <vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com>
> X-Priority: 3
> X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
> X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
> X-Complaints-To: abuse@supernews.com
> Lines: 74

> Xref: cyclone01.bloor.is.net.cable.rogers.com alt.ham-radio.ssb:394
> alt.radio.amateur:1584 rec.radio.amateur.dx:6821
> rec.radio.amateur.misc:23591 rec.radio.amateur.policy:54076
> X-Received-Date: Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:37:11 EDT
>
>
>
> On Tue, 23 Sep 2003 05:22:57 -0400, "BIG AL"
> <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote:
>
> >OLD NEWS BOY.
> >
> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
SONG.
> >
> >WHATS A MATTER THERE BOY SCARED THAT MINE IS BIGGER THAN YOURS. HO HO
> >
> >FRANK SEE YOU TONITE AT 7 ON 39845. BE THERE HO HO
> >
> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
SONG.
> >
> >
> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
SONG.
> >
> >
> >AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT
SONG.
> >
> >
> >BYE
> >
> >
> >"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
> >news:vmv7p6ngniin6d@corp.supernews.com...
> >> This is a little out of date, but should give a little background info
for
> >> those who are unfamiliar with "BIG AL"...
> >>
> >> HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A. Abernethy,
> >> K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit operation below
30
> >> MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the action,
> >> Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC letter
> >> included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by complainants--of
> >> transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16.
> >Hollingsworth's
> >> letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate interference on
> >3.965

> >> MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH, noted
that
> >> Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the time his
> >> station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to protest
the
> >> sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21 and 22
in
> >> the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints from
other
> >> amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said, the FCC
had
> >> received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity, deliberate
> >> interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints to the
> >FCC
> >> alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt Song,"
the
> >> letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate
interference."
> >> Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding Center in
> >> Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to K4OKA. The
> >FCC
> >> letter also said the Commission had received complaints that Abernethy
had
> >> used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of interference" on
or
> >> near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about
over-power
> >> operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start
> >revocation
> >> proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of continued
> >> violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter. (For
> >> additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for Six
> >Months"
> >> elsewhere on the AWE news page.)
> >>
> >> 73 de KG6SGY
> >>
> >> "BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
> >> news:vmv5r2p3qa30c0@corp.supernews.com...
> >> > WE KEPT THE QRMERS OFF 3.894.5 AGAIN TONITE WITH OUR BIG ONES. WE
REIGN
> >AS
> >> > KINGS OF 75. HO HO
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >> >
> >>
> >>
> >

>

5269. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 04:29:25 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <F49cb.4377$ai7.1473@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78584

"Dee D. Flint" wrote:
>
> Regardless of one's stance on the code, reviewing
> the history of the FCC shows that they are NOT
> necessarily concerned with what's best for the ARS.
> If they were, BPL would never have gotten as far
> as it has.

Let me put it another way. I think the FCC is concerned about the best interests of the ARS, within the confines of reality. We have to remember the ARS is not the only pot on the stove - the FCC deals with many other services and has to balance the needs of each service against the others (and that includes the ARS). That means we're not always going to exactly what we want, exactly when and how we want it. But that certainly doesn't mean the FCC is not concerned with the best interests of the ARS or, as some have suggested, has an agenda against it. We have a massive amount of frequencies to play with. We have more modes to play with than most radio services. We have more freedoms (to build or modify out own equipment and so on) than most radio services. When you look at the whole picture, it's fairly hard to complain too much.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5270. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 04:30:24 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkr6l0ctn0@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 78585

Larry Roll K3LT wrote:

> In article <20030923063009.21642.00001128@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
>
>>>If we eliminate the code testing requirement, we therefore
>>>demonstrate that basic communications skills are no longer
>>>necessary to be a licensed amateur radio operator. I, for one,
>>>would like to think that the present syllabus of the written tests
>>>still represents "basic communications skills." So, which will
>>>it be? Code testing, written testing, both, or neither?
>>>
>>
>>I think Clint has already said he only sees a need for regs and safety
>>testing.
>>
>>
>>There's "the future".
>
>
> Jim:
>
> Like it or not, we're definitely heading in that direction. I'd like to think
> it's possible to hold the line somewhere, but in light of the fact that
> abolition of the code testing requirement is almost a sure thing, the
> rest of the dominoes will surely fall shortly thereafter. Once they do,
> we'll most likely experience a major loss of spectrum allocations in
> the ARS. Ironically, that will surely happen in the regions above
> 500 MHz, where there hasn't been any code testing at all for over
> a decade.
>

Don't forget BPL and all that goes with. Just because Cmsr Powell may
leave doesn't mean it goes too. The less ham radio is percieved to have
full value the less important it is to protect it and where it lives.

Dick

5271. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 04:34:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkr6s2ctn1@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 78586

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Dick Carroll;" wrote:
>
>> Gotta hand it to you, Dwight. Not everyone
>>can take few wild statements, mold them into
>>assumptions, then in the same paragraph,
>>change it all into "facts". But you manage that
>>with the ease of someone who writes bafflegab
>>for the Guv'mint.
>
>
>
> What do you expect, Dick? After all, I worked for the government for
> several decades. :)
>
>

Case reated!
>

5272. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 04:36:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkr6vvctn2@208.206.142.79>
Source record: 78587

Dwight Stewart wrote:

I think the FCC is concerned about the best
> interests of the ARS, within the confines of reality.

Maybe, but if you don't believe that very "reality" is a fast moving
target you just haven't been paying proper attention for many years.

5273. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 04:48:13 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bks56h$5715v$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78718

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030923013414.12631.00001336@mb-m28.aol.com...
> In article <ZkJbb.7038$yp6.116603@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
> >However, the requirements for licensure should be reasonable
> >and rational, and while the written tests meet that criteria, the
> >requirement for Morse proficiency no longer does.
> >
> >Carl - wk3c
>
> Carl:
>
> Jim, N2EY, just said, in so many words, that since today's amateur
> radio equipment can no longer be designed, built, or serviced by
> any but the tiny handful of hams who possess professional-grade
> technical knowledge, skill, and facilities, that most of the technical
> knowledge in the present written tests can also be eliminated as
> a licensing requirement. I totally agree. In what way is it
> "reasonable and rational" for someone to know Ohm's Law or
> even the most basic digital theory, if they'll never have to use it
> in their actual practice as a radio amateur? I say it isn't, and
> nothing could prove this better than eliminating the code testing
> requirements for the same reason. After all, code testing has
> the effect of exposing prospective radio amateurs to what is
> always going to be a practical and useful communications tool
> which allows radio amateurs to practice basic radio
> communication with only entry-level skill and technology.

I would not necessarily totally agree with that statement as even though I
am not a master electronics tech, I still can debug a problem with a few
basic pieces of equipment and a schematic. Also, the
electronics/electricity knowledge is important in dealing with alot of
different things in amateur radio, not just "debugging" a Icom 706 (or other
radio) radio problem.

>
> If we eliminate the code testing requirement, we therefore
> demonstrate that basic communications skills are no longer
> necessary to be a licensed amateur radio operator. I, for one,
> would like to think that the present syllabus of the written tests
> still represents "basic communications skills." So, which will
> it be? Code testing, written testing, both, or neither?
>

I personally believe that the written tests need to be more stringent, as most of the tests I have had to take were definitely more than 35-50 questions, more like 100-250 range. As far as the question pool, I have no problem with the questions themselves being released, but the answers shouldn't. At least if the question pool (questions only) was that way, it would encourage people to research the correct answer. That is what I did as a final study tool, after reading and re-reading many times..... They could also incorporate "scenario" questions as well.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

5274. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 04:52:54 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bks56i$5715v$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78719

I would love to, but my employer mandates that everyone work that weekend,
no exceptions, and since my employer and the Dayton committee will not budge
on the date that kinda rules me out. Any other dates??

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> Not only that, but it might take us quite a while to even get around to
> a discussion of code testing, if we ever did!
>
> Anyone interested in an rrap get-together during Dayton '04? I don't get
> to bid on my vacation time until the end of the year, but it could very
> well be "doable" for me, since starting next week, I'll finally have the
> weekends off on a permanent basis.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

5275. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 05:04:29 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bks56j$5715v$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78720
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.policy

> Well, that's pretty sad. I guess you're overlooking the fact that a
person's
> online "personality" can be quite different than what one would experience
> in person, since the written word, particularly in a virtually immediate
forum
> such as Usenet, is, indeed, quite impersonal by nature. Moreover, your
> expression of a lack of desire to meet with certain members of this forum
> could cause all the rest, even those not included on your list, to not
wish
> to meet with you.

All we are here is merely a typeset or font! Until I either talk to the person in person, on the phone or over the air, all of these people here are merely fictional characters in my book. No way to really prove it is even them posting for that matter, and I take most negative comments with a grain of salt in that matter. To me it is purely entertainment, with the rare, occasional educational value to it.

>
> I would jump at any chance to meet any and all of the regulars in this
> newsgroup, for no better reason than to see what they are really like in
> person. I think that even Len Anderson could prove to be a quite affable
> chap, given a chance to get to know him better. I may be wrong, but
> at least I'm willing to take that chance. I would like to think that
given
> the opportunity, your curiosity would ultimately get the upper hand over
> your stated objections. If not, one could quite legitimately call your
> character into question, at a level far deeper than anything ever said
> in this forum.
>

I would agree as well, because after sitting down and actually chatting with all of these people, we might actually find out that some of these people are not really as bad as we think. At least we then could say we actually "have gotten to know" each other and not just see them for the way in which they communicate here, which may not necessarily be the way they are in person. Can you imagine that even Brucie might actually be a decent person in real life? Hell, anything is possible.

I had another idea, of which I thought would be cool..... Since we all need to practice on message handling/sending, I think it would be cool to get some type of message traffic going with RRAP people as the participants. The only problem I have is, with sending message traffic, everything I have learned from "old school" hams is that you MUST have a phone number included

with the message traffic. I personally do not wish to have my number go through the system which now is a cellphone number, as opposed to a landline number. Am I wrong in my information that within a messagegram that you MUST include a phone number????

If I am not wrong, anyone feel like sharing traffic ?? Send your interest and contact info that you wish to use to my email address of kc8pmxNO JUNK OR SPAM@diamondcs.net (remove the NO JUNK OR SPAM to reply.) I definitely can always use the practice, and what the hell, it might actually be fun!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

5276. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 05:06:46 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bks56l$5715v$8@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78721

I would love to, but as long as I am with my current employer, Dayton is
pretty much out for me, as explained in a different posting to Larry here.

Nothing like good ole grill cookin' !

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:sl5cb.3031$iT4.2212731@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Ryan, KC8PMX wrote:
>
> > Especially if there is that beer and barbaque involved as well! :)
>
> I am liking the idea of a rrap meet at Dayton. If it isn't as muddy as
> this past year, we could tailgate!
>
> I bid for Yuengling Lager, Genny Red, or if we can get a designated
> driver, Unibroue Maudite! And Ribs and Chicken, or cow on the cob.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

5277. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 05:12:16 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <QI9cb.4532$ai7.4487@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78588

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> I hate to sound like a scratched CD, but that reply
> is unresponsive. (snip)

Well, Larry, that reply is all you're going to get because that reply is the only truthful response to the issues you raised.

> It most certainly is, if the ARS wishes to continue to
> develop radio operators capable of exploiting the
> many benefits and advantages of the Morse/CW
> mode. (snip)

And why would the ARS wish to continue to specifically develop radio operators capable of using code? What benefit does it offer? Not what it offers you, but what benefit does it offer to the ARS (here is your opportunity to show your position is not just self-serving)? How are the goals and purposes of the ARS served by continued skill testing of this one operating mode? How will this (code skill testing) help to keep the ARS abreast of modern technology, insuring our continued value to others? How will this help move the ARS into the future (where we should be mainly focused)?

> (snip) As already stated by N2EY, this particular logic
> could then be applied to (snip)

Already addressed in my response to N2EY.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5278. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 05:16:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <IM9cb.4536$ai7.4023@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78589

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> Radio Amateur KC2HMZ writes:
>> Sure it is. Part of the basis and purpose of the ARS
>> as specified in Part 97 is to develop a pool of trained
>> radio operators. Since nobody else uses CW anymore,
>> it is no longer necessary to develop pools of Morse-
>> trained radio operators.
>
> Did you see that everybody? "...nobody uses CW anymore."
> Yup, he REALLY said that!

No, Larry, he didn't say that. You misquoted him. He said, "...nobody ELSE uses CW..."

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5279. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 05:23:22 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <eT9cb.4543$ai7.1084@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78590

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> OK, fine. Now, then, precisely which OTHER radio
> services currently require Morse code testing???

Already answered, Larry. I have no desire to talk in circles, repeating everything I say because you fail to understand it the first time. And I also have no desire to participate in your attempts to twist this (other services and code testing) into something that doesn't fit the reality of history or the truth.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5280. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 05:26:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <pW9cb.4549$ai7.1130@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78591

"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>
> OIC. So, you can't answer the question, then.

No, I've already answered the question and don't intend to waste time doing so again. If your memory is really that bad, do a Google search for our past discussion about this.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5281. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 05:37:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <f4acb.4573$ai7.829@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78592

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" wrote:
>
> So, I agree with you that we may well be better off,
> from the standpoint of preserving the use of the mode
> within the hobby, to remove the testing requirement
> and allow the mode to stand on its own merits. If
> someone asks, "Why should I learn Morse code?" the
> answer right now is basically, "You have to in order to
> get the license." And the reaction is basically, "Screw
> that, I'll just find another hobby."
>
> Lose that, and we have "Because sometimes a CW
> signal will get through when a voice signal won't, and
> because Morse contacts in a contest are worth more
> points, and because some operators enjoy it so much
> that (snip)

It's basic human psychology. We tend to resist the expected and enjoy self discoveries. And this is especially true when it comes to recreation.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5282. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 05:47:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Tdacb.4602$ai7.3732@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78593

"WA8ULX" wrote:
>
> you dont fill it in QRZ fills it in.

Go to the QRZ.com web site and choose the option to update your personal information. There is a form you can fill in with your personal information (with instructions on how to change the birth date).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5283. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 05:50:15 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <rgacb.4613$ai7.3402@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78594

"Mike Coslo" wrote:
>
> I like Marconi and Cheese!

Mike, you're obviously taking too much cold medicine. Cut back on the dosage just a LITTLE bit. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5284. Re: BPL: 1st Experimental License Issued

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 07:47:29 UTC
From: Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bkri6i$50fsk$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78595

"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
news:wL98b.49840$3b2.5793786@twister.neo.rr.com...
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030911183717.07383.00001051@mb-m27.aol.com...
> > >WD2XEQ AMBIENT CORPORATION 0118-EX-PL-2003
> > >
> > >New experimental to operate in 1.7-88 MHz for testing power line
carrier
> > >systems. Fixed: States of NY and MA
> >
> > Its about time.
>
> Might as well, NCI and the ARRL are working on giving licenses to the
> retarded masses anyway.

Sorry, but you got it the wrong way around. 'Old' Class A-amateurs (HF)
don't even know what BPL is. They are (in your terms) the 'retarded masses'.
Modern Class 'B' amateurs (technically very proficient) know what BPL is and
that also the > 30 MHz bands are to be protected.

Not that I am not interested in HF though! All amateur bands need to be
protected.

Stating that BPL does not matter anymore because no-coders are allowed to
operate on HF as well, means that you don't care about radio amateurism.
Otherwise, you'd better fight hard to keep no-coders of the HF-bands instead
of complaining about them when they do enter the HF-bands.

If you really feel that the HF bands are 'lost' because of no-coders
entering them, please give up your HF-licence and move on to another hobby.
You lost your perspective on radio amateurism.

73 de Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD

5285. Re: 3.894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 09:25:05 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn2ongovmmqva8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78596
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

WOULD YOU LIKE SOME CHEESE TO GO WITH THAT WHINE BOY.

HO HO

"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message
news:vn1v5ud4v57a02@corp.supernews.com...
> Yeah, if you look at some of the other Big-Al threads you'll see that
we've
> decided he's not for real.
> Now we're trying to get him for violations of Supernews's policy. Write to
> abuse@supernews.com and attach segments of his posts. Maybe then he'll
have
> to post directly...
>
> -KG6SGY
>
>
>
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:lU4cb.2991$ai7.362@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> > news:xb3cb.87$LJ5.6464@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> > > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > > news:842cb.2349$ai7.1102@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > >
> > > > "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:Q7Nbb.51$LJ5.4366@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > "Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in
> message
> > > > > news:vmv6j3kfrkpv64@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > > HICKORY, NC [UPDATE]: The FCC wrote General licensee John A.
> > > Abernethy,
> > > > > > K4OKA, July 27, 1999, modifying his license to prohibit
operation
> > > below
> > > > > 30
> > > > > > MHz for 180 days, effective immediately. Unless he appeals the
> > action,
> > > > > > Abernethy may not get back on HF until January 22, 2000. The FCC
> > > letter
> > > > > > included a copy of a tape recording--supplied by

complainants--of
> > > > > > transmissions said to be of Abernethy's station on July 16.
> > > > > Hollingsworth's
> > > > > > letter described the tape as "consisting of deliberate
> interference
> > on
> > > > > > 3.965
> > > > > > MHz." In the letter, FCC Attorney Riley Hollingsworth, K4ZDH,
> noted
> > > that
> > > > > > Abernethy had been warned about deliberate interference at the
> time
> > > his
> > > > > > station was inspected last January. Abernethy has 30 days to
> protest
> > > the
> > > > > > sanction. FCC personnel inspected Abernethy's station January 21
> and
> > > 22
> > > > > in
> > > > > > the wake of what Hollingsworth called "longstanding complaints
> from
> > > > other
> > > > > > amateurs and from our field offices." In particular, he said,
the
> > FCC
> > > > had
> > > > > > received "numerous complaints" about profanity, obscenity,
> > deliberate
> > > > > > interference, and failure to properly identify. Other complaints
> to
> > > the
> > > > > > FCC
> > > > > > alleged that Abernethy had aired something called the "Porkbutt
> > Song,"
> > > > the
> > > > > > letter said, "for the purpose of harassment or deliberate
> > > interference."
> > > > > > Hollingsworth said the FCC's High Frequency Direction Finding
> Center
> > > in
> > > > > > Maryland tracked the transmissions of the "Porkbutt Song" to
> K4OKA.
> > > The
> > > > > > FCC
> > > > > > letter also said the Commission had received complaints that
> > Abernethy
> > > > had
> > > > > > used AM and upper sideband on 75 "for the purpose of
interference"

> > on
> > > or
> > > > > > near 3894.5 kHz. Abernethy also was warned in the letter about
> > > > over-power
> > > > > > operation. Hollingsworth said that the FCC has no plans to start
> > > > > revocation
> > > > > > proceedings against Abernethy "unless we have evidence of
> continued
> > > > > > violations" of the type the FCC described in its July 27 letter.
> > (For
> > > > > > additional details, see "FCC Takes North Carolina Ham off HF for
> Six
> > > > > Months"
> > > > > > elsewhere on the AWE news page.)
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@porkbutt.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > news:vmqshdfh78hr4b@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > > > SHOW UP ON MY FREQUENCY AND I WILL RUN YOU OFF. HO HO
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > >
> > > > > > > "Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
> > > > > > > news:iO8bb.13$LJ5.2273@iad-read.news.verio.net...
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > "BIG AL" <imafuckingwindbag@bigalk4oka.net> wrote in message
> > > > > > > > news:vmq5ars9c9i455@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > > > > > > HO HO. SELL YOUR GEAR I DONT CARE. JUST STAY OFF OF
3.894.5.
> > > THATS
> > > > > > BIG
> > > > > > > > ALS
> > > > > > > > > FREQUENCY. HO HO. I'LL BE TAKING OVER 3.898 NEXT. HO HO
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > AY YI YI IT'S THE PORKBUTT SONG. AY YI YI IT'S THE
PORKBUTT
> > > SONG.
> > > > > HO
> > > > > > > HO
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > If I choose to talk on that frequency, I will, so long as
I'm
> > > > abiding
> > > > > > by
> > > > > > > > the
> > > > > > > > > rules and regulations as they are spelled out. YOU or no one
> > else,
> > > > > can

> > > > > > > tell
> > > > > > > > > me to stay off. ASS WIPE.
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > BIG AL.. the only thing big about you, is your mouth....
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > > > > > Lou
> > > > > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > > > Well Ass hole AL, looks like you've had your ass reamed out once,
> > trying
> > > > > > for
> > > > > > seconds???? Something tells me, you're due for it.
> > > > > > Lou
> > > > > >
> > > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > Once? Boy are you out of touch.
> > > > >
> > > > > Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >
> > > Not sure how the thread made it past my kill file, but to respond to
> your
> > > comment, I only went with what I was told and seen for myself as
> witnessed
> > > above.. IF there was more than one incident mentioned, then I didn't
> > notice
> > > in my speed read of the article.
> > > But, if it's been more than once, then maybe it's time they show him
> > they're
> > > done playing games.
> > > Lou
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Well first off, the reference violation above is long done with. He
> spent
> > his time in radio prison and returned to the HF bands. He has basically
> > learned his lesson, this time. And has been a decent operator for
> several
> > years now.
> >
> > What I was refering to was he was removed from the radio voluntarily in
> lieu
> > of being fined a big chunk of bux back in the 70s. He stayed off the
air
> > for years. Returned as KJ4JX and began his crap again. He later got
his
> > original call back under the vanity system.
> >
> > He has been a QRMer for many years. BUT as stated above has finally

seen
> > the light.
> >
> > This crap you see here from "BIG AL" is BS.. And same for the "3894.5"
> crap.
> > Its just a troll.
> >
> > But I wanted to set the record straight.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
>

5286. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 09:29:39 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkro2v$aq@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 78597

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:eT9cb.4543$ai7.1084@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
> >
> > OK, fine. Now, then, precisely which OTHER radio
> > services currently require Morse code testing???
>
>
> Already answered, Larry. I have no desire to talk in circles, repeating
> everything I say because you fail to understand it the first time. And I
> also have no desire to participate in your attempts to twist this (other
> services and code testing) into something that doesn't fit the reality of
> history or the truth.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

heh heh....tell 'im you'll get back to him when he has something intelligent
to say. I told Larry that a couple of weeks ago and, except to tell him I
wouldn't be the slightest bit interested in meeting him or most others in
this newsgroup, I've not posted a thing to him since. I just can't find the
"intelligent" part of his posts.

Kim W5TIT

5287. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 09:32:43 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkro8o$e18@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 78598

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:Tdacb.4602$ai7.3732@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "WA8ULX" wrote:
> >
> > you dont fill it in QRZ fills it in.
>
>
> Go to the QRZ.com web site and choose the option to update your personal
> information. There is a form you can fill in with your personal
information
> (with instructions on how to change the birth date).
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

ROFLMAO!!!! This is hilarious. The usual Extra-class nitwit-type CBPlus
ham telling "us" that we're the ones who don't have any sense or
intelligence and that "we're" dumbed down, while all the while demonstrating
their own ignorance...

Oh, I need that grin. Notice the time of day this is posted--I'm off to the
office already!!

Kim W5TIT

5288. AY YI YI AY YI YI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 09:32:59 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn2p6colsb5r12@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78599
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG. CALL THE FCC CALL THE INTERNET POLICE CALL YOUR MOTHER BIG AL DOESNT CARE. IM BIG AL WITH THE BIG ONE. GREG IS GOING TO SAVE THE WORLD. THANK YOU GREG FOR BEING SUCH A MAN. AY YI YI AY YI YI YES GREG IS A PORKBUTT TO.

5289. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 10:11:40 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309240211.6816f7f1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78703

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030923231819.07578.00000761@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0309231354.3e314559@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >> Keith:
> >>
> >> I bought the DVD. Actually, it was a Winchester .270 cal. bolt-action
> >> rifle.
> > >
> > >My father has a .270 Win and it's a nice rifle. Wish I got one for
> > >opening a bank account. Wished I lived in Colorado, too.
>
> Brian:
>
> Ah, yes, Colorado. Beautiful country. However, with urban sprawl
> happening everywhere in the state, and California-style liberal politics
> gaining a foothold, with the high taxes that go with it, it's not exactly
> a place I'd like to live anymore. It may be OK for now, but it is
> going downhill faster than a bobsled.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

My father was stationed at Ent AFB (now Olympic Training Center) in
1970. His last assignment. He was a Buckeye, but none of the rest of
us were. So when he got out, we moved to Ohio. I went to H.S. here
but left as soon as I could.

Ohio has urban sprawl, high crime, and high taxes, but no one seems to
notice.

Oh, yeh, we're a Republican state.

5290. Re: There are only 2 real reasons

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 10:27:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309240227.5a6ce1c6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78705

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030923222701.17694.00000075@mb-m02.aol.com>...
> >Does that mean you'll quit trying to convince me that you're not a liar?
> >
>
> On this subject Im not a Liar, why does it bug you so much that I could do what
> I did. Is because you cant Memorize a few simple answers.

Apparently you could. A whole bunch of them.

5291. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 10:43:55 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309240243.475aef0f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78706

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030923210119.07578.00000755@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> In article <RLIbb.63713$NM1.42393@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Wouldn't it be great if the next political appointee actually had some idea
> >of RF communications technology ?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Dan:
>
> Forgive my cynicism, but since when has practical knowledge and
> experience in a particular field of endeavor ever been a requirement
> to become a political appointee? Mr. Powell became FCC Chairman
> because he's a rare commodity in Washington politics: a black
> Republican. And, I guess, being Colin Powell's son didn't hurt much,
> either. Michael gave President Bush another way to pay off Secretary
> of State Powell for not running against him in the Presidential race,
> and add some "diversity" to his administration. A double-whammy.
> I just wonder what kind of new nightmare we'll get in Michael's place?
>
> Of course, in fairness to Chairman Powell, he does have a point about
> the political back stabbing. However, I guess that's what we get when
> we allow our government to be run mainly by career politicians who are
> all beholden to special interests. I believe that the only way to correct
> this situation is to never vote for an incumbent seeking his third or
> subsequent term in a non-term limited office.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Sounds like Wayne Greene's "Never Reelect Anyone" campaign. I've got
no problem with that.

5292. Re: I WILL BE ON TONITE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 10:45:12 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <YAecb.1546$r81.1023@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78707
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

"B I G A L" wrote in message
news:vn2s04gs8b49ec@corp.supernews.com...
> DO NOT COME MY FREQUENCY TONITE

Gee, what a moron. If the guy was a BoD member at TAPR or something like that, his behavior would be understandable.

After all, he has demonstrated that he lacks the intelligence and social skills necessary to operate on either usenet or ham radio...

Hey, Big Al: Can you give us the latest scoop on what's going on at TAPR? I've noticed that the newsletter is getting really sucky, kind of like the one at TPRS did, right before they went belly-up.

Tell us about it, Big Al!

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

5293. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 10:49:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309240249.711a3665@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78708

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030923063011.21642.00001129@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> In article <bkdiip$a9f$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:
>
> >"Clint" <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> wrote
> >
> >[re: transmitting a 6 mega-pixel image]
> >
> >> I never claimed you COULD send that with CW.
> >
> > Well, actually, you _could_. I don't have all the tech stuff handy
> >to determine just how large a 6 mega-pixel 24-bit color image would actually
> >_be_, so let's just call it a 6 megabyte file, making it, what, 48 million
> >bits? Now, how many bits in a 'word' of Morse, average? A dozen, maybe? So,
> >sending at, let's say, 20 wpm gives us a hypothetical bit-rate of 240
> >bits/min or 4 bits/sec, so we come out with a mere 12 million seconds to
> >transmit the image (I _swear_ I did not intend for that answer to come out
> >that simple!).
> > It would only take 138.88 days.....
> >
>
> Ah, but you forget an important step in the analysis!
>
> One picture is worth a thousand words. Therefore, the time required to send a
> "Morse picture" at 20 wpm is equal to 1,000/20 = 50 minutes with no
> compression.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

So get going with your grossly incomplete picture.

5294. Re: I WILL BE ON TONITE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 10:49:33 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn2tm6eokdkt8e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78709
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

I QUIT THEM MANY YEARS AGO. I THINK YOUR MOMMA IS NOW WRITING THE
NEWSLETTER. HO HO

"charlesb" wrote in message
news:YAecb.1546$r81.1023@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "B I G A L" wrote in message
> news:vn2s04gs8b49ec@corp.supernews.com...
> > DO NOT COME MY FREQUENCY TONITE
>
> Gee, what a moron. If the guy was a BoD member at TAPR or something like
> that, his behavior would be understandable.
>
> After all, he has demonstrated that he lacks the intelligence and social
> skills necessary to operate on either usenet or ham radio...
>
> Hey, Big Al: Can you give us the latest scoop on what's going on at TAPR?
> I've noticed that the newsletter is getting really sucky, kind of like the
> one at TPRS did, right before they went belly-up.
>
> Tell us about it, Big Al!
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>

5295. Re: I WILL BE ON TONITE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 10:54:23 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <zJecb.1547$1h1.184@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78710
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

"B I G A L" wrote in message
news:vn2tm6eokdkt8e@corp.supernews.com...
> I QUIT THEM MANY YEARS AGO. I THINK YOUR MOMMA IS NOW WRITING THE
> NEWSLETTER. HO HO
>

Yo mamma!

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

5296. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 11:34:39 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309240334.32d408e3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78711

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<QI9cb.4532$ai7.4487@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
>
> And why would the ARS wish to continue to specifically develop radio
> operators capable of using code?

Because the mode offers lots of advantages to radio amateurs.

> What benefit does it offer?

- Narrow bandwidth required
- Can be used with a wide variety of technologies
- Capable of both manual and machine generation and recognition
- excellent weak-signal performance
- QSK (near-duplex operation possible on a simplex channel)
- only popular non-voice "audio" mode (can you work PSK-31 while
driving?)
- usable by many disabled persons

> Not what it
> offers you, but what benefit does it offer to the ARS (here is your
> opportunity to show your position is not just self-serving)?

See above. That's the short list.

> How are the
> goals and purposes of the ARS served by continued skill testing of this one
> operating mode?

Introduces new hams to a mode with the advantages cited, just as
theory testing introduces new hams to radio technology.

> How will this (code skill testing) help to keep the ARS
> abreast of modern technology, insuring our continued value to others?

The mode can be successfully used with equipment of almost any level
of complexity, so that beginners can start off with simple equipment
and work their way up to advanced technologies. And have good
performance all along the path.

> How
> will this help move the ARS into the future (where we should be mainly
> focused)?

By empowering more hams to design and build their own radios.

Dwight, how many hams do you know who have designed and built (from
scratch) entire amateur radio stations? And who use them on a regular

basis - in 2003? (Besides me, that is). I'm not talking kits, either, (my K2 doesn't count) nor accessories, but actual transceivers and such.

Do you think a kid with a sodder arn is gonna build an a 2 meter HT or a PSK-31 station as a first project?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5297. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 11:46:00 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309240346.7b2e67ae@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78712

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030922000031.05539.00000935@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> In article <20030921222953.07578.00000724@mb-m25.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >In article <20030921180828.21642.00001042@mb-m01.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >(Len Over 21) writes:
> >
> >>In article <Crhbb.1424$Hd6.1114311@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D.
> >>Flint"
> >><deehays@qix.net> writes:
> >>
> >>>I and other parents that I know have always required our children to eat
> >>>foods that are good for them whether they liked them or not. My children
> >>>have always been required to eat what was served whether they liked it or
> >>>not. Children were not allowed to dictate the menu.
> >>
> >> ...and so you act like you are the "parent" in here telling us what we
> >> are supposed to like?
> >
> >Well, considering how often you act like a small child in here, Leonard,
> >you're certainly not qualified for that role.
>
> Go to bed, little one...it's past your bedtime.

Typical. Hey PUTZ: You are the singular "unifying force" in this
newsgroup. Utter and total disdain and distaste for your personna is
the one "policy" overwhelmingly shared and agreed upon by both the
NCTA and PCTA factions.

Congratulations PUTZ.

>
> LHA

w3rv

5298. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 12:03:37 UTC
From: Eric Oyen - N7ZZT <n7zzt_NO.SPAM_@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.09.24.12.03.35.348632@hotmail.com>
Source record: 78713
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

and we still have to put up with idiots like you, no matter the band or technology.

besides, if you look at echolink, some of the stations in there are linked to repeaters. believe me, if too many bootleggers show up on echolink, it won't be long before their accounts are terminated and they have some explaining to do (the echolink servers to track IP addresses of those who connect).

as for the technical remark, perhaps you don't realize that a computer is almost an essential part of the station these days (logging, aprs, packet, propogation predictions, etc). so don't gripe at us because of YOUR technical and mental deficiencies.

DE N7ZZT
Phoenix, Arizona

On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 05:52:32 -0400, 20 WPM wrote:

>
> 1. Have yet to learn the code.
> 2. NCI Members.
> 3. Lack technical skills to setup a station.
> 4. Bootlegging CB'ers.
>
>
> As long as Echolink keeps the above mentioned off of the HF Bands, I'm all
> for Echolink.

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence has its limits.

5299. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 12:17:38 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309240417.38819ac0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78714

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
news:<20030923210119.07578.00000755@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> In article <RLIbb.63713$NM1.42393@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Wouldn't it be great if the next political appointee actually had some idea
> >of RF communications technology ?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Dan:
>
> Forgive my cynicism, but since when has practical knowledge and
> experience in a particular field of endeavor ever been a requirement
> to become a political appointee? Mr. Powell became FCC Chairman
> because he's a rare commodity in Washington politics: a black
> Republican. And, I guess, being Colin Powell's son didn't hurt much,
> either. Michael gave President Bush another way to pay off Secretary
> of State Powell for not running against him in the Presidential race,
> and add some "diversity" to his administration. A double-whammy.

The problem there is that Powell Jr. ain't even a shadow of his
father, he's like Jackie Gleason's son in "Smokey and the Bandit".
DUD. The way Congress is strangling his attempt to hand control of
local media outlets to the moguls in that biz is why he's on the way
out the door.

> I just wonder what kind of new nightmare we'll get in Michael's place?

I shudder at the thought.

>
> Of course, in fairness to Chairman Powell, he does have a point about
> the political back stabbing.

Pore baby, can't handle it . .

> However, I guess that's what we get when
> we allow our government to be run mainly by career politicians who are
> all beholden to special interests. I believe that the only way to correct
> this situation is to never vote for an incumbent seeking his third or
> subsequent term in a non-term limited office.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

w3rv

5300. Re: 3894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 12:17:56 UTC
From: Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bks21t$54247$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78715
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Ken Bessler" <kg0wx@IHATESPAMyahoo.com> wrote in message
news:pdCdnXYC3uH99u2iXTWJkg@comcast.com...
>
> "Bruce Lane" <SpammersAreVermin@dev.null> wrote in message
> news:MPG.19da046ab64a1ebf989a14@192.168.42.131...
> > In article <MaVbb.57$LJ5.4631@iad-read.news.verio.net>,
> > Spamfree@Spamfree.com says...
> >
> > > " BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
> > > news:vn07dg6h8lftdc@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> > <drivelectomy>
> >
> > Gang, it's just a troll, fercryinoutloud! They've been around
> > since the early days of Usenet, and their entire existence seems to be
> > centered around making outrageous posts just to see what kind of replies
> > they get.
> >
> > Just killfile him and be at peace. Don't even waste your energy on
> > a reply.
> >
> > 73 de KC7GR
> >
>
> Better yet, killfile him and create a message rule like this:
>
> Apply this rule after the message arrives
> Where the Subject line contains '3.894' or '3894' or 'bigal'
> Delete it
>

No!

Where the Subject line contains '3.894' or '3894' or 'bigal'
send the email back

73 de Rene PE1RA

5301. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 12:40:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <7hgcb.4385$pB6.793@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78716

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> heh heh....tell 'im you'll get back to him when he
> has something intelligent to say. I told Larry that
> a couple of weeks ago and, except to tell him I
> wouldn't be the slightest bit interested in meeting
> him or most others in this newsgroup, I've not
> posted a thing to him since. I just can't find the
> "intelligent" part of his posts.

He does have the habit of trying to twist things when the discussion doesn't go his way and I simply don't have the time for that nonsense. If he doesn't want to discuss the issue seriously, he can discuss it with himself.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5302. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 12:47:12 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F719250.9020705@psu.edu>
Source record: 78717

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:Tdacb.4602$ai7.3732@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>"WA8ULX" wrote:
>>
>>>you dont fill it in QRZ fills it in.
>>
>>
>> Go to the QRZ.com web site and choose the option to update your personal
>>information. There is a form you can fill in with your personal
>
> information
>
>>(with instructions on how to change the birth date).
>>
>>
>>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>>
>>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>>
>>
>
>
> ROFLMAO!!!! This is hilarious. The usual Extra-class nitwit-type CBPlus
> ham telling "us" that we're the ones who don't have any sense or
> intelligence and that "we're" dumbed down, while all the while demonstrating
> their own ignorance...

Dwight is a Technician, Kim.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5303. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 13:16:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924091630.23297.00000085@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 78722

>ROFLMAO!!!! This is hilarious. The usual Extra-class nitwit-type CBPlus
>ham telling "us" that we're the ones who don't have any sense or
>intelligence and that "we're" dumbed down, while all the while demonstrating
>their own ignorance...

Hey TIT, Im the one who changed the Birthdate to what it reads now, I thought it was cute and Im not about to change it back.

5304. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 13:35:33 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <F4hcb.4518$pB6.768@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78723

"N2EY" wrote:
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> And why would the ARS wish to continue to specifically
>> develop radio operators capable of using code?
>
> Because the mode offers lots of advantages to radio amateurs.
>
>> What benefit does it offer?
>
> - Narrow bandwidth required
> - Can be used with a wide variety of technologies
> - Capable of both manual and machine generation and recognition
> - excellent weak-signal performance
> - QSK (near-duplex operation possible on a simplex channel)
> - only popular non-voice "audio" mode (can you work PSK-31
> while driving?)
> - usable by many disabled persons
>
>> Not what it offers you, but what benefit does it offer to the
>> ARS (here is your opportunity to show your position is not
>> just self-serving)?
>
> See above. That's the short list.

All those are reasons for a person to choose to use code, but not reasons for the Amateur Radio Service to continue to specifically develop radio operators capable of using this mode. Understand the difference? One is a choice based on the benefits of a mode while the other is a mandated requirement concerning a specific mode. I'm all for urging people to try Morse Code/CW. But the issue at hand is a specific requirement to do so, which I don't think offers any real benefit to the Amateur Radio Service.

>> How will this (code skill testing) help to keep the ARS
>> abreast of modern technology, insuring our continued
>> value to others?
>
> The mode can be successfully used with equipment of almost
> any level of complexity, so that beginners can start off with
> simple equipment and work their way up to advanced
> technologies. And have good performance all along the path.

Again, a reason to promote code, but not a reason to mandate it.

>> How will this help move the ARS into the future (where we
>> should be mainly focused)?

>
> By empowering more hams to design and build their own radios.

Electronics can clearly be taught without a code testing requirement. I'm playing around with basic electronics, obviously without those code skills. However, I'm not building a basic CW rig because it has no widespread application in a modern world. I'm repairing an old SSB radio to learn more about it, but that is clearly a minor project at the moment (my intent is to build a simple SSB radio one day). Instead, I'm now mainly focused on microcomputers, interfacing, programming, and robotics. That leaves little time for pounding out messages with a code paddle.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5305. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 13:36:21 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <ms63nv0t3ep8fmhf00duq7omm0ahl8ebsg@4ax.com>
Source record: 78724

WA8ULX,

Please excuse everyone for being a bit confused by this. When someone pointed out earlier that your birthdate was incorrect, didn't you reply:

>> CBplusser, you dont fill it in QRZ fills it in.

Since then, two people have kindly posted instructions on how to fix it. Now, you are insulting Kim, and telling us that is was you in the first place who changed your birthdate, because its 'cute'.

Had you told us that up front, we probably would have thought so too. Now, I'm not sure what your intent was....to foster confrontation, perhaps? Or are you trying to create a new licence category - Extra Crass :)

73, Leo

On 24 Sep 2003 13:16:30 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>ROFLMAO!!!! This is hilarious. The usual Extra-class nitwit-type CBPlus
>>ham telling "us" that we're the ones who don't have any sense or
>>intelligence and that "we're" dumbed down, while all the while demonstrating
>>their own ignorance...
>
>Hey TIT, Im the one who changed the Birthdate to what it reads now, I thought
>it was cute and Im not about to change it back.

5306. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 13:57:43 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <rphcb.4704$pB6.3756@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78725

"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>
> ROFLMAO!!!! This is hilarious. The usual Extra-class
> nitwit-type CBPlus ham telling "us" that we're the ones
> who don't have any sense or intelligence and that "we're"
> dumbed down, all the while demonstrating their own
> ignorance...

Oh, come on, Kim. After passing all those license exams, you can't really expect Bruce to have any room left in that head to think of anything else. As it is, he had to forget all he knew for the previous exams to make room for the information for the later exams. Of course, he also had to forget all about the later exams to make room to remember his name again. And, as you can see, with that, there clearly isn't any room left for basic spelling and grammer.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5307. SSB Maritime frequencies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 14:37:51 UTC
From: alcca@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924103751.27155.00000098@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 78726

HI, Does any one know where I can find the frequencies and meet times for the various maritime nets. I am interested in both ham and non ham nets.
Thanks
Al Casanova

5308. Re: I WILL BE ON TONITE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 14:45:11 UTC
From: Frank Todd K3EKO <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <X5icb.423131$Oz4.217468@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 78727
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

charlesb wrote:
> "B I G A L" wrote in message
> news:vn2s04gs8b49ec@corp.supernews.com...
>
>>DO NOT COME MY FREQUENCY TONITE
>
>
> Gee, what a moron. If the guy was a BoD member at TAPR or something like
> that, his behavior would be understandable.
>
> After all, he has demonstrated that he lacks the intelligence and social
> skills necessary to operate on either usenet or ham radio...
>
> Hey, Big Al: Can you give us the latest scoop on what's going on at TAPR?
> I've noticed that the newsletter is getting really sucky, kind of like the
> one at TPRS did, right before they went belly-up.
>
> Tell us about it, Big Al!
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>
who cares about TAPR????? Get with the times boy, no one uses packet
anymore....

--
73

Frank K3EKO

5309. I WILL BE ON TONITE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 15:20:46 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn2s04gs8b49ec@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78704
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

DO NOT COME MY FREQUENCY TONITE WHEN ME AND K3EKO ARE ON THE AIR. WE WILL HAVE JIMO BACK ON LATER IN THE WEEK.

GREG YOU DONT COUNT BECAUSE TECHS CANT OPERATE HF HO HO

TO THE ARKANSAS BOYS QUIT TRYING TO QRM US. YOU TRIED AGAIN LAST NITE BUT IT DID NOT WORK. STOP BOY. HO HO

5310. Re: SSB Maritime frequencies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 15:24:26 UTC
From: Spurious Noise <HDA@zilch.com>
Message-ID: <KGicb.12721$Ms2.9693@fed1read03>
Source record: 78728

See URL:
http://ac6v.com/nets.htm#MT

Will try to post the table here

MARITIME MOBILE NETS

Baja California Maritime 7.262 MHz Daily 1600Z (winter) & 1500Z
(summer)
Caribbean Maritime Mobile 7.241MHz Daily 1100Z
Chubasco Net 7.294 MHz, 1530Z (during Std. time) 1530Z (during Std.
time)
Hurricane Net: 14.325 MHz as needed
Manana Maritime Net 14.34 MHz Mon thru Sat 1900Z
Maritime Mobile Service Net 14.3 MHz Daily 1700-0300Z
Mississauga Maritime Mobile Net 14.121 Daily 1245Z
Pacific Maritime Net 21.402 2200Z
Pacfic Maritime 20M Net 14.313 MHz 0400Z
Seafarers Net 14.313 MHz 0200-0400Z
Sonrisa Net 3.968 MHz 1400Z
South Pacific Sailing 7.299 MHz Daily 1700Z
TransAtlantic Net 21.400 MHz Daily 1300Z
US Coast Guard Amateur Radio Net 14.313 Sat 1600Z (summer)
US Coast Guard Amateur Radio Net 14.313 Sat 1700Z (winter)
US Coast Guard Amateur Radio Net 14.327 Sat 1800Z (winter) & 1700Z
(summer)
Waterway Radio & Cruising Club 7.268 Sat 1245Z (winter) & 1145Z
(summer)
73 Fron the spurious noise ';x';;';;'..',''

"ALCCA" <alcca@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030924103751.27155.00000098@mb-m03.aol.com...
> HI, Does any one know where I can find the frequencies and meet times for
the
> various maritime nets. I am interested in both ham and non ham nets.
> Thanks
> Al Casanova

5311. ROHN Files for Chapter 11 Protection...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 15:37:10 UTC
From: Frank Todd K3EKO <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <GSicb.563759$YN5.398188@sccrnsc01>
Source record: 78729
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

ROHN Files for Chapter 11 Protection
September 16, 2003

World Headquarters
6718 W. Plank Rd.
Peoria, IL 61604 USA
Ph: 309-697-4400
FAX: 309-697-5612

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

For Further Information:
Horace Ward
President and Chief Executive Officer
(309) 633-6886
horace.ward@rohnnet.com

ROHN INDUSTRIES, INC. FILES FOR CHAPTER 11 PROTECTION;
$9.5 MILLION DEBTOR-IN-POSSESSION FINANCING SECURED;
BOARD MEMBERS RESIGN

PEORIA, IL, September 16, 2003 ï¿½ ROHN Industries, Inc., (OTCBB: ROHN), (the "Company") a provider of infrastructure equipment to the telecommunications industry, announced today that the Company and five of its direct and indirect subsidiaries have filed voluntary petitions for Chapter 11 relief in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Indiana (the "Bankruptcy Court").

The Company also announced that, concurrent with the Chapter 11 filing, it has entered into a $9.5 million debtor-in-possession ("DIP") line of credit with the lenders that are party to the Company's Amended and Restated Credit Agreement, subject to the approval of the Bankruptcy Court, which will include funds that will be rolled forward from the Company's current credit facility. Subject to the provisions of the Bankruptcy Code, the Company remains in possession of its assets and properties, and continues to operate its business. The Company said that the objective of the Chapter 11 proceeding is to maximize recovery to creditors by facilitating an orderly sale of assets. The Company is currently in discussions with an unrelated third party regarding a proposed sale of the assets of the Company.

Upon the filing of the bankruptcy petition of the Company, but following the approval by the Board of Directors of the Chapter 11 filing, Stephen Gorman and Jordan Roderick each have resigned from the Board of Directors of the Company. Currently, Horace Ward, the Chief Executive

Officer of the Company, is the only remaining director of the Company.

Commenting on today's announcement, Mr. Ward said, "Our immediate goal is to stabilize the Company's financial situation and utilize the Chapter 11 process to enable the Company to conduct normal business operations as the Company works to complete a sale transaction."

The Company has retained the Indianapolis law firm of Ice Miller to act as its legal counsel in the bankruptcy proceedings. The Company has also retained Silverman Consulting, a national turnaround consulting firm.

About the Company

The Company is a manufacturer and installer of telecommunications infrastructure equipment for the wireless industry. Its products are used in cellular, PCS, radio and television broadcast markets. The Companyï¿½s products include towers, poles, related accessories and antennae mounts. The Company also provides design and construction services. The Company has a manufacturing location in Frankfort, IN along with offices in Peoria, IL and Mexico City, Mexico.

Statements in this press release include ï¿½forward-looking statementsï¿½ within the meaning of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 and other related laws, and include, but are not limited to, those statements relating to sales and earning expectations, expected demand and other statements of outlook. The Companyï¿½s actual results and effects could differ materially from those currently anticipated in our forward-looking statements. Factors and risks that could cause such differences include, but are not limited to: wireless and fiber optic communications industry capital spending; the ability of the Companyï¿½s customers to secure adequate financing; elections by customers to terminate or delay previously placed orders; the effects of competition, particularly on pricing and margins; the Companyï¿½s implementation of our growth objectives in foreign markets; the Companyï¿½s indebtedness, which could restrict its operations, making it more vulnerable to adverse economic conditions and making it more difficult for us to implement its business strategy; liquidity problems that confront or may confront the Company; the Companyï¿½s inability to obtain bonding required for certain customer contracts or potential contracts; liabilities arising from an engineering problem with the Companyï¿½s internal flange poles and a testing and repair program undertaken by the Company in connection with that problem; unexpected problems and costs the Company may encounter or incur in consolidating our manufacturing operations at its facilities in Frankfort, Indiana; the Companyï¿½s Commonwealth of Pennsylvania construction project staying on its currently anticipated schedule; and regulatory changes affecting the industry in which the Company operates. The cautionary statement contained in Exhibit 99.1 to the Companyï¿½s Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2002 is incorporated herein by reference. Forward-looking statements are given as of the date of this release and the Company is

not undertaking any duty or obligation to update these statements
publicly as a result of new information, future events or otherwise.

--
73

Frank K3EKO

5312. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 15:52:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <R4jcb.5120$pB6.967@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78730

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030923210119.07578.00000755@mb-m25.aol.com...
> In article <RLIbb.63713$NM1.42393@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:
>
> >Wouldn't it be great if the next political appointee actually had some
idea
> >of RF communications technology ?
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Dan:
>
> Forgive my cynicism, but since when has practical knowledge and
> experience in a particular field of endeavor ever been a requirement
> to become a political appointee? Mr. Powell became FCC Chairman
> because he's a rare commodity in Washington politics: a black
> Republican. And, I guess, being Colin Powell's son didn't hurt much,
> either. Michael gave President Bush another way to pay off Secretary
> of State Powell for not running against him in the Presidential race,
> and add some "diversity" to his administration. A double-whammy.
> I just wonder what kind of new nightmare we'll get in Michael's place?
>
> Of course, in fairness to Chairman Powell, he does have a point about
> the political back stabbing. However, I guess that's what we get when
> we allow our government to be run mainly by career politicians who are
> all beholden to special interests. I believe that the only way to correct
> this situation is to never vote for an incumbent seeking his third or
> subsequent term in a non-term limited office.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

Points well taken, no arguement from me on them.

Maybe the next commissioner will be on the board of Alabama Power. The
corporation that has taken 5 years (so far) to clean up their trashy noisy
lines.

Can't wait till they try BPL.

Dan/W4NTI

5313. Re: 3 8 9 4 . 5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 15:53:30 UTC
From: Concerned of USENET <deletethisbit.itsreallyhere@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3F71BE0D.4A35@yahoo.com>
Source record: 78731
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.flame,alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Thirty-eight ninety-four point five wrote:
>
> MINE MINE MINE
>
> 3 8 9 4 . 5
>
>
> THE CARING STATION
>
> THE SODOMIZER
>
> CAPTAIN TRUTH
>
>

--
"Free flow of information has a price and responsible Internauts"
The Internet under Surveillance a report by Vinton Cerf

5314. Re: I WILL BE ON TONITE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 15:55:05 UTC
From: B I G A L <vn2p9equ7uq5b@corp.upernewscom.com>
Message-ID: <vn3fn0fmkdph60@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78732
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

"Frank Todd K3EKO" wrote in message
news:X5icb.423131$Oz4.217468@rwcrnsc54...
> charlesb wrote:
> > "B I G A L" wrote in message
> > news:vn2s04gs8b49ec@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> >>DO NOT COME MY FREQUENCY TONITE
> >
> >
> > Gee, what a moron. If the guy was a BoD member at TAPR or something like
> > that, his behavior would be understandable.
> >
> > After all, he has demonstrated that he lacks the intelligence and social
> > skills necessary to operate on either usenet or ham radio...
> >
> > Hey, Big Al: Can you give us the latest scoop on what's going on at
TAPR?
> > I've noticed that the newsletter is getting really sucky, kind of like
the
> > one at TPRS did, right before they went belly-up.
> >
> > Tell us about it, Big Al!
> >
> > Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> >
> >
> who cares about TAPR????? Get with the times boy, no one uses packet
> anymore....
>
>
>
> --
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>

HO HO

5315. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 16:01:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Udjcb.5161$pB6.3855@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78733

```
"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309231814.f8fbe4e@posting.google.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<502cb.2332$ai7.1086@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > news:f45722ac.0309230300.30cdb38c@posting.google.com...
> > > "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:<bkocja$g21$0@208.206.142.110>...
> > > > Brian wrote:
> > > >
> > > > >"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:<6BIbb.63583$NM1.20271@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >>I'll tell you this Jim...the Ruskies had and probably still do
have
> > the best
> > > > >>CW operators in the world.
> > > > >>
> > > > >>I used to have to listen to them a lot in a job I had. Amazing
how
> > so many
> > > > >>of them sounded like the hams on 20meters...hi.
> > > > >>
> > > > >>Dan/W4NTI
> > > > >>
> > > > >>
> > > > >
> > > > >And the ones that washed out of CW school? The Gulag?
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Only you and a few like you washed out.
> > >
> > Poor DICK. I was never in a Russian dittybopper school.
> > >
> > > Russian military, as our own,
> > > don't.
> > >
> > Poor DICK. I was never in a US dittybopper school.
> > >
> > > When one is sitting trying to learn code, realizing that if you
```

"just
> > > > can't" then
> > > > it.s off to the infantry, the failure rate is unsurprisingly low to
> > > > nonexistant.
> > >
> > > Poor DICK. I'm sure the failure rate was quite high. Why the big
> > > rush to RTTY and other modes which don't require the operator to be a
> > > human modem?
> >
> > Because RTTY could be run in the 'secure', or 'green' mode.
>
> CW can be coded as well. As long as everyone's o the same "page"
> should work OK. Authenticate.
>
> And RATT was
> > more capable of sending LARGE volumes of messages.
>
> Tell me about the error rate, too.
>
> Due mainly to the
> > untrained CW operators in the US Military at the time you are
referencing.
>
> So the Amateur Radio Service didn't act as a pool of trained operators
> for the military?
>
> > Ten groups a minute is all that was required of a O5C MOS back then.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
>
> Kind of negates many of the arguments for forcing people to test for
> code, doesn't it?

No it does not negate a thing Brian. It shows how ill prepared the US
Military was during the height of the Cold War.

The Iron Curtain countries didn't have a problem with good CW operators.
And IM NOT TALKING ABOUT HAM RADIO.

And thats all I can say on that subject.

Dan/W4NTI

5316. Dan/W4NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 16:30:40 UTC
From: Frank Todd K3EKO <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <QEjcb.565033$Ho3.103436@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 78735

Dan says that I never admitted to what I did in the past. This post from a few years back shows that I did.

PS: I also apologized to him for my actions!

From: Dan/W4NTI (w4nti@my-deja.com)
Subject: Re: A TIP OF THE CAP TO K3EKO
View: Complete Thread (9 articles)
Original Format
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc
Date: 2000/01/15

In article <85qgarqnd1@nntp4.atl.mindspring.net>,
"radiosigs@mindspring.com" <radiosigs@mindspring.com> wrote:
> At one time there was considerable friction between me and Frank Todd, K3EKO
> and I'm sure quite a few would like to see it continue. It ended. For more
> than a month he and I have been communicating privately or as privately as
> the Internet allows and I've grown to really admire him. I learned a lot
> about that fine young man much of which will remain confidential and for all
> who do not know what I know about him, I'm saying he's highly intelligent
> and courageous and deserves the respect of every ham on the air and on this
> board which I own. I want to openly apologize to him for anything I had
> written negatively which includes the episode visiting Herbie on Saint
> Croix. There must be some good in everyone and I therefore thank Herb and
> Monika Schoenbohm for giving Frank a fine Caribbean vacation which he richly
> deserved. We hams hear voices and read posts and draw conclusions which
> oftimes are off base. For instance when Frank was being "wined and dined" by
> Al Abernethy, K3QAM and others whom I didn't particularly like, I saw him
> as a mere pawn who was being trained to use ham radio unlawfully. Frank was
> coming across abrasively and insolently which made me view him as nothing
> more than a punk. Something happened which put things into focus and I'll be
> darned if I can remember what it was but suddenly I saw him quite
> differently. We began e-mailing one another and I'm sure he then saw me
> differently too and now our friendship is etched in stone. Once again

I will
> not divulge certain elements that changed my opinion of Mr.Todd but this
> I'll say. That fellow attends one of the best higher centers of
learning in
> this nation, a school of which I'm especially proud, Penn State
University.
> He is not in good health but is determined to take one day at a time and
> come through the siege. And fellow hams; he WILL-that's the kind of
guy he
> is. And furthermore I'm going to attend his graduation and if I have
to sit
> with "Queenie" to do it, that's just fine. Frank's welfare and success
> transcend any personal dislikes I have. A tip of my cap to you Frank Todd
> and God bless!
> Doc,AF2Y
>
Doc,

You owe Herb Schoenbohm a thank you for helping put Frank on the
correct path. One day Frank was on 20ssb from Herb's station. I was
on frequency and broke in to say hello to Herb. Herb said would I like
to talk with Franky, I declined. He asked why...and I told him I
didn't appreciate how he treated me on the air without him even having
a callsign (at that time). A short pause later Frank came on the air
and apologized to me. I accepted and from then on have been in contact
with him via e-mail.

As for him talking with you and some of the "others in our camp" ...he
and I discussed it and he made the proper moves..with some minor help
from me.

Frank Todd is a good young man now, and a asset to amateur radio.

Dan/W4NTI

--
"Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."

Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
Before you buy.

--
73

Frank K3EKO

5317. Re: SSB Maritime frequencies

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 16:31:57 UTC
From: alcca@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924123157.27103.00000138@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 78736

>See URL:
>http://ac6v.com/nets.htm#MT

Thanks, I will check it out

5318. Dan/W4NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 16:32:57 UTC
From: Frank Todd K3EKO <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <ZGjcb.570693$uu5.93771@sccrnsc04>
Source record: 78737

Frank Todd wrote:

> Dan says that I never admitted to what I did in the past. This post
from a few years back shows that I did.
>
> PS: I also apologized to him for my actions!
>
> From: Dan/W4NTI (w4nti@my-deja.com)
> Subject: Re: A TIP OF THE CAP TO K3EKO
> View: Complete Thread (9 articles)
> Original Format
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc
> Date: 2000/01/15
>
>
> In article <85qgarqnd1@nntp4.atl.mindspring.net>,
> "radiosigs@mindspring.com" <radiosigs@mindspring.com> wrote:
> > At one time there was considerable friction between me and Frank
Todd, K3EKO
> > and I'm sure quite a few would like to see it continue. It ended.
For more
> > than a month he and I have been communicating privately or as
privately as
> > the Internet allows and I've grown to really admire him. I learned
a lot
> > about that fine young man much of which will remain confidential
and for all
> > who do not know what I know about him, I'm saying he's highly
intelligent
> > and courageous and deserves the respect of every ham on the air
and on this
> > board which I own. I want to openly apologize to him for anything
I had
> > written negatively which includes the episode visiting Herbie on
Saint
> > Croix. There must be some good in everyone and I therefore thank
Herb and
> > Monika Schoenbohm for giving Frank a fine Caribbean vacation which
he richly
> > deserved. We hams hear voices and read posts and draw conclusions
which
> > oftimes are off base. For instance when Frank was being "wined and
dined" by
> > Al Abernethy, K3QAM and others whom I didn't particularly like, I

saw him
> > as a mere pawn who was being trained to use ham radio unlawfully.
Frank was
> > coming across abrasively and insolently which made me view him as
nothing
> > more than a punk. Something happened which put things into focus
and I'll be
> > darned if I can remember what it was but suddenly I saw him quite
> > differently. We began e-mailing one another and I'm sure he then
saw me
> > differently too and now our friendship is etched in stone. Once
again I will
> > not divulge certain elements that changed my opinion of Mr.Todd
but this
> > I'll say. That fellow attends one of the best higher centers of
learning in
> > this nation, a school of which I'm especially proud, Penn State
University.
> > He is not in good health but is determined to take one day at a
time and
> > come through the siege. And fellow hams; he WILL-that's the kind
of guy he
> > is. And furthermore I'm going to attend his graduation and if I
have to sit
> > with "Queenie" to do it, that's just fine. Frank's welfare and
success
> > transcend any personal dislikes I have. A tip of my cap to you
Frank Todd
> > and God bless!
> > Doc,AF2Y
> >
> Doc,
>
> You owe Herb Schoenbohm a thank you for helping put Frank on the
> correct path. One day Frank was on 20ssb from Herb's station. I was
> on frequency and broke in to say hello to Herb. Herb said would I like
> to talk with Franky, I declined. He asked why...and I told him I
> didn't appreciate how he treated me on the air without him even having
> a callsign (at that time). A short pause later Frank came on the air
> and apologized to me. I accepted and from then on have been in contact
> with him via e-mail.
>
> As for him talking with you and some of the "others in our camp" ...he
> and I discussed it and he made the proper moves..with some minor help
> from me.
>
> Frank Todd is a good young man now, and a asset to amateur radio.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>

> --
> "Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."
>
>
> Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
> Before you buy.
>
Please note that this message was found via the Google caching system.
Simply go to their webpage, http://groups.google.com and type in the
search field:

``Franky K3EKO"

w/o the quotes of course.

This is to show to others that I did not EDIT any part of this post.

--
73

Frank K3EKO
--
73

Frank K3EKO

5319. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 16:40:25 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924124025.01478.00000085@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 78738

>Since then, two people have kindly posted instructions on how to fix
>it.

I dont need instructions, I know how to change if I wanted to.

>Now, you are insulting Kim,

Kim insults Ham Radio every day with her Callsign

>Now, I'm not sure what your intent was....to foster confrontation,
>perhaps?

Interesting Question

>Or are you trying to create a new licence category - Extra
>Crass :)

No, the FCC will be doing that pretty soon without my help.

5320. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 16:43:16 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924124316.01478.00000086@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 78739

> Oh, come on, Kim. After passing all those license exams, you can't really
>expect Bruce to have any room left in that head to think of anything else.

All those Exams took less than 1% Brain Power, so whats your excuse Dwight,
would that 1% put your brain power on overload.

5321. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 17:20:50 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <hgk3nv80jpvqf4un0os65k27p8jlmo597f@4ax.com>
Source record: 78740

Another delinquent child in an old man's body. Just what the world
needs more of....

Right then, into the killfile you go.

Plonk!

Leo

On 24 Sep 2003 16:40:25 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>Since then, two people have kindly posted instructions on how to fix
>>it.
>
>I dont need instructions, I know how to change if I wanted to.
>
>>Now, you are insulting Kim,
>
>Kim insults Ham Radio every day with her Callsign
>
>>Now, I'm not sure what your intent was....to foster confrontation,
>>perhaps?
>
>Interesting Question
>
>>Or are you trying to create a new licence category - Extra
>>Crass :)
>
>No, the FCC will be doing that pretty soon without my help.

5322. Re: 03894.5-LSB-75-METERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 17:57:02 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn3mnk2p842u9a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78741
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

RENE?

HOMO?

FAGO?

HO HO?

"Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD" <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net> wrote in message
news:bks21t$54247$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de...
>
> "Ken Bessler" <kg0wx@IHATESPAMyahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:pdCdnXYC3uH99u2iXTWJkg@comcast.com...
> >
> > "Bruce Lane" <SpammersAreVermin@dev.null> wrote in message
> > news:MPG.19da046ab64a1ebf989a14@192.168.42.131...
> > > In article <MaVbb.57$LJ5.4631@iad-read.news.verio.net>,
> > > Spamfree@Spamfree.com says...
> > >
> > > > " BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5@bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
> > > > news:vn07dg6h8lftdc@corp.supernews.com...
> > >
> > > <drivelectomy>
> > >
> > > Gang, it's just a troll, fercryinoutloud! They've been around
> > > since the early days of Usenet, and their entire existence seems to be
> > > centered around making outrageous posts just to see what kind of
replies
> > > they get.
> > >
> > > Just killfile him and be at peace. Don't even waste your energy on
> > > a reply.
> > >
> > > 73 de KC7GR
> > >
> >
> > Better yet, killfile him and create a message rule like this:
> >
> > Apply this rule after the message arrives
> > Where the Subject line contains '3.894' or '3894' or 'bigal'
> > Delete it
> >
>
> No!

>
> Where the Subject line contains '3.894' or '3894' or 'bigal'
> send the email back
>
>
> 73 de Rene PE1RA
>
>

5323. Re: I WILL BE ON TONITE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 18:12:42 UTC
From: turdcrusher2003@yahoo.com
Message-ID: <76bc9a29.0309241012.42144eb2@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78742
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

Frank Todd K3EKO wrote in message news:...
> charlesb wrote:
> > "B I G A L" wrote in message
> > news:vn2s04gs8b49ec@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> >>DO NOT COME MY FREQUENCY TONITE
> >
> >
> > Gee, what a moron. If the guy was a BoD member at TAPR or something like
> > that, his behavior would be understandable.
> >
> > After all, he has demonstrated that he lacks the intelligence and social
> > skills necessary to operate on either usenet or ham radio...
> >
> > Hey, Big Al: Can you give us the latest scoop on what's going on at TAPR?
> > I've noticed that the newsletter is getting really sucky, kind of like the
> > one at TPRS did, right before they went belly-up.
> >
> > Tell us about it, Big Al!

> >
> > Charles Brabham, N5PVL
> >
> >
> who cares about TAPR????? Get with the times boy, no one uses packet
> anymore....

fwankie toad will be on tonight, on top of his gay lover's pole. Him
and loid da toid davies are butt buddies.

fwankie is a regular visitor to lloyd's hud apartment, They were
caught by the athens, alabama police a couple of weeks ago. They were
caught in the local pickle park, lloyd said....."we were playing
leapfrog and I got stuck," fwankie couldn't say anything as his mouth
was full of jizz!

5324. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 19:16:41 UTC
From: paule@sfu.ca
Message-ID: <bksqip$81v$1@morgoth.sfu.ca>
Source record: 78743

Leo <nomail@nope.org> writes:

>In response to the WRC 03 decision on Morse Code, Industry Canada
>asked the Radio Amateurs of Canada (RAC, our ARRL equivalent) to
>advise as to what Canadian amateurs want to do with respect to the
>Morse testing requirement.

>RAC set up an online survey on their website for the month of August,
>and invited all Canadian amateurs (both members of RAC and non-members
>alike) to voice their opinions. The results have been tabulated and
>published, and has been presented to the RAC Board of Directors for
>discussion with IC in the near future. The following web site has the
>details:

>http://www.rac.ca/news/mresults.htm

> snip <

>73, Leo

Hi Leo, and RAC did their typical job of making sure their CW
agenda has the guise of widespread canadian amateur approval.

Noone I know knew of the survey, and I strongly suspect that
if the majority of canadian amateurs had really been aware of it,
the results would probably have been different.

I have discussed the issue over the years with a number of
directors, and Jim Cummings, and cannot express
my disgust at the way it was handled.

cheers, Paul - VA7NT

5325. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 19:28:03 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <7pr3nvgmi2vk2ilphosdg3budnuujt0kle@4ax.com>
Source record: 78744

Paul,

Fully agreed - I found the survey quite by accident when I was looking up sonething on the RAC web site in August, otherwise I would not have missed it too..

Was it advertised in the magazine? If so, I don'rt recall seeing it!

Hopefully, the ARRL won't try to pull the same stunt....whatever way the vote goes, it should fairly represent the wishes of the Amateur community, not a small (and perhaps biased??) sampling.

73, Leo

On Wed, 24 Sep 2003 19:16:41 +0000 (UTC), paule@sfu.ca (Paul Erickson) wrote:

>> snip <
>
>>73, Leo
>
>Hi Leo, and RAC did their typical job of making sure their CW
>agenda has the guise of widespread canadian amateur approval.
>
>Noone I know knew of the survey, and I strongly suspect that
>if the majority of canadian amateurs had really been aware of it,
>the results would probably have been different.
>
>I have discussed the issue over the years with a number of
>directors, and Jim Cummings, and cannot express
>my disgust at the way it was handled.
>
>cheers, Paul - VA7NT
>

5326. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 19:30:54 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <r3s3nv4qicefac042ba6i5b8u9a1u45g2i@4ax.com>
Source record: 78745

Hmmm - let;s try that paragraph again!

Fully agreed - I found the survey quite by accident when I was looking
up sonething on the RAC web site in August, otherwise I would have
missed it too..

>>>>>Duh - @#$%^& typos.....<<<<<<

>Fully agreed - I found the survey quite by accident when I was looking
>up sonething on the RAC web site in August, otherwise I would not have
>missed it too..

5327. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 19:38:34 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <0ds3nvc04e0m1duio32idacpe46a19o68u@4ax.com>
Source record: 78746
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

That is definitely going to make somebody's day much more interesting
:)

Well done, Christy - one less troll on the group!

73, Leo

On 24 Sep 2003 19:10:03 GMT, Christy D
<daviesc238@nospam.alvillage.net> wrote:

>On 24 Sep 2003 11:12:42 -0700, Turdcrusher screwed up and wrote:
>> Message-ID: <76bc9a29.0309241012.42144eb2@posting.google.com>
>> NNTP-Posting-Host: 131.22.200.54 <****************************
>
>That's from Burns.keesler.af.mil, the domain of Les and his shriveled
>up little dwarves. Posting from DoD property while you are supposed
>to be at work, eh Maggot Breath?
>
>I've sent your post, complete with full headers, to the abuse account
>there. Let's see if they have you in their proxy logs, and let's see
>how the XO of the base feels about taxpayer-money-sucking, leeching
>cowards like yourself giving a bad name to Keesler while the REAL men
>from that base are serving their country.
>
>You want to threaten other people with bodily harm and stalk them on
>Usenet from an Air Force base, Maggot Breath? Then be prepared to pay
>the price.

5328. TONITE 7PM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 20:06:30 UTC
From: THE CARING STATION <THECARINGSTATION@B>
Message-ID: <vn3ua5i5lbu7da@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78747
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

YOU KNOW THE FREQUENCY 3894.5-LSB. THAT'S ON 75 METERS FOR YOU LIMP ONES.
I'LL BE ON AROUND 7 OR SO. TRANSMIT ONLY AFTER I GIVE YOU PERMISSION.
OTHERWISE I WILL SHOW YOU THE DOOR.

"BIG AL"

5329. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 20:07:34 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <i7i3nv4psbjgpf0p5ak83f2dj6bnosbo77@4ax.com>
Source record: 78748

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On 24 Sep 2003 03:18:20 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>>Sure it is. Part of the basis and purpose of the ARS as specified in
>>Part 97 is to develop a pool of trained radio operators. Since nobody
>>else uses CW anymore, it is no longer necessary to develop pools of
>>Morse-trained radio operators.
>
>Did you see that everybody? "...nobody uses CW anymore." Yup,
>he REALLY said that!
>
>Do me a favor, John, and tell that to K2RSK next time you see him!

Uh, time out, Larry.

Take another look at what was quoted, Larry. It does not say, "Nobody
uses CW anymore." What it says is, "Nobody ELSE uses CW anymore."

There is no longer any use of CW in U.S. commercial, government, or
military radio communications. In the maritime HF bands you'll still
find some individual radio ops chit-chatting on the ship-to-ship
simplex frequencies using CW, but that's the extent of it. CW is no
longer used for passing message traffioc ship-to-ship and is no longer
used to communicate with the shore stations (which abandoned CW three
years ago, a fact that was well-publicized in the radio magazines and
on the Internet discussion groups).

I will assume this is an honest mistake on your part and that even you
aren't so low as to stoop to deliberately overlooking the word "else"
in what I posted. The amateur radio service is the only radio service
left where CW is used by any significant percentage of the operators.
You should know that as well as the rest of us do, right?

Now, back to our regularly scheduled discussion, already in progress:

>>Valuable? In some respects, perhaps. It does have its advantages,
>>although it also has its disadvantages.
>
>Whaaaaat? I thought you just said "...nobody uses CW anymore."

That's what you get for thinking instead of reading what was actually
posted, I guess. Put your bloody glasses on and try again!

>Well, anyway, please enumerate all the "disadvantages" of the
>Morse/CW mode.

1. Use of this mode requires that the operator at the other end of the circuit can copy code. Half the hams licensed in the U.S. are at Technician. Many hams licensed at General and Extra learned the code well enough to pass Element 1 and want nothing more to do with it. Even hams who passed code tests at higher speeds no longer use it. Even if they did pass the test, chances are they haven't used it on the air (probably never had any intention of doing so, since all they wanted to do was pass the stupid test so they could upgrade and gain the privileges they were really interested in), so they probably can't even zero-beat to your signal. There's no guarantee of finding an op at the other end with any proficiency in copying the code, especially at any significant speed, which means that even if you do find a ham who went through the testing procedures recently enough to still remember the alphabet, you're going to have to send pretty slowly in order for what you send to be copied, which means that...

2. You can get the same message through faster using another mode. At 5wpm (which is the fastest code speed that any US-licensed ham is required to be able to copy), in the time it takes to send a 2x3 callsign in CW, you can send a couple of whole sentences on phone.

For that matter, in sixty seconds at 5 WPM, you can send 12 words. You can also send an entire picture in SSTV in sixty seconds - and, as we all know, one picture is worth a thousand words. :-)

3. Because of the narrow bandwidth of a CW signal, CW ops tend to operate rather close together, requiring an optional filter for most rigs to be able to zero in on one and only one signal. The same rig out of the box will have a much easier time zeroing in on one and only one phone signal - assuming that ops observe the courtesy of keeping 7kc or so between themselves and the nearest frequency in use.

4. I'm aware of at least one rig that's been manufactured over the past ten years or so that doesn't even *have* the CW mode. RadioShack, one of your former employers, sold a 10m rig like this. For all I know, there are others as well. Hard to work somebody in CW when their rig doesn't have that capability, wouldn't you say?

Want me to continue?

>>Basic? I'm not too sure of that. It was once upon a time. I'm inclined
>>to think that time is either passed, or very close to it. I don't know
>>what percentage of hams is sufficiently skilled with the mode to
>>actually use it for on-air contacts, but surely the percentage must be
>>shrinking daily.
>
>And just exactly what do you think is causing that, John?

What, reading comprehension problem, Larry? :-)

Obviously, it's because there is a growing percentage of hams who are not interested in using a method of communication that was originally conceived over 150 years ago, and descended from a method of sending messages over hardwired telegraph lines.

>>As for the code testing requirement being essential to the continued
>>use of the mode - if that's the case, then the patient is already
>>brain dead and being kept alive through purely artificial means, and
>>will expire anyway as soon as somebody pulls the plug, either
>>accidentally or deliberately. The question then becomes, for how long
>>do we prolong the inevitable, and for what purpose?
>
>I'm not suggesting that we pull the plug. I'm suggesting that we use
>a well-known cure and allow the patient to recover.

Fine! But a full recovery still involves getting the patient off that
life-support system, doesn't it.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=-=-=

5330. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 20:07:36 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <usj3nvo2579oc6514n3qhh9i5relg5tcu6@4ax.com>
Source record: 78750

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On Wed, 24 Sep 2003 05:16:24 GMT, "Dwight Stewart"
<stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote:

> No, Larry, he didn't say that. You misquoted him. He said, "...nobody ELSE
>uses CW..."

At least someone here can still run up a decent score in a reading
comprehension test...thanks, Dwight.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=-=-=

5331. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 20:07:38 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <fvj3nvkkg4ecol929t1h477uqnfa3ts060@4ax.com>
Source record: 78749

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On 24 Sep 2003 03:18:21 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <0g21nvogafrl9boqvp91s6vhfkcsvd7h1s@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
><kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> writes:
>
>>>Don't look now, Clint, but welfare programs are "handouts" that give
>>>away valuable assets as if the recipient were entitled to them simply
>>>by virtue of being there with his/her hand out.
>>
>>Correct. Therefore, code testing isn't a welfare program, it's a
>>government-subsidized life-support system for an anachronism.
>>
>>73 DE John, KC2HMZ
>>Tonawanda, New York
>
>Well, that's YOUR opinion, John. Thanks for sharing it with us.
>You have a right to be wrong.

What are you saying then? That it *is* a welfare program after all?

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=-=-=

5332. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 20:07:43 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <h1k3nvs89fvcetr46slk1fbk1sidnoopk6@4ax.com>
Source record: 78751

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On Wed, 24 Sep 2003 05:37:15 GMT, "Dwight Stewart"
<stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote:

>"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" wrote:
>>
>> So, I agree with you that we may well be better off,
>> from the standpoint of preserving the use of the mode
>> within the hobby, to remove the testing requirement
>> and allow the mode to stand on its own merits. If
>> someone asks, "Why should I learn Morse code?" the
>> answer right now is basically, "You have to in order to
>> get the license." And the reaction is basically, "Screw
>> that, I'll just find another hobby."
>>
>> Lose that, and we have "Because sometimes a CW
>> signal will get through when a voice signal won't, and
>> because Morse contacts in a contest are worth more
>> points, and because some operators enjoy it so much
>> that (snip)
>
>
> It's basic human psychology. We tend to resist the expected and enjoy self
>discoveries. And this is especially true when it comes to recreation.

You pretty much got my point, Dwight. It's human nature to resist what
gets forced on us. Personality traits differ from one individual to
the next, of course, but generally, I think it is safe to conclude
that the majority of people prefer to choose their own recreational
activities rather than having them mandated by governmental decree or
regulation. I'm certainly among those in that majority.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=-=-=

5333. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 20:07:53 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <34l3nvkm2ogra3vaaugl415hik28aktft5@4ax.com>
Source record: 78752

**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****

On Wed, 24 Sep 2003 13:35:33 GMT, "Dwight Stewart"
<stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote:

> All those are reasons for a person to choose to use code, but not reasons
>for the Amateur Radio Service to continue to specifically develop radio
>operators capable of using this mode. Understand the difference? One is a
>choice based on the benefits of a mode while the other is a mandated
>requirement concerning a specific mode. I'm all for urging people to try
>Morse Code/CW. But the issue at hand is a specific requirement to do so,
>which I don't think offers any real benefit to the Amateur Radio Service.

There's the rub, Dwight. Notice how the PCTAs refuse to see the
distinction between the two? I think there's a reason for that. They
know that the majority of hams is going to want nothing to do with the
code if the testing requirement is abolished . The majority of hams
NOW wants nothing to do with it, and we haven't even gotten the
testing requirement out of the regulations yet.

I think the PCTAs know darn well that if the test goes, they're going
to have fewer and fewer people to beep with as time goes on. They
accuse the NCTAs - and hams who aren't interested in CW - of being
lazy, when in fact, it's the PCTAs who are too lazy to promote their
own favored activity within the hobby, and therefore need a government
regulation to shove it down people's throats for them instead.

I think they also realize that as fewer and fewer hams use CW, there
will be less of a need for subbands, and they will stand to lose turf
if and when the frequencies are refarmed...and I really think that
this is their greatest fear: that subbands will be taken out of the
regulations and put back into the hands of hams, where the issue
belongs anyway. Do we really need regulations of that nature? I don't
believe that we do. CW is already authorized on any frequency where a
ham's license permits him/her to operate. There are no FCC-mandated
subbands on 160, and that band hasn't exactly turned into a mess
without such regulations.

The code isn't the primary issue with many of the PCTAs - it's simply
a turf war, with the code test issue being used to obfuscate their
real agenda.

> Electronics can clearly be taught without a code testing requirement. I'm
>playing around with basic electronics, obviously without those code skills.

It occurs to me that, absent a code testing requirement, there's a
good possibility that the technical qualifications of the ham

community will go up, because any time that would have been spent learning the code (under the old system) can now be spent learning something about digital electronics - or some other topic that has real-world application outside of the ARS.

>However, I'm not building a basic CW rig because it has no widespread
>application in a modern world.

This is something the PCTAs refuse to accept, Dwight.

When's the last time a state-of-the-art communications system was designed that was based on the use of telegraphy?

Today's modern communications system are designed around digital applications, and in fact an emphasis lately is on automated operation. Even within the ARS, the standard for automated store-and-forward transmission of messages and data is AX25, not CW.

>I'm repairing an old SSB radio to learn more
>about it, but that is clearly a minor project at the moment (my intent is to
>build a simple SSB radio one day). Instead, I'm now mainly focused on
>microcomputers, interfacing, programming, and robotics. That leaves little
>time for pounding out messages with a code paddle.

I find it interesting to note that the holder of a Novice license, who passed one and only one written test (prior to April 2000, when they stopped issuing new Novice licenses, this was Element 2), has HF phone privileges on ten meters. A Technician who took his tests on the same day had to pass elements 2 AND 3a, and has no HF privileges at all, unless he/she passes a CODE test - the results of which tell us nothing at all about that person's qualifications to operate a PHONE station on HF (or anywhere else for that matter).

Looking at it from the other side of the glass, the Novice is considered qualified, on the basis of having passed a code test and the easiest written test in existence at the time, to operate HF Phone on ten meters - which when the band is open propagates even a signal well below the 200 watts authorized to a Novice - on a worldwide basis. But the same Novice who is considered qualified to work the world on 10 meters, cannot work the guy down the street on the local 2m repeater because Novices have no 2m privileges.

Back to the Technician - based on that one written test (post-April 2000 Element 2), he/she is permitted to use any mode authorized to any other U.S. licensed ham, be it a General, an Advanced, or an Extra. But until that person passes a code test, he/she can only use those modes on VHF/UHF. Which means that the Tech can run 9600 baud packet on 440 with the bandwidth that comes with using that higher symbol rate, yet he/she is not qualified to use 300 baud packet (with a much narrower bandwidth) on 10 meters unless he/she passes a test pertaining to a mode (CW) that has nothing at all to do with operating packet on any frequency.

Now, what does the fact that these facts make perfect sense ONLY to
the PCTAs tell you about the PCTAs?

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

-=-=-=

5334. LETS SEE IF THEY QRM US TONITE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 20:15:22 UTC
From: THE CARING STATION <THECARINGSTATION@B>
Message-ID: <vn3uqpf53au63f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78753
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

THE BOYS FROM ARKANSAS TRIED LAST NIGHT BUT DIDNT GET THE JOB DONE.

5335. Re: Dan/W4NTI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 20:31:58 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <2bncb.6850$ai7.4209@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78754

"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
news:QEjcb.565033$Ho3.103436@sccrnsc03...
> Dan says that I never admitted to what I did in the past. This post
> from a few years back shows that I did.
>
> PS: I also apologized to him for my actions!
>
> From: Dan/W4NTI (w4nti@my-deja.com)
> Subject: Re: A TIP OF THE CAP TO K3EKO
> View: Complete Thread (9 articles)
> Original Format
> Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc
> Date: 2000/01/15
>
>
> In article <85qgarqnd1@nntp4.atl.mindspring.net>,
> "radiosigs@mindspring.com" <radiosigs@mindspring.com> wrote:
> > At one time there was considerable friction between me and Frank
> Todd, K3EKO
> > and I'm sure quite a few would like to see it continue. It ended. For
> more
> > than a month he and I have been communicating privately or as
> privately as
> > the Internet allows and I've grown to really admire him. I learned a
lot
> > about that fine young man much of which will remain confidential and
> for all
> > who do not know what I know about him, I'm saying he's highly
intelligent
> > and courageous and deserves the respect of every ham on the air and
> on this
> > board which I own. I want to openly apologize to him for anything I had
> > written negatively which includes the episode visiting Herbie on
Saint
> > Croix. There must be some good in everyone and I therefore thank Herb
and
> > Monika Schoenbohm for giving Frank a fine Caribbean vacation which he
> richly
> > deserved. We hams hear voices and read posts and draw conclusions which
> > oftimes are off base. For instance when Frank was being "wined and
> dined" by
> > Al Abernethy, K3QAM and others whom I didn't particularly like, I
> saw him
> > as a mere pawn who was being trained to use ham radio unlawfully.

> Frank was
> > coming across abrasively and insolently which made me view him as
> nothing
> > more than a punk. Something happened which put things into focus and
> I'll be
> > darned if I can remember what it was but suddenly I saw him quite
> > differently. We began e-mailing one another and I'm sure he then saw me
> > differently too and now our friendship is etched in stone. Once again
> I will
> > not divulge certain elements that changed my opinion of Mr.Todd but
this
> > I'll say. That fellow attends one of the best higher centers of
> learning in
> > this nation, a school of which I'm especially proud, Penn State
> University.
> > He is not in good health but is determined to take one day at a time
and
> > come through the siege. And fellow hams; he WILL-that's the kind of
> guy he
> > is. And furthermore I'm going to attend his graduation and if I have
> to sit
> > with "Queenie" to do it, that's just fine. Frank's welfare and success
> > transcend any personal dislikes I have. A tip of my cap to you Frank
Todd
> > and God bless!
> > Doc,AF2Y
> >
> Doc,
>
> You owe Herb Schoenbohm a thank you for helping put Frank on the
> correct path. One day Frank was on 20ssb from Herb's station. I was
> on frequency and broke in to say hello to Herb. Herb said would I like
> to talk with Franky, I declined. He asked why...and I told him I
> didn't appreciate how he treated me on the air without him even having
> a callsign (at that time). A short pause later Frank came on the air
> and apologized to me. I accepted and from then on have been in contact
> with him via e-mail.
>
> As for him talking with you and some of the "others in our camp" ...he
> and I discussed it and he made the proper moves..with some minor help
> from me.
>
> Frank Todd is a good young man now, and a asset to amateur radio.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> --
> "Just tellin the truth, and they cain't stand it."
>
>

> Sent via Deja.com http://www.deja.com/
> Before you buy.
>
>
> --
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>

All fine and wonderful Frank. But your still a barfy and a stumper, right?

Dan/W4NTI

5336. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:32:45 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <hp24nvofjmp93liio9i7ljva15jee1gh4t@4ax.com>
Source record: 78755
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Makes you wonder what drives some of these folks to behave the way
they do.....and in some cases (like today's example, posting obscene
crap from an DoD network), pretty stupid.

Guess these guys aren't too Internet literate - nym-shifting might
fool some of the Usenet community, but the ISP's server logs don't
lie!

Now, if Supernews would be so kind as to TOS this 'Big Al' character,
we could get back to dealing with the usual level of nutbar that lurks
here :)

73, Leo

On 24 Sep 2003 20:36:29 GMT, Christy D
<daviesc238@nospam.alvillage.net> wrote:

>On Wed, 24 Sep 2003 19:38:34 GMT, Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote:
>> That is definitely going to make somebody's day much more interesting
>> :)
>>
>> Well done, Christy - one less troll on the group!
>>
>> 73, Leo
>
>Notice how "Firebottle" jumped to Turdcrusher's defense? That's
>because he is one of the Keesler dwarves. I wonder if he and Ed
>Norton will go silent if computer security figures out who is posting
>from DoD machines? Probably so, because they're all the same person.
>
>A letter of reprimand may soon be delivered by HR just in time for
>Thanksgiving! How special that will be.

5337. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:18 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174218.07578.00000772@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78760

In article <f45722ac.0309230300.30cdb38c@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Poor DICK. I'm sure the failure rate was quite high. Why the big
>rush to RTTY and other modes which don't require the operator to be a
>human modem?
>
>Perhaps Len could shed some light on this.

I could, but it is like trying to teach pigs to fly...it annoys the pig and the instructor. Nonetheless, I clean off the whiteboard and explain:

In the 1950s-1960s, morse code skills were taught to FIELD RADIO MOS school students...but at (then named) Camp Gordon (now Fort Gordon, GA). "Field" radios in the US Army then ranged from the old WW2-era AN/GRC-9 two-man-pack portable to the AN/GRC-26 truck-mounted hut containing an HF-range AM/CW/RTTY station (BC-610 transmitter) and having the masts and wires for a small rhombic.

"Angry-twentysixes" were deployed in Korea during the active war period there (1950-1953) but the overwhelming mode of choice for field communications was RTTY, not morse. The GRC-26 could transmit RTTY and voice simultaneously. NVIS had not become a standard acronym yet. Despite the hilly topology of Korean landscape, VHF radio relay sets had become the "favorite" (most-used) method of radio communication of any kind there. Such VHF radio relay carried voice and TTY circuits, again the TTY preferred over manual morse code.

In the next decade, moving to southeast asia, the AN/TRC-24 (among several) was the most used radio relay equipment, again carrying voice and TTY. The '24 was easily spotted by the curious square antenna configuration that worked from 40 to 400 MHz and could integrate with Spiral-4 land cable having up to four in-line repeater amplifiers along that cable. An integrated solution to networking at higher command levels.

In the 1950s in Korea, the small-unit radio most used at first was the BC-1000 "Walkie-Talkie" designed by Motorola in WW2. The AN/PRC-6 HT was next for easy squad use, on VHF and with the built-in facility for active repeater operations. About 1952 late, the "three-band PRC-9" family of manpacks replaced the SCR-300/BC-1000s, having less than half the weight. Those extended into vehicle-mounted versions of the manpack and were initially planned as three overlapping bands in VHF intended for Artillery-Infantry-Armor units, each of those having a band. All of the "9s" family had provisions for unattended repeater operation.

For Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia all of the mentioned VOICE radios were used plus the appearance of the almost-all-solid-state PRC-25 multi-channel synthesized portable VHF FM set (only the final amplifier was a tube stage). By 1970 or so, the AN/PRC-77 appeared which was essentially the same architecture but having all solid-state circuitry. An eighth of a million models of the '25 and '77 were produced during a decade and a half of production in several countries.

The original SCR-300/BC-1000 "walkie-talkie" was licensed for manufacture in many countries, including the UK (there known as WS-11?). The improved "9s" of the late Korean War vintage were also licensed out to other countries. Motorola's Chicago works was the pioneer in the design, beginning before WW2 (original "handie-talkie") and into the architecture of the 1950s-introduced manpacks.

US military aviation pioneered the UHF "military aircraft band" of 225-400 MHz beginning in the 1950s, notably the Collins Radio design which was channelized and had AM voice...some were still on inventory as of 1970. The SINGLE CHANNEL SSB (single user) was pioneered again by Collins Radio for the Strategic Air Command in the 1950s, the ignition point for the adoption of single-user SSB by radio amateurs.

While several HF range portable and transportable communications transceivers were in use from 1950 through 1990, all with carrier on-off control and having manual telegraph keys as part of their system, the modes of actual use were still voice. Carrier on-off control was largely restricted to semi-remote site operation from a wire-linked control point (some protection of personnel from enemy DFing and bombing of RF emitters). Various forms of voice encryption and data machine coupling appeared then.

The first of the SINCGARS family of VHF small-unit communications sets appeared in 1989. Design was led by ITT Fort Wayne, IN, and allowed both frequency-hopping and external encryption devices to defeat enemy interception. That series continues in production today with the manpack version reduced to half the bulk and weight and including internal encryption
circuitry for both voice and data. A standard US military land and air set for manpack, vehicular, or airborne use, a quarter million has been produced by ITT and the former General Dynamics Land Division in Florida.

Army land communications includes a large number of different radio relay sets (troposcatter included in my definition of that) and whole voice-data telephone exchanges, all mobile and truck mounted, deployable anywhere and capable of supplying all the needs of military communications at any level from Corps on down. The Signal Center at Fort Gordon is now the main Signal School for the US Army and other branches. Fort Monmouth is now the home of the Electronics Command, USA, and is a center for coordinating manufacturing and research in Army military communications.

The Military Intelligence Center at Fort Huachuca, AZ, has the only "code school" left (morse code cognition) and that Center trains ALL branch members and necessary government employees on various Military

Intelligence tasks. Morse code cognition is taught using commercial morse code computer programs. Such cognition schooling is only a PART of the overall M.I. electronic intelligence intercept task. A much larger activity there is the UAV (Unmanned Aerial Vehicle) training.

The old mythology of "special forces behind enemy lines reporting back intel via CW" has never surfaced in any history since the 1960s. During the first Gulf War, the "behind the lines" radios were basically the AN/PSC-2 which is low UHF, has three antenna choices (the largest is a satellite "umbrella") and was designed to handle voice and data, data to 1200 BPS using a small "chiclet" style keyboard. The deployable AN/PSC-5 is now operational with more improvements. USAF "Joint Stars" command aircraft can easily relay PSC radio comm to other sites and the directional UHF antennas defeat most field DF operations.

In the US military, HF radio use is largely considered to be just a backup mode of communications. The primary medium for communications is land radio relay, satellete relay, and small unit radio netting at VHF and higher. At fixed bases, land communications is connected to the DSN which is considered as the "government's own Internet" that handles voice and data digitally and includes encryption for both (if authorized).

There is NO morse code mode used for any tactical radio communications anywhere in today's military. There is no evidence that strategic comm (such as by Special Forces, SEALS, etc) uses any morse code modes; their known equipment characteristics concern only voice and data modes.

It's not possible to tell/explain what happens in "code classes" when there are none today...

Leonard H. Anderson

5338. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174219.07578.00000773@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78756

In article <bkocja$g21$0@208.206.142.110>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>Only you and a few like you washed out. Russian military, as our own,
>don't.
>When one is sitting trying to learn code, realizing that if you "just
>can't" then
>it.s off to the infantry, the failure rate is unsurprisingly low to
>nonexistant.

How do YOU "know" this, DICK?

You never went to Field Radio MOS School at Ft. Monmouth (it was at
Fort Gordon, GA).

Field Radio School at Gordon had washouts and there were re-
assignments. In the United States Army.

5339. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:19 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174219.07578.00000774@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78759

In article <f45722ac.0309231821.2b4365aa@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:<bkohv3qvo1@208.206.142.83>...
>
>> I guess Clint also doesn't understand the admonition to "Never argue
>> with an idiot".
>> Or Iit isn't nice to engage in a battle of wits with unarmed persons".
>
>So Leo doesn't have any arms?
>
>I'm waiting for Dann Finn to come on here and chew you out for making
>fun of the disabled.

"Leo" doesn't EXIST.

No one can do battle with a spectre, a ghost, a will-o-the-wisp.

5340. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:20 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174220.07578.00000775@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78758

In article <bgp1nv87725pavclr3ck5gah78g26ovij8@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>Well, things aren't always quite that black-and-white, Clint. I am
>certainly not a sympathizer nor apologist for either side of the
>arguement. Not beacuse I am firmly in one camp or the other - it's
>much simpler than that.

Much simpler. YOU hide behind anonymity to relieve yourself on
the group by pretending to exist. You HIDE.

>So, here it is - my position: I don't really care that much one way
>or the other.

You MUST "care" a great deal...but don't have the COURAGE to
speak out as yourself, not an ANONYMOUS troll.

>In short, to restate, I don't care too much one way or the other.
>perhaps because I didn't go through the rigourous testing that the
>Extras did years ago. I didn't have to draw schematics on my test, or
>answer essay-type questions, and pass 20 WPM Morse - many of these
>fellows did, though, and it must burn them up to see us get in there
>today with multiple choice answers and 5 WPM code.

How does anyone KNOW "what you did years ago?"

You are ANONYMOUS, have no verifiable identity.

>Now stop debating, Clint - for God's sake, you'll go blind :)

By refusing to identify yourself, EVERYONE is blind to you.

5341. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:21 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174221.07578.00000776@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78761

In article <Mr5cb.3037$iT4.2214570@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

> Or you could try an excercise in "skin toughening", Arnie (don't take >it as an insult, I've done the same thing) It is an amazingly empowering >thing when you can read some of the merde posted by someone that thrives >on confrontation and provocation, knowing that they are failing to >achieve their goal with you. After the first few ignored posts, it's fun.

Ah-nold the Codinator is apparently skinless.

A long time ago I explained facts, and gave a website address for the only remaining morse code test center in the US military, Fort Huachuca. That was in public view.

Arnie insisted I had refused to believe "his" statement of it. Apparently he thought MY posting was his.

He kept hammering in public that I should make a telephone call to some NCO back east to "learn all about a code test" that was required of one Special Forces MOS rating. All of that MOS information on any job description in the US Army is given ON their website...every single MOS rating. For public viewing.

Arnie kept trying to convince everyone that morse code is used today for US military communications. It is not. It's "use" is only for Military Intelligence electronic interception (Ft. Huachuca is an M.I. center). There is NO US military tactical communications done today by morse code and NO evidence that it IS used for that. I gave several web addresses for information, including the US Army's Doctrine and Training Command Digital Library and repeated mention of FM 24-24, the 1994 Field Manual listing ALL land forces signal equipment (which is linked-to by at least three amateur radio websites).

All of that was at a time when Arnie claimed to be employed by the US Army as a civilian criminal investigator.

As a direct employee of the US Army, Arnie would have had easy access to all PUBLIC release documents of the US Army.

I recommended (at the time) that Arnie visit any US Army field communications exercise to investigate the actual USE of morse code in field communications. Arnie ignored that. He preferred to "plonk" me in some "killfile" claiming some personal disatisfaction at not being "nice" to him.

So...the gist of it is that wearing blinders to the real world can cause not only physical but mental problems of cognition. Some "investigator." NOT.

If the US Army ever did hire him as a criminal investigator, I'm glad (for that branch of the military) that he does NOT "investigate" for them now.

Leonard H. Anderson

5342. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:22 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174222.07578.00000777@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78757

In article <fnm1nvon50tnjjufoqs7vi66lelsvdfp3u@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>And the tree, both the one that made the sound and the metaphoric
>'tree' referred to in the posting is very much still there!

Irrelevant. You don't exist in reality. Therefore you would not make
any sound.

You DO make a lot of noise, though, but it is random, just QRM.

WHO are you, anonymous one?

Did your courage of convictions also fall?

5343. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:23 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174223.07578.00000778@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78762

In article <Wl4cb.3767$Hd6.1688432@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>You've got to define sound first. For example if you simply define it as
>waveforms in the air, then yes it does make a sound. However if you define
>it as the result when waveforms in the air are converted to a form that can
>be interpreted by the brain, then it doesn't make a sound.
>
>Either way though you are right that the tree is still there.

There is NO such person in any QRZ listing of Canadian or USA radio amateurs. Ergo, that person doesn't exist.

Why do you believe that spectres or the imagination are "rational, civil" persons?

5344. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174224.07578.00000779@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78770

In article <bkohv3qvo1@208.206.142.83>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

>I guess Clint also doesn't understand the admonition to "Never argue
>with an idiot".

DICK, I've not tried to argue with you for years.

Did that a long time ago and found it to be a lost cause. :-)

> Or Iit isn't nice to engage in a battle of wits with unarmed persons".

Continue with the "unbiased, civil, rational" debate old man. It certainly
helps the morse code testing cause...by showing what a false value it
really is.

5345. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:24 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174224.07578.00000780@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78781

In article <fbbvmvcurgfci05on7iduerg0vvle4ktfk@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>PS - I'm helping your cause? I thought that your cause was the
>elimination of Morse testing. If you review all of my comments so
>far, you'll find that I have never once mentioned Morse testing, pro
>or con. You have no idea what my position is on that subject - nice
>reading comprehension, my friend.

What is your amateur callsign, mighty amateur radio person?

Why do you remain ANONYMOUS? No courage of your
convictions?

5346. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174225.07578.00000781@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78763

In article <bko8pe$3v97v$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>Yep, Dick. It's starting to look like that's what I'll have to do.

Maybe you can get an RM going for a new "Ostrich class" license?

Got your blinders on?

5347. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:25 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174225.07578.00000782@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78780

In article <fs6vmvgkvvm2e7r3tn8nsq13bfa2s2208d@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 20:51:21 -0400, "Arnie Macy"
><kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote:
>
>Of course, that's OK too - if you are not offended by the boorish
>behaviour, and are able to see these people for what they are, you can
>have a lot of fun watching them.
>
>Kind of like the zoo, only more interactive.
>
>But, a word of advice - if you are sensitive about an issue (as many
>people are to the Holocaust, for example), never let then know -
>they'll just use it against you later, usualling when they feel
>threatened by you. That is a pretty scummy technique - but it's the
>only real weapon in a cretin's arsenal. In other words, don't give
>'em any ammunition....

You are mighty "brave" with words, ANONYMOUS one.

What is your callsign, righteous amateur?

5348. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174226.07578.00000784@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78767

In article <38h0nvg48d6jtmhfqn09t06uoh10p2u2kp@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>You can fix this yourself by logging in to QRZ.com and updating your
>listing. Your Birthday is one of the parameters that you can are
>allowed to change online.

Where are YOU in the QRZ listing, "Leo?"

Did you "edit" yourself completely out of it?

5349. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:26 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174226.07578.00000783@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78771

In article <ms63nv0t3ep8fmhf00duq7omm0ahl8ebsg@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>Had you told us that up front, we probably would have thought so too.
>Now, I'm not sure what your intent was....to foster confrontation,
>perhaps? Or are you trying to create a new licence category - Extra
>Crass :)
>
>73, Leo

"Leo," YOU are NOT on any QRZ listing for any country.

5350. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174227.07578.00000786@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78764

In article <20030923210922.23307.00003205@mb-m29.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>I suggested that in my comments to 98-143. FCC went the other way. Tells ya >somethin'.

Yes...the FCC did NOT agree with you.

Too bad about that.

5351. Re: No Heaven for CW coders

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174227.07578.00000785@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78777

In article <f45722ac.0309240249.711a3665@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Ah, but you forget an important step in the analysis!
>>
>> One picture is worth a thousand words. Therefore, the time required to send
>a
>> "Morse picture" at 20 wpm is equal to 1,000/20 = 50 minutes with no
>> compression.
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>So get going with your grossly incomplete picture.

Brian, give it up. The PCTA electrical engineer can't understand that
picture elements are not included in the International Morse Code
character list. He can't be brought into the new millennium and all
the present-day technology of modern electronics.

5352. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174228.07578.00000787@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78775

In article <vmvbh37m8aooe9@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>> WHOA, PUTZBREATH!
>
>Leo, an obvious PCTA, said this in a previous thread.. and I quote..
>
>"Not intellectual enough to make his
>point by rational arguement, he resorts to name calling and other
>juvenile tactics to 'get his way'. "
>
>oops.
>
>A PCTA just did that, not a NCTA type.
>
>Add "hypocrisy" to the list of the PCTA flaws in tactics and
>debate skills.

Clint, you have to consider the ANONYMITY of this mighty, opinionated nobody.

He (or she) hasn't the courage of their conviction to releal their identity.

5353. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174229.07578.00000789@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78779

In article <d22b54c3.0309240346.7b2e67ae@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com (Brian Kelly) writes:

>> >Well, considering how often you act like a small child in here, Leonard,
>> >you're certainly not qualified for that role.
>>
>> Go to bed, little one...it's past your bedtime.
>
>Typical. Hey PUTZ: You are the singular "unifying force" in this
>newsgroup. Utter and total disdain and distaste for your personna is
>the one "policy" overwhelmingly shared and agreed upon by both the
>NCTA and PCTA factions.
>
>Congratulations PUTZ.

Ah, another "calm, rational, civilized" PCTA heard from... :-)

5354. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174229.07578.00000788@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78783

In article <7hgcb.4385$pB6.793@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>>
>> heh heh....tell 'im you'll get back to him when he
>> has something intelligent to say. I told Larry that
>> a couple of weeks ago and, except to tell him I
>> wouldn't be the slightest bit interested in meeting
>> him or most others in this newsgroup, I've not
>> posted a thing to him since. I just can't find the
>> "intelligent" part of his posts.
>
> He does have the habit of trying to twist things when the discussion
>doesn't go his way and I simply don't have the time for that nonsense. If he
>doesn't want to discuss the issue seriously, he can discuss it with himself.

That's really not the point. I think both of you realize this. :-)

Roll's constant repetitions of old Maxims in here and the few personal barbs he throws in are just his way of trolling for those to respond to in the newsgroup. He seems to live by such "responses" which are little more than cut and paste from five years ago.

Roll has a very strong sense of self...and considerable self-promotion (in any other place it would be called "ego").

A good example of that is his self-promotion as a paragon of ethical and moral worth of self-discipline and "motivation" on upgrading via 20 WPM and achieving an extra class license. He loves rebuilding that marble pedestal to stand on. It is as if all US radio amateurs should emulate his self-admitted wonderfulness as the role model for all others.

None of it is a REAL argument for morsemanship. It is just self-praise.

Roll's basic arguments for the morse code test are just a very long-winded version of "I had to do it so you have to do it!" Probably with a good dose of "I'm so wonderful you should all be as good as me..."

:-)

5355. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174230.07578.00000790@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78768

In article <Ar4cb.3769$Hd6.1689555@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>Regardless of one's stance on the code, reviewing the history of the FCC
>shows that they are NOT necessarily concerned with what's best for the ARS.

That's not required under the FCC's charter from the US Congress.

"What is best for the ARS" is an extremely subjective (and thus prejudicial) viewpoint.

>If they were, BPL would never have gotten as far as it has.

5356. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174231.07578.00000792@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78766

In article <bko5pc$14j$1@208.206.142.72>, "Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com>
writes:

> It's beyond obvious by now that his character is ALL flaw.

That's what we all like about DICK...his calm, rational, civilized approach
to discussion and debate...

:-)

5357. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174231.07578.00000791@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78773

In article <3c4cb.3763$Hd6.1686991@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>He does that to distract from the fact that he has no valid arguments and is
>incapable of debating in any logical fashion.

Translation: "I don't like what he says because it is opposite to what I believe and therefore hate his guts."

>He is known to go onto long
>tangents leading to incredible non-sequiters.

It's "sequitur." :-)

Tsk, tsk, tsk..."tangents?" I was handling sines, cosines, and tangents back in high school of 1950. Trigonometry not a problem...always got maximum marks in such subjects.

>Most of us have long ago
>killfiled him because of it though there are a couple of people who continue
>to wrangle with him.

Translation: "I think he is horrid for not expressing 'our' True Belief in the sanctity, nobility, and righteousness of morse code!"

>I never see his posts anymore.

That does not matter to the rest, does it? :-)

If you want to retreat into some magic fantasyland, by all means shut out all discourse on subjects which go against your opinions.

Wearing blinders and doing the ostrich thing is denial, and rather egotistically arrogant in such subjectivity.

Those with the courage of their convictions should not be afraid to speak out. You apparently cannot handle any rational discourse, therefore you try to assassinate another's character instead of standing up for your Beliefs.

A problem with imitating the ostrich is that it leaves the rest of you hanging out for all to see.

5358. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174232.07578.00000793@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78774

In article <LGLbb.2621$iT4.1886808@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> I know I'm pointing out the obvious here, but why do you think it's
>> necessary for Len to *always* pepper his replies with personal insults. A
>> character flaw of some kind, maybe?
>
> Some people can't do any better than that. Nothing like strong words
>for weak arguments.

Let's see..."strong words" like "PUTZ!" for example (a nice little Yiddish
epithet for "dickhead").

"Strong words" like "you are ignorant, don't know anything!"

"Strong words" like implying all those opposed to the writer's opinion
is a child.

Then there's the "strong IMPLICATION" that someone "always" says
something to ruffle another's feathers. Tsk, tsk, tsk.

Michael, as a moderator, you DO have a serious problem at times with
hypocrisy.

Good luck on this one now...

5359. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174233.07578.00000795@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78769

In article <bknvg5$3vppv$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>I know I'm pointing out the obvious here, but why do you think it's
>necessary for Len to *always* pepper his replies with personal insults. A
>character flaw of some kind, maybe?

Just following your own style, Ah-nold... :-)

5360. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174233.07578.00000794@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78772

In article <bko0a6$3vmhp$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>Where did you get your information, Dwight? According to the ARRL (the
>primary ARS organization in the US) -- CW is the second most popular mode in
>the ARS -- Just behind SSB. That on its face would mean that there are
>still a whole bunch of folks out there still using it.

ON-OFF KEYING CW was ONCE the most popular mode for the ARS.

ONCE. Rather long ago...

No more. It's use is going down...

Learn to live with it graciously.

5361. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174234.07578.00000796@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78765

In article <20030922183002.29815.00000760@mb-m21.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>Hans, I am saddened that you revert to personal attack and talking down to
>someone who presents an argument you dislike. At least you didn't send me to
>an Amish rake fight.

...the Amish would win.

5362. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174234.07578.00000797@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78776

In article <Ki4cb.3765$Hd6.1688015@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> writes:

>I do it in self preservation. It can be hard to resist responding to either >one of them when they make such idiotic statements.

Translation: "I can't make a valid counter-argument to them so I will call them names and attack their character instead."

>I'd rather use my time in talking to more rational people.

Translation: "I want to be among My Kind and those who Believe what I Believe."

5363. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174235.07578.00000798@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78782

In article <bko608$41i4i$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>I really hate to see you do that. I killfiled Len for about a year, and in
>the process, missed many a good laughs.

In other words, you CHICKENED OUT.

You seemed to have "killfiled" yourself for that year.

>But, as I said in another reply -- just might have to be done.

That's your right, of course, but all it is proving is that YOU CAN'T TAKE
THE HEAT. Get out of the "kitchen" Arnie.

5364. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 21:42:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924174236.07578.00000799@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 78778

In article <20030923013421.12631.00001342@mb-m28.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <vmu3dc5uoiohad@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
>computron dot net> writes:
>
>>> Well, Clint, you said it, not me! I'm glad you're starting to see the
>>light!
>>>
>>> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>>>
>>
>>I, I see your point.
>>I will be the absolute BEST driver of a modern internal combustion engine-
>>driven automobile if I first take a blacksmith's apprenticeship and learn
>>to shoe a horse.
>>
>>Yes. Quite logical.
>>
>>Clint
>>KB5ZHT
>
>Well, Clint, that kind of cynicism may seem to be amusing to some, but
>just goes to demonstrate a lack of any truly logical argument which
>supports your position.

Roll doesn't have any valid arguments for His opinion, therefore he has to attack the character of anyone "daring" to speak against the radio god's mighty edicts.

>Therefore, it, and you, are easily dismissed.

The radio god spoke again...with a mighty clap of silence the dark lightning shown on the face of the newsgroup. All who viewed it giggled at the pretense of god-hood.

5365. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 22:26:06 UTC
From: THE CARING STATION <THECARINGSTATION@B>
Message-ID: <vn46g1h1u5mh3d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78784
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:hp24nvofjmp93liio9i7ljva15jee1gh4t@4ax.com...
> Now, if Supernews would be so kind as to TOS this 'Big Al' character,
> we could get back to dealing with the usual level of nutbar that lurks
> here :)
>
> 73, Leo
>

WONT HAPPEN LEO. YOU ARE THE ONE WHO USED THE 4 LETTER WORDS. YOU WILL BE
TOS'ED. HO HO

5366. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 22:36:39 UTC
From: Frank Todd K3EKO <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <X%ocb.145408$mp.72200@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 78785
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

THE CARING STATION wrote:
> "Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
> news:hp24nvofjmp93liio9i7ljva15jee1gh4t@4ax.com...
>
>>Now, if Supernews would be so kind as to TOS this 'Big Al' character,
>>we could get back to dealing with the usual level of nutbar that lurks
>>here :)
>>
>>73, Leo
>>
>
>
> WONT HAPPEN LEO. YOU ARE THE ONE WHO USED THE 4 LETTER WORDS. YOU WILL BE
> TOS'ED. HO HO
>
>
>
I vote that BIG AL stays...I enjoy his commentary.

--
73

Frank K3EKO

5367. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 22:40:25 UTC
From: THE CARING STATION <THECARINGSTATION@B>
Message-ID: <vn47ao8hlasebd@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78786
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

THATS RIGHT FRANK. IM STAYING. I HAVE A BIG ONE AND I CAN STAY.

"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
news:X%ocb.145408$mp.72200@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
> THE CARING STATION wrote:
> > "Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
> > news:hp24nvofjmp93liio9i7ljva15jee1gh4t@4ax.com...
> >
> >>Now, if Supernews would be so kind as to TOS this 'Big Al' character,
> >>we could get back to dealing with the usual level of nutbar that lurks
> >>here :)
> >>
> >>73, Leo
> >>
> >
> >
> > WONT HAPPEN LEO. YOU ARE THE ONE WHO USED THE 4 LETTER WORDS. YOU WILL
BE
> > TOS'ED. HO HO
> >
> >
> >
> I vote that BIG AL stays...I enjoy his commentary.
>
>
>
> --
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>

5368. HEY LEO THE LION

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 22:48:59 UTC
From: THE CARING STATION <THECARINGSTATION@B>
Message-ID: <vn47qr82ii6e3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78787
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

THERE IS ONLY REASON THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO GET ME TOS'ED. AND YOU KNOW EXACTLY WHAT IT IS.

I OWN YOU AND YOU CANT STAND IT.

YOU LIVE FOR MY NEXT POST. I OWN YOU! YOU ARE SO FUNNY. YOU SPEND HOURS UPON HOURS HERE WAITING FOR MY NEXT POST. YOU HAVE NO LIFE BEYOND YOUR COMPUTER. I OWN YOU. CALL ANYONE YOU WISH I DONT CARE. CALL YOURSELF I DONT CARE. CALL THE FCC I DONT CARE. CALL AOL I DONT CARE. CALL GW I DONT CARE. I OWN YOU.

HO HO

5369. Re: TONITE 7PM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:05:21 UTC
From: "John S. MacKay" <k35454@direct.ca>
Message-ID: <vn48ple4earc5d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78788
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"THE CARING STATION" <THECARINGSTATION@ B I G A L . O R G> wrote in message
news:vn3ua5i5lbu7da@corp.supernews.com...
> YOU KNOW THE FREQUENCY 3894.5-LSB. THAT'S ON 75 METERS FOR YOU LIMP ONES.
> I'LL BE ON AROUND 7 OR SO. TRANSMIT ONLY AFTER I GIVE YOU PERMISSION.
> OTHERWISE I WILL SHOW YOU THE DOOR.
>
> "BIG AL"
>
7:00 pm what time zone, and standard or daylight saving?
I didn't realize you were a newbie. JSM VE7AFN.

5370. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:14:00 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn49b99goj2873@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78789

>
> Michael, as a moderator, you DO have a serious problem at times with
> hypocrisy.
>
> Good luck on this one now...

Oh, they just overlook what they and thier those on thier side of the fence say. ALL that is okay, and goes without the same scrutiny that they give the rest of us. Yes, stereotypical hypocrisy.

Add to the list of names and phrases you gave the following... "jerk", "moron" and "dumb fuck".

What I REALLY like are the posts where I was called one of the aforementioned insults and then the letter was actually (I kid you not) ended with an accusation of name calling and personal character attacks! LOL

Clint

5371. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:14:28 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn49c436u5pq94@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78790

```
>
> That's what we all like about DICK...his calm, rational, civilized
approach
> to discussion and debate...
>
> :-)

or lack thereof.
```

5372. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:17:45 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn49i99efrv380@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78791

>
> If you want to retreat into some magic fantasyland, by all means shut
out
> all discourse on subjects which go against your opinions.
>
> Wearing blinders and doing the ostrich thing is denial, and rather
> egotistically arrogant in such subjectivity.

My point exactly; you described my thoughts to a word.
I just wonder what those hams out there that haven't made up thier
mind on the matter yet think when they read how the people on
THAT side of the issue behave? Denial & hypocrisy interspersed
with social outlooks that are as static as an oil painting. Yea, that's a
REAL good way to attract support for a controversial issue, isn't it?

Generally those on sinking ships look for lifeboats and lifevests
instead of trying to see what the quickest route to the bottom of
the ocean is.

Clint

5373. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:21:13 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn49oogesfk077@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78793

> That's your right, of course, but all it is proving is that YOU CAN'T
TAKE
> THE HEAT. Get out of the "kitchen" Arnie.
>

Imagine a televised debate on a matter, say a political one, where you
have candidates behind either a table they're sitting at or a podium they
are standing behind.. The first candidate begans to spew out all his
ideas and what he wants to see happen and what he'd do if his
side of the issue one, and then when the other candidate stepped up
for his or her retort, the first candidate just stuck his fingers in his
ears,
rocked his head back and forth and looked up and the ceiling and
started humming loudly to himself so he couldn't see or hear anything
from the other side. Now, he doesn't know what the other side
said, and probably doesn't care....

but the important matter is THIS.. what do all the voters in the
audience think of that fellow????

makes you want to rub your chin and go "hmmmmmmmm...."

Clint

5374. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:24:45 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn49vebj7f0r75@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78795

If you review all of my comments so
> far, you'll find that I have never once mentioned Morse testing, pro
> or con. You have no idea what my position is on that subject - nice
> reading comprehension, my friend.
>

and if you'll read one of my other posts I made to this very stand
you are trying to take, you'll find that nobody buys that as you
have shown a one-sided support in this issue, including your
very hypocritical scrutinizing of what the NCTA'ers have been
saying (grammer and content wise) while NOT holding the
PCTA crowd's feet to the fire. This means if you aren't
a supporter of them, your at least an apologist. OR there IS
a third possiblity; you are a personal friend to one of them
and have been communicating on the side, and he or she has
asked you to jump in here and appear as a "non-commited"
so as to give the air of being ambivalent or indifferent to the
matter at hand.

No, it's not a matter of my comprehension being poor; it's
RIGHT on the mark. In fact, i'd say that I hit the nail square
on the head, Leo. There can be NO other reason why you
have chastized certain things I have said but given those
of the PCTA that have called names and used
personal attacks.

You're just not that clever.

Clint

5375. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:25:35 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn4a0ur5flsdac@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78794

> Why do you remain ANONYMOUS? No courage of your
> convictions?

No, he may be a ham, may not be... it's more like he's simply doing what one of this PCTA friends is ASKING him to do off the newsgroup, either via the phone OR email, or another NG...

BUSTED

5376. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:28:30 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <yMpcb.7707$yp6.151037@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 78792

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:7pr3nvgmi2vk2ilphosdg3budnuujt0kle@4ax.com...
> Paul,
>
> Fully agreed - I found the survey quite by accident when I was looking
> up sonething on the RAC web site in August, otherwise I would not have
> missed it too..
>
> Was it advertised in the magazine? If so, I don'rt recall seeing it!
>
> Hopefully, the ARRL won't try to pull the same stunt....whatever way
> the vote goes, it should fairly represent the wishes of the Amateur
> community, not a small (and perhaps biased??) sampling.
>
> 73, Leo

Given that:

1) the ARRL's membership represents <25% of US licensees

and

2) that the membership is HEAVILY stacked with long-time
hams (Techs have stayed away in droves - in my view because
they correctly have viewd ARRL's Morse policy as designed
to keep them off of HF)

I would, even giving the ARRL credit for the best of intentions,
submit that any survey of ARRL membership is unlikely to be
TRULY representative of the views of the majority of US hams.

Carl - w3kc

5377. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:29:12 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn4a7o6fd0ujd0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78796

>
> Clint, you have to consider the ANONYMITY of this mighty, opinionated
> nobody.
>
> He (or she) hasn't the courage of their conviction to releal their
identity.
>

And i'm telling you, guy, you can BET on this.... he's just a friend of some
sort
to one of the PCTA's who has asked him to jump in here on thier behalf and
appear as hypothetical observer. I've seen this tactic before. You have to
consider how hypocritical HE is (attacking our syntax and grammer, while
not saying a THING about the PCTA group's choice of words or
grammer).

But that's just fine. I don't mind debating with him either, it's even
EASIER
to beat for this reason because his heart and mind aren't really into it...
and if he ISN'T a ham, then it'll show through eventually but i'd hazard the
guess that long before it gets to that point you'll mysteriously see him
vanish.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5378. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:32:02 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <SPpcb.6397$pB6.5620@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78797
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
news:X%ocb.145408$mp.72200@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
> THE CARING STATION wrote:
> > "Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
> > news:hp24nvofjmp93liio9i7ljva15jee1gh4t@4ax.com...
> >
> >>Now, if Supernews would be so kind as to TOS this 'Big Al' character,
> >>we could get back to dealing with the usual level of nutbar that lurks
> >>here :)
> >>
> >>73, Leo
> >>
> >
> >
> > WONT HAPPEN LEO. YOU ARE THE ONE WHO USED THE 4 LETTER WORDS. YOU WILL
BE
> > TOS'ED. HO HO
> >
> >
> >
> I vote that BIG AL stays...I enjoy his commentary.
>
>
>
> --
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>

You would....even if it is a troll.

Dan/W4NTI

5379. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:37:25 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkt9og$6ov@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 78801

"Mike Coslo" <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message
news:3F719250.9020705@psu.edu...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:Tdacb.4602$ai7.3732@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> >>"WA8ULX" wrote:
> >>
> >>>you dont fill it in QRZ fills it in.
> >>
> >>
> >> Go to the QRZ.com web site and choose the option to update your
personal
> >>information. There is a form you can fill in with your personal
> >
> > information
> >
> >>(with instructions on how to change the birth date).
> >>
> >>
> >>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> >>
> >>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> >>
> >>
> >
> >
> > ROFLMAO!!!! This is hilarious. The usual Extra-class nitwit-type
CBPlus
> > ham telling "us" that we're the ones who don't have any sense or
> > intelligence and that "we're" dumbed down, while all the while
demonstrating
> > their own ignorance...
>
> Dwight is a Technician, Kim.
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Oh good grief. He's ANSWERING the question from Waddles, Mike.

Kim W5TIT

5380. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:38:09 UTC
From: Frank Todd K3EKO <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <BVpcb.425394$Oz4.219503@rwcrnsc54>
Source record: 78798
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
> news:X%ocb.145408$mp.72200@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
>
>>THE CARING STATION wrote:
>>
>>>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>>>news:hp24nvofjmp93liio9i7ljva15jee1gh4t@4ax.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>Now, if Supernews would be so kind as to TOS this 'Big Al' character,
>>>>we could get back to dealing with the usual level of nutbar that lurks
>>>>here :)
>>>>
>>>>73, Leo
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>WONT HAPPEN LEO. YOU ARE THE ONE WHO USED THE 4 LETTER WORDS. YOU WILL
>
> BE
>
>>>TOS'ED. HO HO
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>I vote that BIG AL stays...I enjoy his commentary.
>>
>>
>>
>>--
>>73
>>
>>Frank K3EKO
>>
>
>
> You would....even if it is a troll.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Why haven't you responded to my earlier posts? You must know that
you're in the wrong.

--
73

Frank K3EKO

5381. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:38:48 UTC
From: Frank Todd K3EKO <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <cWpcb.145585$mp.72346@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 78799
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

THE CARING STATION wrote:

> THATS RIGHT FRANK. IM STAYING. I HAVE A BIG ONE AND I CAN STAY.
>
> "Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
> news:X%ocb.145408$mp.72200@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
>
>>THE CARING STATION wrote:
>>
>>>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>>>news:hp24nvofjmp93liio9i7ljva15jee1gh4t@4ax.com...
>>>
>>>
>>>>Now, if Supernews would be so kind as to TOS this 'Big Al' character,
>>>>we could get back to dealing with the usual level of nutbar that lurks
>>>>here :)
>>>>
>>>>73, Leo
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>WONT HAPPEN LEO. YOU ARE THE ONE WHO USED THE 4 LETTER WORDS. YOU WILL
>
> BE
>
>>>TOS'ED. HO HO
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>I vote that BIG AL stays...I enjoy his commentary.
>>
>>
>>
>>--
>>73
>>
>>Frank K3EKO
>>
>
>
>
HO HO

--
73

Frank K3EK0

5382. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:38:56 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkt9rb$t3@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 78800

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:ms63nv0t3ep8fmhf00duq7omm0ahl8ebsg@4ax.com...
> WA8ULX,
>
> Please excuse everyone for being a bit confused by this. When someone
> pointed out earlier that your birthdate was incorrect, didn't you
> reply:
>
> >> CBplusser, you dont fill it in QRZ fills it in.
>
> Since then, two people have kindly posted instructions on how to fix
> it. Now, you are insulting Kim, and telling us that is was you in the
> first place who changed your birthdate, because its 'cute'.
>
> Had you told us that up front, we probably would have thought so too.
> Now, I'm not sure what your intent was....to foster confrontation,
> perhaps? Or are you trying to create a new licence category - Extra
> Crass :)
>
> 73, Leo
>

Yeppers, the "smart" *cough* Extras always have nothing but backout when
they called on the carpet... :)

Kim W5TIT

5383. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:39:34 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkt9si$ibj@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 78802

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:rphcb.4704$pB6.3756@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote:
> >
> > ROFLMAO!!!! This is hilarious. The usual Extra-class
> > nitwit-type CBPlus ham telling "us" that we're the ones
> > who don't have any sense or intelligence and that "we're"
> > dumbed down, all the while demonstrating their own
> > ignorance...
>
>
> Oh, come on, Kim. After passing all those license exams, you can't
really
> expect Bruce to have any room left in that head to think of anything else.
> As it is, he had to forget all he knew for the previous exams to make room
> for the information for the later exams. Of course, he also had to forget
> all about the later exams to make room to remember his name again. And, as
> you can see, with that, there clearly isn't any room left for basic
spelling
> and grammer.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

psssssst, there wasn't room to begin with!!! LOL

Kim W5TIT

5384. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:46:06 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <21qcb.6503$pB6.5669@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78803
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
news:BVpcb.425394$Oz4.219503@rwcrnsc54...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > "Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
> > news:X%ocb.145408$mp.72200@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
> >
> >>THE CARING STATION wrote:
> >>
> >>>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
> >>>news:hp24nvofjmp93liio9i7ljva15jee1gh4t@4ax.com...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Now, if Supernews would be so kind as to TOS this 'Big Al' character,
> >>>>we could get back to dealing with the usual level of nutbar that lurks
> >>>>here :)
> >>>>
> >>>>73, Leo
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>WONT HAPPEN LEO. YOU ARE THE ONE WHO USED THE 4 LETTER WORDS. YOU WILL
> >
> > BE
> >
> >>>TOS'ED. HO HO
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>
> >>I vote that BIG AL stays...I enjoy his commentary.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>--
> >>73
> >>
> >>Frank K3EKO
> >>
> >
> >
> > You would....even if it is a troll.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI

> >
> >
> Why haven't you responded to my earlier posts? You must know that
> you're in the wrong.
>
>
>
> --
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>

I did respond numbnuts. But here it is again.

Your still member of the Barf and the Stumpers, right?

Dan/W4NTI

5385. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:46:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924194620.02944.00000116@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 78804

>Yeppers, the "smart" *cough* Extras always have nothing but backout when
>they called on the carpet... :)
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

You dum ass, TiT put your TIT back in your Bra and go home, no one is interested.

5386. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:48:59 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924194859.02944.00000117@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 78805

>Oh good grief. He's ANSWERING the question from Waddles, Mike.
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

Hey TIT, put them hangers back on the Truck Bed and haul them back to the
Mobile Home Park.

5387. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:49:51 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924194951.02944.00000118@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 78806

>psssssst, there wasn't room to begin with!!! LOL
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

TIT, I think all your Brains are in your TITS.

5388. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-24 23:57:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <gbqcb.4030$Hd6.1886988@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78807

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:F49cb.4377$ai7.1473@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" wrote:
> >
> > Regardless of one's stance on the code, reviewing
> > the history of the FCC shows that they are NOT
> > necessarily concerned with what's best for the ARS.
> > If they were, BPL would never have gotten as far
> > as it has.
>
>
> Let me put it another way. I think the FCC is concerned about the best
> interests of the ARS, within the confines of reality. We have to remember
> the ARS is not the only pot on the stove - the FCC deals with many other
> services and has to balance the needs of each service against the others
> (and that includes the ARS). That means we're not always going to exactly
> what we want, exactly when and how we want it. But that certainly doesn't
> mean the FCC is not concerned with the best interests of the ARS or, as
some
> have suggested, has an agenda against it. We have a massive amount of
> frequencies to play with. We have more modes to play with than most radio
> services. We have more freedoms (to build or modify out own equipment and
so
> on) than most radio services. When you look at the whole picture, it's
> fairly hard to complain too much.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Yeah but if we are not in there doing the "squeaky wheel" bit, they might
decide we are adequately served with less and less.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5389. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:01:01 UTC
From: Frank Todd K3EKO <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <1fqcb.567393$YN5.401448@sccrnsc01>
Source record: 78808
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
> news:BVpcb.425394$Oz4.219503@rwcrnsc54...
>
>>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>
>>>"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
>>>news:X%ocb.145408$mp.72200@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
>>>
>>>
>>>>THE CARING STATION wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>>>>>news:hp24nvofjmp93liio9i7ljva15jee1gh4t@4ax.com...
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>Now, if Supernews would be so kind as to TOS this 'Big Al' character,
>>>>>>we could get back to dealing with the usual level of nutbar that lurks
>>>>>>here :)
>>>>>>
>>>>>>73, Leo
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>WONT HAPPEN LEO. YOU ARE THE ONE WHO USED THE 4 LETTER WORDS. YOU WILL
>>>
>>>BE
>>>
>>>
>>>>TOS'ED. HO HO
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I vote that BIG AL stays...I enjoy his commentary.
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>--
>>>>73
>>>>

>>>>Frank K3EKO
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>You would....even if it is a troll.
>>>
>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>
>>>
>>
>>Why haven't you responded to my earlier posts? You must know that
>>you're in the wrong.
>>
>>
>>
>>--
>>73
>>
>>Frank K3EKO
>>
>
>
> I did respond numbnuts. But here it is again.
>
> Your still member of the Barf and the Stumpers, right?
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
Yes, and will always be.

-Frank

--
73

Frank K3EKO

5390. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:07:20 UTC
From: Frank Todd K3EKO <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <Ykqcb.568344$Ho3.104168@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 78809
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Frank Todd K3EKO wrote:

> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
>> "Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
>> news:BVpcb.425394$Oz4.219503@rwcrnsc54...
>>
>>> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>>
>>>> "Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
>>>> news:X%ocb.145408$mp.72200@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>> THE CARING STATION wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>> "Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>>>>>> news:hp24nvofjmp93liio9i7ljva15jee1gh4t@4ax.com...
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>> Now, if Supernews would be so kind as to TOS this 'Big Al'
>>>>>>> character,
>>>>>>> we could get back to dealing with the usual level of nutbar that
>>>>>>> lurks
>>>>>>> here :)
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>> 73, Leo
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>> WONT HAPPEN LEO. YOU ARE THE ONE WHO USED THE 4 LETTER WORDS. YOU
>>>>>> WILL
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> BE
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> TOS'ED. HO HO
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>

>>>>> I vote that BIG AL stays...I enjoy his commentary.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>> --
>>>>> 73
>>>>>
>>>>> Frank K3EKO
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>> You would....even if it is a troll.
>>>>
>>>> Dan/W4NTI
>>>>
>>>>
>>>
>>> Why haven't you responded to my earlier posts? You must know that
>>> you're in the wrong.
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>> --
>>> 73
>>>
>>> Frank K3EKO
>>>
>>
>>
>> I did respond numbnuts. But here it is again.
>>
>> Your still member of the Barf and the Stumpers, right?
>>
>> Dan/W4NTI
>>
>>
> Yes, and will always be.
>
> -Frank
>
>
>
BUt what does that have to do with you accusing me of NOT apologizing
for my actions?

-Frank

--
73

Frank K3EKO

5391. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:09:28 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <hp44nv0686rruin67v0hhamck44hc4epbp@4ax.com>
Source record: 78810

It's a pity.

Poor, sad old man. Blasting off random bursts at his 'enemies' on the newsgroup. Perhaps a bout of 1950s-comms-induced PTSD awakened him from his restless, fitful nap late this afternoon. It is indeed heartbreaking to see the ravages of time on someone who was probably so vital and important in their youth. A real tragedy. Firing off 28 postings in a row, in a valiant effort to smite his those who refuse to cowtow. Fighting in the blind. The last vanguard against the sullied and ignorant opinions of the unwashed masses of rec.radio.amateur.policy, and other important theatres of combat. The pathfinder for the hopelessly dinky-dow. Dudley Do-Right, trying to save his Nell.

Still swinging at ghosts. PTSD - induced firefights in the newsgroup. Endless torment - always in danger of having his newsgroup position overrun. "Incoming !!! Incoming !!! Stand by - returning Usenet message fire !!! Budda-Budda-Budda-Budda !!!!!. Can't get 'em all, though - too many incoming messages - Can't read 'em all...they're too long !!!!!. Ambush !!!! - We've got Hams in the wire !!. Pick your targets, Men, Just hit the ones you can easily kill ! FOLLOW ME ! AIIIIIIEEEEEEE !!!!"

Frustrated. Still unable to score a hit. One shot, no kill. A hundred shots, still no kill. Oh, what would he give for a victory? - the sweet taste of conquest! What would he give to make them listen - to understand? "WHY won't they LISTEN?????????"

And lastly, the big one. Tarnishing one's honor in meaningless online arguments, in the hope that someone somewhere out there will agree. Or submit. Or convert to his way of thinking. To see things from his perspective. To comprehend his point, however small, as it is important to him! "To just DO WHAT I SAY!!!!!!!!!!"

Still searching for the right words to make himself understood. But, the right words fail him. And, tragically, losing his perception of reality, and believing that, if it doesn't have a name, it cannot be real. If you can't see it, it isn't there. Imperceptible. Not tangible. Not defeatable. Kicking a** and taking names - that's what young soldiers do, isn't it? - . But the old, the infirm, the surplus, the forgotten, and those looking at the last few miles (nay, perhaps yards) of life's long road - what is reality for them? Is it only what can be touched? Or seen? Or dominated? Or attacked? Or convinced? Oh, sweet reality - what are you, really? "WHAT IS YOUR NAME ???????? WHO ARE YOU ?????????"

And, inevitably, the question of honor - possibly the most enduring trait that defines a man, and the last one to be bartered for the short-lived rush of Usenet group acceptance. The last one to be cast off in the pursuit of newsgroup gratification. The final frontier. Down to the last dollar. Craps, you lose.

For the best contemporary definition of honor, we need only look to a famous military organization that best personifies that word:

"Honor guides Marines to exemplify the ultimate in ethical and moral behavior; to never lie cheat or steal; to abide by an uncompromising code of integrity; respect human dignity; and respect others. The quality of maturity, dedication, trust and dependability commit Marines to act responsibly; to be accountable for their actions; to fulfill their obligations; and to hold others accountable for their actions. "

But this is far too harsh a standard in our modern-day civilian world. We as a society give latitude, however, to the older members of our group. Sometimes, they lie. Not intentionally - I'm certain that they honestly believe they are reciting fact from memory, a memory that is now growing fragile and occasionally fuzzy and distorted. And sometimes, they become impatient and forget to respect human dignity (after all, society owes them a debt of gratitude for the contributions of a lifetime!, doesn't it? Of course we do!). Or to accord others the respect and dignity that they deserve. And, ironically, the older folks tend to hold others accountable for their actions, to a level that mainstream society is often uncomfortable with. Even when doing do is in violation of the rules of polite society.

But, this is not an affliction. Or a disease. Or the slightest bit unnatural. It is simply the logical, natural progression of life as God intended it to be - perhaps cruel, but it is a road that we all must travel someday. No way out!

So, Stand Down, Old Soldier - we understand! We appreciate everything that you have done for us, and we will make it our goal to make your twilight years comfortable. And happy. And fulfilling. No matter what. If you cannot always see your way clear to respecting others, or keep the old facts straight from time to time, that's OK. We understand!

We're here to help you to be all that you can possibly be, OM - if you will just let us!

Two things in life of of paramount importance right now. People to depend on. And Depends. You will never run out of either, not as long as we are here!!!!!

73 and 88, OM Leo

PS - I'm sure other folks on the newsgroup will check in with you from time to time, and make sure that you're OK. There's nothing like

reassurance to get the elderly through frightening and frustrating
times. Constant reassurance - its the only way!

On 24 Sep 2003 21:42:22 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <fnm1nvon50tnjjufoqs7vi66lelsvdfp3u@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
>writes:
>
>>And the tree, both the one that made the sound and the metaphoric
>>'tree' referred to in the posting is very much still there!
>
> Irrelevant. You don't exist in reality. Therefore you would not make
> any sound.
>
> You DO make a lot of noise, though, but it is random, just QRM.
>
> WHO are you, anonymous one?
>
> Did your courage of convictions also fall?

5392. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:17:02 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <2uqcb.4035$Hd6.1890823@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78811

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in
message news:34l3nvkm2ogra3vaaugl415hik28aktft5@4ax.com...
> **** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****
>
> There are no FCC-mandated
> subbands on 160, and that band hasn't exactly turned into a mess
> without such regulations.
>

160 meters will never be a problem. Very, very few amateurs have the room
to put up an effective 160meter antenna.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5393. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:22:05 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <Nyqcb.4038$Hd6.1891945@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78812

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:yMpcb.7707$yp6.151037@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>
> Given that:
>
> 1) the ARRL's membership represents <25% of US licensees
>
> and
>
> 2) that the membership is HEAVILY stacked with long-time
> hams (Techs have stayed away in droves - in my view because
> they correctly have viewd ARRL's Morse policy as designed
> to keep them off of HF)
>

OK print the demographic DATA that shows that the ARRL membership is deficient in Technician class licenses. Right now you are presenting an unsupported opinion. The policy was never designed to keep them off HF. The policy was intended to require what the membership believed to be a valuable communications tool. Based on the Techs I know, just as many (or just as few) join the ARRL as is typical of holders of other license classes.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5394. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:24:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <FAqcb.3464$iT4.2510294@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 78813

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> Oh good grief. He's ANSWERING the question from Waddles, Mike.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

My bad!

- Mike KB3EIA -

5395. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:26:55 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bktcofug0@208.206.142.96>
Source record: 78814

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

(Techs have stayed away in droves - in my view because
> they correctly have viewd ARRL's Morse policy as designed
> to keep them off of HF)
>

When you codebashers gonna make up your minds?? the earlier story was that techn just didn't care about HF. Must've been a few out there who did obviously, but you're scheme just doesn't square with the attitude of most Techs who only wanted VHF, (a great many of whom dropped out and didn't renew when all the family got cellphones).

> I would, even giving the ARRL credit for the best of intentions,
> submit that any survey of ARRL membership is unlikely to be
> TRULY representative of the views of the majority of US hams.
>

Why, of course you would!

5396. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:31:08 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924203108.02537.00000756@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 78816

In article <20030924174220.07578.00000775@mb-m25.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <bgp1nv87725pavclr3ck5gah78g26ovij8@4ax.com>, Leo
><nomail@nope.org>
>writes:
>
>>Well, things aren't always quite that black-and-white, Clint. I am
>>certainly not a sympathizer nor apologist for either side of the
>>arguement. Not beacuse I am firmly in one camp or the other - it's
>>much simpler than that.
>
> Much simpler. YOU hide behind anonymity to relieve yourself on
> the group by pretending to exist. You HIDE.

Just like someone who posts here under several different AOL screen names, such as "nocwtest", "averyfine", "averyfineman", "lenof21", "lenover21", and probably some more I've forgotten.

It's also interesting that when "vshah101" showed up here and posted "anonymously", Len had no problem with him at all.

>>So, here it is - my position: I don't really care that much one way
>>or the other.
>
> You MUST "care" a great deal...but don't have the COURAGE to
> speak out as yourself, not an ANONYMOUS troll.

Ah, the old ad-hominem. You attack the person, not the issue. Vshah101 is against the code test, so it was OK with Len if he posted "anonymously".
>
>>In short, to restate, I don't care too much one way or the other.
>>perhaps because I didn't go through the rigourous testing that the
>>Extras did years ago. I didn't have to draw schematics on my test, or
>>answer essay-type questions, and pass 20 WPM Morse - many of these
>>fellows did, though, and it must burn them up to see us get in there
>>today with multiple choice answers and 5 WPM code.
>
> How does anyone KNOW "what you did years ago?"
>
> You are ANONYMOUS, have no verifiable identity.

Sure he does. He's "Leo".

Oh wait, now I get it. You are angry because you don't know things about him like his last name, his callsign, his job, his age, his military service, etc.

You can't use any of those things against him.

>>Now stop debating, Clint - for God's sake, you'll go blind :)
>
> By refusing to identify yourself, EVERYONE is blind to you.
>
Then why are you replying? ;-)

5397. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:31:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924203109.02537.00000757@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 78815

In article <20030924174226.07578.00000783@mb-m25.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>YOU are NOT on any QRZ listing for any country.

Neither are you. Len ;-) ;-) ;-)

5398. FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:31:17 UTC
From: opcom <eccm@swbell.net>
Message-ID: <3F72521A.70F5BD12@swbell.net>
Source record: 78817
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

This was posted to ARLI, I don't know how many subscribe, but in spite of the numerous comments against BPL (transmitting wideband internet data over power lines, which will destroy the HF radio spectrum), the FCC seems disposed
to encourage it anyway. evil! evil! just look up BPL on the web. The noise from the radiated signals trashed the ham bands thoroughly.

From:
Amateur Radio Station N0JAA <N0JAA@aol.com>
4:00 PM

Subject:
[ARLI] FCC Commissioner's Comments Concerning BPL
To:
bvarc@clarc.org, clarc@clarc.org, ARLI@topica.com

The following is a transcript from a recent speech given by FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy at the United PowerLine
Council's annual conference regarding BPL. It seems that she is all for it. It also seems that BPL is going to become a reality, regardless
of what ARRL, the military, or anyone else says. As usual, big industry wins over everyone else because they have the money.

This is from today's FCC Digest.

Paul, N0JAA

Reaching Broadband Nirvana
United PowerLine Council Annual Conference Remarks of Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
September 22, 2003 (As prepared for delivery)

Thank you very much for inviting me to speak with you. I am very excited about broadband-over-powerline technology. I
have seen it in action, and I believe it has a very bright future. It is a real honor to be your keynote speaker at this
important juncture for BPL.

As a regulator, I am keenly interested in BPL technology for a number of reasons. One of my central objectives as an FCC commissioner is to facilitate the deployment of broadband services to all Americans. I also fundamentally
believe that the FCC can best promote consumer welfare by relying on market forces, rather than heavy-handed regulation. The development of BPL networks will serve both of these key goals. It will not only bring broadband to

previously unserved communities, but the introduction of a new broadband pipeline into the home will foster the kind of competitive marketplace that will eventually enable the Commission to let go of the regulatory reins. I
want consumers to have a choice of multiple, facilities-based providers, including not only cable and DSL, but also powerline, wireless, and satellite services. Such a robustly competitive and diversified marketplace is
something I would call broadband Nirvana. We will not get there overnight, but the continuing development of BPL technology is a major step forward.

While the long-term objective is a robustly competitive marketplace that is free of regulatory distortions, a more immediate question is: What should the FCC do to help foster such an environment? Sticking with my Nirvana
metaphor, I guess the question would be, what is the path to enlightenment?

I believe the answer, in short, is regulatory restraint. It is tempting for regulators to take every new technology or service that comes along and apply the same rules that govern incumbent services. After all, regulatory
parity and a level playing field are intuitively appealing concepts. But I believe that it would be a huge mistake to carry forward legacy regulations whenever new technology platforms are established. Many of our regulations
are premised on the absence of competition, and when that rationale is eroded, we must not reflexively hold on to regulations that no longer serve their intended purpose. In fact, many of our old rules not only become
unnecessary as markets evolve, but they can be fatal to new services that need room to breathe.

The Nascent Services Doctrine applying more stringent regulations to wireline providers at a minimum must be reconsidered. As other platforms, including BPL and wireless, become more widely available, that will further
undermine the justification for regulating incumbent LECs broadband services as if they were the only available offerings. When the Commission completes this rulemaking, I expect that we will eliminate many existing rules and
substantially modify others; the central question is the degree of regulation that will remain during the transition to a more robustly competitive market.

Finally, it is important to recognize that although the emergence of new platforms like BPL will eliminate the need for many competition-related regulations, other types of regulation may well remain necessary. For example, the
FCC must implement public policy goals unrelated to competition, or even at odds with competition. Universal service and access for persons with disabilities are examples of this kind of regulation. These public policy goals
generally should be applied to all service providers, to the extent permitted by the Communications Act. The FCC also must intervene to prevent competitors from imposing externalities on one another and to protect consumers
where market failures are identified. Although, as I have noted, the Commission was right to refrain from imposing heavy-handed price and service-quality regulations on PCS services when the were introduced, it was also right
to adopt strict interference rules to prevent competitors from externalizing their costs. The same principle will apply to BPL. They key point is that, while some degree of regulation is both inevitable and desirable, we
should ensure that it is narrowly tailored to the particular governmental interests at

stake. I appreciate the opportunity to share these thoughts with you, and I would be happy to answer a few questions if we have time.

******------****** please click on one or more of the links below to send a blank subscribe message.
Amateur Radio Legal Issues List
(A list for discussing legal and legislative issues impacting Amateur Radio from Congress and the FCC)
What have you done for Amateur Radio today?
--^^----------

5399. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:33:04 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bktd40$1nv$0@208.206.142.96>
Source record: 78818

Leo wrote:

> Down to the last dollar. Craps, you lose.
>

Leo, despite the eloquence of your long repartee, the single line above says it all re LHA.

5400. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:34:19 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <rvd4nvgn5k8mb0t8busa25i82j10unf639@4ax.com>
Source record: 78819

LOL !

73, Leo

On Wed, 24 Sep 2003 18:24:45 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>If you review all of my comments so
>> far, you'll find that I have never once mentioned Morse testing, pro
>> or con. You have no idea what my position is on that subject - nice
>> reading comprehension, my friend.
>>
>
>and if you'll read one of my other posts I made to this very stand
>you are trying to take, you'll find that nobody buys that as you
>have shown a one-sided support in this issue, including your
>very hypocritical scrutinizing of what the NCTA'ers have been
>saying (grammer and content wise) while NOT holding the
>PCTA crowd's feet to the fire. This means if you aren't
>a supporter of them, your at least an apologist. OR there IS
>a third possiblity; you are a personal friend to one of them
>and have been communicating on the side, and he or she has
>asked you to jump in here and appear as a "non-commited"
>so as to give the air of being ambivalent or indifferent to the
>matter at hand.
>
>No, it's not a matter of my comprehension being poor; it's
>RIGHT on the mark. In fact, i'd say that I hit the nail square
>on the head, Leo. There can be NO other reason why you
>have chastized certain things I have said but given those
>of the PCTA that have called names and used
>personal attacks.
>
>You're just not that clever.
>
>Clint
>

5401. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:35:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bktd8l$1nv$1@208.206.142.96>
Source record: 78820

Leo wrote:

>
> We're here to help you to be all that you can possibly be, OM - if you
> will just let us!
>

Let's add one short word "....if you will just let us be!"

5402. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:36:43 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <72e4nv8at5cbrla5lrjv6paj8v87n3qelo@4ax.com>
Source record: 78821

Len,

You mean you looked up "Leo" on QRZ, and couldn't find me?

Kinda new to them there Personal Confusers, huh..... ;)

73, Leo

On 24 Sep 2003 21:42:26 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>
> "Leo," YOU are NOT on any QRZ listing for any country.

5403. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:39:41 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <l5e4nvo13rh277hsdl7r3flsg1c5l7utei@4ax.com>
Source record: 78822

Len,

Does it really matter? Would you like to send me a Christmas card, or drop by for a beer someday? ;)

And what convictions - are you suggesting that maybe we done time together? LOL

73, Leo

On 24 Sep 2003 21:42:24 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Why do you remain ANONYMOUS? No courage of your
> convictions?

5404. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:40:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bktdip$2j8$0@208.206.142.96>
Source record: 78823

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in
> message news:34l3nvkm2ogra3vaaugl415hik28aktft5@4ax.com...
>
>>**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****
>>
>>There are no FCC-mandated
>>subbands on 160, and that band hasn't exactly turned into a mess
>>without such regulations.
>>
>
>
> 160 meters will never be a problem. Very, very few amateurs have the room
> to put up an effective 160meter antenna.
>

Actually you can. One that I found worked quite well on 160 was the
Alpha-Delta DX-A Sloper, actually a double sloper, which also works well
on 80 and 40.

A full size 1/2 wave dipole is of course another matter at ~250 feet.

Dick

> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

5405. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:46:03 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <3ee4nvgs7o4d5qlu4oqr3qj3kup741jifj@4ax.com>
Source record: 78824

Thanks, Dick.

But to ascertain whether we have truly touched his soul, we really
need to here his revelations.

As you know, old folks read pretty slow - he'll be back to let us know
if he's "seen the light" in a day or so, I'm sure ;)

73, Leo

Illigitimus Non Carborundum (don't let the bastards wear you down!)

On 25 Sep 2003 00:33:04 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
wrote:

>
>
>Leo wrote:
>
>> Down to the last dollar. Craps, you lose.
>>
>
>
>Leo, despite the eloquence of your long repartee, the single line above
>says it all re LHA.

5406. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:47:37 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <JWqcb.4051$Hd6.1896910@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78826

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bktdip$2j8$0@208.206.142.96...
>
>
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> > "Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in
> > message news:34l3nvkm2ogra3vaaugl415hik28aktft5@4ax.com...
> > >
> > >>**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****
> > >>
> > >>There are no FCC-mandated
> > >>subbands on 160, and that band hasn't exactly turned into a mess
> > >>without such regulations.
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> > > 160 meters will never be a problem. Very, very few amateurs have the
> room
> > > to put up an effective 160meter antenna.
> > >
> >
> >
> >
> > Actually you can. One that I found worked quite well on 160 was the
> > Alpha-Delta DX-A Sloper, actually a double sloper, which also works well
> > on 80 and 40.
> >
> > A full size 1/2 wave dipole is of course another matter at ~250 feet.
> >
> > Dick
> >
> > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >

Ah but how "well" is well. And keep in mind that there are a fair number
who can't manage anything decent on 80 or even 40. I had a nice long,
random wire (about 250') but could only get it about 10 feet off the ground.
While I was able to work stations in Kansas during the 160 meter contest, I
could get California. Yet I heard East Coast stations who were working
those West Coasters that I couldn't hear.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5407. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:47:54 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <sne4nv8ca54ivsit1bt4545mej1t02e802@4ax.com>
Source record: 78825

Well said, Sir! Spot on.

73, Leo

On 25 Sep 2003 00:31:08 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <20030924174220.07578.00000775@mb-m25.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <bgp1nv87725pavclr3ck5gah78g26ovij8@4ax.com>, Leo
>><nomail@nope.org>
>>writes:
>>
>>>Well, things aren't always quite that black-and-white, Clint. I am
>>>certainly not a sympathizer nor apologist for either side of the
>>>arguement. Not beacuse I am firmly in one camp or the other - it's
>>>much simpler than that.
>>
>> Much simpler. YOU hide behind anonymity to relieve yourself on
>> the group by pretending to exist. You HIDE.
>
>Just like someone who posts here under several different AOL screen names, such
>as "nocwtest", "averyfine", "averyfineman", "lenof21", "lenover21", and
>probably some more I've forgotten.
>
>It's also interesting that when "vshah101" showed up here and posted
>"anonymously", Len had no problem with him at all.
>
>>>So, here it is - my position: I don't really care that much one way
>>>or the other.
>>
>> You MUST "care" a great deal...but don't have the COURAGE to
>> speak out as yourself, not an ANONYMOUS troll.
>
>Ah, the old ad-hominem. You attack the person, not the issue. Vshah101 is
>against the code test, so it was OK with Len if he posted "anonymously".
>>
>>>In short, to restate, I don't care too much one way or the other.
>>>perhaps because I didn't go through the rigourous testing that the
>>>Extras did years ago. I didn't have to draw schematics on my test, or
>>>answer essay-type questions, and pass 20 WPM Morse - many of these
>>>fellows did, though, and it must burn them up to see us get in there
>>>today with multiple choice answers and 5 WPM code.
>>
>> How does anyone KNOW "what you did years ago?"

>>
>> You are ANONYMOUS, have no verifiable identity.
>
>Sure he does. He's "Leo".
>
>Oh wait, now I get it. You are angry because you don't know things about him
>like his last name, his callsign, his job, his age, his military service, etc.
>You can't use any of those things against him.
>
>>>Now stop debating, Clint - for God's sake, you'll go blind :)
>>
>> By refusing to identify yourself, EVERYONE is blind to you.
>>
>Then why are you replying? ;-)

5408. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:50:26 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <mZqcb.4055$Hd6.1897455@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78827

```
"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:JWqcb.4051$Hd6.1896910@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bktdip$2j8$0@208.206.142.96...
> >
> >
> > Dee D. Flint wrote:
> >
> > > "Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in
> > > message news:34l3nvkm2ogra3vaaugl415hik28aktft5@4ax.com...
> > >
> > > >>**** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****
> > > >>
> > > >>There are no FCC-mandated
> > > >>subbands on 160, and that band hasn't exactly turned into a mess
> > > >>without such regulations.
> > > >>
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > 160 meters will never be a problem. Very, very few amateurs have the
> room
> > > > to put up an effective 160meter antenna.
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Actually you can. One that I found worked quite well on 160 was the
> > > Alpha-Delta DX-A Sloper, actually a double sloper, which also works well
> > > on 80 and 40.
> > >
> > > A full size 1/2 wave dipole is of course another matter at ~250 feet.
> > >
> > > Dick
> > >
> > > > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > > >
> >
> Ah but how "well" is well. And keep in mind that there are a fair number
> who can't manage anything decent on 80 or even 40. I had a nice long,
> random wire (about 250') but could only get it about 10 feet off the
ground.
> While I was able to work stations in Kansas during the 160 meter contest,
I
```

> could get California. Yet I heard East Coast stations who were working
> those West Coasters that I couldn't hear.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Hate it when I skip a word typing. It should read "...I could not get
California..."

5409. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:53:15 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <5re4nvs0omgqpet3njpni17bo7ss8lnt3l@4ax.com>
Source record: 78828

Dee,

As well, consider that the RAC does not represent anywhere near all of the Canadian amateurs. Their survey was, in all fairness, an open poll available to members and non-members alike.

Just one problem, though - they did not publicise it well (or at all...), which limited the votes to those who knew of it or stumbled upon it - and as Paul pointed out earlier today, this has led to the suspicion that the deck may have been stacked by RAC's leadership.

73, Leo

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 00:22:05 GMT, "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:

>
>"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
>news:yMpcb.7707$yp6.151037@nnrp1.ptd.net...
>>
>> Given that:
>>
>> 1) the ARRL's membership represents <25% of US licensees
>>
>> and
>>
>> 2) that the membership is HEAVILY stacked with long-time
>> hams (Techs have stayed away in droves - in my view because
>> they correctly have viewd ARRL's Morse policy as designed
>> to keep them off of HF)
>>
>
>OK print the demographic DATA that shows that the ARRL membership is
>deficient in Technician class licenses. Right now you are presenting an
>unsupported opinion. The policy was never designed to keep them off HF.
>The policy was intended to require what the membership believed to be a
>valuable communications tool. Based on the Techs I know, just as many (or
>just as few) join the ARRL as is typical of holders of other license
>classes.
>
>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5410. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 00:57:33 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <55f4nvs6l3455v48ijckjdt6f8ff4m2qkn@4ax.com>
Source record: 78829

Clint, me amigo, me compadre....

I'm sure that the Founding Fathers would not have written Free Speech into the Constitution, had they any idea what you would one day interpret it to be!

You have the right to remain silent, too - why not invoke that one for a change?

Leo

On Sun, 21 Sep 2003 15:42:50 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:

>Hey, wanna talk SHUDDER?
>
>this is what makes ME shudder... the thought that you are invoking
>the priviledges of free speech and rights of society just like I am,
>but also advocating that an idea, concept or practice be forced
>upon a person against thier will.
>
>And you're doing that with a straight face.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>

5411. Extra Class Exam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:08:08 UTC
From: dmorgan@rocketmail.com
Message-ID: <bd2ad7b6.0309241708.45863a0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78830

For the extra class exam, do they allow scientific calculators?
If not is the a tan/arctan chart allowed for the rlc phase angle questions?

I took and got the general last year but as I remember it I thought they limited
the test taker to basic function calculators....

5412. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:13:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bktfft$71a$0@208.206.142.103>
Source record: 78831
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

It won't be just hams and other minor users of spectrum below 80 mHz
who will be very seriously impacted by BPL. There are several states
whose statewice Public Service - State Police FM radio communications
systems are located on Low Band VHF, in the 40-50 mHz region. These
include California Highway Patrol and Missouri Highway Patrol, and at
least a few other state public safety and forestry organizations, as
well as many private users.
From personal knowledge of conditions drawn from many years of
personal involvment with these systems I am certain they cannot co-exist
with BPL.

I know they would all jump at the chance to move up to a trunked UHF
or higher system, but with all the state governmental budget woes that
won't be possible anytime soon.
One can only wonder what FCC is thinking here.
BPL is basically a noise generator that is attractive because it
"wires the world" in the eyes of those for whom that end is
the most important feature of advancing technology. Unfamiliar with
the workings of radio or technology itself, they have eagerly latched
onto the totally inaccurate and selfserving assertions of BPL proponants.

As I said in my comments to the NPRM, there are much better ways to
acoomplish the same end without completely ruining the HF spectrum.

Dick

opcom wrote:

> This was posted to ARLI, I don't know how many subscribe, but in spite of the numerous
comments against BPL (transmitting wideband internet data over power lines, which will
destroy the HF radio spectrum), the FCC seems disposed
> to encourage it anyway. evil! evil! just look up BPL on the web. The noise from the
radiated signals trashed the ham bands thoroughly.
>
> ------------------
>
> From:
> Amateur Radio Station N0JAA <N0JAA@aol.com>
> 4:00 PM
>
> Subject:
> [ARLI] FCC Commissioner's Comments Concerning BPL
> To:
> bvarc@clarc.org, clarc@clarc.org, ARLI@topica.com

>
>
>
>
> The following is a transcript from a recent speech given by FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy at the United PowerLine
> Council's annual conference regarding BPL. It seems that she is all for it. It also seems that BPL is going to become a reality, regardless
> of what ARRL, the military, or anyone else says. As usual, big industry wins over everyone else because they have the money.
>
> This is from today's FCC Digest.
>
> Paul, N0JAA
>
> ----------
>
>
> Reaching Broadband Nirvana
> United PowerLine Council Annual Conference Remarks of Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
> September 22, 2003 (As prepared for delivery)
>
>
> Thank you very much for inviting me to speak with you. I am very excited about broadband-over-powerline technology. I
> have seen it in action, and I believe it has a very bright future. It is a real honor to be your keynote speaker at this
> important juncture for BPL.
>
> As a regulator, I am keenly interested in BPL technology for a number of reasons. One of my central objectives as an FCC commissioner is to facilitate the deployment of broadband services to all Americans. I also fundamentally
> believe that the FCC can best promote consumer welfare by relying on market forces, rather than heavy-handed regulation. The development of BPL networks will serve both of these key goals. It will not only bring broadband to
> previously unserved communities, but the introduction of a new broadband pipeline into the home will foster the kind of competitive marketplace that will eventually enable the Commission to let go of the regulatory reins. I
> want consumers to have a choice of multiple, facilities-based providers, including not only cable and DSL, but also powerline, wireless, and satellite services. Such a robustly competitive and diversified marketplace is
> something I would call broadband Nirvana. We will not get there overnight, but the continuing development of BPL technology is a major step forward.
>
> While the long-term objective is a robustly competitive marketplace that is free of regulatory distortions, a more immediate question is: What should the FCC do to help foster such an environment? Sticking with my Nirvana
> metaphor, I guess the question would be, what is the path to enlightenment?
>
> I believe the answer, in short, is regulatory restraint. It is tempting for regulators to

take every new technology or service that comes along and apply the same rules that govern incumbent services. After all, regulatory
> parity and a level playing field are intuitively appealing concepts. But I believe that it would be a huge mistake to carry forward legacy regulations whenever new technology platforms are established. Many of our regulations
> are premised on the absence of competition, and when that rationale is eroded, we must not reflexively hold on to regulations that no longer serve their intended purpose. In fact, many of our old rules not only become
> unnecessary as markets evolve, but they can be fatal to new services that need room to breathe.
>
> The Nascent Services Doctrine applying more stringent regulations to wireline providers at a minimum must be reconsidered. As other platforms, including BPL and wireless, become more widely available, that will further
> undermine the justification for regulating incumbent LECs broadband services as if they were the only available offerings. When the Commission completes this rulemaking, I expect that we will eliminate many existing rules and
> substantially modify others; the central question is the degree of regulation that will remain during the transition to a more robustly competitive market.
>
> Finally, it is important to recognize that although the emergence of new platforms like BPL will eliminate the need for many competition-related regulations, other types of regulation may well remain necessary. For example, the
> FCC must implement public policy goals unrelated to competition, or even at odds with competition. Universal service and access for persons with disabilities are examples of this kind of regulation. These public policy goals
> generally should be applied to all service providers, to the extent permitted by the Communications Act. The FCC also must intervene to prevent competitors from imposing externalities on one another and to protect consumers
> where market failures are identified. Although, as I have noted, the Commission was right to refrain from imposing heavy-handed price and service-quality regulations on PCS services when the were introduced, it was also right
> to adopt strict interference rules to prevent competitors from externalizing their costs. The same principle will apply to BPL. They key point is that, while some degree of regulation is both inevitable and desirable, we
> should ensure that it is narrowly tailored to the particular governmental interests at stake. I appreciate the opportunity to share these thoughts with you, and I would be happy to answer a few questions if we have time.
>
>
> ******------****** please click on one or more of the links below to send a blank subscribe message.
> Amateur Radio Legal Issues List
> (A list for discussing legal and legislative issues impacting Amateur Radio from Congress and the FCC)
> What have you done for Amateur Radio today?
> --^^----------

5413. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:25:01 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn4h125ebq9812@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78832

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:rvd4nvgn5k8mb0t8busa25i82j10unf639@4ax.com...
> LOL !
>

Heh... under MOST circumstances, brevity is the soul of wit.
I would hazard the guess, however, in THIS instance it's because
perhaps I was right. Guess you're sitting off to the side now
and trying to regather your thoughts to make a witty comeback
now.... and only after hashing and rehashing the best way to
spin this latest revelation.

Clint
Better luck in another newsgroup!

--

--
PRAY FOR THE SOULS OF THE FRENCH

"say it isn't so!" ..... The french proposal going
to the United Nations pertaining to the iraqi
situation is to ask for a RETURN of
the baathist part. OH yes, you read that right...
The party responsible for gassing tens of
thousands of it's own people, defying
international laws, pileing bodies in mass
graves as an aftermath of it's bloody internal
policies and many other crimes against
humanity, is going to have a cheerleader
from the country who benifited from it's oil
contracts WITH the baathist party (go
figure!)...And, finally, the french want ALL
mention of liberation taken out of ALL
paperwork and replaced with the word
"occupation", due to the fact that they do
not like its positive connotation. This from
a country that occupied Algeria for 132 years.

--

5414. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:29:55 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn4ha82sv5md3f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78833

>
>
> All those are reasons for a person to choose to use code, but not
reasons
> for the Amateur Radio Service to continue to specifically develop radio
> operators capable of using this mode. Understand the difference?

Yes they do, they just refuse to address it.

5415. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:30:18 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn4haujr05rl5a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78834

>
> 160 meters will never be a problem. Very, very few amateurs have the room
> to put up an effective 160meter antenna.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Good dodge.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5416. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:35:10 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <3ah4nvgns43ndqvfc89uecgik40i8qm00b@4ax.com>
Source record: 78835

Sir, after reading the endless reams of drivel that you have produced
in this newsgroup of late, I believe that you are correct - brevity
is the soul of wit.....;)

Leo

On Wed, 24 Sep 2003 20:25:01 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>news:rvd4nvgn5k8mb0t8busa25i82j10unf639@4ax.com...
>> LOL !
>>
>
>Heh... under MOST circumstances, brevity is the soul of wit.
>I would hazard the guess, however, in THIS instance it's because
>perhaps I was right. Guess you're sitting off to the side now
>and trying to regather your thoughts to make a witty comeback
>now.... and only after hashing and rehashing the best way to
>spin this latest revelation.
>
>Clint
>Better luck in another newsgroup!
>
>
>
>--
>
>--
>PRAY FOR THE SOULS OF THE FRENCH
>
>"say it isn't so!" ..... The french proposal going
>to the United Nations pertaining to the iraqi
>situation is to ask for a RETURN of
>the baathist part. OH yes, you read that right...
>The party responsible for gassing tens of
>thousands of it's own people, defying
>international laws, pileing bodies in mass
>graves as an aftermath of it's bloody internal
>policies and many other crimes against
>humanity, is going to have a cheerleader
>from the country who benifited from it's oil
>contracts WITH the baathist party (go
>figure!)...And, finally, the french want ALL
>mention of liberation taken out of ALL

>paperwork and replaced with the word
>"occupation", due to the fact that they do
>not like its positive connotation. This from
>a country that occupied Algeria for 132 years.

5417. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:35:53 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309241735.5b5e41b1@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78836

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030924174229.07578.00000789@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0309240346.7b2e67ae@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>
> >> >Well, considering how often you act like a small child in here, Leonard,
> >> >you're certainly not qualified for that role.
> >>
> >> Go to bed, little one...it's past your bedtime.
> >
> >Typical. Hey PUTZ: You are the singular "unifying force" in this
> >newsgroup. Utter and total disdain and distaste for your personna is
> >the one "policy" overwhelmingly shared and agreed upon by both the
> >NCTA and PCTA factions.
> >
> >Congratulations PUTZ.
>
> Ah, another "calm, rational, civilized" PCTA heard from... :-)

In other posts he has requested that people "bend over..."

5418. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:38:29 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <ekh4nvojbf85i0qs32ns5nbvl32iu1qo50@4ax.com>
Source record: 78837

Good point, actually - I suppose you have room for a 262.47 foot long
dipole in your back 40, pardner?

Of course, it would be shorter if you built it 1/4 wave.... ;)

Leo

On Wed, 24 Sep 2003 20:30:18 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>
>>
>> 160 meters will never be a problem. Very, very few amateurs have the room
>> to put up an effective 160meter antenna.
>>
>> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>
>Good dodge.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>

5419. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:39:43 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309241739.9a38c5d@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78838

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030924174219.07578.00000774@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0309231821.2b4365aa@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >"Dick Carroll;" <dixie@townsqr.com> wrote in message
> >news:<bkohv3qvo1@208.206.142.83>...
> >
> >> I guess Clint also doesn't understand the admonition to "Never argue
> >> with an idiot".
> >> Or Iit isn't nice to engage in a battle of wits with unarmed persons".
> >
> >So Leo doesn't have any arms?
> >
> >I'm waiting for Dann Finn to come on here and chew you out for making
> >fun of the disabled.
>
> "Leo" doesn't EXIST.
>
> No one can do battle with a spectre, a ghost, a will-o-the-wisp.

He doesn't have a callsign, either. Wonder why all the PCTA pay him any mind?

5420. Re: Extra Class Exam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:43:13 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030924214313.17626.00000192@mb-m16.aol.com>
Source record: 78840

>For the extra class exam, do they allow scientific calculators?
>If not is the a tan/arctan chart allowed for the rlc phase angle questions?
>
>I took and got the general last year but as I remember it I thought they
>limited
>the test taker to basic function calculators....
>

Why would you need a Calculator, none of the Questions are that tough

5421. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:43:25 UTC
From: Frank Todd K3EKO <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <1Lrcb.571589$o%2.257568@sccrnsc02>
Source record: 78839
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> It won't be just hams and other minor users of spectrum below 80 mHz
> who will be very seriously impacted by BPL. There are several states
> whose statewice Public Service - State Police FM radio communications
> systems are located on Low Band VHF, in the 40-50 mHz region. These
> include California Highway Patrol and Missouri Highway Patrol, and at
> least a few other state public safety and forestry organizations, as
> well as many private users.
> From personal knowledge of conditions drawn from many years of
> personal involvment with these systems I am certain they cannot co-exist
> with BPL.
>
> I know they would all jump at the chance to move up to a trunked UHF
> or higher system, but with all the state governmental budget woes that
> won't be possible anytime soon.
> One can only wonder what FCC is thinking here.
> BPL is basically a noise generator that is attractive because it
> "wires the world" in the eyes of those for whom that end is
> the most important feature of advancing technology. Unfamiliar with
> the workings of radio or technology itself, they have eagerly latched
> onto the totally inaccurate and selfserving assertions of BPL proponants.
>
> As I said in my comments to the NPRM, there are much better ways to
> acoomplish the same end without completely ruining the HF spectrum.
>
> Dick
>
>
> opcom wrote:
>
>> This was posted to ARLI, I don't know how many subscribe, but in spite
>> of the numerous comments against BPL (transmitting wideband internet
>> data over power lines, which will destroy the HF radio spectrum), the
>> FCC seems disposed
>> to encourage it anyway. evil! evil! just look up BPL on the web. The
>> noise from the radiated signals trashed the ham bands thoroughly.
>>
>> -------------------
>>
>> From: Amateur Radio Station N0JAA <N0JAA@aol.com>
>> 4:00 PM

>>
>> Subject: [ARLI] FCC Commissioner's Comments Concerning BPL
>> To: bvarc@clarc.org, clarc@clarc.org, ARLI@topica.com
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> The following is a transcript from a recent speech given by FCC
>> Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy at the United PowerLine
>> Council's annual conference regarding BPL. It seems that she is all
>> for it. It also seems that BPL is going to become a reality, regardless
>> of what ARRL, the military, or anyone else says. As usual, big
>> industry wins over everyone else because they have the money.
>>
>> This is from today's FCC Digest.
>>
>> Paul, N0JAA
>>
>> ----------------------
>>
>>
>> Reaching Broadband Nirvana United PowerLine Council Annual Conference
>> Remarks of Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy September 22, 2003 (As
>> prepared for delivery)
>>
>> Thank you very much for inviting me to speak with you. I am very
>> excited about broadband-over-powerline technology. I have seen it in
>> action, and I believe it has a very bright future. It is a real honor
>> to be your keynote speaker at this important juncture for BPL.
>> As a regulator, I am keenly interested in BPL technology for a number
>> of reasons. One of my central objectives as an FCC commissioner is to
>> facilitate the deployment of broadband services to all Americans. I
>> also fundamentally
>> believe that the FCC can best promote consumer welfare by relying on
>> market forces, rather than heavy-handed regulation. The development
>> of BPL networks will serve both of these key goals. It will not only
>> bring broadband to previously unserved communities, but the
>> introduction of a new broadband pipeline into the home will foster the
>> kind of competitive marketplace that will eventually enable the
>> Commission to let go of the regulatory reins. I
>> want consumers to have a choice of multiple, facilities-based
>> providers, including not only cable and DSL, but also powerline,
>> wireless, and satellite services. Such a robustly competitive and
>> diversified marketplace is
>> something I would call broadband Nirvana. We will not get there
>> overnight, but the continuing development of BPL technology is a major
>> step forward.
>> While the long-term objective is a robustly competitive marketplace
>> that is free of regulatory distortions, a more immediate question is:
>> What should the FCC do to help foster such an environment? Sticking

>> with my Nirvana
>> metaphor, I guess the question would be, what is the path to
>> enlightenment?
>> I believe the answer, in short, is regulatory restraint. It is
>> tempting for regulators to take every new technology or service that
>> comes along and apply the same rules that govern incumbent services.
>> After all, regulatory
>> parity and a level playing field are intuitively appealing concepts.
>> But I believe that it would be a huge mistake to carry forward legacy
>> regulations whenever new technology platforms are established. Many of
>> our regulations
>> are premised on the absence of competition, and when that rationale
>> is eroded, we must not reflexively hold on to regulations that no
>> longer serve their intended purpose. In fact, many of our old rules
>> not only become
>> unnecessary as markets evolve, but they can be fatal to new services
>> that need room to breathe.
>> The Nascent Services Doctrine applying more stringent regulations to
>> wireline providers at a minimum must be reconsidered. As other
>> platforms, including BPL and wireless, become more widely available,
>> that will further
>> undermine the justification for regulating incumbent LECs broadband
>> services as if they were the only available offerings. When the
>> Commission completes this rulemaking, I expect that we will eliminate
>> many existing rules and
>> substantially modify others; the central question is the degree of
>> regulation that will remain during the transition to a more robustly
>> competitive market.
>> Finally, it is important to recognize that although the emergence of
>> new platforms like BPL will eliminate the need for many
>> competition-related regulations, other types of regulation may well
>> remain necessary. For example, the
>> FCC must implement public policy goals unrelated to competition, or
>> even at odds with competition. Universal service and access for
>> persons with disabilities are examples of this kind of regulation.
>> These public policy goals
>> generally should be applied to all service providers, to the extent
>> permitted by the Communications Act. The FCC also must intervene to
>> prevent competitors from imposing externalities on one another and to
>> protect consumers
>> where market failures are identified. Although, as I have noted, the
>> Commission was right to refrain from imposing heavy-handed price and
>> service-quality regulations on PCS services when the were introduced,
>> it was also right
>> to adopt strict interference rules to prevent competitors from
>> externalizing their costs. The same principle will apply to BPL.
>> They key point is that, while some degree of regulation is both
>> inevitable and desirable, we
>> should ensure that it is narrowly tailored to the particular
>> governmental interests at stake. I appreciate the opportunity to

>> share these thoughts with you, and I would be happy to answer a few
>> questions if we have time.
>>
>> ******------****** please click on one or more
>> of the links below to send a blank subscribe message.
>> Amateur Radio Legal Issues List (A list for discussing legal
>> and legislative issues impacting Amateur Radio from Congress and the
>> FCC) What have you done for Amateur Radio today?
>> --^^--
>
>
The FCC will approve ANYTHING that will make them $$$$.

--
73

Frank K3EKO

5422. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:43:56 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <kuh4nv822sdvba8vt8f2kmr5bn03u7dtuh@4ax.com>
Source record: 78841

But you are, old fella, you are! There you go = proof positive that
you can do anything, if you set your mind to it.

Now that's inspirational!

73, Leo

On 24 Sep 2003 21:42:19 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>> No one can do battle with a spectre, a ghost, a will-o-the-wisp.

5423. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:49:16 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkthil$5rcer$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78842

"Clint" wrote in part ...

Heh... under MOST circumstances, brevity is the soul of wit. I would
hazard the guess, however, in THIS instance it's because perhaps I was
right.

Wrong. He was just laughing at you.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5424. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:49:16 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309241749.44e148d6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78843

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030924174227.07578.00000786@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> In article <20030923210922.23307.00003205@mb-m29.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >I suggested that in my comments to 98-143. FCC went the other way. Tells ya
> >somethin'.
>
> Yes...the FCC did NOT agree with you.
>
> Too bad about that.

Len, that was kind of obvious, but I guess it needed some illumination
so those with blinders on could see it. Good work.

5425. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:53:59 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <sci4nv8lci20ei97htpvh537ujjhmm98cv@4ax.com>
Source record: 78844

Len,

Inspired by your post, I looked up the "Courage of conviction" that
you mentioned below. The only reference that I could find was on
Amazon.com:

Courage of Conviction: Women's Words, Women's Wisdom
By Linda A. Perry, Patricia Geist
Paperback / April 1997 / 1559347163
Books Similar to Courage of Conviction: Women's Word...
Compare Prices Book Details

Instead of buying one, can I borrow your copy when you are done with
it? I need to discover what these women had to say - seems to have
made an impact on you.

73, Leo

On 24 Sep 2003 21:42:28 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>
> He (or she) hasn't the courage of their conviction to releal their identity.

5426. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:55:01 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <ani4nv4l5abikuvi1h72up4442brjct0ui@4ax.com>
Source record: 78845

Bingo!

73, Leo

On Wed, 24 Sep 2003 21:49:16 -0400, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote:

>"Clint" wrote in part ...
>
> Heh... under MOST circumstances, brevity is the soul of wit. I would
>hazard the guess, however, in THIS instance it's because perhaps I was
>right.
>____
>
>Wrong. He was just laughing at you.
>
>Arnie -
>KT4ST
>

5427. Re: Extra Class Exam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:56:24 UTC
From: Spurious Noise <HDA@zilch.com>
Message-ID: <cXrcb.14464$Ms2.4654@fed1read03>
Source record: 78846

Call your local VEC and ask:

URL:
http://www.arrl.org/arrlvec/veclist.html

--
73 From the Spurious Noise ';';;';x":.,";"'
"Don Morgan" <dmorgan@rocketmail.com> wrote in message
news:bd2ad7b6.0309241708.45863a0@posting.google.com...
> For the extra class exam, do they allow scientific calculators?
> If not is the a tan/arctan chart allowed for the rlc phase angle
questions?
>
> I took and got the general last year but as I remember it I thought they
limited
> the test taker to basic function calculators....

5428. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 01:59:14 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309241759.5c6f0208@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78847

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<Udjcb.5161$pB6.3855@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> news:f45722ac.0309231814.f8fbe4e@posting.google.com...
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:<502cb.2332$ai7.1086@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> > > "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
> > > news:f45722ac.0309230300.30cdb38c@posting.google.com...

> > > > Poor DICK. I'm sure the failure rate was quite high. Why the big
> > > > rush to RTTY and other modes which don't require the operator to be a
> > > > human modem?
> > >
> > > Because RTTY could be run in the 'secure', or 'green' mode.
> >
> > CW can be coded as well. As long as everyone's o the same "page"
> > should work OK. Authenticate.
> >
> > And RATT was
> > > more capable of sending LARGE volumes of messages.
> >
> > Tell me about the error rate, too.
> >
> > Due mainly to the
> > > untrained CW operators in the US Military at the time you are
> referencing.
> >
> > So the Amateur Radio Service didn't act as a pool of trained operators
> > for the military?
> >
> > > Ten groups a minute is all that was required of a O5C MOS back then.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > Kind of negates many of the arguments for forcing people to test for
> > code, doesn't it?
>
> No it does not negate a thing Brian. It shows how ill prepared the US
> Military was during the height of the Cold War.

Meanwhile, the US had listening posts in Turkey, Greece, Germany,
Korea, Japan...

We didn't need to send OUR traffic via CW, we needed to copy THEIR
message traffic using CW.

> The Iron Curtain countries didn't have a problem with good CW operators.
> And IM NOT TALKING ABOUT HAM RADIO.

See above.

> And thats all I can say on that subject.

Aw, c'mon.

5429. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 02:00:23 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkti7g$5m3rk$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78848

"Clint" wrote ...

Imagine a televised debate on a matter, say a political one, where you have candidates behind either a table they're sitting at or a podium they are standing behind.. The first candidate begans to spew out all his ideas and what he wants to see happen and what he'd do if his side of the issue one, and then when the other candidate stepped up for his or her retort, the first candidate just stuck his fingers in his ears, rocked his head back and forth and looked up and the ceiling and started humming loudly to himself so he couldn't see or hear anything from the other side. Now, he doesn't know what the other side said, and probably doesn't care...

but the important matter is THIS.. what do all the voters in the audience think of that fellow???? makes you want to rub your chin and go "hmmmmmmmm...."

Imagine the same debate where the first candidate makes no points on topic whatever, lies about the qualifications and personal history of the other candidate, and injects a string of personal insults as part of his off-topic diatribe. The audience just sits there looking at each other because they know that extremely rude person has just blatantly lied to them. I wonder how many votes that first candidate would get?

Arnie -
KT4ST

5430. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 02:05:34 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bktih7$54or5$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78849

"Clint" wrote in part ...

Add to the list of names and phrases you gave the following... "jerk",
"moron" and "dumb fuck".

Look up my posts for the last four years and see how many times I have used
a personal insult toward *anyone* on this NG. IOW, I reserve that for
people who truly deserve it. Like you.

Arnie-
KT4ST

5431. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 02:08:13 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <0ui4nvoqpc6dcm9c3g5tl3ihuhl73vghoo@4ax.com>
Source record: 78850

Brian,

You know that for a fact, do you?

Fact is, when I used to use a real name and email address on Usenet, I received buckets of spam email and personal rants from every crazy on the planet in my inbox. As such, I don't do that anymore - too much maintenance. Too many nutbars.

My QTH in Ontario, Canada, and my callsign is a VE3 one. I don't use it anywhere off the air for the same reason. On air, it's mandatory - but the groups tend to be smaller and more - um - congenial. And, anyone can surf these groups for info anytime - I'm particular who I give that info out to. Sure, anyone with a radio can hear your call and look you up - but these internet groups have a HUGE audience - and are archived forever (check Google Groups!)

The only reason for providing an address is so that people know where to write back to you - anyone who wishes to communicate with me can find me pretty easily - I'm right here, in this newsgroup.

Like it or not, that's the way it is.

73, Leo

Address your enquiries to 'Leo" - that's my name!

On 24 Sep 2003 18:39:43 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:

>
>He doesn't have a callsign, either. Wonder why all the PCTA pay him any mind?

5432. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 02:35:20 UTC
From: kludge@panix.com
Message-ID: <bktk98$5fe$1@panix2.panix.com>
Source record: 78851
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:
> One can only wonder what FCC is thinking here.
>BPL is basically a noise generator that is attractive because it
>"wires the world" in the eyes of those for whom that end is
>the most important feature of advancing technology. Unfamiliar with
>the workings of radio or technology itself, they have eagerly latched
>onto the totally inaccurate and selfserving assertions of BPL proponants.

BPL, however, will not only emit a lot of radiated trash into the HF bands,
it will also RECEIVE a lot of radiated trash from the HF bands.

My suspicion is that a fairly low power HF transmitter near a transmission
line, even well out of the near field of the line, will wreak havoc with
BPL communication while operating well below the legal limit.

> As I said in my comments to the NPRM, there are much better ways to
>acoomplish the same end without completely ruining the HF spectrum.

As if the HF spectrum is not already ruined. Doesn't ANYONE take Part 15
seriously? If I ran the FCC, I'd make touch lamps illegal for one thing.
--scott
--
"C'est un Nagra. C'est suisse, et tres, tres precis."

5433. FRANK

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 03:00:17 UTC
From: B I G A L <vn2p9equ7uq5b@corp.supernewz.com>
Message-ID: <vn3g0velve6fa8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78734
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

FRANK IF THOSE BOYS FROM ARKANSAS COME BACK TONITE JUST IGNORE THEM. HO HO

5434. Re: HEY LEO THE LION

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 03:13:10 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <5an4nvoj2jqh1v0v9kgq28udp7uiqse3um@4ax.com>
Source record: 78852
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

LOL !

On Wed, 24 Sep 2003 18:48:59 -0400, "THE CARING STATION"
<THECARINGSTATION@ B I G A L . O R G>
wrote:

>THERE IS ONLY REASON THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO GET ME TOS'ED. AND YOU KNOW
>EXACTLY WHAT IT IS.
>
>I OWN YOU AND YOU CANT STAND IT.
>
>
>YOU LIVE FOR MY NEXT POST. I OWN YOU! YOU ARE SO FUNNY. YOU SPEND HOURS UPON
>HOURS HERE WAITING FOR MY NEXT POST. YOU HAVE NO LIFE BEYOND YOUR COMPUTER.
>I OWN YOU. CALL ANYONE YOU WISH I DONT CARE. CALL YOURSELF I DONT CARE. CALL
>THE FCC I DONT CARE. CALL AOL I DONT CARE. CALL GW I DONT CARE. I OWN YOU.
>
>HO HO
>
>
>
>

5435. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 03:29:51 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F7260DF.C9B65572@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 78853
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

The FCC may be listening to "college boy" engineers.
I saw this happen too many times at government sites.

Someone has told them that "the power lines are balanced, so
there will be no radiation from them! My professor told me so,
my text book says so and that's the end of it!"

Well, as any farm boy radio tinkerer can tell you,
them books is one thing, the real world is another.

BPL *is* coming, folks. Count on it.

5436. GREG WILL SAVE ALL OF US

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 03:34:18 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn2p9equ7uq5b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78600
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG. CALL THE FCC CALL THE INTERNET POLICE CALL YOUR MOTHER BIG AL DOESNT CARE. IM BIG AL WITH THE BIG ONE. GREG IS GOING TO SAVE THE WORLD. THANK YOU GREG FOR BEING SUCH A MAN. AY YI YI AY YI YI YES GREG IS A PORKBUTT TO. 38945 BIG ALS STAY AWAY.

5437. Re: Anybody actually heard "BIG AL" on the air?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 03:41:41 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn2pn6ba8g56a7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78701
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

GREG WHEN YOU BECOME A REAL HAM NOT A TECH GET BACK WITH US. WE MAY LET YOU SAY A WORD NOW AND THEN. AY YI YI AY Y I YI GREG IS ONLY A TECH AY YI YI AY YI YI GREG CANT EVEN USE HF.

"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message news:vn1mh7gl0j7b9d@corp.supernews.com...
> As most of you know, there is a troll on these boards claiming to be K40KA.
> I'm still trying to figure out whether this guy is just trying to be
> annoying. If he is actually doing what he said he is, we can go to the FCC,
> so I'd like to find out if he's actually on the air. Not owning any HF
> equipment, I can't do much my self. If somebody could listen in when he says
> he'll be transmitting...
>
>
> 73 de KG6SGY
>
>

5438. GREG AND SCHOOL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 03:53:09 UTC
From: B I G A L <"B I G A L"@B>
Message-ID: <vn2qctno437u91@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78702

HEY GANG GREG CANT BE ON LATE SUNDAY THROUGH THURSDAY. HIS MOMMY MAKES HIM GO TO BED SO HE CAN GET HIS REST AND BE SHARP IN THE 4TH GRADE NEXT DAY. I HAD TO PUT UP WITH HUNDREDS OF LITTLE SNOTS LIKE HIM WHEN I WAS TEACHING. GREG HAS DECIDED THAT HE WANTS TO BE A COP WHEN HE GROWS UP AND NETCOP AT THAT. WELL WELL AY Y I YI AY YI YI GREG IS A PORKBUTT TO. WHAT IS YOUR AGE GREG 8 OR MAYBE 9. HO HO

5439. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 04:27:01 UTC
From: asdf <asdf@qwerty.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9400DA345EA59asdfqwerty@68.6.19.6>
Source record: 78854
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

David Stinson wrote:

>
> The FCC may be listening to "college boy" engineers.
> I saw this happen too many times at government sites.
> ...

No, they're listening to the big money (campaign donor) power companies.
Just like everything else in the Bush administration...money is the only
thing that carries any weight...

5440. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 04:30:59 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bkumda$1gu05$3@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78881

Message recieved. Will place hope towards getting that time off in some
form of a miracle too.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> Ryan:
>
> We'll see how many people we can get to commit to being there. As I
> already said, I won't know until the vacation bids are done at the end
> of the year. However, considering that Dayton usually falls during a
> time of the year that is relatively free of other holidays, it should be
> quite doable for me. I'm going to start looking in to a hotel reservation
> in a place with a party/conference room big enough to hold us, unless
> someone else already has done so and can arrange for the venue.
> Let's keep this on the back burner, but with the heat turned up a bit.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

5441. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 04:37:55 UTC
From: --exray-- <no@no.no>
Message-ID: <vn4s5qq6lfl790@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78855
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

asdf wrote:
> David Stinson wrote:
>
>
>>The FCC may be listening to "college boy" engineers.
>>I saw this happen too many times at government sites.
>> ...
>
>
> No, they're listening to the big money (campaign donor) power companies.
> Just like everything else in the Bush administration...money is the only
> thing that carries any weight...

Oh my, a political troll on Usenet. Betcha said the same thing during
the Clinton administration, huh Troll?.
If you reach 18 by the next election, please vote.

-ex

5442. Re: Anybody actually heard "BIG AL" on the air?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 04:38:03 UTC
From: nm5k@wt.net
Message-ID: <25eb70d7.0309242038.45054e77@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78856
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Greg Courville" <EngNOSPAMinuitor@Gee-Enginuity.com> wrote in message news:<vn1mh7gl0j7b9d@corp.supernews.com>...
> As most of you know, there is a troll on these boards claiming to be K40KA.
> I'm still trying to figure out whether this guy is just trying to be
> annoying. If he is actually doing what he said he is, we can go to the FCC,
> so I'd like to find out if he's actually on the air. Not owning any HF
> equipment, I can't do much my self. If somebody could listen in when he says
> he'll be transmitting...
>
>
> 73 de KG6SGY

The *real* Big Al is dead. Has been for a few years. He was quite a character. MK

5443. Re: 3894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 04:44:53 UTC
From: "Michael A. Terrell" <mike.terrell@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <3F72728D.794F34@earthlink.net>
Source record: 78857
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD wrote:
>
> No!
>
> Where the Subject line contains '3.894' or '3894' or 'bigal'
> send the email back
>
> 73 de Rene PE1RA

How do you bounce a message from multiple news servers? This isn't
e-mail, its usenet.

--

Michael A. Terrell
Central Florida

5444. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 05:33:21 UTC
From: Frank Todd K3EKO <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <B6vcb.569970$YN5.408276@sccrnsc01>
Source record: 78858
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

```
--exray-- wrote:
> asdf wrote:
>
>> David Stinson wrote:
>>
>>
>>> The FCC may be listening to "college boy" engineers.
>>> I saw this happen too many times at government sites.
>>> ...
>>
>>
>>
>> No, they're listening to the big money (campaign donor) power
>> companies. Just like everything else in the Bush
>> administration...money is the only thing that carries any weight...
>
>
> Oh my, a political troll on Usenet. Betcha said the same thing during
> the Clinton administration, huh Troll?.
> If you reach 18 by the next election, please vote.
>
> -ex
>
>
Just to let all of you know that I will be voting for Bush in '04 HO HO...

--
73

Frank K3EKO
```

5445. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 05:55:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925015541.25517.00000936@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 78859

In article <20030924203108.02537.00000756@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>> By refusing to identify yourself, EVERYONE is blind to you.
>>
>Then why are you replying? ;-)

To whom?

5446. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 05:55:41 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925015541.25517.00000935@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 78860

In article <20030924203109.02537.00000757@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030924174226.07578.00000783@mb-m25.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>YOU are NOT on any QRZ listing for any country.
>
>Neither are you. Len ;-) ;-) ;-)

I've never PRETENDED to be one.

I make no bones about not being licensed as an AMATEUR and have
said so from day one in here.

What you have is some idiot who PRETENDS to be an amateur
<something> in Canada and won't identify himself.

If you wish to live in a fairyland of make-believe, be my guest. Just don't
start mumbling about laws for that fairyland.

5447. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 10:25:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309250225.7319ec92@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78861

Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<0ui4nvoqpc6dcm9c3g5tl3ihuhl73vghoo@4ax.com>...
> Brian,
>
> You know that for a fact, do you?

I see no evidence of one.

5448. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 10:34:56 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309250234.2decbd02@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78862

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030925015541.25517.00000936@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> In article <20030924203108.02537.00000756@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
> >> By refusing to identify yourself, EVERYONE is blind to you.
> >>
> >Then why are you replying? ;-)
>
> To whom?

Notice how quickly some anonymous troll is defended IF he has the right opinion?

;^) Brian

5449. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 10:50:25 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn5i3q8h7dktc7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78863

>
> Look up my posts for the last four years and see how many times I have
used
> a personal insult toward *anyone* on this NG. IOW, I reserve that for
> people who truly deserve it. Like you.
>
> Arnie-
> KT4ST
>
>

Thanks for the admission to your hypocrisy.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5450. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 10:52:24 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn5i7hidqhn0f6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78864

I live in texas where there is plenty of room to do anything
you want... and yes, my yard has plenty of room to stretch
a 160m dipole if I wanted to... but if somebody wanted
to get on 160m and hasn't the realestate, they could always
hang a loop sky wire that only require 1/4 wave on any
given side instead of 1/2 of horizontal space; i.e., half
the area needed.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--
PRAY FOR THE SOULS OF THE FRENCH

"say it isn't so!" ..... The french proposal going
to the United Nations pertaining to the iraqi
situation is to ask for a RETURN of
the baathist part. OH yes, you read that right...
The party responsible for gassing tens of
thousands of it's own people, defying
international laws, pileing bodies in mass
graves as an aftermath of it's bloody internal
policies and many other crimes against
humanity, is going to have a cheerleader
from the country who benifited from it's oil
contracts WITH the baathist party (go
figure!)...And, finally, the french want ALL
mention of liberation taken out of ALL
paperwork and replaced with the word
"occupation", due to the fact that they do
not like its positive connotation. This from
a country that occupied Algeria for 132 years.

--
"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:ekh4nvojbf85i0qs32ns5nbvl32iu1qo50@4ax.com...
> Good point, actually - I suppose you have room for a 262.47 foot long
> dipole in your back 40, pardner?
>
> Of course, it would be shorter if you built it 1/4 wave.... ;)
>
> Leo
>
> On Wed, 24 Sep 2003 20:30:18 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron

> dot net> wrote:
>
> >
> >>
> >> 160 meters will never be a problem. Very, very few amateurs have the
room
> >> to put up an effective 160meter antenna.
> >>
> >> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >>
> >
> >Good dodge.
> >
> >Clint
> >KB5ZHT
> >
>

5451. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 10:54:03 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn5iako1h53r1b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78865

> >
> > Ah, another "calm, rational, civilized" PCTA heard from... :-)
>
> In other posts he has requested that people "bend over..."

Fairly typical of a faction that doesn't hold itself to very high
standards (obviously) when it comes to anything outside of
morse code.

5452. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 10:54:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309250254.3ecbba81@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78866

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<bkti7g$5m3rk$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "Clint" wrote ...
>
> Imagine a televised debate on a matter, say a political one, where you have
> candidates behind either a table they're sitting at or a podium they are
> standing behind.. The first candidate begans to spew out all his ideas and
> what he wants to see happen and what he'd do if his side of the issue one,
> and then when the other candidate stepped up for his or her retort, the
> first candidate just stuck his fingers in his ears, rocked his head back and
> forth and looked up and the ceiling and started humming loudly to himself so
> he couldn't see or hear anything from the other side. Now, he doesn't know
> what the other side said, and probably doesn't care...
>
> but the important matter is THIS.. what do all the voters in the audience
> think of that fellow???? makes you want to rub your chin and go
> "hmmmmmmmm...."
> --
>
> Imagine the same debate where the first candidate makes no points on topic
> whatever, lies about the qualifications and personal history of the other
> candidate, and injects a string of personal insults as part of his off-topic
> diatribe. The audience just sits there looking at each other because they
> know that extremely rude person has just blatantly lied to them. I wonder
> how many votes that first candidate would get?
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST

That candidate stole the election in 1992.

5453. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 10:56:43 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn5ifkk1arvs58@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78867

>
> Imagine the same debate where the first candidate makes no points on topic
> whatever, lies about the qualifications and personal history of the other
> candidate, and injects a string of personal insults as part of his
off-topic
> diatribe. The audience just sits there looking at each other because they
> know that extremely rude person has just blatantly lied to them. I wonder
> how many votes that first candidate would get?
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
>

I don't know... I have really no CLUE how many votes you PCTA'ers will
get, considering you are the ones most guilty of what you just described.

Everytime I started giving analogies, facts, supportive evidence and
tried to have a rational conversation, you guys didn't last 2 or 3 rounds
and
broke down into "you WILL do it, that's the way it is, sorry, quit
being lazy, shut up, etc." followed quickly by name-calling that you
YOURSELF
admitted to in another post.

That's another thing the NCTA crowd has over you... like conservatives
beating
liberals by forceing them to stay accountable, we do the same to you.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5454. Re: Extra Class Exam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 10:57:38 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309250257.532cd076@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78868

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030924214313.17626.00000192@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> >For the extra class exam, do they allow scientific calculators?
> >If not is the a tan/arctan chart allowed for the rlc phase angle questions?
> >
> >I took and got the general last year but as I remember it I thought they
> >limited
> >the test taker to basic function calculators....
> >
>
> Why would you need a Calculator, none of the Questions are that tough

Obviously from an Extra that memorized his way to the top, with
absolutely no understanding of the material.

5455. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 10:57:48 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn5ihlhhi2j775@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78869

```
--
"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:3ah4nvgns43ndqvfc89uecgik40i8qm00b@4ax.com...
> Sir, after reading the endless reams of drivel that you have produced
> in this newsgroup of late, I believe that you are correct - brevity
> is the soul of wit.....;)
>
> Leo

It took you 24 hours and THAT was the best you could come up with,
a (non)response.

I would have bet money if I could have found somebody to bet against
me but it was a giveaway. :)

Clint
KB5ZHT
```

5456. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 10:58:25 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn5iiq9qba1j85@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78870

>
> Wrong. He was just laughing at you.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
>

Heh, you guys really don't help your cause much
do you.

5457. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 11:01:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309250301.40d534bd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78871

Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<sci4nv8lci20ei97htpvh537ujjhmm98cv@4ax.com>...

> Instead of buying one, can I borrow your copy when you are done with
> it?

Where should it be sent? To whom should it be addressed?

5458. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 11:03:24 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn5is66su4ple7@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78872

>
> He doesn't have a callsign, either. Wonder why all the PCTA pay him any mind?

Because he's a plant.... the way he came into the debate, "all of a sudden", and quickly jumped on ONE side and attacked it for infractions that the other
side is EASILY more guilty of (any objective observer would see that).
He's a friend or acquaintence of one of the PCTA'ers, i am quite sure of it, from either offline or from email, or another ng... and the conversation went
something like "Hey, leo, come in such-n-such ng and just start saying this and that, and THEN claim that you are not on one side or the other so that you appear like a nuetral party and not somebody that would be biased in favor of the PCTA side!"

it's very obvious. I've seen it before, there is no doubt as it's beyond even just guessing at. When you bark at one side for using "empty personal attacks and name calling" and say therefore, THAT side has the weaker support, when in fact the pro test crowd is the one that has been going haywire since we question thier supreme authority and started name calling and getting personal and THEN childishly saying "we're just going to ignore you!" the way kids do at school (by using the block sender list)... well, you see the obvious conclusion.

Don't ignore him, that's what the PCTA crowd devolves to doing in it's (non)tactics.... but, likewise, take Leo with a grain of salt and realize you are dealing with somebody who is disingenuous and basically a plant.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5459. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 11:04:59 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn5iv7veu8s02@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78873

>
> My QTH in Ontario, Canada, and my callsign is a VE3 one.

It took you THIS long to get with your PCTA contact to get fed
a line to use to try to pump up your legitamacy?

Anybody who has been on the internet more than a few months
nows the secrets of sender blocking (your reality-dodging
PCTA buddies already are using it), and how to avoid spam by
using spam blocking emails... PLUS you could have just been
smart by not sending out your email addy anyway.

busted

Clint
KB5ZHT

5460. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 11:05:16 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn5ivlcq907q06@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78874

>
> I see no evidence of one.

Because there isn't any.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5461. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 11:15:04 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <5aj5nvgga4g7nacp5rfig994o04kbjpicp@4ax.com>
Source record: 78875

As opposed to an idiot who isn't an amateur, and pretends to be
important? ;)

73, Leo

Mental note - full capitalization of random nouns is a paragraph
effective technique for making yourself more clearly understood.
Thanks, old fella - I didn't know that!

On 25 Sep 2003 05:55:41 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> What you have is some idiot who PRETENDS to be an amateur
> <something> in Canada and won't identify himself.

5462. Bandwidth (Was some kind of code/ nocode BS)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 11:23:20 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <IeAcb.8380$297.8210@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78876

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bktcofug0@208.206.142.96...
>
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> (Techs have stayed away in droves - in my view because
> > they correctly have viewd ARRL's Morse policy as designed
> > to keep them off of HF)

Very few hams appear to realize that HF is not nearly so "recycleable" as VHF or UHF, where a repeater or packet node can be on the same freq as you are, maybe 90 miles away, and you cannot even hear each other.

On VHF/UHF. thousands of hams around the world can use the same freq at the same time, without interfering with each other at all. It's recycleable. The same cannot be said, of course, about any of the HF bands. To one degree of another, all of the HF bands have a much larger "footprint" than anything on VHF or UHF... In some cases, this "footprint" is global. One QSO per planet on this frequency, thank you!

It seems to me that either this distiction has whizzed over poor Carl's head, or he is a closet representative of the electrical power industry who would like to see the already overcrowded HF bands totally trashed out, so that hams will not really mind when BPL comes in and finishes it off.

I don't really care much one way or another about morse code testing, but yes I do have a definate opinion about the idea of opening up generalized HF access to entry-level hams. It's a dumb idea that gets even dumber as our population grows.

Over a period of time, we can expect the number of hams wanting access to HF to grow, but the laws of physics will stay the same. Only so many people can reasonably expect to get on the HF bands at one time. We can extend that a little bit through the use of bandwidth-efficient modes like PSK-31, but the fact is that wide-band modes like PACTOR III and Q15x25 are getting more and more attention these days because they can do things that PSK31 cannot do, such as providing reasonable throughput and effective error-correction. People who say that overcrowding on HF is a thing of the past due to PSK31 obviously have not spent much time listening on HF, and are blowing smoke out of their shorts.

Example: An ARRL / ARES group is currently looking into linking all the major NWS EOC's around the country via HF... Their first choice in an HF mode for this purpose? PACTOR III !

I wonder how many PACTOR III stations those dweebs think they are going to get on the air at one time? Don't they ever listen on HF? One area of common ground between the few hams who can afford PACTOR III and the even fewer hams who care about Q15x25, (another wide-band HF mode) is that both groups have a heck of a time finding some place to operate on HF without getting dozens of hams up in arms about the bandwidth they are taking up. - Enough bandwidth for half a dozen or more HF Packet QSO's, or more than a dozen PSK QSO's!

They get complaints, nasty E-mails, they get reported even though they are legal, and they often even get intentional interference from outraged hams. The other night, I heard a guy on 30 meters whistling into his mike, on a freq where PACTOR III was being used. The whistling disrupted the PACTOR III QSO just enough to slow it down and reduce its efficiency without quite breaking the link. The guy was very patient about the whole thing. I listened to him whistle for over half an hour. (I was waiting for the PACTOR III QSO to end, so I could get in there on 30m with another mode.)

If it hadn't been for the "whistling clown", the PACTOR III dude would have gotten in and out of there a lot quicker! - But that is typical of what the few wide-band mode guys put up with, every day. They are not popular, for the obvious reason.

As for that ARRL / ARES group... These are guys who are making decisions that can affect many hams, and aparrently not one member of that group has a clue about operating on HF. That's not a very comforting thought. The big question in this post is, "Why don't more hams understand that HF is not really recycleable like VHF and UHF?"

So, getting back to Carl's accusation that the ARRL is trying to keep entry-level hams off of the HF bands, my response would have to be: I don't know if that is what the ARRL really intends but if that is the end result, it is just fine with me!

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

5463. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 11:27:49 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <unj5nvcf7n6vfloumf93v1p2vt65geb06f@4ax.com>
Source record: 78877

Hmmm....

You , Clint and Len have one thing in common - if you can't attach the individual personally, your argument runs out of steam pretty quickly.

Slash away, gentlemen - your personal attacks are futile here. Ad Hominem is useless when you remove the 'hominem' from the equation, isn't it? Now, you are forced to rely on intellect alone to make rational points, which is uncomfortable for some....and difficult for others. You can't shoot the messenger if you don't like the message. Waaaa.

Now, gentlemen, if you would care to present lucid and cogent points in a civilized manner, I'd be happy to listen to you. I have done so - are you up to the challenge?

73. Leo

On 25 Sep 2003 04:01:09 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:

>Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<sci4nv8lci20ei97htpvh537ujjhmm98cv@4ax.com>...
>
>> Instead of buying one, can I borrow your copy when you are done with
>> it?
>
>Where should it be sent? To whom should it be addressed?

5464. Re: Anybody actually heard "BIG AL" on the air?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 11:29:37 UTC
From: B i g A l <"B i g A l"@B>
Message-ID: <vn5kifi2lo50d9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78878
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.antenna,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Mark Keith" <nm5k@wt.net> wrote in message
news:25eb70d7.0309242038.45054e77@posting.google.com...
>
> The *real* Big Al is dead. Has been for a few years. He was quite a
character. MK

WOW. SORRY TO HEAR THAT IM DEAD. MAYBE IM A GHOST IN HAM HEAVEN. LET ME
PINCH MYSELF. OUCH. NO IM STILL HERE. COME TO 3894.5LSB AND FIND OUT FOR
YOURSELF BOY.

HO HO

5465. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 11:34:49 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <2gk5nvs47cs4jbi65obi4mi1nf8tfe309v@4ax.com>
Source record: 78879

Sir, you posted your message at 9:25 PM EDT - my reply is timestamped
9:35 EDT.

That's 10 minutes, there, feller, not 24 hours.

Are you a'fixin to learn how 't use that thar confuser proper-like,
thar, Son? Ah'm a'waitin!

Leo

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 05:57:48 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>It took you 24 hours and THAT was the best you could come up with,
>a (non)response.

>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>

5466. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 12:07:31 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <a9l5nvcctjhenkv5mu7vdsba7esv77mpl3@4ax.com>
Source record: 78880

Not a troll at all, Sir.

I merely came to this group to post the results of the RAC Morse survey - which I did in an impartial manner. This is the policy group - thought it would be a good place to post it.

Very shortly after that, I was attacked by several of the menbers of the group, for entirely nonsensical reasons. I then tried to clarify my points for all concerned, and received another barrage of crap from a copule of simians (that means monkeys, Clint - don't look it up) who assumed that I was pro code, or not pro code, not a ham, and some moronic 'terrorists come from Canada' inferences, which were way out of line (say, didn't the US Air Force discover that they had a Syrian-born airman in their ranks spying in the secure prisoner area in Quantico recently - did he come from Canada too? Jeez.....)

I have made my position known very clearly - but there are still a few folks in this group who incorrectly assume that someone has to be Pro-this, or Anti-that. Perhaps my language was too erudite for those folks - I'll try again, in plain English:

I learned Code to get on HF. It was the law, so I did it.

I use it more than I thought I would (I like it!)

Many people operate on HF and never use CW - so it isn't really a functional requirement any more. It is a strong tradition, however, dating back to the beginning of the hobby. As Len will tell you, Marine officers don't really need swords anymore - but they all get one, its tradition.

I don't believe that everyone should be forced to learn it. If someone is interested enough to do so, however, they should be encouraged.

If the Amateur community wants to keep it as a requirement, that's OK with me. If tradition is that important to the community, I'll respect that. I have it, I'm in. If the vote says that it goes, then I'm cool with that too. Doesn't mean that I can't continue to use it.

Clear?

73, Leo

Or is a troll just someone who won't agree with you, Sir?

On 25 Sep 2003 03:34:56 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030925015541.25517.00000936@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <20030924203108.02537.00000756@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >> By refusing to identify yourself, EVERYONE is blind to you.
>> >>
>> >Then why are you replying? ;-)
>>
>> To whom?
>
>Notice how quickly some anonymous troll is defended IF he has the right opinion?
>
>;^) Brian

5467. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 12:29:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925082934.08626.00000889@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 78882

In article <bks56h$5715v$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
<REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
>news:20030923013414.12631.00001336@mb-m28.aol.com...
>> In article <ZkJbb.7038$yp6.116603@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
>> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>>
>> >However, the requirements for licensure should be reasonable
>> >and rational, and while the written tests meet that criteria, the
>> >requirement for Morse proficiency no longer does.
>> >
>> >Carl - wk3c
>>
>> Carl:
>>
>> Jim, N2EY, just said, in so many words, that since today's amateur
>> radio equipment can no longer be designed, built, or serviced by
>> any but the tiny handful of hams who possess professional-grade
>> technical knowledge, skill, and facilities, that most of the technical
>> knowledge in the present written tests can also be eliminated as
>> a licensing requirement. I totally agree. In what way is it
>> "reasonable and rational" for someone to know Ohm's Law or
>> even the most basic digital theory, if they'll never have to use it
>> in their actual practice as a radio amateur? I say it isn't, and
>> nothing could prove this better than eliminating the code testing
>> requirements for the same reason. After all, code testing has
>> the effect of exposing prospective radio amateurs to what is
>> always going to be a practical and useful communications tool
>> which allows radio amateurs to practice basic radio
>> communication with only entry-level skill and technology.
>
>I would not necessarily totally agree with that statement as even though I
>am not a master electronics tech, I still can debug a problem with a few
>basic pieces of equipment and a schematic. Also, the
>electronics/electricity knowledge is important in dealing with alot of
>different things in amateur radio, not just "debugging" a Icom 706 (or other
>radio) radio problem.

Ryan,

I suggest you read what I actually wrote, rather than Larry's interpretation.
You may have read it already.

My point was not that hams *cannot* take care of their equipment, but rather that there is not much of an absolute *need* for theory testing compared to years ago because of the changes in typical modern amateur equipment.

That you can troubleshoot equipment is admirable, but I bet most of that knowledge and skill came from your own interest, not from having to pass written tests.

>
>> If we eliminate the code testing requirement, we therefore
>> demonstrate that basic communications skills are no longer
>> necessary to be a licensed amateur radio operator. I, for one,
>> would like to think that the present syllabus of the written tests
>> still represents "basic communications skills." So, which will
>> it be? Code testing, written testing, both, or neither?
>
>I personally believe that the written tests need to be more stringent, as
>most of the tests I have had to take were definitely more than 35-50
>questions, more like 100-250 range.

I agree - but the FCC thinks the opposite. Try to convince them that they're wrong.

> As far as the question pool, I have no
>problem with the questions themselves being released, but the answers
>shouldn't. At least if the question pool (questions only) was that way, it
>would encourage people to research the correct answer. That is what I did
>as a final study tool, after reading and re-reading many times..... They
>could also incorporate "scenario" questions as well.

Wouldn't work. Somebody would do the Dick Bash thing and get the answers.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5468. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 12:29:34 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925082934.08626.00000890@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 78884

In article <20030925015541.25517.00000935@mb-m15.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030924203109.02537.00000757@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <20030924174226.07578.00000783@mb-m25.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>>YOU are NOT on any QRZ listing for any country.
>>
>>Neither are you. Len ;-) ;-) ;-)
>
> I've never PRETENDED to be one.

Why are you shouting, Len?
>
> I make no bones about not being licensed as an AMATEUR and have
> said so from day one in here.

Everything isn't all about you, Len.
>
> What you have is some idiot who PRETENDS to be an amateur
> <something> in Canada and won't identify himself.

Why do you think Leo is pretending anything?

When "vshah101" showed up here and said he was an EE and a ham but would not
identify himself, you had no problems with that. But you are all over Leo for
doing the same thing.

> If you wish to live in a fairyland of make-believe, be my guest. Just
> don't start mumbling about laws for that fairyland.
>

"Fairyland"? You're much closer to Disneyland than I.

5469. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 12:29:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925082935.08626.00000891@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 78883

In article <bkkrmf$3vg$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>> Look again. There are those who not only advocate code test elimination,
>but
>> also the reduction or elimination of the CW/data subbands.
>
> I've only seen that from a very few blindingly obvious trolls and a
>known brain-damaged pair who's personal flame-fest has been infesting
>r.r.*** for _years_.
>
> I'd be interested in some quotes on this.
>
Hello Bob, sorry for the delay in getting back to you.

There was an entire thread on it here on rrap some time back. Thread title was:

"With CW gone, can the CW allocations be far behind?"

Lots of good quotes from various nontrolling parties.

Much of the rest of the world has no subbands-by-mode, and some folks think the
USA shouldn't have any, either. (I'm not one of 'em).

73 de Jim, N2EY

5470. BPL is Consumer Nirvana

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 12:41:44 UTC
From: Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <coBcb.3111$NX3.596@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78885

Thanks to ARRL Ham Radio Luddites.

http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-239079A1.txt
http://hraunfoss.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-239079A1.pdf

--
Best Regards, Keith http://kilowatt-radio.org/
==
= http://slrn.org SLRN 0.9.8.0 is out. =
==

5471. Re: Extra Class Exam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 12:53:27 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925085327.12783.00000213@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 78886

>Obviously from an Extra that memorized his way to the top, with
>absolutely no understanding of the material.
>

You know thats not true Brian, wait a minute, your just a No-Code CBplusser who cant memorize enough answers

5472. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 13:01:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <yGBcb.10862$ai7.2785@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78887

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
>
> Yeah but if we are not in there doing the "squeaky
> wheel" bit, they might decide we are adequately
> served with less and less.

Oh, we should of course be fully prepared to fight for what is ours, and even ask for a little more ocassionally. But I think most would agree it's not in our best interest to carry that too far with unfounded accusations against the FCC itself. They've treated us very well over the years and I certain wouldn't want to see that end.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5473. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 13:25:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <21Ccb.10874$ai7.2517@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78888

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" wrote:
>
> There's the rub, Dwight. Notice how the PCTAs
> refuse to see the distinction between the two? I
> think there's a reason for that. They know that the
> majority of hams is going to want nothing to do
> with the code if the testing requirement is abolished .
> The majority of hams NOW wants nothing to do
> with it, and we haven't even gotten the testing
> requirement out of the regulations yet.
>
> I think the PCTAs know darn well that if the test
> goes, they're going to have fewer and fewer people
> to beep with as time goes on. (snip)

I'm not at all convinced that will be the case. I think there will always be those interested in what code has to offer and thereby attracted to learning code. I think that will be a lot more casual then before, with many more new people pounding out messages at an agonizingly slow rate until they get up speed. My real concern is that the more advanced operators will loss patience with those new experimenters before they have enough time to actually get fully involved. The old timers will have to develop tactics to reduce the interruptions caused by these relatively unskilled operators (drag them off to the Novice frequencies and so on). Perhaps the Novice frequencies should be redefined as the frequencies for all using slower code speeds, with minimum speed limits posted for the other code/CW frequencies (the autobahns of CW use).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5474. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 13:54:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <FsCcb.10887$ai7.9207@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78889

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>
> That's really not the point. I think both of you realize
> this. :-)
>
> Roll's constant repetitions of old Maxims in here and
> the few personal barbs he throws in are just his way of
> trolling for those to respond to in the newsgroup. He
> seems to live by such "responses" which are little more
> than cut and paste from five years ago.

Ah, but there is the old maxim about a lie repeated often enough. At some point, Larry's messages must have a response, if for no other reason other than to address the false impressions he leaves. As for the rest of your (fairly accurate) message, I usually (though not always) tend to keep any opinions, formed as a result of psychoanalyzing Larry, to myself. The poor boy is in bad enough shape without all of us adding to his obvious mental anguish. In fact, I probably wouldn't even have said that if the anguish was not so obvious. ;-)

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5475. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 14:11:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <XHCcb.10909$ai7.8413@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78890

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk..."tangents?" I was handling sines, cosines,
> and tangents back in high school of 1950. Trigonometry
> not a problem...always got maximum marks in such subjects.

Math is not my forte. I got through the classes, but had to struggle every single step of the way. In fact, I still struggle with it to some extent to this day, so I'll obviously never be anything close to an expert on it. Perhaps I need to do what most do and simply avoid situations involving serious math.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5476. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 14:26:36 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkutul$6b3su$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78891

"Brian" wrote ...

That candidate stole the election in 1992.

Ah, something to which we can both agree :-))

Arnie -
KT4ST

5477. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 14:32:23 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkuu9f$67ukd$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78892

"Clint" wrote ...

I don't know... I have really no CLUE how many votes you PCTA'ers will get, considering you are the ones most guilty of what you just described. Everytime I started giving analogies, facts, supportive evidence and tried to have a rational conversation, you guys didn't last 2 or 3 rounds and broke down into "you WILL do it, that's the way it is, sorry, quit being lazy, shut up, etc." followed quickly by name-calling that you YOURSELF admitted to in another post. That's another thing the NCTA crowd has over you... like conservatives beating liberals by forceing them to stay accountable, we do the same to you.

Actually, the reply was specifically directed at Len. He is infamous for doing everything I described. A simple Google search will easily verify that. As to you putting forth arguments that are cogent and fact-filled. Well, that is just too funny. Thanks for the humor, Clint.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5478. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 14:36:17 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkuugq$5vrcp$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78893

"Clint" wrote ...

Thanks for the admission to your hypocrisy.

I take it from your response that you are just too busy writing witty retorts to do a simple search? Doesn't surprise me a bit. After all, you are the same person that called Dee D. Flint a guy in at least two posts, right? A true 'Master' of the facts we have here, folks.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5479. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 14:42:40 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkuuso$6do2f$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78894

"Dwight Stewart" wrote ...

Math is not my forte. I got through the classes, but had to struggle every single step of the way. In fact, I still struggle with it to some extent to this day, so I'll obviously never be anything close to an expert on it. Perhaps I need to do what most do and simply avoid situations involving serious math.

When I was in high school, I absolutely hated math. And not unlike you, I tried to avoid it as much as possible. But for some reason, the light came on when I entered college. As much as we might hate it, math does play a rather large roll in Amateur Radio.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5480. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 14:49:56 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ogDcb.10930$ai7.5431@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78895
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Christy D" <daviesc238@nospam.alvillage.net> wrote:
>
> That's from Burns.keesler.af.mil, the domain of Les
> and his shriveled up little dwarves. Posting from DoD
> property while you are supposed to be at work, eh
> Maggot Breath?
>
> I've sent your post, complete with full headers, to the
> abuse account there. Let's see if they have you in their
> proxy logs, and let's see how the XO of the base feels
> about taxpayer-money-sucking, leeching cowards like
> yourself giving a bad name to Keesler while the REAL
> men from that base are serving their country.

If true, since such use is now considered a serious offense, this person would be well advised to discuss the rules governing the use of military computers for private recreational activities with the facility's system adminstrator or IT security officer. DoD has already come down hard on a few violators (I read in S&S that one E-6 was sentenced to two years in jail and discharged).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5481. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 15:03:20 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <YsDcb.2987$YK7.2303@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78896
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:BXBcb.2841$RW4.2141@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> > As if the HF spectrum is not already ruined. Doesn't ANYONE take Part
15
> > seriously? If I ran the FCC, I'd make touch lamps illegal for one
thing.
> > --scott
>
> Yes, well money talks and Morse Code HF Luddites walk. If there were a
few million
> active HF operators then maybe the FCC would listen, but Ham Radio is "old
technology"
> and BPL is a billion dollar industry.

If there were a "million operators on HF", there would BE no HF. The overcrowding would go even farther than BPL in making it unusable for anyone.

Duh!

Typical of the ignorant, uneducated geeks who just can't stand any sort of organization or regulation, Keith would gladly screw things up for thousands of normal, decent, intelligent hams, just to make some rather dubious "point" that nobody but another ignorant, uneducated geek would care about.

Notice how he doesn't show a callsign? These days, that is a dead give-away for the new batch of anti-ham Trolls who are currently infesting the ham radio - related newsgroups and E-mail lists.

Yes, Keith is a mother's mistake, as he grew up to be an anti-ham Troll.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

5482. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 15:06:45 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <9wDcb.10939$ai7.3226@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78897

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote:
>
> Meanwhile, the US had listening posts in Turkey,
> Greece, Germany, Korea, Japan...
>
> We didn't need to send OUR traffic via CW, we
> needed to copy THEIR message traffic using CW.

And it was all monitored by computers. My father worked at one of those stations in Turkey in the mid-60's (Karamusel Air Station near Istanbu). Nobody actually listened to the initial traffic by ear. Instead, computers listened for key words and recorded conversations that might be interesting (CW messages were printed). Those messages were then sent back to the states for screening and evaluation.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5483. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 15:11:13 UTC
From: kludge@panix.com
Message-ID: <bkv0ihsrm1@panix2.panix.com>
Source record: 78899
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

In article <vn4s5qq6lfl790@corp.supernews.com>, --exray-- <no@no.no> wrote:
>asdf wrote:
>> David Stinson wrote:
>>>The FCC may be listening to "college boy" engineers.
>>>I saw this happen too many times at government sites.
>>
>> No, they're listening to the big money (campaign donor) power companies.
>> Just like everything else in the Bush administration...money is the only
>> thing that carries any weight...
>
>Oh my, a political troll on Usenet. Betcha said the same thing during
>the Clinton administration, huh Troll?.

Sadly, he is more or less right. The FCC has become heavily politicized
in the past few years, and they are controlled more by political pressure
than by folks who understand the technology. Pretty much all of the folks
who actually understand the technology have left the upper reaches of the
FCC management.

And it has nothing to do with the Republicans or the Democrats... it has to
do with the FCC. We can blame Reagan and Clinton both for some of it, but
it is pretty clear that the FCC no longer cares much about the public interest
or about maintaining the airwaves as a sacred trust.
---scott
--
"C'est un Nagra. C'est suisse, et tres, tres precis."

5484. The April Fools Joke that came true?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 15:12:13 UTC
From: Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <hBDcb.2898$RW4.441@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78898

:From: Keith (kewyatt@apexmail.com)
:Subject: FCC Chairman Wants Change in Amateur Radio.
:Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy, rec.radio.amateur.misc
:Date: 2001-04-01 00:32:05 PST

April 1, 2001 -(AP)
FCC Chairman wants to eliminate Morse Code and wasted spectrum by Hams.
In a speech Saturday night to the telecommunications industry FCC Chairman Michael Powell spoke out against the use of Morse Code and the waste of valuable spectrum by ham radio operators, ham radio operators are licensed CB operators that pass a Morse Code test. The Chairman is concerned about the waste of spectrum worth billions of dollars to the telecommunications industry that is currently being used by Ham Radio operators.
The Chairman also wants a big change in the spectrum wasted in the Ultra High Frequency area of spectrum in which Ham Radio Operators hold a staggering sixty megahertz of spectrum, more then any other radio service.

"Amateur Radio operators in this frequency band only need about two megahertz to chat with each other about the weather. Cellular and portable communications are in great demand and the FCC should not allow a few thousand people to hog spectrum needed by millions of consumers."

In a detailed presentation he outlined his plan to ask the International Telecommunications Union for the reassignment of a four megahertz chunk of spectrum to the airline industry that is presently held by amateurs near the overcrowded civilian aircraft band. He also outlined the conversion of thirty megahertz of frequency for use by telecommunications providers for data systems that could be used to supply high-speed access to the internet via radio frequencies.

To demonstrate why the FCC Chairman believes the Amateur Radio Service is wasting spectrum he played several tapes of licensed ham operators using vulgar language and jamming stations in the band he wishes to convert to the airline industry.
When asked by reporters about the possible opposition to his plan by ham radio operators the Chairman smiled and exclaimed, "We are going to cut it off and kill it!"
Â© 2001 Associated Press, All Rights Reserved.
--
Best Regards,
Keith (Use Reply-to for email)

"Where would Christianity be if Jesus got eight to fifteen years with time off for good behavior?" NY State Senator James Donovan, speaking in support of capital punishment.

```
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

--
Best Regards, Keith http://kilowatt-radio.org/
==========================================
= http://slrn.org SLRN 0.9.8.0 is out. =
==========================================
```

5485. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 15:12:15 UTC
From: kludge@panix.com
Message-ID: <bkv0kf$t4c$1@panix2.panix.com>
Source record: 78900
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Keith <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
> Yes, well money talks and Morse Code HF Luddites walk. If there were a few million
>active HF operators then maybe the FCC would listen, but Ham Radio is "old technology"
>and BPL is a billion dollar industry.

Only takes one luddite with a straight key to take down a transcontinental
transmission line....
--scott

--
"C'est un Nagra. C'est suisse, et tres, tres precis."

5486. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 15:20:40 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <cJDcb.10948$ai7.2471@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78901

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
>
> All those Exams took less than 1% Brain Power, so
> whats your excuse Dwight, would that 1% put your
> brain power on overload.

Bruce, one percent of your brain power wouldn't help a snail figure out
where the opening of his shell was. One hundred percent of your brain power
might (on a good day).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5487. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 15:24:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309250724.6fc7276@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78902

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309221407.2163041@posting.google.com>...
> k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309220844.31291566@posting.google.com>...
> > >>In article <20030920184429.14837.00003106@mb-m03.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com
> > >>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
> > > Sonny, I've probably done MORE in radio already than you've done in
> > > your entire "career" as a hambone...er Ham.
> >
> > WHOA, PUTZBREATH!
>
> That from a guy who wears a white dress and a carries a rectal
> thermometer.

I do? Hmmmmm....seems to me I have neither at hand, Brain. You
would please provide some evidence of same?

Failure to do so shall be an admission of lying on your part.

> > Where are YOUR accomplishments in AMATEUR RADIO...?!?!
>
> How many articles did you have published in HAM RADIO magazine?

None. It's Defunct...No longer published.

Furthermore, PLEASE cite for me ANY reference otehr than that
FAILED magazine where Lennie has ACCOMPLISHED anything.

Further yet, please show me where Lennie's work was original.

Can you show me ONE refernece in Amateur Radio where his ALLEGED
work was cited as reference in some project?

> > > You have PLAYED for years at ham radio, using ready-made
> > > equipment, not really understanding what goes on behind your
> > > ready-made front panels. Where are YOUR accomplishments in
> > > amateur radio, your name posted as anywhere involving advancing
> > > anything of the amateur state of the art? On FIDONET? Words,
> > > self-glorifying yourself. On this newsgroup? More words, more
> > > self-glorifying of yourself...plus an extreme amount of patronizing
> > > "I am your moral superior" preacher without a church.
> >
> > GEEEEEEEZUS, Lennie!
> >
> > Pretty deep in the POT/KETTLE/BLACK mode today, aren't ya?

> >
> > I've done some searches on "Leonard Anderson" and "Amateur Radio"
> > and with the exception of YOUR self-glorifying, self gratifying
> > pronouncements of moral superiority of all OF Amateur Radio, the
> > search comes up a BIG FAT ZERO.
>
> Do the same search on "Steve Robeson" and "Amateur Radio" and you'll
> see the same thing.

Quite true. But I am not the one making grand assertions of how
wondrous my alleged contributions to "radio" are, Brain.

> > Yes...we all know about the few articles you wrote in "Ham
> > Radio"...It still amounts to only a fraction of zero.
>
> In your case we cannot divide by zero.

As I said...It's not about what >>I<< am claiming, Brain...it's
what LENNIE is claiming.

> > (BTW...Several of us were gathered at the "CQ" magazine booth at
> > the Huntsville, AL Hamfest last month, and your name was the subject
> > of great laughter and joking...So there lies YOUR contribution to
> > Amateur radio!)
>
> That's pathetic. I hope John Dorr wasn't part of the gaggle. Wonder
> who they laugh at when you're not around?

It's not me, I can assure you.

> > > Any you've done what? Playing with your radios, doing your beeping thing
> > > the same as what was done by amateurs a half century ago or a full
> > > century ago? What kind of "new technology" is on-off keying code use?
> > > Who are you trying to fool other than children, fool?
> >
> > This forum is about AMATEUR RADIO.
>
> The physics of radio communication were not changed by the
> Communications Act of 1934.

Ahhhh...Brain has adapted Lennie's pathetic attempts to dilute
this to radio physic versus the REGULATION of radio.

This forum, Putz Jr, is about Amateur Radio POLICY. Policy
refers to regulation and practice, NOT the physics of radio.

> > It is NOT about Army relay stations in the 1950's, PLMRS, the
> > IEEE or your SWLing of the aeronautical bands and an expired
> > student-pilot permit over four decades old...
> >
> > Morse Code communications is a part of Amateur Radio. That is a
> > fact.
>

> Is it a part of any other communications? 500KHz?

AMATEUR RADIO, Brain...Not maritime...Not Army...Not Commercial.

Specific question that can be answered YES or NO...Do you know
the difference between AMATUER RADIO and any other radio service?

> > And despite the amount of effort you put in to trying to make
> > Larry look like that's ALL he does, you fail miserably.
>
> He's still working on WAS/CW.
>
> > YOU are STILL a liar.
>
> No. He probably has done more in radio communications than you've
> done in your entire ham career, and you probably have always used
> store bought equipment.

And in THIS forum, Brain, he's still got a looooooong track record
of lying, deception and antagonism. YOU are getting there.

> > YOU are STILL unlicensed.
>
> So far I don't think he's lied about that one either.

Then you've not been paying attention. No big surprise there.
>
> > YOU are STILL an outsider looking in. Please wipe the drool off
> > of the window when you're done. It's embarrassing.
>
> Quit showing your ass. It's embarassing.

Oh...And what you and Lennie do in here isn't...?!?!

BBBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHA ! ! ! ! ! ! !

> > And..oh yeah...You're STILL a PUTZ.
>
> And you're still a guy in a dress who can't handle his own emotions.

Failure to present evidence is acknopwledgement that you are a
liar.

ARE you a liar, Brain? I have $100 sitting here says that no
picture of me in ANY item of women's clothing exists, and that this
you are pertetrating a lie.

So...care to try and collect, or ADMIT you are lying?

I say you ar a liar. No big surprise there.

Steve, K4YZ

5488. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 15:28:18 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <mQDcb.10959$ai7.2971@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78903

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
>
> TIT, I think all your Brains are in your TITS.

This bit of wisdom from a person who routinely comments about the overall large size of her breasts.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5489. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 16:03:37 UTC
From: recalcitrant ham op <3evhil4de@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1064506387.907205@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 78904
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"opcom" <eccm@swbell.net> wrote in message
news:3F72521A.70F5BD12@swbell.net...
> This was posted to ARLI, I don't know how many
> subscribe, but in spite of the numerous comments
> against BPL (transmitting wideband internet data
> over power lines, which will destroy the HF radio
> spectrum), the FCC seems disposed to encourage
> it anyway. evil! evil! just look up BPL on the web. T
> the noise from the radiated signals trashed the ham bands thoroughly.

I guess you never heard that money talks and bullshit walks eh?

Did you *REALLY THINK* that a couple hundred
aging HF operating tightwad ham radio operators
are going to stop an emerging technology that will
conceivably network home appliances to the internet
and be worth $BILLIONS$ in potential revenue ??

Jeezehus-H-christ...get F-N real !!

5490. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 16:10:15 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309250810.388adceb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78905

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309250234.2decbd02@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030925015541.25517.00000936@mb-m15.aol.com>...
> > In article <20030924203108.02537.00000756@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > writes:
> >
> > >> By refusing to identify yourself, EVERYONE is blind to you.
> > >>
> > >Then why are you replying? ;-)
> >
> > To whom?
>
> Notice how quickly some anonymous troll is defended IF he has the right opinion?
>
Yep, you and Len sure defended "vshah101" in here...

5491. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 16:13:25 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309250813.475f7e16@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78906

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:<bLMbb.65250$NM1.51590@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030922203001.07346.00000756@mb-m26.aol.com...
> > In article <4Wa9b.12919$Aq2.6141@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill
> Sohl"
> > <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:
> >
> > >IF morse (i.e. radiotelegraphy) had any basis as a foundation
> > >for higher learning of radio concepts, principles or theory
> > >then it would be a requirement of engineering students...which
> > >it has never been to my knowledge anywhere.
> >
> > Faulty logic, Bill.
> >
> > "Radio" is but a small, specialized part of electrical engineering. That's
> one
> > reason Morse isn't and wasn't part of the curriculum. Heck, soldering is a
> much
> > bigger part of electrical engineering than radio, and soldering is not
> taught
> > in EE school either.
> >
> > But if someone wants to learn radio on their own, and wants to
> learn-by-doing,
> > amateur radio can be a really fun way to learn. Skill in Morse code is an
> > excellent tool in that learning process.
> > 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
> Then yoiu should have no problem gaining morse users from those that
> want to learn by doing after the code test is gone.

And by that same reasoning, there's no reason to test for most of
what's in the written test, because there should be no problem gaining
technically-inclined people who want to learn by doing after the
theory parts of the written test are gone.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5492. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 16:21:24 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <i356nvg9qb2f1pp16am1k4k38og3be482a@4ax.com>
Source record: 78907

Absolutely correct, N2EY - for these folks, the message is everything.
Agree, or be attacked personally.

You know, being a member of this group is a lot like adopting a pet
porcupine. For the most part, it's an intelligent and good natured
animal - but you do have to watch out for the pricks.... ;)

73, Leo

On 25 Sep 2003 09:10:15 -0700, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309250234.2decbd02@posting.google.com>...
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030925015541.25517.00000936@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> > In article <20030924203108.02537.00000756@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
>> > writes:
>> >
>> > >> By refusing to identify yourself, EVERYONE is blind to you.
>> > >>
>> > >Then why are you replying? ;-)
>> >
>> > To whom?
>>
>> Notice how quickly some anonymous troll is defended IF he has the right opinion?
>>
>Yep, you and Len sure defended "vshah101" in here...

5493. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 16:31:04 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <cLEcb.7320$ko5.7091@newssvr32.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 78908
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"recalcitrant ham op" <3evhil4de@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:1064506387.907205@newshost03.voicenet.com...
>

Another no-callsign anti-ham Troll.

(yawn)

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

5494. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 16:46:37 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309250846.4eacb2a3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78909

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in message news:<r781nv09pljqcho0nuuplpnkvtjlkgi416@4ax.com>...
> **** Post for FREE via your newsreader at post.usenet.com ****
>
> On 23 Sep 2003 05:34:27 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >Dwight:
> >
> >I hate to sound like a scratched CD, but that reply is unresponsive. If the
> >above were true, then the very second radio amateurs started using modes
> >other than CW, the code testing requirement should have been dropped,
> >for all the same reasons given by the NCTA today. However, it wasn't.
> >In fact, in the late '60's, over a half-century after the need for military and
> >commercial stations to be able to shoo-off "those damn hams" from
> >their frequencies, the Morse code testing requirement was increased
> >as part of the now lamented "Incentive Licensing" scheme.
>
> Obviously a mistake, then...so what is your rationale for compounding
> that mistake by continuing to perpetuate it any longer?

Some history on "incentive licensing" is in order here...

Before 1951, there were three classes of license, two written tests and one code test speed - 13 wpm. All hams had all privileges except that you needed a Class A to work HF 'phone on the ham bands between 3 and 25 MHz. Class A required a years' experience and another written test, but no additional code speed.

In 1951, FCC reorganized the whole system into 6 classes - Novice, Technician, General, Conditional, Advanced, and Extra. Old Class B became General old Class A became Advanced. Old Class C became Conditional.

The new Extra required 2 years experience as Conditional or higher, 20 wpm code and a written that was even more advanced than the old Class A/Advanced.

FCC also announced that at the end of 1952 they would stop issuing new Advanceds. And it would take an Extra or Advanced to work HF 'phone on the ham bands between 3 and 25 MHz.

You can imagine the rush to get an Advanced before Dec. 31 1952.

But at the last minute FCC reversed themselves and gave all operating privileges to all hams except Novices and Techs.

FCC figured that hams would go for the Extra "because it was there"
and because one could get a 1x2 call after 25 years as an Extra, or
some such.

But by 1963 there were only about 4000 Extras out of a quarter-million
US hams.

So FCC asked ARRL for a plan to get more hams to upgrade. ARRL
responded with a simple plan: reopen the Advanced to new issues and
require an Advanced or Extra in order to work HF 'phone on the ham
bands between 3 and 25 MHz.

Simple, huh? No more code test unless you wanted the 1x2.

Then FCC asked for comments, got a big pile (over 6000 letters) and
incorporated all sorts of things that made the whole thing much more
complicated.
>
> >Incentive
> >Licensing was an ARRL initiative,

No, it wasn't. It was FCC's idea.

> >and it was done to ensure that the
> >Morse/CW mode would continue to be used in spite of the increasing
> >popularity of SSB and digital modes.

Wrong again. The main concern of FCC was their perceived stagnation in
amateur technical matters. They were unhappy that so few hams had gone
for the Extra, and also that homebrewing had declined sharply and
"appliance operating" increased. Personally, I think it was also
partly "Sputnik fever".
>
> Another obvious mistake...let's deliberately restrict progress in the
> ARS by clinging to archaic technology like koala bears. Real astute
> leadership from the League there...NOT!

The League did not propose more code testing - just more written
testing. FCC was hot for the 20 wpm code test.

In fact, at one point (1965), FCC proposed demoting all 40,000
then-existing Advanceds to General, and creating a new "Amateur First
Class" license that would require 16 wpm code and a new written test.
(imagine - 5, 13, 16 and 20 wpm code tests). ARRL and others fought
against that move, and it was eventually abandoned.
>
> >It was actually a very brilliant plan,
>
> Actually it was a very stupid plan, as shown by the test of time.

Depends on what you expected the plan to do, and which plan you look
at.
>
> > but was spoiled by the resentment caused by the lack of full

> >"grandfathering" of the existing Generals to the new Amateur Extra
> >class. If only that had been done, we may not be having this debate
> >today.

That was proposed but FCC would have none of it.
>
> To say nothing of the resentment caused by deciding in the face of
> rapidly advancing communications technology to remain rooted in an
> anachronism left over from before the dawn of the 20th century.

You mean voice communications? How old is the wired telephone?

> If
> only that had not been done, the brightest young technological minds
> of two full generations might have been drawn to amateur radio instead
> of computers and the landline BBSes and finally the Internet, and
> there would be no need for this silly debate because the ARS would
> have stayed on the cutting ege of communications technology instead of
> having made the decision to allow itself to be left in the dust.

HOW?

As far back as 40 years ago, US hams were buying instead of building.
Even EE hams. As affluence increased, equipment miniaturized and
became more complex, fewer hams felt qualified to build their gear.

>
> >During the last ARRL 10-Meter Contest, I worked over 160 QSO's on
> >10-meters, using only CW. This is on 10-meters, a band famous as a
> >repository for the 5 WPM Novice/Techs exercising the whole of their HF
> >phone privileges! During contests covering all HF bands, such as the
> >November Sweepstakes (CW), it is not possible to work all of the CW
> >stations participating.
>
> It is not possible to work all of the phone stations participating in
> the phone portion of Sweepstakes, either. The question is, did you
> work a Clean Sweep?

The ultimate question is "what are the trends in participation"? Check
out the scores in the ARRL 160 meter contest - and then realize it is
all CW.
>
> >Well, at least not for me, with my minimal station
> >in a highly antenna-compromised apartment QTH. However, in spite
> >of my operating challenges, the CW mode provides endless potential
> >to make points. During the November SS (Phone) last year, my
> >club station (W3DOV) was also operating under "marginal" conditions
> >at the QTH of Mark, KE3UY. Using literally the same power and
> >antennas as I would at my home QTH, we worked a lot fewer stations
> >than we could have on CW.
>
> That's what you get for wasting all that time pounding brass instead

> of learning some phone operating skills. :-)

HAW!
>
> >It's as simple as that. And, excluding
> >contests, the CW segments are very alive and full of stations all the
> >time, largely thanks to FISTS and the old CW-geezers chasing all
> >that paper.
>
> Excluding contests, the phone segments are also very alive and full of
> stations - no thanks to FISTS or to the old CW-geezers chasing all
> that paper....and no thanks to the code test, for that matter.

Partly because most new hams already know how to talk...
>
> And while we're developing radio operators who have proficiency with
> an operating mode that nobody but hams uses, we're failing to devlop
> operators proficient in the skills that might actually be useful out
> there in the real world.

Like what?

And how could that development be encouraged?

> Yet, old-timers lament the fact that these
> days, having a ham license won't get you a job bagging groceries, let
> alone any meaningful work in a communications-related field. Small
> wonder, when the ARS itself decided to stay rooted in 19th century
> technology, eh?

All we have left is a 5 wpm code test. Is that such a problem?
>
> >The FCC has stated repeatedly that whether or not it will have an
> >interesting in the "continued use of this mode" depends upon a
> >consensus of the amateur radio community itself.

They tossed that idea out five years ago.
>
> Half of which, as no-code Techs, has already voted, by deciding not to
> join the PCTAs in deluding themselves about the usefulness of an
> anachronistic, 19th-century operating mode.

You mean the telephone?
>
> >>As far as the FCC is concerned, it is now
> >>just one more operating mode among the many used within the Amateur Radio
> >>Service. There is no sufficient argument to support the continued existence
> >>of a code testing requirement. As such, the code testing requirement should
> >>be eliminated.
> >
> >As already stated by N2EY, this particular logic could then be applied to
> >testing for knowledge of any of the requirements for technical knowledge,
> >since radio amateurs no longer have the ability to design, build, and repair

> >state-of-the art communications gear unless they possess professional-
> >grade technical knowledge, skills, and facilities.

That's NOT what I wrote, however.

>
> Interesting, isn't it, to note that this separation between
> professional-grade technical knowledge and that available in the ARS
> started shortly after the ARS decided to remain in the Dark Ages while
> the rest of the world took off on the Technology Boom. We stayed in
> the Morse age while the rest of the world entered the Information Age.
> Yeah, incentive licensing was a great idea. Personally, I'd rank it
> right up there with sending troops to Vietnam.

First get the story straight about what incentive licensing was all
about and whose idea it was.
>
> > And, since this is the
> >AMATEUR Radio Service, that is an unreasonable expectation.
>
> Of course it is! Now, an example of a *reasonable* expectation would
> be to expect proficiency in a method of communications that is about
> 150 years old and that nobody else uses anymore.

How old is talking?

All we have is a 5 wpm code test. That's not proficiency, it's basic
entry-level skill.

> That *really*
> encourages people to become part of the ARS and be a part of the
> supposed advancement of the radio art that the Basis & Purpose portion
> of Part 97 says we're supposed to be all about, doesn't it?

Guess when those B&P got added to Part 97?
>
> >Therefore,
> >if code testing *is* eliminated, then we may as well also go to a simple
> >license application process, with, at most, an open-book test on rules and
> >regulations. That would then serve the needs of the dumbed-down
> >licensing process you would seem to prefer.
>
> Come on, Larry. There are guys who can do 30, 40, or 50 wpm that can't
> even *program* a modern transciever, let alone fix the damned thing
> when one of the surface-mount components fails that is too small for
> many of us to even *see* let alone solder one onto a PC board.

Exactly.

And the same thing can be said of many amateurs of any license class.
Including the techno-types that the nocodetest Tech was supposed to
attract.

> These
> rigs have been designed so the owners *can't* fix them, so that they
> have to be dragged back to the dealer or shipped to the factory for
> service, with appropriate outlay of cash since naturally the component
> isn't going to fail until, oh, I dunno, about 6.2 seconds after the
> warranty expires. Chances are that the "factory service" involves
> removing the board the failed component is on and replacing it with a
> brand new one because it isn't cost--effective to do component-level
> repairs on mass-produced PC boards.

Exactly. So why have all that theory stuff in the writtens? It's
keeping out the doctors and lawyers and regular folks who just want to
talk on the radio, not build one.
>
> Following this, the rig gets packed up and shipped back to its owner,
> who opens the package, curses a blue streak when he sees the bottom
> line on the invoice, makes a New Years' Resolution to become a boat
> anchor fanatic, then unpacks the rig and puts it back on the desk in
> his shack. It really doesn't matter if the guy doing the unpacking can
> copy at 50 wpm or doesn't know a dit from a dah, the result is going
> to be the same because that's how the manufacturer designed it. If you
> must blame somebody for that, Larry, then I respectfully suggest that
> you place the blame not on the NCTAs, but on the design engineers at
> YaeComWood, where it rightfully belongs - and remember that some of
> them are hams, who apparently have professional-grade technical
> knowledge, skills, and facilities, whether they ever passed a code
> test or not.

And some of us won't buy any rig we can't fix. Some of us still build
from scratch.

Guess what mode is most popular among the scratch-builders and
rig-repairers.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5495. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 17:05:33 UTC
From: ^^^I Am Fileo - I Am Fileo^^^ <fileo@hotmail.cc>
Message-ID: <dl66nv8ubike66s0q7rrrm4btavo55ehua@4ax.com>
Source record: 78910
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Yup - all of us are "ignorant" except for you, ya pathetic troll!

PLONK!

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 15:03:20 GMT, "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
wrote:

>
>"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:BXBcb.2841$RW4.2141@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>> >
>> > As if the HF spectrum is not already ruined. Doesn't ANYONE take Part
>15
>> > seriously? If I ran the FCC, I'd make touch lamps illegal for one
>thing.
>> > --scott
>>
>> Yes, well money talks and Morse Code HF Luddites walk. If there were a
>few million
>> active HF operators then maybe the FCC would listen, but Ham Radio is "old
>technology"
>> and BPL is a billion dollar industry.
>
>If there were a "million operators on HF", there would BE no HF. The
>overcrowding would go even farther than BPL in making it unusable for
>anyone.
>
>Duh!
>
>Typical of the ignorant, uneducated geeks who just can't stand any sort of
>organization or regulation, Keith would gladly screw things up for thousands
>of normal, decent, intelligent hams, just to make some rather dubious
>"point" that nobody but another ignorant, uneducated geek would care about.
>
>Notice how he doesn't show a callsign? These days, that is a dead give-away
>for the new batch of anti-ham Trolls who are currently infesting the ham
>radio - related newsgroups and E-mail lists.
>
>Yes, Keith is a mother's mistake, as he grew up to be an anti-ham Troll.
>
>Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>

5496. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 17:14:13 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkv7p5$5hm$0@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 78911

Dwight Stewart wrote:
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote:
>
>>Meanwhile, the US had listening posts in Turkey,
>>Greece, Germany, Korea, Japan...
>>
>>We didn't need to send OUR traffic via CW, we
>>needed to copy THEIR message traffic using CW.
>
>
>
> And it was all monitored by computers.

No, Dwight, it was not all monitored by computers. In fact computers
were scarce as midnight sunshine in the 60's. I KNOW some people quite
well who were both operating CW in the military and others who spent
their entire enlistment copying it on HF with headsets.

My father worked at one of those
> stations in Turkey in the mid-60's (Karamusel Air Station near Istanbu).
> Nobody actually listened to the initial traffic by ear. Instead, computers
> listened for key words and recorded conversations that might be interesting
> (CW messages were printed). Those messages were then sent back to the states
> for screening and evaluation.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

5497. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 17:18:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F73234D.40406@psu.edu>
Source record: 78912

Leo wrote:
> Sir, after reading the endless reams of drivel that you have produced
> in this newsgroup of late, I believe that you are correct - brevity
> is the soul of wit.....;)

You might also add for him that the only thing worse than being witty
is not being witty! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

5498. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 17:43:22 UTC
From: GeorgeF <av8tor@licensed4funREMOVEBEFOREFLIGHT.com>
Message-ID: <3F73293A.8050206@licensed4funREMOVEBEFOREFLIGHT.com>
Source record: 78913
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

recalcitrant ham op wrote:

> Did you *REALLY THINK* that a couple hundred
> aging HF operating tightwad ham radio operators
> are going to stop an emerging technology that will
> conceivably network home appliances to the internet
> and be worth $BILLIONS$ in potential revenue ??

Hams are the least of the problems. There are many other users of the HF range who will be effected other than hams. Here's just a few:

US Coast Guard makes high use of HF
All branches of the military
Many long distance marine comms are still on HF
TransAtlantic and Pacific Air Traffic Control Comms are HF
(Imagine if the ATC ground station can't hear an Aircraft call is position).

And that's just a few services who are heavy uses of HF.

George
http://www.MilAirComms.com
With DSL who needs BPL?

5499. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 17:44:34 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F732982.4090905@psu.edu>
Source record: 78914

Arnie Macy wrote:
> "Clint" wrote ...
>
> Thanks for the admission to your hypocrisy.
> _____
>
> I take it from your response that you are just too busy writing witty
> retorts <snip>

Well, retorts anyhow.....

- Mike KB3EIA -

5500. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 17:47:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F732A1B.7050704@psu.edu>
Source record: 78915

Leo wrote:
> Absolutely correct, N2EY - for these folks, the message is everything.
> Agree, or be attacked personally.
>
> You know, being a member of this group is a lot like adopting a pet
> porcupine. For the most part, it's an intelligent and good natured
> animal - but you do have to watch out for the pricks.... ;)
>
> 73, Leo

Interesting, I have a "Porky-Pine" on my QSL card. I don't know what the significance of that is, but I like the critters.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5501. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 17:52:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F732B60.6000904@psu.edu>
Source record: 78916

Leo wrote:
> Hmmm....
>
> You , Clint and Len have one thing in common - if you can't attach the
> individual personally, your argument runs out of steam pretty quickly.
>
> Slash away, gentlemen - your personal attacks are futile here. Ad
> Hominem is useless when you remove the 'hominem' from the equation,
> isn't it?

I add hominem to many meals, Leo. Great fried with onions and butter!

- Mike KB3EIA -

5502. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 18:02:05 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bkvait$7q6$0@208.206.142.110>
Source record: 78917
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

^^^I Am Fileo - I Am Fileo^^^ wrote:
> Yup - all of us are "ignorant" except for you, ya pathetic troll!
>
> PLONK!
>
> On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 15:03:20 GMT, "charlesb" <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
> wrote:
>
>
>>"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>>news:BXBcb.2841$RW4.2141@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>>
>>>>As if the HF spectrum is not already ruined. Doesn't ANYONE take Part
>>
>>15
>>
>>>>seriously? If I ran the FCC, I'd make touch lamps illegal for one
>>
>>thing.
>>
>>>>--scott
>>>
>>> Yes, well money talks and Morse Code HF Luddites walk. If there were a
>>
>>few million
>>
>>>active HF operators then maybe the FCC would listen, but Ham Radio is "old
>>
>>technology"
>>
>>>and BPL is a billion dollar industry.
>>
>>If there were a "million operators on HF", there would BE no HF. The
>>overcrowding would go even farther than BPL in making it unusable for
>>anyone.
>>
>>Duh!
>>

Sure there would be. And it would sound just like 27 mhz sounds.
Just what Keith has in mind, I'm sure.

5503. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 18:39:31 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309251039.2a6d0185@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78918

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<bkuuso$6do2f$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote ...
>
> Math is not my forte. I got through the classes, but had to struggle every
> single step of the way. In fact, I still struggle with it to some extent to
> this day, so I'll obviously never be anything close to an expert on it.
> Perhaps I need to do what most do and simply avoid situations involving
> serious math.
> --
>
> When I was in high school, I absolutely hated math. And not unlike you, I
> tried to avoid it as much as possible. But for some reason, the light came
> on when I entered college. As much as we might hate it, math does play a
> rather large roll in Amateur Radio.

Ham radio simply wouldn't exist if it wasn't solidly based in
mathmatical principles.

> Arnie -
> KT4ST

w3rv

5504. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 19:14:37 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0309251114.75003649@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78919

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<bkuuso$6do2f$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote ...
>
> Math is not my forte. I got through the classes, but had to struggle every
> single step of the way. In fact, I still struggle with it to some extent to
> this day, so I'll obviously never be anything close to an expert on it.
> Perhaps I need to do what most do and simply avoid situations involving
> serious math.
> --
>
> When I was in high school, I absolutely hated math. And not unlike you, I
> tried to avoid it as much as possible. But for some reason, the light came
> on when I entered college. As much as we might hate it, math does play a
> rather large roll in Amateur Radio.

My college Calc II prof called math the ultimate religeon. He said it
was one of the very few things one could put all their faith in and
just about never be disappointed. "Obey the rules and it'll never let
you down."

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

5505. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 19:42:26 UTC
From: wa2si@arrl.net
Message-ID: <b7d1465c.0309251142.76575786@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78920

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<bkuuso$6do2f$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote ...
>
> Math is not my forte. I got through the classes, but had to struggle every
> single step of the way. In fact, I still struggle with it to some extent to
> this day, so I'll obviously never be anything close to an expert on it.
> Perhaps I need to do what most do and simply avoid situations involving
> serious math.
> --
>
> When I was in high school, I absolutely hated math. And not unlike you, I
> tried to avoid it as much as possible. But for some reason, the light came
> on when I entered college. As much as we might hate it, math does play a
> rather large roll in Amateur Radio.

Oops, that was supposed to be "religion." EMMMbarassing!!!

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

5506. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 19:58:45 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925155845.29910.00000132@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 78921

>This bit of wisdom from a person who routinely comments about the overall
>large size of her breasts.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

What are you now in love her TITS?

5507. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:00:31 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309251200.4af66b3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78922

Now, now, Leo, or whoever.

Didn't you just just try to attach an effeminate point of view to
Len's post by dragging in some woman's book?

Or perhaps you think that a woman's point of view has no merit?

Talk about running out of steam and attaching people.

Are we clear?

Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<unj5nvcf7n6vfloumf93v1p2vt65geb06f@4ax.com>...
> Hmmm....
>
> You , Clint and Len have one thing in common - if you can't attach the
> individual personally, your argument runs out of steam pretty quickly.
>
> Slash away, gentlemen - your personal attacks are futile here. Ad
> Hominem is useless when you remove the 'hominem' from the equation,
> isn't it? Now, you are forced to rely on intellect alone to make
> rational points, which is uncomfortable for some....and difficult for
> others. You can't shoot the messenger if you don't like the message.
> Waaaa.
>
> Now, gentlemen, if you would care to present lucid and cogent points
> in a civilized manner, I'd be happy to listen to you. I have done so
> - are you up to the challenge?
>
> 73. Leo
>
>
> On 25 Sep 2003 04:01:09 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
> >Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<sci4nv8lci20ei97htpvh537ujjhmm98cv@4ax.com>...
> >
> >> Instead of buying one, can I borrow your copy when you are done with
> >> it?
> >
> >Where should it be sent? To whom should it be addressed?

5508. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:01:00 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925160100.29910.00000133@mb-m13.aol.com>
Source record: 78923

>Bruce, one percent of your brain power wouldn't help a snail figure out
>where the opening of his shell was. One hundred percent of your brain power
>might (on a good day).
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
>http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Well thats amazing Dwight, I guess yuou and Brian most have less Brain Power
than that.

5509. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:04:56 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <0ei6nv84cp6ti8fqjh8e40lnst2h14c2ts@4ax.com>
Source record: 78924

Certainly not ;) - just trying to see his point of view. He seemed
very passionate about this!

73, Leo

On 25 Sep 2003 13:00:31 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:

>Now, now, Leo, or whoever.
>
>Didn't you just just try to attach an effeminate point of view to
>Len's post by dragging in some woman's book?
>
>Or perhaps you think that a woman's point of view has no merit?
>
>Talk about running out of steam and attaching people.
>
>Are we clear?
>
>Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<unj5nvcf7n6vfloumf93v1p2vt65geb06f@4ax.com>...
>> Hmmm....
>>
>> You , Clint and Len have one thing in common - if you can't attach the
>> individual personally, your argument runs out of steam pretty quickly.
>>
>> Slash away, gentlemen - your personal attacks are futile here. Ad
>> Hominem is useless when you remove the 'hominem' from the equation,
>> isn't it? Now, you are forced to rely on intellect alone to make
>> rational points, which is uncomfortable for some....and difficult for
>> others. You can't shoot the messenger if you don't like the message.
>> Waaaa.
>>
>> Now, gentlemen, if you would care to present lucid and cogent points
>> in a civilized manner, I'd be happy to listen to you. I have done so
>> - are you up to the challenge?
>>
>> 73. Leo
>>
>>
>> On 25 Sep 2003 04:01:09 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>>
>> >Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<sci4nv8lci20ei97htpvh537ujjhmm98cv@4ax.com>...
>> >
>> >> Instead of buying one, can I borrow your copy when you are done with

>> >> it?
>> >
>> >Where should it be sent? To whom should it be addressed?

5510. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:11:10 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <qpi6nvkr5vv7olir14ieomhsvh1dajbum4@4ax.com>
Source record: 78925

BTW, are you Len's new guardian angel? Did Clint get laid off? ;)

And did you want to respond to the issues I raised in my post to you,
or shall we redirect Len's mail to you for follow up?

Inquiring minds want to know...cogent and lucid, remember....

73, Leo

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 20:04:56 GMT, Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote:

>Certainly not ;) - just trying to see his point of view. He seemed
>very passionate about this!
>
>73, Leo
>
>On 25 Sep 2003 13:00:31 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>
>>Now, now, Leo, or whoever.
>>
>>Didn't you just just try to attach an effeminate point of view to
>>Len's post by dragging in some woman's book?
>>
>>Or perhaps you think that a woman's point of view has no merit?
>>
>>Talk about running out of steam and attaching people.
>>
>>Are we clear?
>>
>>Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<unj5nvcf7n6vfloumf93v1p2vt65geb06f@4ax.com>...
>>> Hmmm....
>>>
>>> You , Clint and Len have one thing in common - if you can't attach the
>>> individual personally, your argument runs out of steam pretty quickly.
>>>
>>> Slash away, gentlemen - your personal attacks are futile here. Ad
>>> Hominem is useless when you remove the 'hominem' from the equation,
>>> isn't it? Now, you are forced to rely on intellect alone to make
>>> rational points, which is uncomfortable for some....and difficult for
>>> others. You can't shoot the messenger if you don't like the message.
>>> Waaaa.
>>>
>>> Now, gentlemen, if you would care to present lucid and cogent points
>>> in a civilized manner, I'd be happy to listen to you. I have done so
>>> - are you up to the challenge?

>>>
>>> 73. Leo
>>>
>>>
>>> On 25 Sep 2003 04:01:09 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:
>>>
>>> >Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<sci4nv8lci20ei97htpvh537ujjhmm98cv@4ax.com>...
>>> >
>>> >> Instead of buying one, can I borrow your copy when you are done with
>>> >> it?
>>> >
>>> >Where should it be sent? To whom should it be addressed?

5511. Re: Where Is Porkbut?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:12:38 UTC
From: "BIG-AL-3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL@BIG-AL.KOM>
Message-ID: <vn6j1albio4e4b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78926
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

YOU SPELT HIS NAME RONG. 2 T'S IN PORKBUTT.

"Fudge" <fudge@nrtco.net> wrote in message
news:mDEcb.6435$1H3.399842@news20.bellglobal.com...
> Where is Porkbut?. I still have a WAV file of his but I miss his cheery
> voice.
>
> Farmer John
>
>

5512. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:18:09 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <i2j6nvcf25qcd22h3v6nlqcvs2pcrmpg9c@4ax.com>
Source record: 78928

Me too.

Say, maybe that could be the official mascot of this group? A
Porky-Pine.....;)

73, Leo

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 13:47:07 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>snip

> Interesting, I have a "Porky-Pine" on my QSL card. I don't know what
>the significance of that is, but I like the critters.

> - Mike KB3EIA -

5513. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:31:41 UTC
From: "BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <"BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS"@BIG-AL>
Message-ID: <vn6k5klsh1uf17@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78932
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I VOTE FOR PORKBUTT.

ELECTION OVER.

PORKBUTT IT IS.

HO**HO

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:i2j6nvcf25qcd22h3v6nlqcvs2pcrmpg9c@4ax.com...
> Me too.
>
> Say, maybe that could be the official mascot of this group? A
> Porky-Pine.....;)
>
> 73, Leo
>
> On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 13:47:07 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:
>
> >snip
>
> > Interesting, I have a "Porky-Pine" on my QSL card. I don't know what
> >the significance of that is, but I like the critters.
>
> > - Mike KB3EIA -
>

5514. Luxemburg CEPT-2 also on HF

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:33:40 UTC
From: Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bkvjf4$65nv1$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78933

Since September 25th, 2003

http://www.etat.lu/ILR/freq/decis/0369.pdf

--
73 de Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD

Cuius testiculos habes, habeas cardeo et cerebellum

5515. Re: lloyd da toids favorite website <-- history

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:43:36 UTC
From: "BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <"BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS"@BIG-AL>
Message-ID: <vn6ks039qlbtb5@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78934
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

YOU DO LIVE FOR MY EVERY POST DONT YOU.

I DO OWN YOU AND YOU KNOW IT.

YOU MUST BE A SHUT IN. YOUR ON HERE MOST OF THE DAY. BIG AL GETS OUT AND
ABOUT UNLIKE YOU. HAVE A NURSE TO WHEEL YOU OUTSIDE EVERY ONCE IN A WHILE
GET SOME AIR.

WELL YOU DONT HAVE TO HEAR US FOR US TO HEAR YOU. SO COME ON DOWN YOU CAN BE
THE NEXT CONTESTANT ON AY-YI- YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG. BUT NOW IF YOUR
AFFRAID OF BIG-AL STAY AWAY AND HIDE WE ALL UNDERSTAND. MAYBE YOUR SIGNAL
WILL BE BETTER THAN THOSE GUYS FROM ARKANSAS WHO ALWAYS TRY TO QRM US BUT
NEVER GET THE JOB DONE.

BYE HO$$$HO$$$

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:euj6nvo7mu7r9pr96fnbupna0c17ke09a8@4ax.com...
> QRP, good buddy - can't hear you on 75.
>
> Crank up the Sky-Buddy a bit!
>
> 73, Leo
>
> On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 16:07:59 -0400, "BIG-AL-3894.5-LSB-75-METERS"
> <BIG-AL@BIG-AL.KOM> wrote:
>
> >
> >"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
> >news:20i6nvo6dl5ekjdajtlav78jcus8sa2e9v@4ax.com...
> >> Come to think of it, I haven't seen Big Al around today either.
> >> Perhaps Supernews abuse department caught up with him too...
> >>
> >> He must be going off the air soon, though, - he's selling off his rig
> >> on eBay: ;)
> >>
> >>
> >BEEN RIGHT HERE BOY. HOW DOES IT FEEL TO BE OWNED BY BIG-AL? WHEN YOU
WALK
> >DOWN THE STREET WATCH OUT FOR BIG-AL YOUR FRIEND. HE IS ALWAYS WATCHING
FOR
> >LEO THE LION. COME ON TO 3894.5-LSB-75-METERS TONITE. I WILL BE WAITING
FOR
> >YOU. WE USUALLY GET THERE AROUND 7PM EASTERN TIME. SOMETIMES A LITTLE

LATER
> >THOUGH. JUST STICK AROUND AND I WILL BE THERE. IF YOUR LUCKY YOUR SIGNAL
> >WILL BE A LITTLE STRONGER THAN THE BOYS FROM ARKANSAS. MAYBE WE WILL BE
ABLE
> >TO HEAR YOUR LITTLE PEANUT WHISTLE. DID I TELL YOU HOW BIG MINE IS? I
BET
> >ITS BIGGER THAN YOURS.
> >
>

5516. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:51:03 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309251251.b91e855@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78935

Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<2ecvmv4rt6ito9ddqrh24ka0t1c4k2oium@4ax.com>...

> How so? I have never stated my position one way or the other with
> respect to mandatory Morse testing. I have stated that I did get my 5
> WPM to get on to HF because I had to by law, and that using it for
> QSOs is beginning to grow on me. That doesn't mean that I think
> everyone should have to do it!

Unfortunately, that makes no difference in THIS forum, Leo.

I've expressed not only "tolerence" of NCT's, but have praised
the accomplishments of most of the one's I know, but Lennie, Brain and
a few others always ignore those. It ruins thier rants.

Any opportunity for them to cite "HYPOCRITE" and thereby APPEAR
to be "defending" themselves from some percieved onslaught is never
missed.

As a BIG example, Larry Roll, who is adamantly "pro-code", has
posted countless items on his DIGITAL activities, yet Lennie and his
minions want yo0u (and other countelss faceless readers) to believe
that he's still banging out Code with a Model T spark coil
transmitter.

> So, does that make me pro or con, for mandatory testing? Where's the
> obvious? Hmmm - there's that old reading comprehension problem
> again....

Yes..."reading comprehension" is a problem in this forum.

> I think that you just like to stir things up, Sir - your diatribes
> appear to serve no other useful purpose. Of course you are aware that
> the future of Morse testing will be decided at the government level,
> by committees of civilized people - and not within this group. As
> such, your energies and passionate rants are for nought, as they will
> not sway the decision makers one bit. Like complaining with the guys
> on the loading dock about the boss - won't change anything, but I bet
> that would make someone one feel more important and in control, huh?
> (know the feeling?)

Myself and two or three others have, in times past, tried to
"organize" collective voices on certain REAL policy issues, but they
are always thwarted by Lennie, Brain, and a handful of others who
invariably manage to make almost every post here about the Code issue.

It's really sad in many ways, becasue we have a truly remarkable opportunity of our own at our disposal, yet a very narrowminded few would rather just spit and snarl about perceived "wrongs" rather than truly move forward.

C'est le vie.

73

Steve, K4YZ

> Leo
>
>
> On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 21:21:09 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
> dot net> wrote:
>
> >
> >>
> >> WHOA, PUTZBREATH!
> >
> >
> >Leo, an obvious PCTA, said this in a previous thread.. and I quote..
> >
> >"Not intellectual enough to make his
> >point by rational arguement, he resorts to name calling and other
> >juvenile tactics to 'get his way'. "
> >
> >oops.
> >
> >A PCTA just did that, not a NCTA type.
> >
> >Add "hypocrisy" to the list of the PCTA flaws in tactics and
> >debate skills.

Clint, there's nothing here to debate. Nothing.

5517. GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:56:27 UTC
From: "BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <"BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS"@BIG-AL>
Message-ID: <vn6lk3dd6nrg62@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78936
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

PARIS, France (AP) -- The death toll in France from August's blistering heat wave was nearly 15,000, according to a government report released Thursday that exceeded prior official estimates by 3,000 victims.

5518. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:56:27 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925165627.12631.00001454@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78937

In article <bktfft$71a$0@208.206.142.103>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

> It won't be just hams and other minor users of spectrum below 80 mHz
>who will be very seriously impacted by BPL.

The lower limit of frequency allocations by both ITU-R and FCC is
3 KHz.

80 milliHertz is in the range of natural phenomena and not in any
radio regulations.

5519. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:56:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925165628.12631.00001455@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78944

In article <bkuu9f$67ukd$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>Actually, the reply was specifically directed at Len. He is infamous for
>doing everything I described.

No. My "model of behavior" in here was originally KH2D, an ardent
PCTA and far more caustic than I was at the time.

The other "models of behavior" were still more PCTAs, most of whom
have left. Those PCTAs either went SK or they went to schoolyards
or old age homes to beat up on people they could handle.

All of that is back at Google archives.

>A simple Google search will easily verify that.

Everyone is welcome to search ALL of Google as far as I'm concerned.

Look at ALL of it.

Those that do will see the blatant HYPOCRISY of your claim.

5520. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:56:28 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925165628.12631.00001456@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78948

In article <bkti7g$5m3rk$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>Imagine the same debate where the first candidate makes no points on topic
>whatever, lies about the qualifications and personal history of the other
>candidate, and injects a string of personal insults as part of his off-topic
>diatribe.

PCTAs have done that in here. They are still doing it.

>The audience just sits there looking at each other because they
>know that extremely rude person has just blatantly lied to them.

That's a description of the PCTA "regulars" in here. Well done,
Arnie!

>I wonder how many votes that first candidate would get?

Billions and billions in Fantasyland.

In the case of the morse code test for US amateur radio, the FCC is
the "audience."

The FCC tallied up the public responses (your description of "votes")
and created the no-code Technician class license 13 years ago.

The FCC tallied up the public responses (your description of "votes")
and dropped the maximum morse code test rate to 5 WPM just 3
years ago.

The FCC is well aware of the decisions made at WRC-03 and the
revision of all of S25.

5521. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:56:29 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925165629.12631.00001457@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78938

In article <f45722ac.0309250301.40d534bd@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>news:<sci4nv8lci20ei97htpvh537ujjhmm98cv@4ax.com>...
>
>> Instead of buying one, can I borrow your copy when you are done with
>> it?
>
>Where should it be sent? To whom should it be addressed?

Try sending it to Landing, NJ, in care of General Delivery. :-)

5522. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:56:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925165630.12631.00001459@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78942

In article <vn5is66su4ple7@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>Don't ignore him, that's what the PCTA crowd devolves to doing
>in it's (non)tactics.... but, likewise, take Leo with a grain of salt
>and realize you are dealing with somebody who is disingenuous and
>basically a plant.

Clint, I see a slight resemblance to one newsgroupie in here that used several false identities...had an address in Landing, NJ. :-)

One time this poseur was an "Army officer about to be called to active duty" in some conflict, thus setting the stage for the Fake's disappearance. The same individual used another Fake identity and was going to "visit my neighborhood" to "explain things to me" but never got any farther than Anaheim, CA, some distance to the south. The LAPD got a recording of the "message" he left at my telephone number (authorized tap while my wife and I were up north visiting). The LAPD has a section that works on Stalkers, organized after one stalker knifed a young actress to death some years ago. They take stalking seriously, even with two-bit puerile fakes who don't have the guts to be themselves.

5523. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:56:30 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925165630.12631.00001458@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78945

In article <c2356669.0309250810.388adceb@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) writes:

>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0309250234.2decbd02@posting.google.com>...
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030925015541.25517.00000936@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> > In article <20030924203108.02537.00000756@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> > writes:
>> >
>> > >> By refusing to identify yourself, EVERYONE is blind to you.
>> > >>
>> > >Then why are you replying? ;-)
>> >
>> > To whom?
>>
>> Notice how quickly some anonymous troll is defended IF he has the right
>opinion?
>>
>Yep, you and Len sure defended "vshah101" in here...

Don't misdirect. You are NOT the moderator of this newsgroup.

You TOTALLY NEGLECT the obvious postings of the barbarian
character assassin in here still calling himself "K4YZ."

You are NOT a fair judge at all, just trying to incite a Flame War by
misdirecting to certain others.

By pretense at "fairness," your singling out certain targets is an open
example of HYPOCRISY.

5524. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:56:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925165631.12631.00001461@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78939

In article <f45722ac.0309250234.2decbd02@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030925015541.25517.00000936@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> In article <20030924203108.02537.00000756@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>> writes:
>>
>> >> By refusing to identify yourself, EVERYONE is blind to you.
>> >>
>> >Then why are you replying? ;-)
>>
>> To whom?
>
>Notice how quickly some anonymous troll is defended IF he has the right
>opinion?
>
>;^) Brian

PCTAs have to stick together. If they don't, they hang separately.

:-)

5525. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:56:31 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925165631.12631.00001460@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78943

In article <vn5iiq9qba1j85@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>> Wrong. He was just laughing at you.
>>
>> Arnie -
>> KT4ST
>
>Heh, you guys really don't help your cause much
>do you.

Clint, the PCTA have exhausted their valid reasons for code test retention long ago, well before Restructuring. All the PCTA are able to do in here is go into character assassination. And they do...
:-)

5526. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:56:32 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925165632.12631.00001462@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78940

In article <bkuuso$6do2f$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>When I was in high school, I absolutely hated math. And not unlike you, I
>tried to avoid it as much as possible. But for some reason, the light came
>on when I entered college. As much as we might hate it, math does play a
>rather large roll in Amateur Radio.

Ohm's Law is expressed in simple algebra. That is about all the "large
roll" [sic, should be 'role'] in amateur radio. That and copying someone
else's values from a QST or QEX how-to-make-it article (rare) on
construction.

Please explain the "large roll" that math plays in amateur radio.

Were you on a roll and slipped in the butter?

5527. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:56:33 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925165633.12631.00001463@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78941

In article <bkuugq$5vrcp$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>I take it from your response that you are just too busy writing witty
>retorts to do a simple search? Doesn't surprise me a bit. After all, you
>are the same person that called Dee D. Flint a guy in at least two posts,
>right? A true 'Master' of the facts we have here, folks.

Clint is right, "Master debater."

This is a public-access newsgroup, unmoderated. Unfortunately it is filled with a lot of PCTAs who can't argue their "necessity" for retention of a morse code test for the hobby called Amateur Radio. Those PCTAs must go into a constant character-assassination mode instead of arguing for the subject.

NOBODY with a reasonable memory needs to "search" any archives to talk endlessly about what anyone else said. It is all out in the open.

But, Ah-nold, you are so thin-skinned that you have to mount your high hobby horse to claim some "personal injury." Maybe all that morseman-ship strips all your skin off and you can't take it among others?

5528. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:56:34 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925165634.12631.00001464@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78949

In article <XHCcb.10909$ai7.8413@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>>
>> Tsk, tsk, tsk..."tangents?" I was handling sines, cosines,
>> and tangents back in high school of 1950. Trigonometry
>> not a problem...always got maximum marks in such subjects.
>
> Math is not my forte. I got through the classes, but had to struggle every
>single step of the way. In fact, I still struggle with it to some extent to
>this day, so I'll obviously never be anything close to an expert on it.
>Perhaps I need to do what most do and simply avoid situations involving
>serious math.

Heh, I have to admit that, in undergraduate classes on Calculus I, II, and III, my grades were A, B, and barely C, respectively. A problem with night classes and working all day yet still trying to maintain contact with other people. :-)

In looking back at all I was required to do in actual, working electronics design details, I NEVER had to use any math more complicated than simple algebra and trigonometry to get all the hardware data and parts selection. Some low-level calculus was used LATER for project reports, on a suggestion to make the determinations "look better" for higher-level staff who never got their hands dirty on the hardware. That suggestion was from another higher-level staff person who DID get his hands on the hardware whenever he could.

There's an analogy to code testing ("back to basics") and the rampant credentialism amongst the PCTA ("have to have the certificate to be able to do 'complicated' things)...namely this: The PCTA's "back to basics" is like looking up log and trig values in 5-place tables and "doing things the hard way" (to "show" something to others apparently). I got my HP-35 scientific calculator in 1971 so that I didn't have to waste all that time on look-ups of only 5-place values; the HP-35 came up with 10-place values in an eyeblink. Spot-checking against the NBS AMS 55, "Handbook of Mathematical Functions," showed that the HP values were indeed correct to 10 places.

That same NBS monograph also explained the mathematical approximations used to derive the original 5-place numeric values as well as many more places. Each modern CPU in a PC or Mac has a numeric coprocessor section that uses one of those mathematical approximations internally...and accurate to 14 decimal digit accuracy, not just 3 (as on a slide rule) or 5 (in 5-place tables).

An ardent PCTA devotee will now make some half-assed comment about
"it doesn't apply to HAM radio." Not directly. Having to know morse
code for a hobby activity involving radio regulation by licensing is much
more PRIMITIVE than sitting down and doing a series equation to
obtain a logarithm or other transcendental numeric value.

No doubt the ardent Credentialists in here will come up with some kind of
BS about "needing degrees" to understand it all. :-)

Len Anderson
retired (from regular hours) electronic engineer person
...and never needed to assume any fake identity in here to state an opinion

5529. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:56:35 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925165635.12631.00001465@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78946

In article <FsCcb.10887$ai7.9207@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>>
>> That's really not the point. I think both of you realize
>> this. :-)
>>
>> Roll's constant repetitions of old Maxims in here and
>> the few personal barbs he throws in are just his way of
>> trolling for those to respond to in the newsgroup. He
>> seems to live by such "responses" which are little more
>> than cut and paste from five years ago.
>
> Ah, but there is the old maxim about a lie repeated often enough. At some
>point, Larry's messages must have a response, if for no other reason other
>than to address the false impressions he leaves. As for the rest of your
>(fairly accurate) message, I usually (though not always) tend to keep any
>opinions, formed as a result of psychoanalyzing Larry, to myself. The poor
>boy is in bad enough shape without all of us adding to his obvious mental
>anguish. In fact, I probably wouldn't even have said that if the anguish was
>not so obvious. ;-)

I think that many failed to note a subtle bit of wordplay I did.

Larrah apparently thinks he is a Hiram Percy Maxim reincarnate since
he drags out the 1920s boilerplate "Maxims" that St. Hiram wrote in
early issues of QST when Kode was King in New England.

Hence "Maxims" with a capital M.

Too subtle for most of the personality assassins in here. I'll have to
"dumb down" to their low level. :-)

5530. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:56:36 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925165636.12631.00001466@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 78947

In article <20030925082934.08626.00000890@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030925015541.25517.00000935@mb-m15.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20030924203109.02537.00000757@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>>
>>>In article <20030924174226.07578.00000783@mb-m25.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>>
>>>>YOU are NOT on any QRZ listing for any country.
>>>
>>>Neither are you. Len ;-) ;-) ;-)
>>
>> I've never PRETENDED to be one.
>
>Why are you shouting, Len?

Not shouting. Do your eyes hurt?

>> I make no bones about not being licensed as an AMATEUR and have
>> said so from day one in here.
>
>Everything isn't all about you, Len.

Apparently the PCTA think so.

Since they can't support their view of retaining the morse code test, they
attack personalities.

>> What you have is some idiot who PRETENDS to be an amateur
>> <something> in Canada and won't identify himself.
>
>Why do you think Leo is pretending anything?

She hasn't got the guts to identify herself.

Despite your pain with PREVIOUS screen names, I've never attempted
to post anything without identifying myself.

>When "vshah101" showed up here and said he was an EE and a ham but would not
>identify himself, you had no problems with that. But you are all over Leo for
>doing the same thing.

Don't misdirect into more personality character assassination.

The SUBJECT line of this thread is "1/4 Wave Dipoles."

This whole newsgroup was created to discuss-debate-argue the code
test issue.

It wasn't created for the sole amusement or daily guru column from
Jimmie Miccolis where he would sit in judgement of all others.

>> If you wish to live in a fairyland of make-believe, be my guest. Just
>> don't start mumbling about laws for that fairyland.
>
>"Fairyland"? You're much closer to Disneyland than I.

The CODE FAIRIES, Jimmie.

Walt Disney Hq complex is about 3 miles south of me on Buena Vista
at the intersection of Olive. Walt Disney Productions is not involved in
either morse code testing or amateur radio or fantasizing about days
gone by in radio when Kode was King.

5531. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 20:57:55 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309251257.35fd6743@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78950

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:<vn4a7o6fd0ujd0@corp.supernews.com>...
> >
> > Clint, you have to consider the ANONYMITY of this mighty, opinionated
> > nobody.
> >
> > He (or she) hasn't the courage of their conviction to releal their
> identity.
> >
>
> And i'm telling you, guy, you can BET on this.... he's just a friend of some
> sort
> to one of the PCTA's who has asked him to jump in here on thier behalf and
> appear as hypothetical observer. I've seen this tactic before. You have to
> consider how hypocritical HE is (attacking our syntax and grammer, while
> not saying a THING about the PCTA group's choice of words or
> grammer).
>
> But that's just fine. I don't mind debating with him either, it's even
> EASIER
> to beat for this reason because his heart and mind aren't really into it...
> and if he ISN'T a ham, then it'll show through eventually but i'd hazard the
> guess that long before it gets to that point you'll mysteriously see him
> *vanish*.

Ahhhhhhh....I see. "...even EASIER to beat..."

I think that sums up most of the posts here, even those of
persons who feign "superiority-by-virtue-of-enlightenment" such as
Clint.

Practical experience dictates otherwise, but hey...When it COMES
to facts and practical expereience, that's where the Lennie Crowd
suffer the most.

Steve, K4YZ

5532. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 21:14:07 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309251314.3a43ce53@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78951

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030924174232.07578.00000793@mb-m25.aol.com>...

> Let's see..."strong words" like "PUTZ!" for example (a nice little Yiddish
> epithet for "dickhead").

So far you've not been able to disprove the assertion.

You continue to make assertions about persons and organizations
that are easily disproved via third parties.

Your assertions of "lodge hall" secret organizations,
mismanagement, and obsolesence have all been proven untrue.

You make frequent allegations of dishonesty of the ARRL or it's
staff and elected field organization, yet you refuse to provide any
evidence of any kind to support it what-so-ever.

You frequently state that your "only" intent in here is to
"debate" the validity of Morse Code testing for Amateur Radio
licensure, however your myriad of rants on government, personalities,
politics, alleged bigotry and other NON-Amateur POLICY matters show's
who the TRUE hypocrit is in this forum.

"Putz" is as mild an adjective for you as decorum permits,
Lennie, and so far you've done NOTHING to prove me wrong and
EVERYTHING to prove me right.

Live with it...you ARE your own worst enemy.

Steve, K4YZ

5533. Re: GIVE YOU PERMISSION 3894.5-LSB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 21:21:12 UTC
From: Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bkvm88$6ir4b$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78952
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"BIG-AL-3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL@BIG-AL.KOM> wrote in message
news:vn6jg14ja15c2f@corp.supernews.com...
> YOU KNOW THE FREQUENCY 3894.5-LSB. THAT'S ON 75 METERS FOR YOU LIMP ONES.
> I'LL BE ON AROUND 7 OR SO. TRANSMIT ONLY AFTER I GIVE YOU PERMISSION.
> OTHERWISE I WILL SHOW YOU THE DOOR.
>
> "BIG-AL"

I thought your mothers name was Big Al?

--
73 de Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD

Cuius testiculos habes, habeas cardeo et cerebellum

5534. Re: GIVE YOU PERMISSION 3894.5-LSB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 21:26:08 UTC
From: "BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <"BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS"@BIG-AL>
Message-ID: <vn6nbo2u03ld74@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78953
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

IVE GOT YOUR MOTHER ON HER KNEES RIGHT NOW.

H0H0

"Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD" <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net> wrote in message
news:bkvm88$6ir4b$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "BIG-AL-3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL@BIG-AL.KOM> wrote in message
> news:vn6jg14ja15c2f@corp.supernews.com...
> > YOU KNOW THE FREQUENCY 3894.5-LSB. THAT'S ON 75 METERS FOR YOU LIMP
ONES.
> > I'LL BE ON AROUND 7 OR SO. TRANSMIT ONLY AFTER I GIVE YOU PERMISSION.
> > OTHERWISE I WILL SHOW YOU THE DOOR.
> >
> > "BIG-AL"
>
> I thought your mothers name was Big Al?
>
> --
> 73 de Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD
>
> Cuius testiculos habes, habeas cardeo et cerebellum
>
>

5535. Re: LIMP ONES

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 21:30:45 UTC
From: Concerned of Usenet <deletethisbit.itsreallyhere@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <3F7360F7.16E@yahoo.com>
Source record: 78954
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

path:news.btopenworld.com!btnet-feed5!btnet-peer1!btnet!news.maxwell.syr.edu!sn-xit-03!sn-xit-06!sn-post-01!supernews.com!corp.supernews.com!not-for-mail
From: "BIG-AL-3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL@BIG-AL.KOM>
Newsgroups: alt.ham-radio.hf, alt.ham-radio.ssb,
alt.radio.amateur, rec.radio.amateur.dx, rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,
rec.radio.amateur.misc, rec.radio.amateur.policy
Subject: LIMP ONES
Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2003 23:18:58 -0400
Organization: Posted via Supernews, http://www.supernews.com
Message-ID: <vn6jdmg6b00de0@corp.supernews.com>
Reply-To: "BIG-AL-3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL@BIG-AL.KOM>
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
X-Complaints-To: abuse@supernews.com
Lines: 5
Xref: news.btopenworld.com alt.ham-radio.hf:7357
alt.ham-radio.ssb:1409 rec.radio.amateur.dx:26796
rec.radio.amateur.homebrew:85027 rec.radio.amateur.misc:254967
rec.radio.amateur.policy:237060

BIG-AL-3894.5-LSB-75-METERS wrote:
>
> ALL YOU LIMP ONES STAY AWAY. ONLY THOSE WITH BIG ONES ALLOWED. LIKE FRANK
> AND JIMO. IF YOU THINK YOU HAVE A BIG ONE STOP BY. ILL SHOW YOU MY BIG ONE.
> HO-HO

--
"Free flow of information has a price and responsible Internauts"
The Internet under Surveillance a report by Vinton Cerf

5536. Re: GIVE YOU PERMISSION 3894.5-LSB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 21:37:10 UTC
From: Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bkvn66$6e45q$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78955
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@
BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS> wrote in message
news:vn6nbo2u03ld74@corp.supernews.com...
> IVE GOT YOUR MOTHER ON HER KNEES RIGHT NOW.
>
> H0H0

No, that is your sister.

I've got your mother by the balls!

73 de Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD

5537. Re: LIMP ONES

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 21:39:12 UTC
From: "BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <"BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS"@BIG-AL>
Message-ID: <vn6o47jeju4ed9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78956
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
Path:
sn-us!sn-xit-01!sn-xit-06!sn-xit-08!supernews.com!news.tele.dk!news.tele.dk!
small.news.tele.dk!npeer.de.kpn-eurorings.net!newsfeed.stueberl.de!newsr1.ip
core.viaginterkom.de!btnet-peer1!btnet-feed5!btnet!news.btopenworld.com!not-
for-mail
From: Concerned of Usenet <deletethisbit.itsreallyhere@yahoo.com>
Newsgroups:
alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,re
c.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Subject: Re: LIMP ONES
Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2003 21:30:45 +0000 (UTC)
Organization: BT Openworld
Lines: 31
Message-ID: <3F7360F7.16E@yahoo.com>
References: <vn6jdmg6b00de0@corp.supernews.com>
Reply-To: deletethisbit.itsreallyhere@yahoo.com
NNTP-Posting-Host: host213-122-126-224.in-addr.btopenworld.com
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
X-Trace: hercules.btinternet.com 1064525445 28994 213.122.126.224 (25 Sep
2003 21:30:45 GMT)
X-Complaints-To: news-complaints@lists.btinternet.com
NNTP-Posting-Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2003 21:30:45 +0000 (UTC)
X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.01 (Win95; I)
Xref: sn-us alt.ham-radio.hf:7714 alt.ham-radio.ssb:2306
alt.radio.amateur:2663 rec.radio.amateur.dx:28164
rec.radio.amateur.homebrew:89051 rec.radio.amateur.misc:269086
rec.radio.amateur.policy:262297

"Concerned of Usenet" <deletethisbit.itsreallyhere@yahoo.com> wrote in
message news:3F7360F7.16E@yahoo.com...
>
path:news.btopenworld.com!btnet-feed5!btnet-peer1!btnet!news.maxwell.syr.edu
!sn-xit-03!sn-xit-06!sn-post-01!supernews.com!corp.supernews.com!not-for-mai
l
> From: "BIG-AL-3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL@BIG-AL.KOM>
> Newsgroups: alt.ham-radio.hf, alt.ham-radio.ssb,
> alt.radio.amateur, rec.radio.amateur.dx, rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,
> rec.radio.amateur.misc, rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: LIMP ONES
> Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2003 23:18:58 -0400
> Organization: Posted via Supernews, http://www.supernews.com
```

> Message-ID: <vn6jdmg6b00de0@corp.supernews.com>
> Reply-To: "BIG-AL-3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL@BIG-AL.KOM>
> X-Priority: 3
> X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
> X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
> X-Complaints-To: abuse@supernews.com
> Lines: 5
> Xref: news.btopenworld.com alt.ham-radio.hf:7357
> alt.ham-radio.ssb:1409 rec.radio.amateur.dx:26796
> rec.radio.amateur.homebrew:85027 rec.radio.amateur.misc:254967
> rec.radio.amateur.policy:237060
>
>
> BIG-AL-3894.5-LSB-75-METERS wrote:
> >
> > ALL YOU LIMP ONES STAY AWAY. ONLY THOSE WITH BIG ONES ALLOWED. LIKE
FRANK
> > AND JIMO. IF YOU THINK YOU HAVE A BIG ONE STOP BY. ILL SHOW YOU MY BIG
ONE.
> > HO-HO
>
> --
> "Free flow of information has a price and responsible Internauts"
> The Internet under Surveillance a report by Vinton Cerf

5538. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 21:40:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <XgJcb.11494$ai7.7087@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78957

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>
> Hence "Maxims" with a capital M.
>
> Too subtle for most of the personality assassins
> in here. I'll have to "dumb down" to their low level. :-)

Well, since I missed it, you'll have to include me in that category also.
Since I was rushing through the messages, I wasn't paying attention enough
to catch fine details like that.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5539. Re: GIVE YOU PERMISSION 3894.5-LSB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 21:40:49 UTC
From: "BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <"BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS"@BIG-AL>
Message-ID: <vn6o78997qvh2a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78958
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

MY MOTHER LOST HER BALLS IN WWI. YOU MUST HAVE MY FATHERS BALLS.

"Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD" <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net> wrote in message
news:bkvn66$6e45q$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@
> BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS> wrote in message
> news:vn6nbo2u03ld74@corp.supernews.com...
> > IVE GOT YOUR MOTHER ON HER KNEES RIGHT NOW.
> >
> > H0H0
>
> No, that is your sister.
>
> I've got your mother by the balls!
>
> 73 de Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD
>
>

5540. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 21:41:25 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <c6o6nv4fblhu60egs57d6d3u664v1kf968@4ax.com>
Source record: 78959

Well, then you have nothing to worry about, OM - no character to
assassinate.

Sleep well,

73, Leo

On 25 Sep 2003 20:56:31 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <vn5iiq9qba1j85@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
>computron dot net> writes:
>
>>> Wrong. He was just laughing at you.
>>>
>>> Arnie -
>>> KT4ST
>>
>>Heh, you guys really don't help your cause much
>>do you.
>
> Clint, the PCTA have exhausted their valid reasons for code test retention
> long ago, well before Restructuring. All the PCTA are able to do in here
> is go into character assassination. And they do...
>:-)
>

5541. Re: LIMP ONES

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 21:46:33 UTC
From: "BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <"BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS"@BIG-AL>
Message-ID: <vn6oi0eqbm1m32@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78960
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

OLE LIMP ONE HIMSELF! CUT AND PASTE BOY. YOU SHOW BE BRIGHT THERE YOUNG BOY.

IM IMPRESSED WITH YOUR CUT AND PASTE SKILLS. CAN YOU TEACH THE REST OF US
HOW ITS DONE?

"Concerned of Usenet" <deletethisbit.itsreallyhere@yahoo.com> wrote in
message news:3F7360F7.16E@yahoo.com...
>
path:news.btopenworld.com!btnet-feed5!btnet-peer1!btnet!news.maxwell.syr.edu
!sn-xit-03!sn-xit-06!sn-post-01!supernews.com!corp.supernews.com!not-for-mai
l
> From: "BIG-AL-3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL@BIG-AL.KOM>
> Newsgroups: alt.ham-radio.hf, alt.ham-radio.ssb,
> alt.radio.amateur, rec.radio.amateur.dx, rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,
> rec.radio.amateur.misc, rec.radio.amateur.policy
> Subject: LIMP ONES
> Date: Thu, 25 Sep 2003 23:18:58 -0400
> Organization: Posted via Supernews, http://www.supernews.com
> Message-ID: <vn6jdmg6b00de0@corp.supernews.com>
> Reply-To: "BIG-AL-3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL@BIG-AL.KOM>
> X-Priority: 3
> X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
> X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
> X-MIMEOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
> X-Complaints-To: abuse@supernews.com
> Lines: 5
> Xref: news.btopenworld.com alt.ham-radio.hf:7357
> alt.ham-radio.ssb:1409 rec.radio.amateur.dx:26796
> rec.radio.amateur.homebrew:85027 rec.radio.amateur.misc:254967
> rec.radio.amateur.policy:237060
>
>
> BIG-AL-3894.5-LSB-75-METERS wrote:
> >
> > ALL YOU LIMP ONES STAY AWAY. ONLY THOSE WITH BIG ONES ALLOWED. LIKE
FRANK
> > AND JIMO. IF YOU THINK YOU HAVE A BIG ONE STOP BY. ILL SHOW YOU MY BIG
ONE.
> > HO-HO
>
> --
> "Free flow of information has a price and responsible Internauts"
> The Internet under Surveillance a report by Vinton Cerf

5542. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 21:50:11 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <nqJcb.11534$ai7.517@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78961
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
news:1fqcb.567393$YN5.401448@sccrnsc01...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> > "Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
> > news:BVpcb.425394$Oz4.219503@rwcrnsc54...
> >
> >>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >>
> >>>"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
> >>>news:X%ocb.145408$mp.72200@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>THE CARING STATION wrote:
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
> >>>>>news:hp24nvofjmp93liio9i7ljva15jee1gh4t@4ax.com...
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Now, if Supernews would be so kind as to TOS this 'Big Al'
character,
> >>>>>we could get back to dealing with the usual level of nutbar that
lurks
> >>>>>here :)
> >>>>>
> >>>>>73, Leo
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>WONT HAPPEN LEO. YOU ARE THE ONE WHO USED THE 4 LETTER WORDS. YOU
WILL
> >>>
> >>>BE
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>TOS'ED. HO HO
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>I vote that BIG AL stays...I enjoy his commentary.
> >>>

> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>--
> >>>>73
> >>>>
> >>>>Frank K3EKO
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>You would....even if it is a troll.
> >>>
> >>>Dan/W4NTI
> >>>
> >>>
> >>
> >>Why haven't you responded to my earlier posts? You must know that
> >>you're in the wrong.
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>--
> >>73
> >>
> >>Frank K3EKO
> >>
> >
> >
> > I did respond numbnuts. But here it is again.
> >
> > Your still member of the Barf and the Stumpers, right?
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> Yes, and will always be.
>
> -Frank
>
>
>
> --
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>
Then I was wrong to accept your apology back in 99. I must have actually
fallen for your BS.. You did notice that I stopped replying to your
e-mails, a long time ago, didn't you? Ever wonder why? I'll tell ya.

As far as Im concerned the BARF and the sister organization the Stumpjumpers are nothing but radio terrorists. And if Herby hadn't been popped and thrown off the bands you would ALL still be jamming Intercon and MM nets on 14300/14313. Your ALL A BUNCH OF RADIO TRASH.

That clear enough Franky?

Dan/W4NTI

5543. OH PHOOEY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 21:51:07 UTC
From: "BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <"BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS"@BIG-AL>
Message-ID: <vn6oql1ibn1j18@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78962
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

CONCERNED OF USENET HAS LOCATED MY "SECRET" HEADERS. WHAT TOO DO NOW?

ARE YOU TRYING TO BE DICK TRACEY OR PERRY MASON.

NAH....JUST BARNEY PFIFE. TRY AGAIN BOY.

AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG...

H0H0

5544. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 21:52:42 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <KsJcb.11543$ai7.8141@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78963
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
news:Ykqcb.568344$Ho3.104168@sccrnsc03...
> Frank Todd K3EKO wrote:
>
> > Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >
> >> "Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
> >> news:BVpcb.425394$Oz4.219503@rwcrnsc54...
> >>
> >>> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >>>
> >>>> "Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
> >>>> news:X%ocb.145408$mp.72200@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>> THE CARING STATION wrote:
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>> "Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
> >>>>>> news:hp24nvofjmp93liio9i7ljva15jee1gh4t@4ax.com...
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>> Now, if Supernews would be so kind as to TOS this 'Big Al'
> >>>>>>> character,
> >>>>>>> we could get back to dealing with the usual level of nutbar that
> >>>>>>> lurks
> >>>>>>> here :)
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>> 73, Leo
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>> WONT HAPPEN LEO. YOU ARE THE ONE WHO USED THE 4 LETTER WORDS. YOU
> >>>>>> WILL
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> BE
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> TOS'ED. HO HO
> >>>>
> >>>>

> >>>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> I vote that BIG AL stays...I enjoy his commentary.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>> --
> >>>>> 73
> >>>>>
> >>>>> Frank K3EKO
> >>>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>> You would....even if it is a troll.
> >>>>
> >>>> Dan/W4NTI
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>
> >>> Why haven't you responded to my earlier posts? You must know that
> >>> you're in the wrong.
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>> --
> >>> 73
> >>>
> >>> Frank K3EKO
> >>>
> >>
> >>
> >> I did respond numbnuts. But here it is again.
> >>
> >> Your still member of the Barf and the Stumpers, right?
> >>
> >> Dan/W4NTI
> >>
> >>
> > Yes, and will always be.
> >
> > -Frank
> >
> >
> >
> BUt what does that have to do with you accusing me of NOT apologizing
> for my actions?
>
> -Frank
>
>

>
> --
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>

I guess I HAVE TO SPELL IT OUT TO NUMBNUTS, eh? Ref my last post to you.
Now here is another.

I no longer believe your apology was sincere. Based on your actions and
your remaining membership in a Ham Radio Terrorist group (s).

In otherwords Franky, you have no credibility.

Now take your HO HOs and shove them up your BARFY/SJ arse.

Dan/W4NTI

5545. Re: OH PHOOEY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 21:54:43 UTC
From: "BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <"BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS"@BIG-AL>
Message-ID: <vn6p1apsvesab9@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78964
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

ATTENTION. ATTENTION. THIS IS CONCERNED OF USENET.

I DONT LIKE YOUR POST SO IM GOING TO CUT AND PASTE YOUR HEADERS. THAT'LL SHOW'EM THAT'LL SCARE THEM AWAY.

JUST REMEMBER WHEN MOMMY PUTS YOU TO BED BIG AL IS STILL ON THE AIR.

5546. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 21:56:48 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <AwJcb.11561$ai7.8588@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78965

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote ...
>
>> Math is not my forte. I got through the classes,
>> but had to struggle every single step of the way.
>> In fact, I still struggle with it to some extent to
>> this day, so I'll obviously never be anything close
>> to an expert on it. Perhaps I need to do what
>> most do and simply avoid situations involving
>> serious math.
>
> When I was in high school, I absolutely hated math.
> And not unlike you, I tried to avoid it as much as
> possible.

Well, I haven't openly tried to avoid it yet. I can get it done, but I have to seriously think about it before I remember how to get where I need to go.

> But for some reason, the light came on when I entered
> college. (snip)

That light never came on for me. Like I said, I still have to work at it. And things are certainly not getting better as I grow older - I've clearly forgotten a lot of what I once knew.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5547. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 22:04:43 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <%DJcb.11585$ai7.707@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78967
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:ptBcb.3113$NX3.245@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 00:31:17 GMT,
> opcom in <3F72521A.70F5BD12@swbell.net> wrote:
>
> > What have you done for Amateur Radio today?
> > --^^--
>
> The question is what has the ARRL done to the future of Ham Radio
> by hanging on to the Morse Code Requirement? It has killed it.
>
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> ==
> = http://slrn.org SLRN 0.9.8.0 is out.
=======================================

You really are a dumbass ain't ya Kieth? Tell me, in you apparantly drug clouded brain. How BPL and CW have anything to do with each other?

Oh never mind. You ain't worth reading anylonger.

Dan/W4NTI

5548. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 22:05:46 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <_EJcb.11590$ai7.8255@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78968
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"recalcitrant ham op" <3evhil4de@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:1064506387.907205@newshost03.voicenet.com...
>
> "opcom" <eccm@swbell.net> wrote in message
> news:3F72521A.70F5BD12@swbell.net...
> > This was posted to ARLI, I don't know how many
> > subscribe, but in spite of the numerous comments
> > against BPL (transmitting wideband internet data
> > over power lines, which will destroy the HF radio
> > spectrum), the FCC seems disposed to encourage
> > it anyway. evil! evil! just look up BPL on the web. T
> > the noise from the radiated signals trashed the ham bands thoroughly.
>
> I guess you never heard that money talks and bullshit walks eh?
>
> Did you *REALLY THINK* that a couple hundred
> aging HF operating tightwad ham radio operators
> are going to stop an emerging technology that will
> conceivably network home appliances to the internet
> and be worth $BILLIONS$ in potential revenue ??
>
> Jeezehus-H-christ...get F-N real !!
>

Sure we will. All we need to is put up KW level beacon stations.

End of BPL.

Dan/W4NTI

5549. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 22:11:39 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <vKJcb.11615$ai7.3054@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78969
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Well Dick, apparantly no one else cares. I don't know of any of the aformentioned groups making comments. Do you? Maybe they have no concept of what will happen. Sorta like the FCC having no concept of what will happen either.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message news:bktfft$71a$0@208.206.142.103...
>
> It won't be just hams and other minor users of spectrum below 80 mHz
> who will be very seriously impacted by BPL. There are several states
> whose statewice Public Service - State Police FM radio communications
> systems are located on Low Band VHF, in the 40-50 mHz region. These
> include California Highway Patrol and Missouri Highway Patrol, and at
> least a few other state public safety and forestry organizations, as
> well as many private users.
> From personal knowledge of conditions drawn from many years of
> personal involvment with these systems I am certain they cannot co-exist
> with BPL.
>
> I know they would all jump at the chance to move up to a trunked UHF
> or higher system, but with all the state governmental budget woes that
> won't be possible anytime soon.
> One can only wonder what FCC is thinking here.
> BPL is basically a noise generator that is attractive because it
> "wires the world" in the eyes of those for whom that end is
> the most important feature of advancing technology. Unfamiliar with
> the workings of radio or technology itself, they have eagerly latched
> onto the totally inaccurate and selfserving assertions of BPL proponants.
>
> As I said in my comments to the NPRM, there are much better ways to
> acoomplish the same end without completely ruining the HF spectrum.
>
> Dick
>
>
> opcom wrote:
>
> > This was posted to ARLI, I don't know how many subscribe, but in spite of the numerous comments against BPL (transmitting wideband internet data over power lines, which will destroy the HF radio spectrum), the FCC seems disposed

> > to encourage it anyway. evil! evil! just look up BPL on the web. The noise from the radiated signals trashed the ham bands thoroughly.
> >
> > ------------------
> >
> > From:
> > Amateur Radio Station N0JAA <N0JAA@aol.com>
> > 4:00 PM
> >
> > Subject:
> > [ARLI] FCC Commissioner's Comments Concerning BPL
> > To:
> > bvarc@clarc.org, clarc@clarc.org, ARLI@topica.com
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > The following is a transcript from a recent speech given by FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy at the United PowerLine
> > Council's annual conference regarding BPL. It seems that she is all for it. It also seems that BPL is going to become a reality, regardless
> > of what ARRL, the military, or anyone else says. As usual, big industry wins over everyone else because they have the money.
> >
> > This is from today's FCC Digest.
> >
> > Paul, N0JAA
> >
> > ----------------------
> >
> >
> > Reaching Broadband Nirvana
> > United PowerLine Council Annual Conference Remarks of Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy
> > September 22, 2003 (As prepared for delivery)
> >
> >
> > Thank you very much for inviting me to speak with you. I am very excited about broadband-over-powerline technology. I
> > have seen it in action, and I believe it has a very bright future. It is a real honor to be your keynote speaker at this
> > important juncture for BPL.
> >
> > As a regulator, I am keenly interested in BPL technology for a number of reasons. One of my central objectives as an FCC commissioner is to facilitate the deployment of broadband services to all Americans. I also fundamentally
> > believe that the FCC can best promote consumer welfare by relying on market forces, rather than heavy-handed regulation. The development of BPL networks will serve both of these key goals. It will not only bring

broadband to
> > previously unserved communities, but the introduction of a new broadband pipeline into the home will foster the kind of competitive marketplace that will eventually enable the Commission to let go of the regulatory reins. I
> > want consumers to have a choice of multiple, facilities-based providers, including not only cable and DSL, but also powerline, wireless, and satellite services. Such a robustly competitive and diversified marketplace is
> > something I would call broadband Nirvana. We will not get there overnight, but the continuing development of BPL technology is a major step forward.
> >
> > While the long-term objective is a robustly competitive marketplace that is free of regulatory distortions, a more immediate question is: What should the FCC do to help foster such an environment? Sticking with my Nirvana
> > metaphor, I guess the question would be, what is the path to enlightenment?
> >
> > I believe the answer, in short, is regulatory restraint. It is tempting for regulators to take every new technology or service that comes along and apply the same rules that govern incumbent services. After all, regulatory
> > parity and a level playing field are intuitively appealing concepts. But I believe that it would be a huge mistake to carry forward legacy regulations whenever new technology platforms are established. Many of our regulations
> > are premised on the absence of competition, and when that rationale is eroded, we must not reflexively hold on to regulations that no longer serve their intended purpose. In fact, many of our old rules not only become
> > unnecessary as markets evolve, but they can be fatal to new services that need room to breathe.
> >
> > The Nascent Services Doctrine applying more stringent regulations to wireline providers at a minimum must be reconsidered. As other platforms, including BPL and wireless, become more widely available, that will further
> > undermine the justification for regulating incumbent LECs broadband services as if they were the only available offerings. When the Commission completes this rulemaking, I expect that we will eliminate many existing rules and
> > substantially modify others; the central question is the degree of regulation that will remain during the transition to a more robustly competitive market.
> >
> > Finally, it is important to recognize that although the emergence of new platforms like BPL will eliminate the need for many competition-related regulations, other types of regulation may well remain necessary. For example, the
> > FCC must implement public policy goals unrelated to competition, or even at odds with competition. Universal service and access for persons with disabilities are examples of this kind of regulation. These public

policy goals
> > generally should be applied to all service providers, to the extent permitted by the Communications Act. The FCC also must intervene to prevent competitors from imposing externalities on one another and to protect consumers
> > where market failures are identified. Although, as I have noted, the Commission was right to refrain from imposing heavy-handed price and service-quality regulations on PCS services when the were introduced, it was also right
> > to adopt strict interference rules to prevent competitors from externalizing their costs. The same principle will apply to BPL. They key point is that, while some degree of regulation is both inevitable and desirable, we
> > should ensure that it is narrowly tailored to the particular governmental interests at stake. I appreciate the opportunity to share these thoughts with you, and I would be happy to answer a few questions if we have time.
> >
> >
> > ******-------****** please click on one or more of the links below to send a blank subscribe message.
> > Amateur Radio Legal Issues List
> > (A list for discussing legal and legislative issues impacting Amateur Radio from Congress and the FCC)
> > What have you done for Amateur Radio today?
> > --^^----------
>

5550. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 22:22:08 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bkvptv$haq@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 78970

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:mQDcb.10959$ai7.2971@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
> >
> > TIT, I think all your Brains are in your TITS.
>
>
> This bit of wisdom from a person who routinely comments about the
overall
> large size of her breasts.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

ROFLMAO!!! I like how Waddles keeps addressing me directly, when the only time I see something from him is *if* someone happens to respond to a post of his; and most don't--or at least I don't see them if they do.

I would say that most men who are nitwits are going to be distracted by the topic of tits. Those with some intellect about them, I daresay, are way above the subject of a body part. Oh, wait--did I just mention intellect at the same time we are talking about Waddles? ;)

Kim W5TIT

5551. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 22:29:51 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <z%Jcb.11777$ai7.4662@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78971

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote:
>
> Heh, I have to admit that, in undergraduate classes
> on Calculus I, II, and III, my grades were A, B, and
> barely C, respectively. A problem with night classes
> and working all day yet still trying to maintain contact
> with other people. :-)

I never got an "A" in math. I did get an "F" once and had to take the class over. However, the remainder of my math grades were "B" and "C," and I was darn thrilled to get that "B" occasionally. I did just fine in all my other classes.

> (snip) Having to know morse code for a hobby activity
> involving radio regulation by licensing is much more
> PRIMITIVE than sitting down and doing a series equation
> to obtain a logarithm or other transcendental numeric value.
>
> No doubt the ardent Credentialists in here will come up
> with some kind of BS about "needing degrees" to
> understand it all. :-)

You won't get any argument from me. I probably wouldn't touch most math today without a calculator (and most others wouldn't either). And code is a primitive way of communicating. If that's one's cup of tea, there's absolutely nothing wrong with that. But it is fairly absurd to continue to require it of everyone else.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5552. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 22:32:10 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309251432.caedff0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78972

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<bkuuso$6do2f$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote ...
>
> Math is not my forte. I got through the classes, but had to struggle every
> single step of the way. In fact, I still struggle with it to some extent to
> this day, so I'll obviously never be anything close to an expert on it.
> Perhaps I need to do what most do and simply avoid situations involving
> serious math.
> ____
>
> When I was in high school, I absolutely hated math. And not unlike you, I
> tried to avoid it as much as possible. But for some reason, the light came
> on when I entered college. As much as we might hate it, math does play a
> rather large roll in Amateur Radio.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST

I think that a lot of people who imagine themselves to be "poor" at
math are actually the result of poorly written math books and
less-than-stellar math teachers.

I had the good fortune to have an *exceptional* math teacher in high
school. He taught algebra and trigonometry. I was in his 9th and 11th
grade classes.

His attitude was simple: *Anyone* who could be in high school could
get an A in his class if they knew how to add, subtract, multiply and
divide. All the rest was practice and understanding a few definitions.
Most of all, he made you believe you could do it. "Can't" simply did
not exist in his classes.

Typical test: 40 to 60 problems in a 45 minute class. Sometimes as
many as 80. Problems like factoring polynomials, simplifying complex
trigonometric expressions, etc. And yes, some of us got perfect
scores. Not often, but often enough to know it was possible for us.

We thought he must have been some sort of math genius because he would
do things like multiplying two four-digit numbers in his head, and get
an answer that was either spot-on or very close. In a few seconds. But
when we researched his education, it turned out that he was an English
major! His real skill was not in math at all, but in communicating
clearly. And this was in a working-class school with 40-some teenage
kids.

One day he derived a rather odd looking formula on the board. "Lads", he said, "this is the quadratic formula, which can be used to solve any quadratic equation expressed in standard form. I expect all of you to know it like your name. Can you do that?" We all nodded.

And the lesson continued with how to use the formula.

Next day he walks in, points to a kid and says "What's you're name?"

Kid stands up and says "Bill Gallagher"

"Sit down!" He points to another kid, same question, similar answer.

Finally a third kid gets the idea and kind of stammers through "umm, negative b minus..."

"Sit down!"

Of course none of us could rattle it off - and he called on every single one of us.

"Lads", he said "I'm shocked and disappointed. You were supposed to know that formula like your name."

You can bet that the next day we all knew it.

And to this day, if anyone who had that teacher encounters another of his students, we will be able to rattle off the formula *and use it* with no problem. And that's not just those of us who went into engineering or science or math, but the kids who became lawyers, doctors, businessmen and policemen, etc.

That's the power of a good teacher. Imagine if they were all that good.

Of course, I had a bit of an advantage. I'd learned the elements of trigonometry (sines, cosines, and a few other things) and some very basic algebra on my own, in order to understand what was in the ARRL Radio Amateur's Handbook, build my radios and get my Advanced class license at the age of 14 - before I ever set foot in high school.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5553. Re: THE LIMP ONE LIST - 3 SO FAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 22:36:51 UTC
From: Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bkvqm3$6h91c$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78973
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@
BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS> wrote in message
news:vn6pet1b11o0fc@corp.supernews.com...
> NUMBER TWO (DRUM ROLL)
>
> RENE
>
> WHY. WELL FOR BEING JUST PLAIN DUMB. HEY KIDO, NOBODY CARES. GET IT???

Yeah, I got it all right. Did you get it?

I don't care!

Go live with your parents.... uh.... oops.

73 de Rene PE1RA

5554. Re: THE LIMP ONE LIST - 3 SO FAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 22:38:09 UTC
From: Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bkvqoi$6fr91$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78974
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

So you are one of those No-code CB'ers they keep talking about. Now I understand!

--
73 de Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD

Cuius testiculos habes, habeas cardeo et cerebellum

5555. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 22:40:25 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <hio6nvc53pdg9fpkq87hj5efarc8qr97s2@4ax.com>
Source record: 78975

Thanks, Steve. You're quite correct - there are some remarkable opportunities which we need to explore!

What I don't understand is why the intelligent members of this group put up with all of the QRM intentionally generated by just a few troublemakers.

For example, Len is not an Amateur, (well, not a Radio amateur.... :)), and states freely that he does not have any desire to become one - yet he is involved in endless vitriolic arguements which are entirely moot in his case - no matter whether code stays or goes, he isn't part of the Amateur community, as he has not paid his dues (who in hell cares about military or commercial comms experience - this is Amateur Radio!) Realistically, Amateurs have no interest in his opinions - he has chosen not to join the community, and 'pay the dues" by becoming licenced. Quite obviously, he exists in this group only as the resident troll, bullying all who disagree with his pontifications and opinions. Look at today's barrage of feces that he posted, for example, or yesterdays -- was there a single statement made that would improve or change the state of the hobby? Any positive comments? Any news? Anything relevant at all? No - just a series of personal attacks on those who won't see his way. Who cares what his way is? He don't matter - he ain't a Ham. Just a sad old has-been who enjoys beating folks up (or trying to :)) in the newsgroup. A pitiful old erstwhile military comms operator, circa 1950s. And his buddies aren't much better....just younger clones of the same persona.

Shut them down. Men without honor or intelligence or relevance are not worth anyones' time. I've demonstrated some effective techniques that can be used to squelch QRM from these types of individuals - give 'em a try. Or, use silence as a tool - remove the audience, and adios boors. Go for it! You don't see Len dealing with my posts anymore, do you? He can't - he's been disempowered! Surplussed again. Discharged. He can't argue with logic, or intellect, or reason, and when there's no possibility of personal attack - game over! Plus, he knows that I know what he is.......he ain't fooling me!

This is rec.radio.amateur.policy, not alt.hasbeen.flamefest - let's get these guys over to the appropriate forum, and get back to discussing the future of Amateur Radio! Frankly, there are bigger issues than Code Testing to be discussed here - BPL could wipe out the hobby as we know it.......

To paraphrase Nancy Reagan, "Just Say No To Thugs!"

73, Leo

On 25 Sep 2003 13:51:03 -0700, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
wrote:

>Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<2ecvmv4rt6ito9ddqrh24ka0t1c4k2oium@4ax.com>...
>
>> How so? I have never stated my position one way or the other with
>> respect to mandatory Morse testing. I have stated that I did get my 5
>> WPM to get on to HF because I had to by law, and that using it for
>> QSOs is beginning to grow on me. That doesn't mean that I think
>> everyone should have to do it!
>
> Unfortunately, that makes no difference in THIS forum, Leo.
>
> I've expressed not only "tolerence" of NCT's, but have praised
>the accomplishments of most of the one's I know, but Lennie, Brain and
>a few others always ignore those. It ruins thier rants.
>
> Any opportunity for them to cite "HYPOCRITE" and thereby APPEAR
>to be "defending" themselves from some percieved onslaught is never
>missed.
>
> As a BIG example, Larry Roll, who is adamantly "pro-code", has
>posted countless items on his DIGITAL activities, yet Lennie and his
>minions want yo0u (and other countelss faceless readers) to believe
>that he's still banging out Code with a Model T spark coil
>transmitter.
>
>> So, does that make me pro or con, for mandatory testing? Where's the
>> obvious? Hmmm - there's that old reading comprehension problem
>> again....
>
> Yes..."reading comprehension" is a problem in this forum.
>
>> I think that you just like to stir things up, Sir - your diatribes
>> appear to serve no other useful purpose. Of course you are aware that
>> the future of Morse testing will be decided at the government level,
>> by committees of civilized people - and not within this group. As
>> such, your energies and passionate rants are for nought, as they will
>> not sway the decision makers one bit. Like complaining with the guys
>> on the loading dock about the boss - won't change anything, but I bet
>> that would make someone one feel more important and in control, huh?
>> (know the feeling?)
>
> Myself and two or three others have, in times past, tried to
>"organize" collective voices on certain REAL policy issues, but they
>are always thwarted by Lennie, Brain, and a handful of others who
>invariably manage to make almost every post here about the Code issue.
>
> It's really sad in many ways, becasue we have a truly remarkable
>opportunity of our own at our disposal, yet a very narrowminded few

>would rather just spit and snarl about perceived "wrongs" rather than
>truly move forward.
>
> C'est le vie.
>
>73
>
>Steve, K4YZ
>
>> Leo
>>
>>
>> On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 21:21:09 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
>> dot net> wrote:
>>
>> >
>> >>
>> >> WHOA, PUTZBREATH!
>> >
>> >
>> >Leo, an obvious PCTA, said this in a previous thread.. and I quote..
>> >
>> >"Not intellectual enough to make his
>> >point by rational arguement, he resorts to name calling and other
>> >juvenile tactics to 'get his way'. "
>> >
>> >oops.
>> >
>> >A PCTA just did that, not a NCTA type.
>> >
>> >Add "hypocrisy" to the list of the PCTA flaws in tactics and
>> >debate skills.
>
> Clint, there's nothing here to debate. Nothing.

5556. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 22:44:34 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309251444.3545edfd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 78976

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030921180825.21642.00001040@mb-m01.aol.com>...
> In article <3F6DB2DF.6040104@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
> writes:
>
> >Brian wrote:
> >> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
> news:<20030921022842.11891.00000978@mb-m11.aol.com>...
> >>
> >>>In article <f45722ac.0309200340.4cea8bf@posting.google.com>,
> >>>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>Forever thinking of Kim, aren't you?
> >>>
> >>>Brian:
> >>>
> >>>I think about everyone in this newsgroup, particularly the "regulars" who
> >>>have been here for a number of years. The truth is, in spite of our
> >>>numerous and passionate disagreements, I don't think there's anyone
> >>>here that I wouldn't like to know in person...(SNIP)

> A definite pro-coder tried to connect the Holocaust of WW2 to morse
> code testing...with himself as the "outraged victim of oppression."
>
> Did I say he was suspect of illegal drug abuse? I take that back.
>
> I say he now exhibits symptoms of severe mental imbalance.

Yet another attempt to bring some civility to the NG and Lennie
tries to set a match to it.

Why am I not surprised...?!?!

Steve, K4YZ

5557. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 22:47:47 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ngKcb.11837$ai7.11075@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78977

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> No, Dwight, it was not all monitored by computers. In
> fact computers were scarce as midnight sunshine in the
> 60's. I KNOW some people quite well who were both
> operating CW in the military and others who spent
> their entire enlistment copying it on HF with headsets.

It was where my father worked. We lived right next to the facility and his job just about every night was to go and get those computers (or radios) going again whenever they stopped working. He had a terminal right in the bedroom to monitor it all. Again, this was in the mid-60's (1964 and 1965). I even went into the facility several times and there was only four or five guys working there (and none of them had headsets on whenever I went in). I remember the smell of electronics was strong enough to leave me gasping for air.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5558. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 22:50:49 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <djKcb.11847$ai7.1786@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 78978

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
>
> What are you now in love her TITS?

You're the one obviously obsessed with her breasts. You mention the
subject almost as much as Larry does (and that's a lot).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5559. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 22:54:44 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn6sibe23ba854@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78979

> I think that sums up most of the posts here, even those of
> persons who feign "superiority-by-virtue-of-enlightenment" such as
> Clint.

ah, I don't claim such, as i'll leave "enlightenment" up to left wing
liberals in government that have absolutely no clue about the world
outside of lecture halls, government buildings and lawyer's offices.

I only take the facts as they are and deduce a conclusion, rather
than take a passion-filled idea intermixed with rage against
opposition and launch a scathing attack devoid of everything
necessary to warrant a good debate and argument to back up
one's claims.

>
> Practical experience dictates otherwise, but hey...When it COMES
> to facts and practical expereience, that's where the Lennie Crowd
> suffer the most.
>
> Steve, K4YZ

learn to spell "E X P E R E I E N C E" (your spelling) first and then your
credibility to pass judgement on other people will hold more water.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5560. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 22:56:57 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925185657.08238.00000188@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 78980

>keeps addressing me directly, when the only
>time I see something from him is *if* someone happens to respond to a post
>of his; and most don't--or at least I don't see them if they do.

WQell TIT why do you respond at all if you dont want to read them ?

5561. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:01:35 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkvs4h$67a39$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 78981

"Leo" wrote in part ...

BTW, are you Len's new guardian angel? Did Clint get laid off? ;)

I was actually beginning to think that Len and Clint might be one in the same. But a cursory view of the disparity in writing style, grammar, and spelling dispels that myth fairly quickly.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5562. Leo's self-incriminating AGAIN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:02:32 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn6t0us3n9u90d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78982

>
> Talk about running out of steam and attaching people.
>
> Are we clear?

LOL.. I enjoy your mocking of Leo's spelling.
I also find it funny that they don't see thier hypocrisy; they must
be TOTALLY blind to it. Such a reality filter must come in
handy when having conflicts of the soul... or, rather, when
wanting to avoid one.

Now, to annihilate Leo's attempt at having a dialogue AGAIN...

> > Now, gentlemen, if you would care to present lucid and cogent points
> > in a civilized manner, I'd be happy to listen to you. I have done so
> > - are you up to the challenge?

Oh, it's been done time and time again, and met rebuttles of nothing more
than insults and condescending remarks (young man, you just don't know
how easy you have it, blah blah blah) and then the hypocrisy kicked in
and we were accused of doing all these things when in fact it was your
side of the fence that was doing it.... of course, this was before your
buddy got a hold of you outside the newsgroup and asked you to jump
in and pretend to be an unbiased person who was passing objective
criticism.

BUT ENOUGH OF THAT... I know draw attention to the fact that
you are BUSTED AGAIN..... if you don't have a position one way or
the other (or so you've *CLAIMED*), then, um, why would you need to
hear "lucid and cogent points in a civilized manner" for debate and
argument if you're NOT a PCTA apologist/sympathizer/member?

You better stop while you are ahead. The more you talk, the more
you sabotage yourself... not to mention you better look over your
post VERY carefully and make sure you really meant to type
what you did and use the words you chose....

Clint
KB5ZHT

5563. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:04:23 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn6t4gg7mub36b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78983

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:i356nvg9qb2f1pp16am1k4k38og3be482a@4ax.com...
but you do have to watch out for the pricks.... ;)
>

this from a man who says the NCTA crows uses personal attacks
and abusive language instead of facts, evidence and intellectual
argument.

it's TOO easy...

Clint
KB5ZHT

>

5564. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:06:46 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn6t8sql7v73e3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78985

> You TOTALLY NEGLECT the obvious postings of the barbarian
> character assassin in here still calling himself "K4YZ."
>
> You are NOT a fair judge at all, just trying to incite a Flame War by
> misdirecting to certain others.
>
> By pretense at "fairness," your singling out certain targets is an open
> example of HYPOCRISY.
>
>

here is a quote from Leo just a few threads up.. it's a cut and paste...
..referring to *certain people* in here...

"For the most part, it's an intelligent and good natured
animal - but you do have to watch out for the pricks.... ;)"

oh, yes... hypocrisy? by definition!

Clint
KB5ZHT

5565. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:07:52 UTC
From: Dave Shrader <david.shrader@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <czKcb.339344$2x.101278@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 78984
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Can the FCC be sued for acting in GROSS negligence? Under the premise
that as professionals THEY SHOULD HAVE KNOWN they may be liable.

Yeah, I know you can't sue the government, but it sounds good!

Dave

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> Well Dick, apparantly no one else cares. I don't know of any of the
> aformentioned groups making comments. Do you? Maybe they have no concept
> of what will happen. Sorta like the FCC having no concept of what will
> happen either.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bktfft$71a$0@208.206.142.103...
>
>> It won't be just hams and other minor users of spectrum below 80 mHz
>>who will be very seriously impacted by BPL. There are several states
>>whose statewice Public Service - State Police FM radio communications
>>systems are located on Low Band VHF, in the 40-50 mHz region. These
>>include California Highway Patrol and Missouri Highway Patrol, and at
>>least a few other state public safety and forestry organizations, as
>>well as many private users.
>> From personal knowledge of conditions drawn from many years of
>>personal involvment with these systems I am certain they cannot co-exist
>>with BPL.
>>
>> I know they would all jump at the chance to move up to a trunked UHF
>>or higher system, but with all the state governmental budget woes that
>>won't be possible anytime soon.
>> One can only wonder what FCC is thinking here.
>>BPL is basically a noise generator that is attractive because it
>>"wires the world" in the eyes of those for whom that end is
>>the most important feature of advancing technology. Unfamiliar with
>>the workings of radio or technology itself, they have eagerly latched
>>onto the totally inaccurate and selfserving assertions of BPL proponants.
>>
>> As I said in my comments to the NPRM, there are much better ways to
>>acoomplish the same end without completely ruining the HF spectrum.
>>
>>Dick

>>
>>
>>opcom wrote:
>>
>>
>>>This was posted to ARLI, I don't know how many subscribe, but in spite
>
> of the numerous comments against BPL (transmitting wideband internet data
> over power lines, which will destroy the HF radio spectrum), the FCC seems
> disposed
>
>>>to encourage it anyway. evil! evil! just look up BPL on the web. The
>
> noise from the radiated signals trashed the ham bands thoroughly.
>
>>>--------------------
>>>
>>>From:
>>> Amateur Radio Station N0JAA <N0JAA@aol.com>
>>> 4:00 PM
>>>
>>> Subject:
>>> [ARLI] FCC Commissioner's Comments Concerning BPL
>>> To:
>>> bvarc@clarc.org, clarc@clarc.org, ARLI@topica.com
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>The following is a transcript from a recent speech given by FCC
>
> Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy at the United PowerLine
>
>>>Council's annual conference regarding BPL. It seems that she is all for
>
> it. It also seems that BPL is going to become a reality, regardless
>
>>>of what ARRL, the military, or anyone else says. As usual, big industry
>
> wins over everyone else because they have the money.
>
>>>This is from today's FCC Digest.
>>>
>>>Paul, N0JAA
>>>
>>>----------------------
>>>
>>>
>>>Reaching Broadband Nirvana
>>>United PowerLine Council Annual Conference Remarks of Commissioner

>
> Kathleen Q. Abernathy
>
>>>September 22, 2003 (As prepared for delivery)
>>>
>>>
>>>Thank you very much for inviting me to speak with you. I am very excited
>
> about broadband-over-powerline technology. I
>
>>>have seen it in action, and I believe it has a very bright future. It is
>
> a real honor to be your keynote speaker at this
>
>>>important juncture for BPL.
>>>
>>>As a regulator, I am keenly interested in BPL technology for a number of
>
> reasons. One of my central objectives as an FCC commissioner is to
> facilitate the deployment of broadband services to all Americans. I also
> fundamentally
>
>>>believe that the FCC can best promote consumer welfare by relying on
>
> market forces, rather than heavy-handed regulation. The development of BPL
> networks will serve both of these key goals. It will not only bring
> broadband to
>
>>>previously unserved communities, but the introduction of a new broadband
>
> pipeline into the home will foster the kind of competitive marketplace that
> will eventually enable the Commission to let go of the regulatory reins. I
>
>>>want consumers to have a choice of multiple, facilities-based
>
> providers, including not only cable and DSL, but also powerline, wireless,
> and satellite services. Such a robustly competitive and diversified
> marketplace is
>
>>>something I would call broadband Nirvana. We will not get there
>
> overnight, but the continuing development of BPL technology is a major step
> forward.
>
>>>While the long-term objective is a robustly competitive marketplace that
>
> is free of regulatory distortions, a more immediate question is: What
> should the FCC do to help foster such an environment? Sticking with my
> Nirvana
>

>>>metaphor, I guess the question would be, what is the path to
>
> enlightenment?
>
>>>I believe the answer, in short, is regulatory restraint. It is tempting
>
> for regulators to take every new technology or service that comes along and
> apply the same rules that govern incumbent services. After all, regulatory
>
>>>parity and a level playing field are intuitively appealing concepts.
>
> But I believe that it would be a huge mistake to carry forward legacy
> regulations whenever new technology platforms are established. Many of our
> regulations
>
>>>are premised on the absence of competition, and when that rationale is
>
> eroded, we must not reflexively hold on to regulations that no longer serve
> their intended purpose. In fact, many of our old rules not only become
>
>>>unnecessary as markets evolve, but they can be fatal to new services
>
> that need room to breathe.
>
>>>The Nascent Services Doctrine applying more stringent regulations to
>
> wireline providers at a minimum must be reconsidered. As other platforms,
> including BPL and wireless, become more widely available, that will further
>
>>>undermine the justification for regulating incumbent LECs broadband
>
> services as if they were the only available offerings. When the Commission
> completes this rulemaking, I expect that we will eliminate many existing
> rules and
>
>>>substantially modify others; the central question is the degree of
>
> regulation that will remain during the transition to a more robustly
> competitive market.
>
>>>Finally, it is important to recognize that although the emergence of new
>
> platforms like BPL will eliminate the need for many competition-related
> regulations, other types of regulation may well remain necessary. For
> example, the
>
>>>FCC must implement public policy goals unrelated to competition, or
>
> even at odds with competition. Universal service and access for persons
> with disabilities are examples of this kind of regulation. These public

> policy goals
>
>>>generally should be applied to all service providers, to the extent
>
> permitted by the Communications Act. The FCC also must intervene to prevent
> competitors from imposing externalities on one another and to protect
> consumers
>
>>>where market failures are identified. Although, as I have noted, the
>
> Commission was right to refrain from imposing heavy-handed price and
> service-quality regulations on PCS services when the were introduced, it was
> also right
>
>>>to adopt strict interference rules to prevent competitors from
>
> externalizing their costs. The same principle will apply to BPL. They key
> point is that, while some degree of regulation is both inevitable and
> desirable, we
>
>>>should ensure that it is narrowly tailored to the particular
>
> governmental interests at stake. I appreciate the opportunity to share
> these thoughts with you, and I would be happy to answer a few questions if
> we have time.
>
>>>
>>> ******------****** please click on one or more
>
> of the links below to send a blank subscribe message.
>
>>>Amateur Radio Legal Issues List
>>>(A list for discussing legal and legislative issues impacting Amateur
>
> Radio from Congress and the FCC)
>
>>> What have you done for Amateur Radio today?
>>>--^^--
>>
>
>

5566. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:09:57 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn6tesntop387f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78986

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:55f4nvs6l3455v48ijckjdt6f8ff4m2qkn@4ax.com...
> Clint, me amigo, me compadre....
>

>
> You have the right to remain silent, too - why not invoke that one for
> a change?
>
> Leo
>

I knew your real inner character and feelings would come out if
you kept talking enough, and you JUST did.

No, I will not shut up simply because I have factually destroyed
your position and then continued further to expose YOU for WHO
you are and WHAT you do.

Leo the unbiased objective reader, who attacks NCTA members
for using character attacks, said THIS on september 25, referring
to *certain members* of this NG...

"For the most part, it's an intelligent and good natured
animal - but you do have to watch out for the pricks.... ;)"

I will NOT ask you to shut up... or, how did you put it? invoke
my right to remain silent? (funny, I didn't know I had violated the
law and needed to invoke my rights)... on the contrary, I ask
you to KEEP talking and continue revealing yourself for
what and who you are. You just haven't learned.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5567. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:12:05 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn6tis34a559e2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78987

"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030925165630.12631.00001459@mb-m28.aol.com...

>
> Clint, I see a slight resemblance to one newsgroupie in here that
> used several false identities...had an address in Landing, NJ. :-)

and also, always remember this statement he made on september
25 in THIS newsgroup.... check it out and you'll see, just use a
find string search if need be, but he made THIS comment
when referring to certain people in here.. guess who, right?
And I QUOTE...

"For the most part, it's an intelligent and good natured
animal - but you do have to watch out for the pricks.... ;)"

Okay... now.. remember he said that the NEXT time he jumps
on YOUR for making "personal attacks" instead of "concise
argument and logical debate"...

I TOLD you he'd reveal himself eventually.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5568. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:14:02 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn6tmh6ajno940@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78988

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:c6o6nv4fblhu60egs57d6d3u664v1kf968@4ax.com...
> Well, then you have nothing to worry about, OM - no character to
> assassinate.
>

and you DID it again. That's the SECOND personal attack you've made,
while at the SAME time saying the NCTA crowd is the one who does it.
Along with THIS statement YOU made..

"For the most part, it's an intelligent and good natured
animal - but you do have to watch out for the pricks.... ;)"

referring to some people in this newsgroup on this same date (september
25).

You really SHOULD consider stopping and cutting your losses; the more
you speak, the more you harm your own case. I must admit, you do a much
better job at defeating yourself than 1,000 well trained debaters could.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5569. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:16:31 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn6tr6f9jsb1a3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78989

> Actually, the reply was specifically directed at Len.

And I was replying to it anyway.

Oh, you're FREIND "leo" made this comment-

"For the most part, it's an intelligent and good natured
animal - but you do have to watch out for the pricks.... ;)"

on the same day he accused NCTA members of insults
and personal attacks.

If he's ever going to be a good debater, you may as well
also coach him on the side about how to do it
in a good and civilized manner, and not incriminate himself
by making an accusation and then turning around and
commiting that very same offense himself.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5570. Re: Leo's self-incriminating AGAIN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:21:35 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <g6t6nvo17o7lr7h8mcir5l9nl44q4e6628@4ax.com>
Source record: 78990

LOL !

What in hell are you trying to say? Sabotage what position? Please
get someone to translate my posts into whatever it is that you speak,
then reply! Duh...

Leo

PS - while we're on the subject of spelling errors, I noticed this one
in your post below:

Rebuttles? Try 'rebuttals' next time ;)

Whoops, them thar's one of yer Pot / Black sceen-arios, I reckon!

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 18:02:32 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>
>>
>> Talk about running out of steam and attaching people.
>>
>> Are we clear?
>
>LOL.. I enjoy your mocking of Leo's spelling.
>I also find it funny that they don't see thier hypocrisy; they must
>be TOTALLY blind to it. Such a reality filter must come in
>handy when having conflicts of the soul... or, rather, when
>wanting to avoid one.
>
>Now, to annihilate Leo's attempt at having a dialogue AGAIN...
>
>> > Now, gentlemen, if you would care to present lucid and cogent points
>> > in a civilized manner, I'd be happy to listen to you. I have done so
>> > - are you up to the challenge?
>
>Oh, it's been done time and time again, and met rebuttles of nothing more
>than insults and condescending remarks (young man, you just don't know
>how easy you have it, blah blah blah) and then the hypocrisy kicked in
>and we were accused of doing all these things when in fact it was your
>side of the fence that was doing it.... of course, this was before your
>buddy got a hold of you outside the newsgroup and asked you to jump
>in and pretend to be an unbiased person who was passing objective
>criticism.
>
>BUT ENOUGH OF THAT... I know draw attention to the fact that

>you are BUSTED AGAIN..... if you don't have a position one way or
>the other (or so you've *CLAIMED*), then, um, why would you need to
>hear "lucid and cogent points in a civilized manner" for debate and
>argument if you're NOT a PCTA apologist/sympathizer/member?
>
>You better stop while you are ahead. The more you talk, the more
>you sabotage yourself... not to mention you better look over your
>post VERY carefully and make sure you really meant to type
>what you did and use the words you chose....
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>
>

5571. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:23:12 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <p5u6nv4tp8ba3cc923g98jpf9jbd2q5dsk@4ax.com>
Source record: 78991

Um, Clint...

What's a NCTA crow?

Leo

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 18:04:23 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>
>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>news:i356nvg9qb2f1pp16am1k4k38og3be482a@4ax.com...
> but you do have to watch out for the pricks.... ;)
>>
>
>this from a man who says the NCTA crows uses personal attacks
>and abusive language instead of facts, evidence and intellectual
>argument.
>
>it's TOO easy...
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>
>>
>

5572. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:25:40 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <18u6nvo6do4n2f025no3ns64htp67n0la4@4ax.com>
Source record: 78992

Actally, that's a quote from your friend, Len. Note the
CAPITALIZATION of all of the NOUNS to make it clearer.

You really should investigate an English as a Second Language course,
my friend!

Leo

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 18:06:46 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>
>> You TOTALLY NEGLECT the obvious postings of the barbarian
>> character assassin in here still calling himself "K4YZ."
>>
>> You are NOT a fair judge at all, just trying to incite a Flame War by
>> misdirecting to certain others.
>>
>> By pretense at "fairness," your singling out certain targets is an open
>> example of HYPOCRISY.
>>
>>
>
>here is a quote from Leo just a few threads up.. it's a cut and paste...
>..referring to *certain people* in here...
>
>"For the most part, it's an intelligent and good natured
>animal - but you do have to watch out for the pricks.... ;)"
>
>oh, yes... hypocrisy? by definition!
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>

5573. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:26:01 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <ccu6nvsmqv0tafinue1kufo49upm7plkqv@4ax.com>
Source record: 78993

?

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 18:09:57 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>
>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>news:55f4nvs6l3455v48ijckjdt6f8ff4m2qkn@4ax.com...
>> Clint, me amigo, me compadre....
>>
>
>>
>> You have the right to remain silent, too - why not invoke that one for
>> a change?
>>
>> Leo
>>
>
>
>I knew your real inner character and feelings would come out if
>you kept talking enough, and you JUST did.
>
>No, I will not shut up simply because I have factually destroyed
>your position and then continued further to expose YOU for WHO
>you are and WHAT you do.
>
>Leo the unbiased objective reader, who attacks NCTA members
>for using character attacks, said THIS on september 25, referring
>to *certain members* of this NG...
>
>"For the most part, it's an intelligent and good natured
>animal - but you do have to watch out for the pricks.... ;)"
>
>I will NOT ask you to shut up... or, how did you put it? invoke
>my right to remain silent? (funny, I didn't know I had violated the
>law and needed to invoke my rights)... on the contrary, I ask
>you to KEEP talking and continue revealing yourself for
>what and who you are. You just haven't learned.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>

5574. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:29:21 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <igu6nv0ldqm20biuc2prcd2p86fk1h3e0p@4ax.com>
Source record: 78994

Clint,

That was humour. Not logic.

I'm sorry that I didn't make that clear for you before I posted. ;)

Leo

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 18:12:05 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>
>"Len Over 21" <lenover21@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030925165630.12631.00001459@mb-m28.aol.com...
>
>>
>> Clint, I see a slight resemblance to one newsgroupie in here that
>> used several false identities...had an address in Landing, NJ. :-)
>
>
>and also, always remember this statement he made on september
>25 in THIS newsgroup.... check it out and you'll see, just use a
>find string search if need be, but he made THIS comment
>when referring to certain people in here.. guess who, right?
>And I QUOTE...
>
>"For the most part, it's an intelligent and good natured
>animal - but you do have to watch out for the pricks.... ;)"
>
>Okay... now.. remember he said that the NEXT time he jumps
>on YOUR for making "personal attacks" instead of "concise
>argument and logical debate"...
>
>I TOLD you he'd reveal himself eventually.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>
>

5575. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:31:33 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <8ju6nvk2q2gfu4j7ul6fhkofi33erpdsot@4ax.com>
Source record: 78995

Actually, that was a fact. Character is absent in this individual -
that's why he behaves the way he does. He respects no one other than
himself - so - ergo - no character.

The other was humour. As I have already explained. And also fact!

Leo

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 18:14:02 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>
>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>news:c6o6nv4fblhu60egs57d6d3u664v1kf968@4ax.com...
>> Well, then you have nothing to worry about, OM - no character to
>> assassinate.
>>
>
>and you DID it again. That's the SECOND personal attack you've made,
>while at the SAME time saying the NCTA crowd is the one who does it.
>Along with THIS statement YOU made..
>
>"For the most part, it's an intelligent and good natured
>animal - but you do have to watch out for the pricks.... ;)"
>
>referring to some people in this newsgroup on this same date (september
>25).
>
>You really SHOULD consider stopping and cutting your losses; the more
>you speak, the more you harm your own case. I must admit, you do a much
>better job at defeating yourself than 1,000 well trained debaters could.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>

5576. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:36:14 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <esu6nvo9eimvotmi0kpfut3pjnm84rsdtf@4ax.com>
Source record: 78996

Steve,

I'm afraid you may have met your match there - Len is quite possibly
the world's leading authority on severe mental imbalance! ;)

73, Leo

On 25 Sep 2003 15:44:34 -0700, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP)
wrote:

>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030921180825.21642.00001040@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>> In article <3F6DB2DF.6040104@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>> writes:
>>
>> >Brian wrote:
>> >> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>> news:<20030921022842.11891.00000978@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>> >>
>> >>>In article <f45722ac.0309200340.4cea8bf@posting.google.com>,
>> >>>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>> >>>
>> >>>
>> >>>>Forever thinking of Kim, aren't you?
>> >>>
>> >>>Brian:
>> >>>
>> >>>I think about everyone in this newsgroup, particularly the "regulars" who
>> >>>have been here for a number of years. The truth is, in spite of our
>> >>>numerous and passionate disagreements, I don't think there's anyone
>> >>>here that I wouldn't like to know in person...(SNIP)
>>
>> A definite pro-coder tried to connect the Holocaust of WW2 to morse
>> code testing...with himself as the "outraged victim of oppression."
>>
>> Did I say he was suspect of illegal drug abuse? I take that back.
>>
>> I say he now exhibits symptoms of severe mental imbalance.
>
> Yet another attempt to bring some civility to the NG and Lennie
>tries to set a match to it.
>
> Why am I not surprised...?!?!
>
>Steve, K4YZ

5577. Re: THE LIMP ONE LIST - 3 SO FAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:38:39 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <n2v6nv0rf2f49ke8jruasaop1if0kpd6rn@4ax.com>
Source record: 78997
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Thank yew, thank yew verra much...

Well, first, I'd like to thank the Academy...

73, Leo

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 23:01:55 -0400, "BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS"
<BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@ BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS>
wrote:

>NUMBER ONE ON THE LIST IS (DRUM ROLL)
>
>LEO
>
>WHY. WELL FOR BEING JUST PLAIN EASY TO TROLL.
>
>
>NUMBER TWO (DRUM ROLL)
>
>RENE
>
>WHY. WELL FOR BEING JUST PLAIN DUMB. HEY KIDO, NOBODY CARES. GET IT???
>
>NUMBER THREE (FART SOUND)
>
>CONCERNED OF USENET
>
>WHY. WELL THIS PERSON HAS TO BE THE BIGGEST IDIOT ON HERE. DOES IT THINK
>THAT POSTING PUBLIC HEADERS IN A MESSAGE IS GOING TO AMOUNT TO ANYTHING.
>WELL I GUESS HE/SHE DOESN'T HAVE A CLUE.
>
>
>

5578. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:41:24 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <E2Lcb.3892$iT4.2788610@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 78998

Steve Robeson, K4CAP wrote:
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030921180825.21642.00001040@mb-m01.aol.com>...
>
>>In article <3F6DB2DF.6040104@adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
>>writes:
>>
>>
>>>Brian wrote:
>>>
>>>>yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote in message
>>
>> news:<20030921022842.11891.00000978@mb-m11.aol.com>...
>>
>>>>In article <f45722ac.0309200340.4cea8bf@posting.google.com>,
>>>>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Forever thinking of Kim, aren't you?
>>>>
>>>>Brian:
>>>>
>>>>I think about everyone in this newsgroup, particularly the "regulars" who
>>>>have been here for a number of years. The truth is, in spite of our
>>>>numerous and passionate disagreements, I don't think there's anyone
>>>>here that I wouldn't like to know in person...(SNIP)
>
>
>> A definite pro-coder tried to connect the Holocaust of WW2 to morse
>> code testing...with himself as the "outraged victim of oppression."
>>
>> Did I say he was suspect of illegal drug abuse? I take that back.
>>
>> I say he now exhibits symptoms of severe mental imbalance.
>
>
> Yet another attempt to bring some civility to the NG and Lennie
> tries to set a match to it.
>
> Why am I not surprised...?!?!

Funny how that works, Steve! Are you going to try to make it to Dayton?

Here we have a bunch of people with different opinions that in spite of those opinions look at getting together for a enjoyable weekend that sounds like a blast. And in the middle of this, somone decides to whizz on our Wheaties.

Could it be that this would be a threat to the way he wants the group?

- Mike KB3EIA -

5579. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:45:44 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <I6Lcb.153194$0v4.11414626@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 78999
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:_EJcb.11590$ai7.8255@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>
> Sure we will. All we need to is put up KW level beacon stations.
>
> End of BPL.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Why would that end BPL?

Frank Dresser

5580. Re: Leo's self-incriminating AGAIN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:50:02 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bkvuvc$6mbf5$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79000

"Leo" wrote in part ...

PS - while we're on the subject of spelling errors, I noticed this one in your post below:

Rebuttles? Try 'rebuttals' next time ;) Whoops, them thar's one of yer Pot / Black sceen-arios, I reckon!

Don't be so hard on Clint, Leo. He doesn't specialize in English, grammar, or spelling. His forte is writing non-cogent replies.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5581. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:52:36 UTC
From: Tarapia Tapioco <comesefosse@ntani.firenze.linux.it>
Message-ID: <8c5d8355e1c80fc2bd35a86a4a9a2369@firenze.linux.it>
Source record: 79573
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

```
-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

"Scott Dorsey" <kludge@panix.com> wrote in message news:bkv0ih$srm$1@panix2.panix.com...
> In article <vn4s5qq6lfl790@corp.supernews.com>, --exray-- <no@no.no> wrote:
> >asdf wrote:
> >> David Stinson wrote:
> >>>The FCC may be listening to "college boy" engineers.
> >>>I saw this happen too many times at government sites.
> >>

> >> No, they're listening to the big money (campaign donor) power
> >> companies. Just like everything else in the Bush
> >> administration...money is the only thing that carries any
> >> weight...

> > Oh my, a political troll on Usenet. Betcha said the same thing
> > during the Clinton administration, huh Troll?.

> Sadly, he is more or less right. The FCC has become heavily
> politicized in the past few years, and they are controlled more by
> political pressure than by folks who understand the technology.
> Pretty much all of the folks who actually understand the technology
> have left the upper reaches of the FCC management.

> And it has nothing to do with the Republicans or the Democrats... it
> has to do with the FCC. We can blame Reagan and Clinton both for
> some of it, but it is pretty clear that the FCC no longer cares much
> about the public interest or about maintaining the airwaves as a
> sacred trust.

I'm going to agree with Scott, and by inference, with David: it's not
so simple as writing a check, but the FCC *is* being manipulated by
very powerful interests, and they're in a hurry. Not only are they
powerful because they have immense wealth, but they're all the more
powerful because they know that "Shrub" has presented them an
opportunity which won't come again in their life, and they are
determined to take every advantage of it in the short time left before
their pet goes back to his animal farm.

Bear with me for a moment: I'm moved to step back and take a look from
a wider view -

The most important thing that the Bush administration brought to
Washington is the belief, now widely held in the corporate boardrooms,
that rich people are entitled to enjoy robbing those less ruthless or
```

lucky. Lobbyists for both liberal and conservative causes have complained bitterly about the arrogance and greed that the Republican administration has allowed to fester inside the beltway: there is no longer even the appearance of democracy, and it's starting to strain the credulity of even so staunch a GOP stronghold as the religious right.

- From Reagan's somnambulance, through the first "Right Wing Revival" during the Clinton administration, up to our current economic mess, the Republican Party has been courting those with money by placing a rose between its teeth and a pistol in its pocket. The elder Bush and Newt Gingrich were, and their heirs are now, brazen and unashamed pimps for the idea that those that have shall get, and those that don't shall get screwed.

No sooner had they gained power in the House, then the GOP started to undo (and in a way that was very hard to reverse) every law, program, entitlement, and court decision which gave ordinary people a chance of living with a (little) dignity.

By the way, Newt wasn't just talking about the New Deal when he said "The great social experiment has failed" - he was talking about undoing centuries of progress, not just decades. The fact that his personal life was too personal for the spinmeisters to hide hasn't dimmed his enthusiasm for the good 'ol days: the theme of his book "Gettysburg", an fictional alternative-history of the battle, reveals an attitude that even Publishers Weekly commented on -

"The authors show thorough knowledge of the people, weapons, tactics and ambience of the Civil War, though their portrayals of historical figures like Lee, Meade, James Longstreet and Richard Ewell betray a certain bias (the Confederate men are noble and wise, the Union leaders hot-tempered and vindictive)."

In the "new" Republican view, it's not enough to move your business' assets overseas, or to "outsource" your back office tasks to third-world countries. It's not enough to (once again) utilize the dark-skinned to provide a lifestyle Nero would envy: the Old Elite feels it must squeeze the middle class until everyone with less than $1,000,000 of ready cash is living on rented land in a rented tent, owning nothing but a TV set so that The Massa can tell them how to vote.

But I digress: lets stop looking at the forest and go back to pecking at the BPL tree -

Frankly, if I was one of the old white men who run America, I'd be hard-pressed to find a downside in BPL. Consider:

1. The Air Traffic Control radio system has needed a major overhaul for decades, and BPL will provide the FAA with a perfect reason to spend Billions to trade-in every navigational aid and radio in the country, because BPL operates on some of the same frequencies and

will rendor most of the others unusable. Of course, the planes will have to upgrade as well, but airplane owners, as a class, have plenty of spare cash, and the fact that every other country and every other airline in the world will be forced to go along is just one of those "intangible benefits" that those with a certain lifestyle expect.

By the way, there will be a few dead, burnt bodies lying around while the FAA sells its new system to the Congress, but even that smell can't overpower the ordure of the Potomac at low tide, so you'd better get used to riding in the back of the airbus, paying more for tickets and maybe even thinking of flight insurance as a sensible precaution.

2. The power companies, made stodgy and unprofitable by such quant words as "service" and "obligation" and "customer", will enjoy a dramatic influx of badly-needed cash, which will arrive just in time to save them from having to admit their mistakes, reengineer their transmission systems, or (most importantly) actually work at alternative and/or renewable energy sources.

3. If they design the system well, BPL will enjoy a wealth of new options that even cable moguls don't have: a priceless data coral, with well-penned users whose choices will be limited to those favored by like-thinking men of means: every click will be tracked, every purchase planned, and every complaint laughed off. There won't be any "spam", since there won't be any advertising allowed into the system that the upper crust didn't choose to allow, and those whom exhibit anti-American sentiments or question the wisdom of Those In Charge [tm] will soon find that everything they ever put into an email is available to their boss in an electronic blacklist.

Of course, any slander or complaints about these common-sense capitalist perquisites would be nipped in the bud, and the system will Protect Our Children [tm] by guiding their tiny minds into well-mapped impressions of the hard, hard life that the rich must suffer in order to provide the servants with the benefits we should be grateful we're able to beg for.

BPL is, as its advocates have explained, needed to counterbalance the critical shortage of war movies and of Father Knows Best reruns: it will put those airwaves that have been wasted on other nations' viewpoints and a few hobbyists' toys to more productive use. Your Betters have said so, and now if you're a Right-Thinking American, you will stop whining.

J. Penn

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.0.7 (GNU/Linux)

```
iD8DBQE/c1EnRqMr0Iv3YZURAke3AJ9CaJAP3XVsPBR6q4sR6dlUO64RDACdEaU6
KhxDVWanJ1d0gU7rqQhgIFw=
=Cc5V
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
```

5582. Re: Leo's self-incriminating AGAIN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-25 23:54:40 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <3uv6nv8i20si9c0va6l0jrlmfppmp2drfj@4ax.com>
Source record: 79001

Arnie,

You're right - just that he was so kind to correct a typo in one of my posts, I thought I'd return the favour for him ;)

73, Leo

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 19:50:02 -0400, "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote:

>"Leo" wrote in part ...
>
> PS - while we're on the subject of spelling errors, I noticed this one in
>your post below:
>
>Rebuttles? Try 'rebuttals' next time ;) Whoops, them thar's one of yer Pot
>/ Black sceen-arios, I reckon!
>_____
>
>Don't be so hard on Clint, Leo. He doesn't specialize in English, grammar,
>or spelling. His forte is writing non-cogent replies.
>
>Arnie -
>KT4ST
>

5583. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 00:03:36 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <ld07nv47lav5rudg21dtto481la5n2i8d3@4ax.com>
Source record: 79002

And, never in short supply! Available right here on this newsgroup,
always fresh, always in season...free for the taking!

Mike, you have to tell me what cold medication you're taking - I could
use a shot or two myself! :)

73, Leo

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 13:52:32 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>> Hmmm....
>>
>> You , Clint and Len have one thing in common - if you can't attach the
>> individual personally, your argument runs out of steam pretty quickly.
>>
>> Slash away, gentlemen - your personal attacks are futile here. Ad
>> Hominem is useless when you remove the 'hominem' from the equation,
>> isn't it?
>
> I add hominem to many meals, Leo. Great fried with onions and butter!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

5584. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 00:09:18 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bl003g$5tiea$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79003

"Clint" wrote in part ...

I only take the facts as they are and deduce a conclusion, rather than take a passion-filled idea intermixed with rage against opposition and launch a scathing attack devoid of everything necessary to warrant a good debate and argument to back up one's claims.

Excellent position, Clint. With that in mind, let's do some fact vs fiction debate.

On September 5, 2003 the Dakota Division Director released these survey results:

"Division members are divided on the Entry level license with slightly more of those replying saying that Morse Code should not be required for access to HF. That changes as as we move to General and Extra. Nearly 70% say there should be a Morse requirement for Extra Class licensees."

This is very close to my position on Morse testing. I believe that some HF privileges on all bands should be granted to amateurs upon entry into the ARS, and that CW testing should be required for the higher licenses, General and Extra. It would seem that this survey in the Dakota Division indicates (as I have stated many times) that a majority of hams are not strictly against code testing -- 70% seem to think that there should be some testing for the highest class of license.

Add to this the fact that CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS and that groups like "FISTS" have nearly doubled in size *since* restructuring, and I think the picture becomes clear. The support for the NCTA is not as strong as their advocates would have us believe.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5585. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 00:18:20 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bl00ke$6k02t$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79004

"Clint" wrote in part ...

If he's ever going to be a good debater, you may as well also coach him on the side about how to do it in a good and civilized manner, and not incriminate himself by making an accusation and then turning around and commiting that very same offense himself.

I find Leo's posts to be quite humorous, cogent, and factual. He runs circles around you and Len. That's why you can offer nothing of substance in return.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5586. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 00:23:21 UTC
From: Frank Todd K3EKO <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <ZFLcb.339527$2x.101344@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 79005
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
> news:Ykqcb.568344$Ho3.104168@sccrnsc03...
>
>>Frank Todd K3EKO wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
>>>>news:BVpcb.425394$Oz4.219503@rwcrnsc54...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
>>>>>>news:X%ocb.145408$mp.72200@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>THE CARING STATION wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>news:hp24nvofjmp93liio9i7ljva15jee1gh4t@4ax.com...
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Now, if Supernews would be so kind as to TOS this 'Big Al'
>>>>>>>>>character,
>>>>>>>>>we could get back to dealing with the usual level of nutbar that
>>>>>>>>>lurks
>>>>>>>>>here :)
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>73, Leo
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>WONT HAPPEN LEO. YOU ARE THE ONE WHO USED THE 4 LETTER WORDS. YOU
>>>>>>>>WILL
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>BE
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>TOS'ED. HO HO
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I vote that BIG AL stays...I enjoy his commentary.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>--
>>>>>>>73
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Frank K3EKO
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>You would....even if it is a troll.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Why haven't you responded to my earlier posts? You must know that
>>>>>you're in the wrong.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>--
>>>>>73
>>>>>
>>>>>Frank K3EKO
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I did respond numbnuts. But here it is again.
>>>>
>>>>Your still member of the Barf and the Stumpers, right?
>>>>
>>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>>
>>>>
>>>

>>>Yes, and will always be.
>>>
>>>-Frank
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>BUt what does that have to do with you accusing me of NOT apologizing
>>for my actions?
>>
>>-Frank
>>
>>
>>
>>--
>>73
>>
>>Frank K3EKO
>>
>
>
> I guess I HAVE TO SPELL IT OUT TO NUMBNUTS, eh? Ref my last post to you.
> Now here is another.
>
> I no longer believe your apology was sincere. Based on your actions and
> your remaining membership in a Ham Radio Terrorist group (s).
>
> In otherwords Franky, you have no credibility.
>
> Now take your HO HOs and shove them up your BARFY/SJ arse.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
Whatever Dan....You can go to u know where....

--
73

Frank K3EKO

5587. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 00:26:41 UTC
From: Frank Todd K3EKO <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <5JLcb.339532$2x.101397@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 79006
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
> news:Ykqcb.568344$Ho3.104168@sccrnsc03...
>
>>Frank Todd K3EKO wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>>"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
>>>>news:BVpcb.425394$Oz4.219503@rwcrnsc54...
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
>>>>>>news:X%ocb.145408$mp.72200@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>THE CARING STATION wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>news:hp24nvofjmp93liio9i7ljva15jee1gh4t@4ax.com...
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Now, if Supernews would be so kind as to TOS this 'Big Al'
>>>>>>>>>character,
>>>>>>>>>we could get back to dealing with the usual level of nutbar that
>>>>>>>>>lurks
>>>>>>>>>here :)
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>73, Leo
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>WONT HAPPEN LEO. YOU ARE THE ONE WHO USED THE 4 LETTER WORDS. YOU
>>>>>>>>WILL
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>BE
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>TOS'ED. HO HO
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>I vote that BIG AL stays...I enjoy his commentary.
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>--
>>>>>>>73
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Frank K3EKO
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>You would....even if it is a troll.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Why haven't you responded to my earlier posts? You must know that
>>>>>you're in the wrong.
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>--
>>>>>73
>>>>>
>>>>>Frank K3EKO
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>I did respond numbnuts. But here it is again.
>>>>
>>>>Your still member of the Barf and the Stumpers, right?
>>>>
>>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>>
>>>>
>>>

>>>Yes, and will always be.
>>>
>>>-Frank
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>
>>BUt what does that have to do with you accusing me of NOT apologizing
>>for my actions?
>>
>>-Frank
>>
>>
>>
>>--
>>73
>>
>>Frank K3EKO
>>
>
>
> I guess I HAVE TO SPELL IT OUT TO NUMBNUTS, eh? Ref my last post to you.
> Now here is another.
>
> I no longer believe your apology was sincere. Based on your actions and
> your remaining membership in a Ham Radio Terrorist group (s).
>
> In otherwords Franky, you have no credibility.
>
> Now take your HO HOs and shove them up your BARFY/SJ arse.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
I am NOT going to drop out of these groups (that I have been a member of
for years) just to be a friend to you. If that is what it takes, $%^& OFF!

--
73

Frank K3EKO

5588. Re: Correct Brainlessbluster Your a winner

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 00:30:53 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030925203053.300$kp@newsreader.com>
Source record: 79007
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,misc.transport.trucking,alt.radio.pirate

Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com wrote:
>> I have these boiler plated for n8wwm's abuse.
>
> help4u@wcom.com
>
> abuse-mail@mci.com
>
This one may be better:

abuse@mci.com (remember the headers)

--
http://NewsReader.Com/
50 GB/Month

5589. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 00:40:57 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <an27nv09n5c40s0up406iiei87a1t4utog@4ax.com>
Source record: 79008

"If the only tool you have in life is a hammer, you tend to treat
everything as if it were a nail..."

--Abraham Maslow

73, Leo

On 25 Sep 2003 20:56:31 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <f45722ac.0309250234.2decbd02@posting.google.com>,
>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
>>lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20030925015541.25517.00000936@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>>> In article <20030924203108.02537.00000756@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>> writes:
>>>
>>> >> By refusing to identify yourself, EVERYONE is blind to you.
>>> >>
>>> >Then why are you replying? ;-)
>>>
>>> To whom?
>>
>>Notice how quickly some anonymous troll is defended IF he has the right
>>opinion?
>>
>>;^) Brian
>
> PCTAs have to stick together. If they don't, they hang separately.
>
> :-)

5590. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 00:43:49 UTC
From: W4UDX <w4udx.nospam@juno.com>
Message-ID: <LXLcb.23555$iO.16252@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 79009
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Bring it on! I'll bust through the hash with good ole' CW!

W4UDX

"David Stinson" <arc5@ix.netcom.com> wrote in message
news:3F7260DF.C9B65572@ix.netcom.com...
>
> The FCC may be listening to "college boy" engineers.
> I saw this happen too many times at government sites.
>
> Someone has told them that "the power lines are balanced, so
> there will be no radiation from them! My professor told me so,
> my text book says so and that's the end of it!"
>
> Well, as any farm boy radio tinkerer can tell you,
> them books is one thing, the real world is another.
>
> BPL *is* coming, folks. Count on it.

5591. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 00:47:02 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <a0Mcb.4982$pP6.195@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79010
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

About all that can be done is go to the congress. They run the FCC. Like
what happened when Powel tried increase the broadcasters chunk of the
stations. Congress got into it and gave them a attitude adjustment.

Dan/W4NTI

"Dave Shrader" <david.shrader@comcast.net> wrote in message
news:czKcb.339344$2x.101278@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> Can the FCC be sued for acting in GROSS negligence? Under the premise
> that as professionals THEY SHOULD HAVE KNOWN they may be liable.
>
> Yeah, I know you can't sue the government, but it sounds good!
>
> Dave
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > Well Dick, apparantly no one else cares. I don't know of any of the
> > aformentioned groups making comments. Do you? Maybe they have no
concept
> > of what will happen. Sorta like the FCC having no concept of what will
> > happen either.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bktfft$71a$0@208.206.142.103...
> >
> >> It won't be just hams and other minor users of spectrum below 80 mHz
> >>who will be very seriously impacted by BPL. There are several states
> >>whose statewice Public Service - State Police FM radio communications
> >>systems are located on Low Band VHF, in the 40-50 mHz region. These
> >>include California Highway Patrol and Missouri Highway Patrol, and at
> >>least a few other state public safety and forestry organizations, as
> >>well as many private users.
> >> From personal knowledge of conditions drawn from many years of
> >>personal involvment with these systems I am certain they cannot co-exist
> >>with BPL.
> >>
> >> I know they would all jump at the chance to move up to a trunked UHF
> >>or higher system, but with all the state governmental budget woes that
> >>won't be possible anytime soon.
> >> One can only wonder what FCC is thinking here.

> >>BPL is basically a noise generator that is attractive because it
> >>"wires the world" in the eyes of those for whom that end is
> >>the most important feature of advancing technology. Unfamiliar with
> >>the workings of radio or technology itself, they have eagerly latched
> >>onto the totally inaccurate and selfserving assertions of BPL
proponants.
> >>
> >> As I said in my comments to the NPRM, there are much better ways to
> >>acoomplish the same end without completely ruining the HF spectrum.
> >>
> >>Dick
> >>
> >>
> >>opcom wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>This was posted to ARLI, I don't know how many subscribe, but in spite
> >
> > of the numerous comments against BPL (transmitting wideband internet
data
> > over power lines, which will destroy the HF radio spectrum), the FCC
seems
> > disposed
> >
> >>>to encourage it anyway. evil! evil! just look up BPL on the web. The
> >
> > noise from the radiated signals trashed the ham bands thoroughly.
> >
> >>>-------------------
> >>>
> >>>From:
> >>> Amateur Radio Station N0JAA <N0JAA@aol.com>
> >>> 4:00 PM
> >>>
> >>> Subject:
> >>> [ARLI] FCC Commissioner's Comments Concerning BPL
> >>> To:
> >>> bvarc@clarc.org, clarc@clarc.org, ARLI@topica.com
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>The following is a transcript from a recent speech given by FCC
> >
> > Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy at the United PowerLine
> >
> >>>Council's annual conference regarding BPL. It seems that she is all for
> >
> > it. It also seems that BPL is going to become a reality, regardless
> >

> >>>of what ARRL, the military, or anyone else says. As usual, big industry
> >
> > wins over everyone else because they have the money.
> >
> >>>This is from today's FCC Digest.
> >>>
> >>>Paul, N0JAA
> >>>
> >>>----------
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Reaching Broadband Nirvana
> >>>United PowerLine Council Annual Conference Remarks of Commissioner
> >
> > Kathleen Q. Abernathy
> >
> >>>September 22, 2003 (As prepared for delivery)
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Thank you very much for inviting me to speak with you. I am very
excited
> >
> > about broadband-over-powerline technology. I
> >
> >>>have seen it in action, and I believe it has a very bright future. It
is
> >
> > a real honor to be your keynote speaker at this
> >
> >>>important juncture for BPL.
> >>>
> >>>As a regulator, I am keenly interested in BPL technology for a number
of
> >
> > reasons. One of my central objectives as an FCC commissioner is to
> > facilitate the deployment of broadband services to all Americans. I also
> > fundamentally
> >
> >>>believe that the FCC can best promote consumer welfare by relying on
> >
> > market forces, rather than heavy-handed regulation. The development of
BPL
> > networks will serve both of these key goals. It will not only bring
> > broadband to
> >
> >>>previously unserved communities, but the introduction of a new
broadband
> >
> > pipeline into the home will foster the kind of competitive marketplace
that

> > will eventually enable the Commission to let go of the regulatory reins.
I
> >
> >>>want consumers to have a choice of multiple, facilities-based
> >
> > providers, including not only cable and DSL, but also powerline,
wireless,
> > and satellite services. Such a robustly competitive and diversified
> > marketplace is
> >
> >>>something I would call broadband Nirvana. We will not get there
> >
> > overnight, but the continuing development of BPL technology is a major
step
> > forward.
> >
> >>>While the long-term objective is a robustly competitive marketplace
that
> >
> > is free of regulatory distortions, a more immediate question is: What
> > should the FCC do to help foster such an environment? Sticking with my
> > Nirvana
> >
> >>>metaphor, I guess the question would be, what is the path to
> >
> > enlightenment?
> >
> >>>I believe the answer, in short, is regulatory restraint. It is tempting
> >
> > for regulators to take every new technology or service that comes along
and
> > apply the same rules that govern incumbent services. After all,
regulatory
> >
> >>>parity and a level playing field are intuitively appealing concepts.
> >
> > But I believe that it would be a huge mistake to carry forward legacy
> > regulations whenever new technology platforms are established. Many of
our
> > regulations
> >
> >>>are premised on the absence of competition, and when that rationale is
> >
> > eroded, we must not reflexively hold on to regulations that no longer
serve
> > their intended purpose. In fact, many of our old rules not only become
> >
> >>>unnecessary as markets evolve, but they can be fatal to new services
> >
> > that need room to breathe.

> >
> >>>The Nascent Services Doctrine applying more stringent regulations to
> >
> > wireline providers at a minimum must be reconsidered. As other
platforms,
> > including BPL and wireless, become more widely available, that will
further
> >
> >>>undermine the justification for regulating incumbent LECs broadband
> >
> > services as if they were the only available offerings. When the
Commission
> > completes this rulemaking, I expect that we will eliminate many
existing
> > rules and
> >
> >>>substantially modify others; the central question is the degree of
> >
> > regulation that will remain during the transition to a more robustly
> > competitive market.
> >
> >>>Finally, it is important to recognize that although the emergence of
new
> >
> > platforms like BPL will eliminate the need for many competition-related
> > regulations, other types of regulation may well remain necessary. For
> > example, the
> >
> >>>FCC must implement public policy goals unrelated to competition, or
> >
> > even at odds with competition. Universal service and access for persons
> > with disabilities are examples of this kind of regulation. These public
> > policy goals
> >
> >>>generally should be applied to all service providers, to the extent
> >
> > permitted by the Communications Act. The FCC also must intervene to
prevent
> > competitors from imposing externalities on one another and to protect
> > consumers
> >
> >>>where market failures are identified. Although, as I have noted, the
> >
> > Commission was right to refrain from imposing heavy-handed price and
> > service-quality regulations on PCS services when the were introduced, it
was
> > also right
> >
> >>>to adopt strict interference rules to prevent competitors from
> >

> > externalizing their costs. The same principle will apply to BPL. They
key
> > point is that, while some degree of regulation is both inevitable and
> > desirable, we
> >
> >>>should ensure that it is narrowly tailored to the particular
> >
> > governmental interests at stake. I appreciate the opportunity to share
> > these thoughts with you, and I would be happy to answer a few questions
if
> > we have time.
> >
> >>>
> >>> ******------****** please click on one or more
> >
> > of the links below to send a blank subscribe message.
> >
> >>>Amateur Radio Legal Issues List
> >>>(A list for discussing legal and legislative issues impacting Amateur
> >
> > Radio from Congress and the FCC)
> >
> >>> What have you done for Amateur Radio today?
> >>>--^^--
> >>
> >
> >
>

5592. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 00:48:03 UTC
From: W4UDX <w4udx.nospam@juno.com>
Message-ID: <I%Lcb.23576$iO.9903@bignews5.bellsouth.net>
Source record: 79011
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Boys it looks like it's time to bring back the good ole' spark gap CW transmitters. Will fight hash with some real static! :-)

W4UDX

"Scott Dorsey" <kludge@panix.com> wrote in message news:bktk98$5fe$1@panix2.panix.com...
> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:
> > One can only wonder what FCC is thinking here.
> >BPL is basically a noise generator that is attractive because it
> >"wires the world" in the eyes of those for whom that end is
> >the most important feature of advancing technology. Unfamiliar with
> >the workings of radio or technology itself, they have eagerly latched
> >onto the totally inaccurate and selfserving assertions of BPL proponants.
>
> BPL, however, will not only emit a lot of radiated trash into the HF bands,
> it will also RECEIVE a lot of radiated trash from the HF bands.
>
> My suspicion is that a fairly low power HF transmitter near a transmission
> line, even well out of the near field of the line, will wreak havoc with
> BPL communication while operating well below the legal limit.
>
> > As I said in my comments to the NPRM, there are much better ways to
> >acoomplish the same end without completely ruining the HF spectrum.
>
> As if the HF spectrum is not already ruined. Doesn't ANYONE take Part 15
> seriously? If I ran the FCC, I'd make touch lamps illegal for one thing.
> --scott
> --
> "C'est un Nagra. C'est suisse, et tres, tres precis."

5593. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 00:50:07 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <pr27nv8pgv5ui08i43pi1kocujs8v445vg@4ax.com>
Source record: 79012

And a new attack method is born, to supplement Ad Hominem:

Ad Erratum

- Defined as attacking the typographical errors in a post, rather than the message content of the post itself. This enables the functionally illiterate to divert arguments based solely upon typing minutae....

A Usenet first. Well done, OM!

73, Leo

On 25 Sep 2003 20:56:27 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <bktfft$71a$0@208.206.142.103>, Dick Carroll
><dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:
>
>> It won't be just hams and other minor users of spectrum below 80 mHz
>>who will be very seriously impacted by BPL.
>
> The lower limit of frequency allocations by both ITU-R and FCC is
> 3 KHz.
>
> 80 milliHertz is in the range of natural phenomena and not in any
> radio regulations.

5594. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 00:55:08 UTC
From: Frank Todd K3EKO <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us>
Message-ID: <M7Mcb.579252$YN5.415635@sccrnsc01>
Source record: 79013
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dan/W4NTI wrote:

> "Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> news:ptBcb.3113$NX3.245@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
>
>>On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 00:31:17 GMT,
>>opcom in <3F72521A.70F5BD12@swbell.net> wrote:
>>
>>
>>> What have you done for Amateur Radio today?
>>>--^^--
>>
>> The question is what has the ARRL done to the future of Ham Radio
>>by hanging on to the Morse Code Requirement? It has killed it.
>>
>>
>>--
>>Best Regards, Keith http://kilowatt-radio.org/
>>===
>>= http://slrn.org SLRN 0.9.8.0 is out.
>
> ======================================
>
>
> You really are a dumbass ain't ya Kieth? Tell me, in you apparantly drug
> clouded brain. How BPL and CW have anything to do with each other?
>
> Oh never mind. You ain't worth reading anylonger.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
Keith,

Just ignore Dan. Everyone in his mind is a DUMBASS. the only one who
is perfect is HIM, PERIOD.

--
73

Frank K3EKO

5595. Re: -Watch geo pop his top-/ Revisited

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 01:01:22 UTC
From: Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
Message-ID: <20030925210122.056$q1_-_@newsreader.com>
Source record: 79014
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
"The Fugitive" <aa@eat.com> wrote:
> <Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com> wrote in message
> news:20030925181602.429$uo_-_@newsreader.com...
> > "The Fugitive" <aa@eat.com> wrote:
> > > I know you will still say I am replying to you but just in case you
> > > do, GO FUCK YOURSELF
> >
> > --
> > http://NewsReader.Com/
> > 50 GB/Month
>
> Nah that was just your old lady I popped. Smelly bitch
>
Didn't take n8wwm very long to re-new your asshole license.

--
http://NewsReader.Com/
50 GB/Month
```

5596. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 01:12:43 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl03qb$va2$0@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 79015
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Dave Shrader wrote:
> Can the FCC be sued for acting in GROSS negligence? Under the premise
> that as professionals THEY SHOULD HAVE KNOWN they may be liable.
>
> Yeah, I know you can't sue the government, but it sounds good!
>

As a matter of fact, you can. Just not for monetary damages.

ARRL once sued the FCC over the 220mhz band,if you recall. It wouldn't
surprise me at all if a lawsuit did result if they go ahead with BPL;.
It's just to radical a proposal to be even sensible, much less bernefial.

Dick

5597. Re: Leo's self-incriminating AGAIN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 01:14:10 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl03t2$va2$1@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 79016

Leo wrote:

> LOL !
>
> What in hell are you trying to say? Sabotage what position? Please
> get someone to translate my posts into whatever it is that you speak,
> then reply! Duh...
>
> Leo
>
> PS - while we're on the subject of spelling errors, I noticed this one
> in your post below:
>
> Rebuttles? Try 'rebuttals' next time ;)
>
>

Leo I do believe you've done a fair job of putting both Clint and
Lennie on their rebuttles!

5598. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 01:17:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl0440$va2$2@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 79018
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Frank Dresser wrote:

> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:_EJcb.11590$ai7.8255@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>
>>Sure we will. All we need to is put up KW level beacon stations.
>>
>>End of BPL.
>>
>>Dan/W4NTI
>>
>>
>
>
> Why would that end BPL?
>
> Frank Dresser
>
>

It would more likely end the legality of 1kw for hams.

Dick

5599. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 01:24:35 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <nzMcb.7856$yp6.168883@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79017
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"recalcitrant ham op" <3evhil4de@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:1064506387.907205@newshost03.voicenet.com...
>
> "opcom" <eccm@swbell.net> wrote in message
> news:3F72521A.70F5BD12@swbell.net...
> > This was posted to ARLI, I don't know how many
> > subscribe, but in spite of the numerous comments
> > against BPL (transmitting wideband internet data
> > over power lines, which will destroy the HF radio
> > spectrum), the FCC seems disposed to encourage
> > it anyway. evil! evil! just look up BPL on the web. T
> > the noise from the radiated signals trashed the ham bands thoroughly.
>
> I guess you never heard that money talks and bullshit walks eh?
>
> Did you *REALLY THINK* that a couple hundred
> aging HF operating tightwad ham radio operators
> are going to stop an emerging technology that will
> conceivably network home appliances to the internet
> and be worth $BILLIONS$ in potential revenue ??

Fortunately, our HF bands are interleave in between
allocation for aeronautical mobile, maritime mobile,
DoD, private fixed service, short wave broadcasting,
etc.

I do not believe that we will be anywhere near close
to being alone in this battle.

Carl - wk3c

5600. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 01:28:51 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <nDMcb.7858$yp6.169399@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79019

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bktcofug0@208.206.142.96...
>
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> (Techs have stayed away in droves - in my view because
> > they correctly have viewd ARRL's Morse policy as designed
> > to keep them off of HF)
> >
>
>
> When you codebashers gonna make up your minds?? the earlier story was
> that techn just didn't care about HF.

Dick ... produce the post where I said "techs don't care about/want to get
on HF" ... you can't because I never said that.

Carl - wk3c

5601. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 01:29:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925212928.14837.00003229@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 79020

In article <20030925165636.12631.00001466@mb-m28.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030925082934.08626.00000890@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <20030925015541.25517.00000935@mb-m15.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>>In article <20030924203109.02537.00000757@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>>(N2EY)
>>>writes:
>>>
>>>>In article <20030924174226.07578.00000783@mb-m25.aol.com>,
>>lenover21@aol.com
>>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>>>
>>>>>YOU are NOT on any QRZ listing for any country.
>>>>
>>>>Neither are you. Len ;-) ;-) ;-)
>>>
>>> I've never PRETENDED to be one.
>>
>>Why are you shouting, Len?
>
> Not shouting.

Yes, you are. Capitalizing every letter in a word is online shouting. Bad
manners on your part. It also indicates you are out of control.

Perhaps you should take a time-out and come back to the group when you can
behave in a mature fashion.

> Do your eyes hurt?
>
Nope.

>>> I make no bones about not being licensed as an AMATEUR and have
>>> said so from day one in here.
>>
>>Everything isn't all about you, Len.
>
> Apparently the PCTA think so.

How so? Would you rather that nobody replied to your posts?

Strong opposition to your opinions seems to really bother you. Correction of your mistakes enrages you.
>
> Since they can't support their view of retaining the morse code test, they
> attack personalities.

Who is "they"?
>
>>> What you have is some idiot who PRETENDS to be an amateur
>>> <something> in Canada and won't identify himself.
>>
>>Why do you think Leo is pretending anything?
>
> She hasn't got the guts to identify herself.

"She"? How do you know Leo is female?
>
> Despite your pain with PREVIOUS screen names, I've never attempted
> to post anything without identifying myself.

Yes, you have, Many of your posts do not contain anything that indicates who you really are.

In fact, for all anyone really knows, you could be someone else who has appropriated the persona of one Leonard H. Anderson.

Has anyone on this NG actually met you in person or on the air?
>
>>When "vshah101" showed up here and said he was an EE and a ham but >> would not
>>identify himself, you had no problems with that. But you are all over Leo >> for
>>doing the same thing.
>
> Don't misdirect into more personality character assassination.

I'm not misdirecting. 'vshah101' did not give a name or callsign, even when asked. But you had no problem with him or his anti-amateur remarks.

That's a fact, Jack ;-)
>
> The SUBJECT line of this thread is "1/4 Wave Dipoles."

So? Subject lines never deterred you from going off in other directions.

You sound threatened and angry because someone has noticed your double standard of behavior towards anonymous posters.
>
> This whole newsgroup was created to discuss-debate-argue the code
> test issue.

And other things. You are not the moderator, Len. Much as you want to control how things happen, you're not the boss here. Live with it.

> It wasn't created for the sole amusement or daily guru column from
> Jimmie Miccolis where he would sit in judgement of all others.

It wasn't created for the sole amusement or daily guru column from
Leonard H. Anderson where he would sit in judgement of all others.
>
>>> If you wish to live in a fairyland of make-believe, be my guest. Just
>>> don't start mumbling about laws for that fairyland.
>>
>>"Fairyland"? You're much closer to Disneyland than I.
>
> The CODE FAIRIES, Jimmie.

Who are they?

5602. Re: Bandwidth (Was some kind of code/ nocode BS)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 01:29:30 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030925212930.14837.00003230@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 79021

In article <IeAcb.8380$297.8210@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
<n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:

>"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
>news:bktcofug0@208.206.142.96...
>>
>>
>> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>> (Techs have stayed away in droves - in my view because
>> > they correctly have viewd ARRL's Morse policy as designed
>> > to keep them off of HF)
>
>Very few hams appear to realize that HF is not nearly so "recycleable" as
>VHF or UHF, where a repeater or packet node can be on the same freq as you
>are, maybe 90 miles away, and you cannot even hear each other.
>
>On VHF/UHF. thousands of hams around the world can use the same freq at the
>same time, without interfering with each other at all. It's recycleable.
>The same cannot be said, of course, about any of the HF bands. To one degree
>of another, all of the HF bands have a much larger "footprint" than anything
>on VHF or UHF... In some cases, this "footprint" is global. One QSO per
>planet on this frequency, thank you!

That's true some of the time on HF. Other times it's not. Depends on the band,
time of day, etc.
>
>It seems to me that either this distiction has whizzed over poor Carl's
>head, or he is a closet representative of the electrical power industry who
>would like to see the already overcrowded HF bands totally trashed out, so
>that hams will not really mind when BPL comes in and finishes it off.

I think Carl quite understands the situation with BPL. In fact, he
independently observed BPL interference at the Emmaus test site and commented
at length against BPL to FCC. Excellent comments, btw, plus backed up with 'I
was there, I experienced the interference, BPL is a bad idea, period'. Or words
to that effect.

His independent confirmation of ARRL/W1RFI observation was noted in this
month's QST.

Hopefully the FCC will look at the technical lack-of-merit of BPL.
>
>I don't really care much one way or another about morse code testing, but
>yes I do have a definate opinion about the idea of opening up generalized HF
>access to entry-level hams. It's a dumb idea that gets even dumber as our

>population grows.

Then what would you set up as the entry requirements? Heck, even if the code test stays, it's only a 5 wpm receive-only once-and-done test.
>
>Over a period of time, we can expect the number of hams wanting access to HF
>to grow, but the laws of physics will stay the same.

"wanting access" and actually getting on the air are two different things.

>Only so many people can
>reasonably expect to get on the HF bands at one time. We can extend that a
>little bit through the use of bandwidth-efficient modes like PSK-31, but the
>fact is that wide-band modes like PACTOR III and Q15x25 are getting more and
>more attention these days because they can do things that PSK31 cannot do,
>such as providing reasonable throughput and effective error-correction.
>People who say that overcrowding on HF is a thing of the past due to PSK31
>obviously have not spent much time listening on HF, and are blowing smoke
>out of their shorts.

Are all of the amateur HF bands crowded bandedge to bandedge 24/7?
>
>Example: An ARRL / ARES group is currently looking into linking all the
>major NWS EOC's around the country via HF... Their first choice in an HF
>mode for this purpose? PACTOR III !

Why?
>
>I wonder how many PACTOR III stations those dweebs think they are going to
>get on the air at one time? Don't they ever listen on HF? One area of
>common ground between the few hams who can afford PACTOR III and the even
>fewer hams who care about Q15x25, (another wide-band HF mode) is that both
>groups have a heck of a time finding some place to operate on HF without
>getting dozens of hams up in arms about the bandwidth they are taking up. -
>Enough bandwidth for half a dozen or more HF Packet QSO's, or more than a
>dozen PSK QSO's!

Survival of the fittest.
>
>They get complaints, nasty E-mails, they get reported even though they are
>legal, and they often even get intentional interference from outraged hams.
>The other night, I heard a guy on 30 meters whistling into his mike, on a
>freq where PACTOR III was being used. The whistling disrupted the PACTOR III
>QSO just enough to slow it down and reduce its efficiency without quite
>breaking the link. The guy was very patient about the whole thing. I
>listened to him whistle for over half an hour. (I was waiting for the
>PACTOR III QSO to end, so I could get in there on 30m with another mode.)

whoa - this snazzy digital mode is vulnerable to some yahoo whistling into a mike?
>
>If it hadn't been for the "whistling clown", the PACTOR III dude would have

>gotten in and out of there a lot quicker! - But that is typical of what the
>few wide-band mode guys put up with, every day. They are not popular, for
>the obvious reason.

So what's the cure?
>
>As for that ARRL / ARES group... These are guys who are making decisions
>that can affect many hams, and aparrently not one member of that group has a
>clue about operating on HF. That's not a very comforting thought. The big
>question in this post is, "Why don't more hams understand that HF is not
>really recycleable like VHF and UHF?"
>
>So, getting back to Carl's accusation that the ARRL is trying to keep
>entry-level hams off of the HF bands, my response would have to be: I
>don't know if that is what the ARRL really intends but if that is the end
>result, it is just fine with me!
>
I think both you and Carl are mistaken about ARRL keeping hams off HF.

73 de jim, N2EY

5603. Re: Leo's self-incriminating AGAIN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 01:34:28 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <gs57nvk8gd340mi66e6jqatktnuuadn4f2@4ax.com>
Source record: 79022

Thanks, Dick - they sure had it coming.....

On 26 Sep 2003 01:14:10 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
wrote:

>
>
>Leo wrote:
>
>> LOL !
>>
>> What in hell are you trying to say? Sabotage what position? Please
>> get someone to translate my posts into whatever it is that you speak,
>> then reply! Duh...
>>
>> Leo
>>
>> PS - while we're on the subject of spelling errors, I noticed this one
>> in your post below:
>>
>> Rebuttles? Try 'rebuttals' next time ;)
>>
>>
>
>
> Leo I do believe you've done a fair job of putting both Clint and
>Lennie on their rebuttles!

5604. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 01:38:53 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <7v57nv8kp8q0bijm8qgilitj9phd5op88b@4ax.com>
Source record: 79023

Bingo. This is the root cause of the problem.

Excellent advice, too!

73, Leo

On 26 Sep 2003 01:29:28 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>And other things. You are not the moderator, Len. Much as you want to control
>how things happen, you're not the boss here. Live with it.

5605. Re: Extra Class Exam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 01:43:34 UTC
From: William Warren <wwarren.qrm@timesucker.homelinux.org>
Message-ID: <3F739BE4.3080303@timesucker.homelinux.org>
Source record: 79024

Don Morgan wrote:
> For the extra class exam, do they allow scientific calculators?
> If not is the a tan/arctan chart allowed for the rlc phase angle questions?
>
> I took and got the general last year but as I remember it I thought they limited
> the test taker to basic function calculators....

OM,

You probably won't need a calculator, at least for the reactance questions. Unless the pool has changed since I took the test, they're worded in such a way that you can eliminate two answers based on Ohm's law, and choose from the remaining two just by knowing that capacitance lags and inductance leads.

Frankly, when I realized this, I was a little TO'd ;-J. I'd studied reactance and polar/rectangular conversions for weeks in preparation for the exam.

My advice is to spend more time on directional antenna arrays and mosfet's; that's where the trick questions are.

HTH.

Bill

--
William Warren
(Filter out the qrm to email me directly)

5606. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 01:44:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl05mr$5tr$0@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 79025

Leo wrote:

> And a new attack method is born, to supplement Ad Hominem:
>
> Ad Erratum
>
> - Defined as attacking the typographical errors in a post, rather than
> the message content of the post itself. This enables the functionally
> illiterate to divert arguments based solely upon typing minutae....
>
> A Usenet first. Well done, OM!
>

Oh......you're still paying any attention to Putzie Poo??? Most of us
stopped even opening his postslong ago. We just toggle right on past
them. There never was anything worthwhile therein. No reason to suspect
anything has changed, or evver will. He's just another usenet troll.

Dick

> 73, Leo
>
> On 25 Sep 2003 20:56:27 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>
>
>>In article <bktfft$71a$0@208.206.142.103>, Dick Carroll
>><dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:
>>
>>
>>> It won't be just hams and other minor users of spectrum below 80 mHz
>>>who will be very seriously impacted by BPL.
>>
>> The lower limit of frequency allocations by both ITU-R and FCC is
>> 3 KHz.
>>
>> 80 milliHertz is in the range of natural phenomena and not in any
>> radio regulations.
>
>

5607. Re: SHOW ME YOUR LITTLE ONE AND I'LL SHOW YOU MY BIG ONE BOY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 01:51:10 UTC
From: Walter Treftz <penguino@atlantic.net>
Message-ID: <3F739B74.4840BDBF@atlantic.net>
Source record: 79026
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.dxing,alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew, rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

God!!! I deserted HF and went down to VLF just to get away from
you assholes
N4GL

BIG AL wrote:

> THIS IS K4OKA THE CARING STATION. HO HO
>
> STOP PLAYING WITH YOURSELF BOY.
>
> HO HO

5608. Re: THE LIMP ONE LIST - 3 SO FAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 01:54:28 UTC
From: Walter Treftz <penguino@atlantic.net>
Message-ID: <3F739C3A.54E75D39@atlantic.net>
Source record: 79027
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

You know, you assholes who are determined to ruin ham radio with your
CB behavior, could always do it easier with telephones now that they
have unlimited long distance calling. Then we who are real hams could
enjoy both the internet and the ham bands.

"BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" wrote:

> NUMBER ONE ON THE LIST IS (DRUM ROLL)
>
> LEO
>
> WHY. WELL FOR BEING JUST PLAIN EASY TO TROLL.
>
> NUMBER TWO (DRUM ROLL)
>
> RENE
>
> WHY. WELL FOR BEING JUST PLAIN DUMB. HEY KIDO, NOBODY CARES. GET IT???
>
> NUMBER THREE (FART SOUND)
>
> CONCERNED OF USENET
>
> WHY. WELL THIS PERSON HAS TO BE THE BIGGEST IDIOT ON HERE. DOES IT THINK
> THAT POSTING PUBLIC HEADERS IN A MESSAGE IS GOING TO AMOUNT TO ANYTHING.
> WELL I GUESS HE/SHE DOESN'T HAVE A CLUE.

5609. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 02:07:37 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl0719$a0u$0@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 79028
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Scott Dorsey wrote:

> Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>> One can only wonder what FCC is thinking here.
>>BPL is basically a noise generator that is attractive because it
>>"wires the world" in the eyes of those for whom that end is
>>the most important feature of advancing technology. Unfamiliar with
>>the workings of radio or technology itself, they have eagerly latched
>>onto the totally inaccurate and selfserving assertions of BPL proponants.
>
>
> BPL, however, will not only emit a lot of radiated trash into the HF bands,
> it will also RECEIVE a lot of radiated trash from the HF bands.
>
> My suspicion is that a fairly low power HF transmitter near a transmission
> line, even well out of the near field of the line, will wreak havoc with
> BPL communication while operating well below the legal limit.
>

That might depend on the nature of the signals BPL uses. TJey could be
fairly RFI immune while causing vast amounts of itto other users themselves.

>
>> As I said in my comments to the NPRM, there are much better ways to
>>acoomplish the same end without completely ruining the HF spectrum.
>
>
> As if the HF spectrum is not already ruined. Doesn't ANYONE take Part 15
> seriously? If I ran the FCC, I'd make touch lamps illegal for one thing.
> --scott

The BPL proponents assert strongly that it's no worse than any other
Part 15 device, thus trivial. Lots of Part 15 was *never* trivial, and
I along with many others strongly opposed allowing them on HF
in the first place, but you see what good it did.
And they want the Part 15 output levels raised considerably!
What nonsense!
MY fear is that certain politicians have told officials at FCC to
"Make it happen" regardless of the fallout. IOW, the "fix is in".
If the Commissioner's speech in the quoted post doesn't indicate that
what, the heck DOES it indicate??
If that proves to be how it is, the ship will surely go aground,
("hit the sand") and it WILL be time for ARRL and others to file suit.

Dick

5610. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 02:09:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl075k$a0u$1@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 79029
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Keith wrote:

> On 24 Sep 2003 22:35:20 -0400,
> Scott Dorsey in <bktk98$5fe$1@panix2.panix.com> wrote:
>
>>Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:
>>
>>> One can only wonder what FCC is thinking here.
>>>BPL is basically a noise generator that is attractive because it
>>>"wires the world" in the eyes of those for whom that end is
>>>the most important feature of advancing technology. Unfamiliar with
>>>the workings of radio or technology itself, they have eagerly latched
>>>onto the totally inaccurate and selfserving assertions of BPL proponants.
>>
>>As if the HF spectrum is not already ruined. Doesn't ANYONE take Part 15
>>seriously? If I ran the FCC, I'd make touch lamps illegal for one thing.
>>--scott
>
>
> Yes, well money talks and Morse Code HF Luddites walk.

Take it back to 27 MHZ, Keith, and come back when you finally get a
single hint of a clue. If there's a Ludddite on here it's you.

If there were a few million
> active HF operators

The your CB-ize the entire spectrum agenda would be realized.

5611. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 02:11:31 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl078j$a0u$2@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 79030
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

W4UDX wrote:

> Boys it looks like it's time to bring back the good ole' spark gap CW
> transmitters. Will fight hash with some real static! :-)
>

How do you suppose the FCC plans to do DFing with all that HF BPL
RFI in the way?

Dick

5612. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 02:12:24 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn7851d168vv10@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79031

> I find Leo's posts to be quite humorous, cogent, and factual. He runs
> circles around you and Len. That's why you can offer nothing of substance
> in return.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>

And how is it he's debating us when he also claims that he's not on
one side OR the other of the issue of CW testing?? HMMM???????

Just HOW is it he has managed to find a way to eat his cake and have
it too when the rest of humanity in thousands of years have not been
able to solve that age old paradox? HMMM?????

And, as far as "cogent and factual", is that before or after he made
a reference to us being pricks?

Clint
KB5ZHT

5613. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 02:14:29 UTC
From: Walter Treftz <penguino@atlantic.net>
Message-ID: <3F73A0EB.708AA75A@atlantic.net>
Source record: 79032
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

What's that got to do with BPL???

Keith wrote:

> On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 00:31:17 GMT,
> opcom in <3F72521A.70F5BD12@swbell.net> wrote:
>
> > What have you done for Amateur Radio today?
> > --^^--
>
> The question is what has the ARRL done to the future of Ham Radio
> by hanging on to the Morse Code Requirement? It has killed it.
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> ==
> = http://slrn.org SLRN 0.9.8.0 is out. =
> ==

5614. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 02:15:57 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn78bo8957chab@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79035

> You really should investigate an English as a Second Language course,
> my friend!
>
> Leo
>

Oh, is that the BEST dodge you could come up with? when ANYBODY
can read that you were saying that as a reply to N2EY?

Oh, nice try. I figured something better or nothing, but not just saying
THAT.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5615. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 02:16:03 UTC
From: Walter Treftz <penguino@atlantic.net>
Message-ID: <3F73A148.5AC1312A@atlantic.net>
Source record: 79034
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Right on --
retired merchant marine R/O
N4GL

GeorgeF wrote:

> recalcitrant ham op wrote:
>
> > Did you *REALLY THINK* that a couple hundred
> > aging HF operating tightwad ham radio operators
> > are going to stop an emerging technology that will
> > conceivably network home appliances to the internet
> > and be worth $BILLIONS$ in potential revenue ??
>
> Hams are the least of the problems. There are many other users of the
> HF range who will be effected other than hams. Here's just a few:
>
> US Coast Guard makes high use of HF
> All branches of the military
> Many long distance marine comms are still on HF
> TransAtlantic and Pacific Air Traffic Control Comms are HF
> (Imagine if the ATC ground station can't hear an Aircraft call is
> position).
>
> And that's just a few services who are heavy uses of HF.
>
> George
> http://www.MilAirComms.com
> With DSL who needs BPL?

5616. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 02:16:21 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <mo77nv85uverrpmkh6hlc28kkv341c8dhc@4ax.com>
Source record: 79033

Dick,

He is indeed a troll - and a reprehensible one at that. But, perhaps,
with a little education, he can be saved. Jeez, sometimes I hate
being an optimist. :)

But, I hate being flamed by a contemptible old Visigoth even more 8*p

73, Leo

On 26 Sep 2003 01:44:59 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
wrote:

>
>
>Leo wrote:
>
>> And a new attack method is born, to supplement Ad Hominem:
>>
>> Ad Erratum
>>
>> - Defined as attacking the typographical errors in a post, rather than
>> the message content of the post itself. This enables the functionally
>> illiterate to divert arguments based solely upon typing minutae....
>>
>> A Usenet first. Well done, OM!
>>
>
>
> Oh......you're still paying any attention to Putzie Poo??? Most of us
>stopped even opening his postslong ago. We just toggle right on past
>them. There never was anything worthwhile therein. No reason to suspect
>anything has changed, or evver will. He's just another usenet troll.
>
>Dick
>
>
>> 73, Leo
>>
>> On 25 Sep 2003 20:56:27 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:
>>
>>
>>>In article <bktfft$71a$0@208.206.142.103>, Dick Carroll
>>><dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:
>>>

> snip sanctimonious crap

5617. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 02:18:45 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn78gtbl4eus42@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79037

here is the entire text, you're post to N2EY...

<CUT AND PASTE>

Absolutely correct, N2EY - for these folks, the message is everything.
Agree, or be attacked personally.

You know, being a member of this group is a lot like adopting a pet
porcupine. For the most part, it's an intelligent and good natured
animal - but you do have to watch out for the pricks.... ;)

73, Leo

On 25 Sep 2003 09:10:15 -0700, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:

>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309250234.2decbd02@posting.google.com>...
>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030925015541.25517.00000936@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>> > In article <20030924203108.02537.00000756@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
(N2EY)
>> > writes:
>> >
>> > >> By refusing to identify yourself, EVERYONE is blind to you.
>> > >>
>> > >Then why are you replying? ;-)
>> >
>> > To whom?
>>
>> Notice how quickly some anonymous troll is defended IF he has the right
opinion?
>>
>Yep, you and Len sure defended "vshah101" in here...

=====

The time stamp was 9/25/03 11:21

5618. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 02:19:48 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl07o4bnd0@208.207.71.141>
Source record: 79036
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

David Stinson wrote:

> The FCC may be listening to "college boy" engineers.
> I saw this happen too many times at government sites.
>
> Someone has told them that "the power lines are balanced, so
> there will be no radiation from them! My professor told me so,
> my text book says so and that's the end of it!"
>
> Well, as any farm boy radio tinkerer can tell you,
> them books is one thing, the real world is another.
>
> BPL *is* coming, folks. Count on it.

One thing in our favor- They can't wire the entire
planet at one time, so the early areas should be first to
experience real problems. The first time BPL causes someone
a real serious, costly problem (that WILL happen)
and the lawsuits start, that may slow down the implementation
a bit. Might even head it off. Doesn't look like an exactly
glowing business plan, anyway. And the need to rebuild infra
structure instead of throwing money at BPL was well
demonstrated last month in the NE USA blackout.

I wonder how hams are faring in the test areas. Anyone
heard anything?

Dick

5619. LEO BUSTED AGAIN!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 02:22:21 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn78nmifdfhf09@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79038

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:igu6nv0ldqm20biuc2prcd2p86fk1h3e0p@4ax.com...
> Clint,
>
> That was humour. Not logic.
>
> I'm sorry that I didn't make that clear for you before I posted. ;)
>
> Leo

HEY, wait a minute.. a few threads back up you TOLD me,
and I quote...

"Actally, that's a quote from your friend, Len. Note the
CAPITALIZATION of all of the NOUNS to make it clearer.

You really should investigate an English as a Second Language course,
my friend!

Leo"

Okay, so FIRST you say it's a quote of Len's (which I proved it
was NOT with a cut and paste and the time stamp so it can
be found easily).. THEN you admit it but try to dodge by
saying "it's humor, not logic"... but ADMITTING it all the same
by trying to EXLPAIN it the second time.

BUSTED!

so, in addition to being a hypocrit, you are an outright liar.

It's SO easy.
You need to just find whatever ham set you up to come in
here and do this that you've failed and been exposed.

Talk some more and incriminate yourself. :)))

Clint
KB5ZHT

5620. LEO BUSTED AGAIN

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 02:24:16 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn78r9ddljie67@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79040

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:8ju6nvk2q2gfu4j7ul6fhkofi33erpdsot@4ax.com...
> Actually, that was a fact. Character is absent in this individual -
> that's why he behaves the way he does. He respects no one other than
> himself - so - ergo - no character.
>
> The other was humour. As I have already explained. And also fact!
>
> Leo
>

...and the opposite of a "fact" is a "falsehood", which you commited a few
threads up by trying to pass that off as a quote of Len's!!!! Which is it
hypocrit boy? Yea, you "explained" this time but you ALSO said
it wasn't you and that I needed an english language lesson because you
were quoting Len. I have already cut and paste the post that BUSTS you
on that.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5621. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 02:24:51 UTC
From: Walter Treftz <penguino@atlantic.net>
Message-ID: <3F73A355.BB10806B@atlantic.net>
Source record: 79039
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Here's what we do --- we built a (legal) KW rig into a van, install a vertical-
radiating antenna, cut out the roof and replace it with a fiberglass sheet. Drive directly underneath a power line with BPL running. Run lots of QSO's, and
have at it. We're legal. Induced RF just might make them think twice about it.
Yes, I know Ashcrofts boys are reading this --- Hi, muthers -- I live at

the callbook address. Bring some beer when you come visiting.
N4GL

Frank Dresser wrote:

> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:_EJcb.11590$ai7.8255@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> >
> > Sure we will. All we need to is put up KW level beacon stations.
> >
> > End of BPL.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> Why would that end BPL?
>
> Frank Dresser

5622. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 02:28:18 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <3d87nv4nb2aqgo82n4op1qlhtdurqbiqnk@4ax.com>
Source record: 79041

I never named anyone as the porcupine's - uh - quills. I assumed that
you know who you are, and, well.....apparently, I was correct.

Kindly do not include Arnie in that category by referring to 'us' when
you speak to him about it, though - ....he sure ain't one!

Why must I take a side in the code debate? Or does your ISP carry
this group as rec.radio.amateur.morsecode?

It's a policy group. For amateur radio. All policies. Not just the
one you like! It's a big world out there, 'lil feller.....

Pray for a clue, please - it would be a service to the entire Amateur
community. Pray to Saint Anderson, the Patron Saint of Lids...before
its too late....

That was humour too, Clint. You can go to bed now.

73, Leo

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 21:12:24 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>
>> I find Leo's posts to be quite humorous, cogent, and factual. He runs
>> circles around you and Len. That's why you can offer nothing of substance
>> in return.
>>
>> Arnie -
>> KT4ST
>>
>
>And how is it he's debating us when he also claims that he's not on
>one side OR the other of the issue of CW testing?? HMMM???????
>
>Just HOW is it he has managed to find a way to eat his cake and have
>it too when the rest of humanity in thousands of years have not been
>able to solve that age old paradox? HMMM?????
>
>And, as far as "cogent and factual", is that before or after he made
>a reference to us being pricks?
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>

5623. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 02:32:06 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bl08f8$6nv52$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79042

"Clint" wrote ...

And how is it he's debating us when he also claims that he's not on one side OR the other of the issue of CW testing?? HMMM??????? Just HOW is it he has managed to find a way to eat his cake and have it too when the rest of humanity in thousands of years have not been able to solve that age old paradox? HMMM????? And, as far as "cogent and factual", is that before or after he made a reference to us being pricks?

No, actually he is successfully debating your posting style (or lack thereof) As to the other comment, I read it as a reference to having a pet porcupine. Are you a porcupine, Clint?

Arnie -
KT4ST

5624. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 02:37:30 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <u697nv4v457up1rmq2kuju879r9ta4oclh@4ax.com>
Source record: 79043

Sorry, my error - I read the test from Len at the top of your post,
and assumed you were referring to that - my bad....

Let me know when you set up the ESL course - maybe I'll go with you
;)

But, in answer to your post - that is not hypocrisy at all - its a
fact. This group contains several trolls who try and dominate every
thread, and twist it around to a code argument. You are one of those
trolls. Plain and simple - ask the rest of the group, if you don't
believe me! Ask them!

30, Leo

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 21:18:45 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>here is the entire text, you're post to N2EY...
>
><CUT AND PASTE>
>
>Absolutely correct, N2EY - for these folks, the message is everything.
>Agree, or be attacked personally.
>
>You know, being a member of this group is a lot like adopting a pet
>porcupine. For the most part, it's an intelligent and good natured
>animal - but you do have to watch out for the pricks.... ;)
>
>73, Leo
>
>On 25 Sep 2003 09:10:15 -0700, N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote:
>
>>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>news:<f45722ac.0309250234.2decbd02@posting.google.com>...
>>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>news:<20030925015541.25517.00000936@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>>> > In article <20030924203108.02537.00000756@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>>> > writes:
>>> >
>>> > >> By refusing to identify yourself, EVERYONE is blind to you.
>>> > >>
>>> > >Then why are you replying? ;-)
>>> >
>>> > To whom?
>>>

>>> Notice how quickly some anonymous troll is defended IF he has the right
>opinion?
>>>
>>Yep, you and Len sure defended "vshah101" in here...
>
>
>=====
>
>The time stamp was 9/25/03 11:21
>
>

5625. Re: LEO BUSTED AGAIN!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 02:41:40 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <io97nv8uqmm38nu4llcasve489m9k82fab@4ax.com>
Source record: 79044

Rather than starting a new thread, kindly use the original so that I
can see what you're referring to. In one of your 4,362 posts today,
you credited me with a quote that actually came from Len. Please
clarify - which one?

Leo

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 21:22:21 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>
>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>news:igu6nv0ldqm20biuc2prcd2p86fk1h3e0p@4ax.com...
>> Clint,
>>
>> That was humour. Not logic.
>>
>> I'm sorry that I didn't make that clear for you before I posted. ;)
>>
>> Leo
>
>
>HEY, wait a minute.. a few threads back up you TOLD me,
>and I quote...
>
>"Actally, that's a quote from your friend, Len. Note the
>CAPITALIZATION of all of the NOUNS to make it clearer.
>
>You really should investigate an English as a Second Language course,
>my friend!
>
>Leo"
>
>Okay, so FIRST you say it's a quote of Len's (which I proved it
>was NOT with a cut and paste and the time stamp so it can
>be found easily).. THEN you admit it but try to dodge by
>saying "it's humor, not logic"... but ADMITTING it all the same
>by trying to EXLPAIN it the second time.
>
>BUSTED!
>
>so, in addition to being a hypocrit, you are an outright liar.
>
>It's SO easy.
>You need to just find whatever ham set you up to come in

>here and do this that you've failed and been exposed.
>
>Talk some more and incriminate yourself. :)))
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>
>
>

5626. THE LIMP ONE LIST - 3 SO FAR

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 03:01:55 UTC
From: "BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <"BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS"@BIG-AL>
Message-ID: <vn6pet1b11o0fc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78966
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

NUMBER ONE ON THE LIST IS (DRUM ROLL)

LEO

WHY. WELL FOR BEING JUST PLAIN EASY TO TROLL.

NUMBER TWO (DRUM ROLL)

RENE

WHY. WELL FOR BEING JUST PLAIN DUMB. HEY KIDO, NOBODY CARES. GET IT???

NUMBER THREE (FART SOUND)

CONCERNED OF USENET

WHY. WELL THIS PERSON HAS TO BE THE BIGGEST IDIOT ON HERE. DOES IT THINK
THAT POSTING PUBLIC HEADERS IN A MESSAGE IS GOING TO AMOUNT TO ANYTHING.
WELL I GUESS HE/SHE DOESN'T HAVE A CLUE.

5627. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 03:06:07 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@att.net>
Message-ID: <z2Ocb.153421$0v4.11434217@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 79045

Hi Gang,
Curious about this BPL. Is there a technical treatise somewhere on the web that describes exactly how this BPL will be implemented? I am having a hard time determining how it works. I live a few miles from what once was TVA's largest substation in their electrical grid/system, maybe one of the largest in the world, fed by 0.5 MV lines. Sooooo lets start with block diagrams. How does it work?

73,
--Clay N4AOX

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bl07o4bnd0@208.207.71.141...
>
>
> David Stinson wrote:
>
> > The FCC may be listening to "college boy" engineers.
> > I saw this happen too many times at government sites.
> >
> > Someone has told them that "the power lines are balanced, so
> > there will be no radiation from them! My professor told me so,
> > my text book says so and that's the end of it!"
> >
> > Well, as any farm boy radio tinkerer can tell you,
> > them books is one thing, the real world is another.
> >
> > BPL *is* coming, folks. Count on it.
>

5628. HEY THERE BOY - LEO

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 03:17:18 UTC
From: "BIG-AL-3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL@BIG-AL.KOM>
Message-ID: <vn6jb85k8kks8a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78927
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

AY YI YI AY YI YI YI I OWN LEO.

5629. LIMP ONES

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 03:18:58 UTC
From: "BIG-AL-3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL@BIG-AL.KOM>
Message-ID: <vn6jdmg6b00de0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78929
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

ALL YOU LIMP ONES STAY AWAY. ONLY THOSE WITH BIG ONES ALLOWED. LIKE FRANK
AND JIMO. IF YOU THINK YOU HAVE A BIG ONE STOP BY. ILL SHOW YOU MY BIG ONE.
HO-HO

5630. GIVE YOU PERMISSION 3894.5-LSB

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 03:20:12 UTC
From: "BIG-AL-3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL@BIG-AL.KOM>
Message-ID: <vn6jg14ja15c2f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78930
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

YOU KNOW THE FREQUENCY 3894.5-LSB. THAT'S ON 75 METERS FOR YOU LIMP ONES.
I'LL BE ON AROUND 7 OR SO. TRANSMIT ONLY AFTER I GIVE YOU PERMISSION.
OTHERWISE I WILL SHOW YOU THE DOOR.

"BIG-AL"

5631. STOP PLAYING WITH YOURSELF BOY

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 03:21:57 UTC
From: "BIG-AL-3894.5-LSB-75-METERS" <BIG-AL@BIG-AL.KOM>
Message-ID: <vn6jja2qta67aa@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 78931
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

THIS IS K 4 O K A THE CARING STATION. HO*HO

5632. Re: Bandwidth (Was some kind of code/ nocode BS)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 03:25:36 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <QkOcb.6552$SO7.3847@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79046

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030925212930.14837.00003230@mb-m03.aol.com...
> In article <IeAcb.8380$297.8210@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
> <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:

> >>
> >> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >>
> >
> >It seems to me that either this distiction has whizzed over poor Carl's
> >head, or he is a closet representative of the electrical power industry
who
> >would like to see the already overcrowded HF bands totally trashed out,
so
> >that hams will not really mind when BPL comes in and finishes it off.
>
> I think Carl quite understands the situation with BPL. In fact, he
> *independently* observed BPL interference at the Emmaus test site and
commented
> at length against BPL to FCC. Excellent comments, btw, plus backed up with
'I
> was there, I experienced the interference, BPL is a bad idea, period'. Or
words
> to that effect.
>

Yes, I had noticed that. Good to see Carl doing something good.

> >
> >I don't really care much one way or another about morse code testing, but
> >yes I do have a definate opinion about the idea of opening up generalized
HF
> >access to entry-level hams. It's a dumb idea that gets even dumber as our
> >population grows.
>
> Then what would you set up as the entry requirements? Heck, even if the
code
> test stays, it's only a 5 wpm receive-only once-and-done test.

I'll assume here that you mean entry to HF privilege, not an entry-class
liscense that gets you into the hobby. - Let me know if I misunderstood you,
there.

I really don't have an opinion about retaining the morse code exams. If I
were judging the matter on the basis of the debates I've heard, I'd say the
pro-code guys have won every arguement, hands-down. - But I seriously doubt

that it will be judged on that basis, so that's kind of a moot point, isn't it? Debating points are unlikely to carry the day.

Which ever way it goes, I'll be happy to see the controversy die down. I've been reading the same four or five arguements on both sides of this issue for a long time, years of it... Mainly, I'll just be glad to see it all wrapped up, whichever way it goes.

The ARRL is getting a good start on what I would set up for entry to HF privilege with it's new certification / continuing education setup. Rather than cramming for a test from an answer sheet, I'd require the ham to pass a few of those courses. And yes, I'd make them pay a fee to take the course, just as it is now.

I'd leave the entry into the hobby about like it is. No-code tech, but I'd call it something different. That would be the only "freebee" liscense that would not require taking and passing a course of study to become certified.

I'm weird though.... I'd require ceretification for just about everything beyond basic VHF/UHF privileges. ... If you wanted to set up a packet node or a repeater for example, you'd have to get yourself certified for that. I would even have poor hams taking a course if they wanted to run over 100 watts power but then again, that's just me, and I don't seriously expect the ham community to go for my stodgy old attitude about this kind of stuff.

> >Over a period of time, we can expect the number of hams wanting access to HF
> >to grow, but the laws of physics will stay the same.
>
> "wanting access" and actually getting on the air are two different things.

The HF rigs will not be expensive much longer. Most of the expense today is not in the RF deck, it's in the rig's firmware. They won't be able to justify charging an extra thousand or two for firmware loaded up with creeping feature-isms for much longer, IMHO. It's just software.

I'll go even farther out on a limb and predict that one day we'll be home-brewing our HF rigs again, and not missing a single "bell 'n whistle" because it will be software controlled anyway. We'll just install this or that software on our computers, depending on how we want the radio to behave and what we want to do with it.

So I don't see any future in depending on high prices for equipment to act as a filter to control the number of operators on HF, or to affect the way the operators behave. I'd rather depend upon the filtering effect to be had from the education/certification process, because that is something we can directly control, and tailor to our changing needs.

I understand of course that none of this is likely to come about, but it's fun to talk about it anyway.

>
> >Only so many people can

> >reasonably expect to get on the HF bands at one time. We can extend that
a
> >little bit through the use of bandwidth-efficient modes like PSK-31, but
the
> >fact is that wide-band modes like PACTOR III and Q15x25 are getting more
and
> >more attention these days because they can do things that PSK31 cannot
do,
> >such as providing reasonable throughput and effective error-correction.
> >People who say that overcrowding on HF is a thing of the past due to
PSK31
> >obviously have not spent much time listening on HF, and are blowing smoke
> >out of their shorts.
>
> Are all of the amateur HF bands crowded bandedge to bandedge 24/7?

The usable stuff tends to be used. There are of course times when the bands are hot but hardly anybody is using them, but you don't see that nearly as often as you would have ten years ago, during the previous sunspot cycle.

Whatever the status now, introducing thousands of new operators will not improve the situation or make it less crowded.

> >
> >Example: An ARRL / ARES group is currently looking into linking all the
> >major NWS EOC's around the country via HF... Their first choice in an HF
> >mode for this purpose? PACTOR III !
>
> Why?

That's a good question... The short answer would be "ignorance". This post is already too long.

They ought to make those guys take a course or something.... RF 101 !

> >
> >They get complaints, nasty E-mails, they get reported even though they
are
> >legal, and they often even get intentional interference from outraged
hams.
> >The other night, I heard a guy on 30 meters whistling into his mike, on a
> >freq where PACTOR III was being used. The whistling disrupted the PACTOR
III
> >QSO just enough to slow it down and reduce its efficiency without quite
> >breaking the link. The guy was very patient about the whole thing. I
> >listened to him whistle for over half an hour. (I was waiting for the
> >PACTOR III QSO to end, so I could get in there on 30m with another mode.)
>
> whoa - this snazzy digital mode is vulnerable to some yahoo whistling into
a
> mike?

Yes, I could see the PACTOR III station having to constantly re-adjust its link parameters. Usually that happens in response to the existence of resends. All of that slows the link down, reduces effective throughput.

All digital modes are vulnerable to noise, most often reacting by a reduction in throughput. In severe cases, it is impossible to make or maintain a connection. In that respect, it is comparable to voice or CW. Noise degrades and slows down the ability to transfer info... A lot of noise will shut you down.

> >
> >If it hadn't been for the "whistling clown", the PACTOR III dude would have
> >gotten in and out of there a lot quicker! - But that is typical of what the
> >few wide-band mode guys put up with, every day. They are not popular, for
> >the obvious reason.
>
> So what's the cure?

A rational digital network would use the high-throughput, wideband stuff only for a limited number of long-haul links, organized in much the same way that AMSAT controls the proliferation of SATGATE BBS stations. Once I was going to sink several thousand bucks into a SATGATE station, but AMSAT told me that I was too close to an existing SATGATE - a station located over 450 miles away in west Texas. I could build the station if I wanted to of course - but I couldn't be a part of the network.

With the wide-band stuff, the idea is to limit its use to where it would do the most good... Overseas routes, and coast-to-coast routing. Long-haul stuff. The slower, narrower, cheaper stuff goes for the more numerous statewide and regional links, with VHF/UHF taking up the slack for smaller states and for metro areas in the large ones.

That would be rational - but our present system is anarchic, not rational. We could inject a bit of rationality into the process by requiring education and certification in order to operate as a part of the network. They have been doing this in Europe for quite some time and as a result, their digital network is at least ten or fifteen years in advance of ours. I don't think we'll do that though, so we'll just have to keep muddling along as best as we can.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

5633. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 03:54:37 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hlsknl3.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 79048
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 01:43:25 GMT, Frank Todd K3EKO wrote:

>The FCC will approve ANYTHING that will make them $$$$.

It's a fact that the money, just like the spectrum auction fees,
will not stay with the FCC, but go directly into the bottomless
black bag called the General Treasury Fund, as The Congress mandates.

Who do you think is pulling the FCC's and The Congress' strings ??

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5634. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 03:54:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hlskuk4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 79047
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On 25 Sep 2003 11:11:13 -0400, Scott Dorsey wrote:

>And it has nothing to do with the Republicans or the Democrats... it
>has to do with the FCC. We can blame Reagan and Clinton both for some
>of it, but it is pretty clear that the FCC no longer cares much about
>the public interest or about maintaining the airwaves as a sacred
>trust.

Amen brother.... but do not forget that the Five Gnomes are all
political appointees who reflect the philosophy of the political
administration appointing them.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5635. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 03:54:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hlspc67.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 79049

On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 20:15:45 GMT, Dan/W4NTI wrote:

>Wouldn't it be great if the next political appointee actually had some idea
>of RF communications technology ?

About 20 years ago, Dane Ericksen, N6AJY, who became a senior
engineer with one of the big broadcast engineering consultant firms
after working for me at the FCC for 10 years, and who is a long-term
officer with the Society of Broadcast Engineers, submitted a Petition
for Rulemaking requiring that one of the then-seven Commissioners
have a degree in engineering, parallel to the Rule requirement that
an attorney practicing before the Commission must be admitted to
legal practice in one of the States or the District of Columbia.

His petition was flatly turned down without even getting an RM
number.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon

5636. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 03:54:38 UTC
From: Phil Kane <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop>
Message-ID: <xnfcneeyarg.hlsni26.pminews@netnews.comcast.net>
Source record: 79050

On 23 Sep 2003 03:06:42 -0700, Brian Kelly wrote:

>> > Wouldn't it be great if the next political appointee actually had
>> > some idea of RF communications technology ?

>> He doesn't need to...That is why he has a STAFF!!!
>
>Yeah he has "staff" but they're as clueless as he is. His staffer
>D'Wanna or whatever her name is, the political tootsie who runs the
>FCC outfit which sits on ham radio got up at a seminar and expressed
>amazement at how people on the ground can talk to people in airplanes
>in the sky with radios.

D'wanna Terry is a Division Chief, two levels below the Commissioners. The Bureau Chief - her boss - is also clueless. His job is to honcho spectrum auctions. At one time one became a Division or Bureau Chief by working in the next lower job and getting things right, but that was a long time ago. The present crop are all "revolving door" appointments who, in general, do not have any prior Commission experience other than ability to do what the Eighth Floor wants them to do.

At one time, each Commissioner did have an engineering advisor who was a senior engineer and knew what the technical problems and issues were and so advised his boss. The last Commissioner who had one was Jim Quello, one of the "good guy" Commissioners some 15 or so years ago, a retired broadcast executive who was the author of the phrase "If you think that you can buy my vote with a ham sandwich, you got the wrong guy".

My kind of guy.

--
73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane

5637. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 04:00:27 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <vROcb.159113$3o3.11380023@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 79101
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Walter Treftz" <penguino@atlantic.net> wrote in message
news:3F73A355.BB10806B@atlantic.net...
> Here's what we do --- we built a (legal) KW rig into a van, install a
> vertical-
> radiating antenna, cut out the roof and replace it with a fiberglass
> sheet. Drive directly underneath a power line with BPL running. Run lots
> of QSO's, and
> have at it. We're legal. Induced RF just might make them think twice
> about it.
> Yes, I know Ashcrofts boys are reading this --- Hi, muthers -- I live at
>
> the callbook address. Bring some beer when you come visiting.
> N4GL
>

Do you mean the way CBers made channel 5 unwatchable 25 years ago?

I don't know much about BPL, but I think the TV analogy might hold. Given the bandwidth of BPL, there must be dozens, maybe hundreds of channels on the powerline. Can every one, or most of them, be wiped out? I'm thinking somebody came up with some pretty robust ways to deal with interference.

But what if it does stop BPL? BPL isn't being backed because it's a technically elegant system. It's being backed by politics. Rural areas were critically important in the last Presidential election, and any candidiate would love to say something like "MY OPPONENT IS STOPPING ONE FORM OF HIGH SPEED INTERNET DISTRIBUTION ON BEHALF OF HIS PALS IN THE TELECOMMUNCATIONS INDUSTRY, BUT I PROMISE TO BRING IT IN, RIGHT ON YOUR POWER LINE, AS SOON AS I'M ELECTED!!" Of course, that would be a political misrepresentation, but politicans get away with worse every day. Politics turns into a numbers game.

How many politicians or bureaucrats are saying anything negative about this goofy scheme? Politicians may not know physics, but they do know how to count.

Frank Dresser

5638. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 04:03:03 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bl6edl$8hejv$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79259
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

(not responding directly to this post but in general)

I was thinking recently about this whole BPL thing, and was thinking that if it is going to affect the amateur bands, that logically it would affect other services such as public safety, governmental, and possibly even military and aviation frequency allocations as well.

My thinking is, if my logic in the above paragraph is indeed true, then wouldn't educating and getting those groups to lobby against BPL be more effective rather than just us as a group collective?? Seems to me that those organizations would have more effective "pull" with the FCC than we would.

Am I wrong in this thinking or ???

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:vKJcb.11615$ai7.3054@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> Well Dick, apparantly no one else cares. I don't know of any of the
> aformentioned groups making comments. Do you? Maybe they have no concept
> of what will happen. Sorta like the FCC having no concept of what will
> happen either.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bktfft$71a$0@208.206.142.103...
> >
> > It won't be just hams and other minor users of spectrum below 80 mHz
> > who will be very seriously impacted by BPL. There are several states
> > whose statewice Public Service - State Police FM radio communications
> > systems are located on Low Band VHF, in the 40-50 mHz region. These
> > include California Highway Patrol and Missouri Highway Patrol, and at
> > least a few other state public safety and forestry organizations, as
> > well as many private users.
> > From personal knowledge of conditions drawn from many years of
> > personal involvment with these systems I am certain they cannot co-exist
> > with BPL.
> >

> > I know they would all jump at the chance to move up to a trunked UHF
> > or higher system, but with all the state governmental budget woes that
> > won't be possible anytime soon.
> > One can only wonder what FCC is thinking here.
> > BPL is basically a noise generator that is attractive because it
> > "wires the world" in the eyes of those for whom that end is
> > the most important feature of advancing technology. Unfamiliar with
> > the workings of radio or technology itself, they have eagerly latched
> > onto the totally inaccurate and selfserving assertions of BPL
proponants.
> >
> > As I said in my comments to the NPRM, there are much better ways to
> > acoomplish the same end without completely ruining the HF spectrum.
> >
> > Dick
> >
> >
> > opcom wrote:
> >
> > > This was posted to ARLI, I don't know how many subscribe, but in spite
> of the numerous comments against BPL (transmitting wideband internet data
> over power lines, which will destroy the HF radio spectrum), the FCC seems
> disposed
> > > to encourage it anyway. evil! evil! just look up BPL on the web. The
> noise from the radiated signals trashed the ham bands thoroughly.
> > >
> > > ----------
> > >
> > > From:
> > > Amateur Radio Station N0JAA <N0JAA@aol.com>
> > > 4:00 PM
> > >
> > > Subject:
> > > [ARLI] FCC Commissioner's Comments Concerning BPL
> > > To:
> > > bvarc@clarc.org, clarc@clarc.org, ARLI@topica.com
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > The following is a transcript from a recent speech given by FCC
> Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy at the United PowerLine
> > > Council's annual conference regarding BPL. It seems that she is all
for
> it. It also seems that BPL is going to become a reality, regardless
> > > of what ARRL, the military, or anyone else says. As usual, big
industry
> wins over everyone else because they have the money.
> > >
> > > This is from today's FCC Digest.

> > >
> > > Paul, N0JAA
> > >
> > > ----------
> > >
> > >
> > > Reaching Broadband Nirvana
> > > United PowerLine Council Annual Conference Remarks of Commissioner
> Kathleen Q. Abernathy
> > > September 22, 2003 (As prepared for delivery)
> > >
> > >
> > > Thank you very much for inviting me to speak with you. I am very
excited
> about broadband-over-powerline technology. I
> > > have seen it in action, and I believe it has a very bright future. It
is
> a real honor to be your keynote speaker at this
> > > important juncture for BPL.
> > >
> > > As a regulator, I am keenly interested in BPL technology for a number
of
> reasons. One of my central objectives as an FCC commissioner is to
> facilitate the deployment of broadband services to all Americans. I also
> fundamentally
> > > believe that the FCC can best promote consumer welfare by relying on
> market forces, rather than heavy-handed regulation. The development of
BPL
> networks will serve both of these key goals. It will not only bring
> broadband to
> > > previously unserved communities, but the introduction of a new
broadband
> pipeline into the home will foster the kind of competitive marketplace
that
> will eventually enable the Commission to let go of the regulatory reins. I
> > > want consumers to have a choice of multiple, facilities-based
> providers, including not only cable and DSL, but also powerline,
wireless,
> and satellite services. Such a robustly competitive and diversified
> marketplace is
> > > something I would call broadband Nirvana. We will not get there
> overnight, but the continuing development of BPL technology is a major
step
> forward.
> > >
> > > While the long-term objective is a robustly competitive marketplace
that
> is free of regulatory distortions, a more immediate question is: What
> should the FCC do to help foster such an environment? Sticking with my
> Nirvana

> > > metaphor, I guess the question would be, what is the path to
> enlightenment?
> > >
> > > I believe the answer, in short, is regulatory restraint. It is
tempting
> for regulators to take every new technology or service that comes along
and
> apply the same rules that govern incumbent services. After all, regulatory
> > > parity and a level playing field are intuitively appealing concepts.
> But I believe that it would be a huge mistake to carry forward legacy
> regulations whenever new technology platforms are established. Many of our
> regulations
> > > are premised on the absence of competition, and when that rationale
is
> eroded, we must not reflexively hold on to regulations that no longer
serve
> their intended purpose. In fact, many of our old rules not only become
> > > unnecessary as markets evolve, but they can be fatal to new services
> that need room to breathe.
> > >
> > > The Nascent Services Doctrine applying more stringent regulations to
> wireline providers at a minimum must be reconsidered. As other platforms,
> including BPL and wireless, become more widely available, that will
further
> > > undermine the justification for regulating incumbent LECs broadband
> services as if they were the only available offerings. When the Commission
> completes this rulemaking, I expect that we will eliminate many existing
> rules and
> > > substantially modify others; the central question is the degree of
> regulation that will remain during the transition to a more robustly
> competitive market.
> > >
> > > Finally, it is important to recognize that although the emergence of
new
> platforms like BPL will eliminate the need for many competition-related
> regulations, other types of regulation may well remain necessary. For
> example, the
> > > FCC must implement public policy goals unrelated to competition, or
> even at odds with competition. Universal service and access for persons
> with disabilities are examples of this kind of regulation. These public
> policy goals
> > > generally should be applied to all service providers, to the extent
> permitted by the Communications Act. The FCC also must intervene to
prevent
> competitors from imposing externalities on one another and to protect
> consumers
> > > where market failures are identified. Although, as I have noted, the
> Commission was right to refrain from imposing heavy-handed price and
> service-quality regulations on PCS services when the were introduced, it
was

> also right
> > > to adopt strict interference rules to prevent competitors from
> externalizing their costs. The same principle will apply to BPL. They
key
> point is that, while some degree of regulation is both inevitable and
> desirable, we
> > > should ensure that it is narrowly tailored to the particular
> governmental interests at stake. I appreciate the opportunity to share
> these thoughts with you, and I would be happy to answer a few questions if
> we have time.
> > >
> > >
> > > ******------****** please click on one or more
> of the links below to send a blank subscribe message.
> > > Amateur Radio Legal Issues List
> > > (A list for discussing legal and legislative issues impacting Amateur
> Radio from Congress and the FCC)
> > > What have you done for Amateur Radio today?
> > > --^^--
> >
>
>

5639. Re: George Busch WA3MOJ Goes nuts along with Doug Adair N8WWM

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 04:04:57 UTC
From: Landshark
Message-ID: <JVOcb.3416$vJ5.1614@newssvr29.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79102
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.cb,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.scanner,rec.radio.amateur.equipment

"AKC 4 LIFE" Otherwise known as WA3MOJ<richardkimble_md@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:b7645346.0309251906.1ac174bf@posting.google.com...
> Moparholic@hotmailnospam.com
> >Date: Thu, Sep 25, 2003 7:51 PM
> >Message-id: <20030925225115.330$Pr@newsreader.com>
> >
> >n8_isgod@yahoo.com (Keyclownz R Dopers) wrote:
> >>> Here is brummybusters main problem: hypocrisy. He spends all his time
> >> complaining about georgegeorgegeorge
> >>
> >Who could blame him, after-all you're responding to yourself.
>
>
> WTF are you talking about, liver lips

It's just hard to believe that George &
Doug can act like little children with
full diapers.

Re: Questions from a newbie (A fine example of hammies)
... Sorry liver Lips I never lost a isp, to bad for your lies though I also see myself
as taking partial credit for your inability to post with a valid email... ...
rec.radio.cb - Mar 10, 2003 by #8 - View Thread (14 articles)

From: Don Corleone (lacosanostra@rico.com)
Subject: Re: Freebanding!!
This is the only article in this thread
View: Original Format
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2002-11-07 05:36:51 PST

Don wrote:

Tom, twistedhed said there is no one using those frequencys any longer who
should I believe you or him?

"Twistedhed" <twistedhed@webtv.net> wrote in message
news:5021-3DCA56AB-124@storefull-2312.public.lawson.webtv.net...

: WA3MOJ, do you always feel the need to lie about people when you're
: frustrated and your ego is whipped? You go on claiming more lies...it
: solidifies everything anyone has always said about your character.
****
Where is the lie twisty, you said what you said live up to it like a man.
Lie, lol there goes that word again being tossed around by the chronic liar

twisty, here are the words right from your liver lips.

From: twistedhed@webtv.net (twistedhed@webtv.net)
Subject: Re: Problem with Export Radios
Newsgroups: rec.radio.cb
Date: 2001-02-25 06:46:03 PST

"...As QRM mentioned, many of the freqs are allocated to other
services, but what he doesn't mention, is many of these frequencies
have been deserted and/or abandoned long ago by the perspective
entities that retain rights to these freqs. There may be a few hold
outs, but not many. The only thing one is likely to hear from 26 to
the high 29's are other freebanders."Re: My Gay PastYes please TOS me so we will find out
the
real truth liver lips... Interesting,The post was directed at George, middlefinger
responds. ...
rec.radio.cb - Dec 29, 2001 by middlefiger4@home.comss - View Thread (15 articles)-- Any
day
riding, is better thanbeing a newsgroupie73 Baja Stroppe Bronco98 Buell S3 Thunderbolt99
Ford
F-150 Supercab 4X4 (antenna platform)

5640. Re: LEO BUSTED AGAIN!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 04:20:12 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <pub7nv0g7baqcht1jhli8hebulj0gc45ar@4ax.com>
Source record: 79103

No problem - I found it. As I explained in your previous post, this
was my error - I saw the text from Len that you attached at the
beginning of the message, and assumed that you were attributing that
to me.

Copy below:

Leo

On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 18:06:46 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>
>> You TOTALLY NEGLECT the obvious postings of the barbarian
>> character assassin in here still calling himself "K4YZ."
>>
>> You are NOT a fair judge at all, just trying to incite a Flame War by
>> misdirecting to certain others.
>>
>> By pretense at "fairness," your singling out certain targets is an open
>> example of HYPOCRISY.
>>
>>
>
>here is a quote from Leo just a few threads up.. it's a cut and paste...
>..referring to *certain people* in here...
>
>"For the most part, it's an intelligent and good natured
>animal - but you do have to watch out for the pricks.... ;)"
>
>oh, yes... hypocrisy? by definition!
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT

Note the capitalization of the words in Len's post - that's what I
replied to you on. Your quote from me was actually below that - and I
missed it. Sorry. If you read my reply carefully, you will see that
I do not capitalize any of my comments. Should be a good clue to the
error that occurred (read carefully, please!). But, my friend, you
have tried to jump on folks for making mistakes before, and here we go
again!

To clarify, here's a wrap up of this thread so far: (and referring to
the quoted message above:)

- Len wrote the capitalized buffoonery. As usual. Simila merdae, differo diem.....

- I wrote the 'porcupine' comment. It was intended as tongue-in-cheek humour. It is also quite true (ask the group!)

- I misread your posting, and erroneously thought that you were attributing Len's comments to me. I apologized.

- 'Hypocrisy' means "insincerity by virtue of pretending to have qualities or beliefs that you do not really have." I state my beliefs clearly and honestly in every post. They are mine.

- 'Hypocrisy' does not mean pointing out that some members of this group were accuratery described by the metaphoric porcupine comment. That too is my belief. And others, as you have seen.

- 'Capitalized' means using all big letters in your words.

- You were writing in support of Len's buffoonery. As usual. Simila merdae, differo diem ad nauseum.....

- Porcupines are good natured animals. They have quills. The quills are sometimes called pricks.

- So are obnoxious, loud and arrogant people :) They are not porcupines, though. Just pricks. They are not considered to be good natured animals.

- You seem to see this issue as some sort of victory. It is not. The only issue currently being debated is the manner in which you and a few others deal with issues. I could not care less whether code testing stays or goes. This is beyond your comprehension. But, this group is about amateur radio policy, not just code testing issues!

- English isn't your strong suit. You should read carefully before you answer postings.

- Me too. :)

- You posted this issue three seperate times, in a childish attempt to declare a victory that cannot possibly exist, as discussed above.

- You will misunderstand most of the above.

- The majority of readers of this newsgroup will not.

- Tomorrow, you will post further buffoonery. About code testing, and nothing else.

- Big Al will reply to this message with Ho Ho. Or Ay Yi Yi. Or both.

- The people of Texas are probably very grateful that you are not a lawyer. People on Death Row are probably very upset that you are not a D.A.

All is right with the world.

Sleep well,

30, Leo

On Fri, 26 Sep 2003 02:41:40 GMT, Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote:

>Rather than starting a new thread, kindly use the original so that I
>can see what you're referring to. In one of your 4,362 posts today,
>you credited me with a quote that actually came from Len. Please
>clarify - which one?
>
>Leo
>
>On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 21:22:21 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
>dot net> wrote:
>
>>
>>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>>news:igu6nv0ldqm20biuc2prcd2p86fk1h3e0p@4ax.com...
>>> Clint,
>>>
>>> That was humour. Not logic.
>>>
>>> I'm sorry that I didn't make that clear for you before I posted. ;)
>>>
>>> Leo
>>
>>
>>HEY, wait a minute.. a few threads back up you TOLD me,
>>and I quote...
>>
>>"Actally, that's a quote from your friend, Len. Note the
>>CAPITALIZATION of all of the NOUNS to make it clearer.
>>
>>You really should investigate an English as a Second Language course,
>>my friend!
>>
>>Leo"
>>
>>Okay, so FIRST you say it's a quote of Len's (which I proved it
>>was NOT with a cut and paste and the time stamp so it can
>>be found easily).. THEN you admit it but try to dodge by
>>saying "it's humor, not logic"... but ADMITTING it all the same
>>by trying to EXLPAIN it the second time.
>>
>>BUSTED!
>>
>>so, in addition to being a hypocrit, you are an outright liar.
>>
>>It's SO easy.

>>You need to just find whatever ham set you up to come in
>>here and do this that you've failed and been exposed.
>>
>>Talk some more and incriminate yourself. :)))
>>
>>Clint
>>KB5ZHT
>>
>>
>>

5641. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 05:57:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl0kg1mkv0@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 79104

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bktcofug0@208.206.142.96...
>
>>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>> (Techs have stayed away in droves - in my view because
>>
>>>they correctly have viewd ARRL's Morse policy as designed
>>>to keep them off of HF)
>>>
>>
>>
>>When you codebashers gonna make up your minds?? the earlier story was
>>that techn just didn't care about HF.
>
>
> Dick ... produce the post where I said "techs don't care about/want to get
> on HF" ... you can't because I never said that.
>

YOU aren't NCI, though. Many times one or the other code opponent has
stated that very thing. "Techs don't upgrade because they're happy where
they are".. We've seen this repeatedly.

5642. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 06:08:13 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bl6eds$8hejv$4@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79260
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

I posted something similar to this in a different newsgroup, but I wonder if based on the logic that the interference could also affect other services such as emergency services, aircraft frequencies, and even military frequency allocations, it would seem to me to be important to persuade those groups to pressure the FCC against the whole BPL thing.....

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
"recalcitrant ham op" <3evhil4de@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:1064506387.907205@newshost03.voicenet.com...
>
> "opcom" <eccm@swbell.net> wrote in message
> news:3F72521A.70F5BD12@swbell.net...
> > This was posted to ARLI, I don't know how many
> > subscribe, but in spite of the numerous comments
> > against BPL (transmitting wideband internet data
> > over power lines, which will destroy the HF radio
> > spectrum), the FCC seems disposed to encourage
> > it anyway. evil! evil! just look up BPL on the web. T
> > the noise from the radiated signals trashed the ham bands thoroughly.
>
> I guess you never heard that money talks and bullshit walks eh?
>
> Did you *REALLY THINK* that a couple hundred
> aging HF operating tightwad ham radio operators
> are going to stop an emerging technology that will
> conceivably network home appliances to the internet
> and be worth $BILLIONS$ in potential revenue ??
>
> Jeezehus-H-christ...get F-N real !!
>

5643. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 06:21:18 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bl6edt$8hejv$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79261

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030925082934.08626.00000889@mb-m27.aol.com...
> In article <bks56h$5715v$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
> >news:20030923013414.12631.00001336@mb-m28.aol.com...
> >> In article <ZkJbb.7038$yp6.116603@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> >> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
> >>
> >> >However, the requirements for licensure should be reasonable
> >> >and rational, and while the written tests meet that criteria, the
> >> >requirement for Morse proficiency no longer does.
> >> >
> >> >Carl - wk3c
> >>
> >> Carl:
> >>
> >> Jim, N2EY, just said, in so many words, that since today's amateur
> >> radio equipment can no longer be designed, built, or serviced by
> >> any but the tiny handful of hams who possess professional-grade
> >> technical knowledge, skill, and facilities, that most of the technical
> >> knowledge in the present written tests can also be eliminated as
> >> a licensing requirement. I totally agree. In what way is it
> >> "reasonable and rational" for someone to know Ohm's Law or
> >> even the most basic digital theory, if they'll never have to use it
> >> in their actual practice as a radio amateur? I say it isn't, and
> >> nothing could prove this better than eliminating the code testing
> >> requirements for the same reason. After all, code testing has
> >> the effect of exposing prospective radio amateurs to what is
> >> always going to be a practical and useful communications tool
> >> which allows radio amateurs to practice basic radio
> >> communication with only entry-level skill and technology.
> >
> >I would not necessarily totally agree with that statement as even though
> I
> >am not a master electronics tech, I still can debug a problem with a few
> >basic pieces of equipment and a schematic. Also, the
> >electronics/electricity knowledge is important in dealing with alot of
> >different things in amateur radio, not just "debugging" a Icom 706 (or
> other
> >radio) radio problem.
>
> Ryan,

>
> I suggest you read what I actually wrote, rather than Larry's
interpretation.
> You may have read it already.
>

I was going more on Larry's interpretation for that particular message....

> My point was not that hams *cannot* take care of their equipment, but
rather
> that there is not much of an absolute *need* for theory testing compared
to
> years ago because of the changes in typical modern amateur equipment.

Yes, the equipment has changed, but I still see the need for some knowledge
in that direction.

>
> That you can troubleshoot equipment is admirable, but I bet most of that
> knowledge and skill came from your own interest, not from having to pass
> written tests.

I would honestly say a little bit of both. I have always been a tinkerer
since almost back in the toddler days, which usually drove my parents
completely nuts!!!!! I just gotta know how something works or I am not
satisfied!! :)

> >
> >> If we eliminate the code testing requirement, we therefore
> >> demonstrate that basic communications skills are no longer
> >> necessary to be a licensed amateur radio operator. I, for one,
> >> would like to think that the present syllabus of the written tests
> >> still represents "basic communications skills." So, which will
> >> it be? Code testing, written testing, both, or neither?
> >
> >I personally believe that the written tests need to be more stringent, as
> >most of the tests I have had to take were definitely more than 35-50
> >questions, more like 100-250 range.
>
> I agree - but the FCC thinks the opposite. Try to convince them that
they're
> wrong.

Actually, the VE groups need to push the issue since they are (for the most
part) the persons responsible for administering the tests etc. That needs
to be a collective effort between the arrl, w5yi and any other VE groups out
there, if they could get together and WORK TOGETHER in that respect at
least.

>
> > As far as the question pool, I have no
> >problem with the questions themselves being released, but the answers
> >shouldn't. At least if the question pool (questions only) was that way,

it
> >would encourage people to research the correct answer. That is what I
did
> >as a final study tool, after reading and re-reading many times.......
They
> >could also incorporate "scenario" questions as well.
>
> Wouldn't work. Somebody would do the Dick Bash thing and get the answers.
>

Expand the size of the question pool maybe?? Or is there a better
solution???

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...

5644. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 06:26:51 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bl6edv$8hejv$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79262
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
news:B6vcb.569970$YN5.408276@sccrnsc01...
> --exray-- wrote:
> > asdf wrote:
> >
> >> David Stinson wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>> The FCC may be listening to "college boy" engineers.
> >>> I saw this happen too many times at government sites.
> >>> ...
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >> No, they're listening to the big money (campaign donor) power
> >> companies. Just like everything else in the Bush
> >> administration...money is the only thing that carries any weight...
> >
> >
> > Oh my, a political troll on Usenet. Betcha said the same thing during
> > the Clinton administration, huh Troll?.
> > If you reach 18 by the next election, please vote.
> >
> > -ex
> >
> >
> Just to let all of you know that I will be voting for Bush in '04 HO HO...
>
> --
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>

If you are a Republican and can't laugh at these you need to lighten up.
:)

Bumper Stickers for the '04 Bush Campaign:

BU__SH__!
Bush/Cheney '04: Apocalypse Now!
Bush/Cheney '04: Assimilate. Resistance is Futile.
Bush/Cheney '04: Because the truth just isn't good enough.
Bush/Cheney '04: Compassionate Colonialism

Bush/Cheney '04: Deja-voodoo all over again!
Bush/Cheney '04: Don't Change Whores in Midstream
Bush/Cheney '04: Four More Wars!
Bush/Cheney '04: Get used to it!
Bush/Cheney '04: In your heart, you know they're technically correct.
Bush/Cheney '04: Leave no billionaire behind
Bush/Cheney '04: Less CIA -- More CYA
Bush/Cheney '04: Lies and videotape but no sex!
Bush/Cheney '04: Making the world a better place, one country at a time.
Bush/Cheney '04: Or else.
Bush/Cheney '04: Over a billion Whoppers served.
Bush/Cheney '04: Putting the "con" in conservatism
Bush/Cheney '04: Thanks for not paying attention.
Bush/Cheney '04: The economy's stupid!
Bush/Cheney '04: The last vote you'll ever have to cast.
Bush/Cheney '04: This time, elect us!
Bush/Cheney '04: We're Gooder!
Bush/Cheney: Asses of Evil
Don't think. Vote Bush!
George W. Bush: A brainwave away from the presidency
George W. Bush: It takes a village idiot
George W. Bush: Leadership without a doubt
George W. Bush: The buck stops Over There
God Save the King!
Let them eat yellowcake! Vote Bush!
Peace & Prosperity Suck -- Big-Time
Vote Bush in '04: "Because every vote counts -- for me!"
Vote Bush in '04: "Because I'm the President, that's why!"
Vote Bush in '04: "I Has Incumbentory Advantitude"
Vote Bush in '04: Because dictatorship is easier
Vote Bush in '04: It's a no-brainer!
Vote for Bush & You Get Dick!
Who would Jesus Bomb?

5645. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 06:32:44 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <bl6ee1$8hejv$7@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79263

Interesting Mike, you have one on your QSL card, and I have one, or should I
say parts thereof, on my truck!!!! Roadkilled one the other day!

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>
> Interesting, I have a "Porky-Pine" on my QSL card. I don't know what
> the significance of that is, but I like the critters.
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

5646. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 10:22:24 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn84rokonu6adc@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79108

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:3d87nv4nb2aqgo82n4op1qlhtdurqbiqnk@4ax.com...
> I never named anyone as the porcupine's - uh - quills. I assumed that
> you know who you are, and, well.....apparently, I was correct.

and, like your buddy arnie who set you up as a plant in this newsgroup
in the FIRST place, I now thank YOU for admitting your hypocrisy
the way HE did when he admitted to calling people jerks shortly
after accusing the same people of "name calling".

You guys make it so easy.
No WONDER your losing the morse code test debate; the
FCC is a real government entitiy in the real world and you
won't get anywhere with them by name calling and insulting
them.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5647. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 10:25:35 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn851njguv6q54@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79111

> No, actually he is successfully debating your posting style (or lack
> thereof) As to the other comment, I read it as a reference to having a
pet
> porcupine. Are you a porcupine, Clint?
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>

bzzzzzt, nice try.

There is no debate on my posting style. Debates include at least two opposing sides to an issue who are argueing thier points to try to get an unbiased third party observing to accept thier reasoning. The debating here that sparked him being planted as an unbiased third party that nobody is accepting is over cw testing.

And don't think anybody buys the porcupine anology; he already admitted to having done it as an insult, but tried the explain it away as humor. You're too late to save him on that one. You guys may have prearranged this ordeal of his but you haven't done a good-follow through on coaching one another on what you're going to say before you post.

Clint

5648. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 10:32:59 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn85fk4tjekt5e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79112

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:u697nv4v457up1rmq2kuju879r9ta4oclh@4ax.com...
> Sorry, my error - I read the test from Len at the top of your post,
> and assumed you were referring to that - my bad....

Oh no you didn't. Don't try to claim that you had no idea to what
I referred because I cut and pasted the VERY remark I was referring
to; there was NO doubt to what I was referring to.

You've been caught in a lie and are trying to wiggly your way out
of it. That's why they say "what a tangle web we weave when first
we practice to deceive". You're already snared in your own deception
and falsehoods and are getting tangled with every remark you and
your co-partner in this failed venture make.

Clint
>
> Let me know when you set up the ESL course - maybe I'll go with you
> ;)
>
> But, in answer to your post - that is not hypocrisy at all - its a
> fact. This group contains several trolls who try and dominate every
> thread, and twist it around to a code argument. You are one of those
> trolls.

You're the one that has jumped in here and started making accusations
that I have proved you've made. Too late on that one. And the only
people that would agree with you are people who are on you and
arnie's side of the fence, and as they are people with a biased
belief beforehand, they are not credible witnesses as such (not
hypothetical objective observers), therefore to say "ask them if
you are a troll" is like asking the democratic party if you want
to know if the republicans are bad politicians... it's called a
self-fulfilling arguement as well as circular thinking and not only
biased but not logical.

Well, i've pretty well destroyed your attempt and it's been fun
but continuously doing so really holds no more merit than
stealing candy from a baby.

If you want to continue to say things that conflict with
previous things you've said and make yourself out to
be more and more of a hypocrit, not to MENTION
proving that you are nothing more than a plant and
most likely one of Arnie's, then please feel free to do
so. Empty, meaningless one-way conversations may

not be the original purpose of newsgroups but there is certianly plenty of precident for it.

If you ever do decide to get your ham radio license, we look forward to seeing you on the air. While this newsgroup sounds pretty "spiney" and has it's share of sharp seeds, the airwaves are fun.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5649. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 11:20:04 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bl17gu$tj4@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 79113

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bl0kg1mkv0@208.206.142.82...
>
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bktcofug0@208.206.142.96...
> >
> >>
> >>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >>
> >> (Techs have stayed away in droves - in my view because
> >>
> >>>they correctly have viewd ARRL's Morse policy as designed
> >>>to keep them off of HF)
> >>>
> >>
> >>
> >>When you codebashers gonna make up your minds?? the earlier story was
> >>that techn just didn't care about HF.
> >
> >
> > Dick ... produce the post where I said "techs don't care about/want to
get
> > on HF" ... you can't because I never said that.
> >
>
> YOU aren't NCI, though. Many times one or the other code opponent has
> stated that very thing. "Techs don't upgrade because they're happy where
> they are".. We've seen this repeatedly.
>

And, is not upgrading because someone is happy where they are, a problem?
When are you making your first million/yr., DICK, or are you happy where you
are?

Kim W5TIT

5650. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 11:21:56 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bl17ke$tl3@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 79114

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bl05mr$5tr$0@208.207.71.141...
>
>
> Leo wrote:
>
> > And a new attack method is born, to supplement Ad Hominem:
> >
> > Ad Erratum
> >
> > - Defined as attacking the typographical errors in a post, rather than
> > the message content of the post itself. This enables the functionally
> > illiterate to divert arguments based solely upon typing minutae....
> >
> > A Usenet first. Well done, OM!
> >
>
>
> Oh......you're still paying any attention to Putzie Poo??? Most of us
> stopped even opening his postslong ago. We just toggle right on past
> them. There never was anything worthwhile therein. No reason to suspect
> anything has changed, or evver will. He's just another usenet troll.
>
> Dick
>
>

Until Dick accidentally responds directly to a post.... ;)

Kim W5TIT

5651. Re: LEO BUSTED AGAIN!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 11:48:55 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309260348.7c46db4a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79115

Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<pub7nv0g7baqcht1jhli8hebulj0gc45ar@4ax.com>...
> No problem - I found it. As I explained in your previous post, this
> was my error - I saw the text from Len that you attached at the
> beginning of the message, and assumed that you were attributing that
> to me.
>
> Copy below:
>
> Leo
>
> On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 18:06:46 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
> dot net> wrote:
>
> >
> >> You TOTALLY NEGLECT the obvious postings of the barbarian
> >> character assassin in here still calling himself "K4YZ."
> >>
> >> You are NOT a fair judge at all, just trying to incite a Flame War by
> >> misdirecting to certain others.
> >>
> >> By pretense at "fairness," your singling out certain targets is an open
> >> example of HYPOCRISY.
> >>
> >>
> >
> >here is a quote from Leo just a few threads up.. it's a cut and paste...
> >..referring to *certain people* in here...
> >
> >"For the most part, it's an intelligent and good natured
> >animal - but you do have to watch out for the pricks.... ;)"
> >
> >oh, yes... hypocrisy? by definition!
> >
> >Clint
> >KB5ZHT
>
> Note the capitalization of the words in Len's post - that's what I
> replied to you on. Your quote from me was actually below that - and I
> missed it. Sorry. If you read my reply carefully, you will see that
> I do not capitalize any of my comments. Should be a good clue to the
> error that occurred (read carefully, please!). But, my friend, you
> have tried to jump on folks for making mistakes before, and here we go
> again!

>
> To clarify, here's a wrap up of this thread so far: (and referring to
> the quoted message above:)
>
> - Len wrote the capitalized buffoonery. As usual. Simila merdae,
> differo diem.....
>
> - I wrote the 'porcupine' comment. It was intended as tongue-in-cheek
> humour. It is also quite true (ask the group!)
>
> - I misread your posting, and erroneously thought that you were
> attributing Len's comments to me. I apologized.
>
> - 'Hypocrisy' means "insincerity by virtue of pretending to have
> qualities or beliefs that you do not really have." I state my beliefs
> clearly and honestly in every post. They are mine.
>
> - 'Hypocrisy' does not mean pointing out that some members of this
> group were accuratery described by the metaphoric porcupine comment.
> That too is my belief. And others, as you have seen.
>
> - 'Capitalized' means using all big letters in your words.
>
> - You were writing in support of Len's buffoonery. As usual. Simila
> merdae, differo diem ad nauseum.....
>
> - Porcupines are good natured animals. They have quills. The quills
> are sometimes called pricks.
>
> - So are obnoxious, loud and arrogant people :) They are not
> porcupines, though. Just pricks. They are not considered to be good
> natured animals.
>
> - You seem to see this issue as some sort of victory. It is not. The
> only issue currently being debated is the manner in which you and a
> few others deal with issues. I could not care less whether code
> testing stays or goes. This is beyond your comprehension. But, this
> group is about amateur radio policy, not just code testing issues!
>
> - English isn't your strong suit. You should read carefully before you
> answer postings.
>
> - Me too. :)
>
> - You posted this issue three seperate times, in a childish attempt to
> declare a victory that cannot possibly exist, as discussed above.
>
> - You will misunderstand most of the above.
>
> - The majority of readers of this newsgroup will not.

>
> - Tomorrow, you will post further buffoonery. About code testing, and
> nothing else.
>
> - Big Al will reply to this message with Ho Ho. Or Ay Yi Yi. Or
> both.
>
> - The people of Texas are probably very grateful that you are not a
> lawyer. People on Death Row are probably very upset that you are not a
> D.A.
>
> All is right with the world.
>
> Sleep well,
>
> 30, Leo

You're doing just fine Leo, it's nice to see some serious new mental
horsepower shining the light on these mindless anti-achievers.

w3rv

> On Fri, 26 Sep 2003 02:41:40 GMT, Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote:
>
> >Rather than starting a new thread, kindly use the original so that I
> >can see what you're referring to. In one of your 4,362 posts today,
> >you credited me with a quote that actually came from Len. Please
> >clarify - which one?
> >
> >Leo
> >
> >On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 21:22:21 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
> >dot net> wrote:
> >
> >>
> >>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
> >>news:igu6nv0ldqm20biuc2prcd2p86fk1h3e0p@4ax.com...
> >>> Clint,
> >>>
> >>> That was humour. Not logic.
> >>>
> >>> I'm sorry that I didn't make that clear for you before I posted. ;)
> >>>
> >>> Leo
> >>
> >>
> >>HEY, wait a minute.. a few threads back up you TOLD me,
> >>and I quote...
> >>
> >>"Actally, that's a quote from your friend, Len. Note the
> >>CAPITALIZATION of all of the NOUNS to make it clearer.

> >>
> >>You really should investigate an English as a Second Language course,
> >>my friend!
> >>
> >>Leo"
> >>
> >>Okay, so FIRST you say it's a quote of Len's (which I proved it
> >>was NOT with a cut and paste and the time stamp so it can
> >>be found easily).. THEN you admit it but try to dodge by
> >>saying "it's humor, not logic"... but ADMITTING it all the same
> >>by trying to EXLPAIN it the second time.
> >>
> >>BUSTED!
> >>
> >>so, in addition to being a hypocrit, you are an outright liar.
> >>
> >>It's SO easy.
> >>You need to just find whatever ham set you up to come in
> >>here and do this that you've failed and been exposed.
> >>
> >>Talk some more and incriminate yourself. :)))
> >>
> >>Clint
> >>KB5ZHT
> >>
> >>
> >>

5652. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 12:02:02 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309260402.7498733a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79116

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@att.net> wrote in message
news:<z2Ocb.153421$0v4.11434217@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> Hi Gang,
> Curious about this BPL. Is there a technical treatise somewhere on the
> web that describes exactly how this BPL will be implemented? I am having a
> hard time determining how it works. I live a few miles from what once was
> TVA's largest substation in their electrical grid/system, maybe one of the
> largest in the world, fed by 0.5 MV lines. Sooooo lets start with block
> diagrams. How does it work?

I suggest you start with the ARRL website which is full of info on BPL.

w3rv

5653. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 12:29:57 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030926082957.15923.00000914@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 79117

In article <20030924174233.07578.00000794@mb-m25.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <bko0a6$3vmhp$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy" ><kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:
>
>>Where did you get your information, Dwight? According to the ARRL (the >>primary ARS organization in the US) -- CW is the second most popular mode in >>the ARS -- Just behind SSB. That on its face would mean that there are >>still a whole bunch of folks out there still using it.
>
> ON-OFF KEYING CW was ONCE the most popular mode for the ARS.
>
> ONCE. Rather long ago...

When?
>
> No more.

Probably not.

>It's use is going down...
>
How do you know, Len?

There are more hams today than ever before. Telegraph keys, CW-only transceivers and related equipment are still popular items. Contest scores and participation are up.

Perhaps the percentage of use is decreasing, but the total use may be increasing.

> Learn to live with it graciously.

Set us an example

5654. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 12:29:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030926082958.15923.00000915@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 79118

In article <vn5i7hidqhn0f6@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>I live in texas where there is plenty of room to do anything
>you want... and yes, my yard has plenty of room to stretch
>a 160m dipole if I wanted to... but if somebody wanted
>to get on 160m and hasn't the realestate, they could always
>hang a loop sky wire that only require 1/4 wave on any
>given side instead of 1/2 of horizontal space; i.e., half
>the area needed.

Let's see - a 160 meter square loop is about 140 feet on a side. Many hams don't have enough room for a full size 80 meter dipole......

The loop will also be a cloud-warmer unless it is very high up. Much better off with an inverted L.

5655. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 12:29:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030926082958.15923.00000916@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 79122

In article <bkvs4h$67a39$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
<kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:

>"Leo" wrote in part ...
>
> BTW, are you Len's new guardian angel? Did Clint get laid off? ;)
>_____
>
>I was actually beginning to think that Len and Clint might be one in the
>same. But a cursory view of the disparity in writing style, grammar, and
>spelling dispels that myth fairly quickly.

Do you think that a person can have only one writing style?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5656. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 12:29:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030926082959.15923.00000917@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 79120

In article <hio6nvc53pdg9fpkq87hj5efarc8qr97s2@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>What I don't understand is why the intelligent members of this group
>put up with all of the QRM intentionally generated by just a few
>troublemakers.

Good question.
>
>For example, Len is not an Amateur, (well, not a Radio amateur.... :)
>), and states freely that he does not have any desire to become one -

Just for reference, Leo...

Back on January 19, 2000, Len did say he was 'going for Extra right out of the
box' or words to that effect. Back then he was posting here as 'Lenof21'
(aol.com) . That was over 3-1/2 years ago.

Of course he did not say *when* he was going to do it....

73 de Jim, N2EY

5657. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 12:29:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030926082959.15923.00000918@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 79121

In article <3F73234D.40406@psu.edu>, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> writes:

>Leo wrote:
>> Sir, after reading the endless reams of drivel that you have produced
>> in this newsgroup of late, I believe that you are correct - brevity
>> is the soul of wit.....;)
>
>
> You might also add for him that the only thing worse than being witty
>is not being witty! ;^)

"Your Majesty is like a jelly donut with creme on the top"

"WHAT?!?!"

"Your arrival brings us pleasure, and your departure leaves us hungry for
more!"

"Ah - very witty!"

- Monty Python

73 de Jim, N2EY

5658. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 12:30:00 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030926083000.15923.00000919@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 79119

In article <20030923231819.07578.00000760@mb-m25.aol.com>, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) writes:

>In article <20030923063009.21642.00001128@mb-m01.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>>If we eliminate the code testing requirement, we therefore
>>>demonstrate that basic communications skills are no longer
>>>necessary to be a licensed amateur radio operator. I, for one,
>>>would like to think that the present syllabus of the written tests
>>>still represents "basic communications skills." So, which will
>>>it be? Code testing, written testing, both, or neither?
>>>
>>I think Clint has already said he only sees a need for regs and safety
>>testing.
>>
>>
>>There's "the future".
>
>Jim:
>
>Like it or not, we're definitely heading in that direction.

Been that way for decades.

>I'd like to
>think
>it's possible to hold the line somewhere, but in light of the fact that
>abolition of the code testing requirement is almost a sure thing, the
>rest of the dominoes will surely fall shortly thereafter. Once they do,
>we'll most likely experience a major loss of spectrum allocations in
>the ARS. Ironically, that will surely happen in the regions above
>500 MHz, where there hasn't been any code testing at all for over
>a decade.

More like 12 years, anyway.

btw, didja see where a US and a Czech ham had a successful EME QSO on 24 GHz? Used relatively small dishes and less than 100 W at each end of the QSO. Pretty snazzy bit of homebrewing to put together the required stations.

And the mode used? One guess.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5659. Re: wanna talk SHUDDER?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 12:30:01 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030926083001.15923.00000920@mb-m12.aol.com>
Source record: 79123

In article <20030925165630.12631.00001458@mb-m28.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <c2356669.0309250810.388adceb@posting.google.com>, N2EY@AOL.COM
>(N2EY) writes:
>
>>brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
>>news:<f45722ac.0309250234.2decbd02@posting.google.com>...
>>> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
>>news:<20030925015541.25517.00000936@mb-m15.aol.com>...
>>> > In article <20030924203108.02537.00000756@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>> > writes:
>>> >
>>> > >> By refusing to identify yourself, EVERYONE is blind to you.
>>> > >>
>>> > >Then why are you replying? ;-)
>>> >
>>> > To whom?
>>>
>>> Notice how quickly some anonymous troll is defended IF he has the right
>>opinion?
>>>
>>Yep, you and Len sure defended "vshah101" in here...
>
> Don't misdirect.

Don't tell me what to do or what not to do, little boy. ;-)

>You are NOT the moderator of this newsgroup.

I never claimed to be. And neither are you, Leonard. Live with it.
>
> You TOTALLY NEGLECT the obvious postings of the barbarian
> character assassin in here still calling himself "K4YZ."

Incorrect. I have repeatedly pointed out Steve's behavior as counter
productive. It has become obvious, however, that you and he have some sort of
reciprocal provocation agreement. You proke him and he responds.
>
> You are NOT a fair judge at all, just trying to incite a Flame War by
> misdirecting to certain others.

What did I write that is not true?

'Vshah101' show up here and posted anonymously. Nasty stuff, but he was anti-codetest

You defended him and had no problem with anything he wrote.

It is a fact that no one who agrees with you can do any wrong, and no one who disagrees with you can do any right.

You keep proving the following profile over and over again, Len:

No matter what job, educational level, employer, or government/military service that a radio amateur has, if said radio amateur opposes Mr. Anderson's views, he/she will be the target of Mr. Anderson's insults, ridicule, name-calling, factual errors, ethnic/racial/religious slurs, excessive emoticons and/or general infantile behavior.

;-) ;-) ;-) ;-)

5660. Re: Extra Class Exam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 12:53:05 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309260453.7eaf7cf0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79124

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030924214313.17626.00000192@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> >For the extra class exam, do they allow scientific calculators?
> >If not is the a tan/arctan chart allowed for the rlc phase angle questions?
> >
> >I took and got the general last year but as I remember it I thought they
> >limited
> >the test taker to basic function calculators....
> >
>
> Why would you need a Calculator, none of the Questions are that tough

They're only tough if you try to understand the material, but if
you're just going to memorize the questions and answers, then you're
right.

You would only need a calculator if you were going to work through a
problem, but if you're just going to memorize the questions and
answers, then you're right.

5661. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 13:23:21 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309260523.2b85a025@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79125

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309250724.6fc7276@posting.google.com>...
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309221407.2163041@posting.google.com>...
> > k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309220844.31291566@posting.google.com>...
> > > >>In article <20030920184429.14837.00003106@mb-m03.aol.com>,
> lenover21@aol.com
> > > >>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
> > > > > Sonny, I've probably done MORE in radio already than you've done in
> > > > > your entire "career" as a hambone...er Ham.
> > >
> > > WHOA, PUTZBREATH!
> >
> > That from a guy who wears a white dress and a carries a rectal
> > thermometer.
>
> I do? Hmmmmm....seems to me I have neither at hand, Brain. You
> would please provide some evidence of same?

Are you not a Nurse? Have you never taken a rectal thermometer from
one place to another?

> Failure to do so shall be an admission of lying on your part.

Failure to make this admission shall be an lying on your part.

> > > Where are YOUR accomplishments in AMATEUR RADIO...?!?!
> >
> > How many articles did you have published in HAM RADIO magazine?
>
> None. It's Defunct...No longer published.

Were you an amateur radio operator during any time that Ham Radio
magazine was being actively published?

If so, then you have no excuse for not being published in Ham Radio
magazine.

> Furthermore, PLEASE cite for me ANY reference otehr than that
> FAILED magazine where Lennie has ACCOMPLISHED anything.

One accomplishment is enough. It is 100% higher than your
accomplishments.

> Further yet, please show me where Lennie's work was original.

It was originally published.

> Can you show me ONE refernece in Amateur Radio where his ALLEGED
> work was cited as reference in some project?

Again, cite me your published work, original or otherwise.

> > > > You have PLAYED for years at ham radio, using ready-made
> > > > equipment, not really understanding what goes on behind your
> > > > ready-made front panels. Where are YOUR accomplishments in
> > > > amateur radio, your name posted as anywhere involving advancing
> > > > anything of the amateur state of the art? On FIDONET? Words,
> > > > self-glorifying yourself. On this newsgroup? More words, more
> > > > self-glorifying of yourself...plus an extreme amount of patronizing
> > > > "I am your moral superior" preacher without a church.
> > >
> > > GEEEEEEEZUS, Lennie!
> > >
> > > Pretty deep in the POT/KETTLE/BLACK mode today, aren't ya?
> > >
> > > I've done some searches on "Leonard Anderson" and "Amateur Radio"
> > > and with the exception of YOUR self-glorifying, self gratifying
> > > pronouncements of moral superiority of all OF Amateur Radio, the
> > > search comes up a BIG FAT ZERO.
> >
> > Do the same search on "Steve Robeson" and "Amateur Radio" and you'll
> > see the same thing.
>
> Quite true. But I am not the one making grand assertions of how
> wondrous my alleged contributions to "radio" are, Brain.

Because you have none. Yet you criticize those who have.

> > > Yes...we all know about the few articles you wrote in "Ham
> > > Radio"...It still amounts to only a fraction of zero.
> >
> > In your case we cannot divide by zero.
>
> As I said...It's not about what >>I<< am claiming, Brain...it's
> what LENNIE is claiming.

It is about YOU claiming that Len is a "LIAR."

Show where he lied.

> > > (BTW...Several of us were gathered at the "CQ" magazine booth at
> > > the Huntsville, AL Hamfest last month, and your name was the subject
> > > of great laughter and joking...So there lies YOUR contribution to
> > > Amateur radio!)
> >
> > That's pathetic. I hope John Dorr wasn't part of the gaggle. Wonder
> > who they laugh at when you're not around?
>
> It's not me, I can assure you.

Giggle.

> > > > Any you've done what? Playing with your radios, doing your beeping thing
> > > > the same as what was done by amateurs a half century ago or a full
> > > > century ago? What kind of "new technology" is on-off keying code use?
> > > > Who are you trying to fool other than children, fool?
> > >
> > > This forum is about AMATEUR RADIO.
> >
> > The physics of radio communication were not changed by the
> > Communications Act of 1934.
>
> Ahhhh...Brain has adapted Lennie's pathetic attempts to dilute
> this to radio physic versus the REGULATION of radio.

Non-amateurs regulate amateur radio. Why would you want to exclude
Len from discussion of same?

> This forum, Putz Jr, is about Amateur Radio POLICY. Policy
> refers to regulation and practice, NOT the physics of radio.

Then puhleeze stick to the topic of regulation and off of Len's
personality.

> > > It is NOT about Army relay stations in the 1950's, PLMRS, the
> > > IEEE or your SWLing of the aeronautical bands and an expired
> > > student-pilot permit over four decades old...
> > >
> > > Morse Code communications is a part of Amateur Radio. That is a
> > > fact.
> >
> > Is it a part of any other communications? 500KHz?
>
> AMATEUR RADIO, Brain...Not maritime...Not Army...Not Commercial.

I see, you can bring in your supposed military and CAP anecdotes when
they suit you, but not Len. That is a double-standard.

> Specific question that can be answered YES or NO...Do you know
> the difference between AMATUER RADIO and any other radio service?

Marine radio is not Amateur Radio.

Civil Air Patrol radio is not Amateur Radio.

Both have been talked about here on this Amateur Radio Policy group,
BY YOU!

> > > And despite the amount of effort you put in to trying to make
> > > Larry look like that's ALL he does, you fail miserably.
> >
> > He's still working on WAS/CW.
> >
> > > YOU are STILL a liar.
> >

> > No. He probably has done more in radio communications than you've
> > done in your entire ham career, and you probably have always used
> > store bought equipment.
>
> And in THIS forum, Brain, he's still got a looooooong track record
> of lying, deception and antagonism. YOU are getting there.

I am not lying.

Now show me where Len lied in the instance above where you called him
a "LIAR."

> > > YOU are STILL unlicensed.
> >
> > So far I don't think he's lied about that one either.
>
> Then you've not been paying attention. No big surprise there.

Oh, OK. Must have missed it. I guess he is a "LIAR."

What did he say his ham call was?

> > > YOU are STILL an outsider looking in. Please wipe the drool off
> > > of the window when you're done. It's embarrassing.
> >
> > Quit showing your ass. It's embarassing.
>
> Oh...And what you and Lennie do in here isn't...?!?!
>
> BBBWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHHA ! ! ! ! ! ! !

The infamous Steve Roberson maniacal laugh.

> > > And..oh yeah...You're STILL a PUTZ.
> >
> > And you're still a guy in a dress who can't handle his own emotions.
>
> Failure to present evidence is acknopwledgement that you are a
> liar.

No it isn't. But you're free to judge, convict, sentence, and execute
eveyone who may disagree with you at any time right here on rrap. It
is another double-standard.

> ARE you a liar, Brain? I have $100 sitting here says that no
> picture of me in ANY item of women's clothing exists, and that this
> you are pertetrating a lie.

I've seen photo's of UFOs and Bigfoot.

> So...care to try and collect, or ADMIT you are lying?
>
> I say you ar a liar. No big surprise there.
>

> Steve, K4YZ

So stay in the closet.

5662. Re: 03894.5-LSB-75-METERS

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 13:51:28 UTC
From: Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bl1g91$76hhf$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79126
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Body handling: HTML body converted to readable text

```
Every man is a little big gay. But you sure reign!

--
73 de Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD

Cuius testiculos habes, habeas cardeo et cerebellum

"B I G A L" wrote in message
news:vn3mnk2p842u9a@corp.supernews.com...
> RENE?
>
> HOMO?
>
> FAGO?
>
> HO HO?
>
> "Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD" wrote in message
> news:bks21t$54247$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de...
> >
> > "Ken Bessler" wrote in message
> > news:pdCdnXYC3uH99u2iXTWJkg@comcast.com...
> > >
> > > "Bruce Lane" wrote in message
> > > news:MPG.19da046ab64a1ebf989a14@192.168.42.131...
> > > > In article ,
> > > > Spamfree@Spamfree.com says...
> > > > >
> > > > > > " BIG AL" wrote in message
> > > > > news:vn07dg6h8lftdc@corp.supernews.com...
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > Gang, it's just a troll, fercryinoutloud! They've been around
> > > > since the early days of Usenet, and their entire existence seems to
be
> > > > centered around making outrageous posts just to see what kind of
> replies
> > > > they get.
> > > > >
> > > > Just killfile him and be at peace. Don't even waste your energy on
> > > > a reply.
```

> > > >
> > > > 73 de KC7GR
> > > >
> > >
> > > Better yet, killfile him and create a message rule like this:
> > >
> > > Apply this rule after the message arrives
> > > Where the Subject line contains '3.894' or '3894' or 'bigal'
> > > Delete it
> > >
> >
> > No!
> >
> > Where the Subject line contains '3.894' or '3894' or 'bigal'
> > send the email back
> >
> >
> > 73 de Rene PE1RA
> >
> >
>
>

5663. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 13:52:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F7444A8.8020605@psu.edu>
Source record: 79127

Clint wrote:

> And, as far as "cogent and factual", is that before or after he made
> a reference to us being pricks?

Was that before or after you made reference to us as N***S?

- Mike KB3EIA =

5664. Re: PORKBUTT PORKBUTT PORKBUTT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 13:57:17 UTC
From: Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bl1gjv$74p75$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79128
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

What is it with you and porkbutts? Do you need a transplant? Do you like porkbutts? Do you want somebody porking your butt? What is it?

--
73 de Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD

Cuius testiculos habes, habeas cardeo et cerebellum

" BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5 @bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message news:vn080m13ld4oa1@corp.supernews.com...
> AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.
>
> AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.
>
> AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.
>
> 3894.5 IS MINE. STAY AWAY.
>
>
>

5665. Re: Extra Class Exam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 14:38:29 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030926103829.23607.00000213@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 79129

>They're only tough if you try to understand the material,

No there not, there very Basic.

>but if
>you're just going to memorize the questions and answers, then you're
>right.

I wouldnt know anything about that, I still have not even seen a question pool.

>You would only need a calculator if you were going to work through a
>problem,

You dont need a Calculator, if you know the material. I took the Dumb test without a calculator and scored 100%. I actually thought the Novice Test I took years ago was hardier than the EXTRA.

>but if you're just going to memorize the questions and
>answers, then you're right.
>

Well thats what most of your Buddies say they do.

5666. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 14:52:08 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <soYcb.14416$ai7.6183@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79130
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
news:5JLcb.339532$2x.101397@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > "Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
> > news:Ykqcb.568344$Ho3.104168@sccrnsc03...
> > >
> >>Frank Todd K3EKO wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>>"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
> >>>>news:BVpcb.425394$Oz4.219503@rwcrnsc54...
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>>"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
> >>>>>>news:X%ocb.145408$mp.72200@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>>THE CARING STATION wrote:
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
> >>>>>>>>news:hp24nvofjmp93liio9i7ljva15jee1gh4t@4ax.com...
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>Now, if Supernews would be so kind as to TOS this 'Big Al'
> >>>>>>>>>character,
> >>>>>>>>>we could get back to dealing with the usual level of nutbar that
> >>>>>>>>>lurks
> >>>>>>>>>here :)
> >>>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>>73, Leo
> >>>>>>>>>

> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>WONT HAPPEN LEO. YOU ARE THE ONE WHO USED THE 4 LETTER WORDS. YOU
> >>>>>>>>WILL
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>BE
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>TOS'ED. HO HO
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>I vote that BIG AL stays...I enjoy his commentary.
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>--
> >>>>>>>73
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>>Frank K3EKO
> >>>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>You would....even if it is a troll.
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>Dan/W4NTI
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Why haven't you responded to my earlier posts? You must know that
> >>>>>you're in the wrong.
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>
> >>>>>--
> >>>>>73
> >>>>>
> >>>>>Frank K3EKO
> >>>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>
> >>>>I did respond numbnuts. But here it is again.
> >>>>
> >>>>Your still member of the Barf and the Stumpers, right?
> >>>>
> >>>>Dan/W4NTI
> >>>>

> >>>>
> >>>
> >>>Yes, and will always be.
> >>>
> >>>-Frank
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>
> >>BUt what does that have to do with you accusing me of NOT apologizing
> >>for my actions?
> >>
> >>-Frank
> >>
> >>
> >>
> >>--
> >>73
> >>
> >>Frank K3EKO
> >>
> >
> >
> > I guess I HAVE TO SPELL IT OUT TO NUMBNUTS, eh? Ref my last post to
you.
> > Now here is another.
> >
> > I no longer believe your apology was sincere. Based on your actions and
> > your remaining membership in a Ham Radio Terrorist group (s).
> >
> > In otherwords Franky, you have no credibility.
> >
> > Now take your HO HOs and shove them up your BARFY/SJ arse.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> I am NOT going to drop out of these groups (that I have been a member of
> for years) just to be a friend to you. If that is what it takes, $%^&
OFF!
>
> --
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>
No, that is not it Frank. You just don't get it, do you? Being a member
of the BARF and SJ crowd is not the best thing for ham radio. When you
understand that, we can go from there.

Dan/W4NTI

5667. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 15:02:41 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <lyYcb.14441$ai7.2634@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79131
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:I6Lcb.153194$0v4.11414626@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:_EJcb.11590$ai7.8255@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> >
> > Sure we will. All we need to is put up KW level beacon stations.
> >
> > End of BPL.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> Why would that end BPL?
>
> Frank Dresser
>
>

The transmission lines are radiators. As such they will also receive.

Power lines are right up next to the rigs. The RF from the radios will trash the BPL. Probably by causing drop outs and adding lots of extra delays. Basically it will make BPL useless anywhere near a ham station.

Dan/W4NTI

5668. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 15:03:45 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <lzYcb.14448$ai7.11032@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79132
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bl0440$va2$2@208.207.71.141...
>
>
> Frank Dresser wrote:
>
> > "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> > news:_EJcb.11590$ai7.8255@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > >
> > >>
> > >>Sure we will. All we need to is put up KW level beacon stations.
> > >>
> > >>End of BPL.
> > >>
> > >>Dan/W4NTI
> > >>
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> > > Why would that end BPL?
> > >
> > > Frank Dresser
> > >
> > >
> >
> >
> > It would more likely end the legality of 1kw for hams.
> >
> > Dick
> >

It probably wont take a KW to trash BPL. Just needed to communicate on HF.

Dan/W4NTI

5669. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 15:08:50 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <6EYcb.14457$ai7.14044@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79133
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
news:M7Mcb.579252$YN5.415635@sccrnsc01...
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > "Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > news:ptBcb.3113$NX3.245@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> >
> >>On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 00:31:17 GMT,
> >>opcom in <3F72521A.70F5BD12@swbell.net> wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>> What have you done for Amateur Radio today?
> >>>--^^--
> >>
> >> The question is what has the ARRL done to the future of Ham Radio
> >>by hanging on to the Morse Code Requirement? It has killed it.
> >>
> >>
> >>--
> >>Best Regards, Keith http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> >>==
> >>= http://slrn.org SLRN 0.9.8.0 is out.
> >
> > ====================================
> >
> >
> > You really are a dumbass ain't ya Kieth? Tell me, in you apparantly
drug
> > clouded brain. How BPL and CW have anything to do with each other?
> >
> > Oh never mind. You ain't worth reading anylonger.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
> Keith,
>
> Just ignore Dan. Everyone in his mind is a DUMBASS. the only one who
> is perfect is HIM, PERIOD.
>
>
> --
> 73

>
> Frank K3EKO
>

Gotta give ya credit Franky me boy....when your right, your right.

But I don't think everyone is a dumbass. Just the people I call
dumbass...like you and Keith.

Dan/W4NTI

5670. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 15:15:30 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <mKYcb.14472$ai7.6503@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79134

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030925185657.08238.00000188@mb-m20.aol.com...
> >keeps addressing me directly, when the only
> >time I see something from him is *if* someone happens to respond to a
post
> >of his; and most don't--or at least I don't see them if they do.
>
> WQell TIT why do you respond at all if you dont want to read them ?

Because she is obviously a liar.

Dan/W4NTI

5671. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 15:19:07 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <LNYcb.14481$ai7.13830@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79135
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Quenched or un-quenced ??

Dan/W4NTI

"W4UDX" <w4udx.nospam@juno.com> wrote in message
news:I%Lcb.23576$iO.9903@bignews5.bellsouth.net...
> Boys it looks like it's time to bring back the good ole' spark gap CW
> transmitters. Will fight hash with some real static! :-)
>
> W4UDX
>
>
> "Scott Dorsey" <kludge@panix.com> wrote in message
> news:bktk98$5fe$1@panix2.panix.com...
> > Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:
> > > One can only wonder what FCC is thinking here.
> > >BPL is basically a noise generator that is attractive because it
> > >"wires the world" in the eyes of those for whom that end is
> > >the most important feature of advancing technology. Unfamiliar with
> > >the workings of radio or technology itself, they have eagerly latched
> > >onto the totally inaccurate and selfserving assertions of BPL
proponants.
> >
> > BPL, however, will not only emit a lot of radiated trash into the HF
> bands,
> > it will also RECEIVE a lot of radiated trash from the HF bands.
> >
> > My suspicion is that a fairly low power HF transmitter near a
transmission
> > line, even well out of the near field of the line, will wreak havoc with
> > BPL communication while operating well below the legal limit.
> >
> > > As I said in my comments to the NPRM, there are much better ways to
> > >acoomplish the same end without completely ruining the HF spectrum.
> >
> > As if the HF spectrum is not already ruined. Doesn't ANYONE take Part
15
> > seriously? If I ran the FCC, I'd make touch lamps illegal for one
thing.
> > --scott
> > --
> > "C'est un Nagra. C'est suisse, et tres, tres precis."
>

>

5672. CQ CQ CQ

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 15:23:35 UTC
From: K4-OLD-KING-ALLIGATOR
Message-ID: <vn84u8t6mb580f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79109
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

[No readable article body recovered]

5673. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 15:29:19 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <jXYcb.14503$ai7.9442@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79136
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hlskuk4.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On 25 Sep 2003 11:11:13 -0400, Scott Dorsey wrote:
>
> >And it has nothing to do with the Republicans or the Democrats... it
> >has to do with the FCC. We can blame Reagan and Clinton both for some
> >of it, but it is pretty clear that the FCC no longer cares much about
> >the public interest or about maintaining the airwaves as a sacred
> >trust.
>
> Amen brother.... but do not forget that the Five Gnomes are all
> political appointees who reflect the philosophy of the political
> administration appointing them.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
>
You mean the democrat Colin Powels son?

Dan/W4NTI

5674. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 15:31:21 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <dZYcb.14508$ai7.12981@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79137

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bl17gu$tj4@library2.airnews.net...
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bl0kg1mkv0@208.206.142.82...
> >
> >
> > Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > > news:bktcofug0@208.206.142.96...
> > >
> > >>
> > >>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > >>
> > >> (Techs have stayed away in droves - in my view because
> > >>
> > >>>they correctly have viewd ARRL's Morse policy as designed
> > >>>to keep them off of HF)
> > >>>
> > >>
> > >>
> > >>When you codebashers gonna make up your minds?? the earlier story was
> > >>that techn just didn't care about HF.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dick ... produce the post where I said "techs don't care about/want to
> get
> > > on HF" ... you can't because I never said that.
> > >
> >
> > YOU aren't NCI, though. Many times one or the other code opponent has
> > stated that very thing. "Techs don't upgrade because they're happy where
> > they are".. We've seen this repeatedly.
> >
>
> And, is not upgrading because someone is happy where they are, a problem?
> When are you making your first million/yr., DICK, or are you happy where
you
> are?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

This is your brain....this is your brain on TIT.

Dan/W4NTI

5675. Re: FCC POWELL SETS STAGE FOR EXIT IN INTERVIEW - Drudge report

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 15:47:19 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <bcZcb.14548$ai7.5789@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79138

"Phil Kane" <Phil.Kane@nov.shmovz.ka.pop> wrote in message
news:xnfcneeyarg.hlspc67.pminews@netnews.comcast.net...
> On Mon, 22 Sep 2003 20:15:45 GMT, Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> >Wouldn't it be great if the next political appointee actually had some
idea
> >of RF communications technology ?
>
> About 20 years ago, Dane Ericksen, N6AJY, who became a senior
> engineer with one of the big broadcast engineering consultant firms
> after working for me at the FCC for 10 years, and who is a long-term
> officer with the Society of Broadcast Engineers, submitted a Petition
> for Rulemaking requiring that one of the then-seven Commissioners
> have a degree in engineering, parallel to the Rule requirement that
> an attorney practicing before the Commission must be admitted to
> legal practice in one of the States or the District of Columbia.
>
> His petition was flatly turned down without even getting an RM
> number.
>
> --
> 73 de K2ASP - Phil Kane
>
> From a Clearing in the Silicon Forest
> Beaverton (Washington County) Oregon
>
>

Says it all right there eye boys and girls?

Thanks for you input Phil.

Now maybe some folks will have a clue as to why the FCC has no clue.

Dan/W4NTI

5676. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 16:17:09 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <HCCdnXveVvLR-umiXTWJkQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 79139

Clint > wrote in message ...
>
>Well, if he did in fact cut and paste, or quote verbatim, then the
following
>statement ....
>
>"as a qualifying criterion for an HF amateur license is no
>>longer relevant to the healthy future of amateur Radio."
>
>is, actually, JUST that.
>
>I often wonder about the people that read documentation and
>somehow use a twist of either comprehension or logic to overlook
>what is being read.... just like the same people that read
>UN resolution 678 and UN resolution 1441 and somehow
>overlook that the united nations both KNEW saddam hussein
>had WMD's in 1991 as well as 2001, and overlook that they
>said any UN member nation may use "Any necessary means"
>to enforce the two resolutions should saddam not comply with
>them..... they actually read those documents and say "it
>does not say that!"
>
>but, the resolutions "did".
>WORDS MEAN THINGS

Nowhere in the IARU resolution does it say Morse code *must* be elemintated
as a testing requirement, so what's your point?

5677. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 16:33:41 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <APmdncpHEpEE9umiXTWJkw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 79141

Dan/W4NTI > wrote in message ...
>>
>
>Why bother ? I just used my 20 meter dipole, coax fed with 50 ohm cable on
>7.030. The SWR was off the scale.
>
>I then hit the tune button on my FT-1000mp and that piece of junk wouldn't
>tune it. So I called CQ for a couple of hours. No replies.
>
>I then called my buddy across town to fire up and give me a listen. I was
>S1 and almost in the noise.
>
>So, for an experiment, knowing it was just a lark because the Texas Twit
>said so, I hooked up my 40 meter half wave, center fed with 50 ohm coax.
>My signal was now 30 db over S9.
>
>Can you get the Texas Twit to explain this for me please.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

Just for kicks, I borrowed a tuner from a friend over the weekend. This is a homebrew job. Hooked it to the 40 meter dipole and loaded the KWM-2 into it on 80 meters. Made 5 contacts, 3 out of state, all good copy on both ends. Guess you just don't know how to do it dannyboy.

5678. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 16:37:35 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <jXZcb.7954$yp6.176883@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79140

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bl0kg1mkv0@208.206.142.82...
>
>
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bktcofug0@208.206.142.96...
> >
> >>
> >>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >>
> >> (Techs have stayed away in droves - in my view because
> >>
> >>>they correctly have viewd ARRL's Morse policy as designed
> >>>to keep them off of HF)
> >>>
> >>
> >>
> >>When you codebashers gonna make up your minds?? the earlier story was
> >>that techn just didn't care about HF.
> >
> >
> > Dick ... produce the post where I said "techs don't care about/want to
get
> > on HF" ... you can't because I never said that.
> >
>
> YOU aren't NCI, though. Many times one or the other code opponent has
> stated that very thing. "Techs don't upgrade because they're happy where
> they are".. We've seen this repeatedly.

No, I'm not NCI ... but I can speak authoritatively on NCI positions.
NCI has never said that either.

Carl - wk3c

5679. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 16:58:25 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Re_cb.153982$0v4.11491297@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 79142
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:lyYcb.14441$ai7.2634@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...

>
> The transmission lines are radiators. As such they will also receive.
>
> Power lines are right up next to the rigs. The RF from the radios will
> trash the BPL. Probably by causing drop outs and adding lots of extra
> delays. Basically it will make BPL useless anywhere near a ham station.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

OK, let's say it does slow or even stop BPL near a ham station. Why
wouldn't the FCC restrict amatuer operations around BPL areas?

Frank Dresser

5680. IS THERE ANYBODY OUT THERE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 17:24:14 UTC
From: K4-OLD-KING-ALLIGATOR
Message-ID: <vn84vkh742nn2b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79110
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

[No readable article body recovered]

5681. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 17:43:25 UTC
From: Frank Todd IV <frank@127.0.0.1>
Message-ID: <1V_cb.435478$cF.139232@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 79143
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Dan/W4NTI wrote:
> "Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
> news:5JLcb.339532$2x.101397@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
>
>>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>
>>
>>>"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
>>>news:Ykqcb.568344$Ho3.104168@sccrnsc03...
>>>
>>>
>>>>Frank Todd K3EKO wrote:
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>>"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
>>>>>>news:BVpcb.425394$Oz4.219503@rwcrnsc54...
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>"Frank Todd K3EKO" <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>news:X%ocb.145408$mp.72200@rwcrnsc51.ops.asp.att.net...
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>THE CARING STATION wrote:
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>>>news:hp24nvofjmp93liio9i7ljva15jee1gh4t@4ax.com...
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>Now, if Supernews would be so kind as to TOS this 'Big Al'
>>>>>>>>>>>character,
>>>>>>>>>>>we could get back to dealing with the usual level of nutbar that
>>>>>>>>>>>lurks
>>>>>>>>>>>here :)
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>73, Leo
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>WONT HAPPEN LEO. YOU ARE THE ONE WHO USED THE 4 LETTER WORDS. YOU
>>>>>>>>>>WILL
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>BE
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>TOS'ED. HO HO
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>I vote that BIG AL stays...I enjoy his commentary.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>--
>>>>>>>>>73
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Frank K3EKO
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>You would....even if it is a troll.
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>Why haven't you responded to my earlier posts? You must know that
>>>>>>>>you're in the wrong.
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>--

>>>>>>>73
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>Frank K3EKO
>>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>>I did respond numbnuts. But here it is again.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Your still member of the Barf and the Stumpers, right?
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>>>>
>>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>Yes, and will always be.
>>>>>
>>>>>-Frank
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>
>>>>BUt what does that have to do with you accusing me of NOT apologizing
>>>>for my actions?
>>>>
>>>>-Frank
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>
>>>>--
>>>>73
>>>>
>>>>Frank K3EKO
>>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>I guess I HAVE TO SPELL IT OUT TO NUMBNUTS, eh? Ref my last post to
>
> you.
>
>>>Now here is another.
>>>
>>>I no longer believe your apology was sincere. Based on your actions and
>>>your remaining membership in a Ham Radio Terrorist group (s).
>>>
>>>In otherwords Franky, you have no credibility.
>>>
>>>Now take your HO HOs and shove them up your BARFY/SJ arse.
>>>
>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>

>>>
>>
>>I am NOT going to drop out of these groups (that I have been a member of
>>for years) just to be a friend to you. If that is what it takes, $%^&
>
> OFF!
>
>>--
>>73
>>
>>Frank K3EKO
>>
>
> No, that is not it Frank. You just don't get it, do you? Being a member
> of the BARF and SJ crowd is not the best thing for ham radio. When you
> understand that, we can go from there.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>
You are entitled to your opinion, Dan.

-Frank

5682. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 17:44:55 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <qhu8nvgnnr9000e6l0lphv99umsm7ev77j@4ax.com>
Source record: 79144

He does seem very contemptuous of amateurs, though, because they do
not have the depth of experience or operating knowledge of commercial
and militart licence holders such as himself. Assuming that he does -
he may be a poser.

Technically, he may be able to pass the Extra without the need for
further study, but what would he do with it? He seems to be equally
contemptuous of conversing with people, which is a requirement to
enjoy the hobby.....

73, Leo

On 26 Sep 2003 12:29:59 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <hio6nvc53pdg9fpkq87hj5efarc8qr97s2@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
>writes:
>
>>What I don't understand is why the intelligent members of this group
>>put up with all of the QRM intentionally generated by just a few
>>troublemakers.
>
>Good question.
>>
>>For example, Len is not an Amateur, (well, not a Radio amateur.... :)
>>), and states freely that he does not have any desire to become one -
>
>Just for reference, Leo...
>
>Back on January 19, 2000, Len did say he was 'going for Extra right out of the
>box' or words to that effect. Back then he was posting here as 'Lenof21'
>(aol.com) . That was over 3-1/2 years ago.
>
>Of course he did not say *when* he was going to do it....
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

5683. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 17:47:33 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <cru8nv0ck81l6dqnlas3rlrdtv7t0194aa@4ax.com>
Source record: 79145

Oops, better change that to 'military' before Clint comes 'round to
help me out with my spelling again....;)

73, Leo

On Fri, 26 Sep 2003 17:44:55 GMT, Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote:

>snip

>and militart licence holders such as himself.

5684. Re: PORKBUTT PORKBUTT PORKBUTT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 18:29:01 UTC
From: Frank Todd IV <frank@127.0.0.1>
Message-ID: <Mz%cb.342886$2x.104572@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 79146
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD wrote:
> What is it with you and porkbutts? Do you need a transplant? Do you like
> porkbutts? Do you want somebody porking your butt? What is it?
>
> --
> 73 de Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD
>
> Cuius testiculos habes, habeas cardeo et cerebellum
>
> " BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5 @bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
> news:vn080m13ld4oa1@corp.supernews.com...
>
>>AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.
>>
>> AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.
>>
>>AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.
>>
>>3894.5 IS MINE. STAY AWAY.
>>
>>
>>
>
>
>
Porkbutt is the ex-WB2OTK Rich Whiten out of Easley, South Carolina, USA.

73

Frank K3EKO

5685. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 18:29:56 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030926142956.01893.00000845@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 79147

In article <20030925212928.14837.00003229@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>In article <20030925165636.12631.00001466@mb-m28.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>(Len Over 21) writes:
>
>>In article <20030925082934.08626.00000890@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>(N2EY)
>>writes:
>>
>>>In article <20030925015541.25517.00000935@mb-m15.aol.com>,
>lenover21@aol.com
>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>>
>>>>In article <20030924203109.02537.00000757@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>>>(N2EY)
>>>>writes:
>>>>
>>>>>In article <20030924174226.07578.00000783@mb-m25.aol.com>,
>>>lenover21@aol.com
>>>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>>>>
>>>>>>YOU are NOT on any QRZ listing for any country.
>>>>>
>>>>>Neither are you. Len ;-) ;-) ;-)
>>>>
>>>> I've never PRETENDED to be one.
>>>
>>>Why are you shouting, Len?
>>
>> Not shouting.
>
>Yes, you are. Capitalizing every letter in a word is online shouting. Bad
>manners on your part. It also indicates you are out of control.
>
>Perhaps you should take a time-out and come back to the group when you can
>behave in a mature fashion.
>
>> Do your eyes hurt?
>>
>Nope.
>
>>>> I make no bones about not being licensed as an AMATEUR and have
>>>> said so from day one in here.

>>>
>>>Everything isn't all about you, Len.
>>
>> Apparently the PCTA think so.
>
>How so? Would you rather that nobody replied to your posts?

Not a problem. ALL you PCTAs can whip out the old "killfile" and hide
heads and eyes in the sand.

Makes it easier to comment to the Rest of the Readers. :-)

>Strong opposition to your opinions seems to really bother you. Correction of
>your mistakes enrages you.
>>
>> Since they can't support their view of retaining the morse code test, they
>> attack personalities.
>
>Who is "they"?

All of the PCTAs in here.

>>>> What you have is some idiot who PRETENDS to be an amateur
>>>> <something> in Canada and won't identify himself.
>>>
>>>Why do you think Leo is pretending anything?
>>
>> She hasn't got the guts to identify herself.
>
>"She"? How do you know Leo is female?

How do you she isn't?

>> Despite your pain with PREVIOUS screen names, I've never attempted
>> to post anything without identifying myself.
>
>Yes, you have, Many of your posts do not contain anything that indicates who
>you really are.

There YOU are MISTAKEN.

I've listed my employers in here and I've given names and callsigns to
friends who are radio amateur licensees. My bylines in Ham Radio
magazine carried the same USPS address I have now.

Since you won't accept any e-mail attachments from me, the only
recourse for you seems to be a lot of flame war ignition attempts and
not bother to check anyone out.

>In fact, for all anyone really knows, you could be someone else who has
>appropriated the persona of one Leonard H. Anderson.

Think whatever you imagine.

I am listed in the Southern California white pages...my postal address
is not secret...you can hire a private investigator and have my neighbors
interviewed. No problem. You can also find yourself in a civil court
or (in some government districts) being investigated for harrassment.

You have enough raw data to ascertain who is who. You don't want
to. You would rather have your little jollies in here making your
"opponents" look bad.

>Has anyone on this NG actually met you in person or on the air?

Not that I know of...but then I don't know who all the readers are since
they don't post. :-)

Start with KD6JG. Work on to W6MJN, then N2JTV.

Several more know me but there are over 600,000 licensed radio
amateurs who are NOT in this newsgroup.

That's irrelevant to your little "cause" in this message, isn't it?

You want to "run" this newsgroup because you are here so much and
spend so much time posting.

>I'm not misdirecting. 'vshah101' did not give a name or callsign, even when
>asked. But you had no problem with him or his anti-amateur remarks.

YOU are MISTAKEN again. ERROR...you bad.

Some individuals in here post against YOUR and PCTA viewpoints.
That does not make them "anti-amateur."

You think of yourself as "representing ALL of US amateur radio" through
your expressed opinions in here. You don't. You "represent" only
opinions and viewpoints of a small group of PCTAs who wish to be the
elite of the US amateur radio community...one way or another.

You don't "own" US amateur radio and never did, therefore you don't have
ANY judgement value about who is "anti-amateur" or even "pro-amateur."

>That's a fact, Jack ;-)

Yes, Morrie, what I just wrote IS fact.

>> The SUBJECT line of this thread is "1/4 Wave Dipoles."
>
>So? Subject lines never deterred you from going off in other directions.

I posted IN this thread about dipoles. It's in Google if you've not
saved it to your HD.

YOU and some anonymous person want to use any thread as a
character assassination venue so that you can "get even" for all the
alleged "wrongs" committed against your radiogod personna.

THAT's a FACT.

>You sound threatened and angry because someone has noticed your double
>standard of behavior towards anonymous posters.

Not a problem to me. You MANUFACTURE a situation and try to exploit
it so that you have an excuse for talking bad about someone who has
opposite viewpoints to yours.

All you need to do is search Google for a lot of PCTA general harrassment
such as from the hundreds of postings by "K4YZ" that go un-answered
because that kind of posting only serves to make the harrasser happy.

>> This whole newsgroup was created to discuss-debate-argue the code
>> test issue.
>
>And other things. You are not the moderator, Len. Much as you want to control
>how things happen, you're not the boss here. Live with it.

YOU ARE NOT THE MODERATOR EITHER, JIMMIE.

LEARN TO LIVE WITH THAT.

>> It wasn't created for the sole amusement or daily guru column from
>> Jimmie Miccolis where he would sit in judgement of all others.
>
> It wasn't created for the sole amusement or daily guru column from
>Leonard H. Anderson where he would sit in judgement of all others.

Are you "threatened" by all those others in here who have opposite
opinions from yours? Are you feeling "superior" because you espouse
the standards and practices of US amateur radio of over a half century
ago? Are you so intimidated by those who have the courage to think
for themselves AND to speak out?

YOU sit in judgement on everyone who does not consider morse code
testing as necessary. A very consistent judgement, a condemning
judgement as if you are a holy radio god.

That's really a rather common syndrome of the PCTAs. They allow only
ONE viewpoint...theirs.

All other viewpoints shall be put down, destroyed, those who voice them
shall be harrassed, hunted, and so forth until they stop.

That's a lovely example of dictatorial totalitarianism, the arrogance of the
squatters who feel they "own" the hobby.

That reflects badly on the US amateur radio community when you PCTA
act that way. You are unable to present counter-arguments to NCTAs so
you call all their arguments "illogical, mistaken, or plain wrong" and then
want to harrass, intimidate, and humiliate them.

YOU may not think such is "anti-amateur." Someone attacked your Ego
Turf and you think "anything goes" in "fighting" them.

I'd call that Elitist, Arrogant, and Dictatorial but the Turf Fighters would
get

angry again...so I won't call it that.

I wonder what the FCC would call it if anyone there chanced to look in and read what the PCTA think, say, and do in here?

5686. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 18:29:57 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030926142957.01893.00000846@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 79148

In article <vn7851d168vv10@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>> I find Leo's posts to be quite humorous, cogent, and factual. He runs
>> circles around you and Len. That's why you can offer nothing of substance
>> in return.
>>
>> Arnie -
>> KT4ST
>
>And how is it he's debating us when he also claims that he's not on
>one side OR the other of the issue of CW testing?? HMMM???????
>
>Just HOW is it he has managed to find a way to eat his cake and have
>it too when the rest of humanity in thousands of years have not been
>able to solve that age old paradox? HMMM?????
>
>And, as far as "cogent and factual", is that before or after he made
>a reference to us being pricks?

Arnie is defending his Ego Turf, Clint.

It's a fairly standard way he does it. Just another PCTA who can't get along with NCTAs who do NOT worship his mighty macho morsemanship.

This "Leo" doesn't really exist as any sort of Man.

He (or she) has no real interest in any subjects. "Leo" is just playing with people in a unique form of sociopathy brought out by the Internet's anonymity. It's a juvenile form of harrassment but gives this person much glee for getting away with it. By choosing the PCTA side, "Leo" gets support and encouragement from the PCTA regulars in here.

"Leo" is only involved with bashing personalities. "Leo" doesn't care about any debate, discussion, or argument on any subject. He or she just likes to hide in anonymity of the Internet and work out his or her frustrations of daily whatevers by bashing anyone he or she picks.

"Leo" feels secure in the Internet anonymity. He or she must get some feeling of "power" by remaining unidentifiable, to be able to hit on anyone. It isn't reasonable discourse on subjects. It is just a perverse form of aggression, of getting back at anyone without being physically hurt. It is that person's little fantasy world at work in the mind.

What is ugly about that sort of psychological perverseness is that it reflects badly on the lofty, noble principles that ARRL keeps saying about amateur radio. It is rule by a mild form of terrorism, of the very

"thugs" he (or she) complains "others" are doing.

"Leo" tries to project "power" with the inference that anyone disagreeing with his writings will be subject to harrassment, humiliation, or constant barrage of denigration. He (or she) is "powerful" yet without any power except to drive everyone away in disgust or extreme irritation.

What I find mildly curious is that the PCTA regulars are all "on his side." The PCTA like that for they are frustrated at the turn of events of recent history that is against their particular cause. What the PCTA regulars don't realize is that the syndrome of this "Leo" can just as easily turn against Them if they do not condone his or her statements. :-)

5687. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 18:30:00 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030926143000.01893.00000847@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 79149

In article <hio6nvc53pdg9fpkq87hj5efarc8qr97s2@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>Thanks, Steve. You're quite correct - there are some remarkable
>opportunities which we need to explore!
>
>What I don't understand is why the intelligent members of this group
>put up with all of the QRM intentionally generated by just a few
>troublemakers.

Of course...in the Orwellian Truthspeak of the PCTA, all who do not
love, honor, and obey the PCTA principles are "false, misleading, or
nonsense" and should be opposed to ALL that the NCTA are for...

There is only ONE side that is noble, good, and true...the PCTAs.

Anyplace else that is considered dictatorial, totalitarian.

To this invisible, unidentifiable "Leo" it is Truthspeak for he (or she) is
a mighty "force" for all that is good, noble, and true. Not.

>For example, Len is not an Amateur, (well, not a Radio amateur.... :)
>), and states freely that he does not have any desire to become one -
>yet he is involved in endless vitriolic arguements which are entirely
>moot in his case - no matter whether code stays or goes, he isn't part
>of the Amateur community, as he has not paid his dues (who in hell
>cares about military or commercial comms experience - this is Amateur
>Radio!)

This is just a newsgroup for debate, discussion, or argument. In this
"Leo" situation it is a place to Hide while NOT trying to be reasonable
about any subjects.

"Leo" constantly targets personalities, not the subjects. He (or she)
cannot stand up for what they actually believe so they HIDE, secure in
their safety from physical or mental harm. That is not courage of
conviction. It is just cowardly harrassment of others for personal
pleasure, having nothing to do with the subject of code testing.

In the United States the morse code test for an amateur radio license
is a federal regulation required now by the FCC. Since we US citizens
have the Constitutional Right to petition our government for the redress
of our grievances (First Amendment), ALL US citizens can reasonably
discuss and debate that particular matter of policy.

"Leo" claims to be Canadian, is therefore NOT subject to the same
Constitutional Rights guaranteed by the US Constitution. "Leo" has NO

Right whatsoever (except under Canadian law) to have ANY say in US law. Yet, he (or she) claims some sort of (invisible) "right" to determine who shall say what in an unmoderated newsgroup about the Law of the United States of America.

"Leo" states that non-amateurs (apparently the overwhelming majority of humans not licensed in any administration's amateur radio service) are "ineligible" to speak about US Law concerning the USA's amateur radio regulations. Oddly, many of the PCTA insist that non-amateurs cannot speak or address their government even though those PCTAs are citizens of the USA. That is also illogical, dictatorial, totalitarian.

>Realistically, Amateurs have no interest in his opinions - he
>has chosen not to join the community, and 'pay the dues" by becoming
>licenced.

That is a mental aberration of this "Leo."

There are no such "dues payment" required under US Law, certainly not in the regulations of the FCC, the radio regulating agency for civil radio in the United States of America.

"Realistically," radio amateurs licensed in the USA are under USA law.

"Realistically," over two hundred thousand US radio amateurs became licensed as no-code-test Technicians since 1991. "Realistically," they are all lawfully licensed US radio amateurs who did NOT subscribe to any PCTA commandments.

"Leo's" alleged "realistic" statement is nonsense, nothing more than a perverse statement of territorial imperative ("turf") which is based on nothing but his or her personal opinion...which is solidly rooted in the PCTA mythology of might of morse.

"Leo" has NO data to verify that amateurs are all on his (or her) side. It is perverse personal opinion only, of a single individual hiding under a pseudonym.

>Quite obviously, he exists in this group only as the
>resident troll, bullying all who disagree with his pontifications and
>opinions.

More Orwellian Truthspeak. Falsehoods labeled as "truth of all" when they are just personal opinions.

"Leo" accuses those of opposite opinions as "bullies" when he (or she) is supremely guilty of the same.

>Look at today's barrage of feces that he posted, for
>example, or yesterdays -- was there a single statement made that would
>improve or change the state of the hobby?

Apparently the above statement of "Leo" is another "rational, civil discourse" of the PCTA regulars in here.

Anything against their viewpoints is a "barrage of feces." :-)

>Any positive comments? Any
>news? Anything relevant at all? No - just a series of personal attacks
>on those who won't see his way.

So far, this invisible "Leo" hasn't come up with anything but a lot of individual personality attacks.

"Leo" doesn't seem interested in anything but flame wars. Is that the spirit of US amateur radio? I think not.

>Who cares what his way is? He don't matter - he ain't a Ham.

Did I state the PCTA view of "Leo's" is dictatorial, totalitarian? Yes. One more statement of his (or hers) to prove it.

Perhaps Industry Canada has some rule or regulation requiring amateur radio licensing in order to discuss, debate, or argue Canadian law? No such thing is required in the United States of America...open discourse is a fundamental Right of citizens of the United States.

>Just a sad old has-been who enjoys beating
>folks up (or trying to :)) in the newsgroup.

I am just arguing for the elimination of the morse code test for any United States amateur radio license. So do many citizens of the USA, both licensed radio amateurs and those not licensed in amateur radio.

I am quite sure (by example of years in here) that the PCTA cannot abide by any changes in the US amateur regulations that threaten their rank-status-privileges achieved through federally tested morse code ability.

I am also quite sure, again by example of years of PCTA statements in here, that the PCTA have no interest in any "promotion" or "betterment" of US amateur radio except for themselves. They show little care for any US citizens entering the hobby to do anything but exactly as they had to.

>A pitiful old erstwhile military comms operator, circa 1950s.

Chronologically old, of course. :-)

Somehow living a long life is anathema to the "forever young" PCTA.

"Leo" seems to ignore an entire career spent as a civilian as an electronics design engineer, very much a professional in terms of accepting monetary compensation for services rendered. :-)

>And his buddies aren't much
>better....just younger clones of the same persona.

Tsk, tsk, tsk...more dictatorial totalitarianism and provincial eliteness.

>Shut them down.

"Calm, rational, civil discourse." :-)

>Men without honor or intelligence or relevance are
>not worth anyones' time.

Only the anonymous are "with honor or intelligence or relevance." :-)

Dictatorial. Totalitarian. Elite.

>I've demonstrated some effective techniques
>that can be used to squelch QRM from these types of individuals - give
>'em a try.

"Calm rational civil discourse" in action. Become anonymous!
Harrass those who think differently! Force everyone to become PCTA
by ANY means! :-)

>Or, use silence as a tool - remove the audience, and adios boors.

"Hasta la vista, baby?" :-)

Sorry, Canadians can't run for Governor of California. Make a few movies
first and you, too, can become a "terminator." :-)

>Go for it! You don't see Len dealing with my posts anymore,
>do you? He can't - he's been disempowered! Surplussed again.
>Discharged. He can't argue with logic, or intellect, or reason, and
>when there's no possibility of personal attack - game over!

Apparently "Leo" is so anonymous that his sense of reality is also
anonymous.

>Plus, he knows that I know what he is.......he ain't fooling me!

This "Leo" is one sick puppy... :-)

>This is rec.radio.amateur.policy, not alt.hasbeen.flamefest - let's
>get these guys over to the appropriate forum, and get back to
>discussing the future of Amateur Radio!

"Leo" thinks the "future of amateur radio" lies in emulating the standards
and practices of the 1930s.

>Frankly, there are bigger
>issues than Code Testing to be discussed here - BPL could wipe out the
>hobby as we know it.......

Tsk, tsk, isn't the Brass Pounder League the heart and soul of amateur
radio of today?

>To paraphrase Nancy Reagan, "Just Say No To Thugs!"

NO, "Leo." :-)

5688. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 18:55:16 UTC
From: "Ed G." <Spectrumhog@_REMOVE_StarBand.net>
Message-ID: <Xns940279A9036C4Frog207Junocom@148.78.248.75>
Source record: 79150
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

>
> OK, let's say it does slow or even stop BPL near a ham station. Why
> wouldn't the FCC restrict amatuer operations around BPL areas?
>

Hmmm. That would be real interesting. The FCC restricting the use of
lawfully licensed transmitters in order to accomodate Part15 unlicensed
operations of incidental radiators.....

Ed WB6SAT

5689. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 19:04:15 UTC
From: lenover21@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030926150415.08626.00000907@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 79051

In article <20030926082957.15923.00000914@mb-m12.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>> Learn to live with it graciously.
>
>Set us an example

You first.

5690. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 19:04:57 UTC
From: Frank Todd IV <frank@127.0.0.1>
Message-ID: <t50db.343006$2x.105605@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net>
Source record: 79052
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Ed G. wrote:

>>OK, let's say it does slow or even stop BPL near a ham station. Why
>>wouldn't the FCC restrict amatuer operations around BPL areas?
>>
>
>
>
> Hmmm. That would be real interesting. The FCC restricting the use of
> lawfully licensed transmitters in order to accomodate Part15 unlicensed
> operations of incidental radiators.....
>
>
> Ed WB6SAT
>
They'll modify the rules so it fits their agenda. remember, the FCC
will do anything that can make them $$$$ for the US Treasury.

73

Frank K3EKO

5691. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 19:13:31 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <gs29nvkpmurfjmomuc7lgjjf3et2v354d5@4ax.com>
Source record: 79053

But, Alter Kocker, the points that I make are lucid and cogent.
Something that you seem incapable of achieving.

Unkike the drivel and vitriol that you contunally post. And, if you
cannot attack someone personally, you are impotent. Out of ammo.
Powerless. Where is it written that only comments from people that you
can find in QRZ or in a phone book are valid? A Vue Shtet
Geschreiber, Len?

You are not a Ham. Your opinions don't matter here. Game over. And,
who is to say that you are who you say you are? And would you be any
more real than the disembodied voice of idiocy in the newsgroup that
you are right now? Not likely. Who knows? Who cares.

As Descartes said, "I think, therefore I am". (You won't find him on
QRZ either :0) In this newsgroup, I'm as real as you are. Anytime
you wish, you can find me here. And, if you wish to attempt an
intelligent discussion some day, look no further.

And in honour of your fondness of Yiddish, I leave you with this wish:

Er Zol Vaksen Vi a Tsibeleh, Mit Dem Kop in Drerd.

And soon.

30, Leo

On 26 Sep 2003 18:29:57 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <vn7851d168vv10@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
>computron dot net> writes:
>
>>> I find Leo's posts to be quite humorous, cogent, and factual. He runs
>>> circles around you and Len. That's why you can offer nothing of substance
>>> in return.
>>>
>>> Arnie -
>>> KT4ST
>>
>>And how is it he's debating us when he also claims that he's not on
>>one side OR the other of the issue of CW testing?? HMMM???????
>>
>>Just HOW is it he has managed to find a way to eat his cake and have
>>it too when the rest of humanity in thousands of years have not been
>>able to solve that age old paradox? HMMM?????
>>
>>And, as far as "cogent and factual", is that before or after he made

>>a reference to us being pricks?
>
> Arnie is defending his Ego Turf, Clint.
>
> It's a fairly standard way he does it. Just another PCTA who can't get
> along with NCTAs who do NOT worship his mighty macho morsemanship.
>
> This "Leo" doesn't really exist as any sort of Man.
>
> He (or she) has no real interest in any subjects. "Leo" is just playing
> with people in a unique form of sociopathy brought out by the Internet's
> anonymity. It's a juvenile form of harrassment but gives this person
> much glee for getting away with it. By choosing the PCTA side, "Leo"
> gets support and encouragement from the PCTA regulars in here.
>
> "Leo" is only involved with bashing personalities. "Leo" doesn't care
> about any debate, discussion, or argument on any subject. He or she
> just likes to hide in anonymity of the Internet and work out his or her
> frustrations of daily whatevers by bashing anyone he or she picks.
>
> "Leo" feels secure in the Internet anonymity. He or she must get some
> feeling of "power" by remaining unidentifiable, to be able to hit on
> anyone. It isn't reasonable discourse on subjects. It is just a perverse
> form of aggression, of getting back at anyone without being physically
> hurt. It is that person's little fantasy world at work in the mind.
>
> What is ugly about that sort of psychological perverseness is that it
> reflects badly on the lofty, noble principles that ARRL keeps saying
> about amateur radio. It is rule by a mild form of terrorism, of the very
> "thugs" he (or she) complains "others" are doing.
>
> "Leo" tries to project "power" with the inference that anyone disagreeing
> with his writings will be subject to harrassment, humiliation, or constant
> barrage of denigration. He (or she) is "powerful" yet without any power
> except to drive everyone away in disgust or extreme irritation.
>
> What I find mildly curious is that the PCTA regulars are all "on his side."
> The PCTA like that for they are frustrated at the turn of events of recent
> history that is against their particular cause. What the PCTA regulars
> don't realize is that the syndrome of this "Leo" can just as easily turn
> against Them if they do not condone his or her statements. :-)

5692. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 19:18:47 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <q149nvcd54ijfp88m6cakk7tcd48ub61ij@4ax.com>
Source record: 79054

Not a very convincing arguement at all. All emotion and bluster - but
no fact. Your anger and lack of character is driving your comments,
not intelligence. What you cannot see does not exist - like a child
putting their hand over their eyes, and believing that they are now
alone. Now that's brilliant! ;)

But, you make quite an interesting spectacle of yourself when
dominated by superior intelligence and wit.

Please go on, Alter Kocker - you are making a complete fool of
yourself!

30, Leo

On 26 Sep 2003 18:30:00 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

>In article <hio6nvc53pdg9fpkq87hj5efarc8qr97s2@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
>writes:
>
>>Thanks, Steve. You're quite correct - there are some remarkable
>>opportunities which we need to explore!
>>
>>What I don't understand is why the intelligent members of this group
>>put up with all of the QRM intentionally generated by just a few
>>troublemakers.
>
> Of course...in the Orwellian Truthspeak of the PCTA, all who do not
> love, honor, and obey the PCTA principles are "false, misleading, or
> nonsense" and should be opposed to ALL that the NCTA are for...
>
> There is only ONE side that is noble, good, and true...the PCTAs.
>
> Anyplace else that is considered dictatorial, totalitarian.
>
> To this invisible, unidentifiable "Leo" it is Truthspeak for he (or she) is
> a mighty "force" for all that is good, noble, and true. Not.
>
>>For example, Len is not an Amateur, (well, not a Radio amateur.... :)
>>), and states freely that he does not have any desire to become one -
>>yet he is involved in endless vitriolic arguements which are entirely
>>moot in his case - no matter whether code stays or goes, he isn't part
>>of the Amateur community, as he has not paid his dues (who in hell
>>cares about military or commercial comms experience - this is Amateur
>>Radio!)
>
> This is just a newsgroup for debate, discussion, or argument. In this

> "Leo" situation it is a place to Hide while NOT trying to be reasonable
> about any subjects.
>
> "Leo" constantly targets personalities, not the subjects. He (or she)
> cannot stand up for what they actually believe so they HIDE, secure in
> their safety from physical or mental harm. That is not courage of
> conviction. It is just cowardly harrassment of others for personal
> pleasure, having nothing to do with the subject of code testing.
>
> In the United States the morse code test for an amateur radio license
> is a federal regulation required now by the FCC. Since we US citizens
> have the Constitutional Right to petition our government for the redress
> of our grievances (First Amendment), ALL US citizens can reasonably
> discuss and debate that particular matter of policy.
>
> "Leo" claims to be Canadian, is therefore NOT subject to the same
> Constitutional Rights guaranteed by the US Constitution. "Leo" has NO
> Right whatsoever (except under Canadian law) to have ANY say in US
> law. Yet, he (or she) claims some sort of (invisible) "right" to determine
> who shall say what in an unmoderated newsgroup about the Law of the
> United States of America.
>
> "Leo" states that non-amateurs (apparently the overwhelming majority of
> humans not licensed in any administration's amateur radio service) are
> "ineligible" to speak about US Law concerning the USA's amateur radio
> regulations. Oddly, many of the PCTA insist that non-amateurs cannot
> speak or address their government even though those PCTAs are citizens
> of the USA. That is also illogical, dictatorial, totalitarian.
>
>>Realistically, Amateurs have no interest in his opinions - he
>>has chosen not to join the community, and 'pay the dues" by becoming
>>licenced.
>
> That is a mental aberration of this "Leo."
>
> There are no such "dues payment" required under US Law, certainly not
> in the regulations of the FCC, the radio regulating agency for civil radio
> in the United States of America.
>
> "Realistically," radio amateurs licensed in the USA are under USA law.
>
> "Realistically," over two hundred thousand US radio amateurs became
> licensed as no-code-test Technicians since 1991. "Realistically," they
> are all lawfully licensed US radio amateurs who did NOT subscribe to
> any PCTA commandments.
>
> "Leo's" alleged "realistic" statement is nonsense, nothing more than a
> perverse statement of territorial imperative ("turf") which is based on
> nothing but his or her personal opinion...which is solidly rooted in the
> PCTA mythology of might of morse.

>
> "Leo" has NO data to verify that amateurs are all on his (or her) side.
> It is perverse personal opinion only, of a single individual hiding under a
> pseudonym.
>
>>Quite obviously, he exists in this group only as the
>>resident troll, bullying all who disagree with his pontifications and
>>opinions.
>
> More Orwellian Truthspeak. Falsehoods labeled as "truth of all" when
> they are just personal opinions.
>
> "Leo" accuses those of opposite opinions as "bullies" when he (or she)
> is supremely guilty of the same.
>
>>Look at today's barrage of feces that he posted, for
>>example, or yesterdays -- was there a single statement made that would
>>improve or change the state of the hobby?
>
> Apparently the above statement of "Leo" is another "rational, civil
> discourse" of the PCTA regulars in here.
>
> Anything against their viewpoints is a "barrage of feces." :-)
>
>>Any positive comments? Any
>>news? Anything relevant at all? No - just a series of personal attacks
>>on those who won't see his way.
>
> So far, this invisible "Leo" hasn't come up with anything but a lot of
> individual personality attacks.
>
> "Leo" doesn't seem interested in anything but flame wars. Is that the
> spirit of US amateur radio? I think not.
>
>>Who cares what his way is? He don't matter - he ain't a Ham.
>
> Did I state the PCTA view of "Leo's" is dictatorial, totalitarian? Yes.
> One more statement of his (or hers) to prove it.
>
> Perhaps Industry Canada has some rule or regulation requiring amateur
> radio licensing in order to discuss, debate, or argue Canadian law?
> No such thing is required in the United States of America...open discourse
> is a fundamental Right of citizens of the United States.
>
>>Just a sad old has-been who enjoys beating
>>folks up (or trying to :)) in the newsgroup.
>
> I am just arguing for the elimination of the morse code test for any United
> States amateur radio license. So do many citizens of the USA, both
> licensed radio amateurs and those not licensed in amateur radio.

>
> I am quite sure (by example of years in here) that the PCTA cannot
> abide by any changes in the US amateur regulations that threaten
> their rank-status-privileges achieved through federally tested morse code
> ability.
>
> I am also quite sure, again by example of years of PCTA statements in
> here, that the PCTA have no interest in any "promotion" or "betterment"
> of US amateur radio except for themselves. They show little care for any
> US citizens entering the hobby to do anything but exactly as they had to.
>
>>A pitiful old erstwhile military comms operator, circa 1950s.
>
> Chronologically old, of course. :-)
>
> Somehow living a long life is anathema to the "forever young" PCTA.
>
> "Leo" seems to ignore an entire career spent as a civilian as an
> electronics design engineer, very much a professional in terms of
> accepting monetary compensation for services rendered. :-)
>
>>And his buddies aren't much
>>better....just younger clones of the same persona.
>
> Tsk, tsk, tsk...more dictatorial totalitarianism and provincial eliteness.
>
>>Shut them down.
>
> "Calm, rational, civil discourse." :-)
>
>>Men without honor or intelligence or relevance are
>>not worth anyones' time.
>
> Only the anonymous are "with honor or intelligence or relevance." :-)
>
> Dictatorial. Totalitarian. Elite.
>
>>I've demonstrated some effective techniques
>>that can be used to squelch QRM from these types of individuals - give
>>'em a try.
>
> "Calm rational civil discourse" in action. Become anonymous!
> Harrass those who think differently! Force everyone to become PCTA
> by ANY means! :-)
>
>>Or, use silence as a tool - remove the audience, and adios boors.
>
> "Hasta la vista, baby?" :-)
>
> Sorry, Canadians can't run for Governor of California. Make a few movies

> first and you, too, can become a "terminator." :-)
>
>>Go for it! You don't see Len dealing with my posts anymore,
>>do you? He can't - he's been disempowered! Surplussed again.
>>Discharged. He can't argue with logic, or intellect, or reason, and
>>when there's no possibility of personal attack - game over!
>
> Apparently "Leo" is so anonymous that his sense of reality is also
> anonymous.
>
>>Plus, he knows that I know what he is.......he ain't fooling me!
>
> This "Leo" is one sick puppy... :-)
>
>>This is rec.radio.amateur.policy, not alt.hasbeen.flamefest - let's
>>get these guys over to the appropriate forum, and get back to
>>discussing the future of Amateur Radio!
>
> "Leo" thinks the "future of amateur radio" lies in emulating the standards
> and practices of the 1930s.
>
>>Frankly, there are bigger
>>issues than Code Testing to be discussed here - BPL could wipe out the
>>hobby as we know it.......
>
> Tsk, tsk, isn't the Brass Pounder League the heart and soul of amateur
> radio of today?
>
>>To paraphrase Nancy Reagan, "Just Say No To Thugs!"
>
> NO, "Leo." :-)
>

5693. Re: PORKBUTT PORKBUTT PORKBUTT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 19:30:15 UTC
From: Lou <Spamfree@Spamfree.com>
Message-ID: <gt0db.167$LJ5.9925@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 79055
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Frank Todd IV" <frank@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
news:Mz%cb.342886$2x.104572@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD wrote:
> > What is it with you and porkbutts? Do you need a transplant? Do you like
> > porkbutts? Do you want somebody porking your butt? What is it?
> >
> > --
> > 73 de Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD
> >
> > Cuius testiculos habes, habeas cardeo et cerebellum
> >
> > " BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5 @bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
> > news:vn080m13ld4oa1@corp.supernews.com...
> >
> >>AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.
> >
> Porkbutt is the ex-WB2OTK Rich Whiten out of Easley, South Carolina, USA.
>
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>

So then this guy has a "fetish" for him???? And this idiot called Rene a
Fag? Hmmmm Anyone who loves Pork BUTT, regardless the implication isn't
saying much for themselves. Big ASS er I mean Al, you sure a character.

L.

5694. Re: PORKBUTT PORKBUTT PORKBUTT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 19:37:59 UTC
From: Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bl24io$78j4o$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79056
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lou" <Spamfree@Spamfree.com> wrote in message
news:gt0db.167$LJ5.9925@iad-read.news.verio.net...
>
> "Frank Todd IV" <frank@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> news:Mz%cb.342886$2x.104572@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> > Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD wrote:
> > > What is it with you and porkbutts? Do you need a transplant? Do you
like
> > > porkbutts? Do you want somebody porking your butt? What is it?
> > >
> > > --
> > > 73 de Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD
> > >
> > > Cuius testiculos habes, habeas cardeo et cerebellum
> > >
> > > " BIG AL" <bigal3.894.5 @bigal3.894.5.com> wrote in message
> > > news:vn080m13ld4oa1@corp.supernews.com...
> > >
> > >>AY YI YI YI YES ITS THE PORKBUTT SONG.
> > >
> > Porkbutt is the ex-WB2OTK Rich Whiten out of Easley, South Carolina,
USA.
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Frank K3EKO
> >
>
> So then this guy has a "fetish" for him???? And this idiot called Rene a
> Fag? Hmmmm Anyone who loves Pork BUTT, regardless the implication isn't
> saying much for themselves. Big ASS er I mean Al, you sure a character.
>
> L.

Sorry to help you out of your (wet?) dream(s), but I am not gay. I was just
wondering why anybody would be interested in porkbutts.

Rene PE1RA

5695. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 19:38:43 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <7B0db.159984$3o3.11442659@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 79057
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Ed G." <Spectrumhog@_REMOVE_StarBand.net> wrote in message
news:Xns940279A9036C4Frog207Junocom@148.78.248.75...
>
>
>
> Hmmm. That would be real interesting. The FCC restricting the use of
> lawfully licensed transmitters in order to accomodate Part15 unlicensed
> operations of incidental radiators.....
>
>
> Ed WB6SAT

Uh huh. The BPL folk have important freinds at the FCC. Do the hams? If
so, why has this BPL thing gone this far?

Frank Dresser

5696. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 19:45:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <hH0db.15326$ai7.12772@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79058

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:APmdncpHEpEE9umiXTWJkw@gbronline.com...
>
> Dan/W4NTI > wrote in message ...
> >>
> >
> >Why bother ? I just used my 20 meter dipole, coax fed with 50 ohm cable
on
> >7.030. The SWR was off the scale.
> >
> >I then hit the tune button on my FT-1000mp and that piece of junk
wouldn't
> >tune it. So I called CQ for a couple of hours. No replies.
> >
> >I then called my buddy across town to fire up and give me a listen. I
was
> >S1 and almost in the noise.
> >
> >So, for an experiment, knowing it was just a lark because the Texas Twit
> >said so, I hooked up my 40 meter half wave, center fed with 50 ohm coax.
> >My signal was now 30 db over S9.
> >
> >Can you get the Texas Twit to explain this for me please.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Just for kicks, I borrowed a tuner from a friend over the weekend. This is
a
> homebrew job. Hooked it to the 40 meter dipole and loaded the KWM-2 into
it
> on 80 meters. Made 5 contacts, 3 out of state, all good copy on both ends.
> Guess you just don't know how to do it dannyboy.
>
>
Yeah your right 'JJ'. I just don't know how to do it. But then I give a
damn if I get a good report.

Dan/W4NTI

5697. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 19:47:12 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <4J0db.15332$ai7.14495@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79059
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:Re_cb.153982$0v4.11491297@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:lyYcb.14441$ai7.2634@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> > > The transmission lines are radiators. As such they will also receive.
> > >
> > > Power lines are right up next to the rigs. The RF from the radios will
> > > trash the BPL. Probably by causing drop outs and adding lots of extra
> > > delays. Basically it will make BPL useless anywhere near a ham station.
> > >
> > > Dan/W4NTI
> > >
> > >
>
> OK, let's say it does slow or even stop BPL near a ham station. Why
> wouldn't the FCC restrict amatuer operations around BPL areas?
>
> Frank Dresser
>
>

Well, hopefully, they can still read their own rules and regulations there at the FCC. You see we are the authorized legal service. And BPL is the unlicensed part 15 activity. Part 15 devices must accept interference from the licensed users. Hams.

Course again, we are dealing with lawyers. So anything goes.

Dan/W4NTI

5698. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 19:59:14 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <mU0db.159998$3o3.11444493@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 79060
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:4J0db.15332$ai7.14495@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>

>
> Well, hopefully, they can still read their own rules and regulations there
> at the FCC. You see we are the authorized legal service. And BPL is the
> unlicensed part 15 activity. Part 15 devices must accept interference
from
> the licensed users. Hams.
>
> Course again, we are dealing with lawyers. So anything goes.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

If they don't like what they read, they'll write new ones.

Frank Dresser

5699. Re: PORKBUTT PORKBUTT PORKBUTT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 20:01:35 UTC
From: Lou <Spamfree@Spamfree.com>
Message-ID: <FW0db.168$LJ5.9917@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 79062
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD" <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net> wrote in message
news:bl24io$78j4o$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de...

<whole bunch of stuff snipped>

> > So then this guy has a "fetish" for him???? And this idiot called Rene a
> > Fag? Hmmmm Anyone who loves Pork BUTT, regardless the implication isn't
> > saying much for themselves. Big ASS er I mean Al, you sure a character.
> >
> > L.
>
> Sorry to help you out of your (wet?) dream(s), but I am not gay. I was
just
> wondering why anybody would be interested in porkbutts.
>
> Rene PE1RA
>
>

Not sure if you misunderstood ME or who it was Rene! I was posing a question of why Big Al has a fascination now for what seems another man who someone else pointed out was referred to as Pork Butt at some point in time. He - in a previous post - alluded to "you" - being a fag..... So, I was questioning HIS reasoning there, when it is HIM who seems to have the fascination with men - NOT YOU (Rene). So I TOO am wondering the same thing here.. I question no ones sexuality here except BIG ASS er I mean BIG AL's. I don't hear anyone else singing the Pork Butt song.. I bet his room is full of Porky the pig and Miss Piggy pictures and stuffed animals. He probably has a stuffed animal of each and rubs it on his dong too! The only wet dreams here are Big Ass er I mean Big AL doing Miss Piggy. Probably the only thing that will give him any attention sexually.
L.

5700. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 20:05:47 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <v_0db.7973$yp6.178274@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79065
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

```
"Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:Re_cb.153982$0v4.11491297@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:lyYcb.14441$ai7.2634@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> >
> > The transmission lines are radiators. As such they will also receive.
> >
> > Power lines are right up next to the rigs. The RF from the radios will
> > trash the BPL. Probably by causing drop outs and adding lots of extra
> > delays. Basically it will make BPL useless anywhere near a ham station.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> OK, let's say it does slow or even stop BPL near a ham station. Why
> wouldn't the FCC restrict amatuer operations around BPL areas?
>
> Frank Dresser
>
>

Because we are a licensed service and BPL is not ...

Carl - wk3c
```

5701. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 20:07:39 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <f01db.7974$yp6.178425@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79061
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Frank Todd IV" <frank@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
news:t50db.343006$2x.105605@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> Ed G. wrote:
>
> >>OK, let's say it does slow or even stop BPL near a ham station. Why
> >>wouldn't the FCC restrict amatuer operations around BPL areas?
> >>
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Hmmm. That would be real interesting. The FCC restricting the use of
> > > lawfully licensed transmitters in order to accomodate Part15 unlicensed
> > > operations of incidental radiators.....
> > >
> > >
> > > Ed WB6SAT
> > >
> They'll modify the rules so it fits their agenda. remember, the FCC
> will do anything that can make them $$$$ for the US Treasury.
>
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>

But ... the FCC won't be "making $$$" from BPL ... the spectrum
is not up for auction. (Additionally, the FCC doesn't get to keep
any of the $$$ they do make from auctions ... it all goes straight
into the "general fund.")

Carl - wk3c

5702. Re: PORKBUTT PORKBUTT PORKBUTT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 20:10:02 UTC
From: Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net>
Message-ID: <bl26es$790d5$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79063
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Sorry Lou that I misunderstood your posting! Sorry!

--
73 de Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD

Cuius testiculos habes, habeas cardeo et cerebellum

5703. Re: PORKBUTT PORKBUTT PORKBUTT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 20:18:57 UTC
From: Lou <Spamfree@Spamfree.com>
Message-ID: <Xa1db.169$LJ5.10042@iad-read.news.verio.net>
Source record: 79064
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD" <REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net> wrote in message
news:bl26es$790d5$1@ID-153362.news.uni-berlin.de...
> Sorry Lou that I misunderstood your posting! Sorry!
>
> --
> 73 de Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD
>
> Cuius testiculos habes, habeas cardeo et cerebellum
>
>

No Problem!!!!!!! I thought that was the case which is why I clarified it.
Should have made it more clear at the onset. My fault.
I'm on your side!
L.

5704. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 20:29:38 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Sk1db.160012$3o3.11446399@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 79066
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:v_0db.7973$yp6.178274@nnrp1.ptd.net...

>
> Because we are a licensed service and BPL is not ...
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

Oh. Who writes the licensing rules? Would it be the same politicians and bureaucrats who think BPL is just fine and dandy?

Frank Dresser

5705. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 20:43:27 UTC
From: nospam@nospam.com
Message-ID: <nospam-6B0FE1.15432726092003@hermes-ge0.rdc-kc.rr.com>
Source record: 79067
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <f01db.7974$yp6.178425@nnrp1.ptd.net>,
"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:

> "Frank Todd IV" <frank@127.0.0.1> wrote in message
> news:t50db.343006$2x.105605@rwcrnsc52.ops.asp.att.net...
> > Ed G. wrote:
> >
> > >>OK, let's say it does slow or even stop BPL near a ham station. Why
> > >>wouldn't the FCC restrict amatuer operations around BPL areas?
> > >>
> > >
> > >
> > >
> > > Hmmm. That would be real interesting. The FCC restricting the use of
> > > lawfully licensed transmitters in order to accomodate Part15 unlicensed
> > > operations of incidental radiators.....
> > >
> > >
> > > Ed WB6SAT
> > >
> > They'll modify the rules so it fits their agenda. remember, the FCC
> > will do anything that can make them $$$$ for the US Treasury.
> >
> > 73
> >
> > Frank K3EKO
> >
>
> But ... the FCC won't be "making $$$" from BPL ... the spectrum
> is not up for auction. (Additionally, the FCC doesn't get to keep
> any of the $$$ they do make from auctions ... it all goes straight
> into the "general fund.")
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

Individuals can profit indirectly. The FCC commissioners jobs are not
forever. I'm quite sure many will go on to private practice, if you
know what I mean.
73

Dale, K9xxx
--

5706. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 21:31:53 UTC
From: "Gary S." <Idontwantspam@net>
Message-ID: <esb9nvomi0g5apqit76eg8o9kipsaf1qf2@4ax.com>
Source record: 79068
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

On Fri, 26 Sep 2003 15:43:27 -0500, <nospam@nospam.com> wrote:

>In article <f01db.7974$yp6.178425@nnrp1.ptd.net>,
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote:
>
>> But ... the FCC won't be "making $$$" from BPL ... the spectrum
>> is not up for auction. (Additionally, the FCC doesn't get to keep
>> any of the $$$ they do make from auctions ... it all goes straight
>> into the "general fund.")
>>
>> Carl - wk3c
>
>Individuals can profit indirectly. The FCC commissioners jobs are not
>forever. I'm quite sure many will go on to private practice, if you
>know what I mean.
>73
>
>Dale, K9xxx

In the words of John L. and Paul M. "I get by, with a little help from
my friends".

There have always been concerns about the incestuous relationships
between regulators and the industries they regulate. These concerns
have intensified during the current administration.

Foxes and henhouses.

Happy trails,
Gary (net.yogi.bear)
---
at the 51st percentile of ursine intelligence

Gary D. Schwartz, Needham, MA, USA
Please reply to: garyDOTschwartzATpoboxDOTcom

5707. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 21:38:05 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <p5a9nvsg82p5gclo6hins7ro5u4jdv75bl@4ax.com>
Source record: 79069

Oh well - here we go again.....another attack by everybody's favourite
Sergeant.......

On 26 Sep 2003 18:29:57 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> Arnie is defending his Ego Turf, Clint.

and perhaps threatening yours?
>
> It's a fairly standard way he does it. Just another PCTA who can't get
> along with NCTAs who do NOT worship his mighty macho morsemanship.

It is indeed a simple man who sees all issues only in binary. As I
have made clear many times, I am neither for nor against code
testing....read my posts carefully, and at least try to comprehend...
Do your best, anyway. ;)
>
> This "Leo" doesn't really exist as any sort of Man.

I'm right here! I think, therefore I am.
>
> He (or she) has no real interest in any subjects. "Leo" is just playing
> with people in a unique form of sociopathy brought out by the Internet's
> anonymity. It's a juvenile form of harrassment but gives this person
> much glee for getting away with it. By choosing the PCTA side, "Leo"
> gets support and encouragement from the PCTA regulars in here.

Most of the regulars in here (PCTA or non-PCTA, as you categorize
then) would likely rather spend an afternoon at the dentist than
listen to your endless droning.

I simply represent intelligent, rational thought, and freedom from
your brand of rhetoric, OM
>
> "Leo" is only involved with bashing personalities. "Leo" doesn't care
> about any debate, discussion, or argument on any subject. He or she
> just likes to hide in anonymity of the Internet and work out his or her
> frustrations of daily whatevers by bashing anyone he or she picks.

I'm sorry - that's your schtick, right?
>
> "Leo" feels secure in the Internet anonymity. He or she must get some
> feeling of "power" by remaining unidentifiable, to be able to hit on
> anyone. It isn't reasonable discourse on subjects. It is just a perverse
> form of aggression, of getting back at anyone without being physically
> hurt. It is that person's little fantasy world at work in the mind.

And, my friend, who exactly are you? How do we know that you are who you say you are? Proof? Military history - were you really a marine? Current valid radio Licences held? you are not a Ham, so we can't check you on QRZ either. Who has verified you? Anyone can point to a large city phone book and claim to be someone. Has anyone talked to you on the air? Is there anyone who has even met you on this group?

I submit that you, Sir, are as anonymous as I. People know as many confirmed facts about me as they do about you! On the Internet, no one is necessarily who you think they are!

> What is ugly about that sort of psychological perverseness is that it
> reflects badly on the lofty, noble principles that ARRL keeps saying
> about amateur radio. It is rule by a mild form of terrorism, of the very
> "thugs" he (or she) complains "others" are doing.

You, Sir, are an expert in the area of Usenet terrorism - for quite some time, you have freely attacked anyone who does not think the way you do. In fact, all you posted for the last three days were personal attacks!

To quote a famous idiot, is that what you would call a pot/kettle/black scenario?

> "Leo" tries to project "power" with the inference that anyone disagreeing
> with his writings will be subject to harrassment, humiliation, or constant
> barrage of denigration. He (or she) is "powerful" yet without any power
> except to drive everyone away in disgust or extreme irritation.

Um, who has been driven away? I argue fairly, and can see and agree with others points. Something that you have not yet demonstrated the ability to do. Regrettably.

Projecting yet again, mein Alter Kocker?

> What I find mildly curious is that the PCTA regulars are all "on his side."
> The PCTA like that for they are frustrated at the turn of events of recent
> history that is against their particular cause. What the PCTA regulars
> don't realize is that the syndrome of this "Leo" can just as easily turn
> against Them if they do not condone his or her statements. :-)

I am on no one's side - just a voice of reason. Like many others in the group! If only you could listen as well as you proselytize....

Sadly, OM, you may well be gornisht helfn.....we'll see!

30, Leo

5708. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 21:49:46 UTC
From: beej@piratehaven.org
Message-ID: <bl2c9q0dtf@enews3.newsguy.com>
Source record: 79070
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

In article <4J0db.15332$ai7.14495@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>Well, hopefully, they can still read their own rules and regulations there
>at the FCC. You see we are the authorized legal service.

THEY are the law. If they decide the public need for this kind of
broadband internet access outweighs the need of a few hams to
chit-chat...well...

Politics is quite an interesting thing. What's Right isn't always
clear-cut, and doesn't always go, even if it is.

We're probably talking about a majority of lawmakers who neither
understand radio nor the internet. They're likely to see, "guy with
freaky-ass radio equipment is stopping hundreds of my voters from
getting internet access, and this should be illegal." Or, worse, "Guy
who is giving me no money is interfering with organization that is
laying on the dough."

A united voice speaks better to the government, which is why ARRL is
asking for backing.

-Beej

5709. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 22:29:59 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030926182959.08626.00000913@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 79071

In article <20030926150415.08626.00000907@mb-m27.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030926082957.15923.00000914@mb-m12.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>
>>> Learn to live with it graciously.
>>
>>Set us an example
>
> You first.
>
Don't you know how?

I thought you were the expert and professional, Len.

Show us poor ignorant amateurs how it's done. '-)

5710. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 22:38:46 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn9fvo9ioumt2b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79073

>
> > And, as far as "cogent and factual", is that before or after he made
> > a reference to us being pricks?
>
> Was that before or after you made reference to us as N***S?
>

well, to get the record straight, the analogy I used was calling
you CW nazis... not much difference but I did want to get the
facts straight.... and the intolerant, non-bending, "do as
your told and shut" mentality pretty well makes it an accurate
analogy. Insulting? yes. Then again, I never take "do as your
told" agendas lightly, nor do I treat them with kid gloves
or ATTEMPT to spare thier feelings. "Lieing down and
taking it" isn't what this nation was ever, or is still about, and
neither is my day to day ways I deal with life, especially with
the "we don't like change, and that's what we had to do,
so you should to!" without any reasonable back up or factual
evidence why it SHOULD be so.

Clint

5711. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 22:40:56 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn9g3pd401t3d0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79074

Did you read leo's (or whatever his real name is)
posts where he referred to those opposing his
buddy PCTA hams as "pricks", and upon busting
him for it, tried to say it was YOU saying it, and
upon busting him on THAT with just basic cut
and paste, he tried to claim he didn't know what
I was talking about?

Arnie and/or the rest should have set up a better
player for that game, if you catch my drift.

Clint

5712. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 22:45:00 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <Mj3db.77620$xx4.8044335@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 79072
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:ptBcb.3113$NX3.245@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 00:31:17 GMT,
> opcom in <3F72521A.70F5BD12@swbell.net> wrote:
>
> > What have you done for Amateur Radio today?
> > --^^----------
>
> The question is what has the ARRL done to the future of Ham Radio
> by hanging on to the Morse Code Requirement? It has killed it.
>
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> ==========
> = http://slrn.org SLRN 0.9.8.0 is out. =
> ==========

Makes you happy that you are nothing more than a no-code CB'er.

10-73's!

5713. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 22:47:50 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <icg9nvgd5c2vkl0ki3gaelml2s31l3jh2j@4ax.com>
Source record: 79075

Clint,

You had best stop following so close behind Len - people are going to
think that you are just one of his stooges!

(and, if he stops quickly enough, your head might even disappear....;)

30, Leo

On Fri, 26 Sep 2003 17:40:56 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>
>Did you read leo's (or whatever his real name is)
>posts where he referred to those opposing his
>buddy PCTA hams as "pricks", and upon busting
>him for it, tried to say it was YOU saying it, and
>upon busting him on THAT with just basic cut
>and paste, he tried to claim he didn't know what
>I was talking about?
>
>Arnie and/or the rest should have set up a better
>player for that game, if you catch my drift.
>
>Clint
>

5714. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 23:06:07 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <zD3db.4401$Hd6.2260624@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79076
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"recalcitrant ham op" <3evhil4de@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:1064506387.907205@newshost03.voicenet.com...
>
> "opcom" <eccm@swbell.net> wrote in message
> news:3F72521A.70F5BD12@swbell.net...
> > This was posted to ARLI, I don't know how many
> > subscribe, but in spite of the numerous comments
> > against BPL (transmitting wideband internet data
> > over power lines, which will destroy the HF radio
> > spectrum), the FCC seems disposed to encourage
> > it anyway. evil! evil! just look up BPL on the web. T
> > the noise from the radiated signals trashed the ham bands thoroughly.
>
> I guess you never heard that money talks and bullshit walks eh?
>
> Did you *REALLY THINK* that a couple hundred
> aging HF operating tightwad ham radio operators
> are going to stop an emerging technology that will
> conceivably network home appliances to the internet
> and be worth $BILLIONS$ in potential revenue ??
>
> Jeezehus-H-christ...get F-N real !!
>

Get your facts straight. There are 300,000+ hams licensed to operate HF and another 300,000+ hams licensed in the VHF and higher only category. Note that BPL will also trash 6meters and 2meters.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5715. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 23:14:52 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <ML3db.4404$Hd6.2262288@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79077
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:Re_cb.153982$0v4.11491297@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:lyYcb.14441$ai7.2634@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> >
> > The transmission lines are radiators. As such they will also receive.
> >
> > Power lines are right up next to the rigs. The RF from the radios will
> > trash the BPL. Probably by causing drop outs and adding lots of extra
> > delays. Basically it will make BPL useless anywhere near a ham station.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> >
>
> OK, let's say it does slow or even stop BPL near a ham station. Why
> wouldn't the FCC restrict amatuer operations around BPL areas?
>
>

Right now and under the new power level proposal, BPL must meet Part 15. This means that it legally cannot cause interference to any authorized or licensed radio service and must accept interference from any authorized or licensed radio service. Therefore any problems in BPL must be resolved on the BPL side under current regulations. It would require changes in both Part 15 and Part 97 to restrict operations around BPL areas. Plus don't forget the non-ham spectrum users. The FCC will have a heck of a time telling commercial AM radio, FM radio, and over-the-air TV broadcasters to shut down.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5716. Re: Extra Class Exam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 23:27:03 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <bX3db.4409$Hd6.2264181@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79078

"Don Morgan" <dmorgan@rocketmail.com> wrote in message
news:bd2ad7b6.0309241708.45863a0@posting.google.com...
> For the extra class exam, do they allow scientific calculators?
> If not is the a tan/arctan chart allowed for the rlc phase angle
questions?
>
> I took and got the general last year but as I remember it I thought they
limited
> the test taker to basic function calculators....

You can use scientific calculators but you must demonstrate that all memories are empty and that you have no equations programmed in. It would be a good idea to take your calculator manual and show them the page that describes how to erase all memories and equations and then do so right there so that they can observe.

If could be that in some cases, the VEs are unfamiliar with scientific calculators so that the only way they can be sure that you have nothing programmed is to limit it to simple calculators.

However, the test standards set up by the council do allow scientific calculators.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5717. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 23:40:38 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <W74db.4410$Hd6.2266237@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79079

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:yGBcb.10862$ai7.2785@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
> >
> > Yeah but if we are not in there doing the "squeaky
> > wheel" bit, they might decide we are adequately
> > served with less and less.
>
>
> Oh, we should of course be fully prepared to fight for what is ours, and
> even ask for a little more ocassionally. But I think most would agree it's
> not in our best interest to carry that too far with unfounded accusations
> against the FCC itself. They've treated us very well over the years and I
> certain wouldn't want to see that end.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

I've made no unfounded accusations against the FCC, merely pointed out the
following facts:

1) The FCC regulates all radio spectrum users and devices that may emit
incidental radio waves. Their job is to balance all requirements not attend
to the welfare of ham radio.
2) History has shown, by various documented actions on there part such as
reallocating spectrum to commercial users that hams don't necessarily have
priority.

Now I am not saying that the FCC should give us preference over all other
users. It was never their purpose. What I am saying is that any one who
thinks the FCC will "look out" for hams is overly optimistic or uninformed
of the overall scope of the FCCs job.

Therefore it is up to the amateur community to "squeak" whenever necessary.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5718. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 23:45:04 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <4c4db.4411$Hd6.2267245@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79080

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bkutul$6b3su$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Brian" wrote ...
>
> That candidate stole the election in 1992.
> --
>
> Ah, something to which we can both agree :-))
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
>

Do keep in mind that finally some newspaper, under the Freedom of Information Act, finally did do a recount of all ballots in Florida. Some six months later, the results were published and showed the election results would have been unchanged. Naturally this was printed as a filler at the bottom of the last page of the paper. It was available somewhere on line, but it's been so long ago now that I now longer have the URL and it may have been taken on the site by now.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5719. Re: The April Fools Joke that came true?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 23:47:35 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <re4db.4412$Hd6.2267576@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79081

Shades of the early 1900s. It seems that those who do not study history are doomed to repeat it.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

"Keith" <kilowattradio_spam@earthlink.net> wrote in message news:hBDcb.2898$RW4.441@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net...
> :From: Keith (kewyatt@apexmail.com)
> :Subject: FCC Chairman Wants Change in Amateur Radio.
> :Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.policy, rec.radio.amateur.misc
> :Date: 2001-04-01 00:32:05 PST
>
>
> April 1, 2001 -(AP)
> FCC Chairman wants to eliminate Morse Code and wasted spectrum by Hams.
> In a speech Saturday night to the telecommunications industry FCC Chairman
> Michael Powell spoke out against the use of Morse Code and the waste of
> valuable spectrum by ham radio operators, ham radio operators are licensed CB
> operators that pass a Morse Code test. The Chairman is concerned about the
> waste of spectrum worth billions of dollars to the telecommunications
> industry that is currently being used by Ham Radio operators.
> The Chairman also wants a big change in the spectrum wasted in the Ultra
> High Frequency area of spectrum in which Ham Radio Operators hold a
> staggering sixty megahertz of spectrum, more then any other radio service.
>
> "Amateur Radio operators in this frequency band only need about two
> megahertz to chat with each other about the weather. Cellular and portable
> communications are in great demand and the FCC should not allow a few
> thousand people to hog spectrum needed by millions of consumers."
>
> In a detailed presentation he outlined his plan to ask the
> International Telecommunications Union for the reassignment of a four
> megahertz chunk of spectrum to the airline industry that is presently held by
> amateurs near the overcrowded civilian aircraft band. He also outlined the
> conversion of thirty megahertz of frequency for use by telecommunications
> providers for data systems that could be used to supply high-speed access to
> the internet via radio frequencies.
>
> To demonstrate why the FCC Chairman believes the Amateur Radio Service is
> wasting spectrum he played several tapes of licensed ham operators

> using vulgar language and jamming stations in the band he wishes to
> convert to the airline industry.
> When asked by reporters about the possible opposition to his plan by ham
> radio operators the Chairman smiled and exclaimed, "We are going to cut it
> off and kill it!"
> Â© 2001 Associated Press, All Rights Reserved.
> --
> Best Regards,
> Keith (Use Reply-to for email)
> ---

> "Where would Christianity be if Jesus got eight to fifteen years with
> time off for good behavior?" NY State Senator James Donovan, speaking
> in support of capital punishment.
> ---
--
>
> --
> Best Regards, Keith http://kilowatt-radio.org/
> ==========
> = http://slrn.org SLRN 0.9.8.0 is out. =
> ==========

5720. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-26 23:55:25 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <Nl4db.160286$3o3.11461832@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 79082
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:ML3db.4404$Hd6.2262288@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
>
> Right now and under the new power level proposal, BPL must meet Part 15.
> This means that it legally cannot cause interference to any authorized or
> licensed radio service and must accept interference from any authorized or
> licensed radio service. Therefore any problems in BPL must be resolved on
> the BPL side under current regulations. It would require changes in both
> Part 15 and Part 97 to restrict operations around BPL areas.

Yes, that's the question. If a currently legal amatuer radio operator could
shut down high speed internet access for a given area, is there any reason
the FCC couldn't change it's current regulations, and put in new
restrictions on amateur radio?

>Plus don't
> forget the non-ham spectrum users. The FCC will have a heck of a time
> telling commercial AM radio, FM radio, and over-the-air TV broadcasters to
> shut down.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

I'm sure the FCC wouldn't restrict any of that. The TV networks, radio
networks and all the people who watch and listen won't let them.

Frank Dresser

5721. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 00:10:48 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <cA4db.4416$Hd6.2271466@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79083

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bl17gu$tj4@library2.airnews.net...
>
> And, is not upgrading because someone is happy where they are, a problem?
> When are you making your first million/yr., DICK, or are you happy where
you
> are?
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

There is absolutely nothing wrong with people being happy where they are.
But we get two different stories out of some people. Techs crying because
they aren't getting HF privileges and Techs not upgrading because they are
happy where they are. If the latter is the true case, then there is no need
to make any changes in any portion of the test requirements and NCI has no
reason to exist.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5722. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 00:21:53 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <BK4db.4263$iT4.3116095@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79084

Leo wrote:

> Technically, he may be able to pass the Extra without the need for
> further study, but what would he do with it? He seems to be equally
> contemptuous of conversing with people, which is a requirement to
> enjoy the hobby.....

For some reason, this reminds me of the old joke by Rodney Dangerfield where he notes that when he was a kid, his parents tied a porkchop around his neck so that the dog would play with him. 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

5723. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 00:25:38 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <34m9nv8q2tnho1a0c7mnvbenkflb0i25ce@4ax.com>
Source record: 79085

I remember that one! My favourite Dangerfield line is:

"I could tell that my parents hated me. My bath toys were a toaster
and a radio."

73, Leo

On Sat, 27 Sep 2003 00:21:53 GMT, Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>
>> Technically, he may be able to pass the Extra without the need for
>> further study, but what would he do with it? He seems to be equally
>> contemptuous of conversing with people, which is a requirement to
>> enjoy the hobby.....
>
> For some reason, this reminds me of the old joke by Rodney Dangerfield
>where he notes that when he was a kid, his parents tied a porkchop
>around his neck so that the dog would play with him. 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

5724. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 00:26:21 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <NO4db.4422$Hd6.2274073@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79086
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:Nl4db.160286$3o3.11461832@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:ML3db.4404$Hd6.2262288@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> >
> > Right now and under the new power level proposal, BPL must meet Part 15.
> > This means that it legally cannot cause interference to any authorized
or
> > licensed radio service and must accept interference from any authorized
or
> > licensed radio service. Therefore any problems in BPL must be resolved
on
> > the BPL side under current regulations. It would require changes in
both
> > Part 15 and Part 97 to restrict operations around BPL areas.
>
> Yes, that's the question. If a currently legal amatuer radio operator
could
> shut down high speed internet access for a given area, is there any reason
> the FCC couldn't change it's current regulations, and put in new
> restrictions on amateur radio?
>
>
> >Plus don't
> > forget the non-ham spectrum users. The FCC will have a heck of a time
> > telling commercial AM radio, FM radio, and over-the-air TV broadcasters
to
> > shut down.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> I'm sure the FCC wouldn't restrict any of that. The TV networks, radio
> networks and all the people who watch and listen won't let them.
>
> Frank Dresser

Well interference caused by hams will be small potatoes compared to the
power that some of the commercial broadcasters are allowed to use. That
will compromise BPL over a much larger area than any ham station ever could.
If BPL ever comes to my area, I'm within a few hundred yards of some of

these broadcasters so the BPL users will never even notice my signal since they'll be constantly torn up by the commercial stuff.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5725. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 00:27:34 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <WP4db.4423$Hd6.2274332@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79087

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:BK4db.4263$iT4.3116095@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Leo wrote:
>
> > Technically, he may be able to pass the Extra without the need for
> > further study, but what would he do with it? He seems to be equally
> > contemptuous of conversing with people, which is a requirement to
> > enjoy the hobby.....
>
> For some reason, this reminds me of the old joke by Rodney Dangerfield
> where he notes that when he was a kid, his parents tied a porkchop
> around his neck so that the dog would play with him. 8^)
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

I suspect that joke predates Rodney.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5726. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 00:44:42 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <_35db.160354$3o3.11466095@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 79088
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:NO4db.4422$Hd6.2274073@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
>
> Well interference caused by hams will be small potatoes compared to the
> power that some of the commercial broadcasters are allowed to use. That
> will compromise BPL over a much larger area than any ham station ever
could.
> If BPL ever comes to my area, I'm within a few hundred yards of some of
> these broadcasters so the BPL users will never even notice my signal since
> they'll be constantly torn up by the commercial stuff.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

I expect the BPLers would trap the broadcast frequencies. If the
interference from established broadcasters is still too high, they simply
won't offer service in that neighborhood.

But I don't think RF is the biggest problem for BPL. Overhead power lines
will only intercept a small percentage of the RF, and re-radiate at least
half of that. I think noise sources plugged directly into the power line
are going to cause far more problems.

Frank Dresser

5727. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 00:51:41 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <xa5db.4428$Hd6.2278327@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79091
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

"Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
news:_35db.160354$3o3.11466095@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:NO4db.4422$Hd6.2274073@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
> >
> >
> > Well interference caused by hams will be small potatoes compared to the
> > power that some of the commercial broadcasters are allowed to use. That
> > will compromise BPL over a much larger area than any ham station ever
> could.
> > If BPL ever comes to my area, I'm within a few hundred yards of some of
> > these broadcasters so the BPL users will never even notice my signal
since
> > they'll be constantly torn up by the commercial stuff.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> >
>
> I expect the BPLers would trap the broadcast frequencies. If the
> interference from established broadcasters is still too high, they simply
> won't offer service in that neighborhood.
>
> But I don't think RF is the biggest problem for BPL. Overhead power lines
> will only intercept a small percentage of the RF, and re-radiate at least
> half of that. I think noise sources plugged directly into the power line
> are going to cause far more problems.
>
> Frank Dresser

Could very well be. If one of the neighbors has welding equipment, that can
really put a lot of noise onto an electrical line. It takes a lot of
filtering to keep that out of your radio and no doubt would do a good job of
interfering with the Internet signal.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5728. Re: The April Fools Joke that came true?

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 00:52:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <zb5db.4278$iT4.3126562@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79090

Someone wrote:

>
>>"Where would Christianity be if Jesus got eight to fifteen years with
>>time off for good behavior?" NY State Senator James Donovan, speaking
>>in support of capital punishment.

Now this is bizzarre! This dude is supporting killing Jesus? This
really isn't the best argument for capital punishment!!! and some of us
might find it a bit.... ummm .. sacreligious.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5729. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 00:56:35 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl2n83ukl0@208.207.71.149>
Source record: 79092
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:Re_cb.153982$0v4.11491297@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
>>"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
>>news:lyYcb.14441$ai7.2634@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>>
>>
>>>The transmission lines are radiators. As such they will also receive.
>>>
>>>Power lines are right up next to the rigs. The RF from the radios will
>>>trash the BPL. Probably by causing drop outs and adding lots of extra
>>>delays. Basically it will make BPL useless anywhere near a ham station.
>>>
>>>Dan/W4NTI
>>>
>>>
>>
>>OK, let's say it does slow or even stop BPL near a ham station. Why
>>wouldn't the FCC restrict amatuer operations around BPL areas?
>>
>>Frank Dresser
>>
>>
>
>
> Because we are a licensed service and BPL is not ...
>
> Carl - wk3c
>

Yep. Under current rules that matters. But if you read the fine print in some of the petition and comments by BPL advocates, that's something they'd like to see change. And if they can get such an idiotic scheme as BPL past the Final Five, that little detail should pose as no real show stopper....

5730. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 01:09:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl2nvnnf0@208.207.71.149>
Source record: 79093
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Beej Jorgensen wrote:

> In article <4J0db.15332$ai7.14495@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
> Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>
>>Well, hopefully, they can still read their own rules and regulations there
>>at the FCC. You see we are the authorized legal service.
>
>
> THEY are the law. If they decide the public need for this kind of
> broadband internet access outweighs the need of a few hams to
> chit-chat...well...
>
> Politics is quite an interesting thing. What's Right isn't always
> clear-cut, and doesn't always go, even if it is.
>
> We're probably talking about a majority of lawmakers who neither
> understand radio nor the internet. They're likely to see, "guy with
> freaky-ass radio equipment is stopping hundreds of my voters from
> getting internet access, and this should be illegal." Or, worse, "Guy
> who is giving me no money is interfering with organization that is
> laying on the dough."
>
> A united voice speaks better to the government, which is why ARRL is
> asking for backing.
>
>

Well said, and right on.

Dick

5731. I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 01:14:45 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030926211445.01989.00000246@mb-m22.aol.com>
Source record: 79094

With BPL looking like a sure thing, I now say lets dump the CW testing, and let the CBplussers have it. How great it will be to have the CBplussers alloyed on HF and cant talk to anyone. Maybe that was the FCC idea all along, give the No-Coders HF, and intern with BPL here, they cant talk to anyone. GREAT IDEA..

5732. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 01:16:43 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <6JydnfVCHbSbdemiU-KYgg@gbronline.com>
Source record: 79097

WA8ULX wrote in message <20030926211445.01989.00000246@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> With BPL looking like a sure thing, I now say lets dump the CW testing,
and
>let the CBplussers have it. How great it will be to have the CBplussers
alloyed
>on HF and cant talk to anyone. Maybe that was the FCC idea all along, give
the
>No-Coders HF, and intern with BPL here, they cant talk to anyone. GREAT
IDEA..

Just how does one "alloy" the cbplussers on HF? Is there some kind of
chemical process for that?

5733. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 01:18:56 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl2oi0$1vn$0@208.207.71.149>
Source record: 79095

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> news:bl17gu$tj4@library2.airnews.net...
>
>>And, is not upgrading because someone is happy where they are, a problem?
>>When are you making your first million/yr., DICK, or are you happy where
>
> you
>
>>are?
>>
>>Kim W5TIT
>>
>>
>
>
> There is absolutely nothing wrong with people being happy where they are.
> But we get two different stories out of some people. Techs crying because
> they aren't getting HF privileges and Techs not upgrading because they are
> happy where they are. If the latter is the true case, then there is no need
> to make any changes in any portion of the test requirements and NCI has no
> reason to exist.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Dee, they'll never get over it, they just gotta have it both ways.
"We're happy with no code tech and VHF so stopp griping at us for not
upgrading, but why don't they drop that infernal Morris code test so we
can get our Extras and get on HF?"

Dick

5734. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 01:20:32 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl2ol0$1vn$1@208.207.71.149>
Source record: 79096

Mike Coslo wrote:

> Leo wrote:
>
>> Technically, he may be able to pass the Extra without the need for
>> further study, but what would he do with it? He seems to be equally
>> contemptuous of conversing with people, which is a requirement to
>> enjoy the hobby.....
>
>
> For some reason, this reminds me of the old joke by Rodney
> Dangerfield where he notes that when he was a kid, his parents tied a
> porkchop around his neck so that the dog would play with him. 8^)
>

It'd take at least a 16 oz. T-bone to work for Lennie!

5735. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 01:31:14 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bl2p93$7jfnf$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79098

"Clint" wrote in part ...

and, like your buddy arnie who set you up as a plant in this newsgroup in the FIRST place, I now thank YOU for admitting your hypocrisy the way HE did when he admitted to calling people jerks shortly after accusing the same people of "name calling".

Anyone who has been on this group for a while will tell you that I'm as close to Leo as you are to Bill Clinton. Sheesh, you couldn't be any farther away from the facts if you tried. BTW, when are you going to respond to my post regarding your ability to use the "facts" to make decisions? I'll wait here.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5736. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 01:34:54 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030926213454.12631.00001489@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 79099

In article <BK4db.4263$iT4.3116095@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
<mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:

>> Technically, he may be able to pass the Extra without the need for
>> further study,

I doubt that. The Extra still requires a 5 wpm code test. ;-)

>> but what would he do with it? He seems to be equally
>> contemptuous of conversing with people, which is a requirement to
>> enjoy the hobby.....

Perhaps he is enjoying what he does here.
>
> For some reason, this reminds me of the old joke by Rodney Dangerfield
>where he notes that when he was a kid, his parents tied a porkchop
>around his neck so that the dog would play with him. 8^)
>
HAW!

For some reason I am reminded of an unknown comedian who used to talk about how
bad his mother's cooking was:

"We had the only dog in the neighborhood that would beg at the table for
Bromo-Seltzer"

"In summer, there were usually bugs on the screen door to the kitchen. But our
bugs were on the inside, trying to get out!"

"I was 14 before I realized that pudding wasn't supposed to have bones in it"

Then there are the lightbulb jokes and the yomama jokes.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5737. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 01:44:21 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bl2q1m$7doa6$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79100

"N2EY" wrote ...

Do you think that a person can have only one writing style?

I agree that a person can have more than one writing style. In this case; however, Len would have to work exceedingly hard to destroy any semblance of writing ability. I believe he has too much of an ego for that.

Arnie-
KT4ST

5738. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:15:31 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bl2sod$c0d@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 79163

"JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
news:APmdncpHEpEE9umiXTWJkw@gbronline.com...
>
> Dan/W4NTI > wrote in message ...
> >>
> >
> >Why bother ? I just used my 20 meter dipole, coax fed with 50 ohm cable
on
> >7.030. The SWR was off the scale.
> >
> >I then hit the tune button on my FT-1000mp and that piece of junk
wouldn't
> >tune it. So I called CQ for a couple of hours. No replies.
> >
> >I then called my buddy across town to fire up and give me a listen. I
was
> >S1 and almost in the noise.
> >
> >So, for an experiment, knowing it was just a lark because the Texas Twit
> >said so, I hooked up my 40 meter half wave, center fed with 50 ohm coax.
> >My signal was now 30 db over S9.
> >
> >Can you get the Texas Twit to explain this for me please.
> >
> >Dan/W4NTI
>
> Just for kicks, I borrowed a tuner from a friend over the weekend. This is
a
> homebrew job. Hooked it to the 40 meter dipole and loaded the KWM-2 into
it
> on 80 meters. Made 5 contacts, 3 out of state, all good copy on both ends.
> Guess you just don't know how to do it dannyboy.
>
>

Works darned great, doesn't it?! Did all my MARS on it, including net control for nearly a year. So, yer right, apparently the "high" (high all right) class hams just don't know how to do it!

Kim W5TIT

5739. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:21:54 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl2s82$8t7$0@208.207.71.149>
Source record: 79151
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Dee D. Flint wrote:

> "Frank Dresser" <analogdial@worldnet.att.net> wrote in message
> news:_35db.160354$3o3.11466095@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net...
>
>>"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
>>news:NO4db.4422$Hd6.2274073@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>>
>>>
>>>Well interference caused by hams will be small potatoes compared to the
>>>power that some of the commercial broadcasters are allowed to use. That
>>>will compromise BPL over a much larger area than any ham station ever
>>
>>could.
>>
>>>If BPL ever comes to my area, I'm within a few hundred yards of some of
>>>these broadcasters so the BPL users will never even notice my signal
>
> since
>
>>>they'll be constantly torn up by the commercial stuff.
>>>
>>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>>
>>
>>I expect the BPLers would trap the broadcast frequencies. If the
>>interference from established broadcasters is still too high, they simply
>>won't offer service in that neighborhood.
>>
>>But I don't think RF is the biggest problem for BPL. Overhead power lines
>>will only intercept a small percentage of the RF, and re-radiate at least
>>half of that. I think noise sources plugged directly into the power line
>>are going to cause far more problems.
>>
>>Frank Dresser
>
>
> Could very well be. If one of the neighbors has welding equipment, that can
> really put a lot of noise onto an electrical line. It takes a lot of
> filtering to keep that out of your radio and no doubt would do a good job of
> interfering with the Internet signal.

I'm not sure that BPL will suffer so much at the hands of outside
interference. Remember, these are not analog systems, and will no

doubt be adaptive such that they can operate in noisy environments far better than any analog system. So while operating speeds may drop BPL may well go ahead and function acceptably sucnh that the end user won't realize it is being intefered with.

Dick

5740. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:28:16 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bl2soe$c0d@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 79162

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bl2oi0$1vn$0@208.207.71.149...
>
>
> Dee D. Flint wrote:
>
> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
> > news:bl17gu$tj4@library2.airnews.net...
> > >
> >>And, is not upgrading because someone is happy where they are, a
problem?
> >>When are you making your first million/yr., DICK, or are you happy where
> > >
> > you
> > >
> >>are?
> >>
> >>Kim W5TIT
> >>
> >>
> > >
> > >
> > There is absolutely nothing wrong with people being happy where they
are.
> > But we get two different stories out of some people. Techs crying
because
> > they aren't getting HF privileges and Techs not upgrading because they
are
> > happy where they are. If the latter is the true case, then there is no
need
> > to make any changes in any portion of the test requirements and NCI has
no
> > reason to exist.
> > >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
> > >
>
> Dee, they'll never get over it, they just gotta have it both ways.
> "We're happy with no code tech and VHF so stopp griping at us for not
> upgrading, but why don't they drop that infernal Morris code test so we
> can get our Extras and get on HF?"
>
> Dick
>

I don't know any Tech+'s or, for that matter, any hams who think like that, DICK. Here's an invitation:

If there is anyone, *anyone* at all on this newsgroup, who thinks they'd like to get on HF and will once the CW part of testing is done away with, then please submit your thoughts now. And, if there is anyone, *anyone* at all on this newsgroup who believes that they like the status of their class of license--in this case Tech/Tech+--and figures they'll stay at Tech+ because they like it and enjoy VHF to the exclusion of HF *until* they can get their HF privileges without CW testing, then please submit your thoughts now.

Dick, I am telling you right now before anyone posts a thing: I don't think you'll find more than a couple of folks who think like you state above. I don't think you'll even find two. Yet, your broad paintbrush sees *everyone* who is a Tech/Tech+ thinking like YOU think.

Kim W5TIT

5741. Re: It starts with the basics

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:29:17 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030926222917.29815.00000835@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 79155

In article <f45722ac.0309231758.7cbb7730@posting.google.com>,
brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:

>> Which is just but one of the numerous reasons why I don't use it,
>> Lennie!
>
>Larrah, forget about the law. Get yourself some junk steel and an arc
>welder. With your superior skill, you'll be heard for blocks.

Brian:

Funny, I've not heard many arc welders on the air lately. Everyone must
have switched to MIG/TIG.

BTW, I've never claimed to have any particular skill at welding. I would
have to learn and be tested in this useful skill before I could effectively
employ it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5742. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:29:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030926222918.29815.00000837@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 79152

In article <bks56i$5715v$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>
>I would love to, but my employer mandates that everyone work that weekend,
>no exceptions, and since my employer and the Dayton committee will not budge
>on the date that kinda rules me out. Any other dates??

Ryan:

I'm not sure about myself either at this point, but I'm hopeful. In any case, you would certainly be missed.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5743. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:29:18 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030926222918.29815.00000836@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 79158

In article <oK6cb.559233$Ho3.98151@sccrnsc03>, Frank Todd
<frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> writes:

>> Not that I don't make mistakes, but I don't come into newsgroups
>> acting as if I know everything either! 8^)
>>
>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>Just thought I'd add my two cents worth to the subject....It's about
>time the FCC eradicated this ancient mode of communicaton. The FEDS
>even stopped using it...Time for Amateur Radio to do the same!

Frank:

Sooo, it's not enough for code testing to be eliminated, you want to
see the abolition of the Morse/CW *mode* as well. Well, take a deep
breath and hold it...

73 de Larry, K3LT

5744. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:29:19 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030926222919.29815.00000838@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 79157

In article <bkr6l0ctn0@208.206.142.79>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>> Jim:
>>
>> Like it or not, we're definitely heading in that direction. I'd like to
>think
>> it's possible to hold the line somewhere, but in light of the fact that
>> abolition of the code testing requirement is almost a sure thing, the
>> rest of the dominoes will surely fall shortly thereafter. Once they do,
>> we'll most likely experience a major loss of spectrum allocations in
>> the ARS. Ironically, that will surely happen in the regions above
>> 500 MHz, where there hasn't been any code testing at all for over
>> a decade.
>>
>
>Don't forget BPL and all that goes with. Just because Cmsr Powell may
>leave doesn't mean it goes too. The less ham radio is percieved to have
>full value the less important it is to protect it and where it lives.
>
>Dick

Dick:

I agree. And the best way to prove that the ARS has less than "full
value" is to continue to reduce licensing standards.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5745. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:29:20 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030926222920.29815.00000839@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 79160

In article <QI9cb.4532$ai7.4487@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>> It most certainly is, if the ARS wishes to continue to
>> develop radio operators capable of exploiting the
>> many benefits and advantages of the Morse/CW
>> mode. (snip)

> And why would the ARS wish to continue to specifically develop radio
>operators capable of using code? What benefit does it offer? Not what it
>offers you, but what benefit does it offer to the ARS (here is your
>opportunity to show your position is not just self-serving)?

Dwight:

I've already answered that question many times, but the short form is that without code testing, there is no incentive for radio amateurs to learn the code at all. And, this is hardly self-serving, since, the last time I checked, I'm not the only licensed amateur radio operator in the United States.

>How are the
>goals and purposes of the ARS served by continued skill testing of this one
>operating mode? How will this (code skill testing) help to keep the ARS
>abreast of modern technology, insuring our continued value to others? How
>will this help move the ARS into the future (where we should be mainly
>focused)?

Retaining continued skill in Morse/CW has no negative effect on the development of technology in the future. That's an NCTA red herring.

>> (snip) As already stated by N2EY, this particular logic
>> could then be applied to (snip)
>
>
> Already addressed in my response to N2EY.

But not at all convincingly.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5746. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:29:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030926222921.29815.00000840@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 79154

In article <IM9cb.4536$ai7.4023@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>> Radio Amateur KC2HMZ writes:
>>> Sure it is. Part of the basis and purpose of the ARS
>>> as specified in Part 97 is to develop a pool of trained
>>> radio operators. Since nobody else uses CW anymore,
>>> it is no longer necessary to develop pools of Morse-
>>> trained radio operators.
>>
>> Did you see that everybody? "...nobody uses CW anymore."
>> Yup, he REALLY said that!
>
>
> No, Larry, he didn't say that. You misquoted him. He said, "...nobody ELSE
>uses CW..."

Dwight:

Ah HA!!! So, the fact that amateur radio operators DO use CW *is*
relevant to the code testing debate, and the fact that that the other
radio services which don't, isn't! Thanks for finally clearing that up.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5747. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:29:21 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030926222921.29815.00000841@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 79161

In article <eT9cb.4543$ai7.1084@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> OK, fine. Now, then, precisely which OTHER radio
>> services currently require Morse code testing???
>
>
> Already answered, Larry. I have no desire to talk in circles, repeating
>everything I say because you fail to understand it the first time. And I
>also have no desire to participate in your attempts to twist this (other
>services and code testing) into something that doesn't fit the reality of
>history or the truth.

Dwight:

Well, that's quite a roundabout way of admitting that you don't know what you're talking about when you insist that other radio services which don't use Morse/CW have some relevance to the ARS. And since you can't logically support your position, it's easier for you to bail out. I understand. Just keep in mind that you've single-handedly demolished one of the NCTA's favourite arguments.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5748. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:29:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030926222922.29815.00000842@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 79153

In article <pW9cb.4549$ai7.1130@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" wrote:
>>
>> OIC. So, you can't answer the question, then.
>
>
> No, I've already answered the question and don't intend to waste time
>doing so again. If your memory is really that bad, do a Google search for
>our past discussion about this.

Not necessary, Dwight. I was right the first time.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5749. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:29:22 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030926222922.29815.00000843@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 79159

In article <7hgcb.4385$pB6.793@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Kim W5TIT" wrote:
>>
>> heh heh....tell 'im you'll get back to him when he
>> has something intelligent to say. I told Larry that
>> a couple of weeks ago and, except to tell him I
>> wouldn't be the slightest bit interested in meeting
>> him or most others in this newsgroup, I've not
>> posted a thing to him since. I just can't find the
>> "intelligent" part of his posts.
>
>
> He does have the habit of trying to twist things when the discussion
>doesn't go his way and I simply don't have the time for that nonsense.

Dwight:

Yeah, in a way, you're right. In order to remove the usual NCTA spin placed on everything you post, I guess I do have to "twist" things in the right direction.

>If he
>doesn't want to discuss the issue seriously, he can discuss it with himself.

Sooo, you, like Kim, are going to admit defeat as well?

Kim says my posts lack intelligence. I guess, from her POV, that may be true. She obviously defines "intelligence" as being in agreement with her, or supporting whatever she says or does. I can, therefore, understand why she would want to avoid further debate with someone with whom she would have to make an effort to defend herself. I'll say one thing for Kim -- she knows how to look into a mirror and see a lost cause.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5750. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:29:23 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030926222923.29815.00000844@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 79156

In article <fvj3nvkkg4ecol929t1h477uqnfa3ts060@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
<kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> writes:

>>>>Don't look now, Clint, but welfare programs are "handouts" that give
>>>>away valuable assets as if the recipient were entitled to them simply
>>>>by virtue of being there with his/her hand out.
>>>
>>>Correct. Therefore, code testing isn't a welfare program, it's a
>>>government-subsidized life-support system for an anachronism.
>>>
>>>73 DE John, KC2HMZ
>>>Tonawanda, New York
>>
>>Well, that's YOUR opinion, John. Thanks for sharing it with us.
>>You have a right to be wrong.
>
>What are you saying then? That it *is* a welfare program after all?
>
>73 DE John, KC2HMZ
>Tonawanda, New York

John:

No, you and Clint said that code testing was a "welfare program," and
you're both wrong.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5751. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:35:25 UTC
From: David Rogers <kb9yym@iwc.net>
Message-ID: <QnSdnXAyxJoEQ-miU-KYvg@iwc.net>
Source record: 79089
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

All I can say to that is, Here, Here!
20 WPM <20wpm@arrl.com> wrote in message
news:vmthirclu0qc6d@corp.supernews.com...
>
> 1. Have yet to learn the code.
> 2. NCI Members.
> 3. Lack technical skills to setup a station.
> 4. Bootlegging CB'ers.
>
>
> As long as Echolink keeps the above mentioned off of the HF Bands, I'm all
> for Echolink.
>
>

5752. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:37:44 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn9tvshme7jt70@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79164

BTW, when are you going to
> respond to my post regarding your ability to use the "facts" to make
> decisions? I'll wait here.
>

I have several times until I was blue in the face and got nothing
back in return except "do as your told", "I had to do it so you should
to", and my all time favorite, "you can't possibly learn anything
else about radio until you learn CW first so you MUST be tested
on it" (begging the question AND circular thinking combined on
that (non)logic)...

so, I say to you that I hope things go well for you in your life
and hope you can certainly get over it and move on and not
get really vendictive or beligerant when they finally remove
the outdated and archaic cw testing policy soon.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5753. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:40:05 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn9u48rdspa0c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79165

>
> I've already answered that question many times, but the short form is
> that without code testing, there is no incentive for radio amateurs to
> learn the code at all.

bzzzt

substituting your opinion for facts.
logic says that if this case is true, then all cases must be true; no ham
would learn ANY mode if not forced to be profeciency-tested on
it first.

Just don't take it personally and get vendictive and beligerant on the
air when the remove the testing.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5754. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:42:13 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030926224213.12783.00000305@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79166

>Works darned great, doesn't it?! Did all my MARS on it, including net
>control for nearly a year. So, yer right, apparently the "high" (high all
>right) class hams just don't know how to do it!
>
>Kim W5TIT

Spoken like a TRUE Dump Down CBplusser who doesnt have a Clue.

5755. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:48:18 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vn9ujm4g9sp955@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79167

>
> No, you and Clint said that code testing was a "welfare program," and
> you're both wrong.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

well, if you listen to fellow PCTA types then the only conclusion
is that it IS a governement subsidation.... JUST like the farm subsidies
where the government artifically keeps the prices of food propped up
by buying all the excess crop that isn't sold at a given price instead
of letting the free market determine it.

In terms of ham radio, when the PCTA types say "it's the only
incentive to get people interested in CW, therefore we have to
make people learn it" you are essentially saying "if that product
(morse code) isn't purchased willingly at market price (as
to whether or not the individual is INTERESTED in learning it
in the first place) then the governement (FCC) will subsidize it
by purchasing the excess that doesn't sell (make the remainder
of the hams who don't want to learn it do so against thier will).

Pretty clear analogy.

If you look at it as a welfare program, then all the same it is
equally deserving of criticism.... if a system can't make it's own
way and sell itself and perpetuate itself, you never do it any
good by artificially keeping it alive, it'll never stand on it's own
two feet proverbially speaking.

The government, by the way, STILL buys insande amounts
of helium due to the strategic value of blimbs & derigables
and pumps it underground in northern texas. Yes, you read
that right.. WWI technology is being subsidized due to the
fact that it was ONCE useful, but since it's STILL on the
books as a government hand out, it's STILL purchased in
mass quantities

Cite: Martin L. Gross, "Washington Racket: Government
Waste from A to Z"

Clint
KB5ZHT

5756. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 02:48:21 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <VT6db.4336$iT4.3161094@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79168

N2EY wrote:

> In article <BK4db.4263$iT4.3116095@news1.news.adelphia.net>, Mike Coslo
> <mcoslo@adelphia.net> writes:
>
>
>>>Technically, he may be able to pass the Extra without the need for
>>>further study,
>
>
> I doubt that. The Extra still requires a 5 wpm code test. ;-)
>
>
>>>but what would he do with it? He seems to be equally
>>>contemptuous of conversing with people, which is a requirement to
>>>enjoy the hobby.....
>
>
> Perhaps he is enjoying what he does here.
>
>> For some reason, this reminds me of the old joke by Rodney Dangerfield
>>where he notes that when he was a kid, his parents tied a porkchop
>>around his neck so that the dog would play with him. 8^)
>>
>
> HAW!
>
> For some reason I am reminded of an unknown comedian who used to talk about how
> bad his mother's cooking was:
>
> "We had the only dog in the neighborhood that would beg at the table for
> Bromo-Seltzer"

Howl!

> "In summer, there were usually bugs on the screen door to the kitchen. But our
> bugs were on the inside, trying to get out!"
>
> "I was 14 before I realized that pudding wasn't supposed to have bones in it"

Oh geesh! Thanks, I needed those tonight!

- Mike KB3EIA -

> Then there are the lightbulb jokes and the yomama jokes.
>

> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>

5757. CQ 75 CQ 75 CQ 75

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 03:14:15 UTC
From: K4-OLD-KING-ALLIGATOR
Message-ID: <vn84c75mdd0bc8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79105
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
THIS IS "BIG--AL" CALLING.
CQ 75 CQ 75 CQ 75
THIS IS "BIG--AL" CALLING.
WHERE YOU AT BOY?
THIS IS "BIG--AL" CALLING.
CQ 75 CQ 75 CQ 75
THIS IS "BIG--AL" CALLING.
WHERE YOU AT BOY?
```

5758. CALLING L E O CALLING L E O

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 03:15:10 UTC
From: K4-OLD-KING-ALLIGATOR
Message-ID: <vn84dugelfdtea@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79106
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

wHERE YOU AT BOY?

5759. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 03:17:31 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <fj7db.8012$yp6.183371@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79169

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030926222918.29815.00000836@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <oK6cb.559233$Ho3.98151@sccrnsc03>, Frank Todd
> <frank@franktodd.pgh.pa.us> writes:
>
> >> Not that I don't make mistakes, but I don't come into newsgroups
> >> acting as if I know everything either! 8^)
> >>
> >> - Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >Just thought I'd add my two cents worth to the subject....It's about
> >time the FCC eradicated this ancient mode of communicaton. The FEDS
> >even stopped using it...Time for Amateur Radio to do the same!
>
> Frank:
>
> Sooo, it's not enough for code testing to be eliminated, you want to
> see the abolition of the Morse/CW *mode* as well. Well, take a deep
> breath and hold it...
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT

Larry,

Before you and Dick and others start calling this "the NCI agenda" ...
remember, NCI does NOT have any goal to do away with Morse
USE or to restrict it ... ONLY to eliminate the TEST requirement.

Carl - wk3c

5760. HEY CONCERNED OF USENET

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 03:18:23 UTC
From: K4-OLD-KING-ALLIGATOR
Message-ID: <vn84kask32na59@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79107
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

I'LL SAVE YOU SOME TIME BOY.

Path: sn-us!sn-post-01!supernews.com!corp.supernews.com!not-for-mail
From: "K4-OLD-KING-ALLIGATOR"
<BIG-AL@ -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@@@BIG-AL@@@-003894.5-LSB-75-METERS>
Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy
Subject: CALLING L E O CALLING L E O
Date: Fri, 26 Sep 2003 23:15:10 -0400
Organization: Posted via Supernews, http://www.supernews.com
Message-ID: <vn84dugelfdtea@corp.supernews.com>
Reply-To: "K4-OLD-KING-ALLIGATOR"
<BIG-AL@ -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@@@BIG-AL@@@-003894.5-LSB-75-METERS>
X-Priority: 3
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
X-Newsreader: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2800.1158
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V6.00.2800.1165
X-Complaints-To: abuse@supernews.com
Lines: 3
Xref: sn-us rec.radio.amateur.misc:269134 rec.radio.amateur.policy:262402

5761. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 04:18:26 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030927001826.29815.00000845@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 79170

In article <vn6lk3dd6nrg62@corp.supernews.com>, "BIG-AL@3894.5-LSB-75-METERS"
<BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@ BIG-AL -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS> writes:

>
>PARIS, France (AP) -- The death toll in France from August's blistering heat
>wave was nearly 15,000, according to a government report released Thursday
>that exceeded prior official estimates by 3,000 victims.

Just exactly in what way is this good news? It sounds like a bloody
disaster to me! My sincerest condolences go out to the families and
friends of the unfortunate victims of this tragedy. May their souls rest
in the Lord's peace.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5762. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 04:18:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030927001827.29815.00000847@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 79172

In article <20030926083000.15923.00000919@mb-m12.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>More like 12 years, anyway.
>
>btw, didja see where a US and a Czech ham had a successful EME QSO on 24 GHz?
>Used relatively small dishes and less than 100 W at each end of the QSO.
>Pretty
>snazzy bit of homebrewing to put together the required stations.
>
>And the mode used? One guess.

Prolly that new digital mode developed specifically for EME/AMSAT work. I don't recall it's name.

Waaaaait...you don't mean...naaawww. Not the Morris Kode?

73 de Larry, K3LT

5763. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 04:18:27 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030927001827.29815.00000846@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 79174

In article <20030925082934.08626.00000889@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
writes:

>I suggest you read what I actually wrote, rather than Larry's interpretation.
>You may have read it already.

Jim:

If I failed to paraphrase your comments accurately, I apologize. I admit that
I
did add my own "spin."

73 de Larry, K3LT

5764. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 04:18:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030927001828.29815.00000848@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 79171

In article <djKcb.11847$ai7.1786@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
>
> You're the one obviously obsessed with her breasts. You mention the
>subject almost as much as Larry does (and that's a lot).
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dwight:

Please provide a direct quote of each and every instance of my referring to Kim's breasts (excluding this one, of course.) That will not be quite as difficult as it sounds, I assure you.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5765. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 04:18:28 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030927001828.29815.00000849@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 79173

In article <FsCcb.10887$ai7.9207@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

> Ah, but there is the old maxim about a lie repeated often enough. At some
>point, Larry's messages must have a response, if for no other reason other
>than to address the false impressions he leaves. As for the rest of your
>(fairly accurate) message, I usually (though not always) tend to keep any
>opinions, formed as a result of psychoanalyzing Larry, to myself. The poor
>boy is in bad enough shape without all of us adding to his obvious mental
>anguish. In fact, I probably wouldn't even have said that if the anguish was
>not so obvious. ;-)

Dwight:

Your concern re: my "mental anguish," though unfounded, is noted and appreciated. I think that if you got to know me in person, you'd find me to be someone who is exceptionally free of "mental anguish." In fact, I would dare say that if there is any "mental anguish" in this forum, it would seem to have been expressed almost exclusively by the NCTA's, who, after all, started all this out of their anxiety at the prospect of being tested for entry-level (by that, I mean up to 20 WPM) proficiency in the Morse code as a part of the licensing process in the ARS. I, for one, do not have anxiety, and I am trying my best not to cause it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5766. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 04:59:42 UTC
From: brian <brian@nospam.net>
Message-ID: <3F75193B.FA7B289F@nospam.net>
Source record: 79176
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

The commissioners are lawyers except for two of them, none have engineering or technical degree.

http://ftp.fcc.gov/commissioners/

brian

Dave wrote:

> Can the FCC be sued for acting in GROSS negligence? Under the premise
> that as professionals THEY SHOULD HAVE KNOWN they may be liable.
>
> Yeah, I know you can't sue the government, but it sounds good!
>
> Dave
>
> Dan/W4NTI wrote:
>
> > Well Dick, apparantly no one else cares. I don't know of any of the
> > aformentioned groups making comments. Do you? Maybe they have no concept
> > of what will happen. Sorta like the FCC having no concept of what will
> > happen either.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bktfft$71a$0@208.206.142.103...
> >
> >> It won't be just hams and other minor users of spectrum below 80 mHz
> >>who will be very seriously impacted by BPL. There are several states
> >>whose statewice Public Service - State Police FM radio communications
> >>systems are located on Low Band VHF, in the 40-50 mHz region. These
> >>include California Highway Patrol and Missouri Highway Patrol, and at
> >>least a few other state public safety and forestry organizations, as
> >>well as many private users.
> >> From personal knowledge of conditions drawn from many years of
> >>personal involvment with these systems I am certain they cannot co-exist
> >>with BPL.
> >>
> >> I know they would all jump at the chance to move up to a trunked UHF
> >>or higher system, but with all the state governmental budget woes that
> >>won't be possible anytime soon.
> >> One can only wonder what FCC is thinking here.
> >>BPL is basically a noise generator that is attractive because it

> >>"wires the world" in the eyes of those for whom that end is
> >>the most important feature of advancing technology. Unfamiliar with
> >>the workings of radio or technology itself, they have eagerly latched
> >>onto the totally inaccurate and selfserving assertions of BPL proponants.
> >>
> >> As I said in my comments to the NPRM, there are much better ways to
> >>acoomplish the same end without completely ruining the HF spectrum.
> >>
> >>Dick
> >>
> >>
> >>opcom wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>This was posted to ARLI, I don't know how many subscribe, but in spite
> >
> > of the numerous comments against BPL (transmitting wideband internet data
> > over power lines, which will destroy the HF radio spectrum), the FCC seems
> > disposed
> >
> >>>to encourage it anyway. evil! evil! just look up BPL on the web. The
> >
> > noise from the radiated signals trashed the ham bands thoroughly.
> >
> >>>----------
> >>>
> >>>From:
> >>> Amateur Radio Station N0JAA <N0JAA@aol.com>
> >>> 4:00 PM
> >>>
> >>> Subject:
> >>> [ARLI] FCC Commissioner's Comments Concerning BPL
> >>> To:
> >>> bvarc@clarc.org, clarc@clarc.org, ARLI@topica.com
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>The following is a transcript from a recent speech given by FCC
> >
> > Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy at the United PowerLine
> >
> >>>Council's annual conference regarding BPL. It seems that she is all for
> >
> > it. It also seems that BPL is going to become a reality, regardless
> >
> >>>of what ARRL, the military, or anyone else says. As usual, big industry
> >
> > wins over everyone else because they have the money.
> >

> >>>This is from today's FCC Digest.
> >>>
> >>>Paul, N0JAA
> >>>
> >>>----------
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Reaching Broadband Nirvana
> >>>United PowerLine Council Annual Conference Remarks of Commissioner
> >
> > Kathleen Q. Abernathy
> >
> >>>September 22, 2003 (As prepared for delivery)
> >>>
> >>>
> >>>Thank you very much for inviting me to speak with you. I am very excited
> >
> > about broadband-over-powerline technology. I
> >
> >>>have seen it in action, and I believe it has a very bright future. It is
> >
> > a real honor to be your keynote speaker at this
> >
> >>>important juncture for BPL.
> >>>
> >>>As a regulator, I am keenly interested in BPL technology for a number of
> >
> > reasons. One of my central objectives as an FCC commissioner is to
> > facilitate the deployment of broadband services to all Americans. I also
> > fundamentally
> >
> >>>believe that the FCC can best promote consumer welfare by relying on
> >
> > market forces, rather than heavy-handed regulation. The development of BPL
> > networks will serve both of these key goals. It will not only bring
> > broadband to
> >
> >>>previously unserved communities, but the introduction of a new broadband
> >
> > pipeline into the home will foster the kind of competitive marketplace that
> > will eventually enable the Commission to let go of the regulatory reins. I
> >
> >>>want consumers to have a choice of multiple, facilities-based
> >
> > providers, including not only cable and DSL, but also powerline, wireless,
> > and satellite services. Such a robustly competitive and diversified
> > marketplace is
> >
> >>>something I would call broadband Nirvana. We will not get there
> >

> > overnight, but the continuing development of BPL technology is a major step
> > forward.
> >
> >>>While the long-term objective is a robustly competitive marketplace that
> >
> > is free of regulatory distortions, a more immediate question is: What
> > should the FCC do to help foster such an environment? Sticking with my
> > Nirvana
> >
> >>>metaphor, I guess the question would be, what is the path to
> >
> > enlightenment?
> >
> >>>I believe the answer, in short, is regulatory restraint. It is tempting
> >
> > for regulators to take every new technology or service that comes along and
> > apply the same rules that govern incumbent services. After all, regulatory
> >
> >>>parity and a level playing field are intuitively appealing concepts.
> >
> > But I believe that it would be a huge mistake to carry forward legacy
> > regulations whenever new technology platforms are established. Many of our
> > regulations
> >
> >>>are premised on the absence of competition, and when that rationale is
> >
> > eroded, we must not reflexively hold on to regulations that no longer serve
> > their intended purpose. In fact, many of our old rules not only become
> >
> >>>unnecessary as markets evolve, but they can be fatal to new services
> >
> > that need room to breathe.
> >
> >>>The Nascent Services Doctrine applying more stringent regulations to
> >
> > wireline providers at a minimum must be reconsidered. As other platforms,
> > including BPL and wireless, become more widely available, that will further
> >
> >>>undermine the justification for regulating incumbent LECs broadband
> >
> > services as if they were the only available offerings. When the Commission
> > completes this rulemaking, I expect that we will eliminate many existing
> > rules and
> >
> >>>substantially modify others; the central question is the degree of
> >
> > regulation that will remain during the transition to a more robustly
> > competitive market.
> >
> >>>Finally, it is important to recognize that although the emergence of new

> >
> > platforms like BPL will eliminate the need for many competition-related
> > regulations, other types of regulation may well remain necessary. For
> > example, the
> >
> >>>FCC must implement public policy goals unrelated to competition, or
> >
> > even at odds with competition. Universal service and access for persons
> > with disabilities are examples of this kind of regulation. These public
> > policy goals
> >
> >>>generally should be applied to all service providers, to the extent
> >
> > permitted by the Communications Act. The FCC also must intervene to prevent
> > competitors from imposing externalities on one another and to protect
> > consumers
> >
> >>>where market failures are identified. Although, as I have noted, the
> >
> > Commission was right to refrain from imposing heavy-handed price and
> > service-quality regulations on PCS services when the were introduced, it was
> > also right
> >
> >>>to adopt strict interference rules to prevent competitors from
> >
> > externalizing their costs. The same principle will apply to BPL. They key
> > point is that, while some degree of regulation is both inevitable and
> > desirable, we
> >
> >>>should ensure that it is narrowly tailored to the particular
> >
> > governmental interests at stake. I appreciate the opportunity to share
> > these thoughts with you, and I would be happy to answer a few questions if
> > we have time.
> >
> >>>
> >>> ******------****** please click on one or more
> >
> > of the links below to send a blank subscribe message.
> >
> >>>Amateur Radio Legal Issues List
> >>>(A list for discussing legal and legislative issues impacting Amateur
> >
> > Radio from Congress and the FCC)
> >
> >>> What have you done for Amateur Radio today?
> >>>--^^--
> >>
> >
> >

5767. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 05:04:13 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <hT8db.78376$xx4.8281971@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 79175
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Capt. Carl would you please make BPL go away like you did the real Hams.

Thank you.

10-73's!

5768. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 05:25:15 UTC
From: spam.for.the@buerotiger.de
Message-ID: <bl36vr$7pasd$2@ID-31.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79177
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

In rec.radio.amateur.dx brian <brian@nospam.net> wrote:
> The commissioners are lawyers except for two of them, none have engineering or
> technical degree.
>
>
> http://ftp.fcc.gov/commissioners/

[Snippo 300 lines of useless fullquote]

You don't have a degree in astrophysics either, otherwise you would have
learnt how to use an editor for trimming redundant lines from your own
postings.

Do you talk that way on the radio?

Peter Lemken
Berlin

--
Wer behauptet, den "Playboy" nur der Artikel wegen zu lesen, der schaut sich
auch dreistï¿œndige Pornofilme an, um zu erfahren wie sie ausgehen.

5769. Re: FCC endorses BPL, another threat to ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 05:28:30 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl375u$sv3$0@208.206.142.74>
Source record: 79178
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.shortwave

Frank Dresser wrote:

> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
> news:ML3db.4404$Hd6.2262288@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
>>
>>Right now and under the new power level proposal, BPL must meet Part 15.
>>This means that it legally cannot cause interference to any authorized or
>>licensed radio service and must accept interference from any authorized or
>>licensed radio service. Therefore any problems in BPL must be resolved on
>>the BPL side under current regulations. It would require changes in both
>>Part 15 and Part 97 to restrict operations around BPL areas.
>
>
> Yes, that's the question. If a currently legal amatuer radio operator could
> shut down high speed internet access for a given area, is there any reason
> the FCC couldn't change it's current regulations, and put in new
> restrictions on amateur radio?
>
>
> >Plus don't
>
>>forget the non-ham spectrum users. The FCC will have a heck of a time
>>telling commercial AM radio, FM radio, and over-the-air TV broadcasters to
>>shut down.
>>
>>Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>>
>
>
> I'm sure the FCC wouldn't restrict any of that. The TV networks, radio
> networks and all the people who watch and listen won't let them.

Yeah, but.... TV is going High Definition and will be moving up out of
BPL range by the time it matters. AM BC is going digital and besides it
would be pretty easy to notch AM BC and FM BC bands out of BPL. Not so
easy to notch the several ham HF bands also and still keep BPL working
on track. And the notching might not be effective enough to work right
for hams.
I can't see assuming that the broadcasters won't make their own
deal and thus avoid their own confrontataions with the powers that be,
leaving the rest of us to swim alone in the shark-infested waters.

Our best hope is the opposition of other HF users- military, aviation, marine. Also the many low VHF users, some of whom are statewide police organizations, including the California and Missouri Highway Patrols. A few years ago there were several others. California has well over 5,000 mobile unit users and Missouri around 2000. That doesn't include base station nor repeater operations, which ups the count considerably and which would be even more adversely impacted. They can't move to a location away from the BPL noise as a mobile unit might.

Dick

5770. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 05:46:20 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <Mu9db.2070$RG4.413@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 79179

Certainly a half wave dipole is better than a short one, but if you use a tuner to make the short one work, you'd best be using ladder line. You have no idea how lossy coax will get with a 10 to 1 SWR ratio.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message news:hH0db.15326$ai7.12772@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "JJ" <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc> wrote in message
> news:APmdncpHEpEE9umiXTWJkw@gbronline.com...
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI > wrote in message ...
> > >>
> > >
> > >Why bother ? I just used my 20 meter dipole, coax fed with 50 ohm cable
> on
> > >7.030. The SWR was off the scale.
> > >
> > >I then hit the tune button on my FT-1000mp and that piece of junk
> wouldn't
> > >tune it. So I called CQ for a couple of hours. No replies.
> > >
> > >I then called my buddy across town to fire up and give me a listen. I
> was
> > >S1 and almost in the noise.
> > >
> > >So, for an experiment, knowing it was just a lark because the Texas Twit
> > >said so, I hooked up my 40 meter half wave, center fed with 50 ohm coax.
> > >My signal was now 30 db over S9.
> > >
> > >Can you get the Texas Twit to explain this for me please.
> > >
> > >Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > Just for kicks, I borrowed a tuner from a friend over the weekend. This is
> a
> > homebrew job. Hooked it to the 40 meter dipole and loaded the KWM-2 into
> it
> > on 80 meters. Made 5 contacts, 3 out of state, all good copy on both

ends.
> > Guess you just don't know how to do it dannyboy.
> >
> >
> Yeah your right 'JJ'. I just don't know how to do it. But then I give a
> damn if I get a good report.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.521 / Virus Database: 319 - Release Date: 9/23/03

5771. Re: Extra Class Exam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 05:52:05 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <9A9db.2072$BI4.1311@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 79180

You must have misread what was said. If you understand what is going on, it is a no brainer and you don't have to memorize the question/answer books. I'm not sure what the question is exactly, but roughly one question states: if you have a 100 ohm pure resistance in series with a 50 ohm capacitive reactance, how do you express the impedance?

1) 50 + j100
2) 50 - j100
3) 100 + j50
4) 100 - j50

Come on, put any numbers in there. You don't have to figure anything.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309260453.7eaf7cf0@posting.google.com...
> wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030924214313.17626.00000192@mb-m16.aol.com>...
> > >For the extra class exam, do they allow scientific calculators?
> > >If not is the a tan/arctan chart allowed for the rlc phase angle
questions?
> > >
> > >I took and got the general last year but as I remember it I thought
they
> > >limited
> > >the test taker to basic function calculators....
> > >
> >
> > Why would you need a Calculator, none of the Questions are that tough
>
> They're only tough if you try to understand the material, but if
> you're just going to memorize the questions and answers, then you're
> right.
>
> You would only need a calculator if you were going to work through a
> problem, but if you're just going to memorize the questions and
> answers, then you're right.

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.521 / Virus Database: 319 - Release Date: 9/23/03

5772. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 05:56:19 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <7E9db.13374$pP6.12272@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79181

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> (snip) In fact, I would dare say that if there is any
> "mental anguish" in this forum, it would seem to have
> been expressed almost exclusively by the NCTA's,
> who, after all, started all this (snip)

Too bad Google doesn't go back that far. It would be interesting to see who really "started all this" in these newsgroups. Of course, I suspect it was a member of the pro-code crowd - since the FCC started dropping code years ago, the no-code crowd would have had little reason to even bring the subject up. The pro-code crowd, on the other hand, started complaining before the FCC even changed the rules (the rumor of a rule change was enough).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5773. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 06:11:10 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <2S9db.13438$pP6.9339@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79182

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> (snip) Sooo, you, like Kim, are going to admit defeat
> as well? (snip)

There is no defeat to admit to, Larry. I presented the facts. You were unable to respond without twisting the truth. That pretty much ended the discussion. However, I'm more than willing to continue if you have something worthwhile to say. Of course, you don't really have to say anything intellegent, just something worthy of even a passing reply.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5774. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 06:29:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <17adb.13510$pP6.8436@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79183

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote:
>
> I've made no unfounded accusations against the FCC, (snip)

Relax. I wasn't talking about you. I was referring to what I said in the message you first responded to (how some people were doing so).

> What I am saying is that any one who thinks the FCC
> will "look out" for hams is overly optimistic or
> uninformed of the overall scope of the FCC's job.

Now it's my turn to object. I never suggested anything of the sort. Instead, I said the FCC has treated us (ham operators) fairly well over the years, which does suggest they do have our best interests in mind to some extent when they make rule changes. That's a long way from saying they're uniquely looking out for us.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5775. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 06:38:46 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309262238.638547cf@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79202

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030926143000.01893.00000847@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <hio6nvc53pdg9fpkq87hj5efarc8qr97s2@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
> writes:
>
> >Thanks, Steve. You're quite correct - there are some remarkable
> >opportunities which we need to explore!
> >
> >What I don't understand is why the intelligent members of this group
> >put up with all of the QRM intentionally generated by just a few
> >troublemakers.
>
> Of course...in the Orwellian Truthspeak of the PCTA, all who do not
> love, honor, and obey the PCTA principles are "false, misleading, or
> nonsense" and should be opposed to ALL that the NCTA are for...
>
> There is only ONE side that is noble, good, and true...the PCTAs.
>
> Anyplace else that is considered dictatorial, totalitarian.
>
> To this invisible, unidentifiable "Leo" it is Truthspeak for he (or she) is
> a mighty "force" for all that is good, noble, and true. Not.

Coming from an idiot who tries to re-write Korean War history in
such a way so as to glorify himself in the deaths of KIA's who died
three years before he was himself inducted is hillarious.

"Orwellian", Lennie...?!?! You have no idea what "Orwellian"
means.

Putz.

Steve, K4YZ

5776. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 06:56:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Dwadb.13617$pP6.4408@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79184

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> I've already answered that question many times, but the
> short form is that without code testing, there is no incentive
> for radio amateurs to learn the code at all. (snip)

But, again, why should there be "incentive" for hams to learn code? Notice that I'm not asking why a person would want to learn code on their own. Instead, I'm asking why there should be an effort on the part of the ARS or FCC to promote (boost, encourage, or push) this single operating mode (it's the only mode specifically skill tested)? You have yet to answer this question, and almost seem determined to avoid it.

> Retaining continued skill in Morse/CW has no negative
> effect on the development of technology in the future.
> That's an NCTA red herring.

I didn't say it had a negative effect, Larry. Instead, I asked you how this (code skill testing) will help to keep the ARS abreast of modern technology, insuring our continued value to others? I also asked how this (code skill testing) will help move the ARS into the future (where we should be mainly focused)? If you don't have an answer those questions, fine. Just don't attempt to twist what I said.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5777. Re: A KEESLER AFB COWARD'S POST

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 07:20:28 UTC
From: LaShaun Ivory <NoSpam@NOSpam.com>
Message-ID: <bl3dnr$a09$0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 79185
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
news:97098709.6578F56123@taranews.net...
On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 14:49:56 GMT, Dwight Stewart
<stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote:
>
> If true, since such use is now considered a serious offense, this person
> would be well advised to discuss the rules governing the use of military
> computers for private recreational activities with the facility's system
> adminstrator or IT security officer. DoD has already come down hard on a
few
> violators (I read in S&S that one E-6 was sentenced to two years in jail
and
> discharged).

Google (http://groups.google.com) can be a revealing database when used to check up on a poster's history. Take for example the three entities who call themselves "Ed Norton," "Firebottle," and "Les Locklear," and who have an obsession with trashing someone named Lloyd Davies.

They have the following things in common: (1) they claim to know one another (Firebottle even claimed that Ed Norton hangs out with Les on weekends); (2) they all have AOL accounts; (3) they all have Google accounts, and (4) they all post through Keesler AFB from time to time.

Here are a few of the message IDs which are archived on Google and which contain the supporting information. You can retrieve the message itself by putting the message ID into the form on the advanced search page at Google. Once you have the message, click on "original format", and then take a careful look at the NNTP-Posting-Host header. It identifies the computer which had connected to Google's machines in order to make the post.

Keesler AFB often uses Ft McPherson's proxy server, and so it arises as the NNTP-Posting-Host in those cases. Here are a few messages posted by "Ed Norton" via the McPherson route (IP address 198.26.120.13):

Message-ID: <999c58d3.0302050507.235363ea@posting.google.com>
Message-ID: <999c58d3.0301220427.5ac785b1@posting.google.com>
Message-ID: <999c58d3.0208140417.417b9d96@posting.google.com>

And here is a message that "Ed Norton" posted directly from Keesler via IP address 131.22.200.54:

Message-ID: <999c58d3.0301270810.218de3f1@posting.google.com>

"Firebottle" likes the McPherson route too, as can be seen in:

Message-ID: <edaa3c2a.0301130628.26862bd@posting.google.com>
Message-ID: <edaa3c2a.0301130622.35a242d5@posting.google.com>
Message-ID: <edaa3c2a.0301150542.56b0ab39@posting.google.com>

And Les Locklear also posts through Keesler, as recorded in
Message-ID: <cbf9555c.0301140634.421d12b5@posting.google.com>

Les also connects to Google through Ft McPherson, as indicated in
Message-ID: <cbf9555c.0301131014.ea9f7a5@posting.google.com>

-...-

So what does this mean? The simplest explanation for the great
commonality among those three posters would be that they are all the
same person. If not, and the sock puppet operator is, as he claimed,
a friend of Les', then I'd say that with friends like that, Les
doesn't need any enemies.
-.-.-.-.-.-.

Hey! How about one of us sends these posts to the server to see what
happens? I think it would be a great way to see if Les/Firebottle/Norton and
his other sock puppets can be dealt with on one fell swoop.
Losing Les could hardly be considered a loss. The poor old man injects much
rhetoric but says so little anyway, so who would miss him?
I don't think Lloyd would....

5778. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 07:30:44 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <E0bdb.13758$pP6.5456@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79186

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> Well, that's quite a roundabout way of admitting that
> you don't know what you're talking about when you
> insist that other radio services which don't use Morse/
>CW have some relevance to the ARS. And since you
> can't logically support your position, it's easier for you
> to bail out. (snip)

Trying to twist what I said again, Larry? I never said anything about the other radio services having any relevance beyond the fact that many once used code (which was relevant to the ARS at the time) and their present lack of code use (which has relevance today). If you choose to ignore that past and present relevance, that's certainly your prerogative. However, by doing so, your position has simply lost touch with reality.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5779. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 07:35:06 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <K4bdb.13784$pP6.12402@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79187

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>> No, Larry, he didn't say that. You misquoted him. He
>> said, "...nobody ELSE uses CW..."
>
> Ah HA!!! So, the fact that amateur radio operators DO
> use CW *is* relevant to the code testing debate, and the
> fact that that the other radio services which don't, isn't!
> Thanks for finally clearing that up.

Huh? What the heck are you talking about, Larry? I beginning to think
you're finally lost your mind.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5780. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 07:51:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl3fh5$e9f$0@208.206.142.77>
Source record: 79188

WA8ULX wrote:
>>Works darned great, doesn't it?! Did all my MARS on it, including net
>>control for nearly a year. So, yer right, apparently the "high" (high all
>>right) class hams just don't know how to do it!
>>
>>Kim W5TIT
>
>
> Spoken like a TRUE Dump Down CBplusser who doesnt have a Clue.

Don't pay them too much attention, Bruce. Neither JJ nor TwIT realizes they were NOT using a 1/4 wave dipole. If they had been, neither would have gotten a signal out of the back yard.

If the *antenna system* took a load and performed under the circumstances they describe, then both JJ and TwIT were loading the outer surface of the coax shield, and *that* was doing a major part of the radiating.

Of course when one side of a 1/4 wave dipole is attached to the braid of the coax with no decoupling, then the dipole is no longer a 1/4 wave dipole! What it becomes then depends entirely on the feedline length as well as other local factors. So then it will probably take some load, and maybe even load up to full supplied power, as JJ described. At that point it's a crap shoot-you don't know *what* you've got! For sure it ISN'T a 1/4 wave dipole! But the uninformed will think their "1/4 wave dipole" worked just fine!

If JJ had used a good isolation choke or 1:1 balun to decouple the coax from the 40 meter dipole at the feedpoint the tuner would have balked big time, and all that RF would have bounced around inside it, and made itself known quite loudly in the form of arcs. The KWM-2 finals might have sparked a bit, too.

Been there, done that, seen it happen, got the RF burns.

As I said earlier, they weren't using a 1/4 wave dipole, they just thought they were.

All this stuff is in the books.

Dick

5781. Re: Extra Class Exam

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 07:57:33 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl3ftd$er5$0@208.206.142.77>
Source record: 79189

Jim Hampton wrote:

> You must have misread what was said. If you understand what is going on, it
> is a no brainer and you don't have to memorize the question/answer books.
> I'm not sure what the question is exactly, but roughly one question states:
> if you have a 100 ohm pure resistance in series with a 50 ohm capacitive
> reactance, how do you express the impedance?
>
> 1) 50 + j100
> 2) 50 - j100
> 3) 100 + j50
> 4) 100 - j50
>
> Come on, put any numbers in there. You don't have to figure anything.
>

Jim if they need a calculator for that one they don't need to be taking
the test!

Dick

5782. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 08:00:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl3g3r$er5$1@208.206.142.77>
Source record: 79190

N2EY wrote:

> In article <hio6nvc53pdg9fpkq87hj5efarc8qr97s2@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
> writes:
>
>
>>What I don't understand is why the intelligent members of this group
>>put up with all of the QRM intentionally generated by just a few
>>troublemakers.
>
>
> Good question.
>
>>For example, Len is not an Amateur, (well, not a Radio amateur.... :)
>>), and states freely that he does not have any desire to become one -
>
>
> Just for reference, Leo...
>
> Back on January 19, 2000, Len did say he was 'going for Extra right out of the
> box' or words to that effect. Back then he was posting here as 'Lenof21'
> (aol.com) . That was over 3-1/2 years ago.
>

Could that be taken to mean that Lennie can't find his way out of a box?
Maybe a wet paper bag?

5783. Re: PORKBUTT PORKBUTT PORKBUTT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 08:02:52 UTC
From: LaShaun Ivory <NoSpam@NOSpam.com>
Message-ID: <bl3g7afnl0@pita.alt.net>
Source record: 79191
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Porkbutt is the ex-WB2OTK Rich Whiten out of Easley, South Carolina, USA.

73

Frank K3EKO

==========

Yes, Porkbutt IS the ex operator so named. He made himself infamous during his years as an overbearing, selfish, and overpowered Ham op on 14.313. Rich is not missed save by a few of his malingerers.
The band is a better place without him.

And Frankie, why can't you and Dan just get along? Yeah, Dan is garrulous, he is known to be a pain in the ass at times, but why promulgate it with your inane comments?
Do you take pleasure in needling Dan? Why?
Dan has his schedule full enough as it is...he has to deal with jammers and the likes of David Tolassi and Dumbass Donnie. There is no need for you, Frankie, to be tossing your two cents worth into the already confused foray.
Frankie...ever pull your dictionary off the shelf and read the definition of "maturity"? Perhaps you and Dan should both do so, but most of all, YOU should do so Frankie.

One thing still eludes me in all of this. Why the Hell are all of you guys so set on attacking Lloyd? He doesn't really upset the cart all that much, but yet you guys persist in attacking him at every turn. What gives? Is this a "pile-on" mentality whereby all you macho Ham geeks attack the weakest of the weak? Like sharks going for the scent of blood? Playground Bullies? Cowards? Pussies? Whassa matter? Lloyd doesn't use a pocket protector for his fifteen multi-colored ball-point pens? Doesn't wear his callsign on his baseball hat? Doesn't run around with six HT's on his belt? Doesn't have six antennas on his SUV?
Face it...look at all the posts allegedly made by Lloyd...there are many. You guys don't know the real Lloyd from the sock puppet Lloyds, nor do you care to find out, if you can.

Give Lloyd a break, whoever he is. It is beyond your areas of expertise to cull out the real Lloyd from the anonymous Lloyds.

Maybe one of these days you freaks can take off your aluminum helmets with the rubber duckies mounted on them and join the real world.

Frankie...stop messing with Dan. Change your diapers and move on....

5784. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 08:04:57 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl3gb9$er5$2@208.206.142.77>
Source record: 79192

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
>>Well, that's quite a roundabout way of admitting that
>>you don't know what you're talking about when you
>>insist that other radio services which don't use Morse/
>>CW have some relevance to the ARS. And since you
>>can't logically support your position, it's easier for you
>>to bail out. (snip)
>
>
>
> Trying to twist what I said again, Larry? I never said anything about the
> other radio services having any relevance beyond the fact that many once
> used code (which was relevant to the ARS at the time) and their present lack
> of code use (which has relevance today).

You know, Dwight, I've noticed something about your writings.
Everything you say is couch in such terms that it can be easily
denied and you can always say "I never said it" when that becomes
the attractive out. Of course what you meant is......

5785. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 09:33:57 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bl3li6$7ga3f$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79193

"Clint" wrote ...

I have several times until I was blue in the face and got nothing back in return except "do as your told", "I had to do it so you should to", and my all time favorite, "you can't possibly learn anything else about radio until you learn CW first so you MUST be tested on it" (begging the question AND circular thinking combined on that (non)logic)...

so, I say to you that I hope things go well for you in your life and hope you can certainly get over it and move on and not get really vendictive or beligerant when they finally remove the outdated and archaic cw testing policy soon.

Wow, I guess you *don't* want to argue when the facts are presented. And I thought that's what you held so dear? Run Forrest, Run.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5786. Re: 3894.5

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 09:58:46 UTC
From: ^^^I Am Fileo - I Am Fileo^^^ <fileo@hotmail.cc>
Message-ID: <innanv8hp6e8hlavjeult6942o9ud9fj61@4ax.com>
Source record: 79194
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.mods,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.equipment,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Wed, 24 Sep 2003 14:17:56 +0200, "Rene PE1RA / ON6ALD"
<REMOVErene.altena@gmx.net> wrote:

>No!
>
>Where the Subject line contains '3.894' or '3894' or 'bigal'
>send the email back
>
>
>73 de Rene PE1RA

E-MAIL???

You are on Usenet, Rene - not E-MAIL!

You CAN'T send it back! LOL!

5787. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 11:01:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927070141.12501.00002712@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79197

In article <yMpcb.7707$yp6.151037@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>news:7pr3nvgmi2vk2ilphosdg3budnuujt0kle@4ax.com...
>> Paul,
>>
>> Fully agreed - I found the survey quite by accident when I was looking
>> up sonething on the RAC web site in August, otherwise I would not have
>> missed it too..
>>
>> Was it advertised in the magazine? If so, I don'rt recall seeing it!
>>
>> Hopefully, the ARRL won't try to pull the same stunt....whatever way
>> the vote goes, it should fairly represent the wishes of the Amateur
>> community, not a small (and perhaps biased??) sampling.
>>
>> 73, Leo
>
>Given that:
>
>1) the ARRL's membership represents <25% of US licensees

1A) NCI's membership represents <0.5% of US amateur licensees..
>
>and
>
>2) that the membership is HEAVILY stacked with long-time
>hams

How do you know? Without membership data, this is pure speculation on your
part.

>(Techs have stayed away in droves - in my view because
>they correctly have viewd ARRL's Morse policy as designed
>to keep them off of HF)

Again, pure speculation. Without membership data, it's impossible to know how
many members are of any license class. Even harder to discern is why some are
members and some aren't. For example, I have heard many Techs say things like:

- "$39 is too much money for the magazine"
- "The ARRL is a national organization, and my focus is local and regional"
- "QST is too technical"
- "QST isn't technical enough"
- "There's not enough stuff about what I'm interested in"

ARRL's Morse code test policy is derived from what members want. If enough nocodetest hams join and elect directors who support their views, the policy will change.
>
>I would, even giving the ARRL credit for the best of intentions,
>submit that any survey of ARRL membership is unlikely to be
>TRULY representative of the views of the majority of US hams.
>
I submit that any survey of NCI membership is unlikely to be
TRULY representative of the views of the majority of US hams.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5788. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 11:01:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927070142.12501.00002714@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79199

In article <bklkfs$6ut@library1.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>> Kim, beer and BBQ?
>>
>
>Oh good heavens, no! Pasta, or steak, and a glass of fine wine or a frozen
>margarita.

Cheeseburger in paradise, anyone?

>Beer and BBQ is a Texan thing and, while I'll drink an ICE COLD
>beer on a hot day outside--you won't find me outside much in the Summertime
>around here. BBQ? It's OK.

Wings and a Sam Adams. Or a Black & Tan.

Hot roast beef sandwiches and a Genny Cream Ale or Guinness (drink your beer
before it gets cold)

Or the amateur radio ultimate: Anchovy pizza a la Grommethead Schulz.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5789. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 11:01:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927070142.12501.00002713@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79200

In article <bl17gu$tj4@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
writes:

>And, is not upgrading because someone is happy where they are, a problem?

Nope.

And I suspect that's why every ham isn't an Extra. If someone's interest
doesn't include HF, VEing or a four-character call, there's not much reason to
upgrade, is there?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5790. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 11:01:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927070143.12501.00002715@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79195

In article <6BIbb.63583$NM1.20271@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> writes:

>I'll tell you this Jim...the Ruskies had and probably still do have the best
>CW operators in the world.

I'll take yer word for it about their nonhams. The Rooskie hams I've worked on
CW have been pretty sharp.
>
>I used to have to listen to them a lot in a job I had. Amazing how so many
>of them sounded like the hams on 20meters...hi.
>
bwaaahaahaaa....!

73 de Jim, N2EY

5791. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 11:01:43 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927070143.12501.00002716@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79196

In article <bko63e$3sae4$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:

>I think that these licenses we have should be retested every so often, such >as every ten years! All applicable elements for the respective licenses >including the morse code test. Most every other license out there issued >requires some form of retesting. At least this way we will find out if >anyone has learned anything along the way or not... And it could be that if >you were, for example a 20wpm Extra, you would have to pass all the elements >required for that back then, or the license class you would have/get would >be whatever elements a person DID pass on the retest. Definitely would show >if anyone bothered to "grow" in the ten year period.

Works for me!

73 de Jim, N2EY

5792. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 11:01:44 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927070144.12501.00002717@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79198

In article <5c01b95b.0309262238.638547cf@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:

>Coming from an

[pejorative deleted]

>who tries to re-write Korean War history in
>such a way so as to glorify himself in the deaths of KIA's who died
>three years before he was himself inducted is hillarious.
>
> "Orwellian", Lennie...?!?! You have no idea what "Orwellian"
>means.

Actually, Steve, rewriting history was Winston Smith's job in the book "1984".

73 de Jim, N2EY

5793. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 11:01:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927070145.12501.00002718@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79201

In article <fqn1nvoo2jmf405f1g5toss5qi8jfdtg6d@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org> writes:

>Personally, I'd like to see practical operating knowledge become part
>of the licence procedure.

There are a few questions about operating procedures in the US tests. I presume the Canadian tests are similar. But a new ham can get all those questions wrong and still pass the tests.

>Not for the sake of testing , or making the
>licence harder to get, or screening out the incompetent and
>unmotivated - but to ensure that when you do get the licence, you
>have an excellent idea what is required to actually use it. Like
>driving a car, for example - if folks got their licence based entirely
>on the written test, we might not all be reading this post right
>now.....:).

But if it's not actually part of the test, there's no guarantee that it will be learned.

In the bad old days, almost all hams started out listening to the amateur bands - if for no other reason than to get code practice! Many hams were experienced SWLs before they got licensed. Others "discovered" ham radio by hearing AM ham stations, back when it was common for broadcast receivers to have SW bands. So they had a lot of "listen time" before the test. That's a lot less prevalent today.

It is my understanding that in the UK, part of the licencing process is *mandatory* attendance and a passing grade at an approved training course. Doesn't matter if a prospective ham is a child or a grizzled graybeard witha Ph.D. in EE - the course is *required*.

How about this approach:

Two typical ham rigs are set up so that the operators of each one cannot see or hear each other. The rigs might be connected to dummy loads which are located adjacent to each other. (The idea is to permit a "contact" from one rig to the other, without putting much of a signal on the air). The testee and a VE sit at one rig, and another VE sits at the other. The testee is given a sealed envelope and a few minutes to get familiar with the operation of the rig. (The operating instructions for the rig would be available at any time).

When the actual test begins, the testee opens the sealed envelope and a timer is started. Inside the envelope are a set of instructions telling the testee to go to a specific frequency and call the VE at the other rig, make contact, and send the enclosed formal message. The VE at the other end has a similar sealed

envelope, but with a different message, which is to be received by the testee.

The idea is to test the actual radio operating skills of the testee under controlled conditions. There would be a time limit, too. (That's what the timer is for). The testee would have the choice of CW, voice or a digital mode for the test.

Time limits and exact instructions would vary with the mode and the class of license being tested. Higher class tests could have shorter time limits, longer messages, and more complicated instructions, such as having to change frequency at a certain point in the contact, having to pick the frequency from a list that includes "wrong choices", etc.

Scoring would be on the basis of mistakes. If a word in the messages is missing or misspelled, that's a mistake. If nonstandard procedure or phonetics are used, each deviation is a mistake. If the time limit is exceeded, each minute over the limit is a mistake. Exceed a certain number of mistakes and the test is failed. Asking for a repeat of a missed word would NOT be a mistake.

Typical exams (but not the exact exams themselves) would be available as study guides. Audiotapes of typical tests could be used for study as well.

Yes, it's a bit more complex than a straight code receiving test, and requires some equipment and two VEs to conduct it. (Perhaps the VE at the testee's position isn't really needed). But it could be done quite easily, and in such a way as to test real operating skills. The rigs used need not have lots of features, and QRP power levels would be more than adequate. Or a "rig simulator" that's really a gussied-up intercom could be used.

Is there any real reason such testing could not be done? Is it expecting too much that a prospective ham be able to pass such a test? I think not!

Waddya think?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5794. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 12:29:45 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927082945.22081.00000883@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 79203

In article <fhs9b.16269$NM1.7039@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl"
<billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030915021846.23171.00000765@mb-m05.aol.com...
>> In article <vm9usff4mpm58f@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint"
>> <rattlehead@computronDOTnet> writes:
>>
>> >sending and receiving CW isn't a building block
>> >to anything else.....
>>
>> Yes, it is.
>>
>> First, it's a building block to the use of the mode on the air.
>
>Come on Jim. that's a self fullfilling argument.

It's a plain and simple fact.

> My point, and I know
>you know this, is that morse knowledge is not needed in any manner as
>a foundation, stepping stone, or whatever to any body or radio knowledge
>or concepts.

It's not an *absolute* need. But it is a big help for amateurs who want to
learn about radio. That's my point.
>
>> Although other
>> services have pretty much stopped using Morse Code, hams use it
>> extensivley,
>> and an amateur license is permission to operate an amateur station, not a
>> station in another service. Note that the Morse Code tests are at a very
>> basic level. They're entry-level, nothing more.
>
>Are you afraid that without a code test, people will "pollute the HF
>airwaves" with bad morse?
>
Nope, not at all.

>> Second, if someone wants to actually design and build radio equipment,
>> having
>> skill in Morse Code permits them to use almost anything from very simple
>> to
>> very sophisticated equipment to good advantage. Would you expect a
>> newcomer to
>> radio to build an SSB transceiver as a first project?

>
>They can build whatever they want.

Doesn't answer the question.

>If they want to start with a simple
>morse
>Xmitter then they will learn at least enough morse to be able to use it.
>If they don't self train themselves, the rig will be useless to them. As
>another
>point of reference, when I was going for my AAS in electricl technology we
>built a 10 watt CW rig as part of the lab work. We tested it using a dummy
>load and no one had to know even one character of morse to do the lab work.

And without Morse skill, that project had no practical use once the lab was
over. With Morse skill, it could have been a very useful transmitter.

There's a big difference between a lab experiment that is done purely as a
learning tool, and a practical project that not only helps someone learn *and*
results in a useful radio device.
>
>> >now, the electrical principals of what a CW
>> >transmission is, and a knowledge test of that is a good idea, but
>> >that's comparing apples and oranges.
>>
>> Why should there be *any* written test on theory if all a person wants to
>> do is
>> operate manufactured radios? If someone doesn't want to build a rig, why
>> should
>> they have to memorize all those symbols, diagrams and formulas?
>
>IF that's what you believe then go start NTI (No Theory Int'l).

I'm asking a question. *All* license requirements have to justify themselves,
don't they? Or is that only true for Morse code tests?
>
>> >I think most of the PCTA
>> >is being disingenuous when they come up with "good reasons"
>> >to keep CW testing alive;
>>
>> Why?
>
>Actually, they haven't scored even a single point in the arguments
>made to the FCC now or in the past.

Has nothing to do with "disingenous".
>
>> > I think the true deeper reason lies
>> >somewhere in the "I had to do it so everybody should" relm,
>> >as i've stated before.
>> >
>> You can think what you want, but you're mistaken on that account.

>
>Exactly what is it that the PCTAs fear if there is NO morse test
>at all?
>
I don't "fear" anything from code test removal. My *concern* is the continuing downward trend in requirements and qualifications.

73 de Jim, N2EY.

5795. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 14:10:54 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <jt1bnvg728sjj4arv9gblhbsf6km8lct74@4ax.com>
Source record: 79204

Jim,

As in the US tests, there are indeed a few station operating questions on the Canadian exams. Our Basic exam consists of 100 questions, with a pass mark of 60%. You're right - it is possible to miss all of the operating questions (and more!) and walk out with a licence. I'm told that the test requirements have gone from very difficult (drawing schematics and essay-type questions back in the Fifties ans Sixties) to multiple choice questions and published question pools today. Perhaps because the equipment has evolved to the point where it is more of an appliance today (my HT sure is - select a frequency and talk! Not much radio theory needed there...)

Your proposed practical test is an excellent idea. It creates a real-world operating scenario to test the applicants' ability to operate a station, and would be a step in the right direction for ensuring that the new licencee has the skills, both theoretical and hands-on, to set up and properly use his or her radio equipment. Might increase the role of the local radio clubs too, as they could set up for both the hands on training and practice sessions to prepare folks for the tests.

A definite improvement over the status quo, in my opinion anyway!

73, Leo

On 27 Sep 2003 11:01:45 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>In article <fqn1nvoo2jmf405f1g5toss5qi8jfdtg6d@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
>writes:
>
>>Personally, I'd like to see practical operating knowledge become part
>>of the licence procedure.
>
>There are a few questions about operating procedures in the US tests. I presume
>the Canadian tests are similar. But a new ham can get all those questions wrong
>and still pass the tests.
>
>>Not for the sake of testing , or making the
>>licence harder to get, or screening out the incompetent and
>>unmotivated - but to ensure that when you do get the licence, you
>>have an excellent idea what is required to actually use it. Like
>>driving a car, for example - if folks got their licence based entirely
>>on the written test, we might not all be reading this post right
>>now.....:).
>

>But if it's not actually part of the test, there's no guarantee that it will be
>learned.
>
>In the bad old days, almost all hams started out listening to the amateur bands
>- if for no other reason than to get code practice! Many hams were experienced
>SWLs before they got licensed. Others "discovered" ham radio by hearing AM ham
>stations, back when it was common for broadcast receivers to have SW bands. So
>they had a lot of "listen time" before the test. That's a lot less prevalent
>today.
>
>It is my understanding that in the UK, part of the licencing process is
>*mandatory* attendance and a passing grade at an approved training course.
>Doesn't matter if a prospective ham is a child or a grizzled graybeard witha
>Ph.D. in EE - the course is *required*.
>
>How about this approach:
>
>Two typical ham rigs are set up so that the operators of each one cannot see or
>hear each other. The rigs might be connected to dummy loads which are located
>adjacent to each other. (The idea is to permit a "contact" from one rig to the
>other, without putting much of a signal on the air). The testee and a VE sit at
>one rig, and another VE sits at the other. The testee is given a sealed
>envelope and a few minutes to get familiar with the operation of the rig. (The
>operating instructions for the rig would be available at any time).
>
>When the actual test begins, the testee opens the sealed envelope and a timer
>is started. Inside the envelope are a set of instructions telling the testee to
>go to a specific frequency and call the VE at the other rig, make contact, and
>send the enclosed formal message. The VE at the other end has a similar sealed
>envelope, but with a different message, which is to be received by the testee.
>
>The idea is to test the actual radio operating skills of the testee under
>controlled conditions. There would be a time limit, too. (That's what the timer
>is for). The testee would have the choice of CW, voice or a digital mode for
>the test.
>
>Time limits and exact instructions would vary with the mode and the class of
>license being tested. Higher class tests could have shorter time limits, longer
>messages, and more complicated instructions, such as having to change frequency
>at a certain point in the contact, having to pick the frequency from a list
>that includes "wrong choices", etc.
>
>Scoring would be on the basis of mistakes. If a word in the messages is missing
>or misspelled, that's a mistake. If nonstandard procedure or phonetics are
>used, each deviation is a mistake. If the time limit is exceeded, each minute
>over the limit is a mistake. Exceed a certain number of mistakes and the test
>is failed. Asking for a repeat of a missed word would NOT be a mistake.
>
>Typical exams (but not the exact exams themselves) would be available as study
>guides. Audiotapes of typical tests could be used for study as well.

>
>Yes, it's a bit more complex than a straight code receiving test, and requires
>some equipment and two VEs to conduct it. (Perhaps the VE at the testee's
>position isn't really needed). But it could be done quite easily, and in such a
>way as to test real operating skills. The rigs used need not have lots of
>features, and QRP power levels would be more than adequate. Or a "rig
>simulator" that's really a gussied-up intercom could be used.
>
>Is there any real reason such testing could not be done? Is it expecting too
>much that a prospective ham be able to pass such a test? I think not!
>
>Waddya think?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

5796. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 14:21:01 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bl46g5$346@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 79205

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bl3fh5$e9f$0@208.206.142.77...
>
>
> WA8ULX wrote:
> >>Works darned great, doesn't it?! Did all my MARS on it, including net
> >>control for nearly a year. So, yer right, apparently the "high" (high
all
> >>right) class hams just don't know how to do it!
> >>
> >>Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> > Spoken like a TRUE Dump Down CBplusser who doesnt have a Clue.
>
>
> Don't pay them too much attention, Bruce. Neither JJ nor TwIT realizes
> they were NOT using a 1/4 wave dipole. If they had been, neither would
> have gotten a signal out of the back yard.
>
> If the *antenna system* took a load and performed under the
circumstances
> they describe, then both JJ and TwIT were loading the outer surface of the
> coax shield, and *that* was doing a major part of the radiating.
>
> Of course when one side of a 1/4 wave dipole is attached to the braid
> of the coax with no decoupling, then the dipole is no longer a 1/4 wave
> dipole! What it becomes then depends entirely on
> the feedline length as well as other local factors. So then it will
> probably take some load, and maybe even load up to full supplied power,
> as JJ described. At that point it's a crap shoot-you don't know *what*
> you've got! For sure it ISN'T a 1/4 wave dipole! But the uninformed will
> think their "1/4 wave dipole" worked just fine!
>
> If JJ had used a good isolation choke or 1:1 balun to decouple the coax
> from the 40 meter dipole at the feedpoint the tuner would have balked big
> time, and all that RF would have bounced around inside it, and made
> itself known quite loudly in the form of arcs. The KWM-2 finals might
> have sparked a bit, too.
>
> Been there, done that, seen it happen, got the RF burns.
>
> As I said earlier, they weren't using a 1/4 wave dipole, they just
thought

> they were.
>
> All this stuff is in the books.
>
> Dick
>

Yep. We know all about yer books, DICK...

Kim W5TIT

5797. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 14:33:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927103328.07884.00000237@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 79206

>Yep. We know all about yer books, DICK...
>
>Kim W5TIT
>

Dick your waisting your time, all theses CBplussers know is what Uncle Bob down at the CB Shop has told them. And of course Uncle BOB is always right

5798. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 15:50:45 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl4bkl$b0c$0@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 79207

N2EY wrote:
> In article <bl17gu$tj4@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
> writes:
>
>
>>And, is not upgrading because someone is happy where they are, a problem?
>
>
> Nope.
>
> And I suspect that's why every ham isn't an Extra. If someone's interest
> doesn't include HF, VEing or a four-character call, there's not much reason to
> upgrade, is there?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Agreed! But if it's so OK, why are they virtually all hounding both us
and the FCC over the testing requirements?

5799. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 15:53:08 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl4bp4$b0c$1@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 79208

N2EY wrote:

> In article <5c01b95b.0309262238.638547cf@posting.google.com>, k4yz@aol.com
> (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) writes:
>
>
>>Coming from an
>
>
> [pejorative deleted]
>
>
>>who tries to re-write Korean War history in
>>such a way so as to glorify himself in the deaths of KIA's who died
>>three years before he was himself inducted is hillarious.
>>
>> "Orwellian", Lennie...?!?! You have no idea what "Orwellian"
>>means.
>
>
> Actually, Steve, rewriting history was Winston Smith's job in the book "1984".
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

And it's been all downhill since that. There are so many Winston Smiths
out there these days that a non-revisionist would be much harder to find.

5800. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 16:03:51 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl4cd7cmu0@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 79209

N2EY wrote:

> How about this approach:
>
> Two typical ham rigs are set up so that the operators of each one cannot see or
> hear each other. The rigs might be connected to dummy loads which are located
> adjacent to each other. (The idea is to permit a "contact" from one rig to the
> other, without putting much of a signal on the air).

Could be done using Part 15 rules levels with any type of gear.

The testee and a VE sit at
> one rig, and another VE sits at the other. The testee is given a sealed
> envelope and a few minutes to get familiar with the operation of the rig. (The
> operating instructions for the rig would be available at any time).
>
> When the actual test begins, the testee opens the sealed envelope and a timer
> is started. Inside the envelope are a set of instructions telling the testee to
> go to a specific frequency and call the VE at the other rig, make contact, and
> send the enclosed formal message. The VE at the other end has a similar sealed
> envelope, but with a different message, which is to be received by the testee.
>
> The idea is to test the actual radio operating skills of the testee under
> controlled conditions. There would be a time limit, too. (That's what the timer
> is for). The testee would have the choice of CW, voice or a digital mode for
> the test.
>
> Time limits and exact instructions would vary with the mode and the class of
> license being tested. Higher class tests could have shorter time limits, longer
> messages, and more complicated instructions, such as having to change frequency
> at a certain point in the contact, having to pick the frequency from a list
> that includes "wrong choices", etc.
>
> Scoring would be on the basis of mistakes. If a word in the messages is missing
> or misspelled, that's a mistake. If nonstandard procedure or phonetics are
> used, each deviation is a mistake. If the time limit is exceeded, each minute
> over the limit is a mistake. Exceed a certain number of mistakes and the test
> is failed. Asking for a repeat of a missed word would NOT be a mistake.
>
> Typical exams (but not the exact exams themselves) would be available as study
> guides. Audiotapes of typical tests could be used for study as well.
>
> Yes, it's a bit more complex than a straight code receiving test, and requires
> some equipment and two VEs to conduct it. (Perhaps the VE at the testee's
> position isn't really needed). But it could be done quite easily, and in such a

> way as to test real operating skills. The rigs used need not have lots of
> features, and QRP power levels would be more than adequate. Or a "rig
> simulator" that's really a gussied-up intercom could be used.
>
> Is there any real reason such testing could not be done? Is it expecting too
> much that a prospective ham be able to pass such a test? I think not!
>
> Waddya think?
>

What??? Make them *WORK* for a license??? Whadda ya think this is, the
old Soviet Union or something??

For a fact applicants would have to spend some time around active hams
first, instead of just on the CB band. It's probably no surorise that
so many of htem show up on ham radio using CB operating procedures and
lingo.

5801. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 16:17:56 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <UKidb.81353$xx4.8602739@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 79210

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030926211445.01989.00000246@mb-m22.aol.com...
> With BPL looking like a sure thing, I now say lets dump the CW testing,
and
> let the CBplussers have it. How great it will be to have the CBplussers
alloyed
> on HF and cant talk to anyone. Maybe that was the FCC idea all along, give
the
> No-Coders HF, and intern with BPL here, they cant talk to anyone. GREAT
IDEA..

ARRL Bible, Book of Morse, Chapter 1, Verse 1
Don't worry about it, for it is writter;
And behold, for in the sky I saw a pale rider sat upon a pale horse. The
horse'e name is Codefree, and the rider's name is Capt. Carl.

And it will come to pass that Capt. Carl shall strik down the demon that is
BPL just as had done to the Godless Know-Coders.

As ye shall spend the rest of thy days in peace, without QRM or Morse Code.

5802. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 16:18:20 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl4d8c$ed3$0@208.206.142.81>
Source record: 79211

WA8ULX wrote:

>>Yep. We know all about yer books, DICK...
>>
>>Kim W5TIT
>>
>
>
> Dick your waisting your time, all theses CBplussers know is what Uncle Bob down
> at the CB Shop has told them. And of course Uncle BOB is always right

If TwIT knew anything about my books she'd at least have
a clue to where to find a clue. I gave up on that long ago.

Maybe some newcomer reading here might have learned why
a 1/4 wave dipole is something hams don't try to use.
At least among those who understand why. If you want to
load your feedline and use it as part of the antenna,
fine. But one should be more careful about what you name it.

5803. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 16:31:36 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927123136.02537.00000782@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 79212

In article <9tQ9b.26195$NM1.22855@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> writes:

>The fact that morse is in use o ham bands offers no reason
>to have a code test in order to begin learning and using the mode.

Well, we'll have to agree to disagree about that point.

>If a new ham without code knowledge decided to get together
>with another ham to mutually learn/use code at veerrrryyy slow
>seed (say 1-2 wpm)...would you oppose that?

Not at all!

But I would point out that there are easier and faster ways to learn the code.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5804. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 16:31:37 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927123137.02537.00000783@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 79213

In article <jt1bnvg728sjj4arv9gblhbsf6km8lct74@4ax.com>, Leo <nomail@nope.org>
writes:

>Jim,
>
>As in the US tests, there are indeed a few station operating questions
>on the Canadian exams. Our Basic exam consists of 100 questions,

That's a lot better than our 35 questions!

> with
>a pass mark of 60%.

whew! that's pretty low!

>You're right - it is possible to miss all of the
>operating questions (and more!) and walk out with a licence. I'm told
>that the test requirements have gone from very difficult (drawing
>schematics and essay-type questions back in the Fifties ans Sixties)
>to multiple choice questions and published question pools today.

Same as here in the lower provinces...;-)

>Perhaps because the equipment has evolved to the point where it is
>more of an appliance today (my HT sure is - select a frequency and
>talk! Not much radio theory needed there...)

Exactly!

It used to be that unless you knew how to tune up a ham rig, it was very easy
to transmit out of band. Not a problem with 'modern' ham gear anymore.
>
>Your proposed practical test is an excellent idea. It creates a
>real-world operating scenario to test the applicants' ability to
>operate a station, and would be a step in the right direction for
>ensuring that the new licencee has the skills, both theoretical and
>hands-on, to set up and properly use his or her radio equipment. Might
>increase the role of the local radio clubs too, as they could set up
>for both the hands on training and practice sessions to prepare folks
>for the tests.

That's the idea. Note that the person being tested gets to choose the mode,
too.
>
>A definite improvement over the status quo, in my opinion anyway!
>
Thanks!

This is not a new idea - I first proposed it here on rrap more than 5 years ago. It did not get a welcome reception from certain folks. They noted that no other radio service requires a practical operating exam for the license....

You might want to google up a certain nonamateur's response to the idea...

And while you're at it, you might like to look up my suggestion for replacing the code test with a Smith Chart test. The words "quillpenners" and "nochartists" should bring it right up.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5805. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 17:06:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927130638.11352.00000252@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 79214

>ARRL Bible, Book of Morse, Chapter 1, Verse 1
>Don't worry about it, for it is writter;
>And behold, for in the sky I saw a pale rider sat upon a pale horse. The
>horse'e name is Codefree, and the rider's name is Capt. Carl.
>
>And it will come to pass that Capt. Carl shall strik down the demon that is
>BPL just as had done to the Godless Know-Coders.
>
>As ye shall spend the rest of thy days in peace, without QRM or Morse Code.

So true, if Karl the nut is so great, he better hurry up and get busy on
striking down BPL.
It makes you wonder if the FCC in there plan to put BPL in place, saw Karl as
someone they could use to take the attention off of BPL and put it on CW.

5806. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 17:10:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927131042.11352.00000253@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 79215

> If TwIT knew anything about my books she'd at least have
>a clue to where to find a clue. I gave up on that long ago.
>
> Maybe some newcomer reading here might have learned why
>a 1/4 wave dipole is something hams don't try to use.
>At least among those who understand why. If you want to
>load your feedline and use it as part of the antenna,
>fine. But one should be more careful about what you name it.
>

Dick I do see a way to make money here. Most of these Clowns dont have a clue.
And if someone wanted to make alot of money, they could easily sell just
about anything to these Clowns. And it would just take some key little BUZZ
WORDS that these Clowns would bite into.

5807. Re: Radio Amateurs of Canada - Morse Code Survey Results Published

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 18:03:09 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927140309.21642.00001279@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79216

In article <bl4bkl$b0c$0@208.206.142.81>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>> In article <bl17gu$tj4@library2.airnews.net>, "Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
>> writes:
>>
>>
>>>>And, is not upgrading because someone is happy where they are, a problem?
>>
>>
>> Nope.
>>
>> And I suspect that's why every ham isn't an Extra. If someone's interest
>> doesn't include HF, VEing or a four-character call, there's not much reason
>to
>> upgrade, is there?
>>
>> 73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
>Agreed! But if it's so OK, why are they virtually all hounding both us
>and the FCC over the testing requirements?
>
"Virtually all??!?" You gotta be kidding, Dick!

In the seven years of its existence, NCI has gathered (at most) a few thousand members who are US hams - out of ~685,000 possibles, ~200,000 of whom are Technicians. And a lot of NCI members are neither newcomers nor Technicians.

FCC got how many comments about restructuring that were from Techs who were against the code test? No more than 1,000.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5808. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 18:05:12 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0309270914.403b9483@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79217

yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote

> Just exactly in what way is this good news?

Larry,

Please don't feed the trolls.

73, Hans, K0HB

5809. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 18:14:09 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <rbibnvc90kj6me7nfu2e1k5nccl0k441r9@4ax.com>
Source record: 79218

On 27 Sep 2003 16:31:37 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

Thanks, Jim.

My comments are below:

>This is not a new idea - I first proposed it here on rrap more than 5 years
>ago. It did not get a welcome reception from certain folks. They noted that no
>other radio service requires a practical operating exam for the license....
>

That's very true. But, those other radio services (military,
commercial) have other built-in means to ensure operator competency
and adherence to the rules - the employer has a great deal of control,
as it is his equipment that these licenced personnel operate.

>You might want to google up a certain nonamateur's response to the idea...

I did - and I'm not at all surprised - that gentleman stands as a true
beacon of light for xenophobes everywhere ;)

>
>And while you're at it, you might like to look up my suggestion for replacing
>the code test with a Smith Chart test. The words "quillpenners" and
>"nochartists" should bring it right up.

I did - interesting thread! Smith charts are an excellent way to
visualize the complex impedance relationships on antennas and lines -
I remember them from College, but haven't played around with them at
all since. My thoughts are that it's probably overkill for someone
who just wants to get in to the hobby and operate an 'appliance' type
rig with a Basic (or Technician, for your folks, I suppose...)
licence. But, it's a valid suggestion, much though went in to it, and
it is obviously well deserving of *intelligent* debate!.

I do not see how augmenting testing to encompass new technology, or to
'raise the bar' on licence testing qualifications in the interest of
creating better and more competent Amaueurs is quill-pen type
thinking. Would these folks prefer that we just give operating
privileges away for free? My view of current testing is that we're
already close enough to doing just that right now....just listen to a
novice Amateur on HF asking for a signal strength report while he's
working a repeater, and you'll see what I mean.... ;)

I personally don't mind at all if code testing is retained for HF
access - but it is becoming obvious from observing the rest of the
world that it will end someday. And probably soon. And that's OK

too. However, many other countries have chosen simply to drop CW entirely and hand over HF access to their licenced Amateurs, with no further requirements in place. I, for one, don't believe that the hobby is well served by this approach.

Hopefully, if and when the time comes, we'll have the option to put something in its place to truly improve Amateur Radio as an avocation.

Appreciate your reply!

73, Leo

>73 de Jim, N2EY
>

5810. Re: PORKBUTT PORKBUTT PORKBUTT

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 19:21:57 UTC
From: Frank <frank@127.0.0.1>
Message-ID: <prldb.602930$o%2.282438@sccrnsc02>
Source record: 79219
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

LaShaun Ivory wrote:
> Porkbutt is the ex-WB2OTK Rich Whiten out of Easley, South Carolina, USA.
>
> 73
>
> Frank K3EKO
>
> ========================
>
> Yes, Porkbutt IS the ex operator so named. He made himself infamous during
> his years as an overbearing, selfish, and overpowered Ham op on 14.313.
> Rich is not missed save by a few of his malingerers.
> The band is a better place without him.
>
> And Frankie, why can't you and Dan just get along? Yeah, Dan is garrulous,
> he is known to be a pain in the ass at times, but why promulgate it with
> your inane comments?
> Do you take pleasure in needling Dan? Why?
> Dan has his schedule full enough as it is...he has to deal with jammers and
> the likes of David Tolassi and Dumbass Donnie. There is no need for you,
> Frankie, to be tossing your two cents worth into the already confused foray.
> Frankie...ever pull your dictionary off the shelf and read the definition of
> "maturity"? Perhaps you and Dan should both do so, but most of all, YOU
> should do so Frankie.
>
> One thing still eludes me in all of this. Why the Hell are all of you guys
> so set on attacking Lloyd? He doesn't really upset the cart all that much,
> but yet you guys persist in attacking him at every turn. What gives? Is this
> a "pile-on" mentality whereby all you macho Ham geeks attack the weakest of
> the weak? Like sharks going for the scent of blood? Playground Bullies?
> Cowards? Pussies? Whassa matter? Lloyd doesn't use a pocket protector for
> his fifteen multi-colored ball-point pens? Doesn't wear his callsign on his
> baseball hat? Doesn't run around with six HT's on his belt? Doesn't have six
> antennas on his SUV?
> Face it...look at all the posts allegedly made by Lloyd...there are many.
> You guys don't know the real Lloyd from the sock puppet Lloyds, nor do you
> care to find out, if you can.
>
> Give Lloyd a break, whoever he is. It is beyond your areas of expertise to
> cull out the real Lloyd from the anonymous Lloyds.
>
> Maybe one of these days you freaks can take off your aluminum helmets with
> the rubber duckies mounted on them and join the real world.

>
> Frankie...stop messing with Dan. Change your diapers and move on....
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
NO CALL, NO BALLS HERE.....

73

Frank K3EKO

5811. Re: Bandwidth (Was some kind of code/ nocode BS)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 20:32:35 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927163235.08626.00000917@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 79221

In article <QkOcb.6552$SO7.3847@newssvr33.news.prodigy.com>, "charlesb"
<n5pvl@sbcglobal.net> writes:

>> >I don't really care much one way or another about morse code testing, but
>> >yes I do have a definate opinion about the idea of opening up generalized
>> >HF access to entry-level hams. It's a dumb idea that gets even dumber as
>> >our population grows.
>>
>> Then what would you set up as the entry requirements? Heck, even if the
>> code test stays, it's only a 5 wpm receive-only once-and-done test.
>
>I'll assume here that you mean entry to HF privilege, not an entry-class
>liscense that gets you into the hobby. - Let me know if I misunderstood you,
>there.

Now that I think about it, that question is really three questions:

1) What should the entry-level requirementsbe?
2) What should the HF entry requirements be?
3) Why should there be any difference?l
>
>I really don't have an opinion about retaining the morse code exams. If I
>were judging the matter on the basis of the debates I've heard, I'd say the
>pro-code guys have won every arguement, hands-down.

Agreed - except FCC doesn't seem to think so.

>But I seriously doubt
>that it will be judged on that basis, so that's kind of a moot point, isn't
>it? Debating points are unlikely to carry the day.

'zactly.
>
>Which ever way it goes, I'll be happy to see the controversy die down. I've
>been reading the same four or five arguements on both sides of this issue
>for a long time, years of it... Mainly, I'll just be glad to see it all
>wrapped up, whichever way it goes.

No matter what is decided, the controversy will continue. Some folks are still
ticked off about incentive licensing...
>
>The ARRL is getting a good start on what I would set up for entry to HF
>privilege with it's new certification / continuing education setup. Rather
>than cramming for a test from an answer sheet, I'd require the ham to pass a
>few of those courses. And yes, I'd make them pay a fee to take the course,
>just as it is now.

I understand that in the UK, part of the licencing process is passing an approved course. But I doubt such an idea would ever get off the ground here.
>
>I'd leave the entry into the hobby about like it is. No-code tech, but I'd
>call it something different. That would be the only "freebee" liscense that
>would not require taking and passing a course of study to become certified.
>
>I'm weird though.... I'd require ceretification for just about everything
>beyond basic VHF/UHF privileges. ... If you wanted to set up a packet node
>or a repeater for example, you'd have to get yourself certified for that. I
>would even have poor hams taking a course if they wanted to run over 100
>watts power but then again, that's just me, and I don't seriously expect the
>ham community to go for my stodgy old attitude about this kind of stuff.

The killer problem there is getting FCC to go for it. They want less admin work, not more.
>
>> >Over a period of time, we can expect the number of hams wanting access to
>> >HF to grow, but the laws of physics will stay the same.
>>
>> "wanting access" and actually getting on the air are two different things.
>
>The HF rigs will not be expensive much longer.

Antennas. That's the real problem for more and more hams and would-be hams. Particularly on HF, and particularly as the sunspots decline.

>Most of the expense today is
>not in the RF deck, it's in the rig's firmware. They won't be able to
>justify charging an extra thousand or two for firmware loaded up with
>creeping feature-isms for much longer, IMHO. It's just software.

Perhaps - but the market for ham gear is relatively small, so development cost has to be amortized over relatively few units sold.
>
>I'll go even farther out on a limb and predict that one day we'll be
>home-brewing our HF rigs again, and not missing a single "bell 'n whistle"
>because it will be software controlled anyway. We'll just install this or
>that software on our computers, depending on how we want the radio to behave
>and what we want to do with it.

I'm still homebrewing HF rigs. And building kits. Take a look at the Elecraft K2 - and then imagine what those guys could do if they set their minds to building a data transceiver...
>
>So I don't see any future in depending on high prices for equipment to act
>as a filter to control the number of operators on HF, or to affect the way
>the operators behave.

Se above re: antennas

>I'd rather depend upon the filtering effect to be had
>from the education/certification process, because that is something we can

>directly control, and tailor to our changing needs.
>
Yup.

>I understand of course that none of this is likely to come about, but it's
>fun to talk about it anyway.

Maybe there's a way...
>
>> >Only so many people can
>> >reasonably expect to get on the HF bands at one time. We can extend that
>> >a little bit through the use of bandwidth-efficient modes like PSK-31, but
>> >the fact is that wide-band modes like PACTOR III and Q15x25 are getting >>
>more and
>> >more attention these days because they can do things that PSK31 cannot
>do,
>> >such as providing reasonable throughput and effective error-correction.
>> >People who say that overcrowding on HF is a thing of the past due to
>PSK31
>> >obviously have not spent much time listening on HF, and are blowing smoke
>> >out of their shorts.
>>
>> Are all of the amateur HF bands crowded bandedge to bandedge 24/7?
>
>The usable stuff tends to be used. There are of course times when the bands
>are hot but hardly anybody is using them, but you don't see that nearly as
>often as you would have ten years ago, during the previous sunspot cycle.
>
>Whatever the status now, introducing thousands of new operators will not
>improve the situation or make it less crowded.

To a certain extent, the crowding is needed, because it shows that we need outr
bands and because it acts as an incentive to use more spectrum-efficient
methods.

If the 'phone bands weren't crowded, there'd be a lot less reason for hams to
use SSB instead of AM.

>> >Example: An ARRL / ARES group is currently looking into linking all the
>> >major NWS EOC's around the country via HF... Their first choice in an HF
>> >mode for this purpose? PACTOR III !
>>
>> Why?
>
>That's a good question... The short answer would be "ignorance". This post
>is already too long.

Awww....it was just getting interesting!
>
>They ought to make those guys take a course or something.... RF 101 !

Not about RF at all - it's about human nature.

>> >They get complaints, nasty E-mails, they get reported even though they
>> >are
>> >legal, and they often even get intentional interference from outraged
>> >hams.
>> >The other night, I heard a guy on 30 meters whistling into his mike, on a
>> >freq where PACTOR III was being used. The whistling disrupted the > >
>.PACTOR
>III
>> >QSO just enough to slow it down and reduce its efficiency without quite
>> >breaking the link. The guy was very patient about the whole thing. I
>> >listened to him whistle for over half an hour. (I was waiting for the
>> >PACTOR III QSO to end, so I could get in there on 30m with another mode.)
>>
>> whoa - this snazzy digital mode is vulnerable to some yahoo whistling into
>a
>> mike?
>
>Yes, I could see the PACTOR III station having to constantly re-adjust its
>link parameters. Usually that happens in response to the existence of
>resends. All of that slows the link down, reduces effective throughput.

Understood. But unlike an operator-skill mode, it has no real understanding of
what the problem is.
>
>All digital modes are vulnerable to noise, most often reacting by a
>reduction in throughput. In severe cases, it is impossible to make or
>maintain a connection. In that respect, it is comparable to voice or CW.
>Noise degrades and slows down the ability to transfer info... A lot of noise
>will shut you down.
>
Exactly.

>> >If it hadn't been for the "whistling clown", the PACTOR III dude would
>> >have
>> >gotten in and out of there a lot quicker! - But that is typical of what
>> >the
>> >few wide-band mode guys put up with, every day. They are not popular, for
>> >the obvious reason.
>>
>> So what's the cure?
>
>A rational digital network would use the high-throughput, wideband stuff
>only for a limited number of long-haul links, organized in much the same way
>that AMSAT controls the proliferation of SATGATE BBS stations. Once I was
>going to sink several thousand bucks into a SATGATE station, but AMSAT told
>me that I was too close to an existing SATGATE - a station located over 450
>miles away in west Texas. I could build the station if I wanted to of
>course - but I couldn't be a part of the network.

OK, fine. That means "somebody" has to be in charge, and make wideranging
decisions on who gets to use, say, PACTOR III and who doesn't.

That person or group isn't going to be very popular.
>
>With the wide-band stuff, the idea is to limit its use to where it would do
>the most good... Overseas routes, and coast-to-coast routing. Long-haul
>stuff. The slower, narrower, cheaper stuff goes for the more numerous
>statewide and regional links, with VHF/UHF taking up the slack for smaller
>states and for metro areas in the large ones.

Echoes of the old Trunk Line system.

How "wide" are we talking about, anyway? Aren't all amateur HF data modes in
the non-phone/image subbands limited to less than 1 kHz bandwidth,, or
something like that?
>
>That would be rational - but our present system is anarchic, not rational.
>We could inject a bit of rationality into the process by requiring education
>and certification in order to operate as a part of the network. They have
>been doing this in Europe for quite some time and as a result, their digital
>network is at least ten or fifteen years in advance of ours. I don't think
>we'll do that though, so we'll just have to keep muddling along as best as
>we can.

In case you missed it, some time back ARRL petitioned FCC to "refarm" the
80/40/15 "Novice" subbands into more 'phone space. Some of us opposed that
move, and proposed something very different: Turn the "Novice" subbands into a
"developmental wilderness" where all sorts of modes would be allowed. Like
highspeed data, digital voice, whatever. And existing modes too. Tailor made
for PACTOR III.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5812. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 20:36:35 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927163635.02717.00000272@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 79222

>I bet you are right!
>Capt. Carl is just a sock-puppet for the broadband cartel. Now what will all
>the "engineers" do when they can't hear shit on HF?
>
>This is too funny.....

I think its very funny, I can see it now, Captain Karl and his fruitcakes finally get HF Phone, then find out they cant talk to anyone unless they use CW.

5813. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 20:39:32 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <8Amdb.81873$xx4.8792325@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 79220

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030927130638.11352.00000252@mb-m25.aol.com...
> >ARRL Bible, Book of Morse, Chapter 1, Verse 1
> >Don't worry about it, for it is writter;
> >And behold, for in the sky I saw a pale rider sat upon a pale horse. The
> >horse'e name is Codefree, and the rider's name is Capt. Carl.
> >
> >And it will come to pass that Capt. Carl shall strik down the demon that
is
> >BPL just as had done to the Godless Know-Coders.
> >
> >As ye shall spend the rest of thy days in peace, without QRM or Morse
Code.
>
> So true, if Karl the nut is so great, he better hurry up and get busy on
> striking down BPL.
> It makes you wonder if the FCC in there plan to put BPL in place, saw
Karl as
> someone they could use to take the attention off of BPL and put it on CW.
>
I bet you are right!
Capt. Carl is just a sock-puppet for the broadband cartel. Now what will all
the "engineers" do when they can't hear shit on HF?

This is too funny.....

5814. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 20:52:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <GMmdb.57$Vb3.34322@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79223

Dick Carroll wrote:

> Don't pay them too much attention, Bruce. Neither JJ nor TwIT realizes
> they were NOT using a 1/4 wave dipole. If they had been, neither would
> have gotten a signal out of the back yard.
>
> If the *antenna system* took a load and performed under the circumstances
> they describe, then both JJ and TwIT were loading the outer surface of the
> coax shield, and *that* was doing a major part of the radiating.

Kim is using a DXCC antenna IIRC. That isn't a quarter wave antenna. As for JJ, I suspect you are correct that the coax was radiating if he got a signal out. That might get a signal out, but it isn't a good thing at all.

Anyone care to take this one over to rraa to see what they have to say about it? There are some very good authorities over there.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5815. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 20:54:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <PNmdb.59$Vb3.34666@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79224

Dick Carroll wrote:

>
>
> WA8ULX wrote:
>
>>> Yep. We know all about yer books, DICK...
>>>
>>> Kim W5TIT
>>>
>>
>>
>> Dick your waisting your time, all theses CBplussers know is what Uncle
>> Bob down
>> at the CB Shop has told them. And of course Uncle BOB is always right
>
>
>
>
>
> If TwIT knew anything about my books she'd at least have
> a clue to where to find a clue. I gave up on that long ago.
>
> Maybe some newcomer reading here might have learned why
> a 1/4 wave dipole is something hams don't try to use.
> At least among those who understand why. If you want to
> load your feedline and use it as part of the antenna,
> fine. But one should be more careful about what you name it.
>

Name it the RF in the shack special.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5816. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 21:03:22 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927170322.02717.00000273@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 79225

>Name it the RF in the shack special.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

And the fools would buy and swear by it.

5817. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 22:29:58 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927182958.29660.00000863@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 79226

In article <bl4cd7cmu0@208.206.142.81>, Dick Carroll
<dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> writes:

>N2EY wrote:
>
>> How about this approach:
>>
>> Two typical ham rigs are set up so that the operators of each one cannot
>see or
>> hear each other. The rigs might be connected to dummy loads which are
>located
>> adjacent to each other. (The idea is to permit a "contact" from one rig to
>the
>> other, without putting much of a signal on the air).
>
>
> Could be done using Part 15 rules levels with any type of gear.

But the best way is to use real live ham gear.
>
> The testee and a VE sit at
>> one rig, and another VE sits at the other. The testee is given a sealed
>> envelope and a few minutes to get familiar with the operation of the rig.
>(The
>> operating instructions for the rig would be available at any time).
>>
>> When the actual test begins, the testee opens the sealed envelope and a
>timer
>> is started. Inside the envelope are a set of instructions telling the
>testee to
>> go to a specific frequency and call the VE at the other rig, make contact,
>and
>> send the enclosed formal message. The VE at the other end has a similar
>sealed
>> envelope, but with a different message, which is to be received by the
>testee.
>>
>> The idea is to test the actual radio operating skills of the testee under
>> controlled conditions. There would be a time limit, too. (That's what the
>timer
>> is for). The testee would have the choice of CW, voice or a digital mode
>for
>> the test.
>>
>> Time limits and exact instructions would vary with the mode and the class

>of
>> license being tested. Higher class tests could have shorter time limits,
>longer
>> messages, and more complicated instructions, such as having to change
>frequency
>> at a certain point in the contact, having to pick the frequency from a list
>> that includes "wrong choices", etc.
>>
>> Scoring would be on the basis of mistakes. If a word in the messages is
>missing
>> or misspelled, that's a mistake. If nonstandard procedure or phonetics are
>> used, each deviation is a mistake. If the time limit is exceeded, each
>minute
>> over the limit is a mistake. Exceed a certain number of mistakes and the
>test
>> is failed. Asking for a repeat of a missed word would NOT be a mistake.
>>
>> Typical exams (but not the exact exams themselves) would be available as
>study
>> guides. Audiotapes of typical tests could be used for study as well.
>>
>> Yes, it's a bit more complex than a straight code receiving test, and
>requires
>> some equipment and two VEs to conduct it. (Perhaps the VE at the testee's
>> position isn't really needed). But it could be done quite easily, and in
>such a
>> way as to test real operating skills. The rigs used need not have lots of
>> features, and QRP power levels would be more than adequate. Or a "rig
>> simulator" that's really a gussied-up intercom could be used.
>>
>> Is there any real reason such testing could not be done? Is it expecting
>too
>> much that a prospective ham be able to pass such a test? I think not!
>>
>> Waddya think?
>
> What??? Make them *WORK* for a license???

Not about "WORK" at all. Doing radio the right way is fun!

>Whadda ya think this is, the old Soviet Union or something??
>
Not at all. It's about operating skills.

> For a fact applicants would have to spend some time around active hams
>first, instead of just on the CB band.

Whatta concept, huh?

>It's probably no surorise that
>so many of htem show up on ham radio using CB operating procedures and
>lingo.

In most cases that's because they don't know any better.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5818. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 22:34:49 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <9-idnXN_c-wKj-uiU-KYgw@gbronline.com>
Source record: 79227

Dick Carroll wrote in message ...
>
>>
>
> Don't pay them too much attention, Bruce. Neither JJ nor TwIT realizes
>they were NOT using a 1/4 wave dipole. If they had been, neither would
>have gotten a signal out of the back yard.
>
> If the *antenna system* took a load and performed under the circumstances
>they describe, then both JJ and TwIT were loading the outer surface of the
>coax shield, and *that* was doing a major part of the radiating.
>
> Of course when one side of a 1/4 wave dipole is attached to the braid
>of the coax with no decoupling, then the dipole is no longer a 1/4 wave
>dipole! What it becomes then depends entirely on
>the feedline length as well as other local factors. So then it will
>probably take some load, and maybe even load up to full supplied power,
>as JJ described. At that point it's a crap shoot-you don't know *what*
>you've got! For sure it ISN'T a 1/4 wave dipole! But the uninformed will
>think their "1/4 wave dipole" worked just fine!
>
> If JJ had used a good isolation choke or 1:1 balun to decouple the coax
>from the 40 meter dipole at the feedpoint the tuner would have balked big
>time, and all that RF would have bounced around inside it, and made
>itself known quite loudly in the form of arcs.

The 40 meter dipole does have an HF 1:1 balun at the feedpoint.

> The KWM-2 finals might
>have sparked a bit, too.

Why? As far as the M-2 was concerned, it was seeing a good match, courtesy
of the tuner (that is one function the tuner performs in case you didn't
know). There was no arcing anywhere...have no idea what the swr was on the
feedline, but that is not the point. The point is, I did get a signal out
and made contacts, all with good readability on both ends. I have never
claimed this would make a good antenna or that one should operate such, just
proved that it can work to some extent. I thought you were smarter than
dannyboy but guess not.

5819. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 23:48:27 UTC
From: Frank <frank@127.0.0.1>
Message-ID: <flpdb.449081$cF.144564@rwcrnsc53>
Source record: 79229

Hans K0HB wrote:

> yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT) wrote
>
>
>>Just exactly in what way is this good news?
>
>
> Larry,
>
> Please don't feed the trolls.
>
> 73, Hans, K0HB
Great news...I have to agree...France is our ENEMY period...THey want to see the US fail in everything we do. The hell with the FRENCH...I hope Congress (both chambers) vote NO in any aid for France!

73

Frank K#EKO

5820. Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 23:51:32 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <8opdb.8103$yp6.195867@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79228

I thought I'd forward the thoughtful comments below from
e-ham.net ... they say a LOT. (name/callsign omitted to
at least partially protect the innocent ...)

Carl - wk3c

****
For the last 25 years I have been in the US Coast Guard serving as
telecommunication technician. I am now a instructor at the same course.
I started off as a Morse Code operator in New Jersey. I grant you I
graduated at the near bottom of my Morse code class but still passed the 40
wpm requirement easily.
I also was sent to 9 months of antenna and radio theory and fundamental
classes. Upon graduation billions of years ago we all were required (simply
because the instructor was a Ham Extra Class type) to take the Morse code
and written tests. My class had 37 folks in it. On a windy Saturday in New
Jersey in winter 1978 we all went and took the Ham radio test and all by
simple virtue of having studied Morse and electronic theory and fundamentals
for almost a year left with our Extra licenses.
So in 1978 37 of us got "forced" into Ham radio and to this date - 22 still
are active (three of my class passed away, and I think one is in jail) but
the point is that we are still active running MARS stations, teaching in
service schools and running C2 systems for the DoD and doing so as Hams and
Coast Guard Instructors.
A few years ago the Coast Guard decided to do away with the Morse
requirement for us to learn as newbies - and for good reason - No one ever
used it for emergencies. Technology had developed a means to communicate
request for assistance via HF voice, FM, AM, TacSat. And the trusty
cellphone. I mean - in my opinion only a fool would trust sending a morse
code message that his ship was sinking - people wanted to call on a phone -
ask for help - and hear a warm friendly voice on the other side saying help
is on the way.
Two weeks ago 28 Coasties graduated from the DoD Signal center at Ft
Gordon - they had over a year of telecommunication training, satellite
uplink/downlink, antenna theory, computer ops, you name it - but what they
didn't have is any morse code. So how many of the last 3 classes that have
graduated have became Hams - ZERO. The reason is simple - they simply don't
see a need to study something that the US Govt (both the FCC and Coast Guard
and DoD) themselves have stated was not necessary.
One of the seaman that was asking me about how to become a ham told me that
to be forced to study the code to get a license was like a surgeon being
told he had to learn about Ether because that's how they use to do it back
in the civil war or a skipper having to learn how to pilot a steamboat
because for the longest time that was the naval tradition - and he has a
point - morse code was around and was an acceptable form of communication

when Steamers and biplanes were the norm but technology has changed greatly. But here it is today - the 21st Century and we are judging folk on their capabilities of being good Hams based on a 19th century art form.
Do I believe in tradition - of course -- but tradition shouldn't be the basis of restricting new technology or ideals.
Do I still use morse - yep, do I scream and yell at my new students because even though they can design an antenna system with a coke can and chewing gum that can talk to someone 1000 miles away but must be inadequate because they don't know morse code - No.
Bottom line is that there are a ton of great folks out there that would be a great benefit to Ham radio but just don't want to, or can't learn the code.
And just for the record - for the last two classes I asked "how many of you guys use CB radios" - to date the number is Zero. I had one girl in the telecommunication class raise her hand and ask "What's a CB?". so the argument that if we open the airwaves up to these fine Americans that have served for over a year learning the best in radio theory and fundamentals that they are suddenly going to invade your air space and start talking CB is just ridiculous.
Anyway . my two cents worth.
****
END QUOTE FROM E-HAM.NET

5821. too much

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 23:53:55 UTC
From: JOHN ALLISON ABERNETHY IV <JOHNALLISONABERNETHYIV@JOHNALLISONABERNETHYIV.NET>
Message-ID: <vnc8olsu1tq635@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79232
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

```
static down south
```

5822. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-27 23:57:33 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Ntpdb.8104$yp6.195943@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79230

"shephed" <smokey@twist1up.com> wrote in message
news:8Amdb.81873$xx4.8792325@twister.neo.rr.com...
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030927130638.11352.00000252@mb-m25.aol.com...
> > >ARRL Bible, Book of Morse, Chapter 1, Verse 1
> > >Don't worry about it, for it is writter;
> > >And behold, for in the sky I saw a pale rider sat upon a pale horse.
The
> > >horse'e name is Codefree, and the rider's name is Capt. Carl.
> > >
> > >And it will come to pass that Capt. Carl shall strik down the demon
that
> is
> > >BPL just as had done to the Godless Know-Coders.
> > >
> > >As ye shall spend the rest of thy days in peace, without QRM or Morse
> Code.
> >
> > So true, if Karl the nut is so great, he better hurry up and get busy
on
> > striking down BPL.
> > It makes you wonder if the FCC in there plan to put BPL in place, saw
> Karl as
> > someone they could use to take the attention off of BPL and put it on
CW.
> >
> I bet you are right!
> Capt. Carl is just a sock-puppet for the broadband cartel. Now what will
all
> the "engineers" do when they can't hear shit on HF?
>
> This is too funny.....
>
What a pile of crapola ...

Read "It Seems to Us" (Dave Sumner's editorial) in Oct. QST ...
Read my comments on BPL, either on the FCC ECFS or at
my personal web page at http://home.ptd.net/~wk3c.
Ask Ed Hare if I've been supporting him in the battle against BPL.

Also, I will be lobbying FCC OET and the Commissioners in the
coming weeks against BPL ... and I've been out in the Emmaus, PA
BPL "pilot" area with local reporters SHOWING them just how bad
BPL really is (after showing them what S0-S9 signals sound like on

a quiet band away from the BPL area so that when they see/hear the "wall to wall" S9+ "hash" from BPL they understand just how bad it really is.

So don't give me this "sock-puppet for the broadband cartel" crap.

Carl - wk3c

5823. Re: IS THERE ANYBODY OUT THERE

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 00:01:00 UTC
From: core_dump <corenodumpspam0@mernocuryspamlink.net>
Message-ID: <Xns9403CBB79A0DFcoredumpmercurylinkn@216.168.3.44>
Source record: 79233
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"K4-OLD-KING-ALLIGATOR" <BIG-AL@ -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@@@BIG-AL@@@-003894.5-LSB-75-METERS> wrote in news:vn84vkh742nn2b@corp.supernews.com:

>
>
>

just not if you can hear me...

--
-core_dump

-----BEGIN GEEK CODE BLOCK-----
Version: 3.12
GCS/M/CC d- s-:+ a--- C+++ UL+ P L++++ E--- W++ N+++ o? K? w(--)
O? M-- V? PS+(---) PE(++) Y+ PGP- t+ 5? X+ R tv b+ DI+ D+(---) G e h! r--(---)
z--
------END GEEK CODE BLOCK------
Segmentation fault (core dumped)

5824. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 00:02:21 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <hypdb.8105$yp6.196053@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79231

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030927163635.02717.00000272@mb-m24.aol.com...
> >I bet you are right!
> >Capt. Carl is just a sock-puppet for the broadband cartel. Now what will
all
> >the "engineers" do when they can't hear shit on HF?
> >
> >This is too funny.....
>
> I think its very funny, I can see it now, Captain Karl and his
fruitcakes
> finally get HF Phone, then find out they cant talk to anyone unless they
use
> CW.

And how do you expect CW to get through S9+ noise that's uniform
across all of the HF bands?

Bruce ... normally I simply ignore you, but it is time to tell you
directly that you are a total idiot.

If I gave you an hundred dollars cash and took you to a "rent/buy a clue
store" where clues were 5 cents each, you still wouldn't be able to get a
clue,
so why don't you just go back to CB and stop being such a world-class
AH amongst hams?

Carl - wk3c

5825. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 00:15:52 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl597o$8mc$0@208.206.142.65>
Source record: 79234

JJ wrote:
> Dick Carroll wrote in message ...
>
>> Don't pay them too much attention, Bruce. Neither JJ nor TwIT realizes
>>they were NOT using a 1/4 wave dipole. If they had been, neither would
>>have gotten a signal out of the back yard.
>>
>> If the *antenna system* took a load and performed under the circumstances
>>they describe, then both JJ and TwIT were loading the outer surface of the
>>coax shield, and *that* was doing a major part of the radiating.
>>
>> Of course when one side of a 1/4 wave dipole is attached to the braid
>>of the coax with no decoupling, then the dipole is no longer a 1/4 wave
>>dipole! What it becomes then depends entirely on
>>the feedline length as well as other local factors. So then it will
>>probably take some load, and maybe even load up to full supplied power,
>>as JJ described. At that point it's a crap shoot-you don't know *what*
>>you've got! For sure it ISN'T a 1/4 wave dipole! But the uninformed will
>>think their "1/4 wave dipole" worked just fine!
>>
>> If JJ had used a good isolation choke or 1:1 balun to decouple the coax
>
>>from the 40 meter dipole at the feedpoint the tuner would have balked big
>
>>time, and all that RF would have bounced around inside it, and made
>>itself known quite loudly in the form of arcs.
>
>
> The 40 meter dipole does have an HF 1:1 balun at the feedpoint.
>
>
>
>>The KWM-2 finals might
>>have sparked a bit, too.
>
>
> Why? As far as the M-2 was concerned, it was seeing a good match, courtesy
> of the tuner (that is one function the tuner performs in case you didn't
> know). There was no arcing anywhere...have no idea what the swr was on the
> feedline, but that is not the point. The point is, I did get a signal out
> and made contacts, all with good readability on both ends. I have never
> claimed this would make a good antenna or that one should operate such, just
> proved that it can work to some extent. I thought you were smarter than
> dannyboy but guess not.

>
>
>

So you have a tuner that can match 50 ohms to 10K or higher
at the far end of a run of coax through a 1:1 balun???
I don't think so, JJ.

Again, whatever you thought you were doing, you were *not*
loading a 1/4 wave dipole. And that poor balun is surely toast.
And if it's not, that just proves that it wasn't in the load path and
you *were* loading up your feedline.

Believe whatever you wish. I know you can't load a 1/4 wave dipole
in that manner, and definitely not using coax feedline.
There isn't a tuner that I know of that will handle that
extreme a mismatch.
If it's taking load it isn't acting as a 1/4 wave dipole. THAT
was the initial point.

5826. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 00:23:02 UTC
From: Clay N4AOX <wyn@att.net>
Message-ID: <GRpdb.161636$3o3.11573369@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 79235

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
news:d22b54c3.0309260402.7498733a@posting.google.com...
> "Clay N4AOX" <wyn@att.net> wrote in message
news:<z2Ocb.153421$0v4.11434217@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> > Hi Gang,
> > Curious about this BPL. Is there a technical treatise somewhere on
the
> > web that describes exactly how this BPL will be implemented? I am
having a
> > hard time determining how it works. I live a few miles from what once
was
> > TVA's largest substation in their electrical grid/system, maybe one of
the
> > largest in the world, fed by 0.5 MV lines. Sooooo lets start with
block
> > diagrams. How does it work?
>
> I suggest you start with the ARRL website which is full of info on BPL.
>
> w3rv

Hi Brian,
Thanks for the pointer. It appears that the BPL folks are going to cozy up to the 13KV or less power lines, with internet fiber back to the head end. This will be like your baby crib monitor on steroids. I was wondering how they pump the 2-80 MHz through the step down transformers. The literature mentioned a "high pass" filter around the transformer. I read this as a high voltage, low uF cap. The relatively high inductance "pole pigs" normally isolate households from noise stuff. If you think you have trouble with touch lamps in the neighborhood now, just wait until they add the "high pass" filters around the transformers. Never mind Ed Hare's attempts to show how the power lines along the street radiate. The very walls of your house, your christmas tree lights, etc. would radiate 2-80 MHz.

I remember back in the day when the early CATV providers used cheap braid shielding on their cable lines. Their Channel 18 was quite unusable in some localities due to 2 Meter Ham traffic. Of course, that interference was a two way street also. Imagine what my DXer friend down the street would do to the internet grid with his 10,000 watt erp into the BPL powerline/internet coupler. What a hoot!

Don't you love Commissioner Kat's remarks. Essentially: "Suspend the rules!, Let this fledgling technology flourish! Do they have a sound plan? H**l no! If we get down in the middle of the deployment of this

enterprise and there are problems we will solve them as we go! Just throw some tax payers money at it!" Hey, this fits right in with the current administration, the Tauzin, Dingell committee, etc. and besides, Commissioner Kat will be retired and sucking on a six figure lobbiest job by then. Be afraid, be very afraid. --Maybe some sort of "Homeland Defense" argument would be effective in beating this thing back.

73,
Clay N4AOX

5827. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 00:38:04 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927203804.27009.00000338@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 79236

>Why? As far as the M-2 was concerned, it was seeing a good match, courtesy
>of the tuner (that is one function the tuner performs in case you didn't
>know). There was no arcing anywhere...have no idea what the swr was on the
>feedline, but that is not the point. The point is, I did get a signal out
>and made contacts, all with good readability on both ends. I have never
>claimed this would make a good antenna or that one should operate such, just
>proved that it can work to some extent. I thought you were smarter than
>dannyboy but guess not.
>

Good example of the NEW CBHAMS. By the way why dont you call it a Rhombic, or
Sterba Curtain, or maybe even QUAD, or A Yagi, heck call it what you want, you
still dont have a CLUE.

5828. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 00:42:49 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927204249.27009.00000339@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 79237

>Also, I will be lobbying FCC OET and the Commissioners in the
>coming weeks against BPL ... and I've been out in the Emmaus, PA
>BPL "pilot" area with local reporters SHOWING them just how bad
>BPL really is (after showing them what S0-S9 signals sound like on
>a quiet band away from the BPL area so that when they see/hear the
>"wall to wall" S9+ "hash" from BPL they understand just how bad
>it really is.
>
>So don't give me this "sock-puppet for the broadband cartel" crap.
>
>Carl - wk3c
>

Well there it is folks, Karl the Nut is going to save Ham Radio. Just think Karl is going to put these Billion dollar companies in there place. Lets all bow to Karl the Nut for saving Ham Radio.

5829. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 00:48:37 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927204837.27009.00000341@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 79238

>And how do you expect CW to get through S9+ noise that's uniform
>across all of the HF bands?

I dont, and dont care.

>Bruce ... normally I simply ignore you, but it is time to tell you
>directly that you are a total idiot.
>

Karl do you think I, or anyone except your LOONEY followers care what you say.
Get real Karl, you are a Fruit Cake

>so why don't you just go back to CB and stop being such a world-class

Oh Im already there, with you and all your CB Buddies, who now Claim to be REAL
HAMS, but we all know there just WELFARE HAMS, better know as CBplussers.

5830. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 01:03:37 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927210337.27009.00000347@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 79239

> Don't you love Commissioner Kat's remarks. Essentially: "Suspend
>the rules!, Let this fledgling technology flourish! Do they have a sound
>plan? H**l no! If we get down in the middle of the deployment of this
>enterprise and there are problems we will solve them as we go! Just throw
>some tax payers money at it!" Hey, this fits right in with the current
>administration, the Tauzin, Dingell committee, etc. and besides,
>Commissioner Kat will be retired and sucking on a six figure lobbiest job
>by then. Be afraid, be very afraid. --Maybe some sort of "Homeland
>Defense" argument would be effective in beating this thing back.
>
>73,
>Clay N4AOX
>
>

Heres the solution to the BPL problem, it it makes you wonder why someone as done it yet.
First stop messing with FCC, these Clowns have all ready made up there minds. Look at the Present Dumbing Down, which as been brought to us VIA the FCC Morrons. So believe me they could care less about Hams. And stop waisting your time sending in your comments to the FCC. If anybody in there right mind thinks they care about 1800 comments you kidding yourself.
The solution is Simple, go to there Bosses, I dont mean anybody in the FCC I mean the FCCs Bosses. Tell them how you plan on Voting the next time out if this passes. Be sure and bring up Homeland Security in your comments. This is the only thing that will stop this. If you dont think so, remember the Head Man at the FCC recently got his hands slapped and told he would change another screw up he recently made.

5831. The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 01:05:03 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927210503.27009.00000348@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 79240

Heres the solution to the BPL problem, it makes you wonder why someone hasnt done it yet.
First stop messing with FCC, these Clowns have all ready made up there minds. Look at the Present Dumbing Down, which as been brought to us VIA the FCC Morrons. So believe me they could care less about Hams. And stop waisting your time sending in your comments to the FCC. If anybody in there right mind thinks they care about 1800 comments you kidding yourself.
The solution is Simple, go to there Bosses, I dont mean anybody in the FCC I mean the FCCs Bosses. Tell them how you plan on Voting the next time out if this passes. Be sure and bring up Homeland Security in your comments. This is the only thing that will stop this. If you dont think so, remember the Head Man at the FCC recently got his hands slapped and told he would change another screw up he recently made.

5832. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 01:10:59 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927211059.27009.00000349@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 79241

That would be all fine and good. but you know, as well as the rest of us, that most of the New people will be know where near that level, and probably never will be.

5833. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 01:11:31 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bl5cd0esv1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 79258

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030925082935.08626.00000891@mb-m27.aol.com...
> In article <bkkrmf$3vg$1@nd.eastky.net>, "Robert" <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
writes:
>
> >"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> >
> >> Look again. There are those who not only advocate code test
elimination,
> >but
> >> also the reduction or elimination of the CW/data subbands.
> >
> > I've only seen that from a very few blindingly obvious trolls and
a
> >known brain-damaged pair who's personal flame-fest has been infesting
> >r.r.*** for _years_.
> >
> > I'd be interested in some quotes on this.
> >
> Hello Bob, sorry for the delay in getting back to you.

No worries in this zoo! I'm a bit behind myself, as you can tell...

> There was an entire thread on it here on rrap some time back. Thread title
was:
>
> "With CW gone, can the CW allocations be far behind?"
>
> Lots of good quotes from various nontrolling parties.

I'll have to actually Google it if I can work up enough non-apathy
on the subject.

> Much of the rest of the world has no subbands-by-mode, and some folks
think the
> USA shouldn't have any, either. (I'm not one of 'em).

I'm totally in favor of an enactment that would create CW
'preserves', starting with the current allotments and then rationally
expanding them, even, if it would cool the jets of the more obnoxious
PCTA's. (not that that will happen.)

That aside, I'm rather disappointed that you couldn't name at least
one of the 'regular' NCTA's as being in favor of eliminating the CW bands.
Maybe one sticks out for ya...

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.520 / Virus Database: 318 - Release Date: 9/18/2003

5834. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 01:15:49 UTC
From: JJ <radiobuff0@mailcity.moc>
Message-ID: <NvSdnYB89bKVpOuiXTWJkQ@gbronline.com>
Source record: 79242

WA8ULX wrote in message >
>Karl is going to put these Billion dollar companies in there place. Lets
all
>bow to Karl the Nut for saving Ham Radio.

You mean "in their" as in "in their place" instead of "there" as in put it
over "there". Nothing like a third grade education.

5835. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 01:17:32 UTC
From: Robert <rdbake@prtcnet.org>
Message-ID: <bl5d0g$f3o$1@nd.eastky.net>
Source record: 79257

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:Ca5cb.3016$iT4.2209705@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Larry Roll K3LT wrote:
>
> > In article <vmu3dc5uoiohad@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> > computron dot net> writes:
> >
> >
> > >>>Well, Clint, you said it, not me! I'm glad you're starting to see the
> > >>
> > >>light!
> > >>
> > >>>73 de Larry, K3LT
> > >>>
> > >>
> > >>I, I see your point.
> > >>I will be the absolute BEST driver of a modern internal combustion
engine-
> > >>driven automobile if I first take a blacksmith's apprenticeship and
learn
> > >>to shoe a horse.
> > >>
> > >>Yes. Quite logical.
> > >>
> > >>Clint
> > >>KB5ZHT
> > >
> > >
> > > Well, Clint, that kind of cynicism may seem to be amusing to some, but
> > > just goes to demonstrate a lack of any truly logical argument which
> > > supports your position. Therefore, it, and you, are easily dismissed.
> >
> > I don't know about you, Larry, but I like to know a lot about
> > everything I do.

Really?

That goes for cars, amateur radio, computers,
> > housework, history, or whatever. I suspect you feel at least somewhat
> > this way too. Strange that there is a whole culture built up that
> > celebrates ignorance.

You _revel_ in it.

> That's why if my car breaks down on the road, I stand a good chance of
> getting it running again, why I know it isn't likely the F.C.C. won't
> test me on the design of a 1/4 wave dipole, and why I knew that there
> wasn't any special callsigns for non-coded amateurs.
>
> Not that I don't make mistakes, but I don't come into newsgroups acting
> as if I know everything either! 8^)

I should expect you're straightened out on the whole "anonymous
posting" question then, right? I mean, you _did_ attempt to correct your
ignorance in this matter? You're up to speed on 'net anonymity, remailers,
pseudonyms and all that jazz, right? Or do you not know "a lot" about the
internet?

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.520 / Virus Database: 318 - Release Date: 9/18/2003

5836. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 01:42:09 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vncf3ki6bt441d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79243

> I'm asking why there should be an effort on the part of the ARS or
> FCC to promote (boost, encourage, or push) this single operating mode
(it's
> the only mode specifically skill tested)?

...because the communication mode must be subsidized in order to
continue to exist, as many PCTA'rs have admitted "if people aren't
forced to learn it, they won't and it'll disappear"... so you wonder
how they can also question our use of the term "archaic" or "outdated",
saying "have you listened to that half of the band? there's PLENTY
of CW!" .... if that's so, then how could the mode disappear if not
forced upon people?

very contradictory terms, like most PCTA arguments.

"I had to be tested on it, therefore so should YOU!"

5837. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 01:46:34 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vncfbsg7e3js26@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79244

> Too bad Google doesn't go back that far. It would be interesting to see
> who really "started all this" in these newsgroups. Of course, I suspect it
> was a member of the pro-code crowd - since the FCC started dropping code
> years ago, the no-code crowd would have had little reason to even bring
the
> subject up.

BINGO, just as i've said many times.... the PCTA accuses the NCTA of doing all the crying and whimpering and flame war starting, but WHY would the NCTA have to do that since the tide of events in on thier side? It can only be logically concluded that the PCTA'rs were screaming against what they see as an injustice (in thier view of things).

Facts are, a person is FAR more likely to call a dealership and complain if he feels the car he just bought was a lemon, than to call it and compliment them
if the car they just bought was a real bargain and exceeded thier expectations.

The pro-code crowd, on the other hand, started complaining
> before the FCC even changed the rules (the rumor of a rule change was
> enough).
>

What's WORSE is that most of them won't debate anymore after starting the crying fits, they put the people on ignore that try to discuss the matter with them..... how's THAT for reasonable?

Just imagine how bad it's going to get when the last vestiges of it are removed entirely.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5838. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 01:47:14 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vncfd4mqf0p64f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79245

>
> There is no defeat to admit to, Larry. I presented the facts. You were
> unable to respond without twisting the truth. That pretty much ended the
> discussion. However, I'm more than willing to continue if you have
something
> worthwhile to say. Of course, you don't really have to say anything
> intellegent, just something worthy of even a passing reply.
>

you'll get dodges or a variation of "I did it to, so shut up and do it
yourself!"

Clint
KB5ZHT

5839. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 01:50:40 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vncfjht2l49a19@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79246

nice condescending attitute there.

5840. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 01:59:01 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030927215901.01503.00000282@mb-m17.aol.com>
Source record: 79247

>You mean "in their" as in "in their place" instead of "there" as in put it
>over "there". Nothing like a third grade education.
>

Its sure good to know your good for something other than Ham Radio.

5841. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 04:04:07 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <X4tdb.243$Vb3.150548@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79248

JJ wrote:

> Dick Carroll wrote in message ...
>
>> Don't pay them too much attention, Bruce. Neither JJ nor TwIT realizes
>>they were NOT using a 1/4 wave dipole. If they had been, neither would
>>have gotten a signal out of the back yard.
>>
>> If the *antenna system* took a load and performed under the circumstances
>>they describe, then both JJ and TwIT were loading the outer surface of the
>>coax shield, and *that* was doing a major part of the radiating.
>>
>> Of course when one side of a 1/4 wave dipole is attached to the braid
>>of the coax with no decoupling, then the dipole is no longer a 1/4 wave
>>dipole! What it becomes then depends entirely on
>>the feedline length as well as other local factors. So then it will
>>probably take some load, and maybe even load up to full supplied power,
>>as JJ described. At that point it's a crap shoot-you don't know *what*
>>you've got! For sure it ISN'T a 1/4 wave dipole! But the uninformed will
>>think their "1/4 wave dipole" worked just fine!
>>
>> If JJ had used a good isolation choke or 1:1 balun to decouple the coax
>
>>from the 40 meter dipole at the feedpoint the tuner would have balked big
>
>>time, and all that RF would have bounced around inside it, and made
>>itself known quite loudly in the form of arcs.
>
>
> The 40 meter dipole does have an HF 1:1 balun at the feedpoint.
>
>
>
>>The KWM-2 finals might
>>have sparked a bit, too.
>
>
> Why? As far as the M-2 was concerned, it was seeing a good match, courtesy
> of the tuner (that is one function the tuner performs in case you didn't
> know). There was no arcing anywhere...have no idea what the swr was on the
> feedline, but that is not the point. The point is, I did get a signal out
> and made contacts, all with good readability on both ends. I have never
> claimed this would make a good antenna or that one should operate such, just
> proved that it can work to some extent. I thought you were smarter than

> dannyboy but guess not.

I'll admit stupidity if you can explain how and why that antenna worked as a quater wave dipole.

I already presented some fairly comprehensive data on why it wouldn't. That was pretty basic stuff.

That a quarter wave dipole antenna would work is fairly extraordinary.

Present your evidence and your theory/rationale.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5842. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 04:19:04 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030928001904.12501.00002739@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79254

In article <20030927070145.12501.00002718@mb-m04.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) writes:

>
>The idea is to test the actual radio operating skills of the testee under
>controlled conditions. There would be a time limit, too. (That's what the
>timer
>is for). The testee would have the choice of CW, voice or a digital mode for
>the test.
>
>Time limits and exact instructions would vary with the mode and the class of
>license being tested. Higher class tests could have shorter time limits,
>longer
>messages, and more complicated instructions, such as having to change
>frequency
>at a certain point in the contact, having to pick the frequency from a list
>that includes "wrong choices", etc.
>
>Scoring would be on the basis of mistakes. If a word in the messages is
>missing
>or misspelled, that's a mistake. If nonstandard procedure or phonetics are
>used, each deviation is a mistake. If the time limit is exceeded, each minute
>over the limit is a mistake. Exceed a certain number of mistakes and the test
>is failed. Asking for a repeat of a missed word would NOT be a mistake.
>
>Typical exams (but not the exact exams themselves) would be available as
>study
>guides. Audiotapes of typical tests could be used for study as well.
>
>Yes, it's a bit more complex than a straight code receiving test, and
>requires
>some equipment and two VEs to conduct it. (Perhaps the VE at the testee's
>position isn't really needed). But it could be done quite easily, and in such
>a
>way as to test real operating skills. The rigs used need not have lots of
>features, and QRP power levels would be more than adequate. Or a "rig
>simulator" that's really a gussied-up intercom could be used.
>
>Is there any real reason such testing could not be done? Is it expecting too
>much that a prospective ham be able to pass such a test? I think not!
>
>Waddya think?
>
>73 de Jim, N2EY

Jim:

I think that the voice mode would be chosen 100% of the time. To make your idea into a valid test, three QSO's should be required; one CW, one voice, one digital.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5843. Re: IARU Says "Remove Code"

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 04:19:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030928001905.12501.00002740@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79250

In article <fj7db.8012$yp6.183371@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>
>Larry,
>
>Before you and Dick and others start calling this "the NCI agenda" ...
>remember, NCI does NOT have any goal to do away with Morse
>USE or to restrict it ... ONLY to eliminate the TEST requirement.
>
>Carl - wk3c

Carl:

I've never referred to the no-code testing agenda as the NCI agenda.
The "NCI agenda" would seem to be to simply remove the requirement
for prospective HF-privileged licensees within the ARS to learn and
be tested at the entry-level in a useful communications skill of
proven value to radio operators serving a primarily backup role. Thus,
the NCTA and, by association, the NCI, merely panders to the lack
of motivation and initiative which is common to those who desire
valuable communications privileges without the need to make the
effort involved.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5844. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 04:19:05 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030928001905.12501.00002741@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79251

In article <7E9db.13374$pP6.12272@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>>
>> (snip) In fact, I would dare say that if there is any
>> "mental anguish" in this forum, it would seem to have
>> been expressed almost exclusively by the NCTA's,
>> who, after all, started all this (snip)
>
>
> Too bad Google doesn't go back that far. It would be interesting to see
>who really "started all this" in these newsgroups. Of course, I suspect it
>was a member of the pro-code crowd - since the FCC started dropping code
>years ago, the no-code crowd would have had little reason to even bring the
>subject up. The pro-code crowd, on the other hand, started complaining
>before the FCC even changed the rules (the rumor of a rule change was
>enough).

Dwight:

It was definitely the NCTA's who originated the code/no-code (testing) debate on Fidonet, then Usenet. At least, it was they who threw the first slings and arrows at the pro-coders (PCTA's) and making all the now famous accusations of us being politically-incorrect in every possible way, contributing to everything that is wrong in this world, and seeking to keep the ARS technically archaic. I was there from the beginning, so if you weren't, you'll just have to accept the word of those of us who were.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5845. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 04:19:06 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030928001906.12501.00002742@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79253

In article <2S9db.13438$pP6.9339@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>>
>> (snip) Sooo, you, like Kim, are going to admit defeat
>> as well? (snip)
>
>
> There is no defeat to admit to, Larry. I presented the facts.

Dwight:

Which facts would those be? I haven't seen Fact #1 come out of you yet!

>You were
>unable to respond without twisting the truth.

What truth? You never spoke any "truth." You only presented typical, boiler-plate NCTA strawman arguments.

>That pretty much ended the discussion.

Due to your lack of ability to offer anything of value to the discussion.

>However, I'm more than willing to continue if you have something
>worthwhile to say.

Fine. Propose a topic, and we'll give it a try. However, I believe you've pretty much used up your quota of boilerplate NCTA red herring strawmen, so you'll now have to actually make an attempt to dredge up something original. Good luck.

>Of course, you don't really have to say anything
>intellegent, just something worthy of even a passing reply.

Now you're starting to imitate Kim's whine. You should consider watching that, it's a very bad habit to get into, if you're concerned about your future credibility.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5846. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 04:19:07 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030928001907.12501.00002743@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79255

In article <Dwadb.13617$pP6.4408@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>>
>> I've already answered that question many times, but the
>> short form is that without code testing, there is no incentive
>> for radio amateurs to learn the code at all. (snip)
>
>
> But, again, why should there be "incentive" for hams to learn code? Notice
>that I'm not asking why a person would want to learn code on their own.
>Instead, I'm asking why there should be an effort on the part of the ARS or
>FCC to promote (boost, encourage, or push) this single operating mode (it's
>the only mode specifically skill tested)? You have yet to answer this
>question, and almost seem determined to avoid it.

Dwight:

I've also answered that question numerous times, but here it comes again:

The Morse/CW mode is the only mode which requires the operator to acquire a physical psychomotor skill in order to utilize that mode. Therefore, it makes sense to test for a prospective operator's ability to receive Morse code at some level, in order to ensure that this mode can continue to be effectively employed and it's benefits and advantages conferred upon the user. It's a fairly simple concept to understand, which makes one wonder why the NCTA's fail to grasp it.

>> Retaining continued skill in Morse/CW has no negative
>> effect on the development of technology in the future.
>> That's an NCTA red herring.

> I didn't say it had a negative effect, Larry. Instead, I asked you how
>this (code skill testing) will help to keep the ARS abreast of modern
>technology, insuring our continued value to others?

The above is a non-sequitur, since there is no need for use of the Morse/CW mode to "help keep the ARS abreast of modern technology...". Your statement is illogical and assumes facts not in evidence re: the negative effect of Morse/CW use on the development of other communications technologies within the ARS.

>I also asked how this
>(code skill testing) will help move the ARS into the future (where we should
>be mainly focused)?

Again, non-sequitur. This is a strawman argument offered in place of something more logical, well-reasoned, and relevant. There is no connection between Morse/CW testing or use and any possible deleterious effect on the development of other communications modes. This is merely, as previously stated, one of the NCTA's more famous but totally worthless "red herring" arguments.

>If you don't have an answer those questions, fine. Just
>don't attempt to twist what I said.

No need, you're doing that quite nicely yourself.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5847. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 04:19:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030928001908.12501.00002745@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79249

In article <K4bdb.13784$pP6.12402@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>>
>> Dwight Stewart wrote:
>>> No, Larry, he didn't say that. You misquoted him. He
>>> said, "...nobody ELSE uses CW..."
>>
>> Ah HA!!! So, the fact that amateur radio operators DO
>> use CW *is* relevant to the code testing debate, and the
>> fact that that the other radio services which don't, isn't!
>> Thanks for finally clearing that up.
>
>
> Huh? What the heck are you talking about, Larry? I beginning to think
>you're finally lost your mind.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Dwight:

If you can't remember what you yourself posted only a couple of days ago, then it is your mind which needs to "found." I suggest a microscope.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5848. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 04:19:08 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030928001908.12501.00002744@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79252

In article <E0bdb.13758$pP6.5456@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>>
>> Well, that's quite a roundabout way of admitting that
>> you don't know what you're talking about when you
>> insist that other radio services which don't use Morse/
>>CW have some relevance to the ARS. And since you
>> can't logically support your position, it's easier for you
>> to bail out. (snip)
>
>
> Trying to twist what I said again, Larry? I never said anything about the
>other radio services having any relevance beyond the fact that many once
>used code (which was relevant to the ARS at the time) and their present lack
>of code use (which has relevance today). If you choose to ignore that past
>and present relevance, that's certainly your prerogative. However, by doing
>so, your position has simply lost touch with reality.

Dwight:

You've spent the last couple of weeks attempting to re-attach some kind of significance to the fact that "other" radio services no longer "use code" (Morse code assumed). The only thing that has "lost touch with reality" around here would seem to be your own brain.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5849. More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 05:13:21 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl5qlhbgj0@208.206.142.82>
Source record: 79256

Reposted from another reflector...

---------->>
This is serious, folks.
I am located 65 MILES from a test area...and 160, 80,
and 40 were rendered virtually unusable with any
signal below roughly s-5 to s-7 at some times.
Especially for the QRPp'ers...how many stations have
you worked with just a few hundred milliwatts?
You have maybe a few thousandths of a microwatt on the
receiver's antenna...and this broadband hash puts a
few microwatts on the same antenna...what do YOU
think is going to happen?
Driving through Allentown during PPL's tests, there
were times when my car's AM radio was blotted out!
The power companies want this scheme to happen,
because it would be effortless revenue for them...
>>

>>
Attention All Amateurs...
ARRL Rebukes FCC Commissioner's BPL-Related "Broadband Nirvana" Remarks
(Sep 25, 2003) -- The ARRL has strongly objected to FCC Commissioner
Kathleen Q. Abernathy's suggestion that Broadband over Power Line (BPL)
technology will contribute to what she described as "broadband Nirvana."
Addressing the United Powerline Council's annual conference September 22
in Arlington, Virginia, Abernathy expressed unabashed enthusiasm for BPL and
recommended a combination of regulatory restraint and the elimination or
substantial modification of existing rules as steps along the "path to
Enlightenment." In a terse response faxed today on behalf of the
League's 155,000 members, ARRL Chief Executive Officer David Sumner,
K1ZZ, asserted that Abernathy overlooked some significant issues in her
Nirvana analogy.

YOU CAN EMAIL MISS ABERNATHY AT THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS AND I URGE EVERYONE TO
DO SO.

kabernat@fcc.gov <kabernat@fcc.gov>

5850. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 11:00:30 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vndfqti4rvvb41@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79264

--

--

If you sympathize with terrorists and middle
eastern tyrants, vote for liberals...

--
>
> I've also answered that question numerous times, but here it comes again:
>
> The Morse/CW mode is the only mode which requires the operator to
> acquire a physical psychomotor skill in order to utilize that mode.
Therefore,
> it makes sense to test for a prospective operator's ability to receive
Morse
> code at some level, in order to ensure that this mode can continue to be
> effectively employed and it's benefits and advantages conferred upon the
> user. It's a fairly simple concept to understand, which makes one wonder
> why the NCTA's fail to grasp it.

They don't "fail to grasp" what you're saying... they only point out the
fact
that the one has nothing to do with the other anymore. Yes, testing morse
code ensures that "it's benefits and advantages [are] conferred upon
the user", just like a contest of shuffleboard proves whether or not
the knowledge and sychomotor skills to play shuffleboard are inherint
within a person to play shuffleboard. The line of reasoning at this point
breaks down with all you PCTA people because you then try to make
the erroneous leap to the conclusion "therefore, it's necessary to continue
testing it for ham radio licenses."

Not many of your crowd seemed to have had a problem all through
the years for disabled people to have an exemption for high speed morse
code testing (if you had a physician's endorsement you didn't have to
prove you could send & receive morse code over 5wpm)... why did
none of you guys have the guts to stand up and say "well, the only
conclusion you can draw is that disabled & crippled people are not
real qualified hams" or "if you are disabled, you cannot ever be anything
more than a fake ham"? or how about "since the testing of morse code
is so necessary for ham radio, there should be NO exemptions for
people with hearing disorders because they can't possibly EVER show
the correct skills for being ham radio operators?"

You didn't, showing yet another error in PCTA logic. The only conclusion
a person can draw from this is that you subjectively and selectively apply

the requirements necessary for showing you have "the right stuff" to be a
ham,
and by doing show outright admit that it's more just a simple case of
personal choice and bias more than true, ground level basic needs.

Clint
KB5ZHT

>
> >> Retaining continued skill in Morse/CW has no negative
> >> effect on the development of technology in the future.
> >> That's an NCTA red herring.
>
> > I didn't say it had a negative effect, Larry. Instead, I asked you how
> >this (code skill testing) will help to keep the ARS abreast of modern
> >technology, insuring our continued value to others?
>
> The above is a non-sequitur, since there is no need for use of the
Morse/CW
> mode to "help keep the ARS abreast of modern technology...". Your
> statement is illogical and assumes facts not in evidence re: the negative
> effect of Morse/CW use on the development of other communications
> technologies within the ARS.
>
> >I also asked how this
> >(code skill testing) will help move the ARS into the future (where we
should
> >be mainly focused)?
>
> Again, non-sequitur. This is a strawman argument offered in place of
> something more logical, well-reasoned, and relevant. There is no
connection
> between Morse/CW testing or use and any possible deleterious effect on
> the development of other communications modes. This is merely, as
> previously stated, one of the NCTA's more famous but totally worthless
> "red herring" arguments.
>
> >If you don't have an answer those questions, fine. Just
> >don't attempt to twist what I said.
>
> No need, you're doing that quite nicely yourself.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

5851. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 11:03:02 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vndfvkt3p303a3@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79265

>
> It was definitely the NCTA's who originated the code/no-code (testing)
> debate on Fidonet, then Usenet. At least, it was they who threw the
> first slings and arrows at the pro-coders (PCTA's) and making all the
> now famous accusations of us being politically-incorrect in every
> possible way, contributing to everything that is wrong in this world,
> and seeking to keep the ARS technically archaic. I was there from the
> beginning, so if you weren't, you'll just have to accept the word of
> those of us who were.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

AH, self fullfilling argument... by simply you saying so, it must be true.

Well, it just doesn't stand the light of reason to say that those opposing
the code testing were the first to raise hell when it was quite obvious that
the tide of events were going thier way. It just doesn't make sense. It
would
be that group of people who felt thier interests were being attacked that
naturally would want to raise debate about it and therefore, the law of
averages
says that some of those would be rather sharp, offensive and a little on the
dark side.

5852. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 11:06:01 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vndg57spmvl015@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79266

> Which facts would those be? I haven't seen Fact #1 come out of you yet!

He did, you ignore them conveniently.

>
> >You were
> >unable to respond without twisting the truth.
>
> What truth? You never spoke any "truth." You only presented typical,
> boiler-plate NCTA strawman arguments.

He did. you ignored it conveniently.. and by the way,
you just dodged the fact that he was commenting about
the (non)logic of PCTA people, not those wanting to
advance ham radio into the modern age.

>
> >That pretty much ended the discussion.
>
> Due to your lack of ability to offer anything of value to the discussion.

He did. You ignored it conveniently and asked for facts when there
was plenty of substantial reasoning for his side of the view.

>
> >However, I'm more than willing to continue if you have something
> >worthwhile to say.
>
> Fine. Propose a topic, and we'll give it a try. However, I believe
you've
> pretty much used up your quota of boilerplate NCTA red herring strawmen,
> so you'll now have to actually make an attempt to dredge up something
> original. Good luck.

why bother? you, just like the rest of the PCTA crowd will just overlook and
ignore it and say "where are your facts?" and then continue to not only not
produce any yourself but just rehash the old "boo hoo, my precious morse
code testing system is about to be dumped...."

Clint
KB5ZHT

5853. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 11:27:53 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ZAzdb.31636$ai7.13479@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79267

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
> Heres the solution to the BPL problem, it makes you
> wonder why someone hasn't done it yet.
> First stop messing with FCC, these Clowns have all
> ready made up there minds. Look at the Present
> Dumbing Down, which as been brought to us VIA the
> FCC Morrons. So believe me they could care less
> about Hams. And stop waisting your time sending in
> your comments to the FCC. If anybody in there right
> mind thinks they care about 1800 comments you
> kidding yourself. The solution is Simple, go to there
> Bosses, I dont mean anybody in the FCC I mean the
> FCCs Bosses. Tell them how you plan on Voting the
> next time out if this passes. Be sure and bring up
> Homeland Security in your comments. This is the
> only thing that will stop this. (snip)

It hasn't been done because it won't work, Bruce. First of all, we're (ham operators) only a speck on the political spectrum. Even if we all voted exactly the same (not very likely), we don't have enough numbers to effect elections in any significant way. On the national level, our numbers are about equal to the voting block of a single mid-sized city (in a country with hundreds of cities). On the local level, the hams in a single state are rarely enough to change an election there. Finally, we don't contribute any great amount of money to elections. In other words, taken all together, we don't have any political muscle to throw around.

As for the 1800 comments, have you read those comments? Most are opinions without solid facts. In other words, they lack substance. Only a very small number have anything firm to support the anti-BPL position. Compare that to the technical materials and studies provided by BPL supporters. I warned about this problem weeks ago. We're not giving the FCC enough to hang it's hat on to oppose BPL. If we want them to oppose BPL, we have to give them a solid reason to do so (a reason they can demonstrate to others).

As for homeland security, we're not doing a whole lot when it comes to homeland security. If you talk about that, are you prepared to explain what we're doing and who we're doing it for? What government agency do we work for while participating in homeland security activities? Who in the government is in charge of our homeland security operations? What are we specifically doing for homeland security?

As much as I'm opposed to BPL, I don't see how we can stop it at this point. We should have started our efforts two or three years ago. We should now have solid, preferably long term, studies to back up our claims. We

should have technical materials showing the real impact on specific frequencies and on specific radio services. I'm afraid it's too late to start all of this now.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5854. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 11:59:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <p2Adb.31920$ai7.31338@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79268

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:
>
> Just imagine how bad it's going to get when the last
> vestiges of it are removed entirely.

Actually, once code testing is gone, the pro-testing crowd is not going to have much to say. I'm sure they're going to continue complaining about the new operators, but even that is going to have increasing irrelevance as their numbers continue to go down and new operator numbers continue to go up. Sadly, the pro-coders don't even seem to realize that all this is their own doing - their own behavior is responsible for their declining numbers (and perhaps, to some extent, even the removal of code testing). After talking to some of the pro-coders in this newsgroup, very few new operators are exactly inspired to continue talking to them (on the CW frequencies or elsewhere). By driving new operators away, they have insured their own decreasing numbers. And those decreasing numbers have seriously undermined support for code testing.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5855. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 12:05:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <d8Adb.31976$ai7.19537@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79269

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> (snip) I was there from the beginning, so if you weren't,
> you'll just have to accept the word of those of us who
> were.

Right, Larry. You were there for the very first no-code/pro-code debate.
Actually, I wouldn't be overly surprised if you were. With your attitude, I
could easily see you starting that first debate.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5856. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 12:06:40 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <k9Adb.6881$Gx3.2945@newssvr27.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79270
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:bl6edl$8hejv$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> (not responding directly to this post but in general)
>
> I was thinking recently about this whole BPL thing, and was thinking that
if
> it is going to affect the amateur bands, that logically it would affect
> other services such as public safety, governmental, and possibly even
> military and aviation frequency allocations as well.
>
> My thinking is, if my logic in the above paragraph is indeed true, then
> wouldn't educating and getting those groups to lobby against BPL be more
> effective rather than just us as a group collective?? Seems to me that
> those organizations would have more effective "pull" with the FCC than we
> would.
>
> Am I wrong in this thinking or ???
>

I think that you are absolutely right, Ryan. I know that some of these other
services and agencies have been alerted, but I don't know how many know, or
what they have done in response.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

5857. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 12:10:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928081040.29660.00000865@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 79271

In article <20030927204249.27009.00000339@mb-m11.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>>Also, I will be lobbying FCC OET and the Commissioners in the
>>coming weeks against BPL ... and I've been out in the Emmaus, PA
>>BPL "pilot" area with local reporters SHOWING them just how bad
>>BPL really is (after showing them what S0-S9 signals sound like on
>>a quiet band away from the BPL area so that when they see/hear the
>>"wall to wall" S9+ "hash" from BPL they understand just how bad
>>it really is.
>>
>>So don't give me this "sock-puppet for the broadband cartel" crap.
>>
>>Carl - wk3c
>>
>
> Well there it is folks, Karl the Nut is going to save Ham Radio.

Did you read his comments to the FCC? I did. Lots of good, sound, rational stuff against BPL. Including actual firsthand accounts of the noise.

Hardly the work of a "nut", I'd say.

>Just think
>Karl is going to put these Billion dollar companies in there place.

Not by himself. But his stuff will surely help.

I filed comments against BPL, Carl filed comments, ARRL filed comments, lots of folks filed comments - did you file comments, Bruce?

5858. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 12:10:42 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928081042.29660.00000866@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 79272

In article <8opdb.8103$yp6.195867@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>I thought I'd forward the thoughtful comments below from
>e-ham.net ... they say a LOT. (name/callsign omitted to
>at least partially protect the innocent ...)

Why? We can always go searching through eham
>
>Carl - wk3c
>
>*********
>For the last 25 years I have been in the US Coast Guard serving as
>telecommunication technician. I am now a instructor at the same course.
>I started off as a Morse Code operator in New Jersey. I grant you I
>graduated at the near bottom of my Morse code class but still passed the 40
>wpm requirement easily.
>I also was sent to 9 months of antenna and radio theory and fundamental
>classes. Upon graduation billions of years ago we all were required (simply
>because the instructor was a Ham Extra Class type) to take the Morse code
>and written tests.

WHOA! "Required?"

>My class had 37 folks in it. On a windy Saturday in New
>Jersey in winter 1978 we all went and took the Ham radio test and all by
>simple virtue of having studied Morse and electronic theory and fundamentals
>for almost a year left with our Extra licenses.

So it was a no-effort thing. These folks had all already learned both theory
and code on the taxpayer's dime, to a level far beyond that required for the
amateur license.

>So in 1978 37 of us got "forced" into Ham radio and to this date - 22 still
>are active (three of my class passed away, and I think one is in jail) but
>the point is that we are still active running MARS stations, teaching in
>service schools and running C2 systems for the DoD and doing so as Hams and
>Coast Guard Instructors.

All good things.

>A few years ago the Coast Guard decided to do away with the Morse
>requirement for us to learn as newbies - and for good reason - No one ever
>used it for emergencies.

Morse Code was phased out of the maritime services so that the shipping companies would not have to staff their ships with skilled radio operators whose sole duties would be radio communications.

The maritime radio services exist only because ships need communications, not because the shipping companies or crews like to mess around with radios.

>Technology had developed a means to communicate
>request for assistance via HF voice, FM, AM, TacSat. And the trusty
>cellphone.

I'd like to see how far from shore a cellphone works....

>I mean - in my opinion only a fool would trust sending a morse
>code message that his ship was sinking - people wanted to call on a phone -
>ask for help - and hear a warm friendly voice on the other side saying help
>is on the way.

Not exactly an unbiased opinion...

IIRC, the last use of Morse for a maritime emergency was on December 31, 1997, involving MV Oak.

It should be noted that the newer systems have a much higher false alarm rate than the old manual Morse system.

>Two weeks ago 28 Coasties graduated from the DoD Signal center at Ft
>Gordon - they had over a year of telecommunication training, satellite
>uplink/downlink, antenna theory, computer ops, you name it - but what they
>didn't have is any morse code. So how many of the last 3 classes that have
>graduated have became Hams - ZERO. The reason is simple - they simply don't
>see a need to study something that the US Govt (both the FCC and Coast Guard
>and DoD) themselves have stated was not necessary.

Do they have an instructor *requiring* or *forcing* them to take the test?

>One of the seaman that was asking me about how to become a ham told me that
>to be forced to study the code to get a license was like a surgeon being
>told he had to learn about Ether because that's how they use to do it back
>in the civil war or a skipper having to learn how to pilot a steamboat
>because for the longest time that was the naval tradition - and he has a
>point - morse code was around and was an acceptable form of communication
>when Steamers and biplanes were the norm but technology has changed greatly.

Sure. But modern MDs don't use ether, steam has been largely replaced by diesel and gas turbines. Hams, however, still use Morse code extensively.

>But here it is today - the 21st Century and we are judging folk on their
>capabilities of being good Hams based on a 19th century art form.

Not true at all. Was there no use of Morse code in radio in the 20th century?

>Do I believe in tradition - of course -- but tradition shouldn't be the
>basis of restricting new technology or ideals.
>Do I still use morse - yep, do I scream and yell at my new students because
>even though they can design an antenna system with a coke can and chewing

>gum that can talk to someone 1000 miles away but must be inadequate because
>they don't know morse code - No.
>Bottom line is that there are a ton of great folks out there that would be a
>great benefit to Ham radio but just don't want to, or can't learn the code.

Maybe. We've had a nocode ham license for 12+ years now - and yet none of the students wanted that license, huh? The satellite systems used for maritime distress, GPS, etc., aren't HF systems either.

>And just for the record - for the last two classes I asked "how many of you
>guys use CB radios" - to date the number is Zero. I had one girl in the
>telecommunication class raise her hand and ask "What's a CB?". so the
>argument that if we open the airwaves up to these fine Americans that have
>served for over a year learning the best in radio theory and fundamentals
>that they are suddenly going to invade your air space and start talking CB
>is just ridiculous.

Sure - those folks.

>Anyway . my two cents worth.
>**********
>END QUOTE FROM E-HAM.NET
>
The writer ignores the biggest differences of those 25 years:

1) Back in '78, the students learned Morse Code as part of their CG training, so there was no other training needed for them to get Extra Class amateur licenses. Today, they would need to put in some of their own time, and a bit of effort, learning Morse at 5 wpm for that test.

2) There was no instructor today FORCING them to take the test. In fact, an instructor who tried to do that might be in trouble.

An amateur license is not a license to engage in commercial, maritime, military, broadcast, public safety or other nonamateur radio communications. It's a license to engage in amateur radio, using the amateur radio frequency allocations. And radio amateurs do use Morse code extensively.

73 de Jim, N2EY

5859. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 12:22:54 UTC
From: Phil Witt <pwitt@wcov.com>
Message-ID: <tjkdnv0mkb8qg6gh3kddp371hq21aceorb@4ax.com>
Source record: 79273
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

>If you are a Republican and can't laugh at these you need to lighten up.
>:)
>
>Bumper Stickers for the '04 Bush Campaign:

Boy do I need to lighten up then.

5860. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 12:23:22 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <_oAdb.32137$ai7.17242@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79274

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> Which facts would those be? I haven't seen Fact #1
> come out of you yet!
>
> (snip)
>
> What truth? You never spoke any "truth." (snip)

Larry, as much as you want to claim victory in this debate, you haven't shown anything I've said to be untruthful or shown any facts I've presented to be inaccurate. You've tried to wiggle out from responding to those facts by offering irrelevant arguments and attempting to twist what I've said, but you've had no success with either tactic. At the same time, you've presented nothing solid to support code testing. In the end, you were not able to support your position or undermine my position. This is consistent with the overall code testing debate, which is exactly why code testing will eventually be eliminated in this country.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5861. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 13:12:11 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <L6Bdb.32723$ai7.16590@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79275

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> The Morse/CW mode is the only mode which requires
> the operator to acquire a physical psychomotor skill
> in order to utilize that mode. Therefore, it makes sense
> to test for a prospective operator's ability to receive
> Morse code at some level, (snip)

You didn't answer the question, Larry. I asked why why there should be an effort on the part of the ARS or FCC to promote (boost, encourage, or push) this single operating mode (CW) and you responded with garbage about "physical psychomotor skill." One has absolutely nothing to do with the other. There are skills needed to operate every mode, but those skills are self-taught. That is not the case with Morse code. When I pointed that out, you talked about an incentive to use CW (incentive by the ARS and FCC). At that point, I asked you why there should be an effort on the part of the ARS or FCC to promote this single operating mode. You brought this subject up, so please do answer the question - why should there be an effort on the part of the ARS or FCC to promote (boost, encourage, or push) this single operating mode (CW)?

> The above is a non-sequitur, since there is no need for use
> of the Morse/CW mode to "help keep the ARS abreast of
> modern technology...". Your statement is illogical and
> assumes facts not in evidence re: the negative effect of
> Morse/CW use on the development of other communications
> technologies within the ARS.

If you're going to argue that Morse/CW has no negative effect on the efforts to help keep the ARS abreast of modern technology ("one of the NCTA's more famous but totally worthless "red herring" arguments," you said), it was not unreasonable for me to ask if CW has a positive effect on the efforts to help keep the ARS abreast of modern technology. You've answered my question (CW is irrelevant in that regard), so we can now move on.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5862. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 13:22:21 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vndo54125rige2@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79276

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:p2Adb.31920$ai7.31338@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...

>
> Actually, once code testing is gone, the pro-testing crowd is not going
to
> have much to say.

Do you honestly think so? I disagree.... at least for a stretch of time,
anyway.
It IS human nature, depending on each man's capacity and staying power,
that is, outright fortitude, to eventually back off when they see that they
have
lost or are paddling up stream... and the time this takes, as I said,
depends
on the nature of each person's character... So, in the long run, I agree
with you;
they'll drop off in staggered two's and three's and dozens.. but for a while
it'll be pretty nasty and, quite frankly, since the issue will be over I
wouldn't see
much point in continueing to debate them. You only think they're getting
vicious and nasty NOW, just wait until they find thier security blanket has
been taken from them in the name of "grow up, you're not a child anymore".

>Sadly, the pro-coders don't even seem to realize that all this is their
> own doing - their own behavior is responsible for their declining numbers
> (and perhaps, to some extent, even the removal of code testing). After
> talking to some of the pro-coders in this newsgroup, very few new
operators
> are exactly inspired to continue talking to them (on the CW frequencies or
> elsewhere). By driving new operators away, they have insured their own
> decreasing numbers. And those decreasing numbers have seriously undermined
> support for code testing.

And on that point i'll agree with you totally, 100%. Within this newsgroup,
as you
said, they not only do NOT inspire any sort of good will feeling or give
forth
the same warm fuzzy glow feeling that the new hams found or thought to have
found when they entered the community. One even posted "i'm appalled",
saying
he/she felt that what was SUPPOSE to have been a community of "friendly and
cooperative hams" had quite it's fair share of conflicting personalities and
ideology. It's very sad. If the old gaurd hasn't understood or seen by now
that

the mentality of "you're a child and stupid, you need to do what we say"
(and,
in so many words, this is exactly what the collective thinking of the PCTA
has
been) isn't going to attract new hams, then they also don't realize the
fundamental
error that is resident within them, and that is THIS... a continued agenda
such
that they uphold will do far more to destroy ham radio than any change in
testing requirements OR indirect problems (such as the current BPL
controversy)
will EVER do. If you don't believe me, just look at grey haired old white
men's
clubs and what is happening to them, the ones that ARE left that is.

I have tried my darndest do continue to post, for the benifit of the
undecideds
and the new hams that don't quite know where thier ideological compass
points
to in this hobby yet that the problem isn't the mode of operation itself. I
have
even stated that my first many QSL cards were covering contacts made in
CW. The newbies and undecides see now that the problem resides in the
PCTA, for the PCTA will not argue the true debate but attempt to spin
and twist it into something different... like many who support an erroneous
idea, they attemp at ever turn in the road to turn the argument on it's
axis and aim the very people instead of the issue. My honest feeling,
due to my personal beliefs about human beings and thier psychology,
is that the newbies will react (and have been doing so) toward this in a
negative way (as far as the PCTA crowd's interests) and, in so many
bloated but passionate words I have repeated just what you have.

The PCTA have themselves to blame.

My $.02 worth

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

5863. Re: Leo's self-incriminating AGAIN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 13:24:51 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vndo9tohtjvs49@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79277

In between which lie he spoke, that I posted
poof of, did you see this?

I admire you and those like you who can twist
thier perception of the world to something that
they find peace with so easily.

Doesn't tend to do one's health much good though
when your heading full speed a head down a
dead end alley.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--
"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bl03t2$va2$1@208.207.71.141...
>
>
> Leo wrote:
>
> > LOL !
> >
> > What in hell are you trying to say? Sabotage what position? Please
> > get someone to translate my posts into whatever it is that you speak,
> > then reply! Duh...
> >
> > Leo
> >
> > PS - while we're on the subject of spelling errors, I noticed this one
> > in your post below:
> >
> > Rebuttles? Try 'rebuttals' next time ;)
> >
> >
>
>
> Leo I do believe you've done a fair job of putting both Clint and
> Lennie on their rebuttles!

>

5864. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 13:31:16 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vndolqklu6ip60@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79278

WELL said Dwight.

If you look at the core error in WA8ULX's reasoning, as
you have pointed out, you'll see the core reason they
are losing the testing debate as well. It's really sad, the one
I agree with and the other I do not- that is to say, on the
one argument I am on the opposite side of the fence than
they but on the other we share sentiments... however,
as you pointed out, they refuse to change tactics and
keep with a warplan that is little more than just a static
in the ear of the FCC.

I myself came into the BPL story too late as well..
And when you consider the mega bucks i'm sure the
exploiters of the BPL are going to be willing to shell
out in terms of legal fights & retained lawyers,
political contributions *ahem*, etc., I think we
were are on the losing downhill end of it now. As you
said, things may have been different a long time ago
if a more factual, logical approach had been taken. The
same way they are losing the testing debate.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

5865. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 13:32:05 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <ppBdb.28185$XF.32674409@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 79279

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bl3gb9$er5$2@208.206.142.77...
> You know, Dwight, I've noticed something about your writings.
> Everything you say is couch in such terms that it can be easily
> denied and you can always say "I never said it" when that becomes
> the attractive out. Of course what you meant is......

Dick,

Stop twisting his words. <hihi>

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

5866. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 13:32:08 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <spBdb.28186$XF.32673702@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 79280

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:ZAzdb.31636$ai7.13479@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
> > Heres the solution to the BPL problem, it makes you
> > wonder why someone hasn't done it yet.
> > First stop messing with FCC, these Clowns have all
> > ready made up there minds. Look at the Present
> > Dumbing Down, which as been brought to us VIA the
> > FCC Morrons. So believe me they could care less
> > about Hams. And stop waisting your time sending in
> > your comments to the FCC. If anybody in there right
> > mind thinks they care about 1800 comments you
> > kidding yourself. The solution is Simple, go to there
> > Bosses, I dont mean anybody in the FCC I mean the
> > FCCs Bosses. Tell them how you plan on Voting the
> > next time out if this passes. Be sure and bring up
> > Homeland Security in your comments. This is the
> > only thing that will stop this. (snip)
>
>
> It hasn't been done because it won't work, Bruce. First of all, we're
(ham
> operators) only a speck on the political spectrum. Even if we all voted
> exactly the same (not very likely), we don't have enough numbers to effect
> elections in any significant way. On the national level, our numbers are
> about equal to the voting block of a single mid-sized city (in a country
> with hundreds of cities). On the local level, the hams in a single state
are
> rarely enough to change an election there. Finally, we don't contribute
any
> great amount of money to elections. In other words, taken all together, we
> don't have any political muscle to throw around.

Dwight, I notice that you have a vanity call. I suggest you research how the
vanity call system came about. It only takes one.

> As for the 1800 comments, have you read those comments? Most are
opinions
> without solid facts. In other words, they lack substance. Only a very
small
> number have anything firm to support the anti-BPL position. Compare that
to
> the technical materials and studies provided by BPL supporters. I warned
> about this problem weeks ago. We're not giving the FCC enough to hang it's
> hat on to oppose BPL. If we want them to oppose BPL, we have to give them

a
> solid reason to do so (a reason they can demonstrate to others).

I hope the FCC shows more respect for the *opinions* of this particular
"constituency."

> As for homeland security, we're not doing a whole lot when it comes to
> homeland security. If you talk about that, are you prepared to explain
what
> we're doing and who we're doing it for? What government agency do we work
> for while participating in homeland security activities? Who in the
> government is in charge of our homeland security operations? What are we
> specifically doing for homeland security?

ARES, and they're usually coordinated with local OEM.

> As much as I'm opposed to BPL, I don't see how we can stop it at this
> point. We should have started our efforts two or three years ago. We
should
> now have solid, preferably long term, studies to back up our claims. We
> should have technical materials showing the real impact on specific
> frequencies and on specific radio services. I'm afraid it's too late to
> start all of this now.

Do nothing and nothing will certainly result.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

5867. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 13:33:11 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vndopcsj4ljtb8@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79281

> This, on top of Roll's admissions, couldn't make the PCTA's
position
> and attitude any plainer, to even a casual observer.
>

exactly what i've been saying.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

5868. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 13:36:04 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vndoupoq2coj46@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79282

> Do me a favor, John, and tell that to K2RSK next time you see him!
>

Who?

5869. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 13:45:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ZBBdb.33045$ai7.30016@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79283

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:
>
> You know, Dwight, I've noticed something about your
> writings. Everything you say is couch in such terms that it
> can be easily denied and you can always say "I never said
> it" when that becomes the attractive out. Of course what
> you meant is......

No, I'm just very cautious about what I say, Dick. After years of writing in these newsgroups, I know any word, no matter how minor, can be blown out of proportion or even twisted to suggest something I never intended. Because of that, I'm very careful about the words I choose and the way those words are placed in a sentence. Of course, there is a benefit to the readers also - they can be assured I often mean exactly what I write.

For example, in that last sentence, the word "often" was added. With that, I'm suggesting the sentence above is not always the case. Of course, like others here, I do occasionally write things that are provocative or intended to pull someone's leg. However, that is usually obvious (out of character or not in my normal writing style) and rare (even more so if the topic is serious).

I suspect most others here, including you, do the same thing to some extent. However, because it is so consistent, perhaps my effort to do so is a little more obvious. Or perhaps it is obvious because I do it so poorly. Whatever the case, it serves me well.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5870. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 14:06:57 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928100657.13047.00000245@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 79284

> did you file comments, Bruce?
>

No I dont care

5871. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 14:08:38 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bl6q4t$lqr@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 79285

```
"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:X4tdb.243$Vb3.150548@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> JJ wrote:
>
> > Dick Carroll wrote in message ...
> >
> >> Don't pay them too much attention, Bruce. Neither JJ nor TwIT realizes
> >>they were NOT using a 1/4 wave dipole. If they had been, neither would
> >>have gotten a signal out of the back yard.
> >>
> >> If the *antenna system* took a load and performed under the
circumstances
> >>they describe, then both JJ and TwIT were loading the outer surface of
the
> >>coax shield, and *that* was doing a major part of the radiating.
> >>
> >> Of course when one side of a 1/4 wave dipole is attached to the braid
> >>of the coax with no decoupling, then the dipole is no longer a 1/4 wave
> >>dipole! What it becomes then depends entirely on
> >>the feedline length as well as other local factors. So then it will
> >>probably take some load, and maybe even load up to full supplied power,
> >>as JJ described. At that point it's a crap shoot-you don't know *what*
> >>you've got! For sure it ISN'T a 1/4 wave dipole! But the uninformed will
> >>think their "1/4 wave dipole" worked just fine!
> >>
> >> If JJ had used a good isolation choke or 1:1 balun to decouple the coax
> >
> >>from the 40 meter dipole at the feedpoint the tuner would have balked
big
> >
> >>time, and all that RF would have bounced around inside it, and made
> >>itself known quite loudly in the form of arcs.
> >
> >
> > The 40 meter dipole does have an HF 1:1 balun at the feedpoint.
> >
> >
> >
> >>The KWM-2 finals might
> >>have sparked a bit, too.
> >
> >
> > Why? As far as the M-2 was concerned, it was seeing a good match,
courtesy
```

> > of the tuner (that is one function the tuner performs in case you didn't
> > know). There was no arcing anywhere...have no idea what the swr was on
the
> > feedline, but that is not the point. The point is, I did get a signal
out
> > and made contacts, all with good readability on both ends. I have never
> > claimed this would make a good antenna or that one should operate such,
just
> > proved that it can work to some extent. I thought you were smarter than
> > dannyboy but guess not.
>
> I'll admit stupidity if you can explain how and why that antenna worked
> as a quater wave dipole.
>
> I already presented some fairly comprehensive data on why it wouldn't.
> That was pretty basic stuff.
>
> That a quarter wave dipole antenna would work is fairly extraordinary.
>
> Present your evidence and your theory/rationale.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

Probably for the same reason loading up house plumbing will work, or loading up a coat hanger, or whatever. With a tuner, and with other apparatuses in use or not, coupling--whatever you want to call it--if a signal gets out, it gets out and that is all that counts *sometimes.*

Kim W5TIT

5872. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 14:11:25 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bl6qa3$m5n@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 79286

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:d8Adb.31976$ai7.19537@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
> >
> > (snip) I was there from the beginning, so if you weren't,
> > you'll just have to accept the word of those of us who
> > were.
>
>
> Right, Larry. You were there for the very first no-code/pro-code debate.
> Actually, I wouldn't be overly surprised if you were. With your attitude,
I
> could easily see you starting that first debate.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Except that what Larry does is far from debate. Larry whines.

Kim W5TIT

5873. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 14:14:35 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928101435.13047.00000246@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 79287

> It hasn't been done because it won't work,

Well good then lets just consider it a done deal and forget about it.

As far as In concerned I dont care, I think its a just reward for all the New NO-CODE HF users.

5874. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 14:16:00 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928101600.13047.00000248@mb-m28.aol.com>
Source record: 79288

>Probably for the same reason loading up house plumbing will work, or loading
>up a coat hanger, or whatever. With a tuner, and with other apparatuses in
>use or not, coupling--whatever you want to call it--if a signal gets out, it
>gets out and that is all that counts *sometimes.*
>
>Kim W5TIT

And of course this has no reference to 1/4 Wave dipole

5875. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 14:19:37 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Z5Cdb.33381$ai7.31820@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79289

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> "Dwight Stewart" writes:
> > Trying to twist what I said again, Larry? I never said
> > anything about the other radio services having any
> > relevance beyond the fact that many once used code
> > (which was relevant to the ARS at the time) and their
> > present lack of code use (which has relevance today).
> > If you choose to ignore that past and present relevance,
> > that's certainly your prerogative. However, by doing
> > so, your position has simply lost touch with reality.
>
>
> You've spent the last couple of weeks attempting to re-
> attach some kind of significance to the fact that "other"
> radio services no longer "use code" (snip)

I did that in the very message you replied to (quoted above). You're
point is? As you see, I talked about both the past and present code use by
other radio services and any relevance of that to the ARS. You tried to
twist the focus only to the present, ignoring anything about the past . Of
course, since both are relevant, it would be inaccurate to talk about one
(present code use) without the other (past code use). Not willing to
participate in such a discussion, I asked to to widen your focus to include
all of the relevant facts. You refused to do so, repeating your question
solely about the present. It was at that point, and only at that point, the
discussion fell apart. Again, I'm more than willing to continue the
discussion, but only if it is an honest discussion with all facts
considered. However, if you want to twist facts, you can do so on your own.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5876. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 14:21:07 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bl6qs8$mjk@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 79290

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:ZBBdb.33045$ai7.30016@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:
> >
> > You know, Dwight, I've noticed something about your
> > writings. Everything you say is couch in such terms that it
> > can be easily denied and you can always say "I never said
> > it" when that becomes the attractive out. Of course what
> > you meant is......
>
>
> No, I'm just very cautious about what I say, Dick. After years of
writing
> in these newsgroups, I know any word, no matter how minor, can be blown
out
> of proportion or even twisted to suggest something I never intended.
Because
> of that, I'm very careful about the words I choose and the way those words
> are placed in a sentence. Of course, there is a benefit to the readers
> also - they can be assured I often mean exactly what I write.
>
> For example, in that last sentence, the word "often" was added. With
that,
> I'm suggesting the sentence above is not always the case. Of course, like
> others here, I do occasionally write things that are provocative or
intended
> to pull someone's leg. However, that is usually obvious (out of character
or
> not in my normal writing style) and rare (even more so if the topic is
> serious).
>
> I suspect most others here, including you, do the same thing to some
> extent. However, because it is so consistent, perhaps my effort to do so
is
> a little more obvious. Or perhaps it is obvious because I do it so
poorly.
> Whatever the case, it serves me well.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Y'know what? Speaking of words. The whole CW issue is defended (by many) as being the defense of some premier communication mode and that is usually enhanced by some submission of why the mode should be revered. However, aside from that--when the meat and potatoes of the argument (not debate) comes into play--the only defensible reasoning that is issued from there is that it "dumbs down" the ARS not to have the CW test, or that "lids" will come into the ARS, or that....well, you know them all.

I submit, again, that the hidden among the fervor for the appreciation of CW is the main idea that CW is a filter (no pun intended) to keep people out of the ARS. There's two reasons that's bunk. One: no one should be kept out of the ARS--let them get their license and stand or fail on their merit. Two: it's quite obvious that just because someone's passed a CW test--indeed beyond that: that someone operates CW at high speed even--it does nothing for proof of being a good ham, more technical ham, or intelligent ham.

Basically, when the "dumbed down" rhetoric is puked back up--we all know what the real reason is for the desire of CW testing to stay around: these folks believe in its power to filter out folks who act just like them.

Kim W5TIT

5877. Re: Leo's self-incriminating AGAIN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 14:50:06 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <n1tdnv480qhgpqm6v8imn2ogvq4cp93h99@4ax.com>
Source record: 79291

The response to which, (where the 'lie' was quite obviously an error ,
and apologized for) I can only assume, you never read......?

You might want to check out "Hooked On Phonics", Clint - it might help
you through the bigger words!

30, Leo

On Sun, 28 Sep 2003 08:24:51 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>In between which lie he spoke, that I posted
>poof of, did you see this?
>
>I admire you and those like you who can twist
>thier perception of the world to something that
>they find peace with so easily.
>
>Doesn't tend to do one's health much good though
>when your heading full speed a head down a
>dead end alley.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>
>--
>
>--
>
>Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
>OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

5878. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 15:02:20 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309280702.f58c37b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79292

"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@att.net> wrote in message
news:<GRpdb.161636$3o3.11573369@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
> news:d22b54c3.0309260402.7498733a@posting.google.com...

> > I suggest you start with the ARRL website which is full of info on BPL.
> >
> > w3rv
>
> Hi Brian,
> Thanks for the pointer. It appears that the BPL folks are going to
> cozy up to the 13KV or less power lines, with internet fiber back to the
> head end.

Yup.

> This will be like your baby crib monitor on steroids. I was
> wondering how they pump the 2-80 MHz through the step down transformers.
> The literature mentioned a "high pass" filter around the transformer. I
> read this as a high voltage, low uF cap.

Whatever it is it'll be cheap. Very cheap.

> The relatively high inductance
> "pole pigs" normally isolate households from noise stuff. If you think you
> have trouble with touch lamps in the neighborhood now, just wait until they
> add the "high pass" filters around the transformers. Never mind Ed Hare's
> attempts to show how the power lines along the street radiate. The very
> walls of your house, your christmas tree lights, etc. would radiate 2-80
> MHz.

Yup, yup.

> I remember back in the day when the early CATV providers used cheap
> braid shielding on their cable lines. Their Channel 18 was quite
> unusable in some localities due to 2 Meter Ham traffic. Of course, that
> interference was a two way street also. Imagine what my DXer friend down
> the street would do to the internet grid with his 10,000 watt erp into the
> BPL powerline/internet coupler. What a hoot!

I wouldn't be too sure of that, those old cable systems used 100%
analog technologies. If these BPL goobers use spread spectrum schemes
even a monster signal on a discrete frequency might not have much if
any interference effects on BPL.

> Don't you love Commissioner Kat's remarks. Essentially: "Suspend
> the rules!, Let this fledgling technology flourish! Do they have a sound

> plan? H**l no! If we get down in the middle of the deployment of this
> enterprise and there are problems we will solve them as we go! Just throw
> some tax payers money at it!" Hey, this fits right in with the current
> administration, the Tauzin, Dingell committee, etc. and besides,
> Commissioner Kat will be retired and sucking on a six figure lobbiest job
> by then.

I normally stay away from "political politics" in this NG and stick to
the usual code test politics but I gotta state that as a lifetime
moderate Republican I've about had it with the current
administration's slash and burn tactics across the board. All of 'em,
environmental issues, the Iraq disaster, the incestuous cowboy
cronyism and now this BPL crap. Just for openers. I haven't voted for
a damned (wash my mouf') Democrat for forty years but I'm warming up
to the concept.

> Be afraid, be very afraid. --Maybe some sort of "Homeland
> Defense" argument would be effective in beating this thing back.

That angle might be our only shot at killing this thing. There are a
number of heavy-duty federal agencies using the HF spectrum for very
important purposes and those folks are quietly running studies and
tests on BPL and it's potential impact on their operations. We'll see.

> 73,
> Clay N4AOX

w3rv

5879. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 15:30:15 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl6uq7stv0@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 79293

N2EY wrote:
> In article <8opdb.8103$yp6.195867@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
> <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:
>
>
>>I thought I'd forward the thoughtful comments below from
>>e-ham.net ... they say a LOT. (name/callsign omitted to
>>at least partially protect the innocent ...)
>
>
> Why? We can always go searching through eham
>
>>Carl - wk3c
>>
>>**********
>>For the last 25 years I have been in the US Coast Guard serving
>

>>>BIG SNIPPAGE to make room for the internet cracker/hacker/spammers
to operate<<<

>
>>Anyway . my two cents worth.
>>************
>>END QUOTE FROM E-HAM.NET

There are so many holes, inaccuracies and downright lies in that
piece that it deserves no credibility whatever.

N2EY wrote
>
> The writer ignores the biggest differences of those 25 years:

Indeed those are all true, and consider this
little gem I just learned:

...even though the UK has dropped mandatory Morse testing, they are
still testing for it and retain 4 classes of licenses and they have
different call signs for each class so you can tell which station has a
CW license:

Class A has 12 wpm test and grants calls with M0 prefix

Class B licensees pass the same written test as Class A, but not CW,
and they now get full HF privileges. Their calls are M1 prefixes

Intermediate A (like Novice) has 5 wpm test and grants frequencies
above 144 MHz. They get calls with a prefix 2+Letter+0 (any letter
is possible)

Intermediate B has same written test as Intermediate A and no Morse.
They get call with a prefix 2+Letter+1.

Apparently many are still trying to get a call sign indicating they have
CW skills. (a rather low form of incentive licensing, but still
incentive licensing).

Both the NCVEC and NCI petitions incorrectly state that the UK has
terminated all Morse testing. This is not the case and their petition
suggests that the FCC go beyond what other administrations have done.

Looks like NCI and NCVEC are permeated with obfuscators and zealots
who will go to most any length to hide the truth, doesn't it?

5880. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 15:34:01 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl6v19stv1@208.207.71.174>
Source record: 79294

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote:
>
>> You know, Dwight, I've noticed something about your
>>writings. Everything you say is couch in such terms that it
>>can be easily denied and you can always say "I never said
>>it" when that becomes the attractive out. Of course what
>>you meant is......
>
>
>
> No, I'm just very cautious about what I say, Dick. After years of writing
> in these newsgroups, I know any word, no matter how minor, can be blown out
> of proportion or even twisted to suggest something I never intended. Because
> of that, I'm very careful about the words I choose and the way those words
> are placed in a sentence. Of course, there is a benefit to the readers
> also - they can be assured I often mean exactly what I write.
>
> For example, in that last sentence, the word "often" was added. With that,
> I'm suggesting the sentence above is not always the case. Of course, like
> others here, I do occasionally write things that are provocative or intended
> to pull someone's leg. However, that is usually obvious (out of character or
> not in my normal writing style) and rare (even more so if the topic is
> serious).
>
> I suspect most others here, including you, do the same thing to some
> extent. However, because it is so consistent, perhaps my effort to do so is
> a little more obvious. Or perhaps it is obvious because I do it so poorly.
> Whatever the case, it serves me well.
>
>

And that post made my case.

5881. Re: GOOD NEWS-------France heat wave deaths top 14,000

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 15:43:38 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0309280743.47ceccfe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79295

Frank <frank@127.0.0.1> wrote

> Great news...I have to agree...

At risk of violating my advice to Larry.......

If you think it is "great news" that 14,000 humans, mostly elderly and infirm, suffered death during a heat wave, then your claim to the title "human" is forfeit.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

5882. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 16:09:35 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vne1un2i23kvce@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79296

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:ZBBdb.33045$ai7.30016@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...

>
> No, I'm just very cautious about what I say, Dick. After years of
writing
> in these newsgroups, I know any word, no matter how minor, can be blown
out
> of proportion or even twisted to suggest something I never intended.

That's because they generally have a very weak arguement without any real
pillars of facts to build on, so at every possible chance they get they
dodge and divert the topic of the conversation. I've had them go as far
as simply attack my spelling and grammer, for lack of anything better
to reply with.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

5883. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 16:11:58 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vne2366cm3sb2a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79297

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:bl6qs8$mjk@library2.airnews.net...
> Basically, when the "dumbed down" rhetoric is puked back up--we all know
> what the real reason is for the desire of CW testing to stay around: these
> folks believe in its power to filter out folks who act just like them.
>
> Kim W5TIT
>
>

BRAVO, well articulated.

I couldn't agree more; with each line of reasoning they use a very good
fact is brought up to disprove it and yet THEY devolve down to "go ahead,
present some facts and we'll discuss it"..and, well, this HAS been done,
they just ignore it.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

5884. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 16:12:54 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vne24thlmvrv52@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79298

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bl6v19stv1@208.207.71.174...
>
> And that post made my case.
>

... to the only rare few that will believe it; you and your dwindling group
of
supporters.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

5885. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 16:15:16 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <oODdb.33851$ai7.19488@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79299

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bl3fh5$e9f$0@208.206.142.77...
>
>
> WA8ULX wrote:
> >>Works darned great, doesn't it?! Did all my MARS on it, including net
> >>control for nearly a year. So, yer right, apparently the "high" (high
all
> >>right) class hams just don't know how to do it!
> >>
> >>Kim W5TIT
> >
> >
> > Spoken like a TRUE Dump Down CBplusser who doesnt have a Clue.
>
>
> Don't pay them too much attention, Bruce. Neither JJ nor TwIT realizes
> they were NOT using a 1/4 wave dipole. If they had been, neither would
> have gotten a signal out of the back yard.
>
> If the *antenna system* took a load and performed under the
circumstances
> they describe, then both JJ and TwIT were loading the outer surface of the
> coax shield, and *that* was doing a major part of the radiating.
>
> Of course when one side of a 1/4 wave dipole is attached to the braid
> of the coax with no decoupling, then the dipole is no longer a 1/4 wave
> dipole! What it becomes then depends entirely on
> the feedline length as well as other local factors. So then it will
> probably take some load, and maybe even load up to full supplied power,
> as JJ described. At that point it's a crap shoot-you don't know *what*
> you've got! For sure it ISN'T a 1/4 wave dipole! But the uninformed will
> think their "1/4 wave dipole" worked just fine!
>
> If JJ had used a good isolation choke or 1:1 balun to decouple the coax
> from the 40 meter dipole at the feedpoint the tuner would have balked big
> time, and all that RF would have bounced around inside it, and made
> itself known quite loudly in the form of arcs. The KWM-2 finals might
> have sparked a bit, too.
>
> Been there, done that, seen it happen, got the RF burns.
>
> As I said earlier, they weren't using a 1/4 wave dipole, they just
thought

> they were.
>
> All this stuff is in the books.
>
> Dick
>

I was trying to be 'funny' on my post of using the 20 meter dipole on 40. I can see that was a waste of time. As is trying to explain antenna theory to the Texas Twit. Why bother?

Dan/W4NTI

5886. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 16:17:32 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <wQDdb.33860$ai7.14839@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79300

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:PNmdb.59$Vb3.34666@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Dick Carroll wrote:
>
> > >
> > >
> > > WA8ULX wrote:
> > >
> > > >>> Yep. We know all about yer books, DICK...
> > > >>>
> > > >>> Kim W5TIT
> > > >>>
> > > >>
> > > >>
> > > >> Dick your waisting your time, all theses CBplussers know is what Uncle
> > > >> Bob down
> > > >> at the CB Shop has told them. And of course Uncle BOB is always right
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > If TwIT knew anything about my books she'd at least have
> > > > a clue to where to find a clue. I gave up on that long ago.
> > > >
> > > > Maybe some newcomer reading here might have learned why
> > > > a 1/4 wave dipole is something hams don't try to use.
> > > > At least among those who understand why. If you want to
> > > > load your feedline and use it as part of the antenna,
> > > > fine. But one should be more careful about what you name it.
> > > >
> > >
> > > Name it the RF in the shack special.
> > >
> > > - Mike KB3EIA -
> > >

I bet they don't need a SWR / power meter. Just load it up for maximum lip
burn.

Dan/W4NTI

5887. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 16:17:48 UTC
From: Hans K0HB <k0hb@earthlink.net>
Message-ID: <895b5c88c092acb2645e0ed16416a556.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>
Source record: 79351

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> 1) Back in '78, the students learned Morse Code as part of their CG training,
> so there was no other training needed for them to get Extra Class amateur
> licenses. Today, they would need to put in some of their own time, and a bit of
> effort, learning Morse at 5 wpm for that test.
>

So you're suggesting that 1978 era hams who didn't study Morse
specifically
to obtain an amateur license (ie., they were "forced" to learn it at
<20WPM in a military training program) are less desirable hams than
those today who learn 5WPM (QRS PSE) on "their own time and effort"?

Sunuvagun!

Good luck on this one now!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

--
Posted via Mailgate.ORG Server - http://www.Mailgate.ORG

5888. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 16:17:53 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vne2e951oqln12@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79352

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--
"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:spBdb.28186$XF.32673702@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...

> Dwight, I notice that you have a vanity call. I suggest you research how
the
> vanity call system came about. It only takes one.

That's an excellent and very admirable point... and it should continue as
a one of a person's many underlieing codes and guidelines to determining
his or her beliefs and concepts.

It's just sad that, in this case, there are multimillion dollar corporations
and
corrupt politicians fighting to get it done; there was no such resistance
when
it came to vanity call signs.

Clint
KB5ZHT

5889. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 16:18:58 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vne2ga7v78o133@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79353

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030928101435.13047.00000246@mb-m28.aol.com...
> As far as In concerned I dont care, I think its a just reward for all the
New
> NO-CODE HF users.

Your side sure loosed another measured, finite amount of credibility when
you appear to act from such vengeful petty ideals and or motives.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

5890. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 16:37:12 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <Y6Edb.33932$ai7.23753@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79355

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:ZAzdb.31636$ai7.13479@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
> > Heres the solution to the BPL problem, it makes you
> > wonder why someone hasn't done it yet.
> > First stop messing with FCC, these Clowns have all
> > ready made up there minds. Look at the Present
> > Dumbing Down, which as been brought to us VIA the
> > FCC Morrons. So believe me they could care less
> > about Hams. And stop waisting your time sending in
> > your comments to the FCC. If anybody in there right
> > mind thinks they care about 1800 comments you
> > kidding yourself. The solution is Simple, go to there
> > Bosses, I dont mean anybody in the FCC I mean the
> > FCCs Bosses. Tell them how you plan on Voting the
> > next time out if this passes. Be sure and bring up
> > Homeland Security in your comments. This is the
> > only thing that will stop this. (snip)
>
>
> It hasn't been done because it won't work, Bruce. First of all, we're
(ham
> operators) only a speck on the political spectrum. Even if we all voted
> exactly the same (not very likely), we don't have enough numbers to effect
> elections in any significant way. On the national level, our numbers are
> about equal to the voting block of a single mid-sized city (in a country
> with hundreds of cities). On the local level, the hams in a single state
are
> rarely enough to change an election there. Finally, we don't contribute
any
> great amount of money to elections. In other words, taken all together, we
> don't have any political muscle to throw around.
>
> As for the 1800 comments, have you read those comments? Most are
opinions
> without solid facts. In other words, they lack substance. Only a very
small
> number have anything firm to support the anti-BPL position. Compare that
to
> the technical materials and studies provided by BPL supporters. I warned
> about this problem weeks ago. We're not giving the FCC enough to hang it's
> hat on to oppose BPL. If we want them to oppose BPL, we have to give them
a
> solid reason to do so (a reason they can demonstrate to others).

>
> As for homeland security, we're not doing a whole lot when it comes to
> homeland security. If you talk about that, are you prepared to explain
what
> we're doing and who we're doing it for? What government agency do we work
> for while participating in homeland security activities? Who in the
> government is in charge of our homeland security operations? What are we
> specifically doing for homeland security?
>
> As much as I'm opposed to BPL, I don't see how we can stop it at this
> point. We should have started our efforts two or three years ago. We
should
> now have solid, preferably long term, studies to back up our claims. We
> should have technical materials showing the real impact on specific
> frequencies and on specific radio services. I'm afraid it's too late to
> start all of this now.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>

You know very well, or you should, that the ARRL send it a very comprehensive report on that subject. Both the initial comments and the latest round.

The ARRL is the best, and only, organization that can do a thing to help us against BPL at this time. Its all we have. And I think they are doing a fine job.

The FCC is staffed with a bunch of pro business lawyers. THAT IS THE PROBLEM. They don't have a clue of what they are doing.

If you want to change the thinking at the FCC. Then writting your congressman is the ONLY way to do it. Since the congress controls their purse strings.

The only other alternative would be to take it to court. Make use of the green peace bunch to sue for the destruction of a natural resource, the HF spectrum. etc.. Any port in a storm.

Dan/W4NTI

>

5891. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 16:44:09 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <tdEdb.8157$yp6.205983@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79354

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bl5qlhbgj0@208.206.142.82...
>
> YOU CAN EMAIL MISS ABERNATHY AT THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS AND I URGE EVERYONE
TO
> DO SO.
>
> kabernat@fcc.gov <kabernat@fcc.gov>

I would advise against a mass-mailing campaign to the Commissioner's
direct e-mail address.

The last time the FCC Commissioners got "mail-bombed" by hams
all it did was PO them.

They have staff and a comment/reply comment process ... which
have been used and will continue to be used.

ARRL has done an EXCELLENT job on their technical materials
and the video is a very compelling demonstration of just how bad
the interference really is.

We are just at the "Notice of Inquiry" stage now ... please don't
flame the FCC (and particularly the Commissioners) ... that will
just cause more harm than good.

I believe that NTIA will come down hard on our side on this.
The US Govt agencies that they represent have a LOT of HF
channels that they use and will want to protect ...

I'm not saying "shut up and don't comment" ... all I'm saying is
that the response needs to be measured, polite, and appropriate.

73,
Carl - wk3c

5892. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 16:49:15 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <fiEdb.8160$yp6.206098@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79356

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030928081040.29660.00000865@mb-m24.aol.com...
> In article <20030927204249.27009.00000339@mb-m11.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com
> (WA8ULX) writes:
>
> >>Also, I will be lobbying FCC OET and the Commissioners in the
> >>coming weeks against BPL ... and I've been out in the Emmaus, PA
> >>BPL "pilot" area with local reporters SHOWING them just how bad
> >>BPL really is (after showing them what S0-S9 signals sound like on
> >>a quiet band away from the BPL area so that when they see/hear the
> >>"wall to wall" S9+ "hash" from BPL they understand just how bad
> >>it really is.
> >>
> >>So don't give me this "sock-puppet for the broadband cartel" crap.
> >>
> >>Carl - wk3c
> >>
> >
> > Well there it is folks, Karl the Nut is going to save Ham Radio.
>
> Did you read his comments to the FCC? I did. Lots of good, sound, rational
> stuff against BPL. Including actual firsthand accounts of the noise.
>
> Hardly the work of a "nut", I'd say.

Thanks Jim ... while we continue to disagree on the code/nocode
issue, your sense of fairness in this unrelated matter is appreciated.

> >Just think
> >Karl is going to put these Billion dollar companies in there place.
>
> Not by himself. But his stuff will surely help.
>
> I filed comments against BPL, Carl filed comments, ARRL filed comments,
lots of
> folks filed comments - did you file comments, Bruce?

I can hardly wait to hear Bruce's excuse ... on the other hand, the way
he comes across, we'd be better off if the FCC never, ever, heard from
him.

Carl - wk3c

5893. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 17:11:41 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928131141.04276.00000431@mb-m19.aol.com>
Source record: 79357

>I can hardly wait to hear Bruce's excuse ... on the other hand, the way
>he comes across, we'd be better off if the FCC never, ever, heard from
>him.
>
>Carl - wk3c
>

We you say we, I hope you are referring to your CBplusser Buddies, because you sure dont speak for REAL HAMS.

5894. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 17:16:59 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl752b$8k4$0@208.207.71.132>
Source record: 79358

Brian Kelly wrote:

>
> I normally stay away from "political politics" in this NG and stick to
> the usual code test politics but I gotta state that as a lifetime
> moderate Republican I've about had it with the current
> administration's slash and burn tactics across the board. All of 'em,
> environmental issues, the Iraq disaster, the incestuous cowboy
> cronyism and now this BPL crap. Just for openers. I haven't voted for
> a damned (wash my mouf') Democrat for forty years but I'm warming up
> to the concept.
>
>

I'm quite sure there are many of us who share many of these thoughts.
In fact just last night I did a bit of preplanning on the letters
I plan to write to my three congresspersons, the local rep. and both
senators. It's gonna go something like...

"Folks, your base of support
out here in the hinterlands, upon which you MUST rely for any
future electoral success, is getting fed up with Republican
pandering to the big money interests to the virtual exclusion of
all else. Here's a very good example:::"

(quote the NPRM on BPL)

"The people who are behind this proposal know full well the extent
of the extreme PROVEN damage it will do to the vital High Frequency
and Low VHF radio spectrum, yet they insist on forcing it
onto all other users with no regard to its destructive effects.

Those effects even go to *very* seriously impacting
Public Safety communications here in our own state.

If this abomination is approved,
and we all know that it is FCC appointees of the current
administration who will see it through, you can be sure
that in the fall of 2004, the door will be opened to
the exit of large numbers of current supporters of this
and a number of other atrocities caused by extreme
Republican politics.
I haven't yet mentioned the horribly
expensive mess in Iraq (both in American lives and dollars).
The lack of in-depth advance planning is obvious.

Come on, folks. You don't *really* want us to vote Democratic,
do you? We sure don't want to!"

All the Demos really have to do is bring forth a candidate
who actually IS a candidate instead of the circus they've
shown so far.
That is, if such a candidate exists. I'm certainly not referring
to a carpetbagging Senator Hilarous from New York nor the rogue
ex-General who was fired from his NATO post-by a Democrat.

If not we may be in *big* trouble.

>
> (Homeland Security)
> That angle might be our only shot at killing this thing. There are a
> number of heavy-duty federal agencies using the HF spectrum for very
> important purposes and those folks are quietly running studies and
> tests on BPL and it's potential impact on their operations. We'll see.
>
>

I have no confidence in Homeland Security causing anything to
happen that would work against the Big Money interests. Look at
what the current admin is doing on border security -- ignoring it!
- hoping against hope that posture will lead to a few more Hispanic
votes, which *ain't* gonna happen anyway. "Show and tell" won't fix
anything. They're still carrying weapons through airport security
gates. No telling what's in the air freight cargo bay.

Nope, $$$ rules. The most effective move would be to convince
the BPL proponents themselves that the plan is a money sink and
just another Iridium. But that won't happen as long as their
own techies and the FCC drones are pushing it fullspeedahead as
The Next Big Thing.
Just look at the economic activity in the tech-mfgr sector that
it'll bring-investors spent $22 billion on Iridium for nothing.
Republican/Techie Nirvana, as Commisar Abernathy said.

Can you imagine what a Carl Stevenson with no interest in
ham radio would be doing right now?

5895. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 17:20:17 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl758h$930$0@208.207.71.132>
Source record: 79359

Brian Kelly wrote:

>
> I normally stay away from "political politics" in this NG and stick to
> the usual code test politics but I gotta state that as a lifetime
> moderate Republican I've about had it with the current
> administration's slash and burn tactics across the board. All of 'em,
> environmental issues, the Iraq disaster, the incestuous cowboy
> cronyism and now this BPL crap. Just for openers. I haven't voted for
> a damned (wash my mouf') Democrat for forty years but I'm warming up
> to the concept.
>
>

I'm quite sure there are many of us who share many of these thoughts.
In fact just last night I did a bit of preplanning on the letters
I plan to write to my three congresspersons, the local rep. and both
senators. It's gonna go something like...

"Folks, your base of support
out here in the hinterlands, upon which you MUST rely for any
future electoral success, is getting fed up with Republican
pandering to the big money interests to the virtual exclusion of
all else. Here's a very good example:::"

(quote the NPRM on BPL)

"The people who are behind this proposal know full well the extent
of the extreme PROVEN damage it will do to the vital High Frequency
and Low VHF radio spectrum, yet they insist on forcing it
onto all other users with no regard to its destructive effects.

Those effects even go to *very* seriously impacting
Public Safety communications here in our own state.

If this abomination is approved,
and we all know that it is FCC appointees of the current
administration who will see it through, you can be sure
that in the fall of 2004, the door will be opened to
the exit of large numbers of current supporters of this
and a number of other atrocities caused by extreme
Republican politics.
I haven't yet mentioned the horribly
expensive mess in Iraq (both in American lives and dollars).
The lack of in-depth advance planning is obvious.

Come on, folks. You don't *really* want us to vote Democratic,
do you? We sure don't want to!"

All the Demos really have to do is bring forth a candidate
who actually IS a candidate instead of the circus they've
shown so far.
That is, if such a candidate exists. I'm certainly not referring
to a carpetbagging Senator Hilarous from New York nor the rogue
ex-General who was fired from his NATO post-by a Democrat.

If not we may be in *big* trouble.

>
> (Homeland Security)
> That angle might be our only shot at killing this thing. There are a
> number of heavy-duty federal agencies using the HF spectrum for very
> important purposes and those folks are quietly running studies and
> tests on BPL and it's potential impact on their operations. We'll see.
>
>

I have no confidence in Homeland Security causing anything to
happen that would work against the Big Money interests. Look at
what the current admin is doing on border security -- ignoring it!
- hoping against hope that posture will lead to a few more Hispanic
votes, which *ain't* gonna happen anyway. "Show and tell" won't fix
anything. They're still carrying weapons through airport security
gates. No telling what's in the air freight cargo bay.

Nope, $$$ rules. The most effective move would be to convince
the BPL proponents themselves that the plan is a money sink and
just another Iridium. But that won't happen as long as their
own techies and the FCC drones are pushing it fullspeedahead as
The Next Big Thing.
Just look at the economic activity in the tech-mfgr sector that
it'll bring-investors spent $22 billion on Iridium for nothing.
Republican/Techie Nirvana, as Commisar Abernathy said.

Can you imagine what a Carl Stevenson with no interest in
ham radio would be doing right now?

5896. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 17:28:38 UTC
From: "paulfriedman@comcast.net" <p.paulfriedman@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <aTEdb.611873$Ho3.119284@sccrnsc03>
Source record: 79360

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:Y6Edb.33932$ai7.23753@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
<big clip>

> You know very well, or you should, that the ARRL send it a very
> comprehensive report on that subject. Both the initial comments and the
> latest round.
>
> The ARRL is the best, and only, organization that can do a thing to help
us
> against BPL at this time. Its all we have. And I think they are doing a
> fine job.
>
> The FCC is staffed with a bunch of pro business lawyers. THAT IS THE
> PROBLEM. They don't have a clue of what they are doing.
>
> If you want to change the thinking at the FCC. Then writting your
> congressman is the ONLY way to do it. Since the congress controls their
> purse strings.
>
> The only other alternative would be to take it to court. Make use of the
> green peace bunch to sue for the destruction of a natural resource, the
HF
> spectrum. etc.. Any port in a storm.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
> >
>

I agree that the ARRl is doing a decent job on this issue.

My fears regarding BPL go along these lines:

1) Business wants it. This means that the Republicans, in general, are for
it. It certainly means the FCC Powers-That-Be are for it.

2) Providing broadband access to as many as possible, as cheaply as
possible, is an issue that appels to Liberals. This means, in genral, that
the Democrats are for it.

3) The ARRL has a fairly small percentage (what is it, about 33%?) of
registered U.S. hams as members. This reduces its effectiveness.

4) I doubt that many politicians see BPL as a make-or-break issue for their ham constiuants. That is, how many hams would vote for (or against) someone based on votes relating to BPL? How much money (soft and hard dollars) would increase (decrease) solely based on votes on BPL? If my assumption is true, then the ham community's voice is further reduced in effectiveness.

5) The power companies have done a fine job of defining the issue in a way beneficial to themselves: Which is more important: Cheap, widespread access to broadband or a hobby playground for hams? To tell the truth, if that were the issue, I would support BPL.

6) The ham community's voice, weak enough already, is further reduced by fights over secondary issues. As is: BPL is good because it will serve the No-Coders right. I don't think the power companies could say it better.

To win this issue, we need to try to redefine the issue. We need to be saying:

Cheap Broadband for everyone is EXTREMELY important and we will do nothing to stop it. Here is how to best achieve this......

BPL, in addition to interfering with long time and important users of the HF spectrum, suffers from the following technical problems which makes it ineffective as a broadband solution ....

Paul AB0SI

5897. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 17:42:21 UTC
From: spam.for.the@buerotiger.de
Message-ID: <bl76ht$8ml3v$2@ID-31.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79361
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

In rec.radio.amateur.dx Ryan, KC8PMX <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote:
> (not responding directly to this post but in general)

And yet you quote 400 lines of useless unintelligible garbage.

Superior intelligence at work.

Peter Lemken
DF5JT
Berlin

--
Mail an die im From: angegebene Adresse stellt eine Beauftragung zur
ï¿œberprï¿œfung der Mailfunktion des Absenders dar und wird mit einer
Bearbeitungsgebï¿œhr von EUR 1000,- in Rechnung gestellt.

5898. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 18:19:16 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928141916.24044.00000269@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 79362

This is the only way to kill BPL, waisting time with the ARRL or The FCC is a lost cause.

> "Folks, your base of support
>out here in the hinterlands, upon which you MUST rely for any
>future electoral success, is getting fed up with Republican
>pandering to the big money interests to the virtual exclusion of
>all else. Here's a very good example:::"
>
>(quote the NPRM on BPL)
>
> "The people who are behind this proposal know full well the extent
>of the extreme PROVEN damage it will do to the vital High Frequency
>and Low VHF radio spectrum, yet they insist on forcing it
>onto all other users with no regard to its destructive effects.
>
> Those effects even go to *very* seriously impacting
>Public Safety communications here in our own state.
>
> If this abomination is approved,
>and we all know that it is FCC appointees of the current
>administration who will see it through, you can be sure
>that in the fall of 2004, the door will be opened to
>the exit of large numbers of current supporters of this
>and a number of other atrocities caused by extreme
>Republican politics.

5899. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 18:21:24 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928142124.24044.00000270@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 79363

>Can you imagine what a Carl Stevenson with no interest in
>ham radio would be doing right now?
>

Thats the only reason Karl and his clowns are getting there way.

5900. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 18:42:14 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl7a26$h8g$0@208.207.71.132>
Source record: 79364

paulfriedman@comcast.net wrote:

> 4) I doubt that many politicians see BPL as a make-or-break issue for their
> ham constiuants. That is, how many hams would vote for (or against) someone
> based on votes relating to BPL?

I certainly agree, but added to other known issues it could well
be the defining factor.

How much money (soft and hard dollars) would
> increase (decrease) solely based on votes on BPL? If my assumption is true,
> then the ham community's voice is further reduced in effectiveness.
>
> 5) The power companies have done a fine job of defining the issue in a way
> beneficial to themselves: Which is more important: Cheap, widespread access
> to broadband or a hobby playground for hams? To tell the truth, if that
> were the issue, I would support BPL.

It would make a huge difference if BPL were the only or even the best
solution to that need. It is neither. It just happens to be the one
that was settled on by the power line people's techies.

>
> 6) The ham community's voice, weak enough already, is further reduced by
> fights over secondary issues. As is: BPL is good because it will serve the
> No-Coders right. I don't think the power companies could say it better.
>
> To win this issue, we need to try to redefine the issue. We need to be
> saying:
>
> Cheap Broadband for everyone is EXTREMELY important and we will do nothing
> to stop it. Here is how to best achieve this......
>
> BPL, in addition to interfering with long time and important users of the HF
> spectrum, suffers from the following technical problems which makes it
> ineffective as a broadband solution ....
>

I certainly agree. But you have to wonder just how effective any
alternate voice can be in the face of what we've already seen.

Dick

5901. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 18:48:25 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0309281048.70c4e1cb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79365

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote

>
> 1) Back in '78, the students learned Morse Code as part of their CG training,
> so there was no other training needed for them to get Extra Class amateur
> licenses. Today, they would need to put in some of their own time, and a bit of
> effort, learning Morse at 5 wpm for that test.
>

You know Jim, the more I ponder this paragraph, the more I think you may just have hit on an important way of grading the dedication (and therefore "value") of any given amateur licensee. Just by examining their involvement in the military, we can assign them a scientific "grade of merit" based on whether they got a free pass based on being forced to learn code or not forced.

Merit Zero (0.0): Draftee who was forced into the military and then was forced into Morse school.

Merit Zero-point-one (0.1): Draftee who was forced into the military and then volunteered for Morse school to get a cushy non-infantry job.

Merit One (1.0): Volunteer who joined the military by judicial suggestion ("Boy, come back for sentencing in 10 days, unless you're in the military by then, in which case the charges will be dropped.") but was forced into Morse school.

Merit One-point-one (1.1): Volunteer who joined the military by judicial suggestion ("Boy, come back for sentencing in 10 days, unless you're in the military by then, in which case the charges will be dropped.") and then volunteered for Morse school to get a cushy non-infantry job.

Merit Two (2.0): Volunteer who joined the military to avoid the draft and was forced into Morse school.

Merit Two-point-one (2.1): Volunteer who joined the military to avoid the draft and then volunteered for Morse school to get a cushy non-infantry job.

Merit Three (3.0): Volunteer who freely joined the military and then was forced into Morse school.

Merit Three-point-one (3.1): Volunteer who freely joined the military and then volunteered for Morse school to get a cush non-infantry job.

Merit Four (4.0): Person who declined to volunteer for the military service and learned Morse on his own time and effort. (Hello, Jim)

Merit Four-point-one (4.1): Person who fled the country to avoid military service and learned Morse on his own time and effort.

.... or maybe I've got that all bass-ackwards.

73, de Hans, K0HB

5902. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 19:49:02 UTC
From: r390a <belch@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <1064779134.832988@newshost03.voicenet.com>
Source record: 79366

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030928101435.13047.00000246@mb-m28.aol.com...
> > It hasn't been done because it won't work,
>
> Well good then lets just consider it a done deal and forget about it.
>
> As far as In concerned I dont care, I think its a just reward for all the
New
> NO-CODE HF users.

Sour Grapes.

5903. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 19:49:41 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928154941.23307.00003326@mb-m29.aol.com>
Source record: 79367

In article <20030926142956.01893.00000845@mb-m22.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
(Len Over 21) writes:

>In article <20030925212928.14837.00003229@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>(N2EY)
>writes:
>
>>In article <20030925165636.12631.00001466@mb-m28.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>
>>>In article <20030925082934.08626.00000890@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>>(N2EY)
>>>writes:
>>>
>>>>In article <20030925015541.25517.00000935@mb-m15.aol.com>,
>>lenover21@aol.com
>>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>>>
>>>>>In article <20030924203109.02537.00000757@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
>>>>>(N2EY)
>>>>>writes:
>>>>>
>>>>>>In article <20030924174226.07578.00000783@mb-m25.aol.com>,
>>>>lenover21@aol.com
>>>>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
>>>>>>
>>>>>>>YOU are NOT on any QRZ listing for any country.
>>>>>>
>>>>>>Neither are you. Len ;-) ;-) ;-)
>>>>>
>>>>> I've never PRETENDED to be one.
>>>>
>>>>Why are you shouting, Len?
>>>
>>> Not shouting.
>>
>>Yes, you are. Capitalizing every letter in a word is online shouting. Bad
>>manners on your part. It also indicates you are out of control.
>>
>>Perhaps you should take a time-out and come back to the group when you can
>>behave in a mature fashion.
>>
>>> Do your eyes hurt?
>>>

>>Nope.
>>
>>>>> I make no bones about not being licensed as an AMATEUR and have
>>>>> said so from day one in here.
>>>>
>>>>Everything isn't all about you, Len.
>>>
>>> Apparently the PCTA think so.
>>
>>How so? Would you rather that nobody replied to your posts?
>
> Not a problem. ALL you PCTAs can whip out the old "killfile" and hide
> heads and eyes in the sand.
>
> Makes it easier to comment to the Rest of the Readers. :-)

I see. You want to "comment" without having to face any opposing viewpoints. Or
facts.
>
>>Strong opposition to your opinions seems to really bother you. Correction of
>>your mistakes enrages you.
>>>
>>> Since they can't support their view of retaining the morse code test,
>they
>>> attack personalities.
>>
>>Who is "they"?
>
> All of the PCTAs in here.

Who is that?
>
>>>>> What you have is some idiot who PRETENDS to be an amateur
>>>>> <something> in Canada and won't identify himself.
>>>>
>>>>Why do you think Leo is pretending anything?
>>>
>>> She hasn't got the guts to identify herself.
>>
>>"She"? How do you know Leo is female?
>
> How do you she isn't?

"Leo" is a male name. Unambiguous.

You have a history of calling people by the wrong gender as an insult, Len.
>
>>> Despite your pain with PREVIOUS screen names, I've never attempted
>>> to post anything without identifying myself.
>>
>>Yes, you have, Many of your posts do not contain anything that indicates who

>>you really are.
>
> There YOU are MISTAKEN.

No, I'm not.

You have made posts that include no identification other than your screen name.

>
> I've listed my employers in here

So what? Many of those references are decades old.

>and I've given names and callsigns to
> friends who are radio amateur licensees.

So? You could be one of them.

> My bylines in Ham Radio
> magazine carried the same USPS address I have now.

How do we know they are *your* bylines? We know that *someone* using the name "Leonard Anderson" wrote some articles 20-odd years ago for a now-defunct fanzine, but how do we know that *you* are that same "Leonard Anderson"?

> Since you won't accept any e-mail attachments from me,

Hold on a sec.

Some time back you sent me and a few others several *unsolicited* emails with large (megabyte) attachments and no explanation of what the attachments were. Rather than waste the dialup connection time required to download what could have been viruses, I chose to simply delete them.

You later described what was in the attachments. Nothing in those descriptions was relevant to "proving" your identity.

> the only
> recourse for you seems to be a lot of flame war ignition attempts and
> not bother to check anyone out.

What's to check out? I'm not claiming that you are a fake.

I'm simply pointing out that you *could be* a fake, and that every claim you make against Leo could also be made against you.
>
>>In fact, for all anyone really knows, you could be someone else who has
>>appropriated the persona of one Leonard H. Anderson.
>
> Think whatever you imagine.

I'm simply pointing out possilbilites. Does that scare you?
>
> I am listed in the Southern California white pages...my postal address
> is not secret...you can hire a private investigator and have my neighbors

> interviewed. No problem.

Why would I bother to do all of that?

> You can also find yourself in a civil court
> or (in some government districts) being investigated for harrassment.

Sounds like a threat.

First you say "no problem" and then you talk about courts and harrassment. Odd behavior you display, Len.
>
> You have enough raw data to ascertain who is who.

No, I don't.

> You don't want
> to.

Where have I said you are a fake?

> You would rather have your little jollies in here making your
> "opponents" look bad.

That's what you do, Len, not me.

>>Has anyone on this NG actually met you in person or on the air?
>
> Not that I know of...but then I don't know who all the readers are since
> they don't post. :-)
>
> Start with KD6JG. Work on to W6MJN, then N2JTV.
>
> Several more know me but there are over 600,000 licensed radio
> amateurs who are NOT in this newsgroup.
>
> That's irrelevant to your little "cause" in this message, isn't it?

I'm simply pointing out that every claim you make about Leo's identity can be made about yours.
>
> You want to "run" this newsgroup because you are here so much and
> spend so much time posting.

That's what you do, Len, not me. Compare the number and length of postings - I'm way down the list. You and "Clint" are near the top.
>
>>I'm not misdirecting. 'vshah101' did not give a name or callsign, even when
>>asked. But you had no problem with him or his anti-amateur remarks.
>
> YOU are MISTAKEN again. ERROR...you bad.

What is mistaken? Was vshah101 anonymous or not?
>

> Some individuals in here post against YOUR and PCTA viewpoints.
> That does not make them "anti-amateur."

I was referring to "vshah's" "fat" remarks.
>
> You think of yourself as "representing ALL of US amateur radio" through
> your expressed opinions in here.

Where? I simply post what *I* think. That really bothers you, doesn't it?

> You don't.

Neither do you. Live with it.

> YOU and some anonymous person want to use any thread as a
> character assassination venue so that you can "get even" for all the
> alleged "wrongs" committed against your radiogod personna.
>
> THAT's a FACT.

Nope, not at all. It's simply your opinion.
>
>>You sound threatened and angry because someone has noticed your double
>>standard of behavior towards anonymous posters.
>
> Not a problem to me. You MANUFACTURE a situation and try to exploit
> it so that you have an excuse for talking bad about someone who has
> opposite viewpoints to yours.
>
> All you need to do is search Google for a lot of PCTA general harrassment
> such as from the hundreds of postings by "K4YZ" that go un-answered
> because that kind of posting only serves to make the harrasser happy.

So? I'm not him. And I have repeatedly tried to get Steve to change his
behavior.
>
>>> This whole newsgroup was created to discuss-debate-argue the code
>>> test issue.
>>
>>And other things. You are not the moderator, Len. Much as you want to
>control
>>how things happen, you're not the boss here. Live with it.
>
> YOU ARE NOT THE MODERATOR EITHER, JIMMIE.
>
> LEARN TO LIVE WITH THAT.

Why all the shouting? You must be very angry, Len.
>
>>> It wasn't created for the sole amusement or daily guru column from
>>> Jimmie Miccolis where he would sit in judgement of all others.
>>
>> It wasn't created for the sole amusement or daily guru column from

>>Leonard H. Anderson where he would sit in judgement of all others.
>
> Are you "threatened" by all those others in here who have opposite
> opinions from yours?

Nope. But it sure seems that you are threatened and angered by anyone who dares to disagree with you.

> Are you feeling "superior" because you espouse
> the standards and practices of US amateur radio of over a half century
> ago?

Loaded question of the "have you stopped beating your dog" style. Doesn't work, Len.

> Are you so intimidated by those who have the courage to think
> for themselves AND to speak out?

Not at all. But it sure seems that you are, Len.
>
> YOU sit in judgement on everyone who does not consider morse code
> testing as necessary.

"Sit in judgement"? Not at all. I simply disagree with them.

Is that wrong?

> A very consistent judgement, a condemning
> judgement as if you are a holy radio god.
>
> That's really a rather common syndrome of the PCTAs. They allow only
> ONE viewpoint...theirs.
>
> All other viewpoints shall be put down, destroyed, those who voice them
> shall be harrassed, hunted, and so forth until they stop.

>
> That's a lovely example of dictatorial totalitarianism, the arrogance of
> the squatters who feel they "own" the hobby.

> That reflects badly on the US amateur radio community when you PCTA
> act that way. You are unable to present counter-arguments to NCTAs so
> you call all their arguments "illogical, mistaken, or plain wrong" and
> then want to harrass, intimidate, and humiliate them.
>
> YOU may not think such is "anti-amateur." Someone attacked your Ego
> Turf and you think "anything goes" in "fighting" them.
>
> I'd call that Elitist, Arrogant, and Dictatorial but the Turf Fighters
>would
>get
> angry again...so I won't call it that.

Len, you're describing your own behavior here. To a "T".
>
> I wonder what the FCC would call it if anyone there chanced to look in and
> read what the PCTA think, say, and do in here?
>
They'd probably wonder why we showed such civility towards someone who behaves
the way you do, Len.

5904. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 19:54:16 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928155416.01755.00000339@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 79368

>Sour Grapes.

Sour Grapes, they didnt work for it, and this is what they get.

5905. BPL and NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 20:01:44 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928160144.01755.00000340@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 79369

Amazing, NCI supposedly has all these Techno Whizzards just waiting to get on HF whenever the Code goes away.
I would think that all those Techno Whizzards would have a way all ready set up to be able to deal with BPL.
Come on Karl, get your Techno Gurus working on solving this problem so we can all share HF. Karl this would be an easy way to prove the No-Code Techs are worthy of HF.

5906. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 20:14:55 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <3jHdb.2153$L54.1473@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 79370

Dick,

The best chance you would have to make your comments known would be to write the radio stations that were blotted out. Believe me, the broadcast companies have *much* deeper pockets than amateur operators. They would take a dim view of having their advertising dollars evaporate due to BPL cutting down their coverage. I am quite serious about this.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message news:bl5qlhbgj0@208.206.142.82...
> Reposted from another reflector...
>
> ---------->>
> This is serious, folks.
> I am located 65 MILES from a test area...and 160, 80,
> and 40 were rendered virtually unusable with any
> signal below roughly s-5 to s-7 at some times.
> Especially for the QRPp'ers...how many stations have
> you worked with just a few hundred milliwatts?
> You have maybe a few thousandths of a microwatt on the
> receiver's antenna...and this broadband hash puts a
> few microwatts on the same antenna...what do YOU
> think is going to happen?
> Driving through Allentown during PPL's tests, there
> were times when my car's AM radio was blotted out!
> The power companies want this scheme to happen,
> because it would be effortless revenue for them...
> >>
>
> >>
> Attention All Amateurs...
> ARRL Rebukes FCC Commissioner's BPL-Related "Broadband Nirvana" Remarks
> (Sep 25, 2003) -- The ARRL has strongly objected to FCC Commissioner
> Kathleen Q. Abernathy's suggestion that Broadband over Power Line (BPL)
> technology will contribute to what she described as "broadband Nirvana."
> Addressing the United Powerline Council's annual conference September 22
> in Arlington, Virginia, Abernathy expressed unabashed enthusiasm for BPL
and
> recommended a combination of regulatory restraint and the elimination or
> substantial modification of existing rules as steps along the "path to
> Enlightenment." In a terse response faxed today on behalf of the
> League's 155,000 members, ARRL Chief Executive Officer David Sumner,

> K1ZZ, asserted that Abernathy overlooked some significant issues in her
> Nirvana analogy.
>
>
> YOU CAN EMAIL MISS ABERNATHY AT THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS AND I URGE EVERYONE
TO
> DO SO.
>
> kabernat@fcc.gov <kabernat@fcc.gov>
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.521 / Virus Database: 319 - Release Date: 9/23/03

5907. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 20:19:03 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <XmHdb.2154$b84.338@news02.roc.ny>
Source record: 79371

Dick Carroll mentioned that some AM broadcast stations were virtually obliterated in Allentown, Pa. In that case, everyone noticing interference on broadcast band (AM) stations should complain to the stations involved. Believe me, commercial broadcasting (especially since the FCC allowed a few powerful groups to buy up most of the broadcast stations) has much deeper pockets than amateurs and would likely not hesitate even a moment to bring lawyers and Congress into the mess. Don't complain as a ham operator, however; complain that you can't hear some particular programs from the station due to all of this "interference". Let 'em figure it out :)

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030927210503.27009.00000348@mb-m11.aol.com...
> Heres the solution to the BPL problem, it makes you wonder why someone
hasnt
> done it yet.
> First stop messing with FCC, these Clowns have all ready made up there
minds.
> Look at the Present Dumbing Down, which as been brought to us VIA the FCC
> Morrons. So believe me they could care less about Hams. And stop waisting
your
> time sending in your comments to the FCC. If anybody in there right mind
thinks
> they care about 1800 comments you kidding yourself.
> The solution is Simple, go to there Bosses, I dont mean anybody in the
FCC I
> mean the FCCs Bosses. Tell them how you plan on Voting the next time out
if
> this passes. Be sure and bring up Homeland Security in your comments. This
is
> the only thing that will stop this. If you dont think so, remember the
Head Man
> at the FCC recently got his hands slapped and told he would change another
> screw up he recently made.
>

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.521 / Virus Database: 319 - Release Date: 9/23/03

5908. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 20:42:36 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bl7h3s$8mrm1$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79372

"Clint" wrote ...

I couldn't agree more; with each line of reasoning they use a very good fact is brought up to disprove it and yet THEY devolve down to "go ahead, present some facts and we'll discuss it"..and, well, this HAS been done, they just ignore it.

Oh Really? I brought up a very factual survey along with two other facts concerning CW and you refused to respond (other than to say you wouldn't respond) I asked you in another thread to explain a little bit about some of the new technology that you say you know so well (and we CW'ers don't) I'm *still* waiting for an answer on that one. It seems to me that when facts are presented, *you* are the very first one to run away and hide, not the other way around.

Here is a copy of the other thread -- I'll give you one more chance to answer:

"Clint" wrote in part ...

I only take the facts as they are and deduce a conclusion, rather than take a passion-filled idea intermixed with rage against opposition and launch a scathing attack devoid of everything necessary to warrant a good debate and argument to back up one's claims.

Excellent position, Clint. With that in mind, let's do some fact vs fiction debate.

On September 5, 2003 the Dakota Division Director released these survey results:

"Division members are divided on the Entry level license with slightly more of those replying saying that Morse Code should not be required for access to HF. That changes as we move to General and Extra. Nearly 70% say there should be a Morse requirement for Extra Class licensees."

This is very close to my position on Morse testing. I believe that some HF privileges on all bands should be granted to amateurs upon entry into the ARS, and that CW testing should be required for the higher licenses, General and Extra. It would seem that this survey in the Dakota Division indicates (as I have stated many times) that a majority of hams are not strictly against code testing -- 70% seem to think that there should be some testing for the highest class of license.

Add to this the fact that CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS and that groups like "FISTS" have nearly doubled in size *since* restructuring, and I think the picture becomes clear. The support for the NCTA is not as strong as their advocates would have us believe.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5909. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 20:43:22 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnei0965sis82b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79373

Ah-HA!

"I had to do it, so should YOU!"

It's too easy.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--
"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030928155416.01755.00000339@mb-m10.aol.com...
> >Sour Grapes.
>
> Sour Grapes, they didnt work for it, and this is what they get.

5910. Re: BPL and NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 20:44:16 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnei1v8a5jf35d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79374

More sour grapes.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--
"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030928160144.01755.00000340@mb-m10.aol.com...
> Amazing, NCI supposedly has all these Techno Whizzards just waiting to get
on
> HF whenever the Code goes away.
> I would think that all those Techno Whizzards would have a way all ready
set
> up to be able to deal with BPL.
> Come on Karl, get your Techno Gurus working on solving this problem so we
can
> all share HF. Karl this would be an easy way to prove the No-Code Techs
are
> worthy of HF.

5911. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 20:46:26 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bl7hb2$8u0a1$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79375

"Clint" wrote in part ...

That's because they generally have a very weak arguement without any real pillars of facts to build on, so at every possible chance they get they dodge and divert the topic of the conversation. I've had them go as far as simply attack my spelling and grammer, for lack of anything better to reply with.

No, we actually do have better things to do. But, we would like to see a cogent reply from you from time to time; that's all.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5912. Re: CQ 75 CQ 75 CQ 75

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 20:53:23 UTC
From: Arendal <newsreader@spamhate.org>
Message-ID: <2THdb.33425$Hb.509415@news4.e.nsc.no>
Source record: 79376
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Just one more reason for moderating this group...

"K4-OLD-KING-ALLIGATOR"
<BIG-AL@ -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@@@BIG-AL@@@-003894.5-LSB-75-METERS> skrev i melding news:vn84c75mdd0bc8@corp.supernews.com...
> THIS IS "BIG--AL" CALLING.
> CQ 75 CQ 75 CQ 75
> THIS IS "BIG--AL" CALLING.
> WHERE YOU AT BOY?
> THIS IS "BIG--AL" CALLING.
> CQ 75 CQ 75 CQ 75
> THIS IS "BIG--AL" CALLING.
> WHERE YOU AT BOY?
>
>

5913. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 21:01:47 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928170147.06460.00000345@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 79377

>Ah-HA!
>
>"I had to do it, so should YOU!"
>
>It's too easy.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT

No I dont think its to easy, I think they should give them away in Ceral Boxes

5914. Re: BPL and NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 21:02:48 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928170248.06460.00000346@mb-m26.aol.com>
Source record: 79378

>More sour grapes.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT

Not sour grapes, all these Gurus are waiting in the WINGS lets use them.

5915. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 21:26:29 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <9mldb.35630$ai7.19954@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79379

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote:
>
> I hope the FCC shows more respect for the
> *opinions* of this particular "constituency."

As I explained in my first paragraph, we simply don't have the numbers. Therefore, we're not going to be able to go around screaming we're a constituency with the hopes that alone will convince the FCC to support us. We're going to have to provide cold hard facts and I've seen little of that in the opinions I've read.

> ARES, and they're usually coordinated with
> local OEM.

Sorry, I haven't found a thing ARES is doing related to homeland security. If you're aware of anything, please let me know so I cite that when talking to others.

> Do nothing and nothing will certainly result.

I'm not saying do nothing. Instead, I'm saying what we're doing is probably not going to be enough.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5916. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 21:29:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <Boldb.35653$ai7.14036@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79380

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
>
> As far as In concerned I dont care, I think its a just reward
> for all the New NO-CODE HF users.

We already know that, Bruce. More likely, you probably posted this
subject in an attempt to start another code/no-code debate.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5917. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 21:30:04 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928173004.11967.00000320@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79381

> I'm not saying do nothing. Instead, I'm saying what we're doing is
>probably not going to be enough.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>

No Question about it, this is a DONE DEAL> Thats why I loaded up on some BPL stock this thing is going to ROCK.

5918. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 21:37:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928173728.11967.00000321@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79382

> We already know that, Bruce. More likely, you probably posted this
>subject in an attempt to start another code/no-code debate.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

If the truth was known I could care less about the CW thing. The NO- CW thing is coming, no QUESTION about it. The No Written Test will follow. As I predicted when the 1st No-Code thing passed, there would 3 Steps to converting Ham Radio into CB. The 2nd step is almost here. The third step will follow shortly.
Good Luck CBplusser, I sure hope you enjoy your BPL HF privilages.

5919. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 21:43:28 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0309281343.58babe05@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79383

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

> One: no one should be kept out of the ARS--let
> them get their license and stand or fail on their merit.

You can't really mean that! I do not support continuation of
the Morse test, but to suggest that we should just hand out
licenses to anyone regardless of demonstrated qualification
and let them "stand or fail on their merit" is the silliest
notion I have seen here yet.

That's like saying "let anyone get their drivers license
and stand or fail on their driving record" without having
passed a test.

73, de Hans, K0HB

5920. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 21:47:46 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <6GIdb.35819$ai7.5548@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79384

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
>
> You know very well, or you should, that the ARRL send
> it a very comprehensive report on that subject. Both the
> initial comments and the latest round.

And I applaud them for that effort (that's why I'm a member). However, it is one report in a pile of reports submitted by various companies, all showing exactly the opposite conclusion. The ARRL didn't give the FCC a thing to hang their hat on (a single "ah-ha" that proves those other reports wrong). Instead, it simply contradicts them.

> If you want to change the thinking at the FCC. Then writting
> your congressman is the ONLY way to do it. Since the
> congress controls their purse strings.

Oh, I just wish it was that simple.

> The only other alternative would be to take it to court. Make
> use of the green peace bunch to sue for the destruction of a
> natural resource, the HF spectrum. etc.. Any port in a storm.

A resource controlled by the federal government, which means very few courts would likely to step in.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5921. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 21:50:11 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <7mkenv083m8nmaj5p16jlkcvtgun1a0nic@4ax.com>
Source record: 79385

On 26 Sep 2003 18:29:56 GMT, lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote:

> hasn't got the guts to identify herself.

> How do you she isn't?

Well, I suppose I could be Leonette. Male it is, though....

I have identified myself. I'm Leo ;)

> I've listed my employers in here and I've given names and callsigns to
> friends who are radio amateur licensees. My bylines in Ham Radio
> magazine carried the same USPS address I have now.

But, who knows for sure that you are indeed the person that you claim
to be? Who on the group can vouch for you?

> You don't "own" US amateur radio and never did, therefore you don't have
> ANY judgement value about who is "anti-amateur" or even "pro-amateur."

And you are not a an Amateur at all - your opinion, therefore, is that
of an observer - not a participant. No more welcome than mine would
be if I went in to the nearest VFW post and started telling the folks
there what my 'opinions' of the way the Korean conflict was handled.
I was not a part of it, my opinion is inconsequential.

(Say, yours wouldn't be welcome there, either, OM ?....)

> That's a lovely example of dictatorial totalitarianism, the arrogance of the
> squatters who feel they "own" the hobby.

Your 'hobby', Len? You're an outsider. Not a member. On the
outside, looking in....

We'll take your ideas under advisement, though - thanks for your
input.
>
> That reflects badly on the US amateur radio community when you PCTA
> act that way.

Usenet is worldwide - as is Amateur Radio - there are more than just
US Amateurs in this group. It's a big world out there, Len.... ;)
And, this is a policy group - not just 'code / nocode' - orat least it
should be...there are bigger issues facong our hobby than the code one
today!
>
> I'd call that Elitist, Arrogant, and Dictatorial but the Turf Fighters would
>get angry again...so I won't call it that.

Projecting, Len? Sounds like someone we both know.... ;)

Plus, there was a statement about "going to court for harassment" that was too laughable to quote. Len, all you do is harass folks on this group - that's your entire raison d'etre.

Intelligent debate is what the group should be about - if you're not up to the challenge, then - as they say in Little Jerusalem down in Old Mexico - adios, Alter Kocker!

30, Leo

5922. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 21:58:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <iQIdb.35918$ai7.17784@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79386

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote:
> >
> > Actually, once code testing is gone, the pro-testing crowd
> > is not going to have much to say.
>
> Do you honestly think so?

Hey, I can hope, can't I? No, I don't honestly think the pro-code testing crowd will have nothing more to say. That's why I wrote the rest of that paragraph (the part you didn't include in the quote above).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5923. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 22:07:44 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <QYIdb.36009$ai7.4923@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79387

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
> Except that what Larry does is far from debate. Larry whines.

No, Larry nags. Hes' like a nagging mother trying to convince an adult
child to do what she says, just "because I say so."

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5924. No good threads

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 22:25:58 UTC
From: Radioman <radio@ptt.edu>
Message-ID: <3F775FF6.6014D194@ptt.edu>
Source record: 79388

The only new thread was from the troll WA8ULX, so I hit
SHIFT-C and marked ALL the messages as READ.

Can someone post a good thread worth reading?

Once a thread hits about 5 messages, it's done around here.

5925. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 23:01:38 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <mLJdb.36372$ai7.28386@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79389

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
> (snip) the real reason is for the desire of CW testing
> to stay around: these folks believe in its power to
> filter out folks who act just like them.

I quoted this part because I wanted to make sure everyone read it. When it comes to at least a few of those on the pro-code side, I think you hit the nail right on the head with this, Kim.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5926. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 23:23:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <F3Kdb.36397$ai7.11368@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79390

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote:
>
> Oh Really? I brought up a very factual survey along
> with two other facts concerning CW and you refused
> to respond (other than to say you wouldn't respond)
> I asked you in another thread to explain a little bit about
> some of the new technology that you say you know so
> well (and we CW'ers don't). I'm *still* waiting for an
> answer on that one. (snip)

Let's turn that around at little, Arnie. I haven't seen Clint going around claiming to be superior. Instead, it is those in your circle claiming to be the superior hams. Other than code, what skills or knowledge of technology can be found in the pro-code crowd that cannot be found among the no-code crowd? From what I've seen, there are just as many highly skilled individuals in the no-code crowd as there are in the pro-code crowd, working in just as many professional careers. So, if there is no real difference between the two, why do those like yourself continue to support, or at least nor object to, the superior ham position of some in this newsgroup and elsewhere? The only possible answer I can see is that you also consider those like yourself to be superior hams.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5927. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 23:24:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <e5Kdb.529$Vb3.431037@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79391

Kim W5TIT wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message

<some snippage>

>>I already presented some fairly comprehensive data on why it wouldn't.
>>That was pretty basic stuff.
>>
>>That a quarter wave dipole antenna would work is fairly extraordinary.
>>
>>Present your evidence and your theory/rationale.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> Probably for the same reason loading up house plumbing will work, or loading
> up a coat hanger, or whatever. With a tuner, and with other apparatuses in
> use or not, coupling--whatever you want to call it--if a signal gets out, it
> gets out and that is all that counts *sometimes.*

The idea of using a random length of wire or the rain gutter is a time honored method of making an emergency/stealth or just plain experimental antenna. Tuners often make these antennas work - some ok, some not so well. And a large part of the not so good operation is when the tuner can't match the antenna.

My MFJ949 tuner manual has several lengths that the user is encouraged to avoid. According to them they are the worst possible line lengths:

160 meter dipole - 130 feet

80 meter dipole - 66 feet

40 meter dipole - 32 feet

If you do the calculations, you'll see what fractional wavelength those antennas are for the respective bands.

note: if anyone looks up the MFJ info, they will see a few other frequencies also on the "do not use" list. These are odd multiples of 1/4 wavelength, so I left them out of this discussion. But in general, its a related problem - odd multiples of 1/4 wave are not so hot to use.

They note that if you have trouble tuning an antenna on a frequency you want to use, you should shorten or lengthen the antenna by 1/8th wavelength. Then you should be able to get the tuner to match things up.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5928. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 23:32:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <QbKdb.36412$ai7.22820@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79392

"Hans K0HB" wrote:
>
> "Kim W5TIT" wrote
> > One: no one should be kept out of the ARS--let
> > them get their license and stand or fail on their merit.
>
> You can't really mean that! I do not support continuation
> of the Morse test, but to suggest that we should just hand
> out licenses to anyone regardless of demonstrated
> qualification and let them "stand or fail on their merit" is
> the silliest notion I have seen here yet. (snip)

I imagine she said that within the context of this discussion, Hans (the removal of the code test, with the written tests intact). In that regard, "let them get their license and stand or fail on their merit." I happen to agree with her. We shouldn't be trying to exclude anyone just because of who or what they are (CB'ers or whatever). If they can pass the written tests and meet the citizenship laws, they should be allowed to participate. If they screw up later, that is the time to force them out.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5929. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 23:33:47 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928193347.14837.00003266@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 79393

In article <20030928131141.04276.00000431@mb-m19.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) writes:

>>I can hardly wait to hear Bruce's excuse ... on the other hand, the way
>>he comes across, we'd be better off if the FCC never, ever, heard from
>>him.
>>
>>Carl - wk3c
>>
>
> We you say we, I hope you are referring to your CBplusser Buddies, because
>you
>sure dont speak for REAL HAMS.
>
On the issue of BPL, Carl sure does speak for me. I agree with everyhting he wrote in his comments on BPL. Does that mean I'm not a "real ham", Bruce?

5930. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 23:33:48 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928193348.14837.00003267@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 79394

In article <fiEdb.8160$yp6.206098@nnrp1.ptd.net>, "Carl R. Stevenson"
<wk3cqth@wk3c.com> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
>news:20030928081040.29660.00000865@mb-m24.aol.com...
>> In article <20030927204249.27009.00000339@mb-m11.aol.com>, wa8ulx@aol.com
>> (WA8ULX) writes:
>>
>> >>Also, I will be lobbying FCC OET and the Commissioners in the
>> >>coming weeks against BPL ... and I've been out in the Emmaus, PA
>> >>BPL "pilot" area with local reporters SHOWING them just how bad
>> >>BPL really is (after showing them what S0-S9 signals sound like on
>> >>a quiet band away from the BPL area so that when they see/hear the
>> >>"wall to wall" S9+ "hash" from BPL they understand just how bad
>> >>it really is.
>> >>
>> >>So don't give me this "sock-puppet for the broadband cartel" crap.
>> >>
>> >>Carl - wk3c
>> >>
>> >
>> > Well there it is folks, Karl the Nut is going to save Ham Radio.
>>
>> Did you read his comments to the FCC? I did. Lots of good, sound, rational
>> stuff against BPL. Including actual firsthand accounts of the noise.
>>
>> Hardly the work of a "nut", I'd say.

And if those comments and firsthand observations are the work of a "nut", then
we need lots more "nuts"....
>
>Thanks Jim ... while we continue to disagree on the code/nocode
>issue, your sense of fairness in this unrelated matter is appreciated.

No thanks necessary, Carl, you did a very good thing. I hope it has some
effect.

The code *test* debate pales in insignificance besides the threat of widespread
implementation of BPL. What good is any license or test for same if the bands
are so full of digital noise that they are mostly useless?

Also, having been without electricity for over 38 hours in the wake of
Hurricane Isabel, it seems to me that the electric energy utilities need to
focus more on their core business of providing juice and not further complicate
the operation and maintenance of their distribution systems by trying to use
them as a "broadband" data network.

(Hurricane Isabel was hardly a hurricane by the time it got here [Radnor Township] and damage other than electrical outages was very minimal. The electrical outages, however, were widespread and longlived.)
>
>> >Just think
>> >Karl is going to put these Billion dollar companies in there place.
>>
>> Not by himself. But his stuff will surely help.
>>
>> I filed comments against BPL, Carl filed comments, ARRL filed comments,
>> lots of folks filed comments - did you file comments, Bruce?
>
>I can hardly wait to hear Bruce's excuse ...

Don't hold yer breath, he's too full of nonsense to actually do anything serious like comment on BPL. But don't be too hard on Bruce, Carl - according to qrz.com, he's 305 years old.

>on the other hand, the way
>he comes across, we'd be better off if the FCC never, ever, heard from
>him.

AGREED! (shouting intentional)

The BPL battle is only beginning. Given Com, Abernathy's comments, the whole thing is obviously being driven more by misguided business interests and technically-ignorant investment than by sound engineering principles.

While we're on the subject, check out this bit of info:

"regarding the current BPL discussions you might well be interested to visit

http://www.bbc.co.uk/rd/pubs/whp/

where whp067 (meaning "White Paper" no 67) has just appeared providing a hell lot of the infos regarding the impacts BPL (or PLT or PLC as it is called in Europe) does have on HF reception in a typcal suburban or downtown area. The above web site also provides a bulk of audio files taken within such an area where BPL was / is in use. While the experiments were made using HF broadcast band reception (with those really big signals there...) it is all to easy and obvious what that would mean for any ham band reception (you can bet it's gonna be damn worse...)

Also, I put some files (both audio and video ones) on my web site at

http://www.qsl.net/dl5qe

regarding BPL (PLC, PLT) interferences.

The (British) Radiocommunacations Agency has a report on PLT measurements made at Crieff at:
http://www.radio.gov.uk/topics/research/topics/emc/edcrie_2.pdf

(thanks to G0CLV for the above)

73 es tnx for your anti-BPL efforts

Jim, N2EY

5931. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 23:38:17 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <JhKdb.36460$ai7.22462@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79395

"Dick Carroll" wrote:
>
> And that post made my case.

Your "case" is that I was doing something others don't. Of course, since that is not really true, you haven't made any case whatsoever. Instead, you've given me an opportunity to show that I'm more honest about it then perhaps even you are since you've said nothing about your writing style in this newsgroup.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5932. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 23:38:20 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnes8armt7a8ee@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79396

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:BoIdb.35653$ai7.14036@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
> >
> > As far as In concerned I dont care, I think its a just reward
> > for all the New NO-CODE HF users.
>
>
> We already know that, Bruce. More likely, you probably posted this
> subject in an attempt to start another code/no-code debate.
>

I don't believe that... I honestly think that the feelings of many people
on his side of the debate run so deep and in such a sour vein that
he was honestly just speaking his mind.

And that's sadder.

Clint
KB5ZHT
--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

5933. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 23:42:19 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <vlKdb.36496$ai7.17118@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79397

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bl7h3s$8mrm1$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Clint" wrote ...
>
> I couldn't agree more; with each line of reasoning they use a very good
> fact is brought up to disprove it and yet THEY devolve down to "go ahead,
> present some facts and we'll discuss it"..and, well, this HAS been done,
> they just ignore it.
> ----------
>
> Oh Really? I brought up a very factual survey along with two other facts
> concerning CW and you refused to respond (other than to say you wouldn't
> respond) I asked you in another thread to explain a little bit about some
> of the new technology that you say you know so well (and we CW'ers don't)
> I'm *still* waiting for an answer on that one. It seems to me that when
> facts are presented, *you* are the very first one to run away and hide,
not
> the other way around.
> ----------
>
> Here is a copy of the other thread -- I'll give you one more chance to
> answer:
>
> "Clint" wrote in part ...
>
> I only take the facts as they are and deduce a conclusion, rather than
take
> a passion-filled idea intermixed with rage against opposition and launch a
> scathing attack devoid of everything necessary to warrant a good debate
and
> argument to back up one's claims.
> ----------
>
> Excellent position, Clint. With that in mind, let's do some fact vs
fiction
> debate.
>
> On September 5, 2003 the Dakota Division Director released these survey
> results:
>
> "Division members are divided on the Entry level license with slightly
more
> of those replying saying that Morse Code should not be required for access
> to HF. That changes as we move to General and Extra. Nearly 70% say

> there should be a Morse requirement for Extra Class licensees."
> ____
>
> This is very close to my position on Morse testing. I believe that some
HF
> privileges on all bands should be granted to amateurs upon entry into the
> ARS, and that CW testing should be required for the higher licenses,
General
> and Extra. It would seem that this survey in the Dakota Division
indicates
> (as I have stated many times) that a majority of hams are not strictly
> against code testing -- 70% seem to think that there should be some
testing
> for the highest class of license.
>
> Add to this the fact that CW is the second most popular mode in the ARS
and
> that groups like "FISTS" have nearly doubled in size *since*
restructuring,
> and I think the picture becomes clear. The support for the NCTA is not as
> strong as their advocates would have us believe.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
>
>
>

I'll tell you this Arnie. CW is far from dead. I played on CW ALL weekend. Some in the Alabama and Texas Qso parties. And then most of the day today on the Classic Exchange.

It was , as they say, wall to wall.

I guess what Im saying, and trying to be polite to the detractors (dummies to lazy to learn Morse code) is don't confuse them with the facts, the are to stupid to learn....and like I always like to say. Ya just cain't fix stupid.

Dan/W4NTI

5934. Re: CQ 75 CQ 75 CQ 75

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 23:43:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <%mKdb.36509$ai7.32754@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79398
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

"Arendal" <newsreader@spamhate.org> wrote:
> Just one more reason for moderating this group...

Please delete rec.radio.amateur.policy from future posting to this thread. Nobody from this newsgroup has participated in this thread recently. Cross posting is not a good idea anyway, so you might also want to consider deleting the other newsgroups as well.

Not a lecture - just a simple request.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5935. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 23:45:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <hoKdb.36520$ai7.19673@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79399

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:F3Kdb.36397$ai7.11368@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote:
> >
> > Oh Really? I brought up a very factual survey along
> > with two other facts concerning CW and you refused
> > to respond (other than to say you wouldn't respond)
> > I asked you in another thread to explain a little bit about
> > some of the new technology that you say you know so
> > well (and we CW'ers don't). I'm *still* waiting for an
> > answer on that one. (snip)
>
>
> Let's turn that around at little, Arnie. I haven't seen Clint going
around
> claiming to be superior. Instead, it is those in your circle claiming to
be
> the superior hams. Other than code, what skills or knowledge of technology
> can be found in the pro-code crowd that cannot be found among the no-code
> crowd? From what I've seen, there are just as many highly skilled
> individuals in the no-code crowd as there are in the pro-code crowd,
working
> in just as many professional careers. So, if there is no real difference
> between the two, why do those like yourself continue to support, or at
least
> nor object to, the superior ham position of some in this newsgroup and
> elsewhere? The only possible answer I can see is that you also consider
> those like yourself to be superior hams.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Perhaps you think those that know/use Morse are superior to you. I don't
ever recall seeing anyone that advocates Morse saying they felt superior.

I know I don't feel that way. However I do feel those that don't play on CW
are missing a major part of the enjoyment they could get from having a
amateur license. But thats their loss not mine.

If you thank that is imparting a superior attitude, I say Dwight that you
have the problem, not us.

Dan/W4NTI

5936. Re: No good threads

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 23:45:35 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vneslv6jjusoc1@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79400

My best advice is add any post to your killfile that has
the words CW, PCTA, NCTA or code testing as a
subject.

The reason is you're probably tired of the PCTA trolling,
and quite frankly the only reason I hang with the debate
as long as I do is in the unlikely event I run into a fresh
mind with an angle I myself didn't think of, making
me rethink the whole debate. Unfortunately, however,
most of thier posts on *that* side of the argument
drive you further and further away from sympathizing
with it, especially when the condescending attitudes
start to vomit themselves up.

Other than that, you will find nice posts regarding
antennas, meeting on frequencies, and other
topics.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--
"Radioman" <radio@ptt.edu> wrote in message
news:3F775FF6.6014D194@ptt.edu...
> The only new thread was from the troll WA8ULX, so I hit
> SHIFT-C and marked ALL the messages as READ.
>
> Can someone post a good thread worth reading?
>
> Once a thread hits about 5 messages, it's done around here.

5937. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 23:46:57 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <RpKdb.36533$ai7.25200@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79401

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0309281343.58babe05@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > One: no one should be kept out of the ARS--let
> > them get their license and stand or fail on their merit.
>
> You can't really mean that! I do not support continuation of
> the Morse test, but to suggest that we should just hand out
> licenses to anyone regardless of demonstrated qualification
> and let them "stand or fail on their merit" is the silliest
> notion I have seen here yet.
>
> That's like saying "let anyone get their drivers license
> and stand or fail on their driving record" without having
> passed a test.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

Now you know why I call her the Texas TWIT.

Dan/W4NTI

5938. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-28 23:49:56 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <EsKdb.36568$ai7.23432@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79402

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:QbKdb.36412$ai7.22820@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Hans K0HB" wrote:
> >
> > "Kim W5TIT" wrote
> > > One: no one should be kept out of the ARS--let
> > > them get their license and stand or fail on their merit.
> >
> > You can't really mean that! I do not support continuation
> > of the Morse test, but to suggest that we should just hand
> > out licenses to anyone regardless of demonstrated
> > qualification and let them "stand or fail on their merit" is
> > the silliest notion I have seen here yet. (snip)
>
>
> I imagine she said that within the context of this discussion, Hans (the
> removal of the code test, with the written tests intact). In that regard,
> "let them get their license and stand or fail on their merit." I happen to
> agree with her. We shouldn't be trying to exclude anyone just because of
who
> or what they are (CB'ers or whatever). If they can pass the written tests
> and meet the citizenship laws, they should be allowed to participate. If
> they screw up later, that is the time to force them out.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

You and your ilk 'may have' had a point with the cw set at 20 and possibly
even at 13. But 5 wpm, a multiple guess, given by volunteer examiners
without all the strain and stress of a FCC session, can not be serious now.

All it comes across is as; Im just too lazy to take 2 weeks of ten minutes
a day to memorize the Morse characters. Good grief at 5 wpm you could copy
every third word and guess the test to completion.

Give it a rest.

Dan/W4NTI

5939. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 00:02:11 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnetl6jorujta6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79403

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:hoKdb.36520$ai7.19673@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:F3Kdb.36397$ai7.11368@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote:
> > >
> > > Oh Really? I brought up a very factual survey along
> > > with two other facts concerning CW and you refused
> > > to respond (other than to say you wouldn't respond)
> > > I asked you in another thread to explain a little bit about
> > > some of the new technology that you say you know so
> > > well (and we CW'ers don't). I'm *still* waiting for an
> > > answer on that one. (snip)
> > >
> > >
> > Let's turn that around at little, Arnie. I haven't seen Clint going
> around
> > claiming to be superior. Instead, it is those in your circle claiming to
> be
> > the superior hams. Other than code, what skills or knowledge of
technology
> > can be found in the pro-code crowd that cannot be found among the
no-code
> > crowd? From what I've seen, there are just as many highly skilled
> > individuals in the no-code crowd as there are in the pro-code crowd,
> working
> > in just as many professional careers. So, if there is no real difference
> > between the two, why do those like yourself continue to support, or at
> least
> > nor object to, the superior ham position of some in this newsgroup and
> > elsewhere? The only possible answer I can see is that you also consider
> > those like yourself to be superior hams.
> > >
> > >
> > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > >
> > >
>
> Perhaps you think those that know/use Morse are superior to you. I don't
> ever recall seeing anyone that advocates Morse saying they felt superior.
>

I believe that making references and using analogies that you guys are the
adults and new, entry level hams are children pretty much describes
a superior if not condescending attitude.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

5940. Re: No good threads

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 00:20:33 UTC
From: v8856b@billhorne.homelinux.org
Message-ID: <200309290036.h8T0aEx11606@dell.billhorne.homelinux.org>
Source record: 79406

> The only new thread was from the troll WA8ULX, so I hit
> SHIFT-C and marked ALL the messages as READ.

> Can someone post a good thread worth reading?

> Once a thread hits about 5 messages, it's done around here.

OK, here's one:

Let's talk about the future of Ham Radio, and how
we're going to stop bickering amoungst ourselves
and find a way to keep the hobby going.

5941. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 00:24:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928202438.11685.00000339@mb-m04.aol.com>
Source record: 79405

>I don't believe that... I honestly think that the feelings of many people
>on his side of the debate run so deep and in such a sour vein that
>he was honestly just speaking his mind.
>
>And that's sadder.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>--

Your EXACTLY right, those are my true feelings. I think its just perfect for all the No-Coders. Not only will they be able to get there No-Code Extra, and all of HF, but the beauty of it is, they will have so much noise to deal with, they will not have any one to talk to. What a just reward for all there WHINNING. I cant wait.

5942. Re: No good threads

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 00:24:41 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <dZKdb.7206$RW4.3964@newsread4.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79404

"Radioman" <radio@ptt.edu> wrote in message
news:3F775FF6.6014D194@ptt.edu...

:
: Can someone post a good thread worth reading?
:
: Once a thread hits about 5 messages, it's done around here.

Dear OM "Radioman",

Unfortunately this thread didn't even get past one message before being
"done". Such a shame.

73, Barnabus Grumwich Overbyte, at your service.
....

"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not
be construed."

5943. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 00:29:20 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928202920.02537.00000798@mb-m23.aol.com>
Source record: 79407

In article <d22b54c3.0309280702.f58c37b@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
(Brian Kelly) writes:

>"Clay N4AOX" <wyn@att.net> wrote in message
>news:<GRpdb.161636$3o3.11573369@bgtnsc05-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>...
>> "Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote in message
>> news:d22b54c3.0309260402.7498733a@posting.google.com...
>
>> > I suggest you start with the ARRL website which is full of info on BPL.
>> >
>> > w3rv
>>
>> Hi Brian,
>> Thanks for the pointer. It appears that the BPL folks are going to
>> cozy up to the 13KV or less power lines, with internet fiber back to the
>> head end.
>
>Yup.
>
>> This will be like your baby crib monitor on steroids. I was
>> wondering how they pump the 2-80 MHz through the step down transformers.
>> The literature mentioned a "high pass" filter around the transformer. I
>> read this as a high voltage, low uF cap.
>
>Whatever it is it'll be cheap. Very cheap.

Prolly not cheap, but awful.
>
>> The relatively high inductance
>> "pole pigs" normally isolate households from noise stuff. If you think you
>> have trouble with touch lamps in the neighborhood now, just wait until they
>> add the "high pass" filters around the transformers. Never mind Ed
>> Hare's
>> attempts to show how the power lines along the street radiate.

It's not the inductance.

One of the reasons Edison was against AC distribution was the very real
possibility that a step-down transformer could experience a
primary-to-secondary short that would put truly enormous voltages into your
house wiring. If the transformer also experienced a simultaneous open
secondary, the results could be disastrous. This is also why they don't use
autotransformers in the stepdown role.

The Ancient Ones at Westinghouse solved that one by inserting a grounded copper
shield between primary and secondary, so that any short had to go through the

screen. This screen also greatly reduces capacitive coupling of noise and other
junk through the transformer.

Bypass all that with a capacitor or filter network and the noise racket alone
will increase even if BPL is turned off. I don't wanna be around when a fault
or lightning hit occurs...

>>The very
>> walls of your house, your christmas tree lights, etc. would radiate 2-80
>> MHz.
>
>Yup, yup.
>
One of the big selling points is that you;ll be able to plug in your computer
anywhere and be online thru the power plug. Ugh.

>> braid shielding on their cable lines. Their Channel 18 was quite
>> unusable in some localities due to 2 Meter Ham traffic. Of course, that
>> interference was a two way street also. Imagine what my DXer friend down
>> the street would do to the internet grid with his 10,000 watt erp into the
>> BPL powerline/internet coupler. What a hoot!
>
>I wouldn't be too sure of that, those old cable systems used 100%
>analog technologies. If these BPL goobers use spread spectrum schemes
>even a monster signal on a discrete frequency might not have much if
>any interference effects on BPL.

Yep. The adaptive system might just avoid that freq - or raise power to get
through it!

Worse, the way folks like Comm, Abernathy talk, the rules would be changed so
that the licensed ham is the bad guy!
>
>> Don't you love Commissioner Kat's remarks. Essentially: "Suspend
>> the rules!, Let this fledgling technology flourish! Do they have a sound
>> plan? H**l no! If we get down in the middle of the deployment of this
>> enterprise and there are problems we will solve them as we go! Just throw
>> some tax payers money at it!" Hey, this fits right in with the current
>> administration, the Tauzin, Dingell committee, etc. and besides,
>> Commissioner Kat will be retired and sucking on a six figure lobbiest job
>> by then.

Yup. Even if the whole thing tanks.
>
>I normally stay away from "political politics" in this NG and stick to
>the usual code test politics but I gotta state that as a lifetime
>moderate Republican I've about had it with the current
>administration's slash and burn tactics across the board. All of 'em,
>environmental issues, the Iraq disaster,

WMDs? What WMDs?

Connection to 9/11? Ooops, not really.

Quagmire? What did Dan, W4NTI predict here some time back?

>the incestuous cowboy
>cronyism and now this BPL crap.

It's an environmental issue to the core. Which is why a true environmentalist
is against BPL, and the "let's stripmine Yellowstone Park" folks are for it.

>Just for openers. I haven't voted for
>a damned (wash my mouf') Democrat for forty years but I'm warming up
>to the concept.

Hmmm.....General Wesley Clark, anyone? Dr. Howard Dean?
>
>> Be afraid, be very afraid. --Maybe some sort of "Homeland
>> Defense" argument would be effective in beating this thing back.
>
>That angle might be our only shot at killing this thing. There are a
>number of heavy-duty federal agencies using the HF spectrum for very
>important purposes and those folks are quietly running studies and
>tests on BPL and it's potential impact on their operations. We'll see.

I think perhaps the cooler heads at FCC may be simply taking their time and
allowing limited testing so that:

a) the election is next year and there may be some changes up top

b) the opponents have maximum opportunity to make measurements and observations

c) the truly rotten business model for BPL kills the whole mess. (You think
those filters will be inexpensive? I don't, and they're just one component).

73 de Jim, N2EY

5944. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 00:30:25 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <B2Ldb.36807$ai7.27635@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79408

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:6GIdb.35819$ai7.5548@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > You know very well, or you should, that the ARRL send
> > it a very comprehensive report on that subject. Both the
> > initial comments and the latest round.
>
>
> And I applaud them for that effort (that's why I'm a member). However,
it
> is one report in a pile of reports submitted by various companies, all
> showing exactly the opposite conclusion. The ARRL didn't give the FCC a
> thing to hang their hat on (a single "ah-ha" that proves those other
reports
> wrong). Instead, it simply contradicts them.
>
>
> > If you want to change the thinking at the FCC. Then writting
> > your congressman is the ONLY way to do it. Since the
> > congress controls their purse strings.
>
>
> Oh, I just wish it was that simple.
>
>
> > The only other alternative would be to take it to court. Make
> > use of the green peace bunch to sue for the destruction of a
> > natural resource, the HF spectrum. etc.. Any port in a storm.
>
>
> A resource controlled by the federal government, which means very few
> courts would likely to step in.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

All this talk is really irrevelant. Why? Because once BPL is implemented,
ham radio is dead. All that will be remotly usable would be some V/Uhf,
that is not plagued by harmonics of the square waves.

Forget weak signal work. Its over.

Dan/W4NTI

5945. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 00:35:02 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bl7v83$gv3@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 79414

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0309281343.58babe05@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > One: no one should be kept out of the ARS--let
> > them get their license and stand or fail on their merit.
>
> You can't really mean that! I do not support continuation of
> the Morse test, but to suggest that we should just hand out
> licenses to anyone regardless of demonstrated qualification
> and let them "stand or fail on their merit" is the silliest
> notion I have seen here yet.
>

Hans, what part of "let them get their license" did you NOT understand?
And, your rhetorical, "well that's the silliest thing..." is really old and
boring.

>
> That's like saying "let anyone get their drivers license
> and stand or fail on their driving record" without having
> passed a test.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>

Yeah. What you suggest would be like saying that. But that was not
suggested and your attempt to stretch it to that is rather unlike you...

Kim W5TIT

5946. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 00:36:45 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <x8Ldb.36835$ai7.30220@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79409

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:9mIdb.35630$ai7.19954@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote:
> >
> > I hope the FCC shows more respect for the
> > *opinions* of this particular "constituency."
>
>
> As I explained in my first paragraph, we simply don't have the numbers.
> Therefore, we're not going to be able to go around screaming we're a
> constituency with the hopes that alone will convince the FCC to support
us.
> We're going to have to provide cold hard facts and I've seen little of
that
> in the opinions I've read.
>
>
> > ARES, and they're usually coordinated with
> > local OEM.
>
>
> Sorry, I haven't found a thing ARES is doing related to homeland
security.
> If you're aware of anything, please let me know so I cite that when
talking
> to others.
>
>
> > Do nothing and nothing will certainly result.
>
>
> I'm not saying do nothing. Instead, I'm saying what we're doing is
> probably not going to be enough.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>
I agree, I don't know of any actual ARES/Homeland security happenings at
all.

But I do know of MARS and Homeland security and the SHARES organization.
And last time I checked to be in MARS you had to have a ham license.

Dan/W4NTI

5947. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 00:37:21 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <bl7v84$gv3@library1.airnews.net>
Source record: 79415

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:mLJdb.36372$ai7.28386@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote:
> >
> > (snip) the real reason is for the desire of CW testing
> > to stay around: these folks believe in its power to
> > filter out folks who act just like them.
>
>
> I quoted this part because I wanted to make sure everyone read it. When
it
> comes to at least a few of those on the pro-code side, I think you hit the
> nail right on the head with this, Kim.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

Absolutely. I know I did and I know there's enough sense in this newsgroup
and across the ARS to see this, know it, and understand it for what it
really is. And, I think it probably applies to at least 1/2 of the pro-code
side.

Kim W5TIT

5948. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 00:38:02 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bl7uta$8v9j9$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79410

"Dwight Stewart" wrote ...

Let's turn that around at little, Arnie. I haven't seen Clint going around claiming to be superior. instead, it is those in your circle claiming to be the superior hams. Other than code, what skills or knowledge of technology can be found in the pro-code crowd that cannot be found among the no-code crowd? From what I've seen, there are just as many highly skilled individuals in the no-code crowd as there are in the pro-code crowd, working in just as many professional careers. So, if there is no real difference between the two, why do those like yourself continue to support, or at least nor object to, the superior ham position of some in this newsgroup and elsewhere? The only possible answer I can see is that you also consider those like yourself to be superior hams.

On the contrary, Dwight. He has claimed in one of my threads that we are nothing more than knuckledraggers who don't understand modern technology. I listed some of the communications equipment I used at work and asked if he could explain the technology (no answer as of yet). Then I post a survey and two additional facts related to CW and he doesn't respond to that one either. For someone who says that we (CW types) are lost in a by-gone era and don't have any concept of modern communications technology, and that he bases all of his decisions on the facts, he doesn't seem to know a lot about modern communications technology or seem to think that facts contrary to his position are valid. That was my point. I'm not going to hold my breath waiting for him to respond -- nor will I accept his "I live by the facts" statement.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5949. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 00:40:29 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bl7v1t$94d9s$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79411

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote ...

Perhaps you think those that know/use Morse are superior to you. I don't ever recall seeing anyone that advocates Morse saying they felt superior. I know I don't feel that way. However I do feel those that don't play on CW are missing a major part of the enjoyment they could get from having a amateur license. But thats their loss not mine. If you thank that is imparting a superior attitude, I say Dwight that you have the problem, not us.

I feel exactly the same way, Dan. I promote CW, and will continue to do so, but have never said or even implied that it made me a superior Ham. I *do* think it makes one a more well-rounded ham. But that is not the same thing.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5950. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 00:41:51 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0309281641.56e3cbbb@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79412

"Pat St. Jean" <stjeanp@pat-st-jean.com> wrote

>
> Sounds good to me. Your proposal was a lot more intelligently written
> than mine.
>

Thanks! Hopefully the thrust of it is 'catchy' enough that FCC gives
it some considerations.

73, de Hans, K0HB

5951. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 00:42:39 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bl7v5u$8v10u$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79413

"Clint" wrote ...

I believe that making references and using analogies that you guys are the adults and new, entry level hams are children pretty much describes a superior if not condescending attitude.

That's a pretty big brush you've got there, Clint. Please reference *any* post I've made where I said, or implied that I consider no-code hams as children. I'll wait here.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5952. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 00:46:55 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bl7vdu$97m04$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79416

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote ...

I'll tell you this Arnie. CW is far from dead. I played on CW ALL weekend. Some in the Alabama and Texas Qso parties. And then most of the day today on the Classic Exchange. It was, as they say, wall to wall. I guess what Im saying, and trying to be polite to the detractors (dummies to lazy to learn Morse code) is don't confuse them with the facts, the are to stupid to learn....and like I always like to say. Ya just cain't fix stupid.

I find it interesting, that when I present a set of facts that is contrary to the NCTA position, Clint decides that I'm not worth responding to. This after he says that he bases all of his decisions on the facts. You and I (and a lot of NCTA folks) know that CW is far from dead -- the numbers say just the opposite. But, I guess once you've dug yourself a hole, it can be hard to get out of sometimes.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5953. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 00:53:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928205330.07860.00000349@mb-m05.aol.com>
Source record: 79417

>Thanks! Hopefully the thrust of it is 'catchy' enough that FCC gives
>it some considerations.
>
>73, de Hans, K0HB
>

Look folks its simple, you can put all the comments in you like, it all comes down to one thing, money talks and BS walks, get on your walking shoes.

5954. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 01:00:08 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <suLdb.573$Vb3.454038@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79418

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bl5qlhbgj0@208.206.142.82...
>
>>YOU CAN EMAIL MISS ABERNATHY AT THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS AND I URGE EVERYONE
>
> TO
>
>>DO SO.
>>
>>kabernat@fcc.gov <kabernat@fcc.gov>
>
>
> I would advise against a mass-mailing campaign to the Commissioner's
> direct e-mail address.
>
> The last time the FCC Commissioners got "mail-bombed" by hams
> all it did was PO them.
>
> They have staff and a comment/reply comment process ... which
> have been used and will continue to be used.
>
> ARRL has done an EXCELLENT job on their technical materials
> and the video is a very compelling demonstration of just how bad
> the interference really is.
>
> We are just at the "Notice of Inquiry" stage now ... please don't
> flame the FCC (and particularly the Commissioners) ... that will
> just cause more harm than good.
>
> I believe that NTIA will come down hard on our side on this.
> The US Govt agencies that they represent have a LOT of HF
> channels that they use and will want to protect ...

Agreed, Carl. I suspect that by the end of this sad tale, many amateurs will think much better of the NTIA. Rather than mass emails, right now an interesting and very good experiment might be to do a little HF direction finding.Trace the "mystery signals" to their source. Write it up in a reasonably good fashion, and it might make for some more damning evidence against BPL.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5955. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 01:15:12 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <AILdb.8215$yp6.213090@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79419
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Ryan,

That effort is already in the works ... NTIA is making their own measurements in BPL pilot areas ... I don't believe that they can help but come to the same conclusions as Ed Hare and I have as to the level of interference in the Emmaus, PA pilot area (Ed has visited other areas, I happen to live near the Emmaus pilot area).

We are not alone in the battle. (Thank God!)

Carl - wk3c

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message news:bl6edl$8hejv$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> (not responding directly to this post but in general)
>
> I was thinking recently about this whole BPL thing, and was thinking that if
> it is going to affect the amateur bands, that logically it would affect
> other services such as public safety, governmental, and possibly even
> military and aviation frequency allocations as well.
>
> My thinking is, if my logic in the above paragraph is indeed true, then
> wouldn't educating and getting those groups to lobby against BPL be more
> effective rather than just us as a group collective?? Seems to me that
> those organizations would have more effective "pull" with the FCC than we
> would.
>
> Am I wrong in this thinking or ???
>
>
> --
> Ryan, KC8PMX
> FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
> --. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
> .. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
>
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:vKJcb.11615$ai7.3054@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > Well Dick, apparantly no one else cares. I don't know of any of the
> > aformentioned groups making comments. Do you? Maybe they have no concept

> > of what will happen. Sorta like the FCC having no concept of what will
> > happen either.
> >
> > Dan/W4NTI
> >
> > "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> > news:bktfft$71a$0@208.206.142.103...
> > >
> > > It won't be just hams and other minor users of spectrum below 80
mHz
> > > who will be very seriously impacted by BPL. There are several states
> > > whose statewice Public Service - State Police FM radio communications
> > > systems are located on Low Band VHF, in the 40-50 mHz region. These
> > > include California Highway Patrol and Missouri Highway Patrol, and at
> > > least a few other state public safety and forestry organizations, as
> > > well as many private users.
> > > From personal knowledge of conditions drawn from many years of
> > > personal involvment with these systems I am certain they cannot
co-exist
> > > with BPL.
> > >
> > > I know they would all jump at the chance to move up to a trunked
UHF
> > > or higher system, but with all the state governmental budget woes
that
> > > won't be possible anytime soon.
> > > One can only wonder what FCC is thinking here.
> > > BPL is basically a noise generator that is attractive because it
> > > "wires the world" in the eyes of those for whom that end is
> > > the most important feature of advancing technology. Unfamiliar with
> > > the workings of radio or technology itself, they have eagerly latched
> > > onto the totally inaccurate and selfserving assertions of BPL
> proponants.
> > >
> > > As I said in my comments to the NPRM, there are much better ways to
> > > acoomplish the same end without completely ruining the HF spectrum.
> > >
> > > Dick
> > >
> > >
> > > opcom wrote:
> > >
> > > > This was posted to ARLI, I don't know how many subscribe, but in
spite
> > of the numerous comments against BPL (transmitting wideband internet
data
> > over power lines, which will destroy the HF radio spectrum), the FCC
seems
> > disposed
> > > > to encourage it anyway. evil! evil! just look up BPL on the web. The

> > noise from the radiated signals trashed the ham bands thoroughly.
> > > >
> > > > ----------
> > > >
> > > > From:
> > > > Amateur Radio Station N0JAA <N0JAA@aol.com>
> > > > 4:00 PM
> > > >
> > > > Subject:
> > > > [ARLI] FCC Commissioner's Comments Concerning BPL
> > > > To:
> > > > bvarc@clarc.org, clarc@clarc.org, ARLI@topica.com
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > The following is a transcript from a recent speech given by FCC
> > Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy at the United PowerLine
> > > > Council's annual conference regarding BPL. It seems that she is all
> for
> > it. It also seems that BPL is going to become a reality, regardless
> > > > of what ARRL, the military, or anyone else says. As usual, big
> industry
> > wins over everyone else because they have the money.
> > > >
> > > > This is from today's FCC Digest.
> > > >
> > > > Paul, N0JAA
> > > >
> > > > ----------
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Reaching Broadband Nirvana
> > > > United PowerLine Council Annual Conference Remarks of Commissioner
> > Kathleen Q. Abernathy
> > > > September 22, 2003 (As prepared for delivery)
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > Thank you very much for inviting me to speak with you. I am very
> excited
> > about broadband-over-powerline technology. I
> > > > have seen it in action, and I believe it has a very bright future.
It
> is
> > a real honor to be your keynote speaker at this
> > > > important juncture for BPL.
> > > >
> > > > As a regulator, I am keenly interested in BPL technology for a
number
> of

> > reasons. One of my central objectives as an FCC commissioner is to
> > facilitate the deployment of broadband services to all Americans. I also
> > fundamentally
> > > > believe that the FCC can best promote consumer welfare by relying
on
> > market forces, rather than heavy-handed regulation. The development of
> BPL
> > networks will serve both of these key goals. It will not only bring
> > broadband to
> > > > previously unserved communities, but the introduction of a new
> broadband
> > pipeline into the home will foster the kind of competitive marketplace
> that
> > will eventually enable the Commission to let go of the regulatory reins.
I
> > > > want consumers to have a choice of multiple, facilities-based
> > providers, including not only cable and DSL, but also powerline,
> wireless,
> > and satellite services. Such a robustly competitive and diversified
> > marketplace is
> > > > something I would call broadband Nirvana. We will not get there
> > overnight, but the continuing development of BPL technology is a major
> step
> > forward.
> > > >
> > > > While the long-term objective is a robustly competitive marketplace
> that
> > is free of regulatory distortions, a more immediate question is: What
> > should the FCC do to help foster such an environment? Sticking with my
> > Nirvana
> > > > metaphor, I guess the question would be, what is the path to
> > enlightenment?
> > > >
> > > > I believe the answer, in short, is regulatory restraint. It is
> tempting
> > for regulators to take every new technology or service that comes along
> and
> > apply the same rules that govern incumbent services. After all,
regulatory
> > > > parity and a level playing field are intuitively appealing
concepts.
> > But I believe that it would be a huge mistake to carry forward legacy
> > regulations whenever new technology platforms are established. Many of
our
> > regulations
> > > > are premised on the absence of competition, and when that rationale
> is
> > eroded, we must not reflexively hold on to regulations that no longer
> serve
> > their intended purpose. In fact, many of our old rules not only become

> > > > unnecessary as markets evolve, but they can be fatal to new services
> > that need room to breathe.
> > > >
> > > > The Nascent Services Doctrine applying more stringent regulations to
> > wireline providers at a minimum must be reconsidered. As other
platforms,
> > including BPL and wireless, become more widely available, that will
> further
> > > > undermine the justification for regulating incumbent LECs broadband
> > services as if they were the only available offerings. When the
Commission
> > completes this rulemaking, I expect that we will eliminate many
existing
> > rules and
> > > > substantially modify others; the central question is the degree of
> > regulation that will remain during the transition to a more robustly
> > competitive market.
> > > >
> > > > Finally, it is important to recognize that although the emergence of
> new
> > platforms like BPL will eliminate the need for many competition-related
> > regulations, other types of regulation may well remain necessary. For
> > example, the
> > > > FCC must implement public policy goals unrelated to competition, or
> > even at odds with competition. Universal service and access for persons
> > with disabilities are examples of this kind of regulation. These public
> > policy goals
> > > > generally should be applied to all service providers, to the extent
> > permitted by the Communications Act. The FCC also must intervene to
> prevent
> > competitors from imposing externalities on one another and to protect
> > consumers
> > > > where market failures are identified. Although, as I have noted,
the
> > Commission was right to refrain from imposing heavy-handed price and
> > service-quality regulations on PCS services when the were introduced, it
> was
> > also right
> > > > to adopt strict interference rules to prevent competitors from
> > externalizing their costs. The same principle will apply to BPL. They
> key
> > point is that, while some degree of regulation is both inevitable and
> > desirable, we
> > > > should ensure that it is narrowly tailored to the particular
> > governmental interests at stake. I appreciate the opportunity to share
> > these thoughts with you, and I would be happy to answer a few questions
if
> > we have time.
> > > >
> > > >

> > > > ******------****** please click on one or
more
> > of the links below to send a blank subscribe message.
> > > > Amateur Radio Legal Issues List
> > > > (A list for discussing legal and legislative issues impacting
Amateur
> > Radio from Congress and the FCC)
> > > > What have you done for Amateur Radio today?
> > > > --^^----------
> > >
> >
> >
>
>

5956. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 01:20:00 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <4NLdb.582$Vb3.461215@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79420

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote:
>
>>Oh Really? I brought up a very factual survey along
>>with two other facts concerning CW and you refused
>>to respond (other than to say you wouldn't respond)
>>I asked you in another thread to explain a little bit about
>>some of the new technology that you say you know so
>>well (and we CW'ers don't). I'm *still* waiting for an
>>answer on that one. (snip)
>
>
>
> Let's turn that around at little, Arnie. I haven't seen Clint going around
> claiming to be superior.

No, he isn't. But that's about all the positive things I can say about
him. But I don't think he is exactly a shining example of a NCTA -
unless you agree with the pejoratives he like to call us.

Unless you happen to agree with them, of course. You don't think we're
N***'s do you???

So in the end, he bears a striking resemblance to some of the more
passionate CW'philes. Just a different side

Instead, it is those in your circle claiming to be
> the superior hams. Other than code, what skills or knowledge of technology
> can be found in the pro-code crowd that cannot be found among the no-code
> crowd? From what I've seen, there are just as many highly skilled
> individuals in the no-code crowd as there are in the pro-code crowd, working
> in just as many professional careers. So, if there is no real difference
> between the two, why do those like yourself continue to support, or at least
> nor object to, the superior ham position of some in this newsgroup and
> elsewhere? The only possible answer I can see is that you also consider
> those like yourself to be superior hams.

Do you really think so, Dwight? I would have to say that in principle
that the more knowledge a ham has, the more likely he or she will be a
superoir ham, but that goes for the whole spectrum of what we want a ham
to know, not just the Morse/CW part.

I have in the past objected to some of the more vitriolic posts by some
pro-coders.

I think you paint with too broad a brush.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5957. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 01:36:30 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <y0Mdb.8216$yp6.213358@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79421

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:suLdb.573$Vb3.454038@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > >
> > > I would advise against a mass-mailing campaign to the Commissioner's
> > > direct e-mail address.
> > >
> > > The last time the FCC Commissioners got "mail-bombed" by hams
> > > all it did was PO them.
> > >
> > > They have staff and a comment/reply comment process ... which
> > > have been used and will continue to be used.
> > >
> > > ARRL has done an EXCELLENT job on their technical materials
> > > and the video is a very compelling demonstration of just how bad
> > > the interference really is.
> > >
> > > We are just at the "Notice of Inquiry" stage now ... please don't
> > > flame the FCC (and particularly the Commissioners) ... that will
> > > just cause more harm than good.
> > >
> > > I believe that NTIA will come down hard on our side on this.
> > > The US Govt agencies that they represent have a LOT of HF
> > > channels that they use and will want to protect ...
>
> Agreed, Carl. I suspect that by the end of this sad tale, many amateurs
> will think much better of the NTIA. Rather than mass emails, right now
> an interesting and very good experiment might be to do a little HF
> direction finding.Trace the "mystery signals" to their source. Write it
> up in a reasonably good fashion, and it might make for some more damning
> evidence against BPL.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Mike,

You don't have to DF ... you can clearly tell just by listening when
you're approaching, in, and leaving the BPL area ... and you can
see the couplers they use to get the signal around the transformers.

Carl - wk3c

5958. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 01:36:53 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <V0Mdb.4794$Hd6.2654366@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79424

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bl7v5u$8v10u$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Clint" wrote ...
>
> I believe that making references and using analogies that you guys are
the
> adults and new, entry level hams are children pretty much describes a
> superior if not condescending attitude.
> ----------
>
> That's a pretty big brush you've got there, Clint. Please reference *any*
> post I've made where I said, or implied that I consider no-code hams as
> children. I'll wait here.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST

I suspect that Clint was actually referring indirectly to some of my posts as I have used the parent/child analogy and student/teacher analogy. However he likes to take this as meaning a superior and/or condescending attitude. He fails to be willing to admit that the less experienced should take the advice of the more experienced while they develop sufficient background to make informed choices. He has obviously missed my posts where I have clearly said that if I were interested in satellite work, I would go consult the most experienced satellite operator in our local club, who happens in this case to be a Technician. I am more than willing to respect his expertise. I would willingly, in this area, be the "child" or "student" in learning this activity. If I doubted what he told me about satellite work, I would first wait until I had equal experience before challenging his experience.

However, Clint wants to challenge the issue from a point of inexperience and feels that he should be taken seriously.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

5959. BPL and the New World Order

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 01:40:01 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <7e1ae8b670242db6e1961fab31a93bec@dizum.com>
Source record: 79425
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
Hash: SHA1

The debate on BPL has raised a lot of important issues, and has
also generated a lot of comments by Internauts both with and without
ham licenses. Here's my opinion, FWIW.

It's not so simple as writing a check, but the FCC *is* being
manipulated by very powerful interests, and they're in a hurry. Not
only are they powerful because they have immense wealth, but they're
all the more powerful because they know that "Shrub" has presented
them an opportunity which won't come again in their life, and they are
determined to take every advantage of it in the short time left before
their pet goes back to his animal farm.

Bear with me for a moment: I'm moved to step back and take a look from
a wider view -

The most important thing that the Bush administration brought to
Washington is the belief, now widely held in the corporate boardrooms,
that rich people are entitled to enjoy robbing those less ruthless or
lucky. Lobbyists for both liberal and conservative causes have
complained bitterly about the arrogance and greed that the Republican
administration has allowed to fester inside the beltway: there is no
longer even the appearance of democracy, and it's starting to strain
the credulity of even so staunch a GOP stronghold as the religious
right.

- From Reagan's somnambulance, through the elder Bush's first term, and
continuing with the "Right Wing Revival" during the Clinton
administration, up to our current economic mess, the Republican Party

has been courting those with money by placing a rose between its teeth and a pistol in its pocket. The elder Bush and Newt Gingrich were, and their heirs are now, brazen and unashamed pimps for the idea that those that have shall get, and those that don't shall get screwed.

No sooner had they gained power in the House, then the GOP started to undo (and in a way that was very hard to reverse) every law, program, entitlement, and court decision which gave ordinary people a chance of living with a (little) dignity.

By the way, Newt wasn't just talking about the New Deal when he said "The great social experiment has failed" - he was talking about undoing centuries of progress, not just decades. The fact that his personal life was too personal for the spinmeisters to hide hasn't dimmed his enthusiasm for the good 'ol days: the theme of his book "Gettysburg", an fictional alternative-history of the battle, reveals an attitude that even Publishers Weekly commented on -

"The authors show thorough knowledge of the people, weapons, tactics and ambience of the Civil War, though their portrayals of historical figures like Lee, Meade, James Longstreet and Richard Ewell betray a certain bias (the Confederate men are noble and wise, the Union leaders hot-tempered and vindictive)."

In the "new" Republican view, it's not enough to move your business' assets overseas, or to "outsource" your back office tasks to third-world countries. It's not enough to (once again) utilize the dark-skinned to provide a lifestyle Nero would envy: the Old Elite feels it must squeeze the middle class until everyone with less than $1,000,000 of ready cash is living on rented land in a rented tent, owning nothing but a TV set so that The Massa can tell them how to vote.

But I digress: lets stop looking at the forest and go back to pecking at the BPL tree -

Frankly, if I was one of the old white men who run America, I'd be

hard-pressed to find a downside in BPL. Consider:

1. The Air Traffic Control radio system has needed a major overhaul for decades, and BPL will provide the FAA with a perfect reason to spend Billions to trade-in every navigational aid and radio in the country, because BPL operates on some of the same frequencies and will rendor most of the others unusable. Of course, the planes will have to upgrade as well, but airplane owners, as a class, have plenty of spare cash, and the fact that every other country and every other airline in the world will be forced to go along is just one of those "intangible benefits" that those with a certain lifestyle expect.

By the way, there will be a few dead, burnt bodies lying around while the FAA sells its new system to the Congress, but even that smell can't overpower the ordure of the Potomac at low tide, so you'd better get used to riding in the back of the airbus, paying more for tickets and maybe even thinking of flight insurance as a sensible precaution.

2. The power companies, made stodgy and unprofitable by such quant words as "service" and "obligation" and "customer", will enjoy a dramatic influx of badly-needed cash, which will arrive just in time to save them from having to admit their mistakes, reengineer their transmission systems, or (most importantly) actually work at alternative and/or renewable energy sources.

3. If they design the system well, BPL will enjoy a wealth of new options that even cable moguls don't have: a priceless data coral, with well-penned users whose choices will be limited to those favored by like-thinking men of means: every click will be tracked, every purchase planned, and every complaint laughed off. There won't be any "spam", since there won't be any advertising allowed into the system that the upper crust didn't choose to allow, and those whom exhibit anti-American sentiments or

question the wisdom of Those In Charge [tm] will soon find that everything they ever put into an email is available to their boss in an electronic blacklist.

Of course, any slander or complaints about these common-sense capitalist perquisites would be nipped in the bud, and the system will Protect Our Children [tm] by guiding their tiny minds into well-mapped impressions of the hard, hard life that the rich must suffer in order to provide the servants with the benefits we should be grateful we're able to beg for.

BPL is, as its advocates have explained, needed to counterbalance the critical shortage of war movies and of Father Knows Best reruns: it will put those airwaves that have been wasted on other nations' viewpoints and a few hobbyists' toys to more productive use. Your Betters have said so, and now if you're a Right-Thinking American, you will stop whining.

James Penn

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
Version: GnuPG v1.0.7 (GNU/Linux)

iD8DBQE/d4LrRqMr0Iv3YZURAtVIAJ0aCNGbIMeuQ5pxzzTEjRPZIByJOgCeIYwX
oF2xbszlP82532Ib0BoGVx4=
=zkRh
-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

5960. Re: BPL and NCI

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 01:42:38 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <i6Mdb.83581$xx4.9891210@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 79422

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030928160144.01755.00000340@mb-m10.aol.com...
> Amazing, NCI supposedly has all these Techno Whizzards just waiting to get
on
> HF whenever the Code goes away.
> I would think that all those Techno Whizzards would have a way all ready
set
> up to be able to deal with BPL.
> Come on Karl, get your Techno Gurus working on solving this problem so we
can
> all share HF. Karl this would be an easy way to prove the No-Code Techs
are
> worthy of HF.

Yeah, where are you and your minions at Capt. Carl?

5961. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 01:46:00 UTC
From: shephed <smokey@twist1up.com>
Message-ID: <s9Mdb.83648$xx4.9894706@twister.neo.rr.com>
Source record: 79423

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030927204249.27009.00000339@mb-m11.aol.com...
> >Also, I will be lobbying FCC OET and the Commissioners in the
> >coming weeks against BPL ... and I've been out in the Emmaus, PA
> >BPL "pilot" area with local reporters SHOWING them just how bad
> >BPL really is (after showing them what S0-S9 signals sound like on
> >a quiet band away from the BPL area so that when they see/hear the
> >"wall to wall" S9+ "hash" from BPL they understand just how bad
> >it really is.
> >
> >So don't give me this "sock-puppet for the broadband cartel" crap.
> >
> >Carl - wk3c
> >
>
> Well there it is folks, Karl the Nut is going to save Ham Radio. Just
think
> Karl is going to put these Billion dollar companies in there place. Lets
all
> bow to Karl the Nut for saving Ham Radio.

The only reason Capt. Carl is "lobbying" is for his loyal Freeband minions.

5962. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 01:50:25 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030928215025.24475.00000229@mb-m21.aol.com>
Source record: 79426

>The only reason Capt. Carl is "lobbying" is for his loyal Freeband minions.
>

Capt Karl just hates to see his CBplussers loose out. He knows his constant complaining to the FCC has let them sneak this end. While Karl and his CBplusser Buddies, have been diverting the attention to giving all his CBplussers buddies a FREE RIDE.
I think what really makes Karl upset is the fact that he now knows he has been used by the FCC. The FCC played Karl like a fiddle.
Come on BPL let me be the first customer.
THANK GOD FOR BPL.. How about us starting a "No-Code BPL Group"?

5963. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 02:18:44 UTC
From: Brian <brian@nospam.net>
Message-ID: <3F779682.51288813@nospam.net>
Source record: 79427
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

Superior intelligence at work is using my newsgroup filters.

Peter wrote:

> In rec.radio.amateur.dx Ryan, KC8PMX <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote:
> > (not responding directly to this post but in general)
>
> And yet you quote 400 lines of useless unintelligible garbage.
>
> Superior intelligence at work.
>
> Peter Lemken
> DF5JT
> Berlin
>

5964. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 02:21:50 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030928222150.08626.00000926@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 79429

In article <L6Bdb.32723$ai7.16590@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>
>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>>
>> The Morse/CW mode is the only mode which requires
>> the operator to acquire a physical psychomotor skill
>> in order to utilize that mode. Therefore, it makes sense
>> to test for a prospective operator's ability to receive
>> Morse code at some level, (snip)
>
>
> You didn't answer the question, Larry. I asked why why there should be an
>effort on the part of the ARS or FCC to promote (boost, encourage, or push)
>this single operating mode (CW) and you responded with garbage about
>"physical psychomotor skill." One has absolutely nothing to do with the
>other. There are skills needed to operate every mode, but those skills are
>self-taught. That is not the case with Morse code.

Dwight:

Bingo. You finally stumbled on the truth. To be able to effectively employ the Morse/CW mode, prospective amateurs need to learn and gain reasonable proficiency in what is, for most, an unintuitive communications skill which requires a fairly challenging learning experience. The simple fact is that most prospective hams, like myself at one time, can't be bothered to undergo this learning experience, and find it easier to attempt to do away with the requirement instead.

>When I pointed that out,
>you talked about an incentive to use CW (incentive by the ARS and FCC). At
>that point, I asked you why there should be an effort on the part of the ARS
>or FCC to promote this single operating mode. You brought this subject up,
>so please do answer the question - why should there be an effort on the part
>of the ARS or FCC to promote (boost, encourage, or push) this single
>operating mode (CW)?

In order to retain the ability of radio amateurs to USE this single operating mode, as already (repeatedly) explained.

>> The above is a non-sequitur, since there is no need for use
>> of the Morse/CW mode to "help keep the ARS abreast of
>> modern technology...". Your statement is illogical and
>> assumes facts not in evidence re: the negative effect of
>> Morse/CW use on the development of other communications

>> technologies within the ARS.

> If you're going to argue that Morse/CW has no negative effect on the
>efforts to help keep the ARS abreast of modern technology ("one of the
>NCTA's more famous but totally worthless "red herring" arguments," you
>said), it was not unreasonable for me to ask if CW has a positive effect on
>the efforts to help keep the ARS abreast of modern technology.

It is a well-known fact that some of the simplest homebuilding/kitbuilding
projects available to radio amateurs are CW transmitters. As I can relate
from personal experience, building something that actually works and
gives one the ability to communicate on-the-air is a very motivating
learning experience, which usually leads to more advanced technical
involvement. Moreover, in a lot of the more uncommon modes used
by radio amateurs (EME, for instance), the Morse/CW mode is usually
the only type of modulation that works with any kind of useful reliability.
The value of Morse/CW is well-known to QRP enthusiasts, of course.

>You've
>answered my question (CW is irrelevant in that regard), so we can now move
>on.

I never said that, Dwight -- that's just your own self-serving "spin." And,
in the usual Usenet pattern, you lie, you lose.

Feel free to try again if and when you can get it right.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5965. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 02:21:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030928222152.08626.00000928@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 79428

In article <QYIdb.36009$ai7.4923@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>> Except that what Larry does is far from debate. Larry whines.
>
>
> No, Larry nags. Hes' like a nagging mother trying to convince an adult
>child to do what she says, just "because I say so."

Dwight:

I don't whine or nag. I have a strong belief in my position re: code testing, and I am able to state it with clarity, passion, and conviction. You, Kim, and most of the NCTA appear to be limited to name-calling -- in addition to "whining" about well-spoken PCTA's such as myself. I believe you're long overdue for an examination of conscience.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5966. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 02:21:52 UTC
From: yodoc@aol.comnospam
Message-ID: <20030928222152.08626.00000927@mb-m27.aol.com>
Source record: 79430

In article <Z5Cdb.33381$ai7.31820@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>> You've spent the last couple of weeks attempting to re-
>> attach some kind of significance to the fact that "other"
>> radio services no longer "use code" (snip)

> I did that in the very message you replied to (quoted above). You're
>point is? As you see, I talked about both the past and present code use by
>other radio services and any relevance of that to the ARS. You tried to
>twist the focus only to the present, ignoring anything about the past .

Dwight:

This is quite entertaining. Here we have a card-carrying member of the NCTA, a group which has spent the last dozen years or so blaming us ever so politically incorrect PCTA's of keeping the ARS securely locked up in the "past," and now you're trying to make the "past" code use of non-amateur radio services somehow relevant to the present-day issue of continued code testing. Having memory problems?

>Of
>course, since both are relevant, it would be inaccurate to talk about one
>(present code use) without the other (past code use).

One of the leading arguments *against* code testing throughout this debate has always been that the use of (Morse) code has been deemed to be irrelevant in non-amateur radio services. Now, all of a sudden, Dwight Stewart ups and declares that just the opposite is true. Talk about your neck-snapping turns of events…

>Not willing to
>participate in such a discussion, I asked to to widen your focus to include
>all of the relevant facts.

I have given the "relevant facts" ad nauseum. I suggest you stop wasting my time and start Google-ing.

>You refused to do so, repeating your question
>solely about the present. It was at that point, and only at that point, the
>discussion fell apart.

The discussion fell apart because YOU had nothing new to offer; now you're trying to place the blame on me. Classic NCTA pattern.

>Again, I'm more than willing to continue the
>discussion, but only if it is an honest discussion with all facts
>considered. However, if you want to twist facts, you can do so on your own.

I haven't twisted a damn thing, Dwight, and you know it.

73 de Larry, K3LT

5967. Re: BPL and the New World Order

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 02:48:53 UTC
From: Frank Dresser <analogdial@worldnet.att.net>
Message-ID: <p4Ndb.156980$0v4.11762396@bgtnsc04-news.ops.worldnet.att.net>
Source record: 79431
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

"Nomen Nescio" <nobody@dizum.com> wrote in message
news:7e1ae8b670242db6e1961fab31a93bec@dizum.com...
>

Oh. Who says this BPL plan works reliably? The same people who say it
doesn't cause alot of radio interference.

What a great scheme for the next high tech bubble.

Frank Dresser

5968. Re: BPL and the New World Order

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 03:08:07 UTC
From: Jim Hampton <aa2qa@frontiernet.net>
Message-ID: <rmNdb.3029$FS2.1296@news01.roc.ny>
Source record: 79432
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

Well, someone has some guts to speak their mind. The Republicans in New York State took Gerrymandering to a new high, connecting Buffalo and Rochester with a tiny path and creating a new congressional district. What happens when the large corporate broadcasters discover that BPL does interfere with broadcasting? Big Buck$, meet Big Buck$.

73 from Rochester, NY
Jim AA2QA

Outgoing mail is certified Virus Free.
Checked by AVG anti-virus system (http://www.grisoft.com).
Version: 6.0.521 / Virus Database: 319 - Release Date: 9/23/03

5969. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 03:09:24 UTC
From: Arnie Macy <kt4stnospam@csam.net>
Message-ID: <bl87p4$995ed$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79433

"Carl R. Stevenson" wrote in part ...

I would advise against a mass-mailing campaign to the Commissioner's direct e-mail address. The last time the FCC Commissioners got "mail-bombed" by hams all it did was PO them.

I agree with Carl on this one. BPL is *the* major threat to Ham radio today. If we don't stick together on this one (and I mean *all* of us) we will *all* go down together. Do NOT send e-mails to the FCC at this time. Our time will come, but it is *not* now.

Arnie -
KT4ST

5970. Re: BPL and the New World Order

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 03:25:57 UTC
From: David Stinson <arc5@ix.netcom.com>
Message-ID: <3F77A5E8.117A432D@ix.netcom.com>
Source record: 79434
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

Nomen Nescio wrote:
>
<propaganda snipped>

You know, if I want to read Democratic Party propaganda and
hate-filled fairy tales, I can grab the New York Times or
Washington Post. Take your "opinions" and scatter them
on the nearest garden; that sort of "stuff" is good
for growing things.
D.S.

5971. Re: No good threads

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 03:44:14 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309281944.4a7c73a8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79435

Radioman <radio@ptt.edu> wrote in message news:<3F775FF6.6014D194@ptt.edu>...
> The only new thread was from the troll WA8ULX, so I hit
> SHIFT-C and marked ALL the messages as READ.
>
> Can someone post a good thread worth reading?

I hear the Red Chinese are very good at selecting what they think
people should or should not read.

Otherwise exercise the freedom's provided for you and do it
yourself.

Steve, K4YZ

5972. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 03:54:05 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <x1Odb.30445$pP6.16192@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79436

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> I don't whine or nag. I have a strong belief in my
> position re: code testing, and I am able to state it
> with clarity, passion, and conviction. (snip)

No, more like stated with BS and fanatism.

> (snip) well-spoken PCTA's such as myself. (snip)

LOL. Well, you certainly do have plenty of today's self-esteam. Have you ever thought about teaching school?

> I believe you're long overdue for an examination of
> conscience.

At least I have a conscience to examine. Your examination will have to be limited solely to the code license test.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5973. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 04:27:24 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <MwOdb.30556$pP6.2670@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79437

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> To be able to effectively employ the Morse/CW mode,
> prospective amateurs need to learn and gain reasonable
> proficiency in what is, for most, an unintuitive
> communications skill which requires a fairly challenging
> learning experience. (snip)

A learning experience that can be accomplished without a license exam (Boy Scouts routinely did it), therefore not an argument supporting a code testing requirement.

> In order to retain the ability of radio amateurs to USE this
> single operating mode, as already (repeatedly) explained.

You still haven't answered the question, Larry. I asked why there should be an effort on the part of the ARS or FCC to encourage (boost, promote, or push) this single operating mode (CW)? Or, to put it another way (and use your own words), why should the ARS or FCC make an attempt to "retain the ability of radio amateurs to USE this single operating mode?" Again, this operating mode offers nothing today beyond simple recreation. So I guess another point might be to ask why the ARS or FCC would require testing of all for a primarily recreational operating mode?

> It is a well-known fact that some of the simplest homebuilding/
> kitbuilding projects available to radio amateurs are CW
> transmitters. As I can relate from personal experience, (snip)

And I can relate from personal experience that electronics can be learned easily without building a CW transmitter. Ramsey alone has more than a dozen radio-related kits worthy of consideration by those seeking electronics skills. So, while building a CW transmitter is certainly worthwhile for those interested in CW, there are other avenues for those not interested in CW (a fact that undermines any association this may appear to have with a code testing requirement).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5974. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 04:43:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <vLOdb.30598$pP6.28916@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79438

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get wrote:
>
> Perhaps you think those that know/use Morse are superior
> to you. I don't ever recall seeing anyone that advocates
> Morse saying they felt superior.
>
> I know I don't feel that way. However I do feel those that
> don't play on CW are missing a major part of the enjoyment
> they could get from having a amateur license. But thats their
> loss not mine.
>
> If you thank that is imparting a superior attitude, I say Dwight
> that you have the problem, not us.

Larry posted this claim of superiority well more than twenty times in this newsgroup alone. He specifically and repeatedly claimed that those with code skills are "superior" to those without. He even used the word "inferior" to describe those without code skills. Throughout it all, none of the pro-code crowd raised a single objection to his position and several openly agreed with it.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5975. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 04:46:11 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <bl8dej$nq5$0@208.206.142.65>
Source record: 79439

Jim Hampton wrote:
> Dick Carroll mentioned that some AM broadcast stations were virtually
> obliterated in Allentown, Pa. In that case, everyone noticing interference
> on broadcast band (AM) stations should complain to the stations involved.
> Believe me, commercial broadcasting (especially since the FCC allowed a few
> powerful groups to buy up most of the broadcast stations) has much deeper
> pockets than amateurs and would likely not hesitate even a moment to bring
> lawyers and Congress into the mess. Don't complain as a ham operator,
> however; complain that you can't hear some particular programs from the
> station due to all of this "interference". Let 'em figure it out :)
>

Here's an article on the BPL issue that appeared in the Allentown PA
newspaper....

http://www.mcall.com/news/local/all-a1_5net-glitchsep28,0,2293904.story?coll

Dick

5976. Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 04:46:27 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309282046.173d226@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79440

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030926142956.01893.00000845@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> In article <20030925212928.14837.00003229@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:

> >How so? Would you rather that nobody replied to your posts?
>
> Not a problem. ALL you PCTAs can whip out the old "killfile" and hide
> heads and eyes in the sand.

Actually it would be more like wiping the sand OUT of our
eyes...You know...that irritating mote that you just can't seem to
wipe away...?!?!

> Makes it easier to comment to the Rest of the Readers.

Ahhhhhhhh....You mean the one's who don't know any better.
Easier to have your way with them, I would imagine.

> >Strong opposition to your opinions seems to really bother you. Correction of
> >your mistakes enrages you.
> >>
> >> Since they can't support their view of retaining the morse code test, they
> >> attack personalities.
> >
> >Who is "they"?
>
> All of the PCTAs in here.

Actually just about everyone who dislikes someone who insists on
forcing his uninformed opinion on them. especially where the person
cannot document any practical experience in that discipline.

> How do you she isn't?

"How do you she isn't?"...Gee, Lennie...One of those typos that
manifest when you are angry that you are always alleging...???

> >Yes, you have, Many of your posts do not contain anything that indicates who
> >you really are.
>
> There YOU are MISTAKEN.

No, he's not.

You have a screen name "Len of 21" that says absolutely nothing
about who you are. Who's Len? "21" of what?

In the last 24 hours alone you have posted several items with
absolutely no signature, nor even your "LHA"

> I've listed my employers in here...(SNIP)

Only one of which involved Amateur Radio, and that one is no
longer in business.

>...and I've given names and callsigns to friends who are radio
amateur >licensees.

And they have WHAT to so with YOUR licensure in Amateur Radio? I
am friends with people who are accomplished surgeons, but would you
want ME to cut on you?

> My bylines in Ham Radio
> magazine carried the same USPS address I have now.

Charles Manson has had the same address for even longer. So
what?

> Since you won't accept any e-mail attachments from me, the only
> recourse for you seems to be a lot of flame war ignition attempts and
> not bother to check anyone out.

Since you have proven yourself as untrustworthy and are a
documented liar, why would ANYone accept anything from you that has
the potential to introduce a virus?

> >In fact, for all anyone really knows, you could be someone else who has
> >appropriated the persona of one Leonard H. Anderson.
>
> Think whatever you imagine.

Obviously it works for you, eh Lennie...???

> I am listed in the Southern California white pages...my postal address
> is not secret...you can hire a private investigator and have my neighbors
> interviewed. No problem. You can also find yourself in a civil court
> or (in some government districts) being investigated for harrassment.
>
> You have enough raw data to ascertain who is who. You don't want
> to. You would rather have your little jollies in here making your
> "opponents" look bad.

You are no one's "opponent", Lennie.

An "opponent" suggests that there is some potential for a
challenge.

The only "challenge" you pose is holding down the laughter to a
muffled roar. Your frequent lies, insinuations, insults and stories
are so easily derailed that the only "challenge" posed anymore is
directing some "newcomer" to review your past performance in this
forum.

> Start with KD6JG. Work on to W6MJN, then N2JTV.

Kinda like the Klan leader who points out he has several
"friends" who "happen to be black".

> Several more know me but there are over 600,000 licensed radio
> amateurs who are NOT in this newsgroup.

None that seem to want to join this forum and acknowledge it, it
seems.

> That's irrelevant to your little "cause" in this message, isn't it?

Again, we ask the question "what does THIER licensure have to do
with YOU"...???

> You want to "run" this newsgroup because you are here so much and
> spend so much time posting.

Whoa...POT/KETTLE/BLACK again, Lennie.

> >I'm not misdirecting. 'vshah101' did not give a name or callsign, even when
> >asked. But you had no problem with him or his anti-amateur remarks.
>
> YOU are MISTAKEN again. ERROR...you bad.
>
> Some individuals in here post against YOUR and PCTA viewpoints.
> That does not make them "anti-amateur."

"...against YOUR and PCTA viewpoints."...?!?!

That should have been "...against YOU and YOUR PCTA viewpoints.",
Lennie. But I guess you were too angry to recognize your faux pas.

> You think of yourself as "representing ALL of US amateur radio" through
> your expressed opinions in here.

You assert you know how Jim thinks. How arrogant.

> You don't. You "represent" only
> opinions and viewpoints of a small group of PCTAs who wish to be the
> elite of the US amateur radio community...one way or another.

And YOU represent...?!?! (Please be ready to provide some
evidence of election or employment as such...)

> You don't "own" US amateur radio and never did, therefore you don't have
> ANY judgement value about who is "anti-amateur" or even "pro-amateur."

With over 25 years of PRACTICAL experience in Amateur Radio, Jim
is far better placed to make an INFORMED opinion as to what may or may
not be "anti" or "pro" Amateur Radio.

So far YOUR experience adds up to a few hours of time spent
drafting articles of dubious originality, and obviously NOT directly
pertaining to PRACTICAL Amateur practice or application.

> >That's a fact, Jack ;-)
>
> Yes, Morrie, what I just wrote IS fact.

It's a fact you wrote it. The rest is dubious.

> >> The SUBJECT line of this thread is "1/4 Wave Dipoles."
> >
> >So? Subject lines never deterred you from going off in other directions.
>
> I posted IN this thread about dipoles. It's in Google if you've not
> saved it to your HD.

Uh huh.

This from a fellow who routinely chastises others about straying
from Amateur Radio related topics in this forum...Kindalike the 250+
line tirade that this was quoted from.

> YOU and some anonymous person want to use any thread as a
> character assassination venue so that you can "get even" for all the
> alleged "wrongs" committed against your radiogod personna.

There's no "character assassination" going on here that YOU don't
provide the basis for, Lennie.

You lie, mislead and antagonize anyone who dares engage you in
this forum.

THAT is a DOCUMENTED fact, Lennie.

> >You sound threatened and angry because someone has noticed your double
> >standard of behavior towards anonymous posters.
>
> Not a problem to me. You MANUFACTURE a situation and try to exploit
> it so that you have an excuse for talking bad about someone who has
> opposite viewpoints to yours.

Uh huh. SURE. Where's "Meghz" when you need him, eh,
Lennie...???

> All you need to do is search Google for a lot of PCTA general harrassment
> such as from the hundreds of postings by "K4YZ" that go un-answered
> because that kind of posting only serves to make the harrasser happy.

The only thing "unanswered" to you, Lennie, is parts of my
service record...non of which is pertinent here, and only serves to
irritate YOU like a wet diaper...!
BWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !!

> >> This whole newsgroup was created to discuss-debate-argue the code
> >> test issue.
> >
> >And other things. You are not the moderator, Len. Much as you want to control
> >how things happen, you're not the boss here. Live with it.

>
> YOU ARE NOT THE MODERATOR EITHER, JIMMIE.
>
> LEARN TO LIVE WITH THAT.

"Shouting" will not make your position any more valid, Lennie.

YOU frequently insist on chastising others for exercising thier
freedom of speech, Lennie, yet are quick to defend YOUR right to
discuss whatever YOU care to discuss when it is pointed out that it is
way off base from ANY Amateur Radio related discussion.

> >> It wasn't created for the sole amusement or daily guru column from
> >> Jimmie Miccolis where he would sit in judgement of all others.
> >
> > It wasn't created for the sole amusement or daily guru column from
> >Leonard H. Anderson where he would sit in judgement of all others.
>
> Are you "threatened" by all those others in here who have opposite
> opinions from yours? Are you feeling "superior" because you espouse
> the standards and practices of US amateur radio of over a half century
> ago? Are you so intimidated by those who have the courage to think
> for themselves AND to speak out?

The wonderous and absolutely transparent fact here is that Jim
routinely acknowledges and engages others CIVILLY who have opinions
that are counter to his.

It is also absolutely transparent that the one who needs to
engage in "character assassination" is you.

> YOU sit in judgement on everyone who does not consider morse code
> testing as necessary. A very consistent judgement, a condemning
> judgement as if you are a holy radio god.

POT/KETTLE/BLACK once again, Lennie...

> That's really a rather common syndrome of the PCTAs. They allow only
> ONE viewpoint...theirs.

Whew...third time is a charm...

> All other viewpoints shall be put down, destroyed, those who voice them
> shall be harrassed, hunted, and so forth until they stop.

You mean like the bullying YOU exert, Lennie...?!?!

Makes four.

> That's a lovely example of dictatorial totalitarianism, the arrogance of the
> squatters who feel they "own" the hobby.

Five.

> That reflects badly on the US amateur radio community when you PCTA
> act that way. You are unable to present counter-arguments to NCTAs so
> you call all their arguments "illogical, mistaken, or plain wrong" and then
> want to harrass, intimidate, and humiliate them.

Six.

> YOU may not think such is "anti-amateur." Someone attacked your Ego
> Turf and you think "anything goes" in "fighting" them.
>
> I'd call that Elitist, Arrogant, and Dictatorial but the Turf Fighters would
> get
> angry again...so I won't call it that.

Good thing you didn't, Lennie...That wudda made seven.

> I wonder what the FCC would call it if anyone there chanced to look in and
> read what the PCTA think, say, and do in here?

Since they have absolutely no jurisdiction in here, who cares?

And by the way...remember this from the front end of this
post...?!?!

> >Yes, you have, Many of your posts do not contain anything that indicates who
> >you really are.
>
> There YOU are MISTAKEN.

This post was itself unsigned. A review of your AOL "profile" of
"Len of 21" only reveals the response "male"...No name...no address,
and certainly no evidence of Amateur Radio licensure or experience.

Dang it Lennie...thanks once again for proving me right. You ARE
your own worst enemy.

Steve, K4YZ

5977. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 04:49:01 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <1ROdb.30614$pP6.5955@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79441

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:
>
> I believe that making references and using analogies
> that you guys are the adults and new, entry level
> hams are children pretty much describes a superior
> if not condescending attitude.

I'm not talking about references or analogies, Clint. I'm talking about Larry's specific use of the word "superior" to describe those with code skills and the word "inferior" to describe those without such skills. Since none of the pro-code crowd objected to his position, I now trying to see how many others share the same opinions.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5978. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 05:20:03 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <7iPdb.30690$pP6.4922@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79442

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
>
> No, he isn't. But that's about all the positive things I
> can say about him. But I don't think he is exactly a
> shining example of a NCTA - unless you agree with
> the pejoratives he like to call us.
>
> Unless you happen to agree with them, of course.
> You don't think we're N***'s do you???

Actually, I didn't even noticed Clint before four or five days ago. If he posted to this newsgroup prior to that, he was just another one of the many doing so. To be honest, I don't read most of the messages here. Unless the subject line catches my eye, I routinely highlight large groups of messages and mark them as read in my newsreader. Once that happens, I rarely see those messages again since my newsreader is set to not list messages I've read (or marked as read). The only way to see them again would be as a result in a newgroup search.

But, to answer your question, I don't agree with the use of pejoratives or uncomplimentary terms to describe anybody. Well, I might make an exception with Larry, but that would be a very rare exception. I strongly believe we have to get past this code debate and move on to more productive matters. Throwing around nasty remarks isn't going to help do that.

> (snip) I would have to say that in principle that the more
> knowledge a ham has, the more likely he or she will be
> a superoir ham, (snip)

Perhaps I'm too liberal for this discussion. I don't agree with the very concept of a superior ham. We're all individuals with unique skills, knowledge, and experience, to bring to the table, none of those superior or inferior to that offered by others.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5979. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 05:46:31 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <XGPdb.30754$pP6.8346@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79443

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>
> This is quite entertaining. Here we have a card-carrying
> member of the NCTA, a group which has spent the last
> dozen years or so blaming us ever so politically incorrect
> PCTA's of keeping the ARS securely locked up in the
> "past," and now you're trying to make the "past" code use
> of non-amateur radio services somehow relevant to the
> present-day issue of continued code testing. Having
> memory problems?

First, other than ARRL, I'm not a card carrying member of any Amateur Radio group. Second, the opinions expressed by others don't apply to me and I certainly don't represent the views of others. So please stop trying to throw me into a group you dislike in an effort to dismiss what I have to say.

> One of the leading arguments *against* code testing
> throughout this debate has always been that the use of
> (Morse) code has been deemed to be irrelevant in non-
>amateur radio services.

Which debate is that, Larry? The debates with me or the debates you've had with others. I've never said anything of the sorts in the debates you and I have had. My position has been consistent throughout those debates.

> I have given the "relevant facts" ad nauseum. (snip)

Nonsense.

> I haven't twisted a damn thing, Dwight, and you know it.

You haven't stop twisting things, Larry - right up to the message where you posted the sentence above.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

5980. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipole

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 12:46:40 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F7829B0.705@psu.edu>
Source record: 79444

Jim Hampton wrote:
> Certainly a half wave dipole is better than a short one, but if you use a
> tuner to make the short one work, you'd best be using ladder line. You have
> no idea how lossy coax will get with a 10 to 1 SWR ratio.

Remember Jim, there are certain lengths that even the tuner won't tune out.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5981. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 12:59:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F782CBE.80603@psu.edu>
Source record: 79445

N2EY wrote:

> Sounds like a threat.

Sure does.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5982. Re: BPL and the New World Order

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 13:41:52 UTC
From: Reg Edwards <g4fgq.regp@btinternet.com>
Message-ID: <bl9cr0ppr1@sparta.btinternet.com>
Source record: 79446
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

Wealth is the means whereby the rich are enabled to rob the poor !

5983. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 14:17:32 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F783EFC.5000201@psu.edu>
Source record: 79448

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message

< some snippage>

>>
>>Agreed, Carl. I suspect that by the end of this sad tale, many amateurs
>>will think much better of the NTIA. Rather than mass emails, right now
>>an interesting and very good experiment might be to do a little HF
>>direction finding.Trace the "mystery signals" to their source. Write it
>>up in a reasonably good fashion, and it might make for some more damning
>>evidence against BPL.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> Mike,
>
> You don't have to DF ... you can clearly tell just by listening when
> you're approaching, in, and leaving the BPL area ... and you can
> see the couplers they use to get the signal around the transformers.

I agree that it wouldn't be a difficult thing to find. I just think that if an amateur or group were to take an approach that didn't start out "I can hear the BPL intereference 60 miles away", it might have more impact.

Something like " On such and such date, a strong interference showed up on such and such bands. As the interference did not do away, a local group of amateurs and myself decided to trace the interference to it's source.

Then an outline of the DF method, and finally decribing the cause after finding it.

The point is that if people can easily trace out the interference from far away, it hammers home that it isn't really a local problem.

- Mike KB3EIA -

5984. Re: BPL and the New World Order

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 14:20:23 UTC
From: Phil <plmills@attglobal.net>
Message-ID: <3f78409f_4@news1.prserv.net>
Source record: 79447
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

What a load of horse crap!

"Reg Edwards" <g4fgq.regp@btinternet.com> wrote in message
news:bl9cr0ppr1@sparta.btinternet.com...
> Wealth is the means whereby the rich are enabled to rob the poor !
>
>

5985. Re: CQ 75 CQ 75 CQ 75

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 14:56:14 UTC
From: Concerned of the Internet <deletethis@ho.com>
Message-ID: <3F784820.AFD@ho.com>
Source record: 79449
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Arendal wrote:
>
> Just one more reason for moderating this group...
>

Hopefully Supernews took care of him after the abuse reports "SOMEONE"
sent to them. Not that it'll stop him but just be irritating to him.

--
"Free flow of information has a price and responsible Internauts"
The Internet under Surveillance a report by Vinton Cerf

5986. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 16:09:35 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0309290809.7235be45@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79450

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote

> ... money talks and BS walks, get on your walking shoes.

Guess that means you need to get on your RUNNING shoes!

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

5987. Re: FCC taking Comments on RM-10787 No Code Elimination

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 16:56:19 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030929125619.06990.00000008@mb-m20.aol.com>
Source record: 79301

>Guess that means you need to get on your RUNNING shoes!
>
>With all kind wishes,
>
>de Hans, K0HB
>

No I have no reason to run.

5988. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 17:02:03 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0309290902.4bb5c4e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79302

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote

> > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
> >
> > > One: no one should be kept out of the ARS--let
> > > them get their license and stand or fail on their merit.
> >
> > You can't really mean that! I do not support continuation of
> > the Morse test, but to suggest that we should just hand out
> > licenses to anyone regardless of demonstrated qualification
> > and let them "stand or fail on their merit" is the silliest
> > notion I have seen here yet.
> > That's like saying "let anyone get their drivers license
> > and stand or fail on their driving record" without having
> > passed a test.
> >
> > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> >
>
> Yeah. What you suggest would be like saying that. But that was not
> suggested and your attempt to stretch it to that is rather unlike you...

But that's exactly what was suggested. Your words, written in a clear
English declarative statement are unambiguous and say "NO ONE should
be kept out of the ARS" --- that's pretty much the same as saying
"NO ONE should be denied a drivers license".

Personally, I think persons who fail the test (or haven't taken a test)
SHOULD be kept out of the ARS.

73, de Hans, K0HB

5989. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 18:23:04 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309291023.3ae7187a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79303

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<6GIdb.35819$ai7.5548@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:
> >
> > You know very well, or you should, that the ARRL send
> > it a very comprehensive report on that subject. Both the
> > initial comments and the latest round.
>
>
> And I applaud them for that effort (that's why I'm a member). However, it
> is one report in a pile of reports submitted by various companies, all
> showing exactly the opposite conclusion.

And they're all demonstrably lying thru their teeth. Ya can drive a
Kenworth thru the holes in their explanations of how BPL "won't hurt
nobody".

> The ARRL didn't give the FCC a
> thing to hang their hat on (a single "ah-ha" that proves those other reports
> wrong). Instead, it simply contradicts them.

The ARRL submission is the *only* by-the-numbers engineering study on
record so far and it has the BPL proponents in a royal snit. They're
not brushing it off by any means, they're vigorously attacking it,
they know they have a battle on their hands so don't underestimate the
ARRL's ability to be a spoiler far out of proportion to it's political
and/or financial clout. David did take out Goliath, etc. Technical
submissions are not over either, the NTIA is gonna weigh in eventually
which could very well be the slam dunk BPL killer.

> > If you want to change the thinking at the FCC. Then writting
> > your congressman is the ONLY way to do it. Since the
> > congress controls their purse strings.
>
>
> Oh, I just wish it was that simple.
>
>
> > The only other alternative would be to take it to court. Make
> > use of the green peace bunch to sue for the destruction of a
> > natural resource, the HF spectrum. etc.. Any port in a storm.
>
>
> A resource controlled by the federal government, which means very few
> courts would likely to step in.

>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

w3rv

5990. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 20:49:01 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <1V0eb.35284$pP6.10821@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79304

```
"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vnetl6jorujta6@corp.supernews.com...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
> news:hoKdb.36520$ai7.19673@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> >
> > "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> > news:F3Kdb.36397$ai7.11368@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> > > "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote:
> > > >
> > > > Oh Really? I brought up a very factual survey along
> > > > with two other facts concerning CW and you refused
> > > > to respond (other than to say you wouldn't respond)
> > > > I asked you in another thread to explain a little bit about
> > > > some of the new technology that you say you know so
> > > > well (and we CW'ers don't). I'm *still* waiting for an
> > > > answer on that one. (snip)
> > > >
> > > >
> > > Let's turn that around at little, Arnie. I haven't seen Clint going
> > around
> > > claiming to be superior. Instead, it is those in your circle claiming
to
> > be
> > > the superior hams. Other than code, what skills or knowledge of
> technology
> > > can be found in the pro-code crowd that cannot be found among the
> no-code
> > > crowd? From what I've seen, there are just as many highly skilled
> > > individuals in the no-code crowd as there are in the pro-code crowd,
> > working
> > > in just as many professional careers. So, if there is no real
difference
> > > between the two, why do those like yourself continue to support, or at
> > least
> > > nor object to, the superior ham position of some in this newsgroup and
> > > elsewhere? The only possible answer I can see is that you also
consider
> > > those like yourself to be superior hams.
> > >
> > >
> > > Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
> > >
> > > http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
> > >
```

> > >
> >
> > Perhaps you think those that know/use Morse are superior to you. I
don't
> > ever recall seeing anyone that advocates Morse saying they felt
superior.
> >
>
> I believe that making references and using analogies that you guys are the
> adults and new, entry level hams are children pretty much describes
> a superior if not condescending attitude.
>
> Clint
> KB5ZHT
>
> --
>
> --
>
> Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
> OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one
>
>
> --
>
>

Now why did I know you had to make a comment Clint?

Here is one right back to you ...ten four?

If the shoe fits, wear it.

Have a nice day.

Dan/W4NTI

5991. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 20:50:55 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <PW0eb.35286$pP6.17923@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79305

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:V0Mdb.4794$Hd6.2654366@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com...
>
> "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
> news:bl7v5u$8v10u$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > "Clint" wrote ...
> >
> > I believe that making references and using analogies that you guys are
> the
> > adults and new, entry level hams are children pretty much describes a
> > superior if not condescending attitude.
> > ____
> >
> > That's a pretty big brush you've got there, Clint. Please reference
any
> > post I've made where I said, or implied that I consider no-code hams as
> > children. I'll wait here.
> >
> > Arnie -
> > KT4ST
>
>
> I suspect that Clint was actually referring indirectly to some of my posts
> as I have used the parent/child analogy and student/teacher analogy.
> However he likes to take this as meaning a superior and/or condescending
> attitude. He fails to be willing to admit that the less experienced
should
> take the advice of the more experienced while they develop sufficient
> background to make informed choices. He has obviously missed my posts
where
> I have clearly said that if I were interested in satellite work, I would
go
> consult the most experienced satellite operator in our local club, who
> happens in this case to be a Technician. I am more than willing to
respect
> his expertise. I would willingly, in this area, be the "child" or
"student"
> in learning this activity. If I doubted what he told me about satellite
> work, I would first wait until I had equal experience before challenging
his
> experience.
>
> However, Clint wants to challenge the issue from a point of inexperience
and

> feels that he should be taken seriously.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>

Dang Dee D......you are really cutting his crap down to size. You must have had some courses.

Dan/W4NTI

5992. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 20:52:22 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <aY0eb.35290$pP6.33319@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79306

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:1ROdb.30614$pP6.5955@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:
> >
> > I believe that making references and using analogies
> > that you guys are the adults and new, entry level
> > hams are children pretty much describes a superior
> > if not condescending attitude.
>
>
> I'm not talking about references or analogies, Clint. I'm talking about
> Larry's specific use of the word "superior" to describe those with code
> skills and the word "inferior" to describe those without such skills.
Since
> none of the pro-code crowd objected to his position, I now trying to see
how
> many others share the same opinions.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

He is intitled to his opinion. Just as you are, even if they are
crackpot....in my opinion...see how it works?

Dan/W4NTI

5993. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 20:56:57 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <t01eb.35307$pP6.20468@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79307

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bl7v1t$94d9s$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Dan/W4NTI" wrote ...
>
> Perhaps you think those that know/use Morse are superior to you. I don't
> ever recall seeing anyone that advocates Morse saying they felt superior.
I
> know I don't feel that way. However I do feel those that don't play on CW
> are missing a major part of the enjoyment they could get from having a
> amateur license. But thats their loss not mine. If you thank that is
> imparting a superior attitude, I say Dwight that you have the problem,
not
> us.
> --
>
> I feel exactly the same way, Dan. I promote CW, and will continue to do
so,
> but have never said or even implied that it made me a superior Ham. I
do
> think it makes one a more well-rounded ham. But that is not the same
thing.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
>
Exactly, more rounded, more experienced, more able to provide
communications under adverse conditions...etc.

But not suprerior. In fact when I get my Extra back in the 70s. I could
have opted for a 1X2 callsign at various points since then. I have not,
why is that? Im not one to put on airs, nor do I feel superior to others.

However, based on my experience and background, I feel I am qualified to
advise and suggest. The problem is folks now a days seem to think they know
it all, just because they passed a entry level exam. Oh well.

I believe all of us are more than willing to help the newcomers out. But I
refuse to be insulted and because I enjoy a mode they find 'useless'.

Dan/W4NTI

5994. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 20:58:17 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <J11eb.35310$pP6.18475@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79308

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:vLOdb.30598$pP6.28916@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get wrote:
> >
> > Perhaps you think those that know/use Morse are superior
> > to you. I don't ever recall seeing anyone that advocates
> > Morse saying they felt superior.
> >
> > I know I don't feel that way. However I do feel those that
> > don't play on CW are missing a major part of the enjoyment
> > they could get from having a amateur license. But thats their
> > loss not mine.
> >
> > If you thank that is imparting a superior attitude, I say Dwight
> > that you have the problem, not us.
>
>
> Larry posted this claim of superiority well more than twenty times in
this
> newsgroup alone. He specifically and repeatedly claimed that those with
code
> skills are "superior" to those without. He even used the word "inferior"
to
> describe those without code skills. Throughout it all, none of the
pro-code
> crowd raised a single objection to his position and several openly agreed
> with it.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

I didn't see that post. And I don't agree with it, if that is what was
said.

I don't read all the posts about code/no code. Its just the same over and
over.

Dan/W4NTI

5995. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 21:02:56 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309291302.64d8c737@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79309

groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
news:<5ee63311.0309281048.70c4e1cb@posting.google.com>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
> >
> > 1) Back in '78, the students learned Morse Code as part of their CG training,
> > so there was no other training needed for them to get Extra Class amateur
> > licenses. Today, they would need to put in some of their own time, and a bit of
> > effort, learning Morse at 5 wpm for that test.
> >
>
> You know Jim, the more I ponder this paragraph, the more I think you
> may just have hit on an important way of grading the dedication (and
> therefore "value") of any given amateur licensee.

Well, that wasn't my intent at all. I was merely pointing out that for
some folks, getting a license involves a lot of learning and the
related effort, while others already have the skills and knowledge.

You might want to talk to N0IMD about the concept.

> Just by examining
> their involvement in the military, we can assign them a scientific
> "grade of merit" based on whether they got a free pass based on being
> forced to learn code or not forced.

You can do that.
>
> Merit Zero (0.0): Draftee who was forced into the military and then was
> forced into Morse school.
>
> Merit Zero-point-one (0.1): Draftee who was forced into the military
> and then volunteered for Morse school to get a cushy non-infantry job.
>
> Merit One (1.0): Volunteer who joined the military by judicial suggestion
> ("Boy, come back for sentencing in 10 days, unless you're in the
> military by then, in which case the charges will be dropped.") but
> was forced into Morse school.
>
> Merit One-point-one (1.1): Volunteer who joined the military by
> judicial suggestion ("Boy, come back for sentencing in 10 days,
> unless you're in the military by then, in which case the charges
> will be dropped.") and then volunteered for Morse school to get a
> cushy non-infantry job.

>
> Merit Two (2.0): Volunteer who joined the military to avoid the draft
> and was forced into Morse school.
>
> Merit Two-point-one (2.1): Volunteer who joined the military to avoid
> the draft and then volunteered for Morse school to get a cushy
> non-infantry job.
>
> Merit Three (3.0): Volunteer who freely joined the military and then
> was forced into Morse school.
>
> Merit Three-point-one (3.1): Volunteer who freely joined the military
> and then volunteered for Morse school to get a cush non-infantry job.
>
> Merit Four (4.0): Person who declined to volunteer for the military
> service and learned Morse on his own time and effort.

>(Hello, Jim)

What do you mean by "Hello, Jim?"
>
> Merit Four-point-one (4.1): Person who fled the country to avoid
> military service and learned Morse on his own time and effort.
>
> .... or maybe I've got that all bass-ackwards.

You've left out a few categories:

- Person who earned their Extra amateur license years before they were eligible for military service

- Person whom the military would not accept for legitimate physical reasons (vision, etc.). Would any branch of the military accept a recruit with, say, 20/15 vision in one eye and 20/400 plus extreme myopia in the other?

73 de Jim, N2EY

5996. Re: BPL and the New World Order

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 21:11:56 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <we1eb.8318$yp6.225126@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79310
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

"Jim Hampton" <aa2qa@frontiernet.net> wrote in message
news:rmNdb.3029$FS2.1296@news01.roc.ny...
> Well, someone has some guts to speak their mind. The Republicans in New
> York State took Gerrymandering to a new high, connecting Buffalo and
> Rochester with a tiny path and creating a new congressional district.
What
> happens when the large corporate broadcasters discover that BPL does
> interfere with broadcasting? Big Buck$, meet Big Buck$.

The broadcasters will kick the utilities' butts every day of the week
and twice on Sunday :-)

Carl - wk3c

5997. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 21:16:02 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <mi1eb.8320$yp6.225166@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79311

"Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
news:bl8dej$nq5$0@208.206.142.65...
> Jim Hampton wrote:
> > Dick Carroll mentioned that some AM broadcast stations were virtually
> > obliterated in Allentown, Pa. In that case, everyone noticing
interference
> > on broadcast band (AM) stations should complain to the stations
involved.
> > Believe me, commercial broadcasting (especially since the FCC allowed a
few
> > powerful groups to buy up most of the broadcast stations) has much
deeper
> > pockets than amateurs and would likely not hesitate even a moment to
bring
> > lawyers and Congress into the mess. Don't complain as a ham operator,
> > however; complain that you can't hear some particular programs from the
> > station due to all of this "interference". Let 'em figure it out :)
> >
>
>
> Here's an article on the BPL issue that appeared in the Allentown PA
> newspaper....
>
>
>
http://www.mcall.com/news/local/all-a1_5net-glitchsep28,0,2293904.story?coll
>
> Dick
>

Interesting to note that Dick just couldn't bring himself to mention
that I was the one who took the reporter out and demonstrated
the interference to him ... but I'm not surprised.

Carl - wk3c

5998. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 22:04:21 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030929180421.05693.00000023@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 79312

>Interesting to note that Dick just couldn't bring himself to mention
>that I was the one who took the reporter out and demonstrated
>the interference to him ... but I'm not surprised.
>
>Carl - wk3c

Yea for Karl the savior of HAM RADIO. I hope you told him you are a CBplusser,
and not a REAL HAM.

5999. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 22:29:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030929182925.29660.00000877@mb-m24.aol.com>
Source record: 79313

In article <895b5c88c092acb2645e0ed16416a556.128005@mygate.mailgate.org>, "Hans K0HB" <k0hb@earthlink.net> writes:

>"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
>
>>
>> 1) Back in '78, the students learned Morse Code as part of their CG
>training,
>> so there was no other training needed for them to get Extra Class amateur
>> licenses. Today, they would need to put in some of their own time, and a
>bit of
>> effort, learning Morse at 5 wpm for that test.
>>
>
>So you're suggesting that 1978 era hams who didn't study Morse
>specifically
>to obtain an amateur license (ie., they were "forced" to learn it at
><20WPM in a military training program) are less desirable hams than
>those today who learn 5WPM (QRS PSE) on "their own time and effort"?

No, Hans, I'm not suggesting that at all.
>
>Sunuvagun!

Son of something else.......;-)

>Good luck on this one now!

You too.
>
73 de Jim, N2EY

6000. Re: BPL and the New World Order

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 22:43:36 UTC
From: Biz WD=?ISO-8859-1?B?2A==?=HCO <wd0hco@ev1.net>
Message-ID: <BB9E1FC8.742B%wd0hco@ev1.net>
Source record: 79314
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

Great post. I didn't vote last time... but I sure as shit will vote next year for ABBB. (Any Body But Bush).

Here's another lovely thought...

How about public service? You know... police, fire, EMT's. I guess everyone forgot that old nasty BPL will be going up to the mountain top to power repeaters and tower obstruction lamps.

Just a lovely place for a nice broadbanded RF noise source!

One of the reasons so many firemen will killed on 9/11 is that they did not receive the recall order on their talkies. Think how much better things will be with buildings installed with BPL!

I wonder if BPL will be allowed in radio quiet zones ???

hmmmm. ..Just a thought...

WDï¿½HCO

6001. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 22:49:37 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <5G2eb.8879$Kq4.7961347@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 79315

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:MwOdb.30556$pP6.2670@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> You still haven't answered the question, Larry. I asked why there should
> be an effort on the part of the ARS or FCC to encourage (boost, promote,
or
> push) this single operating mode (CW)?

Then I'll answer it, Dwight. Because preparing for and passing Element 1
requires one to demonstrate a tad more effort and dedication than passing
written exams for which the Q & A pools are published. The 5-wpm is
sufficient enough of a challenge to require some serious studying effort
over approx two or three weeks, but not enough to discourage any individual
serious about earning HF privileges. For those who are not, the no-code
Technician licens is available. It's really quite simple.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

6002. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 22:56:52 UTC
From: "privacy.at Anonymous Remailer" <mixmaster@remailer.privacy.at>
Message-ID: <b71a12673ef49588a687f3794cbf129d@remailer.privacy.at>
Source record: 79316
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <pan.2003.09.24.12.03.35.348632@hotmail.com>
"Eric Oyen - N7ZZT" <n7zzt_NO.SPAM_@hotmail.com> wrote:
>
>
> and we still have to put up with idiots like you, no matter the band or
> technology.
> <...blah blah blah...> so don't gripe at us because of YOUR
> technical and mental deficiencies.

Says the no-code-technician twat.

6003. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 22:58:00 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <YN2eb.35555$pP6.10336@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79317

"N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote:
>
> (Hans K0HB) wrote:
>> (snip) Just by examining their involvement in the
>> military, we can assign them a scientific "grade of
>> merit" based on whether they got a free pass
>> based on being forced to learn code or not forced.
>>
>> (snip)
>>
> > Merit Four-point-one (4.1): Person who fled
>> the country to avoid military service and learned
>> Morse on his own time and effort.
>
>
> You've left out a few categories:
>
> - Person who earned their Extra amateur license
> years before they were eligible for military service
>
> - Person whom the military would not accept for
> legitimate physical reasons (vision, etc.). Would
> any branch of the military accept a recruit with,
> say, 20/15 vision in one eye and 20/400 plus
> extreme myopia in the other?

And lets not forget those who enlisted in the military and selected a signal MOS long after code was pretty much dropped by the military. That would include just about all those who went to the Army's Signal School somewhere after about 1970 (over thirty years ago).

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

6004. Fun activities to do while Packers whup the Bears on Mon nite F'Ball!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 23:06:32 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0309291444.4c4ab5b8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79318

Count ice-cream cones, see a double rainbow, see my comments to the
FCC, see my mental treatment facility, send email to the Dakota
Division Director, visit Minnesota contesters and DXers.

Click on the link below: http://home.earthlink.net/~k0hb/

73, de Hans, K0HB

6005. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 23:21:54 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <m83eb.35640$pP6.24532@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79319

"Brian Kelly" <kelly@dvol.com> wrote:
>
> The ARRL submission is the *only* by-the-numbers
> engineering study on record so far and it has the BPL
> proponents in a royal snit. They're *not* brushing it
> off by any means, they're vigorously attacking it, they
> know they have a battle on their hands so don't
> underestimate the ARRL's ability to be a spoiler far
> out of proportion to it's political and/or financial clout.
> David did take out Goliath, etc. (snip)

I truly hope you're right, Brian. I really do.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

6006. LARDASS posing as an attorney should get him in trouble

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 23:30:03 UTC
From: Nomen Nescio <nobody@dizum.com>
Message-ID: <e457a5f6cf268a821083b2cf10dea556@dizum.com>
Source record: 79320
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

In article <bl3dnr$a09$0@pita.alt.net>
"LaShaun Ivory" [LARDASS LLLOYD DAVIES] <NoSpam@NOSpam.com> wrote:
>
>
>
> "Lloyd" <Lloyd@no.spammmmm> wrote in message
> news:97098709.6578F56123@taranews.net...
> On Thu, 25 Sep 2003 14:49:56 GMT, Dwight Stewart
> <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote:
> >
> > If true, since such use is now considered a serious offense, this person
> > would be well advised to discuss the rules governing the use of military
> > computers for private recreational activities with the facility's system
> > adminstrator or IT security officer. DoD has already come down hard on a
> few
> > violators (I read in S&S that one E-6 was sentenced to two years in jail
> and
> > discharged).
>
> Google (http://groups.google.com) can be a revealing database when
> used to check up on a poster's history. Take for example the three
> entities who call themselves "Ed Norton," "Firebottle," and "Les
> Locklear," and who have an obsession with trashing someone named Lloyd
> Davies.
>
> They have the following things in common: (1) they claim to know one
> another (Firebottle even claimed that Ed Norton hangs out with Les on
> weekends); (2) they all have AOL accounts; (3) they all have Google
> accounts, and (4) they all post through Keesler AFB from time to time.
>
> Here are a few of the message IDs which are archived on Google and
> which contain the supporting information. You can retrieve the
> message itself by putting the message ID into the form on the advanced
> search page at Google. Once you have the message, click on "original
> format", and then take a careful look at the NNTP-Posting-Host header.
> It identifies the computer which had connected to Google's machines in
> order to make the post.
>
> Keesler AFB often uses Ft McPherson's proxy server, and so it arises
> as the NNTP-Posting-Host in those cases. Here are a few messages
> posted by "Ed Norton" via the McPherson route (IP address 198.26.120.13):
>
> Message-ID: <999c58d3.0302050507.235363ea@posting.google.com>

> Message-ID: <999c58d3.0301220427.5ac785b1@posting.google.com>
> Message-ID: <999c58d3.0208140417.417b9d96@posting.google.com>
>
> And here is a message that "Ed Norton" posted directly from Keesler
> via IP address 131.22.200.54:
>
> Message-ID: <999c58d3.0301270810.218de3f1@posting.google.com>
>
>
> "Firebottle" likes the McPherson route too, as can be seen in:
>
> Message-ID: <edaa3c2a.0301130628.26862bd@posting.google.com>
> Message-ID: <edaa3c2a.0301130622.35a242d5@posting.google.com>
> Message-ID: <edaa3c2a.0301150542.56b0ab39@posting.google.com>
>
> And Les Locklear also posts through Keesler, as recorded in
> Message-ID: <cbf9555c.0301140634.421d12b5@posting.google.com>
>
> Les also connects to Google through Ft McPherson, as indicated in
> Message-ID: <cbf9555c.0301131014.ea9f7a5@posting.google.com>
>
> -...-
>
> So what does this mean? The simplest explanation for the great
> commonality among those three posters would be that they are all the
> same person. If not, and the sock puppet operator is, as he claimed,
> a friend of Les', then I'd say that with friends like that, Les
> doesn't need any enemies.
> -.-.-.-.-.-.-.
>
> Hey! How about one of us sends these posts to the server to see what
> happens? I think it would be a great way to see if Les/Firebottle/Norton and
> his other sock puppets can be dealt with on one fell swoop.
> Losing Les could hardly be considered a loss. The poor old man injects much
> rhetoric but says so little anyway, so who would miss him?
> I don't think Lloyd would....

Hey, how about we send your post to support@alt.net, you know crossposting like this is against Altopia's policies....

6007. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-29 23:37:35 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <3n3eb.35705$pP6.8735@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79321

"Dan/W4NTI" wrote:
> Exactly, more rounded, more experienced, more
> able to provide communications under adverse
> conditions...etc.

Code makes a person more experienced? If that is true, then a person who passed a code test yesterday is more experienced than a person who got his license ten years ago without knowing code, and more experienced than all those in the other radio services where code is not used. More rounded in what? Emergency communications? Moonbounce? Satellites? And if a person with code was truly more able to provide communications under adverse conditions, all radio services would still be relying on code. They aren't. In the end, these are all code myths.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

6008. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 00:12:44 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnhilaltg03t80@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79322

```
">
> Your EXACTLY right, those are my true feelings. I think its just perfect
for
> all the No-Coders. Not only will they be able to get there No-Code Extra,
and
> all of HF, but the beauty of it is, they will have so much noise to deal
with,
> they will not have any one to talk to. What a just reward for all there
> WHINNING. I cant wait.

And the PCTA crowd wonders why they aren't being met with a warmer
reception from the newbies wanting to enter the hobby.

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--
```

6009. Re: BPL and the New World Order

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 00:19:10 UTC
From: quickhatch <esejkora@comcast.net>
Message-ID: <2_3eb.636596$o%2.293296@sccrnsc02>
Source record: 79323
Cross-posted to: rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors

I'll throw my two cents worth in, with the paranoid conspiracy twist (nobody's looking... are they??)

I won't get into the political aspect, for it's not a Democrat vs. Republican thing... they're both behind it, and complicit in the development of the fray. Yes, you may argue that the GOP is pro- big business, but after all, Al Gore invented the internet, so the Dems are just as guilty. Enough said... you can make any argument you want.

However, the 'New World Order' twist may have merit, if you want to get into the conspiracy big-brother thing. Consider the following: Have you tuned across the SW bands lately? How many diverse viewpoints do you hear? When I started as an SWL, I used to enjoy tuning into Radio Moscow, BBC, Radio Habana, VOA, etc. just to listen to, and usually chuckle at, the propaganda war that was being broadcast. Think back about how entertaining it was... I often wax nostalgic for those days. But the diversity of viewpoints was there. I wonder about now, though.

Check out 'World Radio Network' on the internet. Here's an international feed to over 70 stations all over the world... the same feed to all stations. Sure, they're different stations and languages, but the same message. Their 'motto' is "Global Voices, Diverse Views, One Station". One could fear that they really mean "Global Voices, One View, Diverse Stations". What better way to get the world ready for the New World Order than to transmit the one and only same message to the entire populous, in umpteen different languages. Wait a minute... isn't that VOA and BBC?

I'll close with a comment on SW broadcasts. Remember those QSL cards from far away places? Now days you hear Radio Korea, Radio Sweden, Voice of Viet Nam, or any of eight other stations from far away places, just to find out the broadcast is coming from our northern neighbor in New Brunswick. The Sackville site re-broadcasts for at least eleven foreign stations on over 40 frequencies. One more step to one voice, one world. Big Brother is on his way. No one's watching us, are they???

See how absurd some of this can sound? Let's stop being so serious and lighten up. Kick back and laugh about these banterings, but respect the thoughts of our fellow newsgroup posters. I don't mean to diminish the concern of BPL, because the bottom line it is a serious threat to our hobby, whether your into SWL or amateur radio. Rather than yell at one another and face off on who we're voting for in next election, put some energy into contacting you Congressmen and let them hear your voice. See the post by Jim, WA8SDF, a couple posts down. That's how we should be expending our energies.

Ken, WB0OCV

"Nomen Nescio" <nobody@dizum.com> wrote in message
news:7e1ae8b670242db6e1961fab31a93bec@dizum.com...
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----
> Hash: SHA1
>
>
>
> The debate on BPL has raised a lot of important issues, and has
>
> also generated a lot of comments by Internauts both with and without
>
> ham licenses. Here's my opinion, FWIW.
>
>
>
> It's not so simple as writing a check, but the FCC *is* being
>
> manipulated by very powerful interests, and they're in a hurry. Not
>
> only are they powerful because they have immense wealth, but they're
>
> all the more powerful because they know that "Shrub" has presented
>
> them an opportunity which won't come again in their life, and they are
>
> determined to take every advantage of it in the short time left before
>
> their pet goes back to his animal farm.
>
>
>
> Bear with me for a moment: I'm moved to step back and take a look from
>
> a wider view -
>
>
>
> The most important thing that the Bush administration brought to
>
> Washington is the belief, now widely held in the corporate boardrooms,
>
> that rich people are entitled to enjoy robbing those less ruthless or
>
> lucky. Lobbyists for both liberal and conservative causes have
>
> complained bitterly about the arrogance and greed that the Republican
>
> administration has allowed to fester inside the beltway: there is no

>
> longer even the appearance of democracy, and it's starting to strain
>
> the credulity of even so staunch a GOP stronghold as the religious
>
> right.
>
>
>
> - From Reagan's somnambulance, through the elder Bush's first term, and
>
> continuing with the "Right Wing Revival" during the Clinton
>
> administration, up to our current economic mess, the Republican Party
>
> has been courting those with money by placing a rose between its teeth
>
> and a pistol in its pocket. The elder Bush and Newt Gingrich were, and
>
> their heirs are now, brazen and unashamed pimps for the idea that
>
> those that have shall get, and those that don't shall get screwed.
>
>
>
> No sooner had they gained power in the House, then the GOP started to
>
> undo (and in a way that was very hard to reverse) every law, program,
>
> entitlement, and court decision which gave ordinary people a chance of
>
> living with a (little) dignity.
>
>
>
> By the way, Newt wasn't just talking about the New Deal when he said
>
> "The great social experiment has failed" - he was talking about
>
> undoing centuries of progress, not just decades. The fact that his
>
> personal life was too personal for the spinmeisters to hide hasn't
>
> dimmed his enthusiasm for the good 'ol days: the theme of his book
>
> "Gettysburg", an fictional alternative-history of the battle, reveals
>
> an attitude that even Publishers Weekly commented on -
>
>

> "The authors show thorough knowledge of the people, weapons,
> tactics and ambience of the Civil War, though their portrayals of
> historical figures like Lee, Meade, James Longstreet and Richard
> Ewell betray a certain bias (the Confederate men are noble and
> wise, the Union leaders hot-tempered and vindictive)."
>
>
>
>
> In the "new" Republican view, it's not enough to move your business'
> assets overseas, or to "outsource" your back office tasks to
> third-world countries. It's not enough to (once again) utilize the
> dark-skinned to provide a lifestyle Nero would envy: the Old Elite
> feels it must squeeze the middle class until everyone with less than
> $1,000,000 of ready cash is living on rented land in a rented tent,
> owning nothing but a TV set so that The Massa can tell them how to
> vote.
>
>
> But I digress: lets stop looking at the forest and go back to pecking
> at the BPL tree -
>
>
> Frankly, if I was one of the old white men who run America, I'd be
> hard-pressed to find a downside in BPL. Consider:
>
>
> 1. The Air Traffic Control radio system has needed a major overhaul
> for decades, and BPL will provide the FAA with a perfect reason to
> spend Billions to trade-in every navigational aid and radio in the

> country, because BPL operates on some of the same frequencies and
> will rendor most of the others unusable. Of course, the planes will
> have to upgrade as well, but airplane owners, as a class, have
> plenty of spare cash, and the fact that every other country and
> every other airline in the world will be forced to go along is just
> one of those "intangible benefits" that those with a certain
> lifestyle expect.
>
>
> By the way, there will be a few dead, burnt bodies lying around
> while the FAA sells its new system to the Congress, but even that
> smell can't overpower the ordure of the Potomac at low tide, so
> you'd better get used to riding in the back of the airbus, paying
> more for tickets and maybe even thinking of flight insurance as a
> sensible precaution.
>
>
> 2. The power companies, made stodgy and unprofitable by such quant
> words as "service" and "obligation" and "customer", will enjoy a
> dramatic influx of badly-needed cash, which will arrive just in
> time to save them from having to admit their mistakes, reengineer
> their transmission systems, or (most importantly) actually work at
> alternative and/or renewable energy sources.
>
>
> 3. If they design the system well, BPL will enjoy a wealth of new
> options that even cable moguls don't have: a priceless data
> coral, with well-penned users whose choices will be limited to

>
> those favored by like-thinking men of means: every click will be
>
> tracked, every purchase planned, and every complaint laughed
>
> off. There won't be any "spam", since there won't be any
>
> advertising allowed into the system that the upper crust didn't
>
> choose to allow, and those whom exhibit anti-American sentiments or
>
> question the wisdom of Those In Charge [tm] will soon find that
>
> everything they ever put into an email is available to their boss
>
> in an electronic blacklist.
>
>
>
> Of course, any slander or complaints about these common-sense
>
> capitalist perquisites would be nipped in the bud, and the system
>
> will Protect Our Children [tm] by guiding their tiny minds into
>
> well-mapped impressions of the hard, hard life that the rich must
>
> suffer in order to provide the servants with the benefits we should
>
> be grateful we're able to beg for.
>
>
>
> BPL is, as its advocates have explained, needed to counterbalance the
>
> critical shortage of war movies and of Father Knows Best reruns: it
>
> will put those airwaves that have been wasted on other nations'
>
> viewpoints and a few hobbyists' toys to more productive use. Your
>
> Betters have said so, and now if you're a Right-Thinking American, you
>
> will stop whining.
>
>
>
> James Penn
>
>

```
>
>
>
> -----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----
> Version: GnuPG v1.0.7 (GNU/Linux)
>
> iD8DBQE/d4LrRqMr0Iv3YZURAtVIAJ0aCNGbIMeuQ5pxzzTEjRPZIByJOgCeIYwX
> oF2xbszlP82532Ib0BoGVx4=
> =zkRh
> -----END PGP SIGNATURE-----
>
```

6010. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 00:19:47 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnhj2clqreen21@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79324

>
>
> A learning experience that can be accomplished without a license exam
(Boy
> Scouts routinely did it), therefore not an argument supporting a code
> testing requirement.

That's where I first learned about the morse code. I had to learn it to get
a badge; upon learning it, I recieved a badge of achievement for haveing
done so. Had I not dont it, I STILL would have been allowed to be a boy
scout, they wouldn't have thrown me out NOR was learning the code
a requirement for joining in the first place. I just wouldn't have gotten
that particular acheivement badge had I not went through the morse
code studies.

I certainly think that by now newbies reading the various posts
on either side of the issue have at least some good starting points from
which to start making thier own conclusion. I wonder if, in retrospect,
the PCTA is proud of the way they've behaved and wonder if they
should not have taken a different tactic?

Clint

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

6011. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 00:20:46 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnhj4a329dhf5d@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79325

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
news:5G2eb.8879$Kq4.7961347@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...

>
> Then I'll answer it, Dwight. Because preparing for and passing Element 1
> requires one to demonstrate a tad more effort and dedication than passing
> written exams for which the Q & A pools are published. The 5-wpm is
> sufficient enough of a challenge to require some serious studying effort
> over approx two or three weeks, but not enough to discourage any
individual
> serious about earning HF privileges. For those who are not, the no-code
> Technician licens is available. It's really quite simple.
>

that's true until the rules are changed and CW testing is taken out.

Clint

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

6012. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 00:23:19 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnhj92fiqbsef@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79326

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message
news:20030928222152.08626.00000928@mb-m27.aol.com...

>
> I don't whine or nag.

Yea, you pretty much do.

>I have a strong belief in my position re: code testing,
> and I am able to state it with clarity, passion, and conviction.

But simply without any convincing debate points or ideas other
than "do it, we all had to" and "do it because you are told to do
it, you are a <insert childish, juvenile personal attack here> if you
do not want to.

>You, Kim,
> and most of the NCTA appear to be limited to name-calling --

boy if that' isn't the pot calling the kettle black.

WHO is doing the name calling? it's not the NCTA group calling
the PCTA "lazy", "stupid", and an assortment of complex insults
using spurious comparisons.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

6013. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 00:24:51 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnhjbsaosq9v40@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79328

>
> At least I have a conscience to examine. Your examination will have to
be
> limited solely to the code license test.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/
>
>

I wonder if when they ascend the golden stairway to the pearly gates
and talk to St. Peter, if they will be looking around and asking where
the key is so they can prove thier code profeciency to enter? <g>

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

6014. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 00:25:09 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <1qihnvoja93r6bfdqhkaqgmbgpgjblg39n@4ax.com>
Source record: 79327

Clint, that's something that I agree with you 110% on.

This type of attitude is not productive, and does nothing to further
the cause of the hobby.

Hoping that BPL will destroy Amateur Radio to spite the 'no coders' is
a nonsensical position to take. Sour grapes, I believe, is the term
for this type of thinking!

73, Leo

On Mon, 29 Sep 2003 19:12:44 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>">
>> Your EXACTLY right, those are my true feelings. I think its just perfect
>for
>> all the No-Coders. Not only will they be able to get there No-Code Extra,
>and
>> all of HF, but the beauty of it is, they will have so much noise to deal
>with,
>> they will not have any one to talk to. What a just reward for all there
>> WHINNING. I cant wait.
>
>And the PCTA crowd wonders why they aren't being met with a warmer
>reception from the newbies wanting to enter the hobby.
>
>--
>
>--
>
>Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
>OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

6015. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 00:26:21 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnhjen6seon793@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79329

YOU personally? or your PCTA buddies?

That was whome I was referring to, and it's been done
by more than one and on more than one occasion...

Want me to cut and paste them, or do you want to
just back off and admit it's been done? Because I
certainly will, if you like for me to.

Clint

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--
"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bl7v5u$8v10u$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Clint" wrote ...
>
> I believe that making references and using analogies that you guys are
the
> adults and new, entry level hams are children pretty much describes a
> superior if not condescending attitude.
> ____
>
> That's a pretty big brush you've got there, Clint. Please reference *any*
> post I've made where I said, or implied that I consider no-code hams as
> children. I'll wait here.
>
> Arnie -
> KT4ST
>
>

6016. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 00:27:17 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnhjgg5uugtfbf@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79330

>
>
> I suspect that Clint was actually referring indirectly to some of my posts
> as I have used the parent/child analogy and student/teacher analogy.
> However he likes to take this as meaning a superior and/or condescending
> attitude.

And that's the way it is percieved.
Thanks for helping.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

6017. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 00:29:05 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnhjjqjdbcbp1b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79331

> >
> > However, Clint wants to challenge the issue from a point of inexperience
> and
> > feels that he should be taken seriously.

okay, is there anybody else who doubts the attitude now?

>
> Dang Dee D......you are really cutting his crap down to size.
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

No he didn't, it only found agreement with the a few other PCTA
members such as yourself, but he didn't prove anything more than
what I said was true.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

6018. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 00:31:12 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnhjnpm59nle9e@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79332

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:1V0eb.35284$pP6.10821@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>

> Now why did I know you had to make a comment Clint?
>
> Here is one right back to you ...ten four?
>
> If the shoe fits, wear it.
>
> Have a nice day.
>
> Dan/W4NTI
>
>

and if you guys need yet ANOTHER bit of evidence
of such an attitude, keep scrolling down and you'll find
more PCTA'er making them....

Clint
KB5ZHT
--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

6019. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 00:38:07 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnhk4p6ummhn7c@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79333

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:1ROdb.30614$pP6.5955@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...

> I'm not talking about references or analogies, Clint. I'm talking about
> Larry's specific use of the word "superior" to describe those with code
> skills and the word "inferior" to describe those without such skills.

Oh, okay... well, I figured a reference would be enough, and t hough
I know i've seen the word superior itself used before, it just hasn't been
with as much frequency as that of a mere attitude showing same...
I think one is just as abhorrant as the other; what's more, it simply is
not conducive to an environment that makes the hobby more attractive
to new potential hams (and remarks have been made about that from
newbies in here)... on the one hand, you read things in the ham
radio books and mags about friendly and helpful communities in ham,
peaceful coexistence in the ranks, etc....

And THEN you come in here and read some PCTA'ers downing,
and I quote, "CBplussers", talking about "cobra HF radios" and using
deragotory remarks using the old 11 meter 10 codes, talking about
no code hf'ers, and one fellow even going so far as to recommend a
new license type call for those who advance after the morse code testing is
removed, so they can all be recognized by the old gaurd and "not
talk to them".. how childish can you get!

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

6020. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 00:44:09 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnhkg339fmsp20@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79334

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:bl7uta$8v9j9$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> "Dwight Stewart" wrote ...

>
> On the contrary, Dwight. He has claimed in one of my threads that we are
> nothing more than knuckledraggers who don't understand modern technology.

BZZZZZT! Wrong...

(1) I have never used the term "knuckledragger" at all, nor have I called
any
of you guys one....

(2) I have never said that you "don't understand modern technology". All
my comments have been to the effect that the PCTA crowd has an agenda
that doesn't reflect the change in times and modernization of
communications,
both of which is suppose to be reflected in the ham radio community... I
never said you didn't UNDERSTAND modern technology, I said you
guys weren't willing to allow the testing to "advance the hobby into the
modern age."

As far as your remarks about me ignoring your questions, I haven't,
I have simply answered the very same questions earlier to the others
in here that share your side of the debate.. and, quite frankly, met
with either diversion & dodging or personal attacks ultimately against
me. Why repeat the same thing over and over, ad naseum? After
the same thing is repeated about 5 times in a NG, it's for no other
purpose than to pump up one's own pride or to flame.

If you're going to quote me, I will forever follow and set the record
straight. Go mischaracterize somebody else, not me.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

6021. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 00:48:02 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnhkned2a7751a@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79335

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:4NLdb.582$Vb3.461215@news1.news.adelphia.net...

>
> So in the end, he bears a striking resemblance to some of the more
> passionate CW'philes. Just a different side

You're either a flamer or one who simply doesn't read many posts. I have repeated over and over and over that I like CW and my first several QSL cards were from CW contacts. My objections are to the testing of this mode (short answer, anyway).

It's amazing how very few things get to and reach people on your side of the argument. I don't know how many times i've had to either defend my position on that regard, or defend the NCTA's position that it simply wants to remove CW testing, not CW... But I can't possibly believe this charge is genuine anyway, I think it's a diversion or a dodge because it's quite a concept EASY to understand, it just isn't being *heard*.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

6022. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 00:50:53 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnhksn1s6pbgd0@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79336

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:7iPdb.30690$pP6.4922@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...

>
>
> > (snip) I would have to say that in principle that the more
> > knowledge a ham has, the more likely he or she will be
> > a superoir ham, (snip)

heh, what was arnie macey saying? LOL

>
>
> Perhaps I'm too liberal for this discussion. I don't agree with the very
> concept of a superior ham. We're all individuals with unique skills,
> knowledge, and experience, to bring to the table, none of those superior
or
> inferior to that offered by others.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Trust me, being too liberal doesn't have anything to do with it. I am on
your side of this discussion.. and I am anything BUT liberal. By admission
I am very right wing, a very proud conservative politically.

Clint
KB5ZHT

6023. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 00:53:03 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnhl0oi1nmb755@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79337

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0309290902.4bb5c4e@posting.google.com...

>
> But that's exactly what was suggested. Your words, written in a clear
> English declarative statement are unambiguous and say "NO ONE should
> be kept out of the ARS" --- that's pretty much the same as saying
> "NO ONE should be denied a drivers license".

see why the PCTA is accused of slant and spin?
I am pretty sure that the phrase "who passes the tests required by
contemporary
modern society" was implied. If not, the part about "get thier license"
pretty much
removed any remaining "grey area" or misunderstanding.

>
> Personally, I think persons who fail the test (or haven't taken a test)
> SHOULD be kept out of the ARS.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB

that's what kim said.

Clint
KB5ZHT
--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

6024. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 01:00:35 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnhlet21vqoj21@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79338

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:mLJdb.36372$ai7.28386@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...

>
> I quoted this part because I wanted to make sure everyone read it. When
it
> comes to at least a few of those on the pro-code side, I think you hit the
> nail right on the head with this, Kim.

She DID.. she articulated one of thier unspoken doctrines exactly.
It was what I meant by overtones of superiority as well (in addition to).

Need more? What about thier constant use of the term "CBplusser" and
so forth... I don't know if THEY have kept up to date on ham
radio violation records, but the vast majority of code & rule violaters are
hams who've been in the hobby for many many years, have advanced licenses
(advanced, extra) and thus have passed morse code testing. The hams I
have met personally that came out of 11 meters were the best hams I ever
met. WHY? Because they KNEW where they came from, how nice it is
up here, and have thus a respect for the advancement into a more
serious hobby.

The foulest mouths i've ever heard were on 75 meters ssb, and one ham
who's call I won't mention was denied advancement by hollingsworth HIMSELF
(you can look it up on ARRL records).. he lived at the time in conroe,
texas....
he use to get just slobbering drunk on the radio and really raise hell;
cussing,
insulting, playing music, everything. He passed the code requirements and
written exam to advance to an even higher license, but recieved a letter
from Hollingworth saying "you are not being given your upgrade, and
furthermore, never will until I recieve a written letter from you explaining
why you feel you DESERVE one."

THAT ham was a long time veteran ham who had already passed a
CW test. Therefore, any argument brought up that CW testing is
a "yahoo filter" as they call it is wrong. It doesn't stop any such thing.
Like you and kim, I feel it's a "good old boy club" sydrome, of you will.
They just don't like these "new people"... "we don't like thier kind
here... they're not like us!"

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--

6025. Re: CQ 75 CQ 75 CQ 75

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 01:14:16 UTC
From: Mohawk Brewing <mohawkspa@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <UcWdne0O4a9zReWiXTWJiw@comcast.com>
Source record: 79339
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

LID

"K4-OLD-KING-ALLIGATOR"
<BIG-AL@ -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@@@BIG-AL@@@-003894.5-LSB-75-METERS> wrote
in message news:vn84c75mdd0bc8@corp.supernews.com...
> THIS IS "BIG--AL" CALLING.
> CQ 75 CQ 75 CQ 75
> THIS IS "BIG--AL" CALLING.
> WHERE YOU AT BOY?
> THIS IS "BIG--AL" CALLING.
> CQ 75 CQ 75 CQ 75
> THIS IS "BIG--AL" CALLING.
> WHERE YOU AT BOY?
>
>

6026. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 01:33:05 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030929213305.09624.00000060@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 79340

>What about thier constant use of the term "CBplusser" and
>so forth...

Because it fits.

>The hams I
>have met personally that came out of 11 meters were the best hams I ever
>met.

Thats because Birds of a Feather stick together, and you dont have a CLUE what a REAL HAM is. And thats another reason you will always be a CBPLUSSER.

6027. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 01:34:30 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030929213430.09624.00000061@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 79341

>And the PCTA crowd wonders why they aren't being met with a warmer
>reception from the newbies wanting to enter the hobby.

You got to be Kidding, we dont need no WARM RECEPTION from you CBPLUSSERS

6028. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 01:37:25 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030929213725.09624.00000062@mb-m25.aol.com>
Source record: 79342

>WHO is doing the name calling? it's not the NCTA group calling
>the PCTA "lazy", "stupid", and an assortment of complex insults
>using spurious comparisons.

Well if the shoe fits wear it you CBplusser

6029. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 01:40:02 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnhnovch4n9p3f@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79343

"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:1qihnvoja93r6bfdqhkaqgmbgpgjblg39n@4ax.com...
> Clint, that's something that I agree with you 110% on.
>
> This type of attitude is not productive, and does nothing to further
> the cause of the hobby.
>
> Hoping that BPL will destroy Amateur Radio to spite the 'no coders' is
> a nonsensical position to take. Sour grapes, I believe, is the term
> for this type of thinking!
>
> 73, Leo
>

It's like taking off your nose to spite your face... I love this hobby,
it's a blast; it has so many avenues to pursue and so many different
ways to enjoy it. I even like it because it adds to my shortwave
listening pleasure!

Why wish it destroyed? How horrible! The very reason I state the
feelings I have to the controversial issues that are posted is because
I feel, ultimately, that I would like to see as many potential hams
come into this hobby as possible.

I think a lot of people are constantly worried about the
low calibur class of people that would flood the hobby; some, I think,
are people that simply don't want just anybody coming into the hobby,
but would rather see a small slice of the population that meets thier
criteria join and nobody else. Both are negative for ham radio, because
i'm sad to say, the first group I mentioned still wouldn't be willing to
try to pass a written test and probably wouldn't be able to; as for
the second group of potential hams I listed, well, there just won't
be enough of them to keep ham alive.

What do you have if you allow ham radio to stagnate? And leo,
of this i'm serious.... you have a hobby that loses what little
clout it has with the FCC because of DROPPING membership,
and thus, we'll see MORE of our bands taken away that are
above 30 megs (I am STILL pissed off that we lost 220! And
I understand that the U.P.S., that petitioned successfully to
steal 220-222 megaherts away from the hams, don't even
use it anymore!)

God, let's work together and keep this going.
You and I and many people in here may have our differences,
but we're both ham operators and enjoy our hobby.

Hell, leo, meet me on HF sometime and we'll have a ball.

Clint
KB5ZHT

6030. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 02:06:08 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309291806.5fcc8a0b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79345

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030926142956.01893.00000845@mb-m22.aol.com>...

>
> I wonder what the FCC would call it if anyone there chanced to look in and
> read what the PCTA think, say, and do in here?

Retain the code tests.

w3rv

6031. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 02:14:46 UTC
From: William Warren <wwarren.qrm@billhorne.homelinux.org>
Message-ID: <200309300214.h8U2EkU01960@dell.billhorne.homelinux.org>
Source record: 79344

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:

> And the PCTA crowd wonders why they aren't
> being met with a warmer reception from the
> newbies wanting to enter the hobby.

Please tell me what "PCTA" means. TIA.

Bill

(Filter the qrm for direct replies.)

6032. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 02:21:06 UTC
From: Clint <"rattlehead at computron dot net">
Message-ID: <vnhq5s20u3ov0b@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79346

one of the two factions fighting over the code testing issue.

PCTA = Pro Code Testing Agenda ...
NCTA = No Code Test Agenda

The former wants to continue testing mores code
profeciency as a means of judging whether or not
you can recieve a ham radio license.

The latter want to remove the last vestiges of
morse code testing, the 5 wmp code test.

Anything past that is debatable, as to what they
really want or believe, but those are the basics.

Clint
KB5ZHT

--

--

Get in touch with your soul: www.glennbeck.com
OR, if you're a liberal, maybe you can FIND one

--
"William Warren" <wwarren.qrm@billhorne.homelinux.org> wrote in message
news:200309300214.h8U2EkU01960@dell.billhorne.homelinux.org...
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:
>
> > And the PCTA crowd wonders why they aren't
> > being met with a warmer reception from the
> > newbies wanting to enter the hobby.
>
> Please tell me what "PCTA" means. TIA.
>
> Bill
>
> (Filter the qrm for direct replies.)
>

6033. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 02:23:47 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <22phnv0125i3do3c4l8upm4ea9vk3vmt7g@4ax.com>
Source record: 79347

On Mon, 29 Sep 2003 20:40:02 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>"Leo" <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
>news:1qihnvoja93r6bfdqhkaqgmbgpgjblg39n@4ax.com...
>> Clint, that's something that I agree with you 110% on.
>>
>> This type of attitude is not productive, and does nothing to further
>> the cause of the hobby.
>>
>> Hoping that BPL will destroy Amateur Radio to spite the 'no coders' is
>> a nonsensical position to take. Sour grapes, I believe, is the term
>> for this type of thinking!
>>
>> 73, Leo
>>
>
>It's like taking off your nose to spite your face... I love this hobby,
>it's a blast; it has so many avenues to pursue and so many different
>ways to enjoy it. I even like it because it adds to my shortwave
>listening pleasure!

Same here - I started out listening to shortwave too, and had this
urge to go further with it, to talk back to the DX...it still amazes
me!
>
>Why wish it destroyed? How horrible! The very reason I state the
>feelings I have to the controversial issues that are posted is because
>I feel, ultimately, that I would like to see as many potential hams
>come into this hobby as possible.

Thinking such as our WA8 friend displays is not going to do the hobby
any good at all. If the regulators get the idea that this isn't
important to us, and with the pressure that the power companies are
putting on them, it might just happen...
>
>I think a lot of people are constantly worried about the
>low calibur class of people that would flood the hobby; some, I think,
>are people that simply don't want just anybody coming into the hobby,
>but would rather see a small slice of the population that meets thier
>criteria join and nobody else. Both are negative for ham radio, because
>i'm sad to say, the first group I mentioned still wouldn't be willing to
>try to pass a written test and probably wouldn't be able to; as for
>the second group of potential hams I listed, well, there just won't
>be enough of them to keep ham alive.

Both sides of the argument seem to share the desire to bring in new people to the hobby. Quality of the new operator, though, is a major concern - I really don't believe that the standards up here are tight enough right now (theoretical testing, forgetting the Code part for a moment...) - as I mentioned, I had a licence, a bunch of radio stuff that I bought at hamfests and hooked up - and no real idea what to do next. Some feel that CW is the answer - some want to see more theory. All (with some exceptions ;)) love the hobby as much as we do, maybe more, and want to preserve and protect it. Explains why some of the discussions are so - uh - passionate....

>
>What do you have if you allow ham radio to stagnate? And leo,
>of this i'm serious.... you have a hobby that loses what little
>clout it has with the FCC because of DROPPING membership,
>and thus, we'll see MORE of our bands taken away that are
>above 30 megs (I am STILL pissed off that we lost 220! And
>I understand that the U.P.S., that petitioned successfully to
>steal 220-222 megaherts away from the hams, don't even
>use it anymore!)

That is unfortunate indeed, and demonstrates the power of industry. We still have the 220 MHz band up here, Amateur exclusive - not sure if that will change, but it does highlight what can happen if we don;t work together as a team. Big business has great influence over government up here - and I suspect there too!

So, if you still have your 220 rig, come on up and visit - it's still good here!

>
>God, let's work together and keep this going.
>You and I and many people in here may have our differences,
>but we're both ham operators and enjoy our hobby.

Fully agreed - we got off to a bit of a bad start (!), but it ends here.....

>
>Hell, leo, meet me on HF sometime and we'll have a ball.

Deal. You know, if we can work things out this calmly, there just might be hope yet! ;) I think that, in many ways, you and I are coming from the same place!

Now, if we can all just focus on some of the things that threaten the hobby...there's a hell of a lot of work to do!

55, 73 Leo

>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT
>

6034. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 02:24:20 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <oP5eb.156$qj6.105117@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79348

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> Interesting to note that Dick just couldn't bring himself to mention
> that I was the one who took the reporter out and demonstrated
> the interference to him ... but I'm not surprised.

Carl, you've noted that we should stick together on this one.

Perhaps "we" doesn't include Dick?

There was no insult toward you in his post, and I would note that he posted the link to the article, which no doubt he read, and no doubt saw that you were a part of the article.

If we are to get together and fight this thing, it might be worth pointing out that not only should those who support Morse testing try to get along with those who don't - but the opposite is also true.

- Mike KB3EIA -

6035. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 02:26:17 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <blaq1o$qtv@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 79350

"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
news:5ee63311.0309290902.4bb5c4e@posting.google.com...
> "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
>
> > > "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote
> > >
> > > > One: no one should be kept out of the ARS--let
> > > > them get their license and stand or fail on their merit.
> > >
> > > You can't really mean that! I do not support continuation of
> > > the Morse test, but to suggest that we should just hand out
> > > licenses to anyone regardless of demonstrated qualification
> > > and let them "stand or fail on their merit" is the silliest
> > > notion I have seen here yet.
> > > That's like saying "let anyone get their drivers license
> > > and stand or fail on their driving record" without having
> > > passed a test.
> > >
> > > 73, de Hans, K0HB
> > >
> >
> > Yeah. What you suggest would be like saying that. But that was not
> > suggested and your attempt to stretch it to that is rather unlike you...
>
> But that's exactly what was suggested. Your words, written in a clear
> English declarative statement are unambiguous and say "NO ONE should
> be kept out of the ARS" --- that's pretty much the same as saying
> "NO ONE should be denied a drivers license".
>

OK, Hans. I forgot how the pholks like you need such phucking (HansTM)
pictures drawn for them. Here you go:

No one should be kept out of the ARS who is willing to meet the requirements
that are in current use at the time they begin entry into the service/hobby.
And the whole damned comment as a defense against the idea of those who
believe CW testing is a great way to filter out people from the ARS. Quit
being so stupid.

>
> Personally, I think persons who fail the test (or haven't taken a test)
> SHOULD be kept out of the ARS.
>
> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>

Me too. I hope you phinally phucking phigured that out. Good phucking grief.

Kim W5TIT

6036. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 02:29:40 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030929222940.21642.00001310@mb-m01.aol.com>
Source record: 79349

In article <vnhl0oi1nmb755@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
>news:5ee63311.0309290902.4bb5c4e@posting.google.com...
>
>>
>> But that's exactly what was suggested. Your words, written in a clear
>> English declarative statement are unambiguous and say "NO ONE should
>> be kept out of the ARS" --- that's pretty much the same as saying
>> "NO ONE should be denied a drivers license".
>
>see why the PCTA is accused of slant and spin?

Nope.

>I am pretty sure that the phrase "who passes the tests required by
>contemporary
>modern society" was implied.

Wasn't clear at all.

>If not, the part about "get thier license"
>pretty much
>removed any remaining "grey area" or misunderstanding.

The word is spelled "THEIR", Clint. Turn on your spellchecker if you can't remember it.

>
>> Personally, I think persons who fail the test (or haven't taken a test)
>> SHOULD be kept out of the ARS.
>>
>> 73, de Hans, K0HB
>
>that's what kim said.
>
No, she didn't.

And, btw, what makes you think Hans is "PCTA"?

6037. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 02:34:46 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <blaq7p$qqv@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 79452

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:oP5eb.156$qj6.105117@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > Interesting to note that Dick just couldn't bring himself to mention
> > that I was the one who took the reporter out and demonstrated
> > the interference to him ... but I'm not surprised.
>
> Carl, you've noted that we should stick together on this one.
>
> Perhaps "we" doesn't include Dick?
>
> There was no insult toward you in his post, and I would note that he
> posted the link to the article, which no doubt he read, and no doubt saw
> that you were a part of the article.
>
> If we are to get together and fight this thing, it might be worth
> pointing out that not only should those who support Morse testing try to
> get along with those who don't - but the opposite is also true.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>

That's a rather lofty goal, Mike, when considering that folks like DICKhead, Larry, and lately, you, act the way you do. Think about it. Most of the people to whom sheer disrespect is aimed at are the folks that have no problem at all with those of you who love, appreciate and admire CW as a mode and even the fact that you wish it to remain as a part of the test requirement. But the lack of tolerance displayed by people such as DICKhead, Larry, you, Dan/W4whatever, and others is overwhelmingly despicable and beyond being able to "join" together for the cause. The only common ground that may be found is that we are all amateurs. And, I doubt you'll even admit that.

At any rate, what I'm saying is, don't look for agreement, pats on the back, or a joining of the hands. The behaviors displayed by folks like you, et al, make me quite untrusting of you, and not particularly interested in your thoughts--whether they be for or against the good of amateur radio. I don't care about amateur radio when I think of people like you being in it. I don't speak for Carl; and I'm probably being a lot more blunt than he would be. But, understand, when it comes to tolerance of you guys--how can you possibly think there'd be any? Any at all?

Kim W5TIT

6038. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 02:36:31 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <P_5eb.160$qj6.108336@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79451

Dwight Stewart wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote:
>
>>No, he isn't. But that's about all the positive things I
>>can say about him. But I don't think he is exactly a
>>shining example of a NCTA - unless you agree with
>>the pejoratives he like to call us.
>>
>>Unless you happen to agree with them, of course.
>>You don't think we're N***'s do you???
>
>
>
> Actually, I didn't even noticed Clint before four or five days ago. If he
> posted to this newsgroup prior to that, he was just another one of the many
> doing so. To be honest, I don't read most of the messages here. Unless the
> subject line catches my eye, I routinely highlight large groups of messages
> and mark them as read in my newsreader. Once that happens, I rarely see
> those messages again since my newsreader is set to not list messages I've
> read (or marked as read). The only way to see them again would be as a
> result in a newgroup search.

That could be enlightening.

> But, to answer your question, I don't agree with the use of pejoratives or
> uncomplimentary terms to describe anybody. Well, I might make an exception
> with Larry, but that would be a very rare exception. I strongly believe we
> have to get past this code debate and move on to more productive matters.
> Throwing around nasty remarks isn't going to help do that.
>
>
>
>>(snip) I would have to say that in principle that the more
>>knowledge a ham has, the more likely he or she will be
>>a superoir ham, (snip)
>
>
>
> Perhaps I'm too liberal for this discussion. I don't agree with the very
> concept of a superior ham. We're all individuals with unique skills,
> knowledge, and experience, to bring to the table, none of those superior or
> inferior to that offered by others.

It's not a liberal or a conservative concept. It's just a matter of what a person inherently likes. In all my pursuits, I like a certain amount of panache in those around me. I like hard working, reasonably skilled people on my hockey team, I like my friends to be hard working, reasonably smart and witty, and I like the idea of the ARS having some sort of standard. Others obviously disagree.

I'm not going to force my opinions on anyone, but by gum, I'll make them known.

- Mike KB3EIA -

6039. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 02:37:03 UTC
From: Kim W5TIT <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <blaqc2$n8c@library2.airnews.net>
Source record: 79455

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030929222940.21642.00001310@mb-m01.aol.com...
> In article <vnhl0oi1nmb755@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> computron dot net> writes:
>
> >"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> >news:5ee63311.0309290902.4bb5c4e@posting.google.com...
> > >
> > >>
> > >> But that's exactly what was suggested. Your words, written in a clear
> > >> English declarative statement are unambiguous and say "NO ONE should
> > >> be kept out of the ARS" --- that's pretty much the same as saying
> > >> "NO ONE should be denied a drivers license".
> > >
> > >see why the PCTA is accused of slant and spin?
> >
> > Nope.
> >
> > >I am pretty sure that the phrase "who passes the tests required by
> > >contemporary
> > >modern society" was implied.
> >
> > Wasn't clear at all.
> >
> > >If not, the part about "get thier license"
> > >pretty much
> > >removed any remaining "grey area" or misunderstanding.
> >
> > The word is spelled "THEIR", Clint. Turn on your spellchecker if you can't
> > remember it.
> > >
> > >> Personally, I think persons who fail the test (or haven't taken a test)
> > >> SHOULD be kept out of the ARS.
> > >>
> > >> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> > >
> > >that's what kim said.
> > >
> > No, she didn't.
> >
> > And, btw, what makes you think Hans is "PCTA"?
> >
> >

Jim, I am really, really surprised that you failed to understand that the part about meeting test requirements was implied. I really am...

Oh well...

Kim W5TIT

6040. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 02:37:42 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <W%5eb.161$qj6.108938@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79453

Hans K0HB wrote:

> Personally, I think persons who fail the test (or haven't taken a test)
> SHOULD be kept out of the ARS.

Elitist! 8^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

6041. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 02:38:44 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blaqbk$vh9$0@208.206.142.97>
Source record: 79454

Brian Kelly wrote:
> The ARRL submission is the *only* by-the-numbers engineering study on
> record so far and it has the BPL proponents in a royal snit. They're
> *not* brushing it off by any means, they're vigorously attacking it,
> they know they have a battle on their hands so don't underestimate the
> ARRL's ability to be a spoiler far out of proportion to it's political
> and/or financial clout. David did take out Goliath, etc. Technical
> submissions are not over either, the NTIA is gonna weigh in eventually
> which could very well be the slam dunk BPL killer.
>
>

Dunno where this fella got his tech info, but he's sure
down on BPL as a viable technology, and he's some sort of
investment heavyweight guru...

<http://www.silicon.com/opinion/164/1/4387.html?rolling=1>

Dick

6042. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 02:47:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blaqs0$q9$0@208.206.142.97>
Source record: 79456

Carl R. Stevenson wrote:

> "Dick Carroll" <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com> wrote in message
> news:bl8dej$nq5$0@208.206.142.65...
>
>>Jim Hampton wrote:
>>
>>>Dick Carroll mentioned that some AM broadcast stations were virtually
>>>obliterated in Allentown, Pa. In that case, everyone noticing
>
> interference
>
>>>on broadcast band (AM) stations should complain to the stations
>
> involved.
>
>>>Believe me, commercial broadcasting (especially since the FCC allowed a
>
> few
>
>>>powerful groups to buy up most of the broadcast stations) has much
>
> deeper
>
>>>pockets than amateurs and would likely not hesitate even a moment to
>
> bring
>
>>>lawyers and Congress into the mess. Don't complain as a ham operator,
>>>however; complain that you can't hear some particular programs from the
>>>station due to all of this "interference". Let 'em figure it out :)
>>>
>>
>>
>>Here's an article on the BPL issue that appeared in the Allentown PA
>>newspaper....
>>
>>
>>
>
> http://www.mcall.com/news/local/all-a1_5net-glitchsep28,0,2293904.story?coll
>
>>Dick
>>

>
>
> Interesting to note that Dick just couldn't bring himself to mention
> that I was the one who took the reporter out and demonstrated
> the interference to him ... but I'm not surprised.
>

Well, Carl, I merely passed on the cut and pasted article which
INCLUDED your involvement. I didn't even delete the comment urging hams
to write the FCC nor the URL to do so, altho I, too, think it might not
be a good idea at this point.
Don't you think that I could have cut
you out if I had wanted to downplay your involvement? Why should
I do something like that? Unlike you, I don't believe you have a
^totally* evil agenda just because we don't agree on the Morse code
testing issue.
If it's thanks and praise you want, then
THANK YOU and CARL BE PRAISED for fighting BPL. At least
this time it's a noble cause.

6043. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 02:53:22 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blar72$1j7$0@208.206.142.97>
Source record: 79457

Jim Hampton wrote:

> Dick,
>
> The best chance you would have to make your comments known would be to write
> the radio stations that were blotted out. Believe me, the broadcast
> companies have *much* deeper pockets than amateur operators. They would
> take a dim view of having their advertising dollars evaporate due to BPL
> cutting down their coverage. I am quite serious about this.
>
>

My thought is that it's looking more and more like FCC has already
made up their minds, or maybe more accurately had their minds made up
for them. In that case, nothing short of Congressional action to
overturn their action will stave it off.

That might prove a real problem given who is lobbying whom these days.

Dick

6044. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 03:11:28 UTC
From: Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
Message-ID: <blas90$3tm$0@208.206.142.97>
Source record: 79458

Leo wrote:

> Hoping that BPL will destroy Amateur Radio to spite the 'no coders' is
> a nonsensical position to take. Sour grapes, I believe, is the term
> for this type of thinking!

Leo, I don't want to see *anything* destroy, or even further damage,
ham radio. That includes lowering the licensing standards so much
that the license is virtually given to anyone and everyone who
even the most mild and fleeting interest. History has clearly
shown where that leads.

Dick

6045. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 03:22:29 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <VF6eb.177$qj6.120427@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79459

Kim W5TIT wrote:

> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> news:oP5eb.156$qj6.105117@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>
>>>Interesting to note that Dick just couldn't bring himself to mention
>>>that I was the one who took the reporter out and demonstrated
>>>the interference to him ... but I'm not surprised.
>>
>>Carl, you've noted that we should stick together on this one.
>>
>>Perhaps "we" doesn't include Dick?
>>
>>There was no insult toward you in his post, and I would note that he
>>posted the link to the article, which no doubt he read, and no doubt saw
>>that you were a part of the article.
>>
>>If we are to get together and fight this thing, it might be worth
>>pointing out that not only should those who support Morse testing try to
>>get along with those who don't - but the opposite is also true.
>>
>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>
>
>
> That's a rather lofty goal, Mike, when considering that folks like DICKhead,
> Larry, and lately, you, act the way you do. Think about it. Most of the
> people to whom sheer disrespect is aimed at are the folks that have no
> problem at all with those of you who love, appreciate and admire CW as a
> mode and even the fact that you wish it to remain as a part of the test
> requirement. But the lack of tolerance displayed by people such as
> DICKhead, Larry, you, Dan/W4whatever, and others is overwhelmingly
> despicable and beyond being able to "join" together for the cause. The only
> common ground that may be found is that we are all amateurs. And, I doubt
> you'll even admit that.

Whoa there. Kim. Point out what exactly I have done that is so despicable. Is this some sort of thing where I stand up for Dick, then I am the same as him? I don't agree with everything he does. I don't care for him calling people names. I don't care for Larry doing that, I don't care for Steve and his Lennie stuff either. I've had discussions with at least Larry and Steve about it.

Are you lumping me together with these guys because of that antenna thread here? I'm not calling anyone names, I'm even trying to make some technical input on the subject, rather than the

> At any rate, what I'm saying is, don't look for agreement, pats on the back,
> or a joining of the hands. The behaviors displayed by folks like you, et
> al, make me quite untrusting of you, and not particularly interested in your
> thoughts--whether they be for or against the good of amateur radio. I don't
> care about amateur radio when I think of people like you being in it. I
> don't speak for Carl; and I'm probably being a lot more blunt than he would
> be. But, understand, when it comes to tolerance of you guys--how can you
> possibly think there'd be any? Any at all?

Sorry that you feel that way about me Kim.

- Mike KB3EIA -

6046. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 03:24:20 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <blbqur$a61i8$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79483
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

And it seems interesting Charles, that I was just forwarded a copy of
something that originated from the arrl, now supporting that direction.

--
Ryan, KC8PMX
FF1-FF2-MFR-(pending NREMT-B!)
--. --- -.. ... .- -. --. . .-.. ... .- .-. . ..-. .. .-. . ..-.
.. --. .... - . .-. ...
>
> > My thinking is, if my logic in the above paragraph is indeed true, then
> > wouldn't educating and getting those groups to lobby against BPL be more
> > effective rather than just us as a group collective?? Seems to me that
> > those organizations would have more effective "pull" with the FCC than
we
> > would.
> >
> > Am I wrong in this thinking or ???
> >
>
> I think that you are absolutely right, Ryan. I know that some of these
other
> services and agencies have been alerted, but I don't know how many know,
or
> what they have done in response.
>
> Charles Brabham, N5PVL
>
>

6047. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 03:28:18 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <mL6eb.179$qj6.122532@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79460

Mike Coslo wrote:

I missed some stuff, so I'm replying to my own post (yeah, bad newsgroup ettiquitte)

> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
>> "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>> news:oP5eb.156$qj6.105117@news1.news.adelphia.net...
>>
>>> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>>
>>>
>>>> Interesting to note that Dick just couldn't bring himself to mention
>>>> that I was the one who took the reporter out and demonstrated
>>>> the interference to him ... but I'm not surprised.
>>>
>>>
>>> Carl, you've noted that we should stick together on this one.
>>>
>>> Perhaps "we" doesn't include Dick?
>>>
>>> There was no insult toward you in his post, and I would note that he
>>> posted the link to the article, which no doubt he read, and no doubt saw
>>> that you were a part of the article.
>>>
>>> If we are to get together and fight this thing, it might be worth
>>> pointing out that not only should those who support Morse testing try to
>>> get along with those who don't - but the opposite is also true.
>>>
>>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>
>>
>> That's a rather lofty goal, Mike, when considering that folks like
>> DICKhead,
>> Larry, and lately, you, act the way you do. Think about it. Most of the
>> people to whom sheer disrespect is aimed at are the folks that have no
>> problem at all with those of you who love, appreciate and admire CW as a
>> mode and even the fact that you wish it to remain as a part of the test
>> requirement. But the lack of tolerance displayed by people such as
>> DICKhead, Larry, you, Dan/W4whatever, and others is overwhelmingly
>> despicable and beyond being able to "join" together for the cause.
>> The only
>> common ground that may be found is that we are all amateurs. And, I

>> doubt
>> you'll even admit that.
>
>
> Whoa there. Kim. Point out what exactly I have done that is so
> despicable. Is this some sort of thing where I stand up for Dick, then I
> am the same as him? I don't agree with everything he does. I don't care
> for him calling people names. I don't care for Larry doing that, I don't
> care for Steve and his Lennie stuff either. I've had discussions with at
> least Larry and Steve about it.
>
> Are you lumping me together with these guys because of that antenna
> thread here? I'm not calling anyone names, I'm even trying to make some
> technical input on the subject, rather than the

Sorry, lost a sentence. I'd tried to point out the errors that were
being made in the 1/4 wave antenna discussion without making anyone feel
put off. Otherwise there was a lot of mistaken impressions about what
was going on.

>
>
>> At any rate, what I'm saying is, don't look for agreement, pats on the
>> back,
>> or a joining of the hands. The behaviors displayed by folks like you, et
>> al, make me quite untrusting of you, and not particularly interested
>> in your
>> thoughts--whether they be for or against the good of amateur radio. I
>> don't
>> care about amateur radio when I think of people like you being in it. I
>> don't speak for Carl; and I'm probably being a lot more blunt than he
>> would
>> be. But, understand, when it comes to tolerance of you guys--how can you
>> possibly think there'd be any? Any at all?
>
>
> Sorry that you feel that way about me Kim.
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
>
>
>

6048. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 03:52:20 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030929235220.11891.00000028@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 79461

>There was no insult toward you in his post, and I would note that he
>posted the link to the article, which no doubt he read, and no doubt saw
>that you were a part of the article.

The problem is simple, Capt Karl thinks hes the best thing that ever happened to Ham Radio, and hes just looking for someone to say thank you Karl for saving Ham Radio.

6049. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 03:57:25 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030929235725.11891.00000029@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 79462

>My thought is that it's looking more and more like FCC has already
>made up their minds, or maybe more accurately had their minds made up
>for them. In that case, nothing short of Congressional action to
>overturn their action will stave it off.
>
>That might prove a real problem given who is lobbying whom these days.
>
>Dick
>

My point exactly, you can send Millions of replys to the FCC, its not going to make any difference. There is way to much MONEY ridding on this thing, and a BUNCH of WHINNING Hams are not about to sway the FCC and BIG Money.

6050. Isnt it Funny

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 04:05:39 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930000539.11891.00000030@mb-m03.aol.com>
Source record: 79463

No-Coders have whinned about being forced to learn CW to use HF. Now we have BPL come along, which will provide MILLIONS of people use of HF without taking a CW test. Now the No-Code Whinners are Whinning that its not fair that Millions of people in this country will be able to use HF without a CW Test.

6051. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 05:24:32 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <ks8eb.37417$pP6.33713@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79464

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
>
> Well if the shoe fits wear it you CBplusser

Do you follow your own advice, Bruce? If so, you must be wearing some really foul smelling shoes at this very moment because that would be the only shoes that fit you.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

6052. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 05:27:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <lu8eb.37419$pP6.30476@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79465

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
>
> Thats because Birds of a Feather stick together, and
> you dont have a CLUE what a REAL HAM is. And
> thats another reason you will always be a CBPLUSSER.

We had this discussion before, Bruce. Remember? We decided in that
discussion you had no clue what a real civilized human is.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

6053. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 05:39:06 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <blbqv0$a61i8$5@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79484
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

And you wasted even a few more. So what's your point? It happens in these newsgroups all the time.

"Peter Lemken" <spam.for.the@buerotiger.de> wrote in message news:bl76ht$8ml3v$2@ID-31.news.uni-berlin.de...
> In rec.radio.amateur.dx Ryan, KC8PMX <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote:
> > (not responding directly to this post but in general)
>
> And yet you quote 400 lines of useless unintelligible garbage.
>
> Superior intelligence at work.
>
> Peter Lemken
> DF5JT
> Berlin
>
> --
> Mail an die im From: angegebene Adresse stellt eine Beauftragung zur
> �berpr�fung der Mailfunktion des Absenders dar und wird mit einer
> Bearbeitungsgeb�hr von EUR 1000,- in Rechnung gestellt.

6054. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 05:49:07 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <nP8eb.37432$pP6.17866@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79466

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote:
>
> And THEN you come in here and read some PCTA'ers
> downing, and I quote, "CBplussers", talking about "cobra
> HF radios" and using deragotory remarks using the old
> 11 meter 10 codes, talking about no code hf'ers, and
> one fellow even going so far as to recommend a new
> license type call for those who advance after the morse
> code testing is removed, so they can all be recognized
> by the old gaurd and "not talk to them".. how childish
> can you get!

You can't take this stuff too seriously, Clint. Most of it is just the wail of ill-mannered malcontents. These fools are convinced others agree with them, when, in reality, they are a pitiful minority in a community filled with fine, outstanding, people. Their own words condemn them to isolation. All you have to do is point those words out to others and explain why they're wrong. The rest of the community will make their own judgments.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

6055. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 06:35:04 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <su9eb.37445$pP6.13174@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79467

"Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote:
>
> Then I'll answer it, Dwight. Because preparing for
> and passing Element 1 requires one to demonstrate
> a tad more effort and dedication than passing written
> exams for which the Q & A pools are published. The
> 5-wpm is sufficient enough of a challenge to require
> some serious studying effort over approx two or three
> weeks, but not enough to discourage any individual
> serious about earning HF privileges. For those who
> are not, the no-code Technician license is available.
> It's really quite simple.

Okay, now all you have to do is show where all that (demonstrated effort, challenge, earning privileges, a two to three week study effort, and so on) is listed in the FCC rules, or furthers the goals and purposes of the ARS. These are exams for a recreational activity with some serious underpinnings. You seem to want to turn those exams into a litmus test form of torture focused mainly on CW.

By the way, didn't you openly oppose the across the board 5 wpm code exam? If so, then why now is it suddenly "sufficient enough of a challenge?"

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

6056. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 06:59:02 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <WQ9eb.37449$pP6.14806@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79468

"WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
> No-Coders have whinned about being forced to learn
> CW to use HF. Now we have BPL come along, which
> will provide MILLIONS of people use of HF without
> taking a CW test. (snip)

Isn't it amazing how unaware you are? Millions of people with no CW/code skills have been using HF for decades. Of course, none of them (CB'ers) are members of the licensed ham radio community. Instead, a couple hundred thousand Technicians did the right thing and "earned" a license to join the ARS, all without being offered even the basic HF operating privileges of an unlicensed CB'er.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

6057. Re: Reflections on rrap

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 08:03:42 UTC
From: "Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net>
Message-ID: <blbqv1$a61i8$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>
Source record: 79485

I will definitely try to find a way out working that weekend, but if not, maybe the following year.

Ryan KC8PMX

"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote in message news:20030926222918.29815.00000837@mb-m21.aol.com...
> In article <bks56i$5715v$6@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Ryan, KC8PMX"
> <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> writes:
>
> >
> > >I would love to, but my employer mandates that everyone work that weekend,
> > >no exceptions, and since my employer and the Dayton committee will not budge
> > >on the date that kinda rules me out. Any other dates??
>
> Ryan:
>
> I'm not sure about myself either at this point, but I'm hopeful. In any case,
> you would certainly be missed.
>
> 73 de Larry, K3LT
>

6058. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 09:52:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930055225.21457.00000973@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 79469

In article <Dwadb.13617$pP6.4408@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Larry Roll K3LT" <yodoc@aol.comnospam> wrote:
>>
>> I've already answered that question many times, but the
>> short form is that without code testing, there is no incentive
>> for radio amateurs to learn the code at all. (snip)
>
>
> But, again, why should there be "incentive" for hams to learn code?

Because it's not a skill that most people will have learned elsewhere.

Most prospective hams already know how to read, write, talk and type. Most dod not know any Morse code.

>Notice
>that I'm not asking why a person would want to learn code on their own.
>Instead, I'm asking why there should be an effort on the part of the ARS or
>FCC to promote (boost, encourage, or push) this single operating mode (it's
>the only mode specifically skill tested)?

See above.

>> Retaining continued skill in Morse/CW has no negative
>> effect on the development of technology in the future.
>> That's an NCTA red herring.
>
> I didn't say it had a negative effect, Larry. Instead, I asked you how
>this (code skill testing) will help to keep the ARS abreast of modern
>technology, insuring our continued value to others? I also asked how this
>(code skill testing) will help move the ARS into the future (where we should
>be mainly focused)?

Some claim that Morse Code testing is at odds with the purpose of the amateur radio service as a fundamentally technical service. But in the practical experience of thousands of amateurs, the opposite is true.

Skill in Morse Code, even at a very basic level, permits amateurs to use radio equipment ranging from very simple to highly advanced designs, and technologies of almost any vintage. Morse Code skill encourages amateurs to actually build their own radio equipment by offering an easy first step, and a growth path that leads to almost any usable technology. It must be remembered that most radio amateurs are self-trained and do not have access to professional level resources. Few amateurs today would consider a single-sideband transceiver as a first project, but the home construction of Morse Code equipment is possible

for almost all amateurs.

I speak from direct experience in amateur radio home construction, having built my first amateur station at age 13. Since then I have built many more projects of increasing complexity, and much of my current amateur radio station is entirely homemade. The construction of my early stations led me to an electrical engineering degree and career. A major factor in that path was being able to start out with very simple but highly effective projects such as a simple Morse Code receiver and transmitter.

The removal of the Morse Code test from the Technician class license has not resulted in a technical revolution in amateur radio from newly-licensed "technically qualified" amateurs. Instead, the continued progress in amateur technical efforts continues to be mostly the result of work done by experienced amateurs, even though the Technician class license has not had a code test for more than 12 years.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6059. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 09:52:25 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930055225.21457.00000974@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 79470

In article <vnhj2clqreen21@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>I certainly think that by now newbies reading the various posts
>on either side of the issue have at least some good starting points from
>which to start making thier own conclusion. I wonder if, in retrospect,
>the PCTA is proud of the way they've behaved and wonder if they
>should not have taken a different tactic?

Neither side is a monolithic group. There are some very well behaved folks on each side. For example, my friend Bill Sohl, K2UNK, manages to get his points across without being insulting or denigrating to anyone.

I'm proud of the way I've behaved here.

Are you proud of the way you've behaved, Clint?

6060. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 09:52:26 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930055226.21457.00000975@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 79475

In article <3n3eb.35705$pP6.8735@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>Code makes a person more experienced?

Using the mode sure does.

>If that is true, then a person who
>passed a code test yesterday is more experienced than a person who got his
>license ten years ago without knowing code, and more experienced than all
>those in the other radio services where code is not used.

No, that's not what is being said.

>More rounded in what?

In the communications methods actually used by radio amateurs. A ham license is a license to operate an amateur station in the amateur radio bands, not to particiapte in other radio services.

> Emergency communications?

To a very small degree. Ask KT4ST - he's been there, done that.

>Moonbounce? Satellites?

A lot of amateur moonbounce and satellite work has been done with Morse code.

> And if a person with
>code was truly more able to provide communications under adverse conditions,
>all radio services would still be relying on code.

No, that's not true.

Other radio services use radio as a means to an end, not an end in itself. Most of them have the complete elimination of radio operators and radio operating skill as a goal. That's why the maritime service phased out Morse code on the high seas - they wanted to save the cost of having radio officers on their ships.

>They aren't. In the end, these are all code myths.

No, they are misunderstandings by those who don't like the code test.

Here, try this one:

"All else being equal, a radio amateur who has Morse Code skills is more experienced, more qualified, and has more radio communications options available than a radio amateur with no Morse Code skills."

73 de Jim, N2EY

6061. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 09:52:27 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930055227.21457.00000976@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 79471

In article <vnhj92fiqbsef@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>WHO is doing the name calling?

Both sides.

> it's not the NCTA group calling
>the PCTA "lazy", "stupid", and an assortment of complex insults
>using spurious comparisons.

it's not the PCTA group calling the NCTA "elitist", "arrogant", "luddite", "stuck in the past", "jackbooted thugs", "stoked on morsemanship", and an assortment of complex insults using spurious comparisons. Like "nazis".

6062. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 09:52:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930055228.21457.00000977@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 79472

In article <mLJdb.36372$ai7.28386@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote:
>>
>> (snip) the real reason is for the desire of CW testing
>> to stay around: these folks believe in its power to
>> filter out folks who act just like them.
>
>
> I quoted this part because I wanted to make sure everyone read it. When it
>comes to at least a few of those on the pro-code side, I think you hit the
>nail right on the head with this, Kim.
>
I am reminded of an old line usually credited to Groucho Marx: "I wouldn't join a club that would have me as a member"....

73 de Jim, N2EY

6063. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 09:52:28 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930055228.21457.00000978@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 79473

In article <F3Kdb.36397$ai7.11368@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>, "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:

>Other than code, what skills or knowledge of technology
>can be found in the pro-code crowd that cannot be found among the no-code
>crowd?

Dwight,

Good question!

Here's one answer:

How many hams do you know who have designed, built and operate homebrew stations? Not kits, not partly home-made, not with homebrew accessories, but 100% built-from-scratch amateur radio receivers, transmitters, transceivers, antennas, power supplies, etc.?

One of the oft-repeated claims has been that the code tests kept out "technically inclined" individuals. At least one NCTA (Vshah101) has claimed that "no self-respecting EE would use CW". Etc.

Yet what kind of equipment are these "technically inclined" individuals actually using on the air? If/when FCC dumps Element 1, will we see a lot more homebrew HF stations?

73 de Jim, N2EY

6064. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 09:52:29 UTC
From: n2ey@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930055229.21457.00000979@mb-m10.aol.com>
Source record: 79474

In article <vnhlet21vqoj21@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> writes:

>What about thier constant use of the term "CBplusser" and
>so forth...

There is only one person who uses that term. He also claims to be 305 years old.

>I don't know if THEY have kept up to date on ham
>radio violation records, but the vast majority of code & rule violaters are
>hams who've been in the hobby for many many years, have advanced licenses
>(advanced, extra) and thus have passed morse code testing.

Your source, please? I read the "FCC enforcement letters", and there seems to be a wide distribution of experience, license classes, etc.

One thing is quite obvious, though: the vast majority of enforcement actions are against hams using voice modes. When's the last time a ham using CW in the CW/data subbands was the target of an FCC enforcement action?

>The hams I
>have met personally that came out of 11 meters were the best hams I ever
>met. WHY? Because they KNEW where they came from, how nice it is
>up here, and have thus a respect for the advancement into a more
>serious hobby.

Some of the best and the worst hams I have known came from 11 meters.
>
>The foulest mouths i've ever heard were on 75 meters ssb, and one ham
>who's call I won't mention was denied advancement by hollingsworth HIMSELF
>(you can look it up on ARRL records).. he lived at the time in conroe,
>texas....
>he use to get just slobbering drunk on the radio and really raise hell;
>cussing,
>insulting, playing music, everything.

And what mode was he using?

>He passed the code requirements and
>written exam to advance to an even higher license, but recieved a letter
>from Hollingworth saying "you are not being given your upgrade, and
>furthermore, never will until I recieve a written letter from you explaining
>why you feel you DESERVE one."

Was he using CW to do all that?
>

>THAT ham was a long time veteran ham who had already passed a
>CW test. Therefore, any argument brought up that CW testing is
>a "yahoo filter" as they call it is wrong. It doesn't stop any such thing.

He'd also passed several *written* tests on regulations and operating practices. Those written tests didn't stop his behavior either. Shall we dump the writtens because they are not a "yahoo filter" either?

No test can be a perfect "filter".

6065. Re: CQ 75 CQ 75 CQ 75

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 10:58:42 UTC
From: "William E. Sabin" <sabinw@mwci-news>
Message-ID: <vniocvogpaqla6@corp.supernews.com>
Source record: 79477
Cross-posted to: alt.ham-radio.hf,alt.ham-radio.ssb,alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.dx,rec.radio.amateur.homebrew,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

Mohawk Brewing wrote:
> LID
>
> "K4-OLD-KING-ALLIGATOR"
> <BIG-AL@ -003894.5-LSB-75-METERS@@@BIG-AL@@@-003894.5-LSB-75-METERS> wrote
> in message news:vn84c75mdd0bc8@corp.supernews.com...
>
>>THIS IS "BIG--AL" CALLING.
>>CQ 75 CQ 75 CQ 75
>>THIS IS "BIG--AL" CALLING.
>>WHERE YOU AT BOY?
>>THIS IS "BIG--AL" CALLING.
>>CQ 75 CQ 75 CQ 75
>>THIS IS "BIG--AL" CALLING.
>>WHERE YOU AT BOY?
>>
>>

Once a LID, always a LID (Rod Newkirk, 1955 QST)

Bill W0IYH

6066. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 11:18:22 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <2Edeb.15677$Kq4.12063213@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 79479

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:vnhj4a329dhf5d@corp.supernews.com...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote in message
> news:5G2eb.8879$Kq4.7961347@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net...
>
> >
> > Then I'll answer it, Dwight. Because preparing for and passing Element 1
> > requires one to demonstrate a tad more effort and dedication than
passing
> > written exams for which the Q & A pools are published. The 5-wpm is
> > sufficient enough of a challenge to require some serious studying effort
> > over approx two or three weeks, but not enough to discourage any
> individual
> > serious about earning HF privileges. For those who are not, the no-code
> > Technician license is available. It's really quite simple.
> >
>
> that's true until the rules are changed and CW testing is taken out.
>
> Clint

Sadly correct, Clint.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

6067. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 11:18:23 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <3Edeb.15678$Kq4.12063706@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 79478

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:su9eb.37445$pP6.13174@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote:
> >
> > Then I'll answer it, Dwight. Because preparing for
> > and passing Element 1 requires one to demonstrate
> > a tad more effort and dedication than passing written
> > exams for which the Q & A pools are published. The
> > 5-wpm is sufficient enough of a challenge to require
> > some serious studying effort over approx two or three
> > weeks, but not enough to discourage any individual
> > serious about earning HF privileges. For those who
> > are not, the no-code Technician license is available.
> > It's really quite simple.
>
>
> Okay, now all you have to do is show where all that (demonstrated
effort,
> challenge, earning privileges, a two to three week study effort, and so
on)
> is listed in the FCC rules, or furthers the goals and purposes of the ARS.

Ok, Dwight. Very easy. It's not. While the FCC is the regulatory body to whom we answer, they are definitely NOT the sum total of who or what defines OUR hobby/service. We, as amateurs radio operators, are a big part in retaining those element that define our rules, tradition, and culture. This is why the NCTA's battle cry is "well, the FCC doesn't think so" and/or "it serves no regulatory purpose." Sure, the FCC defines the rules and regs to which we're beholden, but as rar as basis and purpose goes...we ourselves have more say in that than you or some other NCI folks appear willing to acknowledge. Calling the 5-wpm exam a barrier is just plain silly and in the end, this crusade to eliminate the test will have a negative effect on the overall quality (NOT quantity) of AR. Frankly, I have much more respect for someone with the stones to just admit that they're too lazy or insufficiently motivated to bother meeting the requirements than all this "regulatory" mumbo jumbo.

> These are exams for a recreational activity with some serious
underpinnings.
> You seem to want to turn those exams into a litmus test form of torture
> focused mainly on CW.

The 5-wpm exam..."a form of toture," Dwight? Surely you jest.

> By the way, didn't you openly oppose the across the board 5 wpm code
exam?
> If so, then why now is it suddenly "sufficient enough of a challenge?"

Because it beats a blank. BTW, were you one of those who said that the VHF
and up privies of your license were sufficient for your needs? How long
after Element 1 is dropped can I address you as W5NET/AE, hmm?

> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Vry 73 de Bert
WA2SI

6068. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 11:31:43 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <zQdeb.15761$Kq4.12137836@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 79480

"N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
news:20030930055228.21457.00000977@mb-m10.aol.com...
> In article <mLJdb.36372$ai7.28386@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>,
"Dwight
> Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> writes:
>
> >"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote:
> >>
> >> (snip) the real reason is for the desire of CW testing
> >> to stay around: these folks believe in its power to
> >> filter out folks who act just like them.
> >
> >
> > I quoted this part because I wanted to make sure everyone read it. When
it
> >comes to at least a few of those on the pro-code side, I think you hit
the
> >nail right on the head with this, Kim.
> >
> I am reminded of an old line usually credited to Groucho Marx: "I wouldn't
join
> a club that would have me as a member"....
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

BINGO! It only filters out those who are unwilling to TRY.

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

6069. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 11:36:23 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309300336.3f720532@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79481

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030926150415.08626.00000907@mb-m27.aol.com>...
> In article <20030926082957.15923.00000914@mb-m12.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> writes:
>
>
> >> Learn to live with it graciously.
> > >
> > >Set us an example
>
> You first.

Another LenniePost with no ID, signature, etc, yet only the day
before yesterday he stated that never happened. And of couse he has
once again provided us yet another example of his pattern of
pathological lying.

Thanks, Lennie.

And of course we expected nothing more (we ALWAYS expect
something less from him!) than this reply.

God forbid the "professional" would take a leadership roll to set
a standard of example...Of course >>HE<< always takes the opportunity
to suggest AMATEURS do it for HIM...! ! !

Two faced as ever...

Steve, K4YZ

6070. Re: No good threads

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 11:43:45 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309300343.2ad38112@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79482

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:<vneslv6jjusoc1@corp.supernews.com>...
> My best advice is add any post to your killfile that has
> the words CW, PCTA, NCTA or code testing as a
> subject.
>
> The reason is you're probably tired of the PCTA trolling...(SNIP)

Uhhhhhh, Clint, Old Boy, I will ask you to please show where he
suggested "one side" or the other was "at fault" for his OWN troll.

As for YOUR troll...Nice try. Obvious, unbalanced and pretty
lame. Just about what I'd expect...But NOT from you.

Or MAYBE from you...

Steve, K4YZ

6071. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 11:55:17 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <qhpinvscghbeu4jngcom4gb46988nne9vg@4ax.com>
Source record: 79486

On 30 Sep 2003 03:11:28 GMT, Dick Carroll <dixie@NOSPAM.townsqr.com>
wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>
>> Hoping that BPL will destroy Amateur Radio to spite the 'no coders' is
>> a nonsensical position to take. Sour grapes, I believe, is the term
>> for this type of thinking!
>
>
>
>Leo, I don't want to see *anything* destroy, or even further damage,
>ham radio. That includes lowering the licensing standards so much
>that the license is virtually given to anyone and everyone who
>even the most mild and fleeting interest. History has clearly
>shown where that leads.

Dick, I don't for a moment believe that you (or anyone on this group
with few exceptions) want the hobby to be downgraded or destroyed.
The comment that I was referring to most assuredly does not reflect
that of the majority of Hams (and, coming from an Extra, doesn't lend
much credence to either CW or advanced testing keeping out the
yahoos...;))

Looks to me like the bulk of the disagreement here centers around the
fact that, if and when code goes, what should replace it? Several
schools of thought are clear:

One group believes that it should simply be dropped (like most of the
countries who have removed CW testing have done). There is a problem
with this strategy, or at least a perception here in the group, that
doing this would be bad for the hobby as it will admit many folks who
don't have to put in any extra effort over and above the current
written exam.

Another group believe that CW should be retained - it has great
historical significance, is an excellent operating mode under adverse
conditions, and takes effort to learn - perhaps demonstrating the
commitment of the applicant. CW inherently imposes a civility on
conversation that straight voice does not - it is slower (at least for
me...) than speech, uses standard telegrapher's abbreviations bor
brevity, and does not convey emotion like voice does. It's harder to
have a heated arguement using CW - can be done, but harder ;)
Perlaps in this way the LID-factor is minimized. And sure, it's an
antiquated method of communication in an Internet-wired world - but
voice comminication is much older :)

Yet another group would like to see CW replaced with other testing, again if and when CW is retired. I'm in this category (though not passionate about retiring CW). Additional testing on radio operating practices relating to HF, Smith charts, additional theory or even practical operating tests in various modes have been proposed. This may be the best compromise in ensuring that those who join the hobby are prepared and qualified to do a good job when they get on the air, and well represent the caliber of people in the Amateur Radio ranks.

One obvious problem with the two approaches above (keep CW, add more testing if it goes) is with reciprocal operating agreements with other countries - if the requirements don't align, we could have a situation where foreign amateurs visiting North America would have reduced privileges during their stay here. All global agreements would require renegotiation - a massive task!

There are also several folks here (the WA8xxx initiator of the "hope BPL kills the hobby for the CBPlussers" crap, and hey, Big Al!) whose only purpose it to stir the pot and start fights - and are best ignored.

I'll close with a quote from Clint's post to me last night - something that no one here can argue with, and I wish I had said so well:

"I love this hobby, it's a blast; it has so many avenues to pursue and so many different ways to enjoy it."

Now THAT's the spirit of Amateur Radio!

73, Leo

>Dick
>
>
>

6072. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 12:23:27 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309300423.5504d99e@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79487

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F783EFC.5000201@psu.edu>...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>
>
> < some snippage>
>
>
> >>
> >>Agreed, Carl. I suspect that by the end of this sad tale, many amateurs
> >>will think much better of the NTIA. Rather than mass emails, right now
> >>an interesting and very good experiment might be to do a little HF
> >>direction finding.Trace the "mystery signals" to their source. Write it
> >>up in a reasonably good fashion, and it might make for some more damning
> >>evidence against BPL.
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >
> >
> > Mike,
> >
> > You don't have to DF ... you can clearly tell just by listening when
> > you're approaching, in, and leaving the BPL area ... and you can
> > see the couplers they use to get the signal around the transformers.
>
>
> I agree that it wouldn't be a difficult thing to find. I just think
> that if an amateur or group were to take an approach that didn't start
> out "I can hear the BPL intereference 60 miles away", it might have more
> impact.
>
> Something like " On such and such date, a strong interference showed up
> on such and such bands. As the interference did not do away, a local
> group of amateurs and myself decided to trace the interference to it's
> source.
>
> Then an outline of the DF method, and finally decribing the cause after
> finding it.
>
> The point is that if people can easily trace out the interference from
> far away, it hammers home that it isn't really a local problem.
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

Don't forget the 8X10 glossies with circles and arrows.

6073. Re: 1/4 Wave Dipoles

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 12:28:44 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309300428.1e9ebb5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79488

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030925212928.14837.00003229@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> In article <20030925165636.12631.00001466@mb-m28.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> (Len Over 21) writes:
>
> >In article <20030925082934.08626.00000890@mb-m27.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >(N2EY)
> >writes:
> >
> >>In article <20030925015541.25517.00000935@mb-m15.aol.com>, lenover21@aol.com
> >>(Len Over 21) writes:
> >>
> >>>In article <20030924203109.02537.00000757@mb-m23.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com
> >>>(N2EY)
> >>>writes:
> >>>
> >>>>In article <20030924174226.07578.00000783@mb-m25.aol.com>,
> >>>>lenover21@aol.com
> >>>>(Len Over 21) writes:
> >>>>
> >>>>>YOU are NOT on any QRZ listing for any country.
> >>>>
> >>>>Neither are you. Len ;-) ;-) ;-)
> >>>
> >>> I've never PRETENDED to be one.
> >>
> >>Why are you shouting, Len?
> >
> > Not shouting.
>
> Yes, you are. Capitalizing every letter in a word is online shouting. Bad
> manners on your part. It also indicates you are out of control.
>
> Perhaps you should take a time-out and come back to the group when you can
> behave in a mature fashion.

I invoke your "Bruce Hypothesis."

Len isn't really shouting nor is he out of control.

HE MERELY WISHES TO GIVE THAT IMPRESSION.

6074. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 12:31:32 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309300431.673f47fe@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79489

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<5D4eb.8338$yp6.228429@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0309291302.64d8c737@posting.google.com...
> > groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
> news:<5ee63311.0309281048.70c4e1cb@posting.google.com>...
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> > >
> > > >
> > > > 1) Back in '78, the students learned Morse Code as part of their CG
> training,
> > > > so there was no other training needed for them to get Extra Class
> amateur
> > > > licenses. Today, they would need to put in some of their own time, and
> a bit of
> > > > effort, learning Morse at 5 wpm for that test.
> > > >
> > >
> > > You know Jim, the more I ponder this paragraph, the more I think you
> > > may just have hit on an important way of grading the dedication (and
> > > therefore "value") of any given amateur licensee.
> >
> > Well, that wasn't my intent at all. I was merely pointing out that for
> > some folks, getting a license involves a lot of learning and the
> > related effort, while others already have the skills and knowledge.
>
> The point is that licensing should be based on one's demonstration
> of the required qualifications, no more, no less.
>
> If someone already has the knowledge to pass the tests, fine.
> There is no "value added" in "making them work for it" ... if
> they have the knowledge they are qualified, period. (and likely
> they worked for it or they wouldn't have the knowledge anyway,
> so the logic of "making them work (more)" fails)
>
> Carl - wk3c

Furthermore, if the US government wants to give all prospective
amateurs 3 hots and a cot, and a paycheck, for the duration it takes
to learn the code, I'd gladly enroll in the CG Morse Code school.

6075. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 12:36:58 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F7978EA.5070208@psu.edu>
Source record: 79490

N2EY wrote:
> In article <vnhj92fiqbsef@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
> dot net> writes:
>
>
>>WHO is doing the name calling?
>
>
> Both sides.
>
>
>>it's not the NCTA group calling
>>the PCTA "lazy", "stupid", and an assortment of complex insults
>>using spurious comparisons.
>
>
> it's not the PCTA group calling the NCTA "elitist", "arrogant", "luddite",
> "stuck in the past", "jackbooted thugs", "stoked on morsemanship", and an
> assortment of complex insults using spurious comparisons. Like "nazis".

I think you'll be told "That's different". Somehow, some way, some people are convinced that since they are "right" that civil behavior is not necessary.

Problem is not one of our positions is right or wrong. Its all opinions.

But then it is easier to just lump everyone together into two groups. Then dehumanize them, so that whatever you do is okay, and ends justify means.

- Mike KB3EIA -

6076. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 12:38:48 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <sPeeb.62$s32.12597403@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79491
Cross-posted to:
alt.ham-radio.hf,rec.radio.amateur.policy,rec.radio.amateur.boatanchors,alt.ham-radio.packet,rec.radio.amateur.dx

"Ryan, KC8PMX" <REMOVETHISkc8pmx@diamondcs.net> wrote in message
news:blbqur$a61i8$1@ID-189073.news.uni-berlin.de...
> And it seems interesting Charles, that I was just forwarded a copy of
> something that originated from the arrl, now supporting that direction.

Cool!

I saw the ARRL president at a digital conference in Austin TX last month. He
was talking about the need to organize back then, which I took to mean that
they hadn't done so yet. It's good to see that they are doing something
about it.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

6077. Re: Leo's self-incriminating AGAIN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 12:39:37 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309300439.15a1920a@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79492

Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
news:<g6t6nvo17o7lr7h8mcir5l9nl44q4e6628@4ax.com>...
> LOL !
>
> What in hell are you trying to say? Sabotage what position? Please
> get someone to translate my posts into whatever it is that you speak,
> then reply! Duh...
>
> Leo
>
> PS - while we're on the subject of spelling errors, I noticed this one
> in your post below:
>
> Rebuttles? Try 'rebuttals' next time ;)
>
> Whoops, them thar's one of yer Pot / Black sceen-arios, I reckon!

And so it goes.

It would appear that you've run out of steam again.

6078. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 12:44:15 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309300444.5136c329@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79493

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<9wDcb.10939$ai7.3226@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote:
> >
> > Meanwhile, the US had listening posts in Turkey,
> > Greece, Germany, Korea, Japan...
> >
> > We didn't need to send OUR traffic via CW, we
> > needed to copy THEIR message traffic using CW.
>
>
> And it was all monitored by computers. My father worked at one of those
> stations in Turkey in the mid-60's (Karamusel Air Station near Istanbu).
> Nobody actually listened to the initial traffic by ear. Instead, computers
> listened for key words and recorded conversations that might be interesting
> (CW messages were printed). Those messages were then sent back to the states
> for screening and evaluation.
>
>
> Dwight Stewart (W5NET)
>
> http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

Computers listening for key words in the mid-60's. Hmmm.

I roomed with a ditty-bopper, he listened to live signals on a real
radio in the 1980's.

6079. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 12:49:34 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309300449.297697fa@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79494

"Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<4c4db.4411$Hd6.2267245@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
> news:bkutul$6b3su$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > "Brian" wrote ...
> >
> > That candidate stole the election in 1992.
> > --
> >
> > Ah, something to which we can both agree :-))
> >
> > Arnie -
> > KT4ST
> >
> >
>
> Do keep in mind that finally some newspaper, under the Freedom of
> Information Act, finally did do a recount of all ballots in Florida. Some
> six months later, the results were published and showed the election results
> would have been unchanged. Naturally this was printed as a filler at the
> bottom of the last page of the paper. It was available somewhere on line,
> but it's been so long ago now that I now longer have the URL and it may have
> been taken on the site by now.
>
> Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

Did Florida have a recount in the 1992 election?

6080. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 12:51:09 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309300451.1b31a801@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79495

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030926082958.15923.00000916@mb-m12.aol.com>...
> In article <bkvs4h$67a39$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>, "Arnie Macy"
> <kt4stnospam@csam.net> writes:
>
> >"Leo" wrote in part ...
> >
> > BTW, are you Len's new guardian angel? Did Clint get laid off? ;)
> >_____
> >
> >I was actually beginning to think that Len and Clint might be one in the
> >same. But a cursory view of the disparity in writing style, grammar, and
> >spelling dispels that myth fairly quickly.
>
> Do you think that a person can have only one writing style?
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

Grumwich?

6081. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 12:52:11 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309300452.6c787ecd@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79498

"Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<bl2q1m$7doa6$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> "N2EY" wrote ...
>
> Do you think that a person can have only one writing style?
> ____
>
> I agree that a person can have more than one writing style. In this case;
> however, Len would have to work exceedingly hard to destroy any semblance of
> writing ability. I believe he has too much of an ego for that.
>
> Arnie-
> KT4ST

And Bruce? Jim thinks he is a genius that presents himself as a "morron."

6082. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 12:53:17 UTC
From: brianburke@juno.com
Message-ID: <f45722ac.0309300453.30a74573@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79499

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030925165629.12631.00001457@mb-m28.aol.com>...
> In article <f45722ac.0309250301.40d534bd@posting.google.com>,
> brianburke@juno.com (Brian) writes:
>
> >Leo <nomail@nope.org> wrote in message
> >news:<sci4nv8lci20ei97htpvh537ujjhmm98cv@4ax.com>...
> >
> >> Instead of buying one, can I borrow your copy when you are done with
> >> it?
> >
> >Where should it be sent? To whom should it be addressed?
>
> Try sending it to Landing, NJ, in care of General Delivery. :-)

Is that "Baja" Canada?

6083. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 12:56:30 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F797D7E.4010505@psu.edu>
Source record: 79500

N2EY wrote:
> In article <vnhlet21vqoj21@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> computron dot net> writes:
>
>
>>What about thier constant use of the term "CBplusser" and
>>so forth...
>
>
> There is only one person who uses that term. He also claims to be 305 years
> old.

What is it with the application of one person's pejorative to everyone?
I've never called anyone a name here, and yet you and I are assigned the
infamous "they" and "their".

>
>>I don't know if THEY have kept up to date on ham
>>radio violation records, but the vast majority of code & rule violaters are
>>hams who've been in the hobby for many many years, have advanced licenses
>>(advanced, extra) and thus have passed morse code testing.
>
>
> Your source, please? I read the "FCC enforcement letters", and there seems to
> be a wide distribution of experience, license classes, etc.

> One thing is quite obvious, though: the vast majority of enforcement actions
> are against hams using voice modes. When's the last time a ham using CW in the
> CW/data subbands was the target of an FCC enforcement action?

I did a little research project on this a year or so ago. No vast
majority of any license class as far as perps go. There were a bit more
of the higher classes, but not significantly so. Techs were real close,
and then there were the unlicensed. I'd have to say there was no
significant difference in the license class as far as rule violations go.

>
>>The hams I
>>have met personally that came out of 11 meters were the best hams I ever
>>met. WHY? Because they KNEW where they came from, how nice it is
>>up here, and have thus a respect for the advancement into a more
>>serious hobby.
>
>
> Some of the best and the worst hams I have known came from 11 meters.
>

>>The foulest mouths i've ever heard were on 75 meters ssb, and one ham
>>who's call I won't mention was denied advancement by hollingsworth HIMSELF
>>(you can look it up on ARRL records).. he lived at the time in conroe,
>>texas....
>>he use to get just slobbering drunk on the radio and really raise hell;
>>cussing,
>>insulting, playing music, everything.
>
>
> And what mode was he using?
>
>
>>He passed the code requirements and
>>written exam to advance to an even higher license, but recieved a letter
>
>>from Hollingworth saying "you are not being given your upgrade, and
>
>>furthermore, never will until I recieve a written letter from you explaining
>>why you feel you DESERVE one."
>
>
> Was he using CW to do all that?
>
>>THAT ham was a long time veteran ham who had already passed a
>>CW test. Therefore, any argument brought up that CW testing is
>>a "yahoo filter" as they call it is wrong. It doesn't stop any such thing.
>
>
> He'd also passed several *written* tests on regulations and operating
> practices. Those written tests didn't stop his behavior either. Shall we dump
> the writtens because they are not a "yahoo filter" either?
>
> No test can be a perfect "filter".

And never will be. There are incompetent and even evil doctors. And yet
they have one of the most rigorous entry requirements there are.

No requirements are needed to operate a transciever on HF. We have to
decide how much knowledge is needed. My only wish is that the
requirements are enough that I know that the person is highly interested
in the service.

- Mike KB3EIA -

6084. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 12:58:58 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <m6feb.8394$yp6.234106@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79496

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309300431.673f47fe@posting.google.com...
>
> Furthermore, if the US government wants to give all prospective
> amateurs 3 hots and a cot, and a paycheck, for the duration it takes
> to learn the code, I'd gladly enroll in the CG Morse Code school.

There's one problem ... there IS no CG Morse Code school any
more ... the services are NOT teaching their radiomen Morse any
more. My youngest son is in Navy EOD ... on notch below the
SEALS (which he qualified for 100% except for being just barely
over the line on their perfect uncorrected vision requirement) ... and
he NEVER learned Morse ... despite the fact that his MOS is
"Radioman."

Carl - wk3c

6085. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 12:58:58 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <m6feb.8395$yp6.234106@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79497

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309300431.673f47fe@posting.google.com...
>
> Furthermore, if the US government wants to give all prospective
> amateurs 3 hots and a cot, and a paycheck, for the duration it takes
> to learn the code, I'd gladly enroll in the CG Morse Code school.

There's one problem ... there IS no CG Morse Code school any
more ... the services are NOT teaching their radiomen Morse any
more. My youngest son is in Navy EOD ... on notch below the
SEALS (which he qualified for 100% except for being just barely
over the line on their perfect uncorrected vision requirement) ... and
he NEVER learned Morse ... despite the fact that his MOS is
"Radioman."

Carl - wk3c

6086. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 13:09:00 UTC
From: "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com>
Message-ID: <Mffeb.8397$yp6.234438@nnrp1.ptd.net>
Source record: 79501

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:oP5eb.156$qj6.105117@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>
> > Interesting to note that Dick just couldn't bring himself to mention
> > that I was the one who took the reporter out and demonstrated
> > the interference to him ... but I'm not surprised.
>
> Carl, you've noted that we should stick together on this one.

I agree ...

>
> Perhaps "we" doesn't include Dick?

My comment was just to indicate the perception that because we
disagree on one issue, Dick seems inclined to ignore anything I
do in other areas where we SHOULD be on the same page.

Carl - wk3c

6087. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:05 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <loiinvss1husi02db734kgfno57qrhgj2m@4ax.com>
Source record: 79513

On 28 Sep 2003 04:19:07 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>There is no need for use of the Morse/CW
>mode to "help keep the ARS abreast of modern technology...".

And later in the same post...

>There is no connection
>between Morse/CW testing or use and any possible deleterious effect on
>the development of other communications modes.

>
>73 de Larry, K3LT

I agree with both statements, Larry. And although I admittedly took
them out of context in the above quotes, the two statements are
perfectly capable of standing on their own - as two perfectly good
reasons why there is no longer any need for code testing.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6088. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:06 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <06jinvs9efmk9sg4r6kkeugtgia8qspeau@4ax.com>
Source record: 79506

On Sun, 28 Sep 2003 09:21:07 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>Y'know what? Speaking of words. The whole CW issue is defended (by many)
>as being the defense of some premier communication mode and that is usually
>enhanced by some submission of why the mode should be revered. However,
>aside from that--when the meat and potatoes of the argument (not debate)
>comes into play--the only defensible reasoning that is issued from there is
>that it "dumbs down" the ARS not to have the CW test, or that "lids" will
>come into the ARS, or that....well, you know them all.

I happen to think it's a case of turf defending...the PCTAs feel they
must defend their exclusive little slices of the RF spectrum at all
costs, regardless of what harm is done to the ARS in the process.
They'll kill the mother to save the baby.

>I submit, again, that the hidden among the fervor for the appreciation of CW
>is the main idea that CW is a filter (no pun intended) to keep people out of
>the ARS.

While this may be true, FCC didn't buy that argument from the PCTAs
with respect to lowering the code test speed to 5WPM during the last
restructuring, and I highly doubt that FCC will buy it this time
around, either.

Now...try asking the PCTAs about refarming the Novice subbands once
there aren't any more Novices around to use them, and make sure you've
got your asbestos pantyhose on when you do it. :-)

>There's two reasons that's bunk. One: no one should be kept out
>of the ARS--let them get their license and stand or fail on their merit.

I think there are definitely people who should be kept out of the ARS,
including some who are already licensed. However, I also think that
the proper way to keep them out is through the self-policing that the
ARS is well known for, along with appropriate enforcement efforts on
the part of FCC - rather than through the use of a testing requirement
that also causes many potentially excellent operators to turn away
from amateur radio.

>Two: it's quite obvious that just because someone's passed a CW test--indeed
>beyond that: that someone operates CW at high speed even--it does nothing
>for proof of being a good ham, more technical ham, or intelligent ham.

Again, FCC did not buy this particular PCTA argument the last time
around. The Commission's response to this, in its Report & Order on
Docket WT 98-143, read as follows:

" We do not concur with the comments alleging that the passing of a telegraphy examination is an indication of the examinee's good caracter, high intelligence, cooperative demeanor, or willingness to cmply with our rules. These traits are also found in individuals who have not passed a telegraphy examination rather that being exclusive to those who have passed such a test."

>Basically, when the "dumbed down" rhetoric is puked back up--we all know
>what the real reason is for the desire of CW testing to stay around: these
>folks believe in its power to filter out folks who act just like them.

Or to filter out folks who don't act like them, and thus do not contribute to the task of holding on to their "turf" in the RF spectrum. What really sticks in their collective craw is that if you go back and re-read the comments in the Report & Order that I quoted from above, the writing is already on the wall for the elimination of code testing pursuant to the petitions for rulemaking that have already been filed with FCC - or should I say, the writing is already on the FCC website:

"We are persuaded that because the amateur service is fundamentally a tchnical service, the emphasis on Morse code proficiency as a licensing requirement does not comport with the basis and purpose of the service."

The same document also cites the international requirements as the basis for retaining code testing in Part 97:

"When considering the issue of telegraphy as an examination requirement to obtain an amateur radio operator license, we begin with a number of general principles. First, the Radio Regulations contain certain requirements that an applicant for an amateur radio license must satisfy. With regard to the telegraphy requirement specifically, the Radio Regulations require that persons seeking a license to operate an amateur radio station must prove that they have the ability to send correctly by hand and to receive correctly by ear texts in Morse code telegraphy signals. The Radio Regulations also provide that this requirement may be waived only for an operator of a station transmitting exclusively on frequencies above 30 MHz. In order to comply with the Radio Regulations, our rules require that every class of amateur radio operator license that authorizes privileges below 30 MHz has, as one of the examination elements that an applicant is required to pass or otherwise receive credit for, a telegraphy examination element. The other principles that we consider relevant to examination requirements are that those requirements pertain to the privileges the operator license authorizes and that they constitute the minimum requirements necessary to demonstrate that the control operator of a station can ensure the proper operation of that station."

The Radio Regulations referred to no longer contain this requirement. As for the other two principles that FCC states it considers relevant, Technicians are already authorized full amateur privileges on all the

bands above 30 MHz, with no code test required - so apparently the code test is not necessary to demonstrate that the control operator of a station can ensure the proper operation of that station - and to the extent that the requirements pertain to the privileges the license authorizes, FCC already authorizes Technicians to operate in CW mode on the bands above 30 MHz sans any code testing.

I'd find this mighty discouraging if I were on the PCTA side of this particular discussion, but since I'm not, I'll leave the whining and crying and gnashing of teeth to the PCTAs. :-)

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6089. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:08 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <h4linvghp0iibgeq0hcdmv76nbkgk0qpsg@4ax.com>
Source record: 79503

On Sun, 28 Sep 2003 23:45:17 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote:

>Perhaps you think those that know/use Morse are superior to you. I don't >ever recall seeing anyone that advocates Morse saying they felt superior.

Perhaps you have a short memory, then, Dan. A search of Google or some other UseNet archive would, I'm sure, turn up at least one thread from circa July of this year where at least three of the PCTAs in this NG were claiming exactly that. In fairness, I'll admit that I don't recall you being one of them. Nevertheless, the attitude does exist among some of the PCTAs who regularly post here.

>I know I don't feel that way. However I do feel those that don't play on CW >are missing a major part of the enjoyment they could get from having a >amateur license. But thats their loss not mine.

I feel that those who don't participate in public service work are missing a major part of the enjoyment they could get from having an amateur license. However, I don't go around advocating that hams be required to do so, or that they be tested on their ability to do so as a requirement of obtaining a license.

>If you thank that is imparting a superior attitude, I say Dwight that you >have the problem, not us.

As this pertains to yourself, perhaps. As it pertains to several others in this NG? Hmmm...not quite, sir.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6090. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:09 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <6flinvos9o0ag9vmjbjvu19frto099ikus@4ax.com>
Source record: 79502

On Mon, 29 Sep 2003 19:29:05 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>No he didn't, it only found agreement with the a few other PCTA
>members such as yourself, but he didn't prove anything more than
>what I said was true.
>
>Clint
>KB5ZHT

Ummm...Clint...the person you are referring to as "he" happens to be
female. Not that this has any bearing on the discussion, but it just
looks funny calling Dee "he" rather than "she" which is the
appropriate pronoun until such time as Dee decides to have a gender
change operation (probably a highly unlikely event).

Just thought I'd try to set the record straight...

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6091. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:11 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <9mlinvoa6i3oapitsshpd7kqoicthjg6i7@4ax.com>
Source record: 79514

On Mon, 29 Sep 2003 04:49:01 GMT, "Dwight Stewart"
<stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote:

> I'm not talking about references or analogies, Clint. I'm talking about
>Larry's specific use of the word "superior" to describe those with code
>skills and the word "inferior" to describe those without such skills. Since
>none of the pro-code crowd objected to his position, I now trying to see how
>many others share the same opinions.

Dick Carroll and WA8ULX are two others who come to mind as having exhibited that attitude. Thinking back a few years, I can think of at least one other who I haven't seen posting here lately...definitely an improvement to rrap!

On the other hand, and in all fairness, there are PCTAs who come to mind who have not exhibited this attitude that I recall. Arnie Macy is one - and I give Arnie credit because I really don't get the sense that Arnie's position with respect to code testing is rooted in anything other than a genuine love of the mode and a desire to see its use continued in the ARS. With many of the other PCTAs in here, I get the sense that there are some other agendas underlying what they post.

Whether I agree with someone's opinion or not, I can respect that opinion if I feel that the person expressing it truly believes that they're doing what they think is best for amateur radio. It's the hams that are taking mean-spirited potshots at fellow hams over this issue who I have difficulty respecting the opinions of, especially when their statements on the subject give me the impression that there are other motives afoot and that they could really care less about what's best for the ARS as long as they get their way.

With all this talk about children vs. adults and superior vs. inferior, I can't help observing that insistence upon getting one's way regardless of the consequences to themselves or others is a personality trait that is generally observed in, shall we say, less mature individuals.

It should also be noted that, to non-hams, this whole argument undoubtedly seems quite childish.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6092. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:13 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <leminvs35amlhms9asglihs036mhrk7cep@4ax.com>
Source record: 79510

On Sun, 28 Sep 2003 08:36:04 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>
>> Do me a favor, John, and tell that to K2RSK next time you see him!
>>
>
>Who?

Larry was referring to Peter Liaros, K2RSK, a gentleman who both Larry and myself know personally. Peter happens to be a rather gifted CW operator - this is a guy who can and does operate 40m mobile CW and who is good enough at it that he can do it while driving and not be a hazard to other drivers. Peter undoubtedly would quickly disagree with the notion that *nobody* uses CW anymore, and he would, of course, be absolutely correct.

However, Larry's comment ignored the fact that what I posted was that nobody *else* makes much use of CW anymore - i.e. within government, commercial, military radio use, or anywhere else outside of the ARS...which is also absolutely correct.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6093. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:14 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <buminvkdd1n6autjr5kahfmnpetmja1c47@4ax.com>
Source record: 79521

On 27 Sep 2003 02:29:23 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>In article <fvj3nvkkg4ecol929t1h477uqnfa3ts060@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
><kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> writes:
>
>>>>>Don't look now, Clint, but welfare programs are "handouts" that give
>>>>>away valuable assets as if the recipient were entitled to them simply
>>>>>by virtue of being there with his/her hand out.
>>>>
>>>>Correct. Therefore, code testing isn't a welfare program, it's a
>>>>government-subsidized life-support system for an anachronism.
>>>>
>>>>73 DE John, KC2HMZ
>>>>Tonawanda, New York
>>>
>>>Well, that's YOUR opinion, John. Thanks for sharing it with us.
>>>You have a right to be wrong.
>>
>>What are you saying then? That it *is* a welfare program after all?
>>
>>73 DE John, KC2HMZ
>>Tonawanda, New York
>
>John:
>
>No, you and Clint said that code testing was a "welfare program," and
>you're both wrong.

Ahem...kindly re-read the quoted material.

Clint called it a welfare program.

I called it a (all together now, class):

>>>>government-subsidized life-support system for an anachronism.

Clint has subsequently elaborated on his comment, citing government
subsidizing of the agricultural industry as one example, demonstrating
that this is in fact what he had in mind as well.

Now, then...once the government has stopped subsidizing the
manufacture and testing of CW operators by eliminating the code test,
how do you think we should reallocate the Novice subbands?

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6094. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:16 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <tkninvoaivoetouggtfcceqfst49t1uphn@4ax.com>
Source record: 79504

On Sun, 28 Sep 2003 23:42:19 GMT, "Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this
mindspring.com> wrote:

>I guess what Im saying, and trying to be polite to the detractors (dummies
>to lazy to learn Morse code) is don't confuse them with the facts, the are
>to stupid to learn....and like I always like to say. Ya just cain't fix
>stupid.
>
>Dan/W4NTI

This from the guy who just claimed he doesn't claim to be superior to
the no-coders? Does that mean you also consider yourself a dummy,
lazy, and stupid too?

BTW, not all detractors are people who haven't learned the code.

Stupid *can* be fixed - through education. The problem that you seem
to have, on the other hand, remains a challenge to science.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6095. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:18 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <81oinvs89fq8hvc1ihg0oi6p9o0jtjpse0@4ax.com>
Source record: 79508

On Mon, 29 Sep 2003 21:26:17 -0500, "Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com>
wrote:

>OK, Hans. I forgot how the pholks like you need such phucking (HansTM)
>pictures drawn for them. Here you go:
>
>No one should be kept out of the ARS who is willing to meet the requirements
>that are in current use at the time they begin entry into the service/hobby.

Which (unfortunately) currently includes a code test. :-(

>And the whole damned comment as a defense against the idea of those who
>believe CW testing is a great way to filter out people from the ARS. Quit
>being so stupid.

Personally, I understand what you were trying to say, and I agree with
your underlying premise; however, you could have done a better job of
expressing it more clearly.

>Me too. I hope you phinally phucking phigured that out. Good phucking
>grief.
>
>Kim W5TIT

LOL...Kim, you musta had a bad today today. I've never seen you phreak
out like this over a relatively minor thing. :-)

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6096. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:20 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <ceoinvcuqe7i7nr6h5vhv2u10ibhjtuilk@4ax.com>
Source record: 79520

On 28 Sep 2003 04:19:08 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Dwight:
>
>You've spent the last couple of weeks attempting to re-attach some
>kind of significance to the fact that "other" radio services no longer
>"use code" (Morse code assumed). The only thing that has "lost touch
>with reality" around here would seem to be your own brain.

Well, then allow me:

ï¿½97.1 Basis and purpose.
The rules and regulations in this Part are designed to
provide an amateur radio service having a fundamental
purpose as expressed in the following principles:
(a) Recognition and enhancement of the value of the amateur
service to the public as a voluntary noncommercial
communication service, particularly with respect to
providing emergency communications.
(b) Continuation and extension of the amateur's proven
ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio art.
(c) Encouragement and improvement of the amateur service
through rules which provide for advancing skills in both the
communications and technical phases of the art.
(d) Expansion of the existing reservoir within the amateur
radio service of trained operators, technicians, and
electronics experts.
(e) Continuation and extension of the amateur's unique
ability to enhance international goodwill.

The "reality" is that this text is quoted from the FCC rules that
govern amateur radio wherever the FCC regulates amateur radio, which
last time I checked includes where you and I live. That's a "fact" you
can look up on the Internet if you think I quoted Part 97 incorrectly,
or dispute if you've recently moved to, oh, I dunno, Saudia Arabia
maybe. Now, then...

The FCC R&O on the last round of restructuring said the following (and
you can also look this up on the Internet if you think I'm misquoting
the FCC's R&O):

---
30. Based on our review of the record, we are not persuaded by the arguments of those commenters opposing reduction or elimination of the emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a license requirement in the amateur service.

<snippage>

We are persuaded that because the amateur service is fundamentally a technical service, the emphasis on Morse code proficiency as a licensing requirement does not comport with the basis and purpose of the service. We note, moreover, that the design of modern communications systems, including personal communication services, satellite, fiber optic, and high definition television systems, are based on digital communication technologies. We also note that no communication system has been designed in many years that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the ability to receive messages in Morse code by ear. In contrast, modern communication systems are designed to be automated systems. Given the changes that have occurred in communications in the last fifty years, we believe that reducing the emphasis on telegraphy proficiency as a licensing requirement will allow the amateur service to, as it has in the past, attract technically inclined persons, particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to learn and to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs expertise.

<snippage>

We also note that most amateur radio operators who choose to provide emergency communication do so, according to the amateur radio press, using voice or digital modes of communication, in part, because information can be exchanged much faster using these other modes of communication. Further, we note that in traditional emergency services, such as police, fire, and rescue, there is no requirement that emergency service personnel hold amateur radio licenses or any other license that requires telegraphy proficiency. We conclude, therefore, that telegraphy proficiency is not a significant factor in determining an individual's ability to provide or be prepared to provide emergency communications.

I repeat what I posted earlier this evening in response to a post from aomeone else in this NG: The writing is already on the FCC's wall for elimination of the code test. The petitions (seven of them, I believe) for rulemaking have been filed with FCC (including one by the NCVEC whose input seems to have had considerable influence on FCC's decisions with respect to the last restructuring) to eliminate the code test.

So rather than wonder why Dwight is attaching significance to all of this, I have to wonder why you and other PCTAs are trying to ignore

the "fact" that FCC did not buy your arguments about this the *last*
time around. What makes you think the same arguments are going to do
persuade FCC *this* time around?

In fact, it looks to me as if the code test has one foot out the door
and the other on a banana peel, whether you or I or anyone else likes
it or not, so this entire debate in rrap is rather pointless. Let's
find something worthwhile to discuss in this NG...like for example,
how do we refarm the subbands once there's no longer any need for 'em?

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6097. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:22 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <pkpinvohoj3hscjq6kbe8ut9cgsabcrmqm@4ax.com>
Source record: 79507

On 29 Sep 2003 02:21:52 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>I have given the "relevant facts" ad nauseum. I suggest you stop wasting
>my time and start Google-ing.

The only facts that are truly relevant are the facts about what FCC's
decision will be with respect to petitions for rulemaking on
eliminating the code test.

One need not wade through the clumsy web-based interface at Google in
order to get a pretty good idea of what FCC's view might be. One need
only review FCC's report and order from the last time around.

If you'd like, I can post it for you, in its entirety and without
comment or snippage.

Since it is FCC that will make the decision in the end, that's pretty
much the only "relevant facts" anyone ought to need on the subject.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6098. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:24 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <1tpinv05v299qt1flobtshicvo2es0boj6@4ax.com>
Source record: 79512

On 27 Sep 2003 02:29:21 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Ah HA!!! So, the fact that amateur radio operators DO use CW *is*
>relevant to the code testing debate, and the fact that that the other
>radio services which don't, isn't! Thanks for finally clearing that up.

That doesn't seem to be how the FCC (which is where the final decision
on code testing will come from) views it:

"We note, moreover, that the design of modern communications systems,
including personal communication services, satellite, fiber optic, and
high definition television systems, are based on digital communication
technologies. We also note that no communication system has been
designed in many years that depends on hand-keyed telegraphy or the
ability to receive messages in Morse code by ear. In contrast,
modern communication systems are designed to be automated systems.
Given the changes that have occurred in communications in the last
fifty years, we believe that reducing the emphasis on telegraphy
proficiency as a licensing requirement will allow the amateur service
to, as it has in the past, attract technically inclined persons,
particularly the youth of our country, and encourage them to learn and
to prepare themselves in the areas where the United States needs
expertise."

SOURCE -- The Federal Communications Commission
In the Matter of WT Docket No. 98-143 RM-9148 RM-9150 RM-9196
1998 Biennial Regulatory Review
Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's Amateur Service Rules.
REPORT AND ORDER
Adopted: December 22, 1999 Released: December 30, 1999

You may now proceed to thank me for finally clearing this up.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6099. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:25 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <uaqinvcmmii36p5qj8ifjpeo2cfmiof6ln@4ax.com>
Source record: 79519

On 27 Sep 2003 02:29:22 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Kim says my posts lack intelligence. I guess, from her POV, that may
>be true. She obviously defines "intelligence" as being in agreement with
>her, or supporting whatever she says or does. I can, therefore, understand
>why she would want to avoid further debate with someone with whom she
>would have to make an effort to defend herself. I'll say one thing for Kim --
>she knows how to look into a mirror and see a lost cause.

Now if only you'd follow suit, look into the FCC's report and order
from the last restructuring, and recognize what a lost cause it is
trying to retain a testing requirement that should have been
eliminated 25 years ago and will soon be eliminated regardless of how
may times the same arguments that didn't work last time are retyped
and refiled with FCC this time.

Qouth the FCC:

"We believe that an individual's ability to demonstrate increased
Morse code proficiency is not necessarily indicative of that
individual's ability to contribute to the advancement of the radio
art. As a result, we find that such a license qualification rule is
not in furtherance of the purpose of the amateur service and we do not
believe that it continues to serve a regulatory purpose."

Yeah, I'll repeat:

"...such a license qualification rule is not in furtherance of the
purpose of the amateur service..."

If you'll be so cooperative as to tell us which part of that you have
difficulty comprehending, we'll try to help you.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6100. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:26 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <toqinv0o657p5v318e3ligud5pt5g40fqu@4ax.com>
Source record: 79505

On 27 Sep 2003 02:29:22 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>Not necessary, Dwight. I was right the first time.

Heh...no you weren't - FCC dropped the 13 and 20WPM tests last time,
just like they'll drop the remaining vestiges of code testing this
time around.

There's still time for you to change your mind before a report & order
comes out, though...

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6101. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:27 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <vtqinv0gdvm1pinppbkgksdjcn1cevjtoj@4ax.com>
Source record: 79523

On Sun, 28 Sep 2003 11:59:17 GMT, "Dwight Stewart"
<stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote:

> Actually, once code testing is gone, the pro-testing crowd is not going to
>have much to say. I'm sure they're going to continue complaining about the
>new operators, but even that is going to have increasing irrelevance as
>their numbers continue to go down and new operator numbers continue to go
>up. Sadly, the pro-coders don't even seem to realize that all this is their
>own doing - their own behavior is responsible for their declining numbers
>(and perhaps, to some extent, even the removal of code testing).

You can call it sad if you want, Dwight. I call it poetic justice for
those who chose to value their own selfish interests rather than what
is in the best interests of the ARS.

>After
>talking to some of the pro-coders in this newsgroup, very few new operators
>are exactly inspired to continue talking to them (on the CW frequencies or
>elsewhere). By driving new operators away, they have insured their own
>decreasing numbers. And those decreasing numbers have seriously undermined
>support for code testing.

I'm not sure that the majority of CW users in the ARS shares the
zealousness that some of the PCTAs in here do. Unfortunately for
amateur radio, though, just as the squeaky wheel gets the grease, so
too do the most vocal among us tend to be the ones who are noticed by
the rest of the hobby radio community - and equally unfortunate for
the ARS is the fact that...well...shall we say, certain disgusting
substances...splatter when thrown at a specific target, causing what
the military refers to as "collateral damage."

The code test will soon vanish, and then hopefully we can get around
to the business of repairing the collateral damage that's been done to
the ARS in the process.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6102. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:29 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <1arinvsaj4osp5ebet63vuv9fj2v2aubns@4ax.com>
Source record: 79517

On Sun, 28 Sep 2003 08:22:21 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
>news:p2Adb.31920$ai7.31338@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
>>
>> Actually, once code testing is gone, the pro-testing crowd is not going
>to
>> have much to say.
>
>Do you honestly think so? I disagree.... at least for a stretch of time,
>anyway.
>It IS human nature, depending on each man's capacity and staying power,
>that is, outright fortitude, to eventually back off when they see that they
>have
>lost or are paddling up stream... and the time this takes, as I said,
>depends
>on the nature of each person's character... So, in the long run, I agree
>with you;
>they'll drop off in staggered two's and three's and dozens.. but for a while
>it'll be pretty nasty and, quite frankly, since the issue will be over I
>wouldn't see
>much point in continueing to debate them. You only think they're getting
>vicious and nasty NOW, just wait until they find thier security blanket has
>been taken from them in the name of "grow up, you're not a child anymore".

Obviously, you weren't a regular participant in this NG back in
1999-2000 when the FCC eliminated the 13WPM and 20WPM code tests.

If you go back and read their Report & Order from that action, you can
see that the writing has been on the wall for a complete removal of
code testing ever since. The last three years of quoting and requoting
the same drivel - on both sides of the issue - has been nothing more
than a diversion for its participants, myself included. The fact is
that unless FCC does a complete 180 on it this time around (and
there's really no reason to expect that it will), the code test is
already dead and is just waiting for the doctor to sign the death
certificate so that the undertaker can wheel the corpse away for the
wake and subsequent burial.

The wake will undoubtedly be held here in rrap, where many will call
it the end of ham radio (at least half a dozen other significant FCC
actions over the past 50 years were also termed to be "the end of ham
radio") and will continue to flame everybody in sight, especially the

newcomers to the hobby and the people who will upgrade from no-code Techs to General and Extra without the hindrance of a code test. No matter how many no-code HF ops make DXCC, they'll continue to read the same "Know Code, Know Ham -- No Code, No Ham" crap that's been posted on UseNet since the dawn of personal computers.

Childish? Yes, certainly...and the temper tantrums thrown by children who sense they aren't about to get their way is usually nothing compared to what happens when that suspicion is confirmed.

Fortunately, there are many others who have cooler heads and who will continue to value their participation in the ARS whether it has a code testing requirement or not. In time, their actions will influence most of the tantrum-throwers to wipe the tears from their eyes and see the light, and then ther majority of hams will return to the time-honored practice of extending appropriate respect to fellow hams regardless of license class or particular interests within the hobby...because in the final analysis, whether you're talking CW, phone, PSK31, SSTV, or operating model RC cars and airplanes with black flags on 'em, it's all ham radio.

> >Sadly, the pro-coders don't even seem to realize that all this is their
>> own doing - their own behavior is responsible for their declining numbers
>> (and perhaps, to some extent, even the removal of code testing). After
>> talking to some of the pro-coders in this newsgroup, very few new
>> operators are exactly inspired to continue talking to them (on the CW frequencies or
>> elsewhere). By driving new operators away, they have insured their own
>> decreasing numbers. And those decreasing numbers have seriously undermined
>> support for code testing.

I'm sure this applies to many, in this NG and out. In fairness, I must say that I don't think it applies to all, or even to a majority. If I did think that, I'd be tempted to return my license for cancellation rather than to give the impression of being a part of it. Bottom line though - I think most hams (on both sides of this debate) are above the nonsense that you refer to...and that's definitely a good thing, because I think the ARS is going to need the leadership of those with the cooler heads if we see a significant influx of newcomers to the hobby as a result of the elimination of the code test (and I think there's a very good chance that we will see such an influx). Those who are willing to accept them as fellow hams and welcome them into the fold and pass along the knowledge they'll need to help them grow in the hobby will be doing what ought to be done. Those who talk down to the newcomers, referring to them with the same variety of derogatory names that we see used here in rrap, well, I hope they won't act that way on the air too...I hope they'll think about what's best for the ARS and set a better example than that for the newcomers to follow.

>And on that point i'll agree with you totally, 100%. Within this newsgroup,
>as you said, they not only do NOT inspire any sort of good will feeling or give
>forth the same warm fuzzy glow feeling that the new hams found or thought to have
>found when they entered the community. One even posted "i'm appalled",

>saying he/she felt that what was SUPPOSE to have been a community of "friendly and
>cooperative hams" had quite it's fair share of conflicting personalities and
>ideology.

Well, that strikes me as perhaps a little bit of naivety (sp?) at work
there, because common sense dictates that if you get any sizable
enough group of people together, you're going to have people of widely
varying ideology and personalities in the mix. One should not be
surprised to find this to be the case.

What should be considered surprising is that any ham, regardless of
his/her personal interests or license class, should value amateur
radio so little as to stoop to placing their own selfish agendas ahead
of what is in the best interests of the ARS.

On the other hand, since I'm the one who keeps repeating that common
sense isn't really so common, perhaps I shouldn't find this so
surprising either.

>It's very sad. If the old gaurd hasn't understood or seen by now
>that the mentality of "you're a child and stupid, you need to do what we say"
>(and, in so many words, this is exactly what the collective thinking of the PCTA
>has been) isn't going to attract new hams, then they also don't realize the
>fundamental error that is resident within them, and that is THIS... a continued agenda
>such that they uphold will do far more to destroy ham radio than any change in
>testing requirements OR indirect problems (such as the current BPL
>controversy) will EVER do.

Well...in some cases that's just it, they don't want to attract new
hams, because new hams means more competition for the use of the
exclusive slices of the RF spectrum that the "old guard" you refer to
enjoys the use of. This certainly does not apply to everyone - I know
some guys who literally have been licensed hams longer than I've been
alive, and I don't think they have that attitude - but I agree that
every ham who does display that attitude is doing a disservice to the
ARS and to those of us in the hobby who try to look out for what is in
the best interests of ham radio, even if it means we sometimes have to
compromise what's best for ourselves.

>I have tried my darndest do continue to post, for the benifit of the
>undecideds and the new hams that don't quite know where thier ideological compass
>points to in this hobby yet that the problem isn't the mode of operation itself. I
>have even stated that my first many QSL cards were covering contacts made in
>CW. The newbies and undecides see now that the problem resides in the
>PCTA, for the PCTA will not argue the true debate but attempt to spin
>and twist it into something different... like many who support an erroneous
>idea, they attemp at ever turn in the road to turn the argument on it's
>axis and aim the very people instead of the issue. My honest feeling,
>due to my personal beliefs about human beings and thier psychology,
>is that the newbies will react (and have been doing so) toward this in a
>negative way (as far as the PCTA crowd's interests) and, in so many
>bloated but passionate words I have repeated just what you have.

>
>The PCTA have themselves to blame.

Only the ones who do so for their own selfish reasons, rather than doing it because they honestly believe it to be the correct thing to do. This does not, and is not meant to, excuse insulting fellow hams (especially in a public forum such as UseNet that is open for perusal by hams and non-hams alike)...I simply mean to say that it's one thing for someone's beliefs to differ from another person's, but it's entirely another thing for someone to ignore what they know is right because there's more benefit in it for themselves to go that route.

Often in life, what we say is less important than the way we say it. There's plenty on both sides of this debate who are, or have been, guilty of failing to recognize that. There are also folks on both sides of the debate who've been able to resist the temptation to get frustrated with the folks on the other side and open fire with both barrels. While I must disagree with their opinions, I can at least respect them as fellow hams and tip my hat to 'em for keeping it on an appropriate level.

As for those who can do no better than to hurl insults and derogatory names at anyone who doesn't share their own views, I can only take solace in the fact that their own actions will most likely preclude them from ever becoming leaders in the amateur community...and as far as I'm concerned, that's definitely a good thing, because leadership like that we can do without!

>My $.02 worth

And I, for one, thank you for it, Clint...you catch a lot of BS from some corners in rrap because people here like to trip others up on the least little error, but I think you're heart is in the right place, and that's the most important thing.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6103. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:31 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <tptinv8cua2hjj69g5mdp4d0m6bons219s@4ax.com>
Source record: 79515

On 28 Sep 2003 04:19:05 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
wrote:

>It was definitely the NCTA's who originated the code/no-code (testing)
>debate on Fidonet, then Usenet. At least, it was they who threw the
>first slings and arrows at the pro-coders (PCTA's) and making all the
>now famous accusations of us being politically-incorrect in every
>possible way, contributing to everything that is wrong in this world,
>and seeking to keep the ARS technically archaic. I was there from the
>beginning, so if you weren't, you'll just have to accept the word of
>those of us who were.

Back in the days when I was on Fidonet (fight-o-net), I frequented
CIVLIB and some of the other echoes where the gun control debates were
going on, this being around the time when Chuck Shumer and Dianne
Feinstein were perpetrating the Brady Bill and Sarah Brady was running
Handgun, Inc. with the intention of abolishing all private ownership
of firearms in the U.S.

The only radio-related echo I was reading back then was the SCAN echo,
where the late Bill Cheek was the moderator at the time, so I'll have
to take your word on who threw the first slings and arrows.

However, a few weeks ago I happened to be having lunch near a local
high school just as the students were heading home from school, and I
saw two boys get into a fistfight. It started with a smart remark from
one of the boys aimed at another. The recipient replied in kind.

There followed several iterations of, "Oh yeah?" "Yeah!"

Next came a push...then a shove...and eventually the first punch was
thrown. The fight lasted about a minute, with no clear winner,
although both participants ended up with bloody noses, their clothes
were pretty messed up with mud and grass stains and blood all over
them - not to mention a hefty helping of dog droppings since the lawn
they picked to have their fight on belonged to the owner of a large
Irish Setter - and so by the end of the affair, they both looked (and
undoubtedly smelled) pretty disgusting.

It occurred to me that if, at any point during the events leading up
to the first punch being thrown, either one of the two boys had
decided he was above this sort of thing and walked away from it,
neither of them would have ended up smelling like dog dung. Too bad
for them that neither of them was smart enough to do that, or at least
to suggest that they pick a cleaner lawn to fight on. Since neither of
them did, they both share the responsibility for the fact that they

both came up looking and smelling like s**t, no matter which of them tossed the original smart remark that started it all.

If it seems to you that I am drawing a parallel between this fistfight between two schoolboys and the behavior of some of the participants in this debate, it's because I am...and matters are compounded by the fact that this is not an isolated incident between two boys in a suburban city in the Northeastern U.S., it's right out here on the Internet for the whole world to see...and smell.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6104. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:32 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <84vinvkp5dlud5smondfsrfcdcs5rlm0bo@4ax.com>
Source record: 79524

On Sun, 28 Sep 2003 06:03:02 -0500, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
dot net> wrote:

>Well, it just doesn't stand the light of reason to say that those opposing
>the code testing were the first to raise hell when it was quite obvious that
>the tide of events were going thier way.

Originally, they didn't. The first proposal to institute a no-code
class of license (that could have been debated on a computerized
network such as Fido) was the Communicator Class license back in the
mid-1970's. That proposal was shot down, largely on opposition from
ARRL, and we didn't get a no-code license in the ARS until 15 years or
so later, by which time two generations of technically inclined young
people had found other things to do for a hobby instead.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6105. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:33 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <ahvinvgago6s6mbr84vajuarbkt19mi16o@4ax.com>
Source record: 79509

On 30 Sep 2003 01:37:25 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>WHO is doing the name calling? it's not the NCTA group calling
>>the PCTA "lazy", "stupid", and an assortment of complex insults
>>using spurious comparisons.
>
>Well if the shoe fits wear it you CBplusser

Is that what passes for an intelligent contribution to a discussion
down in Louisiana these days, Bruce? Or is that just another example
of you showing us how smart you aren't?

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6106. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:34 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <r41jnvgsmf0vdur850gjc4835ju1c4d3ph@4ax.com>
Source record: 79516

On 27 Sep 2003 11:01:45 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:

>Scoring would be on the basis of mistakes. If a word in the messages is missing
>or misspelled, that's a mistake.

How does one misspell a word when using a voice mode?

>If nonstandard procedure or phonetics are
>used, each deviation is a mistake.

Welp...that lets out half the contesters I know. Kilowatt Five Texas
Radio, please submit your license for cancellation.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6107. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:35 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <sl1jnv04ae19qpmf31k0a64bnqf6th23ji@4ax.com>
Source record: 79518

On 28 Sep 2003 00:42:49 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

> Well there it is folks, Karl the Nut is going to save Ham Radio. Just think
>Karl is going to put these Billion dollar companies in there place. Lets all
>bow to Karl the Nut for saving Ham Radio.

Well, Carl just told us what he's doing to work against the threat of
BPL. Now, what are YOU doing, Bruce? Anything at all? Or are you too
busy typing "CBplusser" into what passes for an NNTP client on AOL
interface to the newsgroups to be bothered addressing anything that's
actually important to the future of ham radio?

Your personal attack on Carl is really pathetic. Next time you decide
to bite someone's head off like that, at least swallow, that way
you'll have more brains in your stomach than you seem to have inside
of your head.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6108. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:37 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <l32jnvcd9ut9ginv8f6l5o2nhcsi13sk74@4ax.com>
Source record: 79522

On 28 Sep 2003 17:11:41 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

> We you say we, I hope you are referring to your CBplusser Buddies, because you
>sure dont speak for REAL HAMS.

At least he can come up with an intelligent comment, rather than
resorting to nothing more than insults and personal attacks like a
certain guy in Covington, LA.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6109. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:38 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <d82jnvkvbcn620haaani5gi5tb0apgptj8@4ax.com>
Source record: 79511

On 28 Sep 2003 14:06:57 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>> did you file comments, Bruce?
>>
>
>No I dont care

Why does that not surprise me one bit?

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6110. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:10:39 UTC
From: Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net>
Message-ID: <892jnv0ci4ot3989vjq8c5ut48dnmefs1t@4ax.com>
Source record: 79525

On 29 Sep 2003 01:50:25 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote:

>>The only reason Capt. Carl is "lobbying" is for his loyal Freeband minions.

And what are you lobbying for? Anything in particular? Or are you like
the other trolls on AOL and just get off on being able to insult
people without getting a punch in the nose?

> Capt Karl just hates to see his CBplussers loose

Do you mean "lose" maybe?

>out. He knows his constant
>complaining to the FCC has let them sneak this end.

Do you mean "sneak this in" or are you talking about football now
instead of ham radio?

>While Karl and his
>CBplusser Buddies, have been diverting the attention to giving all his
>CBplussers buddies a FREE RIDE.

If so, you fell for it big time, didn't you?

P.T. Barnum was right, there's a sucker born every minute.

> I think what really makes Karl upset is the fact that he now knows he has been
>used by the FCC. The FCC played Karl like a fiddle.
> Come on BPL let me be the first customer.

You'd sign up in a heartbeat, too, I'm sure. After all, you signed up
for AOL...

> THANK GOD FOR BPL.. How about us starting a "No-Code BPL Group"?

Go ahead, Bruce, start one. You can be the President, CEO, chief cook
and bottlewasher, and primary spokesperson of the largest ham radio
organization in support of BPL in the entire world! Why, with your
writing skills and well-demonstarted talent for public relations,
there's no doubt in my mind that you'll manage to get BPL accorded
every bit of the acclaim it so richly deserves.

Don't forget to start a BPL conference on AOL while you're at it,
Bruce - I'm sure the pre-pubescent chatroom dwellers on AOL will grow
up at a severe disadvantage unless they have you around to lead them,
and to teach them proper spelling and grammar skills, too.

In fact, you're a shining example of the finest that ham radio has to
offer, Bruce. I'm sure everyone who reads your posts to this newsgroup

is inspired to go out and get a ham ticket just on the off chance that someday they might be able to put your call in their logbook. If you're an ARRL member, perhaps you should run for section manager next time around. I'm sure the ranks of ARRL members in your section will swell to unprecedented numbers with your leadership.

In the seven years I've been on Usenet before now, I have only killfiled two persons. Congratulations on being the third.

73 DE John, KC2HMZ
Tonawanda, New York

6111. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:19:37 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930101937.10464.00000051@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 79526

> Do you follow your own advice, Bruce? If so, you must be wearing some
>really foul smelling shoes at this very moment because that would be the
>only shoes that fit you.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

WRONG DWIGHT, YOU ARE JUST WISHING YOU COULD BE AS GREAT AS I.

6112. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:20:28 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930102028.10464.00000052@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 79527

> We had this discussion before, Bruce. Remember? We decided in that
>discussion you had no clue what a real civilized human is.
>
>
>Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

Wrong again Dwight, we never had such conversation.

6113. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:23:04 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930102304.10464.00000053@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 79528

>The 5-wpm exam..."a form of toture," Dwight? Surely you jest.
>
>

When you are Mentally challended like Dwight it is a big blocker

6114. Re: The way to stop BPL

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:26:23 UTC
From: Dan/W4NTI <w4nti@get>
Message-ID: <jogeb.37817$pP6.35138@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79529

"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
news:VF6eb.177$qj6.120427@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> Kim W5TIT wrote:
>
> > "Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
> > news:oP5eb.156$qj6.105117@news1.news.adelphia.net...
> >
> >>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
> >>
> >>
> >>>Interesting to note that Dick just couldn't bring himself to mention
> >>>that I was the one who took the reporter out and demonstrated
> >>>the interference to him ... but I'm not surprised.
> >>
> >>Carl, you've noted that we should stick together on this one.
> >>
> >>Perhaps "we" doesn't include Dick?
> >>
> >>There was no insult toward you in his post, and I would note that he
> >>posted the link to the article, which no doubt he read, and no doubt saw
> >>that you were a part of the article.
> >>
> >>If we are to get together and fight this thing, it might be worth
> >>pointing out that not only should those who support Morse testing try to
> >>get along with those who don't - but the opposite is also true.
> >>
> >>- Mike KB3EIA -
> >>
> >
> >
> > That's a rather lofty goal, Mike, when considering that folks like
DICKhead,
> > Larry, and lately, you, act the way you do. Think about it. Most of
the
> > people to whom sheer disrespect is aimed at are the folks that have no
> > problem at all with those of you who love, appreciate and admire CW as a
> > mode and even the fact that you wish it to remain as a part of the test
> > requirement. But the lack of tolerance displayed by people such as
> > DICKhead, Larry, you, Dan/W4whatever, and others is overwhelmingly
> > despicable and beyond being able to "join" together for the cause. The
only
> > common ground that may be found is that we are all amateurs. And, I
doubt
> > you'll even admit that.

>
> Whoa there. Kim. Point out what exactly I have done that is so
> despicable. Is this some sort of thing where I stand up for Dick, then I
> am the same as him? I don't agree with everything he does. I don't care
> for him calling people names. I don't care for Larry doing that, I don't
> care for Steve and his Lennie stuff either. I've had discussions with at
> least Larry and Steve about it.
>
> Are you lumping me together with these guys because of that antenna
> thread here? I'm not calling anyone names, I'm even trying to make some
> technical input on the subject, rather than the
>
>
> > At any rate, what I'm saying is, don't look for agreement, pats on the
back,
> > or a joining of the hands. The behaviors displayed by folks like you,
et
> > al, make me quite untrusting of you, and not particularly interested in
your
> > thoughts--whether they be for or against the good of amateur radio. I
don't
> > care about amateur radio when I think of people like you being in it. I
> > don't speak for Carl; and I'm probably being a lot more blunt than he
would
> > be. But, understand, when it comes to tolerance of you guys--how can
you
> > possibly think there'd be any? Any at all?
>
> Sorry that you feel that way about me Kim.
>
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
>
>
>

Don't worry about it Mike. Twit has been slapped around, and now is fishing
for sympathy. Rots of Ruck.

Dan/W4NTI

6115. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:34:40 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930103440.10464.00000054@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 79530

>Dick Carroll and WA8ULX are two others who come to mind as having
>exhibited that attitude.

Its not an attitude its a FACT, we are superior

6116. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:43:10 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930104310.10464.00000055@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 79531

>P.T. Barnum was right, there's a sucker born every minute.
>

Your right, its called NCI members

>You'd sign up in a heartbeat, too, I'm sure. After all, you signed up
>for AOL...

Damn straight I would be the first if I could be.

>In fact, you're a shining example of the finest that ham radio has to
>offer, Bruce. I'm sure everyone who reads your posts to this newsgroup
>is inspired to go out and get a ham ticket

I hope they dont

>In the seven years I've been on Usenet before now, I have only
>killfiled two persons. Congratulations on being the third.
>
>73 DE John, KC2HMZ

Thank you sissy boy, but thats like most of you Sissy Boys, when you cant handle the truth you run and hide.

6117. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:44:42 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930104442.10464.00000056@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 79532

>Is that what passes for an intelligent contribution to a discussion
>down in Louisiana these days, Bruce? Or is that just another example
>of you showing us how smart you aren't?
>
>73 DE John, KC2HMZ

I thought you had me on Ignore?

6118. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:46:17 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930104617.10464.00000057@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 79533

>Now, what are YOU doing, Bruce?

Nothing Im all for BPL, they dont need my help they can do it all by themselves.

6119. Re: I have changed my mind

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 14:47:38 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930104738.10464.00000058@mb-m14.aol.com>
Source record: 79534

>Why does that not surprise me one bit?
>
>
>73 DE John, KC2HMZ
>Tonawanda, New York

Because I think BPL is a good thing.

6120. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 15:14:55 UTC
From: Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net>
Message-ID: <P5heb.46056$ai7.28280@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79535

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote:
>
> Computers listening for key words in the mid-60's. Hmmm.

That's what my father told me at the time (and I have no reason to doubt what he said). Of course, I was too young to know much about it (maybe about 12-13). I do remember the terminal in the bedroom and going to the building several times. I also remember the antennas (dozens of large vertical antennas in two circular patterns, a large outer circle and a smaller inner circle). You could see those antennas from anywhere on the base. There was also a large collection of smaller antennas. I also remember a little of what that equipment looked like inside the building, but obviously not any of the details.

Dwight Stewart (W5NET)

http://www.qsl.net/w5net/

6121. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 16:03:19 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309300803.9c3fc6b@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79536

"Kim" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message news:<blaqc2$n8c@library2.airnews.net>...
> "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote in message
> news:20030929222940.21642.00001310@mb-m01.aol.com...
> > In article <vnhl0oi1nmb755@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> > computron dot net> writes:
> >
> > >"Hans K0HB" <groupk0hb@earthlink.net> wrote in message
> > >news:5ee63311.0309290902.4bb5c4e@posting.google.com...
> > >
> > >>
> > >> But that's exactly what was suggested. Your words, written in a clear
> > >> English declarative statement are unambiguous and say "NO ONE should
> > >> be kept out of the ARS" --- that's pretty much the same as saying
> > >> "NO ONE should be denied a drivers license".
> > >
> > >see why the PCTA is accused of slant and spin?
> >
> > Nope.
> >
> > >I am pretty sure that the phrase "who passes the tests required by
> > >contemporary
> > >modern society" was implied.
> >
> > Wasn't clear at all.
> >
> > >If not, the part about "get thier license"
> > >pretty much
> > >removed any remaining "grey area" or misunderstanding.
> >
> > The word is spelled "THEIR", Clint. Turn on your spellchecker if you can't
> > remember it.
> > >
> > >> Personally, I think persons who fail the test (or haven't taken a test)
> > >> SHOULD be kept out of the ARS.
> > >>
> > >> 73, de Hans, K0HB
> > >
> > >that's what kim said.
> > >
> > No, she didn't.
> >
> > And, btw, what makes you think Hans is "PCTA"?
> >
> >

>
> Jim, I am really, really surprised that you failed to understand that the
> part about meeting test requirements was implied. I really am...
>
> Oh well...
>
Musta caught me at an inference-compromised moment, Kim. It wasn't
clear to me when I read it.

However, you have since rectified the ambiguity, so that the statement
would now read something like:

"NO ONE who has passed the required tests should be kept out of the
ARS"

How's that?

73 de Jim, N2EY

6122. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 16:12:38 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309300812.210385ba@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79537

"Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<5D4eb.8338$yp6.228429@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> news:c2356669.0309291302.64d8c737@posting.google.com...
> > groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
> news:<5ee63311.0309281048.70c4e1cb@posting.google.com>...
> > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> > >
> > > >
> > > > 1) Back in '78, the students learned Morse Code as part of their CG
> training,
> > > > so there was no other training needed for them to get Extra Class
> amateur
> > > > licenses. Today, they would need to put in some of their own time, and
> a bit of
> > > > effort, learning Morse at 5 wpm for that test.
> > > >
> > >
> > > You know Jim, the more I ponder this paragraph, the more I think you
> > > may just have hit on an important way of grading the dedication (and
> > > therefore "value") of any given amateur licensee.
> >
> > Well, that wasn't my intent at all. I was merely pointing out that for
> > some folks, getting a license involves a lot of learning and the
> > related effort, while others already have the skills and knowledge.
>
> The point is that licensing should be based on one's demonstration
> of the required qualifications, no more, no less.

That's your point, Carl, not my point.

The original story told how, back in 1978, the whole class of CG folks
went down to FCC and became Extras, while today none of them did.

My point was simply that there are significant differences between the
1978 and 2003 situations, such as:

- the 1978 class was 'required' to take the test, and means provided
to do so (do you think they went on their own time? used their own
transportation? paid any fees?).

- the 1978 class had already learned all they needed to know to pass
the 1978 tests.
>

> If someone already has the knowledge to pass the tests, fine.

You can't change that situation anyway.

> There is no "value added" in "making them work for it"

Who said there was? The point is that the 1978 class had a completely
different situation from the 2003 class.

> ... if
> they have the knowledge they are qualified, period.

So would you agree with Kim that anyone who can pass the required
tests should be allowed into the ARS?

>(and likely
> they worked for it or they wouldn't have the knowledge anyway,
> so the logic of "making them work (more)" fails)

It is a fact of human nature that most people value a thing more if it
took some investment of themselves to acquire.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6123. Re: Isnt it Funny (No-Code HF Privileges)

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 16:27:59 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309300827.e8faa69@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79538

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:<WQ9eb.37449$pP6.14806@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>...
> "WA8ULX" <wa8ulx@aol.com> wrote:
> > No-Coders have whinned about being forced to learn
> > CW to use HF. Now we have BPL come along, which
> > will provide MILLIONS of people use of HF without
> > taking a CW test. (snip)
>
>
> Isn't it amazing how unaware you are?

Dwight, given Bruce's many posts here over the past few years, I cease
to be amazed by anything he writes. Occasionally I am amazed at my
ability to decode what he has written....

> Millions of people with no CW/code
> skills have been using HF for decades. Of course, none of them (CB'ers) are
> members of the licensed ham radio community.

Are they the model we hams should follow, or should we take them as a
cautionary tale of what could happen to us?

This is not a trivial question. FCC created 27 MHz cb for a definite
purpose, but they quickly lost control of it to the point. The FCC of
1958 could not imagine that people would just ignore the rules to the
point that enforcement of said rules became impossible.

Why did rule-breaking on 27 MHz become the norm rather than the
exception?

> Instead, a couple hundred
> thousand Technicians did the right thing and "earned" a license

Why the quotes around "earned"? Anyone with a valid amateur radio
license earned it. (Licenses issued as a result of cheating are not
valid, of course, and FCC will invalidate them if sufficient evidence
of cheating is presented).

> to join the
> ARS, all without being offered even the basic HF operating privileges of an
> unlicensed CB'er.

Let's see.....cb user gets a couple of watts on 40/80 channels and two
modes (SSB and AM). Tech gets up to 1500 watts on every amateur band
above 30 MHz, if you just count the most commonly used modes (CW, FM,
SSB, AM, RTTY, packet, APRS, SSTV, FSTV, PSK-31, DSSS, FHSS, more TOR
modes than I can recall, fax, data,.....

Also satellites, repeaters, remote control, remote bases, and a bunch of other stuff.

Plus almost any new mode or technology that a ham can dream up, implement and document to the FCC.

Now which is the better deal?

73 de Jim, N2EY

6124. Re: BPL endorsed by FCC, another threat to HF ham radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 16:33:40 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309300833.34274d9f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79539

n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote in message
news:<20030928202920.02537.00000798@mb-m23.aol.com>...
> In article <d22b54c3.0309280702.f58c37b@posting.google.com>, kelly@dvol.com
> (Brian Kelly) writes:
>

> One of the big selling points is that you;ll be able to plug in your computer
> anywhere and be online thru the power plug. Ugh.

No problem, just run the 110v into one of yer USB ports . . .

> >I wouldn't be too sure of that, those old cable systems used 100%
> >analog technologies. If these BPL goobers use spread spectrum schemes
> >even a monster signal on a discrete frequency might not have much if
> >any interference effects on BPL.
>
> Yep. The adaptive system might just avoid that freq - or raise power to get
> through it!
>
> Worse, the way folks like Comm, Abernathy talk, the rules would be changed so
> that the licensed ham is the bad guy!

At which point ham radio would become another 27 Mhz. "behavior
problem", Riley would need to call up the reserves 'cause we AIN'T
going off the air.

> >I normally stay away from "political politics" in this NG and stick to
> >the usual code test politics but I gotta state that as a lifetime
> >moderate Republican I've about had it with the current
> >administration's slash and burn tactics across the board. All of 'em,
> >environmental issues, the Iraq disaster,
>
> WMDs? What WMDs?
>
> Connection to 9/11? Ooops, not really.

I can more or less shrug those, what really irks me is the complete
lack of understanding of the cultures in the mideast and points east
and the implications of those cultures as they relate to attempts to
impose western style democracies in those countries by force of arms.
One of the bitch points on Dubya when he was running against Gore was
that he's utterly clueless in the field of foreign policy. Bingo.
Welcome to Tikrit.

> Quagmire? What did Dan, W4NTI predict here some time back?

Seconds after we watched the second tower collapse I asked my brother
how many countries he'd bet we were gonna "inherit"and bungle. I bet
four. Two down, two to go.

> >the incestuous cowboy
> >cronyism and now this BPL crap.
>
> It's an environmental issue to the core. Which is why a true environmentalist
> is against BPL, and the "let's stripmine Yellowstone Park" folks are for it.

No, it's gonna become Disneystone Park . . and Haliburton will get the
no-bid contracts to build it.

> >Just for openers. I haven't voted for
> >a damned (wash my mouf') Democrat for forty years but I'm warming up
> >to the concept.
>
> Hmmm.....General Wesley Clark, anyone? Dr. Howard Dean?

Unfortunately. Dig up Harry!

> >That angle might be our only shot at killing this thing. There are a
> >number of heavy-duty federal agencies using the HF spectrum for very
> >important purposes and those folks are quietly running studies and
> >tests on BPL and it's potential impact on their operations. We'll see.
>
> I think perhaps the cooler heads at FCC may be simply taking their time and
> allowing limited testing so that:
>
> a) the election is next year and there may be some changes up top
>
> b) the opponents have maximum opportunity to make measurements and observations
>
> c) the truly rotten business model for BPL kills the whole mess. (You think
> those filters will be inexpensive? I don't, and they're just one component).

Methinks that yer point (c) is where the rubber hits the road if/when
all else fails. BPL was authorized and implemented in a number of
European countries several years ago and wound up falling flat on it's
face via capitalist econmomics. How stupid are these people anyway?

Never mind, been answered previously . . Tikrit, etc . .

> 73 de Jim, N2EY

w3rv

6125. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 16:42:23 UTC
From: kelly@dvol.com
Message-ID: <d22b54c3.0309300842.42e987a3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79540

wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) wrote in message
news:<20030929235725.11891.00000029@mb-m03.aol.com>...
> >My thought is that it's looking more and more like FCC has already
> >made up their minds, or maybe more accurately had their minds made up
> >for them. In that case, nothing short of Congressional action to
> >overturn their action will stave it off.
> >
> >That might prove a real problem given who is lobbying whom these days.
> >
> >Dick
> >
>
> My point exactly, you can send Millions of replys to the FCC, its not going to
> make any difference. There is way to much MONEY ridding on this thing, and a
> BUNCH of WHINNING Hams are not about to sway the FCC and BIG Money.

So what do you suggest? We should just sit on our butts and watch it
go down without a fight or what? Maybe when pigs learn to fly!

w3rv

6126. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 16:45:59 UTC
From: Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch th&#65533; &#65533;nfl&#65533;pp&#65533;bl&#65533; <Gr&#65533;mw&#65533;tch@NOSPAM.THANKS.IM.FULL.lycos.co.de>
Message-ID: <brieb.10146$NX3.3103@newsread3.news.pas.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79541

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:blaq1o$qtv@library2.airnews.net...

: .....phucking .... phinally phucking ....Good phucking

I love it when you talk romantic.

73 Barnabus Grumwitch Overbyte
--
"All persons, living or dead, are purely coincidental, and should not be
construed."

6127. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 17:23:26 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930132326.18927.00000082@mb-m15.aol.com>
Source record: 79542

>So what do you suggest? We should just sit on our butts and watch it
>go down without a fight or what? Maybe when pigs learn to fly!
>
>w3rv

You can fight all you want, if that makes you fell better. But Big Money is controlling this, and 1800 comments fron a bunch of Hams is nothing.

6128. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 17:55:13 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <hffjnvgin307t6lkjqcpfdue6sfuhmbfrj@4ax.com>
Source record: 79543

On 30 Sep 2003 17:23:26 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) poked his head out of the killfile somehow to stir the pot with the following negativity:

>You can fight all you want, if that makes you fell better. But Big Money is >controlling this, and 1800 comments fron a bunch of Hams is nothing.

Well,

As Yogi Berra once said - "It ain't over until its over..."

One question, though - would it be too much to ask for you to perhaps get on board with the rest of the Amateur community and work with us to fight this issue? We may lose, but to just give up would be much worse than fighting it. 1801 comments is better than 1800...

As an alternative, could I respectfully suggest that you transition to your replacement hobby early - we've heard as much whining and negativity as should be expected for the average group of humans to endure....

....unless of course trolling is your new hobby ;) - in that case, could you please torture another group? alt.whine or alt.troll, perhaps?

/ return to killfile

30, Leo

6129. Re: Echolink is great for those who..

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 18:15:43 UTC
From: Eric Oyen - N7ZZT <n7zzt_NO.SPAM_@hotmail.com>
Message-ID: <pan.2003.09.30.18.15.41.531892@hotmail.com>
Source record: 79544
Cross-posted to: alt.radio.amateur,rec.radio.amateur.misc,rec.radio.amateur.policy

On Tue, 30 Sep 2003 00:56:52 +0200, privacy.at Anonymous Remailer wrote:

>
> In article <pan.2003.09.24.12.03.35.348632@hotmail.com> "Eric Oyen -
> N7ZZT" <n7zzt_NO.SPAM_@hotmail.com> wrote:
>>
>>
>> and we still have to put up with idiots like you, no matter the band or
>> technology.
>> <...blah blah blah...> so don't gripe at us because of YOUR technical
>> and mental deficiencies.
>
> Says the no-code-technician twat.
so? you any better? just because I am no-code doesn't mean I don't
KNOW-CODE (I just never bothered to take the damned test, you dope!).

but then again, if all you can do is insult, that means you don't have
brains enough to really do something about it.

oh well, I fail to see where it's my problem anyway.

DE N7ZZT
Phoenix, Arizona

--
the difference between intelligence and stupidity is that intelligence
has its limits.

6130. Re: Leo's self-incriminating AGAIN...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 18:28:05 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <qohjnv85j833apcm56sm2o9am6soj90801@4ax.com>
Source record: 79545

Not really - read the message I replied to - the reply was just following the thread. (you know, replying to the content and in this case the criticism of *my* spelling in the message one up from this one.....). It was a bit of a cheap shot, I admit - the result of fighting fire with fire, I suppose.

As far as I'm concerned, the differences that Clint and I have had have been amicably resolved - we now know exactly where each other is coming from, and why - and peace reigns once again. We may not agree on all points - but we do share common ground, as do the majority of us in the group: see the thread "The Way To Stop BPL" for further details.

Beating each other up isn't going to resolve anything...there are issues we all need to stand together on. Some (like the famous Code / No Code question) simply have no right answer - and others (like BPL) threaten the hobby. Perhaps if we channel all of our energy where it will do the most good for the hobby, we can effect change.

73, Leo

On 30 Sep 2003 05:39:37 -0700, brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote:

>And so it goes.
>
>It would appear that you've run out of steam again.

6131. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 18:30:16 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F79CBB8.60401@psu.edu>
Source record: 79546

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ wrote:

> I happen to think it's a case of turf defending...the PCTAs feel they
> must defend their exclusive little slices of the RF spectrum at all
> costs, regardless of what harm is done to the ARS in the process.
> They'll kill the mother to save the baby.

What is a permitted method of expression, John?

- Mike KB3EIA -

6132. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 18:36:12 UTC
From: wa8ulx@aol.com
Message-ID: <20030930143612.07857.00000088@mb-m11.aol.com>
Source record: 79547

>wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) poked his head
>out of the killfile somehow to stir the pot with the following
>negativity:

You just couldnt stand not hearing from me.

>One question, though - would it be too much to ask for you to perhaps
>get on board with the rest of the Amateur community and work with us
>to fight this issue?

Im not against the ISSUE, I think its a good move for the common man. If Ham Radio cant figure out how to live with sharing, and Modern Improved Technology, then HAM RADIO most go.

>As an alternative, could I respectfully suggest that you transition to
>your replacement hobby early - we've heard as much whining and
>negativity as should be expected for the average group of humans to
>endure....

Well Im already involved in other things, but, I will hang around to see the final Demise of HAM RADIO

6133. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 18:57:49 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F79D22D.2060909@psu.edu>
Source record: 79548

Leo wrote:
> On 30 Sep 2003 17:23:26 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) poked his head
> out of the killfile somehow to stir the pot with the following
> negativity:
>
>
>>You can fight all you want, if that makes you fell better. But Big Money is
>>controlling this, and 1800 comments fron a bunch of Hams is nothing.
>
>
> Well,
>
> As Yogi Berra once said - "It ain't over until its over..."

This brings up something, Leo.

How about eliminating the Morse Code tests, and replacing them with a
test on Yogi Berra quotes? now there is something I could go for!! 8^)

- mike KB3EIA -

6134. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 19:53:04 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <Aaleb.3883$7d7.429@newssvr16.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79549

"Dan/W4NTI" <w4nti@get rid of this mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:7Y3bb.46625$Aq2.568@newsread1.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
> news:vmp78s79dmfee0@corp.supernews.com...
>
> Attempt you insults all you want to Clint. I still say you know nothing
and
> have no experience in the mode.
>
> If you don't run over 18wpm consistantly, and are able to sit down and
copy
> in your head. And have done so for years. Then may statement is true.
> You have no concept.
>
> And with you smart assed attitude you never will.
>

I'll have to take exception to that last comment, Dan! Clint obviously has
a dumb-assed attitude, not a smart-assed one.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

6135. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 19:54:25 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <kjmjnv8utmkkmjervbmgtfg27m9phensbh@4ax.com>
Source record: 79550

Hmmm - gotta admit, that's the first time I've heard that suggestion!

This calls for a couple more! <8^p

"Half the game is 90% mental"
"This is like deja vu all over again"

73, Leo

On Tue, 30 Sep 2003 14:57:49 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>Leo wrote:
>> On 30 Sep 2003 17:23:26 GMT, wa8ulx@aol.com (WA8ULX) poked his head
>> out of the killfile somehow to stir the pot with the following
>> negativity:
>>
>>
>>>You can fight all you want, if that makes you fell better. But Big Money is
>>>controlling this, and 1800 comments fron a bunch of Hams is nothing.
>>
>>
>> Well,
>>
>> As Yogi Berra once said - "It ain't over until its over..."
>
>
>This brings up something, Leo.
>
> How about eliminating the Morse Code tests, and replacing them with a
>test on Yogi Berra quotes? now there is something I could go for!! 8^)
>
> - mike KB3EIA -

6136. Re: Appalling...

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 20:10:19 UTC
From: dennis@wawa.juniper.net
Message-ID: <blcnvb$39k$1@heap.juniper.net>
Source record: 79551

Dwight Stewart <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote:
>
>"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote:
>>
>> Computers listening for key words in the mid-60's. Hmmm.
>
>
> That's what my father told me at the time (and I have no reason to doubt
>what he said). Of course, I was too young to know much about it (maybe about
>12-13). I do remember the terminal in the bedroom and going to the building
>several times. I also remember the antennas (dozens of large vertical
>antennas in two circular patterns, a large outer circle and a smaller inner
>circle). You could see those antennas from anywhere on the base. There was
>also a large collection of smaller antennas. I also remember a little of
>what that equipment looked like inside the building, but obviously not any
>of the details.

I've been trying to figure out who would have enough money to buy, and
the talent to make use of, the 1960's computing resources needed to do
real-time Morse decoding in any volume. The list of possibilities is
really, really short.

I know of a not-small number of advances in Information Theory and
Cryptography where it took independent academics several decades to
(re)discover what the NSA already secretly knew. I've also always
thought that people who assume the performance of available commercial
decoders on hand-sent Morse is an indication of the state-of-the-art in
what is possible are also making a big mistake, though this is a topic
of such decreasing relevance that independent researchers will likely
never get around to reproducing what may have been possible years ago.

Dennis Ferguson

6137. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 20:36:55 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu>
Message-ID: <3F79E967.30603@psu.edu>
Source record: 79552

Leo wrote:
> Hmmm - gotta admit, that's the first time I've heard that suggestion!
>
> This calls for a couple more! <8^p
>
> "Half the game is 90% mental"
> "This is like deja vu all over again"

For the future of the ARS:

"If you come to a fork in the road take it."

And to paraphrase:

"No one uses CW any more. The allocations are too crowded"

He the man!

- Mike KB3EIA -

6138. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 20:42:14 UTC
From: Leo <nomail@nope.org>
Message-ID: <9iqjnv4fbqv1j9lj6es6req7lj40du7nh6@4ax.com>
Source record: 79553

Mike,

Was that allocations, or allegations ....? :*0

73, Leo

On Tue, 30 Sep 2003 16:36:55 -0400, Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote:

>snip
>
> "No one uses CW any more. The allocations are too crowded"
>
> He the man!
>
> - Mike KB3EIA -

6139. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 21:16:55 UTC
From: Alun Palmer <elektros@yahoo.com>
Message-ID: <Xns9406AFC53722Delektrosmdonet@130.133.1.4>
Source record: 79554

<snip>
>
> It is a fact of human nature that most people value a thing more if it
> took some investment of themselves to acquire.
>
> 73 de Jim, N2EY

I think this is precisely why some people argue so vociferously for code tesing despite the lack of any logical arguments for retaining it. That is to say, they value it because it's hard instead of because it's necessary (which it isn't!!!).

73 de Alun, N3KIP

6140. Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 21:56:00 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309301356.4e2103d3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79555

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F79CBB8.60401@psu.edu>...
> Radio Amateur KC2HMZ wrote:
>
> > I happen to think it's a case of turf defending...the PCTAs feel they
> > must defend their exclusive little slices of the RF spectrum at all
> > costs, regardless of what harm is done to the ARS in the process.
> > They'll kill the mother to save the baby.
>
> What is a permitted method of expression, John?

I had been skipping over some of the "KC2HMZ" posts, mistaking
them for Bert...But NOW I remember why "HMZ" was familiar!

I find it unique that John takes the "turf defending" position
and makes the humorous suggestions about "kill the mother to save the
baby".

John was the listowner of an e mail reflector that used to "ban"
members from who didn't heel to his particular viewpoints and
opinions.

Unique how people who like to prevent others from expressing an
opposing viewpoint will jump on others for doing (allegedly) doing the
same thing.

How ya been, John?

Steve, K4YZ

6141. Re: Bowling for Ham Radio

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 22:02:33 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309301402.32ebab8f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79556

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in message news:<r41jnvgsmf0vdur850gjc4835ju1c4d3ph@4ax.com>...
> On 27 Sep 2003 11:01:45 GMT, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY) wrote:
>
> >Scoring would be on the basis of mistakes. If a word in the messages is missing
> >or misspelled, that's a mistake.
>
> How does one misspell a word when using a voice mode?

The messages would have a certain number of proper names and place names that would be uncommon enough to require phonetics.

> >If nonstandard procedure or phonetics are
> >used, each deviation is a mistake.
>
> Welp...that lets out half the contesters I know. Kilowatt Five Texas
> Radio, please submit your license for cancellation.

Is it really too much to ask that 'phone operators learn and be able to use 26 standard words for a test, even if they don't absolutely have to use them on the air?

oh wait - somebody asked that question about the 43 morse code symbols...

73 de Jim, N2EY

6142. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 22:03:15 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309301403.6ac5a0d0@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79557

"Clint" <rattlehead at computron dot net> wrote in message
news:<vn6sibe23ba854@corp.supernews.com>...
> > I think that sums up most of the posts here, even those of
> > persons who feign "superiority-by-virtue-of-enlightenment" such as
> > Clint.
>
> ah, I don't claim such, as i'll leave "enlightenment" up to left wing
> liberals in government that have absolutely no clue about the world
> outside of lecture halls, government buildings and lawyer's offices.

Or Amateur Radio beyond getting as much as possible for as little
as possible invested...

> I only take the facts as they are and deduce a conclusion, rather
> than take a passion-filled idea intermixed with rage against
> opposition and launch a scathing attack devoid of everything
> necessary to warrant a good debate and argument to back up
> one's claims.

No "scathing attacks" or "passion-filled" ideas here, Clint.

My tit-for-tat with Lennie and Brain is based solely upon what
THEY supply. I don't need to make any of it up.

You're getting there.

> > Practical experience dictates otherwise, but hey...When it COMES
> > to facts and practical expereience, that's where the Lennie Crowd
> > suffer the most.
> >
> > Steve, K4YZ
>
> learn to spell "E X P E R E I E N C E" (your spelling) first and then your
> credibility to pass judgement on other people will hold more water.

Ahhhhh...I seeeeeeee...."passion filled" only applies to those
who find themselves in Clint's crosshairs.

Taking Lennie's "If Ya Can't Beat Them, Correct Their Spelling
Errors" tangent, I see.

If I spell it "ekspyryance" the facts are still such that
Lennie's a liar, Brain says the liar is his mentor, and now you want
to join them...

What does that say about you, Clint?

Just curious.

Steve, K4YZ

6143. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 22:05:57 UTC
From: k4yz@aol.com
Message-ID: <5c01b95b.0309301405.398fc2b6@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79558

lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030924174228.07578.00000787@mb-m25.aol.com>...
> In article <vmvbh37m8aooe9@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> computron dot net> writes:
>
> >> WHOA, PUTZBREATH!
> > >
> > >Leo, an obvious PCTA, said this in a previous thread.. and I quote..
> > >
> > >"Not intellectual enough to make his
> > >point by rational arguement, he resorts to name calling and other
> > >juvenile tactics to 'get his way'. "
> > >
> > >oops.
> > >
> > >A PCTA just did that, not a NCTA type.
> > >
> > >Add "hypocrisy" to the list of the PCTA flaws in tactics and
> > >debate skills.
>
> Clint, you have to consider the ANONYMITY of this mighty, opinionated
> nobody.
>
> He (or she) hasn't the courage of their conviction to releal their identity.

Yet another typo made in anger, Lennie? That's what you acuse ME
of...

Your pool-pal Clint says spelling errors undermine one's ability
to be taken seriously.

Is that true?

Are you mad, or just not credible?

I say it's both.

Steve, K4YZ

6144. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 22:12:12 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309301412.1473f961@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79559

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in message
news:<buminvkdd1n6autjr5kahfmnpetmja1c47@4ax.com>...
> On 27 Sep 2003 02:29:23 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
> >In article <fvj3nvkkg4ecol929t1h477uqnfa3ts060@4ax.com>, Radio Amateur KC2HMZ
> ><kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> writes:
> >
> >>>>>Don't look now, Clint, but welfare programs are "handouts" that give
> >>>>>away valuable assets as if the recipient were entitled to them simply
> >>>>>by virtue of being there with his/her hand out.
> >>>>
> >>>>Correct. Therefore, code testing isn't a welfare program, it's a
> >>>>government-subsidized life-support system for an anachronism.
> >>>>
> >>>>73 DE John, KC2HMZ
> >>>>Tonawanda, New York
> >>>
> >>>Well, that's YOUR opinion, John. Thanks for sharing it with us.
> >>>You have a right to be wrong.
> >>
> >>What are you saying then? That it *is* a welfare program after all?
> >>
> >>73 DE John, KC2HMZ
> >>Tonawanda, New York
> >
> >John:
> >
> >No, you and Clint said that code testing was a "welfare program," and
> >you're both wrong.
>
> Ahem...kindly re-read the quoted material.
>
> Clint called it a welfare program.
>
> I called it a (all together now, class):
>
> >>>>government-subsidized life-support system for an anachronism.

by that logic, most of the General and Extra written exams are also
"government-subsidized life-support system for an anachronism" and/or
"a welfare program".
>
> Clint has subsequently elaborated on his comment, citing government

> subsidizing of the agricultural industry as one example, demonstrating
> that this is in fact what he had in mind as well.

What major industry in this country is *not* subsidized in some way?

> Now, then...once the government has stopped subsidizing the
> manufacture and testing of CW operators by eliminating the code test,
> how do you think we should reallocate the Novice subbands?

Reallocate them as special digital experimental subband. Allow any documented digital mode that will fit in the subbands to be used there. Including digital voice, image, and yes, Morse Code/CW. No arbitrary limits on occupied bandwidth or symbol rate as long as the signal fits inside.

If somebody wants to run "PSK-3100" and they can document it for FCC, fine, let 'em have at it.

Meanwhile, give the Novices and Tech Pluses more HF space than those four little slots.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6145. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 22:17:19 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309301417.6d8701f8@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79560

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F7978EA.5070208@psu.edu>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <vnhj92fiqbsef@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
> > dot net> writes:
> >
> >>WHO is doing the name calling?
> >
> > Both sides.
> >
> >>it's not the NCTA group calling
> >>the PCTA "lazy", "stupid", and an assortment of complex insults
> >>using spurious comparisons.
> >
> > it's not the PCTA group calling the NCTA "elitist", "arrogant", "luddite",
> > "stuck in the past", "jackbooted thugs", "stoked on morsemanship", and an
> > assortment of complex insults using spurious comparisons. Like "nazis".
>
> I think you'll be told "That's different".

Of course.

> Somehow, some way, some
> people are convinced that since they are "right" that civil behavior is
> not necessary.

As demonstrated by Bruce, Len and a host of others on both sides.

> Problem is not one of our positions is right or wrong. Its all opinions.

I disagree. Some positions *are* simply wrong. For example, polluting
the electromagnetic spectrum with BPL noise when many other, better
technologies exist is simply *wrong*.

Other positions, like the code test thingie, are really all about
opinions and nothing more.
>
> But then it is easier to just lump everyone together into two groups.

Sure. "Us" and "Them".

> Then dehumanize them, so that whatever you do is okay, and ends justify
> means.
>
And the answer is to refuse to play that game.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6146. Re: Amazin'....Ain't it...?!?!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 22:24:55 UTC
From: charlesb <n5pvl@sbcglobal.net>
Message-ID: <Woneb.11446$NV3.4976@newssvr31.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79561

"Steve Robeson, K4CAP" <k4yz@aol.com> wrote in message
news:5c01b95b.0309301356.4e2103d3@posting.google.com...
>
> I had been skipping over some of the "KC2HMZ" posts, mistaking
> them for Bert...But NOW I remember why "HMZ" was familiar!
>
> John was the listowner of an e mail reflector that used to "ban"
> members from who didn't heel to his particular viewpoints and
> opinions.

Hey, I think I've heard of John! Does he run the E-mail lists at TAPR? They ban hams who don't go along with the TAPR "party line". They even banned Hank Oredson W0RLI, who more or less invented packet BBS's and most of the operating standards for them - from the TAPR BBS special interest group! Hank offended TAPR by suggesting that hams use radio to communicate.

I dunno.... Maybe I'm getting him mixed up with John Ackerman. It was some kind of "John", anyway.

Charles Brabham, N5PVL

6147. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 22:25:29 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309301425.67e14ba9@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79562

Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F797D7E.4010505@psu.edu>...
> N2EY wrote:
> > In article <vnhlet21vqoj21@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
> > computron dot net> writes:
> >
> >>What about thier constant use of the term "CBplusser" and
> >>so forth...
> >
> > There is only one person who uses that term. He also claims to be 305 years
> > old.
>
> What is it with the application of one person's pejorative to everyone?

You mean like the person who called us 'nazis'?

> I've never called anyone a name here, and yet you and I are assigned the
> infamous "they" and "their".

Of course.

In fact, if you really want to get certain people mad, *don't* call
them a name.

> >>I don't know if THEY have kept up to date on ham
> >>radio violation records, but the vast majority of code & rule violaters are
> >>hams who've been in the hobby for many many years, have advanced licenses
> >>(advanced, extra) and thus have passed morse code testing.
> >
> > Your source, please? I read the "FCC enforcement letters", and there seems to
> > be a wide distribution of experience, license classes, etc.
>
> > One thing is quite obvious, though: the vast majority of enforcement actions
> > are against hams using voice modes. When's the last time a ham using CW in the
> > CW/data subbands was the target of an FCC enforcement action?
>
> I did a little research project on this a year or so ago. No vast
> majority of any license class as far as perps go. There were a bit more
> of the higher classes, but not significantly so. Techs were real close,
> and then there were the unlicensed. I'd have to say there was no
> significant difference in the license class as far as rule violations go.

Remember too that HF violations are usually audible over a much wider
area than VHF/UHF violations. The W6NUT machine is a local/regional
problem, while 3950 and 14313 are much more widespread.

How many of the enforcement actions were against hams using CW in the
CW/data subbands?
>
> >>The hams I
> >>have met personally that came out of 11 meters were the best hams I ever
> >>met. WHY? Because they KNEW where they came from, how nice it is
> >>up here, and have thus a respect for the advancement into a more
> >>serious hobby.
> >
> > Some of the best and the worst hams I have known came from 11 meters.
> >
> >>The foulest mouths i've ever heard were on 75 meters ssb, and one ham
> >>who's call I won't mention was denied advancement by hollingsworth HIMSELF
> >>(you can look it up on ARRL records).. he lived at the time in conroe,
> >>texas....
> >>he use to get just slobbering drunk on the radio and really raise hell;
> >>cussing,
> >>insulting, playing music, everything.
>
> > And what mode was he using?

Ahem...

> >>He passed the code requirements and
> >>written exam to advance to an even higher license, but recieved a letter
> >>from Hollingworth saying "you are not being given your upgrade, and
> >>furthermore, never will until I recieve a written letter from you explaining
> >>why you feel you DESERVE one."
> >
> > Was he using CW to do all that?
> >
> >>THAT ham was a long time veteran ham who had already passed a
> >>CW test. Therefore, any argument brought up that CW testing is
> >>a "yahoo filter" as they call it is wrong. It doesn't stop any such thing.
> >
> > He'd also passed several *written* tests on regulations and operating
> > practices. Those written tests didn't stop his behavior either. Shall we dump
> > the writtens because they are not a "yahoo filter" either?
> >
> > No test can be a perfect "filter".
>
> And never will be. There are incompetent and even evil doctors. And yet
> they have one of the most rigorous entry requirements there are.

Exactly.
>
> No requirements are needed to operate a transciever on HF.

?? I'm not sure what you mean by that sentence.

> We have to
> decide how much knowledge is needed. My only wish is that the
> requirements are enough that I know that the person is highly interested

> in the service.
>
Hard to measure "interest".

Fun fact: a few years back, the FCC modified a General class ham's license as part of an enforcement action so that he was limited to using CW only.

73 de Jim, N2EY

6148. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 22:27:47 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309301427.481351a3@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79563

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309300431.673f47fe@posting.google.com>...
> "Carl R. Stevenson" <wk3cqth@wk3c.com> wrote in message
news:<5D4eb.8338$yp6.228429@nnrp1.ptd.net>...
> > "N2EY" <N2EY@AOL.COM> wrote in message
> > news:c2356669.0309291302.64d8c737@posting.google.com...
> > > groupk0hb@earthlink.net (Hans K0HB) wrote in message
> news:<5ee63311.0309281048.70c4e1cb@posting.google.com>...
> > > > "N2EY" <n2ey@aol.com> wrote
> > > >
> > > > >
> > > > > 1) Back in '78, the students learned Morse Code as part of their CG
> training,
> > > > > so there was no other training needed for them to get Extra Class
> amateur
> > > > > licenses. Today, they would need to put in some of their own time, and
> a bit of
> > > > > effort, learning Morse at 5 wpm for that test.
> > > > >
> > > >
> > > > You know Jim, the more I ponder this paragraph, the more I think you
> > > > may just have hit on an important way of grading the dedication (and
> > > > therefore "value") of any given amateur licensee.
> > >
> > > Well, that wasn't my intent at all. I was merely pointing out that for
> > > some folks, getting a license involves a lot of learning and the
> > > related effort, while others already have the skills and knowledge.
> >
> > The point is that licensing should be based on one's demonstration
> > of the required qualifications, no more, no less.
> >
> > If someone already has the knowledge to pass the tests, fine.
> > There is no "value added" in "making them work for it" ... if
> > they have the knowledge they are qualified, period. (and likely
> > they worked for it or they wouldn't have the knowledge anyway,
> > so the logic of "making them work (more)" fails)
> >
> > Carl - wk3c
>
> Furthermore, if the US government wants to give all prospective
> amateurs 3 hots and a cot, and a paycheck, for the duration it takes
> to learn the code, I'd gladly enroll in the CG Morse Code school.

Thank you for illustrating my point so clearly, Brian.

6149. Re: Another Self-Humiliating LenniRiffic Rant

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 22:40:10 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309301440.c31c99c@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79564

brianburke@juno.com (Brian) wrote in message
news:<f45722ac.0309300452.6c787ecd@posting.google.com>...
> "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
news:<bl2q1m$7doa6$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de>...
> > "N2EY" wrote ...
> >
> > Do you think that a person can have only one writing style?
> > ____
> >
> > I agree that a person can have more than one writing style. In this case;
> > however, Len would have to work exceedingly hard to destroy any semblance of
> > writing ability. I believe he has too much of an ego for that.
> >
> > Arnie-
> > KT4ST
>
> And Bruce? Jim thinks he is a genius that presents himself as a "morron."

You are utterly and completely mistaken.

I do not think Bruce is a genius.

6150. Re: More on BPL..."This is serious, folks..."

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 22:45:54 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <CIneb.430$qj6.405420@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79565

Brian wrote:
> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F783EFC.5000201@psu.edu>...
>
>>Carl R. Stevenson wrote:
>>
>>>"Mike Coslo" <mcoslo@adelphia.net> wrote in message
>>
>>
>>< some snippage>
>>
>>
>>>>Agreed, Carl. I suspect that by the end of this sad tale, many amateurs
>>>>will think much better of the NTIA. Rather than mass emails, right now
>>>>an interesting and very good experiment might be to do a little HF
>>>>direction finding.Trace the "mystery signals" to their source. Write it
>>>>up in a reasonably good fashion, and it might make for some more damning
>>>>evidence against BPL.
>>>>
>>>>- Mike KB3EIA -
>>>
>>>
>>>Mike,
>>>
>>>You don't have to DF ... you can clearly tell just by listening when
>>>you're approaching, in, and leaving the BPL area ... and you can
>>>see the couplers they use to get the signal around the transformers.
>>
>>
>> I agree that it wouldn't be a difficult thing to find. I just think
>>that if an amateur or group were to take an approach that didn't start
>>out "I can hear the BPL intereference 60 miles away", it might have more
>>impact.
>>
>> Something like " On such and such date, a strong interference showed up
>>on such and such bands. As the interference did not do away, a local
>>group of amateurs and myself decided to trace the interference to it's
>>source.
>>
>> Then an outline of the DF method, and finally decribing the cause after
>>finding it.
>>
>> The point is that if people can easily trace out the interference from
>>far away, it hammers home that it isn't really a local problem.
>>

>> - Mike KB3EIA -
>
>
> Don't forget the 8X10 glossies with circles and arrows.

We use Power point now.......

- Mike KB3EIA -

6151. Re: Lennie's Double Standard Once Again Revealed...BY Lennie!

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 22:54:26 UTC
From: N2EY@AOL.COM
Message-ID: <c2356669.0309301454.6d7bc74f@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79566

k4yz@aol.com (Steve Robeson, K4CAP) wrote in message
news:<5c01b95b.0309282046.173d226@posting.google.com>...
> lenover21@aol.com (Len Over 21) wrote in message
news:<20030926142956.01893.00000845@mb-m22.aol.com>...
> > In article <20030925212928.14837.00003229@mb-m03.aol.com>, n2ey@aol.com (N2EY)
> > writes:
>
> > >How so? Would you rather that nobody replied to your posts?
> >
> > Not a problem.

Translation: Yes.

> > ALL you PCTAs can whip out the old "killfile" and hide
> > heads and eyes in the sand.

"'Scuse me while I whip this out...."
>
> > >Strong opposition to your opinions seems to really bother you. Correction of
> > >your mistakes enrages you.
> > >>
> > >> Since they can't support their view of retaining the morse code test, they
> > >> attack personalities.
> > >
> > >Who is "they"?
> >
> > All of the PCTAs in here.
>
> Actually just about everyone who dislikes someone who insists on
> forcing his uninformed opinion on them. especially where the person
> cannot document any practical experience in that discipline.

There's this profile.....
>
> > How do you she isn't?
>
> "How do you she isn't?"...Gee, Lennie...One of those typos that
> manifest when you are angry that you are always alleging...???

One penguin meets another penguin.

First penguin: "You look like you're wearing a tuxedo"

Second penguin: "How do you know I'm not?"
>
> > >Yes, you have, Many of your posts do not contain anything that indicates who

> > >you really are.
> >
> > There YOU are MISTAKEN.
>
> No, he's not.
>
> You have a screen name "Len of 21" that says absolutely nothing
> about who you are. Who's Len? "21" of what?

He sure ain't no "Seven of Nine", lemme tellya!
>
> In the last 24 hours alone you have posted several items with
> absolutely no signature, nor even your "LHA"

In the past 7 years, there must be thousands of 'em.

Remember when Len used the wrong screen name in here and outed
himself? Hilarity ensued.

Perhaps Len and Bruce are the same person.

How do we know they're not?
>
> > I've listed my employers in here...(SNIP)
>
> Only one of which involved Amateur Radio, and that one is no
> longer in business.

You mean "defunct"?
>
> >...and I've given names and callsigns to friends who are radio
> amateur >licensees.

And called other amateur licensees names.....
>
> And they have WHAT to so with YOUR licensure in Amateur Radio? I
> am friends with people who are accomplished surgeons, but would you
> want ME to cut on you?

I know a woman who had a baby. Does that make me knowledgeable about
being a mommmy?
>
> > My bylines in Ham Radio
> > magazine carried the same USPS address I have now.
>
> Charles Manson has had the same address for even longer. So
> what?

HAW!
>
> > Since you won't accept any e-mail attachments from me, the only
> > recourse for you seems to be a lot of flame war ignition attempts and
> > not bother to check anyone out.

>
> Since you have proven yourself as untrustworthy and are a
> documented liar, why would ANYone accept anything from you that has
> the potential to introduce a virus?

Or a Nigerian scam.

I may be ugly but I'm not stupid.
>
> > >In fact, for all anyone really knows, you could be someone else who has
> > >appropriated the persona of one Leonard H. Anderson.
> >
> > Think whatever you imagine.

I always do.
>
> Obviously it works for you, eh Lennie...???
>
> > I am listed in the Southern California white pages...my postal address
> > is not secret...you can hire a private investigator and have my neighbors
> > interviewed. No problem. You can also find yourself in a civil court
> > or (in some government districts) being investigated for harrassment.
> >
> > You have enough raw data to ascertain who is who. You don't want
> > to. You would rather have your little jollies in here making your
> > "opponents" look bad.
>
> You are no one's "opponent", Lennie.
>
> An "opponent" suggests that there is some potential for a
> challenge.

Good point.
>
> The only "challenge" you pose is holding down the laughter to a
> muffled roar. Your frequent lies, insinuations, insults and stories
> are so easily derailed that the only "challenge" posed anymore is
> directing some "newcomer" to review your past performance in this
> forum.

They're not lies, Steve. They are mistakes. A lie is when a person
intentionally says something they know to be untrue with the intent to
deceive.
>
> > Several more know me but there are over 600,000 licensed radio
> > amateurs who are NOT in this newsgroup.
>
> None that seem to want to join this forum and acknowledge it, it
> seems.
>
> > That's irrelevant to your little "cause" in this message, isn't it?
>

> Again, we ask the question "what does THIER licensure have to do
> with YOU"...???
>
> > You want to "run" this newsgroup because you are here so much and
> > spend so much time posting.
>
> Whoa...POT/KETTLE/BLACK again, Lennie.

Typical.
>
> > >I'm not misdirecting. 'vshah101' did not give a name or callsign, even when
> > >asked. But you had no problem with him or his anti-amateur remarks.
> >
> > YOU are MISTAKEN again. ERROR...you bad.

"Mongo but pawn in game of life"

> > Some individuals in here post against YOUR and PCTA viewpoints.
> > That does not make them "anti-amateur."
>
> "...against YOUR and PCTA viewpoints."...?!?!
>
> That should have been "...against YOU and YOUR PCTA viewpoints.",
> Lennie. But I guess you were too angry to recognize your faux pas.
>
> > You think of yourself as "representing ALL of US amateur radio" through
> > your expressed opinions in here.
>
> You assert you know how Jim thinks. How arrogant.

How mistaken.
>
> > You don't. You "represent" only
> > opinions and viewpoints of a small group of PCTAs who wish to be the
> > elite of the US amateur radio community...one way or another.
>
> And YOU represent...?!?! (Please be ready to provide some
> evidence of election or employment as such...)

Don't hold yer breath.
>
> > You don't "own" US amateur radio and never did, therefore you don't have
> > ANY judgement value about who is "anti-amateur" or even "pro-amateur."
>
> With over 25 years of PRACTICAL experience in Amateur Radio, Jim
> is far better placed to make an INFORMED opinion as to what may or may
> not be "anti" or "pro" Amateur Radio.

And I'm not fat, either.
>
> So far YOUR experience adds up to a few hours of time spent
> drafting articles of dubious originality, and obviously NOT directly

> pertaining to PRACTICAL Amateur practice or application.
>
> > >That's a fact, Jack ;-)
> >
> > Yes, Morrie, what I just wrote IS fact.
>
> It's a fact you wrote it. The rest is dubious.
>
> > >> The SUBJECT line of this thread is "1/4 Wave Dipoles."
> > >
> > >So? Subject lines never deterred you from going off in other directions.
> >
> > I posted IN this thread about dipoles. It's in Google if you've not
> > saved it to your HD.
>
> Uh huh.
>
> This from a fellow who routinely chastises others about straying
> from Amateur Radio related topics in this forum...Kindalike the 250+
> line tirade that this was quoted from.

prodigous output
>
> > YOU and some anonymous person want to use any thread as a
> > character assassination venue so that you can "get even" for all the
> > alleged "wrongs" committed against your radiogod personna.
>
> There's no "character assassination" going on here that YOU don't
> provide the basis for, Lennie.

Ya can't kill what ain't ever been alive in the first place...
>
> You lie, mislead and antagonize anyone who dares engage you in
> this forum.
>
> THAT is a DOCUMENTED fact, Lennie.

Mistakes, Steve, mistakes.
>
> > >You sound threatened and angry because someone has noticed your double
> > >standard of behavior towards anonymous posters.
> >
> > Not a problem to me. You MANUFACTURE a situation and try to exploit
> > it so that you have an excuse for talking bad about someone who has
> > opposite viewpoints to yours.
>
> Uh huh. SURE. Where's "Meghz" when you need him, eh,
> Lennie...???

Her.
>

> > All you need to do is search Google for a lot of PCTA general harrassment
> > such as from the hundreds of postings by "K4YZ" that go un-answered
> > because that kind of posting only serves to make the harrasser happy.
>
> The only thing "unanswered" to you, Lennie, is parts of my
> service record...non of which is pertinent here, and only serves to
> irritate YOU like a wet diaper...!
> BWWWHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHA ! ! ! ! ! !!

"Mommy - he did it first!"
>
> > >> This whole newsgroup was created to discuss-debate-argue the code
> > >> test issue.
> > >
> > >And other things. You are not the moderator, Len. Much as you want to control
> > >how things happen, you're not the boss here. Live with it.
> >
> > YOU ARE NOT THE MODERATOR EITHER, JIMMIE.
> >
> > LEARN TO LIVE WITH THAT.
>
> "Shouting" will not make your position any more valid, Lennie.
>
> YOU frequently insist on chastising others for exercising thier
> freedom of speech, Lennie, yet are quick to defend YOUR right to
> discuss whatever YOU care to discuss when it is pointed out that it is
> way off base from ANY Amateur Radio related discussion.

Of course.
>
> > >> It wasn't created for the sole amusement or daily guru column from
> > >> Jimmie Miccolis where he would sit in judgement of all others.
> > >
> > > It wasn't created for the sole amusement or daily guru column from
> > >Leonard H. Anderson where he would sit in judgement of all others.
> >
> > Are you "threatened" by all those others in here who have opposite
> > opinions from yours? Are you feeling "superior" because you espouse
> > the standards and practices of US amateur radio of over a half century
> > ago? Are you so intimidated by those who have the courage to think
> > for themselves AND to speak out?
>
> The wonderous and absolutely transparent fact here is that Jim
> routinely acknowledges and engages others CIVILLY who have opinions
> that are counter to his.

Not as well as K2UNK does, though.
>
> It is also absolutely transparent that the one who needs to
> engage in "character assassination" is you.

Zing!
>
> > YOU sit in judgement on everyone who does not consider morse code
> > testing as necessary. A very consistent judgement, a condemning
> > judgement as if you are a holy radio god.
>
> POT/KETTLE/BLACK once again, Lennie...
>
> > That's really a rather common syndrome of the PCTAs. They allow only
> > ONE viewpoint...theirs.
>
> Whew...third time is a charm...
>
> > All other viewpoints shall be put down, destroyed, those who voice them
> > shall be harrassed, hunted, and so forth until they stop.
>
> You mean like the bullying YOU exert, Lennie...?!?!
>
> Makes four.
>
> > That's a lovely example of dictatorial totalitarianism, the arrogance of the
> > squatters who feel they "own" the hobby.
>
> Five.
>
> > That reflects badly on the US amateur radio community when you PCTA
> > act that way. You are unable to present counter-arguments to NCTAs so
> > you call all their arguments "illogical, mistaken, or plain wrong" and then
> > want to harrass, intimidate, and humiliate them.
>
> Six.
>
> > YOU may not think such is "anti-amateur." Someone attacked your Ego
> > Turf and you think "anything goes" in "fighting" them.
> >
> > I'd call that Elitist, Arrogant, and Dictatorial but the Turf Fighters would
> > get
> > angry again...so I won't call it that.
>
> Good thing you didn't, Lennie...That wudda made seven.
>
> > I wonder what the FCC would call it if anyone there chanced to look in and
> > read what the PCTA think, say, and do in here?
>
> Since they have absolutely no jurisdiction in here, who cares?
>
> And by the way...remember this from the front end of this
> post...?!?!
>
> > >Yes, you have, Many of your posts do not contain anything that indicates who
> > >you really are.

> >
> > There YOU are MISTAKEN.
>
> This post was itself unsigned. A review of your AOL "profile" of
> "Len of 21" only reveals the response "male"...

Like I said - no "Seven of Nine"

> No name...no address,
> and certainly no evidence of Amateur Radio licensure or experience.
>
> Dang it Lennie...thanks once again for proving me right. You ARE
> your own worst enemy.
>

6152. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 22:56:17 UTC
From: Bill Sohl <billsohl@mindspring.com>
Message-ID: <lSneb.38204$pP6.30419@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net>
Source record: 79567

"Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
news:su9eb.37445$pP6.13174@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
> "Bert Craig" <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM> wrote:
> >
> > Then I'll answer it, Dwight. Because preparing for
> > and passing Element 1 requires one to demonstrate
> > a tad more effort and dedication than passing written
> > exams for which the Q & A pools are published. The
> > 5-wpm is sufficient enough of a challenge to require
> > some serious studying effort over approx two or three
> > weeks, but not enough to discourage any individual
> > serious about earning HF privileges. For those who
> > are not, the no-code Technician license is available.
> > It's really quite simple.
>
>
> Okay, now all you have to do is show where all that (demonstrated
effort,
> challenge, earning privileges, a two to three week study effort, and so
on)
> is listed in the FCC rules, or furthers the goals and purposes of the ARS.

Exactly. Bert's comment underscores the core of many who don't
give a hoot about having requirements that make sense...they only
want requirements which, by their measure, constitute a "show
of effort" on the part of all applicants. Sorry...but such a desire isn't
any part of FCC's Part 97 Purpose.

Cheers,
Bill K2UNK

6153. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 23:01:33 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <hXneb.437$qj6.410986@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79568

Radio Amateur KC2HMZ wrote:

> It occurred to me that if, at any point during the events leading up
> to the first punch being thrown, either one of the two boys had
> decided he was above this sort of thing and walked away from it,
> neither of them would have ended up smelling like dog dung. Too bad
> for them that neither of them was smart enough to do that, or at least
> to suggest that they pick a cleaner lawn to fight on. Since neither of
> them did, they both share the responsibility for the fact that they
> both came up looking and smelling like s**t, no matter which of them
> tossed the original smart remark that started it all.

Perhaps you grew up in a different area, John. When I was a kid, we moved to a different little town. I was getting picked on by some of the kids, a lot of it in places where I *couldn't* walk away.

My parents always told me that it "took a bigger man to walk away from a fight". In a backward way, they were right, as I had to be pretty brave to get my dose of punches, kicks and rock dodging every day.

Then one day, I decided *no more*, and shall we say, surprised the first kid that came after me. It cost him and myself an expulsion, but I made enough impression on the bullies that I had no more trouble from them.

I don't think the Bully analogy is quite apt.

- Mike KB3EIA -

6154. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 23:05:05 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <B_neb.439$qj6.411750@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79569

N2EY wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F7978EA.5070208@psu.edu>...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <vnhj92fiqbsef@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at computron
>>>dot net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>WHO is doing the name calling?
>>>
>>>Both sides.
>>>
>>>
>>>>it's not the NCTA group calling
>>>>the PCTA "lazy", "stupid", and an assortment of complex insults
>>>>using spurious comparisons.
>>>
>>>it's not the PCTA group calling the NCTA "elitist", "arrogant", "luddite",
>>>"stuck in the past", "jackbooted thugs", "stoked on morsemanship", and an
>>>assortment of complex insults using spurious comparisons. Like "nazis".
>>
>> I think you'll be told "That's different".
>
>
> Of course.
>
>
>>Somehow, some way, some
>>people are convinced that since they are "right" that civil behavior is
>>not necessary.
>
>
> As demonstrated by Bruce, Len and a host of others on both sides.
>
>
>> Problem is not one of our positions is right or wrong. Its all opinions.
>
>
> I disagree. Some positions *are* simply wrong. For example, polluting
> the electromagnetic spectrum with BPL noise when many other, better
> technologies exist is simply *wrong*.

Okay, I'll amend that. I was thinking of test requirements. I'd agree
that BPL is technically bankrupt and an idea of dubious "smarts".

> Other positions, like the code test thingie, are really all about
> opinions and nothing more.
>
>> But then it is easier to just lump everyone together into two groups.
>
>
> Sure. "Us" and "Them".
>
>
>>Then dehumanize them, so that whatever you do is okay, and ends justify
>>means.
>>
>
> And the answer is to refuse to play that game.

Pretty much.

- Mike KB3EIA -

6155. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 23:19:31 UTC
From: groupk0hb@earthlink.net
Message-ID: <5ee63311.0309301519.5d1920b5@posting.google.com>
Source record: 79570

N2EY@AOL.COM (N2EY) wrote

>
> It is a fact of human nature that most people value a thing more if it
> took some investment of themselves to acquire.
>

Jim, you really need to retire this old mantra.

'It is a fact of human nature' that real people don't value a thing
based on it's 'investment' or 'cost', but rather based on the
usefulness, utility, comfort, satisfaction, or enjoyment that comes
from having it.

My amateur license cost me virtually nothing in terms of 'investment
of myself', and the curbs and gutters the city just installed at one
of my places cost me an $8,200 assessment. I value my amateur license
a LOT more than I value the city's new street curbing!

The things that I value the very most quite honestly are literal gifts
which I have recieved without an ounce of 'investment' or 'cost' ---
the love of my wife, the smiles of my grandkids, the whisper of the
wind at sunset on Lake Vermilion, the conversation with an old friend,
or my healthy heart. I value all of these more than my homes, my RV,
my boat, or the QSL collection in the closet.

With all kind wishes,

de Hans, K0HB

6156. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 23:23:04 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <sfoeb.5184$Hd6.3048933@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79571

"Kim W5TIT" <kimscliff@yahoo.com> wrote in message
news:blaqc2$n8c@library2.airnews.net...
> Jim, I am really, really surprised that you failed to understand that the
> part about meeting test requirements was implied. I really am...
>
> Oh well...
>
> Kim W5TIT

It is the fact that people think certain things are "implied" that keeps the lawyers mighty busy. These days, if something isn't stated, it isn't considered part of the meaning or intent of the passage.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

6157. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 23:26:00 UTC
From: Bert Craig <wa2si@arrl.netNOSPAM>
Message-ID: <cioeb.22323$Kq4.15570947@news4.srv.hcvlny.cv.net>
Source record: 79572

"Bill Sohl" <billsohl@mindspring.com> wrote in message
news:lSneb.38204$pP6.30419@newsread2.news.atl.earthlink.net...
>
> "Dwight Stewart" <stewartx@STOPearthlinkSPAM.net> wrote in message
> news:su9eb.37445
> > Okay, now all you have to do is show where all that (demonstrated
> effort,
> > challenge, earning privileges, a two to three week study effort, and so
> on)
> > is listed in the FCC rules, or furthers the goals and purposes of the
ARS.
>
> Exactly. Bert's comment underscores the core of many who don't
> give a hoot about having requirements that make sense...they only
> want requirements which, by their measure, constitute a "show
> of effort" on the part of all applicants. Sorry...but such a desire isn't
> any part of FCC's Part 97 Purpose.
>
> Cheers,
> Bill K2UNK

Bill, I give a great big hoot about the regulatory stuff. I assume you're
referring to the regulatory stuff wrt "making sense," since you appear to
discount any form of testing which serves no "regulatory purpose." Exchange
"only" with "in addition to" and we're in agreement. ;-)

--
73 de Bert
WA2SI

6158. Re: Cw Contest, NCI members pse ignore.

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 23:39:45 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <5voeb.5189$Hd6.3053273@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79575

"Brian" <brianburke@juno.com> wrote in message
news:f45722ac.0309300449.297697fa@posting.google.com...
> "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net> wrote in message
news:<4c4db.4411$Hd6.2267245@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>...
> > "Arnie Macy" <kt4stnospam@csam.net> wrote in message
> > news:bkutul$6b3su$1@ID-166180.news.uni-berlin.de...
> > > "Brian" wrote ...
> > >
> > > That candidate stole the election in 1992.
> > > _____________________________________
> > >
> > > Ah, something to which we can both agree :-))
> > >
> > > Arnie -
> > > KT4ST
> > >
> > >
> >
> > Do keep in mind that finally some newspaper, under the Freedom of
> > Information Act, finally did do a recount of all ballots in Florida.
Some
> > six months later, the results were published and showed the election
results
> > would have been unchanged. Naturally this was printed as a filler at
the
> > bottom of the last page of the paper. It was available somewhere on
line,
> > but it's been so long ago now that I now longer have the URL and it may
have
> > been taken on the site by now.
> >
> > Dee D. Flint, N8UZE
>
> Did Florida have a recount in the 1992 election?

My apologies. I was thinking of 2000 and the mind reacted on what it
expected to see not on what was there.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE

6159. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 23:39:47 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <7voeb.457$qj6.422127@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79574

N2EY wrote:

> Mike Coslo <mjc5@psu.edu> wrote in message news:<3F797D7E.4010505@psu.edu>...
>
>>N2EY wrote:
>>
>>>In article <vnhlet21vqoj21@corp.supernews.com>, "Clint" <rattlehead at
>>>computron dot net> writes:
>>>
>>>
>>>>What about thier constant use of the term "CBplusser" and
>>>>so forth...
>>>
>>>There is only one person who uses that term. He also claims to be 305 years
>>>old.
>>
>> What is it with the application of one person's pejorative to everyone?
>
>
> You mean like the person who called us 'nazis'?

That's a real good example! We have a whole spectrum of people with a
whole spectrum of opinions in here. And some are too busy stereotyping
to actually find out what anthers true opinion is.
>
>
>>I've never called anyone a name here, and yet you and I are assigned the
>>infamous "they" and "their".
>
>
> Of course.
>
> In fact, if you really want to get certain people mad, *don't* call
> them a name.

I find that not ever responding to their posts works pretty well!!

>>>>I don't know if THEY have kept up to date on ham
>>>>radio violation records, but the vast majority of code & rule violaters are
>>>>hams who've been in the hobby for many many years, have advanced licenses
>>>>(advanced, extra) and thus have passed morse code testing.
>>>
>>>Your source, please? I read the "FCC enforcement letters", and there seems to
>>>be a wide distribution of experience, license classes, etc.
>>

>>
>>
>>>One thing is quite obvious, though: the vast majority of enforcement actions
>>>are against hams using voice modes. When's the last time a ham using CW in the
>>>CW/data subbands was the target of an FCC enforcement action?
>>
>> I did a little research project on this a year or so ago. No vast
>>majority of any license class as far as perps go. There were a bit more
>>of the higher classes, but not significantly so. Techs were real close,
>>and then there were the unlicensed. I'd have to say there was no
>>significant difference in the license class as far as rule violations go.
>
>
> Remember too that HF violations are usually audible over a much wider
> area than VHF/UHF violations. The W6NUT machine is a local/regional
> problem, while 3950 and 14313 are much more widespread.
>
> How many of the enforcement actions were against hams using CW in the
> CW/data subbands?

The next one makes one.

>>>>The hams I
>>>>have met personally that came out of 11 meters were the best hams I ever
>>>>met. WHY? Because they KNEW where they came from, how nice it is
>>>>up here, and have thus a respect for the advancement into a more
>>>>serious hobby.
>>>
>>>Some of the best and the worst hams I have known came from 11 meters.
>>>
>>>
>>>>The foulest mouths i've ever heard were on 75 meters ssb, and one ham
>>>>who's call I won't mention was denied advancement by hollingsworth HIMSELF
>>>>(you can look it up on ARRL records).. he lived at the time in conroe,
>>>>texas....
>>>>he use to get just slobbering drunk on the radio and really raise hell;
>>>>cussing,
>>>>insulting, playing music, everything.
>
> >
>
>>>And what mode was he using?
>
>
> Ahem...
>
>
>>>>He passed the code requirements and
>>>>written exam to advance to an even higher license, but recieved a letter
>>>
>>>>from Hollingworth saying "you are not being given your upgrade, and

>>>
>>>>furthermore, never will until I recieve a written letter from you explaining
>>>>why you feel you DESERVE one."
>>>
>>>Was he using CW to do all that?
>>>
>>>
>>>>THAT ham was a long time veteran ham who had already passed a
>>>>CW test. Therefore, any argument brought up that CW testing is
>>>>a "yahoo filter" as they call it is wrong. It doesn't stop any such thing.
>>>
>>>He'd also passed several *written* tests on regulations and operating
>>>practices. Those written tests didn't stop his behavior either. Shall we dump
>>>the writtens because they are not a "yahoo filter" either?
>>>
>>>No test can be a perfect "filter".
>>
>> And never will be. There are incompetent and even evil doctors. And yet
>>they have one of the most rigorous entry requirements there are.
>
>
> Exactly.
>
>> No requirements are needed to operate a transciever on HF.
>
>
> ?? I'm not sure what you mean by that sentence.

This is what my whole argument comes down to, Jim. There is ample evidence that a person, even one who is less clever than most, can put up a station, run some serious power, and come to no harm. People do it on the 11 meter band all the time.

Even on the Ham bands, a person can buy a modern rig, pay people to erect his or her antenna, and be on the air without doing anything but reading the manual.

Things are not what they used to be.

That some people like to homebrew can be considered as irrelevant now as the fact that some people like to use Morse Code CW. A person can use the argument that "If a person likes to build their own equipment, that's fine, but a person shouldn't have to be forced to test for electronic theory. Why should a person have to know Ohms law when they just want to run SSB or computer soundcard modes"?

In fact, modern radios could simply not allow themselves to transmit out of band, (some may already do so) so who needs to know band edges? Another thing not needed to test for.

Nothing is a foolproof filter, but the tests serve as one, both written and Morse proficiency tests.

While some decry this as an elitist thing, it is no more so than any testing regimen. We take tests to get into schools, graduate, drive a car, and do many things in life.

I'm not talking about the Morse code test specifically - for the purpose of the argument, throw it out and to hell with it.

What I am talking about is that we are at a juncture where we can go one of both ways. We can toss the whole thing, and actually just have people buy their licenses, or we can have some sort of minimal testing, or we can have some meaningful testing, where the person demonstrates some sort of proficiency and interest and has to put in some sort of work to get their ticket. Some might also want the prospective ham to be the equivalent of an RF engineer.

It's a whole spectrum of opinions.

>>We have to
>>decide how much knowledge is needed. My only wish is that the
>>requirements are enough that I know that the person is highly interested
>>in the service.
>>
>
> Hard to measure "interest".
>
> Fun fact: a few years back, the FCC modified a General class ham's
> license as part of an enforcement action so that he was limited to
> using CW only.

Oh the horror!!! ;^)

- Mike KB3EIA -

6160. Re: Some thoughtful comments from another forum on the code/nocode debate

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 23:47:51 UTC
From: Mike Coslo <mcoslo@adelphia.net>
Message-ID: <HCoeb.460$qj6.424344@news1.news.adelphia.net>
Source record: 79576

Alun Palmer wrote:

> <snip>
>
>>It is a fact of human nature that most people value a thing more if it
>>took some investment of themselves to acquire.
>>
>>73 de Jim, N2EY
>
>
> I think this is precisely why some people argue so vociferously for code
> tesing despite the lack of any logical arguments for retaining it. That is
> to say, they value it because it's hard instead of because it's necessary
> (which it isn't!!!).

And here I agree with you, Alun. Now, where do we draw the knowledge line?

- Mike KB3EIA -

6161. Re: where PCTA's fail in logic

Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
Date: 2003-09-30 23:51:00 UTC
From: "Dee D. Flint" <deehays@qix.net>
Message-ID: <EFoeb.5195$Hd6.3055586@newssvr28.news.prodigy.com>
Source record: 79577

"Radio Amateur KC2HMZ" <kc2hmz@aa-mail.removespamkiller.net> wrote in
message news:buminvkdd1n6autjr5kahfmnpetmja1c47@4ax.com...
> On 27 Sep 2003 02:29:23 GMT, yodoc@aol.comnospam (Larry Roll K3LT)
> wrote:
>
>
> Now, then...once the government has stopped subsidizing the
> manufacture and testing of CW operators by eliminating the code test,
> how do you think we should reallocate the Novice subbands?
>
>

Well since there are still people who hold Novice licenses, we ought to keep them as is. Otherwise the current Novices (who can renew until they die) will be losing privileges. Normally rule changes attempt to be done in such a manner that current licensees neither gain nor lose privileges other than those very specific to the rule being changed. I.e. dropping the code test would not eliminate the Novice or any other class. If the simplest approach is taken to this change (simply dropping the code requirement), we would actually have an immediate increase in people with access to the Novice subbands as all Techs, not just Techs with code, would now be able to operate there. So this should increase the need to keep these bands allocated to the Novice/Technician groups.

Dee D. Flint, N8UZE